

**BOROUGH OF MENDHAM  
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
MINUTES OF THE JUNE 21, 2021  
REGULAR MEETING**

**CALL TO ORDER/FLAG SALUTE**

The regular meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission was called to order at 7:30PM and the open public meetings statement was read into the record.

**ATTENDANCE**

Mr. Encin – Present  
Mr. Van Arsdale – Present  
Ms. Reilly – Absent  
Ms. Shafran – Absent  
Mr. Maresca– Present  
Mr. Tosso - Alternate I - Absent  
Ms. Rodrigues – Alternate II – Present

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

Mr. Van Arsdale asked for comments on the minutes of the regular meeting of May 17, 2021. There being no corrections, Mr. Maresca made a motion to approve the minutes as written and Mr. Encin seconded.

**ROLL CALL**

In Favor: Mr. Encin, Mr. Van Arsdale, Mr. Maresca, and Ms. Rodrigues  
Opposed:  
Abstain:

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

Chairman Van Arsdale opened the meeting to the public for questions and comments on items not included on the agenda. There being none, the public session was closed.

**APPLICATIONS:**

**HPC#10-21**  
Steve Murphy  
33 W. Main St  
Block 301 Lot 45  
Present via phone: Mr. Murphy, Applicant

Mr. Murphy summarized the application to replace the deteriorating asphalt driveway with a gravel driveway adding belgium block edging from the street to the garage area and also adding a belgium block apron to the sidewalk and from the sidewalk partially into the driveway. Mr. Van Arsdale asked if the belgium block that is being used for the apron would be the same being used for the edging. Mr. Murphy explained that they would be the same gray 9"x5" belgium block for both locations. Mr. Encin asked if the edging would be flush with the ground. Mr. Murphy stated that they would be flush except for a portion in the back area in the rear of the yard that is on a slope which is a little higher than the drive area where he

would like to transition to a higher edging to retain the sod in that area. Mr. Van Arsdale asked if the same block being used for the entire length of the driveway on both sides and Mr. Murphy confirmed that it would.

**Motion** was made by Mr. Maresca, **seconded** by Ms. Rodrigues to approve the application as submitted.

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

In favor: Mr. Van Arsdale, Mr. Encin, Mr. Maresca, and Ms. Rodrigues  
Opposed: None  
Abstentions: None

**The motion carried.**

**HPC#12-21**

Brennan & Jessica Reilly

14 New St.

Block 1902 Lot 8

Present: Mr. Reilly, Applicant

Mr. Reilly began by explaining the reasoning for coming before the HPC after the work to his property was already completed. Mr. Reilly stated that last Fall there was a large Ash tree in the front of the property that needed to be taken down. The roots from the tree were under the walkway, so in order to remove the roots the entire walkway had to be lifted. At that time Mr. Reilly appeared in front of the HPC and received approval to install a bluestone patio with landing area to replace the existing brick one. Due to a snowstorm the contractor was unable to schedule the construction until 2-3 months later. While the contractor was on site to replace the landing area, there was discussion of the plans of what Mr. Reilly would like to do in the future with the house. Mr. Reilly explained that the existing walkway was made of broken slabs of slate and a worn-out dog path that extended into the backyard. When it would rain the dog path would flood and would flow onto the slate and flood the mud room. While the mason was there Mr. Reilly asked for a quote for the walkway and the contractor stated that it could be done while they were already there, or it would be another 2 months before they would be able to come back to complete the project. Mr. Reilly proceeded to apologize to the HPC and stated that he is on the JLUB, Borough Council, and his wife, Ms. Reilly, is a member of the HPC. Mr. Reilly stated that himself and Ms. Reilly discussed whether or not to move forward knowing the risk that if the HPC does not approve the application or wait 2 months to get the work done. Feeling there was little risk due to the fact that the HPC approved the blue slate in the front area, was a replacement to what was there, an improvement to the look, and Mr. Reilly reviewed the lot coverage, they decided to proceed. This project is the first phase of redoing that area of the house. Mr. Reilly plans to get quotes for the remainder of the project that will be done and come in front of the HPC. Mr. Maresca asked if the walkway extends from the driveway to the back of the house? Mr. Reilly stated that that was correct. Mr. Reilly explained that they recently found a brick patio under woodchips in the back yard that is not on his survey and will be going to the Zoning Officer to discuss. Mr. Reilly would like to replace the patio with the blue slate and make it larger at some point. Ms. Rodrigues asked if the walkway was visible from the street and Mr. Reilly stated that is. There was discussion of future plans to the property such as paving the driveway and putting a wall on either side of the driveway as well as making the existing brick patio in the back of the house significantly larger. Mr. Van Arsdale asked if the materials used were the same as in the front of the house and Mr. Reilly said that it was exactly the

same. Mr. Encin stated that it is consistent with the blue stone in the front and is a material that is generally asked for. Mr. Van Arsdale asked Mr. Reilly to keep the HPC in the loop with future projects.

