COLLEGE TOWNSHIP COUNCIL
PUBLIC HEARING AND REGULAR MEETING
HELD MARCH 11, 1982 AND MARCH 16, 1982

MEMBERS PRESENT: Donald E. Bailey, Gale L. Dargitz, J. Carroll Dean, Herbert W. Stewart, and Dolores A. Taricani

OTHERS PRESENT: Manager Elwood G. Williams, Sr.
Treasurer Robert L. Hayden

PUBLIC HEARING

Chairman Taricani called to order at 7:04 p.m. in the College Township Municipal Building the Public Hearing to receive oral and written testimony or comments from interested parties on Spring Creek Estates PRD. She indicated the Public Hearing had been scheduled on the PRD to accommodate the developer in moving ahead with the application for the PRD. Chairman Taricani briefly explained the concept of a PRD.

Mr. Williams confirmed that all adjacent property owners had been notified, the property had been posted, and all legal notices and advertisements had been made.

Chairman Taricani read the "Outline of Procedures for Public Hearings" (Attachment A). There was no objection to the proceedings being recorded. The Applicant waived the right to a verbatim record.

The individuals wishing to testify placed their names and addresses on the Sign Up Sheet and Chairman Taricani swore them in.

Chairman Taricani stated that as far as she could determine, the Applicant had submitted all the necessary documents for an application for a PRD.

Lillian Raycroft, Legal Counsel for the Applicant, indicated the Applicant's Engineer would offer testimony first followed by individuals in favor of the PRD.

Tom Songer, Uni-Tec, read the narrative included in the documents submitted for the PRD Application and pointed out on drawings of the PRD the various sections referred to in the narrative.

Mr. Songer reviewed the proposed development schedule. Phase I is currently under construction and is expected to be completed in 1983. Phase II also is to be completed in 1983. The entire PRD is scheduled to be complete by March 1985.

Mr. Dean referred to the considerations pointed out by the Planning Commission at their February 25 meeting and asked Mr. Songer to respond to them.

"A. That the Developers and the Township Engineer look at the desirability of an easement from Creek Side Drive through the lands to the East and connecting with Trout Road."

Mr. Songer indicated there was a fifty foot easement provided for in the PRD which would permit access to the adjoining property. When the land is developed, this easement would provide access to that development and through that development to Trout Road.

"B. That the Master Plan show the approximate date for end of construction of each phase."

Mr. Songer indicated the proposed construction schedule included with the application materials satisfied this consideration.

"C. And that the merit of a walkway from Rhaubert Circle to the park area in the Northeast corner of the PRD be evaluated."

Mr. Songer pointed out the omission of this walkway was an oversight and indicated on the drawing where it will be located.

Mr. Dean also referred to the comments of the Engineer pertaining to the site distance problem at the top of Fairlawn Avenue. Mr. Songer indicated they were taking the Engineer's comments under advisement and were planning to cut down the grade at this site, regrade it and repave. He asked Pat Ward, of his office, to address this site distance problem.

Mr. Ward indicated that even though plans had been approved with the present grades shown, they felt the situation could be improved and reviewed their plan for improving the site distance problem with grading, etc., and indicated these new grades would be indicated on the revised drawings. Mr. Ward also explained the reason for the difference in percentages of grade of Fairlawn Avenue between that shown on the drawing and that shown on the profile graphic.

Mr. Songer indicated that as the developer for this area proceeds, they would be for safety reasons requesting the Township to erect Stop Signs on Scholl Street and Fairlawn Avenue.

David Sweetland, Engineer, indicated that he felt his concerns for the site distance problems expressed in his February 25, 1982 memorandum had been satisfactorily addressed.

Mr. Sweetland pointed out the area the PRD would be incorporating on aerial maps. He commented on the traffic that would be generated by the development and how it would relate to the surrounding area. Mr. Sweetland distributed a data sheet containing general information about the site, traffic generated, populations. He reviewed the information on the data sheet for Council. He also commented on the PennDOT traffic

figures for Houserville Road and how they would change because of the PRD.

Mr. Sweetland expressed what he felt were the positive aspects of the PRD:

(1) meets housing needs, allowing for flexibility as no other zone does,

(2) does buffer well with homes along Houserville Road,

(3) use of small lots with townhouses,

(4) overall topography is good.

