Members Present: Bob Corman, Chair; Freddie Persic, Vice Chair; Kevin Abbey; Cecil Irvin; Tom Poorman; and Jack Shannon

Members Absent: Tom Hoover

Staff Present: Bob Jacobs; Chris Price; Anson Burwell; Chris Schnure and Linda Marshall

Others Present: Tom Zilla, Centre Regional Planning Agency (CRPA)

1. Call to Order – Pledge of Allegiance

Mr. Corman called the meeting of the Centre County Planning Commission to order at 6:00 p.m. Mr. Corman thanked Ms. Persic for chairing the August meeting, in his absence. Thanks to Linda Marshall for standing in for Mary Wheeler.

2. Citizen Comment Period

None

3. Approval of Minutes

A motion was made by Ms. Persic to approve the minutes of August 28, 2007. In addition to two spelling amendments, there were content changes that Mr. Abbey wanted made 1.) Citizen’s Comments Period - page 1, paragraph 4 should be changed to “The Resource Enhancement and Land Protection Act (REAP) that was created to reimburse farmers (plus a tax credit) for conservation practices of which riparian buffers are one of the biggest.” 2.) Centre County Recreation and Greenway Plan Update - Page 2, paragraph 2, line 4 the words “green highway” were used but Mr. Abbey would like the words changed to “green corridor”. 3.) CCMPO Update - Page 3 paragraph 2, line 2 “or leasing of the turnpike” should be removed from the paragraph because Mr. Abbey states that it is not an option.

Discussion took place noting that the minutes do not necessarily reflect what is intended but rather what is stated.

Motion was made to approve the minutes. This motion was seconded by Mr. Shannon. Motion carried.

4. Planning Commission Member Updates

None
5. Old Business

None

6. New Business

- Centre County MPO Update – Tom Zilla, CRPA

Mr. Zilla gave a brief overview of the upcoming MPO (Metropolitan Planning Organization) agenda. Mr. Zilla informed the Commission that PennDOT (Pennsylvania Department of Transportation) will be presenting the Regional Operations Plan for District 2, which is a district-wide effort and includes incident management, communications between emergency operations, etc. He added that the Department would like the MPO to adopt the Plan; however, he commented that the Centre County MPO will most likely approve the plan instead of adopting it.

Mr. Zilla also noted that Trish will talk about the enhancements program at the next MPO meeting. Ms. Meek was able to obtain an additional $48,000 in Federal monies for the South Atherton Street bike path project. In addition, the next round of enhancements will also be discussed. Due to a statewide backlog, the state did not want to do another round of applications. MPO proposal is to go to the two highest projects of the last round.

In addition, the Borough of State College is slated to talk about streetscape project.

Trish will talk about the next funding round of enhancements which are: sidewalks in Centre Hall Borough as well as Boalsburg.

When the next application cycle is ready in two years the MPO will be clear of projects.

Kevin Abbey referred to the CCPC field trip and the need for a pedestrian underpass in Walker Township on SR 64. He inquired if it would be an eligible enhancement project. Mr. Zilla concurred that it would be an eligible project. He added that the municipality or another eligible entity would need to the project sponsor.

Mr. Zilla suggested that Walker Township invite Trish to meet with them to discuss a potential enhancement project for the pedestrian crossing. Mr. Corman asked Mr. Zilla to bring the concern to Ms. Meek’s attention.

Mr. Zilla referred to his powerpoint presentation (Attachment #1) on PA Act 44 Transportation Funding.

Referring to the second slide, he explained that Act 44 will generate $450 million for highway in 2007-2008 and $300 million for transit. There is still a big gap as to what was recommended by the Transportation Funding and Reform Commission and what was approved.

Act 44 also restructures existing funding sources for transit.

Mr. Zilla listed the new funding sources which are: tolling I-80, turnpike toll increases, debt financing and cost savings from I-80 maintenance and capital expenditures.

Mr. Zilla noted that there will be no co-mingling of funds. The intent of the legislature was getting as many new projects funded as possible. Bridges and maintenance projects will be funded.
Mr. Zilla said that the new funding provides an inflation sensitive source of funding for public transit.

