PHILADELPHIA CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
September 21, 2010

| | |
|---|---|
| PRESENT: | Alan Greenberger, Chairman<br>Joseph Syrnick, Vice Chairman<br>Brian Abernathy, representing Richard Negrin<br>Nancy Rogo Trainer<br>Nilda Ruiz<br>Anna Wallace Adams, representing Rob Dubow |
| ABSENT: | Bernard Lee<br>Patrick J. Eiding |
| Executive Director: | Gary J. Jastrzab |

Acting Chair Joseph Syrnick convened the City Planning Commission Meeting of September 21, 2010 at 1:11pm.

Mr. Syrnick turned the meeting over to Alan Greenberger.

Mr. Greenberger stated we are going to do a few things here this afternoon, and he wanted to make all of the Commissioners and the public aware of this. As you probably know or may be know, the Mayor set-up this organization of Deputy Mayors to basically be coordinating people to be coordinating like portfolios. The portfolio under him is all of the development agencies. Of the 5 Deputy Mayors, there are only two of them that are in charge of other Agencies; which is a particularly difficult task. And he has the task, since the Mayor appointed him as Acting Deputy Mayor last year. He has also had the task of being responsible for the day to day operations of both Commerce and Planning. That is an enormous burden. So when the Mayor named him permanent Deputy Mayor, he asked me to step down as Executive Director of the Philadelphia City Planning Commission; which he announced today that he was doing. The Mayor asked Gary Jastrzab to step-up as the full time Executive Director of Planning. The bad news is, as Director of Commerce, he is returning as a Commissioner of the Planning Commission where he started.

1) Election of the Commission Chairman and Vice Chairman.

Mr. Syrnick stated the Mayor has recommended that our newest Commission, who is Deputy Mayor and Director of Commerce, to be elected as chairman of the Commission.

Upon motion by Ms. Ruiz, seconded by Ms. Rogo Trainer, the City Planning Commission approved Alan Greenberger as Chairman, and Joseph Syrnick as Vice Chairman of the Philadelphia City Planning Commission.

Mr. Syrnick congratulated Mr. Greenberger and Mr. Jastrzab.

Mr. Greenberger thanked Mr. Syrnick. He also thanked him for the year and a half of guidance to this Commission. He learned a lot watching him. And on some difficult issues we have had to face, he made notes on how he did it.

2) Swearing-in of new Commission Members.

Mr. Greenberger stated Anna, Brian and I have to be sworn-in as new Commission members. Which is something we have not done for either of you since we expect you would be alternates with some regularity. That is the right thing to do.

John Mondlak, City Solicitor, asked Alan Greenberger, Anna Wallace Adams, and Brian Abernathy to please stand and raise your right hand. Repeat after me:

“I swear that I will support, obey and defend the Constitution of the United States, the Constitution of the Commonwealth, the Philadelphia Home Rule Charter, and I will discharge my duties of this office with fidelity.”

3) Approval of the Minutes for the August 17, 2010 and September 7, 2010 meetings.

Upon motion by Ms. Rogo Trainer, the City Planning Commission approved the minutes for the August 17, 2010 and September 7, 2010 meetings.

4) Executive Director's Update

Mr. Greenberger stated he was supportive of Mr. Jastrzab, and glad to turn this duty over to him.

Mr. Jastrzab stated he was grateful for the support of the Mayor, Alan Greenberger, Joe Syrnick, the Commissioners, and especially the staff. We have a great staff and a great team. We have a lot of important work to do here, and we are going to continue that work forthwith.

He stated there are minor changes to the Agenda from the version that the Commissioners received last week. Items #9 and 10 are Zoning Bills relating to development at Temple University. Item #9 was on your initial Agenda. It's changed slight because it is a legislative Bill on this Agenda. Item #10 it was added, you saw this item in August, but this was a Bill that was introduced last Thursday in City Council. It implements your recommendation on the IDD amendment. Also item #13 was introduced on Thursday. It is a Zoning Bill on the reconstruction of I-95, and we will get into that later in the meeting.

- **Zoning Code Commission**

The Zoning Code Commission will be conducting 10 public outreach meetings. The first meeting is tomorrow evening at Holy Family University at 6pm. Those meetings will be occurring in September, October, and the first part of November. We hope that you will attend those meetings.

- **Philadelphia 2035**

Also relating to that kind of public outreach, staff is now in the process of putting in place, venues for a series of public meetings on the Philadelphia2035 Comprehensive Plan Initiative that we are undertaking. He will have more information on that for you probably at out next meeting. We are looking for those public meeting to occur at the end of October and beginning of November.

- **POD Regulations**

Also in your packet is a memo from our Law Department. At our August meeting Brian Abernathy asked the Law Department to confirm the 75 days period for City Planning Commission approval for Plan of Development in the Central Delaware Riverfront Overlay District, which this memo does. It confirms the fact that the City Planning Commission has 75 days under those regulations to approve plans submitted to us in that Overlay District.

- **Citizens Planning Institute**

He was happy to announce that the Citizens Planning Institute website went live this morning. Their URL is citizensplanninginstitute.org. He thanked Donna Carney for heading up that effort and getting that website up and running.

- **Item in Accord with Previous Policy:**

There is only 1 item in accord with previous policy. It's a redevelopment proposal calling for acquisition of 15 properties in the Model Cities Urban Renewal Area. The Model Cities Urban Renewal Area was established in the 1960s and it covers most of Lower North Philadelphia. It is bounded by Front Street, 33rd Street, Spring Garden Street, and Cumberland Street. The acquisition is for four development projects in North Philadelphia, including a new headquarters for APM and new housing in North Central Philadelphia and Strawberry Mansion. The acquisitions are in accord with the North Philadelphia Redevelopment Area Plan. We approved that administratively.

