

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

**March 26, 2019 - 8:30 a.m.  
236 West Lamb Street, Bellefonte, PA 16823  
[www.bellefonte.net](http://www.bellefonte.net)**

**CALL TO ORDER:**

The March 26, 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  
Maria Day  
Gay Dunne  
Walt Schneider

**EXCUSED:** Robert Lingenfelter  
Pat Long

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

**GUESTS:** Bonnie and Peter Setaro

---

**ADDITIONS /CORRECTIONS TO THE AGENDA:**

None.

**DECLARATION OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST:**

None.

**DECLARATION OF EX PARTE COMMUNICATION:**

None.

**APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES:**

**Ms. Dunne moved to approve the minutes of the March 12, 2019 meeting, as amended;**  
**Ms. Day seconded the motion;**  
**Motion carried.**

**PROJECT REVIEW AND PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

**251 N. Allegheny Street – Garage Restoration**

The property owners, Bonnie and Peter Setaro appeared before HARB to present their garage project. They were in a few years back to discuss the carriage house and how it was in disrepair. It has been about a year and a half since they have been trying to relocate the carriage house. They cannot succeed as it is land locked in the back end. If the carriage house is taken down, they will have only 1/3 of the size that it already is. There are utilities running everywhere and it is not feasible.

The carriage house has some structural issues. Substantial work will need to the inside to reinforce the structure. Mr. McGinley provided pictures of the old carriage house. The property owners will mimic the old carriage house as much as possible and make it more habitable. The previous owner took the center beam out which made it unstable. The batten was replaced different from the original. What is left of the original batten is all that is left of the original structure, along with a stone foundation on the inside. It was originally timber framed and toed in with spikes and nails.

The property owner discussed the flooding at the house last summer. The water will not stay out of the garage. The garage becomes unusable when the water comes in. The whole area there on Locust is a low spot and the water accumulates. They would like to raise the grade on the inside of the garage about 18 inches and build up with stone following the original stone foundation in the corner. This would protect them from the flooding there. They would like to put faux doors on the alley side to represent the original doors.

Mr. Schneider suggested getting rid of the doors on the façade and put the doors on the other side and truly repurpose it so it looks like it comes in from the side. Keeping with trying to stay with the original design, there would not be a step due to the 18 inch build up. The functionality of the door at that line level would never have existed because it would have been at alley height. It was suggested if the faux doors were removed, they could put two windows in their place.

Ms. Tooker disagreed and liked the look of the carriage house as presented. She did not want it to look like a brand-new apartment. Mr. McGinley stated that having windows at ground level will only get broken on the alley side.

The homeowners like their idea of the carriage door as it also brings in some colors from the house.

Mr. Schneider inquired about the possibility of completely demolishing what is left of the carriage house and rebuilding new in the same spot. He inquired if that would require a variance and Ms. Wright stated that if they would take on demolishing the carriage house, but let the foundation remain she would allow them to rebuild on the same footprint.

Ms. Tooker opined that every carriage house looks different; some look like barns, some are brick. She offered that what they are proposing will be better than what is there now and will retain the period look.

**Ms. Tooker moved to approve the carriage rehab at 251 N. Allegheny Street based on the proposed on the drawings provided;  
Ms. Day seconded the motion;**

Mr. Schneider requested that the siding material be cement-based. It should be a noncombustible material due to fire hazard.

Ms. Tooker suggested making foundation higher as proposed, but then having the front façade go to the ground by laying the hardy board over the foundation so that it gives the appearance of being at alley level. Paving of the alley was discussed briefly.

Mr. Schneider advised the property owners that there are horizontal auto opening doors. They roll sideways. Mr. McGinley liked the look of the door and the windows above it. Mr. Schneider offered that if the other door was done in a façade and instead of making them look like swinging doors, he suggested making them look like sliders. The property owner did not like the sliding doors and she offered that bird and bees try to nest in them (track doors).

