

**MINUTES OF THE
MENDHAM BOROUGH
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
November 15, 2010
Phoenix House, 2 West Main Street, Mendham, NJ**

CALL TO ORDER

The regular meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission was called to order by Vice Chair Nicholson at 7:35 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 28, 2010 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. N. Cusano – Present
Mr. M. Furgueson – Present
Mr. C. Nicholson – Present

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

MINUTES

Ms. Jones-Curl made a motion to approve the minutes of the Regular Meeting of September 20, 2010. Mr. Nicholson seconded. All members being in favor, the minutes were approved.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Vice Chair Nicholson opened the meeting for questions and comments by the public on items that were included on the agenda. There being no public comment, the session was closed.

APPLICATIONS

HC 16-10: Zenjon Enterprises, LLC – Recommendation to BOA
Block 1501, Lot 11, 25 East Main St.

Present: Johnathan Krasney, Applicant
 Robert Simon, Esq., Attorney for Applicant
 Lawrence Appel, Architect for Applicant

The applicant had previously been before the Commission twice for a concept review discussion. They filed a formal Historic Preservation Commission application on November 1, 2010 with architectural plans, elevations and materials list. While the site plan application was originally filed with the Planning Board, the completeness review revealed that it needs to be filed with the BOA. While the formal BOA application has not yet been filed, the applicant chose to proceed with the Historic Preservation review for a recommendation to that Board.

Referencing the plans dated October 7, 2010 as prepared by Appel Design Group, Mr. Appel explained that based on previous discussions with the Commission, they were planning on reconstructing the 1-1/2 story cottage, maintaining its character and also constructing a free standing structure in the rear of the property. Given the deteriorating condition of the cottage, it would be reconstructed from the foundation up with the existing character. They have found historical pictures of the cottage and have decided to reinstitute the shutters.

Addressing the joint area between the cottage and the addition, he addressed the previous concern of the Commission that the roof lines needed to be broken up. He indicated that they have added (1) a porch element with columns, (2) a sea brow with a freestanding roof, and (3) A lantern at the top. In terms of the location, they are showing the location of the new structure areas as conforming. They could pull it closer to Main Street if the Commission prefers and the BOA

approves it. The new building in the conforming view is 9 ft. back from the front of the cottage. The cottage is pre-existing non-conforming. The buildings to the west are closer to the street.

Mr. Appel continued that they could have used an addition to the front building instead of adding the rear standalone building, but it would have created a long bulky building. The two buildings will be separated by parking. The rear building will be located beyond the existing paved parking lot on the currently undeveloped property and back up to the school property in the rear and the Paragano building on the east. They are conforming for parking and conforming for coverage. It is the two principal buildings that send them to the Board of Adjustment.

Addressing Mr. Furgueson's question on whether the rear building will look the same as the front building and use similar materials, Mr. Appel responded that they would be using vinyl as opposed to the hardiplank that would be used on the front building. Mr. Nicholson expressed concern that the buildings would not match. Mr. Cusano advised that the two back corners would not be seen and would work, but the two front elevations would be apparent. Mr. Appel added that the two structures are 150 ft. apart.

Responding to Mr. Cusano on whether the buildings are designed to be separate or "brother and sister" buildings, Mr. Appel stated that they are separate. While the rear building has not been designed as a freestanding garage or shed, it is separate. Shutters would be included on both.

As the Commission had previously discussed not including the shutters on the windows, Mr. Cusano explained that many times when the formal drawing is made, the wall to window proportion becomes too great without the shutters. He understood why they had been added. He did, however, express comments in several other areas:

- In terms of the connecting section, he pointed out that the dormer did not line up with the side elevation putting the front and side elevation in question. If a metal roof were to be used, a small area of asphalt would be visible that would not be in keeping. After some discussion, Mr. Appel agreed to bring the metal roof line all the way up to the dormer in the front.
- As the existing building is more historic in memory and function than architecture, he applauded the applicant and the architect in working with the Commission and creating two buildings on the location. The scale of the buildings is appropriate. They have established the streetscape with the existing building and have let the addition fade back to minimize the height on the street.
- He did have a concern on the materials which would need further discussion.

In terms of moving the addition on the front building back from the street, Ms. Jones-Curl explained that she had faced similar issues with her home on Main Street. Her addition sits back and looks much better. It places the emphasis on the original home.

Mr. Nicholson stated that overall he was pleased with the buildings, but the Commission would need to justify why they allowed a historic building to be torn down. The deterioration was an issue, but the concession was that it be similar in window sizes and materials and maintain the look and feel. Mr. Cusano noted that the Commission would not want the vinyl siding that is there today.

