

**COLLEGE TOWNSHIP
PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
In Person and Via Zoom**



May 18, 2022- 7 p.m.
1481 East College Avenue, State College, PA 16801
www.collegetownship.org

PRESENT: Ray Forziat, Chair
Ed Darrah, Vice Chair
William McKibbon
Robert Hoffman
Jennifer Landry
Matthew Fenton, Alternate
Noreen Khoury, Alternate

EXCUSED: Bill Sharp

ABSENT: Peggy Ekdahl, Secretary

STAFF PRESENT: Mike Bloom, Assistant Township Manager
Donald M. Franson, P.E., P.L.S, Township Engineer
Lindsay Schoch, AICP, Township Principal Planner
Mark Gabrovsek, Township Zoning Officer
Sharon Meyers, Senior Support Specialist – Engineering

GUESTS: Cindy Ross of Lemont

CALL TO ORDER: Mr. Forziat called the meeting to order at 7:01 p.m.

ZOOM MEETING PROTOCOL: Mr. Forziat reviewed Zoom protocol. No one present via Zoom.

ROLL CALL: Mr. Forziat verified Mr. Sharp was excused and Ms. Ekdahl and Ms. Landry were absent. Ms. Landry arrived a few minutes later.

OPEN DISCUSSION: None

CONSENT AGENDA: *Mr. Darrah moved to approve the May 3, 2022 meeting minutes. Mr. McKibbon seconded. Motion carried unanimously.*

PLANS: Nothing presented.

OLD BUSINESS:

OB-2 Request for Qualification/ Form Based Code

Mr. Bloom presented a draft Request for Qualification (RFQ). The draft addressed various questions. For example, why are we looking for a RFQ and not a Request for Proposal (RFP)? Mr. Bloom explained the scope may not be certain, but there is an idea of the outcome to be attained. The RFQ allows the Township to identify a firm which will assist in defining a scope of work and establishing a cost through negotiations. During Mr. Bloom's introduction to the RFQ he addressed the following questions: Why are we doing this? What are we looking for in a consultant? Specifically the qualifications and suggested scope of work of the consultant. How and When? Mr. Bloom broke the process into phases and asked for commissioners input after presenting each phase.

Phase I Screening (tentatively)

June 6, 2022 – Issuance of the Request for Qualification

July 14, 2022 – Optional Pre-Submission Meeting

August 1, 2022 – Submission Deadline

August to September 2022 – Review, Select Finalist(s) and Interviews

Mr. Bloom asked for feedback on Phase I. Mr. Forziat suggested there should be a minimum number of submissions required to move forward. Mr. Bloom acknowledged Mr. Forziat and replied, ideally there will be multiple submissions. Ms. Schoch added, the American Planning Association (APA)'s website hosts an extensive list of qualified consultant teams to which we will send the RFQ.

Phase II (tentatively)

October 2022 – Preferred Consultant Submit Proposal to Council

November 2022 – Negotiations

December 2022 – Notice to Proceed

January 2023 – Project Commence

Mr. Bloom asked for feedback on Phase II. Mr. Darrah suggested there may need to be changes made to zoning. Ms. Schoch stated ability for change is built into the RFQ. Mr. Bloom suggested this may be a 24 to 36 month process.

Mr. Bloom asked the commissioners, are the qualifications listed in the RFQ appropriate and comprehensive enough to address the need? Mr. Forziat asked for comments.

Ms. Landry stated she had none at this time.

Mr. McKibbin questioned what type of consultants are we looking for, ie. Lawyers, Planners, Engineers, etc. Mr. Bloom replied, we are envisioning a team of Architects, Engineers, Planners, etc. with multiple qualifications and experiences which may include legal.

Mr. Hoffman was pleased with the pre-submission process and added a flowchart of the team showing background and expertise may be helpful. In said flowchart Mr. Hoffman requested all members of the team be present including the people who will have boots on the ground, not just the principals of the firms. Mr. Hoffman also suggested we ensure qualifications are adequate for replacements should someone resign. Mr. Bloom acknowledged Mr. Hoffman's suggestions and added, when reviewing proposals resumes are great but who's doing the work?

