

Meeting Minutes
City of Reading Planning Commission
May 25, 2021

Members Present

Will Cinfici
Philip Ashear
Lee Olsen, AIA, Chairman
Wayne Bealer, Vice Chairman
Bob Conklin, AIA

Staff Present

David Peris, Planning and Zoning Manager
Tim Krall, Public Works
Jerome Skrincosky, Hawk Valley Associates, Planning Consultant
Michelle Mayfield, Hartman Valeriano Magovern Lutz, Solicitor
Naomi Crimm, Planner
William Stoudt, Fire Chief

Others Present

Tony Ganguzza, Boyle Construction
Jeffrey Goldstein, Midiplex Property Group
Luke Alexy, Barry Isett & Associates, Inc.
Evan Gray, Manns Woodward Studios
Aristides Otero, Stackhouse Bensinger
Brad King, Albright College
Karl Leitner, Barry Isett & Associates, Inc.
Bob Korp, Barry Isett & Associates, Inc.
Christopher Hartman, Hartman Valeriano Magovern Lutz
Brian Focht, C2C Design Group
Kim Murphy, The Nature Place
Keith Mooney, Barley Snyder
Phil Leinbach, AEM Architects
Lazaro Pepen, Isla Property Management 1 LLC
Dan Laudenslayer, Tarson, LLC
Joe Gurney, First Capital Engineering
Jeff Strader, Albright College

Chairman Olsen called the meeting to order at 6:04.

Item #1 - Agenda

Commissioner Bealer made a motion to accept the agenda as received the afternoon of May 25. Commissioner Ashear seconded the motion. The vote to approve the motion was unanimous, 5-0.

Item #2 - Subdivisions and Land Developments

PC-2020-110: 810 Windsor Street (Jan and Wil Properties, LLC)

Mr. Laudenslayer stated that the plan is ready for approval. He can add a note to the plan to say that Little Cedar Street shouldn't be used as an access point. He sent in a cost estimate for the developer's agreement and can submit final plans that can be sealed. The plans are the same as has been submitted in the past.

Mr. Skrincosky said that a municipal improvements agreement is needed for sidewalks and curbs. The comments he issued have been satisfied. Mr. Peris said that the issues with parking and zoning have been addressed in Hawk Valley's review letter.

Mr. Krall asked about a note on the plan about roof drains directing runoff to the BMP landscape buffer area. Mr. Laudenslayer said that the BMPs are up grade of the building. Mr. Krall asked how they are planning to get runoff to go to that area, as it is on the uphill side of the site. Mr. Laudenslayer explained that this is why he did the drainage plan with drainage areas to all the trees. He thinks they compensate by making the landscaped areas collect water up site. There's no way to put landscaped areas around the building. Mr. Krall asked if the roof could drain to the five-foot wide planting strip. Mr. Laudenslayer said that he will look into it.

Mr. Krall said that the cost estimate and the operations and maintenance agreement looked fine to him. Mr. Laudenslayer said that he can have the applicants sign the agreement with the plans. Mr. Krall said to note the DEP approval number on the plan and the date of the letter.

Ms. Mayfield said that she will want to review the improvements agreement.

Action: Commissioner Bealer made a motion to grant a waiver for preliminary/final plan review. Commissioner Cinfici seconded the motion. The vote to approve the motion was unanimous, 5-0.

Action: Commissioner Bealer made a motion to conditionally approve the plan. The conditions included: that the plan be updated to show the roof drainage into the landscape buffer area, the execution of a municipal improvements agreement, the addition of the DEP Sewer Planning Module approval number and date on the plan, and any other conditions specified in a review letter. Commissioner Conklin seconded the motion. The vote to approve the motion was unanimous, 5-0 (**Resolution #12-2021**).

PC-2021-100-P/F: 1201 N. 9th Street (Marion Street Fire Station)

Mr. Gurney stated that he had received comments from the Berks County Planning Commission, Hawk Valley Associates, Public Works, Berks County Conservation District, and PennDOT. He asked for clarification on a couple of Public Works comments.

