

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

April 10, 2018 - 8:30 a.m.
236 West Lamb Street, Bellefonte, PA 16823
www.bellefonte.net

CALL TO ORDER:

The April 10, 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
Robert Wagner
Mack Mahan
Megan Tooker (late)
Gay Dunne (non-voting)

EXCUSED: Pat Long
Robert Lingenfelter

ABSENT: Alan Uhler

STAFF MEMBERS: Shannon Wright, HARB Administrator

GUESTS: Gary Lucas
Beverly Harader

ADDITIONS /CORRECTIONS TO THE AGENDA:

203 North Allegheny Street – sign project added

DECLARATION OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST:

None.

DECLARATION OF EX PARTE COMMUNICATION:

None.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES:

Mr. Mahan moved to approve the Minutes of the March 27, 2018 HARB Meeting;
Mr. Wagner seconded the motion;
Motion carried.

PROJECT REVIEW AND PUBLIC COMMENTS:

120 W. Curtin Street – Metal Roof

Gary Lucas appeared before HARB to request a metal roof on his property. The existing roof is over thirty years old and has leaks. He has researched options and got bids on metal and shingle and would like the metal roof as he likes the look. He knows that HARB prefers the standing seam. He brought a brochure of the profile of the roof that he is planning. It looks like a standing seam roof. It has a sharp profile and the company uses a good quality metal. His family member had the same company put his roof on. The roof would be a slate gray color. The gutter system is fairly new and was put on a few years back and is a seamless system.

Mr. Lingenfelter sent along notes in his absence that he had some concern with a metal roof on the style of house presented. Ms. Dunne stated that the color seems to be different from the email that was sent. The color looked bluer. Because this is a one-story house, the metal roof was being questioned. The metal roofs were popular historically in the 1850s, then went to outbuildings only, per Ms. Tooker. The house at hand was built in 1911. Discussion was held on the approval of a metal roof for a garage on that street. There are not other metal roofs on the street. Ms. Tooker offered that the color matches what is existing, but material wise the seams will add some visual quality. The property owner stated that when the home was built, it caused some controversy in the town. Ms. Dunne confirmed that he would be adding snow guards. She stated that there is a difference with the wood siding and the lines of the roof which go vertically and diagonally catches her attention.

Mr. McGinley stated that being the first one story home in the historic district makes the home contributing. He stated that metal roofs will become contagious on the street. Some of the persons with more Victorian looking homes may come in complaining that HARB approved it for one and not the other.

Ms. Wright suggested tabling it for further thought until the next meeting. Mr. Lucas does not have a definite timeframe, but the bid expires the end of the month. With missing members, it is difficult to get an overall opinion on the roof.

No building permit will be needed. It was stated that Council would always have the final say on the approval of the project. The roof leaks when it is windy. Water seems to come up from underneath. There is a slight leak in the corner and the property owner has a bucket under it. There is no shingle roof option provided to HARB. The one that he was looking at had an architectural style to it. He will provide that to Ms. Wright for inclusion at the next meeting.

Mr. Mahan moved to table the project until input is provided by the absent members;

**Ms. Tooker seconded;
Motion carried.**

203 N. Allegheny Street – Sign

This project is for a sign. They wish to attach a children's garden sign near it. Ms. Beverly Harader spoke with HARB about this project. She said that they would like to keep the banner as well. HARB approval of the banner was not sought since it was temporary. It is taken down over the winter. She is trying to get the garden more exposure.

**Ms. Tooker moved to approve the sign as proposed;
Mr. Wagner seconded the motion;
Motion carried.**

This project will go to Borough Council for approval at their next meeting.

ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVAL:

None.

INFORMATION/DISCUSSION ITEMS:

Ms. Tooker continued discussion on the roof and she will look into some more information as the shingle that is there does not look quite right to her either. She stated that if the answer will be no for the metal, HARB needs to be consistent. Mr. Mahan stated that metal would not be appropriate because of the pitch of the roof. It does not give any architectural character. Mr. McGinley opined that he did not think the home was contributing because it did not fit in with typical Victorian homes. It is contributing in the sense that it was built in 1910 and one of the first one story homes. Ms. Tooker stated that Curtin does have an eclectic mix of styles of homes.