He also pointed out some negative aspects:

(1) traffic generated is generated into a poor collector system,

(2) internal system is not proposed to connect with Trout Road in a direct way,

(3) placement of easement for connecting to adjoining property would, should that property be developed, direct additional traffic onto Fairlawn Avenue,

(4) relationship of open space to dwellings as outlined in PRD Ordinance not adequately addressed,

(5) topography on approximately 80 acres towards Stearns' property may create drainage problems.

Mr. Sweetland also commented that the traffic from the PRD would be channeled through a single-family home area but the developers did not want any traffic channeled through the single-family home area of the PRD to have access to Trout Road.

Mr. Dargitz asked about the organization of the Homeowners Association. Mr. Songer indicated there would be one large association responsible for the storm water drainage facilities and park areas. The smaller association would be for the multi-family units and would be a part of the large association. Mr. Dargitz indicated there was no mention of whose responsibility it was to carry liability insurance. Ms. Raycroft indicated the requirement for insurance would be in the Association's regulations when they were adopted but could be included in the Articles of Agreement with an amendment stating there will be adequate insurance. Mr. Dargitz expressed his concern about there being adequate insurance, about the Township's liabity in the event of an accident, and about the possibility that the Homeowners Association dues would not be adequate to cover adequate insurance. Ms. Raycroft indicated a clause could be included indicating the Association would obtain the maximum insurance feasible as mutually agreed with the Township.

Mr. Dargitz asked if any construction had been started in Phase II inasmuch as it has been approved as a subdivision at Council's last meeting. Mr. Mitchell indicated that Phase I and II on the PRD are identical to what they were as subdivisions. Mr. Dargitz expressed his concern about having phases of a PRD approved before the PRD is applied for thereby decreasing the flexibility needed for making necessary changes as the PRD is being considered.

Mr. Songer indicated they were seeking approval of the Master Plan and then would request approval of the Final Plans for the various Phases.

Chairman Taricani pointed out that tentative approval of the Master Plan of a PRD does not give the developer the approval to proceed; tentative approval is approval of the concept and the developer then moves on to requesting approval for the Final Plans.

Mr. Dargitz asked if any lots in Phase I or II had been sold. Mr. Songer indicated they could not. No titles to lots in Phases I and II would be transferred until a new Final Plan had been approved for the Phases after approval of the PRD.

Reed McCormick, Township Solicitor, agreed that tentative approval of the PRD was approval of the concept and that approval needed to be requested on the Phases before any construction could proceed.

Mr. McCormick additionally commented about his concern for the persons holding options on the lots in Phases I and II and the problems the change in "zoning" would have for their scheduling of financing, construction, etc. He suggested that all those having an equitable interest be included as applicants in the PRD.

Mr. Dean asked Mr. McCormick if he had reviewed the Homeowners Association Agreement. Mr. McCormick indicated he had reviewed a rough draft but had not given it an extensive review. Mr. Dean indicated that eventually Council would need a statement from the Solicitor indicating that the Homeowners Association Agreement Covenants met the Township Ordinances.

Ms. Raycroft indicated that so far no one has actually exercised the options they have on the lots in Phases I and II. She indicated there is one individual, Barbara Ruff, who through her Counsel had requested to join in the application for the PRD. Ms. Raycroft requested that Council consider this favorably so that she could receive a deed and proceed with her FHA financing prior to the actual approval of the Final Plan. She indicated that to her knowledge there were no others that were in danger of losing their financing. She asked all those who were present who held options with Mr. Mitchell and were in favor of the PRD to stand.

The following individuals stood and indicated they were in favor of the Township Council approving the concept of the Spring Creek Estates PRD and would join in as applicants if this was necessary:

Sandy Lowry, R. D. 1, Julian
Tom Beck, State College
Susan Olson, R. D. 4, Lot 15, Bellefonte
Betsy Hartman, 358 Toftrees Avenue, #272, State College
Barbara Ruff, 400 Galen Drive, State College
Kevin DiFelice, 1378 University Drive, State College

Chairman Taricani asked if anyone was present that held an option that would not participate as an applicant or who was opposed to the PRD. There was no response.

In his comparison of figures demonstrating the imput the PRD would have on the surrounding area, the Township Engineer had used the number of units proposed for Phases I and II as an R-1 District. Mr. Songer commented that the initial rough draft of the proposed tract incorporated more units than had been used to arrive at the traffic figures which would change the figures Mr. Sweetland presented significantly. Also, Mr. Songer indicated that it was hoped that as the PRD was developed that a bus route would be established and would cut down on some of the daily vehicle trips. He pointed out that relative to open space, under the R-1 designation, there was 7.8 acres of open space; under the PRD concept, there would be 9.65 acres of open space.

