



CITY COUNCIL

Committee of the Whole

Monday, February 9, 2015

5:00 pm

Agenda

Although Council committee meetings are open to the public, public comment is not permitted at Council Committee of the Whole meetings. However, citizens are encouraged to attend and observe the meetings. Comment from citizens or professionals during the meeting may be solicited on agenda topics via invitation by the President of Council.

All electronic recording devices must be located behind the podium area in Council Chambers and located at the entry door in all other meeting rooms and offices, as per Bill No.27-2012.

- I. Statewide Preservation Plan – A. Johnson**
- II. Refinance RAWA 2007 Bond (not guaranteed by City) – D. Rauch**
- III. Executive Session re EHD – liability insurance update**
- IV. Agenda Review**
- V. Other Matters**



COMMITTEE of the WHOLE

CITY COUNCIL

MINUTES

January 26, 2015

6:30 P.M.

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

D. Sterner, S. Marmarou, C. Daubert, M. Goodman-Hinnershitz, F. Acosta, D. Reed, J. Waltman

OTHERS PRESENT:

L. Kelleher, C. Snyder, C. Younger, D. Cituk, R. Johnson, A. Morriss

The Committee of the Whole meeting was called to order at approximately 6:30 pm by Mr. Acosta.

I. Towing Update

Mr. Acosta stated that the confidential meeting report from the meeting with the Parking Authority representatives was distributed last Thursday. Any questions should be directed to Mr. Acosta, Ms. Reed or Mr. Waltman.

II. Agenda Review

Mr. Acosta questioned the delay in the receipt of the agenda memo for Phase 2 of the 6th and Canal Project. He stated that information on agenda materials need to be provided to Council in a timely fashion so they have ample time to review and understand the information.

Mr. Johnson explained that the delay was caused by the negotiations with the two lowest bidders to obtain the best pricing while still meeting the project specifications. He explained that Hill and Associates and the City's legal counsel assisted with the negotiation process. He apologized for the delay. He stated that Rummel, Klepper & Kahl LLC has great experience with consent decree projects in Maryland and in Pennsylvania.

Ms. Snyder stated that Duane Morris has not yet submitted their estimate for the legal work associated with the recycling; therefore the resolution listed on the Consent Agenda is withdrawn.

Ms. Reed and Mr. Acosta questioned the resolution regarding the PA Statewide Historic Preservation Plan and its impact on Reading historic districts. They requested a presentation from HARB at the next COW.

There were no questions on the Ordinances for Final Passage or the two ordinances being introduced.

Mr. Acosta stated that there are four resolutions on the Conditional Use hearings held over the past two weeks.

Mr. Marmarou questioned the conditions on the approval of the Conditional Use application to allow two additional units at 231 South 4th Street. Ms. Kelleher read the conditions listed in the decision as follows:

- a. The Applicant shall schedule an inspection by the Building and Trades inspectors who shall perform an inspection to ascertain that the property meets all applicable Building, Trades and Fire Code requirements required by the City's Building and Trades Division and the Fire Department.
- b. The Applicant shall pay the difference in housing permit fees for the years 2006 through 2010 for a total of \$580.
- c. The Applicant shall obtain an occupancy permit.
- d. The Applicant shall install a 4th electrical meter to provide separate electrical service for the common areas of the property.

Mr. Acosta stated that he intends to abstain from the vote on 922 A Franklin Street, as he has a personal relationship with the owner. He stated that the owner is also a client of his at Fulton Bank and that the owner came to the bank to talk to him about the application and the information conveyed by the owner's brother at the hearing.

Mr. Acosta stated that the owner claims that his brother did not convey the correct information at the hearing. He questioned if the resolution could be tabled or if the hearing could be done over.

Mr. Daubert inquired if the resolution was voted down if it would in fact be approved. Mr. Younger expressed the belief that if the resolution was voted down, it would technically be approved.

Mr. Younger stated that the owner's brother was under oath when he testified at the hearing and that Council could only consider the information received at the hearing. Information received after or before the hearing cannot be considered, as it is not part of the record.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 6:55 pm.

*Respectfully Submitted by
Linda A. Kelleher, CMC, City Clerk*