

Phoenixville Planning Commission
MINUTES
June 14, 2018
7:00PM

1. Call to Order/Pledge of Allegiance
 - a) 7:00PM

2. Roll Call
 - a) Present:
 - *Chairperson: William Davidson*
 - *Vice Chairperson: Tom Carnevale*
 - *Members:*
 - *Debra Johnston*
 - *David Thompson*
 - *Christopher Bauers*
 - *Raffaello Di Napoli*
 - *Borough Council Representative: Jonathan Ewald*
 - *Planning Director Dave Boelker*
 - *Land Planner Ray Ott*
 - *Engineer Owen Hyne*
 - *Borough Manager Jean Krack*
 - b) Absent:
 - *Members:*
 - *Kristiaan Wiedegreen*

3. Approval of Minutes
 - a) 5/10/2018 and Continuation of 5/24/2018
 - *Motion to Approve: Johnston*
 - *Seconded: Bauers*
 - *Motion passed 5-0*
 - *DiNapoli was not present for previous meetings.*

4. Updates/Correspondence
 - a) General Announcement:
 - *Davidson – All applicants are responsible for getting any needed extensions to Borough Hall by July 3rd.*
 - b) Update on Regional Planning Committee – Johnston
 - *Johnston - We will discuss at the end of the meeting.*

5. Public Participation – Items not on the Agenda (limited to 30 minutes)
 - a) *Mark Connolly – Request that the Manager or PC direct the initiative called “The Bridges” that extends Devault ROW project, including Norfolk-Southern, under railroad and they are proposing it ends at the Low Bridge (Main St. Bridge). He has*

materials, but needs to know where to go with it. How should the Green Team engage this advocacy project?

Krack – We cannot entertain it at the PC or BC on someone else’s property.

Connolly – may we meet?

Krack – Meet yes, I can’t say proceed. But meet, certainly.

Connolly – Simply seeking what the venue is.

6. Old Business

a) PCE 2018-04:	French Creek West – French Creek TH, LP
Tax Parcel:	15-9-77, 15-9-79, 15-9-80, 15-9-98, 15-8-5, 15-8-7
Property Address:	Former steel site - West of Main Street to French Creek
Proposed Development:	Lot consolidation (3 to 2) and land development of vacant tract
Applicant:	Phoenix French Creek TH, LP
Application Type:	Preliminary Subdivision and Land Development
Plan Prepared by:	T and M Engineering
Application Deemed Complete:	3/16/2018
PC Recommendation Deadline:	6/14/2018
Council Decision Deadline:	7/10/2018

Presenting: Christy Flynn with Rockwell. T&M is working on revisions. Discussion tonight is on one topic, and simply looking for feedback.

Connection to the west, and one to the south. T&M came up with a potential for a second connection. The rub is that the clearance is 14’, but servicing all passenger vehicles.

Bauers – I’d like to know more about the longer term creation of an intersection/landing on the other [West] side of the French Creek.

Hyne – Is that the furthest east a north-south connection can be done?

Flynn – as you go east, the clearance gets lower.

Thompson – Please expand. Concern on queuing?

Flynn – Concern is a cut-through.

Krack – It is a secondary means of egress/ingress.

Ewald – 14’?

Krack – It works.

Hyne – I’d like the furthest east we can get, but want other options deemed infeasible, but the overall attempt meets concerns.

Carnevale – If it’s the furthest east, then it’s a solution.

Flynn – What is minimum feasible?

Krack – 13’ is functional. You can always limit trucks.

Hyne – It would be ideal to connect with the actual street, versus alley.

Bauers – If you were to create the intersection, does it change the orientation of any of the homes?

Flynn – Considering the connection from the south ends at an alley entrance, we’ll have to take the

Ott ideas regarding landscaping to dress up the approach.

- Public Participation

None.

b)	PCE 2018-05:	Bank of America – Eck Landlord, LP
	Tax Parcel:	15-8-16.3
	Property Address:	Phoenixville Plaza – Nutt Road
	Proposed Development:	Construction of a new Bank of America building at existing pad site
	Applicant:	Eck Landlord, LP – Arne Andersen
	Application Type:	Preliminary/Final Land Development
	Plan Prepared by:	arna Engineering, Inc.
	Application Deemed Complete:	4/6/2018
	PC Recommendation Deadline:	6/14/2018
	Council Decision Deadline:	7/10/2018

Presenting: Anand Bhatt from arna engineering, inc.

Bhatt – We will be looking for a recommendation based on the revision we’ve presented.

