

PHILADELPHIA CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
April 15, 2008

PRESENT: Andrew Altman, Chair
Patrick J. Eiding
Alan Greenberger
Bernard Lee
Natalia Olson de Savyckyj
Joseph Syrnick
Peggy VanBelle, representing Rob Dubow

ABSENT: Nilda Ruiz
Camille Cates Barnett

Acting Executive Director

Gary J. Jastrzab

Chair Andrew Altman convened the City Planning Commission Meeting of April 15, 2008 at 11:00 AM.

1) *Executive Director's Update*

Mr. Jastrzab stated that there would not be any meeting minutes to approve from the March 18, 2008 Philadelphia City Planning Commission meeting due to staff illness. He also said that those minutes would be available at the next Commission meeting.

He reported that the Philadelphia Rowhouse Manual: A Practical Guide for Homeowners, which was distributed to the Commissioners, was a joint publication of the Philadelphia City Planning Commission, the Office of Housing and Community Development and the Neighborhood Transformation Initiative. He added that the publication was made possible by a Preservation Development Initiative Grant from the National Trust for Historic Preservation, as well as the John S. and James L. Knight Foundation. Copies of the rowhouse Manual, which should be seen as the first step in a new Rowhouse initiative, will be given to City officials, public libraries, and community groups. It is also available on the Planning Commission's website. Mr. Jastrzab thanked the Planning Commission staff involved, especially the project manager, Laura Spina.

He also provided an update on the work of the Zoning Code Commission. The ZCC was created last August by a charter change and all of the members have been appointed. The ZCC's Operating Budget Hearing would be held before City Council in the afternoon of April 15, 2008. In addition, a draft of the Request for Qualifications has been prepared and, once funding has been ensured, the RFQ will be released. The ZCC's goal is to have a technical consultant on board by the end of May.

2) *Information Only Presentation: 1900 Block of Walnut Street
(Castleway Properties, LLC)*

Mark King, of Castleway Properties, spoke of the challenges of the proposed development, including the fact that it includes two parcels which are split by Moravian Street. He added that parking is difficult, historic buildings are involved, and there are site constraints as well as zoning limitations. However, in addition to the opportunity to create a world-class project and landmark, the development will revitalize the northwest quadrant of Rittenhouse Square.

The proposed development will consist of a 220 ft. hotel in front, with a 525 ft. condominium tower in the rear. There will be high-end retail on the ground level on Walnut Street to create an anchor location in the area. Parking will be four floors below grade and cars will enter from 20th Street. There will be approximately 190 parking spaces and all hotel parking will be valet. A ramp from 20th Street to the basement will be provided for servicing. The developer is looking to get the highest LEED certification through the use of green roofs and garden area, as well as other LEED criteria. Castleway believes the development can be built within the context of the neighborhood

due to the fact that it will not block other buildings, impose on the square or limit other buildings' light or views. The developer has several requests including a zoning change (C4 to C5), a height waiver, and the removal of two existing buildings.

Commissioner Comments:

- Mr. Eiding: Is that part of Moravian Street active?
- Mr. King: About nine other parties currently use it; if it gets stricken from the city plan all property owners would have to agree.
- Mr. Eiding: What kinds of considerations will there be for current business?
- Mr. King: We ay not pursue striking the street (may choose to bridge over it instead, although we would prefer to strike it). Have already begun to meet with the local businesses to either minimize the disruption or to compensate them for it.
- Mr. Greenberger: What is the total square footage?
- Mr. King: It is .83 acres.
- Mr. Greenberger: Does the greenway provide for a bonus in the zoning code?
- Mr. Sklaroff: We are looking to increase the FAR and arrange the deed restrictions concerning height and setback; working with Center City Residents Association's development plan (i.e. parking below grade).
- Mr. Greenberger: Requested a fact sheet from Castleway on zoning strategy.
- Mr. Sklaroff: We are currently working on one.
- Mr. Syrnick: What is the route the valet cars will take?
- Mr. Sklaroff: They have two options (one option is to take 20th Street to Sansom Street); again, they are working with the community and have removed banquet facilities from the plan to reduce traffic.
- Mr. Syrnick: Where will pedestrians be able to walk?
- Mr. King: On the east side of the thruway. We expect light car traffic and are working to restrict public car access. There will be a sidewalk/ footpath for pedestrians.
- Mr. Greenberger: Where will taxis pick up?
- Mr. King: Pull into the thruway when called and then pull out.

