

**HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
MINUTES
April 27, 2015**

The Tewksbury Township Historic Preservation Commission met at a regular meeting on the above date in the Municipal Meeting Hall, 60 Water Street, Mountainville, New Jersey.

Members present were Michael Scheier, Karen Moriarty arrived at 7:43 p.m., Janet Clark, Glenn Likus, Rosemary Hartten and Ruth Melchiorre, Alt. #1.

Absent was: Herbert Ulrich, Alt. #2

Also present was Dennis Bertland, Historic Consultant.

The meeting was called to order at 7:35 p.m. and a quorum established.

OPEN PUBLIC METINGS ACT STATEMENT

Adequate notice of the following meeting had been provided by posting a copy on the bulletin board at the Administration Building, mailing a copy to the Hunterdon Review and the Hunterdon County Democrat and filing a copy with the Municipal Clerk on February 26, 2015.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Those present stood and pledged allegiance to the American flag.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Mr. Scheier asked the public if there were any questions or comments regarding anything not on the agenda. There being no comments or questions, Mr. Scheier closed the public participation portion of the meeting.

RESOLUTION

- **Resolution No. 2015-03** – Marrazza Realty, LLC, Block 44, Lot 2
55 Old Turnpike Road, Oldwick
Eligible to vote: Mr. Scheier, Mrs. Clark, Mrs. Moriarty and Mrs. Hartten

Mr. Scheier made a motion to adopt the following resolution. Mrs. Clark seconded the motion. The motion carried by the following roll call vote:

RESOLUTION NO. 2015-03

**FINDINGS OF FACT AND RESOLUTION IN THE MATTER OF THE
APPLICATION FOR MARRAZZA REALTY LLC/TEWKSBURY INN FOR THE
PROPERTY REFERRED TO AS BLOCK 44, LOT 2,
LOCATED AT 55 OLD TURNPIKE ROAD, OLDWICK, NEW JERSEY**

APPLICATION NO. 15-01

On February 23, 2015, Andrew Millet, Jr., representative for the property owner, appeared before the Tewksbury Township Historic Preservation Commission. The following Findings of Fact were made at that public hearing by the Historic Preservation Commission.

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Marrazza Realty, LLC is the owner of the property located at 55 Old Turnpike Road Oldwick, New Jersey.
2. The subject property is located in the Oldwick Historic District.
3. The applicant applied for a certificate of appropriateness so as to permit the decorative lights installed around the perimeter of the building on the roof line and rake boards (set on a 24 hour timer to operate from the hours of dusk to midnight). The application is also to permit existing stone walls in the outside dining area.

RESOLUTION

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Tewksbury Historic Preservation Commission as follows:

1. That the proposed undertaking is found to be in accordance with the design criteria of the Township Historic Preservation Ordinance.
2. The Historic Preservation Commission authorizes the issuance of a certificate of appropriateness for the decorative lights and stone walls in the outside dining area as submitted in the application of Marrazzo Realty, LLC/Tewksbury Inn.
3. Based upon the findings of fact and the conclusions set forth above, the Township Historic Preservation Commission passed a motion made by Mrs. Clark and seconded by Mrs. Hartten to approve the application with the following conditions:
 - a. Any proposed changes to the lights or stone walls are to be presented in an application to the Historic Preservation Commission. Said approval is not to be considered a precedent.

Roll Call Vote:

Those in Favor: Mrs. Clark, Mrs. Hartten and Mr. Scheier

Those Opposed: None

MINUTES

1. February 23, 2015

Mrs. Clark made a motion to approve the February 23, 2015 minutes with a minor correction on page four (4). Mr. Scheier seconded the motion. All were in favor. Mrs. Melchiorre and Mr. Likus abstained.