Mr. Setaro inquired about if the rehab plans do not work out if they would definitely be able to rebuild in the same footprint. Mr. Schneider went on record as building code official and fire chief that he would support removing the structure and putting it back in its footprint with the idea that some things could be put into place that would garner a better fire protection. The footprint is 31 x 22.

The Setaros wanted to make sure that HARB was okay with the rehab design. A second floor adds to the square footage, per Mr. Schneider. The second floor is used for storage. The zero setback would need to be looked at by an engineer. If the second floor becomes usable, 1,000 square feet would drive code permitting.

HARB members decided to table this project and a meeting will be scheduled with the property owners and Ms. Wright and Mr. Schneider to discuss the options in detail.

Ms. Wright stated that since the property owner may come back with a demo plan, this project could be approved under the new system of conceptual approval and when they return for preliminary and final approvals.

**Ms. Tooker moved to amend the motion to approve the conceptual design;  
Ms. Day seconded the motion;  
Motion carried.**

**ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS: None.**

**INFORMATION/DISCUSSION ITEMS:**

**375 E. Linn Street – Fence Options**

Ms. Wright discussed a possible fence project at this property to keep their dog in. The property owner originally wanted to do chain link and Ms. Wright did not think that would be appropriate. Ms. Wright wanted to get HARB members' opinions.

The property owner pointed out that she has two neighbors with chain link rather close to her. There is one on Curtin. The property owner spoke with a fence installer and he suggested a living fence that would have vegetation growing on it. She did not like that idea. Ms. Wright suggested a chain link with screening around it with the condition that if the vegetation comes down, the fence comes down.

Ms. Tooker stated that the fence may not be that visible due to the existing plantings and shrubs. If she came off the stairs and down the driveway, Ms. Tooker was not sure how visible it would be from there.

Members concurred that the fence would not be that visible, although Ms. Tooker did not know the exact placement of the fence. Ms. Tooker talked about a black chain link. She felt that the footprint of the fence should be brought before HARB members. Mr. Schneider did not like the idea of the black fence as it would rust rather than the galvanized fence. Vinyl coating was recommended. (*talking amongst member*).

Mr. McGinley asked Ms. Wright to relay HARB's comments to the property owner and come back when she had a foot print for the fence.

**Chicken Coops**

Ms. Wright has gotten some questions regarding coops in the Historic District since chickens are now permitted. They are not permitted to be free ranging and need a coop; zoning permits are needed. She was inquiring whether they had to come through HARB to approve coops.

If they are not anchored, Mr. Schneider opined that he was not sure if anything could be done. He discussed the enabling ordinance. In essence the code only applies to buildings and if the subject structure is movable, it may be challenged that it is not a building and therefore not falling under HARB. Only four chickens are allowed and only a 20 square foot coop is allowed. (*talking amongst members*)

Ms. Dunne recommended that if it is anchored and permanent to the ground it would fall under HARB and if it was mobile, and movable it would not.

Mr. McGinley stated that if a coop is raised to Ms. Wright, she can ask them to come into HARB so that they can review colors, etc. The ordinance verbiage was read aloud. Fencing in of the coop was discussed as well as setbacks. Although HARB does not have experience with coops, they will be brought through HARB for discussion.

**OLD BUSINESS:**

**Letter from Silvia Schwartz**

Ms. Wright received a lengthy letter from the property owner of the roof installation that was not approved by HARB. She completed the application, but did not submit any of the required documents and stated that she is unable to attend a meeting. Mr. Stewart, Borough Manager, stated that if she cannot attend, someone would need to attend for her. Ms. Wright will contact Ms. Schwartz this week. If she or her representative cannot make it to a meeting enforcement will begin.

Mr. Schneider recommended that if Ms. Wright feels that the application is not complete, that a letter be sent immediately (Federal Express) and hand delivered and Ms. Schwartz is still subject to getting the full application in to Ms. Wright.

**NEW BUSINESS:**

**Reorganization**

**Mr. Schneider moved to keep officers the same as last year;  
Ms. Day seconded the motion;  
Motion carried.**

**ADJOURNMENT:**

With no other business to come before HARB,

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

Meeting adjourned at 9:38 a.m.