I. Call to Order

II. Roll Call

III. Election of Officers

IV. Approval of Minutes

V. Chair Report

VI. Public Hour - Hearing of Citizens

VII. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
   A. 400 South Gill Street

VIII. Submittal for 251 South Pugh Street
   A. 251 South Pugh Street

IX. Work Program
   A. State of Preservation Report

X. Miscellaneous
   A. 2019 Conflict of Interest Policy

XI. Upcoming Meeting(s)

XII. Adjournment

Documents:

Complete Historical Architectural Review Board Agenda - February 5, 2019.pdf
I. Call to Order

II. Roll Call

Rosalie Bloom-Brooks
Eric Boeldt
Richard Bryant
Harry Burd
Chuck Gambone
Alan Popovich
Eric White

III. Election of Officers

A. Election of a Chair and Vice-Chair

IV. Approval of Minutes – November 6, 2018 (Page 3)

V. Chair Report

VI. Public Hour - Hearing of Citizens

VII. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

A. 400 South Gill Street

On January 10, 2019, applicants Eric Boeldt and Anita Genger submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness application to repair the side porch roof by re-roofing and re-sloping the porch facing South Gill Street at 400 South Gill Street, a contributing structure in the Holmes-Foster/Highlands Historic District. As the applicant’s state, this project is necessary because “poor original design and settling have resulted in roof leaks.” Since the application involves removing the roof of the porch, which is a character-defining feature of the house, and adding a new roof, this project is considered an addition, and therefore, must be reviewed by the Historical Architectural Review Board (HARB) to determine compliance with the Heritage State College Guidelines.

Attached to the agenda on pages 6-19 is the Certificate of Appropriateness application, the HARB checklist for Additions or Renovations (to help with the review), and the review letter from Winter & Company. It is the opinion of Winter & Co. that this application should be approved, and the applicants be permitted to proceed with the proposed work, considering the comments noted in the review letter for each specific topic.
HARB Action: The HARB is asked to make a recommendation to Borough Council for approval or disapproval. Comments made by the Board will be incorporated into the report sent to Borough Council.

VIII. Submittal for 251 South Pugh Street

A. 251 South Pugh Street

On January 31, 2019, staff received a land development plan for 251 South Pugh Street. The application is being reviewed under the zoning requirements pertaining to the former Historic Resources Commission (HRC).

251 S. Pugh Street is a contributing structure in the 1995 National Register Nomination for the Holmes-Foster/Highlands Historic District. The applicant plans to remove the existing front porch and construct a two-story addition to the front of the structure. The addition will be visible from Pugh Street.

Attached to the agenda on pages 20-25 is the submitted land development plan from Evanko-Renwick Engineering.

NOTE: This review is ADVISORY only since this structure is contributing within the National Register Nomination, but is not located within the Local Historic District.

IX. Work Program

A. State of Preservation Report

Every other year, the HRC reviews the draft State of Preservation Report. Attached to the agenda is the Biennial State of Preservation Report beginning on page 26.

HARB Action: Please review and provide comments at this meeting.

X. Miscellaneous

A. 2019 Conflict of Interest Policy

On April 18, 2005, Borough Council adopted a “Conflict of Interest Policy and Code of Conduct with Regard to HUD Programs”. Elected and appointed officials are to receive a copy of the policy at a regular meeting of their respective council, authority, board, or commission. A copy of the policy is attached for review. (Page 39)

XI. Upcoming Meeting

March 12, 2019 at 7 p.m.

XII. Adjournment
The State College Borough Historical Architectural Review Board (HARB) met on Tuesday, November 6, 2018 in the State College Borough Municipal Building, 243 S. Allen Street. Mr. Edward LeClear called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Members Present

Rosalie Bloom-Brooks; Eric Boeldt, Chairman; Richard Bryant; Harry Burd; Alan Popovich; and Eric White, Vice-Chairman

Members Absent

Chuck Gambone

Others Present

Edward LeClear, Director of Planning; Jenna Wargo, Planner; John Wilson, Zoning Officer; and Denise Dobo, Administrative Assistant

Election of Officers

A motion was made by Ms. Bloom-Brooks to nominate Mr. Boeldt as Chairman. Mr. White seconded, and the vote was approved unanimously. A motion was made by Mr. Boeldt to nominate Mr. White as Vice-Chairman and Ms. Bloom-Brooks seconded. The vote was unanimously approved.

Approval of Minutes

There were no minutes to approve.

Chair Report

There was no chair report given.

Public Hour - Hearing of Citizens

No comments or concerns were heard during the public hour.

Submittal for 301 Hartswick Avenue

301 Hartswick Avenue

The building permit application was received prior to the Historical Architectural Review Board (HARB) enactment date of October 1, 2018. The two-story property was situated...
on a corner lot in the R-2 Zoning District of College Heights and a contributing structure in the College Heights Historic District. The applicants have met zoning requirements and all requirements for a Design Review Board (DRB) review.

Brennan Glantz, Glantz Engineering, presented the proposed addition noting the main entrance was located on Hartswick Avenue and the addition would be visible from Holmes Street. The proposed addition’s rear roof would be virtually invisible from the main entrance on Hartswick Avenue.

The HARB’s comments included:

- Ms. Bloom-Brooks asked what type of siding would be used and Mr. Glantz replied wood or cement with the same appearance as the original.
- Mr. Burd asked about matching the stone and Mr. Glantz noted it would be matched and would be complimentary to the existing stone.
- Mr. Bryant inquired about sliding doors in the proposed addition. Mr. Glantz reported that they were at grade level.
- Mr. Boeldt asked if the windows were the same and Mr. Glantz acknowledge they will project the same light pattern.

Mr. Boeldt developed a checklist and his comments on the structure included:

- Located subordinate of structure.
- Not flush with original.
- Site topography – features are reserved.
- Defining features of structure are reserved.
- Rooftop setback from the front.
- Design compatible with neighboring properties.
- Foundation and floor height match original.
- Compatible materials.
- Solid to void ratio – fits in.
- New roof would be the same material.
- Exterior materials blend with original.
- Excessive building solutions have minimal visual impact.
- Structure preserves historic features to meet changing needs.

