

**HISTORICAL ARCHITECTURE REVIEW BOARD
BELLEFONTE BOROUGH
MEETING MINUTES**

January 9, 2018 - 8:30 a.m.
236 West Lamb Street, Bellefonte, PA 16823
www.bellefonte.net

CALL TO ORDER:

The January 9, 2018 regular meeting of the Bellefonte Borough Historical Architecture Review Board (HARB) was called to order by Mr. McGinley at the Bellefonte Borough Municipal Building at 8:30 a. m.

ROLL CALL:

MEMBERS PRESENT: Sam McGinley, Chair
Maria Day
Alan Uhler
Robert Lingenfelter
Walt Schneider

EXCUSED: Megan Tooker
Pat Long
Mack Mahan

STAFF MEMBERS: Shannon Wright, HARB Administrator

GUESTS: Rod Beard
Mike Siggins
Doug Johnson
Dan Jones

ADDITIONS /CORRECTIONS TO THE AGENDA:

None.

DECLARATION OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST:

Messrs. Uhler and McGinley expressed their involvement with the Brockeroff Building, and therefore recused themselves from voting.

DECLARATION OF EX PARTE COMMUNICATION:

None.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES:

Mr. Uhler moved to approve the Minutes of the December 12, 2017 HARB Meeting;
Mr. Schneider seconded the motion;
Motion carried.

PROJECT REVIEW AND PUBLIC COMMENTS:

101 North Allegheny Street – Sign

Mr. Rod Beard presented his sign project to HARB. He stated that a sign was previously approved for that location. He was going to use his old sign from the previous location. He was still considering the hanging bracket when it was decided it was too heavy and large to hang in the location. Ultimately, a small lighter aluminum sign was devised. The picture was in the packet at the table. This will be smaller (24 inches by 12 inches high). There should not be a lot of trouble mounting it with little disruption to the side of the building.

Mr. Schneider moved to approve the sign as proposed as long as it meets zoning requirements;
Mr. Uhler seconded the motion.

Mr. Beard indicated that the sign will be mounted above the door to the entry to the lower level of the building. He hopes to be able to use the existing holes that are already on the building. Mr. Schneider suggested mounting the sign to a plate and then mounting the plate to the building and Mr. Beard agreed. If he cannot reuse the holes, he will make sure to drill into mortar joints. He is aware of the zoning requirements regarding height, etc.

Motion carried.

Project will go to Council at their next meeting.

204 West Linn Street – 3rd Floor Egress

Mr. Mike Siggins presented the project to HARB relative to the 3rd floor egress. This was project was previously presented to HARB and at that point, there were certain code issues that needed to be addressed. These comments have been addressed and have gone

through Code. One of the Code requirements is that there is an approval from HARB before a permit is issued. All technical issues have been addressed and the only two outstanding issues are HARB approval and the information for the contractor that will be doing the work.

This project is similar to the project presented prior to HARB. The drawings were sent to Ms. Wright. This involves an egress on the side of the building as originally decided, but instead of coming straight out from the building, it comes out a little bit and then descends along the side. Other issues that needed to be addressed were the number of exits from the third floor and opening on the one side of the building. This will be addressed by replacing any windows or doors with fire rated alternatives.

Relative to aesthetics, the egress is still on the side of the building where it was proposed before but does not stick out toward the other structure next door as previously proposed. This is the right side, if you are facing the structure on the street. You will not see it from Spring Street. Removal of a window and replacement with a door is still proposed. Mr. Uhler confirmed the proposal of a roof projection out from the bay. It will project out only a little bit visually as there is a chimney there as well. Mr. Schneider confirmed that all complies with Code.

**Mr. Uhler moved to approve the egress project as presented;
Ms. Day seconded the motion;**

Color of the fire escape was discussed. The property owner explained that most are pressure treated around town. Staining it to match the building is something that should be considered, per Mr. Schneider. Horizontal protrusion and shingles will be cream colored. Preservation of the removed windows was discussed briefly. The property owner did not know the history of the windows, as they relate to those originally installed on the structure. If the windows are originals, he opined that they are not efficient as they are single pane. Mr. Schneider added that HARB has historically required the property owners to preserve and store the original windows on the property somewhere for possible future use.

Mr. Schneider proposed an amended motion.

**Mr. Schneider moved to approve the egress project as presented, with the stipulation that the old windows be kept on the property and that the egress is stained to match or compliment the house. Property owner can work with staff relative to color selection;
Mr. Uhler seconded the amended motion;**

The new door on the third floor was discussed. The windows next to this door will be required to be fire rated as they are within ten feet.

Mr. Schneider proposed a further amended motion as follows:

Mr. Schneider moved to approve the egress project as presented, with the stipulation that the old windows be kept on the property and that the egress is stained to match or compliment the house. Property owner can work with staff relative to color section. Additionally, the window configuration should match the current window configuration as closely as possible;
Mr. Uhler seconded the second amended motion;
Motion carried.

This project will go to the next Council meeting.

105 South High Street- Security Camera Installation

Messrs. Uhler and McGinley have recused themselves from voting on this project.

This was discussed at the December meeting but there were several members missing from HARB. The Board did not feel comfortable passing this project through without an appropriate quorum.

Mr. Uhler presented the project on behalf of Brockeroff Building, as a project manager. He summarized some spring projects. The roof will be replaced on the back of the building near and the existing k-style gutters will be replaced. The proposed replacement of a rubber roof meshes with the k-style gutters and will lap right down into the gutter. There will be no gap for water to penetrate between the gutter and the building. Roof and gutter is being replaced in-kind, per Mr. McGinley.

