

REGULAR MEETING
BOROUGH COUNCIL
MALVERN BOROUGH

November 20, 2012
7:30 P.M.

PRESIDING: Woody J. Van Sciver, President

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG

1. ROLL CALL:
 - Council President Van Sciver
 - Council Vice President Raymond
 - Council Member Giandonato - ABSENT
 - Council Member Macaleer
 - Council Member McCrory
 - Council Member Sponenbergh
 - Council Member Uzman - ABSENT
 - Mayor McGlone - ABSENT

2. PUBLIC FORUM:

Council President informed all present that copies of the agenda are available at the front desk. This is a Public Session of Council. Should any citizen/taxpayer wish to offer comments on any item on the agenda, now is the time to bring those comments before Council. Are there any citizens/taxpayers who wish to bring before Council any item not on the agenda?

- a. Presentation by the Malvern Historical Commission – Council President Van Sciver cautioned the residents who attended the public presentation by the Historical Commission that no ordinance was currently in front of Borough Council to be adopted. A proposed ordinance was prepared by the Historical Commission but it had no solicitor review or Borough Council review. There is no ordinance on the Agenda for adoption this evening. Everyone is keen about rules and regulations over an ordinance that might affect their property and regulations that could be adopted for consideration.

Lynne Hockenbury, a member of the Historical Commission, reported that the Commission has been working with two members of the Planning Commission to develop this process for an ordinance. They have also been working with a member of John Milner Associates, Inc., a firm that specializes in historic architecture and preservation planning. Ms. Hockenbury introduced Karen Marshall, Heritage Preservation Coordinator for Chester County. Ms. Hockenbury stated that the Commission has had two public meetings so far where input was shared with, and received from, the residents.

Ms. Hockenbury presented a slide presentation, noting that there are currently 330 properties on the list of properties 50 years of age and older. Of those properties, one property is listed on the National Register of Historic Places (Paoli Battlefield); 216 properties were built prior to January 1, 1941 and have historical/architectural significance and 113 properties were built between 1941 and 1959 with undetermined significance. The Commission proposed a Malvern Historic Resource Protection Zoning Overlay District that includes two buildings on the Malvern Retreat property, the Malvern Preparatory School property and the second oldest house

REGULAR MEETING

November 20, 2012

Page 2

on W. King Street. These properties are not within the area shown on the map but would be included.

In 2008 the Borough residents were polled regarding their opinion of a historic ordinance and 330 residents responded to the poll. 85% stated that the small Victorian town, historical nature and traditions were important; 85% stated that they would agree that an effort should be made to keep the general appearance of commercial buildings and homes of historical significance; 79% stated that if a demolition permit is issued for any historic building, it should require photographs inside and out and a written history and 85% agree that a demolition permit application for any historic building should describe any ideas to adapt and reuse the building or materials contained within the structure.

The Historical Commission Recommendation is that Borough Council should adopt a Historic Resource Protection Ordinance that recognizes properties of historical and architectural significance; provides a review process for the demolition of significant historic resources and removal of significant architectural features; halts demolition by neglect and documents significant historic resources that are approved for demolition. The Commission has proposed that a Historic Resource Protection Ordinance either designate the 216 properties in the Borough inventory built before January 1, 1941, as significant historic resources; or, incorporate the highest density of historic resources within a zoning overlay district, a total of 194 properties within the zoning overlay of 178 contributing historic buildings (92%) and 16 noncontributing buildings (8%).

A Historic Resource Protection Ordinance should require review for *Substantial Demolition* – the razing of more than 50% or any portion of the façade of a significant historic resource. This review should be by the Historical Commission with final approval by Borough Council and an application may be approved, approved with conditions or denied based on resource and neighborhood impacts, merits of the proposal and reasonable use of the property. The Ordinance should also require review for *Selective Demolition* – removal or obscuring any significant architectural feature on the exterior of a significant historic resource with review by the Historical Commission and an application may be approved, approved with conditions or denied based on resource impact and merits of the proposal. For the approval of an application for *substantial* or *selective demolition*, the applicant shall provide archival documentation of the historic resource and allow for the salvage of significant architectural features.

In addition to the above, the Ordinance should require review for any *subdivision* of land associated with a significant historic resource. This should be reviewed by the Historical Commission, Planning Commission with final approval by Borough Council. An application may be approved, approved with conditions or denied based on resource and neighborhood impacts, merits of the proposal, and reasonable use of the property. The applicant shall provide a Historic Resource Impact Study.

