

**Regular meeting of the City of Reading Planning Commission  
November 10, 2005 at 7:30 pm**

**Members present:**

Ermete Raffaelli, Chairman  
Michael Lauter, Secretary  
Wayne Jonas Bealer, Assistant Secretary  
Edmund Palka  
Frederic dep Rothermel

**Staff present:**

Andrew Miller, City Planner  
Michelle Mayfield, Legal Specialist  
Adam Mukerji, Director, Community Development  
William H. Rehr III, Fire Chief  
Charlie Jones, City Engineer

**Others present:**

Jeffrey S. Waltman Sr., City Council  
Donna Reed, City Council  
Stratton P. Marmarou, City Council-Elect  
David H. Feick, Entech Engineering  
David M. Settle, Entech Engineering  
Paul Gazzerro Jr., Albright College  
D. Scott Adams, Albright College  
James J. Brady Jr., Spotts Stevens & McCoy  
M. Brad King, Trammell Crow Company  
Jeffrey E. Holcomb, Trammell Crow Company  
Tom Amoroso, Wells Appel Land Strategies  
C. Donald Jacobs, Traffic Planning and Design, Inc.  
John W. Roland, Roland & Schlegel PC  
Richard J. Mable, Reading Hospital and Medical Center  
Sylvia B. Deye, Dimensional Architecture  
Beth M. Auman, McCarthy Engineering Associates PC  
John K. Wetzel, McCarthy Engineering Associates PC  
Stacey L. Campbell  
Ronald R. Hatt  
Patricia A. Hatt  
Isabel A. Fick  
William Seidel  
Pamela J. Bush  
Shirley J. Batdorf  
Dwight D. Wegman  
Don Spatz, Reading Eagle

**Minutes:**

Chairman Raffaelli called the November meeting to order, recognized a lengthy agenda, and said the Commission may elect to continue the meeting to another night if the presentations run long. He stated that brevity was not always possible, or in the best interests of the community, where land development is concerned. He introduced Ms. Mayfield, who reported the executive session held November 3<sup>rd</sup> to discuss the litigation between the Commission and Big Spring Inc. She asked for a revision to the agenda to review the proposed settlement.

Mr. Miller asked the Commission to consider allowing the Community Development Director time to present the Action Plan for 2006. Mr. Palka motioned to approve the agenda, as amended. Mr. Lauter seconded. And the Commission voted unanimously to approve the agenda.

**Review the FFY2006 Action Plan for the 32<sup>nd</sup> CD year**, a plan for the allocation of Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) funds.

Copies of the Action Plan were sent to the members prior to the meeting. The Plan details the City's intentions for the HUD entitlements. Mr. Mukerji referred to the \$600,000 set aside for a family businesses loan

program. The program would make available fixed-rate financing and working capital for small businesses looking to move into the City or expand. He said area banks had already expressed an interest in participating. He described most of the other line-items as “routine”, paralleling previous years.

Mr. Bealer asked what part of the entitlements was used to repay loans for previous projects, specifically the Wyndam Hotel. Mr. Mukerji answered, about \$281,000, noting that attempts were being made to renegotiate the interest rate. Mr. Bealer asked if any money was allocated for sidewalk or storm sewer improvements. Mr. Mukerji indicated that those items were now part of the Capital Improvement Plan. Mr. Jones added that some limited storm sewer and handicap ramp installations were included in the CIP.

Mr. Lauter asked if the Neighborhood Design Initiative was still a recognized program, mentioning the previous strategy to rotate the program through different neighborhoods on a three-year basis. Mr. Mukerji said no, adding that money was instead reserved for a Neighborhood Organizer, as part of the Reading Beautification Program. Mr. Lauter asked about the rehabilitation specialist salaries included under Reading Revitalization Program. Mr. Mukerji said the program has always allowed “ten percent for administration”.

