

HISTORIC PRESERVATION REVIEW COMMITTEE
Regular Monthly Meeting No. 322
Wednesday, March 3, 2010

MINUTES

The regular monthly meeting of the Historic Preservation Review Committee (HPRC) was convened at 7:30 p.m. in the Council Room in Borough Hall. Nora Kerr, 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: James Constantine, Jane Faggen, William Howard, Nora Kerr, Carolyn Robertson, Celia Tazelaar, Kirsten Thoft

ABSENT: Jeanne Perantoni, Regan Tudor

ALSO PRESENT: Derek Bridger, Historic Preservation Review Officer; Maeve Cannon, Borough Attorney; Pegi Johnson, Acting Recording Secretary

DESIGNATION HEARING – PROPOSED MORVEN TRACT HISTORIC DISTRICT

Opening Statement and Presentation of Nomination Report – Hunter Research

N. Kerr welcomed everyone and announced that the meeting would begin with the review of the proposed Morven Tract Historic District. She noted that proper notice was provided as required, but further noted that there was concern from some residents that ample time was not provided to prepare a response to the proposal and comment. N. Kerr stated that it was the intention of the Historic Preservation Review Committee (HPRC) to allow everyone to have an opportunity to be heard on this matter and to provide a full and fair hearing.

If this district is approved, it will be the first historic designation in Princeton Borough in twenty years.

After tonight's public comments, there will be a continuance of the hearing to a second date; the HPRC will accept written comments submitted in a timely manner. The date of the continuance will be confirmed shortly, as the HPRC members are figuring which days are mutually available for all members. The date for this "Special Meeting" will be posted on the Borough website and noticed in accordance with Ordinance requirements.

N. Kerr made a few comments to clarify the work of the HPRC. She noted that Princeton is rich in history with neighborhoods and buildings of great architectural quality. Princeton Borough is home to seven historic national landmarks, four historic districts as well as the Kings Highway Historic District that runs through Princeton, from Lawrenceville to Kingston. The role of the HPRC is to foster the preservation of the historic sites in Princeton for the education, pleasure and welfare of the people of Princeton.

The makeup of the HPRC is prescribed by Ordinance and includes professionals with expertise in planning, architecture, history and historic preservation. Each member is appointed by the elected Borough Council. The HPRC is an advisory committee that assists the Planning Board and the Zoning Board of Adjustment in their review of applications involving exterior alterations to properties within the historic districts. The HPRC follows the standards of review that are contained in the Ordinance.

Routine maintenance repairs, landscaping, replacement in-kind of deteriorating building elements are not subject to review. The HPRC does review for visual compatibility with the neighborhood streetscapes of the local historic districts. The HPRC does not review or require a particular architectural style. The HPRC is charged with advising Borough Council on the appropriateness of Ordinances that would establish a local historic site or district. The process is set forth in the Ordinance and may be initiated by property owners within the proposed district, as is the case tonight with the proposed Morven Tract District.

The HPRC will begin a review of the proposal presented by Hunter Research that includes information surveys of the exteriors of the buildings, maps, and photographs. After hearing all the information the HPRC will prepare a concise report for Borough Council, which would consider the report at a public hearing and vote on whether or not to approve the historic district nomination. In conclusion, N. Kerr noted that the benefits of an historic district are well documented. They provide safeguards from over-development, increase property values over time and also can provide federal tax benefits in certain instances.

Richard Hunter, Principal of Hunter Research, introduced himself and stated that he was at the meeting at the request of the Friends of the Western Section to provide a presentation about a uniquely stylish and exceptionally well maintained neighborhood that most outsiders would consider as typifying the town of Princeton. Mr. Hunter gave his professional qualifications and began his "PowerPoint" presentation with a composite aerial map of the proposed Morven Tract Historic District.

In terms of boundaries, the proposed district includes both sides of Boudinot Street and Morven Place and both sides of Library Place, between Stockton Street and Hodge Road. Also included is the south side of Hodge Road, between Library Place and Bayard Lane and the west side of Bayard Lane between Stockton Street and Hodge Road.

R. Hunter gave a history of the neighborhood dating back to Morven in the post Civil War era. He described that in order to avoid a sheriff sale in 1890, Samuel W. Stockton transferred Morven to a group of trustees and the first major sub-division began to take place. The 1890 maps showed the following paper streets; Library Place, Hodge Road, Boudinot Street and Morven Place. The 1905 Sanborn map documented the creation of an upscale neighborhood with 25 houses. R. Hunter described the close ties of the new development with many of the faculty members of Princeton University.

