

Minutes
Regular meeting of the City of Reading Planning Commission
February 20, 2008 at 7:00 pm

Members present:

Ermete J. Raffaelli, Chairman
David N. Reppert, Vice Chairman
Michael E. Lauter, Secretary
Wayne Jonas Bealer, Assistant Secretary
Frederic dep Rothermel, Jr.

Staff present:

Andrew W. Miller, Planning Office
Michelle R. Mayfield, Department of Law

Others present:

Mark J. Link, John W. Hoffert, PLS, Ltd.
Marcus Fox, Fairview Christian School
David Burkholder, Burkholder Buildings
Arlin Horst, Fairview Christian School
Joseph A. Mina, F. X. Brownne, Inc.
William J. Vitale, Designworks Architects, PC
Kevin K. Murphy, Berks County Community Foundation
Frances A. Aitken, Berks County Community Foundation
Andrew L. Hicks, Tripoint Properties, Inc.
Michael D. Hartman, McCarthy Engineering Associates, PC
Timothy J. Krall, Spotts Stevens & McCoy, Inc.
Kimberly M. Fasnacht, Spotts Stevens & McCoy, Inc.
Alan W. Shuman, Shuman Development Group
Charles Wanyo, Shuman Development Group
John W. Hoffert, John W. Hoffert, PLS, Ltd.
Steven D. Buck, Stevens & Lee, PC
Seth L. Krull, Bohler Engineering, Inc.
Lori Kiedaisch, McDonald's Corporation
Stephanie Rawden, McDonald's Corporation
Christian Rawden, McDonald's Corporation
Ollie Cherniahivsky, Ollie Cherniahivsky & Associates
John T. O'Neill, Landmark Surveying

Chairman Raffaelli called the February 20th meeting, originally scheduled for February 12th, to order. He eulogized the late S. Henry Lessig, Jr, for his history of public service with Reading. He asked for acceptance of the agenda. Mr. Miller noted the postponement of items 11, 12, and 13, to be heard at a later date. Mr. Rothermel moved to accept the modified agenda. Mr. Lauter seconded. And the Commission voted unanimously to approve the modified February agenda.

Subdivision and Land Development:

Review the **preliminary** subdivision/land development plan for the **Fairview School Subdivision**, an annexation from that parcel known as 421 South 13th Street to that parcel known as 410 South 14th Street. [0:04.14]

Mr. Link described the annexation parcel, and another to be purchased by Fairview Christian School, to allow for a 7200-square foot recreational/multi-purpose building, and seven additional off-street parking spaces. An agreement with the New Apostolic Church of Reading will reserve 55 additional spaces at 414 Chapel Terrace. He reported the Zoning Hearing Board granted variances from the use, coverage, setback, parking, landscaping and screening standards. He intended to address the Planning Office review comments in a revised submission. He displayed photos with building renderings 'doctored in'. Pastor Fox introduced himself as the School's Vice Principal, and described a (Type 5A) masonry and wood-post frame construction, using part of an existing wall. He said they'd relate the color palette to the existing School building, and displayed samples of the white concrete

block, red aluminum trim, and white metal roof materials.

Mr. Link described a combination driveway/utility easement for access to the new parking from South 13th Street. He said 22 spaces are provided on-site, 3 more than required. For extra-curricular events, the off-site parking reserved from the New Apostolic Church will be available. Pastor Fox claimed the building was primarily for the use of the day students. He estimated the School had 150 students enrolled, kindergarten through 12th grade, from 9 area school districts, but 45% from Reading. He said they have 16 staff, 12 living within two or three blocks. He said he'd been with Fairview Christian for 13 years, 6 as a teacher, and looked forward to the new accommodation.

