COLLEGE TOWNSHIP COUNCIL
REGULAR MEETING
HELD FEBRUARY 11, 1982

Chairman Taricani called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. in the College Township Municipal Building.

Members present: Donald E. Bailey, Gale L. Dargitz, Herbert W. Stewart, and Dolores A. Taricani

Members absent: J. Carroll Dean

Others present: Manager Elwood G. Williams, Sr.
Treasurer Robert L. Hayden

OPEN DISCUSSION

Mrs. Laura Bower, President of the Lemont Village Association, commented on an item relating to a children's box at the Lemont Post Office which she had read in minutes of a recent Council meeting. Mrs. Bower indicated the Lemont Village Association is working toward having a children's box at the Lemont Post Office. They have encountered a few problems presented by the Postal Service and are hoping to solve them.

Chairman Taricani noted that Council had responded to the individual in Ohio who had written them concerning the children's box.

MINUTES

Minutes of January 14, 1982, Regular Meeting. Mr. Bailey moved the Minutes of January 14, 1982 be approved as distributed. Mr. Dargitz seconded the motion. The motion was carried unanimously.

Consideration of the Minutes of January 4, 1982 Organizational Meeting was postponed until Council's next Regular Meeting.

UPDATE

1. Mr. Williams indicated he would report on his findings relative to improving Cherry Alley when parking in Lemont was discussed.

2. Mr. Williams reported a map depicting the parking proposed for Lemont had been posted in the Lemont Post Office.

3. Mr. Williams informed the Solicitor that Council had decided to wait until the case dealing with the use of excessive speed preventers is tried before proceeding with posting of signs and preparation of an ordinance.

4. Mr. Williams indicated the meeting on the bikeway along South Atherton Street was held on February 5.

5. Mr. Williams reported he and the Zoning Officer had checked on the matter of the fill being placed in the Flood Plain behind the former auto dealer on the Henszey property along East College Avenue. West Penn Power Company is working on updating their power lines and are grading the fill up to the poles to be worked on and using the fill to provide areas to get their equipment in. West Penn will clean up the area when they are finished.

Upon checking with Mr. Henszey, Mr. Williams learned he had not given anybody authorization to dump fill. Also, the Solicitor had indicated the property owner is liable for any dumping.

6. Mr. Williams informed the Planning Commission to proceed with setting a date for the tour of the Garver Mansion. If Council's schedules permit, they can join the tour.

TREASURER'S REPORT

Treasurer Robert L. Hayden reviewed for Council the information included in the Treasurer's Report for January 1982. The first quarter Revenue Sharing payment was received during January in the amount of $14,406.

Mr. Bailey moved the Treasurer's Report for January 1982 be accepted. Mr. Stewart seconded the motion which was carried unanimously.

CORRESPONDENCE

1. January 25, 1982 letter from Carl B. Fairbanks, Manager, Borough of State College, to Mr. Williams indicating receipt of College Township Council's correspondence of January 7, 1982, concerning the paving of Cemetery Road and indicating the matter had been referred to Borough Council's Public Works Committee.

2. Information on one-day seminars on Zoning Law and Administration to be held at the Pennsylvania State University March 27 and May 1. Chairman Taricani passed the information on these seminars along to John Olivero for his review and to be circulated among the other members of the Zoning Hearing Board. Chairman Taricani suggested if any of the members of the Zoning Hearing Board were interested in attending one of these seminars that they contact the Township Office who will take care of registering them.

PLANS

1. Guenot-Wideman Subdivision (Preliminary and Final). Pat Ward, of Uni-Tec Engineers, presented the plan for Council's consideration. Mr. Ward explained the purpose for the subdivision was to move the existing lot line of the Guenot property thereby permitting Mr. Wideman to build a garage on his property.

Council assured that the comments of the Township Engineer in his January 19, 1982 letter had been satisfied.

Mr. Dargitz moved that Council approve the Preliminary and Final Plan of Guenot-Wideman Subdivision, dated January 7, 1982. Mr. Bailey seconded the motion. The motion was carried unanimously.

2. William Dreibelbis Two-Lot Subdivision. Alan Stuart, of Triangle Engineering, presented the plan for Council's consideration. Mr. Stuart explained the plan proposed cutting the tract of ground containing the farmhouse and some out-buildings of which is approximately two acres from the rest of the farm. Mr. Stuart pointed out this would correct a recent subdivision plan wherein one of the proposed lots did not meet the current zoning requirements.

Council assured that all the comments resulting from the reviews of the plan had been satisfied.

