

Franklin Township Historic Preservation Advisory Commission

Regular Monthly Meeting Minutes

November 1, 2016

Location

Franklin Township Municipal Building, 475 DeMott Lane, Somerset, NJ

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by the Chair, Mr. Burian, at 7:35 pm in accordance with the Open Public Meeting Law of 1975.

Attendance

Members: Andrew Burian (left at 10pm before last formal review), Thomas Gale, Anthony Ganim, Susan Goldey, Robert LaCorte, Barbara ten Broeke

Alternate: Nancy Hohnstine

Staff: Vincent Dominach, Senior Zoning Officer

Historian: Robert Mettler

Council Liaison: Dr. Theodore Chase

Absent

Members: Joanne Kaiser

After taking roll, Mr. Gale noted that there was a quorum and the alternate, Ms. Hohnstine, would be voting.

Guests

Craig Alper, President of Alper Enterprises, Inc., for 3037 RT 27, 16-00028

Michael Bryson, designer, for 10 Laurel Avenue, 16-00023

Bill Doran, architect, for 3059 RT 27, 16-00022

Daniel Doran, engineer, for 3059 RT 27, 16-00022

Brandon Fisher, roofing contractor, for 22 Wortman Street, 16-00024, 27 Wortman Street, 16-00025, and 2346 Amwell Road, 16-00026

Daniel Fortunato, architect, for 10 Laurel Avenue, 16-00023

Margot and Larry Freedman, sign shop owners, for 14 Chapel Drive, 16-00020

Kathryn Kopp, Esq. attorney representing Glen & Andrea McParland, for 10 Laurel Avenue, 16-00023

Andrew W Martin, general contractor, for 3037 RT 27, 16-00021

Glen McParland, for 10 Laurel Avenue, 16-00023

James Mitchell, attorney, for 3059 RT 27, 16-00022

Udaya Nallabathula, guest

Diane Pollard, Elder, Six Mile Run Church, for 3037 RT 27, 16-00021 & 16-00028

Ed Potosnak, for 1008 Canal Road, Griggstown, NJ, 16-00011

Mary Schmidt, Finance Committee Chair, Six Mile Run Church, for 3037 RT 27, 16-00021 7 16-00028

Dominick Stanzione, guest interested in joining HPAC

David Weaver, guest interested in joining HPAC

Formal Reviews

1. Review of a Certificate of Appropriateness (CoA) application submitted by Fisher Roofing, 17 Bartle Road, Somerset, NJ, requesting approval to remove the existing asphalt shingles on the rear low sloped roof and replace them with GAF Ruberoid heat applied bitumen membrane for the roofing and flashing and use white aluminum edging at 27 Wortman Street, East Millstone, NJ, Block 73.01, Lot 35, zoned R 10H, and located within the East Millstone Local Historic District. File 16-00025.

The Commission heard testimony from Brandon Fisher, as well as reviewed the information from a CoA application form and documents that included: a descriptive work proposal # 475, dated 10/26/16; a printed black and white photo of the side elevation of the rear addition titled 20161021_141150.jpg, dated 10/25/16; and a printed black and white photo of the rear elevation titled 20161021_141134.jpg, dated 10/25/16. Mr. Fisher also provided copies of an article titled The History of Roofing, dated 8/11, from Roofing.com and an untitled and undated article by Christopher Jurin about asbestos shingles as background for the three applications he was presenting at this meeting.

The Commission was also provided with an Individual Historic Sites Survey form for this property completed c. 1980 that describes the house as c.1890 in a 19th century vernacular style, 3 bay x 5 bay, side hall, 2 story structure with 2/2 double hung windows (text says 1/1 but survey picture shows 2/2 as currently exists), front gable roof, asphalt shingles and a detached garage.

Mr. Fisher explained that the project involves replacing the leaking asphalt shingles on the rear shed roof that pitches to the rear so that it is not visible from the street. He proposes to use a torched down bitumen membrane roll roofing.

No public chose to comment on this application.

A motion was made (Ms. Goldey) and seconded (Mr. LaCorte) to ***approve the Certificate of Appropriateness application requesting approval to remove the existing asphalt shingles on the rear low sloped roof and replace them with GAF Ruberoid heat applied bitumen membrane for the roofing and flashing and use white aluminum edging as submitted.*** The Commission felt that the property has historic significance but that the project as approved would have little negative impact on the historic property, the neighboring historic properties or the local historic district. The motion was passed by unanimous voice vote.