Responding to Mr. Rothermel's questions, Pastor Fox confirmed their intent to consolidate the parcels on a single deed. Mr. Horst noted a chain-link gate and fencing to secure the new parking area. Mr. Rothermel reminded them to present the site lighting plans to the Planning Office staff. He questioned the color choices, when compared with the existing brick School building, suggesting a darker scheme for a better fit. Asked why they opted for a stand-alone building, as opposed to an addition, Pastor Fox noted an elevation difference. Mr. Burkholder named Timber Tech Engineering Inc. as the designer, and included fire separations and assembly occupancies as additional reasons. Mr. Rothermel suggested a covered walkway. Pastor Fox said they'd consider it, relative to cost.

Mr. Raffaelli noted a vulnerability in the windows facing the alley. Pastor Fox agreed, but wanted to take the chance, for the heat and light gain advantages, considering security grates/bars for the added protection.

Clarifying questions about the façade materials, Mr. Burkholder said masonry is proposed only on that side facing (east) the existing parking area, the remaining three to be metal-sided. Pastor Fox showed some colors previously considered, to the apparent preference of the Commission members.

Asked for landscaping plans, Mr. Link called it impractical, given the building size and site constraints. Mr. Reppert suggested a small planting bed along that façade facing the school yard, at least. Mr. Link referred to an elevation change and a retaining wall.

Mr. Miller noted the concurrence of the Planning Office, the Department of Public Works and the County Planning Commission in seeking more 'land development' detail. He asked if the applicant had any problem with the direction of those review letters. Mr. Link said not. Discussion continued about a possible conditional approval, and the applicant's schedule.

Mr. Bealer moved to approve the preliminary subdivision/land development plan, conditioned on the applicant satisfying the outstanding preliminary plan requirements, together with the final plan requirements, and with consideration of darker tones for the building façade. Mr. Lauter seconded. And the Commission voted unanimously to conditionally-approve the Fairview School Subdivision preliminary plan.

Resolution #11-2008

Review the **preliminary** subdivision/land development plan for the **Berks County Community Foundation – Headquarters and Community Conference Center**, an office headquarters and conference center proposed for those parcels known as 33-37 Thorn, 28-34 North Third and 237 Court Streets. [0:45.45]

Mr. Mina, using a PowerPoint presentation, described the "green building" and other environmentally-conscious improvements for the rest of this current surface parking lot. He described its orientation and existing topography. He noted the 11 off-street parking spaces proposed, accessed by retaining one of the existing Court Street curb cuts, but closing the other.

Mr. Vitale, referring to the materials distributed, described a combination of structurally-insulated metal panels, chosen for their high recycled-material content, and R-value, and split-faced block, chosen for its local production in New Holland. He mentioned a possibility of brick, and said they hadn't settled on colors, either way. He said they'd be seeking LEED certification, and anticipated a "gold" classification, at least. He mentioned a vegetated roof in-part, with standing-seam metal on the balance, to direct rain water toward a cistern. That cistern would supply the water closets, with overflow toward the storm sewer. He mentioned possible, or eventual, photovoltaic panels, to double as sunshades. Turning back to site design, he said their original intent for a shared access with the neighboring property didn't work out, and the renderings presented have yet to be updated. He said they're still finalizing the signage details, but confirmed the main entrance to be at 3rd and Court Streets, with a secondary for employees at the parking level.

Mr. Murphy acknowledged the assistance from the City's "One-Stop Shop" forum, and the cooperation of the City generally. He explained that the Community Foundation was established 1994, as a philanthropy mission based in downtown Reading. He estimated \$50 million in assets managed, and their need to establish a permanent home, preferably downtown. He said the Foundation is similarly committed to a demonstration of sustainable development techniques, claiming a City and County first. He said the Foundation is planning around its own needs

for the next 50 years, while also providing a community conference space on the first floor, in an attempt to encourage more downtown meetings. He estimated 20,000 visits, annually.

Mr. Vitale noted the site's advantage for solar orientation.