- Mr. Altman: Have there been traffic and circulation studies?
- Mr. King: Working with Orth-Rogers and Associates, Inc. and the Streets Department.
- Mr. Altman: Will there be a codified traffic plan?
- Mr. Sklaroff: We hope to make an agreement with CCRA so that they don't oppose the plan later on. We also plan to include some things in the deed restriction and their zoning will limit some things.
- Mr. Greenberger: Strongly suggests that PCPC staff is included in these agreements.
- Mr. Sklaroff: Wouldn't mind if PCPC was the beneficiary of deed restrictions; working to maintain the public interest (parking, loading, retail).
- Mr. Greenberger: Important to keep the public good in mind but don't forget the City departments.
- Mr. Synchronick: Don't leave the City out.
- Mr. Lee: What about discussions with the Historical Commission?
- Mr. Sklaroff: We have talked to them a little bit, and we haven't decided if our strategy is to a public interest demolition or a hardship case. The two buildings have previously been approved for removal for a garage and then that decision was overturned. There are three pieces that need to come together for the plan to work: Moravian Street, FAR change, historic piece – all are necessary.
- Mr. Altman: Is there a timeline for performance following a rezoning? Need to construct an agreement so that the projects that get proposed for a rezoning are the ones that get built.
- Owner: Believe there is sufficient quality and commercial resilience for this project to work in the market.
- Mr. Altman: Need a way to address zoning changes if a project does not get built.
- Mr. Altman: When do you anticipate to present legislation?
- Mr. Sklaroff: Before the legislation recess.

3) *Information Only Presentation: Hotel Development Overview (Bennur Koksuz)*

Tabled for the sake of time.

4) *Bill No. 080253 – Stamper Square Zoning Remapping Ordinance
(Marty Gregorski)*

Marty Gregorski, of the Development Planning Division, gave the presentation. He stated that the zoning change was being requested from an area with both “C2” to “C4” and “R10A” for construction of a 150-unit hotel, residential condominium units and parking. The Development team has met with the community and City Planning Commission staff. Starwoods Hotel has given a letter of intent (which has been extended once) and has until early May to get financing and give their final commitment. A further delay poses a risk to Starwoods involvement. The team is negotiating with Unite Here (a group of hotel union workers).

The Development staff gave a brief history of the site and explained that zoning is because the site had been made smaller and the zoning remained after the site was returned to its original size. Earlier proposals of a 40 story condo and a later one that was 24 stories never materialized. The site is currently vacant and has been since early 2000. There is a contrast of scales in Society Hill; the developer has looked at green paths and plans to knit together the park and the hotel – not a large hotel, but rather one that is a special, luxury hotel. In essence it will consist of a public park/court with the building wrapped around it. All parking will be 100% valet. The six-story hotel will have a small meeting space, a spa, and pool with a green deck with a residents tower above it. It will be a brick building as of those in the neighborhood. Height is the issue of contention regarding this project. Mr. Gregorski cited Mr. Bacon’s plan of 1966 and other tall buildings that are in the area. Again, the area is much larger than what zoning was set at previously.

Mr. Gregorski recapped that PCPC approves the Plan and requests that passage be held for a deed restriction and a sunset provision. He also read an email from Gary regarding Council.

Commissioner Comments:

- Mr. Greenberger: What is the size of the property? FAR?
- Mr. Lee: What discussions did you have with the community group?
- Developer: How construction would be handled, how development would proceed post development (music outside, no cocktail parties outside). Met with Society Hill Civic Association and Zoning Committee. Reduced height from 18 to 15 stories.
- Mr. Greenberger: If this were “C-4” would the walkway get a bonus?
- Developer: Yes.

