

NEW HOPE BOROUGH
COUNCIL WORKSHOP AGENDA

RE: #1 Sketch Plan Review
 44 South Main Street
 #2 Discussion on Proposed Stormwater
 Management Ordinance
 #3 Discussion on Proposed Short Term
 Rental Ordinance Fees

A Borough Council Workshop was held at New Hope Borough community room on Monday, August 1, 2022, located at 123 New Street, New Hoper, PA commencing at 4:00 p.m. by and before William Campbell (Court Reporter).

CONNIE GERING, PRESIDENT
LAURIE MCHUGH, VICE PRESIDENT
TINA RETTIG, PRESIDENT PROTEM
DANIEL DOUGHERTY, MEMBER
KENNETH MAISEL, MEMBER
LOUISE FEDER, MEMBER
PETER MEYER, MEMBER (ABSENT)

PETER GRAY, MANAGER
MARY STOVER, ZONING OFFICER

APPEARANCES:

DANIEL POPKIN, APPLICANT

PAUL COHEN, ESQUIRE

CONNER TRASK, ENGINEER

44 South Main Street

New Hope, PA

1 MS. GERING: This is a work session.
2 Will you take roll.

3 MR. GRAY: Certainly. Ms. McHugh.

4 MS. McHUGH: Here.

5 MR. GRAY: Ms. Rettig.

6 MS. RETTIG: Here.

7 MR. GRAY: Ms. Feder.

8 MS. FEDER: Here.

9 MR. GRAY: Mr. Dougherty.

10 MR. DOUGHERTY: Here.

11 MR. GRAY: Mr. Maisel.

12 MR. MAISEL: Here.

13 MR. GRAY: Mr. Meyer. Ms. Gering.

14 MS. GERING: Here. Thank you. First
15 on the list is 44 South Main Street. Mr. Cohen, the
16 third time is the charm.

17 MR. COHEN: That's right. You are
18 going to be hearing very little from me today. I
19 just want to give a brief explanation. I am going
20 to pass it on to my client, Danny Popkin. As you
21 all will recall, we were here in the Fall with an
22 application on this project, a sketch plan on this
23 project. The feedback we received and concerns
24 about the reduction of the commercial space and the
25 overall scale of the project. We were back here

1 earlier in the Spring ensuring that all of the
2 commercial space would be preserved and also scaling
3 back the project. Instead of asking for four
4 additional dwelling units, we will be asking for
5 two. The reason we are back here today, frankly,
6 is that after the last meeting where we got some
7 positive feedback from council, my client looked
8 into it. And he will come up here to explain and
9 just determine that the feasibility of that project
10 was not going to work.

11 So we tasked the architects with the idea
12 of trying to bring in a third unit. But respecting
13 council's concern about the overall scale of the
14 project, we are going to show that to you today. We
15 do not believe that what we are presenting today
16 requires any additional relief than what we brought
17 in in the Spring. We do need an additional
18 variance, for example, with the additional dwelling
19 because we are asking for three additions as to two.
20 But it is the same type of relief just differently
21 that, I guess, the quantity. But what we didn't
22 want to do is submit a zoning application and come
23 back here asking for three without having first
24 brought it to your attention. So, that's why we are
25 here today. Danny Popkin is going to speak just for

1 a few minutes to explain some of the reasoning
2 behind this change. And Connor Trask is here from
3 Ralph Fey's office to show you the differences
4 between what we reviewed back in the Spring and what
5 we have here today.

6 MR. POPKIN: Thank you, Paul. Thank
7 you, Council, again for seeing us. I apologize for
8 coming back. What happened between the last meeting
9 and now, as I have told you the last time I was
10 here, we are trying to do things the right way. I
11 heard through the past with historic preservation
12 buildings like this. But as we start to get into it
13 with the recent HARB application that was approved
14 to do quite an extensive rehab for the entire
15 building. And also, as part of this project to
16 effectively take, to demolish that back structure.
17 It is a wooden, sort of shed-like structure, that is
18 sitting on some cinder blocks. In order to take
19 that down, raise it up out of the floodplain, add
20 ADA parking spaces, a new elevator. Councilman
21 Meyers asked to put in new sprinklers into the units
22 which I agreed to --

23 MS. GERING: Can you get a little
24 closer to the microphone? Thank you.

25 MR. POPKIN: I am sorry. So to

1 continue on that, taking out the old structure in
2 the back, totally rebuilding it and building the
3 units on top of it. Also raising all of the
4 existing utilities out of the floodplain and up
5 quite a bit is a massive job. So, when looking at
6 all of that, in order to justify doing all of that
7 for just two small units, it became clear that there
8 really needed to do three in order to be effective
9 and be able to do the best job we can.

10 So, I ask Ralph's office to, basically, tuck
11 this relatively small third unit into the attic
12 space that was in the original plan. You will see,
13 Connor will show, it is a relatively small impact on
14 the facade and any of the elevations. But we
15 thought it was a smart item to do to make this
16 project more feasible for us. This is why we are
17 here today. So, if there are any questions before
18 Connor shows exactly what the changes are.

