

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

May 1, 2019

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
McMahon
Switzer
Vande Stouwe¹

Margaret Hickey, Consultant to the Historic Preservation Commission

ABSENT: Moriarty
Grisafi

Introduction and Hearing of the Applications

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

**150 Ridgewood Avenue
Sebastian Voltarelli**

Chair Herrigel called for the application. Sebastian Voltarelli, Owner, presented the application which includes expanding the existing garage to add one bay and converting a single opening for a two-car garage to two separate openings creating an extension with three individual garage bays. The Owner presented large-scale drawings of the proposed plans including two options, Alt 2 and Alt 2A.

The HPC members' first comment was the shutters on windows at the rear of the garage are not needed. The members discussed and reviewed the overall design approach and discussed the scale and whether the site could absorb the expansion. Ms. Githens noted that three-car garages are not typical in the district, especially when they face the street. Other members noted that the size balances the property and there was no height added. The members also discussed the various design options including the incorporation of brick along the base and the two different types of doors. Chair Herrigel was concerned that the design features overall did not reflect the front elevation; an image of the front of the building was passed around. Other members felt the design uses the features of the house well. There was a question about the brick to

¹ Vande Stouwe arrived 5 minutes late during the introductions.

be used; the Owner said the brick will be taken from the brick being removed from the front elevation of the one-story wing. There was a general preference for the use of the brick (Alt. 2) and for the garage doors with square-shouldered windows (Alt 2A).

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

1. Accept the brick detailing at the foundation as shown in Alt. 2.
2. Accept the garage doors proposed in Alt. 2A.
3. Remove the shutters from the rear windows.

| | | | | | |
|---------|-----|-------------------|--------|------------------|--------|
| Darby | Yes | Githens | Yes | Herrigel | No |
| McMahon | Yes | Switzer | Yes | Vande Stouwe | Yes |
| | | Moriarty (Alt. 1) | Absent | Grisafi (Alt. 2) | Absent |

110 Essex Avenue Rush and Elfi Gashi

Chair Herrigel called for the application. Zev Lazar, Architect, presented the application on behalf of the Owners. The work includes opening the formerly enclosed front porch, extending the porch toward the rear to expand the living room, and extending the building to the rear. The architect reviews the revisions based on the comments made as part of the previous submission: no changes to the existing windows on the front at the second floor; any new foundations would include parged concrete to differentiate from original which is articulate concrete block; and explained the changes in how the fenestration at the additions and original building, especially at the two elevations, are articulated. Since the April meeting, the Architect looked at the historic images of the house at the historical society but unfortunately the picture was of poor quality and showed little detail of the front porch. Because there were many elements to the project, the HPC members tried to focus their review on one element at a time.

The initial discussions focused on the front porch/living room extension. The architect noted one original column remains at the front porch and the HPC reiterated the new columns are to match. The elevation drawings do not properly articulate how the under-porch lattice will be detailed but there is a detail drawing showing the lattice set in a frame with a concrete curb behind. The lattice will be set in a horizontal pattern. The HPC noted the railings are very tall and not properly detailed. After some discussion, the Architect will seek a variation from the code official to match the original railing, a portion of which remains. HPC confirmed that the aluminum trim will be removed and the underlying cornice detailing, etc., which is simple, will be repaired. In addition, the existing siding is to be repaired. The windows on the extension are to be wood with no muntins; this matches the existing. The HPC discussed the size of the windows on the left side elevation at the living room extension. They also discussed articulation of the columns; HPC noted that the new columns should align with the existing concrete block piers. The soffit detail at the living room needs to replicate that at the existing porch; the drawings do not reflect this condition.

