

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

July 5, 2023

OPMA & ROLL CALL

Chair Darby called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. and Ms. Hickey read the Sunshine Act Notice and called the roll.

This meeting was held via a video conference.

PRESENT: Chair Geoffrey Darby
Vice Chair Christine Yewaisis
Nicholas Colello
Robert Deacon
Peter Korian
Joaquin Stearns
Gregory Lane (Alt. 1)
Jeff Link (Alt. 2)

Margaret M. Hickey, Consultant to the Historic Preservation Commission

HEARING OF THE APPLICATIONS

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

300 Linden Avenue

Bob and Kelly Lyons

Chair Darby called for the application. Bob and Kelly Lyons, owners, and Ann Sears, architect, presented the application which includes adding two windows on the front elevation; adding additional details on the west side of the front porch; a review and request for approval of as-built conditions including brackets at the roofline that were not installed as designed on the west side; and a different positioning of the windows at the second floor on the west side. There was a lengthy discussion on a number of the issues and they are laid out one-by-one below.

The HPC members found the addition of the two windows at the front to be appropriate.

The HPC members discussed the detailing of the wood brackets on the west side. The one side of the brackets at the upper eave sits on the lower roof and what was installed does not align with the proposed drawings. There were two options presented to either scale the bracket down so the end does not sit on the roof or to shorten the angle and it will bring up the leg of the bracket above the roof. Most of the HPC members preferred the second option to change the angle and shorten the leg on the bracket, which would be applied to both brackets.

The placement of two windows on the west side at the second floor does not match the approved HPC drawings. There was a lengthy discussion on how the windows were placed as built because the drawings were inaccurate and the interior stair appears to have been relocated slightly so the windows would not work as designed. The original design showed the two windows stepped with one

window essentially aligning with the landing of the interior stairs and one set in from the north wall at the second floor. There were several suggestions but most HPC members found that the current as-built condition was not appropriate and provided two options to the owner. The first option would be to return with a better solution shown graphically that speaks more to the intent of the original design and brings the windows so they are not jammed into their respective corners. Or, second, would be to revert to the original design even if that meant making the window between the two floor levels a false window and includes pushing northern-most window to move further south to where it was originally designed; if the owners reverted to the original design, an additional HPC review was not needed. The owners withdrew this portion of the application.

The final item was to add cross bracing on the west end of the existing porch to match the gable end of the main house. For explanation, the original drawings placed the porch in the wrong plane distorting the porch's relationship to the main house/new addition. Once the second floor was added, the owners and architect felt that the end of the porch, especially the west side, looked unfinished. The proposed solution will be to add brackets on the south sides of the end of the porch roof to mimic the north side. This would be just brackets and exposed rafters and no roofing. There was extensive discussion on the design approach and there were several different concerns expressed by the HPC members as well as possible directions the owners/architects could pursue. The HPC members were not prepared to make a decision at the meeting because the solution, as presented, was not found to be acceptable by the majority of the members. One possible solution was to modify the design as proposed to be only partial and set just to the middle of the proposed rim board/bracket. Another was to address both sides of the porch the same where the east side would in interrupted by the second-floor box bay projection and then carry that same form on the west side. Most HPC members found that not addressing the east side was problematic and both sides should be addressed the same or similarly. As noted, after this lengthy discussion, there was no consensus on the approach and no action could be taken because all members needed a graphic representation of any solution.

One: Approval of the Front Windows

On a motion by Mr. Link, seconded by Mr. Stearns, the application was approved as submitted.

Darby	Yes	Deacon	Yes	Korian	Yes
Colello	Yes	Stearns	Yes	Yewaisis	Yes
		Lane (Alt. 1)	Yes	Link (Alt. 2)	Yes

Two: Approval of the Brackets

On a motion by Mr. Link, seconded by Mr. Stearns, the application was approved as submitted with the following conditions to be approved by subcommittee.