R. Hunter presented slides of the 1906 and 1911 Sanborn maps that showed significant (90%) build-out of the vacant lots in this area during this time. Mr. Hunter explained that by the 1890's the College of New Jersey had become Princeton University and expanded as an institution of higher education that could compete on an international level.

HISTORIC PRESERVATION REVIEW COMMITTEE

Regular Monthly Meeting No. 322

Wednesday, March 3, 2010

Page 3

The research report indicated that many of the Morven Tract residents were very well known academics. Information gathered from University catalogs confirm that there were thirty University affiliated homeowners residing in the Morven Tract prior to 1916. It was also noted that there was very little new construction after 1911 and the construction done was mostly garages and outbuildings. The proposed district documents a narrow period of development that was nearly 90% built-out in a twenty-year period. R Hunter noted that a review of the maps from 1911 through 1943 revealed very little change from the present day.

Regarding the architectural element of the proposed district, R. Hunter noted that it is as much the setting of the architecture and the surrounding landscaping that is aesthetically and historically important. He showed slides of photographs of the streetscape and stated that the buildings provide a coherent architectural whole that is more than the sum of its parts in terms of public view and public appreciation of the district. He further described the extraordinary range of architectural styles displayed (i.e. Georgian Revival, Medieval Revival, Tudor Revival, Colonial Revival, Collegiate Gothic and Shingle Style among others).

Within the proposed district, the study has identified fifty-one properties. Five of these properties are considered “key contributing properties” while forty-two properties are regarded as “contributing”. Four properties (Borough Hall, First Church of Christ Scientist, Morven Pool House and 76 Library Place) are regarded as non-contributing. The proposed Morven Tract Historic District boundaries draw very strongly on the 1890 sub-division map. This is the justification of why only the south side of Hodge Road is included. It was noted that the south boundary of the proposed district is contiguous with the Mercer Hill Historic District.

The five “key contributing properties” were identified and their architectural characteristics were described. These properties include 52 Bayard Lane, 56 Bayard Lane, 73 Library Place, 82 Library Place and 159 Library Place. Other properties within the proposed district were described and principal architects for these structures were identified. Mr. Hunter gave a brief history of the Cottage Club (moved to the district in 1908) and also described two Steadman houses that were moved to the district.

It was noted that an advantage to seeking historic preservation designation is that there are protections against the actions of public agencies. There is a stabilization and enhancement of property values in most instances. R. Hunter questioned why the district should be designated now and responded that it was good to be pro-active. Another positive attribute is greater access to grants for preservation purposes as well as an increased awareness and appreciation of the history of a built environment within a community. Regarding legal challenges to historic districts, there is very little case history in New Jersey concerning legality of historic districts. Basically this is because all districts have been created by municipal governments working in conformance with municipal land use law and with the historic preservation element of the land use plan. The Morven Tract Historic District meets the criteria for designation and for historical significance as stated in Section 17A-118.7 of the Borough Land Use Code.

- The district is intimately associated with the late nineteenth century expansion of Princeton as a university town and with the growth of the University into an internationally acclaimed institution of higher learning.
- The district is associated with numerous persons significant with the past.
- The district embodies many late nineteenth and early twentieth century architectural styles of very high quality, both in the aggregate and in individual buildings.

Supporting Statements from the Friends of the Western Section

Chris Rice, 73 Library Place, which is located in the proposed district, described his residence as being designed by Cope and Stewardson for Professor Fine of the University. Mr. Rice expressed that while he knows there is a great deal of support for the proposed district, he is aware that not everyone is onboard with the concept. His own experience with the HPRC in terms of doing exterior repairs on his house was extremely positive with regard to the advice he received. Mr. Rice expressed the hope that differing opinions among neighbors with regard to the historic district will not be used as a criteria for whether neighbors like or dislike one another. He noted that we (the neighbors) are lucky to live on these streets and have a responsibility to preserve what we have. He feels that is what an historic district will do.

David Tolman, 118 Library Place, which is located in the proposed district, hopes that everyone learned as much from the report as he did. He highlighted a number of very important points and most significant was that the district is essentially unchanged from the time of its construction. He feels that the Morven Tract, as a cohesive whole, is an important area to preserve. Mr. Tolman stated that there are pressures to change the neighborhood and that it is vital as we move on this issue now. Mr. Tolman feels that the increase of size and footprint of houses and the inclusion of more and more amenities, put the neighborhood at risk. In conclusion, Mr. Tolman addressed the audience and stated that he feels that we are custodians of our lands and houses and it is up to each of us to realize our responsibility, not only to our children and the successors of our property, but to the neighborhood as a whole and to the residents of Princeton as a whole. He strongly urged the HPRC to recommend approval of this proposed district to the Borough Council.

