# 7330 RIDGE AVE

CIVIC DESIGN REVIEW Date: 2024.07.09

EEE

H



# Team

#### Developer

Terra Firma 7330 Ridge LLC



### Architect



### Consultant



# **Contents**

### Site Context .....

- Way Finding ...... 03-04 Zoning Map ...... 05 Civil Survey ...... 06
- Zoning Analysis ...... 07

### Site Plan .....

Ground Floor Plan ...... 08 Landscape Plan ...... 09 Site Plan ..... 10

#### Pedestrian Experience .....

Sidewalk Condition ...... 11

# Building Plans and Elevations .....

Floor Plans ..... 12-13 Elevations ...... 14-15

### Facade .....

Material Board ......16 Site Section ...... 17-18 Renderings ...... 19-21

# Checklists .....

Sustainability ...... 22 Streets Handbook Checklist ........ 23-29



Looking North



Looking South



Looking East



Looking West



7330 RIDGE AVE













1 - COMMERCIAL @ 1ST FL + SFD ABOVE 2 - COMMERCIAL @ 1ST FL + SFD ABOVE 3 - 80 UNITS

- 4 HEALTH PRACTITIONER @ 1ST FL + SFD ABOVE
- 5 DUPLEX
- 6 DUPLEX
- 7 COMMERCIAL @ 1ST FL + SFD ABOVE
- 8 COMMERCIAL @ 1ST FL + SFD ABOVE
- 9 DUPLEX 10 - 8 UNITS
- 11 84 UNITS
- 12 85 UNITS
- 13 163 UNITS
- 14 3 UNITS
- 15 66 UNITS



COMMERCIAL MULTI-FAMILY 🔴 MIX-USE 🔵 APARTMENT COMPLEX ROXBOROUGH RESERVE THE SITE

7330 RIDGE AVE

NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL MIX-USE-1	CMX-1
NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL MIX-USE-2	CMX-2
COMMUNITY COMMERCIAL MIXED-USE	CMX-3
INDUSTRIAL COMMERCIAL MIX-USE	ІСМХ 🦲
INDUSTRIAL RESIDENTIAL MIX-USE	IRMX 🔍
AUTO-ORIENTED COMMERCIAL-2	CA-2
RESIDENTIAL SINGLE-FAMILY ATTACHED-5	RSA-5
<b>RESIDENTIAL SINGLE-FAMILY DETACHED-3</b>	RSD-3



7330 RIDGE AVE







# **ZONING CHART**

	RSD-3	
:	RSA-2/RSD-3	
<b>FREET:</b>	RM-2, RSA-3	
	59,195.7 US SF	
	PROPOSED 20 SINGLE FA WITH ACCESSORY PARKI	MILY DWELLINGS NG
	REQUIRED/ALLOWED	PROPOSED
	1	20
	41,437 SF (70%)	37,115.7 SF (62.7%)
	17,758.7 SF (30%)	22,080 SF (37.3%)
CK:	25'-0"	28'- 2 1/2" MIN.
	2 / 15' EACH	17' / 18'-1"
	25'	25'
	38'	±36'-6" (NTE 38'-0")
	N/A	±66,940 SF
	6	6
	REQUIRED	PROPOSED
	20 SP	<b>45</b> (1)ADA
	0	0
	_0	0
	RIDGE AVE	
	10'-0"	
	4'-0"	
	0'-0"	





# SITE PLAN

#### **GROUND FLOOR**

SINGLE FAMILY DWELLINGS

BUILDINGS 1-20 1100 SF FOOTPRINT EACH 45 PARKING STALLS

#### KEYED NOTES:

- (1) PROPOSED 24'-0" CURBCUT
- (2) PROPOSED LANDSCAPED AREA
- (3) PROPOSED STREET TREE IN 3' X 6' TREE PITS
- 4 PROPOSED SITE TREE
- 5 EXISTING SITE TREE TO REMAIN
- 6 3' EGRESS ALLEY
- (7) 6' HIGH PVC FENCE @ P.L.
- (8) 4' HIGH METAL ESTATE FENCE W/ GATES
- 9 PRIVATE PAVER PATIOS
- (10) 2' X 2' SIDEWALK
- 11 PEDESTRIAN WALKWAY
- (12) 24' WIDE 2-WAY DRIVE AISLE
- (13) PARKING STALL 8.5' X 18'
- (14) ADA PARKING W/ ACCESS AISLE
- (15) LANDSCAPING STRIP



