# MINUTES OF THE MENDHAM BOROUGH HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION October 21, 2013 Phoenix House, 2 West Main Street, Mendham, NJ

# CALL TO ORDER

The regular meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission was called to order by Chair Zedalis, at 7:30 p.m. at the Phoenix House, 2 West Main Street, Mendham, NJ.

### **CHAIR'S OPENING STATEMENT**

Notice of this meeting was published in the <u>Observer Tribune</u> and <u>Daily Record</u> on January 24, 2013 in accordance with the Open Public Meetings Act and posted on the bulletin board of the Phoenix House on the same date.

# ATTENDANCE

Ms. C. Jones-Curl – Absent Mr. N. Cusano – Present Mr. C. Nicholson – Present Mr. M. Zedalis – Present Mr. J. Dannebaum, Alternate I – Present Ms. S. Carpenter, Alternate II- Absent

######

## MINUTES

Mr. Nicholson made a motion to approve the minutes of the regular meeting of September 16, 2013. Mr. Cusano seconded. All members being in favor, the minutes were approved.

### PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Zedalis opened the meeting to comments by the public on anything that was not on the agenda. There being none, the public session was closed.

######

### APPLICATIONS

HC 30-13: <u>Macie Publishing/Ed Sueta Music</u> – Review of Sign Block 1501, Lot 5, 13 East Main St.

Present: Ed Sueta, Jr. – Applicant Julie Sueta – Applicant

The applicants had provided the Commission copies of their application dated October 2, 2013 with the pre-meeting packages.

Mr. Sueta explained to the Commission that they are planning a sign in the same manner as it exists today. There will not be a change in the sign or the manner of lettering. Addressing Mr. Cusano on the materials to be used, Mr. Sueta stated that it would be a matt laminated material.

Mr. Zedalis noted that with a laminated plastic polymer on top, the finish is dulled somewhat, but he asked the applicants if they would consider a wood finish instead. The Borough has spent a considerable amount of time of late reviewing signage. The Historic Preservation Commission is pushing to try to get the older signs of a non-historic nature removed and replaced with wood signs with either painted or engraved letters. Mr. Dannenbaum added that since the passage of the updated sign ordinance review has taken on even more significance.

Mr. Sueta stated that they would take a look at it.

######

Mr. Cusano explained that the Commission is cognizant of the cost considerations and there are several types of wooden signs available. There are wooden signs with three dimensions including engraving. The engraving could be of gold or another color. Also, instead of plastic, a painted wooden sign with more of a traditional feel can be used.

Mr. Nicholson continued that it would great to see a wooden sign on that building to begin the change out to more traditional signage. They could be of help by being the leaders. He suggested the Commission give them approval, but that they look into using an engraved wood or painted sign.

In discussion, the Commission advised that the sign should be two-sided so that it can be seen from both the east and the west. The applicant could choose a color. The colors as presented are fine, and they could add gold. The size of the sign is acceptable.

Mr. Cusano made a motion to approve the sign as submitted with a recommendation that the Commission prefers a wooden sign with painted or engraved letters and with a matt finish. The colors on the proposed sign are acceptable. The sign should be two-sided. Mr. Nicholson seconded.

ROLL CALL: The result of the roll call was 4 to 0 as follows:

In Favor: Cusano, Nicholson, Dannebaum, Zedalis Opposed: None Abstentions: None

The motion carried. Ms. Callahan will prepare a letter with copies to the Zoning Official and the Construction Department.

#### ######

HC 19-13: <u>DeAngelo, George</u> – Review of Addition (Continuation) Block 302, Lot 4, 59 West Main St.

Present: George, DeAngelo, Applicant

Mr. DeAngelo had provided the Commission with revised architectural drawings dated 9/25/13 in their pre-meeting packages. He provided the Commission a copy of the plot plan at the meeting.

Mr. DeAngelo explained that he has now added a hip roof with a gable and a continuous eyebrow in the front of the home.

Mr. Cusano summarized the changes from the last submission indicating that there was a change in the roofline, divided light windows have been used, the corner boards have been cleaned up, new siding throughout has been used, a continuous eyebrow has been used and gable vents have been added. He applauded the applicant on a more complete application and stated that the changes that have been made are for the better. The overall elevation is now more balanced with windows, the roofline is fine, and the gable break is good. Aesthetically, the design has made great strides.

Mr. Cusano continued that he did have a concern with the octagonal gable vent as with the vinyl siding and all the seams that would need to be created, it could look cosmetic and hence cheapen the look. A round vent might look better. In addition, he did not feel that the leaded glass windows on either side of the door were in keeping. He would prefer plain lights.

Responding to Mr. Cusano on the type of window he would be using, snap in grill or SDL, Mr. DeAngelo stated that he was planning on snap in grill. Mr. Cusano advised that he would like to see the SDL windows.

Mr. Zedalis questioned whether the octagonal vent should be kept or removed. In discussion on the vinyl siding, Mr. DeAngelo stated that the siding is guaranteed and he would use 18 to 20 ft. sheets. Mr. Cusano responded that the seams and the "j" beads are sometimes a problem and that is the concern with the gable vents. Hardiplank is a good product. There is an improvement with the vinyl over what is there today.

Mr. Nicholson stated that he did not find the application acceptable. There is still a 50% increase in the size of the home. In addition to the architectural aspects, the Commission approves or denies based on how the project is in keeping with the neighborhood. The lot is very tight with improvements already. When one pulls out of Lake Drive, they will see a much larger home which will take light from the corner. It is not just siding and roofing, but how it is in keeping with the neighborhood. It is a corner lot

and it is closer to the side street. While Mr. DeAngelo has kept the home in immaculate condition, the proposed addition is not in keeping with the neighborhood.

