

**COLLEGE TOWNSHIP COUNCIL
PUBLIC MEETING AND HEARING**

JUNE 3, 1982

A G E N D A

CALL TO ORDER

BUSINESS:

PUBLIC HEARING:

- (1) Ordinance for Local Government Investment Trust or Federated Securities Corp. for the purpose of Purchasing Shares of the Trust.

PUBLIC MEETING:

- (1) Proposed Change in Zoning Classification from UNIVERSITY, COMMERCIAL, and R-1 to a HISTORIC DISTRICT.
- (2) Discussion of Cemetery Road
- (3) Tax Agreement with State College Area School Board
- (4) Any other items that may come legally before Council

ADJOURNMENT

77

College Township Council
Public Meeting and Hearing

June 3, 1982

7:33 P.M. - 9:40 P.M.

Members present: Donald E. Bailey, Gale L. Dargitz,
J. Carroll Dean, Herbert W. Stewart,
Dolores A. Taricani (Chairman)

Others present: C. Thomas Lechner, Manager

Public Hearing

1. Ordinance #79 for Local Government Investment Trust: Council unanimously agrees to adopt Ordinance #79 which authorizes College Township to join with other local government units as a settlor of the Pennsylvania Investment Trust or Federated Securities Corporation for the purpose of purchasing shares of the trust. This allows the Township to have other (limited) alternatives for investing Township funds.
(Dargitz motions; Bailey seconds).

Council informally agrees to an informal policy of the Township maintaining its investment loyalty to local institutions.

No witnesses present for testimony.

Hearing adjourns at 7:33 P.M.

Public Meeting

1. Proposed Change in Zoning Classification from UNIVERSITY, COMMERCIAL, and R-1 to a HISTORIC DISTRICT for land located in the Centre Furnace Plantation Area: general discussion between Council and community members. This issue comes before Council at the request of the Centre County Historical Society.
- ** Dr. Philip S. Klein (via letter read by Chairman; Klein unable to attend): Intent of Centre County Historical Society is not to prevent development/growth but only to preserve historic areas, archaeological digs, etc. via HISTORIC DISTRICT.
- ** Dennis Elpern, Senior Planner, Centre Regional Planning Commission:
- The issue concerns preserving Centre Furnace Mansion and related properties.
 - Are two strategies under consideration for accomplishing this: a) to make zoning changes (as in Lemont), b) to create an historical district.
 - Are fundamental differences between these two plans; both originate from different enabling legislation from the state, and have different procedures, requirements, objectives.

13

** Dennis Elpern , Continued:

- Zoning powers for preserving historic areas monitors height, setback, roof restrictions, and other structural restrictions.
- Historic District designation controls architectural changes to properties, specifically exterior changes; requires the appointment of an architectural review board; College Township Council would have the right to reject plans to alter buildings which would change their historic nature.
- Klein proposal land boundaries for historic district include the original portion of Centre Furnace Village area which extends from the Duck Pond eastward to Clinefelter's and buildings such as Claster's and Clark Motors, and the Garver Mansion.
- The Pennsylvania Historical Society and the Museum Commission have indicated that these boundaries would probably be unacceptable because they do not meet the criteria for a historic district (since the area already contains many modern buildings); This rules out the use of HISTORIC DISTRICT to preserve this land.

** Chairman Taricani:

- The Historic District requirements are governed by a specific state act (#167); this is not a simple zoning issue and has nothing to do with Village District, R-1, R-2, etc.

** Marlowe Froke, Secretary, Planning Commission:

- Planning Commission drew these specific "historic district" boundaries as a "target for discussion".
- College Township is in a unique position of being the geographical location of two significant developments in Pa. College Township, the Garver Mansion, the Coal and Steel furnaces are the heart of the economics of the Centre Region. There is historical documentation that the mansion and the Garver family is the base for the establishment of Penn State. College Township is the home of two unique historical developments to the state as a whole; the Township should commemorate this.

** Chairman Taricani:

- Section 2 of Pa. Act 167 stipulates that the Museum Commission must be able to certify and agree that College Township's historic district will satisfy federal historic requirements.

** Gale Dargitz:

- concerned about appropriateness of proposed boundaries for historic district; specifically regarding its many commercial buildings and only two undeveloped lots.

** Herbert Stewart: concerned about inclusion of the many commercial buildings within historic district

** J. Carroll Dean:

- "The unpredictability of the future use of these commercial establishments (through ownership changes, natural catastrophe) counteracts any facts based on existing use if it is important to include/designate them as within the historic district. "If you think that the property really belongs in the historic district, then the present construction has no bearing on the situation!"

