General Meeting Information

College Township offers both in-person and virtual meeting attendance for all public meetings. To attend in-person, meetings will be held at 1481 E. College Avenue, State College PA, 16801, 2nd floor meeting room. To attend virtually, please see the information below.

To Attend the LIVE Meeting Via Zoom on Computer or Smart Phone:
- [Click here to REGISTER for the meeting via Zoom](#). Once registered, you will receive a confirmation email containing information about joining the meeting.

To Attend the LIVE Meeting Via Phone:
- Dial: 1 (646) 558-8656  ● Meeting ID: 826 5388 0040  ● Passcode: 333659

*Click Here for detailed instructions on how to participate via zoom.*

VIRTUAL PUBLIC COMMENTS: Please use the raised hand feature to participate. The moderator will recognize those with their hands raised (either by name or phone number).

WRITTEN PUBLIC COMMENTS: For specific Planning Commission agenda items and for items not on the agenda, written public comments may be submitted in advance by emailing smeyers@collegetownship.org by noon the day of the meeting.

CALL TO ORDER:

ZOOM MEETING PROTOCOL:

OPEN DISCUSSION (items NOT on the agenda):

CONSENT AGENDA:  CA-1  May 2, 2023 Meeting Minutes (Approval)

PLANS:

OLD BUSINESS:

NEW BUSINESS:

REPORTS:  
R-1   DPZ CoDesign Update  
R-2   Council Update  
R-3   Centre Region Planning Commission Summary Report

STAFF INFORMATIVES:  
SI-1   Council Meeting Minutes  
SI-2   Zoning Bulletin  
SI-3   Charrette Flyer
OTHER MATTERS:

OM-1 What is a Charrette?
OM-2 REDCAP Update
OM-3 Regional Growth Boundary and Sewer Service Area Implementation
OM-4 Centre Region Planning Commission Draft Comprehensive Plan

ANNOUNCEMENTS:

CTC/PC joint meeting will be Tuesday May 30, 2023 at 7:00pm
Next regular meeting will be Tuesday June 6, 2023 at 7:00pm

ADJOURNMENT:
CALL TO ORDER: Mr. Forziat called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

ZOOM MEETING PROTOCOL: Mr. Forziat verified there were not people present via Zoom and review of Zoom protocol was not necessary.

ROLL CALL: Mr. Forziat verified Mr. Darrah and Mr. Sharp were not present and excused from the meeting.

OPEN DISCUSSION: None presented.

CONSENT AGENDA:
Mr. Fenton moved to approve the April 18, 2023 meeting minutes as written. Ms. Ekdahl seconded. Motion carried unanimously.
PLANS:

**P-1 Summit Park Subdivision Sketch Plan**

Ms. Schoch introduced the plan and Mr. Myers, the engineer from Hawbaker Engineering. She added that staff had requested a sketch plan for this project in order to help with the process. Mr. Myers introduced himself and the Summit Park Subdivision Sketch Plan. He explained how the parcel is to be subdivided and discussed the Industrial Revitalization Area (IRA).

Mr. Toumayants asked if there would be a timeline set for the development of sidewalks. Mr. Franson stated the Township would most likely treat this project much like a residential project for the development of sidewalks. He explained that it would be counterproductive to install sidewalks prior to the development of each lot. Mr. Franson added the Township most likely recommend sidewalks not be built until a certain percentage of development is completed.

Mr. Fenton requested the Township stay as consistent as possible, i.e., sidewalk development timeline or percentage, when it comes to the various developments throughout the Township. Mr. Franson stated that he had no major concerns and he agrees with the idea of setting a percentage of development to be complete before requiring sidewalks to be installed. He also asked that the developer be cognizant of emergency access to all lots in the development.

Mr. Forziat asked if there would be a connection made between lots one and twelve. Mr. Myers explained there would not as there is an elevation change of about twenty feet between the lots. Mr. Toumayants asked if the development of this area would cause a bottleneck issue on College Avenue. Mr. Myers stated that it would be difficult to know until it is determined what is to be developed in each lot. Mr. Franson stated that with the development of each lot there would be a traffic count and possible traffic impact study to determine how the development will impact local traffic patterns.

Mr. Forziat asked about the area of open space on the plan and if it would remain a green open space or be developed in any way. Mr. Myers explained the area designated as open space is a former landfill and no development can be done in that area and it will probably remain a green open space. Mr. Forziat also asked about the lot sizes and how they were determined. Mr. Myers explained that the lots vary in size due to the nature of possible development. Ms. Schoch explained the IRA and the requirements involved with this area. One requirement is that fifty-one percent of the area needs to remain an industrial use while the remaining forty-nine percent needs to be non-industrial. The Planning Commission then discussed the area and how this plan is heading in the right direction for development.

OLD BUSINESS: None presented

NEW BUSINESS: None presented

REPORTS:

**R-1 DPZ CoDesign Update**

Ms. Schoch reported on her correspondence with DPZ CoDesign. She has been developing a stakeholder group for the Dale Summit Area. Ms. Schoch stated that the Charrette is to be held week of June 18th and a Pre-Charrette with stakeholders will be held sometime at the end of May. She explained what the Charrette is and the process. Mr. Forziat asked if the Planning Commission will see the memo to Council on the rezoning of the area on Shiloh Road. Ms. Schoch stated that the memo will not be seen by the Planning Commission, however, it will include the process the Planning Commission went through as well as their recommendation.

**R-2 Council Update**

Mr. Hoffman reviewed the briefing provided. Mr. Forziat asked if the briefing report is replacing the Council minutes previously submitted as a staff informative. Ms. Meyers explained that the report is not replacing the minutes, however, Council minutes must be approved by Council prior to adding them to the Planning Commission packet.
**STAFF INFORMATIVES:**

SI-1 Zoning Bulletin  
Mr. Forziat explained the zoning bulletin and how educational it can be.

**OTHER MATTERS:**

OM-1 Potential Change of Date for June 20th Meeting  
Ms. Schoch stated the reasoning behind the request to change the meeting date. The Charrette is scheduled for that week and there is an open design study scheduled for evening of June 20th. The Planning Commission agreed that June 27th would be an acceptable alternative to meet.

**ANNOUNCEMENTS:**

Mr. Forziat announced the next meeting will be WEDNESDAY, May 17, 2023 at 7:00 p.m. Ms. Schoch confirmed the joint meeting with Council will be held on Tuesday, May 30th at 7:00 p.m.

**ADJOURNMENT:**  
Mr. Hoffman moved to adjourn. Mr. Fenton seconded. Motion carried.

Meeting adjourned at 7:49 p.m.

**Draft**

Sharon E. Meyers  
Senior Support Specialist – Engineering/Planning
## Briefing Paper – DPZ CoDesign Form-Based Code in Dale Summit
Prepared by: Lindsay K. Schoch, AICP | Principal Planner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Next Steps</th>
<th>Staff/Others</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Week ending May 5, 2023</td>
<td>Planned Residential Development Ordinance</td>
<td>Work-in progress.</td>
<td>Staff to continue evaluation of DPZ recommendations to the PRD Ordinance.</td>
<td>Lindsay – Marina – Mark G.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amending Zoning in Dale Summit to Permit more uses, including R3.</td>
<td>Staff preparing memo to Council outlining PC recommendation (denial) for upcoming meeting.</td>
<td>Presentation for May 18 College Township Council Meeting</td>
<td>Adam - Mike -Lindsay</td>
<td>Township Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Engagement</td>
<td>Reached out to Stakeholders</td>
<td>Gathered approximately 30 Stakeholders for the “Pre-Charrette” Meeting.</td>
<td>Lindsay – Jennifer Hurley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sent Doodle Poll to establish date for “Pre-Charrette”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Narrowed down the Stakeholders list to six people who will be called for Key Person Interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Pre-Charrette” is an all-virtual meeting per the request of the consultant.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Upcoming meetings:

**May 9, 2023:** Lindsay Schoch, Mike Weich (DPZ), and Marina Khoury (DPZ) to discuss the existing analysis work Max from Gridics (3D Mapping) has prepared.
COLLEGE TOWNSHIP COUNCIL MEETING
May 4, 2023
Meeting Overview and Report

**Special Presentation:**
- Presentation of Resolution R-23-16 to Mount Nittany Health
- C-Net Annual Report/Presentation by Cindy Hahn

**Plans:**
- PSU Environmental Management Facility – received conditional approval
- Rhodes Lane Condominiums – received conditional approval
- Aspen Heights Minor – received comments

**Old Business:**
- Centre Hills Village Traffic Calming Bid – after much discussion on the topic and process it was decided to deny the current bid, reevaluate the scope, and rebid the project with alternate bids.
- Official Map – ordinance language was discussed; Council members will to discuss mapping

**New Business:**
- COG Capital Improvement Plan – Council reviewed the CIP and gave comments
CENTRE REGION PLANNING COMMISSION

SUMMARY REPORT

May 4, 2023

Submitted By: R. Forziat

2023 Centre Region Planning Commission

Ellen Taricani  Ferguson Township
Andrew Meehan  Halfmoon Township
Chris Gamble  Harris Township
Sharon Collins  Patton Township
Josh Portney  State College Borough
Ray Forziat  College Township
Neil Sullivan  Penn State University

Joint Meeting: LUCI Committee -( Land Use and Community Infrastructure ) and Centre Region Planning Commission

Public Comments:

➤ None

New Agenda Items:

➤ None

Consent Agenda Topics:

1. Approval of Minutes from CRPC Meeting – Mar. 2, 2022
2. Approval of Minutes from LUCI Meeting – Apr. 2023
Preliminary Findings of The 2022 Regional Development Capacity Report (REDCAP):
Presented by – Mark Boeckel
- Provided Preliminary findings of the 5 year review.
- Estimates the total amount of residential and non-residential development potential within the RGB and SSA.
- Identified remaining vacant lands within the RGB and SSA and analyzed the development / growth potential.
- CRPA coordinated with PSU to obtain remaining development capacity for the University Park Campus.
- Preliminary Findings:
  1. Vacant land within the RGB and SSA declined by 12.7 % since 2017.
  2. Approximately 3,300 remaining vacant acres can support over 10,700 dwelling units. ( and 19.5 million sqft of non-residential development.
  3. Findings concluded that the redevelopment significantly reduced the consumption of vacant land within the RGB and SSA.
  4. Municipal re-zonings helped to expand development capacity within the RGB and SSA boundary.
  5. Borough Increases in density has impacts on outlying Municipalities.
  6. Form Based Codes will impact Capacity potential.

Draft of The Amended Regional Growth Boundary and Sewer Service Area (RGB and SSA) - - Implementation Agreement
Presented by Jim May
- Required to be reviewed every 5 years. ( To be completed by the end of 2023 )
- No substantive changes to the process of requesting an expansion of RGB and SSA.
- Agreement provides guidance to Centre Region Municipalities to consider the merits of Development of Regional Impact applications.
- Both CRPC and LUCI took separate actions to recommend that the draft amended RGB and SSA Implementation Agreement be referred to the municipal governing bodies for review and comment.

Ten Year Staff Assessment of the Comprehensive Plan:
Presented by Jim May
- Provided Background Information to help prepare for the upcoming update of the Centre Region Comprehensive Plan.
- Updated every 10 years.
- Serves as a Region’s vision for the future.
- Plan includes: goals, objectives and polices.
- Newer revised format from past. Minimizes silo approach to task management and assignment.
- Assessed the implementation successes and shortcomings of the 2013 plan.
- Upcoming Comprehensive Plan can be structured to be more effective and relevant to the community.
CALL TO ORDER: Ms. Carla Stilson, Chair, called to order the April 20, 2023, Regular Meeting of the College Township (CT) Council at 7:19 PM, which followed a public hearing for Ordinance O-23-02 amending the College Township Zoning Map.

PUBLIC OPEN DISCUSSION:

No Public Open Discussion items brought forward.

NEW AGENDA ITEMS:

No New Agenda Items added.

REPORTS:

a. Manager’s Update

Mr. Brumbaugh, Township Manager, reported that the Pike Street Dedication ceremony would be held on Friday, April 21, 2023, at 1:00 PM. Many distinguished guests have confirmed their attendance. Tree planting on Pike Street is underway.

Mr. Brumbaugh also reported the inaugural meeting of the Thompson Woods Preserve Governance and Advisory Committees was held on April 11. The Solar Power Purchase Agreement Working Group will meet on April 26 to discuss draft contracts. Expectation that CT Council and CT Water Authority will be asked to consider action on contracts by May 31. Application to CFA Grant was not funded for the Path to Campus and the Application for PennDOT Grant was rejected.

b. COG Regional, County, Liaisons Reports
College Township Industrial Development Authority (CTIDA): Mr. Best reported the CTIDA met on April 19, 2023, and offered that Council appointed three new members to the CTIDA. Only one member was able to attend. They approved the HR Office to assist with their Executive Director search.

COG Joint Facilities/Finance Committee: Mr. Bernier and Mr. Francke offered a joint meeting of the Facilities and Finance Committees took place on April 13, 2023, to discuss the COG Capital Improvement Plan. They discussed the Millbrook March Nature Center and improvements to the Fire Station.

COG Public Safety Committee: Ms. Stilson reported the COG Public Safety Committee met on April 11, 2023, and heard Staff updates on the Regional Fire Protection Program, Centre Region Emergency Management, Centre County Code Administration, and Centre Region Office of Administration.

COG Climate Action and Sustainability Committee (CAS): Ms. Stilson offered the CAS met on April 10, 2023, and discussed the curbside organics pilot program, the Climate Action and Adaptation Plan (CAAP) municipality-focused survey, and reviewed the Refuse and Recycle Survey.

Centre County Metropolitan Planning Organization (CCMPO): Mr. Bernier reported the CCMPO met on April 18, 2023, and discussed the State College Area Connector (SCAC) Project, the CCMPO FY 2022-2024 Unified Planning Work Program and the CCMPO Strategic Plan.

Centre County Association of Township Officials (CCATO): Ms. Stilson offered the CCATO Spring Convention was held April 19, 2023. They heard a presentation from Diane Griffith, Centre County Planning and Community Development Office about the Agricultural Land Preservation Program and a presentation by Pam Adams, Centre Regional COG Sustainability Planner, on how residents can lower their carbon footprint.

c. Staff/P.C./Other Committees

Planning Commission (PC): Mr. Robert Hoffman, PC liaison to Council, offered the PC met on April 18, 2023, and made and discussed the Penn State Environmental Management Facility, the Official Township Map, and the Zoning Amendment consideration for the Dale Summit Area Plan. PC recommended Council approve the Penn State plan, recommended moving the Official Map forward to Council and recommended that Council deny the rezoning request for the Dale Summit Area Plan and wait 12-months for a preliminary master plan for the total area to be developed.

d. Diversity, Equity & Inclusion (DEI) Reports (Public Invited to Report)

Mr. Bloom, Assistant Township Manager, offered that he is attending a workshop on Diversity, Equity, Inclusion and Belonging Practices for Municipal Officials at the end of May.

CONSENT AGENDA:

CA-1 Minutes, Approval of
a. April 6, 2023, Regular Meeting

CA-2 Correspondence, Receipt/Approval of
a. Email from Neil Brandt, dated April 4, 2023, regarding Thompson Woods Preserve
b. Email from Daniel Materna, dated April 4, 2023, regarding casino
c. Email from Derek Kalp, dated April 6, 2023, regarding resignation from Parks and Recreation Committee

d. Email from Daniel Materna, dated April 7, 2023, regarding casino

e. Email from Jonathan McVerry, dated April 13, 2023, regarding Dale/Pike street lamp post

f. Email from Daniel Materna, dated April 14, 2023, regarding casino

g. Email from Jude Larkin, dated April 17, 2023, regarding Pike Street

h. Email from Centre Kitchen, dated April 18, 2023, regarding grant match

CA-3 Action Item, Approval of

a. Approve participation in the inter-municipal contract with Ferguson Township awarding bid to Alpha Space Control Co., Inc. for 2023 pavement markings for $53,375.84 as CT’s share.

b. Resolution R-23-12 May as Bike Month

c. Resolution R-23-14 Asian Pacific American Heritage Month

d. Resolution R-23-15 Adopting Guidelines for SC Borough Police Officers when making authorized warrantless arrests

e. Resolution R-23-16 Mount Nittany Health Week, May 8-12, 2023

f. Project #23-05 Council Room Window Replacement Project Bid - Reject bids due to improper bid submission; Staff include replacement of window as an alternate to upcoming Building Replacement project.

Council asked to pull the following from the Consent Agenda: CA-2.e., CA-2.f., CA-2.h., CA-3.c., and CA-3.e. for further discussion.

**Mr. Bernier made a motion to accept the April 20, 2023, Consent Agenda less CA-2.e., CA-2.f., CA-2.h., CA-3.c., and CA-3.f.**

**Mr. Francke seconded the motion.**

Motion carried unanimously.

**CA-2.f.:** Mr. Brumbaugh, Township Manager, offered that the casino is now in the realm of the State Supreme Courts. He asked for clarity from Council related to capturing information on the website moving forward. The Township is not involved in any of the action as it proceeds through court system. Council agreed that it is not the best use of Staff’s time to keep up with every detail of the court proceeding but asked Staff to make sure the links to the court dockets are available on the website.

**CA-2.e.:** Mr. Franson, P.E., P.L.S., Township Engineer, offered information about the correspondence from the McVerry’s. Council asked Staff to get an estimate for a decorative pole, possibly with the lines underground, which could be placed in the future. The cost to move the pole and replace with a typical wooden pole, is approximately $2,000.

Ms. Sue Smith, Lemont, opined that the black street signs should be put back up in Lemont.

**CA-2.h.:** Ms. Sabine Carey, Centre Kitchen Collective, offered information related to a non-profit Centre Kitchens Collective. Her purpose is to seek a $5000 grant match contribution from College Township to support their federal grant application for $500,000 USDA Local Food Promotion Grant (LFPG). The specific purpose of this LFPG is to support development, coordination, and expansion of local and regional food business and enterprises, as well as to
increase access to and the availability of locally and regionally produced agricultural products. The grant application will focus on an incubators commercial kitchen and food hub in Pine Grove Mills, to support both our local agriculture community and food entrepreneurs.

Mr. Bernier made a motion to add to the agenda, NB-1 Centre Kitchen Grant; $5,000 pledge.  
Mr. Best seconded the motion.  
Motion carried unanimously.

CA-3.c.: Chair Stilson read Resolution R-23-14, recognizing and celebrating May as Asian Pacific American Heritage Month.

CA-3.e.: Ms. Trainor read Resolution R-23-16, recognizing and celebrating Mount Nittany Health Week, Emergency Medical Services Week and thanking the Board, Leadership and especially the Clinical Team of Mount Nittany Health for their enduring legacy of service to the community.

Mr. Best made a motion to approve CA-2.e., CA-2.f., CA-2.h., CA-3.c., and CA-3.e. on the Consent Agenda.  
Mr. Bernier seconded the motion.  
Motion carried unanimously.

OLD BUSINESS:

OB-1 Ordinance O-23-02 Amending the CT Zoning Map

Ms. Lindsay Schoch, AICP, Principal Planner, offered that a Public Hearing for Ordinance O-23-02 took place prior to the start of this regular CT Council meeting. If Council approves this Ordinance, a new zoning map

Council offered they look at rezoning with the current owner and future owners of the parcel in mind. The rezoning did not ask for expansion of the sewer service area or public water so this really limits what can be done on the parcel. Council discussed leaving the buffer between the residential area and the rezoned area is favorable to the rezoning. Council offered the core percolation test limits the use as well.

Mr. Don Franson, P.E., P.L.S., Township Engineer, addressed the water basin concern and offered the MS4 program will address this issue.

Ms. Trainor made a motion to approve Ordinance O-23-02, changing three-acres of tax parcel 19-004-078 from forest zoning designation to the industrial zoning designation.  
Mr. Bernier seconded the motion.  
Motion carried unanimously.

OB-2 Residential Rental Ordinance Review

Ms. Lindsay Schoch, AICP, Principal Planner, offered that experience tells us, it is best to work with a newly enacted ordinance for at least a year before reconsidering the elements. Chapter 160-Residential Rentals Ordinance was enacted in December of 2020 and has been administered for over two years.
As well as implementing the new Residential Rentals Ordinance, Staff started the implementation of the Granicus software. Prior to implementation, CT had 30 Short-Term Rentals (STR); currently, CT has 85 STR compliant and registered.

In the past two years, Staff has received over 20 calls regarding the purchase of single-family homes strictly for the use as a “football home” or STR. The response from Staff is all short-term rentals are required to be owner-occupied.

Staff has had both positive and negative feedback to the Ordinance since it was adopted. Ms. Schoch offered the comments received include:

- Proof of residency;
- Confirmed stays versus night rented;
- Consideration of different zones/areas of the township in which STR are permitted, prohibited, capped and not capped;
- Update ordinance text/definition to better define owner-occupied and non-owner occupied;
- Updating the fee with the implementation of Granicus;
- Increase in the nights rented;
- Making the intent section stronger specific to preserving the character of single-family neighborhoods; and
- The intent to preserve single-family residential neighborhoods is not intended to lessen the opportunity for accessory dwelling units and the ability for property owners to rent their homes for extra income.

Council discussed the following:
- Intent of the ordinance;
- Equability for home-owners;
- Fee Schedule;
- Balancing the various interests of home-owners;
- Council should discuss/review the intent; and
- Remand the reviewed intent and a review of the ordinance to the PC.

After discussion, Council asked Staff to bring the Residential Rental Ordinance back to Council to review the intent and fee schedule with the intention of remanding to the Planning Commission for further review.

NEW BUSINESS

**NB-1 Centre Kitchen Grant; $5000 pledge**

Council discussed the request for a $5,000 pledge/match for the Centre Kitchens Collective USDA Local Food Promotions Grant. Mr. Brumbaugh would recommend a one-time payment for the pledge if the grant were awarded.

Mr. Bernier made a motion to authorize the Manager to commit a $5000 pledge/match to the Centre Kitchens Collective USDA Local Food Promotions Grant as referenced in the Consent Agenda item CA-2.h.

Mr. Best seconded the motion.

Motion carried unanimously.
STAFF INFORMATIVES:

No Staff Informatives were pulled for discussion.

OTHER MATTERS:

Mr. Brumbaugh offered that SI-3 is a wonderful resource of all of the events taking place from May through September in the Centre Region. Staff will place this on the website as a reference.

Mr. Bloom, Assistant Township Manger, offered that a Doodle Poll will be sent out to schedule a CIP Strategic Planning Meeting.

ADJOURNMENT:

Mr. Francke moved to adjourn the April 20, 2023, Regular College Township Council Meeting.
Chair seconded the motion.

The April 20, 2023, Regular College Township Council Meeting was adjourned at 9:19 PM.

Respectfully Submitted By,

Adam T. Brumbaugh
Township Secretary
Standing

Billboard owner challenges constitutionality of county’s former sign code but was the challenge moot?

Citation: Adams Outdoor Advertising Limited Partnership v. Beaufort County, 2023 WL 1801827 (D.S.C. 2023)

Adams Outdoor Advertising Limited Partnership (Adams), which owned commercial billboards, filed suit against Beaufort County, South Carolina, its county administrator, and its zoning and development administrator (collectively, defendants). Adams challenged portions of the county’s sign regulations, which were contained within its Community Development Code (CDC).

More specifically, the dispute in this case arose after the county cited Adams in 2021 for rebuilding two of its billboards in contravention of county sign regulations. A magistrate court held a trial on those criminal charges in July 2021 and found Adams and one of its managers guilty. Since that time, the county and Adams had been litigating the validity of the convictions in state court.

Adams also applied to install 11 new digital commercial billboards in the county, but its permit requests were denied, and Adams appealed.

The county’s zoning board of appeals upheld the decision to deny the applications, finding that the proposed signs did not comply with long-standing height and width standards. Adams had not challenged those dimension standards.

The defendants asked the court to dismiss the lawsuit, asserting the “Younger abstention doctrine” applied. Then, they filed a reply to Adams’ response to dismissal, noting that a recent U.S. Supreme Court decision in City of Austin v. Reagan National Advert. of Austin LLC governed.

DECISION: Request for dismissal granted.

Adams lacked standing to bring claims alleging the former sign code was unconstitutional.

But, in this case, Adams contended that the constitutionality of the county’s sign ordinance regulations governing the maintenance and repair of billboards was in question.

The defendants’ request for dismissal argued that Adams’ claims about its reconstructed billboards were barred by the Younger abstention doctrine and its progeny. They also asserted that Adams’ remaining challenges to repeal or amend the sign regulations were moot and that Adams lacked standing to challenge regulations that had not been applied against it.

Adams, conversely, claimed the defendants should have applied the former
Back to the Court’s Ruling

Regarding the former sign code, the court found that Adams hadn’t satisfied the requirement of showing “standing to challenge each provision of an ordinance by showing that [it had been] injured by application of those provisions.” As a result, Adams’ claims against the former sign code were dismissed.

The bottom line: Adams challenged former sign code provisions that were not applied to its applications and that were changed in the CSC. “But challenges to those former provisions do not present a live controversy,” the court found. And there wasn’t any “reasonable expecta-

Land Development

Case Centers Around Whether Landowner Had Vesting of Rights to Develop Parcels

Citation: Carson v. Brown, 2023 WL 1792668 (Ga. Ct. App. 2023)

In 2021, the Georgia Court of Appeals ruled that a landowner obtained vested rights to develop land in Forsyth County, Georgia in a particular manner by virtue of “purchasing the property and making expenditures in reliance upon the probability that a building permit would issue, based upon the property’s then-current zoning status and the assurance of zoning officials.”

The court did not, given the disposition of the case, reach other arguments in favor of the landowner’s claim of vested rights and dismissed as moot the parties cross-appeals for judgment without a trial in a related case in which the landowner had sought mandamus and injunctive relief pertaining to the county’s processing of an application for a land disturbance permit for the property.

Then, the state’s highest court reversed the appeals court’s decision. It found the record hadn’t demonstrated an assurance that gave rise to the vested rights claimed by the landowner. But the court did not address or consider the landowner’s alternative arguments in support of the claim for vested rights.

The appeals court then took the case back in light of the high court’s ruling, vacating its earlier decision and adopting the high court’s opinion, as well as ruling on the merits of the case.

Decision: Affirmed in part; reversed in part.

The appeals court found that the landowner had not failed to exhaust administrative remedies before bringing the action for mandamus and injunctive relief. But on the merits, the court also “affirm[ed] the trial court’s declaration that a valid moratorium existed when the landowner applied for a land disturbance permit and that the moratorium barred the county from accepting the landowner’s permit application.”

The bottom line: The court reversed the portion of the trial court’s order in which it had required certain county employees to accept and process the application and affirm that portion of the order in which it had refused to require the employees to process the permit application without regard to the moratorium.

A Closer Look

The landowner, Red Bull Holdings II LLC, and its
principal, E. Howard Carson, Jr. (collectively, Carson), wanted to develop real property with 9,000-square-foot lots. When Carson bought the property in the spring of 2016, the county’s zoning code permitted that density, but the zoning code was later amended to require larger lot sizes.

Carson bought the property after confirming with the county’s planning director, Tom Brown, that the zoning code in place at the time allowed for his desired density. He then took steps to obtain the necessary sewer easements for his planned development and to prepare an application for a land disturbance permit.

In August 2016, the county took actions to impose an emergency, temporary moratorium barring the acceptance of land disturbance permits for development at certain densities, including those for 9,000-square-foot lots. On September 1, 2016, the county issued a resolution extending the moratorium until December 7, 2016. In October 2016, the county’s Board of Commissioners amended the zoning code to prohibit lots of that size.

In September 2016, after the county had issued the resolution extending the moratorium but before the county amended the zoning code, Carson submitted an application for a land disturbance permit to develop his property with 9,000-square-foot lots.

The parties disputed whether the county accepted that application for processing. And the planner technician in Brown’s department informed Carson in writing that she was “releasing this plan back to [Carson] because of the moratorium.”

Carson sought an administrative determination that he had vested rights to develop the property at his desired density. The county’s planning department ruled against him, and Carson appealed that decision to the county’s zoning board of appeals, which affirmed the decision.

It was then that Carson petitioned the Superior Court of Forsyth County for a writ of certiorari against the county and Brown, the planning director.

THE BOTTOM LINE

The appeals court ruled that:

- Carson’s start of the process to obtain sewer easements under the zoning code’s provisions allowing lots of desired size did not grant him a vested right to a land-disturbance permit to develop lots of that size; and
- A resolution the board of commissioners had adopted prior to Carson’s application for a land-disturbance permit created a valid moratorium on lots of his desired size.

CASE NOTE

The Supreme Court of Georgia had outlined four ways a landowner could acquire a vested right to initiate a specific use of a property despite a change in zoning laws:

- when they were issued building and other permits;
- there was a law in existence at the time a landowner properly filed an application for a permit;
- they formally and informally approved development plans; or
- they were provided official assurances that a building permit would probably be issued.

Practically Speaking:

Carson’s claim for mandamus requiring the planning director to process his permit application without considering the moratorium was denied. The court, however, reversed the lower court’s ruling granting his claim for mandamus requiring them to accept that application for processing. The court also reversed the trial court’s ruling granting Carson’s request for an injunction against the planning director prohibiting him from refusing to process the application.

Special Permit

ZBA’s approval of mixed-use building project comes under legal scrutiny

Citation: Addezio v. Zoning Board of Appeals of Winchester, 102 Mass. App. Ct. 1109, 2023 WL 1486429 (2023)

Angela Addezio, the trustee of the Addezio Realty Trust, Wine Country Inc., and Town Pantry Inc. (collectively, the Addeziors), appealed from a judgment of the Land Court affirming the Winchester, Massachusetts’ Zoning Board of Appeals’ decision to grant a special permit and to approve a site plan allowing 735 Main LLC (735 Main) to construct a three-story mixed-use building (project) located at 735 Main Street in Winchester (proposed site).

The Addeziors, abutters to the property, contended that the trial judge and board had relied on “fatally flawed” traffic and parking data that resulted in clearly erroneous factual findings that the project would not unreasonably or negatively impact traffic in the area and met minimum parking requirements.

DECISION: Affirmed.

The ruling wasn’t arbitrary or capricious (or otherwise unreasonable).

A CLOSER LOOK

735 Main owned the proposed site, which was previously a residential dwelling and currently a vacant lot. The Addeziors owned or operated businesses located in a single-story commercial building with a surface parking lot in front of the building, adjacent to the proposed site.

735 Main applied for a special permit and site plan approval to construct a three-story building that would have
approximately 2,000 square feet of commercial space and a parking garage on the first floor, eight residential units on the second and third floors, and a surface parking lot to be shared by the commercial and residential users.

Following multiple public hearings and project design modifications fashioned in tandem with an architectural consultant the ZBA retained, it unanimously approved the application.

The Addeziros then filed an action in the Land Court, challenging the approval of 735 Main’s application. A bench trial took place, with the judge affirming the ZBA’s decision. Then, the Addeziros appealed.

BACK TO THE COURT’S RULING

The land court judge had provided a “detailed and thorough written ruling support[ing] the [ZBA’s] decision.” And the Addeziros did not assert legal error, so the court agreed with the judge that the ZBA’s “decision was based on legally tenable grounds, and was not unreasonable, whimsical, capricious, or arbitrary.”

The Addeziros argued that the judge made clearly erroneous factual determinations regarding Winchester Zoning Special Permit bylaw based on traffic and parking data that “underestimated the trip generation of the proposed development,” and failed to reflect that “available public parking in the area will not be sufficient to absorb any excess parking demand caused by [the project].” For instance, they cited their own expert’s testimony and asserted that “735 Main’s expert analysis was based on low-traffic volume, ‘variety store’ use rather than higher-traffic volume, ‘coffee shop, . . . bakery, or . . . convenience store’ use that was more appropriate for the site.”

While the judge had “acknowledged the testimony of the Addeziros’ expert, that ‘a high intensity use at the Project would generate more traffic and demand more parking spaces,’ he credited the testimony of 735 Main’s expert that the project in fact would not ‘unreasonably or negatively impact traffic and parking in the immediate area’ based on the Village Center Overlay District (VCOD)’s pedestrian-oriented focus.” Thus, the judge had found “‘the VCOD [did] not encourage the high intensity uses hypothesized by [the Addeziros’ expert].’” Despite the Addeziros’ assertions to the contrary, the judge was entitled to make those credibility determinations,” the court noted.

The bottom line: The Addeziros unsuccessfully challenged the methodology and analysis of 735 Main’s expert. “The judge found the analysis performed by 735 Main’s expert credible because it was based on traffic and parking data collected and evaluated from the area of the proposed site, whereas the Addeziros’ expert ‘did not perform his own traffic impact analysis, did not present alternative or adjusted traffic data . . . and focused much of his testimony on critiquing [735 Main’s expert’s] testimony.’” Also, the judge had found that “735 Main’s expert’s ‘assumption that the anticipated use of the retail space will be low intensity is supported by the minimum parking requirements of the VCOD’ because the ‘reduction in the number of parking spaces required in the VCOD furthers [pedestrian-oriented retail activity].’” “We discern no error in these findings,” the court concluded, and since there was no reason to invalidate the ZBA’s decision to grant 735 Main’s special permit and site plan approval, the judgment was affirmed.

Abutters

Court rules abutters’ claim of ownership not germane to issuance of Certificate of Zoning Compliance

Citation: Three K’s, LLC v. Town of Weston Zoning Board of Appeals, 2023 WL 142327 (Conn. Super. Ct. 2023)

Three K’s LLC and Nicholas Klokus, owned property known as 96 Georgetown Road in Weston, Connecticut, which abutted 100 Georgetown Road, which Umberto and Natalie Torrielli acquired in 2020. Prior to the transfer of title, 100 Georgetown Road LLC, and Arctic Construction LLC owned the property located at 100 Georgetown Road, which was described as a five-bedroom single-family home, with 4.5 bathrooms, a finished basement, and a 120 square foot storage space in the attic (ROR 1). A single-family dwelling was a permitted use in the applicable zone.

In September 10, 2020, James Pjura, Weston’s Code Compliance Officer, acting in the capacity of Zoning Enforcement Officer, issued a Certificate of Zoning Compliance concerning residential property at 100 Georgetown Road (ROR 1). The Certificate of Zoning Compliance stated that the property and improvements “conform to the Zoning Regulations of the Town of Weston.”

The certificate referred to an Improvement Location Survey dated June 8, 2020 and revised to September 2, 2020. The certificate was issued to 100 Georgetown Road LLC, the then property owner.

In October 2020, Three K’s LLC and Nicholas Klokus filed an appeal with the Weston Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) challenging the issuance of the Certificate of Zoning Compliance and alleging that 100 Georgetown Road LLC did not comply with applicable Weston Zoning Regulations.

A public hearing was noticed for October 27, 2020. The notice was consistent with two Executive Orders (EOs) the governor had issued to cope with the COVID-19 pandemic (these EOs suspended many of the General Statutes and municipal ordinances dealing with meetings of government agencies, and mandated public hearings).

The ZBA granted a continuance that one of Three K’s principals requested, and a special meeting was set for November 12, 2020 and properly noticed.
The ZBA voted unanimously to deny the appeal and to uphold the issuance of the Certificate of Zoning Compliance, and an appeal followed.

**DECISION: Appeal dismissed.**

The ZBA’s decision was supported by substantial evidence.

One of Three K’s principals claimed he possessed an interest in 100 Georgetown Road. “The material is not germane to the issuance of the certificate of zoning compliance,” though. And there wasn’t any evidence that a violation of existing Weston Zoning Regulations had been presented.

**A CLOSER LOOK**

“A land use board or commission cannot decide issues concerning the ownership of real property,” the court explained. “Nor does the land use agency have the authority to determine whether a claimed right of way is a public highway. That conclusion can only be made by a judicial authority in an action to quiet title” governed under state law.

**Indenture**

Village repeatedly denies application to build a dock, claims lawsuit challenging decision isn’t ripe

Citation: *Kleinknecht v. Ritter*, 2023 WL 380536 (2d Cir. 2023)

The Second U.S. Circuit has jurisdiction over Connecticut, New York, and Vermont.

Richard and Suzanne Kleinknecht (the property owners) appealed a lower court’s judgment dismissing their lawsuit against the Village of Lloyd Harbor as unripe. They appealed arguing that their § 1983 claim against the village, which alleged an unlawful taking the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments was ripe because at the time they filed suit, the village had issued a final decision preventing them from constructing a waterfront dock on their Lloyd Harbor, New York property.

**DECISION: Reversed; case sent back for further proceedings.**

A final decision had been rendered, so the property owners had grounds to take their appeal to court.

**MORE ON THE FACTS**

The property in question was originally part of a large land tract that was subdivided into smaller residential lots. During the subdividing process, the village was granted an indenture conveying certain development rights over the waterfront residential lots—including the subject property.

The indenture provided that no new docks could be built on these newly subdivided lots, but that the affected homeowners of these lots could use an existing community boathouse and pier instead. The village’s planning board then voted to restate this provision in the deed to each encumbered lot. As a result, when the Kleinknechts purchased the property in 1999, their deed included a provision prohibiting them from building a dock and instead providing them access to the boathouse and pier.

After the village sold the land on which the boathouse and pier stood, the Kleinknechts sought approval to build a dock on their property. A nearly decade-long process ensued, and in 2011, they submitted an application to the planning board seeking permission to build a dock. Following a public hearing, the planning board denied the request.

The property owners challenged that denial with “an Article 78 proceeding” in a New York court. The state court ultimately decided the village’s sale of the community boathouse and pier constituted a “change of circumstances,” entitling the Kleinknechts “to the issuance of a permit to erect a dock upon the filing of an appropriate application.”

Then, in 2014, the property owners filed another dock application with the village’s building department, which denied it on the grounds that the proposed dock didn’t comply with the village zoning code. So, they applied for a variance instead, which the village’s Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) denied.

To challenge that denial, the property owners filed a second Article 78 proceeding, which went its way to a state appeals court, which upheld the ZBA’s decision after finding that it was not “arbitrary and capricious.”

In 2016, the property owners submitted a third dock application to the building department. The village’s attorney responded with a letter stating the building inspector wasn’t authorized to issue any building permits for the encumbered portion of their property.

At that point, the property owners filed a third Article 78 proceeding. The state court ordered the building department to grant their 2016 application. But on appeal, the court modified the order so that the building department was required only to “forward the... permit application to the [village’s] site and Building Permit Review Board in accordance with” local code.

In July 2019, the property owners submitted another dock application to the New York Department of State’s Coastal Management Program., but the state also denied the request.

At that point, the property owners filed this lawsuit, alleging that under § 1983, the village’s conduct had amounted to an unconstitutional taking in violation of the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments. They contended the taking dated back to 2011 and “continuing to date.” They sought monetary damages and an injunction so they could construct the dock.

While the lawsuit was pending, the property owners...
submitted to the village another application to build a dock, which the building department finally approved. In light of this approval, and the fact that the property owners went ahead and constructed their dock, the lower court dismissed the complaint as unripe, reasoning that they did not have a final decision when this lawsuit was filed.

THE APPEALS COURT’S RATIONALE

The Second U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals explained that Supreme Court precedent, in a case decided in 2019, indicated that a plaintiff seeking to bring a takings claim only needed to show a final decision for the claim to be ripe.

“As a threshold matter, because the ‘first claim’ in the complaint alleges only that the taking began in 2011 and continues to date, . . . we must first determine which of the village’s actions were the subject of this claim,” the court explained. In reviewing the lower court’s decision, it was bound to “draw all reasonable inferences” in the property owners’ favor.

While the first claim didn’t differentiate between the various denials of the dock applications, the body of the complaint certainly does, the court concluded. Therefore, it found “the complaint—though lacking clarity—allege[d] a separate taking for the denials of the 2011, 2014, and 2016 applications.” And with respect to the 2011 applications, there couldn’t be a doubt that the planning board had “definitively decided that the [property owners] were not entitled to relief from the restriction in their deed that prohibited them from building a dock.” While the village argued the planning board couldn’t have issued a final decision because the property owners had yet to petition the village’s board of trustees for relief from the indenture restriction, “there was no need for the[m] to seek such relief given that their deed—which contained language that was identical to that in the indenture—was alone sufficient to prevent them from building a dock, and so a petition to the [trustees board] would have been futile.”

Also, the 2014 application had been subject to a final decision. The building department denied that application due to its noncompliance with the zoning code, and when the property owners sought a variance, “the ZBA promptly rejected that request, leaving the[m] with no other avenues by which to seek a clarification or change of the [village’s] decision”—clearly making this a final village decision, the court found.

The property owners also obtained a final decision concerning the 2016 application. “We see no daylight between the [village attorney’s] letter, which stated that the [building department] lacked authority to grant the application, and a letter expressly denying the application.” There weren’t any “magic words necessary for a decision to satisfy the final-decision requirement, and to the extent that the[y] could have sought a variance from this decision, doing so surely would have been futile given the . . . blanket assertion that the ‘Building Inspect-
approve these low- and moderate-income projects as long as they conform with objective building and design standards and comply with CEQA and the Coastal Act. These laws allow localities to address any specific, legitimate environmental concerns on a project-by-project basis,” the AG’s office stated.

The proposed zoning text amendment (No. 2023-001) would bar the processing or approval of any and all applications to build affordable housing under the HAA’s Builder’s Remedy.

To read the AG’s letter, visit oag.ca.gov/system/files/attachments/press-docs/Huntington%20Beach-2-13-23-AG%20final.pdf. A letter the California Department of Housing and Community Development wrote about this issue can also be found at oag.ca.gov/system/files/attachments/press-docs/HuntingtonBeachNOPV021323.pdf.

Source: oag.ca.gov

**Illinois**

**DOJ settles housing discrimination lawsuit against Hinsdale**

The Village of Hinsdale, Illinois has settled a housing discrimination lawsuit the Department of Justice (DOJ) filed for $800,000. The DOJ alleged that the village violated the Fair Housing Act by refusing to allow the operation of a sober living home for those in recovery from drug and alcohol addiction in a residential neighborhood.

“Local governments do not have the right to use zoning laws and restrictions as a vehicle to discriminate against people with disabilities,” said Assistant Attorney General Kristen Clarke of the DOJ’s Civil Rights Division.

“Individuals with disabilities—including those recovering from drug and alcohol addiction—should not be excluded from living in residential neighborhoods,” said U.S. Attorney John Lausch Jr. for the Northern District of Illinois. “Such discrimination by local governments is forbidden under the Fair Housing Act,” Lausch added.

In this case, the DOJ asserted that a reasonable accommodation should have been granted to Trinity Sober Living LLC (Trinity) so it could operate a sober living home with 10 residents and a house manager in a residential neighborhood. A day after Trinity requested an accommodation, the village sued Trinity in state court for violations of the zoning code, including that the home was a “commercial use” and would have more than three unrelated adults, a press release explained.

Per the agreement’s terms, in addition to paying a monetary settlement, the village will amend its zoning ordinance to comply with federal anti-discrimination laws, including permitting homes for persons with disabilities in residential districts, with the same size limitations applied to families of similar size, and implementing a reasonable accommodation policy. It will also take actions to guard against housing discrimination, including training village officials and employees about their obligations under federal law, designating a fair housing compliance officer and reporting periodically to the DOJ.

As of print time, the settlement was still subject to federal court approval.

Source: justice.gov

**Montana**

State sues Portland, Oregon over ordinance to block transportation of fossil fuels

The State of Montana’s attorney general (AG), Austin Knudsen, recently filed suit against the City of Portland, Oregon, over alleged illegal policies to block the transportation of fossil fuels through its borders. The AG alleges the ordinance “hinder[s] the ability of Montana energy products to reach regional and international markets,” a press release stated.

In limiting the supply of energy beyond Portland’s geographic limits, the ordinance “dictates interstate and international trade policy, severs states throughout the west from fuel distribution streams, and is a violation of the United States Constitution and federal law,” the press release added.

“American energy independence, which is critical for our national security and economic well-being, depends on reliable infrastructure to move products to consumers. The Portland government is artificially and intentionally preventing new and expanded infrastructure in order achieve its politically motivated ‘climate action plan,’ ” AG Knudsen said. “Further, Portland’s hypocritical policies kneecap Montana industries and workers from getting our energy products to market while trying to protect its own citizens from the consequences of its short-sighted actions,” he added.

Portland is a key transportation hub for energy distribution, including by deep-water seaport, rail hub, truck, and petroleum and natural gas pipelines—this includes the 400-mile Olympic Pipeline, which connects Puget Sound refineries with 10 petroleum terminals in Portland. “The challenged policies and zoning regulations intentionally discriminate in favor of local users, unreasonably burden interstate commerce, interfere with intermodal and rail transportation, and serve no legitimate local purpose. Therefore, they violate the Dormant Commerce Clause, Foreign Commerce Clause, and Due Process Clause of the U.S. Constitution,” the lawsuit asserts.


Source: dojmt.gov

**New Jersey**

Municipal grants available to assist with warehouse concerns

The Highlands Council recently approved a resolution to authorize up to $50,000 in grants to help municipalities in the Highlands region of the Garden State examine
local zoning to identify inappropriate development, specifically warehouse siting.

“The increasing pressure for warehouse development is hitting the Highlands region just like it’s hitting the rest of the state, with one important difference—the Highlands is the source of drinking water for most of the state,” explained Ben Spinelli, Highlands Council Executive Director. “We must protect the environmental resources that are vital to the well-being of the entirety of New Jersey. There are places in the New Jersey Highlands where warehousing may be an acceptable use, but there are others where it is just the wrong type of development,” Spinelli added.

Many towns permit warehousing as of right, which means a warehouse developer doesn’t have to go through a lengthy variance process via the local zoning board of adjustment. Instead, they can get site-plan approval at the planning board. The Highlands Council’s “Local Zoning Local Control” grant program makes up to $5,000 available for a municipality to review current zoning to ensure that potential as-of-right developments that are permitted by zoning ordinance meet the vision of the municipality and its citizens.

By reviewing current zoning, the idea is that municipalities can avoid a situation where “inappropriate, unintended, or unwanted development” occurs.

“It’s important for municipalities to understand what their local zoning will allow,” said Spinelli. “Often, ordinances and codes have been in place for years—long before the current administration’s tenure. If a town is faced with an application for a development they feel is not appropriate, they may be shocked to learn they legally can’t stop it,” Spinelli added.

To access Highlands-specific siting guidances, visit nj.gov/state/planning/assets/pdf/warehouse-guidance.pdf. And more general information can be found at nj.gov/njhighlands.

Source: insidersnj.com

Texas

Business owners’ group discusses incremental ‘upzoning’ proposal for municipal revitalization

The Haltom United Business Alliance (HUBA), a group of business owners dedicated to representing existing business interests in Haltom City, Texas and promoting the growth of diverse businesses, recently issued a press release announcing a new book that discusses incremental up-zoning proposal for municipal revitalization. The book, Keeping the Lights on Downtown in America’s Small Cities, discusses a white paper that proposes this concept as a way to breathe new life into cities.

The press release explained that according to the white paper, “allow[ing] incremental up-zoning and/or use combinations by right—meaning that the property owner or developer would not have as much red tape to navigate-in specific areas of cities in need of revitalization.” The white paper’s author also noted that up-zoned areas could be deemed “living labs,” where a city could “choose an area known to be in decline such as a particular segment of a road or a broader category as may be appropriate and allow an incremental jump in zoning category, or combination of existing plus new, by right.” “One idea would be to identify a specific residential area along an arterial or collector road and authorize incremental up-zoning to the next category (e.g., the lowest multi-family zone) or to a mixed-use that might be suitable for the area. Another would be to allow pop-up cafes on light industrial sites (such as car lots or auto repair shops) which would not only encourage small business development but would add street appeal and provide industrial customers somewhere nearby to wait. Cities should also consider the possibility of reducing setbacks and lot coverage minimums in certain areas, increasing height allowances, and/or reducing parking requirements if such changes would be beneficial,” the press release explained.

Source: 24-7pressrelease.com

Washington, D.C.

USDA grants relate to zoning, urban-production needs

The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) has released $7.5 million in grant funding targeting areas of food access, education, business and start-up costs for new farmers, and policy development related to zoning and other urban production needs.

For more information about the urban grants, visit usda.gov/topics/urban/grants.

Source: usda.gov
Charrette Public Meetings
June 19 - 22

DALE SUMMIT AREA REDEVELOPMENT PLAN

Meeting Location
Township Building,
2nd floor meeting room
1481 E College Ave, State College, PA

SCHEDULE

Monday, June 19th
10am - 12pm : Open Studio
5:30 - 7pm : Opening Presentation

Tuesday, June 20th
10-10:30am : Open Studio
10:30am 12pm : Marketability
1 2:30pm : Transportation & infrastructure
2:30-4pm : Parks, Trails, & Schools
4-5:30pm : Open Studio
5:30-7pm : Work-in-Progress Open House

Wednesday, June 21st
10-10:30am : Open Studio
10:30am-12pm : Land Use & Zoning
1-7pm : Open Studio

Thursday, June 22nd
5:30-7pm : Closing Presentation

Your Input Matters!

During the charrette, we will explore big ideas for the future of Dale Summit.

We have many different ways for you to engage. The Opening and Closing Presentations and the Work-in-Progress Open House are public meetings where you can get an overview of the whole project and hear about the developing ideas. The topic meetings give a chance for people interested in specific topics to discuss the issues and provide input. The open studio hours are drop-in times where you can stop by to speak one-on-one with team members and see the designers at work.
In every organization and in every endeavor, creating innovative solutions to complex problems requires collaboration – and necessarily involves conflicting positions. How can you avoid endless meetings and participant fatigue while channeling divergent viewpoints into achievable solutions? Collaboration!
Collaboration is transformed by embedding key participants in the design process and bringing them into a radically creative event to build a supported action plan. This flexible yet prescriptive system cuts project timelines in half, saving money and accelerating implementation.

What is a Charrette?
A charrette, or design charrette, is a planning technique for consulting with stakeholders and other interested parties, harnessing their talents and energies, and involving them in the physical design and planning of the community. It is an intense collaborative effort used to create a detailed feasible design or plan for a specific issue or geographic location. While there is flexibility as to how to conduct a charrette, it is generally an involved process where the main activity takes place over several days, and the entire charrette planning process can be months in duration.
A charrette might be used to develop a specific area or to reach a consensus on a design for the area. Another use could be to reach an agreement on a theme or façade for an area.

Who is involved?
To conduct a charrette, the community needs to involve one or more professionals from the following disciplines:
· Professional Planner
· Engineer/Architect
· Facilitator
In addition, the community’s citizens and stakeholders must also be involved.
The following are essential for a successful charrette:

- **Collaboration by design** – all interested parties must be involved from the beginning
- **Compressed work sessions** – into one to four days
- **Communication/Short feedback loops** – effort is directed to having very short turnaround to report back to citizens and stakeholders involved in the process
- **Study the details and the whole** – Lasting agreement is based upon fully informed dialogue, accomplished by looking at the details and the big picture concurrently
- **Use design to achieve shared vision and create holistic solutions** – drawings illustrate the complexity and can be used to resolve conflict by proposing previously unexplored solutions that represent win/win outcomes
- **Multi-day charrette** – should be a minimum of four days
- **Hold the charrette near the site** – those involved to have access to the project site and makes it easy for most of those impacted to be able to participate
- **Produce a feasible plan** – preferred plan is a work-in-progress

**Implementation**

Continued momentum following the charrette is critical. When presented at the final charrette meeting, the preferred plan is a work-in-progress. Following the charrette, more in-depth testing is needed to ensure the accuracy and feasibility of some plan elements. Once the necessary plan revisions are identified, a follow-up stakeholder meeting is advised, ideally four to six weeks after the charrette. The project team will then work to finalize all plan revisions and to complete the project drawings and supplemental documents. The final step will be acceptance, to be accomplished by communication of status of the project, refining the product, and ultimately finalization, public presentation, and adoption.
BACKGROUND

Overview

- First REDCAP Report was published in 2012, updated every five years.
- Supports Regional Growth Boundary policies within the Centre Region Comprehensive Plan.
- Useful in evaluating requests to expand the Regional Growth Boundary and Sewer Service Area, along with other policy decisions related to regional growth.
**PROCESS TIMELINE**

**Where We Are**

- Vacant parcels were identified based on 2017 data and GIS analysis
- Methodology applied to all vacant parcels, except:
  - Awaiting data from PSU for Main Campus and Innovation Park
  - PSU and Mt. Nittany Medical Center tabulated separately
- Initial results for vacant land is complete.
- Staff will begin preparing the final report once PSU data is received.
# PRELIMINARY FINDINGS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Developable Land</th>
<th>Residential Capacity</th>
<th>Non-Residential Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3,320 acres</td>
<td>16,746 units</td>
<td>18,500,000 square feet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Does not include PSU, Innovation Park, or Mt. Nittany Medical Center.
2017-2022 Change

Minimal Decline in all Categories:
- Municipal actions minimized changes to overall development potential

% Change 2017-2022

- Acres: -12.70%
- Residential Units: -6.79%
- Non-Residential: -0.25%
IMPACTS OF REDEVELOPMENT

Findings:

- Approximately 1,150 new units since 2012
- Over 390,000 square feet of non-residential area
- Would have likely consumed more than 500 acres of vacant land if developed on greenfields
- Additional redevelopment projects approved and under construction
IMPACTS OF MUNICIPAL ACTIONS

Rezonings:

• Harner Farm Rezoning
  • 71.4 acres
  • Rezoned from RA to R1 and C
  • 1 EDU in 2017
  • Partially developed as of 2023

• Patton Crossings
  • 27 acres
  • Rezoned from C1/R3 to C2/MXD2
  • 94.1% increase in potential/proposed units
  • 135.9% increase in potential/proposed non-res sq ft
SEWER CAPACITY

Current vs. Potential

- Average flow of 5.31 MGD in 2022
- Up to 9.0 MGD of discharge capacity (currently 8 MGD)
- Planned/potential development flows nearly equal to remaining discharge capacity
- Impacts from future redevelopment/municipal actions are difficult to assess
QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS?
REGIONAL GROWTH BOUNDARY AND SEWER SERVICE AREA IMPLEMENTATION AGREEMENT

JOINT LUCI AND CRPA MEETING MAY 4, 2023
BIG PICTURE

- Direct higher intensity development to certain areas.
- Improve the ability to preserve farmland.
- Preserve rural communities.
- Utilize existing infrastructure.
- Align growth with sewer availability and preserve capacity at UAJA.
- Protect sourcewater and other environmental resources.
- All this requires a REGIONAL agreement to implement from the six Centre Region municipalities
WHERE ARE WE TODAY?

- Most new building permits are issued inside the RGB and SSA.
- Capacity inside the RGB and SSA is adequate to serve growth.
- Rural communities continue to preserve their rural character.
- Approved average monthly hydraulic capacity at UAJA is 10.62 MGD.
  Average monthly flow in 2022 was 5.31 MGD.
- Sourcewater continues to be protected from incompatible development.
- Farmland and open areas have been preserved.
- The RGB and SSA Implementation Agreement helps municipalities implement regional goals.
ASSESSMENT OF EXISTING AGREEMENT

- The process to expand the RGB and SSA is meant to be rigorous.
- Does not require a Development of Regional Impact inside the RGB and SSA. Makes it easier to grow where the Region wants growth.
- It can be a complicated process that is not often utilized.
- Continues to maintain a contiguous RGB and SSA boundary.
- The process requires that all six municipalities to participate in voting on requested expansions of the RGB and SSA.
WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED CHANGES?

- No substantial changes...
- Cleaned up authority and effective date
- Moved exceptions to the front of the Agreement
- The background section was deleted and incorporated into the *RGB and SSA at a Glance* document. A link to the document will be included as reference at the end of the Agreement.
- Deleted the “Limited Review Process” and reauthorized the option for municipalities to approved minor requests to expand the RGB and SSA without going to the COG General Forum.
THANK YOU

- Questions
- Comments
- Clarifications
- Consider a motion to refer the draft amended RGB and SSA Implementation Agreement to the municipalities for review and comment.
CENTRE REGION
GROWTH BOUNDARY AND SEWER SERVICE AREA
(RGB and SSA) IMPLEMENTATION AGREEMENT

An amended and restated IMPLEMENTATION AGREEMENT is enacted by ordinance by College Township, Ferguson Township, Halfmoon Township, Harris Township, Patton Township, and State College Borough, all of Centre County, Pennsylvania, also referred to herein as the Centre Region municipalities.

SECTION 1: AUTHORITY, EFFECTIVE DATE, AND PURPOSE


1.2 Effective Date - This amended and restated Agreement shall be effective upon adoption, by ordinance by the individual Centre Region municipalities.

1.3 Purpose - This Agreement is adopted to:

A. Adopt an amended and restated process that the Centre Region municipalities can use to review and take action upon a Development of Regional Impact (DRI) application to expand the RGB and SSA boundary.

B. Adopt an amended and restated process that the Centre Region municipalities can use to review and provide advisory comments to individual municipalities on major rezonings outside the RGB and SSA when the density exceeds one Equivalent Dwelling Unit (EDU) per acre.

SECTION 2: APPLICABILITY AND EXCEPTIONS

2.1 Applicability

The following actions shall require a Development of Regional Impact application:

1. A request to expand the RGB and SSA
2. A request to rezone property outside the RGB and SSA to a density greater than one EDU per acre

2.2 Exceptions

1. The Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) declares in writing that there is a threat to public health and there is no other alternative to protect public health other than to connect to public sewer. In these instances, the provision of public sewer outside the RGB and SSA is allowed only to serve the existing number of EDUs at time of failure. Any additional capacity would require a future Development of Regional Impact application.
2. Rezoning of parcels to accommodate a use that would not require public sewer.

3. Rezoning to a residential use that does not exceed one dwelling per acre (need to discuss community on-lot septic systems)?

SECTION 3. DEFINITIONS

The following words or terms used in this Agreement will have the following meanings:

Regional Growth Boundary - The Regional Growth Boundary is the boundary within which higher density and intensity of development exists to efficiently and economically support urban services including public sewer, public water, public transportation, fire, police, and schools. The RGB is consistent with the Centre Region Comprehensive Plan.

Sewer Service Area - The Sewer Service Area is the location where public sewer service is provided or planned as identified in the Centre Region Act 537 Sewage Facilities Plan. The Sewer Service Area is delineated in the latest approved Centre Region Act 537 Sewage Facilities Plan.

Alternative Public Wastewater Treatment - Alternative public wastewater treatment is any process designed to produce an effluent of higher quality than normally achieved through primary and secondary treatment processes and does not utilize soils as the primary method for remediation (membrane bioreactor, for example).

Density - For the purpose of this Agreement density is defined in terms of the number of EDUs as established in the UAJA Rate Resolution.

Developments of Regional Impact - Any land development that, because of its character, magnitude, or location will have substantial impact upon the health, safety, or welfare of citizens in more than one Centre Region municipality. The Region will assess the impact on public services including, but not limited to, public sewer, public water, public transportation, fire, police, and schools in determining what qualifies as a Development of Regional Impact.

Equivalent Dwelling Unit (EDU) - A unit of measurement that estimates an average use of wastewater facilities. Roughly the average amount of wastewater generated by atypical family in one day.

Major rezoning: A major rezoning is a rezoning outside the RGB and SSA that increases density by more than one EDU per acre.

SECTION 4: THE PROCESS – GENERAL FORUM ACTION REQUIRED

The six Centre Region municipalities that are signatory to the Centre Region Comprehensive Plan and Act 537 Sewage Facilities Plan agree to the following process for considering requests to expand the Regional Growth Boundary and Sewer Service Area or to rezone or complete zoning text amendments outside of the Regional Growth Boundary and Sewer Service Area that permit development density greater than one equivalent dwelling unit per acre.

1. The following proposals are hereby presumed to be Developments of Regional Impact:
a. Any request to expand the Regional Growth Boundary and Sewer Service Area or to extend public sewer infrastructure to areas outside of the existing Sewer Service Area.

b. Any proposal to rezone or complete zoning text amendments for properties outside of the Regional Growth Boundary and Sewer Service Area that will permit development density greater than one equivalent dwelling unit per acre.

2. Due to the impact that Developments of Regional Impact can have on the community’s wastewater collection, conveyance, and treatment system and overall infrastructure network, the municipalities agree that these proposals warrant increased regional discussion and deliberation. As a result, applicants shall complete the following review process prior to a request to expand the Regional Growth Boundary and Sewer Service Area being granted by the General Forum:

   a. All applications for a Development of Regional Impact to expand the Regional Growth Boundary and Sewer Service Area, shall first be reviewed by the host municipality to determine if they have merit and warrant discussion at the regional level. To ensure that adequate information is provided for the host municipality to consider the proposal, the signatories to this Agreement agree to adopt a regionally consistent application to request expansions of the Regional Growth Boundary and Sewer Service area, including applications for Developments of Regional Impact. This standardized application requires that the applicant to submit the following information to the host municipality for review:

      i. The applicant must address the following questions in the application to expand the Regional Growth Boundary and Sewer Service Area:
         1. Are there locations inside the Regional Growth Boundary that could support the proposed development? If not, explain why.
         2. Does the University Area Joint Authority have capacity to serve existing development inside the Regional Growth Boundary and the proposed expansion? Please provide a letter from the University Area Joint Authority documenting capacity.
         3. Have on-lot septic systems or other methods to provide sewer service to the property been explored? Why are these not viable methods to dispose of waste?
         4. Are there any potential adverse public impacts of the proposed expansion and how will they be mitigated, based upon the items in Section V, Subsections ii. through vi?
         5. Is the expansion contiguous with the existing Regional Growth Boundary?
         6. Do changes in local or regional population or land use forecasts warrant an expansion? Explain how these changes necessitate the expansion.
         7. Are there adjustments or changes in the specific location or direction of growth and development that warrant an expansion? Explain how these changes necessitate the expansion.
         8. Are there changes resulting from goals, objectives, and policies in the Comprehensive Plan or local planning issues that warrant an expansion? Explain how these changes necessitate the expansion.
ii. Effect of the Development of Regional Impact on:
1. Existing sewer collection, conveyance, and treatment system
2. Public water infrastructure
3. Transportation network (including bicycle and pedestrian facilities)
4. Public transportation system
5. Emergency services (for example, fire, police, and ambulance service)
6. Environmental features (such as soils, wetlands, streams, the aquifer, sinkholes, or similar environmental concerns)
7. School facilities
8. Adjacent land uses

iii. In addition to the above noted information, the host municipality, at its discretion may also require information relative to fiscal impacts or specific details on transportation impacts, environmental impacts, or similar studies.

iv. Economic analysis of the impact of the proposal on other areas of the community

v. Quality of life issues and the value the proposal would add to the community

vi. The consistency of the proposal with the Centre Region Comprehensive Plan

b. The Development of Regional Impact application will be forwarded to the Centre Regional Planning Agency to be reviewed for completeness based on the items listed above. The Centre Regional Planning Agency will have 20 business days to review the Development of Regional Impact application and forward comments back to the applicant outlining the information that needs to be revised or added to ensure a complete application, if necessary. The applicant will make any necessary changes and resubmit the application to the Centre Regional Planning Agency for its review and recommendation, including specific reasons and findings of fact. The Centre Regional Planning Agency will have 15 business days to review the completed application and develop its recommendation to be forwarded to the host municipality with the completed Development of Regional Impact application.

c. The host municipality shall not review the request to expand the Regional Growth Boundary and Sewer Service Area and Development of Regional Impact application unless the information required has been reviewed by the Centre Regional Planning Agency for completeness. Following a review of this information, the host municipality will determine if the proposal has merit and warrants regional discussion. If the host municipality determines that the proposal warrants regional discussion, the Development of Regional Impact application shall be forwarded for regional discussion before final action to forward the proposal is taken by the host municipality. The host municipality shall include specific findings of fact used to establish its support of the request to expand the Regional Growth Boundary and Sewer Service Area based upon the Development of Regional Impact application.

i. If the request to expand the Regional Growth Boundary and Sewer Service Area is initiated by a municipality, the municipality shall be responsible for preparing the information outlined in section 2.a.

ii. If the host municipality forwards the request to expand the Regional Growth Boundary and Sewer Service Area for regional review, the process shall begin
with the Centre Regional Planning Commission. Upon receipt of a completed application for a request to expand the Regional Growth Boundary and Sewer Service Area, including a completed Development of Regional Impact application from the host municipality (including findings, in support of the application), the Centre Regional Planning Commission shall review the proposal and provide a recommendation to the General Forum of the Centre Region Council of Governments within 60 days of receipt of the completed application.

iii. Requests to expand the Regional Growth Boundary and Sewer Service Area and completed Development of Regional Impact applications shall be reviewed by the Centre Regional Planning Commission, beginning at the first available meeting that coincides with the regular agenda mailing following receipt from the host municipality.

iv. The Centre Regional Planning Commission recommendation on the request to expand the Regional Growth Boundary and Sewer Service Area and Development of Regional Impact application, along with the completed application (including findings from the host municipality and Centre Regional Planning Agency), shall be provided to the COG General Forum for review.

The COG General Forum shall conduct two meetings to review the request to expand the Regional Growth Boundary and Sewer Service Area. At the first COG General Forum meeting, a member of the host municipality’s governing body shall be designated to present information on the application and indicate why the host municipality supports the proposal. If deemed appropriate by the COG General Forum, the applicant may be asked to provide information on the application. The goals of this presentation are as follows:

1. To encourage communication among the Region’s elected officials on Developments of Regional Impact early in the review process.
2. To solicit comments and suggestions from the General Forum that may result in the identification of solutions to planning issues which can be addressed by the host municipality.
3. To determine the level of support from the other Centre Region municipalities for the proposal.

d. Following the presentation by the host municipality (and the applicant if appropriate), a representative of the Centre Regional Planning Commission will present its recommendation and provide any applicable information related to the discussion that occurred. Municipalities may consider conducting individual governing body meetings between the first and second COG General Forum meeting to study the request in more detail and form a municipal position regarding the request prior to the second COG General Forum meeting.

e. At the second meeting, the General Forum will discuss the results of the first COG General Forum meeting and any municipal governing body meetings and may hold an informal straw vote to determine each municipality’s position on the request. If the discussion indicates that there are not at least five votes in support of an expansion to the Regional Growth Boundary and Sewer Service Area, then the municipalities indicating dissent will
be asked to provide an explanation of their position. Following this discussion, the General Forum will determine whether to proceed to:

i. Refer the proposal to an ad hoc committee or COG standing committee for further discussion.

ii. Request the applicant or the host municipality to provide additional information to the General Forum. Such additional information may include special studies such as detailed land use, fiscal, transportation or environmental impact analyses; or

iii. Vote on the request.

The General Forum shall only approve a request to expand the Regional Growth Boundary and Sewer Service Area by an affirmative unit vote of at least five municipalities, upon finding that the request has satisfied the criteria in Section V.2.a of this Agreement.

f. At the conclusion of the General Forum discussion and following any additional steps and discussion as noted in the preceding step, a unit vote will be held.

i. Requests to expand the Regional Growth Boundary and Sewer Service Area require a minimum of five affirmative unit votes of the municipalities, including the host municipality, for approval. The unit vote will allow each municipality to provide the host municipality an indication of its support for the proposal to expand the Regional Growth Boundary and Sewer Service Area.

Upon approval to expand the Regional Growth Boundary and Sewer Service Area, the COG General Forum will adopt a resolution approving the expansion as a revision to the Centre Region Act 537 and Comprehensive Plans, and the host municipality may proceed to submit the proposal and required planning module to the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection for approval.

By signing this Agreement, each Centre Region municipality agrees not to rezone or complete zoning text amendments for properties outside of the Regional Growth Boundary and Sewer Service Area that will permit development density greater than one equivalent dwelling unit per acre until completing the process as described in Section V of this Agreement.

ii. If a request to expand the Regional Growth Boundary and Sewer Service Area does not receive a minimum of five affirmative votes, said request may be resubmitted for reconsideration after the General Forum concerns are addressed.

iii. Rezonings or rezoning text amendments outside of the Regional Growth Boundary and Sewer Service Area that would result in development density of less than one equivalent dwelling unit per acre do not require General Forum action. The COG General Forum would be informed of the change; however, no action or discussion would be required by the COG General Forum. Rezonings or rezoning text amendments outside of the Regional Growth Boundary and Sewer Service Area that would result in development density of greater than one dwelling unit per acre require General Forum action, unless otherwise permitted in Section VI "The Process - General Forum Action Not Required" to expand the Regional Growth Boundary and Sewer Service Area. Regardless, the authority for zoning decisions will remain with the host municipality.
SECTION 5: THE PROCESS - GENERAL FORUM ACTION NOT REQUIRED

The six Centre Region municipalities that are signatory to the Centre Region Comprehensive Plan and Act 537 Sewage Facilities Plan agree to the following:

1. Each municipality that has land outside of the Regional Growth Boundary and Sewer Service Area is authorized to expand the Regional Growth Boundary and Sewer Service Area by a maximum of 50 Equivalent Dwelling Units, not to exceed 12 acres, for a period of five years from the execution of this amended Agreement. Individual non-residential projects are limited to a maximum square footage that would be expected to generate fewer than 100 vehicle trips during the peak hour, or fewer than 750 vehicle trips in an average day.

2. The governing body of the host municipality will consider comments from the Centre Regional Planning Agency and the Centre Regional Planning Commission in the municipal review process.

3. Requests to expand the Regional Growth Boundary and Sewer Service Area under this Section of the Ordinance must achieve a minimum development density greater than one equivalent dwelling unit per acre.

4. Requests to expand the Regional Growth Boundary and Sewer Service Area under this Section of the Ordinance shall be evaluated in the same manner as requests under Section V "The Process - General Forum Action Required," with the exception that they will not require COS General Forum approval.

5. The request to expand the Regional Growth Boundary and Sewer Service Area must be contiguous to the existing Regional Growth Boundary and Sewer Service Area. This provision does not preclude exceptions to expand the Sewer Service Area as may otherwise be authorized under Section VIII "Exceptions".

6. This Section of the Ordinance will expire five years from the final date of adoption and will require a unit vote in the affirmative of at least five municipalities to be reauthorized.

The CRPA shall annually provide the General Forum with a summary of all requests to expand the Regional Growth Boundary and Sewer Service Area, including an accounting of the number of EDUs approved in each municipality and a map depicting the location of any changes to the Regional Growth Boundary and Sewer Service Area in the preceding year.

SECTION 6: PROJECT SPECIFIC DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENTS

A host municipality is required to enter into a project specific development agreement with a property owner or developer that is requesting an expansion to the Regional Growth Boundary and Sewer Service Area. A project specific development agreement is used to ensure the land development occurs as proposed and is required to be included as a condition of the Resolution authorizing the request to expand the Regional Growth Boundary and Sewer Service Area. It is solely the responsibility of an individual municipality to ensure a development agreement is being executed properly and to approve or deny changes to that agreement. The Centre Region does not have a role in the enforcement or verification of a municipally enacted development agreement.
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Amendments to the development agreement that are de minimus changes or technical corrections, as determined by participants, may be approved administratively by the host municipality. Such changes may be authorized at the discretion of the governing body of the host municipality or its designee and do not require any action by the COG General Forum. The host municipality shall forward any de minimus changes or technical corrections to the COG Executive Director within five days of approval by the host municipality for inclusion as an informational item at the next available COG General Forum meeting.

Major amendments and rescissions must be ratified by all participants to the original development agreement. Such changes may be authorized at the discretion of the governing body of the host municipality or its designee and do not require any action by the COG General Forum, with the exception that the host municipality will notify the General Forum of any major changes. In the case of rescission of a development agreement, or if the governing body of the host municipality determines a major amendment is not consistent with the intent of the expansion as approved by the COG General Forum, a new request to expand the Regional Growth Boundary and Sewer Service Area must be filed and approved by the General Forum as required in this Agreement.

The municipalities agree that development agreements will be used to specify that the property owner or developer of the project for which the Regional Growth Boundary and Sewer Service Area application was approved shall obtain a building permit within five years of COG General Forum approval of the resolution expanding the Regional Growth Boundary and Sewer Service Area. If the property owner or developer of the project has not obtained a building permit within the five-year period, the host municipality shall take action to rescind the development agreement and the Regional Growth Boundary and Sewer Service Area shall be restored to their location prior to the request.

SECTION 7: FUTURE DEVELOPMENTS OUTSIDE OF THE REGIONAL GROWTH BOUNDARY AND SEWER SERVICE AREA

The Centre Region municipalities agree that developments outside of the Regional Growth Boundary and Sewer Service Area served by on-lot sewage disposal systems should be managed under the existing CRCA Sewage Management Program. The proper operation and maintenance of on-lot systems will ensure the health of these systems, prevent the need for costly public sewer line extensions, and discourage the need for the outward expansion of the Regional Growth Boundary and Sewer Service Area. In addition, the Chesapeake Bay Tributary Strategy further emphasizes the need for ensuring the proper operation and maintenance of on-lot sewage disposal systems.

The Centre Region municipalities agree to the following measures for future developments located outside of the Regional Growth Boundary and Sewer Service Area:

1. Sewage management programs will be required for all future developments that propose less than 15 EDUs outside of the Regional Growth Boundary and Sewer Service Area.

2. Developments located outside of the Regional Growth Boundary and Sewer Service Area that propose a cumulative total of 15 or more EDUs, and where any individual lot is less than two acres, shall utilize a community on-lot sewage disposal system (as defined by the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection) designed and maintained according to the
standards of the University Area Joint Authority. The University Area Joint Authority, however, will not be required to perform day-to-day operations on such facilities. For phased developments, this requirement will apply to developments that reach a cumulative total of 15 EDUs.

3. Alternative public wastewater treatment systems (with the exception of UAJA) as defined herein, are prohibited for the term of this Agreement in the Centre Region. The Centre Region Act 537 Sewage Facilities Plan identifies on-lot sewage disposal systems as the only method for wastewater treatment outside of the Regional Growth Boundary and Sewer Service Area. If public sewer service is requested, the University Area Joint Authority has been identified as the provider for public sewer services in the Centre Region.

On-lot developments located outside of the Regional Growth Boundary and Sewer Service Area will not be reviewed by the Centre Regional Planning Commission or COG General Forum. However, by enacting this Agreement, the Municipalities agree to incorporate the requirements described above into their municipal sewage management ordinances.

SECTION 8: REQUIRED REVIEW AND AMENDMENT PROCESS

1. Required Review

The municipalities agree to review and evaluate the effectiveness of the provisions contained herein within five years from the effective date and to amend this Agreement more frequently, if necessary, if recommended by the COG Land Use and Community Infrastructure Committee and approved by a unit vote of the COG General Forum.

The municipalities agree to amend any municipal ordinances to conform to this Agreement within the timeframe established by the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (MPC).

2. Amendment Process

a. Determination of minor and major amendments:
All requests for amendments to the Regional Growth Boundary and Sewer Service Area Implementation Agreement shall be submitted through a Centre Region municipality or the Centre Regional Planning Commission, including those requests originated by an individual or entity seeking an amendment. The municipality or Centre Regional Planning Commission will forward the request to the COG Executive Director, who will schedule the item on the next available COG Land Use and Community Infrastructure Committee agenda.

The COG Land Use and Community Infrastructure Committee, by a majority vote of members present, will determine if an amendment is major or minor. If the COG Land Use and Community Infrastructure Committee cannot agree on a designation, the COG Land Use and Community Infrastructure Committee must forward the proposed amendment to the next available COG Executive Committee meeting for consideration on a COG General Forum agenda. The COG General Forum will then determine if the amendment is major or minor by majority vote of the individual members present.

b. Major amendments:
After designating the request as a major amendment, the COG Land Use and Community Infrastructure Committee (or COG General Forum if necessary) shall refer the major amendment to the COG Executive

Centre Regional Planning Agency
Director for Centre Regional Planning Agency review and Centre Regional Planning Commission recommendation, and to the Centre Region municipalities for their information. The Centre Regional Planning Agency will present a recommendation for consideration at a future COG Land Use and Community Infrastructure Committee meeting. The COG Land Use and Community Infrastructure Committee shall recommend approval, denial, or continuance on the amendment by a majority vote of the members present, no more than 90 days from receipt of the major amendment. The COG Land Use and Community Infrastructure Committee recommendation will be forwarded to the COG Executive Committee for consideration on a General Forum agenda. The COG General Forum shall take action to modify, approve, deny, or continue the amendment by an affirmative unanimous unit vote of the municipalities. The COG Executive Director shall forward the amendment and the results of such action to all of the Centre Region municipalities, the Centre Regional Planning Agency, the Centre Regional Planning Commission, and requesting entities, no more than five working days after such action.

c. Minor amendments:
After designating the request as a minor amendment, the COG Land Use and Community Infrastructure Committee (or COG General Forum as necessary) shall refer the minor amendment to the COG Executive Director for Centre Regional Planning Agency review. The Centre Regional Planning Agency will present a recommendation for consideration at the next scheduled COG Land Use and Community Infrastructure Committee meeting. The COG Land Use and Community Infrastructure Committee shall review the request and take action to modify, approve, deny, or continue the amendment by a majority vote of the members present, no more than 90 days from receipt of the minor amendment. The COG Executive Director shall forward the amendment and the results of such action to all the Centre Region municipalities, the Centre Regional Planning Agency, the Centre Regional Planning Commission, and requesting entities, no more than five working days after such action.

SECTION 9: TERM AND EFFECTIVE DATE

The effective date of this Agreement shall be upon enactment by ordinance of this Agreement by the six Centre Region municipalities:
From Silos to Systems

Centre Region 2040

*New* Approach to Comprehensive Planning for the Centre Region

April 2023
Since November 2022

• Using the Greensboro, NC “GSO2040” Plan as a model for the Centre Region Plan.
• Refined the organization of the Centre Region Plan using the “GSO2040” model.
• Completed a draft staff-level inventory and assessment of the 2013 Comprehensive Plan as a basis to launch this planning effort.
• Planning for the framing the Comprehensive Plan Update in the summer with the following objectives:
  • Begin structuring for the visioning process
  • Provide a brief overview of key results from the assessment
  • Introduce draft principles for the Plan
  • Test the principles and learn what the community sees
Takeaways – Comprehensive Plan Assessment

• **Too wordy** – too long, gets into the weeds, and does not do a good job of communicating the story of what the community wants to be.

• **Discrete plan elements** – need to recognize subject areas (silos) operate as complex systems. Work towards integrating silos into systems.

• **Continuous community engagement** – digital tools have transformed participation but should not overlook underrepresented groups.

• **Not very adaptive** – Need to strengthen resilience to have a plan that can adapt to issues beyond local control.
Takeaways – Comprehensive Plan Assessment

- **Be values driven** – Address the issues and values expressed by the community.

- **Be thematic based** – Organize around cross-cutting themes or principles rather than discrete elements.

- **Be collaborative** – Improve meaningful engagement with citizens, organizations, businesses and other community stakeholders.

- **Link the values with outcomes** – Connect values with a clearly defined action agenda.

- **Regional in focus** – Strengthen the value of multi-municipal
Suggested principles for the Centre Region 2040 Plan
(Source: APA Sustaining Places Task Force)

Livable Built Environment

- Ensure all elements of the built environment, including land use, transportation, housing, energy, and infrastructure work together to provide sustainable, green places for living, working, and recreation with a high quality of life.

Harmony with Nature

- Ensure that the contributions of natural resources to human well-being are explicitly recognized and valued and that maintaining their health is a primary objective.

Resilient Region

- Ensure that the community is prepared to deal with both positive and negative changes in its economic health and to initiate sustainable urban development and redevelopment strategies foster green business growth and build resilience on local assets.
Suggested principles for the **Centre Region 2040 Plan**
(Source: APA Sustaining Places Task Force)

- **Interwoven Equity**
  - **Ensure fairness and equity** in providing for the housing, services, health, safety, and livelihood needs of all citizens and groups.

- **Healthy Community**
  - **Ensure that public health needs** are recognized and addressed through provisions for healthy foods, physical activity, access to recreation, health care, environmental justice, and safe neighborhoods.

- **Responsible Regionalism**
  - **Ensure that all local proposals** account for, connect with, and support the plans of adjacent jurisdictions and the surrounding region.
Why the GSO 2040 Model?

- Is organized around six “big ideas” the community wants to work towards accomplishing over the life of the Plan.

- Limits the big ideas to two or three goals with two or three strategies for each goal. Does not try to address every conceivable problem.

- The plan is organized in a way that shifts the emphasis from working in silos to working in a systems approach that integrates many disciplines to address the big ideas.

- Has multiple paths for participants to be engaged in developing community values, preparing a vision statement, the big ideas, and the goals throughout the process.
GSO 2040 expresses the community's vision for what it wants to be in 2040 and creates a broad framework of policies for achieving that vision. These policies are based on extensive public input and conversation, a review of data about the current state of the city, alignment of existing plans from City departments, collaboration with community partners, and a review of current trends affecting cities across the country. The Plan uses several key pieces to describe our current values, the vision of what we want to achieve, and the goals and strategies we will use to get there.

Suggested model for the Centre Region
2040 Plan
(Source: City of Greensboro, NC)

Link: https://www.greensboro-nc.gov/home/showPublishedDocument/54607/638079117141530000
What does that mean for the CR?

- For many planning projects, teams will need to be multi-disciplinary to more directly support the municipalities.

- Requires the CRPA to be both consensus builders and project managers to bring subject matter experts to bear on specific projects.

- Improved implementation tools in policy plans integration between implementation at the municipal level using the CHIP process.

- "Actionable" Plan that will satisfy the requirements of the Municipalities Planning Code (MPC).
Questions and Comments

Thank you
Draft
Comprehensive Plan Assessment
April 26, 2023
The Centre Region Comprehensive Plan, adopted in 2013 serves as the guiding document for planning for the physical growth of the Centre Region while maintaining a high quality of life. The Plan includes specific plan elements that have goals, policies, and objectives for land use, transportation, community services and other areas. The Centre Region updates the Comprehensive Plan about every ten years as recommended in the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (MPC).

The CRPA prepared this Comprehensive Plan Assessment to take a look at what has been accomplished in the Region over the past ten years of Plan implementation and to gain some insights as to how the next update to the Comprehensive Plan can be most effective in guiding the future physical development in the next planning cycle.

1. What is the status of 2013 Comprehensive Plan goals, objectives, and policies?

   Staff has reviewed all 340 policies in the 2013 Comprehensive Plan to determine the implementation status of each policy. A completed implementation status will be provided for the joint CRPC/LUCI Committee meeting in May.

   The implementation status included the following terms and definitions for each policy:

   - **Complete:** Completed policies were specifically addressed over the past ten years. These were generally “one off” projects that did not have additional work required after completion.
   - **No progress** – The policy was included in the Comprehensive Plan Update but not addressed because it was not elevated to a high priority through the Comprehensive Plan Implementation Program (CHIP), was longer relevant to the community, or could be completed in the future.
   - **No longer applicable** – These policies should not be included in the Comprehensive Plan Update. In some cases, the policy was explored, but was determined unfeasible, unable to be implemented, or was resolved because changing conditions over the past ten years have addressed the policy or rendered it invalid.
   - **Ongoing:** Ongoing policies include recourncing projects or activities that are embedded in the regular workload for the CRPA. These projects include recourncing updates or annual work activities. These may not need to be included in the Comprehensive Plan Update but should be reflected as ongoing work in the annual work program for the CRPA.
   - **In progress:** The policy was started, but not completed. These may continue in future plans if warranted.

   Most of the policies in the 2013 Comprehensive Plan fall into the “Ongoing” category. For example, policies to protect groundwater, preserve agricultural land, improve neighborhood quality are always ongoing. These are the policies that require the CRPA to maintain information, coordinate activities, or monitor progress. For example, the REDCAP Report informs how much development occurred inside the RGB and SSA and if there is capacity in terms of land area and sewage treatment to serve anticipated growth for the next ten years. The strength of a regional plan is that it recognizes the regional forces that incorporate strategies for work with municipalities on common pressing issues.
2. What other strategies might have been more effective in accomplishing the desired policy?

From a strategic point of view, the organization of the 2013 Comprehensive Plan, based largely on the format of the Municipalities Planning Code (MPC) resulted in too many policies that clouded what big picture problems needed to be resolved through the Plan. The Plan provided an excellent accounting of seemingly every issue that needed addressing however, it may have been more effective if the Plan was reorganized to address four or six specific issues that were simply phrased like, “protect groundwater”, “maintain safe neighborhoods”, or “improve mobility”. These statements identify straightforward ideas that are actionable and measurable.

Strategies that may make the updated Plan more effective include:

- Identifying four to six big issues or ideas that people in the community can relate to and organizing the Plan priorities around implementing those ideas.
- The 2013 Plan was very conventional in many respects and was excellent at identifying issues in the community. The 2013 Plan did result in many success stories, but the sheer number of policies tended to push implementation down into the weeds rather than addressing big issues straight on. A bolder approach to guiding growth that is directed to addressing clear issues that face the community is difficult to accomplish but may be more likely to yield positive and measurable results.
- The Comprehensive Plan Implementation Program (CHIP) seemed to be an effective process to keep the Plan elevated and to develop priority projects. The CHIP was weakened during COVID and sometimes progress lagged due to staffing shortage at various points over the past ten years.
- The comprehensive Plan was good at capturing broad issues however more emphasis on small area plans may have helped to better address specific areas of the community. Small area plans for Boalsburg, Pine Grove Mills, and Dale Summit (led by College Township staff) were some of the most successful planning efforts from the 2013 Plan.
- Regional level affordable housing strategies were largely inconsequential in addressing how to increase the inventory of safe, decent places where people can live, at prices that they can afford. Some municipalities and non-profits implemented effective affordable housing policies, but the low inventory of affordable units was further eroded by the ability of students and higher income residents to purchase or rent housing that would normally be available to lower income families.

3. From the staff perspective, are there lessons from the 2013 Comprehensive Plan that can benefit the 2023 Comprehensive Plan?

Staff believes there were far too many detailed policies in the 2013 Comprehensive Plan. The large number of policies detracted from the ability of residents to comprehend the Plan. The 340 individual policies were also difficult to track over time. The large number of policies was the result of preparing a traditional comprehensive plan structured by chapters such as land use, transportation, community facilities, open space and recreation, housing, etc. The 2013 Comprehensive Plan also suffered from trying to capture every conceivable problem that had potential to be resolved over the subsequent ten-year planning process. This has the propensity to make every issue seem like they all had the same priority.
It may have been more intuitive to organize the Plan around future land use planning rather than organizing around the Comprehensive Plan elements articulated in the MPC. That organizational framework can provide a more descriptive statement about the big things the Region wants to accomplish. This often leads the region down into the weeds rather than focusing on the big picture.

There are several lessons here:

- Trying to address every conceivable problem diminishes the value of addressing the most urgent and impactful problems in the Region. Identifying, prioritizing, and addressing four or five of the major issues facing the Region could be more impactful and understandable to residents.
- Utilizing associated plans like those prepared for CATA, the Centre County (Affordable Housing and Long-Range Transportation Plan), Centre Region Parks and Recreation, and State College Borough Water Authority rather than integrating them into a “comprehensive” format helps clarify that those entities maintain their responsibility for planning for and delivering a service that they are charged to complete. The updated comprehensive plan should integrate these plans for the framework for future land use planning in the Centre Region, but there is no reason to reiterate the content of the plans.
- Listing hundreds of policies is not user friendly and is overwhelming for staff and leaders in terms of establishing priorities for implementation. It may be more effective to identify large problems and develop specific approaches to resolving those problems.
- A visioning process should be emphasized. The most critical ingredient for forging a stronger comprehensive plan is not the number of policies in the plan but a willingness to form and articulate a compelling vision for the future, a readiness to take a hard look at current policies and future trends, and a commitment to effective approaches likely to achieve positive, measurable outcomes consistent with the overall vision.
- An updated Comprehensive Plan should build regional and local accountability for effective planning and implementation and not focus deeply on a determination of “consistency” with the requirements of the MPC. The Plan does need to be consistent with requirements of the MPC, but consistency should be driven by what the community wants and how the content and format of the Comprehensive Plan can speak to achieving that to be consistent with the MPC. The Plan must be a community-motivated effort to address existing and future planning challenges in the Centre Region.
- The Comprehensive Plan should be informed by other documents such as the Centre County Long Range Transportation Plan, the Center Region Bike Plan, the Centre Region Comprehensive Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Study, and other plans. The recommendations in these plans need to be integrated into an updated Comprehensive Plan and inform policy in the Plan. They do not need to be repeated in the document.
- Specific policies in long range plans can become forgotten and outdated much more quickly than a well written and articulate vision statement. A strong vision, mission statement, and four to six prominent cornerstone values in the community should be the foundation for the Plan. Results that can be monitored, evaluated, and reassessed regularly to remain on course should be developed. An implementation assessment should be completed about every five years and efforts redirected to get back on course if necessary.
• Responsibilities for implementing policies need to be clear in the Plan. For example, State College Borough and College Township Water Authorities, and the University Area Joint Authority have primary responsibility for assuring there is quality potable water, and clear effluent discharge. The CRPA is responsible for land use, sustainability, and transportation policy that assist with those goals, but it is a joint effort.

• The updated Plan should fully embrace changes in technology and broaden the ability for all members of the community to participate in the process. This includes conducting remote and hybrid meetings, connecting with people through effective social media platforms, public commenting on the internet, and integration of interactive participation, and attending event or meetings of stakeholder groups around the Region.

4. What issues of concern have arisen since the last Comprehensive Plan was adopted?

Several issues have arisen over the past ten years in the Centre Region. Some issues have not been traditionally addressed in a comprehensive plan, but many communities are utilizing their plans to address broader issues and the Centre Region may want to consider exploring new issues to address in the new Comprehensive Plan. An initial list of potential issues developed by that could inform community discussions and could be addressed in the new Comprehensive Plan include:

Climate Action and Adaptation – The Region adopted its first ever climate action plan in 2022 to improve sustainability practices in the Region. This has been a

Bipartisan Infrastructure Legislation (BIL) – This landmark legislation has the potential to reshape mobility in the Region and beyond and contains many sustainability-related potential grant funding opportunities that are directly related to transportation and land use.

Housing - The evolution of the housing market in the Centre Region changed in several substantial ways over the past ten years. The most visible is the influx purpose-built housing in the Centre Region. There was a huge influx of high rise student housing and the movement of some higher density student housing to the Townships. This was fueled primarily by institutional investors and national builders looking for investment opportunities in college towns after the market crash in 2008. Many college towns throughout the nation experienced the same influx of student housing. The CRPA expected that the student rental market would soften, but it appears that student housing still drives the cost of rental housing up despite the influx of student housing in the Centre Region.

The other type of purpose-built housing caters to the over 55 demographic. The area is becoming increasing population for retirees and second home owners that also fall into the over 55 demographic.

Purpose built housing, along with the Pandemic, inflation, supply chain issues, and limited housing supply has made a tight housing market even more difficult for potential homeowners and renters. Housing for all types of people, from families to singles in the community continues to be an increasingly difficult problem to resolve.

Another phenomenon is the continued influx of short-term rental properties and student housing tipping the balance in single family neighborhoods. When student rentals and short-term rentals
force full-time residents out of neighborhoods it slowly erodes the fabric of traditional neighborhoods. This is a difficult problem to solve. In some respects, short-term rentals can help increase tourism activity, but they can also have detrimental impact on quality of life for full-time residents and can hurt traditional lodging venues and local tax revenues if not tracked.

5. **Have there been changes in the supply, treatment, and delivery of potable water to serve growth in the Region?**

The supply, treatment, and delivery of potable water is sufficient to serve the region for the foreseeable future. Water demand from the State College Borough Water Authority (SCBWA) system plateaued in 2004 (in terms of peak and average daily demand) and demand has remained relatively consistent since 2004 even with the addition of almost 2,000 new accounts. Per capita consumption has declined because of water conservation efforts, water-saving plumbing fixtures and economic factors. This is also a national trend and indicative of what to expect from other potable water systems in the region. The SCBWA has also added the new Nixon-Kocher Treatment Facility and will install future upgrades at the Woodside Treatment Facility. (Source: SCBWA 2021 Annual Report). There are several other projects for meter replacement and main replace that are part of the annual improvements for the SCBWA.

In addition to the SCBWA, the College Township Water Authority (CTWA) provides public water to portions of College Township. The Penn State University Water System (PSUWS) and SCBWA also provide service to College Township residents.

Many residents in rural areas obtain their potable water from private on-lot wells. There are no statewide construction standards for private water wells in Pennsylvania, there are however local ordinances that are relevant. Residents are responsible for testing their well water or having a commercial testing laboratory test and measure the results against water quality standards in Pennsylvania.

There is an adequate supply of potable water for water authorities and private wells to serve residents and businesses in the Region for the foreseeable future. As the Region continues to grow, the challenge will be protecting groundwater supply from incompatible land uses development rather than assuring a future supply of water.

The CRPA’s role in protecting potable water is to minimize threats from existing and future land uses through development of appropriate land use policy and assistance with municipal ordinances to implement those policies. The water authorities and providers in the region should continue to develop their own plans for supply, distribution, and testing of their facilities and the CRPA will coordinate on a regular basis with providers.

6. **Have there been changes in sewage treatment capacity and beneficial reuse to serve growth in the Region?**

The UAJA continues to have sufficient capacity at the Spring Creek Pollution Control Facility to support growth in the Region. Hydraulic, nutrient, and biological oxygen demand (BOD) capacity are monitored on an annual basis. There is a need to review where there are operational and
maintenance improvements necessary, but capacity at the Spring Creek Pollution Control Facility will be sufficient for decades.

The UAJA has completed two other projects and is working on a third for the facility. They have completed a solar panel installation on their property to provide renewable power to the UAJA facility. The UAJA also installed equipment to eliminate an odor problem at the facility. They plan to install a biodigester on the property that will utilize organic waste to produce renewable nature gas in the future.

Abundant sewage capacity in terms of hydraulic, nutrient, and BOD remains at the University Area Joint Authority. The plant is permitted a monthly average flow of 10.62 MGD. The 2022 Act 94 Report indicated the UAJA was using 5.31 MGD of the permitted capacity. The UAJA has expanded their facility to produce an additional one million gallons of beneficial reuse water per day to two million gallons daily. The facility is permitted to install equipment to produce another one million gallons per day of beneficial reuse water in the future.

The Pennsylvania State University is nearing completion of a new sewage treatment plant for campus that has capacity for treating 3.0 MGD. Water treated at the PSU plant is utilized to irrigate the “Living Filter”. The expansion of the plant will serve the campus for the foreseeable future.

The Centre Region Code Administration office continues to administer the individual on-lot inspection and pumping program.

7. Have there been changes in refuse and recycling in the Region?

Solid Waste

The Centre Region’s residential solid waste in four of the six municipalities is handled through a contract awarded through a competitive bidding process. The current contracted hauler is Waste Management. The contract covers all single-family dwellings and multi-family buildings of fewer than five units in College, Ferguson, Harris, and Patton Townships. Benner Township has participated in the contract since 2010 as well. State College Borough provides its own refuse collection to residents. Halfmoon Township residents contract individually for their refuse collection needs or self-haul their refuse.

For the years 2011-2020, the tonnage of refuse collected from residences at the curbside averaged about 14,000 tons per year and remained steady. However, the total amount of refuse sent to the landfill increased overall, due to an almost steady increase in commercial refuse. During this time, the average amount of refuse landfilled was 74,847 tons annually.

Commercial collection includes all businesses, residential buildings with dumpster service, and institutions. In all five townships, businesses and institutions contract privately with a hauler for refuse dumpster service. State College Borough provides commercial collection within the borough. The Pennsylvania State University’s refuse and recycling remains separate from the Centre Region’s data.
Commercial refuse collection increased both in total weight and the average amount per resident from 2011 to 2019. For the years 2022-2020, an average of 81% of all refuse came from the commercial sector.

Recycling

Municipal ordinances in Benner, College, Ferguson, Harris, and Patton Townships and State College Borough require the separation of specifically identified recyclable materials from refuse. These materials include glass and plastic beverage containers, jars, and jugs; metal cans; mixed paper and paperboard; and corrugated cardboard. Residential recycling curbside collection in these municipalities is handled by the Centre County Recycling and Refuse Authority (CCGRA) under formalized agreements between CCRRA and the COG and State College Borough. Recycling services are billed with the refuse invoice. Halfmoon Township’s refuse haulers or individual households may contract with the CCRRA for recycling collection.

Except for Halfmoon Township, municipal ordinances also require the separation of recyclables for all industrial, institutional, commercial establishments, and multi-unit residential buildings. State College Borough requires that all these establishments have recycling collection through the CCRRA. In the townships in the COG regional program, establishments can either receive recycling services through their refuse hauler or directly from the CCRRA. A third option permits establishments to file an individual recycling plan with the municipality.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Number of Commercial/Institution permits</th>
<th>Percentage currently identified to have recycling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College Twp</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferguson Twp</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris Twp</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patton Twp</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State College Borough</td>
<td>787</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The CCRRA collects and processes most of the recyclable material in the region. In addition to curbside and cart-collected materials, the CCRRA operates eight drop-off locations in the Centre Region, three of which provide for miscellaneous plastics recycling. The CCRRA also accepts covered electronic devices, appliances, and scrap metal from county residents for free. Residents can dispose of wood, tires, and vinyl siding for a fee. The average total amount of recycled material per year from 2011-2020, excluding drop-off special materials at the CCRRA, was 7,476 tons, or an average of 158 pounds of recycling per person per year in the Centre Region.

STAFF PERSPECTIVE – THE 2023 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN MODEL
Staff has explored several options for a potential structure for the Plan over the past months. After considering a model from Lancaster County, PA the staff believes the model that Greensboro, NC utilized for their comprehensive plan process would be a better model for the Center. The diagram below shows the basic framework for the Greensboro Plan, known as GSO2040.

Suggested model for the Centre Region 2040 Plan
(Source: City of Greensboro, NC)

©2016 it expresses the community's vision for what it wants to be in 2040 and serves as a logical framework of policies for achieving that vision. These policies are based on extensive public input and community conversation, a review of data about the current state of the city, alignment with existing plans, input from City departments, collaboration with community partners, and a review of current trends affecting those across the country. The Plan uses several key pieces to describe our current values, the vision of what we want to achieve, and the goals and strategies we will use to get there.

Link: https://www.greenboro-nc.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/54687/635963381497970000

Additional detail on GSO2040 model is included in the enclosed PowerPoint presentation for this item.

https://www.cc.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/3806/635963381497970000