Ms. Bloom-Brooks asked if the garage doors would be similar to the depiction in the drawing and Mr. Glantz replied the type of doors currently have not been chosen but will not be a standard builder grade.

Mr. Boeldt made a motion to move the plan forward to Borough Council and Mr. Popovich seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

Draft 2018 and 2019 Meeting Calendars

2018 Meeting Calendar/2019 Meeting Calendar
Mr. White made a motion to accept the 2018 and 2019 Meeting Calendar and Ms. Bloom-Brooks seconded. The vote was unanimously approved.

**Work Program**

**2019 Work Program**

Mr. Popovich made a motion to approve the 2019 Work Program and Mr. White seconded the motion. The vote was unanimously approved.

**Adjournment**

There being no further business, Chairman Boeldt adjourned the meeting at 6:38 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Denise Dobo, Administrative Assistant
Historical Architectural Review Board Agenda
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HISTORIC AND ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
OF STATE COLLEGE, PENNSYLVANIA

Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) Application

This is a request for issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) by Borough Council and the Historic and Architectural Review Board (HARB) for work proposed to be performed on the exterior of a contributing structure or new construction located in the College Heights or Holmes-Foster/Highlands Historic Districts. Please complete all sections of this form. COA is not complete until the project complies with the Zoning Ordinance.

APPLICANT AND PROPERTY OWNER INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant Name:</th>
<th>Eric Boeldt &amp; Anita Geiger</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address:</td>
<td>400 S. Gill St, State St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone Number:</td>
<td>814 - 237 - 0845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email Address:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:eboeldt@gmail.com">eboeldt@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner Name &amp; Phone Number:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(if different from Applicant)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner Address:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(if different from Applicant)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROPERTY INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tax Parcel No.</th>
<th>Property Address:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36 - 017 - 023 - 000</td>
<td>400 S. Gill St</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning District:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R-2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historic District:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holmes-Foster/Highlands</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Project:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Addition to the front 50% of the house</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BUILDING IMPROVEMENTS

Describe the proposed project including materials and dimensions. Attach a separate sheet if necessary.

See Attached

ITEMS REQUIRED WITH SUBMITTAL

Staff reserves the right to request any additional information necessary to complete the review of the requested work.

Documents may be submitted digitally or in 8.5" x 11" format. Please fold to appropriate size if larger.

- [ ] Dimensional Site Plan to include:
  - Scale, north arrow, street names and address
  - Footprint of all existing and proposed structures
  - Location/Type of driveways and sidewalks
  - All existing and proposed building setbacks (front, rear, and side)
  - All existing and proposed parking and fencing
  - All known easements

- [ ] Photographs; including all property structures and streetscapes

- [ ] Dimensioned sketches or architectural floor plans; all four elevations, and building sections of the proposed work drawn to legible scale. Drawings shall clearly distinguish between existing and proposed work.

- [ ] Specifications, materials, and sample of materials to be used
HISTORIC AND ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
OF STATE COLLEGE, PENNSYLVANIA
Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) Application

SUBMISSION INSTRUCTIONS

To submit applications to Planning Department:
- email documents to planningdept@statecollegepa.us (attachments must be less than 10MB)
- https://wetransfer.com may be utilized for larger documents, or
- contact staff to set up an appointment to drop off a thumb drive and nine (9) sets of all materials, including photographs.

MEETING SCHEDULE

- Applications are due by 4PM, 14 calendar days in advance of the HARB meeting.
- Application deadlines are firm. All materials must be submitted by the deadline to be considered at the following HARB meeting. Designs must be final at the time of application; revisions will not be accepted after the deadline.
- The HARB will not accept new material or redesigns presented at the HARB meeting. Deferral until the following month's meeting may be necessary in such cases to allow for adequate review by staff and board members.
- The owner or agent for the owner must be present at the meeting of the HARB at the time this application is reviewed. Failure to be represented will result in the application being denied.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2018 MEETING DATES</th>
<th>COA APPLICATION DEADLINES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>November 6</td>
<td>October 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 4</td>
<td>November 19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2019 MEETING DATES</th>
<th>COA APPLICATION DEADLINES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 8</td>
<td>December 24, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 5</td>
<td>January 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 5</td>
<td>February 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2</td>
<td>March 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 7</td>
<td>April 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 4</td>
<td>May 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2</td>
<td>June 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 6</td>
<td>July 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 3</td>
<td>August 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 1</td>
<td>September 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 5</td>
<td>October 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 3</td>
<td>November 18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AFFIDAVIT

I hereby certify that I am the owner in fee or the authorized agent of the owner in fee of the property upon which the work authorized by the permit sought will be performed. All work will be performed in accordance with all applicable laws of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and this jurisdiction.

Signature of Owner or Authorized Agent: [Signature]

Print Name: Eric J. Baulet
400 South Gill Street is a contributing house, built for William and Mary Lutz Fye, c. 1922, of limestone quarried from behind the Hamilton Avenue Plaza.

Tax parcel # = 36-017-023-0000
Type of Project: Side porch roof repair and re-slope, eliminating built-in concealed gutters.

The current project is the re-roofing and re-sloping of the porch facing South Gill Street. Modifications of this porch are required because poor original design and settling have resulted in roof leaks. This porch has been re-roofed twice in thirty years and the right end of the roof is leaking (again).

The porch roof has Yankee (concealed or built-in) gutters. Discharge from the gutters is currently piped through the soffit at the left end of the porch. This is a risky method, since downspout leaking caused by leaf, twigs, and acorn blockage causes the downspout to leak invisibly within the soffit. To eliminate this danger, after the repair and reroof, exterior copper gutters and downspouts will be installed. These will match those on the rest of the house.

Because century-old oaks extend over this porch, and neither tar paper nor membrane roofing has lasted more than fourteen years, a metal roof seems desirable. The minimum slope for concealed-fastener 24-gauge roof is 1:12 which produces a 4.8 degree slope. Thinner-gauge roofing is available that can be used for lower slopes. However, the thicker metal should reduce the likelihood of damage from tree litter. Also, the use of this product allows for the use of concealed fasteners.

