

- Franklin Township Historic Preservation Advisory Commission
Regular Monthly Meeting Minutes
April 7, 2015

Location

Large Conference Room, Franklin Township Municipal Building, 475 DeMott Lane, Somerset, NJ

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Barbara Lawrence at 7:30 pm in accordance with the Open Public Meeting Law of 1975.

Attendance

Present

Members: Andrew Burian, Thomas Gale, Susan Goldey, Anthony Ganim, Joanne Kaiser, Robert LaCorte, Barbara Lawrence, Barbara ten Broeke

Alternates: Frank Aiello, Nancy Hohnstine

Staff: Vincent Dominach, Senior Zoning Officer

Council Liaison: Councilman Chase

Absent

Members: Jean Ambrose

Historian: Bob Mettler

Guests

Robert Bertrand, presenting 17 S. Middlebush Rd., Somerset, NJ

Bill Bowman, Franklin Reporter & Advocate

George M Conway, Jr., Trap Rock Industries, representing Joseph and William Stavola, LLC, for 1391 Canal Road, Princeton, NJ

Kelly Glasgow, DiGroup Architects, presenting Rutgers Prep, 1345 Easton Ave., Somerset, NJ

Tom Kulik, neighbor of 1069 Canal Road, Griggstown, NJ

Carlos Matos, presenting 1069 Canal Road, Griggstown, NJ

Saira Rauf, presenting 1069 Canal Road, Griggstown, NJ

Peter Richardson, presenting Rutgers Prep, 1345 Easton Ave., Somerset, NJ

Shahzad Shakir, presenting 1069 Canal Road, Griggstown, NJ

Jeffery Venezia, DiGroup Architects., presenting Rutgers Prep, 1345 Easton Ave., Somerset, NJ

Adrian Villafan, presenting 17 S. Middlebush Rd., Somerset, NJ

Nancy Zerbe, Arch2, Inc., presenting Rutgers Prep, 1345 Easton Ave., Somerset, NJ

Formal Reviews

Ms. Lawrence started with a discussion of the review process. She said the Commission is guided by the Township's Code and by the Secretary of Interior's Standards which are broken down into four parts including preservation which is the attempt to retain original materials or replace in-kind, rehabilitation which involves repair and reuse, restoration which is returning to an earlier period, and reconstruction which is replacing something that has been lost. She added that in general it is better to repair first, replace in kind if a repair is not possible, or, finally, restore what is missing since reconstruction is not usually practiced on the private property owner level.

1. Review of a Certificate of Appropriateness application submitted by Robert Bertrand, 17 South Middlebush Road, Somerset, NJ, requesting approval to replace an existing cedar shingle roof with a laminated asphalt shingle roof at 17 S. Middlebush Rd., Block 79, Lot 9.01, Zoned R-20H, located within the Middlebush Village Local Historic District. File No. 15-00008

The Commission heard testimony from Robert Bertrand and Adrian Villafan, reviewed a thirteen page packet of documents prepared by the applicants that included a statement of the justifications for replacing the wood shingle roof with asphalt, two pages from the Middlebush Village State and National Register Historic District nomination including a picture and description of the property, two pages with five printed color photos showing existing conditions, a copy of an insurance policy letter stating that a wood roof is ineligible for coverage, three pages of printed color photos of other roofs in Middlebush with a description of the type roofs of each, and six pages of product information for the proposed asphalt architectural shingle replacement roof.

Mr. Bertrand explained that the existing roof is approximately 30 years old. He said that contractors who repaired the four chimneys last year replaced some shingles but the whole roof is rotting and needs to be replaced. He said he tried to consider replacing in-kind but found it would be difficult. He said that the roofer the previous owner had used to maintain the roof has retired and one he has used in the past is approaching retirement. Mr. Bertrand felt that in general it was hard to find roofers with wood roof experience. He also mentioned that the insurance company that he and the prior owner had used was no longer willing to insure the property if it had a wood shingle roof. He felt that trying to replace the roof in-kind would be difficult and expensive. He felt that the proposed Tanko Heritage Vintage asphalt architectural shingles were a better option as they would be less costly, longer lasting, and insurable. He also noted that his was the only house in Middlebush currently with a wood roof.

