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&A APPLICATION NUMBER: ZP-2020-000786C

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

Constructing greater than 50,000 square feet of new floor area (221,523 sf) and greater than 50 new residential dwelling units (220 units).

PROJECT LOCATION

Planning District: North Council District: 4th

Address: 3449 Scotts Lane

Is this parcel within an Opportunity Zone? Yes X No Uncertain
If yes, is the project using Opportunity Zone Funding? Yes No X

CONTACT INFORMATION

Applicant Name: Ronald J. Patterson, Esq. Primary Phone: 215-569-4585

Email: rpatterson@klehr.com Address: Klehr Harrison Harvey Branzburg LLP
1835 Market St, Floor 14 Philadelphia, PA 19103

Property Owner: SDO 3449 Scotts Lane LLC Developer Same

Architect: Design Blendz Scott Woodruff

SITE CONDITIONS

Site Area: 147,435 SF

Existing Zoning: RM-1 Are Zoning Variances required? Yes ___ No X

Conditional Zoning Permit issued #ZP-2020-000786C (5/10/2020)

Proposed Use

Area of Proposed Uses, Broken Out by Program (Include Square Footage and # of Units):

190,147 sf of residential units; 64,096 sf of covered parking garages.

New construction of 2 detached, multifamily structures (4 buildings), having a total of 220
dwelling units.

Proposed # of Parking Units: 220 parking spaces (149 garage spaces and 71 surface spaces)

COMMUNITY MEETING

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

ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT HEARING

ZBA hearing scheduled: Yes ___ No ___ NA X
If yes, indicate the date hearing will be held:
Date: 
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SITE OVERVIEW
3449 SCOTTS LANE IS A 147,433 SF (3.38 ACRES) VACANT PARKING LOT LOCATED IN THE ALLEGHENY WEST NEIGHBORHOOD OF PHILADELPHIA AND IS CURRENTLY ZONED AS RM-1 TO SUPPORT RESIDENTIAL MULTI-FAMILY DEVELOPMENT. IT BORDERS A RAPIDLY DEVELOPING RESIDENTIAL SECTION OF EAST FALLS AND IS WITHIN WALKING DISTANCE TO THE SEPTA MANAYUNK/NORRISTOWN TRAIN STATION.
SITE IMAGES

SCOTTS LANE TOWARDS ROOSEVELT EXPY

FACING SEPTA REGIONAL RAIL LINE

SCOTTS LANE AT SITE ENTRY AND SHARED DRIVE

AERIAL PERSPECTIVE
The Peak at Scotts Lane proposes four multi-family structures, of four stories each, containing a total of two hundred and twenty-one dwelling units. The master plan branches from an existing shared drive, that extends through the adjacent parcel to Henry Avenue, to create a centralized pedestrian and vehicular thoroughfare. Parking is provided under each building with additional surface parking to the south to form a buffer between the development and the neighboring rail line. Pockets of outdoor spaces, shared amenities and roof deck access encourage social engagement across buildings. Each component aims to provide a series of pedestrian scaled experiences that are in tune with the context of the local neighborhoods.

Lot Size: 147,433 SF (3.38 acres)
Building Area: 234,426 GSF
Building Height: 38 ft max
Dwelling Units: 221
Parking: 194 Spaces
Bike Parking: 83 Spaces
FLOOR PLANS - BUILDING C & D