Ms. Wright inquired whether HARB thought the roof profile was comparable to a true standing seam. Mr. Wagner really wishes he could see actual samples. Ms. Wright may contact the company to see if they will send a sample to her. HARB member stated that the photo of the family member's roof did not look like the roof that was being requested at 120 W. Curtin. Ms. Wright stated that the profiles are different, as Mr. Lucas proposed a profile closer to standing seam after talking with her. She believes that the requested roof is similar to the Willowbank Plaza building. It is not a traditional standing seam roof, but does have concealed fasteners and similar appearance to it. She thought the slate color was a good choice. Ms. Tooker thought that an architectural reason not to approve the roof was needed. Snow guards were discussed as well; the main purpose of the snow birds is to split the snow.

There was thought that there may be some metal roofs on smaller homes going towards the high school. Ms. Wright will drive around and see if she can spot some. Glare was a concern on the house on Curtin Street. The distance between the ridges is 16 inches. Ms. Wright suggested after some research is done, a sheet could be developed that outlines points to consider when coming before HARB with a roof replacement. The property owner had come before HARB prior with window replacement project. The windows now looks off.

Ms. Tooker inquired about looking into the project before the HARB meeting. She indicated that clearly a discussion when the property owner is not present is different from the meeting discussion. A work session can also be considered. Packets can go out earlier if needed. Email deliberations were discussed but Ms. Dunne stated that the discussions should be public. Changing the review process was also discussed.

OLD BUSINESS:

Memo re: Board Requirements and Bylaws

Alternates and voting rights of board members were discussed again. Mr. McGinley stated that this should be reviewed again when the entire board is present.

Ms. Wright also included in the packet the State Historic District Act which outlines what the HARB is charged with. The Board cannot be less than five persons, it must have one registered architect, one licensed real estate broker, one building inspector and then the remaining board can be knowledgeable and interested parties. There is no requirement for alternates. Majority board makes quorum. If HARB wanted to go up to nine persons with no alternates, that would be permitted. Ms. Wright thought it may be beneficial to add verbiage “if a regular member is on an extended leave, an alternate can fill in and count as the member during that time” or something to that effect. The second alternate having voting privileged will be discussed when the full board is in.

In-kind replacements were discussed- the Act does not distinguish in-kind replacements. Any type of exterior project, in Ms. Wright’s opinion, should require an application. There can be administrative approvals, but she feels that the projects should still come before HARB. All projects should be documented and have an application on file.

NEW BUSINESS:

Application Review –

A revised application was presented to the Board. Ms. Wright stated that she has been getting incomplete applications. She added some “red” words in the instructions. She added a listing of the types of projects. This section is new, and she asked members to review this for anything she may have missed. Repairing and Rehabilitating were discussed. All exterior projects that are visible from the right of way need to be included – this would include lighting.

Ms. Dunne inquired whether the repair/replace category could be eliminated. Ms. Tooker interjected that she thought that there will always be incomplete applications and those may need to be walked through more. The supporting material on a project is lacking. If the material is given, but do not check all the boxes, it can usually be inferred.

Ms. Wright suggested that members review the revised application, mark it up, and bring it to the next meeting. She would like to see the process streamlined for applicants.

Walking Tour

Ms. Dunne would like to see that added back to the agenda. With better weather coming, a tour may be possible. Mr. McGinley stated that a few years back, they walked the town with some people after a meeting. Ms. Wright stated that it was discovered that the historical district overlay does not match up with the national historical district. Changing the district before was opposed by the residents. Ms. Wright felt that even if projects could not be reviewed or added for that area, demolition projects could possibly be reviewed in the district outside of HARB which stills falls under the national. It is unknown why the two do not match up.

Ms. Wright also stated that in 2020 the HARB district will be 50 years old and everything built from 1921-1970 would then be contributing. Ms. Tooker stated that she felt that HARB needed to use the existing national boundary. She will review this further. The HARB district is larger than the national district. Some of the homes on Linn and Curtin are outside the national district but should absolutely be on the national list. Ms. Wright will print these out for the next meeting. Ms. Tooker indicated that this would be a good topic for a work session. Homes like this are considered individually eligible structure and there are different requirements for it, i.e. interiors, etc.

The Union cemetery was discussed briefly.

ADJOURNMENT:

With no other business to come before HARB,

**Mr. Mahan moved to adjourn;
Mr. Wagner seconded the motion;
Motion carried.**

Meeting adjourned at 9:40 a.m.