The Commission noted the high architectural significance of the 2 ½ story, 5 bay wide by 3 bay deep, c. 1840s Greek Revival/Italianate house and how the existing wood roof was a unique and important characteristic. Mr. Burian offered to provide Mr. Bertrand a list of contractors skilled in wood roofs if he was interested. Members discussed with Mr. Bertrand the availability of cedar shingles that have been pressure-treated with fire retardant and other options to help improve the fire resistance of a wood roof but Mr. Bertrand stated that he believed that it would still require a high level of maintenance including annual applications of retardant that he did not want to deal with. Discussion briefly touched on the insurance issue. Mr. Dominach asked about the cost differential to install the proposed asphalt shingles as compared to a good wood roof and Mr. Burian estimated that the labor of a wood roof could cost four times as much. Mr. Burian asked about the plans for the existing spaced sheathing and Mr. Bertrand stated that they intended to apply plywood over the sheathing.

A motion was made by Mr. LaCorte to approve the application as submitted and it was seconded by Ms. Kaiser. Mr. Gale indicated that he had other questions and discussion and first mentioned he didn't think the shingle product proposed was a good alternative. He said his preference would be for an in-kind replacement but if that wasn't possible he felt that the replacement materials should have characteristics similar to the existing including in pattern, size, texture, and exposure. He said that he felt that the proposed shingles didn't have any of the characteristics of the existing roof but he felt that there were other non-wood roofing materials that would have at least some of the characteristics of the current roof and showed photographic comparisons of historic roof materials, the proposed materials, and examples of other materials he felt would be more appropriate. He

suggested that Mr. Bertrand might want to consider using an alternate material for the roof than the one proposed.

Additionally, Mr. Gale asked about plans for the gutters. Mr. Bertrand indicated that they planned to replace the existing built-in gutters with modern, external, surface mounted gutters. Mr. Burian explained how the existing cornice would have to be destructively modified to accommodate the external gutters. He also pointed out that the roof would have to be re-pitched so that it ended at the edge of the cornice rather than at the interior edge of the built-in gutter. He said the change would be noticeable from the side. Mr. Aiello noted there would be an extra expense to modify the roof and Mr. Ganim said it is usually reasonably possible to repair the built-in gutter and that it can be more cost effective. He added that external gutters mounted to the cornice can have fastening issues. Ms. Lawrence noted that there were no design details for the external gutters and discussed what would be required to approve external gutters.

Mr. Bertrand indicated that he was willing to change his plans and instead repair and retain the existing built-in gutters. Mr. LaCorte amended his original motion to instead be **approve a Certificate of Appropriateness with the condition that the built-in gutters be relined and reused**. Mr. Burian asked that an **additional condition be included, to retain the original spaced sheathing under the new plywood deck**. The motion **as amended included both conditions** and was approved by a majority roll call vote of five (Burian, Ganim, Hohnstine, LaCorte, and Lawrence) to four (Gale, Goldey, Kaiser, Ten Broeke) as the majority felt the proposal as amended would have limited negative impact on the historic property and the local historic district.

2. Review of a Certificate of Appropriateness application submitted by Aamir Shakir, 51 Sandstone Rd., East Windsor, NJ, requesting approval to repair the roof and replace the shingles, change windows, install missing gutters and downspouts and replace damaged siding throughout at 1069 Canal Road, Princeton, NJ, Block 11.01, Lot 84, Zoned CP, located within the D&R Canal Local Historic District. File No. 15-00007

The Commission heard testimony from Saira Rauf, Shahzad Shakir, and Carlos Matos representing the applicant as well as reviewed printed color photos showing existing conditions of the exterior and interior including eight general exterior views of all sides of the building, six siding specific views showing damage and expose examples, and seven window specific views showing exterior and interior conditions, sales pages describing the products being proposed that include asphalt shingles, vinyl windows, aluminum downspouts and plywood panel siding as well as the State and National Register Historic District nomination page for this property.

