

Meeting Minutes
State College Borough Design Review Board
July 19, 2016

The State College Borough Design Review Board (DRB) met on Tuesday, July 19, 2016 in the State College Borough Municipal Building, 243 South Allen Street in Room 241. Vice-Chairman Bond Reinhardt called the meeting to order at 10:01 a.m.

Members present

Bond Reinhardt, Vice-Chairman; Richard Devon, and Sandra Staub.

Others Present:

Jenna Wargo, Planner; Alan Sam, Arborist; Sarah Smith, Staff Assistant; Mark Saville, Sweetland Engineering; Dwayne Rush, Eric Boeldt, Steven Watson, and Margaret Gray.

Approval of Minutes

The Board reviewed the minutes from the June 7th and June 21st Design Review Board meetings. There was a minor correction on the minutes from June 7th, which would be corrected. Mr. Devon made a motion to approve the minutes as corrected and Ms. Staub seconded the motion. The vote was unanimously in favor.

Chair Report

Chairman Bryant was not in attendance so there was no Chair Report.

Public Hour

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

Land Development Plan

Final Plan New Academic Building, Replacement of Fenske Lab for Chemical Engineering and Biomedical Engineering, UPD Sub district 5 Zoning District, The Pennsylvania State University, owner; Sweetland Engineering, Engineer; and HOK, Architect

Mr. Saville's highlights included:

- There was a note added to the Land Development Plan which explained the parking. The displaced parking area would be absorbed by the adjacent service parking areas and the Eisenhower Parking Deck.
- The plans showed the existing utilities and trees.
- The Plan included a minimalistic approach to impervious surface and the plan decreased the impervious surface by over 5,000 square feet.
- The stormwater plan included a subsurface retention center and the inclusion of a new rain garden.

- The pedestrian access will be maintained while the building is under construction.
- The new plan would create connectivity with the Greenway across campus.
- The north elevation included changes to help offset flat face and to give it more character.
- The lower level included a lecture hall and lab spaces.
- The first level included lab spaces, office spaces, and lecture spaces. In addition, it included main entrances and the green roof.
- The upper levels included lab spaces.

Boards' comments included:

- The storm water retention was not noted on the legend. It should be included to show what that shading depicted.
- Inquired if the sidewalk continued all the way past the building. (The sidewalk did continue. It was just under the tree canopy on the plan sheet.)
- Inquired about the setback of the mechanical systems on the roof and inquired if it would be possible to hide the superstructure in a more aesthetic manner in order to mitigate the impact on the building. (The lab space causes a lot of the difficulties in changing the aesthetics due to the need for additional vents, etc. It was mentioned that the penthouse had shrouding so the mechanicals were not exposed. It was noted that due to elevations and setback, the penthouse would not be visible. The plan included tying in the Zinc exterior, a differentiation in the materials and a big setback which limit the visibility of it.) Ms. Staub inquired if the exterior materials and the vents would be difficult to keep clear of dirt.
- Inquired if the air in the superstructure would be treated. (The air was not treated, but was being drawn out by a fan).
- Inquired if the green roof had been included for stormwater management. (It was not included for that, but to mitigate the heat island effect and a muting effect. They had not included it because they had not wanted it in the DEP permit so that they could modify it if they wished to without reapplying to the DEP.)
- Inquired about the mechanicals, if the building would be using standard louvers, and what the superstructure would look like over time. (Using horizontal architectural louvers in order to include a rain screen and maximize air flow.)
- Inquired about the warm air that was being exhausted. (They are maximizing energy reintroduction in all ways possible.)
- Inquired what LEED status they were attempting to achieve with the building. (They were targeting Silver, but hoping to get Gold.)
- Mentioned that the building was very well done overall.
- Noted that even mechanicals could be well designed by including an element to integrate it into the façade and make the superstructure a part of the building.
- Suggested making the drawings as clear as possible in order to show how the building makes improvements.
- Noted that 3D drawings were helpful and stated that including some renderings that would focus on landscaping would be beneficial.

Mr. Sam inquired as to where the rain garden would be located and Mr. Rush explained that it was part of the landscaping plan. Mr. Sam inquired if the applicant had received any feedback from the engineers on the functionality of the rain garden. Mr. Rush noted that there is a significant increase to the maintenance, but there had not been much water quality research on the water that goes back into the stormwater system. Mr. Devon suggested that maintaining the rain garden would be a good project for a student club. Mr. Rush stated that since it was an urban structure and an urban area, the additional maintenance required there be a lining underneath which would make the maintenance and landscaping difficult for a student club to keep up with.

Mr. Boeldt had a suggestion to include horizontal and vertical lines that could mimic the façade so as to appear to be an extension of the building. Mr. Rush noted that the south side of the building included some lines in the façade.

Mr. Devon made a motion to approve the Land Development Plan and Ms. Staub seconded the motion. The vote was unanimously in favor.

Official Reports and Correspondence

Ms. Wargo reported on the North Atherton Street improvements and stated that the Board could become a party if they wished to complete an application. She stated that Ms. Messner thought the Board might be interested since the improvements went through the College Heights Historic District and that Ms. Messner could be the liaison for the Board. Mr. Boeldt stated that he thought the street was going to be widened slightly. Ms. Staub inquired if the sidewalks were going to be removed. Mr. Sam stated that the lanes were nonconforming and the project was to bring the lanes into current standards. In addition, he thought that the project would include the building of retaining walls in certain areas. Mr. Devon stated that the Board was interested in aesthetics not in the historic aspect. The Board overall decided that they did not wish to be a party.

Mr. Boeldt inquired about an agenda item that he had thought was going to be discussed which was the possible merging of the Design Review Board and the Historic Resources Commission. Mr. Boeldt noted that the reason for the suggestion was partially due to the difficulty for getting quorum. Ms. Wargo explained that it was previously on the agenda, but the discussion would be postponed since Ms. Messner was not in attendance.

Adjournment

With no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 10:43 a.m. by a motion from Mr. Devon and second from Ms. Staub.

Respectfully submitted by,
Sarah E. Smith, Staff Assistant