Public Testimony:

- Richard Lush: The tower is too high & out of scale; the site cannot accommodate a project this size. There is no set back on Front Street and the site is central to the district, not on the edge. Society Hill Towers is a special case (shouldn't be considered the norm or the precedent); Society Hill was intended to be historic with low structures and density; need to keep materials and scale in mind. Inventing a new square makes no sense.
- John Gallery, (Preservation Alliance): Need to reanalyze the relationship between PCPC and the Historical Commission. The Historical Commission has full jurisdiction over this project and hasn't voted yet so PCPC shouldn't act before the Historical Commission does (which makes this presentation premature). In regard to zoning, the Historical Commission should be making the decisions about the zoning and because there is no plan for the zoning of this area any rezoning would be spot zoning. The presenter's description of the Bacon Plan was inaccurate; the façade is not compatible with the surrounding area. Is it a "new day" or business as usual?
- Robert Hubner: Lives on the 100 block of Lombard Street and has seen the area change and progress. He is not in support of the project. Believes Headhouse will be in shambles if this is passed.
- Janet Dumas: Has lived in Society Hill since 1990. The current site is an eyesore and the proposed development is good and will fit well in the neighborhood. In addition, having retail is good and she would like to have retail that caters to families with small children. Her only concern is parking; parking should come with the unit (Developer responds that it will). She feels that this project will revitalize Front Street.
- Murat Aslansen: Lives at 108 Pine Street. The developer has been negotiating with the community for three years and this proposal has support on Pine Street, Lombard Street and the Society Hill Civic Association. She believes that the proposal respects the surrounding properties (setbacks, open space, shadows), that there is economic potential (lower South Street is losing good retail), and that this proposal is needed to improve the community.
- Tania Rorke: Has lived in Society Hill Since 1998 and is a member of Society Hill Civic Association. She is in support of the project and thinks that the developer has responded to the community's needs. She stated that Society Hill Civic Association voted: 12-12 concerning supporting the project & 12-8 majority opposed to rezoning. Furthermore, she stated that the project will benefit Queen Village and the Headhouse Corridor and that there has previously been support for tall buildings.
- Ross Nesivich: Owns the condominium building at 113 Lombard Street and said that while the neighborhood and the civic organization might be divided, his condo association is for the development. He went on to say that it is a vocal minority that is at the meeting to voice their opinion and that the area has been waiting 10 years for a proposal and no other proposals have been presented with a lower height.

- Carl Mansfield: Lives at 336 South Front Street. He helped work to collect 230 signatures of those opposed to the project and rezoning. Also believes that some of the project supporters are getting benefits for supporting the project (i.e., parking). He maintains that the majority opposes the project because of the historical aspect that the proposed structure is too high. He believes that the building should only be 10 stories.
- Developer: Offered depictions of the project from different angles.
- Benita Fair Langsdorf: Member of Society Hill Civic Association Zoning & Historic Preservation Committee. Had asked PCPC in the past whether or not the zoning in the area was appropriate and they were told it was. On December 12, 2005 a letter was sent to the Civic Association from Councilman DiCicco about the zoning. The community is not in support of this development and the near neighbors to the project signed a contract that required their public support of the project in exchange for free parking. Society Hill Civic Association voted 13-8 against rezoning.
- David Hammond: Represents 400 businesses. The proposal is a significant opportunity to revitalize the corridor and the 2nd Street plaza. Open space will be a good addition to the area. South Street Headhouse is currently undertaking a streetscape/ revitalization effort and this project is in the South Street Headhouse area and their board voted unanimously to support it.
- Paul Boni: Resident of Society Hill (300 Block of Spruce Street) & Chairman of Society Hill Civic Association's Zoning & Historic Preservation Committee. The current proposal isn't in scale, this is a historic district- don't change the zoning (especially with the civic group against the ordinance and the community has collected 250+ signatures against the proposal). Stamper Square was pulled from the Historical Commission's agenda – wait to send this to City Council until the Historical Commission has seen it. He then read the petition that was circulated (current zoning is correct, against spot zoning).
- James Pearl: Lawyer for the individuals at 402 South Front Street says they support the project.
- Terry Champion: Has lived on Pine Street since 1982. The proposal is not in context with the surrounding buildings or Society Hill. Claims that Society Hill Civic Association ruled against the rezoning and that neighbors within three blocks of the development have signed the petition against the rezoning. Feels that the building is too tall.

