

Phoenixville Planning Commission
Minutes
May 10, 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*
 - *Borough Council Representative: Jonathan Ewald*
 - *Planning Director Dave Boelker*
 - *Engineer Owen Hyne*
 - *Borough Manager Jean Krack*
 - b) Absent:
 - *Members:*
 - *Kristiaan Wiedegreen – Excused*
 - *Raffaello Di Napoli - Excused*

3. Approval of Minutes
 - a) 4/12/2018
 - *Johnston remarked on completing the phrasing in section 10 to include discussion of the Regional Comprehensive Plan rewrite. Boelker to revise.*
 - *Motion to approve with modifications discussed: Bauers*
 - *Seconded: Johnston*
 - *Motion passed 4-0*
 - *Thompson Abstention*

4. Updates/Correspondence
 - a) Update on Regional Planning Committee – Johnston
 - *More of the same of previous months. We are continually working on updating the Regional Comprehensive Plan. They are working with Kimberton Fire for public presentation/workshop space in near future.*

5. Public Participation – Items not on the Agenda (limited to 30 minutes)
 - a) *Avi Ganguly – Schuylkill River Heritage Center – Ferris Wheel – Cosgrove (company) in Chester County has provided a quote for installation. Line of sight. They need a*

contact for Norfolk-Southern to gain an easement for use for the public parking expansion.

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/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

Christy Flynn Presenting – We’ll skip the intro for time. We’ll get into some of the engineering as needed.

Ott Review:

Flynn – All are “Will Comply” or “Will Provide.” Comment regarding the building size length. We will look at designs to find a way to satisfy the intent.

Trail comment – We are working out some of the mechanics of the trail junction to the west.

Pedestrian Access – We don’t disagree with it. We commit to designing a bridge there. As we finalize I am not able to commit to building the bridge today, but am committing to design.

Single Access – We have committed to building that bridge, but need info from the Borough Traffic Engineer. We intend to build that connection.

Bauers – Question as to why CCPC and Ott have identified it as a single access site.

Flynn – Simply, we have not been directed by the Borough yet, exactly what that bridge and connection should look like or where it will go. That is dependent on Borough projects.

Bauers – What number of units before it has to be built and operational?

Flynn – Agree. We’d like to be able to start building units without the bridge being in place, but agree that some number of units is a threshold or max that warrant the bridge being in place.

Landscaping comment – Acknowledging revisions needed.

RVE Review:

Flynn – Many are “Will Complies” and are just clean up.

Open Space Comment #16:

Flynn - “In residential developments proposed to contain 20 or more dwelling units, the applicant shall set aside one acre per 20 units or fraction thereof for open space and recreational purposes.”

Flynn – I feel that the exemption after that applies in that “the lesser” applies.

Ott – The 5% must be “public” open space.

Boelker – What is the distance of improved area around trail? Discussion ensued to distances.

Ott – Everyone agrees that both sides of the trail need help.

Flynn – We intend on improvement, but it will be highly regulated due to floodplain and other jurisdictional restrictions.

Bauers – Question as to if and how the already constructed trail gets to count into the applicant's open space calculation.

Krack – It is an easement, not ownership. So, if they've included it, you can't "count it twice"

Flynn – The easement didn't show in the title report first, but when we come back, we'll take that area out of the equation.

Parking Spaces Comment #29:

Flynn – The number is right, the labels were wrong. Counting individually, we will make sure the spaces are drawn, to reflect the number of labeled spots. All 96 spaces on the Boulevard will be dedicated, and not counted as the number of spaces we need, so the total publicly available parking is now up to 208.

Street Trees Species Comment #64

Flynn - Calls for same along every street?

Krack – We'll work on that.

Sidewalks Comment #80

Flynn – On the south side of Boulevard, they do not exist. Building them would be more building in the floodplain. There will be other connections.

Krack – Our discussion was that we'd like the trail extended to Main Street, aligning with Riverworks' entrance.

Flynn – As long as the engineering works, I am in favor of it.

Road Connectivity Comment #96 – We will provide AutoTurn analysis showing all emergency equipment works.

Carnevale – The smaller areas to navigate make it less vehicle friendly, and in turn, more pedestrian friendly.

Public Participation

Mark Connolly – The public parking lot, can it be utilized or designed to be an event space, essentially?

Flynn – We're more than willing to work with the Borough on design.

7. New Business

a) 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

Rob Romain introducing, Arne Anderson and Ahnand (spelling) present. Paul Much from Stonefield Engineering is there too. He provided a brief history of use of the pad site.

Andersen – BoA is thrilled to move in, and their goal is to be able to be operational by the end of the year.

