

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

**January 8, 2019 - 8:30 a.m.
236 West Lamb Street, Bellefonte, PA 16823
www.bellefonte.net**

CALL TO ORDER:

The January 8, 2019 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
Megan Tooker, Vice Chair
Pat Long
Walt Schneider
Maria Day
Gay Dunne

EXCUSED: Robert Lingenfelter

STAFF MEMBERS: Shannon Wright, HARB Administrator

GUESTS: Joanne Tosti-Vasey

ADDITIONS /CORRECTIONS TO THE AGENDA:

None.

DECLARATION OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST:

None.

DECLARATION OF EX PARTE COMMUNICATION:

None.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES:

**Mr. Schneider moved to approve the Minutes of the December 11, 2018 meeting;
Ms. Tooker seconded the motion;
Motion carried.**

PROJECT REVIEW AND PUBLIC COMMENTS:

None.

ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS:

None.

INFORMATION/DISCUSSION ITEMS:

304 N. Allegheny Street – Roof

This project was done before Thanksgiving. It is one of the roofs that was strongly opposed and inappropriate in the historic district. A letter was sent to the homeowner asking them to get in touch with Ms. Wright and they did not respond. The home is across the street from the elementary school. The prior roof was a shingle roof. The current roof is a silver colored roof which is very bright when viewed from Lamb Street.

Mr. Schneider stated that this type of roof has been routinely rejected and the opinion of HARB was clear. It was questioned if painting the roof was an option. To get any paint to stick to the powder coated metal roof, it will need to be etched. If not, if the paint starts to chip and peel, it will only look worse.

The ordinance was reviewed. Page 5 of the ordinance does not include asking the homeowner to remove the roof, but they can be fined. Mr. Schneider clarified that the homeowner is required to come to HARB prior to doing any work. They did not. At that point in time, an initial notice can be given for them to come before HARB. If they refuse to come to the HARB meeting they could be cited. If they do come to the meeting, the project would be reviewed like anyone else's project. If the project is rejected, it will go to Council. If Council upholds HARB's rejection of the project, they could be continued to be cited daily until they remove the roof.

It was clarified that building and zoning permits are not required by the contractor for roof installation and the ultimate fault falls on the homeowner, and not the contractor. If the contract states that he is permitted to get all permits and permissions, then the contractor may be cited. There was concern that the same contractor will begin installing this type of roof in other areas of the Borough historic district. Ms. Long offered that HARB needs to send a letter to the contractor telling them that their roof is not acceptable in the district.

Mr. Schneider stated that due process needs to be followed. He would ultimately be responsible for following through with this. The homeowner would have 30 days to come before HARB and discuss their project otherwise, it would have to go before the District Magistrate.

Mr. Schneider summarized: Option 1, the homeowner ignores the letter; Option 2, citations and enforcement are issued until they get into HARB; Option 3, HARB rejects it and the roof project with the rejection goes before Council; Council may choose to keep the roof, but if they vote against the roof staying, then at that point in time, Council should give them a time frame for removal of the roof, or defer it back to HARB for removal. At that point, if the roof is not removed, citations will be issued again. There is no cap for this fine. The property owned may be cited daily up to \$1,000. At some point in time, a lien may be issued against the property.

Ms. Wright will send a letter out certified and regular mail to the property owner to get the issue moving.

Ms. Dunne discussed a hardship clause in the ordinance. Mr. Schneider stated that Council can always reject or accept something. He stated further that the roof that was installed was not an inexpensive roof. Ms. Dunne asked that HARB members not make too many assumptions until the property owner is contacted.

Ms. Wright talked about her updates to the files so that it is clear when HARB rejects a project that Council ultimately approves.

Mr. Schneider moved to have Ms. Wright send a letter certified and regular mail to the property owner noticing violation of the ordinance including Section 330-4, asking them to appear at or before the second meeting in February before HARB with an application.

**Ms. Long seconded the motion;
Motion carried.**

106 North Allegheny Street – Ramp

This project was approved for a gray ramp. They installed a yellow ramp. Administrative approval was given for in-kind replacement. The approval specifically stated light gray in color. Ms. Wright will send a letter to the property owner requiring them to rectify the ramp within thirty days.

Ms. Long moved to have Ms. Wright send a letter certified and regular mail to the property owner noticing violation of the ordinance, asking them to repaint the ramp light gray.

**Mr. Schneider seconded the motion;
Motion carried.**

Brief discussion was held on the option for the Borough to fix the problem and bill the homeowner. Discussion was also held on why it was painted yellow, perhaps for visibility purposes. Section 330-10(b) states that the property owner has one year to do the project. Once the project has been started, they have one year to complete the project. If not completed, the Borough can contract to complete the project.

Being color specific is very important, per Ms. Schneider. He stated that HARB should have a pantone chart or a color chart from a specific brand of paint.

OLD BUSINESS:

Parking Lot – The poles at the parking lot have been covered with black. Mr. McGinley opined that they are not jumping out at one anymore, and he thanked Borough staff and Council for fixing them.

NEW BUSINESS:

Reorganization

(deferred until the next meeting).

