

**Meeting Minutes
State College Borough Design Review Board
August 16, 2016**

The State College Borough Design Review Board (DRB) met on Tuesday, August 16, 2016 in the State College Borough Municipal Building, 243 South Allen Street in Room 241. Chairman Bryant called the meeting to order at 10:01 a.m.

Members present

Richard Bryant, Chairman; Bond Reinhardt, Vice-Chairman and Richard Devon

Others Present:

Anne Messner, Planner/Zoning Officer; Jenna Wargo, Planner; Steven Watson, Dave Lopatka and Sarah Smith, Staff Assistant

Approval of Minutes

A motion was made by Mr. Devon and seconded by Mr. Reinhardt to approve the August 1, 2016 minutes as submitted. The vote was unanimously in favor

Chair Report

Chairman Bryant had nothing to report.

Public Hour

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

Land Development Plan

Preliminary Plan Building Entrance Addition to Nursing Sciences Building, UPD Sub District 5 Zoning District, The Pennsylvania State University, owner, Reuther+Bowen, Engineer, Kimmel Bogrette Architecture + Site, Architect

Mr. Watson's highlights included:

- The project is for a 1200 square foot addition to nursing sciences building.
- Includes a new entryway with a primarily glass structure including an elevator.
- Small trees were being relocated. Several of the larger trees needed to be removed. There would be some new landscaping put in and there were large hemlocks in the front that would be remaining. Ms. Messner noted that the arborist was out of town so was unable to review the landscaping plan.
- There would be some foyer seating areas.
- Not much would be changing with regards to the site perspective, just where the entryway was making the addition the new main entry into the facility.
- Some of the sidewalk area would be removed and a sidewalk built to move the handicap accessible sidewalk.

- Stormwater issues had initially been meant to tie into the retention areas, but those needed to stay separate so a low profile concrete box had been designed to hold back the water of the two to ten year storms.

The Board's comments/questions included:

- Inquired if the rest of the building made sense with the entrance in the new location. Mr. Lopatka noted that the entrance comes out mid-floor with an elevator bank and stairs. The project was planning to make a separation with the medical clinic.
- Expressed appreciation of the visual appeal and that the addition appeared to blend well with the rest of the building.
- Inquired if the pedestrian access followed logically. Mr. Lopatka explained that the grading should follow smoothly around the stone monument already in place and it should follow logically.
- Inquired about the seating area out front. Mr. Lopatka explained that the seating area would be near the accessible route into the building with a two foot sitting wall around the seating area.
- Commented that the glass front would let a lot of light into the building and inquired if the light went anywhere inside the building.
- Inquired about a drop off area for the facility as the entrance driveway seemed to be quite tight. Mr. Lopatka noted that vehicles could drop off passengers at the sidewalks without parking. He also noted that the scope of the project only went to the curb line. This project did not address the drive entrance.
- Inquired as to why the stormwater retention had been designed as a tank rather than as pipes. Mr. Lopatka noted that this was at the recommendation of Larry Fennessey of Penn State University Utility Services as they can get more storage with the tank.
- Inquired if there was a policy at Penn State regarding the removal of mature trees and replacing them. Mr. Watson explained that there is a University Tree Commission that reviews all of the trees. There is no net loss when doing a project as year after year, the University is adding to the tree inventory. There is a budget for tree planting and they are currently having difficulty finding locations for trees that will not be built up at a later date.

Mr. Bryant inquired if the Board's comments could be summarized and Ms. Messner responded that she had enough information to continue the process.

Mr. Bryant inquired about the construction time frame and Mr. Lopatka stated that they were intending to get a final development plan back before the Board sometime in September as they have an aggressive schedule and intend to start the work towards the end of September.

Mr. Watson noted that the building would have a clinic for minor ailments for Penn State University faculty and staff. The project was planned to give more of a 'face' to the building. The clinic would have the nursing students involved with it.

Official Reports and Correspondence

Borough Council (BC): Ms. Messner reported Council met and voted to combine HRC and DRB. Staff had put together a draft ordinance for BC which had been approved. Chairman Bryant inquired if there were advertisement and public hearing requirements for that type of change and Ms. Messner responded that those were not required because it was part of the general codification rather than the Zoning Ordinance. Ms. Messner stated that the new Board would be named the Design and Historic Review Board and this change would go into effect as of first of the year. She noted that staff did not have all of the details yet, but she was anticipating that if the members would like to continue to serve then they would be invited to do so. She stated that the DHRB was planned to consist of seven members and that since there were so few members on the DRB and the HRC, staff was hoping to be able to keep the members and simply combine. Ms. Messner stated she would get the new ordinance to the Board to review.

Mr. Reinholdt inquired when and where the meetings would be held. Ms. Messner stated that once the membership was established then the members would be polled to establish the date and time. She inquired if the DRB members had a preference and the members wished to keep it the same as their meeting. Ms. Messner noted that the combination of the two Boards had been discussed at the last HRC meeting and that staff would have to wait to see how the process unfolds. She stated that there could be a possibility to hold of holding one meeting per month during the day and one meeting in the evening.

Mr. Devon inquired what kind of agenda the Commission brings to their Board. Ms. Messner stated that the Commission monitors two historic districts, reviews house plaques on contributing buildings, and reviews land development plans that affect contributing buildings. She noted that the combining of the two Boards will take a little bit of adjustment since the two groups have slightly different emphasis, but the Borough thinks the two can be combined. Mr. Devon expressed concerns about the different viewpoints and different functions. He suggested that there was a possibility of a struggle at the meetings regarding different functions. He inquired what opinions the HRC members would be able to offer on new construction buildings.

Mr. Devon inquired who decided if a historic resources plaque is placed outside of a home. Ms. Messner stated that there is a list of properties that were a part of the submission to the national park and those addresses would be the only ones that were eligible for a plaque.

Next, Ms. Messner reported that the Capital Improvement Plan was adopted. There was some discussion regarding the proposed action park at Orchard Park. Mr. Devon noted that he had heard some concern about the action park being built at Tussey View Park, but he did not think that would be such a bad idea there. Ms. Messner stated that the CIP called for staff to review all the parks to see where an action park might best fit. Mr. Devon inquired if it would be better to obtain a couple of acres to put in a park or to put in a couple of action park items into an existing park. Ms. Messner noted that the CIP was a guide for staff to use studies and budgets in order to get a proposal for an action park. She stated that the CIP chose not to designate a park to be built in 2017, but that

staff was doing a review and building a proposal on the subject. Mr. Devon inquired why there seemed to be dissent to the project. He stated that it seemed like building an action park would provide a good outlet for those types of activities rather than putting that activity into other facilities that are not designed for those activities.

Finally, Ms. Messner reported that the new Police Chief, Chief John Gardner, was sworn in.

Planning Commission (PC): Ms. Messner reported the PC would be seeing the land development plan at their next meeting.

Historic Resources Commission (HRC): Ms. Messner noted that the HRC would be getting the same information on the combining of the two meetings as was reviewed with the DRB.

Mr. Devon inquired what the designation between 'history' and 'present' and Ms. Messner responded that the Borough had no defined policy, but that the standard was typically 50 years. She noted that the important part of designating 'historical' was the collective theme that the buildings created.

Adjournment

With no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 10:39 a.m. by a motion from Mr. Bryant and a second from Mr. Devon.

Respectfully submitted by,
Sarah E. Smith, Staff Assistant