Mr. Bailey moved that Council approve the Preliminary and Final Plan of the Two-Lot Subdivision prepared for William Dreibelbis as revised on 1/21/82. Mr. Stewart seconded the motion. The motion was carried unanimously.

Mr. Stuart asked if a representative of the Planning Commission was present to sign the plan. Chairman Taricani suggested that the plan be left and the Township Office would contact the appropriate individual needed for signature.

3. Spring Creek Estates, Phase II (Preliminary). Chairman Taricani indicated that because of the questions and discussion involved in consideration of the plan, it would be considered as the last item on the Agenda so as not to detain others involved in other Agenda items.

BUSINESS

1. 1982 Work Program. Chairman Taricani explained the purpose of the work progran and outlined the three categories included in the listing and projects included under each category.

Items currently being worked on:
- Zoning Ordinance Amendments
- Guidelines for Solicitor
- Solid Waste Ordinance
- Parking Ordinance
- Struble Road Traffic Light Financing
- Cemetery Road

New Items:
- Citizens Survey/Letter
- Financial Planning -
  - (1) Investments
  - (2) Five-Year Capital Program for College Township

Action Completed by Council: Sign Ordinance
South Atherton Street Bikeway
Park Plan
Five Year Road Plan

Mrs. Hubbard asked if Item 7 on the Agenda -- Storm Water Run-Off Problem (Hubbard's) -- could be included under new items. Chairman Taricani indicated it could be considered and Council would discuss this further when the Agenda item was addressed.

Chairman Taricani indicated the Staff would be dealing with the financial planning item. The citizen's survey will be addressed by a group of citizens representing the various areas of the Township who will bring the concerns of their areas and also solicit names of individuals interested in serving on the various boards, authorities, committees, etc.

2. Rezoning Request -- Jesse M. and Bonnie L. Darlington. Council received the request for rezoning of a portion of property owned by Jesse M. and Bonnie L. Darlington in their letter of January 22, 1982, and agreed to pass it along to the Planning Commission for their review and recommendation.

3. Parking in Lemont. Chairman Taricani provided an outline of the history of the parking issue. She indicated that Messrs. Williams and Dargitz working with representatives of the Centre Region Planning Commission had reviewed the parking problems and had developed a proposal. She indicated the meeting was to provide the residents of Lemont the opportunity to voice their comments which will be taken into consideration as the resolution on parking is finalized. Chairman Taricani outlined guidelines she requested the audience follow in presenting their comments and then asked Mr. Dargitz to explain the proposed parking regulations.

Mr. Dargitz pointed out that there is no parking resolution in the Township at the present time. There is an Ordinance which provides that parking in specific areas will be regulated by Resolution. He provided a brief history of the regulation of parking in the Township and outlined the problems and alternatives considered by the group addressing this issue. He explained the map and resolution that had been prepared were tentative and no action would be taken until the people affected have had an opportunity to provide their opinions. He reviewed the parking restrictions proposed and the reasons for them.

Mrs. Nancy Boal, who lives on the corner of Mt. Nittany Road and Pike Street, indicated the proposed parking restrictions puts "No Parking" around their property and asked how this would affect her off-street parking. Mr. Dargitz indicated the restriction only pertained to parking in the public right-of-way.

Sidney Cohn, owner of the property on the corner of Mary and Pike Streets, indicated he and Chris Exarchos had discussed the problems of the diagonal parking on Mary Street and felt that working together they could come up with a design, using railroad ties and other landscaping tools, that would make diagonal parking on Mary Street along his property a desirable situation. He felt because of the narrowness of Pike Street there should be no parking permitted on the east side of Pike Street and also indicated in his opinion that diagonal parking should be permitted on the west side of Pike Street where it is now permitted.

Chris Exarchos agreed there was a problem with cars parking diagonally on Mr. Cohn's side of Mary Street and extending into the cartway. But he felt this problem could be solved with improved design of the area available for parking and indicated his willingness to work with Mr. Cohn to come up with such a design.

Mr. Dargitz suggested that Messrs. Cohn and Exarchos develop sketches of the design they proposed and present them to Council. Mr. Dargitz indicated the work group realized the number of parking spaces available would be reduced by the proposed resolution but in their proposal they were attempting to resolve many of the problems presently caused by the parking.

Sue Tressler explained they had recently purchased the old post office building. The parking provided in the front of their building is not quite large enough to permit large vehicles to park entirely on their property without extending onto the public right-of-way. She indicated she was aware of the danger of backing from these parking spaces onto Pike Street but asked Council to consider permitting this diagonal parking in front of their store.