The suggested list of Significant Architectural Features include:

- Roof configuration (Parapet, Gable, Gambrel, Hipped and Mansard)
- Roof materials (Slate Shingles, Wood Shake/Shingle and Metal Roofs)
- Roof structures (Dormers, Towers & Turrets, Finials and Primary Chimneys)

REGULAR MEETING

November 20, 2012

Page 3

- Eaves, cornices, fascias (Rafter Ends, Metal Cornice, Bracketed Eaves)
- Exterior wall materials (Brick, Stone, Mixed Materials, Rusticated Concrete Block and Wood Siding)
- Windows and surrounds (Oriel Window, Queen Anne Style, Prairie Style w/Colored Glass, Operable Shutters, 2-over-2 w/Arched Header and Bay Window)
- Entrances and doors (Storefronts, Transoms, Doors, Pents)
- Front and side porches (Columns & Piers, Balustrades, Balconies, Verandas, Porticos and Enclosed)
- Architectural ornamentation (Bargeboards, Scuppers, Brackets and Tierods)
- Historic outbuildings and appurtenances (Hitching Posts, Garages, Fences and Carriage Houses)

Lauren Lewis, 11 E. King Street, asked if there was any funding available to help with historic upkeep. Ms. Marshall responded that there is no funding available to private homeowners. There has to be an economic hardship test. Ms. Lewis asked what this ordinance would do to property values. Ms. Marshall responded that she brought three documents with her that residents may take with them. The State of Pennsylvania outlines the historic benefits for property value increases and decreases and what was determined in West Chester's Historic District was so successful that they expanded it. Houses within newly expanded districts command 36% over other homes. Historical properties tend not to go up in value as fast as new construction, but they also don't go down. Historical districts within Boroughs have enjoyed a tremendous economic advantage in growth rates. Ms. Lewis asked how soon such an Ordinance would be implemented. Council President Van Sciver responded that there would be a whole process. Council would want to make sure controls were in place and staff was in place to process the applications. He would anticipate that it would probably be six months or more before something like this would be adopted.

Rod Andrews asked why we feel this is necessary? Ms. Hockenbury responded that this has been going on for about twenty-five years. It has been discussed, backed-off, and there have been buildings that have disappeared in this Borough. The Borough is a unique place and we like our small Victorian town and want it to stay the way it is. We like our traditions, our town, and that is why we are again considering an ordinance. Ms. Marshall responded that the reason she encourages preservation planning is historical preservation is one of the few grass roots efforts and the whole goal is to empower the community to develop guidelines so the conversation is about specific aspects about your community which you feel is a hallmark of your community that speaks to your home. In a historic borough, you have these very specific Victorian attributes, and the heart of communities were being cut out by urban renewal projects. You want to have a conversation over specific aspects of maintaining your community character. It could range from a step in the development process that requires a conversation based upon your particular ordinance to a much more restrictive ordinance.

Dominic Pisano, 3 Channing Avenue, stated that he came with his banner about preserving our older homes for the future, but after listening to the presentation, he does not think that everybody who owns one of the dots portrayed on the map are super wealthy and there

REGULAR MEETING

November 20, 2012

Page 4

are a lot of restrictions. If we can't do it, it becomes a blighted area. You had dots rather than areas. Isn't that spot zoning? Council President Van Sciver responded that it is his understanding that it is an overlay district and not a specific zoning district so would not be considered spot zoning. Mr. Pisano stated that his house is one of the older ones. He wouldn't want to see all of these restrictions placed on him when his next door neighbor, whose property is not historical, can knock his house down and put up a modern building, but if Mr. Pisano wants to change a screen door, that will cost him a lot of money. That would be a hardship. We must be very careful how we would proceed. The people in West Chester are not happy. It is too costly. Mr. Pisano stated that his house originally had a slate roof but he couldn't afford to replace it with a slate roof. You said you would critique everything that comes up. It makes it harder for resale value. Ms. Marshall stated that she understands that very stringent guidelines are something that Mr. Pisano would feel very strongly about not having. An ordinance can be as simple as a 30-60 or 90-day review period or as stringent as West Chester. The Malvern Historical Commission is asking for basic guidelines and a general ordinance like we have in the County. Ms. Hockenbury stated that if you want to replace a window, adding a storm window may be cheaper than replacing your windows in most cases.