Dan Stearns expressed his concern about the increase in traffic the PRD would generate; his concern about the drainage of surface water onto his property. He indicated his preference for single-family homes in this area but was not opposed to the concept of the PRD. He expressed his hope that the PRD be built in a way that would enhance the area.

Eugenia Harlow expressed her concern about the increase in traffic that would be generated by the PRD and about adequate park space.

Jim Winck, College Township Parks & Recreation Committee, indicated he and representatives of the Centre Region Parks & Recreation Committee had viewed the site of the Spring Creek Estates PRD in their study of whether or not drainage basins make adequate parks. Mr. Winck pointed out for Council that not all the land set aside as open space in the PRD is suitable for park land, only about 4 acres in the area of the bridge.

Ron Danner, who had not been able to be at the meeting when it started, signed in and Chairman Taricani swore him in. Mr. Danner expressed his concern about the difficulty in safely getting from Scholl Street and Oak Lane onto Houserville Road and about the increase in traffic the PRD would cause. He also was concerned about having multi-family housing adjoining the single-family housing area where he lives.

Chairman Taricani indicated that there seemed to be much concern about the traffic generated by the PRD but that if any owner of land

in this area wanted to develop their land and met all the requirements of the Township Ordinances, Council could not prevent them from developing their land.

Mr. Sweetland indicated that the site distance where Oak Lane and Scholl Street enter Houserville Road is adequate if traffic is moving at the posted 25 MPH. He also stated that he did not feel that Phases I and II could have adequately contained the 250 dwellings Mr. Songer indicated could have been placed on the land.

Mr. Songer outlined the plans for handling storm water in the area of the PRD Mr. Stearns had expressed concern about.

Mr. Bailey asked if any thought had been given to providing an easement off Spring Creek Drive through the Stearns property to Trout Road. Mr. Mitchell indicated it was not practical to just put an easement in, there would have to be a street to which to connect and consequently the land would have to have been subdivided. Mr. Dean indicated he did not think it was necessary for land to be subdivided for an easement for a road to be granted. Mr. McCormick agreed with Mr. Dean's opinion. Mr. Ward indicated they were not enthusiastic about connecting to Trout Road at this point in the development because it would encourage traffic to use the PRD as a short cut. They realized that the connector system was not ideal but felt it was manageable in the future.

Mr. Stearns indicated that they had no plans for developing their land in the near future and would want to before considering an easement through their property to Trout Road.

Ms. Raycroft offered to Council the Joiner making Barbara Ruff an applicant in the PRD, indicating that they would plan to close on her property on Monday.

Mr. Sweetland pointed out he did feel there should be a direct tie between the development and Trout Road.

Chairman Taricani explained why it was necessary for Council to make a comprehensive review of the proposed development before making a decision.

Council felt they needed more time to consider the testimony and the information presented before making a decision.

Mr. Dean moved → THERE BEING NO ADDITIONAL TESTIMONY that the Public Hearing in the matter of the consideration of the PRD for Spring Creek Estates be adjourned. Mr. Stewart seconded the motion which was carried unanimously.

The Public Hearing was adjourned at 8:52 p.m.

OUTLINE OF PROCEDURE FOR PUBLIC HEARINGS

IN ORDER TO GIVE EVERYONE AN OPPORTUNITY TO PARTICIPATE IN A PUBLIC HEARING AND TO AVOID CONFUSION, THE FOLLOWING RULES WILL BE OBSERVED:

1. IT IS REQUESTED THAT EACH PERSON WHO WISHES TO TESTIFY SIGN THE SIGN UP SHEET AND BE SWORN OR AFFIRMED UNDER OATH.

2. A FACT SHEET WHICH INCLUDES A BRIEF OUTLINE OF THE ISSUE WILL BE PROVIDED TO THE COUNCIL.

3. IN REZONING MATTERS THE APPLICANT OR APPLICANT'S REPRESENTATIVE SHALL HAVE THE FIRST OPPORTUNITY TO PRESENT TESTIMONY. AN ATTEMPT SHOULD BE MADE TO LIMIT THE PRESENTATION TO TEN MINUTES.

