

**MINUTES OF THE
MENDHAM BOROUGH
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
May 21, 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 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 – Present	Mr. M. Zedalis – Present
Mr. N. Cusano – Present	Mr. J. Dannenbaum, Alternate I – Present
Mr. M. Furgueson – Present (Public)	Ms. Susan Carpenter, Alternate II- Absent
Mr. C. Nicholson - Present	

#####

MINUTES

Mr. Cusano made a motion to approve the minutes of the regular meeting of April 19, 2012 as written. Mr. Nicholson seconded. All members being in favor, the minutes were approved.

#####

PUBLIC COMMENT

Chair 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: 15-12: **Scharfenberg, Susan (Grand Bazaar)** – Review of Sign
Block 1501, Lot 41, 6 Hilltop Road

This application was postponed at the request of the applicant.

#####

HC: 16-12: **Hastings Donna (Simply Country)** – Review of Sign
Block 1501, Lot 41, 6 Hilltop Road

This application was withdrawn at the request of the applicant.

#####

HC 18-12: **St. Marks Church** – Review of Signage/Lighting – Recommendation to PB
Block 1501, Lot 9, 9 East Main St.

Present: Chris Merzatta, Sexton

The applicant had provided the Commission with photos and a description of the sign location with their application dated May 14, 2012.

Mr. Merzatta explained to the Commission that the church would like to flip flop two existing signs, moving the one in the rear to the front and the one in the front to the rear. There would also be a change in the location of the front sign. The blue two-sided sign currently in the front is very close to the sidewalk. They will move the white sign that will replace it on the other side of the path further

back from the sidewalk. There is an existing semi-circle of trees, and this new location appears to be at the center of those trees. They are also moving the lights, 2 x 90 watts, with the existing front sign. The lights are controlled by a timer.

In addition to the sign change, they would like to add 1600 watts of additional lighting to highlight the façade of the church. The source of the light will not be seen. These will be flood lights on the face of the church.

Commission noted that they would comment only on the fixtures. The lighting itself would be for review by the Planning Board. They wanted all fixtures hidden from view from the public way.

Chair opened the meeting to questions and comments by the public. There being none, the public session was closed.

Mr. Cusano made a motion to recommend to the Planning Board approval of the application for the signage change and the lighting fixtures with the stipulation that all lighting fixtures will have the source of light concealed from the public way. Mr. Nicholson seconded.

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

In Favor: Jones-Curl, Cusano, Nicholson, Zedalis, Dannenbaum
 Opposed: None
 Abstentions: None

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

#####

HC 13-12: Zenjon Enterprises, LLC – Changes to Prior Approval – Recommendation to BOA
 Block 1902, Lot 11, 25 East Main St.

Present: Jonathan Krasney, Applicant
 Lawrence Appel, Architect for Applicant

Mr. Krasney explained to the Commission that he could not secure financing for the project given the prior approval from the Board of Adjustment. He needs to return to the Board to ask for a change of usage in the rear building. It does not represent any significant change in design. As he must vacate his current office in July, he has rented purchased property in the Jockey Hollow Professional Park in the interim.

Mr. Appel stated that minor alignments needed to be made in the rear building. As the market is flooded with commercial space, they want to change the use in the rear building to a medical use on the first floor and apartments on the second floor. They believe these uses are complementary as the medical facilities will be used during the day and the residences in the evening.

Mr. Zedalis confirmed with Mr. Appel that the front building would remain the same. Mr. Appel stated that it would, and that there would only be minor modifications to the rear building. The original approval was for storage in the basement and two floors above that of business use. One can put business in a medical use, but not visa-versa and they needed to come back to the Board of Adjustment for the medical use.

The Commission noted that it would only review the aesthetics of the building and make a recommendation to the Board of Adjustment. The other items were for review by the Board of Adjustment. Mr. Appel stated that the Commission did not previously ask that the materials in the rear building match those of the front building. The applicant agreed to that in the Board of Adjustment approval, and it has proven to be not feasible.