Mr. Cusano reviewed the list of materials with the Commission for their comments:

- **Windows:** The proposal is SDL windows either aluminum or vinyl clad. He recommended the aluminum clad. Mr. Appel agreed.
- **PVC Trim Boards:** The Commission has discussed them in other applications. They can be used if painted.
- **Columns:** Those proposed are of good quality.
- **Corner Boards:** They are proposing 4 in. wide boards. They should consider 6 in. on the larger pieces for the proportion.
- **Soffit:** He described his understanding as a vinyl with openings and did not think it appropriate. Mr. Appel explained that this is a hidden vent vinyl beadboard. The vents are hidden at the top of the slots. After the explanations and a short discussion, Mr. Cusano agreed.
- **Shutters:** They are proposed to be a louver wood or Azek. He would like to see an example of the Azek. Mr. Appel indicated that the applicant was looking for maintenance free materials and he had worked with the shutters before.
- **Metal Roof:** Mr. Appel explained that it was a prefinished roof with the look of turn metal.

- **Entry Door:** The applicant was proposing fiberglass doors. Mr. Cusano explained that there is a fine line between maintenance free and not being able to maintain an element. Fiberglass does not hold up to the sun and can appear cheap in the door and light sections. Mr. Appel explained that they would do a thermal painting or gel stained. Mr. Cusano expressed his opinion that a different door should be used. He recommended an aluminum door that could be painted and aluminum clad lights.

Mr. Nicholson again expressed that his major concern is the vinyl siding on the rear building. Mr. Krasney explained that he is not himself a fan of vinyl siding, but the building will be located way back on the lot and not that visible from the street. The ingress and egress will be located on the eastern side, not on the western side and that will provide further buffer to the rear building. The cost difference of vinyl and hardiplank is large.

Ms. Jones-Curl stated that she has visited the site and if the building is located beyond the paved driveway today, it is way back on the property. Mr. Cusano expressed his opinion that while he understood the cost considerations and would support a Commission decision, he thought that the applicant was making a long term mistake by using vinyl on the rear building. It would create a dichotomy of look for the two buildings. There is a façade for both buildings from the rear parking lot and the tenants of the buildings would notice the difference if he were trying to create an upscale look. Responding to Mr. Krasney on whether they would consider vinyl in the back of both the front and rear buildings, Mr. Cusano advised that would be a larger mistake as now the clients would see vinyl in the rear of the front building. Mr. Dannenbaum expressed his opinion that one day there may be a neighbor that would need to look at the building. Mr. Fergusson stated that he preferred the hardiplank, but the objective of the Commission is to reach a balance and the cost is high. The overall project is of benefit to the Borough.

Mr. Appel stated that they would be using Azek quarter boards on the corners. After some further discussion on the Commission goal to assure the streetscape and not that which cannot be seen from the public ways, they agreed that vinyl would be acceptable to them for the rear building.

Before the Commission formulated their recommendation, Mr. Henry, Esq. advised them that since the applicant was going to the BOA for the two buildings, and the two buildings were the recommendation of the Commission, they should include their rationale for why that is the appropriate approach. Depending on the Board interpretation, the BOA could now be reviewing two newly constructed buildings and the front building would no longer be historic. Messrs. Nicholson and Cusano agreed that in addition to the recommendation report, they would attend the BOA meeting to testify. Mr. Cusano also recommended to the applicant that they provide a sketch of what the one building would look like so the BOA could see the difference.

Mr. Cusano raised the issue of the parking indicating that there was a lot of parking that was not in keeping with the character of the Borough. There was a short discussion on the fact that the BOA could consider whether they would allow banking of parking to maintain more of the historic character. Mr. Henry, Esq. advised that the Board would need to consider the type of clients that would be renting space.

Mr. Dannenbaum noted that the applicant reference a Phase I and Phase II. Completing the first building before moving to the second did not concern the Commission.

As there was no public present, there was no public comment.

Mr. Nicholson made a motion to recommend their approval of the elevations dated October 7, 2010 as prepared by Appel Design with the following stipulations:

- The shutters would be of Azek material and of cottage style or an approved alternative which would require returning to the Commission.
- The windows would be SDL aluminum clad or an approved alternative which would require returning to the Commission.
- The front door would be aluminum clad or wood with 9 or 12 lights or an approved alternative which would require returning to the Commission.

Mr. Cusano seconded.

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

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

The motion carried. Ms. Callahan will prepare a draft report that will be reviewed by Mr. Cusano and 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 8:50 p.m. The next regular meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission will be held on Monday, December 20, 2010 at 7:30 p.m. at the Phoenix House, 2 West Main St., Mendham, NJ.

Respectfully Submitted,

Diana Callahan
Recording Secretary