Mr. Bealer asked about the allocation for Section 108 payments. Mr. Mukerji said the regulations require Section 108 loan payments to be itemized and shown separately. They are payments made by the borrowers to the City and then forwarded to HUD. He said payments on the Abe Lincoln (Wyndam Hotel) are delinquent.

Mr. Lauter motioned to issue a resolution expressing the Commission’s agreement that the Action Plan conforms to the City’s Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Palka seconded. And the Commission approved the resolution, unanimously.

**Resolution #39-2005**

**Review the final subdivision plan for the Brentwood Industries - Annexation of Land**, a minor subdivision between the Brentwood property at 110 Orrton Avenue and the Bilger property at 700 Arlington Street.

Mr. Miller indicated that there would be no presentation, reminding the Commission of Stephen Bensinger’s presentation at the October meeting. The plan was tabled, pending receipt of the County Planning review. It has since been received, with favorable comments. The plan proposes a subdivision/annexation only.

Mr. Bealer motioned to approve the plan, as final. Mr. Rothermel seconded. And the Commission voted unanimously to approve.

**Resolution #40-2005**

**Review the preliminary land development plan for Big Spring Inc.**, a water bottling plant proposed for those parcels known as 600-760 Clinton Street, the Riverfront Commerce Center.

Ms. Mayfield reviewed the proposed legal settlement. She described it as a lengthy, but fair compromise between parties. She said several attorneys were involved in the process, and recommended that the Commission approve it.

Ms. Mayfield mentioned some of the particulars of the agreement, including the City’s right of first refusal on the remaining parcels of the Commerce Center, the 1031 exchange provision, the repairs to the river trail footbridge, the construction of a concrete stormwater swale, the privatization and gating of Opportunity Boulevard, the City’s right of access, the waiver of the sidewalk requirement, the relocation of the electric substation, the sewage capacity reserved for the remaining parcels, the designated truck route and penalties for violations, the future traffic impact and mobility studies required, the conditions required of the final plan, and the mutual withdraw of litigation. She felt that it was a fair settlement, accomplishing the City’s goals. She asked for one resolution to authorize the Commission Chair to endorse the agreement, and another to grant final plan approval, subject to the written conditions of the agreement, and authorizing the Commission to endorse the final plan when those conditions have been met to the satisfaction of the City staff.

Mr. Lauter asked for clarification on the terms of the penalties for truck route violations, recalling differing numbers between the terms proposed at the executive session and those being described currently. Ms. Mayfield described the modifications made by the attorneys as a result of their subsequent negotiations. She said the authority to enforce the truck movement is reserved by the Police and Codes Departments. Anyone else witnessing a violation, and wishing to file a complaint, should document the license plate number and be willing to testify.

Mr. Raffaelli asked if any air quality monitoring at the adjacent elementary school was required under the agreement. Ms. Mayfield answered “no”. Mr. Raffaelli wondered how a severe drought circumstance would affect the water service to the bottling operation. Ms. Mayfield indicated that it would be an issue for the Water Authority.

Mr. Bealer asked if signs would be installed to direct the trucks along the designated route. Mr. Jones said signs would be placed at the intersection of West Green Street and Schuylkill Avenue. Mr. Bealer asked how the

privatization of Opportunity Boulevard would affect the planned extension of River Road. Mr. Jones said such an extension would result in that section of Opportunity Boulevard, between the new intersection and Clinton Street, becoming public.

Mr. Raffaelli asked if any consideration was given to moving the bus stop, currently at the northwest corner of West Green Street and Schuylkill Avenue. He felt the current location could present a sight line problem for the traffic at the intersection. Mr. Jones answered no, adding that the intersection will be signalized.

Mr. Bealer asked if anything could be done to protect homeowners from damage to house foundations caused by the trucks. Ms. Mayfield said not. Mr. Rothermel asked if there was anything in the agreement to direct the construction vehicles. Ms. Mayfield said no, indicating that there was not a lot of construction traffic anticipated. Mr. Rothermel asked if there were any plans to study the intersection of West Windsor Street and Schuylkill Avenue. Mr. Jones said that, at the time of the original Riverfront Commerce Center plan, Greater Berks Development Fund had set aside funds to study that situation. He mentioned the possibility of connecting West Windsor and Spring Streets (an existing paper street) at the western edge of the Windsor and Ritter Playground.