19 MS. McHUGH: What's the total height
20 now?

21 MR. POPKIN: Connor, do you want to
22 answer that?

23 MR. TRASK: Hello, Council. My name
24 is Connor Trask, T-R-A-S-K. So the additional
25 height changes between the five and six feet. The

1 reason I say that --

2 MS. GERING: Can you get closer to
3 the microphone?

4 MR. TRASK: I am sorry.

5 MS. GERING: Thank you.

6 MR. TRASK: The reason I say that the
7 additional height changes between five to six feet
8 is how we re-laid out the roof. And this is for the
9 working session. And what I come to, six would be
10 the absolute maximum of the height change. Once we
11 get down to the real construction, it would probably
12 be less. We decided to upscale and it would be best
13 and strongest. By strongest, I mean, I think this
14 construction is going for the maximum.

15 MS. GERING: So, when you say, it is
16 five to six feet; so what is the total height going
17 to be then?

18 MR. TRASK: So, on the prior
19 submission, the peak of the roof at the ridge line,
20 the very top, we, that new ridge line is six feet
21 tall.

22 MS. GERING: Six feet. The prior
23 submission?

24 MR. TRASK: Prior submission.

25 MS. GERING: Taller than it is now.

1 MR. TRASK: Prior submission.

2 MS. GERING: So, what would it be
3 then when you are done?

4 MR. TRASK: That would be, my
5 apologies, the difference from now to the current
6 submission.

7 MR. COHEN: What would be the total?

8 MR. TRASK: Fourteen feet.

9 MS. GERING: Well, our height is 35
10 feet that you are required. You kind of lost me. I
11 am sure that's not 14 feet high, the total building
12 to the peak.

13 MR. TRASK: The total building --

14 MS. GERING: -- you are looking at
15 that total building --

16 MR. TRASK: -- I am sorry. My
17 misunderstanding. I thought you were asking me the
18 height difference from the existing addition on the
19 rear of the building.

20 MS. McHUGH: We are asking for
21 everything.

22 MS. GERING: What is the maximum
23 height of that building going to be?

24 MS. McHUGH: What is the height now?
25 What do you want it to be?

1 MR. TRASK: The current height now is
2 18 feet.

3 MS. GERING: I don't think so. No,
4 it can't be 18 feet.

5 MR. TRASK: On the rear addition; and
6 you said, no?

7 MS. GERING: Yeah. If you take the
8 whole building from the ground to the very peak,
9 what is the height?

10 MR. TRASK: Which portion, Farley's
11 bookstore?

12 MS. McHUGH: The highest part,
13 correct?

14 MR. TRASK: Thirty-two.

15 MS. GERING: Thank you.

16 MS. McHUGH: And you want to make it
17 what?

18 MR. TRASK: Our addition would be
19 eight inches lower, which would be 31'-2".

20 MS. McHUGH: The higher you are
21 making, it is actually lower?

22 MR. TRASK: Yes. Our new addition
23 would be lower than the existing.

24 MS. McHUGH: Even with this new
25 proposed --

1 MR. TRASK: Correct.

2 MR. DOUGHERTY: And the existing
3 structure that is sitting there today in the back is
4 how tall?

5 MR. TRASK: Eighteen feet.

6 MR. DOUGHERTY: That is 18 feet. And
7 it is going to go to how many feet?

8 MR. TRASK: It is going to be 14
9 more, which would be 32.

10 MR. DOUGHERTY: So it would be from
11 18 over, 14 feet taller than the existing structure
12 that's in the back?

13 MR. TRASK: Correct.

14 MR. DOUGHERTY: And as far as the
15 length of the existing structure, roughly.

16 MR. TRASK: Eighteen which would --

17 MR. DOUGHERTY: The width of the
18 existing structure is staying the same?

19 MR. TRASK: Due to the property
20 footprint, it would be in the same location.

21 MR. DOUGHERTY: I am sorry. I am
22 talking about the existing structure. So the
23 existing structure in the rear that's 18 feet tall?

24 MR. TRASK: Yes.

25 MR. DOUGHERTY: How wide is that?

1 MR. TRASK: Twenty-two feet.

2 MR. DOUGHERTY: How wide is the new
3 structure going to be?

4 MR. TRASK: Twenty-two feet.

5 MR. DOUGHERTY: So it is 22 wide, 18
6 tall?

7 MR. TRASK: Correct.

8 MR. DOUGHERTY: It is going to be 22
9 wide, 32 tall?

10 MR. TRASK: Correct.

11 MR. DOUGHERTY: My initial reaction
12 is that one of the most historic structures in our
13 town, of course, the Toll House which use to be and
14 is now the Salt Restaurant, Salt House. It is
15 probably one of the key most critical historical
16 elements in our entire town. Because it was the
17 toll booth, if you will, to get across the river and
18 that is Ferry Street, that is the Ferry House. That
19 building off to the side right now in the prior
20 submission, which I am not sure -- prior submission
21 to the first submission? The second submission? Or
22 what?

23 MS. McHUGH: It is the second.

24 MR. DOUGHERTY: It is just the
25 second.

1 MR. TRASK: This is the second
2 submission.

3 MR. DOUGHERTY: With the second
4 submission, there is a relief, if you will, or a
5 reveal, I guess, between the Salt House and the new
6 structure. With the proposed, the Salt House now
7 appears to me to be jammed onto the side of the
8 structure, right. Prior submission or second
9 submission, has a roof line that goes down towards
10 the bottom of the A-frame roof of the Salt House.
11 The new one has a roof line that appears to be, you
12 guys are very creative with your angles. It appears
13 to be at least as tall as the peak of the A-frame
14 roof on the Salt House. That's my reaction. Now
15 that's that side, okay --

16 MR. TRASK: Are you referring --

17 MR. DOUGHERTY: That's that side. I
18 would be less concerned if it was in the parking lot
19 in the back. That's my feedback. In other words,
20 having that chunk there is no longer a reveal
21 between the Salt House and the Farley's bookstore
22 there that fills in that space. Basically it
23 obliterated the A-frame roof, the view of the
24 A-frame roof of the Salt House and marginalizes the
25 structure itself.