5) Review and Comment: East Logan Street Historic District Designation (Presented by Jonathan Farnham and Erin Cote, Philadelphia Historical Commission)

Erin Cote, stated the Historical Commission has received a nomination in the East Logan Street Historic District. The Philadelphia Historical Commission will consider the creation of the East Logan Historic District at its monthly meeting on 12 November 2010. The City's Historic Preservation Ordinance, Section 14-2007 of the Philadelphia Code, requires the City Planning Commission to comment on all proposed historic districts prior to the Historical Commission's consideration. Section 6.d of the Historic Preservation Ordinance states:

> "*During the sixty days prior to a [Historical] Commission hearing on designation of a particular historic district, the City Planning Commission shall review and comment on creation of the district and transmit its comments to the Historical Commission to assist the [Historical] Commission in making its determination.*"

The proposed East Logan Street Historic District is located in Germantown section of the City. It would be located on the north and south sides of E. Logan Street between Germantown and Stenton Avenues. East Logan Street is a 19th century suburban development comprised of 30 parcels containing a combined total of collection of 30 structures that includes single-family houses, carriage houses, garages, semi-detached houses and rowhouses. The houses on East Logan represent at variety of styles and are arranged along the street to create a stylistic romantic landscape. The majority of houses date from the early-to-mid 19th century, but the neighborhood also contains a collection of late-Victorian and early 20th century buildings that have been well incorporated into the streetscape. This part of East Logan Street is significant today as an early suburban streetscape that has survived remarkably intact from the period of its highest development in the 1870s and 1880's.

The criteria for the East Logan Street Historic District are A, C, D, E, and J:

A) "Has significant character, interest or value as part of the development, heritage or cultural characteristics of the City, Commonwealth or Nation or is associated with the life of a person significant in the past;

C) "Reflects the environment in an era characterized by a distinctive architectural style;

D) "Embodies distinguished characteristics of an architectural style or engineering specimen;

E) "Is the work of a designer, architect, landscape architect or designer, or engineer whose work has significantly influenced the historical, architectural, economic, social, or cultural development of the City, Commonwealth, or Nation;

J) "Exemplifies the cultural, political, economic, social or historical heritage of the community".

The Ordinance requires the City Planning Commission to comment to ensure that the Historical Commission's actions are compatible with the City Planning Commission's plans and policies. Therefore, the Historical Commission respectfully requests that the City Planning Commission determine whether the creation of the East Logan Street Historic District would accord with the City Planning Commission's long-range plans for the area.

Mr. Greenberger asked what that process is. Mostly is that a today issue? How does that work?

Jon Farnham replied the Historic Preservation Ordinance does not provide specific guidance, but it does provide the Planning Commission the opportunity to advise the Historical Commission whether or not the designation of this District would be in conflict with or are compatible with the Philadelphia City Planning Commission's plans for the area. Is this idea in agreement with the Philadelphia City Planning Commission's perspective?

Mr. Jastrzab replied from the staff's point of view, we believe that this is very supportive of the City Planning Commission's overall plan. You may remember a few months ago you adopted the Lower Germantown Transit Oriented Development Plan. This action is consistent with that plan.

Ms. Rogo Trainer asked about an area along Germantown Avenue.

Ms, Cote replied its mostly green space and a parking lot. It is vacant land.

Ms. Ruiz asked have you talked with the community about this issue. Because once it becomes a historic district, they would be required to maintain it at a certain standard.

Mr. Farnham replied at this point and for the past several years the Historical Commission has not submitted a nomination for a Historic District. That has come up from communities, also this has as well. This development issue has come up at a series of community meetings, and this nomination was prepared by the community itself.

Mr. Greenberger asked if this is normal for a relatively small district, which is hard. Is it normal to have an additional land, in which is made a part of the district plan to call a buffer?

Mr. Farnham replied it is not normal. The Historic Preservation Ordinance would not exclude it if in fact it is included in the district. The request is coming from the community. The Historical Commission could amend the boundaries of this district to exclude the vacant parcel.

Mr. Abernathy asked who owns and maintains the green space. What does that green space contribute as a whole?

Ms. Cote replied the community feels it contributes as a buffer. She doesn't know who the owner is.

Mr. Farnham replied privately owned. It was an industrial site. The Historical Commission staff's intention is to inform you this parcels district the argument could be made that it doesn't contribute to historic site. The fact that it is now green space, they feel that the historic district should preserve this space.

Mr. Greenberger replied it is a funny shape and not terribly developable in any case, but it makes him nervous that we are setting a precedence for anybody that they need a green space for a buffer that is significantly bigger that does in fact impinge on other people's property rights.

Ms. Rogo Trainer replied particularly where it is on Germantown Avenue that the green space looks like someone's backyard and doesn't contribute to the character of the district.

Mr. Greenberger replied that you should look at it very carefully and make sure it doesn't add to the Historic District, unless you found that it meets legitimate criteria for your analysis.

Mr. Farnham replied thus far we see no evidence.

Mr. Jerry Gibnish stated he is part of the neighborhood group who is hoping that the East Logan Street becomes a Historic District. The land in question was formerly Rockland Street. It was closed off for corporate use. So it was a City street at one time; now it's over grown. The neighbors would like to develop it as a garden and recreation; and prevent development that would jeopardize the historical character of East Logan. The property was recently part of the Germantown Charter School. He thinks the Councilwoman donated the use for the Charter School. The Charter School was de-certified. So now they are interested in leaving it for the community's use. The community has no funds. It is an historically important section of Germantown. The burial ground, where some Native Americans are buried, goes back to the early 18th century. On the corner of Logan on 3 acres of property is an early 19th century mansion. A former Mayor of Philadelphia's house is on the corner of Germantown and Logan. Mr. Gibnish's house and his neighbor's house goes back to 1760's and 1780's. First White House was a quarter of a mile on Germantown and School House Land. So this should be preserved; although as you have cited there are many problems turning it into recreation.

