

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

**January 23, 2018 - 8:30 a.m.
236 West Lamb Street, Bellefonte, PA 16823
www.bellefonte.net**

CALL TO ORDER:

The January 23, 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
Maria Day
Pat Long
Mack Mahan
Robert Lingenfelter
Walt Schneider

EXCUSED: Megan Tooker
Alan Uhler

STAFF MEMBERS: Donald Holderman, Assistant Borough Manager
Shannon Wright, HARB Administrator

GUESTS: Sandy Schuckers
Sue Hannegan

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 January 9, 2018 HARB Meeting;
Ms. Long seconded the motion;
Motion carried.

PROJECT REVIEW AND PUBLIC COMMENTS:

110-114 North Spring Street – Signs

Sue Hannegan and Sandy Schuckers presented this project for new signage at 110-114 North Spring Street. The building was the old post office. Ms. Hannegan presented images for the south and north façade. She proposed a bracketed sign which would hang in between the two front windows. There are two uses in the building – upstairs is the Youth Service Bureau and downstairs is the Bellefonte Senior Center. Neither have signage visible from travelers driving. The Senior Center is repeatedly overlooked as it has a basement entrance. Signs would be placed in the dedicated sign space that used to be there. It cannot be lit. She believes that was disconnected when the wine store was in the building.

Mr. Schneider moved to approve the project as presented;
Mr. Mahan seconded the motion;

Mr. Schneider inquired about the overhanging of the new sign over the old area. It will extend it but perhaps not to the far right. It will be constructed to be equal distances to both pilasters. He opined that from a certain standpoint it should be “under” but Ms. Hannegan said it looked too tight for two signs. Stacking the signs was suggested. The zoning ordinance may come into play with stacking the signs (making the sign bigger). Putting the senior center lower and the youth center higher it would coincide with their location in the building. Mr. Schneider suggested mounting the signage to the front of the sill. The advantage of going by the sill is the sign size could be matched based on zoning. The signs are restricted by square footage and number of signs per the ordinance. He opined that it would look better and read better, and the sign would be bigger.

Mr. Lingenfelter inquired about the sign colors (red against black). The photograph appears hard to read. He suggested maybe using different colors. The color is orange and is more visible than it appears in the picture.

Mr. Schneider amended his motion as follows:

Mr. Schneider moved to stack the signs underneath the small roof or covering and they can max out based on zoning requirements, as long as they do not exceed the bottom window sill band. The final details would be administratively handled by Ms. Wright;
Ms. Long seconded the motion;

Ms. Hannegan interjected that she would like to see the sign both ways below the sill as it may be nice that it would be one unit of signage, so it almost replicates the big window as they both have dark backgrounds. In that, the sill would disappear. It may also be better to have the sill.

She does not know which would look better. Mr. Schneider offered that the sill may just disappear depending on how they come back with the signs. Ms. Wright will work in resolving this issue. Additional images, if any, will be circulated to HARB members when Ms. Wright receives them. (*discussion amongst Ms. Hannegan and Ms. Schuckers*).

Amended motion carried.

Original motion carried.

Project will go to Council at their next meeting.

135 South Allegheny Street – Door

The property owner was not present at the meeting, so Ms. Wright explained the project to HARB members. The food bank needs to replace their front door. The door is currently wood, and the glass is almost the entire length of the door. Because of the nature of their business, they would prefer not to have the glass running all the way down i.e. carts hitting it, dollies. They would like to replace the door with an aluminum door, painted the same color, with the same configuration, but then instead of the glass being all the way down, it would only be half way down.

Mr. Schneider moved to deny the project.

Ms. Long seconded the motion;

Mr. Schneider opined that the door is wooden, always was wooden, and fits the feel of the storefront. An aluminum storefront door will cause the integrity of the store front to be lost. He believes that protection of the door can be achieved in other ways, i.e. wrought iron bar, instead of doing a door replacement.

Mr. Schneider explained that he would be willing to make a motion to table, for when the property owner is present to discuss this project. He feels that too much would be lost if the wood door is removed.

Ms. Long offered that Faith Centre has something to protect the door, bars, or something on the inside. She does not want to see aluminium doors become acceptable in the district. Mr. Schneider also recommended an internal automatic opener. This would be better from an ADA standpoint as that door is not accessible right now because there is not enough space on either side to have the forward approach. They could put a bollard out front, and do a pad bollard inside. This may cost more, but the historic feel will be maintained. It was noted that there is a rear entrance to the facility, but has steps down to the doorway.

