Civic Design focuses on reviewing the impact of building and site design on the public realm, particularly streets, sidewalks, trails, public parks and open spaces. Please note that all Civic Design Review recommendations are advisory; the Zoning Board and Planning Commission are not required to abide by the Civic Design Review Committee’s recommendations.

The Civic Design Review Committee is located at:
One Parkway, 13th floor
1515 Arch Street, Philadelphia, PA, 19102.
Please contact (215) 683-4615 for more information.

A community presentation was made to the RCO on August 28th, 2019. A community organization letter will be submitted at a later date.
CDR APPLICATION

CDR PROJECT APPLICATION FORM

Note: For a project application to be considered for a Civic Design Review agenda, complete and accurate submittals must be received no later than 4 P.M. on the submission date. A submission does not guarantee placement on the agenda of the next CDR meeting date.

L&I APPLICATION NUMBER: 1015185

What is the trigger causing the project to require CDR Review? Explain briefly.

More than 100,000 sq. ft. of new floor area (216,673 sq. ft.)
More than 100 new dwelling units (159 units)

PROJECT LOCATION

Address: 175 W. Oxford Street
Philadelphia, PA 19122

Is this parcel within a Master Plan District?  Yes  No  X

CONTACT INFORMATION

Applicant Name: Hercules W. Grigos, Esq.  Primary Phone: 215-569-1569
Email: hgrigos@klehr.com  Address: 1835 Market Street, 14th Fl.
Philadelphia, PA 19103

Property Owner: Northern Star Dev. LLC  Developer: Northern Star and Ampere Capital Group
Architect: Sitio Architecture + Urbanism

SITE CONDITIONS

Site Area: 58,391 sq. ft.
Existing Zoning: RSA-5  Are Zoning Variances required?  Yes  X  No  

SITE USES

Present Use: 2-story commercial building
Proposed Use: 159 residential units, commercial uses permitted in IRMX, parking
Area of Proposed Uses, Broken Out by Program (Include Square Footage and # of Units): 176,365 sq. ft. residential (159 units); 32,020 sq. ft. commercial
Proposed # of Parking Units: 51 vehicular parking spaces and 70 bicycle spaces.

COMMUNITY MEETING

Community meeting held:  Yes  X  No  
If yes, please provide written documentation as proof.
If no, indicate the date and time the community meeting will be held:
Date:  Time: 

ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT HEARING

ZBA hearing scheduled:  Yes  X  No  NA  
If yes, indicate the date the hearing will be held:
Date:  
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INSTRUCTIONS

This Checklist is an implementation tool of the Philadelphia Complete Streets Handbook (the “Handbook”) and enables City engineers and planners to review projects for their compliance with the Handbook’s policies. The handbook provides design guidance and does not supersede or replace language, standards or policies established in the City Code, City Plan, or Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD).

The Philadelphia City Planning Commission receives this Checklist as a function of its Civic Design Review (CDR) process. This checklist is used to document how project applicants considered and accommodated the needs of all users of city streets and sidewalks during the planning and/or design of projects affecting public rights-of-way. Departmental reviewers will use this checklist to confirm that submitted designs incorporate complete streets considerations (see §11-905 of the Philadelphia Code). Applicants for projects that require Civic Design Review shall complete this checklist and attach it to plans submitted to the Philadelphia City Planning Commission for review, along with an electronic version.


PRELIMINARY PCPC REVIEW AND COMMENT: DATE

FINAL STREETS DEPT REVIEW AND COMMENT: DATE
COMPLETE STREETS CHECKLIST

GENERAL PROJECT INFORMATION

1. PROJECT NAME
   Oxford Court

2. DATE
   10/10/19

3. APPLICANT NAME
   Ampere Capital Group

4. PROJECT AREA: List precise street limits and scope.
   Lot bounded by North 2nd Street, Turner Street, Hancock Street, and Oxford Street. Existing building to be renovated and redeveloped as part of the project for mixed use.