1 MR. POPKIN: You are referring to --

2 MR. DOUGHERTY: -- that to me
3 basically denigrates or marginalizes one of the most
4 historic structures in our town. I don't know how
5 that relates to that third apartment. That's, I
6 guess -- is that a hallway to the third apartment?

7 MR. TRASK: That would be the
8 northern portion which is like the kitchen.

9 MR. DOUGHERTY: I don't know what the
10 layout is. That's my feedback. It seems to me that
11 having that piece in there...

12 MR. TRASK: If you look at B-3, you
13 can see what that addition is.

14 MR. POPKIN: B-3 it shows that angle
15 in the back.

16 MS. GERING: Which one?

17 MR. POPKIN: B-3 shows the exact
18 change.

19 MR. TRASK: The roof heights from the
20 furthest is the Salt House.

21 MR. MAISEL: So, you are talking
22 about this, southernly?

23 MS. GERING: Right.

24 MR. POPKIN: It is like a small
25 dormer that was added to that back.

1 MR. DOUGHERTY: And that is what you
2 are seeing. Because that is part, I guess, that is
3 part of that apartment. And it is hulking over, if
4 you will, although it is odd -- oh, I know why.
5 Because the Salt House and this building do not run
6 in perpendicular lines, do they? The Salt House
7 runs askew, it runs off; that's why. Otherwise this
8 runs straight. This dormer, this shed dormer there
9 runs straight along the side. The Salt House then
10 it runs into, the Salt House and the bookstore are
11 sort of cocked. They are not lined up with each
12 other.

13 MR. TRASK: So, our addition and the
14 Salt House will be parallel to the edge, and the
15 Farley's bookstore is skewed into that. If you look
16 at A-3 --

17 MR. DOUGHERTY: -- that's my
18 feedback.

19 MS. GERING: Is this A-3 or B-3?

20 MR. TRASK: A-3. I am switching to
21 A-3 to refer to the length of the dormer. So, in
22 our latest proposal, we shrunk up what we would
23 qualify as over the Salt House. If you look at the
24 prior submission, the gable end coming towards the
25 Salt House is hanging over. It is quite tall, while

1 the new proposal has the gable end following the
2 same slope as the Salt House. Hopefully minimizes
3 that impact, putting the dormer towards the taller
4 part of the Salt House.

5 MR. DOUGHERTY: So, that shed dormer,
6 if I am standing inside the shed dormer, I am
7 actually standing up in that apace --

8 MR. TRASK: Yes.

9 MR. DOUGHERTY: -- and I stand at the
10 outer edge and facing the Salt House, I would then
11 stare into the side of the Salt House roof.

12 MR. POPKIN: There is a window there.

13 MR. TRASK: There is a window to
14 allow light to come in.

15 MR. DOUGHERTY: So, it just feels
16 weird to me but...

17 MR. TRASK: Is your concern about the
18 view from inside?

19 MR. DOUGHERTY: My concern is the
20 fact that the Salt House no longer, the Salt House
21 looks like a shed dormer to the building.

22 MS. GERING: Yes. The shed dormer
23 takes away, I totally agree with you, from the Salt
24 House. It looks like, you know, go into the city
25 and they do get extra space. It takes away from the

1 appearance. I mean, you are going to have a massive
2 compound there to start with, what you are putting
3 in that spot. Yeah, this is not eye-appealing.

4 MR. COHEN: If I may. I believe that
5 that area, I agree, that area is probably the most
6 impacted. Fair enough. But when you look at the
7 facade, the facade from the front view prior
8 submission here, very little change. And this
9 dormer here gives some light to the second floor.
10 So from that perspective, playhouse side, people
11 walking down that way, no real change of that
12 elevation. This elevation is to the corner right --

13 MR. DOUGHERTY: -- no real change
14 from the second submission?

15 MR. POPKIN: From the last submission
16 until now.

17 MR. DOUGHERTY: Massive change from
18 where there was. I am saying we are here trying to
19 figure out the current state versus the whatever
20 proposed it is today. We can't say, well it is not
21 much of a change from the second version, therefor
22 it does not matter that much. So, let's keep that
23 in mind. In fact, these plans actually show a prior
24 submission and a third submission, right? And I see
25 there are blue lines where the current building is

1 going on there and stuff like that. But it helps me
2 to decide the impact on the town if I see current
3 state, whatever it is you happen to be proposing
4 this time.

5 MR. POPKIN: Sure.

6 MR. DOUGHERTY: And this doesn't do
7 that. This actually, this pretends that the prior
8 submission, the second submission was approved or
9 something, you are only asking to have the third
10 part. That is not what you are doing, right?

11 MR. POPKIN: It is not what we are
12 doing from the last time. I am not suggesting that.

13 MR. DOUGHERTY: I agree. If you come
14 back five more times and you just keep adding parts
15 to it.

16 MR. POPKIN: I am not going to do
17 that. You are not going to see that. I am not
18 going to come back again. I am really just here to
19 be honest and say, in order to do the best job on
20 this project and do all of that, it became
21 infeasible to do with only two units.

