PHILADELPHIA CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
July 17, 2012

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

Executive Director:	Gary J. Jastrzab
Deputy Executive Director:	Eva Gladstein

Chairman Alan Greenberger convened the City Planning Commission Meeting of July 17, 2012 at 1:07pm.

1) Approval of the Minutes for the June 12, 2012 and June 26, 2012 meetings.

Upon motion by Mr. Abernathy, the City Planning Commission approved the minutes for the June 12, 2012 and June 26, 2012 meetings.

2) Executive Director's Update

Mr. Jastrzab stated there are several items.

- **CALLOWHILL-CHINATOWN NORTH STRATEGIC PLAN** - Tonight there is a "kick-off" public meeting from 6 to 8pm at the FACT Charter School, 1023 Callowhill Street. This was funded by a matching grant fund from OHCD and from the William Penn Foundation. There will be a brief presentation about the plan, followed by a workshop and discussion. Purpose: to gather key issues to address in strategic plan.

- **CPI UPDATE** - Hosting six summer workshops to provide information on new Zoning Code which takes effect on August 22. The Workshop will address:
  - General purpose and limits of zoning
  - What is different in new code
  - Process of zoning applications
  - New procedures affecting civic organizations

  There will be 3 workshops at this location on Saturday July 21, July 28, and August 18 from 9am to noon. And 3 workshops at neighborhood locations on Tuesday July 31 at the Fishtown Rec Center; Wednesday August 8 in East Falls; and Saturday August 25 in Mill Creek.
  There is more information on the flyer.

- **ZONING CODE UPDATE** - There was a flurry of activity at City Council in June with regards to the new Zoning Code. Here is brief summary:

  - The Administration prepared two bills that were introduced into City Council on May 17th: the first, a series of "clean-up" amendments (#120431), and the second, a revised set of sign controls (#120430).

  - On June 21st, #120431 was approved by City Council, and the Mayor signed it. However, the bill was amended, and now contains only one of the many changes recommended by Philadelphia City Planning Commission, L&I, and the Law Department in the original bill.

  - These have to do with updating the City's floodplain standards to meet FEMA requirements. The dozens of other changes, the majority of which corrected typographical or grammatical errors, or clarified graphics, definitions, and charts, were excluded from the bill. City Council felt that

some of the changes were substantive, and they wanted more time for review.

- City Council amended *into* the bill other provisions, the majority of which came from a third piece of legislation, #120484. #120484 was introduced on May 24th by Councilmembers Henon and Green, but was never scheduled for a hearing.

- The major provisions added into #120431 will: 1) make the implementation of the stream buffer requirements of the new Zoning Code dependent upon Council action to approve the City's hydrology map; 2) remove caps on parking in commercial and industrial zones; 3) extend the existing zoning overlay for the Central Delaware Waterfront; 4) allow the Mayor to appoint more than one Civic Design Review (CDR) committee, and; 5) set a time limit of 150 days for CDR review.

- City Council also delayed its review of #120430, providing a revised set of sign controls until the fall.

- **RCO UPDATE** – The City Planning Commission has received a total of 217 applications (182 local, 35 issue-based). Our staff is reviewing applications and reaching out. We will review the list with District Councilmembers. We hope to announce the registry by the end of July. It becomes effective on August 22.

ITEMS IN ACCORD WITH PREVIOUS POLICY – RECOMMEDED FOR ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVAL:

Amendment to the Point Breeze Urban Renewal Plan, authorizing acquisition of 43 vacant properties on scattered sites; 40 properties will be used for housing, and 3 for side yards. These properties will be combined with other PRA sites for assemblages and marketed via RFPs. Proposal is for new and rehab, mixed-income residential, with affordable component. Back in May 2012, we recommended an Administrative approval for 41 properties, but PRA subsequently rescinded that Amendment, revised the property list, and is now re-submitting for 43 properties. The proposed uses are consistent with the Point Breeze Redevelopment Area Plan.

3) Report on the Public Hearing on PCPC Regulations.