#### harman deutsch ohler architecture

# 7330 RIDGE AVE

SITE PLAN Landscape Plan















A CONCRETE SIDEWALKS

C PROPOSED STREET TREE,

B PERMEABLE PAVERS WALKWAY







#### FIRST FLOOR PLAN

SECOND FLOOR PLAN

#### THIRD FLOOR PLAN



# 7330 RIDGE AVE

# Typical Unit Plan TOTAL GFA: 1,104 SF



ROOF PLAN







#### FIRST FLOOR PLAN

SECOND FLOOR PLAN

#### THIRD FLOOR PLAN



# Corner Unit Plan

**TOTAL GFA:** 1,104 SF



**ROOF PLAN** 



# 7330 RIDGE AVE



#### 100 -1111 11111 1111 9999 2111 1111 100 1 1 SIDE YARD REAR YARD RESIDENTIAL UNITS **RESIDENTIAL UNITS**

1 | FRONT ELEVATION









# 7330 RIDGE AVE

- 7

#### 1 | PRIMARY FACADE

#### 2| SECONDARY FACADE









2

6

4

4

2

5

6





### MATERIALS



2	STANDING SEAM		
	METAL @ MANSARD		
	- Red		
	- Blue		
	- Black		







1

### HARDIE PLANK LAP SIDING

- 4" Exposure
- Smooth
- Black/Cobble Stone



### ALUMINUM COMPOSITE PANELS - Black



# 6 VINYL WINDOWS - Sliding, Casement & Fixed



8

# OVERHEAD DOOR

- Black
- **UP / DOWN LIGHT** - Black

MATERIAL



A



B





# SITE SECTIONS | 17



harman deutsch ohler Dal architecture

7330 RIDGE AVE



B













Civic Sustainable Design Checklist – Updated September 3, 2019

#### Civic Sustainable Design Checklist – Updated September 3, 2019

#### Civic Sustainable Design Checklist – Updated September 3, 2019

#### **Civic Design Review Sustainable Design Checklist**

Sustainable design represents important city-wide concerns about environmental conservation and energy use. Development teams should try to integrate elements that meet many goals, including:

- . Reuse of existing building stock
- Incorporation of existing on-site natural habitats and landscape elements •
- Inclusion of high-performing stormwater control .
- Site and building massing to maximize daylight and reduce shading on adjacent sites .
- . Reduction of energy use and the production of greenhouse gases
- Promotion of reasonable access to transportation alternatives

The Sustainable Design Checklist asks for responses to specific benchmarks. These metrics go above and beyond the minimum requirements in the Zoning and Building codes. All benchmarks are based on adaptions from Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) v4 unless otherwise noted.

Categories	Benchmark	Does project meet benchmark? If yes, please explain how. If no, please explain why not.
Location and Transportation		
(1) Access to Quality Transit	Locate a functional entry of the project within a ¼-mile (400-meter) walking distance of existing or planned bus, streetcar, or rideshare stops, bus rapid transit stops, light or heavy rail stations.	Yes. Bus 9 & 62 @ Ridge and Wigard
(2) Reduced Parking Footprint	All new parking areas will be in the rear yard of the property or under the building, and unenclosed or uncovered parking areas are 40% or less of the site area.	10,896 sf / 59,195.7 = 18.4% of the site is uncovered parking area open to the sky
(3) Green Vehicles	Designate 5% of all parking spaces used by the project as preferred parking for green vehicles or car share vehicles. Clearly identify and enforce for sole use by car share or green vehicles, which include plug-in electric vehicles and alternative fuel vehicles.	0% of the parking spaces are EV stalls, but 100% of the garage stalls will be pre-wired for EV chargers should the buyer request one.
(4) Railway Setbacks (Excluding frontages facing trolleys/light rail or enclosed subsurface rail lines or subways)	To foster safety and maintain a quality of life protected from excessive noise and vibration, residential development with railway frontages should be setback from rail lines and the building's exterior envelope, including windows, should reduce exterior sound transmission to 60dBA. (If setback used, specify distance) <sup>i</sup>	N/A. Our site is not adjacent to a railway.
(5) Bike Share Station	Incorporate a bike share station in coordination with and conformance to the standards of Philadelphia Bike Share.	No bike share stations are Proposed