Upcoming actions will be to amend 2007-2010 TIP to add projects funded from fiscal year 2007-2008 revenue; include new revenue / projects in the 2009-2012 TIP, amend LRTP to add projects to be funded with Act 44 revenue.

They are hopeful that Senator Corman will be able to attend the next MPO Coordinating Committee. Mr. Abbey asked if the Technical or Coordinating Committee have had discussions about the effort to block the tolling of I-80. Mr. Zilla replied in the negative since they have not met since the proposal. Mr. Abbey continued by asking if there was any truth that the MPO will provide comments to Senator Corman on their thoughts on Act 44 and tolling I-80. Mr. Zilla said that CCMPO said if you toll I-80 the state should toll them all. They also felt that the Turnpike Commission should not spearhead tolling I-80. Mr. Abbey said that one of the most glaring deficiencies which gives no attention to municipal liquid fuels. He pointed out that locals are getting $30 million which is a small amount. Act 44 is inconsistent with PSATS viewpoint and recommendations and does an inadequate job of trying to keep local road maintenance in the 21st century. He feels that a concern should be included. Mr. Abbey said that transferring resources from highway to transit is unprecedented and not done in other states.

Mr. Corman commented that why should bus fares decrease in urban areas when it cost rural persons more to get to work.

Mr. Abbey said when this issue is raised and discussed by the MPO, it should be said that it is not good public policy. The money is not solid and could go up in a cloud of smoke quickly. He would hate for the Commission to sit idly by and be in acceptance mode.

Square Centre County --- At the Center – Tom Zilla

Mr. Zilla reviewed a powerpoint presentation with the Planning Commission member (Attachment #2). The TIP formula highway allocation (total for 4 years) will be just over $50 million. Total will be $66 million on the highway side and $25 million on the transit side.

Ms. Persic asked for a historical perspective on funding levels. Mr. Zilla said in prior tip years it was around $47-$48 million. The increase in funding is a result of Act 44.

Mr. Corman pointed out the bridge allocation does not cover the cost of many bridge replacement projects.

Construction of the local access for the I-99 and I-80 is a high priority project. Both the local and high speed interchanges will need to be candidates for Spike funding.

Mr. Zilla commented that he does not see the possibility of adding any new projects with the Act 44 monies.

Mr. Zilla added that the focus is on structurally deficient (SD) bridges. There are 4 of 15 bridges on the current TIP completed or under construction. He referred to statistics on page 6. 61 SD state bridges in Centre County; 8 of 9 state bridges on TIP are SD. The last one was SD but has been repaired temporarily.

15 SD state bridges are on the County’s LRTP. 17 SD bridges in Centre County which none are
county owned...they are municipal owned. All 3 local bridges on TIP are SD bridges. Bridges on TIP…all are outside of the Centre Region.

Mr. Abbey asked about the hierarchy of ratings for SD bridges. Mr. Zilla said that there are four factors that are considered. When a bridge gets to a ranking of 4 out of 10 they are classified as SD. With some SD bridge, the fix might be simple.

Mr. Zilla commented that there are several bridges in the Marsh Creek area. Mr. Abbey asked if the local evaluation criteria mesh with the DOT ranking system for structural deficiencies. He wondered if we know which bridges are the most in need of attention.

Mr. Zilla said that they also use the state’s criteria. The criteria used the sufficiency rating and looks at different factors such as volume of traffic and detour ratings. SD ratings looks just at the bridge. Mr. Zilla added that the MPO will have to take on a larger role on the bridges including outreach to municipalities as to how to move local bridges through the program.

Mr. Abbey asked Jack Shannon and Bob Corman if they do engineer inspections of the local bridges. They use the PennDOT inspections. Jack said that Rush has no local bridges by design. Black Bear Creek and Township Road ends at the bridge and the state owns the bridge. They are state bridges on township roads.

Mr. Abbey commented that he hopes that we can do better in taking care of our local bridges with respect to their funding.

