

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

**April 9, 2019 - 8:30 a.m.  
236 West Lamb Street, Bellefonte, PA 16823  
[www.bellefonte.net](http://www.bellefonte.net)**

**CALL TO ORDER:**

The April 9, 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  
Gay Dunne  
Robert Lingenfelter  
Walt Schneider  
Pat Long

**EXCUSED:** Maria Day

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

**GUESTS:** Jeff Johnson  
Yo Jackson  
Joanne Tosti-Vasey

---

**ADDITIONS /CORRECTIONS TO THE AGENDA:**

170 E. Linn Street – Roof Project

**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 March 26, 2019 meeting;  
Mr. Lingenfelter seconded the motion;  
Motion carried.**

**PROJECT REVIEW AND PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

**304 North Alleghany Street – Post Project Approval Metal Roof  
(call in to property owner’s daughter)**

Ms. Wright called Susan Swartz, the owner’s daughter on the telephone and conferenced her into the meeting. Mr. McGinley introduced himself and the committee.

Susan stated that back in July a contractor discussion was held on whether to repair or replace the roof and at that point no decision was made. She believes there was some discussion on which way to go and whether to completely redo the roof or repair it. To her mother’s knowledge, there was no further contact with the contractor. She did not hear from him nor did she follow up. Mid-September, Susan was out of town for work, and when she arrived back home, she found her mother’s health to be declining, and began seeing her doctor almost weekly in October. Because of the health scenario, she was not considering doing anything with the roof. There was nothing agreed to and nothing signed. She put the roof on hiatus until Spring when her health would be improved.

Susan stated that in early November, her mom had an emergency hospitalization for 8-10 days. She believes that there was a pretty good snow fall in mid-November. As far as her mom was concerned, she was not going to take any action on the roof. The end of November, she was hospitalized again. During that hospitalization, the roofer began working on the roof. Susan was not aware of this work and she was focused on her mom’s health. In December, her mother had another health scare.

Susan does not know who the contractor was that went ahead and put the roof on. Her mother does not remember. Payment was via a signed over investment check.

Mr. McGinley offered that in the historical district there is protocol to be followed. Susan stated that it was not that her mother did not wish to follow through but there was lack of communication with the contractor.

Ms. Wright offered that a neighbor knew the contractor and a letter was sent to that company notifying them that the property was in the historical district and in the future, they need to make sure that they have permits for the work being done.

Materials were provided by Susan to Ms. Wright – before and after pictures. The Sanborn map shows the roof would have been a shingle roof. Susan did not know how the roof was installed or the process. Mr. Schneider remarked that at the speed of the roof installation he cannot

imagine that the old roof was pulled. Susan offered that they would work sporadically – an hour or two at a time and then they would leave and come back for another few hours.

Ms. Dunne inquired if Susan had any contact with the contractor crews. Susan was at the hospital with her mother most of the time. She remarked that the work was done in a span of time from mid-November until into December.

The current proposal is that the roof remain as is, without modification. Susan stated that it cost a significant amount to install it. An application was completed and is on record with the Borough. It was a post-project application.

**Mr. Schneider made a motion for denial;  
Ms. Long seconded the motion;  
Motion carried unanimously.**

Mr. McGinley stated that this will go before Bellefonte Council, at which meeting he recommended that Susan have a representative attend to explain what happened if she wanted Council to consider allowing the roof to stay. It was explained to Susan that this type of roof was denied prior by HARB.

**Mr. Schneider moved that Council require the property brought into compliance with HARB regulations;  
Ms. Long seconded the motion;  
Motion carried unanimously.**

### **375 E. Linn Street – Fence**

Property owner appeared before HARB for a fence project. The location of the fence would be from the house back in a square and connecting. It will go around the tree. This is just a square run area for the dog. The square would have been smaller except the tree was in the way. The fence will be chain link. It will be galvanized; the black chain link is more money. Ms. Wright did not believe that it would be visible. There are very tall trees on the side alley and she checked it out and she could not see anything. It was added that the fence would be to make leaving the dog out easier for the property owner's elderly mother.

Ms. Long did not like the idea of the galvanized fencing. Properties on both sides do already have chain link fences. The fence is not permanent and can be removed in the future.

**Ms. Tooker moved to approve the fence as presented at 4 feet in height;  
Mr. Lingenfelter seconded the motion;**

Mr. Schneider was not a fan of the fence type and he reminded HARB members, Ms. Day suggested before that the fence could be done in vinyl coated black. He suggested a wood post and wiring and felt the chain link was industrial looking. He reminded HARB members that cost should not be a consideration. Ms. Long did not think that just because there are others in the neighborhood that it should be installed.