Mr. Jastrzab stated the new Zoning Code becomes effective on August 22. That new code requires PCPC Regulations to be in place to implement established administrative procedures, such as for Civic Design Review (CDR) and Registered Community Organizations (RCOs). The Regulations had been posted online and the staff had 8 months to work on it. The Regulations were adopted by the City Planning Commission on April 17, and filed for public review. Under the Home Rule Charter, the public has the right to ask for a public hearing. We had the hearing following the City Planning Commission on June 12. The Charter requires a hearing report, affirming or modifying the Regulations. Today following the City Planning Commission action, these Regulations will become effective in 10 days. The Sections of the Regulations, where we are recommending tweaks to the Regulations, are minor.

Section 3: The Commission – the conflict of interest disclosure statement (3.4.2) required for entities submitting development plans to the Philadelphia City Planning Commission is too detailed and prescriptive. At the early stages of the development approval process, the entire development team may not yet be assembled, and penalties should not be imposed based on information that may change.

The staff agrees with this comment. The intent of this section is to have a reliable record of plan submissions and contact information available for the developer. A disclosure form will be developed to record basic contact information. The staff recommends deleting items 3.4.2.3 and 3.4.2.4, and revising this portion of Section 3 to read as follows:

3.4.2 Any person or entity submitting physical development projects to the Commission for approval (hereinafter called "Developer") must, prior to any action by the Commission, submit a disclosure statement.
3.4.2.1 Address of the project;
3.4.2.2 Name, address, telephone number, and email of the Developer; and
3.4.2.3 Name, address, and affiliation of each authorized Developer representative.

Section 4: Conduct of Meetings – Requiring Commission Agendas to be posted at least 7 days in advance of each meeting may be burdensome or unworkable. Requiring only 24 hours notice before a special meeting is too short a period for a development team to prepare a presentation to the Commission.

The staff agrees that requiring tentative agendas to be posted at least a week before Commission meetings will be very challenging, given weekly City Council meetings at which new legislation is introduced, and the difficulties of gathering, compiling, and analyzing complete information on development project items so far in advance of scheduled meetings. The staff is committed to the current practice of posting agendas as soon as possible, and at least several days in advance of all regularly scheduled Commission meetings. It should be noted, however, that under the PA Sunshine Act, the minimum amount of time required for notice of special meetings is 24-hours. Special Meetings of the Commission are called infrequently and usually only when there is legally-mandated time constraint for Commission action. Past practice has been to announce Special Meetings and post their agendas as much in advance as possible. The staff is committed to continuing this practice. Right now our current practice is to have it posted 4 or 5 days before our meetings. The staff recommends revising this portion of Section 4 to read as follows:

4.4.1 The Commission shall post agendas on the Commission's website in advance of each meeting.

Mr. Abernathy replied his is agreeing with staff recommendation.

Mr. Jastrzab replied if we were to have a timeframe of 4 or 5 days.

Mr. Abernathy replied to leave this as simple as possible.

Mr. Jastrzab replied our staff is ready to post the Agenda as soon as possible.

Sections 7, 8 and 9: we can take together. Review of Subdivisions, Master Plans, and Zoning and Permit Applications. The submission requirements are excessive. Specifically,

regulations 7.2.2.2.3 and 7.2.3.2.16 regarding sewerage, drainage, stormwater, and water supply requirements for preliminary and final plats are not in the purview of the Philadelphia City Planning Commission. Specifically, the text of regulations 8.2.4 concerning additional materials requested to "guarantee" a proposed master plan is consistent with the stated purpose of the district should be modified to be less deterministic. It is difficult to "guarantee" any outcome. Specifically, regulations 9.2.2 requires geotechnical date, elevations and renderings, and samples of building materials. These items are more appropriate for design review, rather than traditional planning review related to height, setback, access to sunlight, and adequacy of parking.

The staff is not imposing any new informational requirements for subdivision review in these regulations. However, the staff does recommend clarifying regulations 7.2.2.16 by removing the discretionary nature of this requirement. The amended regulations should read as follows:

> 7.2.2.16 The location, depth, and size of sewers, stormwater drains, waterlines, location of wells and cesspools or septic tanks;

The staff does need from time to time to ask for additional information in order to perform a thorough and effective master plan review. The staff recommends clarifying regulations 8.2.4 to read as follows:

> 8.2.4 The Executive Director may request additional materials as he or she deems necessary to guarantee that the proposed Master Plan is substantially consistent with the stated purpose of the district.