Stonefield – Branding package has changed. This will be the first of this prototype, as flagship, as the first in the Northeast.

Bhatt – Eckerd was demolished around 2009. Pad left in space. 51 parking stall as have been striped and can be used. 6 spots for fueling facility. The entire site is about 85% (existing nonconformity. Bank had SWM facilities that will be reused once the BoA is operational. It will be 3200SF of bank area. It will be a reduction of impervious coverage from 85% to 81% in hopes to invoke the SWM exemption available. It will be a slight reduction in parking, but that is for the purpose of reducing impervious surface. The topography will not allow for a connection to the sidewalk on Nutt Rd.

Ott Review:

Bhatt - The build-to will coincide with the K-Mart, which is at a more similar elevation, while the McDonald's is much higher. BoA is America is willing to eliminate 6 parking spaces. This reduction will also bring the impervious coverage into compliance. Considering it is an "existing condition" they will continue this use.

RVE Review:

Bhatt - Everything is a Will Comply except Comment 14 re: accessible route from Nutt Rd. The idea is to cross the

Hyne – IS there a bus stop?

Ewald – There is a bus stop right at the corner.

Hyne – A large switchback would be needed. The easier connection is to cross the internal drive.

Carnevale – Can't it go toward the car access?

Bhatt – We have options, yes. Crossing is easiest.

Davidson – Summary: Pursue all options, and convince of working or not, not what is easiest.

FD Review:

Bhatt – All are a will comply.

CCPC Review:

Ewald – Concern over turning west into it.

Bhatt - We can show car movement if that helps.

Waivers (4):

- 1) Parking Spaces distance. Existing.*
- 2) Slope exceeding 5%. They are existing. The scope is to overlay, not modify with grading.*
- 3) Lot requires raised curb islands. Lot constraint, and an existing condition*
- 4) Lot size restricts buffer size.*

In summary, all of these are due to existing parking being used.

Commission Comments:

Carnevale – Concern and discussion over two-uses traffic flow.

Hyne – Creating the entrance at the NW corner might provide more queueing room.

Davidson – Up against our 30 minutes, I think it's the best idea to come back with multiple options.

The existing conditions may not be the best, as the conditions have changed.

Boelker – Why not take a look at why the Septa stop is at the SW corner of this property corner at all? It might make sense to have it moved to in front of McDonald’s.

Public Participation

Mark Connolly – Provided his comments on sustainability opportunities in the construction process with 4 specific “requests”:

- 1) Make it solar.*
- 2) Hoping for energy efficiency.*
- 3) Requesting the building not have natural gas.*
- 4) Drive-throughs: A minor added convenience but at the cost of an environmental detriment.*

Krack – Correction. The ordinance was that the Borough operations will be 100% renewable.

b) 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

Adam Supplee Presenting – Intro – Former Borough Hall site.

Ott Review:

#11 – Clarification, it is 155 spaces. Using the ITE, we are exceeding requiring parking. If there is additional parking available, we can discuss how the public can use it.

RVE Review:

#7 - 30’ spacing. This requires additional discussion.

#31 - Discussion on SWM.

#38 - Market Analysis is a “Will Comply.”

#39 - Environmental Impact – Seeking a waiver.

#40 Traffic Impact Study – Unsure if we need a waiver on this. The previous project, it was determined that the plan was a reduction from the Borough Hall use, so it was not required.

#41 - Community and Fiscal Impact – No school aged-children, thus requesting a waiver form this.

Water and Sewer #2 - Separate fire and potable laterals discussion.

Krack – Rest assured, BC won’t go for the waiver on the TIS.

Hyne – I believe resurfacing the streets around this will need to get done.

Supplee – We agree.

Krack – There’s another approved plan on this. It will need to be withdrawn.

Boelker – Seems the best thing to do, if the applicant isn’t willing to do so in advance, it could be a condition of approval.

Carnevale – It’s not going to blend at all.

Thompson – How will the parking work?

Evans – Parking is free for residents of the building. We would not charge for special events. If other neighbors have an ongoing need, we can address.

Thompson – Do you think sharing with strangers, would bring about residents’ objections?

Evans – How we manage that from the beginning, I don’t believe so.

Ewald – Odd that there’s an approved plan, with one being put on top of it. This is double the size. Is there market demand for this?

Evans – Previous project was a tax credit (lower income) project. This is middle income. Our analysis shows there’s a huge need for this level.

Ewald – 100% need a TIS.

Bauers – Asks Krack what Council’s view is on Community and Fiscal studies. What do they “look like?”

Krack – Generally speaking, due to nothing happening as an island, projects need to acknowledge other projects, and provide them.