2. Review of a Certificate of Appropriateness (CoA) application submitted by Fisher Roofing, 17 Bartle Road, Somerset, NJ, requesting approval to replace the existing main roof shingles with GAF Sienna diamond asphalt shingles, matching hip and ridge shingles and copper valleys, line the main roof built in gutters with GAF Ruberoid heat applied bitumen gutter liners over the existing 90# roll roofing liners, and install GAF Ruberoid heat applied bitumen membrane over the existing 90# roll roofing on the low slope front porch roof at 22 Wortman Street, East Millstone, NJ, Block 70, Lot 9, zoned R 10H, and located within the East Millstone Local Historic District. File 16-00024.

The Commission heard testimony from Brandon Fisher, as well as reviewed the information from a CoA application form and documents that included: a descriptive work proposal # 462, dated 10/17/16; a printed color photo of the front elevation titled IMG_0155.jpg, dated 10/25/16; and a printed color photo of the side elevation titled IMG_0157.jpg, dated 10/25/16.

The Commission was also provided with an Individual Historic Sites Survey form for this property completed c. 1980 that describes the house as c.1890 in a 19th century vernacular style, 3 bay x 2 bay, 2 ½ story, center hall structure with 2/2 double hung windows, cross gable roof, paired brackets, asphalt shingles, round headed window in front gable, and a 1 story, partial width, centered, front porch with square posts and simple cornice.

Mr. Fisher explained the project is to replace the current 3-tab asphalt on the main roof with a long lifespan, designer asphalt shingle in a diamond shape and showed the Commission product samples. He estimated that the existing roof was about 25 years old. Mr. Ganim asked about the existing roof sheathing and Mr. Fisher reported that it was a solid tongue and groove wood deck. Mr. Fisher mentioned that new cooper valleys were being installed. Mr. Burian asked about the gutters and Mr. Fisher said the existing built in gutters would be retained and would be lined with a new torched down bitumen gutter lining material in a charcoal color. He also reported that the low pitch front porch will receive a torched down bitumen membrane roof.

Members discussed the appropriateness of diamond shingles saying they were once a more common pattern used in the early 20th century. It was noted that while Sanborn insurance maps from the turn of the 20th century show that the predominant roof types in the village were once wood or slate shingle, members felt that the diamond shape is more historically appropriate than some other modern designer asphalt shingles and could be justified in this situation.

No public chose to comment on this application.

A motion was made (Mr. LaCorte) and seconded (Mr. Ganim) to ***approve the Certificate of Appropriateness application requesting approval to replace the existing main roof shingles with GAF Sienna diamond asphalt shingles, matching hip and ridge shingles and copper valleys, line the main roof built in gutters with GAF Ruberoid heat applied bitumen gutter liners over the existing 90# roll roofing liners, and install GAF Ruberoid heat applied bitumen membrane over the existing 90# roll roofing on the low slope front porch roof as presented.***

The Commission felt that the property has historic significance but that the project as approved would have little negative impact on the historic property, the neighboring historic properties or the local historic district. The motion was passed by unanimous voice vote.

3. Review of a Certificate of Appropriateness (CoA) application submitted by Fisher Roofing, 17 Bartle Road, Somerset, NJ, requesting approval to replace the existing asphalt shingle roofs on the east and west wings with CertainTeed Independence asphalt shingles and matching hip and ridge shingles at 2346 Amwell Road East Millstone, NJ, Block 71, Lot 3.01, zoned R 10H, and located within the East Millstone Local Historic District. File 16-00026.

The Commission heard testimony from Brandon Fisher and owner Barbara ten Broeke, as well as reviewed the information from a CoA application form and documents that included; a descriptive work proposal # 470, dated 10/20/16; a printed color photo of the east rear elevation titled IMG_0209.jpg, dated 10/25/16; a printed color photo of the front center elevation titled FullSizeRender.jpg, dated 10/25/16; and a printed color photo showing the details of the shingles currently on the west wing roof titled 20161018_132149.jpg, dated 10/25/16.

The Commission was also provided with an Individual Historic Sites Survey form for this property completed c. 1980 that erroneously lists the house as c. 1950 in a 20th Century Developer style structure but then mentions a c. 1920s photo that shows the house with a different front door and porch detail. The form dates the single story right (west) wing with cupola as a c. 1960s addition. Clearly the 2 story, 3 bay x 2 bay, side gable, side hall, center section with 9/6 double hung windows on the first floor, 6/6 double hung windows on second floor and a pair of internal chimneys is older, possibly 150 to 200+ years old. The east wing is likely older than c. 1950, possibly as old or older than the center section and west single story wing may be older than the 1960s too.

Mr. Fisher started the discussion by telling the Commission that at this project he had come across a roof product that he never seen before. When asked to explain, he turned members' attention to the photo of the west wing's roof as he explained that it was a layered asphalt shingle similar to a modern dimensional asphalt shingle but with a simulated wood grain surface that was unusual. He said he knows of no modern asphalt shingle with a similar wood grain surface but that he felt that in all other aspects the proposed asphalt shingles match the existing shingles, suggesting that it was an in kind replacement. When asked, Ms. ten Broeke said that just the east and west wings would be replaced in this project but that when they are ready to replace the main center section's roof, they would like to use the same shingles proposed for this project. On the question of age, Mr. Fisher and Ms. ten Broeke suggested that the west wing's roof could date from the 1930s and that the east wing's roof from the 1950s.