Phillip Watts, 17 High Street, stated that many of these houses have already had changes. Council President Van Sciver responded that in the draft ordinance he's read, it does mention selective demolition so while Lynne said if you have slate or shakes, you would have to come under review. You would not be required to replace with the same material. Borough Council has not expressed an opinion. We think it is very important to get your input.

Marie Nadeau, 127 Church Street, stated that she resents the fact that the Historical Commission will tell her what she can and cannot do.

Silvio Cifa, 209 E. Broad Street, stated that he received approval two or three years ago to build a house on a second lot that he owns. He asked if he would have to conform to whatever is in the neighborhood? He was told "no". This would be regulated by the borough zoning ordinance.

Peter DeLaurier, 113 W. Broad Street, stated that he lives in half of a historic house in which three portions have been added. His question is about additions if he would want to knock one of those portions down and put something nicer in there. How would that be affected under this ordinance? Ms. Hockenbury responded that she doesn't think the point here is to allow ugly things to remain. Council President Van Sciver responded that you would have to go through this group. There would still be a process.

Andrea Cardamone, 210 E. Broad Street, asked what the review would actually entail? Ms. Hockenbury responded that the review process is not quite complete but there would be a form to complete. We might ask you to come before us and look at what you're doing. It depends on your home and what you are doing. It could either be approved, approved with conditions or denied. If it was denied, you could come to Borough Council and present your case.

REGULAR MEETING

November 20, 2012

Page 5

Jill Holsclaw, 328 E. King Street asked what the Commission would anticipate the additional cost to be for the Historical Commission to review it. Would we then go to the Borough Council and what would that cost be? Council President Van Sciver responded that if the Historical Commission decided that they needed a consultant, you would pay for it. There would be no additional fee to go to the Historical Commission or Borough Council. Ms. Holsclaw stated there may be a consultant fee and what would the time frame be for a response from the consultant? Ms. Marshall responded that they range from thirty days to a year, but most are sixty to ninety days. Ms. Holsclaw asked what the appeal process would be? Ms. Marshall responded that that process would be included in the ordinance. Ms. Holsclaw asked if there was a tentative time frame and Ms. Hockenbury responded that at this time, there was not.

Helen McDonald, 322 E. King Street, asked what is needed for this designation? It is an economic hardship for her. Can you get this designation with the least possible affect on people? Ms. Hockenbury responded that there will be a piece in the ordinance that if there is an economic hardship, the Commission cannot deny you. Ms. Marshall stated that other materials may be considered. No one has raised a concern about demolition and selective demolition and there may be fairly complex woodwork on your building. Ms. McDonald asked if there would be something the residents could look at? Council President Van Sciver stated that he thinks the photographs actually spoke to it.

Sid Baglini, 203 Channing Avenue, stated that in bringing some perspective as a recent Newtown Square resident, this is another level of protection for the community. In Newtown Square she saw the last thousand acres go to developers. There were also numerous historical buildings on those properties. An ordinance would have allowed Newtown Square to look at what was being proposed for those properties and to protect the historical pieces of that community that were set to be razed. If we are looking at a 60-day process, it is actually nice to have a longer review period to look at what it means to your community so a little longer isn't too bad. Newtown Square has paid the price because they didn't have requirements.

Joan Smallwood, St. Patrick's Church, stated that two of the photos were St. Patrick's properties. Her concern was the scuffer on the Church that they just had replaced not too long ago. She asked if she would have had to go through the process for 60-90 days because she couldn't have waited that long because it was leaking. She stated that the house at 118 Woodland Avenue is leaking at the chimney. Does she have to wait 60 days to have it repaired? She asked what are your qualifications over my contractors who tell me I have a leak? Ms. Hockenbury responded that if you have an issue that is a leaking problem, we would react soon. We would rather have the chimney removed than have the house fall down. Ms. Smallwood stated that they maintain their property but do not have any extra money for the borough to dictate that a property has to look a certain way. Ms. Marshall stated that she thinks this would fall under a local ordinance and local historical buildings and there is only one property in the borough that falls under the Secretary of the Interior's standards. There will be very clear wording and specific guidelines in the ordinance. She stated that she wouldn't approve an ordinance that wouldn't have volunteer experts. A real estate agent can tell you how it will enhance your property.