Public Participation

Mark Connolly – Affordable housing is changing in passive housing demand. Passive housing delivers on all those fronts. Comfort and affordability. Acknowledged the correction by Krack.

Weinsteiger – With the exception of the gas cooking, it will be electric. Not passive, but energy star rated.

c) 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

Presenting Victor Grande, PE with Bohler Engineering.

This project will focus on ADA and access improvements, resurfacing, and minor site improvements.

This McDonald’s has a large drive-thru base, and this can help the customer experience and speed.

FD Review:

Grande – We ran an auto/truck turn, and everything works. We’ll provide electronically.

Ott Review:

No comments

RVE Review:

Grande – We will look to reduce the impervious coverage. Parking study - Grande, it will be provided by the owner. Parking and Access Cross Agreement – We are looking into that with the surrounding center. Everything else will be Will-Comply.

Krack - The landscaping to the east creates a huge visibility problem. If there's a way to clean that up, it would be really helpful for usage. If you are talking with them, take a look with them about it.

Davidson – Entrances, exits, nothing changing?

Grande – Second order point in the drive through is the most significant change

Carnevale – Adding a second order point of order will increase traffic.

Marcia Graham – The benefit to us is that the we can shorten the stay. End result is to limit the time in queue.

Davidson – Is this done at other sites?

Graham – We started it in Pottstown in 2007, and Morgantown in 2012. It helps with congestion reduction.

Thompson – Question about mobile ordering. Does more drive-through make sense or is mobile ordering more of a parking demand creator.

Graham – We are averaging only about 4 orders per month.

Ewald – With increased efficiencies, I have concerns over intersection safety.

Hyne – Looking into making the exit/entrance into an entrance only. The farthest SW parking spot is only 11' long. It should be removed.

Grande – We will address as part of the parking study we've been provided.

Davidson – The large truck deliveries make it a mess. Can you look into this too?

Carnevale – A door exits directly into a drive through. Take a look at the egress discharge area.

Ewald – I appreciate the Nutt Rd. access into the lot from Nutt Rd. It's important to us from a Council point of view.

Hyne – Waiver comment re: providing surveyed info for 100' around the site. I think we have the necessary information on this plan to support the waiver.

Grande – Yes, we are seeking a recommendation tonight.

Davidson – The parking is something that we'd want to see.

Hyne – You heard my opinion on the waiver. Maybe the PC's opinion on the waiver would be important at this point just so they don't have to get a survey done.

Carnevale – Agree with Owen, but I want to see the parking.

Bauers – Do I understand there was an entrance/exit is to be altered?.

Hyne – Comment was that discussions should be had about access and easements.

Public Participation

None

d) 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 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.

Dobson – We’re actually looking to remove the two rear yard parking spaces, simply stacking aside the structure as it will reduce impervious and cost, though leaving the SWM sized the same, thus oversized. Infiltration testing showed shallow bedrock. We feel an infiltration berm is best. We are likely to create an overflow on the revision to avoid any neighboring property problems.

Ott Review:

Dobson – Will Comply, or actually, have complied with all comments. We’ll look forward to a recommendation next month. Sidewalk will go to property line. Maybe just a graphical anomaly.

Public Participation

Lisa Hancock – 328 Ann Street. – Concern over architectural features. We value the character of our neighborhood. I commend the cleanup, and hope the existing home will be improved too.

Rich Kirkner – 405 Ann Street- I simply suggest that you keep in mind the many, many water problems in this area. If there is any more runoff from this, but somehow, when these places get built, there seem to be issues. As a PC, please consider strongly any waivers. Question as to if there is an actual alley at the south property line? If there is an alley, it might be nice to open up to rear yard parking for 300 Block of Emmett homes.

Dobson – No SWM waivers are or will be requested. The only one will be for grading within 3’ of a property line.

Johnston – Intentions to improve existing dwelling?

Geraghty - Siding, roofing, landscaping.

e) PCE 2018-10	Phoenixville Borough Civic Center
Tax Parcel:	15-5-20, 15-5-20.1
Property Address:	501 Franklin Avenue
Proposed Development:	Major commercial subdivision and land development
Applicant:	Borough of Phoenixville
Application Type:	Preliminary/Final Land Development
Plan Prepared by:	Remington, Vernick Engineers – Owen Hyne
Application Deemed Complete:	N/A
PC Recommendation Deadline:	N/A

Council Decision Deadline:

N/A

Tom Carnevale recuses himself as the designer of the project and is presenting. This is a new multi-use facility at the previously approved Friendship Fire facility. We are eliminating the Fillmore west entrance. Described facilities uses and amenities. There is an entrance onto Franklin, as well as Ann Street.