Developer Response:

- Regarding the parking space agreement: New Market had provided spaces and there is a legal question if the agreement is still valid with the new development. The developer has agreed to continue the agreement. Finds it offensive to suggest that people were bribed.

- Regarding the Historical Commission: Went to the Historical Commission to ask about their jurisdiction; asked it to be removed from the Historical Commission's agenda so that the developer can have the appropriate staff to interact with the Historical Commission.

Commissioner Comments:

- Mr. Greenberger: Does the Historical Commission have jurisdiction?
- Developer: The Historical Commission believes that they have jurisdiction because this is an already developed site – slab is still there.
- Mr. Altman: When will the Historical Commission see this?
- Developer: They will have to sign off on the project in order for them to get permits from Licenses & Inspections.
- Mr. Altman: If the Historical Commission opposes the project, how is that reconciled, especially if the legislation has already been approved?
- Developer: Have jurisdiction; it would have to be dealt with through the legal process.
- Mr. Greenberger: There will be projects brought to the PCPC before the City has a comprehensive plan and before the zoning reform work is done and there are design guidelines. What is the City Council committee process?
- Mr. Jastrzab: Following the committee hearing, they can either choose to waive the rules or not and it can be held in committee.
- Mr. Greenberger: Doesn't like the idea of rezoning- rezoning establishes a new asset in perpetuity and supports the staff recommendation that the rezoning has a sunset clause. The project itself is well designed.
- Mr. Eiding: If we don't do anything does that leave the decision up to Council?
- Mr. Gregorski: Yes.
- Mr. Altman: Can you elaborate on the analysis that PCPC did to generate the staff recommendation?
- Mr. Jastrzab: The site is 1.5 acres and has been a commercial site in the past. This development is downsized from previous proposals and is consistent with form, materials and plan for the area the projects. Adds public benefit (greenway that will be maintained & has active use), is respectful about meeting the street and will not be overburdened by traffic. Recommend that that the PCPC review the agreement that will tie the design to the rezoning (may review the agreement later this month).

- Mr. Altman: The issue of jurisdiction can't be resolved today. The staff recommendation makes a good point that rezoning isn't the right tool for this (large development projects). Before Council has their final vote, PCPC should see the agreement/ conditions. A sunset clause is necessary.
- Mr. Eiding: Until the zoning system is resolved and the process is smoothed out, PCPC shouldn't pass things to City Council without guidance.
- Mr. Greenberger: Two tools to use- rezoning and the ZBA; neither one is a perfect tool right now. Need to give Council a recommendation.

Greenberger, motion to approve, recommending the deed restriction, Syrnick seconded.

- Mr. Lee: Who would the agreement be with?
- Mr. Jastrzab: A deed restriction agreement is with the City or they have the option of doing a community benefits agreements.
- Mr. Altman: Would project plans be filed as part of the deed restrictions?
- Mr. Jastrzab: Could recommend that.
- Mr. Altman: And what about the time restrictions?

- Mr. Jastrzab & Mr. Schwartz: If the project isn't started within the time limit, the parcel goes back to its original zoning.
- Mr. Altman: PCPC needs to see the details of the agreement.

Mr. Greenberger made motion, Mr. Syrnick seconded. Approved as amended.

5) *Zoning Board of Adjustment: Aloft Hotel,
1501 Locust Street (Mary Gregorski)*

Mr. Altman left to attend another meeting, therefore, Mr. Greenberg acted as Chair.

Peter Kelsen presented the project. The project has a small footprint, the north and west walls are designed to contain windows; the ground floor with retail uses is consistent with C-5 zoning. The community is supportive of the project, hotel use (by right use), off site valet parking (site cannot accommodate on site parking), façade used to mask loading, trash will be kept in building.