**Motion** was made by Ms. Rodrigues, **seconded** by Mr. Van Arsdale to approve the application as submitted.

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

In favor: Mr. Van Arsdale, Mr. Encin, Mr. Maresca, and Ms. Rodrigues  
Opposed: None  
Abstentions: None

**The motion carried.**

**HPC #13-21**

John Rivell (St. Joseph RC Church)  
8 W. Main St  
Block 1902 Lot 27  
Present: Msgr. Joseph Anginoli, Applicant  
Mr. Rivell, Contractor

Msgr. Joseph Anginoli, pastor for the St. Joseph’s church, summarized the application for the replacement of the shingles on the Chapel roof. Msgr. Anginoli gave the history of the Chapel and explained that the last time anything was done to the Chapel was when the new church was built in the late 80’s and the building is showing signs of age. Msgr. Anginoli stated there will be no changes to the Chapel, only repairs. Msgr. Anginoli explained that at a meeting that he recently attended, it was brought to his attention that the gutters on the side that faces the cemetery need to be replaced with a larger size because water is coming over the existing gutters and flowing into the basement. Msgr. Anginoli explained that the replacement gutters will be the same color as the existing and that they would only be larger. Mr. Maresca asked if the entire roof was being replaced and would the shingles be the same color? Mr. Rivell stated that the entire roof would be replaced, and the color would be the same texture and look. Mr. Van Arsdale asked what the plan for the gutters and Mr. Rivell stated that they would be the same K gutters that are there only would now be 6” instead of 5”. Ms. Rodrigues asked if the 6” gutters would be large enough for the amount of rain that comes off of the roof. Mr. Rivell stated that there was an engineer there when that size was determined.

**Motion** was made by Mr. Encin, **seconded** by Mr. Maresca to approve the application as submitted with the additional approval for the change in gutter size.

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

In favor: Mr. Van Arsdale, Mr. Encin, Mr. Maresca, and Ms. Rodrigues  
Opposed: None  
Abstentions: None

**The motion carried.**

**HPC#11-21**

Scott Tanelli

2 Prospect St  
Block 1901 Lot 5  
Present via phone: Mr. Tanelli, Applicant

Mr. Tanelli summarized the application for fencing that he would like to extend. Mr. Tanelli stated that the property is fenced in on 3 sides with a 48” high wooden picket fence that is painted white and would like to extend it across the front of the property with a 4’x4’ gate matching the existing fencing. Mr. Van Arsdale pointed out that the existing PDF drawing that was submitted does not show that location for the new gate.

Application tabled. Applicant to send revised plan of fencing location.

**DISCUSSION/MISCELLANEOUS**

**a) Dean Road Improvements Sections 1 & 2 Project**

Mr. Van Arsdale summarized the information provided regarding the Dean Rd. project. The HPC concluded that the proposed concrete and granite block curbing and concrete sidewalk as designed is consistent with the rest of the Borough Historic District. Therefore, we are favor of the project.

Mr. Van Arsdale asked for a Motion to approve the use of a like for like curbing material for the Dean Rd. project. **Motion** was made by Mr. Maresca, **seconded** by Mr. Encin to approve.

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

In favor: Mr. Van Arsdale, Mr. Encin, Mr. Maresca, and Ms. Rodrigues  
Opposed: None  
Abstentions: None

**The motion carried.**

**b) Main Street Corridor Design Review Committee-** Tabled to July Meeting

**c) HPC Rules and Regulations-** Tabled to July Meeting

**d) 41 East Main St. walkway-** At a previous meeting Ms. Reilly asked about a walkway at 41 East Main St. that was installed without coming in front of the HPC. Ms. Smith spoke with the Zoning Officer and was told that a walkway does not need a permit and would not trigger the applicant to come before the HPC for approval.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

There being no additional business, Mr. Maresca made a motion to adjourn, and Mr. Encin seconded. On a voice vote, all were in favor. Mr. Van Arsdale adjourned the meeting at 9:05PM.

The next meeting of the HPC will be held on Monday, July 19, 2021 at 7:30PM at the Garabrant Center, 4 Wilson Street, Mendham, NJ.

Respectfully Submitted,

*Lisa Smith*

Lisa Smith  
Land Use Coordinator