

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

**March 27, 2018 - 8:30 a.m.  
236 West Lamb Street, Bellefonte, PA 16823  
[www.bellefonte.net](http://www.bellefonte.net)**

**CALL TO ORDER:**

The March 13, 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  
Walter Schneider  
Mack Mahan  
Robert Lingenfelter  
Megan Tooker  
Gay Dunne (non-voting)

**EXCUSED:** Alan Uhler

**STAFF MEMBERS:** Shannon Wright, HARB Administrator

**GUESTS:** Jim Jackson

---

**ADDITIONS /CORRECTIONS TO THE AGENDA:**

100 W. Allegheny Street should read Linn Street

**DECLARATION OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST:**

Mr. McGinley declared that he would abstain from vote on the church project.

**DECLARATION OF EX PARTE COMMUNICATION:**

None.

**APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES:**

**Mr. Mahan moved to approve the Minutes of the March 13, 2018 HARB Meeting;**  
**Mr. Schneider seconded the motion;**  
**Motion carried.**

**PROJECT REVIEW AND PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

**120 W. Lamb Street – Step Demo and Replacement (St. John’s Episcopal Church)**

Mr. Jackson took over the role of property manager about two years ago. He realized early on that the church hall was not a legal structure as it only had one working access. The access on the end has steps in disrepair and the railing is not up to code.

**Ms. Long moved to approve the project as presented;**  
**Mr. Schneider seconded the motion;**

The railing looks compliant on the renderings. The stonework looks good, per Mr. McGinley. Ms. Dunne looked at the project in person. She stated that there was a block that appeared to be the material sample. It was moved because some kids were playing with it, but that sample was the material that they chose to use for the stone. The landing will look cleaner and all the excess concrete will be gone. The steps will descend to a pad which extends to the sidewalk. Ms. Tooker confirmed that the railing would be located on both sides. Mr. Schneider opined that he did not have a problem with using the full set of metal steps presented in the picture if the church would rather that route. This would allow for the building to speak for itself without the concrete mass blocking much of the front. The cool gray was mentioned regarding its contrast against the warmer gray color in the stone. Cleaning the existing block may remedy this. If, after cleaning, the blocks clash, the church will consider staining the new block to be compatible with the old. The existing railing is 32 inches and the new will be 42 inches. Round rail will be used.

**Motion carried with Mr. McGinley abstaining from the vote.**

Project will go before Council on Monday, April 2, 2018. Building permit will be applied for after Council approval.

**ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVAL:**

**137 W. High Street – Shingle Roof**

Ms. Wright approved the shingle roof at 137 W. High St. This project came before HARB in December. The property owner proposed a standing seam metal roof and during the discussion it was offered that architectural shingle in dark gray would be more appropriate. That is what the property owner decided to go with.

**INFORMATION/DISCUSSION ITEMS:**

**100 W. Linn Street – Site Plan for Elevation Update and Discussion**

The old drawings were included in the packet for comparison purposes. After the last meeting, Ms. Wright was informed that they were able to remove the ramp and the handrails. The site plan would remain the same. However, because of the grade, the elevation changed. Ms. Wright wanted to bring this before HARB as a discussion item because she was concerned with the changed design. A2.1 shows an elevator with two windows above but nothing below it. There was originally a door proposed on that side but that was removed from the plan and instead placed on the other side. Ms. Wright's concern was that on most of the rest of the building, there are three in line, and that is what was approved. It is now two windows with a blank area and two faux windows with a door below. She emailed the architect that a window would be preferred on the bottom floor, but the architect did not get back to her.

From Lamb Street the door would be visible. From the alley you will see two windows without the door. It is basically a symmetry issue. Mr. Schneider suggested continuing the faux windows on both sides. There are faux windows above the door, per Ms. Wright. (*talking amongst members*). The reason they moved the door was because the grade was higher on the one side and could meet with the floor on the inside of the elevator.

Mr. Schneider stated that they should just emphasize on it being a modern addition to an old building. He does not think the faux window will be visible anyway and it will look like a big masonry wall from the distance. Mr. Schneider opined that the way it is planned, it will stand out like a sore thumb from Spring Street. He also offered that the building is old and in dire need of full renovation, but if it can be done so that it stands out and the children may think it looks cool and it will freshen the building up a little with respect to their clientele.

Mr. McGinley stated that the plan was approved as presented prior with the door. It was also approved with the condition that the site plan was not seen. The site plan was integral to the design of the addition.

Ms. Long stated that new additions should not be made to look old, per the standards. Mr. Mahan added, however, that it should harmonize with the existing materials in place. Mr. McGinley offered that the Gamble Mill is going to put a glass tower on the side of the mill. It is different, and it is new. Some people did not like the idea. The same could apply to the school project. Mr. Schneider offered that in looking at the two windows, the cadence is missing. Ms. Wright agreed that this was her concern.