1

Water Efficiency		
(6) Outdoor Water Use	Maintain on-site vegetation without irrigation. OR, Reduce of watering requirements at least 50% from the calculated baseline for the site's peak watering month.	The site will require irrigation for the first 3 years until the plants are established, then no irrigation will be required.
Sustainable Sites	watering month	
(7) Pervious Site Surfaces	Provides vegetated and/or pervious open space that is 30% or greater of the site's Open Area, as defined by the zoning code. Vegetated and/or green roofs can be included in this calculation	26,219 sf (44.3%) of our site is vegetated or pervious pavers.
	Conform to the stormwater	
	requirements of the Philadelphia Water Department(PWD) and either: A) Develop a green street and donate it to	we do not conform to either of these.
(8) Rainwater Management	PWD, designed and constructed in accordance with the PWD Green Streets Design Manual, OR B) Manage additional runoff from adjacent streets on the development site, designed and	
	constructed in accordance with specifications of the PWD Stormwater Management Regulations	
(9) Heat Island Reduction (excluding roofs)	Reduce the heat island effect through either of the following strategies for 50% or more of all on-site hardscapes: A) Hardscapes that have a high reflectance, an SRI>29. B) Shading by trees, structures, or solar panels.	All hardscapes will have a high reflectance of SRI>29. We are also proposing several site trees.
Energy and Atmosphere		
(10) Energy Commissioning and Energy Performance - Adherence to the New Building Code	PCPC notes that as of April 1, 2019 new energy conservation standards are required in the Philadelphia Building Code, based on recent updates of the International Energy Conservation Code (IECC) and the option to use ASHRAE 90.01-2016. PCPC staff asks the applicant to state which path they are taking for compliance, including their choice of code and any options being pursued under the 2018 IECC. <sup>ii</sup>	2018 IECC (RE) + PRESCRIPTIVE
(11) Energy Commissioning and Energy Performance - Going beyond the code	Will the project pursue energy performance measures beyond what is required in the Philadelphia code by meeting any of these benchmarks? <sup>III</sup> ©Reduce energy consumption by achieving 10% energy savings or more from an established baseline using	No additional measurements Will be pursued.

armar deutsch ohler architecture



	ASHRAE standard 90.1-2016 (LEED v4.1 metric). Certification in Energy Star for Multifamily New Construction (MFNC). Achieve Passive House Certification	Yes to energy star appliances + light fixtures Not Energy Star Cert. Not Passive House
(12) Indoor Air Quality and Transportation	Any sites within 1000 feet of an interstate highway, state highway, or freeway will provide air filters for all regularly occupied spaces that have a Minimum Efficiency Reporting Value (MERV) of 13. Filters shall be installed prior to occupancy. <sup>iv</sup>	Yes, compliant filters will be installed
(13) On-Site Renewable Energy (13) O		Roof top solar cells have been proposed on top of the optional pergolas.
Innovation		
(14) Innovation	Any other sustainable measures that could positively impact the public realm.	No

<sup>1</sup> Railway Association of Canada (RAC)'s "Guidelines for New Development in Proximity to Railway Operations. Exterior Sound transmission standard from LEED v4, BD+C, Acoustic Performance Credit.