5. OWNER NAME
   Northern Star Development

6. CONTACT INFORMATION
   196 Maple Street, Englewood, NJ 07631

7. ENGINEER / ARCHITECT NAME
   Maser Consulting P.A., Rhett Caliberi, P.E.

8. CONTACT INFORMATION
   [Contact Information]

10. STREETS: List the streets associated with the project. Complete Street Types can be found at www.phila.gov/map

    N. 2nd St.     Oxford St.     Turner St.
    Harvard St.   Hancock St.   Hanover St.
    Oxford St.    N. 2nd St.

11. Does the Existing Conditions site survey clearly identify the following existing conditions?
    a. Parking and loading restrictions in curb lanes adjacent to the site
    b. Street Furniture such as bus shelters, honor boxes, etc.
    c. Street Direction
    d. Curb Cuts
    e. Utilities, including tree grates, vault covers, manholes, junction boxes, signs, lights, poles, etc.
    f. Building Elevations into the sidewalk, such as stairs and stoops

APPICANT: General Project Information

DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW: General Project Information

COMPLETE STREETS HANDBOOK CHECKLIST

PHILADELPHIA CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

PEDESTRIAN COMPONENT (Handbook Section 4.3)

12. SIDEWALKS: List sidewalk widths for each street frontage. Required sidewalk widths are listed in Section 4.3 of the Handbook.

   STREET FRONTAGE
   TYPICAL SIDEWALK WIDTH
   CITY PLAN SIDEWALK WIDTH
   STREET
   REQUIRED / FACING / Proposed
   Paved
   Unpaved

   N. 2nd St. 12' 12' 12' 12'
   Turner St. 12' 12' 12' 12'
   Hancock St. 12' 12' 12' 12'
   Oxford St. 12' 12' 12' 12'

13. WALKING ZONE: List Walking Zone widths for each street frontage. The Walking Zone is defined in Section 4.3 of the Handbook, including required widths.

   STREET FRONTAGE
   WALKING ZONE
   REQUIRED / FACING / Proposed
   Paved
   Unpaved

   N. 2nd St. 6' 9' 6' 9'
   Turner St. 6' 9' 6' 9'
   Hancock St. 6' 9' 6' 9'
   Oxford St. 6' 9' 6' 9'

14. VEHICULAR INTRUSIONS: List Vehicular Intrusions into the sidewalk. Examples include but are not limited to:

   a. driveways, lay-by lanes, etc. Driveways and lay-by lanes are addressed in sections 4.8.1 and 4.9.3, respectively, of the Handbook.

   EXISTING VEHICULAR INTRUSIONS

   INTRUSION TYPE
   INTRUSION WIDTH
   PLACEMENT
   Driveway
   12'
   N. 2nd St. 131.6 feet North of Oxford St.
   N. 2nd St. 100 feet South of Turner St.
   Turner St. 150 feet East of 2nd St.
   Hancock St. 130.4 feet South of Turner St.

   PROPOSED VEHICULAR INTRUSIONS

   INTRUSION TYPE
   INTRUSION WIDTH
   PLACEMENT
   Driveway
   16'
   Turner St. 62 West of Hancock St.
   Driveway
   21'
   Oxford St. 60.6 feet East of 2nd St.
COMPLETE STREETS CHECKLIST

COMPLETE STREETS HANDBOOK CHECKLIST
Philadelphia City Planning Commission

PEDESTRIAN COMPONENT (continued)

15. Does the design limit block lengths to 500 feet or less? YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A ☑

16. When considering the overall design, does the design create a pedestrian environment that provides safe and comfortable access for all pedestrians? YES ☑ NO ☐ N/A ☑

APPLICANT: Pedestrian Component
Additional Explanation / Comments:

DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW: Pedestrian Component
Reviewer Comments:

BUILDING & FURNISHING COMPONENT

(Handbook Section 4.4)

17. BUILDING ZONE: List the MAXIMUM, existing and proposed Building Zone width on each street frontage. The Building Zone is defined as the area of the sidewalk immediately adjacent to the building face, wall, or fence marking the property line, or a lawn in lower density residential neighborhoods. The Building Zone is further defined in section 4.4.1 of the Handbook.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STREET FRONTAGE</th>
<th>MAXIMUM BUILDING ZONE WIDTH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N. 3rd St.</td>
<td>3.5'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turner St.</td>
<td>0'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hancock St.</td>
<td>0'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford St.</td>
<td>0'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. FURNISHING ZONE: List the MINIMUM, recommended, existing, and proposed Furnishing Zone widths on each street frontage. The Furnishing Zone is further defined in section 4.4.2 of the Handbook.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STREET FRONTAGE</th>
<th>MINIMUM FURNISHING ZONE WIDTH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N. 3rd St.</td>
<td>4.0'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turner St.</td>
<td>3.5'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hancock St.</td>
<td>4.5'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford St.</td>
<td>4.0'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Identify proposed “high priority” building and furnishing zone design treatments that are incorporated into the design plan, where widths permit (see Handbook Table 1). Are the following treatments identified and dimensioned on the plan?