Mr. Uhler is requesting approval on the installation of security cameras and modifications to the handrail on the portico (next project). The building has had some security concerns lately and incidents of indecent behavior on the stairwells at the north of the building, and a slip and fall incident on the sidewalk that was not captured on video.

On the front of the building, on the underside of the portico there will be two cameras. Architectural features will not be disturbed. It will be installed underneath and behind all the wrought iron. This will not be visible from the street unless you walk under the portico and look up at the cameras. They are simple bubble style cameras, one in each front corner in crossing patterns for a view of the door and the sidewalks.

They would also like to install a camera on the north side of the building. Other options were considered, and it was concluded that the most logical place to install it would be underneath the window sill on the north side of the building. The cameras were chosen as they are in white. The locations were considered carefully and deemed to be the best scenarios.

The cameras will be mortar joint anchored mounted such as not to disturb the architecture.

**Mr. Schneider moved to approve the camera project;
Mr. Lingenfelter seconded the motion;**

The only colors available are white or black for the cameras. Mr. Schneider would like the cameras to blend in with whatever they are in front of. The building is off white. They will be a very close match to the building to begin with.

Mr. Schneider amended his motion as follows:

**Mr. Schneider moved to approve the camera project as long as the cameras are color matched to what they are mounted to. Staff can assist with the approval of the color match.
Mr. Lingenfelter seconded the amended motion;
Motion carried with two recusals.**

105 South High Street – Portico Handrail

Mr. Uhler recapped the previous discussion with HARB relative to the portico handrail. The rubber membrane of the decking of the portico is also being replaced. To provide a more appropriate surface, a rubber tile will be laid that is designed for insulation over the rubber membrane. The rubber tile is about one inch thick. The existing railing of the portico is short and does not seem safe at only 32 inches high. Mr. Uhler was uncomfortable with this height. By raising the floor up about an inch, the railing would be even shorter. Code requires a minimum of 42 inches for a rail.

Mr. Uhler would like to replace this with a safer railing because there are elderly residents at the Brockeroff House. Ultimately, it was proposed to install architectural panels on the top of the hand rail. They are commercially available. There is an existing cap rail on top of that which is intended to be removed. The new panels will be installed on top of the handrail and the original cap rail would be placed on top of that. This is subject to the salvageability of the cap rail. Ideally, they will be bolted in place. The character features of the panels match the architectural features of the existing rail and the iron on the bottom. This will bring the railing up to about 43 inches.

As part of this project, the small opening exposed will be closed (less than four inches). The railing does not meet Code as it stands presently.

**Mr. Schneider moved to deny the project;
Mr. Lingenfelter seconded the motion;**

Mr. Schneider questioned how the existing rail was mounted. Mr. Uhler indicated that this cannot be ascertained without carving into the existing membrane and floor of the

portico. Mr. Schneider inquired about cutting the existing rail loose, putting the “add” on the bottom. That would raise the “original railing” up and viewable from the street. The lower portion (new portion) could be strengthened as needed. Perhaps a straight picket could be sturdily installed so that it would meet Code requirement for strength at the base and keep the architectural feature of the original railing. Mr. Schneider explained that there is a required force and resistance that needs to be met at the top of the railing. This would allow this to happen.

Mr. Uhler will present this suggestion to the Board for feedback.

Mr. Lingenfelter stated that if the Brockerhoff board did not like the suggested option, the original project could be presented again. He had a question relative to color. The color would be similar to what was originally on the railing. It is red with cream colored pickets. Mr. Schneider indicated that there is a non-compliant scroll panel. Mr. Uhler looked at this and stated that he has not come up with any good ideas on this panel. The non-compliant area is where the scrolls come together. If a “B” or an anchor was placed in there it would dress this area up and get rid of the non-compliance.

Motion carried, with two recusals.

A plan will be devised, and the project will be brought back to HARB at a future meeting.

ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVAL:

None.

OLD BUSINESS:

NEW POLICIES FOR THE NEW YEAR:

Ms. Wright discussed some items that were previously discussed over the prior year, for the new year. She mentioned the clarification and assistance to homeowners with “in-kind” replacements. Ms. Wright suggested that all the projects could come through her first and she would make the determination whether it was in-kind, administrative approval, or if it needs to come to the board. From a project standpoint, having a record of every project would be helpful as well. HARB inspections were also discussed prior. Additionally, the by-laws only allow for one alternate to vote. She inquired about changing that.

Mr. Schneider stated that with no projects, the meetings are cancelled. Trying to plan for the length of meetings is a difficult standpoint. He respectfully requested that meetings are not cancelled, but those meetings should be used for other items on a working list. He requested a list be developed so that if nothing else is on the agenda, other more administrative issues can be discussed and resolved.

Ms. Wright asked for ideas for this “list” and asked members to email her their ideas.

Mr. McGinley also mentioned that on occasion Mr. Stewart is called in to fill in. He did not feel that Mr. Stewart should be considered an alternate if called in to a meeting, but a voting member. Mr. Schneider disagreed in that the Borough Manager had an inherent conflict of interest because he is the Borough Manager and Borough staff. While a great alternate, Mr. Schneider did not feel that he should be a standing voting member of the HARB board. He would also like to see Mr. Holderman, as assistant manager, be trained as an alternate. They would not count against only one alternate voting.

Public comment should be added as an agenda item. Ms. Wright suggested adding this category during the time projects are been presented.

These items will be reviewed for the next HARB meeting.

Mr. Johnson was in the audience and Mr. McGinley acknowledged his presence at the meeting.

NEW BUSINESS:

None.

ADJOURNMENT:

With no other business to come before HARB,

**Mr. Schneider moved to adjourn the January 9, 2018 HARB meeting;
Mr. Uhler seconded the motion;
Motion carried.**

Meeting adjourned at 9:18 a.m.