Any replacement trim pieces will be matched to the original style with profiles identical or nearly identical to the original.

If not for problems due to the poorly conceived original design, no modifications would be performed.

Additionally, a contributing auxiliary building, behind 400 South Gill Street at 610 West Nittany Avenue, will soon need its roofing replaced. We plan to use metal roofing identical to the roofing on this porch. Concealed fasteners are highly desirable for this more visible location.
HISTORIC AND ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
OF STATE COLLEGE, PENNSYLVANIA
Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) Application

STAFF USE ONLY

Application accepted ______ Yes ______ No ______

APPLICATION PAID $50

Yes ______ No ______
Cash _____ Check _____ CC _____

RECOMMENDED BY STAFF

☐ Approval Date: __________
☐ Disapproval

RECOMMENDED BY THE HARB

☐ Approval Date: __________
☐ Disapproval Vote: ______ For ______ Against

REVIEW AND ACTION OF BOROUGH COUNCIL

I hereby certify that a Certificate of Appropriateness was ☐ granted ☐ denied by the Borough of State College Council on the ______________ day of __________________, ________.

__________________________________________
Borough of State College Planning Department

Date

RECORD OF EVENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REVIEW</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Received by Planning Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewed by Planning Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARB Review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Recommend Approval to Borough Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disapproval</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Recommend Disapproval to Borough Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borough Council Review and Action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval: Certificate of Appropriateness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disapproval: Letter to Applicant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permit Issued</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Inspection by Staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Permit issued by: ____________________________
Permit No. ____________________________
Historical Architectural Review Board Agenda
February 5, 2019
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Porch Rafters Replacement
Increase Pitch
Right Elevation
12/18/18

Central States MFG.
Central Snap Steel Roofing 1/12 Pitch
Ph. 1-817-931-2764

Synthetic underlayment
7/16 OSB roof sheathing
2x6 SPF rafters 12" OC.
Copper gutter

Top Rafter AT Beam
2x6 PT. Plate Bolted To Beam

10" Existing Steel I-Beam
Existing fascia to remain

Repair damaged wood as needed
Porch Rafters Replacement

2x6 Rafters, 12" O.C.

Existing 10" Steel Beam

3/8" web

22' 4"
Every project looks beautiful with this easy to install panel.

Central Snap® has a modern 1 3/4" high snap-lock joint making it ideal for residential, light commercial and architectural applications. Central Snap® is available in overall coverage widths of 16" or 18". It offers an architecturally pleasing look over solid decking.

- Snap-together panel, no field seaming required.
- Factory applied sealant insures a weather-tight and secure lap.
- Available with a 1 1/8" notch on either end of the panel for the ease of turning under, reducing installation labor and costs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pitch</th>
<th>Gauge</th>
<th>Overall Coverage</th>
<th>Rib Height</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16&quot; x 18&quot;</td>
<td>1 3/4&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<image>
ROOF PREPARATION

Central Snap can be installed over solid decking or over purlins/open framing without insulation at 3' O.C. Do not install over an existing asphalt shingle roof. It is the responsibility of the contractor to ensure a suitable substrate prior to the application of Central Snap. Substructures should be designed to meet all necessary code requirements. Green lumber is not recommended as moisture can damage the metal panels and cause fasteners to back out.

SOLID DECKING

1. Make sure decking is smooth, level and in good condition. Remove any debris that might interfere with installation.
2. Apply 30 lb. felt or synthetic underlayment using nails or staples.

OPEN FRAMING

Central Snap can be installed directly over purlins/wood framing without insulation. Check load tables to ensure that purlin spacing is adequate for your load requirements. This method should only be used for heated spaces if adequate protection against condensation is used. Without this protection, the underside of the panel may collect condensation and drip into structure.
2. Begin installation of trim and panels following guidelines on pages 10-11.
APPLICATION FOR BUILDING PERMIT

APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS: Documents to be submitted with an application for –

NEW SINGLE FAMILY BUILDINGS – Zoning, Water and Sewer Permits and Two Sets of Plans
NEW COMMERCIAL BUILDINGS – Zoning, Water and Sewer Permits, Two Sets of Plans
BUILDING ADDITIONS – Zoning Permit, Two Sets of Plans and May Need Water and/or Sewer Permits
OTHER WORK – Two Sets of Plans and May Need Zoning, Water and Sewer Permits

LOCATION OF PROPOSED WORK OR IMPROVEMENT

Municipality: State College Borough
Tax Parcel No.: 36-017-023-0000
Number and Street: 400 S. Gill St

TYPE AND COST OF WORK OR IMPROVEMENT

Type of Improvement
1 □ New building
2 □ Addition
3 □ Alteration
4 □ Repair, replacement
5 □ Demolition
6 □ Electrical (only)
7 □ Sprinkler System (only)

Declared Cost (Omit cents)

$ 5000

Describe Work:
Replace porch roof rafters and roof covering, strip, repair, & steal

Will this be used as a rental? □ Yes X No

Dimensions
Height in feet .............. 16
Number of stories ............ 1
Total square feet of all floor areas (inc. garage & basement) based on exterior dimensions ...... NA

Type of sewage disposal
□ Public or private company
□ Private (septic tank, etc.)

Type of water supply
□ Public or private company
□ Private (well, cistern)

IDENTIFICATION

Name  Mailing address - number, street, city, and state  Phone no.
1. Owner  Eric Boeldt  400 S Gill St  814-
2. Contractor  Whitman  145 N. Hoffer Ave  PA 16801  814-
3. Architect  Whitman  444 Contracting

AFFIDANT

I hereby certify that I am the owner in fee or the authorized agent of the owner in fee of the property upon which the work authorized by the permit sought will be performed. All work will be performed in accordance with all applicable laws of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and this jurisdiction.

