

**FERGUSON TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION  
MEETING MINUTES  
MONDAY, AUGUST 14, 2017  
6:00 PM**

**I. ATTENDANCE**

The Planning Commission held its regular meeting of the month on Monday, August 14, 2017 at the Ferguson Township Municipal Building. In attendance were:

**Commission:**

Marc McMaster, Chairman  
Rob Crassweller, Vice Chair  
Ralph Wheland  
Lisa Strickland, absent  
Bill Keough  
Eric Scott  
Andrea Harman, absent  
Cristin Mitchell, alternate (absent)

**Staff:**

Ray Stolas, Director of Planning & Zoning  
Lindsay Schoch, Community Planner  
Jeff Ressler, Zoning Administrator

Others in attendance were: Marcella Bell, Recording Secretary; Ruth Cooper, C-Net Discussion; Todd Giddings, Sourcewater Protection Ordinance; Lynda and Greg Mussi, Petcare in the IRD; Cindy Hahn, C-Net Discussion

**II. CALL TO ORDER**

Mr. McMaster called the August 14, 2017 Planning Commission meeting to order at 6:01 p.m.

**III. CITIZEN INPUT**

There was no citizens' input.

**IV. PETCARE SERVICES WITHIN THE IRD – PROPOSED TEXT AMENDMENT**

Mr. Stolas stated that On April 14, 2017, Planning & Zoning staff received an ordinance amendment application from Robert and Judy Burgess of 3020 Research Drive to add Pet Daycare facilities as a permitted use in the Light Industrial/Research and Development (IRD) Zoning District. The Planning Commission reviewed the proposed request at the June 12th meeting and requested staff to work with its consultant, EPD, to draft new language as part of the zoning update. Staff did develop and review the proposed language with Carolyn Yeagle and met with Greg and Lynda Mussi on their Dog Daycare Plans. The amendment includes a consolidation of terms, a new definition, parking standards, and provisions for "Petcare Services".

Mr. Crassweller provided a number of comments:

- On page 2 of the proposed ordinance text amendment, number 3 under bullet point EE, Mr. Crassweller clarified that 75 sq. ft. of floor for each animal is a minimum number. Mr. McMaster stated that the applicant could have a minimum of 250 sq. ft. of floor space for 30 animals.
- On page 3, number 6, Mr. Crassweller asked how the minimum of 500 sq. ft. of outside exercise space was derived. Mr. Stolas replied that staff look at some

commercial dog run size and they were a little smaller than the area being proposed here, which is a 10x15 area of outdoor exercise space. Mr. Stolinis stated that the size of the outside area does not take into account the number of dogs who attend the petcare facility. Mr. Crassweller stated that if the minimum exercise area is 500 sq. ft., it would be too small for 30 dogs. Mr. Stolinis stated that most likely, there would be rotation of the dogs in the exercise area.

- On page 3, number 7, Mr. Crassweller stated that "fence posts" should say "fences."
- On page 3, number 8, Mr. Crassweller questioned who would make the determination that the quarters and runs are clean, dry, and in sanitary condition. Mr. Stolinis stated that it would be the responsibility of the ordinance officer.
- On page 3, number 9, Mr. Crassweller stated that there is no indication of how long be boarding would be for.
- On page 3, number 10, Mr. Crassweller asked if that also included that the animals must be vaccinated. Mr. Stolinis stated that staff did not consider that factor.

Mr. Keough stated that there is a need in the Centre Region for space for stray animals that are unlicensed. He wondered if this facility would be in a position to temporarily board stray animals. Ms. Schoch stated that the Township has a contract with Pets Come First so that any stray dogs picked up by the Township have a place to go until the owners are found.

Mr. Mussi stated that this particular location has about 17,000 sq. ft. of unpaved, usable space for the dog run and exercise area; however, about 14,000 sq. ft. will be used for the outdoor area. On the site plan, the green areas depict the pervious surfaces. In response to a question from Mr. Crassweller, Mr. Mussi stated that fencing will be a requirement. Mr. Mussi referred to the projector to show where the fencing would be located.

There was a lengthy discussion about required parking per the 27-809 Off-Street Parking and Loading Regulations. Some of the Commission members felt that the ordinance was unclear about how many parking spaces, including handicap spaces, were required for the doggy daycare proposal. Mr. Ressler stated that the number of parking spaces would never be below what the zoning ordinance required, but it could be more. Based on the building code from the Centre Region Code office, there is also a requirement for handicap spaces.

Mr. Crassweller referred to the very last paragraph in the ordinance text amendment that includes a definition of Pet Care Services: "A building, structure, or portion thereof designed or used for the retail sale of pet products and food, grooming, boarding, training, daycare, or overnight boarding of dogs, cats, or other household domestic animals." Mr. Wheland stated that "cats or other household domestic animals" should be struck because the ordinance requires the dogs to be licensed to attend the pet care facility, and cats and other household domestic animals are not required to be licensed; therefore, they could not attend the pet care facility.

In response to a question from Mr. Crassweller, Mr. Mussi stated that the building interior will stay the same. The applicants plan to use the space that is already there. Their goal is to have "cage-less" boarding and to have an open floor plan. Ms. Mussi spoke to PA state regulations and guides to a kennel or boarding facility. The state recommends not having more than five dogs in the exercise area at one time, as well as being careful to pair dogs that get along well. Mr. Mussi stated that according to PA state law, his proposed facility would be considered a level Class 1 Kennel, which allows for 25-50 dogs. Mr. Mussi stated that his business is required to keep all of the vaccination records of each dog. It was confirmed that a person does not need to have their dog vaccinated to get a dog license.

In response to a question from Mr. Wheland, Mr. Stolinis stated that staff removed the 1,000-foot restriction from residential or food service because the ordinance will require the applicants to do an acoustic study and analysis to prove there will be no disturbances to the surrounding areas. Mr. Mussi stated that his business does not intend to have overnight boarding; however, the Planning Commission may feel it is necessary to place regulations on overnight boarding in the ordinance for future projects.

Mr. Keough stated that changing the ordinance will affect all future projects of this nature, so the Planning Commission has to consider the ordinance amendments for other applicants. Mr. Keough stated that he noticed this particular type of service is permitted in the Rural Residential (RR) and Rural Agricultural (RA) districts. He questioned what the logic is of making this a conditional use in the IRD. Mr. Stolinis explained that when the Board of Supervisors first reviewed the application, it suggested that pet care services be a conditional use in the IRD so that the proposal comes back to the Board to review. In response to a question from Mr. Keough regarding the number of allowable animals, Mr. Stolinis stated that staff chose 30 dogs because of the size of the building and space dedicated to the activity. Mr. Keough suggested the ordinance refer to the PA state law on how many dogs a pet care service can have instead of making it 30 dogs period. Mr. Stolinis stated that 30 was a middle ground because when the Mussis' originally proposed their plan, they wanted 50 dogs allowed. The original ordinance allows for 20 dogs. In response to a question from Mr. McMaster, Mr. Mussi stated that the 25-50 dog allowance at the state level speaks to the type of license a pet care service facility can have. Mr. Mussi stated that the Planning Commission can consider limiting applicants to a Class 1 license only to limit the number of dogs an applicant may want to have in their facility. Mr. Keough stated that he is concerned about providing enough flexibility to make the business economically feasible to provide the service. He explained that a limit of 30 dogs may be okay for this applicant, but if it's limited in this way, another applicant may have space for 40 dogs but not be allowed. The applicant is still controlled by how many sq. ft. per dog they can have. He would prefer to see wording about a Class 1 License.

Mr. Keough referred to page 3, number 6 and asked why the run and exercise space hours wouldn't be from 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. since the business is allowed to be open from 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. Mr. Keough referred to number 10 on the same page and asked that staff include "and all animals will have the appropriate and required vaccinations." Mr. McMaster replied that there is no state law that requires vaccinations



except for the rabies vaccination. Mr. Keough stated that the ordinance could just require the state minimum of vaccinations and the business owner can have its own guidelines. Mr. Keough referred to number 13 on the same page and stated that he believes the acreage should be .75 acres instead of .5 acres. There was some confusion as to whether the conditions being discussed in the ordinance amendment would also apply to the RR and RA districts. Mr. Stolinis clarified that yes, it was the intention that the conditions would apply to those districts as well, with the exception of a conditional use in the IRD. Mr. Keough stated that he believes the requirement of .75 acres in the Commercial district is too limiting and not economically viable for this type of business.

Mr. Scott stated that he is concerned about the removal of the 1,000-foot restriction from residential and food service areas. He explained that the current location is probably okay regarding noise; however, if someone proposed a pet care service right against a residential neighborhood, the acoustical study would not be acceptable because the dogs would be outside for most of the day. Since these are provisions for a conditional use, he believes it might be okay.

Mr. Stolinis stated that the ordinance will allow for retail sales of pet products, but staff can add wording to make retail sales an accessory use to the main use. Mr. Ressler asked the Commission if a limit of 25% of the floor space to be dedicated to retail sales would be acceptable. There was consensus that it was.

There was discussion about item number 11 on page 3, regarding what entity would approve or sign off on acceptable storage of animal waste—the Sewage Enforcement Officer (SEO), the University Area Joint Authority (UAJA), or the State College Borough Water Authority (SCBWA). Mr. Ressler stated that the reason for this addition was due to another plan that included a kennel. The applicants had to get a specially designed, Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) approved septic dog waste system. These types of septic systems are different from human waste septic systems. Mr. Mussi stated that there is a 10-gallon digester that is essentially in-ground and flush with the surface of the ground. There is a foot-activated lid, which allows for hands-free disposal of the dog waste. An enzyme tablet would be placed in the digester daily, which would digest the waste and return it to the Earth. Mr. Keough stated that he would like for the approval to come from a local entity, instead of DEP. Mr. Wheland stated that staff should start with UAJA first. Mr. Ressler stated that once staff figures out who should approve the storage of animal waste, they will add it to item number 11.

In response to a question from Mr. Giddings, Mr. Stolinis stated that the outdoor run and exercise area did not have an abatement fence requirement; however, he will relay this to the Mussis'.

A motion was made by Mr. Keough and seconded by Mr. Wheland to table the final recommendation until the next Planning Commission meeting to allow staff to make changes to the text amendments. The motion carried 5-0.



**V. DRAFT SOURCEWATER PROTECTION OVERLAY DISTRICT ORDINANCE (w/ APPENDICES)**

Mr. Stolinas stated that Planning & Zoning staff met with the Sourcewater Work Group on July 20th and 27th to complete updates and revisions to the draft ordinance and map. The latest revisions culminate the previous review at the April 10th Planning Commission meeting and subsequent presentations from Todd Giddings and the State College Borough Water Authority at the April 24th and May 8th Planning Commission meetings.

Mr. Keough referred to page 9, item c regarding agriculture being exempt from the proposed ordinance. He asked if since the agriculture community is not exempt in Section 7 of the proposed ordinance, it means that the agriculture community is exempt from filling out the facilities profile sheet. Mr. Stolinas clarified, yes, the farmers would have to fill out the facilities profiled sheet and would be notified via mail. Mr. Keough expressed concern that 90 days was not sufficient enough time for the agriculture community to fill out the facilities profile sheet and return it to the Township. Mr. Keough would like to see wording that would inform the agriculture community that all related documents to the facilities profile sheet has to be sent in at the same time as the form. In response to a question from Mr. Keough, Mr. Stolinas stated that the facilities profile sheet will have to be filled out every two years. Mr. Keough expressed concern that the facilities profile sheet and related paper work would be too much for Township staff to handle without discussing a way to manage the incoming paper work.

Mr. Crassweller asked why the Township needed the facilities profile sheet from the agriculture community since the reporting of chemicals onsite is already required by other state entities. Mr. McMaster stated that the way the ordinance is written says that farmers are supposed to let the Township know before they spray any chemical on their crop. Mr. Keough stated that the majority of famers do not spray their own crops—they hire certified spraying companies to do it for them. That way, the farmers aren't storing large amounts of chemicals on their property. Mr. McMaster wondered how the approval process would work since no one is actually going out and checking the farms to ensure they are spraying what they said they would spray. If farmers are using certified, licensed companies to spray their crops, why do they need to submit a facilities profile sheet to the Township?

Mr. Giddings stated that when he is invoiced for his business's commercial lawn care application of herbicides, pesticides, or fertilizer, he is provided a report that includes the temperature at the time of the application, the weather conditions, the number of square feet that was treated, the amount of the compound, what the compound was (including CAS numbers), and the name of the licensed applicator. He stated that he understands that farmers hire private companies to spray their crops.

Mr. Keough asked if the Township is looking for chemicals that are stored on someone's property versus chemicals applied to a person's property. Mr. Giddings stated that he believes the emphasis on the facilities profile sheet is regarding what chemicals are stored on the property—not what chemicals are applied. The facilities profile sheet is looking for chemicals that could be spilled or leaked or escaped during a fire so that the Township can mitigate the issue accordingly. Mr. Keough stated that the current draft does not reflect what the Township is actually asking for.

In response to a question from Mr. Wheland, Mr. McMaster clarified that any person who falls under Table 1, Regulated Land Uses and Activities has to complete a facilities profile sheet for the Township—residential and multi-family homes are not included.

Mr. Keough pointed out that under Table 1, number 16 should be considered agriculture. Mr. Wheland added that the Department of Agriculture has ruled that horse farms are considered commercial agriculture. Mr. Keough explained that not allowing horses to be exempt under agriculture would be in conflict with Section 4c on page 9. Mr. Keough also added that number 26 under Table one should also fall under Section 4c. Mr. Ressler stated that number 26 is intended to reference commercial-type production, manufacturing, assembly, processing, cleaning, repairing, storage, or distribution of goods. Mr. Keough argued that farmers do the same actions under item number 26, and if the Township is referencing to commercial or industrial type operations, the ordinance should say so under number 26. It was Mr. Scott's opinion that number 26 should not be included in exempt agriculture under Section 4c.

The conversation revolved around compensation for the land owners in the Zone 1 radii. Mr. Keough stated that the proposed ordinance does not adequately address the issue of Zone 1 encroaching onto someone's property without compensation or ownership by the Township or the State College Borough Water Authority. Mr. Giddings stated that the Sourcewater Protection Work Group had a lengthy discussion with Brian Heiser of the SCBWA regarding the SCBWA's official position on Zone 1. Mr. Heiser provided several examples where through the SCWBA's water testing, it found an impact on the water at an indicator level. The SCBWA would then go to nearby land owners to figure out where the contamination was coming from. The land owners, being good citizens, would correct the problem. The SCBWA has successfully implemented land use changes by educating the land owners and by asking the land owners to fix the issue that caused the contamination of the wellfield. Mr. Giddings explained that the Sourcewater Protection work group did not receive a request to limit land uses in Zone 1; therefore, the narrative portion of the proposed ordinance is silent on that issue. Mr. Keough pointed out that on page 9 under the Zone 1 definition, it defines exactly where the Zone 1 radii are located. Mr. Giddings stated that the ordinance is defining Zone 1 on a map. He explained that from a regulating land use standpoint, there are no special Zone 1 extraordinary requirements. The proposed ordinance, which applies to the entire Township, has a uniform application across all of the Zones defined in the ordinance.

Mr. Ressler explained that the issue is that in Table 1, there are 51 land uses that are not permitted in Zone 1 versus Zone 2. Mr. McMaster stated that he remembers the Township Solicitor saying that the Township might be required to pay for the land in the Zone 1 radii, since the ordinance would be taking the usefulness of those specific properties away. Mr. Keough stated that before this ordinance is passed, the issue of Zone 1 radii boundary lines need to be resolved.

Mr. Scott stated that this ordinance is addressing a public safety issue, and the work group has already exempted farmers from the ordinance. Mr. Scott asked the Commission what they would like the work group to do. Mr. McMaster stated that the Township can't just take the land in Zone 1 because it's a public safety issue—that would



be considered eminent domain by the adoption of this ordinance. Mr. Keough referred to a church that is in a Zone 1 radius. He explained that the ordinance would keep the church from doing any of the 51 regulated land uses, even though the well inside the Zone 1 radius is not being used. The ordinance does not specify anything about off-line wells. Mr. Keough stated that it has been suggested before that the ordinance not include the off-line wells, however, the SCBWA would prefer that the wells be included in case the SCBWA would need to use them in the future. Mr. Keough stated that it has been suggested in the past to reduce the radii around Zone 1. Mr. Scott stated that it's not about property lines—it's about geology and public safety. He explained that if the church were to spill a chemical, they would be responsible to clean it up, and the ordinance is merely providing best management practices for people to follow. Mr. McMaster stated that the Township has to provide a zoning designation for every kind of activity that someone would want to do, and the ordinance does not allow that.

Mr. Keough stated that the SCBWA did not consult with the abutting land owners when it chose to drill wells. He explained that he believes the SCBWA and maybe even the Township would have a significant amount of responsibility if something contaminated the wells, since neither entity adequately accounted for ownership of the property in Zone 1. Mr. Giddings explained that the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) came up with the Zone 1 radii based on a calculation that derived from the aquifer material, the depth of the water table, and the rate of pumpage of the well. All of those things make a well react to a contamination in the ground quicker or slower. The EPA generated a Zone 1 alert and Zone 2, a direct flow to the well when the pump is running. Mr. Scott mentioned that a Board of Supervisor member would be in favor of compensating the affected landowners. Mr. McMaster stated that compensation or easement agreements would need to be done before the ordinance is passed.

Ms. Strickland was not in attendance to provide her comments, so Ms. Schoch read her comments from an email she received from Ms. Strickland:

- If the entire Township is Zone 1 or Zone 2, with some uses not allowed in either zone, does that violate the Township's requirement to allow for all uses somewhere in the Township. At the last CRPC meeting, there was discussion about having agreements with other municipalities to share uses. This could be explored as a solution if this is an issue.
- Why are quarries/mining allowed (as a special exception) in Zone 2? It seems like a lot of similar and less invasive uses are not permitted in Zone 2.
- Were we going to add a conditional use allowance for de-icing/salt where Zone 1 overlaps roads or neighborhoods?

Mr. Keough stated that the ordinance exempts the Township from the de-icing/salt restriction. Mr. McMaster added that the Township has to monitor how much de-icing/salt it uses during each storm event. He questioned how residents in Chestnut Ridge Manor would be able to de-ice their sidewalks if it is not allowed in Zone 1? Mr. Giddings explained that when controlled and proportionate to a storm, there is not enough salt to contaminate the water supply. If there was, the water may taste a little saltier, and a person could even have mild diarrhea. Mr. McMaster stated that the ordinance is unclear



on what exactly the Township will monitor, salt-wise, during a storm event—is it just the Township's application, or will it also monitor what the residents apply during a storm? Mr. Giddings stated that he believes the ordinance is only referring to the Township's application of de-icer/salt. Mr. Stolinas added that the language in the ordinance should include that the monitoring would be in Zone 1 and Zone 2.

Mr. McMaster referred to Table 1, number 43, regarding underground storage tanks. He asked if under 44c, any new gas stations not be permitted in the Township. Mr. Scott stated that he was under the impression that gas stations were not a part of number 43 or 44c, due to the already strict guidelines. Mr. McMaster referred to the definition of underground storage tank on page 8 and stated that it sounds like a new gas station would be allowed in the Township, however, Table 1 is conflicting. Mr. Giddings stated that the goal of the work group was to not permit residential underground heating tanks for future use.

Mr. Keough referred to Section 10b on page 17 regarding regulated land uses. He asked if agriculture uses are considered a regulated land use in this ordinance because if it is, it shall be deemed nonconforming. Mr. Ressler replied that agriculture land uses are not regulated under this ordinance. There was some discussion regarding what types of activities constitutes a land development or subdivision that would be required under this ordinance. Staff will need to clarify the language for the next draft.

Mr. Stolinas stated that there was a question regarding blasting that came up around the time the Township's Stormwater Ordinance was adopted. Board of Supervisor, Peter Buckland, mentioned to the Sourcewater Protection work group that citizens may ask why blasting has not been mentioned in the proposed ordinance. He also asked why drilling and fracking were not mentioned in the proposed ordinance. It was determined by Mr. Giddings that this area does not have shale gas or oil; therefore, the work group determined it was not necessary to place in the ordinance. Mr. Giddings stated that he researched how closely blasting is regulated by DEP and the state and is thoroughly addressed in Chapter 10 of the Safety and Property Maintenance Code from the Centre Region Council of Governments. He stated that where there is an adequate and very thorough treatment of a potential risk, the proposed ordinance is deliberately silent on the issue.

Mr. Keough stated that the Township continues to talk about affordability, and yet it continues to put layers of costs associated with land developments that gets passed onto the applicant. He stated that this ordinance is a big deal and one way or another it impacts a majority of the residents in the Township. He explained that he has not seen anything that would present how the Township plans to inform and educate the public about this ordinance, and the education needs to be done before the ordinance is adopted. Mr. Giddings stated that the work group has discussed holding open houses with stations where questions would be answered in real time, face to face. The work group also discussed future education and outreach to allow residents to put the ordinance into context. Mr. Keough suggested that there be separate education materials and outreach for the business community and the residents since the issues and opportunities of impact are different. He also suggested holding the open houses in

various places in the Township instead of making everyone come to the Township building. He went on to state that he is concerned about the unintended consequences of this proposed ordinance, economically and possibly in legal forms. He explained that the bottom line is that everyone should be concerned about the quality of our water. He believes the proposed ordinance is an overreach regarding the water sources and the relationship with the SCBWA. He explained that the ordinance is not very friendly, and could be backed off on and still achieve the same goals. Mr. McMaster agreed that the ordinance is an overreach.

Ms. Ruth Cooper asked if the Sourcewater Protection work group meetings were open to the public to attend. Mr. McMaster stated that they were not and that she should speak to the Township Manager, Dave Pribulka. Ms. Cooper stated that all discussions regarding this subject do not appear to be archived anywhere. Mr. McMaster stated that minutes are recorded at every meeting and are published on the Township website. Ms. Cooper stated that she would like to be able to listen to the audio recordings since the minutes are not word-for-word. Ms. Bell stated that it might be possible for her to receive the recordings through a right-to-know request, however, she will need to check with the Township Manager.

The Planning Commission would like staff to go back and make sure the map and ordinance match, clean up grammar errors, and get answers to the questions asked tonight. Mr. Scott and Mr. Keough suggested that staff bring other municipal ordinances to the work group to work out some the issues the ordinance seems to have as well as get opinions from the Township Solicitor regarding legal issues surrounding the Zone 1 radii and property boundaries.

#### **VI. C-NET COVERAGE OF FERGUSON TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION MEETINGS**

Mr. Stolinas stated that at the August 7, 2017 Board of Supervisors meeting, members discussed C-NET coverage of future Planning Commission meeting due to a request from a Ferguson Township resident. Ferguson Township does not contribute to C-NET coverage of Planning Commission meetings as The Township's contribution to C-NET is based on a five-year rolling average that lags two years behind the budget year. Prior Boards have discussed C-NET coverage of Planning Commission meetings and have historically left the decision up to the Planning Commission. At this time, the Board of Supervisors provided consensus on requesting feedback from the Planning Commission on whether they support or oppose coverage from C-NET at their meetings.

Mr. Keough stated that only four members of the Planning Commission are present, so the Commission should table any recommendations until all members can give their input. There was a brief discussion between the Planning Commission members about whether or not they would be in favor of meetings aired on C-NET. Ms. Hahn addressed some of the Commission's concerns regarding the cost and technical issues.

A motion was made by Mr. Keough and seconded by Mr. Scott to table the C-NET discussion until all Planning Commission members are present to provide their

comments. The motion carried 4-0 (Mr. Crassweller was not in attendance during this vote).

## **VII. PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

Mr. Stolinis provided the Director's report. On July 24, 2017, the Planning & Zoning Director and Community Planner attended the Pennsylvania Planning Association Conference Committee meeting at the Penn Stater. The APA/PA Annual Conference will be held here in State College October 22nd through the 24th. Planning Commission members are encouraged to register for the conference with the assistance of Planning & Zoning staff. Also on July 24, 2017, the Planning & Zoning Director, Community Planner, Township Manager, Public Works Director and Township Engineer met to develop a preliminary Gantt Project Planning chart for the proposed fire station for western Ferguson Township.

On July 25, 2017, the Planning & Zoning Director, Zoning Administrator and Township Manager met with Mei Guo-Kaplan and her client Qian Zhang regarding property at 356 E. Clinton Avenue and the adjacent 35' easement established for the Overlook Heights Tot Lot. Also on July 25, 2017, the Planning & Zoning Director and Community Planner met with Trish Meek, Centre Region Bike Planner on proposed changes to the 2017 Draft Official Map that includes an extension of a future share use path from the Foxpointe Drive Extension off Whitehall Road. The Board of Supervisors requested this extension of shared use path to connect Pine Grove Mills. The Planning Commission will review this revision at their August 28, 2017 meeting. The Centre Region Planning Commission will review this revision at their September 7, 2017 meeting.

On July 27, 2017, the Planning & Zoning Director and Zoning Administrator met with Gene Corl at 3745 West College Avenue regarding variance requests to place a 40' X 80' implement shed for his farming operation. The variance requests for setbacks and floodplain conservation at the August 22, 2017 Zoning Hearing Board meeting. Also on July 27, 2017, Planning & Zoning staff met with the Sourcewater Work Group to discuss final revisions to the draft ordinance and overlay map.

On July 28, 2017, the Planning & Zoning Director and Zoning Administrator met with Kelli Hoover of the Nittany Valley Water Coalition to discuss alternate locations of the Cottages project on University Lands #3, #4 and #12 within Ferguson Township.

On August 2, 2017, Planning & Zoning staff, Township Manager and Police Department toured the Ag. Progress Days property with Jesse Darlington, College Facilities Coordinator for the property.

On August 3, 2017, the Planning & Zoning Director and Zoning Administrator met with Greg & Lynda Mussi to review the Pet Daycare in the Light Industrial/Research and Development (IRD) Zoning District text amendment request. Also on August 3, 2017, the Planning & Zoning Director attended the Centre Region Planning Commission meeting. The CRPC heard a presentation from the Pine Hall Design Team and Attorney related to the proposed Traditional Town Development text amendment.



On August 9, 2017, the Planning & Zoning Director, Township Manager and Chief of Police met to discuss proposed Conditions of Transfer of Liquor License for Jac-Jac, Inc. for 1301 W. College Ave. for the new Highway Pizza location. Planning & Zoning staff has assisted with application review and posting the property for Public Hearing on September 5, 2017.

On August 10, 2017, the Planning & Zoning Director and Zoning Administrator met with Donald Bainbridge and Lou Prato of 114 Rushcliffe St. and 391 Havershire Blvd. regarding a side property line. The Zoning Administrator followed through with a site visit to the property. Also on August 10, 2017, the Planning & Zoning Director and Zoning Administrator met with Laura Dininni regarding properties adjacent to the Ridge Overlay District in Pine Grove Mills.

**VIII. ACTIVE PLANS UPDATE**

Ms. Schoch reviewed the active plans in the Township, which included West Cherry Lane Multi-Use Building Lot Consolidation Plan; J.L. Cidery at J.L. Farms; CSC Northland Buffalo Wild Wings; The Cottages at State College; Whitehall Road Regional Park.

Ms. Schoch also reviewed the rezoning requests and text amendments, which included Harner Farms Rezoning Request; the Traditional Town Development Text Amendment; and the Water Production Facilities Text Amendment.

**IX. CENTRE REGION PLANNING COMMISSION (CRPC) REPORT**

There was no report, as Ms. Strickland was absent.

**X. SOURCEWATER PROTECTION WORK GROUP UPDATE**

Mr. McMaster stated that the Commission has already discussed the proposed Sourcewater Protection Ordinance.

**XI. ZONING/SALDO STEERING COMMITTEE UPDATE**

There was no update.

**XII. APPROVAL OF THE REGULAR MEETING MINUTES –JULY 24, 2017**

A motion was made by Mr. Wheland and seconded by Mr. Keough to approve the July 24, 2017 Planning Commission meeting minutes. The motion carried 4-0.

**XIII. ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business for the Planning Commission, Mr. Keough made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 9:42 p.m. The motion carried 4-0.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,



LISA STRICKLAND, SECRETARY  
FOR THE PLANNING COMMISSION