Responding to Mr. DeAngelo's comment that he is only adding 20 feet to the front for 500 sq. ft. in total and the home sits back from Main Street, and that he is making an improvement on the corner, Mr. Cusano explained that the lot is 200 ft. x 50 ft. for 10,000 sq. feet which is less than a  $\frac{1}{4}$  acre. It is an undersized lot. For some reason his lot is measured from the center of the street, so in practicality it is 9,000 sq. ft. The home is shifted to one side. He noted that Mr. Nicholson is concerned with how the home will appear on the corner as the size will be increased by 50%. Mr. Cusano stated that he does not share Mr. Nicholson's opinion.

Addressing Mr. DeAngelo on his comment that he needs more space to live and wants to move into the property, Mr. Nicholson noted that it is currently a two family and it could be converted to a one family to provide more space. The addition that he is proposing can be seen right along the side street and can be seen from almost every angle. The addition goes up and out.

Responding to Mr. Dannenbaum's concern that the issue being raised was new, Mr. Nicholson stated that he has raised the issue before. Mr. Dannenbaum noted that he was not at all the meetings.

Mr. Zedalis made a motion to make a recommendation to the Board of Adjustment that the Historic Preservation Commission denies the proposed renovations as put forward in particular the overall size of the structure relative to the size of the lot and relative to the streetscape view of the proposed edifice when entering town from the western side. For the record, the proposed architectural changes that Mr. DeAngelo has put forward in particular the newly proposed roofline, windows (first and second floor), doorway, entranceway, and siding are acceptable with some minor changes. These include changing to a round gable vent, removing the leaded glass from the front door and using simulated divided light instead of snap in grills. Mr. Nicholson seconded.

ROLL CALL: The result of the roll call was 3 to 1 as follows:

In Favor:Dannenbaum, Nicholson, ZedalisOpposed:CusanoAbstentions:None

The motion carried. Ms. Callahan will prepare a report to the BOA.

Mr. Cusano wished to clarify that his vote reflected that he dissented on the first point in the motion, not on the second.

### ######

# CONCEPT DISCUSSION

Jensen, Barbara & Ralph – Home Renovation Block 301, Lot 5, 8 Mountain Avenue

Present: Barbara Jensen – Homeowner Ralph Jensen – Homeowner

Mrs. Jensen informed the Board that they initially wanted to put an addition on their newly purchased home, but to do so they would need a variance and timing is important as they want to move in an elderly parent. Instead they want to make some other renovations.

She continued that there is a bay window that sits right next to the driveway off the living room. They want to eliminate the window. Mr. Cusano advised that he did not have any problem with removing the bay window, but suggested that they put in double windows side by side. He added that they could place a small roof over the windows.

Mrs. Jensen stated that for the time being, the porch is staying as it is. There is a rear addition, however, that has huge structural problems. They want to rebuild it in the same size with a second floor. Mr. Cusano responded that two stories 12 ft. wide would look tall and narrow. Mr. Nicholson interjected that it would not be seen from the street.

Continuing, Mrs. Jensen explained that all the windows will be replaced with 2 over 2 wooden SDL windows with a large historic sill. They would use hardiplank.

As the Jensen's had a necessity to move quickly with their renovation, the Commission discussed possible alternatives in the sequence of the renovations as they would need to apply to the HPC, and

obtain Zoning and Construction permits. In terms of the Historic Preservation Commission, the Commission requested that they determine what they want to do and provide an application and appropriate supporting information. This might include windows, siding and a sketch of the replacement for the bay window. They would consider a special meeting in early November if all the application information is provided.

### ######

### DISCUSSION

**By-Laws Update:** Ms. Callahan had provided the Commission with an updated draft based on Mr. Zedalis' request to remove the detailed list of minor applications from the Chair/Vice Chair section, and place it in the application section. Commission had received copies of the draft with their pre-meeting packages and did not have any further discussion.

Mr. Cusano made a motion to approve the By-Laws with revision dated October 21, 2013. Mr. Nicholson seconded.

ROLL CALL: The result of the roll call was 4 to 0 as follows:

In Favor:Cusano, Dannenbaum, Nicholson, ZedalisOpposed:NoneAbstentions:None

The revised By-Laws were approved.

#### ######

### **OTHER BUSINESS**

**Tranquility Garden:** Mr. Nicholson reported that the sign has been placed at Tranquility Garden. He had thought that the sign, based on previous discussions, was to be a small sign placed on the property. The sign that has been installed is located in the right of way and is about 9 ft. tall. While the sign is the same as other Borough signs, the location and the height are not in keeping with this property that is located in the Historic District. The neighbor has already expressed concern. The size and style of the sign face itself are appropriate.

Mr. Nicholson continued that he has spoken with the Administrator and that she is agreeable to have the sign moved and lowered in height. The Commission should advise the most appropriate place.

Commission briefly discussed a location out of the right –of-way behind the driveway within about the first quarter of the property. Mr. Zedalis and Mr. Dannebaum agreed to visit the property and then provide feedback to Mr. Nicholson.

######

### ADJOURNMENT

There being no additional business to come before the Commission, on motion duly made, seconded and carried, the meeting was adjourned at 9:15 p.m. The next regular meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission will be held on Monday, November 18, 2013 at 7:30 p.m. at the Phoenix House, 2 West Main St., Mendham, NJ. The Commission will consider a special meeting if required earlier in November.

Respectfully Submitted,

Diana Callahan Commission Secretary