

Phoenixville Planning Commission
MINUTES
July 12, 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*
 - *Kristiaan Wiedegreen*
 - *Borough Council Representative: Jonathan Ewald*
 - *Planning Director Dave Boelker*
 - *Land Planner Ray Ott*
 - *Borough Engineer Owen Hyne*
 - *Borough Manager Jean Krack*
 - b) Absent:
 - *None*

3. Approval of Minutes
 - a) 6/14/2018
 - *Motion Bauers to approve*
 - *Seconded by Johnston.*
 - *Motion passed 5-0 with one abstention and one silent*

4. Updates/Correspondence
 - a) Update on Regional Planning Committee – Johnston
 - *Deferred to later in the meeting.*

5. Public Participation – Items not on the Agenda (limited to 30 minutes)
 - a) *David Saneck – Read verbatim a letter prepared by his legal representation regarding his extended plan known as Fillmore West, claiming it was emailed to “you” just this afternoon.*

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: 7/12/2018
Council Decision Deadline: 8/14/2018

Kristy Flynn, Andrea Thompson, PE, David Babbit from David C. Babbitt & Assoc., LLC and Borough Traffic Engineer Chris Williams to present the study.

Flynn - We've come back with the suggestions from last meeting including moving the additional North-South street to the east, where there is 13' clearance, including sidewalk on one side.

Carnevale – It's MUCH better to connect to a street than an alley.

Flynn – I think it's positive all around.

Bauers – There were RVE recommendations on street widths. Does this zoning compliance reflect those?

Flynn – The compliance exhibits do not, but the overall plan is being revised with all those nuances in mind.

Traffic Study

Williams – We analyzed multiple locations at multiple times of day. We looked at 2 scenarios. 1) With one access only. 2) With Main Street access, then with Paradise/Mason connection. Put simply, the first recommendation is that 2 access points are critical. The grid system of the Borough is what lets it be usable at all. It should continue. We looked at the needs for traffic signals. Volume projections show that the signal is not currently warranted at Main St. PennDOT will only approve a signal when the monitoring meets the warrant criteria. Mason/Paradise will meet those criteria. Those are the highlights and the study is available for review.

Bauers – Do you look at specific design of intersections? As in, could they be built to PennDOT standards?

Williams – Currently, no. Not that specific.

Ott – What would be the impact if the Northern Relief Route was built?

Williams – We did not actively look at that for this, but it can only help. Connectivity of streets is the critical path.

Krack – We are working on a McMahon/RVE proposal to study 724/23 to Whitehorse Rd. including to look in East Pikeland and Schuylkill and an audit process. The proposal was just received today. This is all separate from this project.

Carnevale – Recommendation on Mason or Paradise?

Williams – Either work, but it seems Paradise seems more feasible. It might get a connection made sooner.

Krack – To clarify, the applicant will only have to “land” their access, physically. It will be the

Borough's responsibility to extend this connection further, how and when are being looked at.
Williams – Riverworks doesn't warrant a signal alone. The analysis is only ever on ONE side. Riverworks' left hand turns on to Main Street don't warrant it. Since most of the FCW drivers will be turning right, it does not warrant it. When the intersection is designed, it should be done so with signalization in mind so the geometry and infrastructure should be ready to accept it.
Flynn – I was surprised it's not warranted either. However, we think our drivers would prefer one.

Impact Statement

David Babbitt – Social and demographics characteristics. This project will have 1,048 and 72 public school students. I find that high, especially considering the results of the Riverworks reporting from the school district. Borough expenditures will be \$343K. The revenue on taxes alone is \$385K. EIT is \$216K (Minimum). The real estate transfers, per capita taxes, rental fees. Total revenue estimates \$700K. The NET is about \$300K for the Borough. The news is similar for the school district. \$2.5M revenue and significant net gain. Same for the county.

D. Thompson – I commend the value and professionalism of the report, however I question, how does this change the affordable aspect of this.

Flynn – I think the question of affordability, is a question that you should be having with me, not Mr. Babbitt. I provided data to Mr. Babbitt. Understanding that there is no ordinance to guide us there, but we are more than willing to look at the concept.