The next discussion was of the rear extension and the modification of the right-side elevation as a whole. The focus was on the choice of windows for the pantry plus the

modification and addition of windows at the existing building. The small double-hung pantry windows do not work with the fenestration of the main building and the HPC also had concerns about the new window at a new half-bath on the first floor. It was determined the windows should take their proportions from the one stair window on that elevation. This may mean moving to four instead of three windows at the pantry. The final concern was the expanse of the roof with the new addition. There was much discussion on whether there was a good way to break up the roof either by lowering the addition roof or in-setting the addition; however, it was generally agreed upon that, because of the main roof's deep overhang, doing either of those would create an awkward cornice line.

On a motion by Ms. Githens, seconded by Mr. McMahon, the application was approved with the following conditions.

1. Elevations (front) noted on A3:
 - a. Columns at front porch to match existing.
 - b. Columns shall sit on top of the existing porch piers.
 - c. The lattice shall extend to the right side of stair, shall be framed on four sides and laid in a horizontal pattern.
 - d. Windows shall be framed/trimmed to match existing.
 - e. Railings shall the height, detailing and spacing of the existing railings.
 - f. Windows shall be wood; Owner is proposing Marvin.
 - g. The overhang at the living room shall match the existing porch (2/A3).
2. Elevation (Right Side) noted on A4.
 - a. The windows at the pantry and the new half bath are to match existing stair window on that elevation.
 - b. The head height of the windows shall align with the front window on the right elevation.
3. The drawings shall articulate the details are to match the existing and that the aluminum is to be removed.

| | | | | | |
|---------|-----|-------------------|--------|------------------|--------|
| Darby | Yes | Githens | Yes | Herrigel | Yes |
| McMahon | Yes | Switzer | Yes | Vande Stouwe | Yes |
| | | Moriarty (Alt. 1) | Absent | Grisafi (Alt. 2) | Absent |

168 Sherman Avenue

Antonella Cacciatori (Find-Design-Restore)

Chair Herrigel called for the application. Antonella Cacciatori, Owner, appeared before the Commission to present the application, which includes removal of aluminum siding and installation of vinyl siding at the body and vinyl shakes at the dormers. The owner noted she plans to restore the hood over the front door. The HPC noted that vinyl is not an acceptable replacement material but a composite material, such as Hardie Board with a smooth finish, would be acceptable. HPC also noted a drawing needs to be provided for the trim. The proposed treatments apply to the front and two side elevations.

The application was withdrawn.

Gregory Switzer recused himself from the next application.

**206 Linden Avenue
Budinick Residence**

Chair Herrigel called for the application. Ed Lopez, Architect, appeared before the Commission on behalf of the Owners and presented the application, which includes modifications to the kitchen including the window over the sink. The HPC discussed the application and had issue with the use of casement sashes when the rest of the house has double-hung sashes. The HPC also noted that the windows on this elevation are separated by mullions rather than grouped together as shown.

On a motion by Ms. Githens, seconded by Mr. Darby, the application was approved with the following conditions to be reviewed by subcommittee.

1. The windows should either be double-hung or casements with mullion making it look like a double-hung window.
2. The two windows should be separated by a mullion properly sized to the opening.
3. There should be a historic sill to match the others on the rear elevation.
4. Anderson 400 series windows would be acceptable.

| | | | | | |
|---------|-----|-------------------|--------|------------------|--------|
| Darby | Yes | Githens | Yes | Herrigel | Yes |
| McMahon | Yes | Switzer | Recuse | Vande Stouwe | Yes |
| | | Moriarty (Alt. 1) | Absent | Grisafi (Alt. 2) | Absent |

Gregory Switzer returned to the meeting.

**480 Ridgewood Avenue
Sabrina Sodja and Aaron Kramer**

Chair Herrigel called for the application. Aaron Kramer, Owner, and Courtenay Rombough, Architect, appeared before the Commission to present the application, which includes repair and upgrade of an existing enclosed porch. The work includes creating a new door, which would match those at the kitchen, and new windows, which would be painted wood and to match those in the living room at the main house.