Mr. Skrincosky said that the biggest issue remaining is the PennDOT Highway Occupancy Permit (HOP) for site improvements and the flashing warning beacon. Mr. Gurney said that they

resubmitted on May 18th. They anticipate a result in fifteen to eighteen days. They are hoping to get a response in the next couple of weeks. Mr. Skrincosky asked if the entire process with PennDOT would be less than sixty days. Mr. Gurney said that he thought so. Half of PennDOT's comments are technical, while the other half have to do with agreements. There are some things that the City has to do, including ordinances and resolutions that have to do with parking restrictions and signal maintenance.

Mr. Krall said that the HOP includes the flashing warning beacon. That needs to be approved by an ordinance. City Council looked at the draft ordinance on Monday, May 24, but the earliest it will be approved is June 14. There is also a resolution for Stan Rugis, Deputy Director of Public Works to sign the various applications that PennDOT needs to see. Mr. Krall said that this can probably happen within sixty days, but he thinks it will take most of that time. The only thing from a technical standpoint would be the site distance. Mr. Gurney said that they gave PennDOT an exhibit. PennDOT may want more restriction than what is proposed. Mr. Krall said that the potential issue is having to revise the parking restriction plan because of a comment from PennDOT. It would be good to know if PennDOT has additional comments so that the City Council ordinance doesn't have to change. He said that this needs to happen before June 14th.

Ms. Mayfield suggested that they can also make the ordinance more restrictive. They can always add the parking back in. Mr. Ganguzza said that it is pretty restrictive right now. Mr. Krall said that he'd rather have it the way it is going to be rather than changing it.

Mr. Gurney asked Mr. Krall to clarify his first comment in the review letter. Mr. Krall said to delineate the easement area on the plan. Mr. Krall asked Ms. Mayfield if a separate agreement is needed for the pedestrian walkway. Ms. Mayfield said that a separate document is not needed. They can put a note on the plan to say that it is a public access walkway. Mr. Gurney confirmed that he can add the note and delineate the easement area. Mr. Ganguzza clarified that the easement is for parking and pedestrian access.

Mr. Gurney and Mr. Krall discussed the inspection port on the infiltration chamber.

Mr. Krall asked about the lawn area, as it might not be the best space for vegetation. Mr. Gurney said that in that area they are going to put in river stone. There will be some areas with pea gravel and some areas under mulch around the street trees. They will better define it on the plan.

Mr. Gurney asked about Mr. Skrincosky's comment four on his review letter. Mr. Skrincosky clarified that the complete Zoning Hearing Board decision includes the date, the case number, the language that's the prelude to the decision and the conditions of the approval. For comment number six, Mr. Gurney clarified that they can reduce the intensity of the lights. Mr. Ganguzza confirmed that it can be done, but said that he would defer to Chief Stoudt if they want that to be done. Evan Gray stated that the auxiliary lighting only pertains to signage. All other lights are for egress. Emergency egress lighting isn't set to a time clock, but they can switch to a time clock. Mr. Skrincosky said that the station is in the R-3 residential district, so the comment is meant to address making the station to be friendly to the neighborhood and to be night sky-friendly. Mr. Ganguzza confirmed that they can adjust the lighting.

Mr. Peris confirmed that in order to grant approval a waiver of the preliminary plan requirement would be needed. Mr. Skrincosky said that the plan was submitted before the SALDO amendments, so a preliminary/final waiver is possible. Another outstanding question is how long the PennDOT approval will take. The ordinance states that if granting conditional approval, outside approvals need to be granted within ninety days. If everything can be sorted out in sixty days, then that should give the Planning Commission time to sign the plan.

Action: Commissioner Cinfici moved to waive the requirement of the submission of preliminary plan. Commissioner Bealer seconded the motion. The vote to approve the motion was unanimous, 5-0.

Commissioner Cinfici commented on the truck movements. Mr. Krall confirmed that North Mill Street is a public street. Commissioner Bealer asked if the applicant would need a waiver for sidewalks on North Mill since it is a public street.

Action: Commissioner Bealer made a motion to waive the sidewalk requirements on North Mill Street. Commissioner Cinfici seconded the motion and added in a provision for curbs. Commissioner Conklin asked to confirm that there are no sidewalks or curbs existing now. Mr. Gurney confirmed that there are not any curbs or sidewalks on North Mill Street. The vote on the motion was unanimous, 5-0.

