PHOENIXVILLE BOROUGH COUNCIL
Tuesday, June 9, 2026
7:00 PM

MINUTES
(Minutes approved by Borough Council on July 14, 2026)

I. Pledge of Allegiance/Moment of Silence

II. Roll Call – Borough Manager

Mr. Ewald, President	Present
Ms. Burckley, Vice President	Present
Mrs. Budnik	Present
Ms. Dugan	Present
Mrs. McGhee	Present
Mr. Moore	Present
Mrs. Vogel	Present
Mr. Weiss	Present
Mayor Urscheler	Present
Mr. Krack, Borough Manager	Present
Ms. Getzfread, Asst. Borough Manager	Present
Chief Marshall, Police Chief	Present
Mr. Denlinger, Solicitor	Present

III. Public Comment

Dana Waldman, resident. She thanked the Council, Staff, and TAC for conversations over the past several weeks and she appreciates everyone's willingness to engage. She stated there have been some gaps in communication and she believes everyone shares the same goal of a healthy, safe and resilient urban canopy. She stated she is here this evening to speak on the appointment of the Arborist and the proposal for the tree assessment she asked that the TAC be invited to participate in the interview process. She expressed concerns on removal of tree during nesting season and the process with PECO choosing removal over pruning of trees. She shared her appreciation to the Council, staff and Policy committee for the Ordinance Amendment regarding ICE being considered later on tonight's agenda.

David Lutzker, resident and President of the Green Team. He stated he is blessed to have a mature tree at his property, and it provides shade that keeps his home cooler in the summer months. He stated that mature tree save money in the long run by lowering the costs of cooling our homes. He encouraged the Council to provide an ordinance amendment that would give the Tree Advisory Commission a decision making authority and that allows the administration to make the day-to-day decisions that they need to make. He congratulated the Borough on the successful Phoenix Wheel event and provided information on the Green Team's Summer Garden Tour. He shared there were

15 gardens in the borough and in the surrounding area, that support native plants and birds specifically. That was the theme this year. They had a fantastic collaboration with the Valley Forge Audubon Society and Bird Town PA for the tour.

IV. Presentations - None

V. Consent Agenda:

A. Approval of May 12, 2026, Regular Meeting Minutes.

B. Items from Parks and Recreation Committee.

1. Motion to approve a Temporary Community Event Application for the Phoenixville Car Show at Reeves Park on Sunday, August 23, 2026, from 11:00 am to 3:00 pm. Second and Third Avenue between Main Street and Starr Street to be closed from 9:00 am to 4:00 pm. Conditioned upon receipt of valid Certificate of Insurance naming Borough as Additional Insured.

C. Items from Finance Committee.

1. Motion to approve the 2026 Pre-Paid dated 4/1/2026 - 4/30/2026 in the amount of $2,239,923.96.
2. Motion to approve the 2026 Pre-Paid Credit Card Statement dated 4/1/2026 - 4/30/2026 in the amount of $30,069.96.
3. Motion to approve the 2026 Pre-Paid ACH dated 4/30/2026 in the amount of $71,880.73.
4. Motion to approve Budget Increase 2026-08 from General Fund Balance in the amount of $4,661.00 to Fire Protection (Contracted Services) for reimbursement to PVFRA for our portion of equipment on Engine 65-2 and Ladder-65.
5. Motion to approve Budget Increase 2026-09 from Water Fund Balance in the amount of $50,00.00 to Water Storage (Repairs & Maintenance) for emergency replacement of 18" valve influent side large reservoir and repairs to cover.
6. Motion to approve the Staff recommendation for suggested write-off of $1,200 from AR Account 701090 as uncollectable.

Ms. Burckley made a motion to approve the consent agenda. Seconded by Mrs. McGhee.

Motion Approved 8-0.

VI. Communications/Council Participation

Ms. Burckley thanked everyone for a successful Dogwood Fair and Parade this year. She understands it is big lift that is supported by the Police Department, Borough Staff and the parks and Recreation Department and she appreciates all of their efforts. She reported on the most recent Coffee with a Cop, and she addressed the concerns she received for the large police presence at the Giant Shopping Center and let the public know it was for the coffee event with police. She congratulated Ann's Heart on their ribbon cutting for the Purcell House. She stated that it was beautiful and really shows when the community gets together and the government, private and public sectors get together great things can happen. She reported that the Civil Service is currently working through the testing process for the hiring of a Police Officer.

Mr. Ewald thanked everyone on Council, the previous councils and the staff that helped out with this weekend's dedication of the Phoenix Wheel. He stated that it's easy to overlook, now that we've accomplished it, how difficult a project that was, and how much effort was put into it. Projects like this remind us that great places, great communities, and great placemaking don't happen by accident, so he thinks it's a tremendous project that took a long time and he appreciates everybody's efforts that went into this project.

VII. Mayor's Report

Mayor Urscheler expressed his congratulations on the Phoenix Wheel Ribbon Cutting and its return to the borough. He stated it is an extraordinary accomplishment for the Schuylkill River Heritage Center, and he recognized Barbara Cohen for being the very passionate driver behind so many of these projects here in our community for so many years. He reported on the Memorial Day Celebration at the American Legion, the Bike Rodeo with Twisted Cog and the Police Department and he congratulated all the students graduating and moving up in the district. He reminded the public of the upcoming 4th of July Fireworks and the Borough's 250 America celebration.

VIII. Appointments

A. Call for Residents interested in being appointed to various Boards and Commissions.

Mr. Ewald encouraged residents to continue to apply for openings on the various Boards and Commissions and stated openings can be found on the Borough's Website.