*6) Philadelphia2035 Update*

Alan Urek, Division Director of Strategic Planning and Policy, stated the focus on most of his presentation is on the work they have been doing on the Philadelphia2035 Plan, modeling development scenarios across the City. You will recall we are working on a schedule of a one year timetable to complete the Citywide portion of the Comprehensive Plan. We are in the third quarter of that work, that we call drafting. We are drafting in terms of developing strategies, recommendations, and objectives. It is our intent toward the end of this year or the beginning of 2011 to have a Citywide Plan that will enable us to do a Citywide District process. We recently had an Advisory Board meeting, and last week we had a Working Group meeting. These are

groups of experts who shape our recommendations as we move forward. As Gary has mentioned, we will be having more public meetings in October and November. This shows the outline of the document that we are preparing, it will be a 4 chapter Citywide Plan. The first chapter, the introductory chapter will be what's the reason behind planning Philadelphia. The second chapter is a major chapter on the existing content what Philadelphia might look like in the year 2035. The third chapter is the real substance of the book. It will list all of the various goals, objectives, and strategies for actions cluster under the 2 themes that we have been talking about: Thrive, Connect, and Renew. There will be an elaborate matrix that shows how all of the recommendations relate to various benefits for economic development, public health, environment, sustainability and so on. The last chapter will focus on how we are going to implement the plan with all of our various City partners in government and private sector. This summer we completed the communications plan with Sage Communication Partners. It is going to help us put together the work of the Zoning Code Commission and the Citizens Planning Institute in the Philadelphia2035 network; that we are clearly articulating the various purposes of those efforts and making the public and others understand how they relate. You will recall we talked about the integrated zoning and planning process. We are very deeply involved in trying the costs estimates for applicable implementation plus the operations of various recommendations will float in the plan. From both our Advisory Board and our Working Group that they model the cost against the benefits all of that information that puts them in the plan be in terms of the cost savings over time. It has become quite expensive. We will have a fairly large capital cost associated with it. We are doing that over a 3 different time frame: short term, medium term, and long term; and will identify the agencies and entities responsible. That is high lights of some of the major work we have done. Now he spoke of the process of modeling development scenario. He acknowledged a few people. We had a great amount of support from Guy Thigpen, from the Redevelopment Authority, who really worked with us on a program called Community VIZ to develop these scenarios. He wanted to publicly acknowledge his great help and on our staff: David Fecteau, John Haak, and Jametta Johnson, and Octavia Hall, who left to have a baby a few months ago, she began this investigation of how we could use this scenario and technology. And the short story is that it depends on 2 sides to that equation. What is the supply to the sustainably land for redevelopment? What is demand to building out for 25 years based on the assumptions of the equation growth? Throwing into this model using the assumptions as fact that and coming up with alternatives. He wanted to show some examples of how this was being used as a tool for our plan as we move ahead. This is being done in parallel with developing all of those other strategies. Recommendations begin to merge the two as we get closer to the conclusions to this. The first is quite an accomplishment, an up-to-date land use base in Philadelphia. The purple color is industrial, the yellow is residential, the red is commercial, and the green is open space. First thing we do as part of this modeling is try to build an understanding of how this block, we are using Census blocks to measure the number of parcels, are susceptible to change. The factors we are looking at help to indicate the matter of vacant land or vacant building is on those lots, whether or not the ownership, the investment, the conditions of the structures and non-accessory parking lots are usually an indication of the non-use of the parcel. So those are the factors that we determined will help identify what is susceptible to change. We ran that through the City's log for some understanding. Everything that is blue is least susceptible to change. It has a use on it or a development that is not likely to be changing over the next 25 years. The yellow ones are the one that would be moderately susceptible to change. The purple ones are coming up as highly susceptible to change. So we consider those blocks that are moderately and highly susceptible to change and start to understand what are they suitable for in terms of their future development. And we developed another list of factors that helped to influence the decisions about how suitable different blocks are for different types of uses have different influences on adjacent blocks suitability per different use. For instance, open space has a pretty high influence on residential development

and is seen as a positive factor for attracting residential development into it, whereas, it would not be as attractive as industrial land. So that is the second component of this. We can go through and identify blocks throughout the City for their suitability for commercial development, Industrial development, and open space that is the suitability for change. Together they give us supply for opportunity for the next 25 years. Under the demand side, we need it to understand what's needed for development. We talked to you previously about projecting 100,000 growth of population for 25 years based on housing we have done; and that projects to 40,000 jobs. We also know that over the next 25 years there is going to be a need to replace and rehab existing buildings, just because of their life cycles. So between those two categories, and the new category, we have approximately 7,000 acres of different land for new development. We are assuming that half of the replacement and rehab demand will occur on land that he identified earlier under land that is moderately susceptible to change. And all of the new development will land on that is susceptible to change, so about 4,200 acres, in our 25 year demand is for land development according to this model. In terms of land that is considered moderately susceptible to change is about 13,000 acres. You begin to see we have more supply than we have demand. The last specifics in the land use, we have other factors like market trends relationships to a particular use. We begin to see more specifically where this use might more likely occur. This is one example for a pattern of growth that we might see happen based on the assumptions. You can see that there are clusters of industrial land on the edges of the City that seemed to appear suitable for industrial development; and commercial uses out in West Philadelphia. And for housing, we see higher density and lower density areas in the City. This is just one example of how, using those assumptions. We go back to examine whether the land can be absorbed according to the program. And we go back to see whether the model is telling us things that make sense; and we have been tweaking it one way or the other. One to look at population forecast and once we are pretty comfortable with most of the assumptions, we are going to start the overlay on some of the major interventions or plan ideas that have begun to emerge around our recommendations around TOD locations. How will that affect the reallocations of the growth? This is somewhat incomplete. For example, it shows that if we were to concentrate where our existing transit nodes are, the model tells us that it is considerately more around the Broad Street and Market Street lines. That is the way this model is allowing us to look at different potential futures and then to identify with what those futures seem to make sense from our planning perspective. We like to get back to the recommendations that are part of this Thrive, Connect, and Renew. We feel pretty good about the fact that we have been able to use computer technology to sort out what the future options might be.

