### Community responses to ULS Working Group presentation via web form: 7.23.2020

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1 | 1. will section 8 vouchers be included to help make a dent in the lack of affordable housing in Philadelphia  
2. preserving heritage trees and open space seems like a big priority and maybe could be highlighted more  
3. What responsibility do the developers have on items that begin with "consider"  
4. If retail isn't welcome what about office space?  
5. Is there a limit to how many stories for multifamily? |
| 2 | The Working Group should be commended for their hard work and detailed and thorough documentation of community concerns.  
I have one thought ...Beyond the project ...Can a community advisory committee be established with ULS and neighbors, EMAN, etc. as a long term partnership for on-going review of issues or changes that arise in relationship to residences and campus activities. This would provide a forum for neighbors to address questions and problems and resolve quickly. It would also serve to strengthen on-going relationship of community with ULS and enhance transparency and trust. |
| 3 | This looks great. I'd like to also emphasize both the green space and the heritage trees. Within recent years Mt Airy has experienced devastating destruction to our canopy by blight, storms, and construction. These trees will "*never*" be replaced in our lifetime (or our children's lifetime). Simply "planting new trees" to replace the ones removed is not enough. But legally, that's how many developers get around the heritage tree laws in Philadelphia. Most of the small, newly planted trees die within a few years and take upwards of 100 years to reach even half the size of some of the trees on that property.  

The increased hard surface coverage of the area (concrete, rooftop, blacktop etc.) has created *serious* stormwater management issues. Our sewers, streams, and rivers are just not equipped to deal with the loss of water-absorbing dirt & grass. Many developers have stipulations for "stormwater management" but their concern (legally) stops at the property. The erosion along the Wissahickon is directly related to how much runoff there now is. The fallen trees in recent years is partly related to rotting and or dried out root systems from all these buildings and parking lots.  

We are allowing profit-seeking developers to systematically destroy our home. They are experts in manipulating the laws, minds (and pockets) of decision-makers to achieve what they want.  

Please continue to fight the good fight. |
| 4 | Thank you so much for all the thought, effort, and incredible dedication to community reflected in these documents. I want to underscore and expand upon several aspects of these recommendations.  
I am so glad that the recommendations/criteria not only seek to mitigate potential negative outcomes, but also to proactively promote community benefit through asset creation. I suggest pushing the concept of local asset creation further, stressing meanwhile that attentive governance is a precondition.  

Huge benefits could flow from sustained commitment to creating as many ‘circular’ economic loops as possible within Mt. Airy/the Northwest for procurement (e.g., energy via community solar and/or on-site generation, food, services) and employment. It may be helpful to organize the recommendations with this in mind (i.e., separate out mitigation of potential negative impacts with creation of positive community assets). Some of these assets may be monetizable (e.g., energy) which would also help provide funding for ongoing site operations.  

It might also be helpful to list out potential ways for Mt. Airy/the Northwest as a community and region to help with developing and implementing ideas around the creation of these circular loops and local assets (e.g., the types of orgs, groups, non-profits that could be partners in this type of creative, collaborative thinking).  

Related, attention will need to be paid in the long run to ensure that any publicly accessible green space truly functions as such. Good maintenance and the absence of exclusionary/harmful surveillance are musts. Ideally there would also be emphasis on programming/partnerships to activate the space appropriately in response to ongoing community interests/needs.  

This all takes attention to organizational governance. I would ask the working group to consider making a recommendation related to Mt Airy representation in the ongoing governance of the site, directly and/or via entities (with actual say) such as advisory committees. |
Hello,

I would like to emphasize:
1) the need for green spaces that include trees and gardening
2) a specific plan to DECREASE traffic congestion and provide parking spaces that includes visitors, families, deliveries, consumers and normal traffic

Thank you for taking the time to keep the community safe, comfortable and beautiful!

