

PHILADELPHIA CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

April 19, 2007

PRESENT:

Patrick J. Eiding, Acting Chair

David Adelman

Tumar Alexander, representing Pedro A. Ramos

Duane Bumb, representing Stephanie Naidoff

Gloria Levin

Peggy VanBelle, representing Vincent Jannetti

ABSENT:

Marcia Moore Makadon

Lynette Brown-Sow

Executive Director
Deputy Executive Director

Janice Woodcock, AIA, AICP
Gary Jastrzab

Acting Chair Patrick J. Eiding convened the City Planning Commission Meeting of April 19, 2007 at 1:17PM.

Mr. Eiding stated that item #3 will be moved to the last item of business.

- 1) Minutes of the Meeting of March 20, 2007.

Upon motion by Mr. Bumb, the City Planning Commission approved the minutes of March 20, 2007.

- 2) Executive Director's Update

Janice Woodcock thanked Patrick Eiding for taking over the chair for this meeting since Marcia could not be here.

Ms. Woodcock said her main topic of her Executive Report was to acknowledge her staff and other volunteers for helping with the American Planning Association Convention that we had this past week in our city. Over 6,000 planners visited our city, and looked at walkable streets and attended sessions at the Convention Center. Ben Franklin kicked it off. It was a great success. The National Chapter was very thankful and wanted to acknowledge our hospitality and the quality of the city. They also mentioned there will be another opportunity to host the convention in another 5 or 6 years, and we want to be on that list.

Mr. Eiding stated that he was very fortunate to have attended the reception at the Constitution Center and also had an early breakfast at the convention. The people he sat with from Dallas, New York, and Maryland, and some other places were really impressed with Philadelphia not only the treatment they got, but what they saw in the city and the way the city was laid out. It was quite a conference.

Ms. Woodcock said one of the things she wants to do, in the Executive Director reports in the upcoming meetings, is to talk about ideas that our staff got at the convention itself. We didn't want to rush that, we want to do a good, thorough job of the presentation. Secondly, today the Mayor will be announcing a week long list of activities for Earth Week. One of those initiatives is the incorporation of the sustainable principals into our land use regulations and into our future planning. She didn't tell the details because the Mayor will announce it at 3:30 today. She said we would also be telling you the details about this in the coming meetings.

Ms. Woodcock thanked Ms. Levin for joining us by phone.

- 3) Preliminary Plat – Twins at Frankford Creek Subdivision. To subdivide a 5-acre parcel of land to allow for the construction of 50 single-family semi-detached dwellings on a proposed new city street. Also, 2 acres adjacent to the Frankford Creek, west of the former Frogmoor Street, will be set aside for future recreational purposes.

Sarah Chiu, Development Planner at the Philadelphia City Planning Commission, stated that this item is for the approval of a preliminary plat located in the Juniata Park section of the city, bounded by Wingohocking Street, Castor Avenue, Tioga Street, and the Frankford Creek. The purpose is to subdivide a 5-acre parcel of land for the construction of 50 semi-detached homes on existing streets and a proposed new street. Also a 2-acre parcel of land will be set aside for future recreational use. The existing zoning is "G-2" Industrial. The developer is looking for the approval of the

preliminary plat and at a future date they will go before the Zoning Board of Adjustment for a variance. At a future date, they will come back for the rezoning. This residential proposal is consistent with the Frankford Creek Redevelopment Plan that the City Planning Commission approved in 2002. We recommend the residential use and the green space along the Frankford Creek, which this is consistent with the Redevelopment Plan. Frogmoor Street is a paper street, that is not open, and it will be stricken from the City Plan and be used for a utility right-of-way. The City Planning Commission staff's recommendation for the plat is for approval, and that the developer continue to work with the adjacent property owner that they can extend the future greenway over to connect to the north of Wingohocking Street.

Mr. Eiding asked Ms. Chiu what are we looking at now, the approval of one plat.