On a motion by Ms. Githens, seconded by Ms. Vande Stouwe, the application was approved as submitted.

| | | | | | |
|---------|-----|-------------------|--------|------------------|--------|
| Darby | Yes | Githens | Yes | Herrigel | Yes |
| McMahon | Yes | Switzer | Yes | Vande Stouwe | Yes |
| | | Moriarty (Alt. 1) | Absent | Grisafi (Alt. 2) | Absent |

**79 Oxford Street
Neil and Elizabeth Rosini**

Chair Herrigel called for the application. Mr. and Mrs. Rosini, Owners, appeared before the Commission to present the application, which includes a kitchen expansion on the first floor and a bedroom expansion on the second floor. The HPC found the massing of

the addition to be fine and the large windows on second floor help to balance the west elevation; the east and rear elevations are not visible from the street. The HPC had concerns about how the roof projection of about 3 feet would appear on the front elevation, which was not provided. The HPC also noted more detail on the proposed windows is needed.

On a motion by Mr. McMahon, seconded by Ms. Githens, the application was approved with the following conditions to be reviewed at subcommittee:

1. Applicant to provide more detail on the proposed windows.
2. Applicant to provide a drawing showing the addition from the front (south) elevation.

| | | | | | |
|---------|-----|-------------------|--------|------------------|--------|
| Darby | Yes | Githens | Yes | Herrigel | Yes |
| McMahon | Yes | Switzer | Yes | Vande Stouwe | Yes |
| | | Moriarty (Alt. 1) | Absent | Grisafi (Alt. 2) | Absent |

Chair Herrigel recused himself from the next four (4) applications.

The following four (4) applications were presented on behalf of the Glen Ridge Board of Education (BOE) by the following: Dirk Phillips, Superintendent; Barbara Murphy, Business Administrator; Patrick Seiwell, Architect, and Jeffrey Merlino, Attorney.

Ridgewood Avenue School
235 Ridgewood Avenue
Glen Ridge Board of Education

Vice Chair Githens called for the application. Patrick Seiwell, Architect, presented the application which focuses on the placement of the switch gear and transformer to the rear of the property along High Street. Mr. Seiwell explained that they asked PSE&G if this equipment could be placed in a vault, PSE&G returned with a determination that it could not be placed in a vault due to limitation in the existing power distribution zone of the school property. The architect reviewed with the HPC alternative locations. Mr. Seiwell explained that the proposed placements have to do with access and sight lines for safety. The BOE representatives and the HPC had a lengthy discussion on the possible alternative locations taking into consideration the overall size and height of the equipment and the various equipment required minimum buffers around each piece of equipment to buildings and each other for life-safety and maintenance.

On a motion by Mr. McMahon, seconded by Ms. Vande Stouwe, the application was approved with the following conditions to be reviewed at subcommittee:

1. The preferred location is No. 4 of the submission, which is along the gymnasium wall on the north side of the parking enclosed by a fence and with bollards.
2. Applicant is to provide plan showing location, clearances and other considerations for the subcommittee to review and approve.

| | | | | | |
|---------|-----|---------|-----|--------------|--------|
| Darby | Yes | Githens | Yes | Herrigel | Recuse |
| McMahon | Yes | Switzer | No | Vande Stouwe | Yes |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|-------------------|--------|------------------|--------|
| | | Moriarty (Alt. 1) | Absent | Grisafi (Alt. 2) | Absent |
|--|--|-------------------|--------|------------------|--------|

Central School**12 High Street****Glen Ridge Board of Education**

Vice Chair Githens called for the application. Patrick Seiwel, Architect, presented the application for the fencing around the proposed chiller at the Central School (High Street/Bloomfield Avenue). Mr. Seiwel explained the type of fencing, location adjacent to existing retaining wall and the visual implications from Bloomfield Avenue. The HPC members were generally not satisfied with the placement of the equipment behind a fence and suggested the BOE look at the enclosure at the library for their chiller equipment, which is behind a brick wall with an almost solid gate to permit access for maintenance.

