

**MINUTES OF THE  
MENDHAM BOROUGH  
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
March 19, 2012  
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 Mr. Michael 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 Observer Tribune and Daily Record on January 26, 2012 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. M. Furgueson – Absent  
Mr. C. Nicholson – Present

Mr. M. Zedalis – Present  
Mr. J. Dannebaum, Alternate I – Present  
Ms. S. Carpenter, Alternate II- Present

Also present where: Peter Henry, Esq. Commission Attorney and Cynthia Delane, Land Use Assistant

#####

**MINUTES**

Mr. Cusano made a motion to approve the minutes of the regular meeting of February 27, 2012 as written. Mr. Dannebaum seconded. Mr. Nicholson and Zedalis abstained. 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 06-12:**     **Pacconi, Wayne & Susan**– Review of Signs  
Block 601, Lot 10 22 East Main St.

Present:        Mr. and Mrs. Wayne Pacconi, Applicant

The applicant provided photographs of the present signage at the location, and drawings and diagrams of the proposed signage with their application dated March 5, 2012. The Commission reviewed the application and pictures.

The applicant came before the Commission seeking guidance on the aesthetics of the sign materials. The font would be as presented in the drawings. The colors would be red to match the shutters on the building and gold. The applicant has options on the selection of materials for their signage and wants the Commission's opinion.

Responding to the Commission on the size of the proposed sign, the applicants explained that the current sign is 49 inches across, 29.5 to the top of the straight edge, and 42.25 to the highest point of the arch on the sign. They further explained that the proposed sign would be 60 inches across (11 inches wider than the current sign) and 36 inches high. They wish to enlarge the size to compensate for the location of the sign being set back from the road. This will make it more visible to attract customers to their retail establishment.

Mr. Cusano commented that from his perspective, all three sign style options were in the spirit of the Historic District aesthetics and made a motion to approve the sign as designed in the drawing labeled Exhibit A. The colors would be antique gold and a historic red to match existing shutters in either of the following style options:

- Carved out letters the same as the existing sign with gold flake
- Vinyl metallic embossed with a slightly reflective quality
- Traditional painted wood sign

Chair opened the meeting for comments by the public. There being none, the public session was closed. Mr. Nicholson seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL: The result of the roll call was 5 to 0 as follows:

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

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

#####

**HC 09-09:** **Borough of Mendham**– Tranquility Garden Review  
 Block 601, Lot 3.01, 34B East Main Street

Present: Mr. C. Nicholson, Representing Applicant

Mr. Nicholson returned to the Commission on behalf of Tranquility Garden. He had reviewed fence plans with some of the members at the February meeting. The application before the Commission is for 80 feet of 6 foot high stockade fencing.

The neighboring property owner has an ongoing privacy concern regarding their property and the Tranquility Garden property borders. He is not satisfied with a previous proposal of removing, repairing, then replacing the existing lattice fence since that fencing will not provide sufficient privacy for their property. The property owner would prefer something solid such as stockade fencing. A stockade fence exists in the back of the property and the owner wishes to create a continuous fencing. The surrounding area will be landscaped to soften the fence line.

The Commission considered the streetscape and view points from which the fencing could be seen. The fence would not be visible from inside the garden as it will be landscaped, but the fence could be seen driving from the east side of town.

They expressed concern over a solid stockade fence and wanted to explore additional options.

Chair opened the meeting to questions by the public. Diana Callahan, Land Use Coordinator spoke as a resident. She was concerned that the park has been owned by the town for three years and the public still cannot use it. She requested that the Commission consider moving forward.

With the assistance of Mr. Cusano, the Commission was able to explore fencing options real time. After review of several options, they identified an alternate proposal.

Mr. Cusano made a motion to approve a cedar estate plane fence with square lattice. The fence is approximately 5 feet of solid fencing with 1 foot of square lattice (+/-). The fence would be positioned as outlined by Mr. Nicholson on the site plan, and there will be screening planting on the garden side of the fence. The fence would not project beyond the existing fence line as existing.

Ms. Carpenter seconded the motion.

Mr. Nicholson stated that he would take the Commission's decision and the desired fence to the Administrator who would need to return to the neighbor and advise of the decision.

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

In Favor: Cusano, Furgueson, Dannebaum, Carpenter  
Opposed: None  
Abstentions: Nicholson

#####

**DISCUSSION**

**Sign Issues** Mr. Peter Henry, Esq. was present to discuss with the Commission the existing Borough Ordinance relating to signage. Mr. Henry elaborated upon the differences between and sign and a display. A number of businesses have added large pictures of their products in the store front windows and held the belief that these signs are displays of their products. It is the opinion of counsel that these pictures not considered displays but indeed signs and some business owners may be in violation of the Borough sign ordinance.

Mr. Henry discussed the existing layers of control and the vehicles that the Commission had for enforcement. The Ordinance allows 5% of the façade for signage, but if an applicant has been before the Planning Board and/or the Historic Preservation Commission, they may have a more restrictive regulation. To increase their use of signage they would need to get an amendment of site plan. If the Site Plan is not restrictive then they would need a sign permit and approval of Historic Preservation Commission in District. If there is no site plan then the requirements need to be addressed on a case by case basis.

Mr. Cusano made a motion for the Commission to send a letter to the governing body (Borough Administrator) to ask that the Zoning Officer inform certain properties that the erected signs have not been approved by the Historic Preservation Commission. Ms. Carpenter seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL: The result of the roll call was 5 to 0 as follows:

In Favor: Cusano, Nicholson, Furgueson, Dannebaum, Carpenter  
Opposed: None  
Abstentions: None

**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 meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission will be held on Monday, April 16, 2012 at 7:30 p.m. at the Phoenix House, 2 West Main St., Mendham, NJ.

Respectfully Submitted,

Cynthia Delane  
Land Use Assistant