Commissioner Bealer said that he prefers to wait to act on this plan until City Council coordinates everything they need with the PennDOT HOP. Mr. Ganguzza asked if there were questions and concerns from Council. Mr. Krall said that there were not.

Action: Commissioner Bealer moved to table the plan. Commissioner Cinfici seconded. The vote on the motion was unanimous, 5-0.

PC-2021-101-P: 459 Miltimore Street et al. (Buttonwood Gateway)

Chairman Olsen recused himself. Commissioner Bealer took over as chair. Brian Focht represented Habitat for Humanity.

Mr. Skrincosky said that the issues involving lots one, ten, and eleven encroaching on other lots have been resolved.

Ms. Mayfield said that she has spoken with Mr. Mooney about it. Where there will be a license allowing encroachment onto the proposed building lots, notice will be given to the adjoining properties that the new owners will use the bakers' alleys. The baker's alleys will be needed by the new properties so notification will be given to the neighbors that the alleys will be utilized.

Mr. Skrincosky said that new deed descriptions are needed for this project, which has been discussed with the applicant. Parking and vehicle maneuvers on lots nine, ten, and eleven have been resolved. The applicant should discuss this with the Public Works Department to make sure that the site improvements proposed along the alley between Miltimore and Gordon Street are satisfactory. Curbs and sidewalks along Miltimore Street are also needed. This will be

coordinated with the city project, so it should be coordinated with the Public Works Department. A municipal improvements agreement is required for the project.

Mr. Krall said the city is hiring an engineer to do streetscaping along Miltimore Street. It has not yet been determined how that will happen. He cannot recommend a final plan approval based on the idea that the city would do this work, as this is not guaranteed. If the final plan is approved, it would have to be the developer doing the improvements. This can change going forward. Ms. Mayfield recommended posting the improvements and escrow. They can always be released if the city does some of the work.

Commissioner Bealer asked if the applicant submitted an estimate for a municipal improvements agreement. Mr. Focht said that they have not been submitted yet, as there was still discussion about the curbs and sidewalks. Now that this has been resolved, they will submit the estimate.

Ms. Mayfield said that a stormwater agreement is required as well. Mr. Focht said that one operations and maintenance agreement has been submitted. Mr. Krall said that he looked at it briefly, but it looked pretty close to what is in the ordinance. He and Ms. Mayfield will take a closer look. He asked who will sign the agreement. Mr. Focht said that the developer will sign it and as part of settlement it would get transferred over to the new owner of the lot. Ms. Mayfield confirmed asked if it will be handled as individual lots. Mr. Focht confirmed.

Mr. Krall asked if the driveway apron on Miltimore Street will vary or if it will necessarily be four and a half feet. Mr. Focht said that it would be consistent dimensions - they will make it four and a half feet.

Commissioner Bealer asked if the stormwater management reports have to be submitted before action is taken. Mr. Krall said that was done last month. They were satisfactory. Mr. Focht confirmed the stormwater management reports and calculations were submitted previously. He said that they received approval from the County Conservation District. Commissioner Bealer asked about sewer planning modules. Mr. Krall said that they are not necessary. The applicant submitted a narrative that explained that – there are fewer lots than there were before so there is a net loss of EDUs (equivalent dwelling units), so Public Works is satisfied with that response.

Mr. Skrincosky confirmed that the easements address the encroachment issues. Ms. Mayfield confirmed that there will be notes on the plan and in the deed descriptions.

Mr. Skrincosky outlined the conditions of final plan approval: Deed descriptions be submitted for each individual lot which will account for the easements, the curbs and sidewalks along Miltimore Street be included within the escrow agreement, the execution of a municipal improvements agreement. Mr. Krall added the change to the driveway apron dimension in the detail. Ms. Mayfield added a reference to the review letters.

Action: Commissioner Cinfici made to a motion to approve the plan subject to meeting all the conditions as set forth in the memos from staff. Commissioner Bealer seconded the motion. The vote on the motion was unanimous, 4-0 (**Resolution #13-2021**).

