

**Meeting Minutes
State College Borough
Redevelopment Authority
April 25, 2018**

The State College Borough Redevelopment Authority (RDA) met on Wednesday, April 25, 2018, in the Municipal Building, 243 South Allen Street. Chairman Lenker called the meeting to order at 12:00 p.m.

Members Present

Sally Lenker, Chairman; Colleen Ritter, Vice-Chairman; Mark Huncik, Rebecca Misangyi, and James Shincovich

Council Members Present

Don Hahn, Mayor; Evan Myers, Council President; David Brown, Janet Engeman, Theresa Lafer, Dan Murphy, Jesse Barlow, and Cathy Dauler

Others Present

Thomas Fountaine, II, Borough Manager; Ed LeClear, Planning Director; Jenna Wargo, Planner; Rhonda Johannesen, Planner-Redevelopment Specialist; Terry J. Williams, Borough Solicitor; and Sarah Smith, Administrative Assistant

Approval of Minutes

A motion was made by Mr. Shincovich and seconded by Ms. Ritter to approve the February 28, 2018 minutes as submitted. The vote was unanimously in favor.

Chair Report

Chairman Lenker had nothing to report.

Public Hour – Hearing of Citizens

There were no public who wished to speak on items not on the agenda.

Mr. LeClear noted there would be a change in the agenda to conduct the RDA specific items first and allow for the Economic Development presentation to be later in the meeting.

Financial Issues

February & March 2018 Expense Voucher Approvals

Mr. Shincovich inquired about what some of the items were and Mr. LeClear stated there was a plumbing issue at one of the properties.

Ms. Ritter made a motion to approve the February and March 2018 vouchers and Ms. Misangyi seconded the motion. The vote was unanimously in favor.

Official Reports and Correspondence

Mr. LeClear noted the draft of the Design Guide had been submitted to Borough Council. He briefly reviewed where members could locate information on the Historical and Architectural Review Board (HARB) as well as where the new land development plans map and data was located on the Borough website.

Economic Development

Urban Redevelopment Law & State College Town Centre Orientation

Mr. LeClear gave a brief overview on the status of the project then asked Mr. Williams to review the laws associated with it.

Mr. Williams' presentation included the information below on Urban Redevelopment Law:

- Reviewed the history and process for a redevelopment plan.
- Reviewed several prominent redevelopment projects in other cities.
- Reviewed some of the aspects that must be included in a Redevelopment Proposal.
- Reviewed restrictions on redevelopment.

RDA members had no questions for the Mr. Williams.

Mr. LeClear explained that the Borough was in the process of preparation and adoption of the Redevelopment Proposal. Mr. LeClear gave a brief history of the process of the redevelopment plan to date including an overview of the Allen Street Civic District Site Plan.

Questions and Comments:

- Ms. Engeman inquired about the parklet and Mr. LeClear explained it was not a part of the proposal, but it could have some potential for enhancement.
- Mr. Huncik inquired what the obligations were of the RDA with regards to Right-to-Know requests and Mr. LeClear explained they would fall under the same regulations as all Borough requests.

Mr. LeClear introduced Bud Sweet from the National Development Council to review the State College Town Centre proposal.

Mr. Sweet's presentation included:

- When reviewing a developer, staff needed to consider whether the developer had the capability to complete the project and in considering the Highland Holding Group, it appeared they had the experience, capability and financial ability to complete the project.
- Explained the two scenarios – Scenario A included the Post Office site and the First National Bank site while Scenario B only included the Borough controlled

properties. He noted that Scenario A was preferred, but there were uncertainties in terms of acquisitions.

- Reviewed different scenarios and next action steps.

- Key Elements
 - Required
 - 15,000 square feet of commercial space to be leased to the Borough.
 - Replication of 32 public parking spaces for public control by the Borough.
 - Proposed
 - Option for a “fee simple sale” for Borough owned properties with legal restrictions.
 - 2-year option to purchase.
 - Additional 3-year requirement for construction.
 - Prohibited
 - Adult-oriented business.
 - Residential use allowing undergraduate student housing.
 - Development above six stories in height along Allen Street and eight stories in height along Fraser Street.

Questions and Comments:

- Mr. Myers expressed concern about a public auction process for the Post Office and parking lot as the property could have an impact on the redevelopment plan. He inquired if there was any recourse if another party were to purchase the property and develop something different and potentially incompatible. Mr. LeClear stated the process for the project would be to enter into a pre-development agreement to review the two properties owned by the Borough and give the developer a time frame in which to gain control of the other sites.
- Ms. Lafer inquired if the Borough had rezoned the area and if both scenarios would require the same zoning. Mr. LeClear noted the area had the same zoning and it was not a signature district and did not have overlays.
- Ms. Lafer inquired if there could be student housing on the Post Office site if another developer were to purchase it. Mr. LeClear noted there was potential for that, but the developer would need to qualify for incentives.
- There was some discussion regarding the plans with the Discovery Space. Mr. Fontaine noted the original intent of purchasing the building was to lease it to Discovery Space.
- Mr. LeClear noted the proposed scenario would have 280 sub-surface parking spaces. He also stated the spaces would be in private development, but under public control and would replicate 32 public spaces that were currently available in the Allen Street Parking Lot. He noted terms would be negotiated in the final agreement. Mr. Sweet noted there were monthly and transient spaces needed for the anticipated commercial, retail, and hotel uses of the project. Mr. LeClear noted, even though zoning did not require that number of spaces, the target market would still need it. He also noted it was a condition from Discovery Space that there be available parking for them.
- Ms. Engeman inquired if there were residential uses there that permitted student housing. Mr. LeClear stated since the Borough was entering into a development agreement, the Borough could add prohibitions to the agreement. Mr. Fontaine noted there was a covenant on the Fraser Centre property. There was some

discussion regarding other ways to prohibit undergraduate students at the property and Mr. Williams explained some of the difficulties with prohibitions in the long term.

- Mr. Huncik inquired about a previous redevelopment area that included properties further to the south as those areas were already commercial. He suggested pushing the area south rather than to the west. Mr. LeClear noted that his predecessor, Carl Hess, had worked with the Planning Commission to review the Fairmount Avenue Redevelopment Area, but the plan was scaled back in order to move quickly.
- Mr. Myers noted it seemed like Scenario A would be a more beneficial plan, but in order to work towards Scenario A, the Borough would need to agree to Scenario B. Mr. Fountaine stated the redevelopment site was originally discussed as Scenario B. Mr. LeClear stated there had been some conversations regarding other options, but nothing had been finalized.
- Mr. Brown expressed concern about only having one developer. Mr. Fountaine stated there had originally been four developers and the RDA had selected the best choice after a year-long process.
- Ms. Dauler noted there had been difficulties finding a developer for the Fraser Centre as well due to site constraints.

Mr. LeClear noted he would draft a pre-development agreement that would allow for at least Scenario B to be developed, but would give the developer two years to work towards Scenario A. He would review it with the RDA when it was drafted.

Adjournment

With no further business to discuss, a motion to adjourn the meeting at 1:19 p.m. was made by Chairman Lenker. At that time, the Authority adjourned to an Executive Session.

Respectfully submitted,

Sarah Smith,
Administrative Assistant