Developer & Architect presented the façade plans. They are in the process of

developing a more detailed design; within a few weeks they will be completed and the windows will be in accordance with the building code. They will continue to involve the community & PCPC, using LEED standards, and have done traffic and analysis studies.

Commissioner Comments:

- Mr. Syrnick: Will the project connect to the PATCO line?
- Mr. Kelsen: We looked at the possibility and determined that it couldn't be done.
- Mr. Syrnick: Is the loading done inside or hidden?
- Architect: Fully internalized within the building, even though that's not required by law.
- Mr. Syrnick: What happens when the trash truck come to collect the trash?
- Mr. Kelsen: The truck pulls up to the curb and the trash is brought out.
- Mr. Syrnick: What street will the trash pick up happen on?
- Mr. Kelsen: 15th.
- Ms. Olson: Will this limit traffic all the time?
- Mr. Kelsen: The amount of trash will be small and they will time the trash pick up to keep it as simple as possible.
- Mr. Eiding: What is the process to remove the trash?
- Mr. Kelsen: A small dumpster.
- Mr. Syrnick: What about the current lanes?
- Dick Orth: A lane is currently closed due to construction and there are already bollards on 15th Street. The West lane has always been used for parking/ loading. The proposal will not be taking a lane out of traffic use.

Public Comment:

- Lynn Fox: Business Manager of Unite Here: Hersha Group is experienced. This project will cater to business travelers and Convention Center overflow. It's in a good location and they support the project.

Commissioner Comments:

- Mr. Greenberger: When are you going to the ZBA?

- Mr. Kelsen: April 23rd.
- Mr. Greenberger: Are you asking for a FAR and setback variance?
- Mr. Kelsen: Yes.
- Mr. Greenberger: What about a freight elevator- doesn't run for the entire building.
- Mr. Kelsen: Freight will be transferred to the regular elevators.
- Mr. Greenberger: What argument will be used to argue for the FAR variance?
- Mr. Kelsen: It is a tight site and in order to create retail space it is necessary for the hotel to be the size they are asking for while keeping scale in mind; can't get any bonuses if they stay with the current zoning.
- Mr. Greenberger: It would be possible to build a smaller hotel by right.
- Mr. Kelsen: Business model wouldn't work; need a critical mass.
- Mr. Greenberger: On the rendering there is a triangular light shown- is that a shadow or glass?
- Architect: Still working on finalizing the design- design will be shown to the community & PCPC.
- Mr. Greenberger: Dealing with the party walls- must be able to take the windows out.
- Mr. Kelsen: Yes, but hopefully will get a variance that will allow them to keep them.
- Mr. Greenberger: Need a concrete service operation proposal.
- Mr. Kelsen: Committed to getting hours of operations that are conducive to neighbors and traffic.
- Mr. Greenberger: Will moving trash be a problem for pedestrians?
- Mr. Kelsen: Want to do it early in the morning.
- Ms. Olson: How does the community feel?
- Mr. Kelsen: They are not in opposition.
- Mr. Eiding: Will you have a final design by the ZBA hearing?
- Mr. Kelsen: No.

- Mr. Lee: How will the agreement for trash pick up be shown?
- Mr. Kelsen: We can state it in the contract with the vendors.
- Mr. Lee: CCRA didn't ask for a formal commitment?
- Mr. Kelsen: No.
- Mr. Eiding: Where will passenger loading and unloading happen?
- Mr. Kelsen: No lay by lane, they will sign it with the Streets Department.
- Mr. Eiding, motion to approve, Ms. Olson seconded. Passes.

6) *Tabled Bill 080209 – Disposition of 1043-1047 and 1101-1119 Front Street (Gregory Hartman)*

Gregory Hartman, of the Development Planning Division, made the presentation. This Bill allows the City to transfer the properties at 1043-1047 N. Front Street and 1101-1119 N. Front Street to PAID, who, in turn, will market the property to a private owner.

