

PHILADELPHIA CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
March 18, 2008

PRESENT: Andrew Altman, Chair
Alan Greenberger, Vice Chair
Camille Cates Barnett
Bernard Lee
Natalia Olson de Savyckyj
Nilda Ruiz
Joseph Syrnick
Peggy VanBelle, representing Rob Dubow

ABSENT: Patrick J. Eiding

Acting Executive Director

Gary J. Jastrzab

Acting Executive Director Gary Jastrzab convened the City Planning Commission Meeting of March 18, 2008 at 1:12pm.

1) Swearing-in of new City Planning Commission Member

Henry Schwartz, of the Philadelphia Law Department, read the oath to Andrew Altman, who agreed to it. Mr. Schwartz swore Mr. Altman in.

2) Election of Chairperson and Vice Chair

Upon motion by Mr. Greenberger, seconded by Ms. VanBelle, the City Planning Commission approved the election of Andrew Altman as Chairperson to the City Planning Commission.

Upon motion by Mr. Syrnick, seconded by Ms. Olson, the City Planning Commission approved the election of Alan Greenberger as Vice Chair to the City Planning Commission.

Mr. Jastrzab welcomed them as the new Chair and Vice Chair to the City Planning Commission.

Mr. Altman stated that this was his first meeting. He had met with the Mayor regarding the role of the Philadelphia City Planning Commission, and his commitment and support of the Philadelphia City Planning Commission, and our role in the development process with the Zoning Board of Adjustment, whose support is very important. We will do all we can to strengthen the Philadelphia City Planning Commission. Projects, especially major projects, need to come to the City Planning Commission early and not at the end of the process.

3) Approval of the Minutes for the following meetings:
a) January 15, 2008

Upon motion by Ms. VanBelle, the City Planning Commission approved the minutes of January 15, 2008.

b) February 8, 2008

Upon motion by Dr. Barnett, the City Planning Commission approved the minutes of February 8, 2008.

c) February 19, 2008

Upon motion by Mr. Syrnick, the City Planning Commission approved the corrections to the minutes of February 19, 2008 on page 6 regarding the Penn Treaty Towers to read as follows:

“Mr. Syrnick and Ms. Olson asked if the path on the east (i.e., river)

side of the building could be wider than 10 feet, which is very narrow for a trail.

Mr. Labov replied that that the distance between the proposed building and the riverbank was about 25 feet and that this total width would be public space and available for the trail and greenway."

4) Executive Director's Update

Mr. Jastrzab stated that the proposed development at 1501 Locust Street has been removed from the Agenda at the request of the developer.

Mr. Jastrzab stated that all of the Commissioners were enrolled in the APA at a special rate. They will receive all APA materials, plus the publication called "The Commissioner."

The City Budget hearing process started on March 4 for the Recommended Capital and Budget. On March 25 the Philadelphia City Planning Commission will have its Operating Budget hearing.

5) Interim Report on Industrial Land Policy, Industrial Land Working Group

John Haak, Senior Planner for the Strategic Planning and Policy Division, gave an interim report on Industrial Land Policy. An Industrial Land Working Group consisted of the Philadelphia City Planning Commission, the Commerce Department, Philadelphia Industrial Development Corporation, and Urban Industry Initiative. The purpose was to develop updated understanding of issues influencing the market for industrial land, and propose interim guidelines for changes-of-use. The Industrial Land Working Group conducted preliminary district surveys and data analysis in 2007. While the City considers updated zoning language and mapping, the interim guidelines are proposed to help City agencies evaluate change-of-use proposals.

He gave background information, stated what the issues and the interim recommendations were. Industrial land is not just manufacturing, it is also construction, utilities, wholesaling, real estate, professional, scientific, and technical, health care and social assistance, emergency vehicles, and other services. There are 18,000 acres of industrially zoned land, which is 21% of the City's total land area. This includes utilities, airports, ports, food distribution center, rail terminals, and power plants. Overall demand for industrial land has decreased since 1990. We have had a net reduction of 5% in the amount of industrially zoned land that has been rezoned for some other use between 1990 to 2007. Federal military base closings have been included in this number. Local conditions have also contributed to the reduced demand such as non-competitive tax structure, and real estate speculation. Many underutilized industrial properties have characteristics that also make them attractive for non-industrial land use, such as large, flat sites, and adaptable buildings, accessible and visible locations, and/or close to business, institutional, or residential centers. Both the private and public sectors have converted industrially zoned land to non-industrial uses, such as stadiums, market rate and affordable housing, stores, shopping centers, and schools. Philadelphia's remaining

industrially zoned land continues to be under pressure to conversion for non-industrial uses.