22 MR. DOUGHERTY: Economically.

23 MR. POPKIN: Economically. Yes,
24 economically to make the entire thing work. And so,
25 I am sort of stuck with -- I am not trying to make

1 this as an either/or. But I really have to go back
2 to the drawing board. I can't then do the ADA, I
3 can't do the raising of the building out of the
4 floodplain. I can't sprinkler it. So, it is just
5 --

6 MR. DOUGHERTY: We are blind a little
7 bit tonight because we don't have our attorney here.
8 I don't know well enough about this stuff to know
9 whether or not economically is a driver. I wish our
10 attorney was here. Is it the intent to use this as
11 a driver to justify making it bigger, larger, et
12 cetera. I need five apartments. I am not making
13 threats to the accountant.

14 MS. GERING: The little bit I know
15 is, it is not our job to approve it because it does
16 not work for you feasibly, economically. Our job is
17 simply to approve the project because it is in line
18 with our guidelines. The other question I have for
19 you; are these going to be apartments rentals or are
20 they going to be condos?

21 MR. POPKIN: They are rentals.

22 MS. FEDER: May I have a question
23 while looking at page A-4? There was a change from
24 the prior submission to the proposed. Not looking
25 at the dormer but looking at the windows; we moved

1 from just regular windows to the, they look like,
2 Juliette balconies with doors. This is on the rear
3 of the building facing what it looks like; can you
4 just walk us through the reason for that change.

5 MR. TRASK: Yes. So, those are, they
6 are 18-inch Juliette balconies. They won't house
7 any furniture on those. Nobody will be standing
8 there, to allow air, more direct light coming into
9 their unit. But it is only there for ventilation
10 and esthetics. It is calling to the rear side of
11 the parlors currently. There is those, the fire
12 escape standing on the rear side. They have those
13 balconets. These are not a place to sit out and
14 grill or sit with furniture. They are going to be
15 doors to allow some air coming through.

16 MS. FEDER: So the reason was not to
17 do the layout change, the apartments just to do a
18 design?

19 MR. TRUST: It was a design decision,
20 yes.

21 MS. GERING: They are to let air flow
22 and not to have balconies out there opening doors.
23 I mean, are they looking upon the parking lot of the
24 Playhouse?

25 MR. POPKIN: We are going to get the

1 view of the river from there. It is just an idea of
2 being able to open up the door. It is a little 18
3 inches, more of a detail. So it is not like a flat
4 building, it is not to sit out there.

5 MS. RETTIG: Which one, is there a
6 river view?

7 MR. POPKIN: I think this one here is
8 the view of the river to the side. I am not
9 suggesting that is the only reason for the doors --

10 (SHORT RECESS)

11 MS. GERING: Okay. Go ahead.

12 MR. POPKIN: I think it is a nice
13 detail, frankly, the back of the building to give a
14 little depth. So it is called a Juliette balcony.
15 I think it is more for the look. I think it is
16 nicer in the unit. You can open that and just have
17 a little feeling like you can sort of peak out of
18 it. It is nice as opposed to a flat window.

19 MR. COHEN: And if I may. This end,
20 I am sure you are all aware, where we go from here.
21 The next step will be to file an application with
22 the zoning hearing board. We require a number of
23 variances. Eventually we would have to go before
24 HARB and then before you for a certificate of
25 appropriateness. And I am not suggesting it is not

1 up for discussions now. We would be happy to hear
2 all feedback that we can get. But, obviously,
3 details like the windows, the balconies and other
4 items like that is going to come up and be addressed
5 during the HARB review and through that process.
6 These are all conceptual at this point in time.
7 Again, I think this goes with Danny's overall view
8 here. He doesn't want to come before you one day
9 and you stop and say, wait a minute every time you
10 came to us we are shown windows, and now you are
11 asking for balconies. So, I think it is intended to
12 be a straight forward presentation for what we have.
13 We do appreciate your feedback.

14 The only other thing I did want, just real
15 quickly because the question was ask about
16 economics. I know we are here on a sketch plan.
17 And this isn't a zoning hearing board hearing. But
18 part of the application is going to take economics
19 into account. And, obviously, you have your own
20 solicitor. But from my perspective, it is relevant
21 when you are going for a zoning relief, you are
22 trying to show an undo-hardship. In this particular
23 case, we have a unique property with a significant
24 older structure that we are trying to preserve and
25 restore. And I do think that all does go into that

1 argument of undo-hardship. And, obviously, I think
2 in the presentation, I don't recall which page, we
3 do have a listing of the cost for renovations of the
4 property. We are going to get into much more detail
5 with the zoning hearing board about those issues.
6 But just in response to that point, I do believe
7 that that becomes a factor here because there is a
8 question of the ability to maintain this property,
9 restore and preserve the structure and being able
10 to, you know, still continue on. Obviously,
11 somebody is not going to be able to do that if they
12 are not able to make it work financially. So,
13 again, I am not saying it is the only reason for
14 what we are looking to do, but that is a fact.

15 MS. McHUGH: Could you just refresh
16 my memory real quick. How many of those apartments
17 are there?

18 MR. POPKIN: Four current apartments.

19 MS. McHUGH: And how many are you
20 looking -- because according to our engineer's
21 report, it says that you are looking for seven
22 apartments. The proposed 4,300 square feet of
23 retail space and seven apartments require 18 parking
24 spaces; is that--

25 MR. COHEN: We would be adding three

1 apartments to the existing four.