Ms Chiu replied that we are looking to approve the 5-acres and also the 2-acres parcels of land for future recreational use.

Mr. Bumb asked for some clarification, the site is zoned "G-2" , and are we at some point, going to see a rezoning for this site.

Ms. Chiu replied yes we will be seeing a rezoning at a future date.

Mr. Bumb asked is this not out of sequence that you can put a preliminary plat for residential development on an industrial zoned site.

Peter Kelsen, attorney for the developer, replied that the sequence is that we would ask the City Planning Commission to support the creation of the plats. We have gone before L&I, we have had our site plan review and we are waiting for that to be refused to allow us to go before the Zoning Board to get variances for the plat as you see it. After Council comes back from session in September, we will ask them to introduce legislation to rezone it a residential designation. But because of the timing we are going to ask the Zoning Board to grant a variance for relief for residential use, on almost a concurrent basis for a residential remapping. It is an affordable housing and homeownership program, and in order to meet the deadline with the Redevelopment Authority, city financing, as well as, PHA financing, we are going to fast track. While you are correct that it is a little bit out of sequence, but the L&I process is literally right behind you.

Mr. Eiding asked is this approval for support.

Mr. Kelsen replied absolutely.

David Adelman asked who is the developer.

Mr. Kelsen replied the developer is OKKS Development.

Upon motion by Mr. Adelman, seconded by Ms. VanBelle, the City Planning Commission approved the preliminary plat for the Twins at Frankford Creek Subdivision.

Mr. Kelsen thanked them.

- 4) Bill No. 070236 – Rezones Jefferson Street, Mascher Street, Oxford Street, and Howard Street. (Introduced by Councilmember Clarke on March 29, 2007)

William Kramer stated that Bill #070236 was introduced by Councilmember Clarke on March 29, 2007. It is a rezoning bill affecting the area of Jefferson Street, Mascher

Street, Oxford Street, and Howard Street. It is currently zoned "G-2" Industrial. At the corner of Jefferson and Mascher Streets already have single-family houses. They will remain. What they are proposing to do on site, is rezone the properties to a classification of "R-10" Residential based on the Bill that was introduced. The plan at the moment calls for a number of duplexes at either end of Oxford Street. We are still working with the developer on the site plan. We have some issues with the way parking is laid out. However it would not be a detriment to rezone the property. However, when we had a chance to review the details of the site plan, it came to our attention that leaving the rezoning at "R-10", even though the plan calls for single-family dwellings

The City Planning Commission staff recommendation for this project is for approval with the proposed Bill to be amended with the rezoning to "R-10A", which would make it all single-family dwellings and the developer has the option of going to the Zoning Board for the duplexes that he proposes or if he decides to make it commercial. Again the Zoning Board is one option, or he can make a request to us to amend the corner to "C-1" commercial.

Upon motion by Mr. Bumb, seconded by Mr. Alexander, the City Planning Commission approved the City Planning Commission's staff recommendation to approve Bill No. 070236 with the recommendation to rezone to "R-10A".

- 5) Streets Bill No. 070225 – To authorize the striking and vacating of Belgrade Street from Butler Street to Wheatsheaf Lane. (Introduced by Councilmember Krajewski on March 29, 2007)

William Erickson stated this is Streets Bill #070225 authorizing the striking and vacating of Belgrade Street from Butler Street to Wheatsheaf Lane. This Streets Bill was introduced by Councilwoman Krajewski on March 29, 2007. The party-of-interest is Evans, Domestic & Global Transportation Services, they are a train shipper and customs inspection facility. Currently it is not physically improved due to short dumping. The adjacent property owners would like to have control of that. The purpose is to reduce short dumping by allowing for the expansion of existing adjacent business. The City Planning Commission staff recommendation is for approval.

Upon motion by Mr. Adelman, seconded by Mr. Bumb, the City Planning Commission approved Streets Bill No. 070225.

