Meeting Minutes
State College Borough Design Review Board
June 7, 2016

The State College Borough Design Review Board (DRB) met on Tuesday, June 7, 2016 in the State College Borough Municipal Building, 243 South Allen Street in Room 241. Chairman Rick Bryant called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m.

Members present

Rick Bryant, Chairman; Richard Devon, Sandra Staub, and Bond Reinhardt.

Others Present:

Anne Messner, Planner/Zoning; Sarah Smith, Staff Assistant; Mark Saville, Sweetland Engineering; John Fisher, Sweetland Engineering; Steve Kirsch, Sweetland Engineering; John Sepp, PennTerra Engineering; Tom Flynn, Penn State University; Steven Watson, Penn State University; Margaret Gray, Penn State University; Tom Chinnock, Shepley Bulfinch; Dan Hrankowsky, CA Ventures; Susan Venegoni; Nate Watts, Penn Terra Engineering; Cassandra Lemon, Shepley Bulfinch; Michael Misselwitz, PennTerra Engineering; Mark Huncik; and David Stone.

Approval of Minutes

Mr. Devon made a motion to approve the April 5, 2016 minutes as submitted and Mr. Reinhardt seconded the motion. The vote was unanimously in favor.

Chair Report

Chairman Bryant noted that since Mr. Wheeler had resigned from the Board, there would need to be a new Vice-Chair. He nominated Mr. Reinhardt for the position and Ms. Staub seconded the nomination. The vote was unanimously in favor.

Public Hour

No one in the audience wished to discuss items not on the agenda.

Sign

<u>Replacement Sign, University Drive Veterinary Hospital, 1602 University Drive, CP2 Zoning District</u>

Ms. Messner requested that the Board review the replacement sign for comments and/or questions.

Boards' comments included:

- Suggested including the street number and/or address on the sign.

- Thought the red cross that was used for the ‘t’ makes the sign confusing and that changing it to a normal ‘t’ would make it clearer.

Chairman Bryant made a motion to approve the sign with the Board’s comments and Mr. Reinhardt seconded the motion. The vote was unanimously in favor.

Ms. Messner noted that she would forward the Board’s comments to the Applicant.

Land Development Plan

Final Plan Agriculture Engineering Replacement Building and renovation of Klauder Building, UPD Subdistrict 5 Zoning District, The Pennsylvania State University, owner Sweetland Engineering and Associates, Engineer.

Mr. Saville’s highlights included:

- The initial Klouder building would be preserved while the back portion of the building would be demolished and rebuilt to increase capability.
- The project will preserve the existing trees and landscaping.
- The parking lot was being repurposed and the overhead doors into the building would be moved to the parking lot area to minimize pedestrian/equipment conflicts.
- The back of the first floor elevation would be raised to help deal with a storm water issue.
- The existing building footprint could not be extended due to significant utility corridors surrounding the building so the footprint would actually be slightly smaller so as to not disturb those utilities.
- The lighting plan for the project should not allow for any dark areas in order to increase pedestrian safety. There would be cameras at the North Hall project and at the building entrances as well.
- There would be some elevation differences in the first floor between the Klauder Building and the new addition.
- The project would address all ADA accessibility requirements.
- The second floor would have the same elevation across the Klauder building and the new addition and would include coordination of natural light within building.
- The third floor was planned to be mostly mechanical, but with some lab spaces.
- There was one glass lantern stairwell.

Boards’ comments included:

- Inquired if there was an entrance at the stairwell. (Mr. Saville responded that there was one on the corner)
- Inquired about LEED status. (Mr. Saville noted that the project would be updating the rain gardens to allow for more efficient function)
- Approved of the clean roofline without the mechanical constructions sticking out.

Ms. Messner stated she would summarize the Board's comments to be a part of the plan review letter to the applicant.

Land Development Plan

Final Plan, 532 and 538 East College Avenue RISE at State College, Commercial Zoning District with Collegiate Overlay, CA Ventures, owner, PennTerra Engineering Inc., Engineer, Shepley Bulfinch, Architect.