REGULAR MEETING

November 20, 2012

Page 6

Chris Johnson, 124 W. King Street, asked if your designation goes through, can we apply for grants? Ms. Marshall responded that State and National Tax Credits would be eligible. There is no funding for private homeowners.

Mike Martinez, 142 W. First Avenue, asked how many homes there are in the Borough? It was responded that there are approximately 1200 homes. He asked what the financial impact would be? The Commission said no monetary, but there is. Document retrieval would have a monetary impact. If you tell me I need documentation for my house, I can tell you that I can't find it because I've already tried. Ms. Hockenbury responded that they would only be asking for it if there is a total demolition. Mr. Martinez stated that the Commission put the 1941 date but Malvern Borough is one of the few areas around that have six Sears & Roebuck homes. Ms. Hockenbury responded that we have a quad home on Woodland Avenue and we are the only one in the whole County with a quad home. We also have the only double dormers on Church Street. We have quite a number of gems in the Borough.

Lori Coyle, speaking on behalf of her aunt at 117 Woodland Avenue, stated her aunt has a Sears house. The ordinance is about demolition. What if we wanted to add to the home? How much of a deterrent would that be? What if we want to put a second floor on a Sears home? Also on Woodland Avenue just about every house has a porch. You're talking about putting them in on Church Street. I have someone next to me that doesn't have a historical house, and if they decide to build another house and do it with a modern front, would there be an advisor on the zoning permit process to say this is too modern to be on this property? It would not have the same feel with a monstrosity in the middle of the block. Would someone from the Historical Commission be on the Planning Commission? Ms. Hockenbury responded that the Planning Commission asks the builder to have their new house look like the remaining houses on the block. Council President Van Sciver stated the draft document will not address this issue. If there was a single lot, I'm not sure there would be anything said in the ordinance about this issue. Ms. Hockenbury stated the other question you asked was about adding another property and changing the façade. If you obscured something because you enclosed it, that would require review. We would not discuss adding a second floor to this process.

Council Member McCrory asked, by a show of hands, who would be totally opposed to a historical ordinance. There were only about eight residents opposed.

Jerry Madden, 337 Broad Street, stated that the letter said a specific property "may" be on the list. How will we know if our property is on the final list? Ms. Hockenbury responded that we have a recommendation of that small area. Borough Council instructed us to send to the larger area. We did not know what direction we were going at that time. Mr. Madden asked if they would be notified and Ms. Hockenbury responded that when there is an official list, it will be published on the website.

David Burton, 19 Powelton Avenue, stated that he is not in favor of having to go before anyone to have changes made to his house. He doesn't think anyone on the Historical Commission has credentials and he wasn't thinking about the demolition. David Evans was the

REGULAR MEETING

November 20, 2012

Page 7

founder of Malvern and his home was demolished. Maybe an ordinance could be added to the current ordinances that address demolition without a separate ordinance or by a Commission that advises without them saying we have to do something. I think the demolition of an entire building could be added to the current ordinances without adding all these extra ordinances and the Historical Commission coming up with their advisory. Ms. Hockenbury responded that the goal is to be an advisory position to the Borough Council or Planning Commission. But, there has to be a process to get to us. Mr. Burton stated that he installed a Victorian fence on his property but he is looking into better storm windows. They try to maintain that; they recognize what they have and they try to do that with all of their projects. Council President Van Sciver stated that the Historical Commission can make an education piece available to the owners of historical properties. Ms. Hockenbury also pointed out that David Evans was not the founder of Malvern but was one of the first residents of Malvern.

Ms. Smallwood, Woodland Avenue, stated the Historical Commission could not find the original structure of the house. The demolition was approved. Before that house was demolished, that house was going to be the rectory. Prior to St. Pat's owning that property, the center support to that house had been taken down. It was a wonder the house didn't fall down on its own because it was an unsafe structure.

Mr. Burton stated that he would not want to be restricted in what he could do to his property.