#### <sup>ii</sup> Title 4 The Philadelphia Building Construction and Occupancy Code

See also, "The Commercial Energy Code Compliance" information sheet: https://www.phila.gov/li/Documents/Commercial%20Energy%20Code%20Compliance%20Fact%20Shee

#### and the "What Code Do I Use" information sheet:

https://www.phila.gov/li/Documents/What%20Code%20Do%20I%20Use.pdf

#### <sup>III</sup> LEED 4.1, Optimize Energy Performance in LEED v4.1

For Energy Star: <u>www.Energystar.gov</u> For Passive House, see <u>www.phius.org</u>

<sup>iv</sup> Section 99.04.504.6 "Filters" of the City of Los Angeles Municipal Code, from a 2016 Los Angeles Ordinance requiring enhanced air filters in homes near freeways

**Philadelphia City Planning Commission** 







6

#### INSTRUCTIONS

This Checklist is an implementation tool of the Philadelphia Complete Streets Handbook (the "Handbook") and enables City engineers and planners to review projects for their compliance with the Handbook's policies. The handbook provides design guidance and does not supersede or replace language, standards or policies established in the City Code, City Plan, or Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD).

The Philadelphia City Planning Commission receives this Checklist as a function of its Civic Design Review (CDR) process. This checklist is used to document how project applicants considered and accommodated the needs of all users of city streets and sidewalks during the planning and/or design of projects affecting public rights-of-way. Departmental reviewers will use this checklist to confirm that submitted designs incorporate complete streets considerations (see §11-901 of The Philadelphia Code). Applicants for projects that require Civic Design Review shall complete this checklist and attach it to plans submitted to the Philadelphia City Planning Commission for review, along with an electronic version.

The Handbook and the checklist can be accessed at http://www.phila.gov/CityPlanning/projectreviews/Pages/CivicDesignReview.aspx



FINAL STREETS DEPT REVIEW AND COMMENT:

DATE



# റ്റ

#### INSTRUCTIONS (continued)

- APPLICANTS SHOULD MAKE SURE TO COMPLY WITH THE FOLLOWING REQUIREMENTS:
  - of the checklist. Text fields will expand automatically as you type.
  - subsequent sections of the Handbook) should be identified and dimensioned on plans.
  - shelters, street signs and hydrants.
  - right-of-way may require a maintenance agreement with the Streets Department.
  - ADA curb-ramp designs must be submitted to Streets Department for review
  - Streets Department for a City Plan Action is required when a project plan proposes the:
    - Placing of a new street;
    - 0 Removal of an existing street;
    - Changes to roadway grades, curb lines, or widths; or
    - Placing or striking a city utility right-of-way.

#### Complete Streets Review Submission Requirement\*:

- EXISTING CONDITIONS SITE PLAN, should be at an identified standard engineering scale
  - FULLY DIMENSIONED
  - CURB CUTS/DRIVEWAYS/LAYBY LANES 0
  - TREE PITS/LANDSCAPING 0
  - **BICYCLE RACKS/STATIONS/STORAGE AREAS** 0
  - TRANSIT SHELTERS/STAIRWAYS 0
- PROPOSED CONDITIONS SITE PLAN, should be at an identified standard engineering scale
  - PINCH POINTS
  - PROPOSED CURB CUTS/DRIVEWAYS/LAYBY LANES 0
  - PROPOSED TREE PITS/LANDSCAPING 0
  - BICYCLE RACKS/STATIONS/STORAGE AREAS 0
  - TRANSIT SHELTERS/STAIRWAYS

\*APPLICANTS PLEASE NOTE: ONLY FULL-SIZE, READABLE SITE PLANS WILL BE ACCEPTED. ADDITIONAL PLANS MAY BE **REQUIRED AND WILL BE REQUESTED IF NECESSARY** 





# 7330 RIDGE AVE

### COMPLETE STREETS HANDBOOK CHECKLIST

**Philadelphia City Planning Commission** 





This checklist is designed to be filled out electronically in Microsoft Word format. Please submit the Word version

All plans submitted for review must clearly dimension the widths of the Furnishing, Walking, and Building Zones (as defined in Section 1 of the Handbook). "High Priority" Complete Streets treatments (identified in Table 1 and

□ All plans submitted for review must clearly identify and site all street furniture, including but not limited to bus

Any project that calls for the development and installation of medians, bio-swales and other such features in the

