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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: ZP-2020-007455

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

The proposed project includes more than 100,000 sq. ft. of new gross floor area and more than 100 additional dwelling units.

PROJECT LOCATION

Planning District: South Council District: 1

Address: 1401 S. Christopher Columbus Blvd.
Philadelphia, PA 19147

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: Klehr Harrison Harvey Branzburg LLP
1835 Market St., Ste. 1400
Philadelphia, PA 19103

Property Owner: South Christopher Columbus Capital 1499 LLC

Developer: South Christopher Columbus Capital 1499 LLC

Architect: BLT Architects

SITE CONDITIONS

Site Area: 975,288 sq. ft.

Existing Zoning: CMX-3 Are Zoning Variances required? Yes No X

SITE USES

Present Use: Vacant

Proposed Use:

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

Previously reviewed 370 multi-family dwelling units; 485 multi-family dwelling units, 504,981 sq. ft.; 37,865 sq. ft. of vacant commercial space

Proposed # of Parking Units:

200 accessory parking spaces (554 total spaces, including those previously reviewed)

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: January 13, 2021 Time: 7pm

ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT HEARING

ZBA hearing scheduled: Yes No NA X

If yes, indicate the date hearing will be held:

Date: 

© BLT ARCHITECTS 2020
- APPROVED BY ZONING PERMIT #1049616 AND #ZP-2020-002175 -
vehicular drop-off

public realm

drop-off drive
blending of vehicular and pedestrian pavements for flexible event planning

drop-off drive

plaza precedent

sugar beach, toronto

security bollards

bike racks

bend seating

diana memorial fountain at hyde park

loch plaza t the MET
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Ground Level - Materials
planning

Ornamental Planting: drought + salt tolerant perennials, grasses, shrubs, and groundcovers.

Vegetated buffer

Shade Trees

Aesculus hippocastanum - Horse Chestnut

Liquidambar styraciflua - Slender Silhouette

Taxodium distichum - Bald Cypress

Prunus subhirtella - Autumnalis Cherry

Thuja plicata - Green Giant

Quercus shumardii - Shumard Oak

Cradachus kentukea - Yellowwood

river trail and natural buffer

field path in wildflower meadow

rain garden
1. Metal panel
2. Window with clear glazing
3. Alum. storefront with clear glazing
4. Entrance to parking
5. Entrance to loading dock
6. Precast concrete
7. Metal panel
GENERAL PROJECT INFORMATION

1. PROJECT NAME
   1401 Columbus Boulevard
2. DATE
   November 23, 2020
3. APPLICANT NAME
   Hercules Grigos, Esq.
4. APPLICANT CONTACT INFORMATION
   hgrigos@kklaw.com
5. OWNER NAME
   South Christopher Columbus Capital 1499 LLC
6. OWNER CONTACT INFORMATION
   MIKE BURKE, MBURKE@PAXMANAGEMENT.COM
7. ENGINEER / ARCHITECT NAME
   Ruggiero Plante Land Design
8. ENGINEER / ARCHITECT CONTACT INFORMATION
   dennis@ruggieroplante.com
9. STREET FRONTAGE: List the streets associated with the project. Complete Streets Types can be found at www.phila.gov/map under the “Complete Street Types” field. Complete Streets Types are also identified in Section 3 of the Handbook.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STREET FRONTAGE</th>
<th>COMPLETE STREET TYPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Columbus Boulevard</td>
<td>Tasker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reed Street (Private)</td>
<td>Auto Oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus Blvd</td>
<td>Local (CITY NEIGHBORHOOD)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. STREETS: List the streets associated with the project. Complete Streets Types can be found at www.phila.gov/map under the “Complete Street Types” field. Complete Streets Types are also identified in Section 3 of the Handbook.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STREET</th>
<th>STREET FRONTAGE</th>
<th>COMPLETE STREET TYPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Columbus Boulevard</td>
<td>End</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasker Street</td>
<td>Local (CITY NEIGHBORHOOD)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reed Street (Private)</td>
<td>End</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
   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 Extensions into the sidewalk, such as stairs and stoops
12. Additional Explanation / Comments: THIS SUBMISSION IS FOR THE REVISED NORTHERN END OF THE PROJECT FRONTING ON “REED STREET”. REED STREET IS STRICKEN AT COLUMBUS BLVD. IT IS PRIVATE PROPERTY (SPLIT OWNERSHIP BETWEEN OUR PROPERTY AND THE COMCAST SITE TO THE NORTH). IMPROVEMENTS TO TASKER WERE APPROVED PREVIOUSLY AND ARE NOT BEING CHANGED. FOR DICKENSON STREET WE HAVE SLIGHTLY REVISED THE LAYOUT FROM THE PREVIOUS APPROVAL. WE STILL PROVIDED 5’ MIN. SIDEWALKS ON EACH SIDE. ALONG FORMER REED STREET WE PROVIDED 2 CURB CUTS. ONE TO A DRIVE SERVICING THE SITE AND ANOTHER TO PARKING THAT HAS BEEN ALLOCATED FOR PRIVATE RESIDENCES TO BE ENFORCED BY THE GOVERNING HOA.