Mr. Greenberger replied that after this kind of process there is a certain amount of skepticism. It feels like you might be relying on a computer to do thinking work, when in fact what is going on is the computer is doing sorting work. The computer is doing dumb stuff in a way. The real key to this is the analysis factors and the overlay feeling like we have entered the right factors. Left to its own devices, if you didn't insert public will anywhere, this is where it would take you. It is not a great picture because what you see is a tremendous amount of very low market demand for poor neighborhoods in Philadelphia. So high susceptibility to change but very low demand, the result is that left to its own devices nothing is redeveloped. One of our hopes here is that you can test different improvement ideas at a more strategic level and see how they play out in affecting redevelopment possibilities where it would otherwise not happen. He thinks it is also intuitive. And intuitive means something. It tests from a different direction and try to build up around a case of how the City could develop.

Ms. Rogo Trainer replied all the factors you talked about are highly positive factors; none of the factors are negative.

Mr. Urek replied there is one negative factor.

Ms. Rogo Trainer replied having some fact based basis is a great thing so that you are not just planning in a vacuum.

Mr. Urek replied you can tweak every one of those factors and it would generate another outcome.

Mr. Abernathy asked when you looked at land use, was it actual land use or zoned land use.

Mr. Urek replied this is the actual land use; not zoned land use.

Mr. Greenberger replied it does map on the Census block, so for most of the City, a fairly small mosaic, there are a couple of ones like the Navy Yard, which is a single Census block. When it makes a determination, it spreads it across the thing such as Center City. There are a couple of anomalies, where you might say you don't mean that for the whole Navy Yard. We had to figure out how to tell the computer to put it off. We might have to create artificial Census blocks in a couple of places.

Mr. Urek replied it is not our intent to use ultimately what this program gives as the plan. We are using it as a tool to understand issues in the interim process. When we see the Navy Yard as one block, it is not helping us.

Mr. Abernathy asked was it surprising to see 9,000 underutilized acres.

Mr. Urek replied there is 13,000, we are categorizing it as moderately or highly susceptible to change; 4,000 or so is absorbed by this area. It was a wake-up call in some ways.

Mr. Greenberger replied every City has a portfolio that has an area that is susceptible to change whether vacant or underutilized. We don't have any statistical data, but it probably be worth our while to get some to do a quick City comparison. Because he thinks we will find that we are probably in the middle in a lot of things. We are not the City with the biggest vacant land problem in this country. That had industrial largely taken out but didn't have the assets to put them back. We have the assets.

Ms. Ruiz replied it is an enormous amount of work. It's a lot to absorb.

Mr. Urek replied he thinks it is well worth the effort to learn.

7) Presentation of the Hunting Park West Plan (Presented by John Beckman)

Jennifer Barr, presently the Northwest Community Planer and future South Philadelphia Community Planner, as well as, Project Manager for Hunting Park West Site, stated the study was commissioned by the City of Philadelphia and managed by the Philadelphia City Planning Commission. The project was funded in by grants provided by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Department of Community and Economic Development, and the City's Commerce Department. Total funding was $150,000.00. The "Hunting Park West: Reviving

Philadelphia's Industrial Lands" study recommends redevelopment strategies for approximately 400 acres of primarily industrial lands. The study area has seen many of its large industrial employers close; leaving large portions of the study area vacant, such as the former Tasty Baking and Budd facilities. A redevelopment plan was necessary to tackle the issues of future land use in an informed and coordinated way. As a part of the study, an environmental analysis, market study, and traffic study were conducted. The Hunting Park West Plan also includes a special reuse plan for the former Eastern Pennsylvania Psychiatric Institute, now the home of the temporary Youth Study Center. Wallace Roberts and Todd were the primary consultants.

