

**A SUMMARY OF THE MINUTES OF THE
GLEN RIDGE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
HELD IN THE MUNICIPAL BUILDING**

November 1, 2017

OPMA & Roll Call

Chair Herrigel called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. and Ms. Hickey read the Sunshine Act Notice and called the roll.

PRESENT: Chair Herrigel
Vice Chair Githens
Darby
Kopec
McMahon
Travia
Wright

ABSENT: Vande Stouwe
Way

Secretary Henry
Margaret Hickey, Consultant to the Historic Preservation Commission

Introduction

Chair Herrigel introduced himself and briefly described the hearing process to the members of the public.

Hearing of the Applications

134 Ridgewood Avenue

Michael Pensak

Chair Herrigel called for the application. Michael Pensak, owner, appeared before the Commission to present the application. Mr. Pensak briefly presented the timeline of his initial application before the Commission, his appeal to the Planning Board, and his construction processes including a change contractor and the need to obtain additional permit drawings for the contractor who completed the work. Mr. Pensak explained he received an e-mail from Commission members regarding the garage doors and the choice of railings at the front porch. It was determined that the garage doors were not an issue but the balusters do not match those shown on the approved permit drawings, which are square where those installed are round and turned. Mr. Pensak is requesting the HPC approve the railings as installed as they were chosen by his wife and himself as their preferred option for various reasons.

Chair Herrigel explains that the request by the HPC for this application is precedent; an installed change must come before the full commission where a request for change prior to installation can be reviewed and approved at the subcommittee level.

Wright clarified that the initial e-mail to the Owner was for clarification and any question regarding the garage doors was quickly resolved as not an issue. Wright noted that the balusters installed are not appropriate for the architecture of the house.

Githens further noted during the initial application process that iron railings were discussed because these would be more appropriate for a mid-20th century residence and that the railings installed introduced a level of fussiness that goes against the strong modern lines of the house.

The Commission discussed the application with regard to the shape and spacing of the balusters in the context of the existing architecture.

Before the vote, Githens and Chair Herrigel explained the Owner has options: application could pass and nothing would need to be done; application could not pass and Owner would have to remove balusters and work with a subcommittee to determine an appropriate replacement; or application could not pass and Owner to present their objections to the Planning Board.

On a motion by Chair Herrigel, seconded by Mr. Kopec, to approve the application, the application was denied as submitted.

Darby	Recuse	Githens	No	Herrigel	Yes
Kopec	Yes	McMahon	No	Way	Absent
Wright	Abstain	Travia (Alt. 1)	No	Vande Stouwe (Alt. 2)	Absent

16 Sherman Avenue

Lillian Shi and Victor Lu

Chair Herrigel called for the application. Lillian Shi, Gary Novello, Builder, and George Azrak, new architect of record, appeared before the Commission to present the application. The architect noted there were certain items in the execution of the design approved by the HPC that were not properly implemented. The four key elements were: the siding on the front of the house was spaced too far apart; the siding is not the 6" Dutch lap as specified; overhang on the porch does not match the historic photograph; and the roof pitch on the front porch was increased to permit installation of asphalt shingles (the roof pitch also resulted in the loss of a window on the second floor). The architect, on behalf of the owner, is looking for relief on the siding installation and the porch roof pitch, and proposed a modified solution for addressing the roof overhang on the porch.

The Commission discussed the key issues of the modifications to the original design. The members were consistent in their concern about the spacing and type of the siding because the siding exposure matched the water table, which is not typical for a residence of this period, and it also changed the proportion of the windows making them

look shorter than seen in the historic images. Since this is a unique property in Glen Ridge, members felt the siding is an important element in preserving the integrity of the property. Members worked through the changes to the porch including review of the supplemental drawing provided by Azrak to cut back the overhang. McMahon suggested adding a slight hip at the north end of the porch roof.

On a motion by Ms. Githens, seconded by Mr. Darby, the application was approved with the following conditions and subject to subcommittee review and approval:

1. The siding shall be replaced with Dutch Lap at a 5" exposure on the east original portion of the residence, the south back to where the plane of the original wall meets the front wall of what is now the principal volume of the dwelling, and on the north side - back to where the plane of the original wall meets the new addition that extends to the north.
2. Modify the overhang on the porch roof as proposed by Azrak and add a small hip at the north return.
3. Subcommittee requested review of Dutch Lap siding proposed to be installed prior to installation.