No public chose to comment on this application.

A motion was made (Ms. Goldey) and seconded (Ms. Hohnstine) to **approve the Certificate of Appropriateness application requesting approval to replace the existing asphalt shingle roofs on the east and west wings with Certainteed Independence asphalt shingles and matching hip and ridge shingles as presented.** The Commission felt that the property has historic significance but that the project as approved would have little negative impact on the historic property, the neighboring historic properties or the local historic district. The motion was passed by unanimous voice vote with Ms. ten Broeke recusing herself, as a co-owner with her husband, from voting.

4. Review of a Certificate of Appropriateness (CoA) application submitted by AW Martin Construction, Inc., 614 US 130 Ste 5, E. Windsor, NJ, requesting emergency repair approval to rebuild in kind the rear stairs and entry porch deck damaged by a car at 3037 RT 27, Franklin Park, NJ (Six Mile Run Church), Block 35, lot 4, zoned NBH, and located within the Franklin Park Local Historic District. File 16-00021

The Commission heard testimony from Andrew W Martin, as well as reviewed the information from a CoA application form and documents that included: an undated drawing titled Deck repairs with a plan view of the deck with notes and other detail drawings; an undated drawing titled Deck Steps with a side elevation of the steps and railing as well as specifications; and a set of undated printed black and white photos that include recent views of the damaged steps, deck, railings at the entry door taken from the stairs side (looking northeast), head on towards the door (looking southeast), at an angle (looking south), at a distance to include more of the rear elevation (looking east) and from the back side of the deck (looking southwest).

The church is an individually listed State and National Register Historic Site. The c. 1879 main sanctuary section replaced an earlier c. 1817 structure destroyed by fire, the memorial chapel was added c. 1907, and the fellowship hall, to which the stairs and deck are attached, was added c. 1957. The style of the sanctuary is described as late Victorian Carpenter Gothic, the chapel as Gothic Revival, the fellowship hall as neo-colonial vernacular. The sanctuary and chapel sections have steeply pitched slate roofs and wood shingle siding while the fellowship hall has vinyl shingle siding and a moderately pitched asphalt shingle roof.

Mr. Martin said that the stairs, railing and deck need to be repaired after being damaged when a car ran into them. He noted that the repairs will be made with direct in kind replacements of the existing components. He explained that the frame, posts and railing will be replaced using pressure treated lumber and he said he would like to use a composite decking material for the surface of the stairs and deck. The Commission noted that the deck is behind the fellowship hall near the middle of the property so is not readily visible from anywhere but the church's rear driveway.

No public chose to comment on this application.

A motion was made (Ms. ten Broeke) and seconded (Ms. Goldey) to **approve the Certificate of Appropriateness application requesting emergency repair approval to rebuild in kind the rear stairs and entry porch deck damaged by a car as submitted.** The Commission felt that the property has historic significance but that the deck and the fellowship hall to which they are attached are not historically significant so the repairs as approved would have little negative impact on the historic property, the neighboring historic properties or the local historic district. The motion was passed by unanimous voice vote [Mr. LaCorte had stepped out of the meeting during the hearing so did not vote].

5. Review of a Certificate of Appropriateness (CoA) application submitted by Alper Enterprises, Inc., 530 Kings Highway, Moorestown, NJ, requesting approval to replace the existing slate roof in kind at 3037 RT 27 Franklin Park, NJ (Six Mile Run Church), Block 35, lot 4, zoned NBH, and located within the Franklin Park Local Historic District. File 16-00028

The Commission heard testimony from Craig Alper, as well as reviewed the information from a CoA application form and documents that included: a nine page report prepared by EagleView Technologies, Inc., dated 6/5/2016 with: Report cover page with table of contents, roof details data, and a plan view drawing of building; Page 1 with a black and white printed photo titled Top View which is a plan view aerial photo of the building; Page 2 with two black and white printed photos titled North Side which is an oblique view aerial photo of the north side of the building and South Side which is an oblique view aerial photo of the south side of the building; Page 3 with two black and white printed photos titled East Side which is an oblique view aerial photo of the east side of the building and West Side which is an oblique view aerial photo of the west side of the building; Page 4 titled Length Diagram with a plan view drawing of the building, length data and roof dimensions indicated; Page 5 titled Pitch Diagram with a plan view drawing of the building with roof pitch data indicated; Page 6 titled Area Diagram with a plan view drawing of the building with total and individual roof sections area indicated; Page 7 titled Notes Diagram with a plan view drawing of the building on which report notes are indicated; Page 8 titled Penetration Notes Diagram with a plan view drawing of the building with roof penetrations and data indicated; Page 9 titled Report Summary with charts and data from the report; two pages copied from a product brochure for GAF

WeatherWatch leak barrier; and two pages copied from a product brochure for Evergreen Slate. At the meeting, Mr. Martin provided the Commission with printed color versions of pages 1-3 from the EagleView report.