We still feel very strongly about industrial uses. We feel that public planning, zoning, and investment policies for industrial land use should be based on foresightful assessment of future needs. Philadelphia needs to ensure a diverse economy and tax base; preserve and reuse unique locational and infrastructure resources; provide a competitive mix of goods and services within timely and energy-efficient reach of businesses and households; generate a range of employment opportunities within timely and energy-efficient commute of current and future residents; foster local opportunities for entrepreneurs and investors; reduce land use and transportation conflicts; improve performance in environmental, energy, and emergency management; and accommodate transitions to new technologies. Current policy assumptions suggest emerging demands for industrial land to support a growing population; capture investment encouraged by continued tax reductions; secure critical infrastructure; retain and grow industrial establishments displaced from other sites; support modernization of aging building stock and infrastructure; modernize and expand region-serving aviation, port, rail, food distribution, and hospitality facilities; support improvement and extension of transit services; upgrade utility infrastructure, adapt to energy-efficient technologies; and expand capacity for recycling and waste management. Philadelphia also needs enough industrial land to equitably and flexibly address social responsibilities to encourage a range of employment opportunities to help reduce high levels of poverty; to avoid concentrations of environmental impacts on lower income or minority communities; and to maintain capacity within the City to manage waste generated by City households and businesses.

Over the next 25 years, Philadelphia may need as much as 17,000 industrially zoned acres, or nearly 20% of the City's land area, such as, 4,000 acres for airports, marine terminals, rail yards and related facilities; 3,000 acres for utility and waste management facilities and corridors; 6,000 acres for modern, competitively available industrial facilities; 1,500 acres for smaller, neighborhood-based industrial facilities; and 2,500 acres for 25-year pipeline of redevelopable land and facilities. Industrially zoned land should be located to provide an adequate amount of land in appropriate assemblages to meet future industrial demands; a distribution of land to ensure efficient access to industrial suppliers, clients, and workers; a market expectation to reinforce industrial use in appropriate, designated locations; and a concentration of like-uses to reduce conflicts between industrial and non-industrial activities. Sometimes mixed-use doesn't work with industrial use. Industrially zoned land should be supported by a modern infrastructure to provide reliable, affordable, and secure service; a fiscal structure to encourage industrial investment and employment; and a public/private partnership that supports attraction and retention of industrial enterprises. We are hoping to use these guidelines with the information from the *Imagine Philadelphia* meetings and the Zoning Code Commission. We are using this informally between the Commerce Department, the Philadelphia City Planning Commission and Philadelphia Industrial Development Corporation.

Mr. Greenberger asked where it would be appropriate for decession of industrial land use. Also is there an overlay of known ground – clean-up?

Mr. Haak replied yes, there are a number of industrial areas that may transition to new uses. We do not have an overall list of contaminated sites.

Ms. Olson asked about the 17,000 acres of industrial land. Are we down sizing that? Are we on the right track?

Mr. Haak replied that trends are in the direction of a smaller inventory, though we don't want to risk losing important areas. Some areas not currently zoned industrial could be rezoned for industrial.

Mr. Altman – loss of industrial uses. Have you mapped it?

Mr. Haak replied no, current data comes from the "County Business Patterns" data from the US Census Bureau. We are hoping to get more feedback with Commerce Department and PIDC.

Mr. Altman asked that we think about transition areas.

6) Adoption of technical amendments to the Recommended FY2009-2014 Capital Program and Budget.

Alan Urek, Division Director for the Strategic Planning and Policy Division, stated that the technical amendments have arisen since the Philadelphia City Planning Commission approved the Capital Program and Budget on February 8, 2008. These changes were introduced by City Council on March 4, 2008 as amendments to Bills 080154 and 080155. The new set of amendments change the funding source from "CT" (carried-forward loans) to "CA" (pre-financed loans) for each of the following carried-forward projects. The first three are for Fairmount Park. They are as follows:

- 31E: Fairmount Park—Building Improvements—FY04 (\$124,000)
- 33F: Fairmount Park—Parkland/Site Improvements—FY01 (\$15,000)
- 33N: Fairmount Park—Facility Improvements—FY04 (\$501,000)

The fourth project is for Public Property as follows:

- 55H: Public Property—Family Court—FY04 (\$1,500,000)

He stated they shift the money from CT to CA. The City Planning Commission staff recommendation is approval.