Mr. Chinnock's and Mr. Hrankowsky's highlights included:

- There was not many changes from the preliminary plan, but they had instituted the change from the Design Review Board to add more glass to the structure.
- The project had added a grocery store component to the first floor and part of the second floor. This will coordinate with the residential component of the second floor. The first floor window space will have produce displays. The second floor would be a café. The loading dock for the store was planned to be on Calder Way.
- The project had moved the main lobby and added a secondary lobby on south side of building.
- There was some difficulty with the grade of the property and there was a seating area added on College Avenue to help level out some of that grade change.
- The parking situation had changed to be all below ground with some spaces being removed, but the project would still be meeting the parking requirements.
- The loading dock looked small, but it was designed by a grocery store designer and would be sufficient to handle the store's needs.
- There is an interior room to hold the refuse which wasn't moved, but there was an additional access door added to the room to provide access from the grocery store.
- There will be a bike parking area in the lower level parking, one space for ADA van parking, and additional ADA spaces included in the parking.
- The second floor retail would include a covered patio area with seating. It would be covered by the building, but open to the outside.
- The second floor residential would include a fitness center, a yoga room, showers, lockers, an outdoor fitness area, a spa, and a spa deck. There were still some areas to be determined.
- There would be a clear cordoning off between the public areas and the private areas on the second floor including a two sided fireplace.
- The plan to split the lobby in two locations was included to separate the commercial and residential areas.
- The dumpsters for the property would be in the interior room with the loading dock being closer to the grade of the alley.
- The third and fourth floors were planned to be for graduate students. There were two stair cores.

- The third floor plan included areas open to the outside and below. The corner units were lofted units with all other units being 1 or 2 bed units.
- The upper floors were 4 bedroom units.
- The roof plan included the mechanical units which would be pushed to the west side towards the interior of the building. These areas would be fully screened with plans to include ways to throw sound up or trap it.
- The building included variations in façade and different material changes including metal panel, resistance board, glass and fibrous cement product. There would be glass for the grand staircase and for the grocery area.
- The residential areas would have paneling, glass, and possibly metal panel or a type of privacy glass for the bedrooms.
- The utility service would be on the south elevation which would be metal panel and extends up higher in order to hide some of the mechanicals.
- The upper sections that might be visible from downtown would be paneled in a wood grain material.

Boards' comments included:

- Inquired where the loading dock would open into. (It opens into the grocery area. The loading area would allow for a semi to fit in completely. There would be steps and a lift inside the loading area.)
- Inquired if there would be charging stations in the parking areas. (This was not shown on the plan, but they were thought to be included since the property was planned to be LEED silver.)
- Inquired if there would be cameras at the property. (There were cameras planned.)
- Inquired about the makeup of the grocery store and noted that it would be in an area of town that did not have access to a grocery store. (The store was geared towards the downtown with a modern concept, fresh produce, and it would be geared towards a student population).
- Inquired what the ceiling height was on the first floor. (14 feet)
- Inquired where the mechanicals would be located and expressed concern about the sound for nearby residential units. (Portions would be located in the head space in ramp going down into the garage and the central mechanicals would be the top of the building.)
- Inquired if there would be a net decrease in imperviousness for the site. (There might be a slight decrease and they were reviewing possibilities for rain water harvesting.)
- Noted that Calder Way was being developed to be more upscale and that this site would fit in well with that shift in dynamic.
- Inquired about the layout of the higher floors and expressed concern that it might be confusing to get around the floors. (Explained that a person can get to all of the units on the upper floors, but the person might have to go all the way around.)
- Inquired about rates on the upper floors due to the better views. (The upper floors would be market rate.)
- Inquired if the wood grain was vertical. (The grain was vertical.)

- Expressed concern that the wind might make planned the outside space on the second floor unpleasant. (Explained that there's some plantings that should shield from some of the winds).
- Voiced concern that the glass corner would be too transparent.
- Expressed appreciation that it breaks with traditional tone and made it a gateway building.
- Inquired if there were any barriers that they encountered when working on the project. (Stated that the overlay ordinance gave guide to how to get to the building and enjoyed working with the incentive programs which allowed them to include things such as underground parking, LEED, etc. that would normally be cost prohibitive.
- Inquired about what kind of lighting was being used. (Low wattage and LED.)
- Inquired about heating and cooling. (This was still being discussed with possibly a water source or heat pump driven by electricity.)
- Expressed appreciation of the way that the project acknowledged pedestrian activity on Calder Way.
- Expressed appreciation for the interesting design elements and good functionality.
- Encouraged additional thought about the windows in the residential areas and adding a screening layer for privacy.
- Inquired if the windows were operable. (Portions of the windows are operable in the lower sections for venting. There would be a mechanical system that would draw interior air out. They were researching frosted glass or a roller shade.)
- Expressed concern that since the glass is on the North and East sides of the building, it might lose heat in the glass units.

