

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

November 1, 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
Joaquin Stearns
Dina Deshan (Alt. 1)
Jeff Link (Alt. 2)

Margaret M. Hickey, Consultant to the Historic Preservation Commission

ABSENT: Peter Korian
Greg Lane

HEARING OF THE APPLICATIONS

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

51 High Street

Luke Franklin and Nicole Little

Chair Darby called for the application. Luke Franklin and Nicole Little, owners, and Michael Sweebe, architect, presented the application, which is a return from last month, to raise the ridge and broaden the front dormer and add a rear dormer to make the attic a habitable space. The owner and architect presented updated drawings, which lowered the ridge line by one foot from the previous submission and showed the changes in relation to the neighboring houses. Mr. Stearns expressed some concerns about how the change in pitch will change the exposed roof rafters; however, he felt more comfortable with the lowering of the ridge line by one foot over the previous request. However, he continues to have issues with the relationship of the proposed and with the neighbors' houses and wondered if there was further exploration as how to address the ceiling heights rather than raising the ridge, such as putting a gabled dormer on the front. The owners noted that they did not want to change the dormer style of the front and wanted to keep the original design intent. Mr. Stearns noted he is concerned about setting a precedent for raising roofs and he remains concerned about the overall height. Mr. Sweebe also explained that the placement of the stairs is driving some of the design decisions as it will be stacked over the existing second floor stairs and needs code-compliant head height.

Most of the HPC members agreed with using a shed dormer and not using a gable dormer on the front. Overall, most HPC members had less concerns with this version of the design than last month

and many of the HPC members noted that the roof/height analysis helped with their decision-making regarding this application. Mr. Deacon noted that the attic plan is not drawn correctly at the rear; architect to correct.

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

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

69 High Street

Ashley Ochs and Jonathan Perrelle

Chair Darby called for the application. Ashley Oachs, owner, presented the application to replace a series of jalousie windows at the front of the house, a mid-20th-century change, and install two spaced double-hung windows in the same opening. The owner presented the 1908 image for reference. Mr. Colello noted that what is being proposed is similar to the 1908 image, but also noted that it is not exact because the area of discussion is now indoor space and was previously a sleeping porch. Mr. Stearns noted the windows should be the same height as the first-floor windows and this would bring the windows above the porch roof, which is preferred visually. Vice Chair Yewaisis had a concern that there was not enough information provided as there are no exterior elevations. Mr. Stearns thought that since they are working within the existing opening, it is easier to assess the proposed changes. He asked what the materials of the windows would be; the owner noted they will provide them.

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

1. Provide the cut sheets of the windows to be installed.
2. Raise the windows and match the size of the first-floor windows in height.
3. Confirm the rough opening sizes.

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

40 High Street

Ronald Monacelli

Chair Darby called for the application. John Guadagnoli, architect, presented the application to enclose an existing deck and turn it into a rear screened-in porch including vertical siding, a gable roof, and screened casement sashes; it will serve as a three-season room. Mr. Link noted that the style of the porch does not match the main house. Mr. Deacon noted that the massing is not out of line with the existing house, but the vertical siding is not appropriate. Mr. Guadagnoli suggested maybe the porch siding should match the main house. Mr. Colello wondered if casements that look like double-hung windows would be better, and they should be called out as wood. Mr. Stearns expressed a concern about the proportion of the glass, such as three windows set in a row without any divisions or equal placement and the four windows on the rear without division. Mr. Stearns also expressed concern about the bump around the existing rear window at the main house, which is

creating some issues with the windows and roof configuration and does not appear to be necessary. Removing the bump around the window may also help to simplify the roof. The cut sheets for the windows also need to be provided. The architect chose to continue this application next month after making the changes discussed during the meeting.

560 Ridgewood Avenue

Gaytha Kraushar

Chair Darby called for the application. Gaytha Kraushar, owner, presented the application to replace the existing slate roof with asphalt shingles in a color that matches slate. The owner noted the slate has reached the end of its useful life and the cost to replace it with slate is very expensive, much more than asphalt shingles. Chair Darby explained that the HPC cannot take cost into their decision making. As background, Ms. Hickey confirmed for the HPC members that the house is considered a contributing resource in the Glen Ridge Historic District as part of Expansion No. II. She further noted that there are a number of houses built prior to 1940, at least in the north end of the district, that were fitted with slate roofs, but this is the only house built in the 1950s with a slate roof. There was also a discussion about the type of slate roof. Most houses with slate roofs in the mid-20th century got their slate from Pennsylvania that does not have the longevity of either a Vermont or Canadian slate. This is not to say that the owner cannot obtain a slate roof from Vermont that matches the Pennsylvania slate, which is no longer quarried, but Pennsylvania slate does not last as long. There was extensive discussion on the slate roofs in the district and the policy of the HPC to retain them since they are a character-defining feature and are rare in the district when they once were prolific. The HPC is also concerned about setting a precedent on replacing slate roofing. The owner would like a decision that if the asphalt shingle roof is not going to be approved and the HPC members are open to a synthetic slate, that it be she does not have to return to another meeting to gain approval for the synthetic slate.

There were lengthy discussions on slate roofing and previous approvals for synthetic slate when structure was an issue and where clay tile synthetic was used; on availability of slate and there being little difference between Vermont/Canadian and Pennsylvania slate other than their durability and possibly the thickness of the slate, which may impact structural integrity; on setting precedent and noting that the age and style of the house may be considered in the decision-making; and the difference in quality of synthetic slate material and no all are equal in appearance or durability. On a motion by Vice Chair Yewaisis, seconded by Mr. Colello, the application was denied for the installation of asphalt shingles, but if the Owner chooses, the HPC would accept a quality synthetic slate on a post-World War II house that is clad with Pennsylvania slate. The synthetic slate would have to be reviewed by the subcommittee. The HPC noted that this decision is essentially within a narrow confine of criteria to be applied on a case-by-case basis.

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

No minutes available for review this month.

SUBCOMMITTEE:

64 Benson Street (exterior repairs and rear addition/front stoop): Subcommittee approved all of the edits to the design with the exception of the composite shingles, which were not approved.

31 Appleton Street (front steps) – This application is still under review by subcommittee.

957 Bloomfield Avenue (addition over enclosed porch) – This application is still under review by subcommittee.

OLD BUSINESS

- Ordinance Changes: Ms. Hickey and Chair Darby met with the Borough and the Borough Council went ahead with the first reading of the ordinance changes at their last meeting but there were some errors in the language that were contradictory; part of the issue was the original ordinance has some errors, so the Borough is going to make the corrections for the second reading planned for November 11.
- Continuing Education: It will probably be the February meeting for the continuing education, which will be in person.

NEW BUSINESS

- New Jersey Historic Preservation Office sent a letter on their review of our meetings, which they audited, and their feedback was such that the HPC is well operated.
- Chair Darby noted that he is going to get a list of members and see where they are in their renewals.

ADJOURNMENT

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

Respectfully submitted,

Margaret M. Hickey, AIA
Consultant to Glen Ridge HPC