

DRAFT
As of 12/18/2009
HISTORIC PRESERVATION REVIEW COMMITTEE
Regular Meeting No. 318
Wednesday, November 4, 2009

MINUTES

The regular meeting of the Historic Preservation Review Committee (HPRC) was convened at 7:30 PM in the East Conference Room in Borough Hall. Jeanne Perantoni, Vice-Chairperson, opened the meeting in accordance with the New Jersey Open Public Meetings Act, Section 5, Chapter 231, P.L. 275 by reading the following statement:

In conformance with the requirements of the Law, Notice was provided of the date, time and location of this regular meeting by posting a copy of the adopted Schedule of Regular Meetings in the Borough Hall, by mailing copies to the Trenton Times, Princeton Packet, and by filing a copy in the Office of the Clerk of Princeton Borough. Adequate notice was provided to the public and to all parties concerned.

PRESENT: Jane Faggen, Jeanne Perantoni, Carolyn Robertson, Celia Tazelaar, Kirsten Thoft, and Regan Tudor.

ABSENT: James Constantine, William Howard and Nora Kerr.

ALSO PRESENT: Derek W. Bridger, Historic Preservation Review Officer and Danielle A. Britton, Recording Secretary.

ADMINISTRATIVE WAIVERS

20 Twenty Nassau Prof. Bldg. LLC /Owner, Applicant
20 Nassau Street, Block: 19.02, Lots: 19 & 20
CBD Zone/ Central Business Historic Overlay Zone
Replacement of Building Sign
Approved-October 17, 2009-Nora Kerr

Benson and Henderson Enterprises/Owner
Jane Henderson-Kenyon/Applicant
7 Spring Street, Block: 27.01, Lot: 9
CBD Zone/ Central Business Historic Overlay Zone
Main Business Sign
Approved-October 19, 2009-Nora Kerr

Laurel LaPlaca/Owner
Lynne Mastrilli (Greene Street Consignment)/Applicant
162 Nassau Street/ Block: 28.01, Lot: 25
CBD Zone/ Central Historic Overlay District
Awning and Signage
Approved-October 26, 2009-Nora Kerr

Trustees of Princeton University/ Owner, Applicant
Various Locations throughout
CBD & MHHD Zone/ Central and Mercer Hill Historic Overlay Districts
Shuttle Signs
Approved-October 27, 2009-Nora Kerr

Princeton Theological Seminary /Owner, Applicant
134 Mercer Street; Block 39.01, Lot 8
MHHD Zone/ Mercer Hill Historic Overlay District
Front door relocation-Subcommittee Review
Approved-October 27, 2009-Nora Kerr

HEARING

39-43 Witherspoon Street; Block 27.02, Lot 68, CBD Zone/CHD
CKT Enterprises L.L.C. / Owner & Applicant
Amendment to previously approved Historic Preservation Plan for approval of
siding not authorized in the original approval.

Present for the application was Huei (Tom) Tsai, applicant, and Murray Gilbert, contractor with Main Street Siding, LLC.

Derek Bridger provided the committee with an overview of an application made to amend a previously approved preservation plan regarding the exterior siding. The applicant requested permission to utilize “Hardie Plank” siding on the front façade

D. Bridger advised the committee that he was driving by the subject property on October 13, 2009 and noticed that the exterior cedar siding on the Spring St. façade, the Hinds Plaza façade and the rear façade had all been resided with Hardie Plank. The applicant appeared before the HPRC on May 7, 2008 with an application to construct an addition on the southern elevation of the property that faces Albert Hinds Plaza. The addition was designed to provide a storage area for trash and recycling and shield it from public view. The HPRC recommended approval and the Zoning Board of Adjustment (ZBA) approved the application at the May 22, 2008 meeting. The approval of the siding for the exterior addition was “Hardie Plank”, and cedar wood siding on the balance of the building including the front façade was to remain and be painted. D. Bridger issued a stop work order halting the installation of the Hardie Plank.