Signature of owner or authorized agent: Eric Boeldt
Print Name: Eric Boeldt
Address: 400 S Gill St
Application date
E-mail: eboeldt@gmail.com
### ZONING PLAN EXAMINER'S NOTES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Lot Square Footage</th>
<th>Percent Coverage</th>
<th>Permit No.</th>
<th>Number of off-street parking spaces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

- Zoning Permit Not Required

### OCCUPANCY INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Construction</th>
<th>Number of Units</th>
<th>Maximum Occupancy Load</th>
<th>Maximum Live Loads lbs. per sq. ft.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BASEMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRST FLOOR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECOND FLOOR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THIRD FLOOR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOURTH FLOOR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIFTH FLOOR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIXTH FLOOR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Use Group

- SEVENTH FLOOR
- EIGHTH FLOOR
- NINTH FLOOR
- TENTH FLOOR
- OTHER
- ROOF

### VALIDATION

- Building
- Permit Number
- Date
- Permit Issued 20
- Permit Fee $ 
- Approved
## HARB Checklist for Additions or Renovations

The goal of this meeting is to assure that the proposed construction meets State College Borough’s overall goal of preserving the historic neighborhoods by preserving the features of the original historic homes while allowing growth and change to individual buildings to meet the changing needs and desires of property owners.

An official vote to RECOMMEND that State College Borough Council approve or deny the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness will take place. An approval with conditions is also possible. This recommendation will be passed to the Borough Council for their action at their next voting meeting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>✓</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Sec.</th>
<th>Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Considering lot and location, the addition is minimally visible from the street(s).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2)</td>
<td>4.1 (a)(b)</td>
<td>Addition is located to be subordinate to the structure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3)</td>
<td>4.1 (c)(d)</td>
<td>The addition is not flush with, or forward of, original structure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4)</td>
<td>4.2 (a)</td>
<td>Site topography and site features are preserved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5)</td>
<td>4.2 (b)</td>
<td>Character defining features of structure are preserved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6)</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Rooftop additions are setback from front to minimize impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7)</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>The design is compatible with existing structure, neighbors, and neighborhood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8)</td>
<td>4.4 (e)</td>
<td>Foundation heights and floor heights match those of the original.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9)</td>
<td>4.5 (a)</td>
<td>Compatible or simplified materials slightly distinguish addition from original.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10)</td>
<td>4.5 (c)</td>
<td>The addition does not contrast starkly with the original.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11)</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>The solid-to-void ratio (door and window spacing) on the addition preserves the ratio of that on the original building. Window muntin design is compatible with original.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12)</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>Roof is compatible with but visually subordinate to original.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13)</td>
<td>4.7 (a)</td>
<td>Roof shape and slope are similar to original.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14)</td>
<td>4.7 (b)</td>
<td>Roof materials are similar and compatible with original and throughout neighborhood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15)</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>Exterior materials are similar and compatible with original and throughout the neighborhood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16)</td>
<td>4.8 (c)</td>
<td>If not copying original materials, use materials found in the neighborhood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17)</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>Accessibility solutions have minimum visual impact and are easily reversed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18)</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>A new front porch is not added or expanded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19)</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>A new side porch is in scale to the house and neighborhood with appropriate roofline.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Suggestions:
MEMORANDUM

TO: Jenna Wargo, Planner, Borough of State College
State College Historic and Architectural Review Board (HARB)

FROM: Winter & Company

DATE: February 5, 2019

RE: Review of HARB Application for 400 S. Gill Street

On January 10, 2019, applicants Eric Boeldt and Anita Genger submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness application to repair the side porch roof by re-roofing and re-sloping the porch facing South Gill Street at 400 S. Gill Street, a contributing structure in the Holmes-Foster Highlands Historic District. As the applicants state, this project is necessary because “poor original design and settling have resulted in roof leaks.” Since the application involves removing the roof of the porch, which is a character-defining feature of the house, and adding a new roof, this project is considered an addition, and therefore, must be reviewed by the HARB to determine compliance with the Heritage State College Design Guidelines.

General Compliance with the Heritage State College Design Guidelines
As submitted, it is the opinion of Winter & Company that this application should be approved and the applicants should be permitted to proceed with the proposed work, considering the comments noted below with each specific topic. While the application proposes the removal of a component of a character-defining feature, the work to correct leaking issues is proposed in a manner that would not negatively impact the porch and the contributing building as a whole. The partial demolition considerations presented on page 46 apply to the removal of the porch roof, and the additions design guidelines presented on pages 40-42 of the design guidelines apply to the reconstruction and addition of the porch roof and new gutter system. All other porch components - such as the stone posts, the stone wall and rail around the exterior of the porch, and the stairs – will remain untouched.

The following topics provide a more detailed look at the evaluation of this application.

Roof Pitch and Shape
Design guideline 4.7a on page 41 states:

“Design a roof shape and pitch to be similar to those of the existing historic building.”

While the proposed pitch is not identical to that of the original porch roof, it does not significantly alter the appearance of the porch as a character defining feature, so long as the masonry window sill directly above the porch is still visible in its entirety. This means that the roof and the
flashing should not negatively effect this feature. While a specific roof pitch may be necessary based on the proposed material, it is crucial to maintain the separation between roof and masonry window sill.

**Roof Material**

Design guideline 4.7b on page 41 states:

“Use a roofing material for an addition that is similar to, and compatible with, the original historic building and the roofing materials used throughout the historic district.”

Generally, metal roofs are inappropriate in the district; however, if this material is not visible from the street it could be used in this instance. In addition, the material should retain a low profile, preferably less than 1”. Finally, it should appear similar in color to the existing roof and have a matte finish.

**Fascia/ “Trim Pieces”**

Design guideline 4.5 on page 40 states:

“Use simplified versions of building components and details found in the historic context.”

Design guideline 4.8 on page 42 states:

“Use exterior materials and finishes that are similar, but visually subordinate to those of the original historic building and historic context.”

The fascia board around the current porch roof is an important component of the porch as a whole. In the proposed work, the fascia board would be removed in order to fix the roof. In the description attached to the submitted application, the applicant notes that “Any replacement trim pieces will be matched to the original style with profiles identical or nearly identical to the original.” In follow-up emails with the applicant, he noted that “there will be fascia board used on the front and sides. He’s using a local carpenter and it will look similar to how it currently is, along with color... the molding will also be similar to what is currently used.” The applicant, therefore, confirms that the existing fascia and profile of the porch will be maintained, which is essential to the character-defining porch.

**Gutters**

Design guideline 4.5 on page 40 states:

“Use simplified versions of building components and details found in the historic context.”