Mr. Schneider explained that the owners could go to Harrisburg to appeal the ADA accessibility, or they can do a push button alternative which is acceptable under Code.

Mr. Schneider rescinded his previous motion to deny.

Mr. Schneider moved to table this project;

Ms. Long seconded the motion;

Motion carried.

Ms. Wright will be in touch with the property owner with HARB's comments.

ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVAL:

None.

INFORMATION/DISCUSSION ITEMS:

Talleyrand Park Improvements

Mr. Lingenfelter presented a PowerPoint® on the improvements at Talleyrand Park. This same presentation was shown to Council. The projects fall under the Talleyrand Safety Improvement Grant from the DCNR.

A pathway extension for accessibility along the raceway was discussed as well as the pergola repair, and creek bank stabilization which is an ongoing effort to stabilize Spring Creek. U.S. Fish and Wildlife are a partner in the creek bank stabilization efforts. The path extension from the train station will connect High Street across from the raceway to the train station. The guide wire will be moved. The path brick would match. New landscaping will be added. The path would be impervious due to the nature of the walkway. The plan was to minimize and stabilize it for accessibility reasons. Tying it into the raceway is ideal.

The pergola needs replaced as it is an old wooden structure. The wisteria in the middle has overgrown and ultimately wove through the structure. The pergola will be replaced with what is already there i.e. wood. Council's parks committee researched some information on this project. This is from 1988. The original concept will not be changed.

The Spring Creek bank to the left needs to be established. Mud sill application will be used to achieve this. As mentioned previously, U.S. Fish and Wildlife will be assisting with this project. They did work in other locations and this is a typical application to prevent further erosion of the bank. It is a natural material and will occur on the opposite side of the train tracks.

Mr. Schneider inquired about the pergola. It was confirmed that the configuration of the existing pergola will be mimicked and will be an in-kind replacement, with no noticeable difference except that it will look new. The steel shall remain. The desire is also to replace the fencing behind this project, in-kind, as the wood has also deteriorated.

Mr. Holderman discussed the raceway gate system. He wants to do the project, but it is not in this year's budget. He talked a little about the grant in that the Talleyrand Park Committee received some funding, about \$24,000, and the Borough contributed a little more to apply for a grant to see if funds could double. That was the idea behind these projects. The grant is approximately \$110,000. If everything turns out, depending on where the budget comes in, the fence can be at least stabilized but the next project would be the raceway having a type of mechanical system that would adjust the water flow.

Mr. Lingenfelter discussed lowering the fencing height as an opportunity to open the view. For aesthetics, a matching black iron fence was also considered. Mr. Schneider encouraged protecting the race head.

Mr. Holderman offered that perhaps HARB can give Ms. Wright approval to administratively approve the projects. He hopes to have the project(s) out to bid by late February.

**Mr. Schneider moved to approve all three projects, as presented, with minor modifications being done with staff;
Mr. Mahan seconded the motion;
Motion carried with Lingenfelter abstaining from the vote.**

OLD BUSINESS:

None.

NEW BUSINESS:

Working To-Do List

This is a list for when the agenda is light.

Ms. Wright will keep updating the list and if there is time, an item can be discussed. Other ideas are welcomed. The listing was reviewed for priority order.

Projector presentations were recommended to reduce paper. The PowerPoint® presentation will still be sent as part of the packet.

Mr. Schneider recommended the following prioritization:

1. Inspections (process)
2. In-kind replacement policy
3. Materials tool box
4. By-laws/meeting format
6. Newsletter
7. Plaques
8. Educational opportunities for HARB.

The reason for putting the inspections topic first is that there are projects that have been out there for years and HARB has no clue if they have been completed or if they have been done properly. There is no enforcement or follow up. Approvals are good for one year. The residents have up to one year to start the project. There is nothing formal in place to check on these projects. Some preliminary ideas were discussed, i.e. putting something on the HARB forms relative to final inspections.

Ms. Long suggested sending a letter to the State College Borough HARB congratulating them on their formation. Ms. Wright will take care of this.

ADJOURNMENT:

With no other business to come before HARB,

**Mr. Schneider moved to adjourn the January 23, 2018 HARB meeting;
Mr. Mahan seconded the motion;
Motion carried.**

Meeting adjourned at 9:27 a.m.

DRAFT