Mrs. Tressler also explained there was an error concerning the date in the leaflet circulated by the Lemont Village Association announcing this meeting. Consequently, many people interested in the proposed parking changes were not present. Mr. Albright, owner of Moyers' Sew-n-Vac, was not present but had suggested to her that parking on Pike Street be limited to 15 minutes.

Louise Mayes asked about Cherry Alley. Mr. Dargitz explained there is sufficient parking behind the apartment house on Pike Street for the tenants but there is no way the Township can force the tenants to use this parking.

Mr. Williams reported he and the Township Engineer had looked into the upgrading of Cherry Alley. They felt there would not be much involved in upgrading the alley as far as the Houser property beside the old post office building. However, the grade from that point on would make it impractical to do anything to that portion of the alley.

Chairman Taricani indicated she had talked with a member of the Art Alliance who indicated the Art Alliance was opposed to the Township improving Cherry Alley. However, Chairman Taricani felt the Art Alliance did not understand what the Township had in mind for the upgrading.

Mrs. Tressler asked about the railroad right-of-way being used for parking. Chairman Taricani explained this had been available for parking in the past and was not used because people were not willing to walk from there to Pike Street.

John Olivero commented on the number of people using Lemont as a "bypass" and suggested that some control be placed on the traffic through Lemont. He also commented on the speed of the individuals using Pike Street. Mr. Dargitz indicated that when the upgrading of Pike Street and Branch Road is complete they will be turned over to the Township. Although the Township will not be able to eliminate all the problems with traffic on Pike Street, it will be able to control the type of traffic. Mr. Dargitz suggested that relative to the problem of speeding on Pike Street that the Police Department be requested to put more emphasis on speed control on Pike Street.

Chairman Taricani indicated Council will take the comments that had been made under advisement, including Mrs. Tressler's suggestion about limiting the time of parking; and will expect to receive the sketches from Messrs. Cohn and Exarchos; and will work toward a resolution covering the parking in Lemont; and will discuss this issue at their next Regular Meeting.

4. Zoning Officer's Annual Report for 1981. Council had no questions on the report and accepted the report as received.

5. Status of Traffic Signal for intersection of Struble Road, Gerald Street and East College Avenue. Council reviewed the February 2, 1982 letter from Thomas C. Ickes, District Engineer from PennDOT, indicating that funds would not be available for this traffic signal before June 1982. Chairman Taricani indicated that Council is currently developing a formula for equitable voluntary contributions from businesses in the area of this proposed traffic signal.

6. Rental Housing Advisory Committee. Council noted COG was requesting that the Municipal Representatives of the R.H.A.C. be appointed. Mr. Bailey suggested Kay Mitchell be considered as College Township's Representative on this Committee. Mr. Bailey explained the Committee is a group that consisted of property owners, renters, students, members of the University, and others who discuss and seek solutions to housing problems in the State College area. Council discussed their reservations with this Committee and whether or not it benefitted the area or only the Borough.

Council agreed to table action on the appointment of this representative and let the Township's Representative for 1981 (Roger Johnson) continue to serve until they resolve this issue.

7. Storm Water Run-Off Problem (Hubbards). Chairman Taricani read the February 4, 1982 letter from H. C. and Joan F. Hubbard bringing this run-off problem to Council's attention.

Chairman Taricani indicated this problem had been looked into before with no definitive answer resulting. She suggested the Township Engineer

look into this run-off problem, report back to Council, and that this report be followed up on. Council agreed with this process.

Chairman Taricani asked Mr. Williams to have Mr. Hoy talk to Mrs. Hubbard, have her define the problem for him, have him look into the matter, and have the Township Engineer report back to Council with the extent and cause of the problem by Council's next regular meeting.

Mrs. Hubbard gave Council a copy of the history of this run-off problem she had compiled. She also pointed out the safety hazard this run-off has created.

Mr. Bailey reminded Council to add this storm water run-off problem to the 1982 Work Program under new items.

8. Request for Meeting to get Update on the Reutgers-Nease Case. Chairman Taricani reviewed the February 1, 1982, letter from William P. Parsons, Regional Water Quality Manager, Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Resources, indicating their willingness to meet with interested individuals on an update on the Reutgers-Nease case.

Chairman Taricani indicated that when the last problem with Reutgers-Nease occurred she had complained to DER that the Township had not been notified of the problem before it appeared in the papers. She had been promised by DER that the Township would receive regular monthly reports. To date none have been received.