As mentioned in the previous review, the church is a State and National Register Historic Site that currently has slate roofs on both the sanctuary section and the chapel section. Mr. Alper said that the sanctuary still has its original slate roof that, after over 135 years, has started to deteriorate to the point that it needs to be replaced. The proposal calls for in kind replacement using new 18"x9" Vermont semi-weathering slate installed with a 7" exposure. Mr. Alper noted that copper will be used as flashing where needed. Mr. Burian asked about the need for snow guards but Mr. Alper said that, as there were no gutters or sidewalks directly below the roof, they were not needed. Ms. Hohnstine asked if the original roof would be recycled and Mr. Alper said the church could receive the salvaged materials. Ms. Goldey asked what material was on the chapel roof and Mr. Alper said he believed that it was a synthetic slate material like Ecoslate. He was asked about the costs of real vs synthetic slate and said that a lot depends on the materials selected and the type of roof but that the weight of real slate can be a factor and that the labor costs to install real slate can run three times the labor costs of synthetic slate.

No public chose to comment on this application.

A motion was made (Mr. LaCorte) and seconded (Mr. Ganim) to **approve the Certificate of Appropriateness application requesting approval to replace the existing slate roof in kind as proposed.** The Commission felt that the property has historic significance but that the in kind roof replacement as approved would have little to no negative impact on the historic property, the neighboring historic properties or the local historic district. The motion was passed by unanimous voice vote.

6. Review of a Certificate of Appropriateness (CoA) application submitted by Signarama Manville, 32 S. Main St., Manville, NJ, requesting approval to install new lettering on a church building and 4 additional address detail signs at 14 Chapel Drive, Zarephath, NJ, Block 516, Lot 1, 2, 3, zoned A, and located within the D&R Canal Historic District. File 16-00020

The Commission heard testimony from Margot Freedman, as well as reviewed the information from a CoA application form and documents that included a job proposal sheet with a printed color photo simulation of the lettering proposed for the Ministry Center with dimensions and materials detailed, and a job proposal sheet with elevations of four proposed signs, sign dimensions and materials details, and four printed color photo simulations of the signs mounted as proposed.

Ms. Freedman started the discussion by describing the lettering that is proposed for the curved front of the Ministry Center. She noted that the individual letters would be of lightweight black PVC plastic mounted using threaded rod. When asked, she said there would be no lighting. It was noted that there was no site plan or survey included with the application so members were uncertain where the Ministry Building was on the property. Ms. Freedman said it was a new building somewhat behind but near the old high school on the property east of Weston Canal Road. Members were not familiar with the building coming for Commission review and Mr. Dominach offered to look into its approval.

Ms. Freeman explained that the four other signs were basically address signs being installed to help first responders and others identify the individual buildings. She said they would be made from 1" thick PVC plastic boards, 20"h x 24"w and include the address and name of the buildings. She indicated that each unique sign would be mounted to the side of the individual buildings including the new ministry building, the old high school, and the two trailers being used for offices. When asked, she said that only the #1 sign would face Weston Canal Road and estimated the distance to the road as over 100 feet.

No public chose to comment on this application.

A motion was made and seconded to **approve the Certificate of Appropriateness application to requesting approval to install new lettering on a church building and 4 additional address detail signs as submitted.** The Commission felt that the property has historic significance but that the buildings involved with this proposal do not so the alterations as approved would have little negative impact on the historic property, the neighboring historic properties or the local historic district. The motion was passed by unanimous voice vote.

7. Review of a Certificate of Appropriateness (CoA) application [FTHPAC recommendation to FTZBA on Variance application] submitted by James Rivera, PO Box 264, New Hope, NJ, requesting approval to install a first floor master bedroom addition onto the existing house at 150 Grouser Road, Block 73.01, Lot 1.08, zoned CP, and located within the D&R Canal Historic District. File 16-00027

No one appeared to present this application so the Commission took no action.