4. THERE WILL BE NO DISCUSSION BACK AND FORTH DURING ANY PRESENTATION, AND INTERRUPTIONS WILL NOT BE TOLERATED.

5. ANY INDIVIDUAL WILL HAVE THE RIGHT TO RESPOND; RESPONSES SHOULD BE LIMITED TO FIVE MINUTES, IF POSSIBLE.

6. ANY RULING ON PROCEDURE WILL BE MADE BY THE CHAIRMAN.

ATTACHMENT (A)

REGULAR MEETING

Chairman Taricani called the regular meeting of the College Township Council to order at 8:58 p.m. She explained that because the Public Hearing had taken longer than expected, Council would only consider the Agenda items that were pressing. The meeting would be continued at a later date and the remainder of the Agenda items considered.

The continuation of the Regular Meeting was set for Tuesday, March 16 at 12:00 noon in the College Township Municipal Building.

PLANS

1. Suburban Realty Joint Venture Subdivision, Preliminary and Final. Karl Colyer, of Uni-Tec, presented the plans for Council's consideration. He indicated that Marion Isenbaum had sold the entire tract to Suburban Realty Joint Venture with the option that he could buy back Lot 2. He wants to exercise this option. Provisions have been made on the Plan for an extension of the College-Harris Joint Authority sewer line and the Lemont Water Company water line to Lot 2, and letters are available from the Authority and the Water Company indicating they will provide service to the lot.

Mr. Dean asked if the proposed access to Lot 2 was through the present "curb cut" through Lot 1. Mr. Colyer agreed that it was not good to have an additional curb cut but the buyer wishes to retain his right to the curb cut. However, there are provisions in the agreement between Mr. Isenbaum and Suburban Realty that he may use the existing curb cut if he wishes. Council discussed the matter of the additional curb cut and their opposition to it. They felt that before a decision was made on this subdivision plan that Council should review the original site plan and the minutes of the meetings at which that Site Plan was considered.

Mr. Dean moved that Council table consideration of the Suburban Realty Joint Venture Subdivision, Preliminary and Final Plan, until they examined the original Site Plan. Mr. Bailey seconded the motion which was carried unanimously.

Consideration of this subdivision plan will be continued at Council's March 16 Meeting.

Council asked Mr. Williams to obtain from the files the original Site Plan and Minutes.

2. Whitehill Re-Subdivision of a Portion of the Mountain Terrace Subdivision, Preliminary Plan. Karl Colyer presented the plan for Council's consideration. He explained that Bill Whitehill had purchased eight lots in the past and now wanted to re-subdivide these lots to make three additional lots. These lots are still within the regulations of

the R-1 Zoning Distr... He indicated the sewer line had been constructed and will be considered for inclusion in the College-Harris Joint Authority system at their Board Meeting this month.

Council assured that the considerations established by the Planning Commission and the comments of the Township Engineer had been satisfied.

Chairman Taricani read the following comment by the Township Engineer.

> "In addition, it should be noted that this area has been developed with large lot sizes and 30 foot front setback lines. These features could be construed to have given Mountain Terrace a character which would be violated by allowing houses to be placed closer together and closer to the right-of-way, in effect changing the density of development and atmosphere that may have been indirectly guaranteed to other owners in the subdivision. The Council may wish to consider the validity of this point of view."

Mr. Dean indicated that this is one of the things the Planning Commission is to consider in their review of a plan and inasmuch as they have recommended approval they apparently feel it will not alter the character of the neighborhood.

Council briefly discussed this matter.

It was noted that the adjoining property owners had been notified and none were present or had contacted the Township concerning this subdivision.

> Mr. Dean moved that the Preliminary Plan, Whitehill Subdivision at Jalice Circle, dated February 1, 1982, Revised 3/11/82, be approved. Mr. Dargitz seconded the motion. The motion was carried unanimously.

BUSINESS

1. Final Payment on Post Office Building. Mr. Williams indicated that all the items on the "punch list" had been completed and the Architect had authorized payment.

> Mr. Dean moved Council approve payment of the Certificate of Payment for the Post Office Building with particular compliments to the builder on a job well done. Mr. Bailey seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously carried.

Council asked Mr. Williams to draft a letter to the Builder.

Mr. Williams indicated the lease has been signed by the Township and the Postal Service and rental payment should be forthcoming.