Mr. Raffaelli asked if the Commission was ready to entertain a motion. Ms. Mayfield reiterated the language required of the resolutions.

Councilman Waltman asked for an opportunity to address the Commission. He requested that the Commission refuse the agreement, fully recognizing that there may be legal consequences for doing so. He said that "shortcomings in the process" should not be a justification to allow an obvious danger in the residential neighborhood. He described it as a bad business decision to even consider directing such a large volume of trucks through the area. He promised to do everything he could to stop the project, regardless of the legal predicaments or cost. He thanked the Commission for its time.

Ms. Mayfield requested an executive session before the vote. The Commission agreed. And Ms. Mayfield asked that the public vacate the room.

---

Upon resuming the meeting, Ms. Mayfield asked for a motion to approve the agreement and authorize the Chair to execute it. Mr. Palka made the motion. Mr. Bealer seconded. And the Commission voted 4 to 1 to approve, Mr. Raffaelli casting the dissent.

**Resolution #41-2005**

Ms. Mayfield asked for a motion granting the conditional final approval, subject to the terms and conditions set forth in the agreement, and authorizing the members to endorse the plan when those conditions are met. Mr. Bealer made the motion. Mr. Rothermel seconded. And the Commission voted 4 to 1 to approve, Mr. Raffaelli casting the dissent.

**Resolution #42-2005**

**Review the sketch land development plan for the Albright College – New Science Center**, a new academic building proposed for the Albright campus at 1601 North Thirteenth Street.

Mr. Feick introduced himself as a principal with Entech, and in charge of projects for Albright College. He mentioned the firms of Lord Aeck Sargent, Inc., assisting with the architectural design, and Clark, Richardson & Biskup Consulting Engineers. He introduced Paul Gazzo and Scott Adams, representatives from Albright College, and David Settle, architect with Entech.

Mr. Settle described the location of the proposed building and its orientation to North Thirteenth and Union Streets. He explained the planned transition from the street level to the campus generally, and chapel specifically. He noted the drop-off proposed on North Thirteenth Street, the at-grade entrance to the facility, and the difference in elevations. He mentioned the courtyard at the rear and the auditorium to be installed beneath it. He said the primary motivation for the building was to enhance the existing science curriculum and provide the needed laboratory and classroom space. He described the façade, including the planned greenhouse structure at the northeast corner. He mentioned the improved handicap access to the chapel, and listed the zoning items varied by the Zoning Hearing Board.

Mr. Feick said the building would provide a welcoming presence to the campus and compliment the east-west axis of the campus geometry. He described the entrance to the four-story atrium space and the connection to the narthex of the chapel. He said he has already consulted the City Engineer, Fire Marshal and a building inspector.

There was some discussion about the jurisdiction over North Thirteenth Street (City or Penn DOT) and the permission needed for the proposed drop-off. Mr. Settle felt that events at the college would rarely conflict with the peak activity at the elementary school.

Mr. Rothermel complimented the efforts of the College in the design of the building and the accessibility initiative, but lamented the choice of placement so close to the street line in a zoning district that seeks to preserve greater setbacks. He also felt the height of the structure compounded the impact. Mr. Feick replied that College's projects deserve a different consideration than the residentially-designed regulations. Mr. Bealer agreed that the size of the building was inappropriate, and wondered why a new science building wouldn't be placed on the other side of the campus with the existing science building. Mr. Feick mentioned the proximity to other academic areas and indicated that there were other plans for the green space next to the existing science building. Mr. Bealer anticipated some maintenance challenges with the subterranean auditorium and wished other locations for the building would be considered. He admitted some nostalgic bias, having been married in the Albright Chapel. Mr. Lauter asked if the location between the chapel and the computer center was considered. Mr. Feick said it could have been placed anywhere, but repeated the consideration of the quadrangle geometry. Mr. Lauter regretted the loss of the dogwood trees and their spring bloom. Mr. Feick said a certified arborist has been retained to study the best way to preserve and/or replace trees.