The staff recommends amending the text of regulations 9.2.2 to more clearly state the purpose for discretionary information requests, as well as to link such requests to the actions of the Commission. Also the staff recommends clarifying regulations 9.2.2.10 to remove an unnecessary requirement. The amended regulations should read as follows:

> 9.2.2 The Executive Director may require any of the following additional information to be provided on site plans, where necessary for the Commission to make a determination as required by the Zoning Code

Section 5: The Comprehensive Plan and Other Plans – Acceptance of plans by the community. The comment was that accepting the plan may not be bad policy because it sanctions the recommendations, intentions, and actions of entities that may not be fully subject to public review, or may not have the full support of municipal government. "Accepted" plans are not referenced in the new Zoning Code, and therefore should not be referenced in these regulations.

Staff and Commission have been accepting plans like these for several years now. Such plans are "accepted" only when the planning process includes a broad array of stakeholders and community members, is conducted through an open, public meeting process, and includes the City Planning Commission staff on the sponsoring organization's advisory committee to provide professional planning expertise and guidance. The intent of this regulation is to require such an open, inclusionary, and transparent planning process in order for any non-governmental entity's plan to be considered for acceptance. These "accepted" plans are intended to inform and provide guidance to the Commission in the development of the City's Comprehensive Plan and other Commission policy. The staff is sensitive to the

concerns of this statement, and recommends clarifying this portion of Section 5 to read as follows:

> 5.2.3 An accepted plan may be considered in the development of the Comprehensive Plan and other Commission policy.

Section 6: Recommendations on Legislation – Authorizing the Executive Director to make the recommendation on behalf of the Commission is cause for concern. The Home Rule Charter grants these powers to the Commission itself, and they should not be delegated to the Commission Staff.

The Commission's delegation of this authority is limited only to routine items for which policy has already been well-established on the basis of previous Commission recommendations and actions. No change to the regulations is recommended.

Section 10: Civic Design Review – There are 2 components here: 1 relates to procedure. One of the comments was that there was confusion for the by-right projects, which also requires civic design review due to size or the adjacency of other uses, and its submission for the CDR process deemed incomplete, regulations 10.4.1 prohibits it from being forwarded to the Civic Design Review Committee. As a result, without the CDR recommendation to the Department of Licenses and Inspections, the developer would risk revocation of their zoning permit. The developer's only recourse would be to appeal the "incomplete" decision of the Zoning Board of Adjustment. This is a faulty process. If it were incomplete, what would happen to the developer?

The staff recommends amending the text of regulation Section 10.4 as follows:

> 10.4.1 The Executive Director shall review the application and determine its completeness pursuant to the submission requirements delineated in subsection 10.5, below. The Executive Director shall forward the completed application to the CDR Committee.

Civic Design Review Guidelines (10.6) are too restrictive, and the word "should" is repeated often. Such usage mandates a requirement, rather than encouraging the Civic Design Review Committee to use its judgment in making recommendations. It also results in internal conflicts in the regulations, where a building "should" be built to the street line or "may" also be set back to accommodate public space (10.6.4.1). Another individual made a general comment that the guidelines need to be clearer.

The staff acknowledges that, and recommends CDR committee should do something. Change to CDR should encourage something.

Section 11: Nomination of a Neighborhood Conservation Overlay District – Nomination criterion relating to vacant lots and building, where eligibility is limited to areas not exceeding 20% vacant properties, should be removed. This will have distressed neighborhoods in need of conservation.