Design guideline 4.5c on page 40 states:

“Do not design an addition to contrast starkly with the original structure.”

Using a simplified version of a half-round gutter, as proposed, is appropriate. The gutter should not be highly reflective, should use a matte finish and should not detract from the existing historic fabric. If feasible, we encourage wrapping the gutter from the front to the side fascia and extending it to the front façade to lessen the visual impact of the downspout on the front column (character-defining feature). Best preservation practices tip: the downspout should drain away from the foundation.
Preliminary/Final Site Plan
For 251 Pugh Street
State College Borough, Centre County
Pennsylvania
31-Jan-19

Landowner Landscaping Agreement
L. herein, hereby certifies that the Landmark Management Plan meets the design standards and criteria of the State Borough Stormwater Management Ordinance.

Borough Engineer Stormwater
L. hereby requests the Engineer to review the Engineer’s Stormwater Management Plan.

Zoning Officer Approval
Zoning Officer Date

Borough Arborist approval
Date

Site Data
Tax Plan Number: 30603-195
Street Address: 251 Pugh Street
Acres: 0.64 Ac (2606 sq ft)
Zoning: Commercial
Use: Retail

Schedules
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Expected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zoning</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roof Area</td>
<td>12,000 sq ft</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adjacent Zoning
West: 100 ft
Northeast: 200 ft
South: 200 ft

Parking Requirement
A parking area for 200 vehicles is proposed.

Owner: John & June Sproul
275 South Road
Fort Mifflin PA 19038

Engineer: Evans & Tank Engineering
4601 Hammonton Road
Warner’s Mark PA 16875

Contact: (512) 290-7090
Email: info@evansandtank.com

Acknowledgments
The information contained herein may not be used or copied in any manner without the written permission of Evans & Tank Engineering.
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INTRODUCTION

The Historic Resources Commission (HRC) was established in 1995 to advise Council on matters pertaining to historic resources, advocate for the preservation of those resources, and serve as a clearinghouse for information and education on such matters. They reviewed and made recommendations on construction plans involving historic structures and worked closely with the State College Planning Commission and Design Review Board.

In 2017, Borough Council passed Ordinance 2104 that adopted the Local Historic District and the Historic and Architectural Review Board (HARB). The Ordinance only regulates the addition to or demolition of contributing buildings, or any new construction, in State College’s Holmes-Foster/Highlands and College Heights Historic Districts.

HARB Mission

The HARB now absorbs HRC’s mission along with additional goals of maintaining the integrity of the historic districts by promoting compatible additions and new construction. The HARB will help preserve the historic context, residential fabric and neighborhood character—focusing on the character of the blocks rather than individual historic resources.

Purpose of this Report

As previously stated, the HARB’s mission is to advise, advocate, and educate the general public on preservation matters. The HARB is committed to supporting these goals and fostering an appreciation for our rich and unique 20th century heritage. This report stresses the benefits of historic preservation, highlights losses, as well as accomplishments in the community, and provides a set of activities which the HARB will focus on in the future.

Currently the Board works to fulfill its mission through a variety of tasks. These include ongoing efforts such as the approval of plaque applications, maintenance of the HARB website and now the review of HARB applications. Future projects, such as updating and expanding upon the current Historic District Walking Tour and adding a Mail Order Home Walking Tour, are also a part of our mission.

The HARB recognizes historic preservation and neighborhood preservation are linked. There are some property owners that also embrace the concepts in the HARB mission by completing successful projects that have embraced neighborhood preservation such as: the revitalization of a historic home in the 100 block of East Hartswick; the restoration of 317 East Hartswick; the survival of; new construction at 700 West College Avenue, renovation of Beta Theta Pi at 220 North Burrowes Street and the conversion of a single-family home at 334 South Atherton Street into an attorney’s office.

The HARB is an advisory board to Borough Council, and therefore only has the ability to recommend to Council to either approve or deny the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) Application for a contributing structure in the Borough’s Local Historic Districts.

In the last two years, there were no contributing buildings in the Local Historic Districts that were demolished. There were thirteen contributing buildings in the Local Historic District that were partially demolished to modernize, repair or expand the buildings. A complete listing and map illustrating the location of these properties is provided at the end of this report in Appendix A.

The losses and potential losses are the greatest incentive the HARB has for reaffirming its commitment to educate the public on preservation issues and to advocate for more diligent stewardship of these resources. The HARB believes it is worth noting that losses will not always be replaced, and continued efforts must be made to maintain the integrity of the Historic Districts. Education can lead to appreciation, and this appreciation can in turn lead to advocacy in support of preservation. To provoke appreciation, there are some benefits that land owners and members of the community should be aware of and board members can help provide this awareness.
Benefits

Preserving historic resources in State College is a key factor in promoting sustainability, which yields substantial benefits to the community. These can be described in the three basic categories of sustainability, which are: Cultural/Social, Environmental, and Economic.

Cultural/Social Benefits

Historic landscapes, sites, structures, buildings, and features are essential components of the Borough’s identity. Preserving historic places, including landmarks and neighborhoods, helps maintain a connection to the community’s heritage. This has been a fundamental part of the preservation movement in State College since its beginning.

When historic buildings occur on a block, they create a street scene that is “pedestrian friendly,” which encourages walking and neighborly interaction. They also contribute to a sense of place and security that enhances quality of life. Historic properties and archaeological sites provide direct links to the past. They convey information about earlier ways of life that helps current residents anchor their sense of identity with the community, which is a key ingredient in cultural sustainability.

Preserving existing neighborhoods retains the social fabric of the Borough. Older neighborhoods are relatively compact, and lend themselves to walking, which supports healthy living initiatives that enhance quality of life. Residences are located near the public transportation system, thereby reducing vehicle miles traveled by car. While this could be considered a part of the environmental component of benefits of historic preservation, it crosses over into social considerations, in that these places help support a sense of community.