Mr. Irvin asked if there was going to be any more timber bridges. The College Township bridge is structurally deficient and the one in Ferguson is okay.

Mr. Zilla referred to the next steps: The next TIP is to be adopted by June of 2008. The next key steps are developing a preliminary TIP by February and then going through a public review process. It will be discussed starting this November at the CCMPO.

Mr. Zilla referred to the MPO performance review committee. They will set aside the discussion on the reorganization between now and the end of the year.

Mr. Abbey said the CCPC is the link between the County and the County MPO due to the representation on the Commission.

Mr. Zilla thanked the Commission for their time. He asked if the Commission members are receiving the full MPO packets. The Commission members replied in the affirmative.

Mr. Corman thanked Mr. Zilla for his presentations.

*Comprehensive Planning - Bob Jacobs and Chris Price*

Mr. Jacobs said that they would like to give the Commission an overview of where they are with the Rush Comprehensive Plan review.

He said that Rush Township’s Comprehensive Plan process goes back a few years and that their Plan encompasses a lot of issues, including regional issues such as the landfill proposal and the I-80 interchange. Mr. Jacobs also outlined how this will relate to an upcoming MPO review. Mr. Shannon
said the interchange review has been put on hold for now.

Staff is reviewing the plan as part of the 45 day review which ends on October 10. The County will get a formal memo to the township. Based on Mr. Price’s initial review, staff will likely be recommending some additional amendments. Comments will be forwarded to the municipality within the next couple of weeks and it can then be discussed at the October meeting.

Rush Township’s original Comprehensive Plan was adopted last year. He said the consultant did a good job of laying out the recommendations and implementation measures. When the merger with South Philipsburg occurred in January 2007, the plan became invalid due to the fact that Comprehensive Plans must include all areas within the jurisdiction. Amendments to include South Philipsburg were prepared in the spring and Mr. Price reviewed the plan. Staff recommended several amendments regarding language related to the merger, general consistency between the County comprehensive plan and neighboring municipal plans, and inconsistencies between Plan language and the Township’s recently adopted Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance. Regarding the interchange, which has been the subject of much discussion, Rush Township said the I-80 interchange was not just to service the landfill, but also to accomplish the goal of connecting I-80 southward to Route 504 to provide access to the airport and improve accessibility to the park and to the Keystone Opportunity Zone (KOZ). Rush Township has the only 3 KOZ’s in the entire county and two of them are in the Black Moshannon area, near the airport. This fall there will be an opportunity to discuss the comments with Rush Township and the comments will be brought before the planning commission as well. The ball is in Rush Township’s court as to whether they wish to address the County’s comments.

Mr. Price reiterated Jake’s comments that they want to focus on local land use issues and they have asked for more information on the local access proposal.

Mr. Shannon added that their thoughts on the southern alternative were that the Township has always been working towards an access road to the airport. They always considered coming in from 322 to the airport. However, there is another advantage to interstate access to 504. Presently if someone was going to the park or the forests they are getting off at Milesburg. This access would get people into and out of the park painlessly.

Mr. Abbey asked about the process. When staff does its review and comments on Rush Township’s Comprehensive plan, are they then reviewed and endorsed by the Board of Commissioners? As a planning commission, we should not be interested in making things more bureaucratic. Is that the way this commission is set up that the staff reviews plans without the Planning Commissions input.

Mr. Price said that the Office is doing the technical review based on the MPC requirements. Any policy issues would be brought to the attention of the Commission as well as the Commissioners.

☐ Plan Submission as Digital Files - Bob Jacobs

This process goes back 10 years. State College Borough (SCB) had adopted an Ordinance in 1997. He provided the Commission with a memo from the SCB (Attachment #3) on their Ordinance. He has been talking with Andy Kuster about the County doing something similar. He added that the Planning Commission could adopt this as an amendment to the County’s Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (SALDO). Developers and consultants who have this capability could submit a digital file after the plan is developed, reviewed and approved by the Planning Commission and recorded. A digital file has a certain set of criteria that ties into our GIS System and also would allow the Tax
Assessment Office to geo-reference property corners so that when the digitizing of the parcels is done it is tied to the state plane grid. Four departments would take advantage of this information: Tax Assessment; Planning; GIS and the Recorder of Deeds Office.

