LOWER EASTWICK PUBLIC LAND STRATEGY

PRA SITE 1
PRA SITE 2
PRA SITE 3
FORMER COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY HIGH SCHOOL
FORMER GEORGE PEPPER MIDDLE SCHOOL

SCHOOL DISTRICT PROPERTY
PRA PROPERTY
PARKS & OPEN SPACE
CITY OF PHILADELPHIA BOUNDARY
HOW WAS THIS PROCESS DESIGNED?

• Include many perspectives, including residents, business owners and outside experts
• Get **ALL** the history on the table
• Get **ALL** the problems on the table
• Analyze the problems and their effects on the sites and on the neighborhood
• Develop a list of recommended uses and a vision for the sites
WHAT IS THIS PLAN FOR?

• This is a land use **feasibility and vision** plan. It is the **first step** in determining the future of publicly owned, vacant sites in Eastwick.
  • **Our task** – A feasibility analysis looking at:
    – What can the market support?
    – What are the environmental constraints?
    – What are the community’s goals?

• The final deliverable is a **research document** so that the City **with** the community can make thoughtful decisions in public land development moving forward.
WHAT IS IT NOT FOR?

- Selecting future owners of the land
- Selecting developers
- Selecting particular development proposals
- Drawing site specific plans that may or may not get built
- Addressing neighborhood concerns outside of these parcels (for example, the sinking homes)
THE PLANNING PROCESS
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PLANNING PROCESS PARTICIPATION [SO FAR]

In addition to 42 interviews:

170 residents have participated in this planning process to date.

170 residents have participated in this planning process to date.

144 total participants, with 69% living in Eastwick.

55 participants at Round Table 1, 78% living in Eastwick.

35 participants at Round Table 2, 49% living in Eastwick.

43 participants at Round Table 3, 53% living in Eastwick.

113 participants at Public Meeting 2, 71% living in Eastwick.

93 unique participants in total.

63% live in Eastwick, 37% live elsewhere.

Participants by role:
- Work Here: 8
- Unknown: 7
- Potential Developer: 6
- City/State Rep: 4
- Advocate: 4
- Researcher: 3
- Press: 1
- Nearby Resident: 1
- Gardener: 1
3 ROUND TABLES

These were designed as a collaborative learning process to engage diverse stakeholders, identify key issues from both current and historical neighborhood conditions and personal experience with the sites.
SO WHAT ARE WE TRYING TO ACCOMPLISH?
IN THE COMMUNITY’S WORDS...

Proposals for future development in Eastwick should:

> Honor Eastwick’s rich and complex history
> Involve the community and respect its neighbors
> Cultivate a safe, stable, and healthy neighborhood
> Work to heal the environment (and not make any of the issues worse)
> Celebrate Eastwick’s natural setting
> Provide sustainable access to opportunity and nurture our youth
> Build community ties and foster diversity
This map summarizes the top land use choices for each of the zones, hatching indicates ‘ties’.

### Total Times Participants Selected Each Land Use

- **Open Space**: 66
- **Residential**: 25
- **Institutional**: 24
- **Commercial**: 20
- **Industrial**: 18

### Top Choices for All or Part of Each Zone

- **Residential**
  - “Open Space”
  - “Flood remediation”
  - “Incorporate education”
  - “Hotels, retail, office”
  - “Light, agriculture, outdoor concerts”

- **Industrial**
  - “Light industrial”
  - “Solar farm”
  - “Aquaculture”
  - “Expand Eastwick garden”
  - “Flood remediation”

- **Commercial**
  - “Education, job training”
  - “Rec center, pool”
  - “Light industry”
  - “Residential if it can be remediated”

- **Institutional**
  - “Garden, Heinz”
  - “Fields, open space, recreation courts”
  - “Trail, playground, water”

- **Open Space**
  - “City of Philadelphia Boundary”
  - “Parks & Open Space”
The second public meeting was a review of the team’s understanding of how flooding occurs in the area and what was learned during the roundtable discussions. Residents were then asked whether or not they agreed or disagreed with the top land use choices for the different zones from the final roundtable, and to explain why they felt that way.
WE ASKED if you agree or disagree with the uses suggested below

There was alignment between our market experts and roundtable input on these uses, do you agree with this potential use?