Ordinance and Bylaws

Ms. Wright stated that she included the ordinance and the bylaws in the packet to refresh everyone on HARB's charge. Ms. Long stated that it may be a good idea for HARB to send the property owners in the historic district a letter reminding them that if they wish to do exterior changes to their homes, they do have to come before HARB, no matter how small the project. Ms. Wright stated that this is included in the newsletter in the spring. She was thinking about having a meeting around March to have an informational session on how to fill out the application and what a good and bad project submittal would be. Mr. Schneider suggested Ms. Wright doing a presentation and having C-NET videotape the presentation. It will be posted to their website and the Borough can be linked to the video. Ms. Tosti-Vasey stated that Ms. Wright should request Council have C-NET video tape it because it will be an additional cost.

Project Updates and Open Projects List

Ms. Wright stated that she will continue to keep a running list of open projects and put it with the agenda for review. Projects due for expiration will be listed as well. She was open for suggestions from HARB members. Ms. Wright will be asking the homeowners to let her know when the projects are started and when they are completed.

HARB Awards

Ms. Tooker discussed awards. HARB awards in the past were a bit ceremonial, per Ms. Dunne. There were different categories in the past for the awards. It may be able to be tied into the Old House Fair.

Mr. Schneider stated that the awards took a lot of time and he suggested coming up with some kind of a certificate program wherein the homeowners are thanked by Council for doing the project and continuing to reinvest into the community. This would be done for every project. Ms. Wright did not think it was appropriate for every project. She liked the idea of perhaps doing three projects. It can also be placed in the Borough newsletter, per Mr. McGinley. He also suggested that substantial projects be noted.

Keeping track of completed projects was discussed. Ms. Wright discussed her listing of all the projects that came in last year, but she said that there has never been anything for following up with the projects.

Mr. Schneider also mentioned that if everyone is thanked, then there will be no competitiveness amongst homeowners. If every project is thanked, then it demonstrates that Council and the Borough acknowledge the investment into the structure. He also discussed the reward program that was considered to award people for sprinklering their structures. It never came to fruition.

Ms. Tooker stated that the awards were a good marketing tool for HARB. There may be other ways that are more beneficial today. Email contact for historic district residents was discussed briefly. Mass media, and mail is a good resource.

CLG Status

Ms. Wright summarized the CLG program. The hierarchy is as follows: Secretary of interior, national parks service, each state has their own state historic preservation office (SHPO), and the guideline program for the municipal level is the Certified Local Government. She believed that the Borough entered the program in the 1970s. There are only 45 in Pennsylvania. They updated the standards for CLG status. Ongoing performance standards have to be met no matter when you entered into the program. HARB does meet most of them, but there are some that are not met.

They are going from funding administration to funding preservation projects. Single project would be \$25,000.00. The matching guidelines were reduced to either 50,25 or 10 percent depending on the project. It would fund such projects as design guidelines, or outreach projects.

Ms. Wright called out specific criteria that HARB currently does not meet. CLG will be sending a letter to Council in February letting them know that these changes are happening. Council will have to re-sign. She felt it would be beneficial to work with Council before the letter comes so that the criteria can be discussed.

A survey was done in the 1970s and in 1995. There is some information online. Some of the information is still used but at this point could use updating. The survey (inventory) would also need to be kept up with. Ms. Wright will look into where the survey stands and bring that back at the next meeting.

Discussion was held that HARB would divide up and hit the streets to inventory the contributing structures. "Contributing" needs to be redefined, per Mr. Schneider. Perhaps HARB can contact Penn State for a master's project.

Ms. Wright discussed the criteria for procedure to carry out a comprehensive recognizance level survey to further identify historic building, sites, etc, as required in the standards. With no one wanting to expand the historic district Mr. McGinley thought that this would not be possible. Inventory information must be accessible to the public as well. There is a GIS map online. Once the survey information is obtained, perhaps someone at the County could update the map for the Borough.

Filling vacancies on the review board within 90 days was another criteria. This appeared to be a new criteria. Moving an alternate off the list onto the Board would be a possibility.

Board members and staff must participate in at least 4 hours of continuing education annually. Mr. Schneider suggested a “lunch and learn” type of education to be held four times for one hour. There are also webinars available. There are no real stipulations for HARB training.

Municipally owned properties and projects within in historic districts or property with such designation, follow the established review procedures and deadlines. Ms. Wright stated that this is something that is possible, but might get overlooked at times. For example, the parking lots were not approved by HARB. It looks good to the public if they see Borough projects setting a high standard with HARB. Ms. Tosti-Vasey stated that it would be a good idea to put this in the next Council update.

Something that might fall under this point, Ms. Wright thought, was the armory property. It is not in the historic district it is a nationally registered historic property. From the way this clause reads, while the property is municipally owned, they should come through HARB.

Ms. Wright discussed nominations. Ms. Tooker stated that she sends to the state quarterly and she gets all of the national nominations for historic. Most are not from Centre County. The last one was a farmhouse in the Marion/Walker area. A family member wrote the nomination. Sometimes letters of support are received. Ms. Wright needs a way to know that the nominations exist to comment on any nominations in the Borough.

The railroad building was briefly discussed.

ADJOURNMENT:

With no other business to come before HARB,

**Mr. Schneider moved to adjourn;
Ms. Tooker seconded the motion;
Motion carried.**

Meeting adjourned at 10:15 a.m.