Environmental Benefits

The environmental component of sustainability tends to be the main focus when discussing historic structures and their relationship to green building. Among other things, this component focuses on saving energy, and generating it through “clean” methods, as well as minimizing the demand for water and conserving building materials.
Embodied Energy
Embodied energy is defined as the amount of energy expended to create the original building and its components. Preserving a historic structure retains this energy. If demolished, this investment in embodied energy is lost and significant new energy demands are required to replace it. Studies confirm that the loss of embodied energy associated with replacing an existing structure takes three decades or more to recoup from reduced operating energy costs in a high-efficiency replacement building.

Economic Benefits
The economic benefits of protecting local historic districts are well documented across the nation. These include higher property values, job creation in rehabilitation industries, and increased heritage tourism. Examples also exist in ways in which the quality of life is enhanced by living in historic areas, and that these in turn help recruit desirable businesses to the community at large.

Historic Rehabilitation Projects
Direct and indirect economic benefits accrue from a rehabilitation project. Direct benefits result from the actual purchases of labor and materials, while material manufacture and transport results in indirect benefits. Preservation projects are generally more labor intensive, with up to 70% of the total project budget being spent on labor, as opposed to 50% when compared to new construction. All of these purchases of labor and materials add dollars to the local economy. Furthermore, a rehabilitation project will provide functional, distinctive and affordable space for new and existing small businesses. This is especially relevant to the local economy where many local businesses operate in historic buildings.

Heritage Tourism
The National Trust for Historic Preservation defines cultural heritage tourism as, “traveling to experience the places, artifacts, and activities that authentically represent the stories and people of the past and present. It includes cultural, historic, and natural resources.” Heritage tourism is another benefit of investment in historic preservation, as people are attracted to the cultural heritage sites within the area. Historic resources provide visitors with a glimpse into State College’s heritage. Heritage tourists spend more on travel than other tourists, which generates jobs in hotels, bed and breakfasts, motels, retail stores, restaurants and other service businesses.
Demolitions
The HARB reviews demolition of contributing structures and provides advisory input to Borough Council. The locations of all demolitions of contributing properties are shown in Appendix A.

Historic Streetscapes
Street trees present among historic districts add quality and character to the districts. Some of these face infestations and diseases; the Commission fully supports the Tree Commission in maintaining these street trees as part of the Borough’s historic district.

Planning Commission
The HRC provides feedback to the Design Review Board and the Planning Commission when required.

Historic District Plaques
Since the inception of the program, 101 plaques have been requested. Four (4) plaques were requested from 2017-2018.

HARB Website
The HARB website can be found as a part of the Borough’s website. It is updated periodically with information about the Borough’s history and architecture.

Ordinance 2104
In December 2017, Borough Council adopted Ordinance 2104 establishing two Local Historic Districts and the Historic and Architectural Review Board (HARB).
CONTINUED TASKS & FUTURE PROJECTS

Public Education & Awareness
Like the HRC, the HARB will work to provide information by discussing potential projects and holding meetings on these projects. Education of the architectural and geographic history can stimulate sentiments of pride, leading to a stronger sense of community.

Mid-Century Inventory
Houses that were built between 1945 and 1960 are of great interest to the Borough’s historic preservation efforts. During the period following World War II, from 1946 to 1966, the Borough experienced great expansion in its populations, as well as its landscape and buildings. The homes and architecture created during this period will continue to be reviewed for consideration as contributing properties. Staff has not been able to make progress on this project due to limited time available to devote to this effort.

Walking and House Tours
Organized tours of specific historic houses and walking tours of historic neighborhoods will create increased appreciation of architecturally historic sites. This appreciation can raise advocacy of the citizens in favor of historic preservation. If the Board is willing, they can assist with future tours. None are known at this time.

Historic House Plaque Program
Plaques for historic households help in educating and raising awareness for preservation. Planning staff aids property owners in researching historical information on the structure. The text for the plaque, which contains the historical information of the structure, is then approved by the HARB. Approval of applications for properties within the Holmes-Foster/Highland and College Heights District will be reviewed.

HARB Website
The HARB website will experience continued updates, creating a learning environment for those interested in the history of the Borough.

Recommendations to Property Owners
Advice will be given to owners who submit demolition plans or enclosures of porches of contributing properties. Maps will also be updated in response to any contributing properties lost or demolished.

Continued Evaluation of Properties
Properties that could potentially contribute to the existing historic districts will be reviewed and amended to the National Register Historic Districts.
PROPERTIES LOST

In 1995 there were 1,175 properties listed in the Holmes-Foster/Highlands and College Heights National Register Districts. In 2018, 23 years later, there are 1,146 remaining. The following list of losses within and outside of our historic districts have been demolished since 1995.

1. 315 South Pugh Street
   Doty and Hench House

2. 301 South Pugh Street
   John Henszey House—c. 1940
   2 story brick frame apartment complex, Colonial Revival style

3. 319 South Pugh Street
   Dr. Harry’s House—c. 1910
   3 story, frame house with brick façade, asphalt shingle roof,
   Colonial Revival style

4. 236 South Allen Street
   Robison House

5. 237 South Allen Street
   Sigma Tau Gamma Fraternity

6. 224 Locust Lane
   Hillel House

7. 329 East Beaver Avenue
   Sigma Tau Gamma Fraternity

8. 514 East Beaver Avenue
   c. 1920—2½ story brick house

9. 518 East Beaver Avenue
   Abramson House – c. 1925
   2 story frame house, stone and clapboard siding,
   Dutch Colonial style

10. 811 West College Avenue
    Margaretta Way House—c. 1920
    2½ story brick frame house, dormers, wooden shingle roof,
    Colonial Revival style

11. 530 East Beaver Avenue
    Single Family House – c. 1935
    1½ story, brick frame structure, asphalt and slate shingle roof,
    Colonial Revival-Cape Cod style

12. 524 East Beaver Avenue
    Single Family House—c. 1925
    2 story brick frame house, Sears home, Tudor Revival style
13. **241 South Atherton Street**  
   Single Family House—c. 1922  
   1 story frame bungalow, wood siding, Sears home  
   *(The Sunshine model)*

14. **245 South Atherton Street**  
   M.T. Lewis House – c. 1922  
   1 story frame bungalow, wood siding, Sears home

15. **500 South Allen Street**

16. **113 East Park Avenue**  
   Vernacular Queen Anne—1905

17. **121 N. Patterson Street**

18. **223 South Garner Street**  
   Mildred Fowler House—c. 1925  
   2 story Colonial Revival stone home