ZONE 1
INSTITUTIONAL, COMMERCIAL, OR RESIDENTIAL USES
34% AGREE
24% KEEP OPEN
10% FLOOD MITIGATION
29% DISAGREE: BLANK
2% DIFFERENT USE

ZONE 2
RESIDENTIAL USES
33% AGREE
18% KEEP OPEN
20% FLOOD MITIGATION
28% DISAGREE: BLANK
3% DIFFERENT USE

ZONE 3
COMMERCIAL AND/OR INSTITUTIONAL
29% AGREE
20% KEEP OPEN
22% FLOOD MITIGATION
22% DISAGREE: BLANK
2% DIFFERENT USE

ZONE 4
RESIDENTIAL USES
36% AGREE
21% KEEP OPEN
17% FLOOD MITIGATION
19% DISAGREE: BLANK
0% DIFFERENT USE

ZONE 5
LIGHT INDUSTRIAL
27% AGREE
12% KEEP OPEN
12% FLOOD MITIGATION
32% DISAGREE: BLANK
15% DIFFERENT USE

(Percentage of residents who participated in the exercise - 43 in all)

Why all the disagreement?
ONE IN THREE OF ALL PARTICIPANTS MENTIONED FLOODING IN AT LEAST ONE OF THEIR REASONS FOR DISAGREING

ONE IN FIVE MENTIONED FLOODING IN THEIR DISAGREEMENT TO EVERY SINGLE ZONE
“fix current flooding” “flood mitigation only” “do not develop with buildings, do flood abatement work”
BALANCING DEVELOPMENT AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERNS

[CAN’T WE DO BOTH?]

A. BASELINE: Don’t make any of the flooding issues worse

B. PRESERVE THE OPPORTUNITY for flood mitigation in low lying areas

C. USE DEVELOPMENT to improve existing conditions where it’s appropriate

HOW, YOU ASK?

Limit new residential development in the 100-year floodplain
Balance cut + fill
Mitigate impervious cover with green stormwater infrastructure
Study potential use for flood mitigation
Encourage green building best practices
100 YR FLOOD:

1% annual chance flood

These areas are referred to as Special Flood Hazard Area (SFHA) representing moderate flood hazard.

FEMA FLOOD ZONES

Source: FEMA, Interface Studio LLC

- 100 YEAR FLOOD - ZONE A
- 100 YEAR FLOOD - ZONE AE
- 500 YEAR FLOOD
- STUDY AREA
Developing in a 100 year floodplain: balance cut and fill

a developer must build to the base flood elevation

BASE FLOOD ELEVATION

EXISTING ELEVATION

FILL

10FT

5FT
Developing in a 100 year floodplain: balance cut and fill
New development must also adhere to PWD regulations

**FLOOD CONTROL:** A development project must **meet or reduce peak rates** of water runoff from what exists today.

**STORMWATER:** Onsite management of the **first 1.5 inches** of runoff from impervious surfaces
The Vision: “A Village in the City”

Eastwick has the soul of a village. People love the proximity to nature, and the quiet, pastoral setting. Eastwick lacks the organization of a village -- it has no Main Street, with a set of inviting shops that serve as a gathering places and crossroads. Becoming a real village involves enhancing both of those parts: enhancing the connection to nature and developing a ‘Main Street’ that brings together civic, commercial and cultural life. Finally, becoming a “village in the city” means solving the numerous disconnections -- within the neighborhood and between the neighborhood and the rest of the city -- that would make it easy to navigate, hospitable and charming.
**APPROACH**

1. **REUSE COMM. TECH**
2. **COMMERCIAL/OFFICE OR MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT ALONG 84TH**
3. **SENIOR APARTMENT DEVELOPMENT**
4. **LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL INFILL**
5. **COMMERCIAL / INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT**

- **PARCELS**
- **DEVELOPMENT POTENTIAL**
- **GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE**
- **OPEN SPACE**
- **RECONNECTED STREET NETWORK**
- **PROPOSED INTERSECTION**
- **PROPOSED TRAIL NETWORK**
EXISTING CONDITIONS
- 87.8 acres in the 100 year floodplain
- 23 acres in the 500 year floodplain
- 1.7 acres wetlands
- Flooding comes down 86th Street to the wetlands, as well as from the Heinz Refuge
- Infrastructure (sewer and water) from previous plans still exists and likely cannot be buried

COMMUNITY IDEAS:
- Residents were open to development around the edges of the site
- Open Space to mitigate potential flooding.
CUT & FILL PARCEL STRATEGY

Recommended approach for how a developer could build.

- **EXISTING PROPERTY LINE**
- **PROPOSED PARCEL LINES**
- **EXISTING CONTOURS**
- **PROPOSED 2' CONTOURS**
- **EXISTING WETLAND**
- **100' SETBACK FROM WETLAND**
- **POTENTIAL TRAIL CONNECTION**
- **POTENTIAL FILL AREA FOR DEVELOPMENT**

*Assumes a base flood elevation of +10.0 ft. As per the zoning code, new development must be built above this base flood elevation.

