

**FERGUSON TOWNSHIP
JOINT BOARD OF SUPERVISORS AND PLANNING COMMISSION
PINE HALL WORK SESSION MINUTES
TUESDAY, JUNE 5, 2018
6:00 PM**

I. ATTENDANCE

Board of Supervisors:	Planning Commission:	Township Staff:	Pine Hall Representatives:
Peter Buckland	Lisa Strickland	David Pribulka	Derek Anderson
Steve Miller	Erik Scott	David Modricker	Peter Crowley
Laura Dininni	Ralph Wheland	Ron Seybert	Stephanie Pankiewicz
Sara Carlson	Jeremie Thompson	Ray Stolinis	Michael Pratt
		Lindsay Schoch	Susan England
		Jeff Ressler	Stephanie Marino

Others in attendance were: Bill Knoel, citizen

II. CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Buckland called the Joint Board of Supervisor and Planning Commission Pine Hall Work Session to order at 6:09 p.m.

III. PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no public comments.

IV. WHERE WE ARE NOW—LINDSAY SCHOCH, COMMUNITY PLANNER

Mrs. Schoch thanked everyone for attending the work session. She provided a brief overview of the history of the Pine Hall General Master Plan and explained that there is an approved 2009 Pine Hall General Master Plan; however, Residential Housing, the developer for the new plan, came to the Township about two years ago to propose a new general master plan. In February 2017, the Township held a charrette with Pine Hall representatives, however, tonight's work session will not be a charrette. Staff has met with the Pine Hall design team to provide comments from the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors. Mrs. Schoch explained that once the master plan is officially submitted after the Traffic Impact Study (TIS) is completed, the Board of Supervisors will have 90 days to make a decision on the plan. After the approval of the general master plan, Specific Implementation Plans (SIPs) will be submitted for approval as well. Mrs. Schoch then turned the floor over to Mr. Crowley.

Mr. Crowley, Land Design, referred to the large scale concept plans that were posted around the room. He explained that they are in chronological order from the left to the right starting from the year 2009 to the newest concept plan submitted in June 2018. In the interim of the TIS being completed and after dialog with Township staff, Land Design incorporated elements from the comments they received previously. Mr. Crowley reviewed the most significant changes from the February 2018 plan to the June 2018 plan. The changes include a reconfigured entrance into the town center from Blue Course Drive, the elimination of a street due to block and scale requirements, a tree preservation and replacement plan, a commercial core that will encourage community events, the redistribution of workforce housing, a reimaged eco-district design, and community gardens have been incorporated into the plan as well.

V. WHY WE ARE HERE

Mrs. Schoch stated that this work session is a joint effort to concentrate on comments that the Board of Supervisors and Planning Commission members received from Township staff on Friday. Mrs. Schoch stated that staff is really looking forward to an expanded dialog between the Board of Supervisors and the Planning Commission and developing a consensus as we move toward a formal plan submission.

Mr. Pribulka added that staff has heard many requests from the Board of Supervisors and the Planning Commission to have a venue to have direct dialog regarding large development proposals. This work session is for thoughts and comments members of the Board and Planning Commission may have since it is a very large plan. Land Design and Residential Housing are here to answer questions, listen to comments, and take notes. Mr. Pribulka stated that this is not a charrette and staff is here to guide the Board and Planning Commission members.

Mrs. Schoch stated that the next agenda item is for break out discussion. The topics include:

- Transportation Network. Bike and pedestrian connections, access, and public transit.
- Recreational and Open Space Components of the Plan
- Housing Distribution
- Commercial Component
- Town Center

The room has been divided into three discussion tables with a mix of Board of Supervisor members, Planning Commission members, staff, and Pine Hall representatives at each table. Each topic discussion will last 20 minutes.

VI. SUMMARY OF BREAK-OUT DISCUSSIONS

After the tables discussed the five topics, each table gave a summary of their discussion.

Table 1:

- Transportation Network: Are the proposed CATA stops consistent with how far people will walk to a bus stop? The placement of bus stops may be too far from the commercial area and the customer base is residential. Table 1 liked the reconfiguration of the main entrance. There was concern regarding curb design and the conveyance of storm water. Table 1 felt that even though the curb design is required as outlined in the ordinance, they would like flexibility in the design. The group felt the spacing of the trees within the development should look more natural.
- Recreation and Open Space Components: The group would like further consideration of maintenance of invasive species in the open space areas and along trails. This could possibly be addressed through the terms and conditions or incorporated into the park plan. Recreation amenities and trails are too close to storm water detention areas. The group suggested maximizing incentives for both the Township and the developer to solve this issue. Table 1 prefers a wetland mix of vegetation instead of manicured grass in storm water basins. The trail system is lost with the reorganization and reorientation of the eco-village. The group would like the developer to be more creative with placing more play areas throughout open spaces in the development.

- Housing Distribution: Table 1 suggests that there be flexibility regarding rentals and fee-in-lieu with the Township's current requirements. The group supports fee-in-lieu to help with rental housing costs. There was a question regarding whether or not the roofs in the eco-village will be painted white. How is rain being captured in the eco-village? The group felt that with the reorganization and reorientation of the eco-village, the compactness was lost. Another option for the eco-village would be to propose car ports instead of garages. The group suggested that the developers keep the slopes within the eco-village instead of leveling out that area.
- Commercial Component: The group believes there is an opportunity to integrate solar and other green infrastructure on the grocery building rooftop. The group would like to see local businesses in the commercial space. If there is a lack of liquor licenses in the Township, a local craft beer or distillery company could still have a space in the commercial area since those types of businesses have different licensing.
- Town Center: Table 1 would like the developer to consider using bird proof glass on any building that is going to have large scale windows. The group would like a commitment from the developer to have a schedule of activities in the town center/plaza or any public spaces. The group was very interested in how the activities would be organized. There was a suggestion to create a Ferguson Township Business Association and possibly have the Township as a member of the association. The group would like the developer to keep the holiday decor and banners within the Ferguson Township wishes and standards. Table 1 would like the developer to avoid using herbicides and pesticides in the town center.

Table 2:

- Transportation Network: A question was asked regarding the function of the narrower roadways throughout the development, especially the road that connects the eco-village to the rest of the development. It was of the group's opinion that although at first glance it may seem that the parking areas are excessive, these parking areas are also for residents visiting the area. The group would like the developer to keep the development commuter friendly by creating connected paths so that a commuter can walk from their house to the commercial area or the town center. The group would like the developer to consider connecting those paths to the regional paths as well. The group made a comment that the developer should involve the State College Area School District as well as CATA.
- Recreation and Open Space Components: Table 2 discussed the connection of the parks in the development as well as to the parks outside of the development. The parks are more intimate as you go through the development, however, it should be a goal of the developer for people outside of the development to use the parks as well. There was a question regarding who would manage the parks—the HOAs or Centre Region Parks and Recreation (CRPR)? The group would like the developer to consider a path that connects the wooded area to the rest of the development by constructing a tunnel to go through the culvert instead of over it. For the businesses along Science Park Road—do they want privacy or connectivity?
- Housing Distribution: A question regarding the management of the residential properties was asked by the group. It was suggested to have eight (8) HOAs and one (1) master HOA. The group suggested that the developer integrate senior housing into the development. Table 2 discussed rentals regarding workforce housing. Their suggestion was to encourage home-ownership now and discuss the need for workforce rental housing and fee-in-lieu in the future.

There was a question from the group regarding what the 10% of affordable housing was based on.

- Commercial Component: Table 2 made the comment that anchors like the proposed hotel and plaza are key to the development being profitable. The group also discussed the timing of the commercial phase in relation to the other phases in the master plan.
- Town Center: There was concern from the group regarding how the Township or developer can create this development without making it a Planned Residential Development (PRD). The goal is to make this development a destination, and not just a place for people to be. The timing of the infrastructure and the commercial areas are vital.

Table 3:

- Transportation Network: Table 3 would like to encourage CATA to reconsider the stops closer to the commercial areas, particularly the grocery store. The group would like the developer to integrate existing bike paths with the proposed bike paths. The trails should be networks for people of all skills and abilities through the preserved tree mass. If the designs are appropriate and acceptable, the developer should consider pervious paved sidewalks. The group would also like the developer to consider a pedestrian crosswalk to the bike path across Blue Course Drive.
- Recreation and Open Space Components: Outside of the already preserved tree mass, Table 3 would like the developer to preserve existing mature trees for recreation use. The group encourages the developer to use native landscaping and pollinators in storm water basins and structures. They also want to encourage forestation of infiltration basins that are not required to be lined. There should also be a detailed discussion with the developers regarding how and what to plant in the muse area since storm water features will be present. The group suggested rye grass and beautifying natives for these types of areas. The group suggested looking at distributed Best Management Practices (BMPs) throughout the conveyance of storm water rather than concentrating the water in storm water basins. Table 3 encourages the developer to increase the density of the tree mass to encourage aesthetic value, energy use reduction, and added quality of life.
- Housing Distribution: Table 3 discussed the phasing of the development and specifically the residential areas, recognizing that the Township has limitations on rentals and workforce housing. The group suggested a partnership with the Township so that workforce housing can be built in earlier stages of the development rather than later. It was also mentioned that commercial banks may have different requirements for down payments in areas that have high-intensity rental units. That may make the owner-occupied workforce housing unit cost-prohibitive for the people who otherwise qualify. The group encourages the developer to have discussions with the banking industry as well as the Centre County Housing and Land Trust. The group would like to see the developer integrate the workforce housing product with accessibility standards (universal access). They would also like to encourage housing at a variety price points, not just within the 80%-120% median income range. Mr. Buckland stated that he would be willing to lobby the state with Mr. Anderson's to help to get a Property Assessed Clean Energy (PACE) grant for the green infrastructure proposed for the development. Table 3 pointed out that since the eco-village will not be constructed until phase 3 of the development, the developer could use some proposed southerly facing units as a test for the eco-village.

- Commercial Component: The group stated that there needs to be further discussion regarding the restriction of adult businesses in the development. The developer should encourage local businesses in the commercial area. The group would also like to encourage local and public art so that local culture is integrated into the design. The group encourages the developer to use Pennsylvania sourced materials. Table 3 would like the developer to consider public WiFi and high speed broadband internet as an incentive for businesses to come to the area.
- Town Center: Table 3 suggested an indoor and outdoor ice skating rink. They pointed out that the town center would be perfect for farmer's markets. The group suggested street lighting standards that allow for lighted ornaments to be affixed to them for decorations throughout the year. There should be hookups for audio, visual, and electrical to help facilitate festivals, concerts, food trucks, etc. General sources of inspiration would be Pine Grove Mills, Curtin Village, and the Center Furnace Mansion.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

With there being no further discussion, the work session adjourned at 8:59 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,



David G. Pribulka, Secretary