Tom Teti, 115 W. Broad Street, stated that his chimney needs work. How can it be monitored as to who has what and what needs to be done? Council President Van Sciver responded that if you need an existing building permit, you would have to come in anyway. If you're on the list, the Codes Officer will send you to the next step. Mr. Teti asked if there would be a review of the houses on the list and if an inventory would be taken of what kind of shape the structure is in and what has been modified on the structure? Ms. Hockenbury responded that they have many pictures. Some were taken in the 1980's and others are more current as of five years ago. Ms. Marshall stated that there were two things that came up for the Historical Architectural Review Board. A Historical Commission can only recommend denial. Ms. Marshall stated that she is here more about guidelines vs. mandates. What about design guidelines for the rest of the business district? Consider some working guidelines for recommendations for in-fill development.

Ms. Holsclaw stated that she is confused. If we're talking about portions of a building and a railing has been replaced since 1941, will she be required to go to the Historical Commission? She is also confused about the storm door. If this door is historical and I want to put on a storm door, what will I be required to do? Ms. Hockenbury responded that we might ask you to put on a glass storm door so that the historical door can still be seen.

Ms. Marshall stated that Historical Commissions throughout the County are responsible to make recommendations to homeowners. Frequently an alternative solution can be offered and unless you fall under a mandate, you can do whatever you want. Ms. Holsclaw responded that if a property was on the list, any improvement could still be denied. Council President Van Sciver

REGULAR MEETING

November 20, 2012

Page 8

responded that he would presume that Borough Council would not be interested in having a parade of people coming before them to request an overturning of a denial.

Council Member McCrory stated the confusion is that the ordinance is not really written. There are degrees for this ordinance or not to have an ordinance at all. The lesser degree is if you are going to demolish, we want pictures. More onerous, we will advise you but not mandate. A proposed ordinance is above advisory but not mandated. Some ordinance probably has value. Everybody else of any significance in the County has thought about this and enacted something. We are probably the most historical and have enacted nothing. When we don't do something, we lose the opportunity to do it because it is gone. I think what we're trying to understand is the balance of onerous. The crowd wants an ordinance to be on the lesser side and the Historical Commission wants it more onerous. What's the advantage of making it more strict? Ms. Hockenbury responded that if a resident wants to change a window, they can now just take it out and replace it. With a more onerous ordinance in place, they would then be required to come to the Historical Commission for guidance.

Ms. Marshall stated that the reason the boroughs have the more onerous ordinances is because they are dense and changes to the buildings have a much larger impact on the overall aesthetics of the street. That is why you see that most of the boroughs have realized that there needs to be a stricter ordinance besides the demolition review and with no requirements in the partial demolition, you aren't really accomplishing the overall goals of preserving the quality of life of the community. The other thing is a lot of these ordinances have come out and it is important for your business district that you have these guidelines and reviews and these are proven economical benefits. I think you can really enhance your business district and complement your neighborhoods.

Kathy Johnson, 124 W. King Street, asked that if this ordinance was in effect several years ago, would the E. King Street development have occurred? Council President Van Sciver responded "yes", it probably would have happened.

Bill Shaddock, 116 S. Warren Avenue, asked what impact to the Historical Commission would there be regarding their volunteer time? Has there been any thought about that impact and is there a precedence in other locations? Ms. Hockenbury responded that she, personally, has thought about it. There are options to increase the amount of meetings each month. Ms. Marshall stated that there will need to be a more fully staffed Historical Commission. They can also choose to work in teaming on a project. I think most of the issues will be quickly resolved. Mr. Shaddock stated that he is leaning towards any ordinance being more advisory.

Jill Holsclaw stated that in just thinking about the historical area, has our historical properties decreased because of the E. King Street development? Ms. Hockenbury responded that it will cause an impact. Your property values should go up because of the new development but it does not impact. Ms. Marshall stated that the Borough lost one of the six criteria for historic integrity. Council President Van Sciver stated that if there was a historical ordinance that would not regulate selective demolition and was only an advisory piece, take an advisory brochure, how many people would prefer that? Ms. Marshall reminded the crowd that their neighbor would get the same brochure and they can say "forget it".

REGULAR MEETING

November 20, 2012

Page 9

Jamie Romanoff, 326 Raspberry Avenue, stated that we are trying to maintain and repair these houses because we like the beauty of them. There are houses on Raspberry Avenue that are not on the list. After reviewing the map, it was determined that Raspberry Avenue is not on the list at all.

Council President Van Sciver asked if there is the last onerous component that you would just get an advisory packet vs. having to go through a discussion with the Historical Commission, would that be preferable?