Ott Review: *All 5 comments are Will Comply.*

Hyne Review: *#3 will be addressed by traffic engineer. #4, we’ve removed parking spaces to address ADA access, as well as reducing impervious surface. As discussed with Mr. Hyne, we have added a mountable curb instead of the striped area for a use separation and reduce cross traffic. We have also added stop signs.*

Eric Ostimchuk, P.E., PTOE (TPD) – We did some video traffic counts of the main intersection. We did it on a Friday from 3-7PM. The intersection cleared every cycle. No stacking from the gas pumps, observing the stop signs. South bound from Giant, were rolling through some times. We can implement flashing lights on stop sign. Also suggested a pedestrian warning sign north/inbound.

Hyne – Any thought, feasible to get landing area changed from the paving area?

TPD – We’ve further reduced stacking ability with mountable curb.

Hyne – There will be a crosswalk either way.

Bauers – Can we confirm NW corner for Septa bus stop? If so, isn’t crossing make it more difficult?

Hyne – We asked for a west side feasibility.

Bhatt – The connection is not feasible due to retaining wall, pylon sign, and light mast. Also, the drop in grade would require an infeasible switchback.

Carnevale for Ostimchuk – Have you accounted the existing vehicular use plus the proposed?

Ostimchuk – Yes. The stacking occurs, but the video analysis shows it’s for seconds.

DiNapoli – Have you accounted for incoming traffic adding to egress queueing?

Ostimchuk – Of the 600 currently, this max use would add 30 per hour. Insignificant.

DiNapoli – Is one, 4 hour period a good enough sample size?

Ostimchuk – This is typically done this way in the industry.

Ewald – talking to Septa, the one in front of Kmart is the most heavily used.

Arne Anderson – A bus shelter; It’s new and not something we’ve thought about.

Johnston – Can you remove more parking spaces?

Bhatt – We’ve met the requirements. We started with 51, and are down to 36. The tenant needs those as part of the lease agreement.

Davidson – Waivers: All 4 are a result of existing conditions.

Bauers – I can see waivers 1, 2 and 4, but not 3 since this is a redevelopment.

Ott – The 4th edition ITE is the basis of what I’ve found, an average SUPPLY of 8.4 spaces per 1000SF and an average DEMAND of 4/1000SF.

Carnevale – Can we get a green roof to assist in the view?

Davidson – To move forward, we could make it a condition of the motion, for council to grant waivers with a green roof added.

- Public Participation

Mark Connolly – I’m making the request again, it would be great if we had a demonstration, a flagship business to take the lead. If it pleases the PC, this is a gateway to the center AND Phoenixville.

Carnevale – I am not talking about the whole building, but a limited area.

BoA (as tenant) Engineer – From safety and security standpoint, a green roof is not accepted. What you see in the rendering, from the road is a curved, masonry façade, providing a much more aesthetically pleasing view. A green roof is not part of their roof safety standard. There are a lot of players in that red tape area. We’re hoping that this new façade design will ease that concern.

Anderson – The height of the stone façade is 21’.

Carnevale to Hyne – Why only one sheet?

Hyne – This revision addressed the biggest issues. A full submission will address any additional engineering concerns not raised in the revision.

Bauers – What I hear is more green is desired. We are hearing “no’s” from the applicant.

Davidson – We can recommend any condition or refuse waivers.

Bauers – If the waivers are existing conditions, are they even waivers?

Davidson – We need to move forward or give feedback.

RECOMMENDATION:

Carnevale – I acknowledge you’ve inherited a difficult site. But I have concerns on traffic.

Motion: Motion to approve with standard conditions, Planner/Engineer clean letters, and with granting of waivers 1, 2, and 4. I feel they can add more ‘greening’ by removing the eastern parking spaces and planting trees.: Carnevale

Seconded: Bauers.

Hyne – Sought Carnevale clarification.

Carnevale - Based on the planner’s statement of parking demand, remove the eastern 9 spaces.

Motion passes 6-0

c) PCE 2018-06:	Barclay Gardens – Church Housing Corp.
Tax Parcel:	15-9-458
Property Address:	140 Church Street
Proposed Development:	Construction of a new, 125 unit senior living facility with below-building parking
Applicant:	Church Housing Corp. – Kathryn Evans
Application Type:	Preliminary/Final Land Development
Plan Prepared by:	Alta Planning
Application Deemed Complete:	4/6/2018
PC Recommendation Deadline:	6/14/2018

Council Decision Deadline: **7/10/2018**

Mike Murray (OWM) Presenting. Since last appearance, Alta has resubmitted and reviews received. The review letters are relatively clean. There may be some note clarifications. All the letters are Will Comply. We are here to request approval and address questions.