- 6) Institutional Development District Master Plan Amendment for Saint Joseph's University.

Martin Gregorski, Development Planner with the Philadelphia City Planning Commission, stated this item is for the Institutional Development District to St. Joseph's University. They are requesting an amendment to the District. The amendment consists of three items.

The first amendment will be completed in three phases. The first phase is for the Alumni Memorial Fieldhouse. It would consist of the construction of a new wing, 2 to 3 stories tall on the south side of the Fieldhouse. This would house locker rooms, coaching and administrative offices, and press facilities. Phase Two would consist of the renovations to the existing recreation complex attached to the north side of the Fieldhouse. And Phase Three would be the expansion of the seating areas of the Fieldhouse to raise seating to 1,000 seats. There will also be improvements made which will help fans to circulate better as well as provide new amenities. This Phase will extend the building to the 54th Street property line and is proposed to be limited to 65ft. in height.

The second amendment is for the proposed addition of the Campion Student Center for student dining area, as well as, banquet use. A new accessible entrance and elevator are also proposed. This addition will be two to three stories high.

The third amendment is to expand the Learning Center/Library Addition. This will be a three-story addition that will be used as a 24-hour quiet, secure study space connected to the library.

Total increase of gross floor area is 107, 600 square feet. The total required parking spaces for the IDD is 309 spaces. The University currently provides 1,177 spaces, which is well above the requirement. The demolition of two buildings is necessary in order to expand the Fieldhouse. Flanigan Hall is a student residence building originally built as a single-family house, and the Barry Hall Annex is a small office building and both will be demolished. It should be noted that in order for these changes to go through, a Bill from Council will be needed to be introduced and approved by City Council. The City Planning Commission staff recommendation is for approval.

Ms. Woodcock asked Mr. Gregorski to talk about the Institutional Development Districts and when they were first adopted.

Mr. Gregorski stated that he was not sure when it was first adopted. The Institutional Development District was created to give universities and hospitals the space to grow on their own campus without going back and forth for zoning variances from the Zoning Board. He gave an example like having a day care center in one spot and then moving it to another spot or building. The downside to the IDD is that anytime a change or amendment is made that the building footprints needs to come to the Philadelphia City Planning Commission and City Council for approval. We watch and guide the expansion of a District. If we approve these buildings and they if they make changes to make it a small building, then it can be approved over the counter, if they increase the gross floor area of the footprint of the building, they will have to come back here for approval, and then to City Council.

Ed Goppelt, Hallwatch.org, said that Councilman DiCicco said an Institutional Development District is like a Commercial Entertainment District.

Mr. Gregorski replied no they are not. They are similar, but the difference is the Institutional Development Districts are created solely for universities, hospitals, and schools. The Commercial Entertainment District is created for casinos, and we do not have any Commercial Entertainment District zoned.

Mr. Goppelt asked about the 45-day time limit.

Mr. Gregorski replied the 45-day time for approval is for some Districts. There was a Bill introduced in City Council 2 years ago that after 45 days if Council did not move to approve, it was automatically approved. That is no longer the case. A Bill of Council is needed.

Upon motion by Ms. VanBelle, seconded by Mr. Bumb, the City Planning Commission approved the Institutional Development District Master Plan Amendment for Saint Joseph's University.

- 7) Institutional Development District Master Plan Amendment for Holy Family University

