

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

June 5, 2019

OPMA & Roll Call

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

PRESENT: Chair Herrigel
Vice Chair Githens
Darby
Grisafi
McMahon
Moriarty
Switzer
Vande Stouwe

ABSENT: Margaret Hickey, Consultant to the Historic Preservation Commission

Introduction and Hearing of the Applications

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

168 Sherman Avenue

Antonella Cacciatori (Find-Design-Restore)

Chair Herrigel called for the application. Antonella Cacciatori and Nadia Degazzin, Owners, appeared before the Commission to present the application, which includes removal of aluminum siding and installation of new composite siding at the body and composite trim at the door and window surrounds. The Owners provided drawings and historic photographs. Ms. Githen's first concern is that the building originally did not have cornerboards but the drawings are proposing cornerboards. There was a question on whether the composite siding can be installed without cornerboards because it is difficult to miter the edges. However, further discussions noted there is a new line of siding from the proposed manufacturer that makes mitering the edges and eliminating the need for cornerboards possible. Mr. McMahon clarified that the manufacturer has a new product which is thicker making mitering a possibility so the preference would be to eliminate the cornerboards. Mr. Herrigel clarified on the process of approving this change. Mr. Darby noted that the composite trim would be acceptable. The Owner clarified the trim will match the original on the building. Mr. Switzer questioned the porch detailing around the front doors as seen in the historic pictures; Owner clarified the trim at the porch is not changing even though the drawings do not show it. Mr. Grisafi questioned the treatment of the wood sills which have been lopped off when the aluminum siding was removed. The Owner noted that the sills will be extended beyond

the width of the window trim. The HPC clarified that the siding will have an 8-inch coursing and the soffits and eaves are not to change.

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

1. The corners be mitered and not to include cornerboards.
2. The porch details are staying as is; no changes except there should be trim around the door, which is not drawn.
3. The width and exposure of the siding shall be as drawn; 8 inches.
4. The window sills be extended beyond the trim.

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

Chair Herrigel recused himself from the next applications.

The following three (3) applications were presented on behalf of the Glen Ridge Board of Education (BOE) by the following: Dirk Phillips, Superintendent; Patrick Seiwel, Architect, and Frank Bowsby, Project Manager for DRG Architects; and Jeffrey Merlino, Attorney.

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

Vice Chair Githens called for the application noting this application is for the enclosure at the chiller equipment. Mr. Bowsby explained the design for the new brick wall and gate proposed to surround the equipment. The gaps in between the brick shown on the drawings presented will be slightly tighter due to the structural engineer requiring additional rebar in the wall due to its heights; this change will meet the air circulation requirements for the chiller equipment. The brick will also match what was approved at a previous HPC meeting for the infill at the main building. Mr. Bowsby noted there is a mortar mock-up and will inform the HPC when it is ready for review. The capstone on the new wall will also match the sills at the main building. Ms. Githens noted the design for the gate is a nod to the front door of the building. Mr. Bowsby note it will be iron. There was a concern expressed about children climbing the wall; Mr. Bowsby noted it is similar to a chainlink fence to prevent a toe hole. Clarification on the tops of piers and caps on wall shall be precast concrete with a slight pitch. Mr. Grisafi asked about safety issues with regard to the railing at the nearby steps; Mr. Bowsby noted, if needed, an extender can be added to the steps to reduce any safety hazard.

On a motion by Mr. Switzer, seconded by Mr. Darby, the application was approved as submitted.

Darby	Yes	Githens	Yes	Herrigel	Recuse
McMahon	Yes	Switzer	Yes	Vande Stouwe	Yes

		Moriarty (Alt. 1)	Yes	Grisafi (Alt. 2)	Yes
--	--	-------------------	-----	------------------	-----

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

Vice Chair Githens called for the application. Frank Bowsby explained the application, which includes moving the PSE&G electrical equipment approximately 11 feet closer to the back of the building toward Glen Ridge Parkway as discussed at the June HPC meeting. HPC questioned how it will be treated; Mr. Bowsby noted it will be behind a chain link fence and that there is already a fence which is left open during the day as a means of egress only. There will also be bollards around the equipment. Mr. Switzer asked about this configuration and acceptance by the fire department. Mr. Bowsby explained the fence has been in place since 2012 and it is reviewed and approved every year. HPC noted that the equipment that has the conduit coming from it should be one set furthest in the courtyard; Mr. Bowsby noted he would confirm with PSE&G that this configuration would be okay.

The chiller on the roof has been provided to show several options however if set closer to Glen Ridge Parkway a guardrail, that will visible from the street, would be required. The preferred location is set about center depthwise so the chiller will not be visible from Stonehouse or GR Parkway but will be visible as one approaches from the far north on Forest Avenue. There were some questions about the structural aspects of supporting the chiller which were explained/clarified by Mr. Seiwel.