B. Interview applicants interested in being appointed to the Tree Advisory Commission.

Mr. Ewald explained that the interviews would be conducted this evening and the appointments will be made at the July 14, 2026, Council Meeting.

Mr. Ewald asked James Carminito to come forward and introduce himself.

Mr. Carminito introduced himself and provided his background as a resident of the Borough, his tenure on Borough Council and his time as the Council Liaison to the Tree Advisory Commission. He expressed his desire to be appointed to the Tree Advisory Commission.

Mrs. Vogel asked Mr. Carminito, with your experience already, having done a lot of work with the commission what is one thing you would change?

Mr. Carminito stated he would improve the communication of the commission and their outreach efforts.

Mr. Weiss asked if there is any relevant experience Mr. Carminito would bring to the commission either personally or professionally.

Mr. Carminito stated that he feels his leadership skills, being a team player, and being able to collaborate with people are all things he would bring to the commission. He explained professionally he believes he is a great communicator. He stated he has been involved with the trees, and he has an understanding of the ecological benefits of trees as well as the constraints we have in the Borough with the infrastructure and budgets.

Ms. Burckley asked Mr. Carminito, what he thinks is the biggest step forward, or the biggest success point in that time that he served as liaison to the TAC?

Mr. Carminito stated he worked with the commission and the Council to increase the budgets for the shade tree program. This provided the funding to have a more robust planting and replacement of trees that were taken down.

Mr. Moore asked based on your time on TAC, as well as being a Borough Council member and having to respond to concerns from the public. How do you, as a member of the Commission, view the Commission's role in balancing the desire to maintain old trees with the real demand for safety, because in my experience, you have some people who want that big tree out of the way because they're worried about their car, and then right next door, somebody says, please don't cut down my tree.

Mr. Carminito stated that he feels it is important to defer to the professionals. The Borough has a lot of consultants that we use, and not just for trees, but for other things, too. He believes getting their opinions, on if a tree is savable and if so can we just prune and then being able to communicate that adequately to those that have concerns.

Mr. Ewald asked if he has a favorite tree.

Mr. Carminito stated his favorite tree is a red maple.

Mrs. McGhee asked what brings him back to TAC now. Did something spark his attention to rejoin the commission.

Mr. Carminito stated that the last two years on Borough Council he was appointed as the liaison and he feels like he was just getting started on the commission and when he saw the opening he jumped at the opportunity.

Mr. Ewald asked Andrew Dunn to come forward and introduce himself.

Mr. Andrew Dunn introduced himself and provided his background as a resident of the Borough. He stated he favors a red maple, and he is currently enrolled in a master's program for Watershed Steward at Penn State. He expressed his desire to be appointed to the Tree Advisory Commission.

Mrs. Vogel asked Mr. Dunn what one thing you would change in what you know about TAC now and if appointed what would change about what the TAC currently does.

Mr. Dunn stated getting the removal list out as early as possible and working to get it out to as many people as possible whether that means putting notices in local businesses or posting it more predominantly on the Borough Website and social media. He would like to see more engagement with the TAC and the public to educate them on the benefits of trees, provide lists of trees we recommend and if it's allowed go door to door to offer this education.

Mr. Weiss asked is there a relevant experience that you bring from your personal or professional life that you think would benefit, the TAC.

Mr. Dunn stated he has worked many different jobs so he is very adept at learning new things, gaining experience and he listens very well. He stated he has a lot of experience with volunteering and canvassing specifically.

Ms. Burckley asked what's something positive that you've gotten from the meetings, or something that you feel is going well with TAC right now.

Mr. Dunn stated one of the best things was and actually brought up earlier about nesting. At the last meeting last Monday, it felt like the response was very well received from previous meetings about bird nesting. The discussion yielded a solution to pause the removal of trees during nesting season.

Mr. Moore asked about the Watershed Steward program. What is that program, and is that just purely volunteer, or is that a change in your profession.

Mr. Dunn explained they offer a Master Watershed and a Master Gardener program, it was held every Thursday, 2 hours of educational training from February until last week, was the last actual class, and then they also have us make sure we do, 20-plus hours of in-person volunteering, whether that's doing something like TAC, doing community cleanups, going to green fairs, and, like.

Just talking about water, doing water sampling, a bunch of different things like that. Through the educational seminars, they teach us all about climate, a lot about trees, and stormwater runoff. Pollution, different types of animals in watersheds, about watersheds in general, just all the different types of watersheds, the big ones throughout the state, and then all the much, much, much smaller ones, like French Creek. The program is completely volunteer based.

Mr. Moore asked as a member of the Commission, how would you help guide decision-making that balances the desire to maintain many of these beautiful trees as a tree city, with the demands for safety.

Mr. Dunn stated he would try to strike a balance of maintaining the canopy while still addressing the concerns presented to the TAC. Not over pruning or overcutting but doing everything we can to ensure safety and ensure that those who want tree cover are still able to get it.

Mr. Ewald asked Sharon Pronchik to come forward and introduce herself.

Ms. Sharon Pronchik introduced herself and provided her background as a resident of the Borough. She stated she has a master's degree from the University of Michigan, and she has done tree management and tree surveying. She expressed her desire to be appointed to the commission.

Mrs. Vogel asked what one thing you would change in what you know about TAC now and if appointed what would change about what the TAC currently does.

Ms. Pronchik stated she is excited to be involved in the planning for the future of the shade tree canopy in the borough.

Mr. Weiss asked, is there a relevant experience that you bring from your personal or professional life that you think would benefit TAC.

Ms. Pronchik stated that her experience with GIS would benefit the TAC and she feels the data in GIS can be used to help the public feel comfortable with the decision-making and ensuring there is that transparency and trust being built.

Ms. Burckley asked while attending the TAC meetings what have you found valuable or positive coming out of your participation and what you see as currently happening.