STAMM DEVELOPMENT GROUP
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JR 1 BEDROOM UNIT
495 GSF
11% OF TOTAL

1 BEDROOM UNIT
635 GSF
66% OF TOTAL

2 BEDROOM UNIT
865 GSF
23% OF TOTAL

FLOOR PLANS - RESIDENTIAL UNITS
LANDSCAPE DESIGN

THE STREETSCAPE BOASTS SHADE TREES AND MANICURED LAWNs, ALONG WITH LARGE CONTINUOUS TREE PITS FILLED WITH SHOWY PLANTINGS AND COLUMNAR TREES STRATEGICALLY PLACED TO ENCOURAGE SAFE PEDESTRIAN MOVEMENTS THROUGHOUT THE SPACE. OVERALL, THE NATIVE AND ADAPTED PLANTINGS PROVIDED AT THE PEAK AT SCOTTS LANE WILL BRING LOW MAINTENANCE BEAUTY THROUGHOUT THE CHANGING SEASONS.
From the moment one enters the site, they are greeted with showy ornamental plantings, elevated by natural boulders to provide a welcoming first impression. The site boundary situated above the Roosevelt Expressway is planted with evergreen trees, large evergreen shrubs, as well as shade trees and deciduous shrubs that will provide year-round interest against the backdrop of a modern opaque fence.
AN ORNAMENTAL TREE FLANKED WITH COLORFUL PERENNIALS AND STATELY SEAT WALLS MARKS THE ENTRY TO THE COURTYARD. UPON ENTERING THE SPACE, THE ORNAMENTAL TREES GUIDE THE USER TO MULTIPLE DESTINATIONS ULTIMATELY UNIFYING THE SPACE AND ADDING FOCAL POINTS ALONG THE WAY. A VARIETY OF PLANTINGS CREATE A COMFORTABLE ATMOSPHERE INVITING USERS TO SIT AND STAY AWHILE EITHER AT A MODERN CAFE TABLE, COZY LOUNGE CHAIR, OR ALONG ANY OF THE SEAT WALLS LOCATED THROUGHOUT THE SPACE.
COMMON SPACE BETWEEN BLDG C & D
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LANDSCAPE - FURNISHING PALETTE

SEAT WALLS
- Techo-Bloc Graphix

PAVERS
- Hanover Slateface Pavers

MOVABLE TABLES & CHAIRS
- Landscape Forms Catena Table and Chairs

OPAQUE FENCE
- Trex Horizons Horizontal Fence with Iron Posts

ALUMINUM FENCE
- Ameristar Montage II Majestic

LOUNGE SEATING
- Forms+Surfaces Vaya Lounge Seating Family

STAMM DEVELOPMENT GROUP
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LANDSCAPE - HERBACEOUS PALETTE

Feather Reed Grass
Northern Sea Oats
Green Forest Grass
Creeping Lily Turf
Dwarf Pink Astilbe
Chocolate Chip Buckwheat
Chinese Astilbe
Wind Flower
Brandywine Lenten Rose
Helen Von Stein Lamb’s Ear
EXTERIOR MATERIALS

FACEBRICK
GLEN GERY - ELYRIA

FIBER CEMENT SIDING
HARDEMT - CEDARMILL RICH ESPRESSO

METAL PANEL
CENTRIA INTERCEPT - REGAL WHITE

EXPOSED SCREW METAL PANEL
CENTRIA TR-4 - 9910 LIGHT SEAWOLF

STAMM DEVELOPMENT GROUP
06/23/2020

3449 SCOTTS LANE
CIVIC DESIGN REVIEW
SOUTH EAST ELEVATION 01

NORTH WEST ELEVATION

SOUTH EAST ELEVATION

SOUTH WEST ELEVATION

EXTERIOR ELEVATIONS - BUILDING A

STAMM DEVELOPMENT GROUP

06/23/2020
## Civic Sustainable Design Checklist

### 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.

### Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location and Transportation</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Does project meet benchmark? If yes, please explain how. If no, please explain why not.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| (1) Access to Quality Transit | Locate a functional entry of the project within a 0.5-mile (0.8-km) walking distance of existing or planned bus, streetcar, or rideshare stops, bus rapid transit stops, light or heavy rail stations. 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. 
| (2) Reduced Parking Footprint | No new parking located in rear yard or under the building. Uncovered parking less than 40% of site area. |
| (3) Green Vehicles | Designate 5% of all parking spaces used by the project as preferred parking for green vehicles or car share vehicles. Identify and enforce use by car share or green vehicles, which include plug-in electric vehicles and alternative fuel vehicles. Yes. 
| (4) Railway Setbacks (Excluding frontages facing training/light rail or enclosed subsurface rail lines or subways) | To foster safety and maintain a 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. If setback used, specify distance. Yes. Building A minimum setback at 175’ from track. Building B minimum setback 11-5’ with no openings facing railway. |
| (5) Bike Share Station | Incorporate a bike share station in coordination with and conformance to the standards of Philadelphia Bike Share. Yes. Final location to be determined. |