We are recommending two changes. The staff recommends amending the criteria for NCOs by also permitting area nominations to be recommended by the Philadelphia City Planning Commission staff. The adopted regulations authorized the Executive Director to only

accept nominations from others. The staff further recommends that only the proportion of vacant lots in an area be used as an NCO eligibility criterion, and that vacant building not factor into eligibility decision. As a result, the amended regulations should read as follows:

> 11.1 Nomination Criteria – the Executive Director is hereby authorized, on behalf of the Commission, to accept nominations and to make recommendations for NCO districts. The Executive Director shall not offer a recommendation in support of the creation of the NCO district unless the proposed district satisfies all of the following criteria:
>
> 11.1.4 No more that 20% of the NCO's area shall consist of vacant lots;

Section 12: Registered Community Organizations – The subject of RCOs drew more public participation comments than any other component of these regulations. At the public hearing, strong feelings were expressed both in support of, and in opposition to, RCOs. The testimony for these respective positions is summarized below.

In support of RCOs: It was stated that the purpose of RCOs is to facilitate communication between developers and the community, and will promote more transparent community engagement in the development process. Requiring developers to meet with neighbors through the RCO mechanism will promote the dissemination of information and open discussion. RCOs are not intended to disenfranchise any individual, who retains the right to express their views before any City board or commission.

In opposition to RCOs: Several concerns were expressed. Among these were that RCOs will be exclusionary; they will be unable to recognized individual views, and will represent the position of sanctioned groups only; they will infringe on the independence of long-established, but less mainstream community organizations; RCOs will have a chilling effect on allowing a diversity of views to be expressed by becoming the de facto voice of the community; and there will be a lack of transparency and accountability in the relationship between developers and RCOs.

The staff acknowledges and is respectful of the range of opinions. In the Code it is identified as a mechanism for discussions between developers and community. RCOs are identified in the new Zoning Code, as a community organization that is registered with the City Planning Commission and to which notice must be given for development projects requiring special exception, zoning variance, or civic design review. Extensive civic engagement on RCOs was conducted by the Zoning Code Commission, as well as the "Common Ground" process co-led by the Urban Design Committee for the Philadelphia Chapter of the American Institute of Architects and the Penn Project for Civic Engagement, in which community residents had an open dialog among themselves, and then with representatives of the development community. Following this extensive civic outreach process, RCOs were approved by City Council in the new Zoning Code and signed into law. And the Zoning Code calls on the Commission to establish regulations concerning RCOs.

The staff supports that right of any individual to voice their individual opinion concerning development projects before the City Planning Commission. The Commission will continue to offer such an opportunity at its public meetings. The creation of a public, civic design review process through a committee of the City Planning Commission will create an additional venue for such opinions to be voiced on matters on urban design, the quality of the public realm, and the beauty of our City. Staff recommends retaining the RCO components of the regulations,

but amending several of its provisions relating to qualifying criteria (including definitions of Local and Issue-Based RCOs) and registration procedures in order to be as clear and inclusive as possible. These amended regulations should read as follows:

12.2.1 Local RCOs – An organization must meet all of the following criteria to become a Local Registered Community Organization:

12.2.1.1 The organization's meetings must be scheduled on a regular basis, such as monthly. Meetings with zoning permit applicants as required by the Zoning Code must be open to the general public.

12.2.1.3 The organization must have an executive committee, board, officers, or other leadership chosen through elections.

12.2.1.4 The organization must have written rules, such as bylaws or articles of incorporation, that establish the mission and operation of the organization. The stated mission must involve land use, or a specific aspect thereof, such as zoning or development.

12.2.1.5 The organization's rules must establish the boundaries for the organization's geographic area of concern.

1. The geographic area of concern of a Local RCO shall be at least five city blocks and no more than seven square miles, except an organization that covers an area smaller than five city blocks, has been in existence as of December 22, 2011, and satisfies all other requirements provided in subsection 12.2.1 of these Regulations may register as a Local RCO. For the purposes of this subsection.1, "Block" shall be defined as provided in the Zoning Code.
2. Pursuant to the Zoning Code, a Local RCO's geographic area of concern shall be the same as the geographic area set forth in the organization's articles of incorporation, bylaws, or other governing documents.
3. Any changes to the limits of an RCO' geographic area of concern must be publicly announced through flyers, newsletters, newspaper notice, electronic or social media, or another form accepted by the Executive Director.