Ms. Pronchik stated its cool to see all the different pieces, how it all fits together. She explained she has worked a lot with the federal government, so she has an understanding, but her experience with borough government is new and this is her first interaction. She finds the energy and incredible listening skills of the Council and the commission.

Mr. Moore asked given your experience how could you help with system engineering while still upholding the duties of the commission as a recommending body.

Ms. Pronchik stated that she would work toward compromise while still mitigating risk and try to come up with a full solution to then take to policy.

Mr. Moore asked about the balance between safety versus preserving.

Ms. Pronchik explained she would take the different elements in the decision making process and try to assign some values, develop metrics and start tracking toward a common goal.

Mr. Ewald asked if Ms. Pronchik has a favorite tree.

Ms. Pronchik stated her favorite is a tulip poplar.

Mr. Ewald stated the Council expect to be making an appointment at next month's meeting. TAC is particularly open and collaborative during their meetings, so we do invite everybody to partake in those to join, even if you're not chosen for the opening.

C. Interview applicants interested in being appointed to the Human Relations Commission.

Mr. Ewald asked Zakkiyyah Barron to come forward and introduce herself.

Ms. Zakkiyyah Barron introduced herself and provided her background as a resident of the Borough. She spoke about her humanitarian work and her desire to be appointed to the HRC.

Mr. Weiss asked, is there a relevant experience that you bring from your personal or professional life that you think would benefit HRC.

Ms. Barron stated that being a sustainability leader she understands how to weigh the needs of stakeholders and the needs of those with the problem or concern that you are trying to solve.

Mrs. McGhee asked is there anything that you enjoy the most and are looking forward to being able to jump in and get involved in.

Ms. Barron stated she loves the enthusiasm and mindset of the member of the HRC are incredible. She is excited to be involved with a group of people who want to of service.

Ms. Burckley asked what the one thing would be she would like to take as an initiative or something new for the commission.

Ms. Barron stated she likes working in teams and giving specific roles or job roles to folks and then driving accountability to that particular task or role.

IX. New Business

A. Motion to authorize adopt the Phoenixville Borough Firefighter Pension Plan Investment Advisory Agreement and Amendments to the Non-Uniform and Uniform Pension Plan Investment Advisory Agreements.

Ms. Burckley made a Motion authorize adoption the Phoenixville Borough Firefighter Pension Plan Investment Advisory Agreement and Amendments to the Non-Uniform and Uniform Pension Plan Investment Advisory Agreements. Seconded by Mr. Weiss.

Motion Approved 8-0

B. Motion to accept Staff's recommendation to award a 2026 Tree Assessment Services Contract to ArborPro, Inc. for a total contract value of $29,960.

Mr. Weiss made a Motion to accept Staff's recommendation to award a 2026 Tree Assessment Services Contract to ArborPro, Inc. for a total contract value of $29,960. Seconded by Ms. Burckley.

On the Question:

Mr. Moore asked Mr. Krack to explain the RFP and the assessment being standalone.

Mr. Krack explained Borough Staff is trying to, work in a more collaborative way. As it relates to both the arborist and the process that was being used. Staff has separated the assessment from the arborist so that there's no linkage between the person that's making the assessment, and the person that's making the final decision.

Mr. Moore asked if the Council votes on the list of trees to be removed and replaced or is that something that is work out between the arborist, the staff, and TAC?

Mr. Ewald stated it is a shared responsibility and the Council always see the list prior to and during the budget season, that's what the funds are being allocated for.

Mr. Krack stated that is the intent here and why the process has been started now. The assessment has to be completed before the middle of October, because once the trees start to go into the dormant stage, it becomes a little bit more difficult to make that assessment. Secondly, the assessment is needed so it can be provided to the arborist and working with TAC and staff and the arborist to come up with a list in that October timeframe, so that we have the final two months of November and December for the budget process to get a reasonable expectation of how much we're going to have to spend on tree removal and tree pruning. He explained when we do put that list together, and we go to bid for the trees, it is going to be in the bid package that there is a nesting season component, and they have to make their bids based off of that knowledge that you can only go to point A, and then you can only start again in point B.

Ms. Burckley stated when she served as the liaison to TAC was really when we kind of got things going with the tagging of the trees, and getting them mapped, by staff. She stated Alexus has done a wonderful job with the maps and asked if the assessment will use the same technology as the currently used by the staff.

Mr. Krack stated that staff has engaged Esri to bring the information in-house, and they're training our folks in-house, so that the staff is in absolute control of the empirical data as to what trees are where, where they're located on the maps, all of that information. That will be given to the tree assessment group. Their role is to just go out and take a look at that, verify that the tag is there, verify the condition of the tree, and anything else needed to assess the tree.

Mr. Ewald asked if the award would be acted on immediately.

Mr. Krack explained that if you get to the point where this is approved tonight, staff will notify Arbor Pro and set up a time schedule. Of the four, three were out of state, and one was in the region. One of the things that really struck us is their availability all in, and really, it's a shorter amount of time, staff hopes to get that information even before the September timeframe, which will give us a better opportunity to work with the budget process for 2027.

Mr. Weiss stated he wanted to note as staff was putting out this RFP from the TAC and from the community, there were concerns about finding a certified urban arborist and people with experience in that area, and this arborist does have that experience. He stated he believes they even do this type of services for Drexel University here in Philadelphia.

Motion Approved 7-0. Ms. Dugan out of the room.

C. Motion to accept Staff's recommendation to appoint Gilmore & Associates as the Borough Arborist.

Mr. Weiss made a Motion to accept Staff's recommendation to appoint Gilmore

& Associates as the Borough Arborist. Seconded by Mr. Moore.