John Beckman, from Robert Wallace and Todd, stated the study is 400,054 acres with Roosevelt Boulevard on the northwest side, Hunting Park Avenue on the south side, Wissahickon, Abbortsford Homes at the Water Department Reservoir. This area has two pockets with residential, Abbortsford Homes and over on Roberts Street, and the rest is historically industrial. This is an area surrounded by neighborhoods with small pockets of residential in it. The surrounding neighborhoods are: East Falls, Southeast Germantown, Northwest Tioga and Allegheny West. One of the important pieces of it is the visioning phase working with an Advisory Committee with representatives from many community groups, institutions in and outside the study area, and citizens to come up with ideas and desires with what to do with this place in between all of these neighborhoods. They had a series of ideas and concepts to come up with recommendations. Most of the Advisory Committee handled public meetings. We had 3 public meetings that were attended by between 125 to 200 people. A quick Summary of that is there is a vision that people came together for land uses connected to the surrounding communities that supported them. This is an area that is largely vacant at the moment. The land use and urban design framework that we arrived at took a look at the existing land use at the SEPTA facility at Wayne Junction, the CROC Center, that will opening soon, and the Abbortsford Homes area. A lot of this area is industrial/historical land that is vacant at the moment. We also needed to take a look at environmental contamination. The SEPTA yard at the Roberts yard is highly suspected by environmental contamination. We looked at market demand for all this land, and found that in 3 categories: Entertainment, residential, and grocery store uses where were the simple incomes and the spending patterns in the surrounding areas were dramatically under served. Proposed land use is built on the existing assets and existing initiatives that are already underway – the Green Works, Zoning updates, the Comprehensive Plan, and PIDC's Citywide Industrial Land Study. The general plan was developed under the working study - generally industrial to east, mixed-use industrial arts in the center, and mixed-use residential/commercial to the west, and Abbortsford Homes remaining. The land use need to be responsive to market demand. There is a real opportunity to establish Henry Avenue and Park Avenue as mixed-use corridors. There is a desire and market potential to establish a commercial corridor. There is also some desire by PIDC to re-use some of historic industrial land as repositioned industrial land or buildings. A need to dovetail other City initiatives with site planning guidelines using large industrial buildings not only for industrial, and to also create open spaces. Street framework using green boulevards along Henry, Hunting Park, Wissahickon, Roberts, and Fox. Henry Avenue is all traffic all of the time. There is sufficient right of way through much of it. Make it pedestrian friendly with a bicycle path and landscape medium within the right-of-way where it exists now, and to form part of the stormwater management system with impervious pavement. Wissahickon Avenue – it is important it be upgraded with the opening of CROC Center. Several thousand kids are expected to be there every day. It is important to create linkage between Tioga/Allegheny to the center and Southwest Germantown and Fernwood Park to make it pedestrian and bicycle friendly. Treating the rail corridors and improving public transportation infrastructure. We are in an interesting time with the re-writing the zoning code. But we have to work with what we have now. We are looking at using the existing district – industrial in the east, commercial mixed-use, Abbortsford Homes,

IDD of CROC Center, ASC – area shopping center, ”L2” and “L4” entertainment area, this is clearly a holding center not CED - DO NOT permit gaming. Allow high density mixed-use on Hunting Park Avenue. Apply standards into the zoning. Look at EPPI property. What is the best use? The EPPI site consists of 15 ½ acres. What would you do with this piece?

A) Adaptive reuse and partial demolition - You could convert to an extended stay hotel.
B) Second take a look at the building and add-on to it. Add more residential units.
C) Third community’s preference – demolition it – develop mixed-use with townhouses, condominiums, rental, offices, neighborhood retail.

What appears the best way at this time is adaptive reuse and demolition. It gives us a good handle on what is feasible at the moment. The 4 major land use strategies to focus on this entertainment arts production district, adaptive reuse, park reuse, and promote retail center – the market and demand are there. Create space for light industrial use. Make Henry and Hunting Park Avenues mixed-use corridors. A number of things can be done to make it happen.

Ms. Barr replied the Planning Commission staff recommendation is adoption of the “Hunting Park West: Reviving Philadelphia’s Industrial Lands” study.

Mr. Greenberger replied a couple of things are going on with this plan. Tasty Baking Company has moved into a new factory in the Navy Yard. They found a buyer interested in a grocery store for their old site. A new shopping center with grocery store, we think this is a good site for this, especially on Fox Street. We have worked with the developer of this site. Their plans for the Tasty manufacturing building are different because it is a pretty tough building to tear down. Other thing we have started a discussion on with SEPTA regarding their long term plans.

Ms. Barr stated green building on the CROC Center. We did the Zoning Bill back in May.

Ms. Rogo Trainer asked what is “C3”.

Mr. Greenberger replied “C3” is Commercial mixed-use zoning. To give you an idea of its capacity, all of Old City is “C3”. It is the most robust mixed-use zoning not in Center City. Ideally to transit nodes; but this doesn’t have one.

Gina Snyder, Director of East Falls Development Corporation, stated 4 years ago we were actively seeking planning because she saw significant changes in property throughout the area with the Psych center being closed, and not knowing what the School District was doing with the Randolph School. All of that come to a head when the Youth Study Center came there. The City and the State came together to put the resources that were needed there. She thanked the Planning Commission and Jennifer for working so hard on it. What is supposed to happen in the future with EPPI, however the State disposes of it. In regards to the EPPI site study: Not able to get inside; 2) External – economy. Prior to the study, there was significant interest by developers. The limited stay hotel is not supported by community. We wanted to make it very clear for the record – no support for the extended stay hotel. We would like resources put to solutions that would be a good long term solution for the neighborhood.

Mr. Greenberger replied we have probably a half a dozen hotel proposals in front of us at the moment that we are working on, except for the one in University City, most of them are in Center City. He doesn’t see a hotel at this site. He stated there have been talks of the State ultimately transferring the property to the City. This Administration is very focused about public

process. We have been approached by several people about the property. They wanted the City to give it to them, and only them the property. It is not going to happen.

Meg Greenfield, East Falls Chair of Zoning and Land Use Committee, stated she wanted to applaud the open space and transportation improvement and the green spaces. They were involved with sending Donald Trump packing. She is concerned with the long range planning, we have been there before. She is concerned with putting a hotel there. She is concerned with the Randall School moving. She is concerned with a casino going there. She doesn't want gaming there. She thanked Jen and the staff for their responses.

Mr. Greenberger replied we have a plan to adopt.

Ms. Rogo Trainer asked remind us what adoption means.

Mr. Greenberger replied adopt means this plan is our policy statement on moving forward. It doesn't mean we live with our hands on the controls to do implementation, but this now becomes part of the planning policy of the City.