Mr. Forziat built onto this conversation suggesting under the qualifications portion there should be added, a background check may be performed. Mr. Bloom suggested maybe a disclaimer should be added. For example, as part of this submission, you may be held to a background check.

Mr. Darrah suggested liability insurance should be considered or possibly consider bonding the contract. Mr. Darrah also suggested asking the question of whether the team has the ability to take complex plans and translate them into layman's terms, as the plans will be presented to the public. Mr. Bloom replied, references should be asked how the person or team connect with the community.

Mr. Fenton asked how long of a track record should companies you are looking at have? Mr. Bloom suggested the track record would vary by the time a team has been around.

Mr. Forziat acknowledged Ms. Khoury, who stated she had no comments at this time.

Mr. Bloom asked the commissioners to comment on the scope of work section of the RFQ.

Mr. Hoffman suggested there should be an outline added with steps to be taken on how to change the scope should unforeseen circumstances arise. Mr. Forziat added, to not allow the scope to change so much that we no longer agree with the direction the project is taking.

Mr. McKibbon stated he had nothing more to add.

Mr. Darrah stated utilities need to be taken into consideration. Does the Township have the infrastructure like water system and sewer capacity for said project?

Ms. Landry suggested the consideration of an on-going technical assistance as well as keeping a retainer for 6 to 12 months.

Mr. Bloom will take these suggestions into consideration.

Mr. Forziat suggested the integration of how Form Based Code (FBC) is typically used in an urbanized area, and ask what their vision of urbanization is for Dale Summit. Also, do they have the ability to take former FBC for an urban area and change it to be implemented in College Township? Mr. Hoffman suggested a section be added to consider social economic revitalization.

Mr. Bloom will consider these suggestions and requested feedback on the evaluation of submittals section of the RFQ.

Ms. Landry stated she had no comments at this time.

Mr. Darrah would like to see comparable projects from the team. Has the team worked in the redevelopment of brown-fields or environmentally sensitive areas?

Mr. McKibbon suggested all categories may not need a scoring system. In fact, a color coding system may be enough. Green or red, if a team receives a red they are disqualified.

Mr. Forziat suggested a red score would be equal to a zero score, either way they are disqualified. Mr. Hoffman stated he likes the number system, but it could use more detail.

The commissioners agreed the RFQ draft is an excellent starting point and thanked Mr. Bloom for his time and presentation.

8:04 pm Mr. Forziat suggested the Commission take a five minute break.

8:10 pm meeting reconvened.

OB-1 Pedestrian Facilities Master Plan – A Walkable College - Process Flow Chart

Ms. Schoch presented the Pedestrian Facilities Master Plan Flow Chart. The Planning Commission suggested two minor changes to the flowchart and requested the narrative Mr. Franson provided, which is a written guideline of the flowchart, be added as a guide along with the flowchart.

Mr. McKibbon moved to recommend Council adopt the Draft Pedestrian Facilities Plan, the guidelines within the memo, and the process flow chart, with the inclusion of the written process guidelines, as dated May 18, 2022. The Planning Commission recommends staff further evaluate the actual cost of sidewalk and accessible ramps to be considered for fee-in-lieu. Mr. Hoffman seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

NEW BUSINESS:

NB-1 Conditional Use Application – 127 Dale Street

Ms. Schoch introduced Ms. Ross' conditional use application for 127 Dale Street. Mr. Gabrovsek, the Township Zoning Officer, read from the newly enacted ordinance O-22-01 Historically Significant Properties. Specifically, Chapter 8-45, Sections D2 and D3 which state:

- D2: The underlying zoning district setbacks may be reduced or increased to that of the Village Zoning District standards to allow the structure/property reflect its original form and footprint, and shall be reduced or increased to the minimum change that will afford the relief and will represent the least modification possible of the regulation required in the Village Zoning District.
- D3: ... Setbacks may be reasonably adjusted and approved by Council, to allow the structure/ property reflect its original form and footprint, and shall be reduced or increased to the minimum change that will afford relief and will present the least modification possible of the regulation required in the underlying zoning district. In no case shall the setback be reduced to less than 3' from the property line.