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>Required / Existing / Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TASKER Street</td>
<td>10’ / 12’ / 12’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REED STREET (PRIVATE)</td>
<td>10’ / 8’ / 12’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14. 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>INTRUSION TYPE</th>
<th>INTRUSION WIDTH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TASKER Street</td>
<td>5’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REED STREET (PRIVATE)</td>
<td>5’ / 8’ / 5’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
15. REVIEWER COMMENTS:
   DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW: General Project Information
   REVIEWER COMMENTS:
   PROVIDE 2 CURB CUTS. ONE TO A DRIVE SERVICING THE SITE AND ANOTHER TO PARKING THAT HAS BEEN ALLOCATED FOR PRIVATE RESIDENCES TO BE ENFORCED BY THE GOVERNING HOA.
PEDESTRIAN COMPONENT (continued)

15. When considering the overall design, does it create or enhance a pedestrian environment that provides safe and comfortable access for all pedestrians at all times of the day? 

DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW: Pedestrian Component

DEPARTMENTAL APPROVAL: Pedestrian Component

Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A ☐

FORMALIZING AND WIDENING THE WALKWAY ALONG REED STREET, MULTIPLE TRAIL CONNECTIONS, ALLOWING FOR BIKE RACKS AND MORE STREET TREES ALL IMPROVE THE ACCESS AND COMFORT OF PEDESTRIANS. IN ADDITION, THE DEVELOPMENT ENABLES THE CONTINUATION OF THE DELAWARE RIVER TRAIL. REED’S LAYOUT HAS BEEN ADJUSTED TO MEET CITY NEIGHBORHOOD REQUIREMENTS (6’ WALKING ZONE).

DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW: Pedestrian Component

Reviewer Comments:

BUILDING & FURNISHING COMPONENT (Handbook Section 4.4)

16. 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.

| STREET FRONTAGE | MAXIMUM BUILDING ZONE WIDTH
|------------------|-------------------------------
| Reed Street (PRIVATE) | 6’ / 6’ / 6’ |

DEPARTMENTAL APPROVAL: Building & Furnishing Component

Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A ☐

17. 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.

| STREET FRONTAGE | MINIMUM FURNISHING ZONE WIDTH
|------------------|-------------------------------
| Reed Street (PRIVATE) | 4’ / 0’ / 0’ |

DEPARTMENTAL APPROVAL: Building & Furnishing Component

Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A ☐

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

- Bicycle Parking
- Lighting
- Benches
- Street Trees
- Street Furniture

DEPARTMENTAL APPROVAL: Building & Furnishing Component

Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A ☐

19. Does the design avoid tripping hazards?

20. 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

DEPARTMENTAL APPROVAL: Building & Furnishing Component

Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A ☐

BUILDING & FURNISHING COMPONENT (continued)

21. Do streets trees and/or plants comply with street installation requirements (see sections 4.4.7 & 4.4.8)

DEPARTMENTAL APPROVAL: Building & Furnishing Component

Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A ☐

22. Does the design maintain adequate visibility for all roadway users at intersections?

DEPARTMENTAL APPROVAL: Building & Furnishing Component

Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A ☐

APPLICANT: Building & Furnishing Component

Additional Explanation / Comments: STREET TREES, LIGHTING AND BENCHES WILL BE PART OF THE OVERALL SITE DESIGN.

DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW: Building & Furnishing Component

Reviewer Comments:
**BICYCLE COMPONENT (Handbook Section 4.5)**

23. List elements of the project that incorporate recommendations of the Pedestrian and Bicycle Plan, located online at http://phila2035.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/06/bikePedfinal2.pdf. On-street bike racks as well as covered spaces in the residential buildings will be provided.

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 14-804.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BUILDING / ADDRESS</th>
<th>REQUIRED SPACES</th>
<th>ON-STREET Existing / Proposed</th>
<th>ON SIDEWALK Existing / Proposed</th>
<th>OFF-STREET Existing / Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1499 Columbus Boulevard (phase 2)</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>0 / 0</td>
<td>0 / 0</td>
<td>0 / 169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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

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

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

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

28. Does the design limit conflict among transportation modes along the curb?

29. Does the design connect transit stops to the surrounding pedestrian network and destinations?

30. Does the design provide a buffer between the roadway and pedestrian traffic?

31. How does the proposed plan affect the accessibility, visibility, connectivity, and/or attractiveness of public transit?

Formalized sidewalk along Reed, better access to the proposed trail system.

**APPLICANT: Bicycle Component**

Additional Explanation / Comments: The River Trail including a bicycle component runs through the site and the residences are safely connected to it via pedestrian "streets" and driveways.

**DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW: Bicycle Component**

Reviewer Comments:

**APPLICANT: Curbside Management Component**

Additional Explanation / Comments:

**DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW: Curbside Management Component**

Reviewer Comments:
VEHICLE / CARTWAY COMPONENT (Handbook Section 4.7)

32. If lane changes are proposed, identify existing and proposed lane widths and the design speed for each street frontage; if not, go to question No. 35

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

33. What is the maximum AASHTO design vehicle being accommodated by the design?

34. Will the project affect a historically certified street? An inventory of historic streets is maintained by the Philadelphia Historical Commission.

35. Will the public right-of-way be used for loading and unloading activities?

36. Does the design maintain emergency vehicle access?

37. Where new streets are being developed, does the design connect and extend the street grid?

38. Does the design support multiple alternative routes to and from destinations as well as within the site?

39. Overall, does the design balance vehicle mobility with the mobility and access of all other roadway users?

APPLICANT: Vehicle / Cartway Component
Additional Explanation / Comments: FORMALIZING “REED STREET” TO MAKE IT A STREET WITH FULL SIDEWALK AND CURB ALONG THE FRONTAGE.

DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW: Vehicle / Cartway Component
Reviewer Comments:

URBAN DESIGN COMPONENT (Handbook Section 4.8)

40. Does the design incorporate windows, storefronts, and other active uses facing the street?

41. Does the design provide driveway access that safely manages pedestrian / bicycle conflicts with vehicles (see Section 4.8.1)?

42. Does the design provide direct, safe, and accessible connections between transit stops/stations and building access points and destinations within the site?

APPLICANT: Urban Design Component
Additional Explanation / Comments:

DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW: Urban Design Component
Reviewer Comments:

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

43. If signal cycle changes are proposed, please identify Existing and Proposed Signal Cycle lengths; if not, go to question No. 48.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIGNAL LOCATION</th>
<th>EXISTING CYCLE LENGTH</th>
<th>PROPOSED CYCLE LENGTH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Questions

44. Does the design minimize the signal cycle length to reduce pedestrian wait time?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

45. Does the design provide adequate clearance time for pedestrians to cross streets?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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?

If yes, City Plan Action may be required.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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?

- Marked Crosswalks
- Pedestrian Refuge Islands
- Signal Timing and Operation
- Bike Boxes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

48. Does the design reduce vehicle speeds and increase visibility for all modes at intersections?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

49. Overall, do intersection designs limit conflicts between all modes and promote pedestrian and bicycle safety?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**APPLICANT: Intersections & Crossings Component**

Additional Explanation / Comments:

---

**DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW: Intersections & Crossings Component**

Reviewer Comments:
Civic Sustainable Design Checklist – Updated September 3, 2019

Civic 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:

- Reduction 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. If no, please explain why not</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Access to Quality Transit</td>
<td>Locate a functional entry of the project within a ¼-mile (400-m) walking distance of existing or planned bus, street, or sidewalk stops, bus rapid transit stops, light rail or heavy rail stations.</td>
<td>Yes. One residential entry lobby will be less than 1/4 mile from the bus stop located at the corner of Columbus Boulevard and Tasker Street, and this walk will be by the Philadelphia Streets Management Regulations.</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 unobstructed or uncovered parking areas are 40% or less of the site area.</td>
<td>No, the parking area will be located within a fully enclosed parking garage under the building. Although mostly new, some of the existing parking spaces will also be provided.</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.</td>
<td>Yes. 5% of the parking spaces will be designated as electric vehicle charging spaces, green vehicle spaces, and/or car share spaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Railway Setbacks (Excluding frontages facing trolley/light rail or enclosed subsurface rail lines or subways)</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Property does not front any railway.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Water Efficiency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Water Efficiency</th>
<th>Water Efficiency</th>
<th>Water Efficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[6] Outdoor Water Use</td>
<td>Maintain on-site vegetation without irrigation. OR, Reduce of watering requirements at least 50% from the calculated baseline for the site’s peak watering month.</td>
<td>Yes. Plant selections made to minimize irrigation requirements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sustainable Sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainable Sites</th>
<th>Sustainable Sites</th>
<th>Sustainable Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[7] Permeable Site Surfaces</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Yes. More than 30% of the site will be provided with vegetated and/or pervious surfaces.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rainwater Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rainwater Management</th>
<th>Rainwater Management</th>
<th>Rainwater Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[8] Permeable Site Surfaces</td>
<td>Conform to the stormwater requirements of the Philadelphia Water Department (PWD) and either: A) Develop a green street and mandate it 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.</td>
<td>Yes, the adjacent streets on the development site will conform with section B.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Energy and Atmosphere

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Energy and Atmosphere</th>
<th>Energy and Atmosphere</th>
<th>Energy and Atmosphere</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[10] Energy Commissioning and Energy Performance - Adherence to the New Building Code</td>
<td>PCPC notes that as of April 1, 2019 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 ask 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.</td>
<td>The project will pursue Option B under IECC 2018 by following MANDATORY DESIGN IN Section 9.1, specifically ASHRAE 90.1-2016.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| [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, the project will pursue energy performance measures beyond what is required in the Philadelphia code by meeting any of these benchmarks: 1) Reduce energy consumption by achieving 10% energy savings or more from an established baseline using:

- Energy Star: www.energystar.gov
- LEED 4.1, Optimize Energy Performance in LEED v4.1
- For Passive House, see www.phius.org
- Section 9.04.504.6 “Filters” of the City of Los Angeles Municipal Code, from a 2016 Los Angeles Ordinance requiring enhanced air filters in homes near freeways.


2. Title 4 The Philadelphia Building Construction and Occupancy Code


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

5. For Energy Star: www.energystar.gov

6. For Passive House, see www.phius.org

7. Section 9.04.504.6 “Filters” of the City of Los Angeles Municipal Code, from a 2016 Los Angeles Ordinance requiring enhanced air filters in homes near freeways.