Kathy Johnson asked how it would benefit us as a homeowner? Ms. Marshall responded that you have some protection from houses that are being left to fall apart. There is a design consistency for your block.

A resident stated that one thing to consider is onerous vs. advisory. What level of change triggers any kind of review? The nature of the town isn't going to change because of the color of the porch.

Carroll Sinquett, 223 Green Street, stated that as far as the historical ordinance, if we aren't going to have design standards for new construction, we are missing something. The Planning Commission tries to ask the developers to have the new houses look like the existing houses on the street. Ms. Marshall responded that there are provisions for that if you have an overlay district. You can then have design guidelines.

Ms. Marshall informed Borough Council that the Chester County Vision Partnership Plan Grant is available for this kind of project and will fund a preservation planner to come in and provide more information.

Council President Van Sciver and Council Member McCrory thanked the members of the audience for their input.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

A motion was made by Council Member Macaleer, seconded by Council Member Sponenbergh and unanimously carried by a vote of 5-0 to approve the minutes of the Regular Meetings held on Tuesday, October 2 and Tuesday, October 16, as submitted.

4. APPROVAL OF REPORTS:

A motion was made by Council Vice President Raymond, seconded by Council Member Sponenbergh and unanimously carried by a vote of 5-0 to approve the Treasurer's Report, the Committee Reports for Finance and Administration, Public Safety, Public Works and the Chief of Police Report, the Code Enforcement Officer's Reports (Building Inspector's Report, Housing and Property Maintenance Report and Zoning Report), the Superintendent of Public Works Report and the Manager's Report for the month of October 2012, as submitted.

5. OTHER BUSINESS:

a. Proposed 2013 Budget – Council Member McCrory stated that he had asked the Chief to present the Police Dept. budget to Council so that various expenditures could be explained. Most of the stuff in the Public Works budget is stuff we do ourselves. Most of the Police Department expense, some were things that we would be buying into every year going forward and Council Member McCrory thought it would be prudent of Council to hear the story behind the police budget.

Chief Ercole explained that the increase in part-time salaries was to keep us in fair competition with other municipalities. We're a training ground. A lot of the officers are young men that are trying to live. This is not a huge increase and would only be given to officers who have been with the department for two years or more. Chief Ercole also feels that some of the functions in town should be billed back to the organizations requiring part-time police services. For example, the Fall Festival and Spring Blooms are events where money is collected for vendor participation. We should consider charging the events just the amount of money for payroll to make us whole. Events such as the Memorial Parade, Victorian Christmas and the Malvern Fire Company Fair are more community based events that the Borough should consider to pay for. The bike race should be paying for additional manpower.

We should keep our supply of ammunition up so in the event we need it another year, and ammunition is not available because of a war, we would have it.

The Chief requested an increase in the training budget for attendance by the officers at various training seminars and the increase will pay for lodging and the training.

Phone cards for the vehicles will allow access to the computer system for real time information, it can tie into all the police systems and it will give the officers access to the web while out of the office and on the streets. While out of the office, they can get into J-Net and get pictures and go into the Department's report system that is tied into five other Counties.

An increase has been budgeted for vehicle maintenance as the older vehicles require more maintenance and repairs. If we have two men working, we need the additional car and it must be kept in good repair.

The Chief requested budgeting for two new computers. If a Detective is brought in, we can upgrade one of the older computers and put the old one into the processing room for video arraignments in the holding room. This will allow us to leave the prisoner sitting in the processing room, do the video arraignment and have the camera right there. The other new computer would be used by the Detective.

We currently have two tasers. If one breaks, we don't have a back-up. If you have a power shift man out on the street with one taser, and the Malvern Fire Company Fair is being held, for example, we might only have one taser if the other one is out of service. We would then not have a taser for the Fair.

The police uniforms are ugly and we have gotten away from the Star. Sheriff's wear Stars. Pennsylvania State Police wear a shield, not a star. We would like to go to a uniform that

REGULAR MEETING

November 20, 2012

Page 11

is more presentable but we can get the uniforms off the rack. We will have to outfit the part-time officers, as well. We should be able to refit everyone for about \$3,000

Chief Ercole reported that he had spoken to the Public Safety Committee about adding a part-time Detective to the Department. The Malvern Police Department is a good Department but is lacking in follow-up and investigations. With only one officer on duty, he can't leave the Borough to follow-up on investigations nor can he leave the County. The Officer might be off for three days, then it goes to the next officer on duty. We need to be able to tell our residents this is your point of contact and this is the person you want to talk to regarding your incident. Realistically, we can't afford a full-time person for this position, but Chief Ercole stated he would use someone with experience.