1. Change the angle of the bracket and shorten the leg on the west side, upper gable, so it clears the lower roof.

Darby	Yes	Deacon	Yes	Korian	Yes
Colello	Yes	Stearns	Yes	Yewaisis	Yes
		Lane (Alt. 1)	Yes	Link (Alt. 2)	Yes

181 Ridgewood Avenue**Elizabeth and Rajeev Prabhakar**

Chair Darby called for the application. Elizabeth and Rajeev Prabhakar, owners, and Daniel Kopec, architect, presented the application to install a new rear deck, which will provide extra space to an existing two-story porch. The extension will match the detailing of the existing rear deck including painted wood railings and skirt board and a painted composite deck material but set at a slightly lower level. Another change will be to add siding with the flair to an existing second floor sleeping porch so it matches the main house. Mr. Colello noted the second-floor door was appropriate and had no objection to the rear deck. He asked why the horizontal skirt board at the lower porch will be deeper than the original; this makes the lower porch appear prominent. The architect noted that the spans are much larger so the framing will be deeper but they can adjust the framing so the skirt board matches and all the framing will be covered by the lattice. Mr. Deacon said the drawings should add a note that the baluster spacing to match the existing rear porch. Mr. Stearns asked how the new and old railings are to meet and additional posts should be added where the existing railing meets the new railing. He also recommended the lattice be added to the cantilever on the north side of the extended porch.

On a motion by Mr. Stearns, seconded by Mr. Korian, the application was approved as submitted with the following changes to be reviewed by the HPC consultant:

1. Spacing of balusters to be noted as to match the existing.
2. Add the newel posts where the existing and new make the transition.
3. Add the wood lattice to the north side.

Darby	Yes	Deacon	Yes	Korian	Yes
Colello	Yes	Stearns	Yes	Yewaisis	Yes
		Lane (Alt. 1)	Yes	Link (Alt. 2)	

12 Tuxedo Road**Jeff and Heather Blee**

Chair Darby called for the application. Jeff and Heather Blee, owner, and John Guadagnoli, architect, presented the application to construct a new larger garage to replace one that was destroyed in a storm last summer. The garage will be two cars and will be finished wood clapboard with a board-and-batten gable end. Mr. Darby noted that the architect should provide the product data on the garage doors and windows. Mr. Stearns noted the shutters at the gable end window should be removed. Ms. Yewaisis noted that board-and-batten siding does not appear to match the main house but after a review of the front elevation it was noted that this detail exists on the front portico (no images of the main building front were provided with the application). Mr. Stearns also recommended lowering the head of the window slightly as well so it sits better proportionally within the gable end.

On a motion by Mr. Link, seconded by Mr. Colello, the application was approved as submitted with the following changes to be reviewed by subcommittee.

1. Lower the gable end window
2. Provide a cut sheet for the windows, doors, and lanterns.
3. Remove the shutters at the gable end window.

Darby	Yes	Deacon	Yes	Korian	Yes
Colello	Yes	Stearns	Yes	Yewaisis	Yes

		Lane (Alt. 1)		Link (Alt. 2)	Yes
--	--	---------------	--	---------------	-----

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

No minutes to review at this meeting.

SUBCOMMITTEE:

50 Essex Avenue (rear two-story addition): Architect added the delineation requested by the subcommittee and the changes were approved.

104 Osborne Street (front entrance and stoop): Exterior lighting reviewed and approved by subcommittee.

21 Herman Street (rear addition): Proposed changes to the windows and skylight at rear were reviewed but the owner since decided to keep the design as presented and approved by the HPC.

186 Linden Avenue (rear addition): Minor comments picked up by the architect on the proposed skylight and added a window on the east elevation; these changes were reviewed and approved by subcommittee.

OLD BUSINESS

- **Ordinance:** Borough Officials are looking to approve the ordinance changes in the fall.

NEW BUSINESS

- None.

ADJOURNMENT

On a motion by Vice Chair Yewaisis, seconded by Mr. Korian, with all in favor, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Margaret M. Hickey, AIA
Consultant to Glen Ridge HPC