Mr. Syrnick replied the discussion was on the extended stay hotel. There was not support for it. If we were to adopt this where would that leave us?

Mr. Greenberger replied on the EPPI site, the scenario "C" and statement was and will be this is the preferred option of the community.

A) Acceptance of adoption of this plan means we have options. We cannot direct or know what will happen at this time.
B) Any disposition of property will come from separate public process. Our goal is to get it under the City's control so that we can control that process.

Ms. Barr replied each of the scenarios and evaluations are what could happen with the site
as EPPI becomes available to potential developers.

Mr. Syrnick replied we are going to adopt one part of it; there is one part we can strike out scenario "A".

Ms. Ruiz replied she sees their preference is "C", but these are possibilities that could happen, good or bad.

Ms. Rogo Trainer asked does it really change anything in the plan's recommendations.

Ms. Barr replied that is the condition of the grant. These are the various scenarios, even if they are not recommending "A". The Philadelphia City Planning Commission could also state they recommend scenario "C".

Mr. Greenberger asked Mr. Syrnick, "You didn't propose to strike one of the Chapters, you just wanted to strike one of the scenarios."

Mr. Syrnick replied yes, just one of the scenarios. It didn't make sense proposing that scenario for an extended stay hotel. He's not so keen on scenario "A"

Ms. Rogo Trainer asked if you strike scenario "A", does that change.

Ms. Barr replied she want to keep it in. It is important to her for the plan to be realistic.

Mr. Abernathy asked can we just lay out the 3 scenarios, and recognizing the community's choice preferred choice is "C".

Mr. Greenberger replied we can. The study does address the use as is.

Upon motion by Ms. Rogo Trainer, seconded by Ms. Ruiz, the City Planning Commission approved the adoption of the Hunting Park West Plan.

Mr. Abernathy left at 2:46pm.

8) *Information Only: Presentation of the Temple University Master Plan, Temple Framework 20/20 (Presented by Thomas McCreesh, Temple University)*

Martin Gregorski stated this is an information only item for the Temple 20/20 Framework. We have had a number of Temple items in the past. It was requested by the Commission and the public that Temple come here and give a presentation of their 20/20 Framework plan. The two Temple items after this presentation are Commission items for the Commission's approval.

Thomas McCreesh, Temple University, stated we have had a couple projects here. We have already been to the Commission for a few of our projects. The last 4 projects were the Tyler School of Art, which we have relocated from the Elkins Park Campus; we have also had Arthur Hall for the Business School which was completed in January 2009; Medical Research School completed in June, the first class was in there last year; and one of his favorites was the renovation and reuse for the Historic Baptist Temple on Broad Street. It is presently a 1,200 seat presentation and performance space.

He is very glad that the Philadelphia City Planning Commission has worked with them. Temple is the 29th largest university. Projects that would be affected by this Commission. Why have we waited to do a Master Plan? This is not really a Master Plan but a framework. Their library was built in 1960's, and looks that way. They want to build a new one at Berks and Broad Streets; new research facility; construct a facility to increase the size of Monigal Hall. There is not enough open space for students. We need to give the students some space to throw around a ball. They have been working with Councilman Clarke. You have approved Pierce and McGonigal Halls. They are moving ahead to complete that. Wind turbines – not going to do a lot of energy saving, but their engineering students are going to built it. Another building you approved is our Architecture Building attached to Tyler School of Art. It's a 4-story facility that will open in the fall of 2011. Also building a dining facility for the increase of students attending Temple University. Should be opening in the fall of 2012. A Science and Research facility to increase research and education facility within next few months, abuts the Engineering and Architecture. One of the concerns is parking, we cannot control where they park. The Redevelopment Authority is talking about building structure parking. We do need 21st century library on Broad Street; a community-based and university-based library. The Olin and MGA concept stated what better suited edifice within the next 4 or 5 years. Last but not least, a green space on the site where Barton once was. That will happen after the library is built, the Pealy Library with classrooms. This is what we expect to do within the next 8 years.

Mr. Greenberger thanked Mr. McCreesh.

Ms. Rogo Trainer asked are any of the projects you describe have any modifications.

Mr. McCreesh replied no.

Brian McHale stated he is glad Temple has presented their framework of the 20/20 plan. It goes far beyond the boundaries of Temple University. It falls to the Philadelphia City Planning Commission to conduct meetings. It is your job to make sure everything works together; that it doesn't come clashing together. It is one thing at a time as money comes along.
Improve the campus and edges. There are things that fall under the Philadelphia City Planning Commission's domain. He apologized to Temple, you don't have a bad plan but your plan happens to be the big project. He whole heartedly supports this plan. He thinks the Temple plan and its development make Temple the next great university, like Philadelphia makes the great city.

Mr. Greenberger replied he appreciates that all of the development and issues are all on Temple's campus.

9) Zoning Bill No. 100555: Amending the Philadelphia Zoning Maps by adding the area bounded by Broad Street, Cecil B. Moore Avenue, Park Avenue, and Oxford Street to the Temple University Institutional Development District, to permit the construction of a new student residence building.

