

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

November 4, 2020

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.

This meeting was held via a video conference.

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

Margaret M. Hickey, Consultant to the Historic Preservation Commission

ABSENT: Vande Stowe
Grisafi

Introduction and Hearing of the Applications

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

50 Douglas Road

Ian and Rebecca Peterson

Chair Herrigel called for the application. Ian Peterson, Owner, and Matthew Smetana, Architect, presented the application, which is a return from the October meeting. As such, the Architect reviewed the changes made to the design for a three-car garage with storage at the rear and a home office on the second floor. Specifically, the primary revision is to narrow the width of the building approximately six feet and adjusted the roofline, etc. to align with the narrower building. The muntin configuration on the windows were also adjusted to better reflect the main house. Many of the HPC members commented that the narrowing of the building helped with the massing. There were questions on the cupola and whether it added to the design. Mr. Switzer noted that the materials need to be clearly defined on the drawings, such as the windows and doors and the detailing of the corbel. In addition, there are elements, such as the corner boards and heavy mix of materials, that are not necessarily consistent with the main house. There was significant discussion on the corner boards, which are used to properly

terminate the shingles (at the ground floor on the rear and one side of the garage facing the property line) at the clapboards (applied to the front and one side facing the main house). There are no corner boards at the main house so the corner boards either need to be eliminated and the shingles changed to clapboards or the corner board set only on the sides facing the property lines.

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

1. Applicant to provide window and garage door specifications.
2. Applicant to provide specification for light fixture.
3. The drawings shall note the materials.
4. The corner boards need to be either removed entirely or limited on the street-facing elevations.
5. Applicant to provide more detail on the corbels.

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

372 Ridgewood Avenue **Kevin and Anne Marie Bogle**

Chair Herrigel called for the application. Kevin and Anne Marie Bogle, Owners, and Mark Wright, Architect, presented the application to modify an existing garage to serve as a garage and pool house. The former carriage house has been previously modified to serve as a garage. The scope includes adding a large gambrel dormer to the rear, but this is not visible. The work at the front includes reconfiguration of the windows, entry door and garage doors, to work with a new interior layout. The Architect explained the material choices, such as the windows and doors, and the existing poor condition of the wood frame and stucco finishes, which will be repaired or modified depending on location. Ms. Moriarty noted that the building is set approximately 200 feet from the street so has limited visibility. The Applicant will need to provide a cut sheet for the lighting and for the doors, which are custom fabrication so shop drawings will be prepared. Mr. Switzer asked whether the hoist beam is to remain; Mr. Wright noted that because the former loft doors are now to be windows, keeping the hoist beam is not an option. Mr. McMahon questioned the location and configuration of the gutters and leaders, which are not shown on the drawings. Mr. Switzer also questioned the detailing of the trim at the double windows at the loft level; Mr. Wright noted the detailing of the trim is to match the main house but will show a detail on the drawings. Mr. Darby noted that the proposed plans are to such an extent that the building will no longer reflect its historic carriage house function, which is a disappointment. There was a discussion on this point between the members and some discussion on if any details could change to better reflect the carriage house function.

On a motion by Mr. McMahon, seconded by Mr. Switzer, the application was approved with conditions to be reviewed and approved by subcommittee.

1. Provide additional detail on the trim for the loft-level window on the front elevation.
2. Add the location of the gutters and leaders on the drawings.
3. Provide design specifications for the garage doors.

4. Provide cut sheets for the light fixtures.

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

Dan McMahon and Gregory Switzer recused themselves from the next application.

3 Roswell Terrace**Andrea and Brian Cretella**

Chair Herrigel called for the application. Andrea and Brian Cretella, Owners, and George Azrak, Architect, presented the application to enlarge the existing kitchen toward the rear of the house and enclose an existing porch to house a power room and mud room on the side of the house. Mr. Azrak explained the detailing to match the existing house, and windows will be wood with SDL/GBG.

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

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

Dan McMahon and Gregory Switzer returned to the meeting.

273 Forest Avenue**Lorraine and Michael Deblis**

Chair Herrigel called for the application. Lorraine Deblis, Owner, and Babatunde Adewunmi, Engineer, presented the application to replace steps at the rear, which are not visible from the street, and add a raised deck at the rear off of an enclosed screened porch. The HPC members noted that the railings should be detailed with a top and bottom rail and since the deck is raised above the grade significantly, framed lattice should be installed. A square lattice would be the best approach for this building.

On a motion by Ms. Githens, seconded by Mr. McMahon, the application was approved with the following conditions to be reviewed and approved by the HPC Consultant.

