

1. **CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Mark Stevenson called the meeting to order at 7:03 p.m. Other Supervisors present were Todd Kirsten, Ben Pisoni, Barbara Spencer and Andy Merritt. Staff present were Amy Smith, Township Clerk and D.J. Liggett, CRPA. Residents & others in attendance: Paul Mervine, Half Moon Land Co., Shane Levine & Sheri Hartman.

2. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

3. **CITIZEN COMMENTS**

There were no citizen comments.

4. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

- ***MOTION: Mr. Pisoni moved to approve the meeting minutes dated June 14<sup>th</sup>, 2012; Ms. Spencer seconded; Vote 5-0-0; Motion Carried.***

5. **MANAGER REPORT**

Ms. Smith state Ms. Steele provided a written report and had nothing to add unless the Board has any questions.

6. **SUPERVISORS' REPORTS**

Ms. Spencer stated she will leave applications at the Municipal Office to purchase a brick for the military wall being built in Port Matilda. Ms. Spencer commented you need to be a military member and must provide a DD2 with your application. The fee is \$75.00 for a brick.

7. **HEALTH, DENTAL AND VISION EMPLOYEE INSURANCE PROPOSALS**

Ms. Smith stated there were no new proposals received and the proposals that were received were from the current insurance carriers.

- ***MOTION: Mr. Merritt moved to renew the Employee's Health Insurance with Geisinger Health Plan, Dental Insurance with Delta Dental Plan an Vision Insurance with VBA; Ms. Spencer seconded; Mr. Pisoni questioned how much the health insurance increased. Ms. Smith stated about \$100.00 per employee; Vote 5-0-0; Motion Carried.***

8. **REQUEST FOR SHANE LEVINE REGARDING POTENTIAL EAGLE SCOUT PROJECT**

Mr. Levine stated he is sixteen years old and a life scout of Troup 375 and is proposing to build or obtain a flag disposal box to be place at the Municipal Lane Park. Mr. Levine stated he would also like to improve the fire pit currently at the park and with the Troup start an annual flag retirement ceremony. Mr. Levine commented that most people do not know how to properly dispose of their flags and explained that you cut the flag into two pieces and burn it properly. Mr. Levine stated he would like to complete the flag ceremony on Flag Day. Mr. Levine stated he would like to place the box outside the building. Ms. Spencer questioned if the box could be moved if the township office moves elsewhere in the township. Mr. Kirsten questioned the size of the box. Mr. Levine commented it would be about the size of the blue US Postal mailboxes. Mr. Pisoni stated that it may be better to keep the box inside. Mr. Levine commented there would be no expense to the township and all expenses would be done through fundraising. Mr. Levine stated during Penn State football games the Scouts sell hoagies. Mr. Stevenson questioned whether the bricks used will be fire proofed. There was discussion whether the fire pit would be grandfathered from any new rules. Mr. Kirsten commented that any improvements to the fire pit would be welcomed. Ms. Spencer stated Mr. Levine should have a permanent reservation to use the park on Flag Day each year. There was discussion on the mortaring, lose bricks and the possible theft of bricks. Mr. Levine stated he hopes to have the fire pit completed by the end of the year.

9. **CONTINUED DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE APPROVAL TO SET PUBLIC HEARING FOR AMENDMENT TO TOWNSHIP CODE, CHAPTER 112, DRIVEWAYS**

Ms. Liggett stated there was some concern from the 911 Administrator regarding stacked addresses that share driveways so in response to those concerns the Board of Supervisors asked the Planning Commission to look at the driveway Ordinance. The Planning Commission recommended the driveways be restricted to two lots per driveway. Ms. Liggett stated the current regulations state that there can be four homes to a driveway. Ms. Liggett

stated Mr. Pisoni raised a question of where the number 2 came from and questioned what if there were no shared driveways. Ms. Liggett stated she completed a matrix to address some of these questions.

Ms. Liggett stated a driveway that just serves one home would address the 911 Administrators concern. However, that raises potential for more driveways to access township roads or State roads and no other municipality in Centre Region requires a driveway to serve just one lot. This would lead to multiple driveways.

Ms. Liggett explained that the Planning Commission looked a driveway serving two homes and looked at how it jived with the State Transportation Code. The State Transportation Code for a minimum use driveway talks about access for no more than 25 vehicles a day per day. If the regulations were changed to two homes this would not require a private road and they would be able to share the driveway and it would reduce the concern regarding stacked addresses.