On the Question:

Ms. Burckley asked for some background on Gilmore and the borough's experience with them. She stated she is aware the staff has had a great experience, we have a lot of, you know, trust, we know their work ethic, we know their professional ethics, I know some correspondence I've gotten kind of was like, hey, is this kind of like, you know, you're already in this relationship? Is this gonna affect, you know, transparency? And I think it makes me feel better that we have an established relationship, but just wanted to get some feedback from staff on, you know, what a great relationship we have. And also, for those that don't know, like, this is someone that is not necessarily always been involved with us, but we know they're professional.

Mr. Krack explained Gilmore & Associates actually has two certified arborists on board. One of them is the person that's assigned to our Planning Commission, Judy Stern-Goldstein, and then there's a separate staff person that has not really been involved in this, this leg of the workload. I think the thing that we've taken from all of the stuff that we've learned over the last 6 years in this process Is there's somewhat of a juxtaposition. What we're trying to accomplish on a local level as it relates to the re-canopy, the urban forestry, the replanting's, and what have you, against development. The use of Gilmore & Associates is going to give us the opportunity to really work, I think, in a hand-in-glove relationship between the existing canopy and the existing urban forest versus what we're potentially looking at in the form of maybe losing trees because of development, but also replacing trees because of development, and how do those things work together so that the community feels good that if we do a development, the development is tied to the Tree Advisory Commission's concerns, the staff's concerns, and Borough Council's concerns. Nobody knows for sure, but this relationship is, you know, certified arborists, they've got all of the qualifications, and I think it's just going to give us the ability to communicate in a more fruitful way for what we're trying to accomplish.

Mr. Moore stated as the liaison to the Planning Commission he has a lot of confidence in and has been impressed by Gilmore & Associates, the people who've dealt with them. Now, of course, that was people dealing with reviewing projects from the subdivision and land development ordinance perspective, and the recommendations on it. But, you know, I was pleased to see that they did have a Certified arborist, because this past year, we've been talking about not having we've been talking about, you know, we need an arborist, and we haven't gotten one yet, so it's nice to finally have that. I think it's a good idea to get one finally in place they're aware of some of the long-standing and evolving concerns around our urban canopy, and how we can preserve it.

Mr. Ewald stated that looking through the applications, he thinks Ms. Liggett has an excellent, background and should match well with what we're looking for and he is excited to work with them.

Motion Approved 8-0.

X. Public Hearings

XI. Resolutions/Ordinances

A. Motion to adopt an Ordinance amendment to Chapter 6, "Conduct," For the purpose of adding Part 13 "Immigration Enforcement" new Sections 6-1302 and 6-1303 of the Code of Phoenixville Borough.

Mrs. Vogel made a Motion to adopt an Ordinance amendment to Chapter 6, "Conduct," For the purpose of adding Part 13 "Immigration Enforcement" new Sections 6-1302 and 6-1303 of the Code of Phoenixville Borough. Seconded by Mrs. McGhee.

On the Question:

Mr. Denlinger explained all three of the ordinances that we are considering this evening were scheduled to be advertised with the Pottstown Mercury on May 26, 2026, and were sent to the Pottstown Mercury and Chester County Law Library for public inspection on May 21st, 2026. He stated specifically to this ordinance, as you know, last month we adopted an ordinance that created Part 13, immigration enforcement of Chapter 6 conduct, and also added a Section 6-1301. This evening's proposed ordinance amendment would add two additional new sections; Section 6-1302 adds a definition section and the and the terms included in this section are Immigration and Customs Enforcement and Immigration Enforcement Operation. Section 6-1303 provides that just as borough property is not permitted to be used by any private entity. For such purposes, the borough property is also not to be used by Immigration, Customs, and Enforcement as a staging area, base of operations, or processing location, except as required by federal law.

Motion Approved 8-0.

B. Motion to adopt an ordinance amendment to Chapter 15 "Motor Vehicles".

Mrs. Vogel made a Motion to adopt an ordinance amendment to Chapter 15 "Motor Vehicles". Seconded by Mr. Moore.

Motion Approved 8-0.

C. Motion to adopt an ordinance amendment to Chapter 16 “Parks and Recreation”.

Mrs. Vogel made a Motion to adopt an ordinance amendment to Chapter 16 “Parks and Recreation”. Seconded by Ms. Dugan.

On the question:

Mr. Denlinger explained this ordinance provision, contains a couple different amendments, to Chapter 16, Parks and Recreation, Part 1, Parks and Recreation. In order to basically clarify that although parks and recreation spaces are typically areas open to the public, there are, in fact, certain areas that are off-limits, you know, for example, public works sheds, or areas that are determined to be dangerous. The amendment to Section 16-101 adds a new definition of recreational property, so we have a single broad term instead of having to identify each different type of property. Section 16-110 is to add a new subsection 1M, that there's no trespassing in certain areas of regulation. And then Section 16-113, Is also being amended to clarify that there is a difference between how general parks and recs violations would be handled versus a trespass violation, in which case a trespass would be handled as any trespass would. Under the Pennsylvania Criminal Code.

Motion Approved 8-0.

XII. Reports of Committees, Boards, and Commissions

A. Historical and Architectural Review Board – Ms. Dugan

B. Planning Commission - Mr. Moore

1. Motion to adopt a Resolution to officially conditionally approve or deny the Preliminary/Final Subdivision and Land Development Plan for the development known as 101 High Street.