Mr. Kramer stated continuing in the line with Institutional Development Districts. This is an IDD for Holy Family University in the Far Northeast section of the city, located at Grant and Frankford Avenues. It has been here since 1968, but the Institution has been here longer than that. A year ago the City Planning Commission approved the residential facility. At the time of our approval the East Torresdale Civic Association had heard the matter and had supported the approval. After this Commission approved it, an Ordinance of Council was introduced by Councilwoman Krajewski to adopt this amendment. The neighbors had immediate concerns that they took up with the Councilwoman, and then the Institution. As a result of those negotiations, they moved the residential facility further down to Stevens Lane near Poquessing Creek with the development in 3 phases. They had long-term concerns. We are here to approve the residential facility, which will be a 6-story building that will house 350 students when completed. They are also requesting a student facility expansion. This will be a 2-story structure. A new parking garage is proposed containing 474 parking spaces. It will be a 4-story, 200,000 square foot structure. In addition to the proposed parking garage, there are 4 different surface parking lots proposed, in total, they will provide 273 parking spaces in addition to those provided by the Parking garage. One surface parking lot would be eliminated-34 parking spaces. A 4-story 60,000 square foot structure is proposed as a new business school for the University. The proposal requires an additional 67 parking spaces for the district raising the required parking from 120 spaces to 187 spaces. This project will add 747 parking spaces while removing 34 spaces for a net gain of 717 spaces. This would raise the total of parking spaces to 1574 spaces for the entire IDD. The high school also uses these parking spaces. The neighbors were complaining that the students were taking up the parking spaces on the street, but when a traffic study was done it showed that the people taking the train were parking on the street. The City Planning Commission staff recommendation is for approval. Following this approval an Ordinance will have to be drafted and forwarded to the applicant. This IDD is blessed with 2 Councilpersons, Krajewski and O'Neill. Since most of the changes are in Councilman O'Neill's district, he will probably be the one to draft and introduce the Ordinance to City Council.

Upon motion by Mr. Adelman, seconded by Mr. Alexander, the City Planning Commission approved the Institutional Development District Master Plan Amendment for Holy Family University.

- 8) Bill No. 070002 – Rezoning of an area bounded by Orthodox Street, Garden Street, Lefevre Street, Richmond Street, Buckius Street, and the Delaware River. (Introduced by Councilmember Krajewski on January 23, 2007)

Mr. Kramer stated this is another rezoning bill, this one in the Bridesburg section of the city, it is an area bounded by Orthodox Street, Garden Street, Lefevre Street, Richmond Street, Buckius Street, and the Delaware River. This Bill was introduced by Councilwoman Krajewski on January 23, 2007. This is for Westrum Development. It is a rezoning to Waterfront Development District, and the adoption of a Master Plan, and the Master Plan Narrative. They will come back at a later time for the east side of the parcel when those negotiations are finally worked out. What we are talking about is a development that is taking different forms, some of them are duplexes, some of them are condos, but most of them are single-family classifications. It is consistent and it is another Master Plan with open spaces, gazebos, etc.

The City Planning Commission staff recommendation is for approval with the recommendations that the following be amended to the Master Plan Narrative. The Master Plan Narrative under the Waterfront Development District is the controlling document. For the proposed open space, we need the figures to include what kind of open space, and the breakdown of what is the public open space, shared open space, what is the individual open

space, as well as, the gross floor area. We have other site concerns. We need to have to tie it down with gross floor area so that the developer cannot say that anything goes. Paul Loney from Westrum Development is here. They have indicated 70 ft. front on riverfront and bike path from it, and height limit on Delaware Avenue is 4 stories. Minimizing front parking needs to be worked out. Most of these streets will be Philadelphia City Streets and that is a different procedure to go through. The Philadelphia City Planning Commission will have the design review on the properties facing Richmond Street. Establishing a 10-foot set back on Orthodox Street, and no building will be facing it.

Ms. Woodcock wanted to know if the minimum width of the residential units is indicated.

Mr. Kramer replied it is not indicated, but he has seen numbers as low as 13 and 14 feet. We would normally like to see a 16 ft. width, and we are negotiating with the developer at this time.

Ms. Woodcock asked him to please describe it to the Commissioners so that they can understand that issue.

Mr. Kramer would like to see the width expanded. We think that it may be designed that way for affordable housing. We were still negotiating up until noon today, and it is not over yet.