Ms. Liggett stated the 911 Administrator would like to see any driveway serving more than one home named. This raised concern for the Planning Commission because it blurs the difference between and driveway and a private road. Ms. Liggett explained this would make maintenance issues difficult for the Township as they would have to make sure that the signs are in place and could become an additional expense to the Township.

Ms. Liggett stated there is a provision in the Township Code that there be an easement or agreement for access and repairs for shared driveways. This is not under the shared driveway language but in another section of the code.

Ms. Liggett commented that the State College Borough, College Township and Harris Township allow for shared driveways to serve two homes.

Ms. Liggett explained that a shared driveway serving three lots would eliminate the need to construct a private road. This is not preferred by the County 911 Administrator. Ms. Liggett stated this again would cause the township to ensure signs are posted. Ms. Liggett commented that there are no other municipalities in Centre Region that permit three homes on a driveway.

Ms. Liggett stated the current regulations allow four homes to share a driveway. Patton Township allows this as well. Ms. Liggett commented the intent to allow four homes to a shared driveway was meant for Rural Preservation Subdivisions to allow farms to be able to subdivide for the family to sustain the farm. Ms. Liggett stated that although Ferguson Township allows four homes on a shared driveway they also require the driveway be named.

Mr. Merritt questioned whether the Township could pick a name such as, "Lane" or "Drive" to use so when the landowner chooses a name for the driveway emergency vehicles would know it is a shared driveway based on using a specific word. Mr. Stevenson questioned whether if when a driveway splits off, would the name of the driveway be placed there too along with a house number? Ms. Merritt stated the Township could require that each lot have a house number at the end of each split. Ms. Liggett stated she could look at adding that requirement. There was discussion on the size and visibility of the house numbers.

Mr. Kirsten questioned what else the Board of Supervisors is looking for to make the change to the number of homes on a shared driveway. Mr. Stevenson commented he is wondering if the Board is making it more difficult for the farmer to subdivide for their families. Ms. Spencer stated she believes it is making it more difficult and would like to leave the regulations alone. Mr. Kirsten commented that a private street may be an alternative but there are some burdens for private streets so it may not be a good alternative. Mr. Kirsten discussed the limitations for a private street. Ms. Spencer stated staff could educate residents on the signage for driveways. Ms. Liggett stated she would defer to the County 911 Administrator for addressing. Ms. Smith stated that the property owner submits several driveway/road names to the 911 Administrator and he check the County registry to see if the name is duplicated prior issuing an address. Mr. Kirsten questioned whether the Township had enough staff to enforce signage to make sure the signs are in place. Ms. Liggett stated that over time signs tend to disappear and the Township would need someone to oversee replacement of those signs.

- **MOTION:** *Mr. Pisoni moved to authorize the publication of the legal notice advertising a public hearing on July 12, 2012 at 7:00 p.m. to hear staff and citizen comments regarding the amendment to Township Code, Chapter 112, Driveways, Section 112.4 (N) amending the number of lots to be*

---

Secretary

*served by a shared driveway from four to two, and approving advertisement of same; Ms. Spencer seconded; Mr. Kirsten commented that he did not know if there should be a change and would like more information and more discussion and would like staff to check with the County 911 Administrator regarding Andy's idea. Mr. Kirsten commented that the township could receive a volume of waivers and this would make the Board of Supervisors dictate the number of homes on a driveway. Mr. Pisoni stated that over the years there have been some headaches with shared driveways but if the Board is not in favor of changing the number than they should not vote to advertise. Ms. Spencer stated she is not in favor of changing the number. Mr. Pisoni stated that there have been a lot of complaints. Ms. Smith stated the complaints received have been mainly from private road citizens. Ms. Spencer questioned whether there were issues with agreements. Ms. Smith stated typically when a subdivision comes in or a building permit is requested and the Township knows there will be a shared driveway involved they provide a shared driveway/maintenance agreement to the property owners. Ms. Spencer stated that based on all the comments there should be a public hearing. Ms. Liggett stated the Planning Commission is concerned about 911 addressing and maintenance issues. Mr. Stevenson stated he does not know if he is in favor of changing the number. Mr. Kirsten requested staff look into naming driveways and maintenance agreements. Ms. Spencer invited residents to the public hearing. Ms. Liggett reiterated that current driveways are grandfathered and if the number changes it only affects new shared driveways. Mr. Stevenson stated he would like to see how many driveways there are, how many are shared and to what extent that are shared. Mr. Stevenson stated he would like to see how many there are to see if there is an issue. Ms. Liggett stated it would be good to see how many the township could see in the future. Mr. Stevenson stated it sounds like the Board is concerned for the farmers. Mr. Stevenson stated he would like to see this information on driveways off of Smith Road, Marengo Road and Loveville Roads and not in developments. Ms. Liggett stated she would work with staff to collect this information. Mr. Pisoni stated it is obvious that the Board is split so why not hold more discussion and then decide whether there needs to be a public hearing if the Board decides to change the number. Mr. Pisoni requested staff look back in the minutes to see what prompted this decision. Mr. Pisoni withdrew his motion and Mr. Stevenson tabled this agenda item until the next meeting. Motion not carried.*

Mr. Kirsten stated he would like to keep an open mind on the Planning Commission recommendations. Mr. Stevenson stated he would like to see the rationale behind the Centre Region numbers for shared driveways.