Mr. Denlinger invited the applicant to approach the podium and provided the background on the project. He stated the applicant for this project is PCG Development LLC, which is the owner of, or I believe, equitable owner, of 5 contiguous parcels of land located at 109and 111 High Street, and 102, 104, and 106 Dayton Street. Which parcels are more particularly identified as Chester County UPI numbers 15-5-533, 15-5-534, 15-5-534.1, 15-5-534.2, and 15-5-534.3. The application proposes the consolidation of the five parcels into one resultant parcel, with the construction of one detached, four-story, 14-unit multi-family dwelling, containing not more than 17 bedrooms, with a building area of approximately 3,257 square feet. Paved drive aisles, parking lot containing 14 parking spaces, sidewalks, lighting, landscaping, and stormwater management facilities-related improvements. After reviewing the project at several meetings, the Planning Commission voted at its May 14th, 2026, meeting to conditionally recommend approval of the application and the requested waivers, which I will allow the applicant to discuss in more detail.

Mr. Joel Comanda of Inland Design stated he is the engineer for the project and is representing the applicant for the project. He explained there are five (5) waivers.

The first is for section 22-303 – Requiring the approval of a preliminary plan prior to the consideration of a final plan, to allow the submission to be reviewed as a single, combined preliminary/final plan application. This was requested to expedite the process and since we had already worked through much of the project with the Borough consultants, prior to the application, we felt comfortable going forward in that manner.

The second waiver is from section 22-411.3. B – Requiring a sight triangle of 75 feet from the center of the street intersection, to provide a clear site triangle of not less than 52.4 feet. This is related to the triangle at the intersection of Dayton Street and High Street. He stated there was a revision to the plan to provide a chamfer on the corner of the building and to increase the distance being shown in our request. Since this property is on a corner and the requirement is for parking to be in the rear of the building, creating a hardship at the location as it 75 foot triangle would reduce the site considerably. The intersection of High and Dayton is currently stop sign controlled and there is the opportunity to come to a full stop and see if there is traffic before making the turn.

Mr. Denlinger asked Mr. Comanda to confirm that the request for the waiver was 52.4 feet not the 47 feet indicated in your waiver request.

Mr. Comanda did confirm that 52.4 feet is correct and that his waiver letter was not updated.

The third waiver request is from section 22-414.10. E – Requiring driveways to be located not less than 60 feet from the radius of the intersection, to allow the enter-only and exit-only driveways to be located not less than 26.6 feet and 38.1 feet, respectively, from the radius of the intersection of High Street and Dayton Street. He explained that there is an in-only driveway off of Dayton Street and an exit-only driveway onto High Street. They did widen the radius at the intersection to a 20-foot radius, to try and improve the existing condition there, so that also reduced the lengths that we have from the intersection to the driveways. So that's the reasoning behind that waiver request.

The fourth waiver is from section 22-505.5. B – Requiring all development grading to be set back from the Site's property line by not less than three (3) feet, to allow grading within 3' of the property line, provided that it causes no adverse effects to the adjacent properties and temporary construction easements are acquired. He explained there is a proposed wall around the majority of the site. In order to construct this there needs to be grading behind it and to make it work it would be within 3 feet of the property line. This is the reasoning for the request.

The last waiver is from section 22-428 & Attachment 3 Landscape Guidelines – Requiring plantings at building frontages, to not have to provide the building façade planting requirements along Dayton and High Streets. He stated that with the building being pushed forward on the site and providing a planting strip between the sidewalk and the curb. He stated this why this waiver is being requested.

Mr. Moore stated that the plans for the project went through a number of review sessions with the Planning Commission. There was another plan for the site from a few years ago that was approved on the site and the clearing of it was completed then. He explained that the site, which has five parcels, has been vacant for several years. He stated that it is interesting to get some new development on that block, and he feels this will be an additional contribution to the development of the north side which will be appreciated. Since the site is smaller and has tight constraints, he feels the four way stop intersection is safe enough and controls the traffic in that area. He explained that this plan was developed slightly off of the previously submitted plan and these waivers are slightly less intrusive than the ones previously approved.

Ms. Dugan asked for clarity on the number of units and parking spaces. She stated she remembered seeing documentation with 15 units in the building.

Mr. Comanda confirmed it is 14 units and 14 parking spaces and did acknowledge the previous submission had 15 units, but the last revision reduces the units to 14.

Mr. Moore asked if one of the ground floor units is still being designed as an ADA accessible unit.

Mr. Comanda confirmed there is one ground floor units that will be ADA accessible.

Mr. Ewald asked if the current streetscape plan will remain at the site.

Mr. Comanda explained the black streetlights will be reinstalled, they may be relocated slightly with the curb work but yes, they will remain.

Mr. Denlinger invited the public to come forward in Council Chambers and on Zoom if they wished to comment on this project.

Public Comment – None

Mr. Moore made a Motion to adopt a Resolution to officially conditionally approving the Preliminary/Final Subdivision and Land Development Plan for the development known as 101 High Street. Seconded by Mrs. McGhee.

Motion Approved 8-0.

2. Motion to adopt a Resolution to officially conditionally approve or deny the Final Subdivision and Land Development Plan – Major Amendment for the development known as Odessa Development.

Mr. Denlinger invited Ms. Kestra Kelly of BL Companies to approach the podium while he provides the background on the project.