Mr. Laudenslayer said that he had a preliminary meeting with staff last week to go over most of the issues. The city has rezoned the whole property to the C-N District. He will prepare a deed description. Regarding parking, Dr. Pepen has correspondence from the city saying that seventeen parking spaces were required, when they were going to have a restaurant. Now, they are going to have retail and carry-out food. The parking is limited in that area. He said that requiring twenty-four parking spaces, as Hawk Valley requested, is very difficult. There were eight spaces on the site, but Mr. Skrincosky looked at the layout and it was too tight. There are now only four spaces along the building instead of the original five and two handicapped spaces on the site. According to the ADA requirement information he has, for between one and twenty-five parking spaces only one van-accessible space is required, so he is not sure why he is being asked to provide two. He will submit an updated parking agreement with the off-site spaces. He will take off mention of the R-3 District on the plan, and replace that with the C-N District.

Mr. Peris said that the Zoning Hearing Board (ZHB) decision allowed for a reduction in the total number of parking spaces (eight on site, twenty off-site). Based on the review and the necessity of reducing the number of parking spaces on site to seven to allow for safe vehicular motion, it would be consistent with the ZHB's decision to provide twenty-one spaces off-site. Mr. Skrincosky confirmed that twenty-five spaces total would only require one handicapped parking space. Mr. Peris said that the recommendation from Ms. Mayfield was to put a note on the plan that indicates the property address of the twenty-one off-site parking spaces. The language should be that if that parking location became unavailable, notice would be given to the city about an alternative site for the spaces that fits the ordinance. Dan confirmed that twenty-one spaces are needed off-site. Mr. Skrincosky confirmed, as that is what the ZHB decision stated.

Mr. Skrincosky said that an offsite parking and access easement is needed for the entire property to indicate that the point of ingress is off of Schuylkill Avenue and the egress off of Miltimore Street. This would prevent one property-owner from blocking or controlling all the parking spaces or access to the site. Mr. Peris asked if that would be required if the lots are being consolidated into a single parcel. Mr. Skrincosky said it is because there are four uses. The easement would apply to the four tenants to ensure that one use does not dominate the parking and access. Ms. Mayfield said that she can put something together.

Mr. Skrincosky said that sidewalk improvements along Schuylkill Ave are required. There are no sidewalks along Miltimore Street so a waiver is needed for that requirement. Mr. Laudenslayer said Mr. Krall's comment was that a permit was needed for a new driveway apron off of Miltimore Street. Mr. Krall said that they agreed to a curbed driveway apron by permit according to city standard along Miltimore Street.

Mr. Krall asked if anything has been submitted for sewer planning. Mr. Laudenslayer said that he came up with a narrative. There will be less sewage flow given that the building was a social club and will now be a retail area with two employees. He has a letter but has not yet submitted it.

Mr. Bealer said that they haven't received a narrative and there are still some outstanding issues. He suggested that the applicant submit a ninety-day extension request. Ms. Mayfield asked if ninety days is needed, or if thirty or sixty would be sufficient. Mr. Bealer said that whatever staff thinks is sufficient. Mr. Krall said that planning modules could drag the process along for a couple of months, but he is confident that the explanation Mr. Laudenslayer will provide will resolve the issue.

Commissioner Cinfici asked if the staff thinks an extension is needed. Mr. Skrincoosky said that his issues are minor and they can be addressed if granted conditional final approval. Mr. Krall agreed, and said it should be up to the applicant to request a time extension. Ms. Mayfield said that the deadline is the day before the next meeting and the Planning Commission can act on the request if the applicant follows up with a written extension. Mr. Laudenslayer said that they will ask for an extension. Ms. Mayfield said she'd recommend an extension to the July 27th Planning Commission meeting.

Action: Commissioner Bealer made a motion to grant a waiver for the sidewalks along Miltimore Street. Commissioner Cinfici seconded the motion. The vote on the motion was unanimous, 5-0.

Commissioner Cinfici asked about the parking lease renewals. Mr. Peris said that the zoning approval becomes void if the applicant loses the off-site parking. The other alternative is to provide staff with the renewed lease every year, which is not consistent with current practice. Ms. Mayfield said that requiring the leases to be renewed will overwhelm staff. The notes on the plan satisfy her that the parking issues are confirmed and addressed. Mr. Skrincoosky added that if the lease is not renewed then the applicant will be in violation of the plan and the zoning ordinance and action can be taken. Commissioner Cinfici said that he understands that this is satisfactory for now.