CORRESPONDENCE

1. A Memo dated April 7, 2015 from Shana Goodchild re: LUB Appl. No. 15-05, Block 39, Lot 27.

Applications

Appl. No. 15-02 David and Marjorie Peterson
Block 23, Lot 43
18 Church Street, Oldwick

Applicant David Peterson was sworn in by Mr. Bertland. Mr. Peterson presented his application for an outside generator on the rear on his house. When asked by Mr. Scheier if he intends to put anything around the generator, Mr. Peterson responded that there is not a plan at the moment but ultimately they will plant something around the unit. When asked if there is any other spot for the generator, Mr. Peterson explained that they would have preferred to install it in the front of the house near the gas meter but it would not meet setback requirements and they did not want to seek a variance. Mrs. Clark made a motion to approve the application as submitted. Ms. Melchiorre seconded the motion. The motion carried by the following roll call vote:

Roll Call Vote:

Those in Favor: Mrs. Clark, Mr. Scheier, Mrs. Moriarty, Mrs. Hartten, Mr. Likus
and Ms. Melchiorre

Those Oppose: None

Appl. No. 15-03 Brian and Melissa Waggenspack
Block 38, Lot 10
10 King Street, Oldwick

Applicant Melissa Waggenspack & architect Ezio Columbro were sworn in by Mr. Bertland. Mrs. Waggenspack testified that she and her husband purchased the home five (5) years ago and raise their two (2) young boys in the home with a third on the way. As the house is currently configured they are outgrowing the space and want to stay in the home and are therefore requesting approval for a rear addition to the home in order to accommodate the growing family. The proposed addition would be for a family room and guest room to accommodate family members who visit from out of State. Mr.

Columbro explained that the house lacks a viable powder room on the ground floor so the addition will also contain a more useable powder room space. The property is located immediately behind the general store parking lot. The proposed addition extends approximately 18 feet to the rear of where the building currently ends. On the westerly side the proposed addition will house a laundry area, a mud room and a small covered porch adjacent to the principal driveway. Mr. Columbro noted that there is currently a detached garage and a shed structure on the property. The left side elevation is the most prominent view and becomes the principal entry point. Mr. Columbro noted that the owner did not want to make the addition overpowering so the upper floor has low knee walls and small dormers which reduce the scale of the building; the principal objective was to replicate the existing gables on the front of the house. When asked why the southern elevation is not shown, Mr. Columbro explained that it is effectively unchanged. He noted that the upper floor is an extension of the master suite which will provide an additional full bath since the existing second floor contains only one (1) full bath. Mr. Columbro noted that they plan to use the same Williamsburg Slate Timberline roofing material on the addition as is currently on the home. He noted that there is a mixture of cedar and clapboard on the existing home and the applicant is proposing the use of hardiplank (smooth finish out) with the exposure to match the existing. The millwork (gable lattice, soffits, corner boards, etc.) will match existing; the material will be Azek (cellular pvc) and/or Boral product. When asked by Mr. Bertland about the proposed porch details, Mr. Columbro explained that the turnings will match the existing porch and will be made from cedar wood. The lattice work will also match the existing however the rails will not match due to code issues; the existing porch rail is too low and the space between the spindles are too wide. Mr. Bertland opined that the applicant could request a waiver for relief from the standard. Mr. Columbro noted that the applicant has concern with the height of the railing because of her small children. When asked, Mr. Columbro noted that that railing engages the base of the post. In conclusion, Mr. Columbro noted that they propose natural thin stone veneer on the foundation similar to the stone used on the project approved by the Commission on Joliet Street. When asked if stone exists on the foundation, Mr. Columbro responded in the positive and explained that they have attempted to match the stone and mortar color as closely as possible. Mr. Columbro noted that the plan contains two (2) proposed stained glass window panels on the parking lot side of the home but asked for latitude with matching the stained glass to match the existing. They agreed to make every effort to match it to the existing but if they can't they would like to replace it with double hung windows the same size as shown. When asked by Mr. Likus if the basements will be connected, Mr. Columbro responded in the negative and noted that it is the intent to install an exterior access to the newly constructed basement/crawlspace. When asked if there are any lot coverage issues, Mr. Columbro noted that the property currently exceeds the requirements however the entire addition is being constructed over an existing deck structure and the coverage will be reduced. Mrs. Clark asked if the deck was constructed with permits noting that if it was done illegally it will not be counted towards the existing impervious coverage. Mr. Columbro also noted that the owners have considered demolishing the storage shed. The Commission reminded them that they would need to return for permission to demolish any structure.