Mr. Denlinger explained the applicant for this project is Franklin Phoenixville LP. Which is the owner of 5 parcels of land, all located southeast of the intersection of Fillmore Street and Township Line Road, consisting of Chester County tax parcel UPI numbers 15-4-8.2, 15-4-8.4, 15-4-49,15-456, and 15-456.1. This overall development proposes the consolidation, subdivision, and development of the five parcels into one 4-story apartment building with a parking garage having 355 parking spaces. With first floor commercial space and 224 dwelling units. 79 stacked townhomes with 158 stacked townhouse dwelling units. For a total of 382 dwelling units. 17 surface parking lot spaces and approximately 96 street parking spaces. Internal streets and alleys, all with associated grading, stormwater management facilities, utility layout, sidewalks, trails, emergency access easements, landscaping and lighting, and related improvements. As well as off-site improvements, such as the connection of the development to Ashburn Road, sidewalks, rerouted emergency access circulation, utilities, stormwater management facilities, repaving of portions of Fillmore Street, creating and other improvements. So, this project originally received final approval in 2021, pursuant to Resolution 2021-46 and was before us in 2023 for a final major revision approval, by Resolution 2023-19. The development plans were recorded, and construction was begun in 2025. So, since the plans were recorded, this is a major amendment application. The review of this submission is principally related to the changes as compared to the previously approved development. Generally speaking, those changes are mostly on the left-hand side of the plan. It's his understanding we're required due to changes in the overall grading of a portion of the site. In this application, there is a reduction of 4 stacked townhome buildings, so there will be 8 less dwelling units. 3 fewer surface parking lot spaces, but 20 to 26 additional parallel parking spaces. A modification of the location of Road D, a modification of the Schuylkill River Trail Extension Grading. An addition of a sidewalk on the west side of Road D and the addition of a potential future road connection. No additional waivers or extension of previously granted waivers were requested by the applicant in this application. After reviewing the project at several meetings, the Planning Commission voted at its May 14, 2026, meeting to conditionally recommend approval of this application.

Ms. Kelly stated she is here on behalf of the applicant. She stated she is here seeking approval for this major amendment. She highlighted some key points including maintaining the overall track boundary of the parcel and reducing the density, as discussed, from 166 stacked townhomes to 158. She stated this led to the introduction of additional open space, which will be designed to act as a gathering plaza for the residents. The configuration of Road D was shifted slightly, a sidewalk was added, and we are going to make accommodations for a potential future roadway extension. At the time of the plans that will be recorded, we'll make sure that there's associated curbs, so the road won't look unfinished, but we'll just have it, facilitated to be a future extension if needed. The amended plan has adjusted the driveway entrances into the apartment building. She explained it's a two-story garage and originally it had internal ramping, and now the plan provides an entrance and exit for each level. She stated they are not seeking any additional waivers at this time.

Mr. Moore asked about the scale of the apartments and how many floors it will be on top of the two floors of parking garages.

Ms. Kelly explained there are four stories of apartments which has remained unchanged from the previous submissions.

Mr. Moore stated it would be six stories then with the garage and parking he was under the impression that it was four stories total up again the trail and overlooking the racetrack. He asked Ms. Kelly if she could describe a little bit more the circulation of site and how it was adjusted as it was a topic of major discussion during the Planning Commission meeting. There was discussion about a second exit out to township line road through an adjacent development.

Mr. Denlinger stated for clarification this evening, the Council is only considering this development, and this plan does not propose any connection to Township Line Road. He stated in his opinion the circulation remains the same and any opportunity for additional circulation would have to be discussed at the time that any future project would be before the Council.

Ms. Kelly stated that the circulation remains unchanged and that the plan has always maintained the same kind of roadway network. Some of the grading has been modified to allow for any potential future connection. As you may recall, the original plan had fewer retaining walls that were higher in height. This plan allows for more retaining walls but they are lower in height and kind of tier to the site a little bit more to respond to the grades of the site as well as making any future connections feasible from a grading perspective.

Mr. Ewald stated that he believed the apartment building to be 4 stories in total.

Ms. Kelly stated that it's always been 2 levels of garage and 4 stories above. The apartment building remains unchanged with this application, with the exception of the driveway entrance connecting into the garage levels.

Mr. Weiss asked if grading is changing in a couple different places within the plan, does that have implications for stormwater runoff that have been evaluated and checked?

Ms. Kelly explained that the existing site has always been on a hill and all of the water has always drained and ended up in this, you know, really old railroad ravine, which essentially has turned into a stream over time. The overall drainage pattern discharge point remains unchanged. Some of the technical details of the elevation of an inlet at a location, you know, have been adjusted to match the grades, but we are still providing the same amount of stormwater management, the same type, and essentially in the same location, so most of our water quality is underground in MRC BMPs (Managed Release Concept Best Management Practices), and then we still have a larger surface, detention basin.

Mr. Ewald asked if this is the last plan revision whether it be minor or major for this project.

Ms. Kelly stated that it is to the best of her knowledge, and she understands the need for this plan to need no future revisions.

Mr. Denlinger stated there were a number of easements in prior plans that were offered to the Borough and asked the if the offer of them remains in the current plan.

Ms. Kelly confirmed they are still there.

Mr. Denlinger asked about the new sidewalk being added along Road D.

Ms. Kelly explained there was always a road along this area with retaining walls. These walls were very large and high that went along the rear of the homes on Township Line Road. The applicant for this project has also purchased those parcels and while they are not part of the application it does allow them to grant easements associated with that for construction. The project is able to take advantage of the ability to do some grading there, which allows for the reduction of the retaining wall, and then allows for the ability to install a sidewalk along this side of Road D as well.

Mr. Denlinger invited the public to come forward in Council Chambers and on Zoom if they wished to comment on this project.

Public Comment – None

Mr. Moore made a Motion to adopt a Resolution to officially conditionally approve the Final Subdivision and Land Development Plan – Major Amendment for the development known as Odessa Development. Seconded by Mr. Weiss.

On the Question:

Ms. Dugan stated that historically she doesn't vote in favor of large, high density projects. She asked if voting against this is a vote against the whole project or just the amendment.