Council suggested that a meeting date of March 4 at 7:30 p.m. in the College Township Municipal Building be proposed to DER. If that date is agreeable, then Mr. Williams is to place an ad in the newspaper so that all interested residents may attend.

PLANS (Continued).

3. Spring Creek Estates, Phase II, (Preliminary). Chairman Taricani indicated consideration of this plan had been held to the last item of the meeting because there were several aspects being considered that would have to be clarified before any action could be taken and she wanted to provide sufficient time for this discussion.

Jack Mitchell, developer of Spring Creek Estates, accompanied by Pat Ward and Kari Colyer of Uni-Tec, presented the plan for Council's consideration.

Mr. Bailey asked if the question of whether or not Scholl Street and Fairlawn Avenue were dedicated had been answered. Mr. Ward indicated that Scholl Street had been dedicated, Fairlawn Avenue had not.

Chairman Taricani indicated David Sweetland was not able to be at the meeting but had expressed concern about the site distance at the intersection. Mr. Ward indicated he felt the grade at this intersection was closer to 4%. Also, a curve had been discussed to bring the grade

down at the intersection but then there was a problem with existing driveways.

Mr. Dargitz indicated he was confused over the issue of PRD versus Subdivision. Ron Weis outlined the situation indicating that approval of subdivision plans has been requested for Phase I and Phase II. When approval was being requested for Phase I, the Planning Commission suggested that possibly a better way to approach the matter would be to look at the whole thing as a PRD. Mr. Weis indicated that until the developer sells a lot, there is no reason why he could not resubdivide Phase I and II and include them in a PRD. Mr. Weis indicated the developer is considering the PRD but did not feel that should interfere with the developer finishing the process of requesting approval of the Preliminary Plan for Phase II.

Chairman Taricani restated what she felt was before Council -- request to approve the Preliminary Plan for Phase II; also request for approval of a PRD. If this is the case, Council could consider the subdivision for Phase II and send the request for a PRD on to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Mitchell indicated the PRD had been applied for when they met with the Planning Commission. Mr. Williams indicated that no application letter with the proper attachments had been submitted.

Reed McCormick indicated he felt the issue was a matter of timing -- when the PRD application begins. He indicated he felt that the PRD application could not have begun by this time because it is not complete. The difficulty is the issue of phases and including those phases already approved in the PRD and the problems encountered with the individuals having options on the lots in the approved phases. These individuals would have to become party to the covenants and conditions related to the common open space and other conditions of the PRD.

Mr. Mitchell indicated he saw no problem with this; that his legal counsel had indicated this could be covered with the individuals having options on the lots/houses signing a statement indicating they are aware that a PRD has been applied for and that they have no objection to joining a homeowners association. This would provide legal coverage for Council and with Council's permission would enable him to proceed to sell lots and build houses.

It was suggested that Phase I be left as a subdivision and the PRD be pursued with the remainder of the phases.

Mr. Mitchell indicated the participation of those living in Phase I was needed in the homeowners association. Additionally, if they were not included in the PRD, they would have use of the open space and not paying for it.

Mr. Ward pointed out that the open space and detention pond included in Phase I was designed to include the entire area.

It was clarified that even though houses have been built in Phase I and options have been taken on lots, no deeds have yet been transferred.

Chairman Taricani asked in what way the Township was delaying the procedure when Mr. Mitchell indicated that the Township needed to take action "before the clock ran out".

Mr. Mitchell indicated it was his understanding that to apply for a PRD he needed only to submit ten copies of the plans. This he did at the Planning Commission's meeting last month. He explained the time-table he thought needed to be followed in order for the request for the PRD to be acted on within the sixty days.

Mr. McCormick indicated that for a proper application for a PRD to have been initiated the homeowners association would have to have been established. Mr. McCormick suggested that Council, the Planning Commission, and the developer agree when the "clock" starts on the application for the PRD. The developer then needed to prepare all documents necessary for applying for the PRD, submit them and all parties then would be clear on when the process would start.

Discussion followed on what constitutes an application for a PRD. Chairman Taricani referred to the portion of the PRD Ordinance which specifies what is needed for an application for a PRD. She encouraged Mr. Mitchell to prepare all the necessary data and submit it to the Township Office at which time the clock on the application for the PRD would start.

Mr. Dargitz suggested that included in the application materials for the PRD that Mr. Mitchell include a letter stating what he intends to do about including Phase I, his intentions concerning the lots and houses that individuals have options on, etc.