□ Any project that significantly changes the curb line may require a City Plan Action. The City Plan Action Application is available at http://www.philadelphiastreets.com/survey-and-design-bureau/city-plans-unit . An application to the

• FULLY DIMENSIONED, INCLUDING DELINEATION OF WALKING, FURNISHING, AND BUILDING ZONES AND

2

Philadelphia City Planning Commission



്റ

	F	
	-	
	۲.	-



2. DATE

07.09.2024

and scope

59,195.7 SF



5. PROJECT AREA: list precise street limits

# **COMPLETE STREETS HANDBOOK CHECKLIST**



**DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW: General Project Information** 

Ś

#### **GENERAL PROJECT INFORMATION**

1. PROJECT NAME

7330 Ridge Ave.

- 3. APPLICANT NAME
  - Rustin Ohler [HarmanDeutschOhler Architecture]
- 4. APPLICANT CONTACT INFORMATION 1225 N. 7<sup>th</sup> Street, 267-324-3601
- 6. OWNER NAME Robert V. Robertson, Jr.
- 7. OWNER CONTACT INFORMATION 1833 Kalorama Rd NW, Washington DC, 2009-5188
- 8. ENGINEER / ARCHITECT NAME
- Rustin Ohler [HarmanDeutschOhler Architecture]
- 9. ENGINEER / ARCHITECT CONTACT INFORMATION 1225 N. 7<sup>th</sup> Street, 267-324-3601
- 10. STREETS: List the streets associated with the project. Complete Streets Types can be found at www.phila.gov/map under the "Complete Street Types" field. Complete Streets Types are also identified in Section 3 of the Handbook.

Also available here: http://metadata.phila.gov/#home/datasetdetails/5543867320583086178c4f34/				
STREET FROM TO COMPLETE STREET TYPE				
Ridge Ave.	Harmon Rd.	Wigard Ave.	Urban Arterial	

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

a.	Parking and loading regulations in curb lanes adjacent to the site	YES 🔀	NO		
b.	Street Furniture such as bus shelters, honor boxes, etc.	YES 🔀	NO	N/A	
с.	Street Direction	YES 🔀	NO		
d.	Curb Cuts	YES 🖂	NO	N/A	
e.	Utilities, including tree grates, vault covers, manholes, junction boxes, signs, lights, poles, etc.	YES 🔀	NO 🗌	N/A	
f.	Building Extensions into the sidewalk, such as stairs and stoops	YES 🔀	NO 🗌	N/A	
APPLICA	NT: General Project Information				
Additiona	al Explanation / Comments:				



**Philadelphia City Planning Commission** 







COMPLETE STREETS 24 HANDBOOK CHECKLIST

Philadelphia City Planning Commission

#### 

#### PEDESTRIAN COMPONENT (Handbook Section 4.3)

12. SIDEWALK: list Sidewalk widths for each street frontage. Required Sidewalk widths are listed in Section 4.3 of the Handbook.

Ridge Ave.	<u>12' / 14' / 14'</u>	<u>14' / 14'</u>
	Required / Existing / Proposed	Existing / Proposed
	(BUILDING LINE TO CURB)	WIDTH
STREET FRONTAGE	TYPICAL SIDEWALK WIDTH	CITY PLAN SIDEWALK

13. WALKING ZONE: list Walking Zone widths for each street frontage. The Walking Zone is defined in Section 4.3 of the Handbook, including required widths.

Ridge Ave.	<u>6' / 10'-0" / 10'-0"</u>
	Required / Existing / Proposed
STREET FRONTAGE	WALKING ZONE
, 0 1	

14. VEHICULAR INTRUSIONS: list Vehicular Intrusions into the sidewalk. Examples include but are not limited to; driveways, lay-by lanes, etc. Driveways and lay-by lanes are addressed in sections 4.8.1 and 4.6.3, respectively, of the Handbook.