Mr. Denlinger stated tonight's vote if just for the amendment part. Mr. Denlinger explained that the way he has written the resolution ensures nothing is lost in translation. The resolution is written as an amended and restated resolution, so it is, in essence, adopting the whole development again. However, what the Council is reviewing, from a legal standpoint, is just the amendment changes.

Motion Approved 7-1. Ms. Dugan voting No.

C. Phoenixville Regional Planning Committee – Mrs. McGhee

Mrs. McGhee reported the next meeting is on June 24, 2026

D. Recreation Board – Ms. Dugan

Ms. Dugan reported on the upcoming programs and camps at the Recreation Center including yoga for all ages, Soccer Shots, the Chester County Mobile Market, Pickleball, summer camps and the 4th of July celebration and fireworks.

E. Tree Advisory Commission – Mr. Weiss

Mr. Weiss reported the majority of the tree removals for the year are completed and the focus is of the commission is the planning for the fall plantings and moving forward with the newly appointed arborist.

F. Human Relations Commission – Ms. Burckley

Ms. Burckley reported that there is potentially a second vacancy coming on the commission so anyone interested in being appointed can apply to the borough office.

XIII. Council Action referred from:

A. Personnel and Public Safety Committee – Ms. Burckley

1. Motion to authorize Staff to submit an application for five (5) firefighters under the Staffing for Adequate Fire and Emergency Response (SAFER) Grant.

Ms. Burckley made a Motion to authorize Staff to submit an application for five (5) firefighters under the Staffing for Adequate Fire and Emergency Response (SAFER) Grant. Seconded by Mr. Weiss.

On the question:

Ms. Burckley stated the Staff has submitted these applications before and it does follow the trajectory of hiring for the Fire Department. This grant would enable us to hire more firefighters quicker and be reimbursed.

Mr. Krack explained last year that we applied for 7, because we didn't get the grant, and then the budget approved the 2 people. This year's application is now down to 5. If we don't get the grant, then the budget process will likely bring the 2 people in and next year's application will maybe be even less, so, it's the same process. It's just unfortunate this normally goes through finance. In this case, because the federal government put the applications out at an odd time, and with a short lead time we didn't have time to go through the normal process.

Ms. Dugan stated that last year the grant application didn't go through the Finance Committee and she has concerns because, if this is a possibility in this or any other committee, if it is going to potentially affect the taxes and the budget it can't just be sprung on the Council. She would like to have a plan in place and to understand if this would require hiring all 5 at once if the grant is awarded. She asked that more information be provided since we have three new Council Members.

Chief Brazunas stated this is a Federal Program, that has existed post 9-11. This is the most competitive grant program that exists, for fire and EMS.

Staff has applied for this grant, this is the fourth year, so this will be our fourth application for this. So far our application has not been successful in the past, but as you know, with all the grants that we do here, we try to go after every grant that we can get, to help, reduce, the tax burden on the taxpayers, and help with the scaling that was talked about already with our staffing plan that has been in place with the support of, Councilmember Dugan and others, on the board, previously. He explained that the grant is based on a reimbursement structure. It's a 3-year period performance for the grant, year 1, you get 75% reimbursement, year 2, you get 75% reimbursement, and year 3, you get 35% reimbursement. The intent is by year 4, then you're assuming that total cost of all those employees in your budget moving forward. As far as the reimbursement structure the way that typically works with all the grants, whether, at least on the fire EMS side, for example, right now, we've gone through assistance to firefighters grant reimbursements. A lot of that really is based on how fast they're approving these, and the cadence in which we are submitting. Having administered a FEMA grant in my previous role at another Fire Company for two employees we were pretty consistent doing it every month and getting on that cycle. And typically, in our region, we will have a specific person that gets used to working with us, so as they see how we're reporting things, it's really incumbent upon us, upon him and working with our finance team and submitting those things. He stated his intent would be on a monthly basis, really, to answer your question, because that's a prudent thing to do versus waiting bi-monthly or quarterly, because you want that money coming back in from a reimbursement standpoint. He reported that for the first time since applying, since he's been here, that we made it past the computer, so application made it into an actual human being's hands last year for actual review.

Ms. Dugan asked if the request for hiring would 2 one year and 3 the next or vice versa.

Chief Brazunas stated that there is a 180-day recruitment period for the grant that we have to hire these people. You can stagger to an extent in year one. Basically, what would end up happening is our period of performance depends on when we would sign and when it would officially start. It may not be exactly on January 1st. That could get staggered a little bit later. The Staff will have to plan for all 5. We wouldn't necessarily want to be bringing all those folks in immediately. That could be staggered. We could space that out a little bit, at least in year one, and that could be coordinated with the Finance Department. And if for some reason we need to, FEMA will grant certain amendments with their applications within reason. He doesn't anticipate having a problem recruiting. With the Council's support and what we're doing here in Phoenixville, we're attracting good talent. We want to retain folks here, so I don't anticipate having an issue when we go to do another test, getting qualified applicants to apply.

Ms. Dugan asked if the Borough gets the grant would it be discussed further at the Finance Committee.

Chief Brazunas stated it would be discussed at the Finance Committee, and he explained the reasoning behind the request for 5. Currently, the department has 7 non-managerial firefighters full-time on 3 platoons. They're working 24 hours on, 48 hours off, with a Kelly day. He stated in his view it’s the best of both worlds. It's nice for the employee, it's also nice for the employer. With that schedule design, the requirement is 3 platoons. If we were to go to what's called a 24-72 schedule, it would require a 4th platoon and 4 additional firefighters on top of that to make our scheduling schematic work. There are hires in the future in our plan, but at a core level, what the grant is looking at, we want 4 firefighters together on a truck at all times, 24-7. That's the goal. As you all know, the Borough has part-time employees. Those folks are invaluable to us, but as mentioned in his monthly reports, and this is not germane to Phoenixville, part-time employment is difficult. Every part-timer that the Borough has on staff works at least one other full-time job, and at least over half of them work not only another full-time job, but they also have another part-time job. It’s a constant struggle to get them to work hours for us.