** Mrs. Hubbards:

- reports on McCloghlin letter which advises against using Pa. Act 167 as legislation for establishing the historic district; letter advises instead to use local ordinances and nonconforming uses of the area where historic sites are located.
- presents alternative proposal for establishing the Garver Mansion as a "scale model" walk-through-museum representing and portraying the use of this 6,000 acre land area to visitors.
- advocates making the mansion the focal point rather than an extensive historic district.

** Chairman Taricani:

- If the Historic District is established, it would not take away the right of the present property owners to use their land commercially or residentially; the ordinance intends only to preserve existing historical sites and to restore what might have disappeared.

** K. Ronald Weis, Chairman, Planning Commission:

- The Planning Commission's interpretation of the enabling legislation for historic districts made it necessary to establish exact boundaries; Planning Commission designed the boundaries according to old maps and existing physical evidence of the mill race and grist mill; It is because the Planning Commission tried to include all historically significant sites that its boundaries for the historic district are so large.
- Planning Commission's intent:
 - a. to preserve archaeological evidence; there seems to be no legislation that specifically protects underground artifacts
 - b. to preserve and enhance the aesthetics of College Township, and the entrances to the University and State College; using conventional zoning would be problematical
 - c. utilizing a HISTORIC DISTRICT plan would allow the Township to establish a review board which would grant Council control that zoning lacks
 - d. the Planning Commission was unaware of Pa. Act 167 stipulations about meeting federal registry requirements

** Chairman Taricani:

- Council has postponed action on a request for rezoning in the area of the proposed historic district; Council must respond soon to the applicant.
- Council must decide: a. how narrowly to define the historic district b. whether to use usual zoning laws to protect historic sites; c. what action to take on the rezoning request.

** Jerry C. Clinefeiter, property owner:

- thinks that Council should concentrate on making the Garver Mansion the site of the historic district

** Mr. Stout, Vice-President Centre County Historical Society:

- Presently, the historical society uses the Garver Mansion as a meeting place and repository for historical artifacts; the historical society intends to establish the mansion as a museum open to the public.

** Bill Clark, Clark Motors:

- Council should concentrate on establishing the Garver Mansion as the historic site to be preserved; extending the historic site would be a hardship on residents and property owners (both private and commercial); thinks the historical society has the responsibility to be the forefront symbol of historic preservation by establishing first the mansion as a museum.

** Spokesman, Clasters:

- the proposed boundaries for the historic district are too encompassing

** Charles Rallis, homeowner:

- the historic district should be narrow; Council should regulate building architecture of surrounding structures through some appropriate, permissible means

** Homeowner:

- would like her property, which contains archaeological artifacts, to be designated a historic district

** Ernest Waite, property owner:

- prefers that the boundaries of the historic district be narrow

** Galen Dreibelbis, owner of gas station in front of Garver Mansion:

- favors establishment of historic district, but cautions of consequential problems for property owners; is concerned that an expansive historic district would create much non-conforming use sites that could lead to deterioration of properties because of constraints as to allowable architectural designs

81

** W.E. Esber, commercial property owner:

- the mansion is a registered historic site
- he has contributed 3 shacks to the historical society
- Council should somehow control the architecture within the historic district

** David Stewart:

- Council must decide soon about land use and zoning in the historic district as requested by the applicants for rezoning.

** J. Carroll Dean:

- believes Council can preserve historic sites without having to use Pa. Act 167
- says Council's own zoning ordinance allows it to draw boundary lines where it chooses; thus, Council can draw boundary lines that would accommodate both the historic sites and concerned property owners
- says Council can incorporate a new zoning classification that would not be "spot zoning" necessarily since it would be the only zoning of its kind

** Council's Summation:

- Council unanimously agreed to return the historic district issue to the Planning Commission; Council requests that the Planning Commission make another recommendation for the preservation of historic sites in College Township (specifically the Garver Mansion and surrounding area) taking into account tonight's discussion. (Dean moves; Stewart seconds.)

2. Discussion of Cemetery Road:

- Council agreed (informally) to send a letter to the State College Borough Council stating it has discussed again the Cemetery Road issue in light of the escalated construction price and extenuating circumstances; College Township Council has explored the alternatives and finds none that are feasible, practical, or permissible. Thus, Council stands by its initial commitment of \$10,000.

3. Tax Agreement:

- Council unanimously approves the signing of the agreement with the State College Area School Board; this formalizes the tax agreement that Council previously approved. (Bailey moves; Stewart seconds.)

82

4. Bikeway:

- Chairman Taricani reported that the Borough of State College has agreed to be the lead municipality for the establishment of the South Derton Street Bikeway; this requires the Borough to act as the agent; make applications, transactions, etc. Chairman Taricani already drafted a letter in Council's name granting its approval of State College as the lead municipality.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 9:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

C. Thomas Lechner
Secretary

CTL:mc