Mr. Gabrovsek stated his purpose is to administer the ordinance as it is written. After talking out some calculations, Mr. Darrah asked about the set back. Mr. Gabrovsek stated, the house is in the set back. Mr. Forziat asked, does this meet the ordinance, are we supporting the ordinance? Mr. Gabrovsek stated this does not meet the ordinance. Mr. Darrah disagreed and asked where the measurements are coming from. Mr. Gabrovsek stated the measurements are being interpreted from very old, poor records. After much debate, Ms. Landry asked why the five inches are in demand and stated the job here is to hold-up the ordinance. Mr. McKibbon stated his main concern is whether setback are met and stated we are to follow the ordinance. Mr. Hoffman stated, by the ordinance. Mr. Fenton agreed, by the ordinance. Ms. Khoury agreed, follow the ordinance.

Mr. Forziat invited Ms. Ross to join the discussion. Ms. Ross stated there is no evidence which shows the original porch was ever eight feet deep. Ms. Ross also stated she had measured, with a string, from the neighbor's porches on either side of her house to figure out where her porch would have originally been. From this string measurement she determined the porch should be eight feet five inches deep. Ms. Ross also stated when this line was drawn between the neighbors houses she had found what she believes to be the original footers, which fall directly in line with the string. Mr. Gabrovsek stated there is no documentation showing these houses had "aligned". Mr. McKibbon asked Ms. Ross to describe the footers. Ms. Ross described the "footers" as, "not dirt, gravel rocks and gritty stuff". Ms. Landry asked, "other than aesthetics, why five inches?" Ms. Ross stated "just to be in line with the neighboring houses and make it what was original. At eight feet five inches they all line up." Mr. Hoffman asked if the steps count in the set back. Mr. Gabrovsek stated an encroachment of three feet into setback is allowed for the steps and steps are not part of the footprint.

Mr. Forziat asked for a motion.

Mr. Darrah moved to recommend to approve the proposed plan of a porch to be eight feet five inches by twenty-six feet in length, which then has a setback from the street of eleven feet seven inches allowing for the porch steps to encroach. Mr. McKibbon seconded. Motion failed by vote of three to two. Mr. Forziat, Mr. Hoffman and Ms. Landry were opposed. Mr. Darrah and Mr. McKibbon were for.

Mr. Darrah stated he respected all of the votes.

REPORTS: Nothing presented.

STAFF INFORMATIVES:

SI-1 Council Meeting Minutes April 21, 2022

Mr. Forziat stated the minutes from College Township Minutes from the April 21, 2022 meeting are available for everyone to refer to. No comments.

SI-2 Lancaster County Places 2040

Mr. Forziat stated the Lancaster County Places 2040 attachment is available for everyone to peruse. No comments.

SI-3 College Township Engineering Zoning Planning Update from May 4, 2022

Mr. Forziat stated the update of the Engineering Zoning and Planning staff meeting is available as an attachment for the Planning Commission the review. No comments.

SI-4 Zoning Bulletin Vol. 16 Issue 6

Mr. Forziat stated the Zoning Bulletin is available for everyone to peruse. No comments.

ANNOUNCEMENTS: Mr. Forziat submitted a report from the CRPC which was also emailed to the Planning Commission. Mr. Forziat stated CRPA training was mentioned at the last Planning Commission meeting and there is a schedule attached to the current agenda. Mr. Forziat verified with Mr. Hoffman the fire marshal presentation will be set for a future meeting. Mr. Hoffman confirmed and stated a date has not been set.

OTHER MATTERS: Mr. Fenton questioned when alternates vote. Mr. Forziat stated alternates will be asked what their thoughts are as diversity of thought is welcome. However, should an alternate need to vote in the instance there is not a quorum, the chairman will make an announcement at the beginning of the meeting giving the alternate(s) the ability to vote on matters.

ADJOURNMENT: *Ms. Landry moved to adjourn. Mr. McKibbon seconded. Motion carried.*

Meeting adjourned at 9:33 p.m.

Sharon E. Meyers
Sharon E. Meyers
Senior Support Specialist - Engineering