- Bicycle Parking
- Lighting
- Parklets
- Street Trees
- Street Furniture

20. Does the design avoid tripping hazards?

21. Does the design avoid pinch points? Pinch points are locations where the Walking Zone width is less than the required width identified in Item 13, or requires an exception.
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**COMPLETE STREETS CHECKLIST**

**COMPLETE STREETS HANDBOOK CHECKLIST**

*Philadelphia City Planning Commission*

### BUILDING & FURNISHING COMPONENT (continued)

22. Do street trees and/or plants comply with street installation requirements (see sections 4.4.7 & 4.4.8)?
   - **YES** ☑️
   - **NO** ☐
   - **N/A** ☐
   - **YES** ☑️
   - **NO** ☐

23. Does the design maintain adequate visibility for all roadway users at intersections?
   - **YES** ☑️
   - **NO** ☐
   - **N/A** ☐

24. When considering the overall design of the Building & Furnishing Component, does the design enhance the pedestrian environment?
   - **YES** ☑️
   - **NO** ☐
   - **N/A** ☐

**APPLICANT:** Building & Furnishing Component

The single family residence located at 15 Oxford Street includes some tree and shrub access. Street tree locations are restricted by underground utilities and driveway sight distance. Bicycle parking is provided on the property.

**DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW:** Building & Furnishing Component

**Reviewer Comments:**

---

**BICYCLE COMPONENT** *(Handbook Section 4.5)*

25. List elements of the project that incorporate recommendations of the Pedestrian and Bicycle Plan, located online at http://philap2035.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/06/bikeplanfinal2.pdf

*PLEASE SEE BELOW*

26. List the existing and proposed number of bicycle parking spaces, on- and off-street. Bicycle parking requirements are provided in The Philadelphia Code, Section 14-804.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>BUILDING/ADDRESS</strong></th>
<th><strong>REQUIRED SPACES</strong></th>
<th><strong>ON SIDEWALK OR STREET</strong></th>
<th><strong>OFF STREET (Side/Proposed)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>175 W. Oxford Street</td>
<td>☑️ 35</td>
<td>☑️ 0</td>
<td>☑️ 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27. Identify proposed "High priority" bicycle design treatments (see Handbook Table 1) that are incorporated into the design plan, where width permits. Are the following "High Priority" elements identified and dimensioned on the plan?
   - Conventional Bike Lane
   - Buffered Bike Lane
   - Bicycle-First Street

28. Does the design provide bicycle connections to local bicycle, trail, and transit networks?
   - **YES** ☑️
   - **NO** ☐
   - **N/A** ☐

29. Does the design provide convenient bicycle connections to residences, work places, and other destinations?
   - **YES** ☑️
   - **NO** ☐
   - **N/A** ☐

**APPLICANT:** Bicycle Component

The existing site is surrounded by an existing street system. The project plans to maintain the existing roadway configuration.

**DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW:** Bicycle Component

**Reviewer Comments:**

1. Design improves safety for pedestrians and bicyclists. Sidewalk cross slopes will be designed to meet ADA requirements (trans slope 1:20). Driveways will be designed to alert pedestrians and drivers to be aware of one another through the use of different types of materials and pavement surfacing patterns.

2. Encourages biking and walking. We have provided bicycle racks on the property to promote the use of bicycles.
### COMPLETE STREETS HANDBOOK CHECKLIST

#### CURBSIDE MANAGEMENT COMPONENT (Handbook Section 4.6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30. Does the design limit conflict among transportation modes along the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>path?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Does the design connect transit stops to the surrounding pedestrian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>network and destinations?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Does the design provide a buffer between the roadway and pedestrian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>traffic?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. How does the proposed plan affect the accessibility, visibility,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>connectivity, and/or attractiveness of public transit?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**APPLICANT:** Curbside Management Component

Additional Explanation / Comments:

**DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW:** Curbside Management Component

Reviewer Comments:

---

#### VEHICLE / CARTWAY COMPONENT (Handbook Section 4.7)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STREET</th>
<th>FROM</th>
<th>TO</th>
<th>LANE WIDTHS (Existing/Proposed)</th>
<th>DESIGN SPEED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

35. What is the maximum AASHO design vehicle being accommodated by the |     |    |     |     |
project? Yes | No | N/A |     |     |

36. Will the project affect a historically certified street? An inventory of |     |    |     |     |
historic streets is maintained by the Philadelphia Historical Commission. Yes | No | N/A |     |     |

37. Does the design plan incorporate roadway medians (e.g., high priority) |     |    |     |     |
vehicle/cartway design treatment for some street types? Yes | No | N/A |     |     |

*Any proposed median may require a maintenance agreement with the Streets Department.*

38. Does the design facilitate safe and accessible deliveries to local |     |    |     |     |
industries and businesses? Yes | No |     |     |     |

39. Will the public right-of-way be used for loading and unloading |     |    |     |     |
activities? Yes | No |     |     |     |

40. Does the design maintain emergency vehicle access? Yes | No |     |     |     |

41. Where new streets are being developed, does the design connect and |     |    |     |     |
extend the street grid? Yes | No | N/A |     |     |

42. Does the design support multiple alternative routes to and from |     |    |     |     |
destinations within the site? Yes | No | N/A |     |     |

43. Overall, does the design balance vehicle mobility with the mobility and |     |    |     |     |
access of all other roadway users? Yes | No |     |     |     |

**APPLICANT:** Vehicle / Cartway Component

Additional Explanation / Comments:

**DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW:** Vehicle / Cartway Component

Reviewer Comments:

---

### COMPLETE STREETS HANDBOOK CHECKLIST

**Philadelphia City Planning Commission**

#### URBAN DESIGN COMPONENT (Handbook Section 4.8)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>44. Does the design incorporate windows, storefronts, and other active uses facing the street?</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>DEPARTMENTAL APPROVAL</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45. Does the proposed project have a Philadelphia Water Department (PWD) Work Number? If so, please provide:</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. List the stormwater management and drainage features incorporated into the design of the Right of Way (see Section 4.8.4).</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Does the design provide driveway access that safely manages pedestrian / bicycle conflicts with vehicles (see Section 4.8.3)?</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Does the design provide direct, safe, and accessible connections between transit stops and building access points and destinations within the site?</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**APPLICANT: Urban Design Component**

Additional Explanation / Comments: __________

**DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW: Urban Design Component**

Reviewer Comments: __________

### COMPLETE STREETS HANDBOOK CHECKLIST

**Philadelphia City Planning Commission**

#### INTERSECTIONS & CROSSINGS COMPONENT (Handbook Section 4.9)

| 49. Identify Existing and Proposed Signal Cycle Lengths |
|---|---|---|
| **SIGNAL LOCATION** | **EXISTING CYCLE LENGTH** | **PROPOSED CYCLE LENGTH** |
| N/A | N/A | N/A |
| N/A | N/A | N/A |

#### **17 COMPLETE STREETS CHECKLIST**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>50. Does the design minimize the signal cycle length to reduce pedestrian wait time?</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>DEPARTMENTAL APPROVAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51. Does the design provide adequate clearance for pedestrians to cross streets?</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Does the design minimize pedestrian crossing distances by narrowing streets or travel lanes, extending curbs, reducing curb radii, or using medians or refuge islands to break up long crossings?</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* If yes, City Plan Action may be required.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. Identify “High Priority” intersection and crossing design treatments (see Handbook Table 1) that will be incorporated into the design, where width permits. Are the following “High Priority” design treatments identified and dimensioned on the plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Marked Crosswalks</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Pedestrian Refuge Islands</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Signal Timing and Operation</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Bike Ramps</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. Does the plan simplify complex intersections where possible?</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. Does the design reduce vehicle speeds and increase visibility at intersections?</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. Overall, do intersection designs limit conflicts between modes and promote pedestrian and bicycle safety?</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**APPLICANT: Intersections & Crossings Component**

Additional Explanation / Comments: __________

**DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW: Intersections & Crossings Component**

Reviewer Comments: __________

---

**NOTE:** This project does not propose intersection improvements. The existing intersections will be maintained. The corner ADA ramps will be reconstructed for the block.
COMPLETE STREETS CHECKLIST

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

APPLICANT
Additional Explanation / Comments: 

DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW
Additional Reviewer Comments: 

Civic Design Review Sustainable Design Checklist

Sustainable design represents important city-wide concerns about environmental conservation and energy use. Development teams should try to integrate elements that meet many goals, including:

- Reuse of existing building stock
- Incorporation of existing on-site natural habitats and landscape elements
- Inclusion of high-performing stormwater control
- Site and building massing to maximize daylight and reduce shading on adjacent sites
- Reduction of energy use and the production of greenhouse gases
- Promotion of reasonable access to transportation alternatives

The Sustainable Design Checklist asks for responses to specific benchmarks. These metrics go above and beyond the minimum requirements in the Zoning and Building codes. All benchmarks are based on adaptations from Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) v4 unless otherwise noted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Does project meet benchmark? If yes, please explain how. If no, please explain why not.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location and Transportation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Access to Quality Transit</td>
<td>Locate a functional entry of the project within a 1-mile (400-meter) walking distance of existing or planned bus, streetcar, or rideshare stops, bus rapid transit stops, light or heavy rail stations. Yes - Approximately 350 feet from the SEPTA Bus stop #57 located at the corner of American St and Oxford St.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Reduced Parking Footprint</td>
<td>All new parking areas will be in the rear yard of the property or under the building, and unenclosed or uncovered parking areas are 40% or less of the site area. Yes - Uncovered parking area is less than 40% of the site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Green Vehicles</td>
<td>Designate 5% of all parking spaces used by the project as preferred parking for green vehicles or car share vehicles. Yes - 2 parking spaces will be dedicated to electric vehicle spaces.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Railway Setbacks</td>
<td>To foster safety and maintain quality of life protected from excessive noise and vibration, residential development with railway frontages should be setback from rail lines and the building's exterior envelope, including windows, should reduce exterior sound transmission to 60dba. No - Project site not located near railway frontage.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Bike Share Station</td>
<td>Incorporate a bike share station in coordination with and conformance to the standards of Philadelphia Bike Share. No - Bike share station is not planned for the development; however, bike stations are in the building.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Water Efficiency                  |                                                                                             |                                                                                          |
| (6) Outdoor Water Use             | Maintain on-site vegetation without irrigation. OR, Reduce of watering requirements of at least 50% from the calculated baseline for the site's peak watering month. Yes - The proposed development provides vegetated and pervious area of approximately 12,773 SF which is (22%) greater than 11,810 SF (20%) of the required open area. |                                                                                          |
| (7) Pervious Site Surfaces        | Provides vegetated and/or pervious open space that is 30% or greater of the site's Open Area, as defined by the zoning code. Vegetated and/or green roofs can be included in this calculation. Yes - Landscaping will comply with requirements. |                                                                                          |
| (8) Rainwater Management          | Conform to the stormwater requirements of the Philadelphia Water Department(PWD) and either: Yes - However, all on-site stormwater is being managed on-site, conforming to the stormwater requirements of the Philadelphia Water Department. |                                                                                          |
| (9) Heat Island Reduction         | Reduce the heat island effect through either of the following strategies for 50% or more of all on-site hardscapes: A) Hardscapes that have a high reflectance, an SRI>29. B) Shading by trees, structures, or solar panels. Yes - Combination of shading by trees. |                                                                                          |

| Energy and Atmosphere             |                                                                                             |                                                                                          |
| (10) Energy Commissioning and     | PCPC notes that as of April 1, 2013 new energy conservation standards are required in the Philadelphia Building Code, based on recent updates of the International Energy Conservation Code (IECC) and the option to use ASHRAE 90.1-2016. PCPC staff asks the applicant to state which path they are taking for compliance, including their choice of code and any options being pursued under the 2018 IECC. Yes - The prescriptive path outlined in 2018 IECC will be used for compliance. |                                                                                          |
| Energy Performance — Adherence to |                                                                                             |                                                                                          |
| the New Building Code             |                                                                                             |                                                                                          |
| (11) Energy Commissioning and     | Will the project pursue energy performance measures beyond what is required in the Philadelphia code by meeting any of these benchmarks? A) Reduce energy consumption by achieving 10% energy savings or more from an established baseline using |                                                                                          |
| Energy Performance — Going beyond |                                                                                             |                                                                                          |
| the code                          |                                                                                             |                                                                                          |