This drawing does not take into account the potential for flood conveyance infrastructure to alleviate the flooding threat in the planet streets.

BLD recommends a ground survey to confirm elevations and to ensure proper existing elevations are maintained to prevent increased risk of flooding.

Elevation Source: PASDA Philadelphia terrain products: 2015
**DESIGN APPROACH:**
- Sensible infill housing in area outside of the 100 year flood plain
- Sustainable building techniques and a levee behind the buildings likely required

**COMMUNITY BENEFITS:**
- Local employment opportunity
- Connect fractured streets
- Address illegal dumping
- Provides an opportunity for a community green space (garden, etc)

---

**SITE 1 APPROACH**
POTENTIAL USES:
- Residential Infill on the 500 year floodplain - 74 - 150 unit twin houses
- No Development – Open space
- Light Industrial Development along the rail – 250k sf - 500k sf

CONCEPT ONLY - ACTUAL DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL DEPENDS ON SELECTED DEVELOPER
EXISTING CONDITIONS
• 2.6 out of 6.25 acres is in the 500 year floodplain
• Currently acts as protection from Cobbs Creek floodway
• Though not surveyed, has high quality upland forest species according to local environmentalists

COMMUNITY IDEAS:
• Serve as a gateway to the Heinz
• Senior Apartments (since it's outside of the floodplain)
**Design Approach:**
- Buildings should activate the street corner.
- Parking should be placed in the back, a single curb cut should intersect with the forthcoming Cobbs Creek trail alignment.
- Limit disturbance of the Heinz Refuge as much as possible.

**Community Benefits:**
- Incentivize improvements to 84th and Lindbergh intersection.
- Provide affordable housing option for seniors.
- Activate underutilized street frontage.

---

**Site 2 Approach**

- **Parcel**
- **Development Potential**
- **Green Infrastructure**
- **Existing Open Space**
- **Proposed Trail Network**
POTENTIAL USES:
- No Development – Gateway to the Heinz
- Affordable senior housing 60-120 units

CONCEPT ONLY- ACTUAL DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL DEPENDS ON SELECTED DEVELOPER
SITE OWNERSHIP

- Split ownership between PRA and the School District of Philadelphia

1. FORMER COMM. TECH. SCHOOL
2. FORMER PEPPER SCHOOL

- SCHOOL DISTRICT PROPERTY
- PRA PROPERTY
EXISTING CONDITIONS
• Mostly within the 100 year floodplain (except for Comm. Tech)
• Contains areas that are at or below sea level
• Likely contains wetland areas but has not been surveyed

COMMUNITY IDEAS:
• Job Training facility
• Community meeting space
• Maintain playing fields

1 FORMER COMM. TECH. SCHOOL
2 FORMER PEPPER SCHOOL

- NOT IN 100 OR 500 YEAR FLOODPLAINS
- 500 YEAR FLOODPLAIN
- 100 YEAR FLOODPLAIN
- VERY LOW ELEVATION (LESS THAN 2 FT.)
- EXISTING WETLANDS
- PARCEL LINES
CONDITION OF THE SCHOOLS

PEPPER MIDDLE SCHOOL
Year Built: 1971
Vacant Since: June 2013
Gross Building Area: 200,000 sf excluding partially finished basement area
Renovation Cost*: $19m ($95 per sf)*
Condition**: “The property is in a state of serious disrepair. While built in 1971 the property’s effective age is much older, and in our opinion, it is at the end of its economic life.”

COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY
Year Built: 1926 (on the National Register of Historic Places)
Vacant Since: June 2013
Gross Building Area: 66,937 sf
Estimated Deferred Maintenance Cost**: $600,000
Condition**: “Despite being vacant for a number of years, the property is in relatively good condition.”

*Source: School District Estimate
**Source: May 2015 appraisal, based on 2013 inspection
**DESIGN APPROACH:**
- Reuse the historic CommTech building as a community center, workforce/skills training for youth and adults, or affordable housing
- Relocate recreation fields to centralize community resources

**COMMUNITY BENEFITS:**
- Bring together civic, commercial and cultural life
- Opportunity for a community hub
- Meeting space

**SITE 3 APPROACH**

- VERY LOW ELEVATION (LESS THAN 2FT)
- PARCELS
- DEVELOPMENT POTENTIAL
- RECREATION SPACE
DESIGN APPROACH:
• Reconnect Lyons Ave to 84th Street

COMMUNITY BENEFITS:
• Bridge the neighborhood divide

NOTE:
This study recommends demolition of the Pepper School given its state of disrepair, cost to maintain, and location in the floodplain. However, proposals to rehabilitate the structure will be considered provided they demonstrate financing of capital and ongoing maintenance costs, and do not worsen the flood risk in the neighborhood any further.
**SITE 3 APPROACH**

**DESIGN APPROACH:**
- Align buildings along the street to activate frontage and increase neighborhood walkability
- Proposed building footprint not to exceed the existing Pepper School building

**COMMUNITY BENEFITS:**
- Bring together civic, commercial and cultural life
- Connect sub-neighborhoods
- Activate 84th street
DESIGN APPROACH:
- Work with community to utilize the open space for stormwater infiltration and recreation uses.