Davidson – We don't have a plan at this point.

Krack – At this point, it is a "compel."

Davidson – I agree that it changes the study. We'll have to consider it, that it changes the fiscal impact if we go down any affordable route.

Flynn – The positive part is that this shows a surplus. SFH demand much higher municipal needs and costs. This surplus might allow OTHER units be built that don't have a surplus.

Davidson – Recognizing there's a surplus, we'd like to work with you on this.

Babbitt went through Fire Department, Police, Hospital, Parks, Schools, etc. Existing amenities can accommodate this development.

Babbitt - Regarding historic resources, it's my understanding that the only remaining building is a deteriorated pump house.

Ewald – Does the study assessment take into consideration the fact that after the houses sell, and are assessed, builders are known to tell the new owners to immediately appeal their taxes? Is this based on the first tax assessment or other?

Babbitt – These numbers are based off the Common Level Ratio used. 53% of the sale price.

Bauers – The price points do show a lack of diversity to entry to ownership.

Ott Review Letter

Flynn – I'd like to circle to Ray's letter. There may be some discrepancies in the charts. We should get together about that. I'd like to discuss open space. In the Open Space exhibit, light green is to be dedicated to public and dark green will be private. In the dedicated area, we do plan on improving the entirety of this space with plantings and landscaping and possible amenities such as benches, etc.

Wiedegreen – The far eastern part that is private, it's at the Borough lot. Shouldn't it be public?

Flynn – We'd be fine to offer that area too. We only plan on signage and plantings.

Wiedegreen – I've come from Richmond, VA. They had fountains and a play area. I just think that some really higher level attractive/activities would be great in the triangle and I think it should be public too.

Flynn – We would be totally into doing some community attractant. BUT, it would still be private.

Johnston – We had asked about reworking the layout of integrating of the unit mix.

Flynn – I don't think I can reasonably integrate the apartments IN the townhouse area. I do still have to completely reorient the apartments with passages and access. I am working on it.

Ott – I have a strong recommendation for more active recreation in the public open spaces.

A. Thompson – The basin areas are actually much smaller, and it's a 3:1 slope to be stabilized and landscaped.

Ott – We'd like to look at amenities places.

Thompson – The exhibit is presented to show area compliance, a differentiating between public and private.

Ott – What about the public area shown above the railroad line?

Thompson – At the moment, it doesn't seem public, but with the future plans of the trails as slated to be completed, this will become critical.

Ott – The ordinance focuses on land not simply being open, but should be usable.

A. Thompson – Just the trail area open space does satisfy the zoning part, assuming some amenities come on.

Bauers – I struggle with what is compliant and what is useful. With boulevard grading, and basins, etc., isn't much of the public open space inaccessible to your folks? It's underwhelming as far as what is proposed.

RVE Letter

Flynn – A couple of items have been addressed. Borough is to collect trash?

Krack – Not in the apartment buildings, but otherwise yes. We'd like it in with the HOA agreements. Andrea will work the sanitation truck through the development.

Flynn - The new North-South road satisfies a number of concerns. Impervious coverage and lot dimensions are de minimis.

Owen – I concur that these deviations are 1-1.5%. Lot depths show a max deviation of fewer than 2'. In the scope of the project, they are.

Davidson – Are you coming back next month?

Flynn – Not likely. An updated plan can be expected, though.

Carnevale – For the waivers, can you indicate what you are providing? So, if it needs 60', what are you providing? I believe the pump house is salvageable and a huge asset. I did a crude overlay to show where it is.

Flynn – The Army Corps and PHMC stated that there is no value in this structure. I would like to reutilize the stones from it, and reutilize them within the community. I agree it could have been beautiful. It is not feasible to reuse as it is now.

Wiedegreen – Like the idea of the stones being used.

Flynn – Me too.

Carnevale – It could be a feature in the community.

Bauers – Are we going to see the alleys beautified?

Flynn – We are looking into it, taking Mr. Ott's recommendations into consideration.

Davidson – I'll assume that updated plans will show all these items.