Mr. Lingenfelter offered that the steps and ramps were the issue requiring administrative approval prior and now the door is in a different location. The steps and ramps have been corrected, and the door is moved – it is the same plan with slight modifications. The entire plan has not changed. He offered that since the main plan was already approved, it would not be appropriate to be they are offered a new design idea. This would be a concern.

Ms. Wright offered the scenario of if the architect came back to HARB and said they will just put the window in. She wanted to know if she could administratively approve that plan. Mr. Schneider would like to see more detail on the faux windows. He does not think that based on the drawing, that you can tell what they will look like. Mr. Mahan opined that that plan was conditionally approved with the condition that HARB see the site plan. Now the site plan has been altered and they will need to come back and present the project to HARB again. Mr. McGinley did not think that the changes were that severe that they needed to come back to HARB. (*talking amongst members*).

Ms. Wright closed the conversation by stating that she will tell the architect the following and does HARB agree: The new elevation is fine if the third window is put in on the bottom floor. She does not think that, because it was already approved, the other concerns should not be mentioned to them. These should have been addressed when they presented to HARB. She suggested that if ideas are going to be thought of after the fact, that perhaps large projects should be seen twice so that those ideas can be formulated. After the project has been approved, she does not think it is right to go back the applicant and try to alter them with other after-thought ideas.

Mr. Schneider offered that he thought that with a large project, until it is done and ready for approval, the project should continue to come back to HARB to readdress. Ms. Wright agreed and explained that her former experience in Charleston with their BAR, the projects came back three times. They first addressed height, scale, and mass with the building and surrounding neighborhood. Second they addressed preliminary design. Third they addressed final design. She has seen a trend that projects will come in and are approved, but then other things are thought of. After approval, HARB cannot go back to them and change things. Once they have the permit it is done. Changing the approval process for large projects would ease and allow for after-thoughts and hopefully produce better overall projects.

Ms. Long mentioned the food bank door and how there were alternatives that could have been discussed and recommended but it was approved as they presented it. Significant changes need to be looked over vigorously and the plan can be tabled to the next meeting. Ms. Long does not have a problem with the elevator as they need one.

## **OLD BUSINESS:**

### **HARB v. Historical District Tour**

#### **To do list - Bylaws**

Alternate voting procedure was discussed. Ms. Tooker stated that if two alternates are sitting, they should be able to vote as they are sitting at the table taking part in discussions. This would be the case if there are two or three missing from the HARB table. The alternates could assist with approval of projects. Ms. Wright gave the example of the Brockerhoff building project where there were not enough non-conflicting members to get a full vote on the project Ms. Dunne stated that it can be added to item 4. Mr. Schneider offered that just because there is a conflict of interest, it does not exclude the member and in some instances the conflicted member can vote (he gave an example of an appeal he was involved in). Mr. McGinley confirmed that the alternate vote would be taken only if the HARB was short members. Ms. Wright also mentioned that when Ms. Tooker was away Ms. Day was sitting in for three or four months, but she was technically an alternate coming regularly to the meeting (*talking amongst members*).

Quorum is four members. Mr. McGinley can vote anytime as chair. He can abstain and vote last, he can vote in normal order in roll call, per Mr. Schneider. Most chairs on organizations that Mr. Schneider is on do not vote as a matter of business unless a tie is needed to be broken. The bylaws refer to the Modern Rules of Order to be used in conducting business, per Ms. Dunne. She is not sure if there is a difference.

HARB is seven people. This comes out of the state guidelines. Mr. Schneider wanted to confirm that the membership can be only seven and if the state requirements limit alternates voting privileges. He would prefer to just make the HARB nine members. Ms. Wright will check into the state regulations and get back to HARB.

It was mentioned that if there was a personal gain in the project at hand, they would need to leave the room during the discussion and vote per the bylaws as they are written. Quorum was discussed once more relative to a member recusing themselves, or a chair choosing not to vote. If a quorum is met at a meeting, a meeting can proceed.

### **New Additions on Historical Buildings**

Ms. Wright sent out some informatives on this topic, but this topic was discussed during the school elevator addition project.

### **Old House Fair**

The Borough will pay for any HARB members that wish to attend the fair. It is June 8 and 9, 2018. Credits are being offered on both days.

### **Historical Street Name Signs**

Mr. Mahan stated that the Borough put up new street signs designating the historical district. The brown is historical, and the green is not. They were phased in and the project is complete currently. He had concern whether the signs covered one or both sides of the street. He opined that there are a lot of gaps in terms of understanding where the limits are. Ms. Dunne stated that the BHCA talked about having designation signage for the historical district.

### **ADJOURNMENT:**

With no other business to come before HARB,

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

Meeting adjourned at 9:30 a.m.