Upon motion by Mr. Syrnick, seconded by Mr. Lee, the City Planning Commission approved the Technical Amendments to the FY2009-2014 Capital Program and Budget.

7) Zoning Board of Adjustment Calendar 4315 for 218 Arch Street

Paula Brumbelow, Zoning Planner for the Development Planning Division, stated the Philadelphia City Planning Commission gives a non-binding recommendation to the Zoning Board of Adjustment. She stated that the original application was tabled at the November 2006, City Planning Commission Meeting, but the Zoning Board of Adjustment granted variances for that proposal for a 268 foot building with 80 residential units, 793 % FAR and 48,720 square feet of retail. This is a new application for a new

project at this location. This site is zoned "C-3" Commercial, and is currently being used as a parking lot. The proposed use is for a 9-story building with 101 dwelling units; parking for 90 vehicles in a below grade, valet public parking garage; and 3,745 square feet of retail on the first floor. They will need variances for the following:

	Allowable	Proposed
Height:	65 feet	108 feet 5 inches
Gross Floor Area:	450% (94,400 sq. ft.)	645% (131,536 sq. ft.)
Maximum width of street:	70 feet	79 feet 9 inches
Parking:	4 handicap spaces 101 parking spaces	3 handicap spaces 90 spaces

As well as, other technical variances for legally required windows and courts.

Old City has been working with the developer and the Philadelphia City Planning Commission. The City Planning Commission staff recommendation is approval.

Matt McClure, attorney with Ballard Spahr, named the people who were with him, Craig Schelter, Michael Yaron owner of 218 Arch Street, Richard Orth from Orth-Rodgers, and Eric Leighton of Cecil Baker.

Mr. Leighton described how the building would be set-up and what would be located on each floor.

Mr. Greenberger asked the following questions:

1. What about resident's parking on Arch Street?
2. How will vehicles service the building?
3. Who will be taking the garbage, the building management?
4. What is the relationship of the height to Christ Church steeple?

Mr. Leighton's response was that the garbage for the retail will be taken in the basement, and for the residents it will be at curbside. The building management would take care of the garbage, and that the truck would not enter the building.

Ms. Brumbelow replied that the height of the steeple was 195 feet with the base at 125 feet. The building's massing is below the steeple.

Mr. Greenberger asked if the alley is a private alley.

Mr. McClure replied that it is not a public street. This will be the entrance to this building. You would be able to walk down Market Street, pass the Church, through Little Boy's Way to Arch Street.

Mr. Schelter talked about the improvements along the way of the Little Boy's Way. It does have the character of the Society Hill walkway.

Joe Schiavo, resident, stated he was encouraged by Mr. Altman's opening comments to participate at staff level. Please have a representative from the community and staff level at the beginning of the review.

Mr. Altman asked about the variance for parking. He asked how do we go about finding out what is the appropriate requirement.

Ms. Brumbelow replied that ratio is .7 to each unit, but in this area there is a .5 ratio. License and Inspections issued a refusal based on a 1 to 1 parking ratio.

Mr. McClure replied it has 90 spaces dedicated.

Mr. Jastrzab replied that if the .5 parking ratio had been applied a variance would not be needed.

Mr. McClure stated that there is a hearing on April 8 with the Zoning Board of Adjustment.

Dr. Barnett would like to hear about the schedule for construction.

Mr. McClure replied that they are not ready to discuss that.

Mr. Altman stated that there are 2 points that Commissioner Greenberger is concerned with. What do you have to show for a variance, and have staff do a brief presentation of the criteria of variances and hardships of projects; and the foundation for how you make recommendations.

Upon motion by Mr. Greenberger, seconded by Ms. VanBelle, the City Planning Commission approved the Zoning Board of Adjustment Calendar 4315 for 218 Arch Street.

Mr. McClure replied that he would be happy to put together the information.

Mr. Jastrzab commended Mr. Yaron and the community in making this a much better proposal since the last year.