- Public Property: This process started four years ago with a meeting with Councilman DiCicco who had an interested developer at that time. A bill was introduced and there was a public hearing. The developer then pulled out so the site was marketed- got one additional response, have signed an agreement of sale and have an ordinance prepared.
- Mr. Greenberger: Not consistent with an RFP process.
- Mr. Jastrzab: Doesn't seem to be. This is just a transfer of property?
- Mr. Hartman: Yes.
- Mr. Greenberger: In principal the sale of excess property is fine but the question is whether we should be recommending the sale of property without having a plan for it. With an RFP, proposals would include an intended use so the City would have a say.
- Public Property: The community will get a say when a zoning change and permitting is done; doing an RFP process doesn't mean that a developer is required to develop the land.
- Mr. Redding: PCPC staff met with the community. They are open to development but they want to see a plan. Northern Liberties Neighbors Association & New Kensington are opposed to the transfer without a plan.

- Mr. Synchronick: We know who would get the land and that it will be a mixed use development (commercial and residential).
- Ms. Belle: We will get control as street striking or zoning comes up.
- Mr. Kramer: Spoke with the developers and they aren't planning on doing anything in the near future.
- Public Property: There have been complaints of short dumping so part of the area has been fenced in.
- Mr. Greenberger: Is it an advantage to have it in private hands? Do we want to authorize transfer to PAID?
- Public Property: There is less liability.

Public Comment:

- Jennifer Lewis (Northern Liberties Neighbors Association): she is speaking on behalf of the: Fishtown Neighbors Association & Northern Liberties Neighbors Association & the Kensington CDC. There is community based planning in this area and there is support for planning but not land banking. A public property transfer should require a plan and this transfer should wait until there is one.

Commissioner Comments:

- Ms. Olson: Can we do a deed restriction?
- Mr. Jastrzab: Maybe. Is this an option?
- Public Property: In the past deed restrictions have been used .
- Ms. Van Belle: There is already a de facto deed restriction because it is zoned industrially.
- Henry Schwartz: City Council has already held hearings. PCPC should make a legal recommendation, not legal conditions.
- Mr. Synchronick: Is it customary to sign a deal for a property that Public Property doesn't own?
- Public Property: Yes.
- Mr. Greenberger: Maybe table this until there is a plan. This is land banking and that should be acknowledged.
- Ms. Van Belle: People won't develop a plan until they have the title to the land.

- Public Property: If you do an RFP, most likely won't be a lot of response. Public property isn't getting a lot of interest in the property.
- Mr. Eiding: Concerned with how long the property will stay undeveloped once sold but there is enough process to see the plans for development.
- Mr. Syrnick: Is this an active developer?
- Ms. Van Belle, motion to approve the transfer only, Mr. Eiding seconded. Vote taken Mr. Eiding, Mr. Syrnick & Ms. VanBelle voted YES; Ms. Olson voted NO.

7) *Bill No. 080277 – Creating a new section 14-114 entitled “Sustainable Zoning” (Marty Gregorski)*

Marty Gregorski, of the Development Planning Division, made the presentation. He read the definitions listed in the Bill. He supports the ideal of sustainable zoning (definition of building area may be unnecessary). The Bill, which requires a building occupying a minimum horizontal area of 50,000 sq. ft. to have a green roof for at least 75% of the roof top space, states where you need a green roof but not where can't have one. He has a problem with the idea of no variances unless it is an unconstitutional taking. He said that the staff recommends that the Commission request an additional 45 days to consider this Bill.

Commissioner Comment:

- Ms. Olson: Have you seen these types of bills recurring?
- Mr. Gregorski: Yes, for about the last two years. The problem is that there is no sustainable feature in the zoning code.
- Mr. Eiding: The problem is a misunderstanding of how to accomplish these goals.
- Mr. Lee: Can the PCPC come up with something in 45 days?
- Mr. Gregorski: The minimum- we can fix pieces of this bill.
- Mr. Jastrzab: Can begin to craft legislation.
- Mr. Lee: Must choose between fixing this bill or creating a new one?
- Mr. Gregorski: Eventually.
- Mr. Eiding: A green roof can change the structure of a building.
- Mr. Syrnick: What is the impetus of this bill?