Ms. Rauf said the applicant had recently purchased the property because the colonial nature of the property appealed to him. She and Mr. Shakir said the fact that the roof on the wing was completely gone and protected only by a tarp wasn't noticed before the house was purchased. They said the plan was to repair the roof deck as needed and replace the existing three-tab asphalt shingles with a matching product. They indicated the applicant also wants to replace gutters and downspouts where missing. They said completing the roof was the most important and urgent part of the application that needed to be done to preserve the building and allow further repair.

They described how the double hung windows on the first floor were no longer operational as they were missing parts and the upper and lower sash have been screwed together. The applicant

wants to replace these windows with units that would be similar to the windows of the upper level which they said are vinyl replacements.

They said because some of the siding was damaged and generally in poor condition, the applicant wanted to cover the building with vertically grooved plywood panels. They added that he had considered enlarging the building but has decided against it.

The history of the building was discussed. From the National Register nomination page the Commission learned that the house is a c. 1791 1 ½ story center hall, 5 bay wide by 2 bay deep, vernacular style building that has a wing addition, front and rear dormers, and front vestibule that were all added c. 1915. The nomination page also notes the building's historical significance as it is attributed to be the homestead of an early settler in the area, Cornelius Simonson, and the stream that flows past the property is named for the family. From the pictures, members suggested that it was possible the front wide beaded edge clapboard siding and the raised panel shutters with early pintle style hinges were original, certainly very early and very significant. In discussion, the Commission learned that the building has been impacted by several recent floods so much of the first floor interior is currently gutted.

Commission members advised the applicants that it was possible and more appropriate to replace damaged pieces of siding, keeping as much of the original as possible, rather than covering the building with the plywood proposed which members felt was an inappropriate material to use on a historic building such as this. Members also expressed their opinions that the use of vinyl windows would be inappropriate here. Suggestions were made to consider wood replacement windows that would allow them to keep the existing casings and jams. Members also suggested the applicant further research the history of the building and the appropriate methods and materials to use in renovating it. When asked for advice how to do that, members suggested contacting the local historical society and finding information available from the County, State and Federal Governments including the National Park Service's Preservation Briefs.

Ultimately a motion to **approve the Certificate of Appropriateness application to replace the gutters and downspouts and the replace the roof in-kind with three tab asphalt shingles as submitted** was made by Mr. Burian, seconded by Mr. LaCorte and approved by unanimous voice vote. No action was taken on the proposed changes to the windows and siding as the Commission expected the applicants to come back with a revised application that proposed more appropriate materials for both. It was felt that the proposal as approved would have limited negative impact on the historic property and the local historic district.

3. Review of a Certificate of Appropriateness application submitted by Jack Schimpf, Director of Purchasing, Trap Rock Industries, LLC for owner Joseph and William Stavola, LLC, PO Box 419, Kingston, NJ requesting approval to demolish the existing house at 1391 Canal Road, Princeton, NJ, Block 9, Lot 3.02, Zoned CP, located within the D&R Canal Local Historic District. File No. 15 00006

The Commission heard testimony from George M. Conway, Jr., representing the applicant and reviewed seven full page printed photographs that were undated but appeared to be recent, a zoning map of the lot with the building footprint indicated, and the survey page for the property from the Griggstown State and National Register Historic District nomination.

Mr. Conway said the property was under contract to be sold to Somerset County but the County has stipulated that the building must be removed before they purchase the property and referred to a letter from the County stating that position. Therefore, he said the applicant wishes to demolish the building, cap the well, and remove the septic system.

The nomination page describes the building as a c. 1840, 1 ½ story, 4 bay wide by 3 bay deep, vernacular style house and listed its architectural significance as notable. It currently has an asphalt shingle roof, vinyl siding and shutters, one over one replacement windows, a replacement front door and storm door, and front porch railing that all appear to be fairly recent changes that currently appear to be in good condition. Members asked about the stone ruins on the property but Mr. Conway said he didn't know anything about them.