8) Act 94 Blight Certification for 60 properties

Richard Redding, Division Director of Community Planning, stated that Act 94, in the Pennsylvania Urban Redevelopment Law, allows for spot condemnation of properties located inside and outside of redevelopment areas. This item consisted of scattered sites in North, West, Southwest and South Philadelphia, as well as, in Oak Lane, Frankford and Germantown. The majority of the organizations requesting the properties are Community Development Corporations with some private developers. The purpose is for acquisition for affordable housing, greening, side yards and commercial revitalization. The criteria for blight certification of single properties are that the property must be vacant and meet one of the following:

- Tax delinquent for 2 years.
- Declared public nuisance, dangerous or unfit.
- Liens exceeding 150% of market value.

All of the properties recommended for approval are documented as being vacant, tax delinquent, and in violation of City Code, with the exception of 4545 E. Thompson

Street where vacancy has not been clearly established by the photo and other documentation. It is possible that it could be resubmitted. The City Planning Commission staff recommendation is approval with the exception of 4545 E. Thompson Street.

Dr. Barnett asked if there was a review from the Historical Commission.

Mr. Redding replied that there has been no review by the Historical Commission, but he assumes that historical review will be done through the zoning and building permit process.

Mr. Greenberger asked if the property is in a Historic District or on a historic directory.

Mr. Redding replied this check has not been done.

Dr. Barnett stated that it might be in the process.

Mr. Greenberger asked what would happen next.

Mr. Redding replied the Philadelphia City Planning Commission's recommendation would be sent in a letter to the Vacant Property Review Committee, and that Act 94 Condemnation is a major way that CDC's are able to acquire properties for community development projects.

Dr. Barnett asked how many are vacant lots. How many are vacant buildings?

Mr. Redding replied that he thought it was half and half.

Mr. Greenberger asked do we have any guarantees that the building will be rehabbed instead of demolished.

Mr. Redding replied that we don't have any guarantees, but there are very few (if any) demolitions involved.

Mr. Altman asked if the Redevelopment Authority submits a plan with what they propose to do.

Mr. Redding replied that the Redevelopment Authority indicates only who receives a property, it, not the specific development plan. The City Planning Commission asks for information identifying the recipient organization. The Redevelopment Authority prefers not to give this information because they believe that blight should be evaluated only on the basis of the blight criteria.

Mr. Greenberger asked what is going happen to the properties once they are condemned.

Mr. Redding replied that they would be conveyed to the interested parties.

Mr. Greenberger asked if they are sold at fair market value.

Mr. Redding replied they would be sold at fair market value except for non-profit organizations, which can receive properties at nominal cost.

Upon motion by Mr. Lee, seconded by Ms. VanBelle, the City Planning Commission approved the Philadelphia City Planning Commission's staff recommendation for approval of Act 94 Blight Certification for 59 of the 60 properties, with the exception of 4545 E. Thompson Street.

Mr. Greenberger replied that this is about Blight Certification not about what happens afterwards. He asked what is our responsibility.

Henry Schwartz, City of Philadelphia Law Department, replied that what is required of the Philadelphia City Planning Commission is under technical advisement. You are going beyond to ask those questions, but you can.

Mr. Redding stated that background information is not a part of the folder, but we can contact the CDC's and do research.

Dr. Barnett replied that this is a twofold process, and has concerns regarding the middle of the block or areas where the block could be rehabbed to preserve historic and affordable housing.

Mr. Redding replied that with the CDC's, especially Allegheny West, there is a proven track record and support from the Office of Housing and Community Development.

Mr. Lee replied the Act 94 Plan process put it in the hands of the CDC's that would rehab it.

Dr. Barnett stated she would like to have more information, since her larger concern is that a lot of the properties do not have plans for redevelopment.

Mr. Redding replied there is little or no demolition proposed in this package.

Mr. Altman asked if this is a time sensitive item. He wanted to understand the process of what will happen next to the properties. He would like further information from the Redevelopment Authority.

Mr. Redding stated that the CDC's are operating on a time schedule. City Council has monthly meetings, as does VPRC, regarding vacant property transfer.

Mr. Schwartz replied that the vacant property comes under Public Property.

Mr. Redding replied that the VPRC ultimately approves Act 94 Condemnation, according to state Redevelopment Law.

Mr. Schwartz replied the VPRC was created by City Council; it's an advisory committee and VPRC recommends to Commissioner of Public Property.