2. College Township Parks & Recreation Committee 1982 Goals. Jim Winck, Chairman of College Township Parks & Recreation Committee, indicated no dollar amount had been assigned; the goals were subjective goals, things that they would like to see done if funds were available.

Council asked Mr. Winck to prioritize the items on the list and work with the Township Manager and Treasurer and assign dollar amounts to the goals.

Chairman Taricani indicated that Council would be conducting a citizen's survey and one of the questions should be - are the citizens in favor of more tax dollars for parks and recreation.

Mr. Winck indicated that CETA had indicated they would be interested in working on the project of building the additional picnic pavillion at Spring Creek Park. The Township would have to provide the materials plus 25% for their transportation and costs.

Council briefly discussed the project of resurfacing the tennis courts at Spring Creek Park. Chairman Taricani expressed her feelings that since this is a Regional park and is used by the Region that projects of this nature should be funded by the Region.

Mr. Winck asked that Richard Fox be appointed to the Parks & Recreation Committee.

Mr. Winck distributed copies of the 1981 Centre Region Parks & Recreation Annual Report and invited Council and the Manager to tour at their convenience some of the Regional programs that are offered.

Mr. Bailey moved that Richard Fox be appointed to the College Township Parks & Recreation Committee. Mr. Dean seconded the motion which was carried unanimously.

3. Cemetery Road. Steve Hurvitz gave a brief history on the issue involving Cemetery Road and indicated that at the 1st meeting with the Borough of State College, the Borough had discussed paying for 1/3 of the cost of the road. Mr. Hurvitz indicated that if the road was built to Borough specifications he was not sure what the total cost would be. He previously had canvassed the residents of Oak Ridge area and had received pledges for 1/3 of the estimated cost of $33,000 -- an approximate amount given him by Spring Creek Paving. Mr. Hurvitz asked Council to consider resolving to share in the cost of the road by 1/3 or some specific amount. He indicated he had checked with legal authorities who had indicated the Township could legally enter into an agreement with the Borough for paving of this road.

Mr. Dargitz explained that at the first meeting on this matter the 1/3 - 1/3 - 1/3 split was discussed but had not been initiated by the Township's representative nor had the Township representative indicated Council would agree to that. Mr. Dargitz emphasized that the road is a Borough road and as such it is their responsibility to maintain it in a passable condition. Mr. Dargitz also suggested that the developer of the Oak Ridge area has some responsibility in this matter for providing adequate access. Mr. Dargitz suggested that the Township could extend their offer of snow removal of Cemetery Road to include the development across Branch Road from the Kissinger property. Then the Borough would not have to run their equipment out to take care of this area.

Council briefly discussed the recent letter from Carl Fairbanks on this matter and indicated the importance of coming to an agreement on the type of road that would be built, i.e., width, construction specifications, etc.

Mr. Dean agreed that Cemetery Road is the Borough's responsibility but did not feel they would carry out this responsibility. He proposed that the Township agree to participate setting a maximum amount which they would contribute.

Chairman Taricani also felt that Cemetery Road was the Borough's responsibility but felt the situation needed to be resolved and indicated she would be in favor of setting a dollar amount that the Township would contribute toward the construction cost of this road.

Council briefly discussed the legality of the Township contributing to the construction of a road outside the Township.

Mr. Dean pointed out that in an earlier letter Council sent to the Borough they had offered to guarantee the residents' share of the cost. If the Township decides to participate in the cost of the road, he felt it should not also guarantee the residents' portion.

Mr. Stewart expressed his feeling that the road is a Borough road and should be maintained by the Borough.

Council discussed the practicality of writing another letter to the Borough, additional involvement of the developer in the cost of the road construction, the disadvantages of pressing the issue through legal action.

Mr. Dean suggested that before Council's March 16 meeting that Council members write down the conditions under which Council would enter into an agreement and compare them at the meeting. After these conditions are established then another letter to the Borough could be drafted.

Council discussed the fact that the Borough had not notified the Township of the last meeting where this matter was discussed. It was

suggested that a request be put in the letter to the Borough that the Township be notified when Cemetery Road is an Agenda item.

4. Rezoning Requests. Chairman Taricani indicated that the request for rezoning of the Rallis, et al, tract and the Darlington property had been received several months ago and she felt a date should be set to consider these requests and the Planning Commission notified that Council wanted their recommendation by that date.

Pat Vernon, of the Planning Commission, indicated a work session needed to be scheduled between Council and the Planning Commission.