Mr. Conway briefly discussed recent history of the property by saying that the previous quarry owners had acquired many properties that surrounded the Kingston quarry and all these properties had transferred to the current owners with the sale of the quarry in April 1971. Mr. LaCorte said the property was being acquired with other neighboring land for what is being called the Somerset County Southern Park. He said it was an open space purchase and that Franklin Township was contributing 10% of the purchase price. Mr. Dominach said he understands that the County does not want to be a landlord so doesn't want to purchase land with buildings.

Some members felt that they needed to better understand what the County's intentions were for this property. Some questioned if subdividing the property or moving the building were options. Mr. LaCorte said he did not believe moving was an option. Mr. Burian wondered if mothballing the building was an option. Ms. Lawrence suggested that due to the lack of answers to these questions perhaps the application might be considered incomplete.

The meeting was opened to the public and Nancy Zerbe, a historic preservation consultant attending the meeting with another applicant, said she thought the application to demolish a building on the State and National Register would likely require approval from the State Historic Sites Review Board just as it would if the County were the owner. She said it was her experience when she was in the State Historic Preservation Office that the policy then was that a public agency like Somerset County couldn't place conditions on a private party to complete projects that would otherwise require State review if the public agency instead were proposing those projects.

The public portion of the meeting was closed and there was discussion that perhaps the applicant should seek advice of the State Historic Preservation Office regarding the need for State review of the demolition. Ms. Lawrence suggested that the application be withdrawn to allow the applicant time to get advice from the State and Mr. Conway agreed.

The Commission took a brief recess before starting the next review.

4. Review of a Certificate of Appropriateness application submitted Rutgers Preparatory School, 1345 Easton Avenue, Somerset, NJ, requesting approval of what is described as a preservation project of the Elm Farmhouse on school property at 1345 Easton Avenue, Block 466, Lot 1.01, Zoned R-20, located within the D&R Canal Local Historic District. File No. 15-00005

The Commission heard testimony from Peter Richardson, Nancy Zerbe, Kelly Glasgow, and Jeffery Venezia. Members also reviewed three sets of architectural drawings and thirty pages that were

printed from the PowerPoint presentation that was shown to the Commission at the meeting prepared by Arch² and DiGroupArchitecture, LLC, dated 3/3/15. The architectural sets included: sheets A-000, A-001, A-101 through A-105, A-201, and A-601 through A-605, titled Elm Farm Exterior Improvements, prepared by DiGroupArchitecture, LLC, dated 3/3/15, that show first, second, and third floor plans, elevations of the four sides of the building, egress plans for all floors, details for wood siding, front vestibule, and rear wood stair installation, window replacements, door and window schedules, and construction specifications; sheets A-000 and S-1 through S-3 titled Elm Farm Masonry Improvements, prepared by DiGroupArchitecture, LLC, dated 3/3/15, that show foundation, first, second, and third floor framing plans, and details plus construction, concrete, and masonry specifications; sheets A-000, A-201, and A-601 through A-603, titled Elm Farm Exterior Improvements, prepared by DiGroupArchitecture, LLC, dated 3/3/15, that show elevations of the four sides of the building, egress plans for all floors, roof plans and roof installation details plus specifications. To help process the many parts of the application, Ms. Lawrence developed a spreadsheet that broke the project down into the separate elements, listing what actions were proposed and where details could be found in the documents we received.

The PowerPoint presentation included several historic photos of the building along with color photos that showed the current appearance and detailed many of the problem areas that need attention. The presentation dated the 5 bay, 2 and 3 story section with full width 1 story porch on the right as the original c.1750 house and the large 2 and 3 story, 10 or so bay by 5 bay section with 2 story center section front porch and single story porch that extends to the porte cochere on the left as the c.1850s addition to the Shingle Style house with gambel roof and shed dormers.