Council President Van Sciver stated that we have talked about buying this service from one of our neighbors. Chief Ercole responded that if we did this, we would be looking at a full-time person and we would have to pay the overtime rate of \$65-\$85 per hour. If we can find someone at 1/3 of the cost, that is the way I would prefer to go. The Chief said the power shift runs Wednesday/Thursday/Friday/Saturday nights. In order to help defray the cost of a Detective, and based on the number and types of calls received, we can run the power shift Friday and Saturday. We will do away with Wednesday and Thursday. We can take those hours and apply those funds to a part-time Detective. Council President Van Sciver asked if that takes away our ability to pull anyone else from within the Department. The Chief responded that if he took them, because of the twelve hour shift, it becomes a scheduling nightmare. If we get to the point where we can afford a full-time Detective, we would use one of our guys. In the meantime, this gives them the opportunity to work with the trained Detective and gives them an opportunity to realize what they are lacking when they take reports and why. It is a learning curve.

Council Member Macaleer told the Chief that the guys are looking to extend the power shifts to the rest of the week. The Chief responded that he's heard that. They don't want to become burdensome to our neighboring departments. The Chief has talked to the administration and the men in East Whiteland and Willistown and it doesn't seem to be an issue with them. Ninety percent of the time our officers have had the back-up they needed.

Training for Emergency Response Team – one officer has been training for years on his own time, bought his own equipment and has been told for years that the Chief will check into it. This officer has put a lot of his time into it. It is not a bad thing. If we should ever need it, we have someone in a team and we will get the response from the team because we are part of the team. The \$2,000 for training and equipment is a rough estimate.

Regarding capital expenditures, we are requesting a rifle. We have patrol shot guns. The rifle would be for the person on the Emergency Response Team. If I could get two rifles for one same price, I would get one for the ERT person and one for the patrol car. They make suppressors for them and they are not noisy. Access to a range is always a problem. There is a pistol range in East Whiteland and a shot gun range at another location. The Chief is working on searching out alternative training sites.

The Chief received a \$3,000+ grant for bulletproof vests and our friends at Wegman's have given us 200 Temporary No Parking Signs. We changed our stationery vendor and are now

REGULAR MEETING

November 20, 2012

Page 12

getting twice as much stationery and envelopes for the same price. We also contacted the car wash people and saved about \$300 a year for car washes. We were able to have the traffic light wired for a generator for \$500; a \$1,000 savings from the original cost. As we only have one traffic light in town, we should have had a generator for this light and it was a worthwhile investment.

The Manager reported that the proposed budget includes a six-bay pole barn and a new salt shed for Public Works. It was suggested that we look into fiber clad salt shed buildings instead of steel. The Manager responded that the Supt. of Public Works will check into this alternative. These expenses, as well as the monies approved by Council at the last meeting for the HVAC system at the Borough Hall, will be paid for by a \$300,000 loan at 1.58% interest for a term of ten years. Currently, there is no planned tax increase in 2013.

The Finance & Administration Committee discussed some financial guidelines at their last meeting. Council Member Macaleer prepared a Financial Guidelines Memorandum for recommendations of how new contingency funds should be allocated in the General and Sewer Funds and recommended a cap of \$500,000. Council President Van Sciver asked if we made the completion of the metrics part of the auditors package and Council Member Macaleer replied "yes".

b. Malvern-Willistown Greenway Trail Public Meeting – Council President Van Sciver reported that he, David Knies and Sandra Kelley attended the public meeting for the Malvern-Willistown greenway trail held at Sugartown School. Only a few Malvern residents attended. The good news is the consultants got some verbal approval from the Retreat grounds that a path could be constructed there near the fence line. Also, approval was received from Malvern Prep for a path along Paoli Pike and Warren Avenue that would lead into the Paoli Battlefield grounds.

5. ADJOURNMENT:

All business having been discussed, a motion was made by Council Vice President Raymond, seconded by Council Member Macaleer and unanimously carried by a vote of 5-0 to adjourn the meeting at 10:24 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sandra L. Kelley
Secretary/Manager