A brief discussion ensued regarding the solar panels that were approved by the Commission and installed by the previous owner. Mr. Scheier noted that since that application the installation standards for solar panels have changed.

Mr. Scheier noted that he would prefer the applicant use Boral material as opposed to the pvc because it more like wood and doesn't move as much. Mr. Columbro agreed and noted that he worked with Boral material for the first time on the Joliet property (next to Turpin) and he was very pleased with the outcome. Mr. Columbro noted that he prefers to use pvc on the window sills and the gutter fascia because it holds up better. When asked about the windows, Mr. Columbro explained that they will be vinyl clad Anderson double hung windows with trim to match existing with the exception of the bay window. He noted that some of the windows in the existing house are wood and in a perfect scenario they would like to install wood windows with paint to match but the owners are hoping for some latitude due to budgetary constraints. Mr. Bertland noted that scale of the addition is effective in keeping what would have been appropriate for the time period and doesn't overwhelm the existing house. Mr. Scheier agreed and opined that the design is thoughtful and works well with the existing house.

Ms. Melchiorre made a motion to approve the application as submitted with the condition that the applicant may substitute 1/1 sash windows detailed like the others on the proposed addition, in lieu of the small-paned stained-glass windows proposed on the plans submitted for the east elevation. Mrs. Clark seconded the motion. The motion carried by the following roll call vote:

Roll Call Vote:

Those in Favor: Mrs. Clark, Mr. Scheier, Mrs. Moriarty, Mrs. Hartten, Ms. Melchiorre and Mr. Likus

Those Opposed: None

Appl. No. 15-04 Wendell Jeffrey and Alec Karros
Block 31, Lot 13
317 Main Street, Mountainville

Mrs. Clark recused herself from the application.

Applicants Wendell Jeffrey & Alec Karros were sworn in by Mr. Bertland. Ms. Jeffrey noted that they were present to seek approval to renovate the structure known as the Mountainville Hotel. She explained that the foundation in the rear is sinking so they will be repairing the foundation, installing a new roof and porch and replacing as many windows as the budget will permit. Mr. Karros noted that there is no change to the existing footprint. When asked by Mr. Scheier if the project will be phased, Ms. Jeffrey opined that the foundation, roof and porch will be done together and if the budget permits the windows will be replaced at the same time. When asked if the foundation, deck and roof structure of the porch will be replaced, Ms. Jeffrey responded in the positive. When asked by Mr. Likus about the plan for the foundation, Ms. Jeffrey explained that the