Mr. Shannon asked if Mr. Jacobs was referring to all plans submitted. He also asked if all of the clients have the capabilities to do digital plan. Mr. Jacobs noted that it would be for those firms who have the capabilities. The Planning Office does not wish to put an undue burden on smaller firms.

Mr. Burwell said that it is more for taxing purposes so that property owners were taxed properly.

Mr. Abbey said they could consider exemption language. He referred to the software and said that Rick Day and others are looking to move from proprietary software to freeware so that it is more accessible to others. He said that web-based freeware is catching up and many universities are moving in that direction. He also said that they might want to consider non-proprietary or freeware software. Licensing fees from ESRI and others have been a barrier, as per Mr. Abbey. Mr. Abbey said that Ferguson has a digital plan requirement. He added that Ferguson was having space problems in storing the plans.

Mr. Burwell commented that you cannot archive the plans since you need to be able to refer to them.

Mr. Jacobs will draft language for the Commission members to review at a later date.

□ **LUPTAP Grant application - Linda Marshall**

Our office is in the process of developing an application to the Department of Community and Economic Development (DCED) for a grant under the Land Use and Planning Technical Assistance Program (LUPTAP). Ms. Marshall is putting this together and it is geared towards affordable housing issues.

Ms. Marshall stated that in terms of the implementation of the Needs Assessment, the next step that is really critical to the process is looking at model regulations for municipalities to consider as part of their zoning, subdivision/land development regulations, stormwater and street regulations in order to promote the production of affordable housing. In many of the municipalities, the minimum lot size is too large; the cartway width is too wide. One approach would be to develop an a model ordinance however you have a range of needs from the more urban to your growing suburban municipalities to the more rural, so in order to meet those needs, the intent will not be to develop one specific ordinance but a menu of options that would pertain to the specific needs of those three types of municipalities. In order to do that we made the decision to apply for a LUPTAP Grant so that we have money to set aside staff resources for this purpose. We have met with the Centre Region Planning Agency and they have agreed to participate in this effort so that we make sure that we are all on the same page, and we are working in the same direction, but in order for affordable housing to happen in the county and to increase the housing inventory, we really need to address those regulations. Part of that would include an education process to help the municipal officials better understand why we are moving in this direction. Ms. Marshall referred to the Toolkit developed by the Centre County Affordable Housing Coalition. She explained that the document was for the most part was the first step in making sure that the regulations are in place, so it gives municipal officials a better understanding as to what the issues are and some of the regulations that need to be addressed. This will be actual regulations that municipal officials can consider for adoption. A draft application is being reviewed by Mr. Jacobs and Mr. Price. I spoke to our DCED representative, and she was very excited about our application.
Mr. Burwell questioned if any of that material will address incentives to the developers in a standard format to set aside a segment for affordable housing.

Ms. Marshall stated “yes” and as we go through this process, we will in the initial phase look at existing ordinances. As part of the needs assessment there was a barrier analysis done, but it was done for only 6 municipalities, so we will continue with that inventory as to what is out there and what specifically needs to be addressed. Then we will have for the lack of better term: focus type groups which will involve the various interested entities to make sure that their concerns are heard as to what is really happening in practice and what needs to be addressed. The focus interviews will include: developers, builders, municipal officials, and realtors.

Mr. Abbey questioned if it would be appropriate to consider a possible tie in with low impact development?

Ms. Marshall stated “yes”.

Mr. Abbey stated that he always thought in looking at subdivision plans, that the savings associated with low impact development stormwater improvements, we really had our land use and planning act together, could easily be plowed right back into the portion of the development that you are trying to get workforce housing. The savings associated with being more environmentally sound in your thinking about development, really could mesh nicely with some of the barriers.