Turning to the Planning Office review, Mr. Mina addressed the zoning issues. He said they'd attempt to correct the parking stall/aisle dimensions, but noted the limited space available, similarly challenging the required buffer. He said they weren't planning to curb the full interior of the lot; only at the west end for drainage design. He said most of the retaining wall on the northern boundary would be removed, as part of the grading planned. He said they're looking at fencing options, for the screening required. He didn't believe any variances necessary, intending to discuss existing nonconformities with the Zoning Administrator. Addressing stormwater management issues, he noted several different management practices proposed, and the reduction in impervious surfacing. Mr. Miller clarified that they were simply seeking more detail, fully realizing an improved condition. Mr. Mina said they'd continue to investigate the possibility of a 'rain garden' at the western end of the property, and its bearing on the karst geology. He mentioned some early feedback from the County Conservation District, expecting an approval of their revised submission.

Asked if the cistern could provide for the roof-top vegetation, Mr. Mina said the plantings chosen, the sedum and soil matrix, are designed for all conditions, and that the cistern water should be fully-used in the toilet flushing. He said the public supply would be connected for contingency needs anyway. Mr. Vitale named Jonathan Alderson Landscape Architects, Inc. for coordination of the landscaping plans.

Regarding sidewalks, Mr. Mina preferred to omit the installation along Thorn Street, noting the deficiency on the neighboring property (Zion Baptist Church), and the adequacy on the other side of Thorn (the Second and Washington Parking Garage). He said waiving the sidewalk could improve the greening/screening opportunities adjacent to their parking lot. He committed to replacing the broken handicapped-accessible ramp at that corner. Mr. Miller agreed with their assessment of the existing conditions, but recommended the Commission give the Department of Public Works an opportunity to 'weigh-in'. Discussing it further, the Commission expressed no objections to waiving the requirement, or recommending the same to Public Works.

Mr. Mina offered to provide a copy of the "Phase I" environmental assessment, and a "will-serve" letter from the Water Authority. He reported the sewer planning module in-process, and expected the Conservation District's approval shortly.

Mr. Vitale mentioned their consideration of a water feature at the entrance; close to ground, and without standing water. He said it may have to wait, but that the infrastructure would be provided, in any case. He said the LEED (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design) score has yet to be determined, responding to a request that it be included in the plan set. He said they'd discuss the provision of public trash/recycling receptacles with the Downtown Improvement District. Mr. Miller characterized it as an opportunity to promote recycling. Mr. Murphy assured the entire property would be "non smoking".

Mr. Vitale called the required parking buffer a challenge, and suggested an "existing condition" argument. Mr. Miller confirmed that no setback was required, but that screening still was. Mr. Rothermel passed them a sketch of his own, presumably with a suggested alternate design for the parking area.

Mr. Miller lamented the zoning complications, complimenting an otherwise well-prepared plan, but noting the Commission's policy withholding approvals until zoning matters are resolved. He countered the classification as a nonconformance. Mr. Mina intended to consult the Zoning Administrator, suggesting the possibility of preliminary/final approval at the next presentation, likely in April. Mr. Miller called it possible, noting the cooperative experience of working with the Community Foundation and its design team, so far.

Mr. Reppert moved to table the preliminary plan, pending resolution of the zoning issues identified. Mr. Lauter seconded. And the Commission voted unanimously to table the Berks County Community Foundation's preliminary subdivision/land development plan.

Review the **preliminary** land development plan for **Barley Square**, demolition of the former Garden State Tanning plant for a proposed redevelopment of 60 apartments and first-floor retail spaces on those parcels known as 125 South Second and 221 Chestnut Street, and a microbrewery on that parcel known as 122 South Third Street.

[1:41.31]

Mr. Hartman explained the orientation of the proposed improvements, a residential/retail tower on the west, and a manufacturing facility to its east. He proposed widening Grape Street from its 14-foot cartway width, to 24 feet, and allowing two-way traffic on Chestnut Street. He acknowledged the City and County review memoranda, and mentioned the sewer planning process, believing Garden State Tanning's former usage to sufficiently cover the redevelopment volumes.