Mr. Gregorski, Development Planning Division and Acting IDD Administrator, stated that they want to see property re-zoned from "C4" Commercial to a new classification of "IDD" Institutional Development District. This Bill will also then approve the new South Gateway Student Residences on that site. It is for the area bounded by Broad Street, C.B. Moore Street, Park Avenue, and Oxford Street. The Temple University Gateway Residential Complex is a high-rise student residence community comprised of 1576 student beds organized in various suite configurations. The residential areas include lobbies, lounges, teaching, and administrative support spaces. The complex includes a dining pavilion/food court with 950 seats and food preparation facilities; a parking garage/service area at grade with six (6) loading dock positions and approximately 70 parking spaces; a raised open air exterior courtyard in the center of the site, and several residential apartments at street level along Oxford Street. The central terrace is one level above the street, and is accessible via a ramp at the northeast corner of the site, and a grand stair at the southwest corner. The terrace will include green space, a water feature, and landscape areas for special events. The facility is anticipated to be LEED certified, and is designed to fully accommodate accessibility needs of the Temple community. The GFA is 24 floors with 612,089 sq. ft.; 420 sq. ft. of height; The total parking spaces are 2,951; the total parking spaces required in the IDD are 1,273 spaces. Planning Commission staff recommendation is approval.

Ms. Ruiz asked about parking.

Ms. Rogo Trainer asked about loading and all of those functions.

Mr. Gregorski replied parking and loading will be on the minor street.

Ms. Rogo Trainer asked what is across the street.

Mr. McCreesh replied residential dorm, south is the Fresh Grocer; west is the EDGE (Bart Blatstein); east is SEPTA station. There is no student parking.

Mr. Greenberger asked if requirement is 1,273 parking spaces, why are people complaining there are not enough parking spaces.

Mr. McCreesh replied we have more students than when the parking requirement was set in the 1960's. Michelle has tried to explain to the students why they should not bring their cars.

Mr. Greenberger replied ratio of on campus and off campus students

Mr. McCreesh replied 46,000 to 12,000.

Ms. Ruiz replied if we see an increase of students driving in, she thinks there should be more parking.

Ms. Rogo Trainer replied more students, more parking. She is sure you are trying to get students to use public transportation.

Mr. Greenberger replied this is one of Temple's participation of getting involved with North Broad Street. He took the subway to Temple and he noticed the stations along N. Broad like Fairmount. It has been renovated.

Mr. McCreesh replied Temple tries to be good neighbor. The president encourages employees to use SEPTA.

Upon motion by Ms. Rogo Trainer, seconded by Ms. Ruiz, the City Planning Commission approved Zoning Bill No. 100555.

10) Zoning Bill No. 100556: Amending the Institutional Development District Master Plan of Temple University, located on the block bounded by 12th, 13th, Diamond, and Norris Streets, to permit the construction of a new School of Architecture building.

Mr. Gregorski, stated Bill No. 100556 was introduced last week in Council. You approved this item at our August meeting. The Gross Floor Area for Block H: Existing GFA is 230,135 sq. ft.; Proposed GFA is 51,020 sq. ft.; and the New Total will be 281,155 sq. ft. The total parking spaces are 2,951 spaces; and the required spaces in the IDD are 1,119 spaces.
Most IDD need approval from the Philadelphia City Planning Commission and a Bill of Council.
Planning Commission staff recommendation is approval.

Upon motion by Ms. Ruiz, seconded by Ms. Rogo Trainer, the City Planning Commission approved Zoning Bill No. 100556.

11) Amendment to the Center City Redevelopment Area Plan: 1701 Vine Street.

Laura Spina, Center City Planner, stated this is an Amendment to the Center City Redevelopment Area Plan at 1701 Vine Street, which is a parking lot right now. The Center City Redevelopment Plan calls for commercial/residential use at the property of 1701 Vine Street. This does not allow the temple for the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints. The amendment for the plan would show commercial/residential/institutional use for the site. The amendment is to add Institutional for Church of Latter-Day Saints. The City Planning Commission previously approved an ordinance that would allow the steeples for the temple to be built taller than the height limit for the neighborhood. Planning Commission staff recommendation is approval.

Ms. Spina stated the staff of the City Planning Commission and the staff of the Redevelopment Authority can start working with the Church.

Mr. Greenberger stated parking will be below grade.

Mr. Syrnick replied from the last time we were here for this item, it was the approval of the height limit.

Ms. Spina replied this is from the Redevelopment Authority.

Mr. Greenberger replied this from the Redevelopment Authority Plan.

Mr. Syrnick replied he thought it only needed height

Mr. Greenberger replied this was the Redevelopment Authority Plan that was cooked up 25 or 35 years ago.

Mr. Syrnick replied this is something that should have been brought up the last time.

Ms. Spina replied everything else can be done administratively.

Upon motion by Mr. Syrnick, seconded by Ms. Rogo Trainer, the City Planning Commission approved the Amendment to the Center City Redevelopment Area Plan: 1701 Vine Street.

12) ZBA Case No. 13126: University City Science Center mixed-use research and retail development at 3701-3737 Market Street.

Larissa Klevan stated this is a ZBA Case No. 13126 for University City Science Center. One variance will be considered tomorrow at the Zoning Board of Adjustment. The proposed FAR is 824,132 sq. ft. This building will have retail on the first floor with office, an auditorium, conference space, and laboratories on above floors. The increase in height from that of the buildings in the interior of the block is compatible with the RDA's plan for the Science Center. This is the second, and final, phase of the University City Science Center's development on this block. The proposed building will complete the block. Planning Commission staff recommendation is approval.

Mr. Greenberger asked what is the FAR for.

Ms. Klevan replied 3701, 3711, and 3737 Market Street.

Ms. Rogo Trainer replied the last time she was concerned with the transparency at grade.

Bob McCully, architect with CGF, stated they worked together on both phases. Phase 2, 3737 is on the corner. The Redevelopment Authority has always asked for this as a gateway. Chris Kenney talked about this the last time. Phase 1 and 2 together have over 85% transparency on the ground floor. Black granite hides most of the garage with a 30 ft wide transparent window.