Mr. Altman replied that the Redevelopment Authority asked the Philadelphia City Planning Commission to approve the blight certification, and then we approve and recommend it to the Redevelopment Authority. Who recommends it to the VPRC?

Jennifer Barr, Community Planner, stated that she is the representative on the VPRC. It is the last step for property disposition. The property is sold at fair market value. First there is a presentation to the District Councilperson, and then VPRC makes a recommendation to the Redevelopment Authority and Office of Housing and Community Development, which these agencies will then execute.

Mr. Redding stated that we are the only agency that can certify for blight.

Ms. Olson asked that since we have so much varied information, could we see this item next month.

Ms. Ruiz replied that she is not comfortable with this. She would like to know what is happening with the property, not just blight.

Ms. VanBelle replied that she was worried about delaying this process, and that we are delaying this by tabling.

Kathy Murray, from Council President Verna's office, replied that the CDC's are at risk of losing money with a delay.

Sylvia Wilkins, South Philadelphia resident, asked if there is a time frame for the proposed rehabilitations.

Mr. Redding replied that the CDC's have a time frame, and there are time limits in contracts that will be signed by the redevelopers.

Mr. Altman replied that it's hard to know what you are approving.

Motion was moved to table this item. Vote was taken for tabling: Ms. Olson, Dr. Barnett, and Mr. Greenberger; against tabling: Mr. Lee, Ms. VanBelle, Ms. Syrnick, and Ms. Ruiz.

The previous motion to approve stands. Upon motion by Mr. Lee, seconded by Ms. VanBelle, the City Planning Commission approved the Philadelphia City Planning Commission's staff recommendation for approval of Act 94 Blight Certification for 59 of the 60 properties, with the exception of 4545 E. Thompson Street.

Mr. Altman replied that we would send a message to the Redevelopment Authority that this will not be acceptable for approval in the future.

- 9) Redevelopment Agreement between the Redevelopment Authority and the City of Philadelphia for 917-19 and 923-31 S. 22nd Street. Purpose: development of a public park in the South of South neighborhood. (2nd District – Council President Verna)

David Knapton, Community Planner, stated the purpose of this item is the development of a public park with fence, trees, benches and trash receptacles in the South of South neighborhood. This site is ready for disposition. The developer is the PA Horticultural Society, and the City of Philadelphia Department of Recreation will maintain it. The following groups are providing the funding:

\$70,000 by the William Penn Foundation
\$20,000 by the City of Philadelphia
\$10,000 by Citizens Bank

This item is supported by Friends of Montrose Park and Council President Verna's office. The park was recommended in the South of South Community Plan prepared by PCPC, and our staff had meetings with the community to help design the park. The City Planning Commission staff recommendation is approval.

Kathy Murray stated this was first seen in 2000.

Upon motion by Mr. Lee, seconded by Ms. VanBelle, the City Planning Commission approved the Redevelopment Agreement between the Redevelopment Authority and the City of Philadelphia for 917-19 and 923-31 S. 22nd Street for the development of a public park in the South of South neighborhood. It is zoned "R-10" Residential, which is appropriate for a public park.

Mr. Altman asked if all of the Redevelopment Agreements come before the Philadelphia City Planning Commission.

Mr. Knapton replied yes because a blight certification or an urban renewal plan has already happened. We see it on monthly reports from the Redevelopment Authority.

10) Institutional Development District Master Plan Amendment for the University of Pennsylvania.

Martin Gregorski, Development Planner, explained that the Institutional Development District (IDD) Master Plan is required to be approved by the Philadelphia City Planning Commission. The University of Pennsylvania does not need an ordinance of Council. This item is for the University of Pennsylvania at 34th and Walnut Streets. He stated the purpose of this item is to permit the renovation and an addition to the Music Building located on Block D. This project will remove existing 1-and 2-story additions, as well as, the existing link to the adjacent Morgan Building. The University will erect a 3-story, 13,675 square feet addition, to be used for classrooms, faculty offices, practice rooms and recording studios. They will keep the historic design of the 1890's. The exterior renovation will include restoration of the windows, the brick and terra cotta masonry, and various historic features, such as the front porch and eave brackets. While the new addition will create better acoustics for the students, the building itself will benefit from the use of recycled materials, reduced water use from high efficiency plumbing, outdoor air monitoring, the use of daylighting, "green" construction waste management, and sustainable cleaning and furniture. One new parking space will be required as a result of the proposed construction, raising the total number of required parking spaces to 3241 spaces. The University currently provides more than double the amount of parking as required under the provisions of the Zoning Code. The City Planning Commission staff recommendation is approval.