- Public Participation

David Saneck – If you want to save the pump house, maybe the Borough can give them the ability to offset the cost to reclaim the number of units.

b) 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:	7/12/2018
Council Decision Deadline:	8/14/2018

Victor Grande presenting. Since the last presentation, we have moved the side by side ordering to the north that allowed us to maintain all parking and to consider some of the suggestions from the PC last time. Additionally, as requested, we made the circulation a one way IN from the shopping center. The east door now has a full row of parking versus walking into a drive through lane. The undersized stall has been changed to be compliant. The FD had no additional comments. Ott review letter is clean. RVE review is mostly technical regarding survey spots. #17 – We have made contact with shopping center owner. We are here for a conditional recommendation based on the remaining RVE items.

Carnevale – The ADA spaces, you have to exit the vehicles and traverse in back of the vehicles.

Boelker – Do you need 2 spaces?

Grande – No. One is all that is required.

Davidson – Commended

MOTION

Motion to approve Bauers, with standard conditions, and clean letters, as well as mutually-agreed reorientation of the ADA parking.

Seconded by Wiedegreen.

- Public Participation

None

Carnevale – There is a waiver.

Bauers – Amend my motion to include the waiver.

Approved amendment by Wiedegreen.

Motion passed 7-0.

c) 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:	7/12/2018
Council Decision Deadline:	8/14/2018

Presenting, Mike Bercek with Bercek and Smith, project engineer.

Boelker – Reviews are from original plan, the plan being shown tonight has NOT been reviewed, and was sent to you all under separate cover of the PC Packet.

Bercek – Primary change was lot depth back to Columbia Ave.

Carnevale – Concern. The house to be built, does this new layout provide rear parking and not front?

Bercek – Current owner is looking to add driveway apron on Columbia. Theoretically, someone COULD drive past the back of 136 Columbia’s accessory structure.

Hyne – We looked at existing monumentation and deeds, with Bercek. There is a 12.5’ ROW that seems available. We are unaware of the deed to the lots to the south. PC could ask for a driveway easement for lot #2, but it’s not a development so we could not make the applicant construct.

Significant discussion ensued over the use of Roberts Alley usage versus an easement being placed on Lot 1 for access by Lot 2.

Krack – The best case scenario is to vacate the street, but that is a significant process.

Carnevale – My previous comments were to simply get an easement ON the fee simple Lot 1.

Wiedegreen – Could a condition be placed on the plan note, that if the street is vacated, the easement is shifted south to utilize the new fee simple property line?

Hyne – Yes. Also, I showed some small variations, the lot width and lot area vary from the minimums, but seem de minimis.

Davidson – How do we handle?

Hyne – You could add notes, certainly, with staff to determine dimensions, later. You could add the note in case it gets moved.

Bercek – we’d be agreeable to add the easement across Lot 1.

MOTION

Carnevale makes a motion to approve the subdivision plan with standard details, clean letters from consultants, with acceptable driveway easement language added on Lot 1 for parking area access of Lot 2.

Seconded by Wiedegreen.

- Public Participation
None.

Motion carried 7-0

d) 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:	7/12/2018
Council Decision Deadline:	8/14/2018

Boelker – Late in the day, the applicant informed me that they would not be appearing tonight.

- Public Participation

7. New Business

- a) None

8. Public Participation

9. Review of Project Dates

a) *French Creek Manor Center Street*

- *Motion to deny: Bauers*
- *Seconded: Di Napoli*
- *Motion carries 7-0*

10. Review of Zoning Ordinance

- a) *Krack – We are working on a pretty significant change you’ll see in August likely.*

11. Planning Commission Members Updates/Discussions

a) Regional Comprehensive Plan Review and Discussion

- *Davidson – While we have had an affordable housing offer from Eland Point, they reference an “affordable housing plan.”*
- *Krack – The regional is referencing projects that do not even exist.*
- *Davidson - I’m in support of identifying the task force, but there’s no legislation. Please get your comments back to Debbie. She’s on a deadline.*

- b) *Davidson – I’d like to commend Jean on his 10 years of service to the Borough.*

12. Adjournment

- a) *Motion to adjourn, Wiedegreen.*

- b) *Adjournment 9:29PM*