8. Review of a Certificate of Appropriateness (CoA) application submitted by Glen & Andrea McParland, owners, requesting approval to add a carport, change siding, remove 2 windows and replace all others, add fencing and extend the stone wall, add a driveway gate, replace the roof, and repair and extend foundation at 10 Laurel Ave., Kingston, NJ, Block 3, Lots 12 & 13, zoned R 10H, and located within the Kingston Local Historic District. File 16-00023

The Commission heard testimony from Daniel Fortunato, Kathryn Kopp, Michael Bryson, and the applicant, Glen McParland, as well as reviewed the information from a CoA application form and documents that included: four pages of undated printed color photos of the property with a view of the front façade and front wall head on, a view of the front façade and wall from a slight right angle, a view of the front and right side facades, wall, and right side and rear yards, and a view of the front and left facades, wall, and left side and rear yards; two elevation renderings of the proposed fence and carport additions and building alterations; a colorized rendering of the front façade and proposed fence; a site survey prepared by Land Map, Inc. dated 6/14/16; and a set of architectural drawings prepared by Daniel Fortunato Architect, P. A., dated 10/17/16, that include a sheet titled A-1 with the proposed basement/foundation plan, proposed site plan, and construction notes, a sheet titled A-2 with proposed first and second floor plans and construction notes, and a sheet titled A-3 with front, rear, left and right side elevations and construction notes.

The applicants, Glen and Andrea McParland, had previously submitted a similar application as file 16-0013 that the Commission reviewed at the 9/6/16 regular meeting but the Commission felt that more information was needed so only made suggestions in an informal review format.

Previously, the Commission learned that the building dates from c. 1845 and has been reported to have been used as a doctor's office and by an undertaker at various times. We also learned the McParlands are new owners having purchased the property in June.

The perimeter fence was discussed first. We learned that the existing stone faced CMU wall will be retained but that the spaces between the capped columns will be filled in with new, decorative wrought metal like units similar to a piece that was found in the house. Though the drawings made it seem as though the columns were being raised, we learned they will remain unchanged and that the metal units will be installed in between to just fill the space below the top of the columns giving the wall a more uniform and substantial, while still relatively low, height. A decorative arched top gate in a matching wrought pattern is proposed to be installed between the columns where there is a gap in the wall that leads to the front walk. The existing wall currently stops at the driveway and there is currently no fence across the remaining front side yard of the property. The applicants are proposing to install a new wall in the empty space from the edge of the driveway to the front corner of their property using a stone faced CMU and metal inserts in the same style and dimensions as the existing wall. They are also proposing to install new aluminum decorative fencing on either side of the driveway from the front wall to beyond the front of the house. They also propose an arched top gate be installed in this new fence leading from the driveway to the front walk and another arched topped gate be installed across the driveway at the rear end of the new driveway fence. They also propose a new side yard fence be installed using matching aluminum fence from the front wall for the first twelve feet and for the remainder of the side yard using six foot white PVC solid fencing. Ms. Goldey asked about the finish on the vinyl fence and we learned that it would have a matte finish. Mr. Burian asked if they had considered wood instead of vinyl and Mr. McParland said that the neighbors have a vinyl fence that they were copying.

Windows were discussed next. We learned that the existing windows are proposed to be replaced with new Anderson 400 Series 2/1 double hung windows that are vinyl clad on the outside and have a wood face on the inside. The front and bay windows will be replaced with the same size. The second floor bedroom windows on the driveway side of the house will be enlarged slightly to meet egress code. Mr. Burian asked if the similarly located first floor windows directly below them will be enlarged to match and we learned that they will be enlarged as well. Ms. Goldey asked how much wider the windows will be to meet code and we learned that they will be 3" wider and will be centered in the existing space. Mr. Ganim asked about the existing plaster and we learned that the interior had already been gutted. We also learned that the new windows will have screens and storms. Mr. Fortunato noted that to accommodate the revised floor plan, several windows in the rear will be removed and a second floor window near the back on the side opposite the driveway will also be removed. It was also noted that the existing basement windows will be replaced with sliding vinyl windows and the new rear foundation under the carport addition will have new casement windows and egress window wells.

The siding was the next item reviewed. Mr. Fortunato explained that they plan to remove the existing siding and sheathing and then install 5/8" plywood sheathing and Hardy Board fiber cement siding in the same size, color, and exposure and the existing wood siding. Mr. Burian asked why the original siding was not being retained and Mr. Fortunato explained that it was in poor condition, there were inconsistencies and there was a need to fill several window openings with the modifications proposed. Mr. Burian asked about trim and corner boards and Mr. Fortunato

explained that HardyTrim fiber cement trim would be used for the new work but it was noted that the original gingerbread rake trim, exposed rafter tails, and front porch trim would be retained and refinished as required.

The roof was discussed next. Mr. Fortunato said they were proposing to install a standing seam metal roof after the existing asphalt shingle roof was removed. Mr. Gale noted that the plans mention a standing seam metal roof on the bay window and the front porch but note that the main roof would be a material selected by the owner. Ms. Kopp said that the intention was to install a standing seam metal roof on the main roof also but that if their plans change that they would come back for Commission for approval of an alternative roof. Mr. Fortunato mentioned that they propose to install ½ round gutters and smooth round downspouts.