### Water Efficiency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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>(6) Outdoor Water Use</td>
<td>Maintain on-site vegetation without irrigation. IR. Reduce of watering requirements at least 50% from the calculated baseline for the site’s peak watering month. Yes. Intent to provide, final design not finalized at this time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sustainable Sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Does project meet benchmark? If yes, please explain how. If no, please explain why not.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| (7) Permeable Site Surfaces | Conform to the stormwater requirements of the Philadelphia Water Department (PWD) and either: A) Develop a green street and contribute to PWD, designed and constructed in accordance with the PWD Green Streets Design Manual, OR B) Manage additional runoff from adjacent streets on the development site, designed and constructed in accordance with specifications of the PWD Stormwater Management Regulations Reduce the heat island effect through either of the following strategies: 50% or more of all on-site hardscapes. A) Hardscapes that have a high reflectance, in SRH-29, B) Shading by trees, structures, or solar panels. Yes. 
| (8) Rainwater Management | Yes. Site runoff from approx. 17,000 sq of adjacent property including 500 of impervious shared drive surface |

### Energy and Atmosphere

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Does project meet benchmark? If yes, please explain how. If no, please explain why not.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| (9) Heat Island Reduction (Excluding roofs) | 50% of all parking spaces used by the project as preferred parking for green vehicles or car share vehicles. Identify and enforce use by car share or green vehicles, which include plug-in electric vehicles and alternative fuel vehicles. Yes. 
| (10) Energy Commissioning and Energy Performance - Adherence to the New Building Code | PCPC notes that as of April 1, 2015, 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 and 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. 
| (11) Energy Commissioning and Energy Performance - Going beyond the code | Will the project pursue energy performance measures beyond what is required in the Philadelphia code by meeting any of these benchmarks? Yes. 
| No. commitment not established or not at this time. Intent to provide energy performance measures where possible. |
## SUSTAINABLE DESIGN CHECKLIST

| (12) Indoor Air Quality and Transportation | 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 replaced prior to occupancy. 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 replaced prior to occupancy. |
| (13) On-Site Renewable Energy | Produce renewable energy on-site that will provide at least 3% of the project’s anticipated energy use. No systems design not finalized at this time. |
| Innovation | Low-flow plumbing fixtures |
| (14) Innovation | Any other sustainable measures that could positively impact the public realm. |

---

1 Railway Association of Canada (RAC)’s “Guidelines for New Development in Proximity to Railway Operations. Exterior Sound transmission standard from LEED v4, BD+C, Acoustic Performance Credit.”

2 Title 4 The Philadelphia Building Code and Occupancy Code.


5 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.
**COMPLETE STREETS HANDBOOK CHECKLIST**

**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 $11-901 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.


**WHEN DO I NEED TO FILL OUT THE COMPLETE STREETS CHECKLIST?**

**WHEN YOU WANT TO:...**

[Diagram showing when to fill out the checklist]

**PRELIMINARY PCPC REVIEW AND COMMENT:**

**DATE:**

**FINAL STREETS DEPT REVIEW AND COMMENT:**

**DATE:**

1.

---

2.

---

**STAMM DEVELOPMENT GROUP**
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**PHILADELPHIA, PA | MONTCLAIR, NJ | 215.995.0228**
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**COMPLETE STREETS HANDBOOK CHECKLIST**

**INSTRUCTIONS (continued)**

APPLICANTS SHOULD MAKE SURE TO COMPLY WITH THE FOLLOWING REQUIREMENTS:

- This checklist is designed to be filled out electronically in Microsoft Word format. Please submit the Word version of the checklist. Text fields will expand automatically as you type.
- All plans submitted for review must clearly identify the width of the curb line, sidewalk, and roadway (as defined in Section 1 of the Handbook). "High Priority" Complete Streets treatments (identified in Table 3 and subsequent sections of the Handbook) should be identified and dimensioned on plans.
- All plans submitted for review must clearly identify and site all street furniture, including but not limited to bus shelters, street signs, and hydrants.
- Any project that calls for the development and installation of medians, bioswales, and other street furniture in the right-of-way may require a maintenance agreement with the Streets Department.
- ALL curb-adjacent designs must be submitted to the Streets Department for review.
- Any project that significantly changes the curb line may require a City Plan Action. The City Plan Action Application is available at [http://www.phila.gov/PlanningProjectReviews/Pages/DesignReviewApplications.aspx](http://www.phila.gov/PlanningProjectReviews/Pages/DesignReviewApplications.aspx). An application to the Streets Department for a City Plan Action is required when a project plan proposes the:
  - Placement of a new street;
  - Removal of an existing street;
  - Changes to roadway grades, curb lines, or widths; or
  - Placement or striking a city utility right-of-way.

Complete Streets Review Submission Requirement:

- **EXISTING CONDITIONS SITE PLAN,** should be at an identified standard engineering scale:
  - FULLY DIMENSIONED
  - CURB CUTS/DRIVEWAYS/UA/LAVY LANES
  - TREE PITS/LANDSCAPE
  - BICYCLE RACKS/STATIONS/STORAGE AREAS
  - TRANSIT SHELTERS/STAIRWAYS

- **PROPOSED CONDITIONS SITE PLAN,** should be at an identified standard engineering scale:
  - FULLY DIMENSIONED, INCLUDING DELINEATION OF WALKING, FURNISHING, AND BUILDING ZONES AND PINCH POINTS
  - PROPOSED CURB CUTS/DRIVEWAYS/UA/LAVY LANES
  - PROPOSED TREE PITS/LANDSCAPING
  - BICYCLE RACKS/STATIONS/STORAGE AREAS
  - TRANSIT SHELTERS/STAIRWAYS

*APPLICANTS PLEASE NOTE: ONLY FULL-SIZE, READABLE SITE PLANS WILL BE ACCEPTED. ADDITIONAL PLANS MAY BE REQUIRED AND WILL BE REQUESTED IF NEEDED.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STREET</th>
<th>FROM</th>
<th>TO</th>
<th>COMPLETE STREET TYPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scotts Lane</td>
<td>US Route 1</td>
<td>Property Boundary</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEPTA Regional Rail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Route 1</td>
<td>Scotts Lane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Neighborhood Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Does the Existing Conditions site survey clearly identify the following existing conditions with dimensions?

| a. Parking and loading regulations in curb lanes adjacent to the site | YES | NO |
| b. Street furniture such as bus shelters, honor boxes, etc. | YES | NO | N/A |
| c. Street direction | YES | NO | N/A |
| d. Curb Cuts | YES | NO | N/A |
| e. Utilities, including tree grates, vault covers, manholes, junction boxes, signs, lights, poles, etc. | YES | NO | N/A |
| f. Building Extensions into the sidewalk, such as stairs and stoops | YES | NO | N/A |
### COMPLETE STREETS HANDBOOK CHECKLIST

**PEDESTRIAN COMPONENT (Handbook Section 4.3)**

13. **Sidewalk:** List sidewalk widths for each street frontage. Required sidewalk widths are listed in Section 4.3 of the Handbook.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STREET FRONTAGE</th>
<th>SIDEWALK WIDTH</th>
<th>CITY PLAN SIDEWALK WIDTH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scotts Lane</td>
<td>6' / 6' / 6'</td>
<td>N/A / N/A / N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Route 1</td>
<td>N/A / N/A / N/A</td>
<td>N/A / N/A / N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. **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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STREET FRONTAGE</th>
<th>WALKING ZONE</th>
<th>CITY PLAN WALKING ZONE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scotts Lane</td>
<td>5' / 6' / 6'</td>
<td>N/A / N/A / N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Route 1</td>
<td>N/A / N/A / N/A</td>
<td>N/A / N/A / N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. **Vehicular Intrusions:** List vehicular intrusions into the sidewalk. Examples include but are not limited to driveways, lay by lanes, etc. Driveways and lay by lanes are addressed in sections 4.8.1 and 4.6.3, respectively, of the Handbook.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXISTING VEHICULAR INTRUSIONS</th>
<th>INTRUSION WIDTH</th>
<th>PLACEMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Curb Cut</td>
<td>56”</td>
<td>Scotts Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED VEHICULAR INTRUSIONS</th>
<th>INTRUSION WIDTH</th>
<th>PLACEMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Curb Cut</td>
<td>24”</td>
<td>Scotts Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### COMPLETE STREETS HANDBOOK CHECKLIST