Ott – Presentation of the building is a concern. It “backs up” to both streets. In context of the rest of the efforts in the Borough, it would be nice if something fronted Fillmore.

Carnevale – There is a controlled entrance on Franklin. On Fillmore, there are windows and signage and a façade.

Ewald – Amenities along the raised walkway to access the field? Speed table and circulations concerns discussion.

Bauers – Any improvements on the south side of Fillmore?

Krack – Discussion of phases/projects (possibly concurrent but not part of this) for Fillmore and Franklin and other nearby intersections to be realigned and connected.

Hyne – We can add details on sidewalks and connections that are planned.

Bauers – Stormwater concerns.

Hyne – Significant, oversized underground facilities with overflows.

Public Participation

Mark Connolly – Have any design elements gone beyond athletics, into the multipurpose realm?

Carnevale – It will be created acoustically for a large gathering. It can accommodate multiple uses, even at once.

Connolly – Brought up storm resilience for emergency aspects. Natural gas still?

Carnevale – Yes.

Connolly – Solar?

Carnevale – Borough didn't get the grant for install, but it is set up for later install.

Vicki Viscuso – 427 Franklin Ave. – Looking forward to have something nice. A few concerns. The south parking area. Is there a delineation to keep people from trespassing on my property?

Hyne – Berm and fence were described.

Krack – We can look at any other ideas you have to help avoid trespassing, just send it to us. Sooner than later, please.

V. Viscuso – I second the comment about creating a safe way to eliminate cutting through Ann Street, and the lot.

Rich Kirkner – 405 Ann Street – Not only am I a council member, but a neighbor as I live right next to Friendship Field. I appreciate the use of the property. I have a concern over the driveway onto Ann Street. It is a dead end street, and has been forever. It's quiet. A pedestrian and bicycle entrance seems great. Also, a concern over the runoff coming down Ann Street. Concern over neighbors looking at constantly lit windows.

Hyne – There are actually two inlets collecting all water from getting onto Ann Street.

Dave Saneck – What are the hours of operation?

Krack – Until 10PM. 7AM. Sunday is lesser hours.

Saneck – Noise mitigation would be appreciated. How tall is it?

Carnevale – 26' clear inside. 46' at the highest point.

Saneck – Has there or will there be a traffic study?

Krack – We have not conducted a traffic study.

Saneck – Were emergency services looked at for this site?

Krack – We have only one fire department. It's on Church Street. Staging is another issue.

Saneck – Why doesn't the Borough have to do a TIS?

Krack – We have. Globally.

Irene Hilly – Concern is noise and lights. I would like to see sound mitigation. I don't want to hear basketballs bouncing.

Matt Viscuso – 427 Franklin – Concern over the swale.

Hyne – The swale is going to be on the Borough's property with an inlet at the toe.

Saneck – Is the street parking still on Fillmore?

Krack – Yes. That is not part of the project.

Kirkner – What is the Ann Street driveway grade?

Hyne – Maybe 10%. I'll have to get back to you.

- *Motion to recommend approval: Johnston*
- *Seconded: Bauers*
- *Vote: Motion passed 4-0.*

f) PCE 2018-11	Phoenixville Borough Waste Water Treatment Plant Subdivision
Tax Parcel:	15-14-405
Property Address:	17 Second Avenue
Proposed Development:	Minor commercial subdivision
Applicant:	Borough of Phoenixville
Application Type:	Preliminary/Final Land Development
Plan Prepared by:	Remington, Vernick Engineers – Owen Hyne
Application Deemed Complete:	N/A
PC Recommendation Deadline:	N/A
Council Decision Deadline:	N/A

Continuation discussion.

Krack – Simple subdivision. Intro. With discussions over civic events and items like Ferris Wheels, and the heavy equipment operator next to us on Bridge Street, and not being able to build next to the sewer plant, but being able to place equipment there, the idea to trade space came up and the current owner listened. As soon as we subdivide, we can swap and trade.

Public Participation

Saneck – What is the size difference?

Hyne - .6 for 1.3 acres.

- *Motion to recommend approval: Carnevale*
- *Seconded: Johnston*
- *Vote: Motion passed 5-0.*

8. Review of Project Dates
 - a) *No additional action needed.*

9. Review of Zoning Ordinance
 - a) *District Specifications and language discussion.*
 - *To be discussed at a later meeting*

10. Planning Commission Members Updates/Discussions
 - a) *None*

11. Adjournment/Continuance
 - a) *Motion: To continue the meeting until May 24, 2018: Johnston*
 - b) *Second: Carnevale*
 - c) *Passed 5-0*
 - *10:45PM*