2 MS. McHUGH: So it's seven
3 apartments?

4 MR. POPKIN: Yes.

5 MS. McHUGH: Okay. How much are you
6 renting them for?

7 MR. POPKIN: I just bought the
8 building. They are all currently vacant.

9 MR. COHEN: These are not, if you
10 look at the footprints -- may be Connor can more.
11 These are relatively smaller apartments, these are
12 not going to be, you know, larger apartments.

13 MS. McHUGH: Connor, I have a
14 question for you. How are you going to deal with 18
15 parking spots that are going to be required?

16 MR. COHEN: I will address that.
17 Right now, if any of you, and I am sure you have
18 passed the property and the parking in the past, I
19 have seen just kind of cars piled up in there.
20 Technically there are four spots in that lot right
21 now. And it requires I believe 15 parking spaces
22 based on the current usage. So, the property is
23 already non-compliant. We are proposing to add
24 because in this area here, we are moving this space
25 in and sort of, you will see it is marked,

1 exchanging square footage with the commercial space
2 which allows us to add two parking spaces, including
3 a handicap accessible spot here. We would then have
4 a spot here. And with the township and work with
5 the engineers and council through land development
6 making sure that the parking is acceptable. And we
7 are looking at also two parallel spots right along
8 here that would allow for an addition of a total of
9 five. So we would still be non-complaint, but we
10 would be less non-compliant given the additional
11 parking spaces than the property currently is.

12 MR. DOUGHERTY: Well, technically,
13 currently it is grandfathered. And you are asking
14 to modify to bring it back to that line. If that, I
15 guess, the four parking specifically, if you don't
16 have this third one -- the seventh one, I am sorry,
17 the seventh one, how many spots would it be then?

18 MR. COHEN: Just one less. Part of
19 our variance request will be to request a variance
20 on a number of units permitted in that category.
21 And for a dwelling combination we are required one
22 parking space.

23 MR. DOUGHERTY: So one less spot, you
24 would get closer to complying with the parking
25 required, correct?

1 MR. COHEN: Yes.

2 MR. DOUGHERTY: Where is the trash?

3 MR. COHEN: For the commercial?

4 MR. DOUGHERTY: Seven apartments.

5 Every one of them needs a fairly large trash
6 container, where would that be on here? Could the
7 public view for all of the people who walk by.

8 MR. COHEN: Let's swap out.

9 MR. TRUST: The current condition
10 people are piling --

11 MR. DOUGHERTY: -- where will the
12 trash be?

13 MR. TRUST: That is something that
14 still needs to be worked out going through the
15 process, the design process and getting approved.

16 MR. DOUGHERTY: You don't have a plan
17 for it?

18 MR. TRASK: Correct.

19 MS. McHUGH: You don't have a
20 dumpster?

21 MR. DOUGHERTY: Dumpster back there.

22 MS. McHUGH: It is going to need a
23 space.

24 MR. DOUGHERTY: Got to be a parking
25 space, a large dumpster.

1 MR. POPKIN: I guess roll it out.

2 MR. DOUGHERTY: It is going to be a
3 large dumpster.

4 MR. POPKIN: Currently it is right
5 here. We will figure that out. We will screen it
6 properly. One of the things I was going to show
7 from, and this is page C-2, we were talking earlier
8 about the current existing condition of this
9 structure in the back. So, if you look at C-2,
10 which is also shown. But C-2 really shows the
11 elevation of that facade of the Salt House behind
12 it. And that's really what we are attempting to
13 change, I think, for the better. And back to your
14 point about the prior submission does not show the
15 existing versus what we are proposing. That's a
16 valid point. We are --

17 MR. DOUGHERTY: -- we actually bring
18 that point up at virtually every one of Ralph Fey's
19 presentations for the last five years. So that's
20 why it is concerning.

21 MR. POPKIN: My apologies. What
22 would have been better probably with the prior
23 submission to propose would be existing. But C-2
24 does show you what is existing right now.

25 MS. McHUGH: Is there a reason why

1 you are not using a CAD. You have minor, you have
2 original, you have the first version, the second
3 version, and a third version. We have asked them
4 and reminded them. It is easier if you have a CAD
5 file; so is there a reason you are not doing that?

6 MR. POPKIN: We can request it. I
7 think the attempt was, I always heard you are not
8 allowed to bring anything new to the meeting. So,
9 this is the submission. You are saying what Ralph
10 presented was inappropriate. I apologize in order
11 to correct that before the meeting.

12 MS. McHUGH: I am not attacking him.
13 I am just asking, we are going by Ralph Fey's work.

14 MR. TRASK: You are asking and we did
15 not bring it. We didn't know that -- I was not told
16 that was required for a suggestion. My apologies.

17 MS. McHUGH: Can I ask a question --

18 MR. COHEN: For this particular
19 application. I can assure you that, and I can only
20 control my application, for this particular
21 application, when we come back in, when we submit a
22 zoning application and things like that are not
23 required for zoning just because zoning is more
24 about the use, the footprint; we would provide that
25 any way. I heard you. And just to make it clear.

1 What you are asking for is; if we were to come in
2 that you would see the current versus proposed,
3 getting rid of the prior proposals because they are
4 no longer on the table. Just that you can actually
5 see visually what the new thing would look like.

6 MS. RETTIG: What it looks like now
7 and what you are asking for from the same exact
8 angle, not three feet one way, three feet the other
9 way. From the same exact place so we can make an
10 educated side-by-side comparison of what we got and
11 what you are asking for. And Ralph knows this.