12.2.2 A majority of the organization's membership must consist of residents, property owners, business owners or operators, or tenants from the organization's registered geographic area of concern.

12.2.2 Issues-Based RCOs – An organization must meet all of the following criteria to become an Issued-Based Registered Community Organization:

12.2.2.1 The organization must have governing documents, such as bylaws or articles of incorporation, that establish the mission and operation of the organization. The stated mission must involve land use, or a specific aspect thereof, such as zoning or development.

12.2.2.2 The organization must be incorporated as a non-profit in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

12.2.2.3 The geographic area of concern of an Issued-Based RCO shall be greater than seven square miles.

12.3 Registration

12.3.3.4 An organization that allows its RCO status to lapse may re-register as a new organization during a subsequent registration period.

Proposed New Section 17: one of the Bills amended was to the Central Delaware Overlay District. The Philadelphia City Planning Commission comment: This section is related to the extension of the existing Central Delaware Riverfront Overlay District through a June 21st legislative amendment to the new Zoning Code, and the absence of any provisions in the adopted regulations for required Philadelphia City Planning Commission approvals of Plans of Development in this district. Regulations for such approvals must be added to the Philadelphia City Planning Commission regulations. Because the Philadelphia City Planning Commission regulations adopted on April 17, 2012 did not anticipate this "end-of-session" amendment concerning the Central Delaware Riverfront, they do not contain any provisions for Plan of Development approvals by City Planning Commission in this District. The staff currently operates under regulations adopted by the Commission in 2010 for this purpose. We are adding a sunset provision so that if Council passes new provisions for the Central Delaware Riverfront at a later date.

The City Planning Commission staff recommendation is support of these Regulations so that they could go in effect in 10 days.

Craig Schelter, Development Workshop, replied changes you have made we don't agree with all of them. We heartily endorsed what Brian Abernathy has said. If you are going to accept plans, you need to have a cost estimate to those plans. Regarding stormwater management, we don't understand the Commission's involvement since that has already been approved by the Water Department.

Mr. Greenberger replied regarding the 3 day notice. We are routinely pressured by developers to be placed on the agenda. If people can't get their information in a timely manner, they will not go on the agenda. Casinos are not plan of development

Ms. Gladstein replied the plan of development regulations are in place for that overlay.

Mr. Schelter replied special entertain district supersedes the overlay given the discussions on Council with this.

Mr. Jastrzab replied otherwise there will no process in place.

Mr. Greenberger replied we don't know where the next casino will be. We will know soon, if we need to make an adjustment to that.

Mr. Schelter asked what code do we go forward with and what is going to be the Administration's with regard to doing the CDO in the fall. It seems to us that it would be something good to have done and out of the way. Nobody quite knows how this came to be so quickly.

Mr. Greenberger replied we don't know either. We got in 18 hours before it happened. The people, who are proposing that, are Philadelphia based. It is pure speculation, he's sure the State saw that and they are going to get a license fee out of this. And maybe it was decided on that basis. We have not heard. We are going to keep our eyes on it. The good news is having been through this, we now know the right questions to ask.

Upon motion by Mr. Abernathy, seconded by Ms. Rogo Trainer, the City Planning Commission adopted the PCPC Regulations with the recommended amendment.

Mr. Greenberger thanked the Gary Jastrzab, Eva Gladstein, and staff for getting us through this. After August 22, if we see that things are not working, we encourage the public and Commissioners to come forward and speak up.

Mr. Greenberger replied he want to share the success of the City in getting suburban based companies to open up gateway offices in the City. The first is Bentley Software Systems at 3 Parkway. Two months ago, it opened an office with 30 people. The second one is Fiberman. Their business is cloud management. Our IT Officer referred to it as the dark fiber. They also open at 3 Parkway with 100 or more employees.

Mr. Greenberger left at 1:53pm.