Mr. Mitchell indicated he would gather the necessary information for the PRD application and requested that Council consider the Preliminary Plan for Phase II.

Council asked Mr. Mitchell if he wanted them to approve Phase II now even though he would be coming in with a request for a PRD which included Phases I and II. Mr. Mitchell indicated he would like Council to approve Phase II. Mr. Ward added that they wanted Phase II approved because in their PRD concept Phase II would remain as is and with approval of Phase II, if the PRD process should take a long time, Mr. Mitchell would have something to work on.

Discussion followed on the importance of the developer having control of land that is included in a PRD; problems related to part of the area being subdivision and part PRD and attempting to combine the two; options available to Mr. Mitchell to include or not include all the phases in the PRD; the homeowners association and who should be included; the necessity for orderly planning when a developer is considering a PRD; what action was needed by Council.

Chairman Tericani suggested that the developer and his engineering consultants recess for five minutes to discuss what action they wanted Council to take.

There was a five minute recess.

Upon returning, Mr. Mitchell asked Council to approve the Preliminary Plan for Phase II.

Mr. McCormick encouraged Mr. Mitchell to make a strong proposal to the people who would buy the lots in Phases I and II that when and if approved they would join the PRD.

The question concerning the dedication of Fairlawn Avenue was raised. It was indicated that it would be updated and dedicated along with the other streets in the Subdivision.

Mr. Dargitz observed that the more construction that is done in Phases I and II, the more difficult it will be to include them in the PRD later.

Council assured that all cited deficiencies had been corrected.

Mr. Dargitz moved that Council approve the Preliminary Plan, Spring Creek Estates, Phase II, dated January 8, 1982, Revised February 11, 1982. Mr. Bailey seconded the motion which was carried unanimously.

BUSINESS (Continued)

9. Mr. Stewart asked about the status of the piece of land across Pike Street from the Bathgate Barber Shop at Grove Circle. The Hospital had dedicated it to the Township. Mr. Williams indicated it had been dedicated to the Township with the restriction that it be used for Park Land. Mr. Dargitz suggested that Mr. Williams check with the Hospital to see if they would lift the restriction so that the Township could sell the land. If they would not lift the restriction, then would they take the land back.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Dargitz moved and Mr. Bailey seconded the motion for adjourn ment.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted.

Elwood G. Williams, Sr.
Secretary

EGW:lf:bh

COLLEGE TOWNSHIP

TREASURER'S REPORT

JANUARY, 1982

DESCRIPTION	REFERENCE
General Funds - Receipts & Expenditures	Schedule I
Township Funds - Cash & Investments	Schedule II

Schedule I

COLLEGE TOWNSHIP

TREASURER'S REPORT

GENERAL FUND - RECEIPTS & EXPENDITURES

JANUARY, 1982

	JANUARY '82	DECEMBER '81
Check Book Balance - Beginning of the Month	$ 402	$ 266
Receipts During the Month	34,624	21,447
Net Transfers from Savings	-0-	47,643
	$35,026	$69,356
Expenditures for the Month	$26,548	$58,954
Net Transfers to Savings	8,025	-0-
Transfers to Other Funds - Revenue Sharing	-0-	10,000
Check Book Balance - End of the Month	$ 453	$ 402

Schedule II

COLLEGE TOWNSHIP

TREASURER'S REPORT

CASH & INVESTMENTS

JANUARY, 1982

	GENERAL	STREET LIGHT	EQUIPMENT	PARKS & REC.	STATE	REVENUE SHARE	SPEC. RD. CONST. FUND
I. CASH:							
Checking Account	$ 455[a]	$ 408	$ 504	$ 585	$ 266	$ 3[illegible]0	$ 363
II. INVESTED:							
A. Daily Interest 5.25%	8,349	3,390	8,225	4,926	12	20,140	5,869
B. 90 Day Certificate 5.5% Annual							
C. 6 Month Money Market Cert.							
TOTAL FUNDS JANUARY 1982	$ 8,804	$ 3,798	$ 8,729	$ 5,511	$ 278	$20,510	$ 6,232
PREVIOUS MONTH	$ 729	$ 3,448	$18,536	$ 5,357	$ 556	$ 6,016	$ 6,182

CASH	$ 2,951
INVESTED	$50,911
TOTAL	$53,862
PREVIOUS MONTH	$40,824

NOTES:

1. General Fund Checking
   a) Includes $100.00 in Payroll Account