The first problem area discussed was the 2 story porch. The architects stated there are issues with the masonry columns and porch framing. The application proposes rebuilding the 2 story porch starting with a continuous reinforced concrete footing. New replacement masonry columns are proposed to be installed that match the existing in appearance. New floor and roof framing are then proposed to be installed followed by new tongue and groove flooring, bead board ceiling and wood trim. The proposal reports the center porch work will have no effect on the visual appearance of the porch.

The architects reported that the single story porches on either side of the center porch show signs of recent water damage and both have been repaired with mismatched materials in the past. The proposal calls for all the damaged material to be removed including all the roof framing of the 1850's section, all roof deck, ceiling, and fascia material, and all flooring and floor framing. New masonry piers at the back (wall side) of the porch and new bearing wall set back from the front edge are proposed to be built to receive new floor framing. The roof framing is proposed to be rebuilt and new deck installed followed by new tongue and groove flooring, bead board ceiling and wood fascia. The existing masonry column on the canal end of c.1750 section porch is proposed to be reconstructed on a new footing and foundation. Existing columns, brackets and serviceable sections of existing balustrade are proposed to be reused. All the balustrade is to be reinstalled with new portions fashioned to replicate the original sections where needed. Mr. Burian asked if the balustrade will be reinstalled at the current height or as required by building code. Mr. Venezia explained that the height on the first floor wasn't a problem with the code as the porch deck is less than two feet above grade. He said code would only affect the second floor where they can either raise the height to code or prevent access. Half the columns are modern replacements that will be

changed to the more ornate original design if affordable. The proposal reports the work will have no effect on the visual appearance of the porches.

The next problem discussed was a western section of the back wall and first floor framing in the eastern section of the 1750 section. The wall reportedly is in imminent danger of complete failure and the floor framing is damaged and coming off the foundation. The application proposes that existing wall be removed and rebuilt of masonry on a new footing and block foundation. The wall can then be re-stuccoed to match existing stuccoed sections and the foundation covered with stone veneer to imitate the original foundation. Piers are proposed to be built to support the damaged floor framing and new engineered lumber joists sistered to the damaged members. The proposal reports the structural work will have no visual impact on the building.

Two improvements are proposed for the back of the building. The application proposes replacing the columns of the small one story porch on the 1750s section with posts and brackets that match the ornate style posts found on the front porch. Also, all metal fire escapes are proposed to be removed and the wood stairs reframed and extended to connect both the second and third floors to grade for egress. Mr. Aiello asked if the stairs will be covered as may be required by code. The architects explained that while the frame would be wood, the treads would be metal. There was further discussion about the covering, with the applicant's architects expressing their opinion that it wouldn't be required. The issue was left as submitted with the belief that if a covering was required by code, the change would come back for Commission review.

The next issue discussed was windows and doors. The Commission learned that all 12 existing wood windows, including multiple diamonded-paned units, are proposed to be repaired as needed and most would receive interior storm panels to replace the exterior storms that are to be removed, which is expected to improve their appearance. The remaining 80 vinyl-clad replacement windows are proposed to be replaced in-kind. Some windows were downsized when the windows were replaced and the new windows would match the downsized opening rather than the original opening. Additionally the two window openings that were converted to doors on the second and third stories to provide egress are proposed to be restored to a window configuration with vinyl clad replacements that match the other replacement windows. This change would also allow the exterior fire escapes on the front to be removed, which is expected to improve the appearance. The existing solid wall front door vestibule on the center porch is proposed to be replaced with a fully glazed storefront system of similar size which will allow a clear view of the historically significant wood front door. The existing storm doors on the four French doors are proposed to be upgraded to fully glazed units to allow better view of the historic wood doors.