Darby	Yes	Githens	Yes	Herrigel	Yes
Kopec	Yes	McMahon	Yes	Way	Absent
Wright	Recuse	Travia (Alt. 1)	Yes	Vande Stouwe (Alt. 2)	Absent

83 Douglas Road

Kevin and Beth Ege

Chair Herrigel called for the application. Kevin and Beth Ege, owners, appeared before the Commission to present the application. As part of a renovation completed in 2015, the building code inspector noted that the window and panel configuration on the north elevation of the one-story extension did not match the drawings. Owner noted that windows installed match the house and the panels match the front elevation.

The Commission discussed the design.

On a motion by Mr. Wright, seconded by Ms. Travia, the application was approved as submitted:

Darby	Yes	Githens	Yes	Herrigel	Yes
Kopec	Yes	McMahon	Yes	Way	Absent
Wright	Yes	Travia (Alt. 1)	Yes	Vande Stouwe (Alt. 2)	Absent

205 Linden Avenue

Linden Avenue School

Chair Herrigel called for the application. Stephanie Stancel, representative of Linden Avenue School, appeared before the Commission to present the application. The school is seeking approval to install a sign that is similar to the one installed at Forest Avenue School but in a different color.

The Commission discussed the application. The design of the sign was discussed in brief but greater focus was placed on the location. Kopec and others noted that the sign blocks the front of the building and is duplicative of the sign that sits above the front entrance doors.

On a motion by Mr. McMahon, seconded by Ms. Travia, the sign was approved as submitted but the Commission requested the School return to their December 2017 meeting with three placement options for their review and consideration.

Darby	Yes	Githens	Yes	Herrigel	Yes
Kopec	Yes	McMahon	Yes	Way	Absent
Wright	No	Travia (Alt. 1)	Yes	Vande Stouwe (Alt. 2)	Absent

48 Midland Avenue

Brad Bushue/Emily Peters

Chair Herrigel called for the application. Brad Bushue, owner, and George Azrak, R.A., architect of record appeared before the Commission to present the application. The owner is seeking approval for a rear kitchen/family-room addition including a small entrance porch.

The Commission discussed the application.

On a motion by Mr. Kopec, seconded by Mr. Wright, the application was approved.

Darby	Yes	Githens	Yes	Herrigel	Yes
Kopec	Yes	McMahon	Yes	Way	Absent
Wright	Yes	Travia (Alt. 1)	Yes	Vande Stouwe (Alt. 2)	Absent

10 Hillside Avenue

Mr. and Mrs. Patrick Higgins

Chair Herrigel called for the application. Patrick Higgins, owner, and Doug Moore, builder, appeared before the Commission to present the application. The owner is seeking approval to enclose a porch and add a small stair off the rear.

The Commission discussed the application. Wright noted that there is an ambiguity in the support for the corner of the proposed stair. The sketch provided by the Architect shows a masonry support finished with stucco and the plans show a 4 x 4 wood post. Githens noted the balusters should match existing and owner noted they will be trying to utilize as much of the existing railing as possible. Herrigel noted that the drawings do not indicate the material choices for the siding, railings, etc.

On a motion by Mr. Wright, seconded by Mr. Kopec, the application was approved with the following conditions/clarifications to be reviewed by subcommittee:

1. Drawings shall indicate all material choices.
2. Clarification on approach to corner support for the stair.

3. Confirm approach to railing / balusters.

Darby	Yes	Githens	Yes	Herrigel	Yes
Kopec	Yes	McMahon	Yes	Way	Absent
Wright	Yes	Travia (Alt. 1)	Yes	Vande Stouwe (Alt. 2)	Absent

Mr. Wright stepped away from meeting to present next application.

142 Ridgewood Avenue**Frank and Eva Reda**

Chair Herrigel called for the application. Mark Wright, architect of record and representative of owner, appeared before the Commission to present the application. The owner is seeking approval to repair/replace wooden front steps to match and restore painted wood railings to curve plan with custom rail profiles and balusters.

The Commission discussed the application.

On a motion by Ms. Githens, seconded by Mr. Kopec, the application was approved.

Darby	Yes	Githens	Yes	Herrigel	Yes
Kopec	Yes	McMahon	Yes	Way	Absent
Wright	Recuse	Travia (Alt. 1)	Yes	Vande Stouwe (Alt. 2)	Absent

Mr. Wright rejoined the meeting.

11 Mead Terrace**Amy Owens and Daniel Weinstein**

Chair Herrigel called for the application. Amy Owens, owner, Brandon Rogers, builder, and Val DiGiacinto, architect of record, appeared before the Commission to present the application. The owner is seeking approval to replace the roof, to add a one-story addition to the rear and left side of the residence, and add two dormers to the third floor.

The Commission discussed the application.

On a motion by Mr. Wright, seconded by Mr. McMahon, the application was approved.