proposal is concrete solid footings and block walls which will be hidden by fieldstone. When asked about the current porch foundation and the proposed foundation, Ms. Jeffrey explained that it is currently loose fieldstone. Mr. Bertland opined that the porch may be rotting since there is no air or drainage under the boards. Mr. Bertland recommended that the Commission urge the applicant to replicate as much detail (capital moldings, etc.) as possible to retain the historical detail. Mr. Scheier noted that there are unique details such as the cap and fascia trim that should be carefully replicated. Mr. Bertland opined that the details are related to the Greek Revival style and are very important character features. He recommended that the applicants save the moldings that are taken down. When asked which windows will be replaced, Ms. Jeffrey responded that the two (2) windows above the door on the back side (north). When asked if the front doors and screen doors will remain, Ms. Jeffrey responded in the positive. She noted that there are some spots that are rotting that will be replaced with new wood. When asked if the beaded porch ceiling will be replaced in kind the response was positive. When asked what material will be used for the porch deck, Ms. Jeffrey responded Aeratis pvc plank. When asked about the roof material, Ms. Jeffrey noted that they propose a metal "charcoal grey" roof on the porch and Landmark Timberline shingles in "pewter wood". Mr. Scheier opined that the porch is very important and the trim work and column details define the building. Mr. Bertland opined that money would be better spent on the porch details rather than the stone veneer on the foundation. The Commission agreed that the emphasis should be on the porch details and less on the foundation finish since it is not as visible. When asked about the chimney, Ms. Jeffrey noted that it was constructed in the 1940's, is coming away from the building and should be removed; none of the chimneys in the house are operable. When asked about the door to be replaced, Ms. Jeffrey explained that it is a dutch-door that she would like to replace with a sliding French door to allow additional light into the room. When asked if it had to be a sliding door, Ms. Jeffrey explained that it opens up into the kitchen and would function better as a sliding door. Mr. Likus noted that it would not be visible from the street. Mr. Scheier noted that he was not comfortable with it especially since it is vinyl. Ms. Jeffrey explained that there was a door that she really liked but it was \$8,000. When asked by Mr. Bertland if a regular door with glass lights would provide enough light, Ms. Jeffrey explained that it is very dark and she likes being able to see her garden which provides an interior/exterior space. Mr. Scheier noted that the door would not be visible from the street or from anyone else.

When asked if they will completely demolish the porch, Ms. Jeffrey responded in the positive. Mr. Bertland explained that it will be very important to take very precise measurements of the existing porch before it is removed. He noted that the drawing submitted does not reflect the porch as it is shown in the photographs. When asked by Mrs. Moriarty what the columns will be made of, Ms. Jeffrey responded pvc. Mr. Scheier suggested that the applicants consider Boral material rather than pvc for the columns or a composite column. Mr. Scheier suggested that the contractor pay close attention to the photographs to replicate the existing details of the porch. When asked if there could be a site visit after the columns have been designed, Ms. Jeffrey responded in the positive. Mr. Scheier suggested that accurate measurements be taken of the porch

before it is demolished. Mr. Likus agreed that an accurate drawing of the porch should be prepared before the porch is demolished.

Mr. Bertland outlined the following points that were raised and agreed upon:

- the rebuilt porch would replicate the existing porch in its dimensions and details, including the cornice eaves & fascia detailing & post capital detailing (which the commission noted different as photographed from their depiction on sectional drawing porch submitted).
- before the porch was taken down for rebuilding, accurate detailed drawing would be made (at least one floor plan and one section through a post) recording existing dimensions and architectural details; the drawing(s) to be submitted to the commission.
- rebuilt foundation can be stucco instead of stone veneer.
- roofing to be timberline asphalt shingles, as per submitted sample; metal roof on porch as proposed in application.
- deteriorated wooden siding to be replaced in kind to match existing exposure & profile.
- deteriorate rear door may be replaced with a sliding door as proposed, provided it is wood with small paned wooden muntins.
- main roof cornices, corner pilasters, windows sashes and frames, & front doors, frames and screen doors are to be retained.

The Commission discussed possibly having a site walk at the property prior to the next meeting.

When asked by Ms. Jeffrey if they could begin work on the other elements of the project while they work on the drawings for the porch, the Commission responded in the positive.

Mr. Scheier made a motion to approve the application with the conditions outlined by Mr. Bertland above. Mrs. Moriarty seconded the motion. The motion carried by the following roll call vote:

Roll Call Vote:

Those in Favor: Mr. Scheier, Mrs. Moriarty, Mrs. Hartten, Mr. Likus and Ms. Melchiorre

Those Opposed: None

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 9:30 p.m. by motion of Mr. Scheier and seconded by Mr. Likus. All were in favor.

Respectfully submitted,

Shana L. Goodchild
Land Use Administrator