4) *Philadelphia2035* Lower Northeast District Plan Update

Ian Litwin, Project Manager for the Lower Northeast District Plan, stated we started the planning process back in January for this District. We haven't been giving you an update until now because our Agenda have been so long. Next month we will present the draft to you. We will also have a public open house, and then a 2 month public comment. We will then have a vision plan, which we will present to you for adoption. It includes the neighborhoods of Frankford, Northwood, Summerdale, Oxford Circle, and Lawncrest. The southern boundary is the Frankford Creek, the eastern boundary is not quite I-95 (northeast corridor), and the northern boundary is around Cheltenham Avenue. The Lower Northeast is home to a number of landmarks and economic drivers that help give the district its unique character. These include Friends Hospital, a national historic landmark; the Frankford Transportation Center, where 17 bus routes connect with the Market-Frankford El; the Naval Support Activity, home to 5,900 military and civilian jobs; and the Globe Dye Works, an adaptive reuse of a historic industrial facility that is giving new life to the Frankford neighborhood. This is the fastest growing District in the City. Growth increase was in households. In 1990 the average household was 2.5 people. Today it is 2.9 people. Roughly there are 10,000 more people living in these households. We are projecting citywide for the year 2035, a gain of 100,000 people. Most of the jobs are in industrial and the military. Cardone Industries and the Navy are big employers in the District. There are 25,000 jobs and 35,000 residents. Over the past 6 months we have done a lot of outreach. There were 4 Philadelphia2035 exchange meetings with City agencies. We had two public meetings with over 90 attendees. We recently sent to all of the Naval employees a survey on how they get to work. We also did Code for America – Textizen that we also advertise on bus shelters and buses. We asked would you use public transit on Roosevelt Boulevard. Answer was yes. Would you use Broad Street exchange? Response was yes. At the first community meeting, we discussed the top destinations: Global Dye Works, Castor Avenue Restaurants, Naval Supply, Northeast Tower Center, Friends Hospital, Juniata Golf Course, Frankford Transportation, and Aria Hospital. The boulevard itself is a barrier; it's not pedestrian friendly. The Northwood neighborhood has the Juniata Golf Course and Friends

Hospital. At the second community meeting, we asked "Where should commercial growth be?" Overall the participants were supportive of more commercial development on the neighborhood commercial corridor, but noted the quality of life improvements must happen if corridors are to be successful. The neighborhood commercial corridors are along Castor, Rising Sun, and Frankford Avenues. We asked "Transit expansion or road improvement?" Transit expansion was the answer. "Where should the plan recommend investment in improving existing recreation centers or greenways?" General participation said investing in existing recreation centers. They offered a better opportunity to address broader community issues like safety, education and health. The Castor Avenue Commercial corridor had half of that 10,000 growth. The last one, Frankford Transportation Center – we would like to open a health center there. The next meeting will be at Global Dye Works on August 7 between 6 and 8:30pm.

5) *Information Only: 410 S. 2nd Street, a 70-unit residential development.*

Brian Emmons, Vice President of the Philadelphia office of Toll Brothers, stated throughout the last 8 months they have met with Society Hill Neighborhood Association, the Historical Commission, Historical Alliance, the South Street Business district, and the Philadelphia City Planning Commission. The site is located between Pine and Lombard on 2nd Street. It butts up against the shambles of the headhouse. It is zoned "C2"; it was rezoned to "C4" due to the sunset clause it went back to "C2". It is limited to 3-stories. There will be one story of underground parking, 69 units with 108 to 110 parking spaces. The entrance will be on Front Street with raised landscape bed and a green roof on the condo. The ground floor condos access right on to Front Street. The main condo entrance will go right to the elevators. There will be a private gated garden. The immediate neighbors didn't want people to be there that shouldn't be there due to South Street. We are working with the Society Hill Neighborhood Association. See if we can bring commercial to this are. On Front Street will be stone and masonry and glass. The elevator tour will go up to fifth floor. Two garage doors will go down to parking spaces. The balconies don't overhang the sidewalk; they overhang the building. The private courtyard will be using the same type of materials.

Mr. Lee arrived at 2:14pm.

Mr. Emmons stated they have received approval from the Historical Commission, and are working on a couple of details with Society Hill Neighborhood Association. It was going to be technically 5-stories, but it will be coming to ZBA and the Philadelphia City Planning Commission with 4-stories. We will need a variance for parking spaces.