Ms. Marshall totally agreed with Mr. Abbey stating that those are two concepts that are important to marry. The intent is to include low impact development techniques in the model regulations. As part of this strategy, what is important is that we provide model regulations, but they will be tied into growth management strategies where growth should occur. The key will be to promote growth within the sewer service areas and extensions of those areas in order to preserve the ag land. In addition, residential growth could also occur in line with conservation design, where you are preserving as much as possible the ag soils that Mr. Irvin so passionately works to protect. All of these principles will be tied together, including low impact development, through this effort so it won’t be these are inclusionary regulations. The Planning Commission has provided such great input in the past; I really look forward to working with you throughout this process. There are a couple of holdups on the production of affordable housing. One is the cost and availability of land and the other is the regulations. This effort is the logical next step, and it is going to be a very exciting process.

7. **Review / Approval of Subdivision and Land Development Plans** – Anson Burwell & Chris Schnure

**Subdivisions:**

1. **Fox Ridge Subdivision**
   Preliminary Plan
   11-Lots (Residential)
   Benner Township

This Plan is at the corner of Fillmore Road and Buffalo Run Road and adjacent to Patton Township and Benner Township common municipal boundary line and is a replot and subdivision for residential use which includes applicable infrastructure.

Mr. Abbey questioned if reclassification is different than rezoning?
Mr. Burwell stated “yes” that in our ordinance we have many classifications of subdivisions and land development and one of the types of classification that can be processed through our regulations that was defined as an open space resource use lot. It can be ag resource, forested resource or mineral resource and this was earmarked as ag open space. It gets that definition by the exemption of sewage planning requirements (no soil test, no perc test) and it is defined as an open space ag classification. This classification is not cast in concrete; it could be amended at any time through a reclassification plan process.

Mr. Burwell stated that “no” this is not a change in zoning. This is subdivision and land development.

Mr. Abbey stated that you are taking it from ag open space to residential. That is a change is that correct.

Mr. Burwell stated that “yes” it is a change, but a change in a subdivision classification of intended use, not a zoning change. It is in an R-2 Residential zoning district and always has been.

Mr. Abbey stated that the classification of open space ag within a residential zone allows for the exemption of on lot sewage testing and sewage planning.

Mr. Price stated that they always by right had the ability to build residential on there, but because of the openspace designation they opted for a sewage facilities planning exemption. They need to amend that designation for sewage facilities planning, but regardless that lot is permitted for residential use by the applicable Benner Township zoning ordinance.

The developer, Mr. Gummo owns land on both sides of State Route 550 (Buffalo Run Road). He earmarked several lots on the northeastern side of Buffalo Run Road for residential purposes and they were subdivided in that fashion. He retained this one as a classification called open space ag, because it is actively being farmed and he didn’t want to go through the additional cost associated with amending the official sewer plan.

Mr. Abbey asked if there was any critical evaluation of the reclassification or is it accepted that it is some confirmed right?

Mr. Burwell stated that it is a confirmed right. Mr. Gummo has an option to eliminate some of the criteria; it is either pay me now or pay me later. In the sense that Mr. Gummo wished to subdivide his farm and he wanted to create five (5) residential lots northeast of Buffalo Run Road and then the remaining lot he wanted to retain and earmark as open space classification which eliminated his responsibility to go in and do percs, defined as a residential lot knowing through our open space ag resource use note that he is defined as an ag classification and he can anytime in the future that he wants to, change that classification, he must do so by bringing in a reclassification plan or if anytime in the future he wants to further subdivide, he will need to reclassify and replot.

Mr. Price stated that the original plan as approved under Benner Township’s R-2 zoning district preserved certain development rights. If the Township would rezone this land in the future, by the fact that he has a previously approved subdivision plan, he is vested in those rights.

Mr. Jacobs stated that the growth boundary is “not” across the street, it is Patton Township’s identified ag district. The growth boundary is cattycorner off this map.

Mr. Burwell stated Centre County Planning Office (CCPO) received and reviewed the sewage planning module. The municipality has executed their portion of that planning module package.
The planning module is to be done at the preliminary plan phase as per the County's requirements. The general concept is okay as per discussions with the township zoning officer and township engineer.