Mr. Fortunato discussed the front and back doors next. He said the front door will be replaced in kind and that the rear upper patio door will be full glass, similar to what is proposed for the basement entrance. The first floor rear door will also be a replacement with glass in the upper half.

The foundation was the next item reviewed. The plans call for the building to be raised and the entire existing foundation replaced. The area under the carport will also be excavated to create additional basement area. Engineered plank will be used for the deck over the carport basement. There was a discussion about how the water table might impact the project but there was no expectation of problems expressed. The new foundation will be made of CMU and Mr. McParland noted that the exterior will have a stucco finish.

The next topic was the new carport design. Mr. Fortunato explained that the upper deck perimeter will be enclosed with white posts and black metal balusters with a wave pattern. There was discussion about the potential to match the metal of the front but some felt that they were two separate and distinct areas so did not need to match visually. Mr. Burian said he felt that eliminating the spiral stairs at the rear of the deck would improve the appearance of the carport. Mr. Fortunato explained that a regular scissor type stair would take up more space. Mr. Goldey asked if it was required by code and Mr. Fortunato said it was not but added to the overall safety of the deck. Mr. McParland added that it would allow guests to come and go without having to go through their upper floor bedroom area. Mr. Ganim asked about the stair material and we learned that it would be metal. He also asked about the height and we learned that the deck would be 11' high. It was explained that the deck would be made of bar joists and receive a vinyl bead board ceiling below and a membrane surface above. Mr. Ganim asked about how thick the deck would be and how it would be trimmed. Mr. Fortunato answered that it would be about a foot thick and that it would likely be trimmed in a HardyTrim fiber cement material but that the width may present some design issues. The depth of the carport was discussed with Mr. Fortunato explaining that the proposed depth is 30' with about 20' of parking space. Mr. Burian wondered if the depth might be reduced. Ms. Hohnstine asked if the roadbed of the carport would be paved with asphalt and Mr. Fortunato said it would have an epoxy membrane surface. Mr. McParland pointed out that as the house sits close to the busy road it is currently hard to turn around on the site and there isn't much space for guests to park. He felt that the carport would help correct some of these issues.

Moving on to the front porch, we learned that the existing concrete porch will be replaced in kind but that the other features will not change. The foundation of the front porch was discussed in more detail and it was noted that currently the foundation and the piers supporting the front columns were

also stone faced CMU like the front wall. Members asked if the exposed porch foundation could be done in stone faced CMU that match the wall since new material was also required for the new portion of the front wall and the applicant agreed to use stone faced CMU there.

Discussion returned to the appropriateness and size of the carport. Arguments on appropriateness included that it did little damage to the historic elements of the house, that it was relatively easily removed and that the open design helped keep it from being overwhelming. Mr. Burian pressed the issue of size and felt that the carport could function fine being 28' deep rather than 30' deep.

The meeting was opened to the public and Mr. Weaver, who lives across the street from the property, said he had no issues with what was proposed. No one else chose to comment on this application so the public portion was closed.

A motion was made (Ms. Goldey) and seconded (Mr. LaCorte) to **approve all parts of the Certificate of Appropriateness application (i.e. siding, windows, fencing, wall, gates, roof, foundation and front porch) except the proposed carport as discussed on the condition that if it is determined that the existing roof deck can't support the proposed metal roof that the applicants will return for approval of an alternate roof material.** The motion was passed by unanimous voice vote.

A second motion was made (Mr. Burain) and seconded (Mr. LaCorte) to **approve the part of the Certificate of Appropriateness application that proposes the carport as discussed on the condition that the depth of the carport is reduced by 2' from the proposed 30' to 28'.** The motion was passed by majority roll call vote.

The Commission felt that the property has historic significance but that the alterations as conditionally approved would have minimal negative impact on the historic property, the neighboring historic properties or the local historic district.

At this point in the meeting, Mr. Burian excused himself and Mr. LaCorte assumed the role of Chair for the rest of the meeting.

9. Review of a Certificate of Appropriateness (CoA) application [FTHPAC recommendation to FTPB on Site Plan application] submitted by S4 Estates, requesting approval to construct a 14,989 sf retail building including 9,989 sf of proposed retail space and 5,000 of proposed restaurant space and the potential of consolidating the two existing lots into one new lot at 3059 RT 27, Franklin Park, NJ, Block 34.01, Lot 32.01 & 33.01, zoned NBH, and located within the Franklin Park Local Historic District. File 16-00022.