Ms. Mayfield recommended that the Planning Commission accept the verbal time extension with the condition that it will be submitted in writing. Mr. Laudenslayer requested an extension until the July Planning Commission meeting.

Action: Chairman Olsen made a motion to grant the time extension until the July 27th meeting. Commissioner Conklin seconded the motion. The vote on the motion was unanimous, 5-0.

Action: Commissioner Bealer made a motion to table the plan. Chairman Olsen seconded the motion. The vote on the motion was unanimous, 5-0.

PC-2021-104-PF: 575 Saint Bernardine Street (The Nature Place Phase 2)

Kim Murphy introduced the project team and the project. The Nature Place is proposing a roof-top deck and classroom space. Bob Korp added additional details about the project. Berks Nature occupies a portion of Angelica Creek Park as part of a tri-party lease with Alvernia University and the City. The Nature Place has limited indoor space, so this project was conceived to provide more educational capacity on inclement weather days. The new space sits ovetop of the current building. The net increase in building coverage will be about eleven hundred square feet. There will be underground chambers beneath the lawn in front of the Nature Place for stormwater

runoff for the increase in impervious coverage. The restrooms will be discharged to the on-lot sewer system. There is a dedicated path for fire department access from Saint Bernadine Street. There is a minor encroachment into the floodplain, but there is no impact to the floodway. They are requesting a waiver to review the plan as combined preliminary and final.

Mr. Skrincosky said that there were some issues with off-street parking and loading requirements. A lighting plan is not needed.

Mr. Krall said that there was a meeting with staff and the developer group to talk about some of the issues. The group talked about the triparty lease agreement with Alvernia, the city, and Berks Nature and the DCNR agreement for the park itself. The city solicitor said that for the purposes of this land development, both of the agreements would be satisfied. There is a permit for the on-lot sewage disposal system. He asked that a note be added to the plan with the permit number for future reference. Some of the notes on the 2016 land development plan would be appropriate to put on this one. For instance, the survey datum. He reviewed the stormwater management plan and can approve it with the condition that a written stormwater management plan be executed to specifically address the BMPs because it's not addressed in any agreement. There was a note on the 2016 plan that summarized the general operation and maintenance that Berks Nature will provide on this tract which would be good to repeat on this plan for reference. He asked Mr. Korp if there will be a renewal of the open NPDES permit. Mr. Korp confirmed that the permit from the prior phase is still open so there will be a major modification to it. There was no notice of termination on it. Mr. Krall asked what kind of satisfaction would the city get with regards to the NPDES permit, as normally the permit number would be noted on the plan. Mr. Korp said that he will reference the approval letter for the major modification on the plan.

Mr. Korp said that he will include the parking plan and zoning exhibit with the submission. Mr. Peris said that Hawk Valley will update the review letter to address the remaining issues.

Mr. Peris confirmed that the city solicitor said that the proposal is consistent with the existing agreements. Any additional agreements will need to go through the solicitor's office.

Action: Commissioner Bealer made a motion to waive the submission of a preliminary plan, and Chairman Olsen seconded the motion. The vote on the motion was unanimous, 5-0.

Action: Chairman Olsen made a motion to waive the curb and sidewalks requirements and Commissioner Ashear seconded the motion. Commissioner Cinfici asked if this needs to be waived again, as it was waived during the first phase. Mr. Peris said that to be thorough it would be prudent to waive it again. The vote on the motion was unanimous, 5-0.

Commissioner Bealer said that the Planning Commission cannot make a motion to approve the plan until the applicant gets the extension approval for the NPDES permit from the Conservation District. Mr. Korp said that they have an open active permit, there are small items to be resolved and they hope to receive approval any day. Commissioner Bealer said that he believed that the memorandum of understanding says that approval is needed. Chris Hartman said that where a third party agent is involved, the Planning Commission can make it a condition of approval. Mr. Krall said that the memorandum of understanding between the city and the Conservation District,

the Planning Commission would not approve a plan until the Conservation District is notified of the activity being presented to the Planning Commission. Commissioner Bealer agreed if the staff is willing to enforce that part of the SALDO he has no problem granting a conditional approval.