EXISTING VEHICULAR INTRUSIONS				
INTRUSION TYPE	INTRUSION WIDTH	PLACEMENT		
<u>Curbcut (to be infilled)</u>	<u>14'-3"</u>	<u>Ridge Ave.</u>		
PROPOSED VEHICULAR INTRUSIONS				
INTRUSION TYPE	INTRUSION WIDTH	PLACEMENT		
<u>Curbcut</u>	<u>24'</u>	<u>Ridge Ave.</u>		

## **COMPLETE STREETS**

Philadelphia City



PEDESTRIAN COMPONENT (continued)

15. When considering the overall design, does it create o pedestrian environment that provides safe and comfor all pedestrians at all times of the day?

#### **APPLICANT: Pedestrian Component**

Additional Explanation / Comments:

#### DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW: Pedestrian Component

**Reviewer Comments:** 



y Planning Comm	DK CH nission	ECKLIST		
			DEPAR	RTMENTAL
or enhance a fortable access for	YES 🔀	NO 🗌	YES 🗌	) NO 🗌

Philadelphia City Planning Commission







#### **BUILDING & FURNISHING COMPONENT (Handbook Section 4.4)**

16. BUILDING ZONE: list the MAXIMUM, existing and proposed Building Zone width on each street frontage. The Building Zone is defined as the area of the sidewalk immediately adjacent to the building face, wall, or fence marking the property line, or a lawn in lower density residential neighborhoods. The Building Zone is further defined in section 4.4.1 of the Handbook.

Ridge Ave.	<u>0' / 0'</u>
	Existing / Proposed
STREET FRONTAGE	MAXIMUM BUILDING ZONE WIDTH

17. FURNISHING ZONE: list the MINIMUM, recommended, existing, and proposed Furnishing Zone widths on each street frontage. The Furnishing Zone is further defined in section 4.4.2 of the Handbook.

Ridge Ave.	<u>4'-0"</u> / <u>4'-0"</u> / <u>4'-0"</u>
	Recommended / Existing / Proposed
STREET FRONTAGE	MINIMUM FURNISHING ZONE WIDTH

# COMPLETE STREETS HANDBOOK CHECKLIST





#### **BUILDING & FURNISHING COMPONENT**

- 21. Do street trees and/or plants comply with street inst requirements (see sections 4.4.7 & 4.4.8)
- 22. Does the design maintain adequate visibility for all reintersections?

#### **APPLICANT: Building & Furnishing Component**

Additional Explanation / Comments:

DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW: Building & Furnishing Compor **Reviewer Comments:** 

18. Identify proposed "high priority" building and furnishing zone design to	reatments that are	<u>}</u>		
incorporated into the design plan, where width permits (see Handbool	k Table 1). Are the		DEPART	MENTAL
following treatments identified and dimensioned on the plan?			APPROV	AL
<ul> <li>Bicycle Parking</li> </ul>	YES 📃 NO 🗌	) N/A 🛛	YES 🗌	NO 🗌
<ul> <li>Lighting</li> </ul>	YES 🔀 🛛 NO 🗌	] N/A 🗌	YES 🗌	NO 🗌
Benches	YES 📃 NO 🗌	) N/A 🖂	YES 🗌	NO 🗌
<ul> <li>Street Trees</li> </ul>	YES 🔀 🛛 NO 🗌	] N/A 🗌	YES 🗌	NO 🗌
<ul> <li>Street Furniture</li> </ul>	YES 🔀 🛛 NO 🗌	) N/A 🗌	YES 🗌	NO 🗌
19. Does the design avoid tripping hazards?	YES 🔀 🛛 NO 🗌	) N/A 🗌	YES 🗌	NO 🗌
20. Does the design avoid pinch points? Pinch points are locations where	YES 🔀 🛛 NO 🗌	N/A 🗌	YES 🗌	NO 🗌
the Walking Zone width is less than the required width identified in				
item 13, or requires an exception				



Philadelphia City Planning Commission

			7	
YES 🔀	NO 🗌	N/A 🗌	YES 🗌	NO 🗌
YES 🔀	NO 🗌	N/A 🗌	YES 🗌	NO 🗌
	YES X	YES ⋈         NO □           YES ⋈         NO □	YES ⋈     NO □     N/A □       YES ⋈     NO □     N/A □	YES         NO         N/A         YES           YES         NO         N/A         YES

nent		

**Philadelphia City Planning Commission** 



**BICYCLE COMPONENT (Handbook Section 4.5)** 

്റ

23. List elements of the project that incorporate recommendations of the Pedestrian and Bicycle Plan, located online at http://phila2035.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/06/bikePedfinal2.pdf

24. List the existing and proposed number of bicycle parking spaces, on- and off-street. Bicycle parking requirements are provided in The Philadelphia Code, Section 14-804.