Roof, gutter and siding replacements were discussed next. The existing siding on the upper stories is wood shingles which is proposed to be replaced in-kind everywhere but on the canal end of the building as that area was recently repaired. Any damaged sheathing would be replaced and building paper or membrane used where appropriate. The 3 existing through wall air conditioning units would be removed and their openings closed and shingled. The architects displayed a siding mock-up and explained that a double layer of shingles would be installed. New 6" aluminum half round gutters and matching downspouts are proposed. The second story building-in gutter above the damaged rear wall is proposed to be changed to an external half round gutter also. The flat roof areas over the one story front porches and the rear second story projection in the 1750 section is proposed to be re-roofed with EPDM roofing materials after being properly flashed. The existing roof is a three tab asphalt shingle which is proposed to be replaced with Tamco Heritage

dimensional asphalt shingles. The application called the shingles an in-kind replacement but Mr. Gale expressed his opinion that the replacement shingles were visually different from the current material and therefore, in his opinion not an in-kind replacement. He also exhibited printed photos of the recently demolished carriage barn that was part of the estate built with features that mirrored the house. The barn and neighboring garage still had slate roofs in the photos so Mr. Gale suggested that using a simulated slate-like shingle might appear better and be more appropriate. He also said that he felt a true in-kind replace using a three tab asphalt shingle was preferable to the dimensional shingles proposed. Mr. Venezia said he did not recognize evidence of slate being used on the house and that the dimensional shingles were speced due to their long warranty. Mr. Gale cautioned that current warranties simply cover manufacture's defects not service life which can be shorter. With the roofing project, the application proposes that diverters be installed above all the dormers to help reduce water damage.

Chimneys were discussed next. It was reported the stucco coating on all seven chimneys has surface cracks and that there is deterioration of the roof deck and framing at the base of the chimneys that is evident in the attic. The proposal calls for the condition of all the chimneys to be evaluated and the chimneys repaired as necessary. Any damaged framing and decking is proposed to be replaced, the bases of all the chimneys properly flashed and all re-stuccoed to match the existing finish.

Lastly, the modern style ceiling lights and surface mounted electrical conduit on the front porches are proposed to be replaced with hidden wiring and historically inspired surface mounted LED lighting units.

Approval of the Certificate of Appropriateness application was separated into sections that included: masonry including chimneys and rear wall rebuilding; porch repairs including lighting; window and door replacements; and roof, siding, and gutter replacements. A motion to **approve the masonry work as submitted** was made, seconded and approved by unanimous voice vote. A motion to **approve the roof, siding and gutter replacement as submitted** was made, seconded and approved by majority voice vote (eight yes, one no). A motion to **approve the porch repairs as submitted** with the understanding that if the rear egress stairs need to be covered an application for approval would have to come back to the Commission was made, seconded and approved by unanimous voice vote. A motion to **approve the window and door replacements as submitted** was made, seconded and approved by unanimous voice vote. The majority of members felt that the application as approved would have limited negative impact on the historic property and the local historic district.

Mr. Burian asked to be excused at this point in the meeting.

Correspondence

Resolution to Township Council re: National Preservation Month Proclamation (see attached)

A motion to **approve submission of the National Preservation Month Proclamation to Council for introduction at a future meeting** was made by Ms. Goldey, seconded by Mr. LaCorte and approved by unanimous voice vote.

Public Discussion

There was no one from the public that wished to speak

Approval of minutes

Approval of Minutes of the December 2014 and January 2015 meetings

A motion to **approve the December 2014 minutes as submitted and the January 2015 minutes with typographical corrections** was made by Mr. LaCorte, seconded by Mr. Burian and approved by unanimous voice vote.

Reports

1. Township Open Space Advisory Committee

Mr. LaCorte reported that there was no OPAC meeting in March. He offered no reports for the months of January and February.

2. Township Properties preservation status

The Commission briefly reviewed an email memo to Mr. Dominach from Tiffany Delaney providing status updates on five Franklin Township owned historic properties. There was brief discussion regarding whether there was proper understanding of when projects need State approval and when simple maintenance can be performed without approval. Mr. Dominach suggested that Ms. Lawrence write a polite letter to the Township Manager, Mr. Vornlocker, offering Ms. Delaney Commission assistance with projects.