Council discussed the importance of informing the applicants of what was happening.

Mr. Dean moved that Council write the applicants requesting a change in zoning from University District to Commercial District on East College Avenue and tell them in view of the larger problem than just dealing with their specific request that Council cannot foresee considering a public hearing before late summer or early fall. Mr. Bailey seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously carried.

The work session with the Planning Commission was set for March 23.

5. Chairman Taricani indicated that the regulations governing authorities in Pennsylvania require that the authorities submit a semi-annual report to the creating municipality stipulating the circumstances of the employees of the authority. Council suggested that after checking to be sure that the reports are not in the files, the Township Manager write the authorities citing this regulation and requesting these reports.

6. Chairman Taricani announced that Mr. Williams will be retiring April 1. She complimented him on his years of effective and efficient managing of the Township.

Chairman Taricani announced that Thomas Lechner will be Township Manager effective April 1, 1982.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Dean moved and Mr. Dargitz seconded the motion for adjournment. The motion was carried unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:28 p.m.

RECONVENED

Council's March 11, 1982, meeting was reconvened at 12:00 Noon March 16, 1982, by Mr. Bailey in the absence of Chairman Taricani (who arrived after the meeting was convened).

MEMBERS PRESENT: Donald E. Bailey, Gale L. Dargitz, J. Carroll Dean, Herbert W. Stewart and Dolores A. Taricani

OTHERS PRESENT: Manager Elwood G. Williams, Sr.
Treasurer Robert L. Hayden

MINUTES

Minutes of January 4, 1982, Organizational Meeting.

Mr. Dean moved the Minutes of January 4, 1982, be approved as distributed. Mr. Stewart seconded the motion which was carried unanimously.

Minutes of February 11, 1982, Regular Meeting.

Mr. Dargitz moved the Minutes of February 11, 1982, be approved as distributed. Mr. Stewart seconded the motion which was carried unanimously.

UPDATE

1. Mr. Williams reported Mr. Hoy has been in touch with Mrs. Hubbard in regards to the storm water run-off. Mr. Hoy has taken a look at the problem, but at that time there was not too much water running and what was, was staying in the ditch. Mr. Hoy has taken some pictures of this situation. He and Mrs. Hubbard have decided to wait until there is greater run-off and at that time they will review the situation and then Mr. Hoy will make his recommendations to Council. Mr. Williams indicated Council will probably have a report from the engineer on this matter at their next meeting.

2. Mr. Williams contacted Don Spackman, at the Centre Community Hospital, about the deed restriction which prohibited the Township from selling the piece of land along Pike Street and asked if they would consider removing the restriction from the deed, and if they wouldn't, would they agree to take the land back. Mr. Williams reported in a recent letter from the Hospital, they indicated they wished to have the land returned to them for resale.

TREASURER'S REPORT

Treasurer Robert L. Hayden reviewed the information included in the Treasurer's Report for February 1982 for Council.

Mr. Bailey moved that the Treasurer's Report for February 1982 be accepted. Mr. Dargitz seconded the motion. The motion was carried unanimously.

CORRESPONDENCE

1. Chairman Taricani had in hand six letters from residents of the Township opposing approval of Spring Creek Estates PRD. The letters were from: Jeffrey B. Danner, 169 Fairlawn Ave.; Ronald P. Danner, 169 Fairlawn Ave.; Mr. & Mrs. Chen-Chi Chang, 181 Fairlawn Ave.; Harvey B. and Glenda Manbeck, 159 Fairlawn Ave.; and Carol & Paul Kersavage, 229 Oak Lane.

Mr. Dean pointed out that although these letters are now in the record they are not in the record of the Public Hearing and as such do not constitute official testimony.

2. Letter from Uni-Tec, Inc. Engineers representing the developer of the Spring Creek Estates PRD refuting some figures presented at the Public Hearing.

3. Letter from John Ziegler indicating his opposition to the Township participating financially in the paving of Cemetery Road and his opposition to the Township participating in the acquisition of property for parking lot for the Alpha Fire Company.

BUSINESS

1. Gypsy Moth Spray Program - Final Acreage and Cost Figures.

Council reviewed the March 1, 1982 letter from the Centre County Board of Commissioners regarding the final acreage and cost figures for the 1982 Gypsy Moth Spray Program. It was indicated that the total number of acres in the Township to be sprayed are 594 at a cost of $1,188.