Upon motion by Mr. Syrnick, seconded by Ms. Olson, the City Planning Commission approved the Institutional Development District Master Plan Amendment for the University of Pennsylvania.

- 11) Bill No. 080206 – An Ordinance authorizing the Commissioner of Public Property on behalf of the City of Philadelphia to transfer to the Philadelphia Authority for Industrial Development, for nominal consideration, a certain parcel of land, with the building and improvements thereon, known as 815 E. Washington Lane, for further conveyance at fair market value. (Introduced by Councilmember Miller on February 28, 2008.)

Gregory Hartman, Development Planning Division, stated the purpose of this item is to authorize the City of Philadelphia to transfer the property to Philadelphia Authority for Industrial Development, who will then transfer the property to Mt. Airy USA. The developer is proposing housing. The existing zoning is “R-9” Residential and “G-2” General Industrial. This is vacant property. This transfer of property is consistent with the Department of Public Property’s surplus property initiative. The proceeds of \$565,000 from the sale of this property shall be deposited into the City’s General Fund. The City Planning Commission staff recommendation is approval.

Mr. Schwartz replied that according to Section 2-307 of the Home Rule Charter, “City Council cannot enact any bill which shall in any manner affect any zoning ordinance, the Physical Development Plan of the City, plans of streets and revisions of such plans, and land subdivision plans or any bill which would authorize the acquisition or sale of City real estate without first receiving the recommendation thereon through the Mayor of the City Planning Commission”.

Dr. Barnett asked what happens if we don’t approve it, will it go to City Council.

Mr. Schwartz replied that City Council wants to hear from the Philadelphia City Planning Commission.

Mr. Altman asked about the planning analysis, and what might be proposed.

Mr. Syrnick said that if we thought it might be better for industrial use then we would not approve it for sale.

Ms. Olson wanted to know if we would see this property again.

Mr. Jastrzab replied that we would see it again for rezoning or a variance.

Bennur Koksuz, Division Director of Urban Design, replied that our staff worked with Mt. Airy USA on transit oriented development.

Dr. Barnett asked what is Mt. Airy USA going to do with this property.

Ms. Barr replied that they are going to rehab the building on this parcel. Since they do not own or control this property, they have a conceptual design plan.

Mr. Greenberger replied that Mt. Airy USA has a good track record.

Upon motion by Mr. Greenberger, seconded by Dr. Barnett, the City Planning Commission approved Bill No. 080206.

- 12) Bill No. 080208 – An Ordinance authorizing the Commissioner of Public Property to transfer to the Philadelphia authority for Industrial Development, for nominal consideration, a certain parcel of land with the buildings and improvements thereon, known as 4301 Tacony Street, for further conveyance at fair market value. (Introduced by Councilman DiCicco on February 28, 2008.)

Mr. Hartman stated the purpose of this item is to authorize the City of Philadelphia to transfer the property to Philadelphia Authority for Industrial Development, who will then sell the property at fair market value to the First Philadelphia Charter School for Literacy. This is in the Bridesburg section of the City. The school will use this property to expand its current facility across the street. The subject property will also include a playground that will be open to the public. The existing zoning is “L-3” Limited Industrial. This transfer of property is consistent with the Department of Public Property’s surplus property initiative. The proceeds of \$270,000 from the sale of this property shall be deposited into the City’s General Fund. The City Planning Commission staff recommendation is approval.

Upon motion by Mr. Greenberger, seconded by Ms. Ruiz, the City Planning Commission approved Bill No. 080208.

- 13) Bill No. 080209 – An Ordinance authorizing the Commissioner of Public Property on behalf of the City of Philadelphia to transfer to the Philadelphia Authority for Industrial Development, for nominal consideration, some or all of the City’s interest in certain parcels of land, with the buildings and improvements thereon, located in an area bounded by N. Front Street, Wildey Street, Leopard Street, and Richmond Street; certain parcels of land, with the buildings and improvements thereon, known as 1101-1119 N. Front Street, located on the east side of N. Front Street; and certain parcels of land with the buildings and improvements, thereon, known as 1043-1047 N. Front Street, located on the east side of North Front Street, for further conveyance. (Introduced by Councilman DiCicco on February 28, 2008.)