Mr. Peris said that staff hasn't seen the revised zoning exhibit. He can't comment on that and the floodplain zoning permit at this point. Mr. Skrincosky confirmed that those items have not been resolved. Mr. Korp said that the zoning exhibit is known and seen; they will submit it with this submission. Mr. Peris said the revisions regarding the addition of a loading area have not been submitted. Mr. Korp said that will be provided. Mr. Hartman said that with regard to the floodplain issue, Mr. Korp presented the proposal for the floodplain and it is identical to the original project. Mr. Korp said that the encroachment is now one hundred and thirty square feet and last time it was four hundred and eight square feet. Commissioner Bealer asked if the applicant has received a permit from the floodplain administrator, as this needs to happen before the plan can be approved. Mr. Skrincosky confirmed that the permit has not been issued. Mr. Peris said that the issues need to be resolved within ninety days. He will need to defer to Hawk Valley as to whether the remaining items can be resolved. The loading space needs to be shown on the plan. The floodplain application has been reviewed in the context of a land development plan but not in the context of a floodplain zoning permit application.

Mr. Skrincosky said that the revised plan should be submitted to make sure the issues are resolved. If a revised plan can be submitted to address the remaining issues within thirty days, then staff can make sure the issues are resolved. Mr. Korp confirmed.

Mr. Hartman said that the loading issue can easily be accommodated and shouldn't be an impediment to the Planning Commission moving forward with an approval. The floodplain is similar to an NPDES permit - it is a third party approval, so the Planning Commission could consider making it a condition of approval. Commissioner Bealer said that the SALDO requires that the issue is resolved before the Planning Commission takes action. Mr. Peris said that the review and approval process must be completed prior to municipal approval. It enables the Planning Commission delegate to staff. If Mr. Krall and Mr. Skrincosky are comfortable reviewing and the Planning Commission is comfortable delegating to staff with final review letters, then they can grant a conditional final approval. Mr. Korp confirmed. They will put the remaining items on the plan.

Commissioner Cinfici asked about the additional footprint of the building. Mr. Korp said that the addition will sit overtop the present building. It is on independent stilts. It touches on the west side for an at-grade entrance. There is an eleven hundred square foot overlap.

Kim shared some renderings of the new building.

Commissioner Conklin asked Jerome if he is comfortable with granting conditional preliminary final plan approval. Mr. Skrincosky said that the plan can be revised to reflect the conditions. He doesn't see anything that would be a major obstacle, but the plan should be submitted within a timely fashion so that there is time to review it. He said that the architectural renderings should

have been submitted with the application package. He would recommend granting conditional preliminary/final approval. Bob Korp committed to submit in an orderly fashion.

Action: Chairman Olsen made a motion to grant conditional preliminary final plan approval and Commissioner Ashear seconded the motion. Mr. Skrincosky asked for a time frame on the motion. He recommended the condition that the revised documents be submitted in two weeks to facilitate resolving the issues within thirty days. All staff and Berks Nature representatives agreed. The vote on the motion was unanimous, 5-0 ([Resolution #14-2021](#)).

PC-2021-109-S: 1015 Rockland Street (Albright College Rockland Street Warehouse)

Mr. Otero introduced the team and the project. Albright College is proposing to adaptively reuse the existing warehouse building. The building will house the Science Research Institute Program. The program will not take up the entire footprint. The rest of the building will be used for storage for the library. The site is fully developed. The College is proposing interior renovations to partition the space. They have added additional line striping to add in parking. The total population proposed will be sixty-nine people. Forty-nine people will be high school students, the majority based from Albright campus. The traffic count is relatively low, but pick-up and drop-off circulation will be needed. They have had informal discussions with city staff. The plan has a five-foot concrete walk and street trees at the request of city staff. As result of the potential increase in impervious coverage due to the sidewalk, the existing asphalt around the foundation will be removed to offset. If they do not put in the sidewalk at this time, nothing on site is proposed. They have submitted a sketch plan and a waiver request of the land development procedure.