Mr. Burwell pointed out that rain gardens are handling the stormwater as best management practices through the stormwater management ordinance. They will sump the downspouts and collect all the impervious area associated with the building sumping process and route the stormwater from the driveways as well as the runoff and vegetative swales for natural recharge which will go through a level lip spreader and eventually discharge to Buffalo Run Road.

Buffalo Run is an (HQCWF) and Mr. Abbey asked how this fits with Mr. Irvin’s comment about riparian buffer.

Mr. Burwell stated that it is about 200 feet from the property being subdivided, which is a large buffer.

Mr. Abbey asked if the CCPO is excited about 44 agriculture acres becoming 11 residential lots and leapfrogging to other lands. Doesn’t that see rather excessive?

Mr. Price informed Mr. Abbey that Benner Township dropped out of the Nittany Valley Planning Commission’s drafting of the zoning ordinance of which Spring has adopted and Bellefonte and Marion are about too adopt. On a parcel like this you would have seen a minimum of 50% or likely 80% open space for more overall lot yields on much smaller lots. The maximum size of the lots in this district would have been 5 acres, but that is only if you achieve 80% open space.

Mr. Abbey said that from a land use standpoint …..44 acres and 11 lots, that is not good land use planning.

Mr. Burwell commented that zoning ordinance is the driver.

Mr. Abbey questioned if staff could go back and ask for 30 lots instead of 11? Is this stepping on their toes?

Mr. Jacobs said that across the highway is a rural preservation district in Patton Township and then he referred to general consistency.

Mr. Abbey said that this type of development promotes more sprawl.

Mr. Shannon commented that the type of development that is planned is similar to the type of development that currently exists along Buffalo Run Road.

Mr. Burwell said that staff has to look at whether or not it meets the criteria of the ordinances.

Mr. Abbey said doesn’t staff have a professional obligation to promote sound land use planning?

Mr. Abbey said that he “can’t say yes” to the preliminary plan.

Mr. Price explained that Benner was not interested in a regional TDR program. He hopes to get them back on board.

Mr. Shannon said that he sees nothing wrong with Mr. Abbey’s suggestion but feels that the developers are following the procedures.
Mr. Jacobs said that the Planning Commission (PC) has an opportunity to make additional comments to the developer.

Mr. Burwell said that public services are not available for increased density on this track, which is development cost issues. The water line at Nittany Glen is private. There is no water main running along Fillmore Road or Buffalo Run Road.

Mr. Irvin said that they could create their own water source to be shared since they are close to the Alexander well fields.

Mr. Abbey asked if their role is to look at appropriate land use planning and resource utilization or to approve what a developer proposes because they don't want to put in a public water line. I am balking at the fact that they have come up with this because that's what the developer wants, but we have some obligation to sound land use planning and I want to be respectful of Benner Township, don't get me wrong, but when I see a plan like this, that's got such huge lots and more McMansions on really good ag ground, I just say to myself, where is all the good land use techniques that we are using in other places in the county to apply here. Why are we ignoring them?

Mr. Price pointed out that we do not know what Benner Township’s position is on the proposed plan. We haven't said that Benner Township supports this, but simply that their ordinance doesn’t prohibit this. Do we know what their desire is?

Mr. Abbey stated maybe Benner Township needs to go to the developer and let them know that the Centre County Planning Commission doesn’t like the plan; maybe we need to empower them. But I can tell you that as someone who comes to these meetings to try and do a good job with land use planning, this isn’t it.

Mr. Irvin concurred with Mr. Abbey.

Mr. Burwell reviewed the SALDO review process. The staff would have to say that this is in compliance with the criteria for the preliminary plan procedural steps and we would be in a position to recommend conditional preliminary plan approval followed by complying with the conditions so noted and receiving preliminary plan approval and subsequently submitting the final plan.