BUILDING / ADDRESS	REQUIRED SPACES	ON-STREET Existing / Proposed	ON SIDEWALK Existing / Proposed	OFF-STREET Existing / Proposed
<u>Ridge Ave.</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0/0</u>	<u>0/0</u>	<u>0/0</u>
		/	/	/
		/	/	/
		/	/	/

25.	<ul> <li>Identify proposed "high priority" bicycle design treatments (see Handbo incorporated into the design plan, where width permits. Are the followine elements identified and dimensioned on the plan?</li> <li>Conventional Bike Lane</li> <li>Buffered Bike Lane</li> <li>Bicycle-Friendly Street</li> <li>Indego Bicycle Share Station</li> </ul>	ok Table : ng "High YES YES YES YES YES YES	1) that ar Priority" NO NO NO NO NO	N/A X N/A X N/A X N/A X	DEPARTI APPROV YES YES YES YES YES	MENTAL AL NO NO NO NO
26.	Does the design provide bicycle connections to local bicycle, trail, and transit networks?	YES 🔀	NO 🗌	N/A 🗌	YES 🗌	NO 🗌
27.	Does the design provide convenient bicycle connections to residences, work places, and other destinations?	YES 🔀	NO 🗌	N/A 🗌	YES 🗌	NO 🗌

#### **APPLICANT: Bicycle Component**

Additional Explanation / Comments:

#### **DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW: Bicycle Component**

**Reviewer Comments:** 

#### **COMPLETE STREETS HAI**

So

**Philadelphia City Planning Commission** 

#### CURBSIDE MANAGEMENT COMPONENT (Han

- 28. Does the design limit conflict among transportation modes curb?
- 29. Does the design connect transit stops to the surrounding pe network and destinations?
- 30. Does the design provide a buffer between the roadway and traffic?
- 31. How does the proposed plan affect the accessibility, visibility of public transit? N/A

#### **APPLICANT: Curbside Management Component**

Additional Explanation / Comments: \_\_\_\_

#### DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW: Curbside Management Component **Reviewer Comments:**





_
•

	æ		1	7	
dbook Sec	tion 4	.6)			
				DEPARTI	MENTAL AL
along the	YES 🔀	NO 🗌		YES 🗌	NO 🗌
edestrian	YES 🔀	NO 🗌	N/A 🗌	YES 🗌	NO 🗌
l pedestrian	YES 🔀	NO 🗌	N/A 🗌	YES 🗌	NO 🗌
ty, connectivit	y, and/or	attractiv	reness	YES 🗌	NO 🗌

#### COMPLETE STREETS 27 HANDBOOK CHECKLIST

Philadelphia City Planning Commission





æ



#### VEHICLE / CARTWAY COMPONENT (Handbook Section 4.7)

32. If lane changes are proposed, , identify existing and proposed lane widths and the design speed for each street frontage;