Ms. Rogo Trainer asked could you explain the relative grade at the plaza level.

Mr. Emmons replied the first floor condo is 4 ft. above sidewalk, Plaza level is the same level as the first floor. One of the unique challenging is the existing walls that are there today. We don't want to tear down the walls to the neighbor's property. We are going to build foundation on existing wall. We are going to build a separating wall.

Ms. Rogo Trainer asked between their wall and your wall, there will be an opening.

Mr. Emmons replied they will be able to use it and we to suggest their home association maintain it. Some of the neighbors are concerned about privacy. Right hand on Front Street will be 3 to 4 ft., and a nice gradual slope on 2nd Street. We are working with landscape architect, and we are hoping to be able to present it to you next month.

Ms. Rogo Trainer asked why are they doing it this way.

Mr. Emmons replied like the way it looks and we don't want to dig along the neighbor's wall because they are not in good shape.

Ms. Rogo Trainer replied it is a modernist building, That is out of the scope of what we are reviewing. There are a lot of mixed metaphors.

Mr. Emmons replied he met with the groups there.

Mr. Greenberger returned at 2:45pm.

6) *Information Only: 52nd Street Economic Development Plan.*

Andrew Meloney, West Philadelphia Community Planner, and Aiisha Herring-Miller, Commerce Department, gave the presentation of this plan. It is located in West Philadelphia at 52nd from Arch to Spruce Streets. It is zoned "C2, C3, and C4". They have been working on this report for a number of years. It is located in a very transit accessible node where the Market-Frankford El stops. This area has large pedestrian activity. They worked very closely with Councilmember Blackwell. They started strategy in 2008 at Market and Chestnut Streets. In the 1980's, Lucian Blackwell put up the canopies**.** They have asked the Commerce Department along with Blackwell to remove the canopies. Part of this project use $400,000 to remove the canopies. They had a different type of hardship; they didn't have a CDC. They have an implementation plan as well. One of their goals is keeping the corridor clean and changing people's behavior. Working with Councilwoman Blackwell's office, she was able to pass an ordinance for the Business Corridor. Vendors must be compliant, have a license, etc. This Commercial Corridor is diverse between Market and Walnut. They looked at the storefronts themselves. The canopies were down over first and second floors. The Commerce Department is offering money for brick point, and lighting. This is tying everything to our Citywide Vision.

Kurt Constantine asked if there were any plans to improve safety along that corridor. Also there are vendors who well whatever they want. Like bootlegged items.

Ms. Herring-Miller replied we have been encouraging the businesses so that they can get security cameras on their buildings. The vendors are a challenge. They are working with L & I. We are not just going to give a kiosk to vendor.

Mr. Meloney replied there are some plans for streetscape like lighting.

Mr. Abernathy replied bootlegged items are illegal.

Ms. Ruiz replied you should contact the Police Captain in that District.

Mr. Meloney replied the Police Lieutenant had a few meetings.

Ms. Miller asked who is going to carry it forward at the local level.

Ms. Herring-Miller replied she is and some other people.

7) Acceptance of the *Lower Lancaster Avenue Revitalization Plan.*

Mr. Meloney stated this is a request to accept *Make Your Mark! Lower Lancaster Revitalization Plan.* They received money from Wells Fargo, and Interface. It has had it struggles. They want to celebrate the corridor. We are looking at Lancaster Avenue from 37th to 48th and the surrounding neighborhoods. It goes down to Market Street in the West Powelton Village Mantua/Walnut Hill, Mill Creek and Belmont. The West Park District Plan borders on this plan. They have had many steering committee meetings, he was on this committee. A large survey was done. This is a very comprehensive document. There are 6 sections in the plan concerning lighting, crime prevention, greening, and connecting Lancaster Avenue, like we did in the West Park Plan, tie streetscape into it. There will be greening on Lancaster. Infill development – there are pockets of vacancies some in Millcreek, Eastern Mantua, and Belmont. There are dangerous intersections with trolley lines in multiple directions and bus stops. There will be corridor management and the gateway. Second Friday is for artists. History is big. A lot of historic sites, mostly on the eastern side. We are looking to preserve the sites. The Citywide goals include shrinking the use of automobiles, TOD, on and off street parking, pocket parks, preserving historically and architecturally buildings in the District. The University South District Plan we will be working on in September. This is a document we will be using for a long time.