Mr. Hicks explained the current three-parcel configuration, proposing a redivision to two. He said the added Grape Street width would only encroach on his own property, and include sidewalk installation for both sides. He described one floor of retail spaces, with five stories of one- and two-bedroom apartments above it. He said the western side of the tract would be filled in order to level the site and raise it from the regulated flood elevation. With elevation renderings, he noted the wide sidewalk and plaza area planned on the South Second Street frontage, and entrances to the retail spaces from that frontage and the parking lot side (ADA accessible), alike. He estimated almost 10,000 square feet of retail space, with the balance of the first-floor footprint reserved for the elevator lobby and a small fitness facility. He counted 12 residential units per floor; 4 one-bedroom and 8 two-bedroom in three different configurations: 1-bedroom units at 773 square feet, 2-bedroom/2-bathroom units at 1142 square feet, and 2-bedroom/1-bathroom units at 1037 square feet. Turning to the South Third Street development, he estimated a 20,000 square-foot, single-story manufacturing facility. He said the prospective tenant is still raising the necessary capital, and hasn't yet committed. He displayed sample materials chosen for the residential/retail tower façade; two different colors of brick, with flat metal paneling and window trim.

Mr. Bealer complimented the visual interest suggested by the renderings, and its relation to the surrounding neighborhood architecture. Mr. Raffaelli asked about any supplemental storage planned for the tenants. Mr. Hicks offered only the large floor plans, and their closets. Mr. Bealer questioned the traffic patterns and the intersection of South Second and Franklin Streets. Mr. Hicks referred to the Reading Area Community College's Master Plan preference to eventually close Franklin Street, west of South Second, to simplify the turning movements at that intersection. He noted that Chestnut Street's 34-foot width is plenty for two-way traffic, adding that Remcon Plastics (208 Chestnut Street) had already requested the same.

Asked about their intentions for the South Third Street space pending a lease agreement, Mr. Hicks said they'll continue their marketing effort, intending to stabilize the post-demolition site enough to remove the construction fencing. He said they couldn't allow something unsightly to impact their residential marketing.

Mr. Rothermel suggested backing off the South Second Street frontage, and placing some off-street parking between the structure and the Street, thinking the six stories an imposing height if placed too close to the Street. Mr. Hicks said they were attempting to create a more urban-oriented "street wall", with pedestrian interaction. Mr. Rothermel countered that the surrounding uses are more "manufacturing" in nature. Mr. Hicks agreed with that current assessment, but predicted the area to be beginning a more residential and mixed-use transformation, overall, spurred by entertainment and riverfront renewal efforts.

Mr. Reppert asked about their consideration of stocking and delivery needs in retail layouts with public entrances at both ends. Mr. Hicks mentioned another similar redevelopment project in Downingtown. He called the entrances from the parking lot side "secondary", and available for deliveries.

Mr. Miller said the County Planning review criticizes the apparent floodplain construction. He hoped to resubmit plans with clarification of the grading proposed. He encouraged a preliminary approval.

Mr. Bealer moved to approve the preliminary plan. Mr. Miller suggested considering the preliminary approval for the whole, and allowing final approvals in parts, depending on the outcome of Tripoint's marketing efforts for the manufacturing element. He noted provisions in the Planning Code for such staged approvals. Mr. Reppert seconded the motion. And the Commission voted unanimously to approve the preliminary plan for Barley Square.

Resolution #12-2008

Mr. Miller asked if Tripoint could explain their redevelopment designs on 525 Lancaster Avenue. Mr. Hicks described the former home of Oakbrook Hosiery Mills, Inc., later Gilbert Associates, Inc. (1958 – 1971?), and at-last occupied by Sovereign Bank. He said they've been marketing the building for office uses, and have a couple of prospective tenants. He said they'll raze the concrete parking annex, gut and rebuild the interior of the mill building, including new window glass and modernizations for corporate tenants. He estimated the existing floor area at about 150,000 square feet, expecting about 110,000 square feet remaining after their work.