19
## Sustainability

| Any sites within 1000 feet of an interstate highway, state highway, or freeway will provide air filters for all regularly occupied spaces that have a Minimum Efficiency Reporting Value (MERV) of 13. Filters shall be installed prior to occupancy. | No - Site is not within 1000 feet of a highway. |

| (12) Indoor Air Quality and Transportation | Produces renewable energy on-site that will provide at least 3% of the project’s anticipated energy usage. | No - Site does not plan to implement renewable energy sources. |

| (13) On-Site Renewable Energy | Any other sustainable measures that could positively impact the public realm. | Introduction of pedestrian only street in the approximate location of Palenthorp, including the use of pervious pavers and planters. |

---


2. Title 4 The Philadelphia Building Construction and Occupancy Code


3. LEED 4.1, Optimize Energy Performance in LEED v4.1

   For Energy Star: www.energystar.gov
   For Passive House, see www.passiv.org

4. Section 99.04.504.6 "Filters" of the City of Los Angeles Municipal Code, from a 2016 Los Angeles Ordinance requiring enhanced air filters in homes near freeways
**LANDSCAPE PLAN**

**PLANTING 'A'**
- GINKGO BILoba 'PRINCETON Sentry'

**PLANTING 'B'**
- AMELANCHIER X GRANDIFLORA SERVICEBERRY
- CHIONANTHUS RETUSUS CHINESE FRINGE TREE
- CERCIS CANADENSIS EASTERN REDBUD
- HYDRANGEA ANOMALA

**PLANTING 'C'**
- KALMIA LATIFOLIA 'MINUET' MOUNTAIN LAUREL
- BUXUS X 'GREEN GEM'

**PLANTING 'D'**
- HYDRANGEA ANOMALA

**PLANTING 'E'**
- BUXUS X 'GREEN GEM'

**PLANTING 'F'**
- GREEN GEM BOXWOOD

**PLANTING 'G'**
- HOLLANDSTONE™ BY UNILOCK OR APPROVED EQUIVALENT, TYP. (4X8 - 6CM X 10 CM X 6 CM 7.875" X 3.875" X 2.375")

**HARDSCAPE 1'**
- ASPHALT PAVEMENT, TYP.

**HARDSCAPE 2'**
- BRUSHED FINISH CONCRETE, TYP.

**HARDSCAPE 3'**
- HOLLANDSTONE™ BY UNILOCK OR APPROVED EQUIVALENT, TYP.

---

**RAYMOND C. LOCITA**

**LANDSCAPE PLAN**

FOR

**AMPERE CAPITAL GROUP**

LOCATION: OXFORD STREET

OXFORD COURT

CIVIC DESIGN REVIEW

PHILADELPHIA, PA 19123

CIVIC DESIGN REVIEW | OXFORD COURT 21
FLOOR PLANS

SECOND LEVEL

THIRD LEVEL

FOURTH LEVEL

PROGRAM:
- RESIDENTIAL
- RETAIL
FLOOR PLANS

PROGRAM:
- RESIDENTIAL
- RETAIL
SITE SECTIONS

PROGRAM:
- RESIDENTIAL
- RETAIL
ELEVATIONS

1. NORTH ELEVATION - TURNER STREET

2. EAST ELEVATION - HANCOCK STREET

KEY:

A  CLEAR GLAZING
B  BRICK MASONRY
C  METAL PANEL – 1
D  METAL PANEL – 2
E  PAINTED CONCRETE
F  METAL CANOPY
**3. WEST ELEVATION - SECOND STREET**

**4. SOUTH ELEVATION - OXFORD STREET**

**KEY:**
- A: CLEAR GLAZING
- B: BRICK MASONRY
- C: METAL PANEL – 1
- D: METAL PANEL – 2
- E: PAINTED CONCRETE
- F: METAL CANOPY
MATERIALS

A CLEAR GLAZING

B BRICK MASONRY

C METAL PANEL – 1

D METAL PANEL – 2

E PAINTED CONCRETE

F METAL CANOPY

KEY:

A CLEAR GLAZING
B BRICK MASONRY
C METAL PANEL – 1
D METAL PANEL – 2
E PAINTED CONCRETE
F METAL CANOPY
MASSING

VIEW FROM SOUTH-EAST

VIEW FROM NORTH-WEST
PERSPECTIVE VIEW
VIEW FROM 2ND STREET & OXFORD STREET