Comments from community members:
Mr. Huncik inquired if there would be composting on site and expressed concern about the odors that would be produced by composting or storing refuse inside of the building. Mr. Hrankowsky stated that he did not believe there was any plan to compost. He also noted that he did not know the protocol, but he felt that they would schedule pickups frequently enough that there would not cause an odor problem. Mr. Huncik inquired how the refuse trucks would access the dumpster and Mr. Hrankowsky explained that it would be accessed by a loading area just to the West of the loading dock and that the refuse area was at grade and set back from the alley to allow space for the trucks.

Mr. Huncik inquired where a second truck would go if two vehicles would be on the premises at the same time and Mr. Hrankowsky stated that the deliveries would be coordinated to ensure there would not be that situation, but there was enough space that a second truck could pull into the refuse area to wait until the loading dock was available. Mr. Huncik noted that the fact that Calder Way has two way traffic behind the building could cause traffic conflicts.

Mr. Huncik inquired about the parking spaces in the underground garage and how a customer would know if there was a designated retail space was available prior to driving into the garage. Mr. Hrankowsky explained that they were still exploring options

for that issue and suggested possibly having an attendant or a digital sign or a drop arm to get a ticket. He also stated that this was an ongoing discussion as they were still negotiating with the tenant. Mr. Huncik inquired about the parking for the employees of the store and suggested that consideration be given for bus stop or bus unloading areas for one of the retirement community buses.

Mr. Huncik noted that there were large windows along College Avenue and inquired how those windows would not become full of large advertisements, beverage signs, etc. Mr. Hrankowsky explained that this would not be allowed in the lease, but he also noted that the tenant was very serious about keeping the store front clean without signs.

Mr. Huncik noted that there seemed to be more 3-4 bedrooms units than 1-2 units and that this may not be what would be needed with inclusionary housing. He stated that if the inclusionary housing would target single parent families then they may not need bigger units which could be unaffordable. He also noted that it might be beneficial to have some common area for the children. Mr. Hrankowsky explained that there would be a quantity of 1 and 2 bedroom units which would be declared as inclusionary housing. These units could be used for a recent graduate, or a young family, or a single family.

Mr. Huncik inquired about the trend that rooms become football rentals, short term rentals, or event weekend rentals and Mr. Hrankowsky explained that this would be precluded through the lease.

Ms. Venegoni inquired where the inclusionary housing units would be located within the building. Mr. Hrankowsky explained that there did not need to be a permanent location for the units, they just to keep a certain number and they needed to be spread out throughout the floors.

Ms. Venegoni inquired if the units would be rented by the apartment or by the bed and Mr. Hrankowsky responded that the units would be rented by the bed.

Mr. Stone inquired about how the property would be controlled regarding signage posted in the windows by the residents. Mr. Hrankowsky explained that would be stated in the lease and that management would be required to ensure that any signs were removed quickly.

Mr. Stone inquired about using less glass or making it more reflective and Mr. Hrankowsky explained that the type of glass had not be selected prior to the renderings and that management would choose the best product for the use.

Mr. Stone inquired about the increased pedestrian traffic in the area due to the addition of the grocery store to the project. He raised a concern about the possible need for additional traffic studies due to this change. In addition, he expressed a concern about the loss of parking and inquired as to how many parking stalls would be reserved for the grocery store. Mr. Hrankowsky responded that there would be approximately 13 spaces, but that could possibly be expanded by a contract with the public garages if the traffic to

the site would require additional parking. Mr. Stone expressed concern about people parking on Foster Avenue to visit the store.

Mr. Stone inquired if the simulated wood could be a darker color which might be a richer color. He stated that the residents might have liked to have expressed their opinions on what color palette would work best in the area. Mr. Hrankowsky noted that the simulated wood was an accent material and there was not much of it.

Mr. Hrankowsky inquired about procedures as the project moved forward and Ms. Messner explained that the Final Plan would be presented to the Planning Commission on June 23 for approval. The plans would not need to be reviewed by the Design Review Board again unless there were substantial design changes and those should be submitted to Ms. Messner for her to decide if there was a need to take the plans back to the Board.

Official Reports and Correspondence

Ms. Messner noted that there was a vacancy in the Historic Resources Commission and requested that the Board encourage anybody interest parties to apply.

Adjournment

With no further business to discuss, this meeting was adjourned at 12:31 p.m. by a motion from Mr. Reinhardt.

Respectfully submitted by,
Sarah E. Smith, Staff Assistant