Mr. Moore stated that with the 180-day, and the recruitment period, and however long it takes us to get the grant. At some point, the Borough is going to have to be funding at least 25% of 5 employees in year one and two and 65% in year 3. He asked Mr. Krack if the Council doesn’t want to fund these employees, what are the downsides of turning the grant down.

Mr. Krack stated that he has had experience with turning back state grant funds but not federal funds. You need to carefully explain why you are turning the funds back however; he would submit that at this level with competition being so fierce nationwide it would not be advisable to turn back the funds.

Ms. Burckley stated that the strategic plan has always been to add 2 per year to get to the 6 needed and to have it be the least impactful. She asked Chief Brazunas what the platoon makeup would look like.

Chief Brazunas stated it would place 4 full time firefighters on the three platoons if the grant is awarded and after the folks are onboard.

Ms. Burckley stated that the Borough constructed this fire station and the Council committed to this strategic plan, this grant provides an opportunity to be reimbursed some of the expenses to assist the Borough is hitting it's target for the strategic plan for safety.

Ms. Dugan stated she is going to vote for it but she wants to make sure everyone is aware of what is being done here and how to work this out to actually get it.

Motion Approved 8-0.

B. Parks and Recreation Committee – Mr. Moore

1. No action to report.

C. Policy Committee – Mrs. Vogel

1. Motion to schedule and advertise an ordinance amendment to Chapter 2, "Animals" by adding a new Part 6 "Retail Sale of Dogs".

Mrs. Vogel stated this ordinance is related to retail sale of dogs and it will add an additional layer of protection of the state laws already in place.

Mrs. Vogel made a Motion to schedule and advertise an ordinance amendment to Chapter 2, "Animals" by adding a new Part 6 "Retail Sale of Dogs". Seconded by Ms. Burckley.

Motion Approved 8-0.

2. Motion to schedule and advertise an ordinance amendment to Chapter 13 "Licenses, Permits, and General Business Regulations".

Mrs. Vogel made a Motion to schedule and advertise an ordinance amendment to Chapter 13 "Licenses, Permits, and General Business Regulations". Seconded by Mr. Moore.

On the Question:

Mrs. Vogel explained this particular motion has to do with outdoor furnishings and pedestrian zones as it relates to the permit for PXV Inside Out.

Mr. Denlinger explained the current Part 11 only deals with sidewalk cafes. However, in practice not everyone who has a sidewalk permit has a cafe. There are stores that have displays and offer things for sale, so this is to kind of update things for, you know, what's actually happening in practice, and this is slightly different than Inside Out, but it does take into account Inside Out, in that anyone who has a sidewalk permit, that may be suspended during other events, like Inside Out.

Motion Approved 8-0.

3. Motion to schedule and advertise an ordinance amendment to Chapter 15 “Motor Vehicles and Traffic”.

Mrs. Vogel made a Motion to schedule and advertise an ordinance amendment to Chapter 15 “Motor Vehicles and Traffic”. Seconded by Ms. Burckley.

Motion Approved 8-0.

D. Infrastructure/Technology/Transportation/Sustainability Committee – Mr. Weiss

1. No action to report.

E. Finance Committee – Ms. Dugan

1. Motion to approve the Staff recommendation to implement account changes to the Truist Banking Account.

Ms. Dugan made a Motion to approve the Staff recommendation to implement account changes to the Truist Banking Account. Seconded by Ms. Burckley.

On the Question:

Ms. Koza-Lubinsky explained a banking proposal was included in the packet for council tonight. Initially, the proposal was presented to Finance Committee at the May meeting. The proposal moved forward, however, committee asked staff to discuss a more favorable rate with the bank, and, as you can see, the borough team did, and you have the final results in your packet.

Ms. Dugan wanted to make sure that everyone understood the proposal and that this is a great move for the Borough and she is really happy that we have great staff to help the borough out.

Mr. Ewald asked Mr. Krack to elaborate more.

Mr. Krack explained that various bank accounts have different levels of participation, and with the amount of funding that we have we weren't getting a very good rate, and staff was able to talk to Truist and got the interest rate raised from 1.75% up to 3% which is a very significant amount of money that's going to come in over the course of the year. He thanked Ms. Koza- Lubinsky, Ms. Niemczuk and the Finance Department specifically for reaching out and sitting down with Truist, listening to the Finance Committee and bringing back an even better rate than was presented a couple of weeks ago.

Mr. Ewald stated that conservatively this could translate into a $700,000.00 increase and it is well worth the effort. He appreciates everything that was put into this increase.

Mr. Moore asked if the monies will be managed and allocated to the appropriate funds.

Ms. Getzfread explained that is how it is managed currently. So ultimately, that’s not going to change how staff will bifurcate those funds. The other thing that's important is the banking relationship that we have with Truist, not only in this way of seeing these interest rates, but also on a daily basis with our utility payments, and our lockbox. Monica and her team have absolutely created a wonderful relationship with them.

Motion Approved 8-0.

XIV. Public Comment - None

XV. Communications/Council Participation

XVI. Staff Reports are in the packets.

A. Manager
B. Police
C. Fire
D. Planning and Codes
E. Public Works
F. Finance
G. Human Resources
H. Recreation

XVII. Adjournment
9:03pm. Ms. Burckley made a Motion to Adjourn. Seconded by Mr. Weiss

E. Jean Krack
Borough Manager

Transcribed by: Jennifer Logan
Administrative Assistant
June 2026