19. **229 South Garner Street**  
   Neil Fleming House—1925  
   2 ½ story Dutch Colonial wood frame home

20. **700 West College Avenue**  
   Earl Meyers—1915  
   2 ½ story Colonial Revival wood frame home

21. **500 East Beaver Avenue**  
   Benjamin Hanns—1920  
   2 ½ story brick home

22. **445 West Park Avenue**  
   Benjamin Hanns—1920  
   2 ½ story brick home

23. **204 North Burrowes Street**

24. **117 East Park Avenue**  
   California Bungalow—1923

25. **123 East Park Avenue**  
   Vernacular—1907

26. **412 West College Avenue**  
   Georgian—1948

27. **418 West College Ave**  
   Vernacular—1910

28. **338 West College Ave**  
   Queen Anne—1910

29. **312 West College Ave**  
   Colonial Revival—1910
MAJOR ALTERATIONS

1. 805 Holmes Street
   Removal of room and garage

2. 434 West College Avenue
   Porch enclosure

3. 230 South Sparks Street
   Removal of porch pillars

4. 218 Adams Avenue
   Porch enclosure

5. 423 West Park Avenue
   Removal of porch, garage and small building wing

6. 732 West Nittany Avenue
   Porch removal

7. 804 West Fairmount
   Porch removal

8. 617 Sunset Road
   Removal of first story roof

9. 720 West College Avenue
   Porch removal

10. 229 Locust Lane
    Entrance removal

11. 517 West Park Avenue
    Alterations to the home

12. 200 East Beaver Avenue
    Demolition of chimney

13. 139 North Gill Street
    Removal of infill on front porch
    See below.
DEMOLISHED AND MAJOR ALTERATIONS
Borough of State College Planning Department
January 2019
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Borough of State College
MEMORANDUM

**to:** All Borough Employees  

**from:** Ed LeClear, Director of Planning and Community Development  

**re:** Conflict of Interest Policy and Code of Conduct with Regard to HUD Programs  

**date:** November 15, 2018  

A Conflict of Interest Policy and Code of Conduct with Regard to HUD Programs was adopted by the State College Borough Council in 2005 and updated by Borough Council as recently as 2017. This attached policy will be distributed to Borough employees annually. Please review the policy.

If you have questions or comments, please contact me at 234-7109.
BOROUGH OF STATE COLLEGE

Conflict of Interest Policy and Code of Conduct
With Regard to HUD Programs

SECTION 1 NON-PROCUREMENT CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

A. COVERED INDIVIDUALS:

Any employee, agent, officer, elected official, appointed official or consultant of the Borough of State College (Participating Jurisdiction) or; any member of an employee’s, agent’s, officer’s, elected official’s or appointed official’s immediate family; an employee’s, agent’s, officer’s, elected official’s or appointed official’s partner; or an organization that employs or is about to employ any of the above.

CONFLICTS PROHIBITED:

No person(s) described in Paragraph 1 of section 1 who exercises or has exercised any functions or responsibilities with respect to activities assisted with HOME Investment Partnerships Program (HOME) or Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) or other U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) funds, or who is in a position to participate in a decision-making process or gain inside information with regard to these activities, may obtain a real or apparent financial interest or financial benefit from a HOME, CDBG, or other HUD-assisted activity, or has a real or apparent financial interest in any contract, subcontract, or agreement with respect to HOME, CDBG, or other HUD-assisted activity, or the proceeds from such activity, either for themselves or those with whom they have business or immediate family ties, during their tenure or for one year thereafter. Immediate family ties include (whether by blood, marriage or adoption) the spouse, parent (including a stepparent), child (including stepchild), brother, sister (including a stepbrother or stepsister), grandparent, grandchild and in-laws of a covered person. Occupancy of a HOME-assisted unit by a covered person constitutes a financial interest.

EXCEPTIONS:

Threshold Requirements – Upon the written request of the participating jurisdiction, the U.S. Housing and Urban Development (HUD) or its successor, may grant an exception to the provisions of the CONFLICTS PROHIBITED of section 1 on a case-by-case basis when it determines that the exception will serve to further the purpose of the HOME, CDBG or other HUD program and the effective and efficient administration of the Borough’s program or project. An exception may be considered only after the participating jurisdiction has provided the following:

1. A disclosure of the nature of the conflict, accompanied by an assurance that there has been public disclosure* of the conflict and a description of how the public disclosure was made; and
2. An opinion from the Borough’s attorney that the interest for which the exception is sought would not violate state or local laws.

*The requirements for public disclosure include publication in a local newspaper or disclosure during an advertised public hearing.
Factors to be considered for Exceptions – In determining whether to grant a requested exception after
the participating jurisdiction has satisfactorily met the requirements of paragraphs a. and b. above,
HUD, or its successors, will consider the cumulative affect of the following factors, where applicable:

1. Whether the exception would provide a significant cost benefit or an essential
degree of expertise to the program or project which would otherwise not be available;
2. Whether the person affected is a member of a group or class of low-income
persons intended to be the beneficiary of the assisted activity, and the exception
will permit such person(s) to receive generally the same interests or benefits as
are being made available or provided to the group or class;
3. Whether the affected person(s) has withdrawn from his/her functions or
responsibilities or the decision-making process with respect to the specific
assisted activity in question;
4. Whether the interest or benefit was present before the affected person was in a
position as described in the COVERED PERSONS Paragraph of this section
5. Whether undue hardship will result either to the participating jurisdiction or the
person affected when weighed against the public interest served by avoiding the
prohibited conflict; and
6. Any other relevant considerations.