12 MS. McHUGH: It would be cheaper for
13 you as a client, this cost. It is always more
14 expensive or expensive to do drawings.

15 MR. DOUGHERTY: I would like to say.
16 Since none of my constituents have the power of
17 flight, we do not need overhead what it looks like
18 from drones. Because we are interested in our
19 constituents and our visitors what it looks like
20 from what they would see while walking around.

21 MR. COHEN: I believe for this
22 project, the renderings we have --

23 MR. DOUGHERTY: -- staring down like
24 three miles away.

25 MS. GERING: Ken.

1 MR. MAISEL: I want to bring in a
2 little, some positivity for the thing. I think we
3 are very fortunate to have a group of people that
4 are prepared to take this from the current state
5 that it is in and move it up to anything close to
6 this, you know, would be an amazing thing. I don't
7 think any of us feels any different. It is at what
8 cost, and how realistic it is and what the economics
9 of it can be made to work. So, I am personally
10 hopeful and I believe everyone on this council feels
11 that we hope that sort of way. We are certainly not
12 trying to be obstructionist here. But I do think, I
13 just, for the record, I also wanted to make a point
14 about one of those balconies on A-3. That is also
15 included so that would cover at least a visible
16 representations of the Juliette balconies. There is
17 one on A-3, in addition to A-4.

18 MS. FEDER: I agree. We are not here
19 to go through every single architectural detail,
20 that would be a whole other meeting. But I think
21 the reason why we are taking a look at it now
22 because the sketch plan what I am trying to get my
23 arms around this is what this type of addition would
24 do to the character of this part of town, right.
25 And I think there is something very different about

1 having several Juliette balconies whether or not a
2 better or worst, just significantly different than
3 having regular windows. I am pointing this out
4 there. I think it becomes important, again I am not
5 saying whether it's good, bad, it's just different.
6 So I think it make sense to do it now so that we are
7 prepared for whatever comes next.

8 I did want to circle back, I apologize to
9 have you keep looking back in your packets. I am
10 looking at B-4, like the letter B and then to
11 compare versus we have a prior submission. And this
12 new proposed considering just the change that this
13 expansion will make on this property. And I think
14 the roof line, which we talked about a lot at the
15 start of this conversation, is just so dramatically
16 different around the Salt House around from this
17 angle. It is one that does give me pause. I think
18 so much what you have designed or plan makes so much
19 sense to the building and the area. That roof line
20 back there is very high. And I think at this point
21 the historic district, as Dan mentioned, the Salt
22 House is such an important facade there. I am not
23 even talking about the change to the rear. As we
24 round that corner and look down that street,
25 normally what you would see is a historic facade and

1 the Farley's building and the Salt House. And now
2 to have a few different roofs, not just a dormer.
3 Because the taller roof line it just changes, it is
4 pretty substantially.

5 MR. TRUST: My understanding though,
6 and I agree, that the elevations it is architect
7 drawing everything is drawn flat. And when we have
8 A-2 at that perspective, you do see that dormer
9 coming down towards the Salt House. But in that
10 particular angle it goes down the line two steps
11 until you, that roof line backwards does hide from
12 view.

13 MR. COHEN: If you figure in the
14 width of Ferry Street that is very narrow. So that
15 image, maybe pointed out before by like what Dan was
16 saying, you have to be in a drone half way between
17 the buildings to see that. When you are down on
18 Ferry Street looking up at the sides of the building
19 and the side of the Salt House, that roof is further
20 back. And, again, that dimension is not sort of
21 captured.

22 MR. POPKIN: If you look at B-3 that
23 will show you that nothing has changed with that
24 elevation at that place. It is sort of like flying
25 very high looking back at the view. I understand.

1 MS. McHUGH: I am very familiar with
2 respect to the architectural rendering. Because I
3 am looking here and I am just -- even on B-3, it's I
4 think very, very big change between the two in the
5 back there. It is just something, we get plans. We
6 are talking about stages. I think that is a pretty
7 sizable amount back there to the Salt House. That's
8 all. It is changing the character of the
9 relationship between those two buildings. But
10 otherwise, I completely understand what you are
11 trying to do back there. I think it is commendable
12 to try to preserve the retail spaces, adding
13 apartment space. But your addition of the seven
14 apartments, the maximum is pretty significant. I am
15 just interested in seeing if it goes forward what
16 the relationship is going to look like.

17 MR. DOUGHERTY: I have a question.
18 You had proached the subject economics driving the
19 desire to go from six apartments -- actually from
20 four apartments to seven apartments. But six
21 apparently wouldn't work. I don't want to put words
22 in your mouth. Are these going to be rental units?

23 MR. POPKIN: Yes.

24 MR. DOUGHERTY: Rental apartments. I
25 understand what the properties go for. An apartment

1 at that location, I am just going to use a round
2 number, say \$2,500, \$2,000, it maybe \$24 to \$30,000
3 a year. That's a big break. It just seems like
4 \$24,000 a year before --

5 MR. POPKIN: The real issue I have --

6 MR. DOUGHERTY: What makes this a
7 million dollar project.

8 MR. POPKIN: Let me explain what I am
9 struggling with. So if you look at C-4, if you look
10 at that current elevation, that shed building, wood
11 structure in the back, that's what's there now. I
12 could do a renovation, re-skin it, put new windows
13 on it. That commercial space, that has to stay.
14 But once you go from demolishing it, right, lifting
15 it up out of the floodplain, make that whole floor
16 on the same level, that's a big, big job. Then you
17 get into adding handicap space, adding sprinklers.