Review the **sketch** subdivision/land development plan for the **Shuman Development Group – Buildings #8 and #9**, new commercial buildings proposed for those parcels known as 623 North Eighth and 810 Oley Streets.

[2:14.42]

Mr. Krall introduced Alan Shuman as the developer, briefly described the site's orientation within the former Reading Outlet Center. He explained the *two* buildings proposed as several contiguous commercial spaces joined in party walls. He said no tenants have been committed, but alluded to several prospects. He said the site is presently a paved parking area, to be demolished, regraded, and reconfigured for circulation. He believed the

existing driveway to be the vacated Cedar Street. He felt the off-street parking to remain would be sufficient for the 'post-outlet' commercial uses considered. He stated the plan would result in reduced impervious coverage and increased green space. He then turned to the zoning complications, and the need for a comprehensive strategy to address them.

Mr. Miller mentioned the applicant's frustration at the need for tenant-by-tenant variances for the Zoning Ordinance's off-street parking standards. He questioned the relevance of the current Residential-Outlet zoning classification. Mr. Shuman said there is currently no problem finding parking in the area, but that they were approaching the capacity in relation to the 'one space per 150 square feet' off-street parking standard. He said that standard, together with the size of the buildings, calculates a need between 500-600 spaces, for just those buildings in the 800-block of Oley Street, and not including the Big Mill building at 8th and Oley Streets or Building #1 at 9th and Douglass Streets. Asked about the overall plan, Mr. Shuman estimated 120,000 square feet available in the 1- and 2-story buildings for "neighborhood retail" spaces, adding that those on the north side of Oley were already over 50% occupied, with further tenancy restricted by the off-street parking standard. He speculated on 60 "luxury apartments" for the Big Mill, with retail on first, and parking assigned to that lot between Oley and Douglass Streets (behind Building #5). He noted the large courtyard amid Building #1 as available for off-street parking needs there. He said he couldn't imagine the destination-outlet shopping returning to the area, and focused instead on the neighborhood-oriented attractions. He hoped to avoid the zoning appellate process with each and every lease.

Mr. Miller sought efficiency for the long run. Mr. Rothermel recalled the curative amendment process having been used in prior instances where the prevailing zoning was deemed incorrect, or the neighborhood character had changed in spite of it. He gave Glenside as an example. He said the Residential-Outlet zoning was established about 15-20 years ago, at the behest of outlet developers who lobbied for it. Mr. Miller confirmed that cures remain as available tools, where zoning defects are alleged, but doubted there were any timing benefits. He felt that since everyone seemed to agree change was in order, the normal amendment process was preferable. Mr. Rothermel recalled the curative amendment process being much faster, without the public hearings required of a zoning change. Mr. Miller noted that a zoning map change, itself, wouldn't address the parking standards. He said the amendment process need not necessarily take any longer than the variance process. He suggested the Commercial-Neighborhood designation as more accommodating of Shuman's potential tenants, and the possibility of calculating the parking needs based on the outlet complex, as a whole. Mr. Shuman agreed that the Commercial-Residential, like the Commercial-Neighborhood district, scheduled favorable uses, but cautioned against the total parking exemption associated with the Commercial-Residential. Mr. Miller suggested recommending a zoning change and an application for parking variance considering the 'bigger picture'. He repeated his resistance to the zoning cure process, unless alleging a defect, noting a statutory limitation on the frequency of its use by a municipality. He felt the remaining challenge to be accounting for the potential tenant fill-out, cataloging the available off-street parking and determining the overall need. Mr. Krall wanted the Commission's position for future meetings with City staff. Mr. Rothermel felt it the applicant's, or staff's responsibility to make a clear recommendation for the Commission's consideration, noting that the district includes a lot of residential properties, not necessarily appropriate for rezoning. Mr. Miller intended to consider it further, and return in March with firm recommendations and resolution language.