Commission requested clarification from Mr. Appel on the changes to the rear building from the first application. He explained that in terms of the footprint, the original building was 82 ft. long and 37.8 ft. wide. The new footprint is 90 ft. long and 37.8 ft. wide. Mr. Cusano noted that there was now more floor area. Mr. Appel continued that they have omitted the basement and created a habitable attic. In terms of the height of the building, the original building was 34.6 ft. high and it is now 37 ft. high. Mr. Cusano summarized that it is now taller and longer. A dormer has been added in the back, and the gable in the front has been raised. Mr. Appel explained that originally they had two 9 ft. floors, but now with the medical use on the first floor will have a 10 ft. height and the second floor 9 ft. height. They have added 1 ft. of height.

Mr. Cusano noted that there is also a kneewall at the gable making the total front 2 ft. higher. The front is the most apparent rise, however, it also does not face the street. Ms. Jones-Curl stated that the chimney side faces the street and that it is shielded by the front building. Mr. Dannenbaum was concerned that there was a sight line from the driveway.

Commission and Mr. Appel discussed the depth of the lot at 334 ft. and the positioning of the rear building at approximately 200 ft. back from the street. Some members were of the opinion that it is not prominent from the public way and others noted that it was still a public building, to which public would be coming. Some still preferred to see matching materials with the front building. The Commission reviewed documentation dealing with their last approval and rationale and members were consistent with their prior review

Mr. Appel was of the opinion that using Aluminum SDL windows, corner boards, freize board and rakes and the vinyl siding would provide the building with appropriate details. Board discussed whether to prioritize those items in their recommendation to the Board of Adjustment, but decided not to.

Chair opened the meeting to questions and comments by the public. There being none, the public session was closed.

After some discussion on an acceptable motion to the Commission members, Mr. Zedalis made a motion to recommend HPC approval to the Board of Adjustment of the proposed drawings of March 1, 2012 as the rear building will not be seen from the public way which is the Commission's focus. The Commission prefers that the materials of the rear building match those of the front building, but it is not a requirement. The Commission appreciates the applicant's use of residential design for the usage. Mr. Cusano seconded.

ROLL CALL: The result of the roll call was 4 to 0 with 1 abstention as follows:

In Favor: Jones-Curl, Cusano, Nicholson, Zedalis
 Opposed: None
 Abstention: Dannenbaum

The motion carried. Ms. Callahan will prepare the BOA recommendation report for Commission review at the June Meeting.

#####

HC 17-12: **5 Hilltop Holdings, LLC** – Review of Fire Access Window/Lighting
 Block 1902, Lot 21, 5 Hilltop Road

Present: Justin Marcucci, Applicant
 Seth Clifford, Applicant

Applicants had provided the Commission with elevations dated 4/23/12 (window) and 5/4/12 (lighting) with their application dated May 4, 2012.

Mr. Marcucci explained that in September or October 2010 they had appeared before the Commission for approval of renovations to the rear of their building. They now want to use the attic space in their building as a conference room. They met with the Board of Adjustment on May 1 and obtained approval for the conference room, but with the condition that the Historic Preservation Commission would approve the fire egress window that they are proposing on the third floor. They are adding this window to the south side of the building. The Fire Marshall recommended that the window be placed on the unobstructed side of the building.

Mr. Cusano advised that the window can be seen from the streetscape. It appears squeezed between the two existing windows and half of the shutters need to be removed. He recommended that the third window not be used, and instead the two existing windows be replaced with two casement windows of required egress size. The windows would not be double hung, but SDL casement with a faux sash bar to give the appearance of a double hung window. They would crank out. The shutters would then be replaced to match the other shutters on the building.

The rest of the Commission members and the applicant were agreeable to this solution.