Mr. Rothermel hoped the building could be repositioned to alleviate the impact of its size. He felt moving it somewhat north would accomplish this while still preserving the campus geometry and allowing a connection to the chapel. Mr. Palka cited the indoor sports complex as an example of higher construction in the area.

Mr. Rothermel asked about the parking provided and the details of the parking variance. Mr. Feick acknowledged the newly constructed lot at the Shirk Stadium, and arrangement with the elementary school for use of their facilities off-hours, and the future plans to use the site of the armory for parking. Ronald Hatt mentioned the current parking problems in the neighborhood. Mr. Feick said the project won't influence the day-time parking situation, as no additional students are being added as a result of this project. Mr. Gazzo mentioned a memorandum of understanding between the College and the City. He said when environmental studies are completed, the College will take title of the armory and demolish it for parking. He estimated the demolition could occur in six to eight months. Mr. Palka felt the elementary school had more to do with the parking and traffic problems. Stratton Marmarou stated that North Thirteenth Street is a state highway, and vehemently opposed the proposed drop-off. He said other promised parking lots were never constructed.

Mr. Feick said the suggestions and comments would be discussed with the project team. Mr. Rothermel repeated his request that the team consider moving the building and form an overall campus parking strategy. Since the plan was a sketch submission, no official action was taken.

Mr. Raffaelli restated the option to continue the meeting to another night, calling the agenda "too ambitious". A rearranging of the agenda was briefly considered.

**Review the preliminary land development plan for the Reading Hospital and Medical Center - School of Health Sciences**, a technical school and dormitory proposed for those parcels known as 1001 and 1025 Old Wyomissing Road.

Mr. Roland greeted the Commission and reminded them of the previous presentation when the Hospital was petitioning for a re-zoning. He introduced the other representatives of the design team and Mr. Mable.

Mr. Brady introduced himself as the project manager. He gave a brief description of the location and configuration of the approximately 5.4-acre parcel, the location of the existing driveways, the placement of the three-story, approximately 62,000 square foot building, and the proposed arbor structure entrance. He said the proposal meets all the parking requirements, including the handicap provision. He recognized Mr. Miller's review letter, stating that the issues raised would be addressed by the final plan submission.

Mr. Raffaelli asked why the Hospital chose to build anew, rather than renovate their existing academic facility at Sixth and Spruce Streets. Mr. Roland cited the building's age and lack of modern facilities. He mentioned the current arrangement at the Reading Motor Inn (Inn at Reading) for the housing of the nursing students.

Mr. Lauter suggested finishing the triangle at the junction of Museum and Old Wyomissing Roads. Ms. Mayfield stated that this involves an off-site improvement and cannot be required. Mr. Raffaelli said the installation of some curbing and fill would enhance the look of the School project with some additional greening and also serve as a traffic calming benefit. Mr. Mable said it would be explored, not wanting to make any promises. Mr. Rothermel said the first step would be a consent from Public Works.

Mr. Jacobs recognized that the proposed School was actually a relocation of an existing operation. He recognized the walkable nature of the campus and the need to maintain access for modes other than personal automobiles, namely pedestrians and the Hospital's shuttle service. He mentioned the pedestrian component to the

signalized intersection at Museum Road and Parkside Drive North. He described the existing traffic conditions, according to his manual counts performed at several area intersections. He says the study shows that at least one additional signal is warranted at the intersection of Museum Road and Parkside Drive South, and improvement they are proposing. They are also proposing a right turn lane, from Parkside Drive South to Museum Road, to accommodate traffic leaving the School for the Hospital's main campus. Mr. Raffaelli appreciated the scope of the study. He suggested that the right turning radius from Museum Road to Parkside Drive South also be considered. He also felt the pedestrian crossing at the Museum Road/Parkside Drive North intersection was inadequate, as the signal does not stop traffic from all the side streets.