STREET	FROM	ТО	LANE WIDTHS DESIGN Existing / Proposed SPEED
			/
			/
			/
			1

					DEPARTI APPROV	MENTAL AL
33.	What is the maximum AASHTO design vehicle being accommodated by the design?	<u>P, WB60</u>			YES 🗌	NO 🗌
34.	Will the project affect a historically certified street? An <u>inventory of</u> <u>historic streets</u> <sup>(1)</sup> is maintained by the Philadelphia Historical Commission.	YES 🗌	NO 🖂		YES 🗌	NO 🗌
35.	Will the public right-of-way be used for loading and unloading activities?	YES 🗌	NO 🔀		YES 🗌	NO 🗌
36.	Does the design maintain emergency vehicle access?	YES 🔀	NO 🗌		YES 🗌	NO 🗌
37.	Where new streets are being developed, does the design connect and extend the street grid?	YES 🗌	NO 🗌	N/A 🔀	YES 🗌	NO 🗌
38.	Does the design support multiple alternative routes to and from destinations as well as within the site?	YES 🔀	NO 🗌	N/A 🗌	YES 🗌	NO 🗌
39.	Overall, does the design balance vehicle mobility with the mobility and access of all other roadway users?	YES 🔀	NO 🗌		YES 🗌	NO 🗌

#### **APPLICANT: Vehicle / Cartway Component**

Additional Explanation / Comments:

DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW: Vehicle / Cartway Component

**Reviewer Comments:** 

(1) http://www.philadelphiastreets.com/images/uploads/documents/Historical Street Paving.pdf

# COMPLETE STREETS HANDBOOK CHECKLIST



#### URBAN DESIGN COMPONENT (Handbool

- 40. Does the design incorporate windows, storefronts, ar uses facing the street?
- 41. Does the design provide driveway access that safely pedestrian / bicycle conflicts with vehicles (see Section 2014) and a section of the section of the
- 42. Does the design provide direct, safe, and accessible of between transit stops/stations and building access prodestinations within the site?

#### **APPLICANT: Urban Design Component**

Additional Explanation / Comments:

#### DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW: Urban Design Component

Reviewer Comments:





Philadelphia City Planning Commission

<b>,</b> ;			L	7	
Section 4.8)					
				DEPARTMENTAL APPROVAL	
nd other active	YES 🔀	NO 🗌	N/A 🗌	YES 🗌	NO 🗌
manages on 4.8.1)?	YES 🔀	NO 🗌	N/A 🗌	YES 🗌	NO 🗌
connections oints and	YES 🔀	NO 🗌	N/A 🗌	YES 🗌	NO 🗌

Philadelphia City Planning Commission







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

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

NO. 48.		
SIGNAL LOCATION	EXISTING CYCLE LENGTH	PROPOSED CYCLE LENGTH
		DEPARTMENTAL APPROVAL
44. Does the design minimize the signal cycle length to reduce pedestrian YES wait time?	🗌 NO 🗌 N/A 🛛	YES NO
45. Does the design provide adequate clearance time for pedestrians to ross streets? YES	🗌 NO 🗌 N/A 🛛	YES NO
46. Does the design minimize pedestrian crossing distances by narrowing YES streets or travel lanes, extending curbs, reducing curb radii, or using medians or refuge islands to break up long crossings?	🗌 NO 🗌 N/A 🛛	YES 📄 NO 🗌
If yes, City Plan Action may be required.		
47. Identify "High Priority" intersection and crossing design treatments (see Hand will be incorporated into the design, where width permits. Are the following design treatments identified and dimensioned on the plan?	YES NO	
<ul> <li>Marked Crosswalks</li> <li>Pedestrian Refuge Islands</li> <li>Signal Timing and Operation</li> <li>Bike Boxes</li> <li>YES</li> </ul>	NO       N/A         NO       N/A         NO       N/A         NO       N/A         NO       N/A         NO       N/A         NO       N/A	YES     NO       YES     NO       YES     NO       YES     NO
48. Does the design reduce vehicle speeds and increase visibility for all YES modes at intersections?	🗌 NO 🗌 N/A 🛛	YES NO
49. Overall, do intersection designs limit conflicts between all modes and promote pedestrian and bicycle safety?	🛛 NO 🗌 N/A 🗌	YES NO
APPLICANT: Intersections & Crossings Component		
Additional Explanation / Comments:		

**DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW: Intersections & Crossings Component** Reviewer Comments:





	APPLICANT				
	Additional Explanation / Comments:				

#### DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW

Additional Reviewer Comments:





# COMPLETE STREETS HANDBOOK CHECKLIST

Philadelphia City Planning Commission







COMPLETE STREETS 29 HANDBOOK CHECKLIST