There was a discussion regarding the placement and position of the fencing and bollards with regard to emergency access and other related considerations.

On a motion by Mr. Darby, seconded by Ms. Moriarty, the application was approved as submitted with the recommendation the plans be reviewed by the fire department to confirm their acceptance of the fencing and bollards with regard to emergency vehicle access.

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

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

Vice Chair Githens called for the application. Frank Bowsby presented the application noting the electrical equipment will be placed to the rear of the building (a change from the June HPC meeting) and which turns out to be more convenient as electrical service is closer by. The plan is to enclose in a fence, it could be chain link or decorative, it is the HPCs preference. The chiller shall be placed on the roof in the approximate location shown, which is similar to the Forest Avenue application, but it is not fully engineered yet; it will be set at least 10 feet from the roof edge to avoid needing guardrails. It was noted that this chiller is harder to see then that at Forest Avenue but

visible from Hawthorne. Mr. Bowsby noted that along Hawthorne it will be seen behind an existing chainlink fence, which reduces visibility. It was noted this may be the best solution and there was a clarifying discussion that the chillers are noisy.

The conversation switched to the electrical equipment. There was a question on whether the transformers could be located at the inside corner towards Hawthorne. Mr. Bowsby noted the equipment cannot go too close to the wall for servicing and for clearances to combustible materials. There was a discussion on the fencing, the preference by the HPC is iron. The placement was also discussed and HPC recommended placing the fence as close to the equipment as possible but this will be dictated by PSE&G for servicing and code clearances. Some of the location documents are not to scale so the architect will provide clarifying documents for the placement of all equipment by subcommittee.

On a motion by Mr. McMahon, seconded by Mr. Darby, the application was approved as submitted with the condition that the following be approved by subcommittee:

1. Final location of the chiller, electrical equipment and fencing.
2. The fence should be iron around the electrical equipment, to match that at Central School.

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

Chair Herrigel returned to the meeting.

20 High Street

Brianna and Noel Christopher

Chair Herrigel called for the application. George Azrak, Architect, appeared before the Commission on behalf of the Owners and presented the application, which includes enclosing an existing porch with new windows and insulating the area so it can be used for four seasons. The work includes removing the wood storm windows and installing new windows but because the top of the opening is curved and the columns are tapered at the bottom, new windows to match the existing opening are very expensive. As such, the proposal is to square off the shape by infilling with panels at top and sides and installing new standard windows in between. The Architect noted they could adjust the opening slightly so there is more window than panel as currently shown. He further noted that this work is focused on the far left bay on the front and the two bays on the side of the porch. The windows would be casements with nine lights each. There was clarification that the masonry openings and the existing sill are not changing, and the sashes are to be wood. There was discussion about the masonry openings in that not only do the columns change in the vertical dimension but their depth also changes so that any new window would have to account for this change, which creates a distinct shadowline. Mr. Azrak noted new windows would be centered on the existing sill.

There was extensive discussion on how the changes to the porch openings would be appropriate to the house and discussions ranged from whether divided lights for the

new windows would be appropriate if all of the other windows lack divided lights especially when the design is further complicated by the infill pieces at the top and sides. There was a discussion on infilling with double-hung windows without lights but this was generally discounted however the discussion went back to no lights in order to simplify the design and to be more similar to the part of the porch, the center bay on the front, that is currently without storm sashes (and to remain this way). The Architect noted he would need to go back to the Owner on eliminating the divided lights. The other concern is all of the ideas discussed keep the curved head honored which may be a problem for the Owner; he would have to inquire and make a decision based on the costs. It was suggested to keep the curve at the top of the windows and keep the sides square. The HPC wants to keep the rhythm of the bay by maintaining the head of the opening. This would apply to all openings to be changed.

Since the Architect has to go back to the Owner, it was determined that some direction will be taken at this meeting but final decisions will have to be addressed at subcommittee.

On a motion by Mr. Switzer, seconded by Ms. Githens, the application is denied as designed/submitted.

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

A second motion by Ms. Githens, seconded by Mr. Switzer, to approve the window portion of application with the following:

1. Change the windows on the left front bay and the sides of the porch so the tops of the windows maintain the curve, the sides are squared off, and
2. The three sashes are a single glass pane (no dividing muntins).

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

The second item for discussion is the side door from within the porch that is partially visible from the center bay on the front elevation. The door is being widened, two side panels narrowed and each of the new door and side panels will have six divided lights and be thermally insulated. The panels on the bottom will be maintained and two panels added at the top. HPC noted that the panels are really not needed on the bottom, cannot be seen. Architect noted that this would need to be discussed with the Owner.