Ms. Woodcock asked Mr. Kramer does L&I have a minimum width requirement of each unit.

Mr. Kramer replied not in a Waterfront Development District.

Ms. Woodcock asked in other parts of the city.

Mr. Kramer replied they have a requirement of 16 feet frontage for a townhouse.

Ms. Woodcock suggested that Mr. Kramer provide that information to the Commission as a proviso.

Mr. Kramer replied that is fine.

Ms. Woodcock stated that we have work extensively and I want to illustrate the result that Bill and I have accomplished. We asked the developer to list the open spaces and streets on the site plan. The Streets Department has looked at this site plan, and some of the streets are not normally what you would put in a site plan street layout, but they are comfortable with it and feel it can be worked out.

Mr. Eiding asked is the approval with the contingency of the 13 foot and 14 foot width.

Ms. Woodcock replied that we need to ask the Commissioners if you think that should be a proviso for our approach.

David Adelman replied that he doesn't think we should get involved with the economics of a project. He doesn't think it's our place. It's a market driven economic issue.

Ms. Levin asked is this market rate housing, and she wanted to know what the cost would be.

Mr. Eiding replied that he thought they were going to be affordable housing.

Mr. Kramer replied the smaller units are supposed to be affordable housing. Mr. Loney may be able to relay that information.

Paul Loney replied that these are all market rate houses, so that we are not competing with ourselves. Bridesburg is a family type community, and they asked us for us to construct some housing they could afford. The only way to do that, so that it's affordable to some of these people, is to narrow it down.

Mr. Eiding asked Ms. Levin if she heard the answer.

Ms. Levin replied yes, she got most of it.

Mr. Eiding asked Ms. Levin, "Didn't you ask for the price ranges?"

Ms. Levin replied, "Yes, I did."

Mr. Loney replied it would cost \$200 a sq. ft., therefore, at 1,200 sq. ft. townhouse would be \$240,000. It would be more than that per a larger sq. ft. for a bigger townhouse.

Ms. Woodcock asked if there is any description in the Master Plan to fill us in on a sequence of development and what the public amenities are.

Mr. Kramer replied that it has not been put in the Master Plan Narrative.

Mr. Loney replied that what we did was we went to the community and signed a MOU, which is a Memo of Understanding, and part of that was we said that in the first phase we will dedicate the ground along the river and to construct the bike path. We want to give the entire Bridesburg community the public rights to the riverfront. The rest of them are going to be in the middle of the site during construction. I would hope the people would stay safe just out on the perimeter.

Rene Goodwin had a question regarding the 50 ft. set back, does that include the riparian rights and is that necessary.

Mr. Loney said the 50 ft. is inside the bulkhead, since we do not have ownership of the river.

Upon motion by Mr. Bumb, seconded by Ms. VanBelle, the City Planning Commission approved Bill No. 070002 with staff's recommendation of amendments to the Master Plan Narrative.

Mr. Eiding stated that ends the plan agenda. He asked if anyone had any other business before this Commission.

Representative Mike O'Brien stated his visit here today has seemed to become a moot point 10 minutes ago. Because it seems as though Ms. Woodcock e-mailed her response, to questions he had been asking for a week to 10 days, 10 minutes ago. He would have appreciated if Ms. Woodcock responded in a timely manner, she would have saved him and the members of the community a visit here today. He told Ms. Woodcock that she did not answer one of his questions. He wanted to know about the plans she had under

consideration for the 2 gaming sites, are they with or without riparian rights. Is it 11 acres at Sugarhouse or 22. Is it 9 acres at Foxwood or 16.

Ms. Woodcock replied that she believed she did answer it, but if she didn't she will answer it now. We are looking at the plans as if they do have the riparian rights, assuming that the riparian rights will be passed, and that is consistent with how we looked at the entire development, as her letter spells out. (Exhibit "A")

Ms. Woodcock told Representative O'Brien, "With all due respect, I think your questions are perfectly valid and I wanted to answer them as clearly as I can. First let me comment on the length of my letter, with all due respect to the timeliness of it, we prepared a careful response because the gaming issues are very complex indeed. It deals with the economy of the entire space, as well as, the economy of our city, and our entire region. Most of the letter deals with that.

Ms. Woodcock replied that the plans that were submitted to the City Planning Commission, that we are reviewing assumed that we have the zoning, and the regulations of the riparian rights in place for the development and the Gaming Task Force.

Ms. Woodcock stated the reason for that is the Gaming Task Force chose the site for the casinos. We want to do what is best in accordance with Gaming Task Force, and this Administration. In doing our job, we want to make sure the best possible facilities can be built, for the best possible amenities with the rules that have been given to us by the Zoning Code in regards to the Commercial Entertainment District. Certainly the developers are aware that there are other plans should the rules not be passed the way we are assuming, but we believe they will be eventually.

Representative O'Brien replied, "So you are saying what would be best for the city and the region, maximizing as a whole, that you have considered the plans where the riparian rights are granted. Do we have your commitment that you will consider no other plans. Is that your plan, that you are waiting for the riparian rights be granted by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania?"

Ms. Woodcock replied, "I'm not quite sure what you mean by that, but the developers have the right, as any developer does in the city, to submit a preliminary plan for technical review. Any developer, who comes to the City for due process, can also ask under which regulations they can do that under the CED that was passed by City Council". She didn't remember the votes and asked Kevin Greenberg, City Law Department, how many voted to approve.

Mr. Greenberg replied that it was unanimous.

Ms. Woodcock stated this is a zoning classification, if you will, without a home. If a developer comes in and says here is an ordinance, and asks us to review a plan under this ordinance of the City of Philadelphia, we do not have anything to compare it with. We as civil servants are paid to review those plans, just like for any other developer.

Representative O'Brien asked for a commitment from Ms. Woodcock that when he asks her questions, that he will receive a response in a timely and honest manner.

Ms. Woodcock replied, "Absolutely. And considering the contents of the letter that contains large aspects of this issue, I feel my response was timely and you began to e-mail me Friday, and you copied folks that I did not know who they were, and I felt that my response to you should be as carefully put together as your questions."

Mr. Greenberg stated to Representative O'Brien, "I cannot let my client promise to give you an honest answer if it concerns a confidential matter. She will do so to the best of her legal ability, that's what I'll let her do. I'm going to stop her from making a universal one. I also want to clear something Ms Woodcock, as proud as I am of our work, we were not the ones who picked the locations."

Representative O'Brien thanked the Commission.

Mr. Goppelt asked Ms. Woodcock if the preliminary plans that were submitted to the City Planning Commission could be made available to the public at this point. This is a right-to-know question.

Mr. Greenberg replied, "Then submit a right-to-know request."

Mr. Goppelt asked Ms. Woodcock if she would make the preliminary plans available without a right-to-know request.

Ms. Woodcock replied that when a developer submits a plan for site review, we do not release it to the public.

Terry Paler stated, "I am just a citizen of the city who pays taxes, and Ms. Woodcock when you are making the decisions for developers, that don't live in the city, you are doing this by the people that have paid their taxes. I'm paying your salary, and I think that my consideration, as well as everyone on the riverfront should be considered, so please keep that in mind. My responses need to be made."

Ms. Woodcock replied, "I can say the public hearing process has been the foundation of my entire professional life.

Mr. Eiding suggested that she shouldn't take it out on us. That she should go back to City Council, where they should have done something months ago instead of waiting for the last minute. He told Ms. Paler that Ms. Woodcock didn't do this to you, it was done by due process.

Ms. Woodcock stated that again it is the foundation for all planning, and that should be the legal process that has been afforded to the City by the Zoning Code set in place, that the Zoning Code has times when the public can be heard, and you can get word when that will be.