Mr. Abbey stated that it's not good planning but they can do it. At a preliminary stage I would like to go on record as saying that the County Planning Commission should be forward thinking and working with municipalities to do sound land use planning that addresses appropriate growth, looks at resources; pays attention to riparian buffers all of things that are in the rules and regulations but doesn’t abdicate our responsibility to be good planners. I think from the standpoint of staff, with all due respect, you have the professional obligation to keep that parallel thinking in mind as well, that it isn’t just that it meets the requirements.

Mr. Jacobs said the Centre County Planning Commission is required to back up a rejection with specific reasons within the ordinance citing section and subsection or, the Planning Commission can table the plan and express the comments to the developer and the township and say, because of these reasons, we feel that this plan is not appropriate. The Planning Commission would like you to reconsider that design and come up with another option.

Mr. Abbey said that he liked that better. I want to work with these folks and communicate in a neighborly and friendly way and in a cooperative and constructive manor with Benner Township and say, we can do better. He said that he is not trying to be reactionary and he would like to work
through the system, I want to be constructive with them, but I would very much like to continue the discussion.

Mr. Jacobs compared it to the Airport Park Industrial Subdivision where staff asked that the plan be tabled, and the Commission responded that there is an important well field; the Alexander Well Field....that needs to be protected. In that case it was very positive.

Mr. Abbey moved that they table the plan and authorize staff to go back to the township and relay the concerns and conversation that the Planning Commission has had including those comments from the review meeting. Mr. Irvin seconded. Motion carried.

Mr. Shannon commented that tabling can only go on so long, otherwise you are deeming it approved, so we need to be ready.

Mr. Poorman said Benner Township can provide its own comments.

Mr. Irvin commented that affordable housing should also be included.

Mr. Irvin asked if they would have to put in a pump station to get public sewer.

Mr. Burwell replied that was how staff understands it.

Mr. Burwell indicated that he will produce correspondence to reflect the Commission’s concerns and send it to the developer and the local governing body and suggest that they schedule a meeting with the staff.

Land Developments:

2. Eagle Valley Personal Care Home Land Disposition/Land Development
   Final plan
   1-Unit (Building Expansion)
   Milesburg Borough

Mr. Burwell noted that Milesburg Borough issued building and zoning use permits without Eagle Valley going through the SALDO process. This is a replotted lot of 1.8 acres of an existing facility, 13,400 square feet with 24 beds. The Proposal is an additional 15,000 sq ft addition with 28 beds for a total of 52 beds.

This proposal reflects 70% coverage and they are allowed up to 90%. Milesburg Borough has their own stormwater management ordinance and when they met with the developers engineer and Doug Weikel, Milesburg Borough’s Engineer, they suggested a “no harm” scenario for stormwater management which includes rain gardens which discharge to a culvert on Front Street and then into Bald Eagle Creek. Parking meets zoning criteria. Zoning district is residential / commercial. We have an application mailer (initiated by the applicant and local governing body) whereby they are going to use the 7 equivalent dwelling units (EDU’s) that have been voided by the removal of the 7 mobile homes that existed on site. They did also acquire an additional 10 (EDU’s) through a letter of intent to provide service, which we have received from the sewer authority. There are some minor graphic deficiencies because they can’t yet cite the source of the lot consolidation plan which will be recorded shortly.
Mr. Abbey asked if it requires NPDES.

Mr. Burwell replied in the negative.

Mr. Abbey said he is uncomfortable taking action unless the deed and replots are not resolved.

Mr. Burwell said the office has the information; however it only has to be recorded.

Mr. Schnure said he has reviewed the second draft of the deeds and they are complete.

Mr. Shannon asked about rain gardens, do they retain water openly?

Mr. Burwell stated that the rain gardens allow for evaporation, retention and percolation. He said that the gardens are linked. Mr. Burwell said that with just under a major storm event, it will hold water for a short period of time, evaporate and then runoff directly to the Bald Eagle Creek. This is the whole theory of the “no harm” scenario.

Mr. Burwell reviewed the outstanding issues.

Mr. Poorman commented that sewer should read Mid-Centre and not Milesburg Borough. Mr. Burwell agreed.

A motion was made by Mr. Irvin and seconded by Mr. Persic to approve staff’s recommendation of Conditional Final Approval of the above-mentioned Plan. Motion carried.