Mr. Roland concluded, thanking the Commission for its time. Mr. Bealer asked that a reduction in parking be considered, if the terms of the zoning relief allow it. There was some discussion about the actual terms of the zoning variance.

Mr. Rothermel felt the overall layout was attractive, adding his concurrence for a reduction in parking. The Hospital representatives said the additional parking would be helpful for events. Mr. Mable said the lot would be controlled by an electronically-operated gate, similar to the system at their Spruce Street garage. Exceptions would be made for events and moving days for students living in the future dormitory. Students, including the dormitory residents, would not be permitted to use the lot for their personal vehicles. Stacey Campbell, a resident of the Albright area and referring to parking shortages there, stated, "we would welcome a sea of macadam in our neighborhood... welcome it with open arms". She saw no problem with additional parking.

Mr. Raffaelli asked if the Commission was ready to vote on the proposal. Ms. Mayfield, citing the legal timeline, suggested that the Commission delay action while the parking issues were resolved.

**Review the preliminary land development plan for the Glenside Elementary - School of Performing Arts, a magnet school proposed for the Reading School District property known as 1301 Schuylkill Avenue.**

Ms. Deye mentioned a previous presentation to the Commission and the Act 34 hearing, required by the Department of Education. She noted the Zoning Hearing Board's request that off-street traffic circulation be explored. She said the new design aims to remove all existing bus and parent drop-off activity from Lackawanna Street, adding that the new school will start classes a half-hour earlier than the existing elementary school. This is to have the effect of staggering the traffic, as well. She indicated the new driveway, the bus staging area, the parent drop-off area, and the staff parking lot, to be doubled in capacity.

Ms. Deye gave a brief review of the materials, and their colors, proposed for the façade. She used samples to describe a brick-colored, split-face masonry, semi-panel and a vertically-corrugated metal siding, each with accents meant to compliment the limestone and pre-cast of the existing school building. She also described the roofline and its pitch in terms of its relation to the existing school.

Mr. Wetzel explained the placement of the building and the surrounding topography. Ms. Auman explained the driveway and the width needed to accommodate the turning radius of school buses entering the campus. Some members of the Commission expressed skepticism that the parents would use the new driveway, as opposed to stopping on Lackawanna Street. Ms. Deye indicated that the Superintendent previously mentioned having personnel enforce the intended circulation pattern. Mr. Bealer recalled the Superintendent's idea to deputize his staff, allowing them to cite violators. He described that deputizing process as "long", wondering if it could even be done.

Mr. Raffaelli asked about the "life cycle" of the building. Ms. Deye replied that the siding materials had a life-long warranty, with a 30-year warranty on the metal roof. She said the floors were all steel and concrete.

Councilwoman Reed, representing her district, spoke in opposition to the proposed location of the magnet school. She recognized the available area that makes the Glenside site attractive, but feared for the increased congestion on streets with no substantial modifications planned. She mentioned the increased volumes expected from the Big Spring bottling operation and the Saint Joseph's Medical Center. She doubted the ability of the police and/or faculty to effectively enforce the proposed circulation policies. She urged the Commission to reject the plan. Dwight Wegman agreed with Ms. Reed's comments, doubted the merit of the traffic study, and recalled routine traffic violations. He requested that the Commission reject the plan. Chief Rehr described the difficulty of making turns from Lackawanna Street to Schuylkill Avenue, and visa versa. He said emergency vehicles have trouble negotiating the streets. He encouraged the Commission to turn the plan down. Ms. Reed described a history of fatal accidents at the intersection.