COMMUNITY BENEFITS:
- Bring together civic, commercial and cultural life
- Connect fractured sub-neighborhoods
- Activate 84th street
- Opportunity for a community hub
WHAT DO WE MEAN BY MAIN STREET?

POTENTIAL USE:
- Commercial/Office with ground floor retail amenities
- Apartments with ground floor retail amenities
- Hotel
- Community centered institutional or educational reuse

CONCEPT ONLY- ACTUAL DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL DEPENDS ON SELECTED DEVELOPER
NEXT STEPS

• **90-DAY PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD**
  View presentation:  www.tinyurl.com/eastwickpublicland
  Send comments:  ashley@interface-studio.com

• **DRAFT FEASIBILITY STUDY**

• **FINAL FEASIBILITY STUDY**
THE LONG ROAD AHEAD

WE ARE HERE!
OVERALL VISION +
FEASIBILITY STUDY

RESIDENTS DEMAND
THOUGHTFUL DECISIONS
IN PUBLIC LAND
DEVELOPMENT

ROAD TO DEVELOPMENT

- LOWER EASTWICK -
PUBLIC LAND
STRATEGY

REQUEST FOR
PROPOSALS ISSUED

DEVELOPER SELECTION
PROCESS

DEVELOPERS PITCH IDEAS

LEGAL /
ENTITLEMENTS
QUESTIONS FOR DEVELOPERS

General:

Why do you want to locate in Eastwick?
What do you know about Eastwick?
How many acres do you need? How big is your footprint?
How much space do you need?
Where do you want it to land in Eastwick?
What is your timeline?

Community Benefits:

How will this development enhance our neighborhood?
How is what you want to develop going to interact with Eastwick and its residents?
Explain in detail how your proposed project will enhance my property value and my quality of life?
What is your social commitment to this community? How will you ensure that community amenities are a component of the development?
Will you provide resources for seniors?
What is the community impact, socially, economically, ecologically? How does it address the needs and deficiencies in the neighborhood?
How might your development affect noise in the neighborhood? *we love how quiet it is*
If residential, will it be homeowner or renter?

Providing Opportunity:

Will you provide jobs?
Will the jobs created be recruited from our community? How?
Will you provide training and certification opportunities?

Eastwick has very real environmental challenges. How will your project help to ameliorate them?
How will your project impact local flooding?
Will you provide open space? Will everyone have access?
What will you do to add/improve safe healthy recreational activities for families in Eastwick? How?
How do you mitigate the environmental impact of your development?
How would development control for flooding?
How will you manage the stormwater?
How might your development be able to address dumping?

Environmental Impact:

What will you do to reduce barriers in our community?
How will your project impact the community connectivity, such as traffic volume and flow and pedestrian access?
Does it have enough parking?
How might your development slow traffic?
How might your development stop drag racing?

Connectivity:
THE RFP PROCESS

1. RFP Posted with evaluation criteria and scoring sheet attached.
2. Pre-bid meeting (open to public).
3. List of all interested parties posted publicly on PRA’s website.
4. Multi-agency review committee scores proposals and makes preliminary selection.
5. Proposal posted on PRA’s website for public comment period.
6. Developer due diligence, including working with community-based organizations.
7. PRA review and approval of plans, budgets, and financing.
8. Execution of Redevelopment Agreement by developer.
9. Presentation to Planning Commission for approval (open to public).
10. Presentation to PRA Board for developer selection (open to public).
11. City Council Resolution hearings for approval (open to public).
12. Execution of Redevelopment Agreement by PRA.
13. Settlement and transfer of title to developer.
15. Construction period.
16. Review of completed development to determine compliance with Redevelopment Agreement.
17. Issuance of Certificate of Completion.
BEFORE YOU LEAVE

1. FILL OUT THE SHORT SURVEY + COMMENT CARD

2. I HAVE A QUESTION ABOUT _________.

Each of the three general site areas have their own station. Visit each station to dive deeper into each of those areas and tell us what questions we need to address in the report.
QUESTIONS?

0:03

we kindly ask you to keep comments to (3) minutes per speaker