**10. CLARIFICATION OF MOTION FOR FINAL PLAN-RELOT OF REMAINING LANDS OF OAK LEAF DEVELOPMENT**

Mr. Stevenson stated he thought the motion was clear made by the Board of Supervisors. Ms. Liggett explained that the Board of Supervisors approved the plan contingent upon staff comments and those comments were number one and numbers three through eight. Ms. Liggett stated comment number two had to do with water flow rates. Ms. Liggett stated Mr. Franson, Mr. Piper and Mr. Shuey were all in attendance at this meeting and there was discussion whether this requirement was necessary. Mr. Liggett explained that this was a replot with no new lots being created and the hydrant flow rates were not available. Mr. Franson had suggested that this requirement may not be necessary due to those reasons. Ms. Liggett stated she would like to clear up whether a replot was considered a subdivision. Ms. Liggett stated she believed this did meet the requirements but referred it to Kathleen Yurchak, Township Solicitor. Ms. Yurchak provided an opinion that the township does not have a specific definition and refers back to the Municipalities Planning Code. Ms. Liggett stated other municipalities in the Centre Region consider replot plans to be minor plans and their regulations are very specific that minor plans in some cases do not even come before the Planning Commission or Board of Supervisors and are addressed on a staff level. Ms. Liggett commented that staff comment number two is still outstanding, a waiver could be given and that is what is being recommended by the Township Solicitor. Mr. Stevenson requested Ms. Liggett list again the reasons for the waiver. Ms. Liggett stated the flow rate data is not available, the subdivision was a replot and no new lots were created and the fire protection circumstances have not changed.

- **MOTION:** *Mr. Kirsten moved to clarify the Supervisors' 6/14/12 motion for approval of the Final Plan Replot of the remaining lands of Oak Leaf Development. The plan is approved upon applicant meeting conditions number 1, 3 through 8 of the CRPA's comments letter. The Board of Supervisors waived condition number two of the CRPA comment letter referring to the*

---

Secretary

*requirement of the need for a waiver of the Township's Subdivision Regulations as it pertains to hydrant flows within the community water system for the reasons that the elements of a waiver were satisfied based on the reasons identified at the 6/14/12 meeting; Mr. Merritt seconded; Vote 4-0-1; Messrs. Stevenson, yea; Kirsten, yea; Merritt, yea; Ms. Spencer, yea; No Nays; Mr. Pisoni, abstention; Motion Carried.*

**11. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE APPROVAL OF RESOLUTION 2012-18, 2012-19 & 2012-20**

This agenda item was tabled until further discussion can be completed by a joint meeting with the Open Space Preservation Board. Mr. Pisoni requested Ms. Smith invite the OSPB to the meeting of July 12<sup>th</sup> to discuss issues with the OSPP Ordinance regarding mortgages, advance payments and leases.

**12. PRESENTATION OF MARK STEVENSON REGARDING HIS BUDGET GRAPHS AND ANALYSIS**

Mr. Stevenson reviewed figures and graphs from 2007 – 2011 for Major Revenue Sources (Tax Sources), Major Revenue Sources (Tax Sources), Major Expenses for Salaries, Benefits/Payroll Taxes, Professional Services, COG/Outside Services & Affiliations, Public Safety, Parks & Recreation, Roads, Travel & Dues, Operations. Mr. Stevenson reviewed a summary of all the revenues & expenses. Mr. Stevenson also reviewed the costs of running the summer park program and commented attendance has decreased and costs have increased and the Board may want to consider either eliminating the program or charging a fee. Mr. Stevenson stated there would be more discussion regarding these items during budget sessions. The Board thanked Mr. Stevenson for his work in providing this information.

**13. ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business before the board, the meeting was adjourned at 8:40 p.m.

- ***MOTION: Mr. Kirsten moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:40 p.m.; Mr. Merritt seconded; Vote 5-0-0; Motion Carried.***