Carl Primavera, attorney for ProMed owner of 3535 Market Street, stated ProMed paid over $100,000,000 and is happy to be part of the Science Center. It is either ignorance or arrogance. It's an elaborate plan. He hears that space is already being in use. He is formally asking this matter be held

Neil Sklaroff, attorney the developer, replied who said what to whom. He isn't going to go into that here. He was here a month ago. He is here for your recommendation and approval. He believes he earned your favorable vote.

Mr. Syrnick asked Mr. Primavera why could your client not come to the public meeting.

Mr. Primavera replied he was told about it by Neil Sklaroff. Neil's client didn't invite his client.

Mr. Sklaroff replied he doesn't send out invitations to community groups. That is the community group who does it. We are ready to meet within the next two weeks.

Upon motion by Ms. Rogo Trainer, seconded by Ms. Wallace Adams, the City Planning Commission approved the ZBA Case No. 13126: University City Science Center mixed-use research and retail development at 3701-3737 Market Street.

13) Zoning Bill No. 100553: Amending the Zoning Code by adding a new section entitled "I-95" Condemnation Corridor".

Mr. Greenberger stated this was introduced last Thursday in City Council.

Paula Brumbelow stated this bill would amend the Zoning Code by adding a new section entitled "Interstate Condemnation Corridor. We are asking for a 45-day extension to review this Bill. The I-95 Condemnation Corridor shall consist of all properties within the entire I-95 project limits, which include both northbound and southbound directions of I-95 bounded by the north curbline of Bleigh Avenue, south to the north curbline of Arch Street and all arterial streets, collector streets, and ramps. The width of the area shall be 200 feet from the PennDOT right-of-way lines as they exist as the time of the Application for Relocation. PennDOT has announced that it will widening 4 lanes and upgrade portions of Interstate 95 that pass through the City. Many properties will be condemned, and receive payment for their properties from the State. It is anticipated that many structures may be impacted and will face relocation with the assistance of

the State. The purpose of this Bill is to encourage and aid in the continuation of business or other uses with minimal dislocation or interruption.

The Bill allows that any permitted structure, or use to relocate and be rebuilt if the following conditions are met:

- The owner has received a “Notice of Taking” from PennDOT or its agents.
- The proposed relocation for the structure or use is within 200 feet of the PennDOT right-of-way lines as they exist at the time of the Application for Relocation.
- The new use and/or structure does not exceed the old structure or use, in terms of size, height, or square footage.
- The distance between the relocated structure and/or use and a residential property located within a residentially zoned district will not be closer than as existed prior to the relocation, provided that the residential property is 400 or more feet away from the structure or use.

This Bill was introduced last Thursday, and the City Planning Commission has not had adequate time to review the legislation, the impacted area, and the types of businesses that may be in this condemnation area. Additionally, PennDOT has only confirmed the Girard Avenue and Cottman Avenue interchanges and started acquisition. The other interchanges are still in the design stages, which could change the boundaries. Planning Commission staff recommendation is to request a period of 45 days to further review this Bill and the impacts it will have throughout the corridor.

Mr. Syrnick asked are we saying that anyone who is within 200 feet of the PennDOT right-of-way lines as they exist at the time of the Application for Relocation. With less regulation the structures could be placed in an area that we would not normally approve of.

Ms. Ruiz asked would they have to purchase it.

John Mondlak, City Solicitor, replied yes, they would have to purchase it.

Ms. Rogo Trainer asked where could they relocate the structure.

Mr. Mondlak replied they could build it no closer than 400 ft. of residential property.

Mr. Jastrzab replied that the original 30-day period would expire before out next Planning Commission meeting.

Upon motion by Ms. Rogo Trainer, seconded by Mr. Syrnick, the City Planning Commission requests of a 45-day extension to review this legislation in order to obtain a better understanding of the impacts of Zoning Bill No. 100553.

Mr. Greenberger adjourned the City Planning Commission Meeting of September 21, 2010 at 4:15pm.

## SUMMARY

1) Election of Commission Chairman and Vice-Chairman.

2) Swearing-in of new Commission Members.

3) Approval of the Minutes of the August 17, and September 7, 2010 meetings. Approved

4) Executive Director's Update.

5) Review and Comment: East Logan Street Historic District Designation Presented by Jonathan Farnham and Erin Cote, Philadelphia Historic Commission). Review & Comment

6) Philadelphia2035 Update (Presented by Danielle DiLeo Kim) Presented

*7)* Presentation of the Hunting Park West Plan (Introduced by Jennifer Barr; Presented by John Beckman) Adopted

*8) Information Only: Presentation of the Temple University Master Plan, Temple Framework 20/20 (Presented by Thomas McCreesh, Temple University). Presented*

9) Zoning Bill #100555: Amending the Philadelphia Zoning Maps by adding the area bounded by Broad Street, Cecil B. Moore Avenue, Park Avenue, & Oxford Street to the Temple University Institutional Development District, to permit the construction a new student residence building (Presented by Martin Gregorski). Approved

10) Zoning Bill #100556: Amending the IDD Master Plan Amendment of Temple University, located on the block bounded by 12th, 13th, Diamond, and Norris Streets, to permit the construction of a new School of Architecture building (Presented by Martin Gregorski). Approved

11) Amendment to the Center City Redevelopment Area Plan: 1701 Vine Street (Presented by Laura Spina). Approved

12) ZBA Case #13126: University City Science Center mix-use research and retail development at 3701-3737 Market Street. (Presented by Larissa Klevan). Approved

13) Zoning Bill #100553: Amending the Zoning Code by adding a new section entitled "I-95 Condemnation Corridor" (Presented by Paula Brumbelow). Request a 45-day extension