Council briefly discussed the areas that had not been included in the spray area and the possibility of setting up an alternate spray program.

Mr. Dean proposed that the Township try to get some appraisal of how much spraying will be needed on an individual basis and then contract with a sprayer for a block of time. The individuals who would want spraying services would call the Township to be scheduled and would reimburse the Township for the spraying done.

Chairman Taricani suggested that the Manager working with the new Manager make the formulating of a spray program one of the priority items when the new Manager starts. It was further suggested that an ad be placed in the paper requesting those property owners who are not included in the spray area and are interested in the spray program to be coordinated by the Township call the Township.

Mr. Stewart asked about those who object to the spraying. Chairman Taricani indicated the aerial spraying being planned was the County's responsibility and those who object to it are also the County's responsibility.

Mr. Dean suggested that because of possible objections that any program investigated by the Township be ground-based equipment.

Council asked Mr. Williams to place the ad in the paper to determine the interest of the Township residents in a spray program. If there is interest, then the Township will proceed to put such a program together.

2. Alpha Fire Company Parking Lot. Chairman Taricani explained that this item had been placed on the Agenda to give Council an opportunity to discuss it at their March 11 Meeting before the COG Meeting on March 15. Inasmuch as Council's Meeting of March 11 had to be continued and the item was discussed thoroughly at the COG Meeting on March 15, she did not feel further discussion was needed. Chairman Taricani briefly explained for the audience the background for this issue and some of the questions surrounding it. Mr. Dargitz commented that he felt the comments at the March 15 COG Meeting had indicated a definite need for the parking lot and explained that the COG Safety Committee would be investigating the question of other options before the property currently being considered is purchased.

Bob Hines, Vice President of Alpha Fire Co., was present and commented on the need for parking.

3. Cemetery Road. Mr. Dargitz outlined the circumstances surrounding Cemetery Road to date. He indicated he was of the opinion that Cemetery Road is a Borough road and should be maintained by the Borough in a passable condition. He suggested that the Township offer to do winter maintenance on Cemetery Road and the streets in Centre Hills East in return for the Borough fulfilling their responsibility to pave Cemetery Road.

Mr. Stewart also felt it was the Borough's responsibility to pave the road and did not feel the Township should contribute any money for that purpose.

Mr. Bailey felt regarding snow removal that if the Township was going to perform snow removal they should also do routine maintenance to be sure the roads were in good condition for snow removal.

Mr. Dean disagreed with this point. He suggested that College Township agree to snow removal on Cemetery Road and [redacted] Hills East in exchange for the Borough doing snow removal on the portion of McCormick Avenue which lies in the Township. He also felt the Borough had abdicated their responsibility for Cemetery Road.

Mr. Dargitz was not convinced that legally the Township could contribute to the paving of a road outside the Township and suggested that a more explicit legal opinion be obtained.

Chairman Taricani felt Cemetery Road was the responsibility of the Borough but that its present condition did present problems to the

residents of the Township. She was in favor of going to the Borough with a counter-proposal supplemented with an offer of snow removal for Cemetery Road and the road in [redacted] Hills East. She was satisfied that the legal opinion that had been received was sufficient.

Several residents spoke about the hazardous condition of Cemetery Road.

Steve Hurvitz commented that he felt progress had been made in that the Borough had been unwilling to pay anything initially and now are offering to pay 1/3 of the cost of the road. He indicated that the sharing of the cost was probably the only way to get anything done to the road.

Chairman Taricani pointed out that the Township had been trying to get this situation resolved and had, in an earlier offer to the Borough, offered to guarantee the pledges of the residents of this matter.

Mr. Dargitz expressed his concern in the sharing of cost about the Borough having control over the design of the road.

Mr. Hurvitz also was concerned about having no control over the design and ultimately the final cost and suggested a counter-proposal to the Borough of a dollar amount from the residents and a dollar amount from the Township. He indicated the amount of the pledges from the residents of Oak Ridge Avenue and the developer was $11,300.

Mr. Dean moved that Council make a counter-counter-proposal offer to the Borough regarding the paving of Cemetery Road, that portion of it which is now not paved and at least these five conditions be included:

1. The project be put out to bid;
2. College Township offer to pay $10,000 or 1/3 of the cost, whichever is less;
3. College Township is to have no responsibility in collecting pledges;
4. Offer of snow removal exchange -- College Township to do Cemetery Road for the Borough doing McCormick Avenue Extension;
5. Same standard as recent improvement.