Davidson – Requested waivers. No longer requesting SALDO Checklist,

22-414.6 - drive access to a street

22-406.1 - # of street trees

22-601 – environmental impact

Ewald – Where are you proposing to plant?

Supplee – On Hall St., only one tree.

Hyne – There’s a storm sewer in the grass area. Is that what would prevent it?

Supplee – That is correct.

Carnevale – Are they ADA (DWPs) Detectable Warning Pavers] at all garage entrances?

Hyne – We require them for commercial driveways.

Supplee – Then, yes.

Carnevale – It would be nice, even if not required, considering the tenant population.

Ewald – Why no trees again?

Weinsteiger – We are proposing vertical screens/gardens too.

Carnevale – I acknowledge this need. I am just concerned for the Hall Street neighbors. I simply want to voice the concern of sheer height.

Ott – Where are the vertical panels going to go?

Weinsteiger – We haven’t fully identified yet, but we want them. When we get further into design, we can do so. The Whole Foods in Exton has something similar.

Ott – The Hall Street storm sewer. How deep is the storm sewer? Could you put shrubbery there?

Supplee – Yes, we can put significant shrubbery.

DiNapoli – I want to reflect Tom’s concern. The height of the existing homes, only lets them see your walls. The homes are not even tall enough to see the courtyard.

Ewald – Utility plan?

Weinsteiger – We had an electrician on site to look into.

Carnevale – Not replacing all curbs and sidewalks?

Supplee – We are trying to keep under an acre of disturbance?

Ewald – I need more detail on the utility plan.

Hyne – Lighting. Wall-mounted lights. Along Church, it should be Phoenixville streetscape lighting, and possible amenities/features.

Krack – We would want all streetscapes standards as Church St. WILL get a complete streetscape redo.

Evans – We will comply with the Phoenixville Streetscapes standards.

Ewald – Can you do a treatment on the windows. If motion-activated.

Evans – We are happy to put in window treatments.

- Public Participation

None.

RECOMMENDATION:

Motion: Recommend approving with the standard conditions of clean letters, and granting of the

three listed waivers and the requirement that all driveways have DWPs, that the Borough streetscape standards are used, and that a vertical "green-screen" is installed along the Hall Street façade.

Seconded: Bauers

Comments:

Bauers – Should waiver 2 be in lieu of trees, that it be shrubbery?

Carnevale – Amending motion to have internal stair tower lighting as well as window treatments.

Accepted by Bauers.

Ewald – Two approved plans?

Krack – We would likely write the withdrawal into the resolution.

Motion passes 6-0.

d) PCE 2018-07:	McDonald's Renovations
Tax Parcel:	15-8-15
Property Address:	651 Nutt Road
Proposed Development:	Exterior and interior renovation of existing McDonald's including drive-thru reconfiguration and site lighting
Applicant:	McDonald's Corp. – C/O Eileen Seeburger
Application Type:	Preliminary/Final Land Development
Plan Prepared by:	Bohler Engineering
Application Deemed Complete:	4/6/2018
PC Recommendation Deadline:	6/14/2018
Council Decision Deadline:	7/10/2018

Applicant declined appearance and discussion and sent extension letter.

- Public Participation

e) PCE 2018-08:	323 Ann Street - Geraghty
Tax Parcel:	15-5-128
Property Address:	323 Ann Street
Proposed Development:	Minor residential subdivision and land development
Applicant:	Providence Capital Group, LLC - Mark R. Geraghty
Application Type:	Preliminary/Final Subdivision and Land Development
Plan Prepared by:	Inland Design
Application Deemed Complete:	4/11/2018
PC Recommendation Deadline:	6/14/2018
Council Decision Deadline:	7/10/2018

Chuck Dobson presenting from InLand Design. We've revised based on all comments. June 7, all are satisfied except #6, involving the methodology. I believe you spoke with Joel from my office, and are in agreement.

Hyne – I agree and will be reissuing the review.

Dobson – Only waiver is grading within 3’ as the applicant controls both. We request a recommendation.

Carnevale – Does the SWM system take runoff from the existing dwelling?

Dobson – The SW runoff is better already, and natural grading is better due to previous removal of impervious.

Carnevale – But no piping?

Dobson – No. Also, the sidewalk short of the property line isn’t a mis-drafting, it is an infeasible grade change. We would need a grade easement.

Geraghty – We’ve addressed earlier concerns and have already started beautifying the existing house on the property.

- Public Participation

None.

RECOMMENDATION:

Motion: Motion to approve with clean letters, and single waiver.: Bauers

Seconded: Thompson.

Comments:

Ewald – We’re not going to have any SWM concerns?