There are many good recommendations and requirements, and some items suggest goals for sustainable design and green building, but it is not explicit or clear enough to make a real impact. New housing, some affordable, adding density to an existing neighborhood, assisting the Seminary to continue its mission are all necessary. Climate change is happening and we are responsible to do what we can now to mitigate its effects and impacts in the near future. All new construction at the site should commit to high performance building at a level more efficient than the current 2018 Energy Code. Materials should have Environmental Product Declarations and be free of Red List chemicals. All plumbing fixtures should meet Water Sense criteria for reduced water use. No gas appliances or heating equipment to reduce CO2 emissions. Commit to purchasing Renewable Energy Credits for 100% of the power used at the site. These are all easily achievable tactics with little to no added cost when integrated into the planning and design from the start.

The builders should provide evidence of compliance, even without a green building certification program such as LEED, WELL, LBC or PassiveHouse. This is not too much for a community to demand in 2020! Thanks for the opportunity to comment on all the good work done so far.

In response to the current and long lasting coronavirus crisis, new buildings should provide adequate fresh air ventilation systems, equipment, planning and controls. Just having operable windows to meet code is not enough. Windows are rarely opened for most of the year, and if opened need exhaust fans to pull outside air into the spaces. An Energy Recovery Ventilator is the recommended solution.

I think this was touched on in the aspects of the matrix concerning zoning, but I wanted to emphasize concern about future owners of the ULS-PH property in the event that ULS goes through with a development plan and then in the future the seminary itself, or campus, fully closes. How will this development open doors for future developments that may not be in the best interest of the community? ULS seems to think this development will rectify the financial difficulties of the seminary, but it is always possible that this will not be the case.

Hi, thanks for producing this excellent report. As a very near neighbor of ULS on Boyer st, I am concerned about traffic and a traffic study from this proposal, and as I've indicated directly via email I do not think the idea under "site design" of using the Boyer st driveway as a potential entrance access to a one-way ring road around the inside of the development to be positive. I think this would have unwelcome impacts not only on my house and my next door neighbor, but particularly for the neighboring properties at one end of Boyer off Mt. Airy Ave, as well as the houses on Mt. Airy backing on to ULS, which presumably would see even more traffic. I hope the working group could convene or communicate with these near neighbors to clarify this particular part of the matrix -- and hopefully ease these concerns. Thanks again.

I live at 7213 Boyer Street. I am concerned about using the road to the seminary on Boyer as an entry point to the ring road. The increased traffic on Boyer to enter the seminary grounds will increase noise, congestion and reduce safety for children and pedestrians for this end of the block. Ten homes on the north side of the street will be affected by the additional traffic. The roads on Germantown and Gown are more able to handle traffic. The entrance on Gowen has ample room to be widened also. The loop could have an entrance and exit on Gown.

I am concerned about the number of housing units proposed and the corresponding number of additional parked cars on the seminary site. There should be a traffic study that can estimate the traffic flow during peak travel times on a work day. Parking spaces should be included for each proposed housing unit with additional sites in the overall plan for guests and visitors.

Thank you for all your work and protecting the cultural heritage of Mt. Airy!!! In fact this is the historic site where William Allen's "Mt. Airy" began and rightfully should represent the zenith of our values, not spreadsheet architecture. Lastly I would caution that the Northwest 2035 plan states they want to defend "green spaces", but they actually just highjacked the term are just referring to a very few predesignated green spaces. Thank you again!!!!!!!
In the Near Neighbors Concerns document under "Site Design", it specifies that "Minimize sizing and impact by creating one-way only street (possibly entering from Germantown/Boyer, exiting to Gowen)". I live across from the Boyer Street access road to the campus (which now dead-ends at the Library). I and many of my neighbors object to that right-of-way being used either as an entrance or an exit to any future ring-road that ULS might construct. Boyer Street is a narrow street, with 1-lane of traffic and parking on both sides of the street. The traffic from a Boyer Street access to the campus would be very dangerous and a serious disruption to the neighbors who live on Boyer Street.