Mr. Bailey seconded the motion.

Several residents of Oak Ridge Avenue were present and indicated they felt the only way to have Cemetery Road improved was for the Township and the residents to initiate the proposal.

There was a brief discussion on the specifications that would be used for the road. Chairman Taricani indicated the Borough's letter indicated it would be built to the minimum Borough standards.

Mr. Dargitz indicated that he felt the Township should not be committing this amount of money at this time in the negotiations on this matter.

Chairman Taricani felt Council needed to move cautiously in this matter.

The motion was carried with four voting in favor (Dean, Bailey, Taricani, and Stewart) and one opposing vote (Dargitz).

4. Spring Creek Estates PRD. Chairman Taricani indicated the Public Hearing on this PRD had been held on March 11 and that since then several items of correspondence have been received as indicated earlier in the meeting.

Mr. Dean moved the Spring Creek Estates PRD as presented be disapproved. Mr. Bailey seconded the motion.

Mr. Dean indicated his motion was based on two main criticisms:

1. The impact on surrounding community is too extensive for the area to bear in view of the location of the proposed PRD.

2. PRD as such shows no imaginative plan -- no community planning.

Mr. Bailey felt there could be more effective ways to handle the traffic generated by the PRD and he too felt the impact on the surrounding area would be extensive.

Mr. Stewart felt that there would be an impact on the surrounding area and a good deal of traffic would be generated by the PRD but felt there was a need for the affordable type of housing the PRD offers.

Mr. Dargitz was concerned about the impact on the area, that minimal consideration was given to open space provisions, and the increase in traffic.

Chairman Taricani indicated her support for the PRD concept but in this particular situation felt the developer proceeded or was encouraged to proceed with the PRD before thorough consideration had been given to the area being suitable for a PRD.

Mr. Mitchell commented on considerations that had been made which led to the application for the PRD.

Mr. Songer, Engineer for the developer, indicated they had provided for open space in the plans for the PRD and had not intended to use Spring Creek Park as a PRD Park Facility. Additionally, Mr. Songer took issue with the traffic figures presented by the Township Engineer at the Public Hearing.

The motion to disapprove the application for the development known as Spring Creek Estates PRD was carried with four voting in favor of the motion (Dean, Bailey, Taricani, and Dargitz) and one opposing vote (Stewart).

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Bailey moved and Mr. Stewart seconded the motion for adjournment. The meeting was adjourned at 1:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Elwood G. Williams, Sr.
Secretary

EGW:lf:bh

Attachment (A)

COLLEGE TOWNSHIP

TREASURER'S REPORT

FEBRUARY, 1982

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

Schedule 1

COLLEGE TOWNSHIP

TREASURER'S REPORT

GENERAL FUND - RECEIPTS & EXPENDITURES

FEBRUARY, 1982

	FEBRUARY '82	JANUARY '82
Check Book Balance - Beginning of the Month	$ 453	$ 402
Receipts During the Month	49,218	34,624
Net Transfers from Savings	-0-	-0-
	$49,671	$35,026
Expenditures for the Month	$32,025	$26,548
Net Transfers to Savings	17,165	8,025
Check Book Balance - End of the Month	$ 481	$ 453

COLLEGE TOWNSHIP

TREASURER'S REPORT

CASH & INVESTMENTS

FEBRUARY, 1982

	GENERAL	STREET LIGHT	EQUIPMENT	PARKS & REC.	STATE	REVENUE SHARE	SPEC. RD. CONST. FUND
CASH:							
Checking Account	$ 482[a]	$ 753	$ 61	$ 98	$ 135	$ 359	$ 363
INVESTED:							
A. Daily Interest 5.25% Annual	25,515	2,401	740	5,547	12	17,140	5,892
B. 90 Day Certificate 5.5% Annual							
C. 6 Month Money Market Cert.							
TOTAL FUNDS @ FEBRUARY	$25,997	$ 3,154	$ 801	$ 5,645	$ 147	$17,499	$ 6,255
PREVIOUS MONTH	$ 8,804	$ 3,798	$ 8,729	$ 5,511	$ 278	$20,510	$ 6,232

CASH	$ 2,251
INVESTED	$57,247
TOTAL	$59,498
PREVIOUS MONTH	$53,862

NOTES:

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