- Mr. Gregorski: The Councilmen have tried different avenues to implement green features.
- Mr. Kramer: Responding to flood concerns, sees a need to bring the Councilmen into the process. This bill has no hearing date scheduled but we don't want our time to comment to pass.
- Ms. Olson made motion, Mr. Eiding seconded. Passed. Mr. Greenberger abstained.

8) *Technical Changes to the Recommended FY2009-2014 Capital Program & Budget (Alan Urek)*

Alan Urek, Director of Strategic Planning, gave the presentation. The purpose is to make changes to the Recommended FY2009-2014 Capital Program and Budget, which was approved on February 8, 2008. These changes will be included in amendments to Bills 080154 (Capital Program) and 080155 (Capital Budget) for City Council consideration in April.

- Mr. Eiding, motion to approve, Ms. Van Belle, seconded. Passed.

9) *Act 537 Plan to provide a sewer system in River Road. The amendment includes the adoption of several other bills to insure implementation of the provisions of this plan (William Kramer)*

William Kramer, Acting Division Director of Development Planning, gave the presentation. The properties on River Road are currently served by individual on-lot sewage disposal systems. In order to prevent pollution to the Schuylkill River, construction of a sewer with a pumping station has been proposed. New zoning controls are also being proposed to ensure that the improvements will not be overwhelmed by new development. There is no development on the river side of River Road, except for the lots that don't have property on the land side. There is a Swim Club, but he did not know how it came into existence; they don't have permits. The plan has input and support from the community.

Commissioner Comment:

- Mr. Eiding: What is the cost to the individual owner to hook up to the sewer system?
- Mr. Kramer: Has been discussed with them- it is about \$9/ linear foot (quoted to them in December); will also pay to hook up a new line and the water/ sewer charges in the future -- want to reduce pollution.
- Mr. Syrnick: Is the road closed off at the county line?

- Mr. Kramer: Yes.

Public Comment:

- Carl (resident) Water Department sent him a letter saying that they would serve the existing 43 properties; they were supposed to be grandfathered in- can my property be grandfathered in? Will the addressing problems be addressed? Properties are losing both electricity and phone service when it rains. Water is leaking into the properties. Will the supply line be changed?
- Mr.Kramer: The Water Department is responsible for the supply line. They should be able to repair it or replace it.

Commissioner Comment:

- Mr. Eiding: Can we add to the plan?
- Mr. Kramer: Yes, the water line should be repaired and will make an inquiry about the stormwater.
- Mr. Eiding motion to approve, Ms. Van Belle seconded. Passed.

*10) Redevelopment Proposal authorizing acquisition of 11 properties
In the North Philadelphia Redevelopment Area. (David Ortiz)*

Rick Redding, Director of Community Planning, gave the presentation. This Redevelopment Proposal and Plan authorizes the acquisition of 11 properties in North Philadelphia for the purpose of housing developments at 31st and Norris Streets and at 10th and Norris Streets. He stated that all of the properties are vacant and none are historically certified. Properties are moderate rate and market rate housing prices. Both developments were planned with community input and support.

- Mr. Syrnick motion to approve, Ms. Van Belle seconded. Passed.

11a) Bill No. 080279 –26th Street – Navy Yard (Bill Erickson)

Bill Erickson, of the Development Planning Division, made the presentation. This Bill authorizes the placement of 26th Street on the City Plan from Penrose Ave. to the Navy Yard in order to improve utilities and street access.

Commissioner Comment:

- Mr. Syrnick: Is it legally opened?
- Mr. Erickson: No.

- Mr. Syrnick: Could it be opened by affidavit?
- Mr. Erickson: It's an access easement but they want to provide for utilities and to do that they need to put in a legally opened street.
- Mr.Syrnick: Can do it by affidavit if its been open for 21 years.
- Mr. Erickson: The affidavit process only applies to travel lanes.
- Mr. Eiding motion to approve, Van Belle seconded. Passed.