B. OWNERS AND DEVELOPERS:

Any owner, developer or sponsor of a project assisted with HOME, CDBG or other HUD funds (or officer,
employee, agent, elected or appointed official or consultant of the owner, developer or sponsor or
immediate family member of an officer, employee, agent, elected or appointed official, or consultant of
the owner, developer or sponsor) whether private, for-profit or non-profit (including a community
development organization (CHDO) when acting as an owner, developer or sponsor)

CONFLICTS PROHIBITED:

No person(s) described in Paragraph 2.A of section 2 may occupy, or appear to occupy, a HOME, CDBG
or other HUD-assisted affordable housing unit in a project during the required period of affordability
specified in §92.252(e) or §92.254(a)(4). This provision does not apply to an individual who receives
HOME, CDBG or other HUD funds to acquire or rehabilitate his or her principal residence or to an
employee or agent to the owner or developer of a rental housing project who occupies a housing unit as
the project manager or maintenance worker.

EXCEPTIONS:

Upon written request of a housing owner or developer, the Borough may grant an exception to the
provisions of the above paragraph of this section on a case by case basis when it determines that the
exception will serve to further the purposes of the HOME, CDBG or other HUD program and the
effective and efficient administration of the owner’s or developer’s HOME, CDBG or other HUD-assisted
project. In determining whether to grant a requested exception, the Borough shall consider the
following factors:

1. Whether the person receiving the benefit is a member of a group or class of low-income persons intended to be
the beneficiaries of the assisted housing, and the
exception will permit such person to receive generally the same interest or benefits as are being made available or provided to the group or class:

2. Whether the person has withdrawn from his or her functions or responsibilities, or the decision-making process with respect to the specific assisted housing in question;

3. Whether the tenant protection requirements of Sec. 92.253 are being observed;

4. Whether the affirmative marketing requirements of Sec. 92.351 are being observed and followed; and

5. Any other factor relevant to the Borough’s determination, including the timing of the requested exception.

SECTION 2 PROCUREMENT CONFLICT OF INTEREST

COVERED INDIVIDUALS:

Any employee, officer, or agent of the Borough of State College (Participating Jurisdiction).

CONFLICTS PROHIBITED:

The CDBG, HOME and other HUD Programs follow the procurement policy of the Borough of State College located in the Borough of State College Code of Ordinances, Chapter 1, Part N. If any provisions of 2 CFR 200.318, 24 CFR 570.611, and 24 CFR 92.356 are not included or conflict with the Borough’s Procurement Policy, the provisions of 2 CFR 200.318, 24 CFR 570.611, and 24 CFR 92.356 shall supersede the Borough’s Procurement Policy.

No Covered Individuals in section 2 may participate in the selection, award or administration of a contract supported by HOME, CDBG or other HUD Program if a conflict of interest, real or apparent, would be involved. Such a conflict would arise when any of the following parties has a financial or other interest in the firm selected for award:

- employee, agents, or officer of the Borough of State College;
- any member of an employee’s, agent’s or officer’s immediate family;
- an employee’s, agent’s or officer’s partner; or
- an organization that employs or is about to employ any of the above

No employee, officer, or agent of the Borough or subrecipient may solicit or accept gratuities, favors or anything of monetary value from contractors, potential contractors or parties to subagreements.

EXCEPTIONS:

There are no exceptions for real or apparent procurement conflicts of interest. A request for a regulatory waiver can be submitted pursuant to 24 C.F.R. § 5.110 Upon determination of good cause, the Secretary may, subject to statutory limitations, waive any provision of this title and delegate this authority in accordance with section 106 of the Department of Housing and Urban Development Reform Act of 1989 (42 U.S.C. 3535(q)).
SECTION 3 CODE OF CONDUCT:

Persons covered in section 2, paragraph 1, are expressly forbidden from soliciting or accepting money, gifts, gratuities, services, favors, or anything of monetary value (excepting unsolicited calendars, pens, or other items of nominal value used as an advertising medium) from any person, company, firm, or corporation to which any purchase order or contract is, or might, be awarded or from a party to any potential subcontract.

The Borough shall also take disciplinary action in accordance with the Borough Personnel Rules and Regulations against any covered persons in section 2 paragraph 1 who violate this conflict of interest policy.

Employees will receive a copy of the conflict of interest policy on an annual basis as a mailer included in a paycheck. Elected and appointed officials will receive a copy of the policy at a regular meeting of their respective council, authority, board or commission. Distribution of the policy will be noted in the minutes of the meeting. Members who are absent will receive a copy by mail. Consultants and agents will be provided a copy of the policy as part of their contracts.

SECTION 4 SUB-RECIPIENTS:

Applicable Conflict of Interest and Procurement Policies for the Borough’s subrecipients are covered under CFR 200.318, 24 CFR 570.611 and 24 CFR 92.356. Each subrecipient has developed its own Conflict of Interest Policy and Procurement Policy in accordance with the applicable regulations.

Authorized Official: Ed LeClear, Director of Planning and Community Development
243 S. Allen Street
State College, PA 16801
814-234-7109

Summary of Revisions:
Adopted by the State College Borough Council on April 18, 2005.
Revised by staff on April 30, 2015.
Revised policy adopted by the State College Borough Council on November 6, 2017.
Borough of State College
MEMORANDUM

to: All Borough Employees

from: Ed LeClear, Director of Planning and Community Development

re: Drug-Free Workplace Requirements for the Community Development Block Grant and HOME Programs

date: November 15, 2018

The State College Borough Community Development Department is mandated by the Department of Housing and Urban Development to notify all employees who are engaged in the performance of the Community Development Block Grant program and the HOME program of the status of drugs in the workplace.

It is unlawful to manufacture, distribute, dispense, possess or use a controlled substance in the workplace. Any employee who does manufacture, distribute, dispense, possess or use a controlled substance in the workplace shall be prosecuted under all applicable State and Federal laws, and shall face appropriate personnel action, up to and including termination; or the employee shall participate satisfactorily in a drug abuse assistance or rehabilitation program approved for such purposes by a Federal, State or local health, law enforcement or other appropriate agency.

Employees must notify the Borough in writing of their conviction for a violation of a criminal drug statute occurring in the workplace no later than five calendar days after such conviction. The State College Community Development Department is required to notify HUD, within ten calendar days after receiving notice from an employee or otherwise receiving actual notice of a conviction.

State College Borough has in place an Employee Assistance Plan designed to deal with drug and alcohol problems in the employee population. The telephone number for the Employee Assistance Plan is 1-800-252-4555; the website is www.theEAP.com.

If you have any questions or comments, please contact me at 234-7109.