In terms of the lighting, Mr. Marcucci explained that they would be using the same stantion as that being used at Hilltop Church. Commission noted that there had been some issues with the lighting at the church, but that it was related to the source of light itself and not the stantion. They had approved it before, and it could be used again.

Chair opened the meeting to questions and comments by the public. There being none, the public session was closed.

Mr. Cusano made a motion to approve the application with the recommended Commission changes to the windows. Instead of three windows in the gable end of the building, two SDL casement windows with sash bar detail to simulate double hung at the minimum size required to meet fire egress would be used. They would be located in similar locations as the existing windows. Ms. Jones-Curl seconded.

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

In Favor: Jones-Curl, Cusano, Nicholson, Zedalis, Dannenbaum
Opposed: None
Abstentions: None

The motion carried. Ms. Callahan will prepare a report back to the BOA. Applicant should work with his attorney, architect and the Fire Official to solidify the recommendation.

#####

Ms. Jones-Curl recused from the Commission.

#####

HC 14-12: Curl, Gary & Carol Jones – Review of Deck Renovations
Block 1501, Lot 15, 35 East Main St.

Present: Carol Jones-Curl, Applicant

The applicants had provided material specifications and photographs with their application dated May 1, 2012. Ms. Jones-Curl brought a sample of the material with her to the meeting.

Ms. Jones-Curl explained that the original cedar wooden railings on the deck located in the rear of their home had rotted and in the October storm, they finally fell. As the wooden railings had rotted in a very short period of time, she wanted to use Azak as a replacement. Commission had no problem, but recommended that the level of professional installation was key to the final look.

Mr. Cusano made a motion to approve the application as submitted. Mr. Nicholson seconded.

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

In Favor: Jones-Curl, Cusano, Nicholson, Zedalis, Dannenbaum
Opposed: None
Abstentions: None

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

#####

Ms. Jones-Curl returned to the Commission.

#####

OTHER BUSINESS

Mendham Cooperative Nursery School Sign: The Mendham Cooperative Nursery School had provided a sign design to the Commission. They had been approved for the sign to be located on the entranceway to the driveway located on Orchard Street. This particular property was not located in the new Historic District, but the Chairman wanted to bring it to the attention of the Commission in case they wanted to comment. After short discussion, the Commission decided that as the property on which it is located is not in the Historic District, they would not comment. Ms. Callahan will advise the Zoning Officer and the Construction Official.

Main Street Corridor Approval – Provident Bank Sign, 95 East Main Street: In accordance with the Main Street Corridor review procedures, the Chair, Vice Chair and Zoning Officer had reviewed

the proposed sign and approved it. The Chair requested that a copy be provided to the Commission members for their information. No one had issue.

Minor Application – Picararo, 66 East Main Street: In accordance with the Commission review procedures for minor applications, vinyl siding for a garage had been approved by the Chairman and the Vice Chairman. The approval was shared for the Commission's information.

Planning Board Request – Solar Panels: At the request of the Planning Board, the Commission considered their position on the use of solar panels in the Historic District. After a short discussion, dealing with roof mounted, ground mounted and utility mounted panels, the Commission decided that they did not want solar panels to affect the streetscape. Any solar panels of any type, size, shape, etc. would not be acceptable if seen from the public way. They requested that a memo be prepared to the Planning Board from the Chairman. At invitation of the Planning Board, and pending personal business commitments, several members of the Commission may attend the June 11 Planning Board meeting.

Signage – Corner Hilltop and East Main Street: The Commission again questioned the status of the signage at 1 East Main Street. They had provided a memo to the Borough Council, and requested a status. They expressed concern that the signage still remained up without their approval.

#####

ADJOURNMENT

There being no additional business to come before the Commission, on motion duly made, seconded and carried, the meeting was adjourned at 9:30 p.m. The next meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission will be held on Monday, June 18, 2012 at 7:30 p.m. at the Phoenix House, 2 West Main St., Mendham, NJ.

Respectfully Submitted,

Diana Callahan
Recording Secretary