Mr. Abernathy asked about costs estimates. You mention grant funding.

Mr. Meloney replied Wells Fargo would like to do projections.

Ms. Miller replied don't want to raise people hopes because it will take years to do this.

Mr. Abernathy replied the idea behind the grants is great, but the planning and implementation will take a lot.

Kira Strong replied we did apply to Wells Fargo.

Mr. Greenberger replied find some easier going in projects that you can do. He has received calls regarding parking space in the area from the businesses in the area.

Gabriel Gottlieb replied he is a real estate agent in Center City and he lives a few blocks in this area. Councilwoman Blackwell did streetscape, but there is no pedestrian lighting.

Mr. Meloney replied yes, there is lighting between 34th to 63rd Streets along Lancaster. They want to keep hammering the Streets Department for pedestrian lighting.

Mr. Abernathy replied they don't want to take money for pedestrian lighting. You have to raise the money for it.

Mr. Greenberger suggested Mr. Meloney talk to Karen Fegely in Commerce about it.

Mr. Gottlieb replied it is a beautiful park, but it is not safe to walk at night. This is another place for lighting.

Ms. Ruiz replied in Miami there is a meter where they put money in it to light the basketball courts.

Upon motion by Ms. Ruiz, seconded by Mr. Abernathy, the City Planning Commission accepted the *Lower Lancaster Avenue Revitalization Plan*.

8) Zoning Bill 120635: Remapping the area bounded by Parkside Avenue, 50th Street (extended), Merion Avenue, 52nd Street, Columbia Avenue, and 51st Street, from "L3 and L5" Industrial to "C3" Commercial (Introduced by Councilmember Jones on June 28, 2012).

Martin Gregorski, Manager, stated this Bill came about from the West Park Plan. It is located at 5070 Parkside Avenue in the area bounded by Parkside Avenue, 50th Street (Extended), Merion Avenue, 52nd Street, Columbia Avenue, and 51st Street. This area is zoned "L3 and L5" Industrial. The party-at-interest is the Philadelphia Business Technology Center. Take this property and rezone it for "C3", so that it can be expanded without going to the ZBA. West Park Plan suggested this zoning action. We are going to recommend approval, but we will have to amend the Bill because it was introduced on June 28. The City Planning Commission staff recommendation is approval with amended maps that would include the new zoning districts which will go into effect in August with the new Zoning Code.

Upon motion by Mr. Lee, seconded by Ms. Rogo Trainer, the City Planning Commission approved Zoning Bill 120635.

Mr. Syrnick adjourned the City Planning Commission Meeting of July 17, 2012 at 3:07pm.

SUMMARY

1. Approval of the Minutes for the June 12 and June 26, 2012 meetings.
Approved

2. Executive Director's Update.

3. Report on the Public Hearing on PCPC Regulations (Presented by Gary Jastrzab).

4. *Philadelphia2035* Lower Northeast District Plan Update (Presented by Ian Litwin). Presented

5. *Information Only: 410 S. 2nd Street, a 70-unit residential development (Presented by Brian Emmons of Toll).* Presented

6. *Information Only: 52nd Street Economic Development Plan (Presented by Andrew Meloney and Aiisha Herring-Miller, Commerce Department).*
Presented

7. Acceptance of the *Lower Lancaster Avenue Revitalization Plan* (Presented by Andrew Meloney). Accepted

8. Zoning Bill 120635: Remapping the area bounded by Parkside Avenue, 50th Street (extended), Merion Avenue, 52nd Street, Columbia Avenue, and 51st Street from "L3 and L5" Industrial to "C3" Commercial (Introduced by Councilmember Jones on June 28, 2012; Presented by Martin Gregorski)
Approved w/amendments