There was a lengthy discussion about the HPC members' displeasure with the choice of materials presented for this application and that this and the other school applications (to be heard) were not part of their packet and therefore giving them no time or opportunity to review prior to the meeting.

The BOE expressed as part of their presentation that a decision is needed in a rush because much of the work is to occur over the summer and the schools need to be ready for the heating season in mid-October. The HPC was extremely displeased that the BOE thought they could bypass the HPC procedures by just attending the meeting and not providing the packages the 10 days prior so that HPC members are only now looking at the scope of work and expected to make an informed decision, which is not possible nor according to procedure. The members feel they are being placed in a difficult position by the BOE and given the impression that they have no choice but to approve the plans proposed.

Since Ridgewood Avenue School was previously before the commission for the unit locations, the above motion stayed but based on the discussions, the HPC determined the Central School application as well as the subsequent two will be reviewed and commented upon but the BOE will have to return in June to obtain approval. BOE can pre-submit their application materials based on the HPCs comments this evening prior to the meeting and work through subcommittee so come the June meeting, the approval process could potentially be more straightforward.

Forest Avenue School**287 Forest Avenue****Glen Ridge Board of Education**

Vice Chair Githens called for the application. Patrick Seiwel, Architect, presented the application which includes adding new electrical switch gear and transformer equipment and a chiller to the site. The electrical equipment is proposed to be placed within the courtyard. The chiller is to be placed on the roof, upper left on the one-story addition.

HPC noted the chiller on the mid-20th century addition's roof was acceptable but other options could be provided to help minimize disturbance of the sightlines especially when

approaching the school from the north along Forest Avenue. The location of the transformer and switch gear is too visible from its position within the courtyard when driving south on Forest Avenue. The BOE is to investigate placing the equipment further into the courtyard so it is less visible.

Linden Avenue School**205 Linden Avenue****Glen Ridge Board of Education**

Vice Chair Githens called for the application. Patrick Seiwel, Architect, presented the application which includes adding new electrical switch gear and transformer equipment and a chiller on site. All three pieces of equipment are proposed to be installed on the south side in front of the 1958 addition taking the place of an existing garden. The HPC had significant issues with the placement of all three pieces of equipment in this location. Placement of the chiller on the roof was discussed; the Architect and BOE noted their concern with noise to the neighboring properties, which are set closer than those on Forest Avenue. The placement of the electrical equipment on the front was considered not acceptable by the HPC.

The HPC had significant concerns that the BOE and their consultants did not do their due diligence in investigating the appropriate locations for the equipment not only at Linden Avenue but all of the schools in question and there seemed to be no discussions with PSE&G in how to adequately address alternative locations other than the standard clearances needed. As previously discussed, the BOE will return in June to discuss the issues and approvals related to Central School, Forest Avenue School, and Linden Avenue School.

Chair Herrigel returned to the meeting.

Public Comment

None.

Adoption of the April 6, 2019 Minutes

On a motion by Ms. Githens, seconded by Mr. Herrigel, the minutes of the April 3, 2019 meeting were unanimously adopted as noted and corrected by Ms. Hickey for some typographical and grammatical errors.

Subcommittee Reports

1 Mead Terrace: The Owners responded to the HPC comments / updated drawings; waiting on response from subcommittee.

48 Lincoln Street: Subcommittee is to review siding in the field on Friday.

51 High Street – Detailing of the rear deck submitted and approved by subcommittee.

49 Clinton Road – The subcommittee reviewed the window detailing and approved.

New Business

Ms. Hickey will submit a redesign for the HPC application at the next meeting.

Executive Session

On a motion by Ms. Githens and seconded by Mr. Darby, the meeting moved into Executive Session.

On a motion by Mr. Darby and seconded by Ms. Vande Stouwe, the meeting moved out of Executive Session.

Adjournment

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

Respectfully submitted,

Margaret M. Hickey, AIA
Consultant to Glen Ridge HPC