Review the **final** subdivision plan for the **Davis Annexation Subdivision**, an annexation from that parcel known as 427 McArthur Avenue to that parcel known as 417 McArthur Avenue. [2:50.04]

Mr. Hoffert said the plan's purpose is limited to annexation, and will bring a dimensional nonconformance closer to conformity, by adding to the lot's width for 48½ of a required 50 feet. He said they would have annexed the additional half-foot, but for the need to maintain the side yard required on the residual lot. He said a "deed line" on that residual property will also be eliminated. Mr. Miller confirmed that the Planning Office review had been satisfied.

Mr. Rothermel moved to approve the final plan, as presented. Mr. Bealer seconded. And the Commission voted unanimously to approve the Davis Annexation Subdivision final plan.

Resolution #13-2008

Review the **final** land development plan for the **McDonald's Restaurant No. 37-0036**, a demolition and reconstruction of the restaurant located on those parcels known as 400-416 Lancaster Avenue. [2:53.00]

Mr. Krull recalled the plan's approval being postponed pending clarification of some zoning issues. He said they've since received a letter from the Zoning Administrator, and distributed copies to the Commission members. He said McDonald's has no issue with the letter's content, which recognizes the maintenance or

improvement of the existing nonconformities. Asked if there were any problems in meeting the remaining Subdivision/Land Development Ordinance issues, Mr. Krull answered none, intending to resubmit plans with those remaining items addressed. Asked about the Planning Office's position, Mr. Miller parried. Mr. Bealer noted the letter didn't directly address the setback from Carroll Street, the main issue needing clarification. Mr. Buck, referring to a meeting with the Zoning Administrator, felt she relied on the proposed improvements of those issues identified. Mr. Bealer agreed that to be the tone of the letter, but defended the Commission's effort to resolve those issues clearly, for everyone's benefit. Asked if the Zoning Administrator had issued a permit, Mr. Krull said not. Mr. Rothermel wondered why, if the proposal wasn't being referred to the Zoning Hearing Board. Mr. Buck assumed it wasn't specifically requested. Mr. Rothermel, recognizing the binary nature of zoning administration, considered the matter unresolved without a permit, and resisted the implication that the Commission should be interpreting zoning matters. Asked for the legal opinion, Ms. Mayfield noted the Zoning Administrator's responsibility to enforce violations, suggesting another request to the Zoning Administrator as the only alternative. Mr. Lauter took to Zoning Administrator's letter to suggest that the existing conditions were being allowed, without variance. Mr. Miller reminded that the Commission was advised to consider the plan as new. He advised taking action, in fairness to the applicant. Mr. Rothermel wondered if it was advisable to do so, on the condition of a zoning permit. Mr. Buck understood it to be McDonald's risk. Mr. Bealer recognized the applicant's "good faith" effort, and asked about other required permits outstanding. Mr. Miller hoped for their issuance in-time for the record plan set to reflect them. Ms. Mayfield reminded a municipal improvements agreement was still required.

Mr. Bealer moved to approve the final plan, conditioned on the provision of an executed municipal improvements agreement, and all required permits from regulating agencies, taking the Zoning Administrator's letter to cover the zoning issues identified in the Planning Office review, but believing the plan to be inconsistent with the Zoning Ordinance, and more appropriately referred to the Zoning Hearing Board for possible relief. Mr. Lauter seconded. And the Commission voted unanimously to approve the McDonald's Restaurant No. 37-0036 final land development plan, with conditions.