Mr. Hartman stated the purpose of this Bill is for the City of Philadelphia will transfer the property to PAID, who will then sell the property to Tower Investments. The developer is looking to develop the properties as residential and commercial mixed use. It is zoned “L-5” Limited Industrial and it is vacant. This transfer of property is consistent with the Department of Public Property’s surplus property initiative. Net proceeds of \$2.4 million from the sale of this property will be deposited in the City’s General Fund.

The City Planning Commission staff recommendation is approval. The Fishtown Neighborhood Association supports the Cecil Baker conceptual plan for open spaces. The Northern Liberties Neighborhood Association would like a plan with open space.

Duane Smith, of the New Kensington Community Development Corporation, wants to see what the new developer wants to do with it.

Mr. Jastrzab stated that no plans have been introduced to the City Planning Commission's staff.

Mr. Greenberger replied that the City should see a plan for what the developer wants to propose.

Ms. VanBelle replied that there are 50 to 60 million dollars of underutilized properties in the City, and that Public Property is looking to sell the underutilized property that the City owns to generate money.

Dr. Barnett replied that it seems like we are selling property for less than it's worth.

Mr. Altman replied that it is obvious that there are planning issues here. He asked what other city owned property do we have here near this site. He also asked what are the parameters of use.

Henry Schwartz replied that the Home Rule Charter states if you do not approve it in 30 days or extend the time to 45 days, City Council will then accept it as approval.

Mr. Altman asked if it is advisory.

Mr. Schwartz replied yes.

Upon motion by Mr. Greenberger, seconded by Ms. Ruiz, the City Planning Commission tabled and extended for 45 days Bill No. 080209.

Mr. Altman adjourned the City Planning Commission Meeting of March 18, 2008 at 3:47pm.

SUMMARY

- 1) Swearing-in of new City Planning Commission Member
- 2) Election of Chairperson & Vice Chair
- 3) Approval of the Minutes for the following meetings:
 - a) 1-15-08 Approved
 - b) 2-8-08 Approved
 - c) 2-19-08Approved w/changes
- 4) Executive Director's Update
- 5) Interim Report on Industrial Land
n
Policy, Industrial Land Working Group (John Haak) Presentatio
- 6) Adoption of Technical Amendments to the FY2009-2014 Capital Program & Budget (Alan Urek). Approved
- 7) ZBA Calendar 4315 for 218 Arch St. (Paula Brumbelow) Approved
- 8) Act 94 Blight Certification for 60 properties (Richard Redding) Approved
except for
4545
E. Thompson St.
- 9) Redev. Agreement bet. the RDA & the City of Phila. for 917-19 & 923-31 S. 22nd St. Purpose: development of a public park in the South of South neighborhood. (2nd District – Council President Verna) (David Knapton) Approved
- 10) IDD Master Plan Amendment for the University of Penn. (Martin Gregorski) Approved
- 11) Bill #080206 – An Ordinance authorizing Approved

the Commissioner of Public Prop. on behalf of the City of Phila. to transfer to PAID, for nominal consideration, a certain parcel of land, w/the bldgs & improvements thereon, known as 815 E. Washington Lane, for further conveyance at fair market value. (Introduced by Councilmember Miller on 2-28-08) (Gregory Hartman)

- 12) Bill #080208 – An Ordinance authorizing the Commissioner of Public Prop. on behalf of the City of Phila. to transfer to PAID, for nominal consideration, a certain parcel of land, w/the bldgs & improvements thereon, known as 4301 Tacony St., for further conveyance at fair market value. (Introduced by Councilmember DiCicco on 2-28-08) (Gregory Hartman)

Approved

- 13) Bill #080209 – An Ordinance authorizing the Commissioner of Public Prop. on for 45 days behalf of the City of Phila. to transfer to PAID, for nominal consideration, some or all of the City's interest in certain parcels of land, w/the bldgs & improvements thereon, located in an area N. Front St, Wildey St., Leopard St., & Richmond St.; certain parcels of land, w/the bldgs & improvements thereon, known as 1101-1119 N. Front St, located on the east side of N. Front St.; & certain parcels of land, w/the bldgs & improvements thereon, known as 1043-47 N. Front St., located on the east side of N. Front St., for further conveyance. (Introduced by Councilmember DiCicco on 2-28-08) (Gregory Hartman)

Tabled &
extend