On a motion by Mr. Grisafi, seconded by Mr. Switzer, to approve the door portion of application with the following:

1. Accept door and side lights with with single panel on the bottom
2. A single pane in the door and sidelights, ie no muntins;

3. The door remains enlarged as shown.

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

On a motion by Mr. Herrigel, seconded by Mr. McMahon, to approve the door portion of application as drawn and submitted.

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

41 Hawthorne Avenue

Dina Medhane and Aregahen Faris

Chair Herrigel called for the application. Dina Medhane and Aregahen Faris, Owners, and Jermain Lewis, Contractor, presented the application. The work includes adding an exterior door to an existing sunroom addition and changing the window to a door opening. The new door proposed to be used has two options. One is a new painted insulated steel door with 15-lights. The second option is to reuse an existing multi-light exterior wood door that was salvaged from the house. HPC noted that the grills proposed for the glass is not optimal on the steel door and the preference would be to use the existing wood door in this location.

The second aspect of the project is to add a wood deck and a railing; a sample was provided. The railing would be 42 inches with a lighted LED (solar) bollard cap. HPC noted the railing only needs to be 36 inches. Contractor noted spacing on balusters to be 2" between balusters.

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

1. Lower the top of the railing to 36 inches from 42 inches.
2. Reuse the existing wood door with multiple lights instead of the steel door proposed.

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

340 Washington Street

Neil and Roberta Baldwin

Chair Herrigel called for the application. Neil and Roberta Baldwin, Owners, and Neil Chambers, Contractor, presented the application. The contractor explained that the work includes replacing the existing deck with massaranduba wood and IPE railing. Mr. Herrigel clarified that the HPC review is on the left-hand side of the deck with railing but

no stairs. The contractor clarified that lattice under the deck has not been shown but may be desired. HPC noted that lattice is permitted and an option as long as it is wood, it is to be framed and the slats are to be laid vertical rather than diagonal. Contractor explained the railing is to be 42 inches, newel on the bottom step, and balusters 1 ½" square at 3 ½" on center. Dan McMahon noted the railing only needs to be 36 inches but the Owners would prefer the 42 inches for safety, which matches the existing railing height.

On a motion by Ms. Githens, seconded by Mr. Darby, the application was approved with the following conditions to be indicated on the drawings:

1. Confirmation the spacing on the balusters are 2" that is 1 ½" square at 3 ½" on center.
2. The materials are to be as described.
3. Lattice could be added with vertical rather than diagonal slats.

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

295 Washington Street

Tom Garske

Chair Herrigel called for the application. Tom Garske, Owner, presented the application to replace existing columns at front porch with new tapered columns of 10" diameter of permacast material. HPC questioned impact to the railing. Owner clarified that the railings can be removed, repaired and returned to original position. If they do not go back, they will replicate to match existing but they are in good condition so they should go back. The Owner considered wood columns but was warned against it because of the poor quality of the material today. The columns are structural but hollow.

On a motion by Mr. Switzer, seconded by Mr. Grisafi, the application was approved as submitted.

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

Public Comment

None.

Adoption of the May 1, 2019 Minutes

Mr. Darby noted that the only comment on the May 1, 2019 minutes is the displeasure of the HPC members with the Board of Education (BOE) should be more strongly worded.

On a motion by Mr. Darby, seconded by Mr. Switzer, the minutes of the May 1, 2019 meeting were unanimously adopted with the condition that the discussion regarding the

Board of Education better reflected the HPCs displeasure with the approach to the HPC by the BOE regarding their applications.

Subcommittee Reports

150 Ridgewood Avenue: The Owner is proposing to change the front door and add sidelights, the change is approved in concept but the HPC remains concerned that this will not work because the sidelight will move the door. Until this is framed out, this remains in subcommittee.

170 Hawthorne Avenue: Architect has proposed removing the chimney and changing a window; both issues are currently in subcommittee.

79 Oxford Street: The detailing of the roof return has been resolved at subcommittee.

1 Mead Terrace: The Owners and Subcommittee have been in discussions regarding the configuration of the windows where they are enclosing the porch. The Owners are currently weighing the options proposed by the subcommittee.

110 Essex Avenue – Changes were submitted per the meeting comments, approved by Subcommittee and the drawings are currently under permit review.

Ridgewood Avenue School – The final location for the electrical equipment location and enclosure were reviewed and approved by subcommittee.

New Business

None noted.

Executive Session

Mr. Darby motioned for Executive Session, seconded by Ms. Githens.

Adjournment

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

The above minutes have been prepared based on notes taken by Lynn Vande Stouwe, Member, and the recorded minutes of the meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Margaret M. Hickey, AIA
Consultant to Glen Ridge HPC