Resolution #14-2008

Review the **sketch** land development plan for the **Reading Four Senior Apartments**, 32 age-restricted apartments and accessory facilities proposed at that parcel in the 800 block of Court Street (Parcel G, Downtown East Urban Renewal Area). [3:24.58]

Mr. Cherniahivsky described the proposal as the fourth of four phases in the Market Square complex; 32 senior apartments on the third and fourth floors, and a "life center" on the first and second (essentially a health-maintenance organization day care program using state funding). He said the proposal meets the guidelines of the adopted parcel controls, but for the maximum building cover, approximately 7500 square feet over the 50% maximum for entire site. Mr. Miller interrupted that he read the maximum as 60%. Mr. Cherniahivsky suspected the proposed cover equaled about 65%, still exceeding the permitted maximum. Asked how to resolve the matter, Mr. Rothermel thought it the Commission's decision, with possible input from the Redevelopment Authority and City Council.

Turning toward the architecture, Mr. Cherniahivsky noted the 3rd and 4th floor connections from the new building to the Manor Apartments building to the south. He said the access and clearance issues have already been okayed by the fire officials. Asked about the off-street parking capacity, Mr. Cherniahivsky noted the provision under the building. He said one or two current spaces may be lost, but that they still exceeded the required count. He described the structure as a pre-cast concrete plank, with steel or wood framing for the apartment building above. He preferred wooden studs as the *safer* option. He noted a drop-off point designed on Court Street for the "life center", which he said will provide health services for non-residents, as well. Mr. Rothermel reminded him to consult with the City Engineer regarding the curb cut. Mr. Raffaelli criticized the acrylic cement finish applied on the Manor Apartments, and wearing off. Mr. Cherniahivsky recognized the problem. Asked if the new apartments were classified as "assisted living", Mr. Cherniahivsky called them "market-rate... elderly, independent-living with supportive services". Mr. Raffaelli suggested adding to the outdoor amenities and social areas, noting the limited spaces currently available on the porches. Discussion turned to the courtyard at the rear of the Manor Apartments, which Mr. Cherniahivsky assumed would be available to the new residents.

Mr. Rothermel suggested a possible action on the parcel controls. He felt that, by taking action, the Commission could formalize its position, for the Redevelopment Authority's and City Council's consideration, if the same is deemed necessary. Mr. Miller requested firm calculations. Mr. Cherniahivsky put the total building coverage at 60,329 square feet, over the allowed 52,751 square feet, when based on the total site area of 105,502

square feet. Mr. Rothermel reckoned a percentage below 60. Mr. Cherniahivsky agreed. And the presentation concluded, assuming no need for amended parcel controls.

Review the **final** land development plan for the **Goggleworks Apartments**, fifty-nine (59) high-rise apartments proposed for those parcels known as 100 and 110 North Second Street and 101 Pear Street. [3:50.54]

Scott Miller noted the previous final approval (September 26, 2006) for this five-story apartment building, with off-street parking beneath. He alluded to minor changes, and the Planning Office's request for an updated presentation. He said the locations of some underground utilities were changed, with the consent of the Department of Public Works. He said the rounded windows planned, have since been designed as squared corners. Andrew Miller added that the associated building curvature had also been eliminated, along with the detail atop the elevator tower, the windows' sun shades, and some of the masonry elements. Scott Miller affirmed, citing budget constraints. He apologized for the lack of architectural elevations, noting the architect was unable to attend.

Mr. Rothermel asked about the required permits from the Department of Transportation. Scott Miller said they've been approved, and as well the Conservation District and Department of Environmental Protection permits. He asked that the prior approval be reaffirmed. Asked if the current budget and resulting design changes had any bearing on the previously-mentioned inclusion of rent-subsidized units, Scott Miller could not answer.

Ms. Mayfield restated the requirement for a municipal improvements agreement. Andrew Miller asked if the developer intended to seek waiver of the improvements agreement from City Council. Scott Miller said they would prepare an estimate, and make that decision based on it. Andrew Miller recalled the last such experience, the R/C Theatres land development, and the demise of the adjacent pedestrian corridor.

Mr. Rothermel moved to reaffirm the final approval of September 26, 2006, Resolution #39-2006, subject to the provision of a municipal improvements agreement. Mr. Bealer seconded. And the Commission voted unanimously to reaffirm approval of the Goggleworks Apartments final plan.