1. Provide detail for the railing showing a top and bottom rail.
2. Provide framed lattice under the proposed deck.

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

88 Essex Avenue

Vincent and Stephanie South

Chair Herrigel called for the application. Vincent and Stephanie South, Owners, presented the application to remove the enclosure at the front porch and renovated the porch to be open with full columns and a new wood railing, deck and parged CMU piers. The HPC members noted opening the porch is a positive approach and much of the discussion focused on the details. Mr. Switzer and Mr. McMahon led the discussions. Columns are to be square with a Doric capital and pointed the owners in the direction of first picture in the product literature provided with the application. The drawings should be updated to reflect the design approach for the column. The stairs, as shown, do not align with the front door; stairs should be centered on the door. Roof is flat and it is to remain with the girder being upgraded. The space between the piers should be enclosed with a framed lattice.

On a motion by Mr. Switzer, seconded by Mr. McMahon, the application was approved with the following conditions to be reviewed and approved by the HPC Consultant.

1. Edit the drawings to show the newel at the railings to land on the bottom step.
2. The detailing of the columns to be clearly defined on the drawings.
3. The underside of the porch shall be covered with framed lattice, diagonal is acceptable in this condition. Frame shall be 1 x 4.

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

281 Bay Avenue

Abe Litchfield

Chair Herrigel called for the application. Abe Litchfield, Owner, presented the application, which is to seek approval for as-built conditions. Mr. Litchfield noted that when he purchased the property it was in poor condition and the intent was to only replace the windows at the exterior and all work was to focus on the interior. The permit drawings show a window and door to be enclosed on the side elevation but this was not picked up by the building department as the drawings were not entirely clear. In the end, only the window was enclosed and new aluminum siding placed over the opening. The railings at the deck were replaced; this work was not indicated on the permit drawings. The garage was sided with new vinyl siding.

The HPC members noted that the railings at the deck should have a top and bottom rail; currently the balusters are attached to the sides of the new deck with only a top rail. Alternatively, since the deck is low to the ground, the Owner could opt to remove the railing entirely. Regarding the enclosed window, there was an extensive discussion on the treatment. The HPC requires as-built drawings since the door removal was not undertaken. The HPC would have, if the Owner applied to the HPC prior to the undertaking the work, asked for an alternative approach to enclosing the window as there is now a long expanse of wall with no window. The HPC discussed options but the main point came to the siding texture does not match the existing siding making the enclosing of the window noticeable. The Owner could potentially move siding from less noticeable elevations (the house is on a corner) and use this siding to enclose the window. Regarding the garage, the HPC noted that vinyl siding is not

permitted and the Owner will be required to remove the vinyl siding and encouraged to repair and paint the wood siding that remains underneath. The window opening should also be retained. Note that during the discussions, the HPC members utilized Google and Bing maps and street views to understand the “before” conditions. Brian and Andrea Cretella, neighbors, commented on the siding not matching where the window was enclosed and it is highly noticeable, and the chain link fence recently installed is unsightly. HPC members clarified no purview over fencing in the district. Nelson Hassinger, a neighbor, reinforced the unsightly nature of the ill-matching aluminum siding. These comments prompted further discussion on how to approach the siding so at least on the most visible portions of the building, the siding matches in texture to the existing.

No motion was made on most of the application; the applicant will return to the next meeting with revisions based on the HPCs comments.

However, on a motion by Ms. Githens, seconded by Mr. McMahon, the removal of the siding and restoration of the wood siding and window opening at the garage was approved.

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

Public Comment

See discussion on 281 Bay Avenue.

Adoption of Meeting Minutes:

Ms. Githens made a motion and Mr. McMahon seconded to approve the September 9, and October 7, 2020 minutes; all were in favor with Mr. Switzer abstaining.

Subcommittee Reports

26 Old Oak Road: Subcommittee reviewed a minor change to an opening.

20 Hillcrest Road: Subcommittee reviewed a minor change at the opening for the garage.

497 Ridgewood Avenue: Finalized the changes to the windows per comments at the October meeting.

15 Hamilton Road: Finalized the detailing of the side entry roof overhang.

Old Business

Design Guidelines: RFP has been completed and submitted to the New Jersey Historic Preservation Office for their review and comment.

Architect for the HPC: Issue held to next meeting on the importance of finding a new member for the Commission and the goal to find an architect, or someone of similar qualifications.

New Business

None.

Adjournment

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

Respectfully submitted,

Margaret M. Hickey, AIA
Consultant to Glen Ridge HPC