**BICYCLE COMPONENT (Handbook Section 4.5)**


24. List the existing and proposed number of bicycle parking spaces, on- and off-street. Bicycle parking requirements are provided in The Philadelphia Code, Section 10-B04.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BUILDING / ADDRESS</th>
<th>REQUIRED SPACES</th>
<th>ON-STREET (Existing / Proposed)</th>
<th>SIDEWALK (Existing / Proposed)</th>
<th>OFF-STREET (Existing / Proposed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential Buildings</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0 / 0</td>
<td>0 / 0</td>
<td>0 / 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25. 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-Friendly Street
- Access Bicycle Share Stations

| DEPARTMENTAL APPROVAL | YES | NO | N/A | YES | NO |

26. Does the design provide bicycle connections to local bicycle, trail, and transit networks?

27. Does the design provide convenient bicycle connections to residences, workplaces, and other destinations?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPLICANT: Bicycle Component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Additional Explanation / Comments: A total of 16 bike parking spaces will be provided inside the four proposed residential buildings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW: Bicycle Component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reviewer Comments:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CURBSIDE MANAGEMENT COMPONENT (Handbook Section 4.6)

28. Does the design limit conflict among transportation modes along the curb? YES NO N/A

29. Does the design connect transit stops to the surrounding pedestrian network and destinations? YES NO N/A

30. Does the design provide a buffer between the roadway and pedestrian traffic? YES NO N/A

31. How does the proposed plan affect the accessibility, visibility, connectivity, and/or attractiveness of public transit? YES NO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPLICANT: Curbside Management Component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Additional Explanation / Comments: There is currently no bus route stop along Scotts Lane. The site is situated between multiple bus routes on Ridge Ave and Henry Ave. The #33 bus route located approximately 0.6 miles from the site on Henry Ave runs along Henry Avenue from Broad/Chestnut in Center City to Ridge/Lavonne in Haddonfield. The #3 bus route located approximately 0.3 miles from the site on Ridge/Avery Ave runs from 9th Street to Park Cemetery. The #31 bus route located approximately 0.3 miles from the site on Ridge Ave runs from 9th and Market in Center City to Manayunk. The #4 and #51 bus routes also serve the Wissahickon Transportation Station which is located on the Manayunk/Norristown Regional Rail Line.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW: Curbside Management Component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reviewer Comments:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### COMPLETE STREETS HANDBOOK CHECKLIST
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**COMPLETE STREETS HANDBOOK CHECKLIST**

**Philadelphia City Planning Commission**

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

41. If signal cycle changes are proposed, please identify Existing and Proposed Signal Cycle lengths; if not, go to question

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIGNAL LOCATION</th>
<th>EXISTING CYCLE LENGTHS</th>
<th>PROPOSED CYCLE LENGTHS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

42. No.

43. N/A

44. Does the design minimize the signal cycle length to reduce pedestrian wait time?  
   - Yes [ ]  
   - No [ ]  
   - N/A [ ]

45. Does the design provide adequate clearance time for pedestrians to cross streets?  
   - Yes [ ]  
   - No [ ]  
   - N/A [ ]

46. 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?  
   - Yes [ ]  
   - No [ ]  
   - N/A [ ]

47. 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?
   - Pedestrian Refuges  
   - Median Strips

48. Does the design reduce vehicle speeds and increase visibility for all modes at intersections?  
   - Yes [ ]  
   - No [ ]  
   - N/A [ ]

49. Overall, do intersection designs limit conflicts between all modes and promote pedestrian and bicycle safety?  
   - Yes [ ]  
   - No [ ]  
   - N/A [ ]

**APPLICANT: Intersections & Crossings Component**

Additional Explanation / Comments: Site is not located at a signalized intersection.

**DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW: Intersections & Crossings Component**

Reviewer Comments: ______

---
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