Mr. Skrincosky said that the city passed the SALDO amendment, which states that a land development is required for a change in use. They are going from a warehouse use to educational use. Keith Mooney said that this is not in the definitions section. Mr. Peris noted the section: 515-202. Mr. Otero said that they are not changing the coverage or grading, and should be exempt from stormwater engineering design. He compared this project to the 401 Penn Street project, in which land development planning was not required. Other than having trees and sidewalks he is not sure what else needs to be reviewed. Mr. Mooney said that the city's definition of a land development is the same as the Municipalities Planning Code's. What the applicant is proposing is not a land development, it is an interior fit-out of the existing facility. The only exterior changes are planting trees and painting stripes for parking spaces- there are no site improvements, nothing is being built. With regard to the sidewalk, the city has another project in the area with PennDOT and the applicant will make a monetary contribution to sidewalks that will be installed at a later time. Mr. Otero said that he understands that a change in use is the purview of the zoning ordinance, but not land development. The proposed use is a use by-right.

Phil Leinbach shared his screen to show the proposed interior modifications.

Mr. Skrincosky said that the application for 401 Penn Street was submitted last year before the SALDO amendments. This plan is a preliminary/final plan, as specified by the SALDO to outline any conditions by the change in use. He asked how the city will know if the SRI use goes to a full-blown university use and there's no connectivity between Albright College campus and

this facility. Maybe the only thing this project will involve is some pedestrian connectivity to Albright College. The applicant should also address the point of ingress that is very close to 11th and Rockland Street. The remaining issues are minor.

Ms. Mayfield said that with 401 Penn Street there was a plan of record. Mr. Otero said that the old use for the ingress had semi-trucks navigating the entrances. Now, there will be box trucks, perhaps. The loading docks won't be used. Traffic concerns should consider that historically semi-trucks maneuvered on state/city property into the loading docks on the property. Brad King said that they are shuttling students from the main campus to this building. Students will not walk back and forth from the main campus to the building. Mr. Otero said that they can put a note on the plan as part of a revised plan of record regarding requirements for future changes in uses. Mr. Skrincosky said that it would be best to have all of this documented on a plan.

Ms. Mayfield asked about the number of trips per day. Mr. King said that there will be two to three shuttle buses in the morning. The students will be shuttled back to main campus for lunch, then back to the site, and then back to Albright for parents to pick them up. Ms. Mayfield asked about the students driving. Mr. Mooney said that the students driving will park at the main campus. Mr. Otero said that twenty-five percent of students would be of driving age. That would be thirteen spaces, in addition to spaces for employees. Ms. Mayfield asked if they have located a plan for the site. Mr. Otero said they have not. Mr. Mooney asked if the city checked their files. Mr. Otero said that in 2008 there were some ADA accessibility improvements to the building. Mr. Peris said that they have focused on looking with the Recorder of Deeds, but are open to additional evidence. Mr. Skrincosky asked where the students will park on campus. Mr. King said that by the visitors' center there are plenty of spaces.

Chairman Olsen confirmed with Mr. Leinbach that eighty percent of the building is not changing use. He asked where the threshold is for asking an applicant for a land development plan.

There was an extended discussion of whether or not this project is a land development.

Ms. Mayfield asked if the Planning Commission would table the waiver request while there was more research into the history of the property. Mr. Mooney said that there is a deadline, so this needs to be determined now.

Mr. Skrincosky asked for the total square footage of the renovations. Mr. Leinbach said that the renovations will be less than one thousand square feet.

Commissioner Cinfici asked if the city's ordinance can grant the authority for review by the Planning Commission independent of the definition in the MPC. Ms. Mayfield said that the MPC allows for the adoption of an ordinance. Other municipalities have a sketch plan of record. Mr. Otero said other in municipalities a minor land development includes an expansion under a certain threshold of square feet. Mr. Mooney said that the city only has the powers that the state grants to it.

Chairman Olsen asked if there were federal dollars involved in the project. Mr. Mooney said that the city is the grantee for the SRI program and the College is the sub-grantee. Chairman Olsen

asked if Ms. Mayfield and Mr. Mooney could reconvene before the weekend. Mr. Peris said that this meeting happened yesterday. The recommendation made was that this be submitted as a minor land development and in the meantime any required permits for internal demolition only that are not conditioned on land development approval be allowed to proceed in the meantime. Mr. King said that they need to have building permit approved as well, not just the demolition permit. They need the program up and running by July 5th. They are anticipating building permit approved in early June. Ms. Mayfield said there is no required action right now. A special meeting has a twenty-four advertising requirement. Commissioner Cinfici said that he would consider continuing the meeting. Ms. Mayfield said that an additional meeting may or may not be needed, but she doesn't want to leave the issue open.