Darby	Yes	Githens	Yes	Herrigel	Yes
Kopec	Yes	McMahon	Yes	Way	Absent
Wright	Yes	Travia (Alt. 1)	Yes	Vande Stouwe (Alt. 2)	Absent

160 Linden Avenue**Erick and Julia Van Tuyl**

Chair Herrigel called for the application. Erick Van Tuyl, owner, and Paul Ashworth, architect of record, appeared before the Commission to present the application. The owner is seeking approval to add a dormer to the front of the building, and add a side

extension to the existing sun room. Architect noted they plan to take brick from sun room and use it in the addition to the extent practical.

The Commission discussed the application.

On a motion by Mr. Wright, seconded by Mr. Darby, the application was approved with the following conditions:

1. Add a slight overhang to the front dormer to match the rear dormer.
2. Owner may want to change windows to a composite. If this approach is taken, Owner will need to submit cut sheet with muntin bars and a letter from manufacturer stating the material is paintable.

Darby	Yes	Githens	Yes	Herrigel	Yes
Kopec	Yes	McMahon	Yes	Way	Absent
Wright	Yes	Travia (Alt. 1)	Yes	Vande Stouwe (Alt. 2)	Absent

311 Bay Avenue

One Bay Urban Renewal, LLC

Chair Herrigel called for the application. A memorandum was distributed to all HPC members prior to meeting noting this application is advisory and references the recommendations of *The HUMC/MountainSide Hospital Redevelopment Plan*.

Representatives of the Owner included: John P. Michalski of Drinker, Biddle & Reath, LLP; Allen R. Kopelson, AIA of NK Architects, Timothy O'Brien, Chief Operating Officer of Hackensack Meridian Health, and Donald J. Engels, Principal of Hampshire Real Estate Companies. Allen Kopelson, AIA was the primary presenter of the application. Kopelson presented the general site layout and general idea on landscape buffers, reviewed the plan layout, and reviewed the articulation of the exterior elevations including presentation of a material board and the decision-making behind the choices of the primary materials of brick, cast stone, metal, and glass.

The Commission discussed the application. The following is a summary of the comments from various members as part of an open discussion.

- There was a general consensus that a little too much deference was paid to the main hospital building in some of the design features. The members were generally fine in the choice of the brick and cast stone.
- At the elevations, the members found that the North and East Elevations were more successful than the West and South Elevations. The north and east sides, apart from the paired windows at the corners, have a regular fenestration pattern that speaks better to the examples provided in the redevelopment plan, such as the former Oakes Mills in Bloomfield and the Sherman Avenue School in Glen Ridge, and to the specific recommendation in *5.5 Windows and Fenestration* of the redevelopment plan, i.e., the windows in general be square or rectangular, similar to adjacent structures.

- The simplicity of the North and East Elevations is attractive. To that end, the paired windows at the corners do not serve any real purpose and, as such, are superfluous. This condition also applies to the west and south facades.
- The committee members were not in favor of the strip windows and the metal panels above the strip windows that articulate the southwest corner of the building on both the south and west sides at the third floor and parapet levels. The recommendation is to continue the same articulation of the façade at the third floor as found at the second floor possibly incorporating the sun-shading devices where currently shown.
- Keeping the remaining metal elements, such as at the articulation of entrance and the roof screening, were considered acceptable.

No motion was made for this application since the HPC review is advisory. Chair Herrigel noted that HPC will generate a Memorandum to the Planning Board and applicant outlining the comments and concerns with the design.

Public Comment

None.

Adoption of the September 6, 2017 Minutes

On a motion by Ms. Githens, seconded by Mr. Darby, the minutes of the October 4, 2017 meeting were unanimously adopted with the noted change that for the application for 117 Midland the motion was made by Ms. Githens and seconded by Mr. McMahon.

Subcommittee Reports

97 Sherman Avenue

Mr. Kopec reviewed and approved the revised drawings. Mr. Wright drafted a detailed letter to be sent to the owner regarding issues with the chimney.

9 Hillside Avenue

Approval of supplemental materials remains outstanding. Darby, Way, and Travia were assigned to subcommittee

435 Ridgewood Avenue

Wright and Kopec met with owner and contractor to discuss various items. Once all items are installed Owner to call and final review will be completed.

518 Ridgewood Avenue

The subcommittee recommended changing from a synthetic slate to a standing seam metal roof at the new addition and the final detailing are being reviewed by Kopec and Wright.

162 Ridgewood Avenue

McMahon and Kopec worked with owner and architect to resolve outstanding issues and Owner was informed that based on revisions can submit project for permit approval.

Adjournment

On a motion by Mr. Wright, seconded by Mr. Darby, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Margaret M. Hickey, AIA
Consultant to Glen Ridge HPC