The Commission heard testimony from Bill Doran, Daniel Doran, and James Mitchell, as well as reviewed the information from a CoA application form and documents that included: a set of preliminary and final site plan drawings, numbered 16001, prepared by William Doran and Sons, dated 8/27/16, that include a sheet title area map, sheet titled site plan, and a sheet titled lighting and landscaping plan; and a set of architectural drawings prepared by 3D Architecture, last dated 9/27/16 that include a sheet labeled A-1 showing a first floor plan and south elevation and a sheet labeled A-2 showing West, East, and North Elevations.

The applicant, S4 Estates, had previously submitted a similar application as file 16-0014 that the Commission reviewed at the 9/6/16 regular meeting but the Commission felt that more information was needed so it was only discussed in an informal review format.

Previously we had learned that the proposal was for the construction of a new shopping center on the vacant lot where Chauncey's Restaurant used to be before it was improperly demolished without Commission approval in 2009 and on the neighboring lot that has an existing house that had a proposal to construct a new 6,270 sf commercial building to be used as an electronics store in 2006 but that was never built. There was discussion of the recession era permit extension act related the need to demolish the existing house. Mr. Dominach felt that the requirements had been met and that no further approvals regarding the existing house were required.

Mr. Mitchell introduced Mr. B. Doran who reviewed the design of the proposed building noting it would be 152' wide and 102' deep creating 15,000 sf of retail space. He also noted that the façade would have various heights ranging from 26' to 31'. Walls, he said, will be mainly stucco with a stone face base and decorative trim. He explained that the design is similar to what was proposed in the 2006 application but the proposed building is larger now. Ms. Hohnstine asked if terracotta decorative pieces might be introduced into the design to recall and reference the important history of terracotta manufacture in Franklin Township and Mr. B. Donn indicated that it could be considered. She suggested a keystone design might be used. Members asked about plumbing and bathrooms and Mr. Donn explained that bathrooms might be located near the front doors but the final plumbing would not be designed until there were specific tenants to accommodate their needs. There was a discussion about tenants but Mr. B. Donn and Mr. Mitchell said that other than the potential to have part of the building used as restaurant space there were no concrete plans. There were questions about how a restaurant including a kitchen would be incorporated into the proposed design. Mr. B. Donn said that the unit opposite the driveway, #104, was targeted as the location for a restaurant but that the space could be adjusted as required. Mr. Chase noted that the 10 year old commercial space behind this property is currently fairly vacant. Ms. Hohnstine asked if there was second floor use and Mr. B. Donn said that there would just be storage space. There was discussion about the doors and windows, particularly on the street side. The Commission learned that the doors on the street side were really not intended for use and there was discussion that changes to the window and door design necessitated by a particular tenancy might not necessarily have to come back to the Commission. Mr. Dominach explained that the Commission was basically commenting on the architectural appearance in general. On the suggestion that the windows might be more historic, Mr. B. Donn said he did not believe they would be appropriate in this design. Mr. Ganim asked about signage and Mr. Dominach suggested that they would have to come back for sign approvals. Mr. Mitchell asked if in general a typical sign design might be proposed and suggested that they might like to use channel lit signs. Mr. Dominach suggested that one common style be used for all the tenants. There was concern expressed about certain tenants needing to meet corporate design guidelines. Mr. Gale said he believed past suggestions were for panels like those on the Cedar Grove Shopping Center.

Mr. Ganim asked about site lighting and Mr. D. Donn produced a drawing from the site plan drawings, numbered 16001, prepared by William Doran and Sons, dated 8/27/16, titled Construction Details to show the design of the proposed light fixtures. He explained that the low profile heads using LED lights will be mounted on 14' bronze or green bronze poles. Mr. Ganim

asked if it would be possible to use something more antique looking and Mr. D. Donn said that he had not found anything that was usable other than sodium which wasn't favored. He stated that the lights would go off one hour after closing. There was a discussion about the site layout including parking, trash receptacle, and detention basin locations and screening of the site. Mr. D. Donn said the detention basin was located in relation to the natural flow of the site. He said he took advantage of the bump out of the site behind the doctor's office property to locate parking there. He noted that the plans call for a 6' white vinyl stockade fence along the north and west sides of the site as well as a mixture of deciduous and evergreen plantings which he said will eventually grow taller than the fence. Ms. Hohnstine suggested that too often vegetative screens are neglected and become ineffective. She also noted that the plans call for ash trees that are threatened by the emerald ash borer but Mr. Dominach said that is something not in our jurisdiction but is something that will be address by the Planning Board. Mr. Ganim asked if an 8' fence had been considered to better screen the property from the neighboring residential properties but Mr. Dominach suggested that an 8' fence may be more objectionable to the neighbors than a 6' fence. Mr. D. Donn also noted that there will be a post and rail fence around the detention basin. Mr. Gale expressed concern that the parking design puts quite a few cars facing the rear yards of the historic houses that front on Pleasant Plains Road separated only by a fence and some plantings. He said he would favor a site plan that included more of a buffer to minimize the impact of the site on the neighboring historic properties.