Mr. Mooney said that he is not averse to submitting something, but questions what nonexistent condition of the site would need to be submitted. Mr. Skrincosky said that pedestrian accessibility would be needed, as well as landscaping and a revision to the driveway entrance. Mr. Mooney asked if they should put a note on the plan that says that Albright will make a contribution to the city for sidewalks that they will put in later.

Mr. Krall said that there is no stormwater management needed. It doesn't sound like the occupancy being proposed would generate more than one equivalent dwelling unit in addition to the current use, so planning modules wouldn't be required. The location of the eastern driveway does concern him, as it is on a state highway. He would want to know if there is a highway occupancy plan.

Ms. Mayfield said that if the Planning Commission waives the land development review, then the applicant should submit a planning module to Public Works. She asked if there has been an investigation into a highway occupancy permit. Mr. Otero said no. Ms. Mayfield said that they are probably lowering the utilization of the existing driveways. Mr. Mooney asked if the Planning Commission would be willing to grant a contingent plan approval for a sketch plan of record with notes. Mr. Skrincosky confirmed, and added that it can be a preliminary/final minor land development.

Ms. Mayfield recommended to the Planning Commission supporting Mr. Mooney's suggestion. Commissioner Cinfici suggested submitting as-built plans. He asked for advice on approving a revision to a plan of record, if there is a plan of record. Mr. Mooney said that it is unknown whether there is a plan of record so it would be better to record the minor land development plan so that there is something of record. Ms. Mayfield agreed.

Chairman Olsen asked Mr. Leinbach if what he has drawn up could be submitted as an as-built plan. Mr. Leinbach said that he could do that. They don't anticipate much changing. Mr. King confirmed that they will submit as-built plans.

Mr. Otero said that he will submit the plan already provided with a changed name – a minor land development plan. He will coordinate with city staff for the wording of the plan notes. The plan will be resubmitted for final city review and approval. Commissioner Bealer asked for a note about research on the highway occupancy permit. Mr. Otero confirmed that if there are future changes in use then PennDOT would need to review. Mr. Skrincosky said that the existing

driveway doesn't meet city standards now. If the Planning Commission is alright with it, the applicant can put in signage to say that the eastern driveway is only for ingress. Mr. Otero agreed. He asked about fees. Mr. Peris said that would be sent in a follow-up email.

Commissioner Cinfici asked for an update on the existing library. This is one of the busiest intersections in the city. The rail line is active. He would suggest coordinating with their schedule to make sure there aren't conflicts.

Action: Commissioner Bealer made a motion to approve the minor land development plan with the provision that the existing sketch plan is updated with the notes as reviewed at this meeting, the eastern-most driveway is changed to ingress only, and that a submission of a narrative approved by Public Works is submitted. Chairman Olsen seconded. The vote on the motion was unanimous, 5-0 (**Resolution #15-2021**).

Item # 3 - Other Business

Action: Commissioner Cinfici submitted minor edits to the April meeting minutes to Ms. Crimm. There is only one major change. Lee made a motion to accept the April meeting minutes as amended by Commissioners Bealer and Cinfici. The motion was approved unanimously, 5-0.

Action: Chairman Olsen made a motion to approve the time extension request for the Schaeffer Subdivision final plan until August 31. Commissioner Bealer seconded the motion. The vote on the motion was unanimous, 5-0.

Action: Chairman Olsen made a motion to reaffirm the final plan approval for the Reading Skate Park. The vote on the motion was unanimous, 5-0.

For the Blighted Property Review Committee, Chairman Olsen reported that he attended the meeting on Thursday, May 20. There were a total of sixteen properties that were certified as blighted.

For the Commission Liaison Report, Commissioner Bealer reported that he attended the Buttonwood Gateway groundbreaking.

Ms. Mayfield asked about the reopening of City Hall. Mr. Peris said that City Hall opens to the public on June 1, but public meetings will not be in person yet.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:05pm.

Respectfully submitted by Naomi Crimm, Planner