The property owner opined that the wooden fence with wire would look like a chicken coop. She asked if HARB was concerned about aesthetics or historical accuracy. She offered that the policy as she read it was to make the fence as least visible as possible. Regardless of the materials, if you cannot see it would seem to be less of an issue. The fence should be minimally visible from the street.

**Motion failed 3 to 2.**

**Mr. Schneider moved to approve the proposed fence with the exception that the fence be black vinyl coated;  
Ms. Long seconded the motion;**

The property owner inquired about the fact that she cannot afford the other fence. Mr. Schneider stated that the motions will go before Council and they will consider the denials. He invited the property owner to the Council meeting to argue her point. Council can consider cost; HARB cannot.

The property owner stated that she is really just trying to solve a problem. A smaller area for the dog was asked to be considered by HARB.

Amended motion was presented,

**Mr. Schneider amended the motion that the maximum size of the fence would be as presented;  
Ms. Long seconded the amended motion;  
Motion carried.**

### **170 E. Linn Street – Roof**

The property owner, Jeff Johnson, submitted an application and brought a sample of the roof material. The current roof is a 20-year asphalt shingle. It is an old standard three tab asphalt shingle roof and they would like to put a better quality, architectural shingle that others have used. The color would be slate.

**Mr. Schneider moved to approve the substitution of the GAF Timberline Architectural Shingle in color slate for the existing three tab asphalt shingle;  
Ms. Long seconded the motion;  
Motion carried.**

### **ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS:**

#### **135 S. Allegheny Street – Storefront**

The property owner proposed reconfiguring the storefront to a two-door entry when they received HARB approval in October. When they went through code review there were issues with grading and the door so they have gone back to the current configuration but with the same

glass they proposed. Ms. Wright administratively approved the reconfiguration. This property is home to the Blonde Bistro.

They are still installing the ADA push button for the door. The color of the rails will be a dark bronze in color.

### **INFORMATION/DISCUSSION ITEMS:**

#### **Update: 251 N. Allegheny Street – Garage**

Mr. Schneider reported that Ms. Wright and he met with the owners to discuss the garage. Jim Royer from Code was also at the meeting. They are going back to their design professional to discuss. It is more viable to remove the existing building and put something in its place at the same size and scale as what is there. As part of that discussion, the overall look of the building was discussed and recommendation was made to make the carriage house look like a carriage house.

Coming back, the project should have clabbered siding versus vertical batten siding. Garage doors will be at the end of the structure on the gable end. Based on discussion, there may be solar panels on the roof or provisions for later installation. The look will be tied into the look of the house with some windows on the west and east face.

Discussions will be had with the church regarding the wall as the church will need to do some work if the building comes down. Ms. Wright stated that the garage also may have a standing seam roof on the porch and the new carriage house. The foundation will remain. They will cap the existing foundation to stabilize the top of the foundation as well. Hardy board siding will be used.

#### **Museum – Cellar Door**

This review was prompted by multiple complaints. Mr. McGinley drove by and noted that the basement door is now the focal point and not the museum. It is diamond plated and was done without going through HARB. Ms. Wright showed pictures of the door.

Ms. Wright stated that her and Lori from the museum discussed the door previously and she recommended the museum remove it if they were not using it. If they wanted to replace the door, it would need administratively or board approval depending on the scope.

Ms. Wright is suggesting that the entire door be painted the same as the color of the shutters or flat black. She stated that if they would have come to her, she would have done an administrative approval. Ms. Wright will contact the museum about painting the doors.

**OLD BUSINESS:** Nothing to report.

**NEW BUSINESS:**

**East Bishop and South Allegheny Street**

Ms. Long inquired about this property and what project is occurring there. The building is being used for storage. Ms. Long opined that the windows need to be cleaned up as it looks unsightly. Ms. Wright stated that HARB does not regulate the inside and there is nothing that can be done.

### **Newsletter**

Ms. Dunne acknowledged the article about HARB written by Ms. Wright in the Borough newsletter.

### **Ordinance Review**

Ms. Tosti-Vasey discussed Council setting up an ordinance review committee. They will be looking at all of the ordinance to see what needs to be updated. She stated that if HARB thinks that something should be added to cite a contractor in the event of a situation like the Swartz's roof, that would need to be sent to Council so that they can consider that information.

Education of the contractors was discussed. Mr. Schneider suggested establishing a requirement that all contractors that work in the historical district are required to be licensed by the Borough, registering through the Borough, charge a \$50 fee, and at that point in time, if they are caught working without going through HARB, the registration is revoked for a period of time.

### **ADJOURNMENT:**

With no other business to come before HARB,

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

Meeting adjourned at 9:53.