No public chose to comment on this application.

A motion was made (Mr. LaCorte) and seconded (Ms. Goldey) to ***take no exception to the proposal to construct a 14,989 sf retail building including 9,989 sf of proposed retail space and 5,000 sf of proposed restaurant space and the potential of consolidating the two existing lots into one new lot noting the need to maintain the landscaping, the suggestion that terracotta details be incorporated into the design and the concerns of the neighbors be respected.*** The Commission felt that the property as a vacant lot has little historic value (though it once had greater significance when there were buildings on it) and that the project as discussed would have minimal negative impact on the property, the neighboring historic properties or the local historic district. The motion was passed by majority voice vote.

Informal Reviews:

1. Ed Potosnak, the owner at 1008 Canal Road, Griggstown NJ. Re: Discussion related to the recent demolition without approval of a barn on the property.

Mr. Potosnak had appeared at the 6/7/16 HPAC regular meeting seeking approval to rehab the existing barn and add a deck at 1008 Canal Road, Griggstown, NJ, Block 19 Lots 22/23, zoned CP and located within the D&R Canal Local Historic District. File 16-00011

From documents, the Commission had learned that the two story, side gable, 36' x18.5' vernacular barn with irregular bays is set midway back on a treed lot over 450' deep that backs up to the D&R Canal. The c. 1980 Historic Structures Survey Form mentions that one of the outbuildings was used as a weaving shop by the notable owner, John Honeyman, but the form does not identify which outbuilding nor does it specifically describe or date the barn. The house is dated c. 1750 on the form.

On 6/17/16, Mr. Potosnak had explained that they were the new owners of the property and that they wanted to first rehab the barn so that they could live there while they worked on restoring the Honeyman House. He walked the Commission through the existing conditions including the metal roof that was failing and missing sections. He also described the existing siding as simple board siding.

The Commission had tried to understand the age of the barn to determine its historic significance. Following a discussion with Mr. Potosnak, members felt that there was some potential that it was an early barn but that could not be confirmed. It was acknowledged that it could just as easily be a replacement. From Mr. Potosnak's description of the roof framing, members felt that the roof is likely not as old as the rest of the barn. Mr. Potosnak also noted that they discovered the remains of a foundation near the garden that might be the location of a Honeyman era building.

The Commission reviewed Mr. Potosnak's proposals to replace the roof, siding, windows, doors, gutters and downspouts, add an exterior stairway and change a part of the rear roof and add a second story deck. Following the review, the Commission voted unanimously to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness application to rehab the existing barn and add a deck with the following conditions:

- 1) The replacement siding will exclusively be vertical board and batten siding.
- 2) The replacement roof will be a standing seam metal roof.

The Commission felt that the property has historic significance but that the additions and alterations to the barn as conditionally approved would have little negative impact on the historic property, the neighboring historic properties or the local historic district.

Since that meeting the Township had issued a stop work order. Mr. Potosnak explained that he had come to the meeting to discuss what had taken place once he started work on the barn. He reviewed what they had understood about the barn when they purchased it and explained how they had to get a use variance to use it as a residence even though it had been used as living space prior to their purchase.

He apologized for not being able to distribute copies of pictures he wanted to discuss and for having to view them on his laptop, but he went through some of the issues they had once they started working on the building. He discussed and showed examples of the deteriorated conditions of some of the walls and roof. He said they had tried to correct how out of level and plumb the building was by jacking, but as they removed more and more material, they discovered how deteriorated much of the frame was. He said with the assistance of his father-in-law, who was familiar with timber framing, they had tried to replace parts of the frame using custom ordered replacements to repair it but noted that a full demolition would have been easier and cheaper. He explained that several of the salvageable frame parts were used in areas where they would be visible but acknowledged that much of the second floor was framed in modern platform framing style. Mr. Dominach explained that the Construction Department considered the work a repair so there was no need for it to come back to the Commission for review. He noted that the stop work order was issued because the Township wanted Mr. Potosnak to demonstrate that the foundation would support the building that was being completed. Mr. Potosnak offered that an engineer had noted that the barn frame was primarily hemlock and speculated that it dated from the 1840s.

Some members saw the project as a dismantling of the barn which by definition would be a demolition requiring Commission review.

Adjournment

Due to the late hour, a motion to suspend to rest of the agenda and adjourn the meeting was made at 11:45 pm and passed by unanimous voice vote.

Respectfully submitted,

Thomas Gale, Secretary

EC:

Robert Vornlocker, Township Manager
Ann Marie McCarthy, Township Clerk
Mark Healey, Director of Planning
Vincent Dominach, Senior Zoning Officer
FTHPAC members