D. Bridger informed the HPRC Chair, Nora Kerr, of the issue and a site visit was conducted the same day. Nora Kerr made an onsite determination that the existing three sides of the building could be finished utilizing “Hardie Plank” siding based on the following:

1. The rear elevation is shielded from public view by other adjoining building(s).
2. The elevation facing the plaza has fire escapes and other structures that obscure the view of the siding, and is screened by a pergola and plants in the plaza and the façade facing Spring Street was located on a second story which was set back from the street.

3. The existing cedar siding on the front facade would remain because of the location of the subject property on a prominent, high visibility section of Witherspoon Street. The subject property possesses prominent front façade design features and the elimination or alteration of these could set a negative precedent for other structures in the historic district.

H. Tsai stated that there was a change of contractor from Nini Construction to Main Street Siding. D. Bridger noted that while there was a change of contractors, there was never a submission of new building plans reflecting the change of the existing cedar siding to Hardi Plank.

J. Faggen asked what was the procedure for this type of situation. D. Bridger explained that the filed building plans were filed complied with the approvals of record from the HPRC and the ZBA and that any substantial deviation, such as changing the exterior siding material, would require new approvals by the boards of jurisdiction.

H. Tsai informed the HPRC that his contractor had determined that certain sections of the building have rotted.

M. Gilbert noted that as the new contractor he was unaware of preservation procedures that require any revisions made to existing plans must be reviewed and approved by HPRC. He further stated that he was unaware that the “Hardie Plank” material *only* applied to the approved addition, and not the entire building. D. Bridger provided a copy of the approved building plan which reflected the HPRC and ZBA approvals “May 7 and 22 2008”.

There was discussion with regard to replacing the beams & sheathing underneath the cedar wood siding on the front facade. H. Tsai agreed to paint and maintain the existing wood, if the beams and sheathing have not rotted and deteriorated.

The HPRC offered to assist H. Tsai with preservation issues concerning the replacement of the existing cedar siding and suggested that a contractor experienced in historic preservation be contacted.

There was no public comment.

ACTION: Overall the Committee objected to the Hardie Plank materials being utilized on all three sides, especially on the front façade.

J. Faggen made a motion to **deny** the preservation application to replace the front façade with Hardie Plank. K. Thoft seconded the motion. The motion carried with a voice vote of ayes: no one opposed.

There was discussion with regard to the replacement of the beams and sheathing underneath the cedar wood siding on the front façade. H. Tsai agreed to only paint and maintain the existing wood, if the beams and sheathing have not rotted and deteriorated. If deterioration is found behind the board then beams and sheathing will be replaced, and the cedar wood will be replaced with cedar wood on the front façade.

K. Thoft was concerned about monitoring the replacement materials.

C. Tazelaar moved that the existing cedar wood siding and all other materials on the front façade will be replaced in-kind and that a sample or detailed list of replacement items be submitted to subcommittee for review. The subcommittee to review material consists of:
C. Robertson, K. Thoft and R. Tudor

J. Faggen seconded the motion. The motion carried with a voice vote of ayes: no one opposed.

OTHER BUSINESS

Proposed Revisions to the Historic Preservation Component of the Borough of Princeton Land Use Ordinance

The Committee reviewed the revised historic preservation components of the Land Use Ordinance. The following changes were suggested:

1. J. Faggen suggested that the word “imposed” in paragraph (a), page 3, be changed to “recommended”.
2. The definition of “contributing” (page 1) was amended with the deletion of the following phrase after the word “significance”; *because it was present during the period of significance and possesses historic integrity reflecting its character at that time.*
3. The words “within a historic district” were added to Section 1 after the word “permit”.
4. Under Criteria for Reviewing Proposed Demolitions on page 8, the words “interior and exterior” were removed from Section 3. The phrase “e.g. cost estimates, feasibility studies.” was also deleted from Section 3.

At 9:50 p.m., C. Tazelaar made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Motion seconded by K. Thoft. Motion carried.

The next regular scheduled Historic Preservation Review Committee meeting will be held on Wednesday, December 2, 2009 at 7:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Danielle Britton, Recording Secretary
Historic Preservation Review Committee