Unfinished Business

1. Approval of revised FTHPAC 2015-16 Meeting Calendar (see attached)

A motion to **approve the revised FTHPAC 2015-16 Meeting Calendar** was made by Mr. LaCorte, seconded by Mr. Ganim, and approved by unanimous voice vote.

2. CLG status

Mr. Dominach reported that he had previously sent a letter requesting a status update but had no new information.

3. Historic structures "windshield survey" and mapping

Ms. Lawrence advised the Commission that she, Mr. Aiello, and Mr. Gale would be meeting with Township Planner, Mr. Healey to discuss the project.

4. HPAC 2015 goals

Ms. Lawrence asked Commission members to review the proposed goals and be prepared to discuss them at the next meeting.

New Business

1. Meetings of interest

NJ History and Historic Preservation Conference, June 3-4, Mt Laurel, NJ.

Ms. Lawrence asked who wished to attend the Conference. Mr. Gale, Ms. Goldey, and Ms. ten Broeke said they were interested. Ms. Lawrence will forward their names for Mr. Healey to complete the registration process.

Upcoming meetings

Next meeting - May 5

Tom Gale to present "Connecting floor plans, elevations, and reality"

Adjournment

At 10:45 p.m. a motion to adjourn was made 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

Action Items:

1. Write a polite letter to Mr. Vornlocker– Ms. Lawrence
2. Send Mr. Healey the names of conference attendees – Ms. Lawrence

National Preservation Month Proclamation

WHEREAS, historic preservation is relevant for communities across the nation, both urban and rural, and for Americans of all ages, all walks of life and all ethnic backgrounds; and

WHEREAS, it is important to celebrate the role of history in our lives and the contributions made by dedicated individuals in helping to preserve the tangible aspects of the heritage that has shaped us as a people, and

WHEREAS, historic preservation is an effective tool for managing growth and sustainable development, advancing sustainability, fostering local pride and maintaining community character while enhancing livability, and

WHEREAS, Franklin Township has recognized the importance of preserving its rich history and heritage and has forwarded the goals of historic preservation

- by establishing local historic districts, a historic preservation commission, and trust funds that support local historic preservation,
- by seeking Certified Local Government recognition,
- by obtaining preservation grants and other assistance,
- by acquiring historic properties and easements on important historic resources,
- by sharing preservation techniques with historic homeowners
- by implementing redevelopment plans for historic areas,
- by successfully nominating districts to the State and National Register of Historic Places
- by developing a Eco-Heritage Tourism program, and
- by working with various organizations to help preserve important elements of its heritage; and

WHEREAS, May 2015 is National Preservation Month sponsored by the National Trust for Historic Preservation

NOW, THEREFORE, I Mayor Chris Kelly together with my fellow Council members, do proclaim May 2015 National Preservation Month and call upon the people of Franklin Township to join their fellow citizens across the United States in recognizing and participating in this special observance.

TOWNSHIP OF FRANKLIN

HISTORIC PRESERVATION ADVISORY COMMISSION

REVISED 2015-16 MEETING SCHEDULE

The Franklin Township Historic Preservation Advisory Commission generally holds regular meetings on the first Tuesday of the month at 7:30 PM in the Franklin Township Municipal Building at 475 DeMott Lane, Somerset, New Jersey.

Special meetings are scheduled as needed and will be announced as they are fixed.

All meetings are established, published, made available, and open to the public in accordance with the Open Public Meetings Act P.L. 1975, Chapter 231 of the Laws of the State of New Jersey.

The following are the scheduled meeting dates of the Commission in 2015-16:

January 20 2015

February 17, 2015

March 3, 2015

April 7, 2015

May 5, 2015

June 2, 2015

July 7, 2015

August 4, 2015

September 1, 2015 (revised)

October 6, 2015

November 9, 2015

December 1, 2015

January 19, 2016

Adopted by the FTHPAC on 4/7/15