Dobson – No. All SWM plans will always be a designed ball valve in the system to manually relieve a standing water condition.

Ott – What if the homeowner leaves it open?

Dobson – Good question. There wouldn’t be a lot of infiltration, but there would still be rate control. There’s also an O&M agreement that is enforceable if a an owner does so.

Motion passed 6-0

7. New Business

a) PCE 2018-09	136 Columbia Ave – Deutsche Kapital, LLC
Tax Parcel:	15-12-2
Property Address:	136 Columbia Avenue
Proposed Development:	Minor residential subdivision
Applicant:	Deutsche Kapital, LLC
Application Type:	Preliminary/Final Subdivision
Plan Prepared by:	Bercek and Smith Engineering, Inc.
Application Deemed Complete:	4/27/2018
PC Recommendation Deadline:	6/14/2018
Council Decision Deadline:	7/10/2018

Mike Bercek presenting from Bercek and Smith. Client is proposing a simple subdivision.

Ott Review:

Roberts Ave discussion and ordained streets and discussion ensued.

Hyne – Since this is a minor subdivision. A house to be built here won’t come back here. If there are any requirements to get any design elements of the size, shape, access of the lot needs to come back here.

Carnevale – willing to give an extension?

Bercek – Of course.

RECOMMENDATION:

Motion: Motion to recommend denial, without a received extension by July 3.

Seconded: Bauers

Motion passed 6-0.

- Public Participation

None.

b) PCE 2018-12	19 E. Grant St - Geraghty
Tax Parcel:	15-5-360
Property Address:	19 E. Grant Street
Proposed Development:	Demolition of an existing house and construction of 2 sets of twin dwelling units
Applicant:	Mark R. Geraghty
Application Type:	Preliminary/Final Subdivision and Land Development
Plan Prepared by:	InLand Design – Joel Comanda, PE
Application Deemed Complete:	5/7/2018
PC Recommendation Deadline:	6/14/2018
Council Decision Deadline:	7/10/2018

Chuck Dobson from InLand Design presenting for applicant. Almost all review comments are Will Comply except a couple improvement concepts.

RVE Review: *Comments 12-15. Heckle width. We'd like to discuss with this group an alternative to the street widening and sidewalks.*

Ewald – The width is already an issue with trucks.

Carnevale – We need sidewalks, curbs and safe roads.

Davidson – We know the concern. We also know BC will force the issue. So we try to here.

Hyne – Shouldn't this be a narrower drive, and a shared driveway easement?

Dobson – That would need a waiver, but so long as the commission and client are in favor, I can look at it.

Bauers – Since a shared agreement on a driveway, what about shared SWM?

Dobson – That then calls for an HOA...

Hyne – You CAN do it without an HOA. It IS possible.

Dobson – The topography will afford it. If the Borough is okay without an HOA, we are game.

Dobson – Need we extend the sanitary extend to Heckle?

Hyne – No.

Dobson – To lot 4, yes?

Hyne – Yes.

- Public Participation

None.

RECOMMENDATION:

Motion to recommend denial, without a received extension by July 3.: Carnevale

*Seconded: Bauers.
Motion passed 6-0.*

8. Review of Project Dates

- a) *Boelker – sent extension request to McDonald’s 10:30am considering they sought to not appear. Received it in the meantime.*

Franklin Apartments

RECOMMENDATION:

*Motion to recommend denial, without a received extension by July 3.: Carnevale
Bauers: Second.
Motion passed 6-0.*

9. Review of Zoning Ordinance

Krack – We should have something to bring in the next month or two after Policy review.

10. Planning Commission Members Updates/Discussions

- a) Regional Comprehensive Plan Review and Discussion

Davidson – For next meeting, we have the next three chapters to review.

Carnevale – Significant discussion over unnecessary language and topics within it that just aren’t necessary.

Krack – The entirety of the documentation is available on the Phoenixville website.

Davidson – The first portion here, is over 100 pages already. Is there anything that is absorbable to the public?

Johnston – Hopefully, if the climate changes, the municipalities should be working together.

Carnevale – The \$129K plan presented should be relevant.

Ewald – It’s township-heavy in its descriptions, but I think we can throw out some of the very specific comments.

Carnevale – “Buffering” between municipalities shouldn’t be a topic, then. That is a separating topic, versus a unifying one.

Johnston – This is a means to an ends.

Krack – I’ve talked to the County. It’s almost time to do a plan. The suggestion, however, is to not do a Comp Plan, rather, a Strategic Plan. We can serve ourselves on a continuing basis without going back.

11. Adjournment

Motion to adjourn: Carnevale

Seconded: DiNapoli

Passed 6-0. 10:00PM