Resolution #15-2008

Review the **sketch** land development plan for the **Department of Fire and Rescue Services – Southwest Station**, a new fire house proposed at that parcel known as 101 Lancaster Avenue. [4:05.07]

Scott Miller described the new fire station proposed at the intersections of Lancaster Avenue, East Wyomissing Boulevard and Morgantown Road. He reported the former building already removed, and proposed alterations to East Wyomissing Boulevard allowed by City Council's vacating the section. He said it will change to a "one-way in" toward Brookline Street. He said the garage bays will front Lancaster Avenue, the returning apparatus to back in. He assured that the Fire Chief had already tested the necessary turning movements, and that they will not encroach on the Lancaster Avenue cartway. He said four fire fighters will staff the Station on a 24-hour basis. He said they've already engaged the Department of Transportation regarding signalization changes to the lights at the Lancaster Avenue/Morgantown Road intersection, and at the ramps to the West Shore By-pass. Andrew Miller asked about the amphibious vehicle currently stored at the Liberty Fire Station. Mr. Raffaelli indicated that it would not be transferred to the Southwest Station.

Scott Miller said they'd be applying for the conditional use and the necessary variances, with City Council and the Zoning Hearing Board respectively. Mr. Raffaelli suggested the long bay design should be provided a rear entrance, disputing the ability to maneuver ladders without impeding the Lancaster Avenue cartway. Ms. Mayfield said the storage of longer pieces therein would only be for temporary needs. Scott Miller intended to provide a turning movement plan with his next submission, and have the Fire Chief in attendance at the next presentation, probably the April meeting.

Other business:

minutes-January 08, 2008 Planning Commission meeting [4:14.24]

Mr. Lauter moved to approve the January 8th minutes, as presented. Mr. Rothermel seconded. And the Commission voted unanimously to approve the January 08, 2008 meeting minutes.

Resolution #16-2008

minutes-January 28, 2008 Planning Commission meeting [4:15.30]

Mr. Raffaelli moved to approve the January 28th minutes, as presented. Mr. Rothermel seconded. And the Commission voted unanimously to approve the January 28, 2008 meeting minutes.

Resolution #17-2008

annual report-draft 2007 Planning Commission Annual Report [4:16.34]

Mr. Miller reminded the Commission of his need to submit the report to City Council by March 1st. He felt the only corrections needed were updates to the members' profiles. Mr. Rothermel moved to accept the draft report. Mr. Lauter seconded. And the Commission voted unanimously to approve the draft 2007 Planning Commission Annual Report.

Resolution #18-2008

§513.a approval reaffirmation-Quaker Maid Meats - Plant No. 3 - revision to record plan [4:17.32]

(... reaffirming the Commission's approval of December 11, 2007, Resolution #76-2007, following the Berks County planning Commission's review dated January 18, 2008.) Mr. Rothermel moved to reaffirm the Commission's approval of the revision plan. Mr. Lauter seconded. And the Commission voted unanimously to reaffirm approval of the Quaker Maid Meats - Plant No. 3 plan.

Resolution #19-2008

Ms. Mayfield asked for the Commission's decision on the three remaining agenda items, concerned with the possible expiration of the statutory time limits. Mr. Miller assured the Commission has until the March meeting, and that the applicant has additional items to provide, anyway. Mr. O'Neill asked about the next presentation opportunity for the "Slovak Catholic Sokol – Addition and Alterations" plan, informing him that his client ordered him to attend this meeting, in case. Mr. Raffaelli offered the March 11th meeting.

Mr. Lauter moved to carry the remainder of the February 12th agenda to the March 11th meeting. Mr. Rothermel seconded. And the Commission voted unanimously to reschedule the three Habitat for Humanity plan presentations.

Resolution #20-2008

Mr. Reppert moved to adjourn the February meeting. Mr. Lauter seconded. And the Commission voted unanimously to adjourn the February 20th meeting. – 11:31 pm.