Mr. Raffaelli asked about a former intention to have the traffic enter the campus from Schuylkill Avenue and exit onto Lackawanna Street. Mr. Bealer said the stacking lane required would not meet PennDOT's requirements. Mr. Jones agreed. Mr. Bealer inquired about money that had been earmarked "years ago" for

upgrades to the PA 12/PA 183 interchange. Mr. Jones described the efforts associated with acquiring the necessary land, as cost prohibitive.

Several other residents voiced their disapproval, all on the grounds of traffic congestion and lack of enforcement. Pamela Bush claimed that the neighborhood residents have been intimidated by parents dropping off their children. Ms. Reed said there is no money in the City budget to increase the police presence. Mr. Raffaelli said there are 19 buildings in the District dismissing students during police shift changes.

Mr. Miller mentioned that he hadn't yet received the County Planning review.

Mr. Palka motioned to table the plan. Mr. Bealer seconded. And the Commission voted unanimously to table the plan.

**Continue - Review the preliminary land development plan for the Reading Hospital and Medical Center - School of Health Sciences**, a technical school and dormitory proposed for those parcels known as 1001 and 1025 Old Wyomissing Road.

Following a meeting with the Hospital's attorney in the hallway, Ms. Mayfield returned and suggested that the Commission consider a conditional preliminary approval based on conditions they negotiated. Mr. Raffaelli reminded that the Commission was previously advised that they are not obligated to make a decision at this time. Mr. Miller said he was still waiting on the County Planning review. Ms. Mayfield outlined the following conditions; that the planning staff comments be addressed, that the City Engineer's comments be addressed, exhibiting the traffic improvements and drainage revisions previously discussed, clarification of the parking variance, obtaining all necessary permits, submitting a "minor municipalities improvements agreement", the accompanying escrow and bond, and receipt of the County Planning review. She said the installation of the triangle was an off-site improvement, but would consider it and discuss it with Public Works. Mr. Jones asked about the study for, and installation of the traffic signal. Ms. Mayfield indicated that the issue was included in the conditions. Mr. Roland agreed with the conditions, as read. Mr. Miller pointed out that the Commission was being asked for another conditional approval, based on verbal promises.

Mr. Rothermel made a motion to approve the preliminary plan. Mr. Palka seconded. Mr. Bealer asked for some clarification on the Engineer's comments. The Commission voted unanimously to approve the preliminary plan.

#### Resolution #43-2005

**Review the preliminary land development plan for the Thomas Ford Elementary - School of Science**, a magnet school proposed for the Reading School District property known as 1020 Old Wyomissing Road.

Ms. Deye mentioned a previously-granted sketch approval. She described how the proposed building has since been rotated, to accommodate an improved driveway design. She pointed to the expanded off-street staff parking, and the on-street bus staging and parent drop-off areas. She said the materials were identical to those proposed for the Glenside project, and the color scheme reflective of the existing Thomas Ford school.

Mr. Raffaelli asked about the elevation of the cut at the building's southeast corner. Mr. Wetzel said there would be a 3½ drop at the retaining wall, and another 4½ feet of slope to the building corner. Mr. Raffaelli said the proposal was not "site friendly". Ms. Deye admitted that the fit was tight, but felt the impact wasn't visual. She called the boundary between the school property and the Wyomissing Garden Apartments as "heavily wooded". Mr. Raffaelli disagreed with her assessment.

Mr. Raffaelli asked for clarification on the stormwater drainage issues raised in the Engineer's review. Ms. Deye assured that trenches and inlets would effectively convey the runoff to the storm sewers. She said other outstanding issues would be resolved.

Mr. Miller said the Zoning Hearing Board had yet to issue its decision regarding the special exception use, and the County Planners had yet to issue their review. Mr. Rothermel suggested tabling the plan. Ms. Deye wondered if a "preliminary/final" approval would be possible at the next meeting, indicating a time constraint. Mr. Rothermel mentioned the possibility of a special meeting, if necessary.

Mr. Rothermel motioned to table the plan. Mr. Lauter seconded. And the Commission agreed 4 to 0 to table the preliminary plan, Mr. Palka having left the meeting by this time.

#### **Other business**

**Proposed Zoning Ordinance amendment redefining the terms "family" and "roommate household", and the conditions regulating approvals of "roommate housing arrangements"**, submitted by Dr. Pressley, Zoning

Administrator.

Mr. Bealer expressed some confusion over the subsection numbering for the proposed amendment (the result of proposing a subsection for a dated version of the Zoning Ordinance). He indicated a few additional typographical areas. He reminded the Commission of the possible conflict with a Supreme Court ruling on a related issue. He also wondered about practicality of the 800-foot buffer distance.

Stacey Campbell expressed a frustration with the deterioration of the Albright neighborhood and the possibility of neighbors leaving the neighborhood. She said the students don't respect the residential area. Stratton Marmarou described their apartments as overcrowded "pig pens". He recalled his own confrontations with the students, and calls to the police. Mr. Bealer said the apartments that Albright College had built to the north of the campus had not relieved the pressure on the neighborhood, as intended. There was confusion about the effect of the proposed ordinance on existing leases and existing apartments.

Mr. Rothermel said he supports the ordinance, as long as it is legal and enforced. He made it a motion for a recommendation to City Council. Mr. Lauter seconded the motion. Mr. Seidel expressed skepticism that the ordinance could or would be enforced. He said his student neighbors also have dogs that bite. The Commission agreed to the recommendation, 4 to 0.

### Minutes

Mr. Raffaelli asked if there were any questions on the October Planning Commission minutes. Mr. Bealer noted a typographical error. Mr. Rothermel motioned to approve the October minutes, with the noted correction. Mr. Lauter seconded. The Commission approved the October minutes, 4 to 0. Mr. Raffaelli complimented the preparation of the minutes, pleading that the record of the November meeting be "compressed".

Mr. Raffaelli said that the agendas need to be shortened. Mr. Miller said that regular additional meetings would have to be considered, as plans cannot be tabled indefinitely and allowed to back up. Ms. Mayfield suggested that two monthly meeting be considered. She said she would check the Ordinance for any legal conflict. Mr. Miller mentioned the difficulty in arranging meetings with seven members and advertising on short notice, suggesting that such arrangements be agreed to during the course of a regular session. Mr. Bealer felt that another permanent night should be agreed to, in case. Mr. Miller requested that the Law Department look into the matter of holding public meetings on City holidays, adding that most of the meeting cancellations were due to these conflicts. He said that rescheduling meeting at a time agreeable to everyone is rarely possible. The Berks Community Television schedule is also inconvenienced by cancelled and rescheduled meetings.

Mr. Lauter asked about the previously requested workshop with Mullin & Lonergan Associates Inc. Mr. Miller said pending legislation in the General Assembly, designed to change the rules of urban redevelopment, have put the proposed redevelopment plans on hold.

Mr. Lauter asked what was expected of the Commission regarding the Neversink Mountain proposal. Mr. Miller described the re-zoning petition, and likened the Commission's role to the recent petitions from the Reading Hospital, Reading School District, and Jewish Federation. He mentioned Council's re-zoning hearing scheduled for December 5<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Rothermel expressed disapproval for continuing the City grid up the side of a mountain, adding that he would be more favorable to a more appropriate design. Mr. Miller described the three-way negotiations between the developer, the City and the Berks County Conservancy. Mr. Bealer mentioned the steep slope restrictions in the Borough of Spring City's land development ordinance. Mr. Miller stated the need for steep slope regulations in the City, referring to the current street construction standards as a "de facto steep slope ordinance". Don Spatz recalled, from one of the neighborhood meetings, that the developer is paying for all new streets and improvements. Mr. Miller agreed, adding that the maintenance responsibility comes back to the City.

With no further business, the Commission voted unanimously to adjourn the October meeting. Motions were not recorded. – 11:45 pm. (?)

AWM / awm

H:\CDPlan\COMMDEV\Planning Office Files\RPC\Minutes\2005\November 10, 2005 RPC Minutes.doc