18 MR. DOUGHERTY: You are using the
19 elevator because you are adding seven units, going
20 to the third floor.

21 MR. POPKIN: Well, first of all, I
22 think I am going 50 percent more, that 50 percent
23 threshold when you cross that. I need to bring
24 everything up to code. So you need ADA, the
25 sprinklers. I need to lift all of the utilities out

1 of the basement.

2 MR. DOUGHERTY: First you are saying

3 --

4 MR. COHEN: Access that was actually
5 proposed at the last proposal when we had the second
6 floor units. It would give access to all four,
7 second floor units in the building.

8 MR. POPKIN: And also that ADA -- so
9 they can wheel them in a wheelchair and not to be
10 pushed up --

11 MR. DOUGHERTY: The elevator was to
12 be there regardless. You basically say that in
13 order to tear down part of the building --

14 MR. POPKIN: Correct.

15 MR. DOUGHERTY: -- to make that worth
16 while to be built the new section, you need to build
17 up more.

18 MR. POPKIN: Nothing is larger.

19 MR. DOUGHERTY: Fifty percent larger,
20 two units in the back, correct?

21 MR. POPKIN: It is a third unit.

22 MR. DOUGHERTY: The two and three.

23 MS. GERING: I saw a plan there, one
24 was --

25 MR. POPKIN: All three units are one

1 bedrooms, all new three units are one bedrooms.

2 MR. DOUGHERTY: These are the
3 bedrooms?

4 MR. POPKIN: Right. You know, they
5 are not large but it is not. These are not like,
6 these are not like luxury things that are going for
7 \$3,000 or \$2,000. I don't really know if they will.
8 So when you start to look at the economics going
9 from those, from not doing them or doing them, it
10 truly is a tripping point.

11 MR. DOUGHERTY: Tear off the back
12 existing structure.

13 MR. POPKIN: Raise it up out of the
14 flood plain.

15 MR. DOUGHERTY: Bring it back to two
16 apartments. Are there two apartments in that --

17 MR. POPKIN: There are no apartments
18 there, it's all commercial.

19 MR. DOUGHERTY: So, we are increasing
20 that by adding -- how many apartments?

21 MR. POPKIN: Adding three apartments
22 above the back.

23 MR. DOUGHERTY: Four apartments
24 existing in that building right now?

25 MR. POPKIN: Correct.

1 MR. DOUGHERTY: Those four, plus
2 adding the density.

3 MR. POPKIN: Three units to the
4 building or two. Last meeting --

5 MR. DOUGHERTY: So the parking spaces
6 are not compliant now because it is only four
7 apartment spaces. Then these new parking spaces
8 would be less non-compliant. Arguably there is
9 enough space back there now to have sufficient, much
10 more required parking spaces. So it is kind of a
11 specious argument to say we are going to be less
12 non-compliant because of the seven units than we are
13 today. We have only four spots today. Because
14 there is more than four spots back there. The way
15 you are using spots then, you could squeeze spots
16 into them.

17 MR. COHEN: Not entirely.

18 MR. DOUGHERTY: You are getting at
19 least three more spots back there, just like
20 painting lines. And then you would be almost
21 compliant today, right? It is a specious argument.

22 MR. COHEN: No. You couldn't paint
23 lines and then be complaint. Because today with the
24 current use I think you are required to have 15
25 spaces. You are not --

1 MR. DOUGHERTY: This isn't much more
2 worse than the current status. There are at least
3 enough spots back there to get four apartments
4 current status?

5 MR. POPKIN: That's correct. This
6 would add the handicap spots that you couldn't have
7 now.

8 MR. DOUGHERTY: No more room.

9 MS. GERING: All right. Any other
10 questions or comments?

11 MS. RETTIG: I do like the
12 drawings -- I appreciate the fact that these look
13 like they belong like in the middle of our historic
14 town.

15 MR. POPKIN: I appreciate it. If you
16 go to C-4 this is a current photograph of that
17 space. What was done for my mind is, this is a new
18 rendering of that. That's really what we are trying
19 to do. From the Playhouse aspect, I agree it is the
20 most prominent position walking down the street.
21 Seeing that, solving a way changing the architecture
22 of the existing building, I think it is very
23 appropriate. I think it has been a lot of time
24 doing that. I am just trying to find a way to make
25 it all work, to do the best I can with the project.

1 I don't know if you know about my history. But
2 Modern Recycle Spaces, look at my website. I invite
3 all of you. We spend a lot of time working on
4 historic structures like this. And try to make sure
5 we are sensitive on how to do it right. We don't do
6 cheap jobs. Look at what we have done and come see
7 the projects we have done. It is quite amazing.
8 So, I take a lot of pride and I spend a lot of time
9 doing this. And I am just being honest with you
10 council, I don't know if I can do it with two units.
11 I know that sounds silly -- a million people have
12 been here and said, this is a threat I can't do this
13 without it. It is truly looking at a fabulous
14 property that needs a lot of work should be raised
15 out of the flood plain, should have ADA, should have
16 sprinklers in that new use, should have much cleaner
17 side line from the Playhouse side. And that's what
18 we are trying to accomplish. I think it is a
19 relatively small change. I think in Ralph's -- in a
20 benefit to Ralph, we are truly trying to show how
21 small the difference is by adding a dormer here. It
22 is a relatively small difference. He tucked this
23 extra unit really, like, into an attic space on the
24 third floor. So, it's much less of a change than
25 the square footage for a third unit. It is a

1 minimal change presented tonight.