Time Extension Requests:

- Phoenix on Stover Subdivision, Phase II (CFA)  
  Penn Township.................................................................1st Request (No Fee Required)

- Mark E. & Doris J. Kauffman Subdivision (CFA)  
  Gregg Township.................................................................1st Request (No Fee Required)

- Grazzini at Benner Township Land Development (CFA)  
  Benner Township.................................................................1st Request (No Fee Required)

- Eagle Point Subdivision, Phase 3 (CPA)  
  Benner Township.................................................................2nd Request (No Fee Required)

- Timothy F. Tressler & Michael C. Fedor Land Development (CFA)  
  Huston Township.................................................................2nd Request (No Fee Required)

- Sinking Creek Subdivision (CFA)  
  Potter Township.................................................................2nd Request (No Fee Required)

- Jeffery D. Hosterman Subdivision (CFA)  
  Gregg Township.................................................................3rd Request (No Fee Required)
• Mountainview Estates Subdivision, Phase 1 (CFA) File No. 158-06
  Potter Township................................................................. 4th Request ($50.00 Fee Required)
• Nittany Building Specialties, Inc. Land Development (CFA) File No. 186-06
  Huston & Worth Townships................................................... 4th Request ($50.00 Fee Required)
• The Village of Nittany Glen Land Development, Phase IIA (CFA) File No. 95-06
  Benner Township................................................................. 4th Request ($50.00 Fee Required)
• Freestone Golf Course Land Development for PennGolf Corporation (CFA) File No. 162-05
  Huston Township................................................................. 4th Request ($50.00 Fee Required)
• Opequon Hill Land Development, Lot 83, Phases 2 & 3 (CFA) File No. 93-06
  Benner Township................................................................. 5th Request ($100.00 Fee Required)
• Grauch Enterprises Expansion Land Development (CFA) File No. 278-05
  Rush Township ................................................................. 7th Request ($200.00 Fee Required)
• Gary G. Wilt Subdivision (CFA) File No. 307-05
  Howard Borough................................................................. 7th Request ($200.00 Fee Required)
• Authentic Ridge Subdivision (CPA) File No. 308-05
  Walker Township................................................................. 7th Request ($200.00 Fee Required)
• Snow Shoe Travel Plaza Lot Consolidation and Land Development (CFA) File No. 235-05
  Snow Shoe Township........................................................... 8th Request ($250.00 Fee Required)
• The Drucker Company Land Development (CFA) File No. 244-03
  Worth Township................................................................. 16th Request ($650.00 Fee Required)

Note: CPA = Conditional Preliminary Plan Approval
      CFA = Conditional Final Plan Approval

A motion was made by Mr. Shannon and seconded by Ms. Persic to approve the above-mentioned Time Extensions. Motion carried.

September’s Subcommittee meeting:

Mr. Burwell noted that this month’s meeting will be cancelled since the Hunter Ridge Subdivision plan has already been reviewed.

8. Director’s Report and Other Matters to Come Before the Commission

Mr. Jacobs noted that staff is working on Growing Greener II applications.

Mr. Jacobs stated that next month, he hopes to have Karl Mierzejewski, Gypsy Moth Coordinator review the spray blocks in the County with the Planning Commission. They are due in DCNR at the
beginning of October.

Mr. Jacobs referred them to the Ridge Protection Seminary that is being held in Ferguson Township the end of October. This municipality adopted one of the first ridge protection ordinances.

Mr. Irvin asked if the County is paying for spraying.

Mr. Jacobs said that the County is currently only paying for the County Coordinator’s position and the spraying will cost the landowners $17 per acre. Patton Township is agreeing to cover all of the spraying costs for their residents. Ferguson is also going to cover the cost. It will be up to the municipalities that aren’t covering those costs to collect the money from their residents.

With no further business to come before the Commission, Chairman Corman adjourned the meeting at 8:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert B. Jacobs
Director
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THESE MINUTES WERE APPROVED AT THE OCTOBER 16, 2007 CENTRE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING.