COLLEGE TOWNSHIP COUNCIL/PLANNING COMMISSION
SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES
Wednesday, April 30, 2025
1481 E. College Avenue, State College PA 16801
2nd Floor Meeting Room

ATTENDED BY – COUNCIL:	L. Eric Bernier, Chair Susan Trainor, Vice Chair Dustin Best D. Richard Francke
PLANNING COMMISSION:	Ed Darrah, Chair Matt Fenton, Vice Chair Peggy Ekdahl, Secretary Ray Forziat Ash Toumayants
STAFF:	Adam T. Brumbaugh, Township Manager/Secretary Mike Bloom, Assistant Township Manager Don Franson, P.E., P.L.S., Township Engineer Lindsay Schoch, AICP, Principal Planner Mark Gabrovsek, Zoning Officer Keri Miller, Economic Development Coordinator Katy VanAmburg, Assistant Township Secretary Sharon Meyers, Senior Support Specialist Engineering/Planning
ABSENT:	Tracey Mariner, Council Suleman Din, Planning Commission

CALL TO ORDER:

Mr. Eric Bernier, Council Chair, called to order the April 30, 2025, Special Joint Meeting of the College Township (CT) Council and Planning Commission (PC) at 7:04 PM and led in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. Adam Brumbaugh, Township Manager, offered an overview of the topics that Council and PC would discuss during the joint meeting. The topics included a review of PC progress to date on Form Based Code (FBC) in the Dale Summit Area, proposed streetscapes, and a presentation by Staff on the use of land and block structures.

OLD BUSINESS: **OB-1 Review of Planning Commission Progress**

Ms. Lindsay Schoch, AICP, Principal Planner, offered the Dale Summit Area (DSA) Plan Vision.

The overarching Vision of this Area Plan is to transform Dale Summit into The Gateway to College Township. Establishing Dale Summit as an attractive and instantly recognizable place within the context of the larger Township, Region, and County. The community envisions an activity hub that is vibrant, economically prosperous, socially equitable, and environmentally sustainable.

A place, which through proactive planning and well-tailored regulations, strikes a sound balance between encouraging business and industry expansion, while remaining respectful to important community livability factors such as improving housing affordability, sufficient public services, and traffic improvements through improved connectivity for all transportation modes.

Ms. Schoch offered a Powerpoint presentation, and explained the Streetscape Elements include the right-of-way and everything within, including the sidewalk, planting strip, parking lane, bike lane, travel lanes, and medians. She then proceeded to review the ten (10) proposed commercial and residential streetscapes developed to this point, and asked Council and PC to provide feedback on each.

Proposed Commercial Streetscapes

Commercial Street #1 (minimum standard) includes a 70-foot right-of-way, provides two 12-foot travel lanes and two 8-foot parking lanes, an 8-foot sidewalk, and no bike lane.

Boulevard (maximum standard) includes a 160-foot right-of-way, provides two 12-foot and four 10-foot travel lanes and two 8-foot parallel parking lanes, a 10-foot sidewalk, and a shared bike lane.

Commercial Street #2 includes an 80-foot right of way, provides two 11-foot travel lanes and two 8-foot parking lanes, an 8-foot sidewalk, and a 5-foot bike lane.

Avenue #3 includes a 90-foot right-of-way, provides two 12-foot travel lanes and two 8-foot parking lanes, two 7-foot sidewalks, and two 5-foot bike lanes with two 3-foot buffers.

Avenue #2 includes an 80-foot right-of-way, provides two 12-foot travel lanes and two 8-foot parking lanes, two 6-foot sidewalks, and a shared bike lane.

Questions/Comments on Commercial Streetscapes -

- Tree scale along sidewalks – keep trees staggered and away from utility lines
- Consider utility placement along the streetscapes
- Reduce median sizes to allow for bike lanes
- Maintenance of medians – who maintains these areas?
- Entryways/driveways into businesses – rear entry only?
- Zero setbacks to buildings and sidewalks?
- Consider bike lanes as a requirement?
- Consider connectivity and alternative transit options other than the streets
- Consider emergency vehicle access
- Provide minimum design standards and allow the developer flexibility

Proposed Neighborhood Streetscapes

Neighborhood Street #5 (minimum standard) includes a 40-foot right-of-way, provides two 11-foot travel lanes, two 5-foot sidewalks, and a shared bike lane.

Neighborhood Street #2 includes a 60-foot right-of-way, provides two 12-foot travel lanes and two 8-foot parallel parking lanes, two 5-foot sidewalks, and a shared bike lane.

Neighborhood Street #1 includes a 50-foot right-of-way, provides two 11-foot travel lanes and one 8-foot parallel parking lane, two 5-foot sidewalks, and a shared bike lane.

Neighborhood Street #4 includes a 60-foot right-of-way, provides two 12-foot travel lanes and one 8-foot parking lane, a 6-foot sidewalk, and a 10-foot shared use path.

Neighborhood Street #3 includes a 50-foot right-of-way, provides one 10-foot travel lane and two 8-foot parallel parking lanes, two 6-foot sidewalks, and a shared bike lane.

Questions/Comments on Neighborhood Streetscapes –

- Bike lanes versus pedestrian facilities in neighborhood streetscapes – consider a shared use path on one side and a sidewalk on the other
- Rear loading streets – is it necessary to have parking on one or both sides of streets?
- Shared rear parking and accessibility to that area?
- No on-street parking option – temporary parking waiver or application needed?
- Mixed use areas are welcomed

Chair Bernier recessed the meeting at 8:00 PM. The meeting was called to order at 8:08 PM.

OB-2 Hybrid Form Based Code in the Dale Summit Area

Mr. Brumbaugh introduced the topic the use of land and block structures, and noted that neither Council nor PC have seen the presentation. Ms. Schoch explained the block structure key includes lot coverage, yard area, and setback area. The streetscape key includes sidewalks, planting strips, parking lanes, and travel lanes. She noted the streetscape used for all visuals is a 70-foot right-of-way and offered a picture of a typical block structure with a perimeter of a maximum of 2400 feet. Mr. Bloom noted the 2400 foot block perimeter is a recommendation from the consultant, DPZ.

Mixed-Core Single Family Minimum
Minimum Lot Width: 16’
Lot Depth: 130’
Maximum Coverage: 75%
Minimum Front Yard Setback: 6’
Minimum Side Yard Setback: 0’
Minimum Rear Yard Setback: 6’
Maximum Stories: 3

Comments –

- Offers minimum lot size with maximum density
- Need to bisect the block at least once
- Mark out all PennDOT owned roads in the Dale Summit area – how many can be developed in this area?
- Scalability, remain flexible to the developer
- Consider pervious/impervious areas and green spaces
- Walkability, maintain a sense of place, rear loaded entries
- Topography might dictate the block structure
- Is there a recommended distance between bisects?
- Is there a recommended standard block ratio to improve walkability and sidewalk widths?
- Lot width and coverage – too dense, offers options for Attainable Housing, rear-loading and alleys must be present, green spaces present for the amount of density, consider emergency and refuse service access, requirement of a front porch, minimum lot width of 20’and lower coverage.

Mixed-Core Single Family Maximum
Maximum Lot Width: 48’
Lot Depth: 130’
Maximum Coverage: 75%
Maximum Front Yard Setback: 12’
Minimum Side Yard Setback: 0 or 5’
Minimum Rear Yard Setback: 6’
Maximum Stories: 3

Comments -

- Keep lot sizes diverse, allow flexibility/options to the developer for potential buyers of all stages of life
- Set parameters about the esthetic and maintain integrity
- Could mix percentage of lot coverage and lot widths
- 65% lot width coverage was preferred

Mixed-Core Multi-Family/Non-Residential Minimum
Minimum Lot Width: 16'
Lot Depth: 120'
Maximum Coverage: 95%
Maximum Front Yard Setback: 4'
Minimum Side Yard Setback: 0 or 5'
Minimum Rear Yard Setback: 3'
Maximum Stories: 5

Comments –

- Height/stories is the biggest difference
- 16' lot width is narrow given the height, but could still be an option – example is the Flat Iron Building in NYC
- 24' should be the minimum lot width
- Consensus is 95% coverage and 16' lot width is not ideal

Mixed-Core Multi-Family/Non-Residential Maximum
Maximum Lot Width: 240'
Lot Depth: 120'
Maximum Coverage: 95%
Maximum Front Yard Setback: 4'
Minimum Side Yard Setback: 0 or 5'
Minimum Rear Yard Setback: 3'
Maximum Stories: 5

Comments –

- 240' lot width is too wide, 95% coverage is too large
- Ratio of frontage to lot depth is too large
- Parking could be an issue with the amount of coverage, may need underground parking
- Offer options regarding coverage to the developer
- 65% coverage should be the maximum amount
- Allow for green spaces, aesthetics
- Uses are not specific to retail/commercial and can be residential

The following block structures were presented without solicitation of opinions:

Mixed-Neighborhood Single Family Minimum
Minimum Lot Width: 16'
Lot Depth: 120'
Maximum Coverage: 70%
Minimum Front Yard Setback: 8'
Minimum Side Yard Setback: 0 or 5'

Minimum Rear Yard Setback: 24’
Maximum Stories: 3

Mixed-Neighborhood Single Family Maximum
Maximum Lot Width: 60’
Lot Depth: 120’
Maximum Coverage: 70%
Maximum Front Yard Setback: 18’
Minimum Side Yard Setback: 0 or 5’
Minimum Rear Yard Setback: 24’
Maximum Stories: 3

Mixed-Neighborhood Multi- Family & Non-Residential Minimum
Minimum Lot Width: 60’
Lot Depth: 120’
Maximum Coverage: 85%
Minimum Front Yard Setback: --’
Minimum Side Yard Setback: 0 or 5’
Minimum Rear Yard Setback: 3’
Maximum Stories: 4

Mixed-Neighborhood Multi-Family & Non-Residential Maximum
Maximum Lot Width: 150’
Lot Depth: 120’
Maximum Coverage: 85%
Maximum Front Yard Setback: 8’
Minimum Side Yard Setback: 0 or 5’
Minimum Rear Yard Setback: 3’
Maximum Stories: 4

The Special Joint Meeting ended with a discussion on measuring building heights in stories versus feet. Both PC and Council agreed that emergency equipment access should be considered when developing this part of FBC. Additionally, a discussion occurred about requiring renderings as part of Land Development Plan (LDP) submissions with proposed developments of a particular size – how size is measured is still to be determined.

ADJOURNMENT:

Chair Bernier called for a motion to adjourn the April 30, 2025, College Township Council and Planning Commission Joint Meeting.

Mr. Forziat moved to adjourn the April 30, 2025, Joint Meeting.
Ms. Trainor seconded the motion.

Chair Bernier adjourned the April 30, 2025, Joint Meeting at 9:42 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Adam T. Brumbaugh

Adam T. Brumbaugh
Township Secretary