2 MS. McHUGH: What is the name?

3 MR. POPKIN: Modern Recycled Spaces.

4 We have two projects, one we just did in Hamilton
5 and won a beautification award. It is going to be
6 in October. We also have a National Park
7 recognition. So they are studio apartments we did,
8 it is \$200,000. The next one is a three-story
9 building -- I like to show it and we would do the
10 same.

11 MS. McHUGH: I like the website.

12 MR. POPKIN: That's everything.

13 MS. GERING: Any questions from
14 council?

15 All right, let's get rolling here.
16 Our next item is the proposed ordinance updated.

17 MR. GRAY: Yes. We were requested to
18 consider to the board our storm water management
19 ordinance -- if Council were to consider this it
20 would be brought forward at the next council meeting
21 for advertising and eventually adoption. I am
22 meaning to have this in by September.

23 MS. GERING: Any questions from
24 Council?

25 MR. DOUGHERTY: I have a question.

1 Is there anything with this proposed ordinance. It
2 is an ordinance update, correct?

3 MR. GRAY: Yes.

4 MR. DOUGHERTY: Amended. You are
5 asking us to advertise --

6 MR. GRAY: No --

7 MR. DOUGHERTY: -- so this is just an
8 update to tell us this is their --

9 MR. GRAY: Yes. This is a
10 discussion.

11 MS. GERING: Can you speak into the
12 microphone --

13 MR. DOUGHERTY: Generally the
14 question is, what I would like to be served as in
15 this position, obviously, I agree 100 percent. Is a
16 summary of what substantive changes are, like -- for
17 us to -- I think I need to know whether I can vote
18 on something like this -- like, the road to hell is
19 paved with good intentions. If there is something
20 in here that suddenly impacts our property owners, I
21 just don't know -- this is 40 pages, I think. So a
22 summary of what is changing it is very technical.
23 We are going from a 12 inch type, 13 inch -- but
24 from a impact to our constituents -- I am sorry that
25 we are not sort of blindly approving something

1 that we didn't realize. By the way, this means
2 people are not allowed to have rain barrels in town
3 or no one's downspout is permitted to dispense water
4 within 15 feet of the drain, of a street drain.
5 That type of -- we may approve it anyway.

6 MS. STOVER: What we did with the
7 current ordinance with what the DEP model ordinance
8 requires. And there were a few commission -- any
9 permit issued based on false information can be
10 repealed. We added an allowance for waivers from
11 various -- how you go about getting a waiver from
12 items in the storm water ordinance. People do that
13 now, but it is not written into the current
14 ordinance. This has some requirements for
15 inspections of DMP. If you have a seepage pit or
16 something put on your property, it would require you
17 to do a couple of inspections annually for the first
18 five years, one for every three years thereafter.
19 And then the DEP requires that the O & M plan deed
20 covenant, restricted deed covenant with the land, so
21 that puts that requirement in there. And it
22 requires an O & M agreement, certain language. So
23 that the municipality performing anything, they can
24 put a lien on. These are technical issues.

25 MR. DOUGHERTY: I understand. If we

1 would red line would --

2 MS. McHUGH: -- I like the small
3 summaries. I would like --

4 MR. MAISEL: Something that places --
5 we only looking at the red line, then it's easier --

6 MR. DOUGHERTY: -- looks to add it.

7 MR. MAISEL: -- I would like to take
8 the position that this has been in place forever any
9 kind of --

10 MS. GERING: I would like to schedule
11 for advertisement.

12 MR. GRAY: That's fine. We have two
13 weeks before the next meeting, then we have to
14 advertise two times.

15 MS. GERING: Thank you.

16 MR. DOUGHERTY: The last bullet on
17 your manager summary a statement -- I didn't read
18 that before I said about people --

19 MS. STOVER: -- probably like a
20 seepage bed or a rain garden or something like that
21 --

22 MR. DOUGHERTY: Thank you. That
23 would be very helpful.

24 MS. GERING: That sounds very good.
25 Any other questions? Okay, we are going to mark the

1 discussion it is proposes short term rental. They
2 are two changes that has been, it has been
3 advertised. And the two change are an application
4 fee for \$250 and -- \$150.

5 MS. McHUGH: It has been advertised?

6 MR. GRAY: No, no. This document,
7 this ordinance proposal has been advertised, ready
8 to be brought before you for consideration August
9 meeting. We are asking to review the application
10 and the fees that would be -- No. What we would do
11 is also present at the next meeting the amended fee
12 schedule to incorporate these rates, so we can
13 reflect on those going forward.

14 MS. GERING: Any questions from
15 council? No. All right. Any public comment? I
16 have a motion to adjourn.

17 MS. McHUGH: Aye.

18 MR. MAISEL: Second.

19 MS. GERING: Thank you.

20 - - -

21 (Wherein the New Hope Borough Council workshop
22 meeting was concluded at 5:00 p.m.)

23

24

25

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, WILLIAM CAMPBELL, being
a Court Reporter do hereby certify that the
foregoing oral testimony was taken stenographically
by me and that this transcript is a true and correct
transcript of the same, fully transcribed under my
direction, to the best of my ability and skill.

WILLIAM CAMPBELL

Court Reporter