11b) Bill No. 080280 – Creek View Condo at Welsh Road (Bill Erickson)

Bill Erickson, of the Development Planning Division, made the presentation. This Bill authorizes the placement on the city plan of a variable width right-of-way for drainage purposes.

- Mr. Syrnick motion to approve, Mr. Eiding seconded

11c) Bill No. 080281 – Stout Road (Bill Erickson)

Bill Erickson, of the Development Planning Division, made the presentation. The Bill authorizes revisions to the lines and grades of Stout Road by striking 2 ft. from the northerly sidewalk, reducing it's size from 15 ft. to 13 ft. wide in order to legalize an existing encroachment.

Commissioner Comment:

- Mr. Greenberger: A mistake got made and to avoid a big fight the City has to sell property?
- Mr. Erickson: Result of a court case.
- Mr.Greenberger: There will be no physical change?
- Mr. Erickson: No. This bill came to the PCPC as a study bill before.
- Mr. Syrnick: Hope that this bill doesn't set a precedent.
- Mr. Greenberger: Will be a lot of problems if this issue comes up again, in this case the issue is who made the mistake.
- Ms. Van Belle: Where does the money go?
- Mr. Erickson: Pretty sure the money goes into the General Fund.

- Mr. Syrnick motion to approve, Ms. VanBelle seconded. Passed.

11d) *Bill No. 080282 – Florist Street – Time Extension 050592 (Bill Erickson)*

William Erickson, of the Development Planning Division, made the presentation. This Bill extends the time to complete the conditions of Street Bill No. 050952 which authorizes the placing of Florist Street between 2nd and 3rd Street under certain terms and conditions.

Commissioner Comment:

- Mr. Syrnick: Why couldn't they meet the requirements the first time?
- Mr. Erickson: DRPA wanted to move additional pieces at once; they may come as property bills.
- Mr. Syrnick: Who is the party at interest?
- Mr. Erickson: DRPA owns the property.
- Mr. Syrnick: Does DRPA get the money?
- Mr. Erickson: No, they get the easement that if it reverts will go back to DRPA or they will get fair market value for it.
- Motion made by Ms. Van Belle, Mr. Syrnick seconded. Passed.

Mr. Greenberger adjourned the City Planning Commission Meeting of April 15, 2008 at 3:30pm.

SUMMARY

- 1) Executive Director's Update
- 2) Information Only Presentation: Presentation
1900 block of Walnut St.
(Castleway Properties, LLC)
- 3) Information Only Presentation: Tabled
Hotel Development Overview
(Bennur Koksuz)
- 4) Bill # 080253 – Stamper Square Approved
Zoning Remapping Ordinance as amended
(Martin Gregorski)
- 5) ZBA: Aloft Hotel, 1501 Locust St Approved
(Martin Gregorski)
- 6) Bill #080209 – Disposition of Approved
1043-1047 & 1101-1119 Front St.
(Gregory Hartman)
- 7) Bill #080277 – Creating a new Approved
section 14-114 entitled
“Sustainable Zoning”
(Martin Gregorski)
- 8) Technical Changes to the Approved
Recommended FY2009-2014
Capital Program & Budget
(Alan Urek)
- 9) Act 537 Plan to provide a sewer Approved
system in River Rd. The amendment
includes the adoption of several
other bills to insure implementation
of the provisions of this plan.
(William Kramer)
- 10) Redevelopment Proposal authorizing Approved
acquisition of 11 properties in the
N. Phila. Redevelopment Area.
(David Ortiz)
- 11a) Bill #080279 – 26th St. – Navy Yard Approved
(William Erickson)
- 11b) Bill #080280 – Creek View Condo Approved
at Welsh Rd. (William Erickson)
- 11c) Bill #080281 – Stout Rd. (William Erickson) Approved

PCPC Meeting
4-15-08

11d) Bill #080282 – Florist St – time extension
050592 (William Erickson)

Approved