Ms. Goodwin replied that she understands that there is litigation, assuming the worst happens, how long when the clock starts ticking, what will be the steps, the process, what will happen at that point.

Mr. Eiding asked her is that it as far as the City Planning Commission is concerned.

Ms. Goodwin replied yes as far as the City Planning Commission is concerned, how much time will they have to the point that they are getting building permits.

Ms. Woodcock replied that she wanted to use the correct terminology. That if the state legally rules the Zoning code review process is removed for the Commercial Entertainment District, the City Planning Commission will not be ruling. We will no longer have any ruling authority, nor will we have the ability to get the best possible plan.

Ms. Goodwin asked who then would be making that decision.

Mr. Greenberg replied depending what the rulings are from the Supreme Court, the process may or may not change. As it exists today, any applicant who owns a property would submit a formal application for a formal process. The Supreme Court or the legislative body in Harrisburg may take other actions to short circuit that, whether with a variance or other process. We, in the City, have fought hard to keep control of the zoning authority. That even if you are going to have casinos, it would be better than not, to keep control of it. Beyond that, what the laws are going to be is a very good question.

Ms. Goodwin said then your reply is that when a developer comes with a plan, that when it comes to zoning they would have to comply with zoning, but this is such a unique situation that technically there is no zoning for this sort of development for that location. The zoning would have to happen first, the zoning would have to happen legislatively through Council.

Mr. Greenberg replied that one or two things could happen. A) Have Council to act with input from the communities, the City, and the developers; B) due to a unique situation, a Court Order may tell us we don't have a say where the casinos will go, and then we are stuck with that. The exact details of that have yet to be released to us.

Ms. Goodwin replied, "We would lay down our lives to stop this from happening. It's not only that we don't want this in our back yards, it's so much beyond that, it's about changing the soul of the City. I know we need revenue generating businesses to make money, but there has to be another way to generate revenue or take it from another source. You as public servants, we have to rely on you to look after our best interests, and I know you are up against the wall. But laws are made because that is the best way to handle things, but the laws are not always perfect and if they need to be changed, now would be the time.

Mr. Eiding replied, "Thank you very much. We broke away from the agenda because we felt that with you folks taking the time to come here we wanted to give them the opportunity, but we have done as much as a Commission here. And you certainly heard the restraints. We have to go forward, not knowing how this will play out. I think we have one more motion available."

The Commissioners replied, "Motion to adjourn."

Mr. Eiding adjourned the City Planning Commission Meeting of April 19, 2007 at 2:18PM.

SUMMARY

- 1) Minutes of the Meeting of 3-20-07
Approved
- 2) Executive Director's Update
- 3) Preliminary Plat – Twins at Frankford Creek Subdivision. To subdivide a 5-acre parcel of land to allow for the construction of 50 single-family semi-detached dwellings on a proposed new city street. Also, 2 acres adjacent to the Frankford Creek, east of the former Frogmoor St., will be set aside for future recreational purposes. (Sarah Chiu)
Approved
- 4) Bill #070236 – Rezones Jefferson, Mascher, Oxford, & Howard Sts. (Introduced by Councilmember Clarke on 3-29-07) (William Kramer)
Approved
- 5) Streets Bill #070225 – To authorize the striking & vacating of Belgrade St. from Butler St. to Wheatsheaf Ln. (Introduced by Councilmember Krajewski on 3-29-07) (William Erickson)
Approved
- 6) Institutional Development District Master Plan Amendment for St. Joseph's University. (Martin Gregorski)
Approved
- 7) Institutional Development District Master Plan Amendment for Holy Family University. (William Kramer)
Approved
- 8) Bill #070002 – Rezoning of an area bounded by Orthodox, Garden, Lefevre, Richmond, Buckius Sts., and the Delaware River. (Introduced by Councilmember Krajewski on 1-23-07) (William Kramer)
Approved w/staff recommendations to amend the Master Plan Narrative