John Heilner, 144 Library Place, which is located in the proposed district, addressed the HPRC and stated that he moved here eleven years ago and chose to live on Library Place because of the streetscape, surrounding homes and the welcome feel of the whole area. He noted that the Historical Society conducts walking tours around the neighborhood and feels it is important to be pro-active in preserving the area and neighborhood as it has been for one hundred years. Those who support the historic designation look at this as an insurance policy or a very good form of risk management that they would like to see put in place sooner rather than later to head off probable changes to the proposed district.

Liza Rice, 73 Library Place, told the HPRC that when the historic designation was proposed three years ago, she and her husband were very new to Library Place, though they had lived in Princeton for fifteen years. She described her immediate reaction as being opposed to anyone telling them what they could do on their own property. After researching the matter, she realized that the designation is a small but a very important tool in terms of protecting architecture and history. The restrictions would be minimal. She believes that approving the designation is a very un-intrusive way to protect what we have.

Wendy Benchley, 35 Boudinot Street, lives in the proposed district and agreed with everything that has been previously stated. She noted that she has been on the Planning Board for many years and knows that zoning laws are to protect the value of the town. W. Benchley expressed concern about the issue of "tear-downs" and what could be built in their place. W. Benchley commented it is very important to maintain the integrity of the neighborhood. She further noted that residents have great flexibility in complying with the zoning laws and that in an historic district, the emphasis is basically on the front and sides of houses that can be seen from the street.

HISTORIC PRESERVATION REVIEW COMMITTEE

Regular Monthly Meeting No. 322

Wednesday, March 3, 2010

Page 5

There being no further comment or questions from the Friends of the Western Section, N. Kerr asked for questions and comments from HPRC members, to be followed by public comment.

Questions and Comments from Historic Preservation Review Committee Members

Celia Tazelaar commended the Friends of the Western Section and the consultant, Hunter Research for pulling this report together. She remarked that we have been working on this for quite a few years. C. Tazelaar noted that her comments are in no way meant to diminish her opinion that this neighborhood is eligible to be nominated for an historic district designation. The neighborhood is already in the state and national historic district and has been identified as a potential historic district in the historic preservation element of the Master Plan. Her comments are aimed at improving the reporting terms of scholarly questions as well as its usefulness to the Committee.

- She would like to know a bit more about the Trustees who were involved in the Morven Tract sub-division. What was their motivation? Who were they? What can that tell us about the history of the neighborhood?
- The report states that by 1926 more than half the homes in the district housed Princeton University faculty members. Was this a unique situation for a Princeton neighborhood? Were there any other neighborhoods in Princeton that had such a preponderance of faculty members? Did the growth of Princeton University add to the size of its faculty and did that create additional demand for housing?
- What kind of publication was "Indoors and Out" referenced in the report with a quotation from the art historian Howard Butler? Who was Butler's intended audience? Was he merely providing a travelogue for casual readers and might that speak a bit to the context of understanding the significance of this district. She noted that Hunter Research might benefit from a bit more background on the overall architectural history of that period; mainly the colonial revival and how it connects with the specific situation in Princeton with the veneration of Morven as an important revolutionary war site as well as the other historic revivals of that period. How did the neighborhood development possibly relate to the "City Beautiful" movement?
- 159 Library Place is designated as a key contributing structure. Could there be more research done to determine who the architect was?
- The survey sheets should indicate that all of the properties in the proposed district are within the State and Federal Historic Districts.
- What kind of thinking and discussion went into the approach of including subdivision lines vs. using the whole streetscape of Hodge Road and including both properties on the north side lines? The state and national historic district for this neighborhood includes both sides of Hodge Road.

Carolyn Robertson asked if the report should include the Grover Cleveland house since it is a national landmark and adding it may add depth to the study. She was interested in the key contributing buildings and would also like to have more information about the Gardener cottage located on Boudinot Street near the intersection with Morven Place. She also asked for more information to be included about the Morven pool house.

Kirsten Thoft asked for clarification regarding the significance of the area being designated as part of the state and national historic districts. She asked if there was any impact in terms of individual properties. K Thoft questioned what area these districts covered.

R. Hunter replied he would provide a map.

C. Tazelaar stated that there is a distinction between the state and national historic designation. Once a district becomes a state historic district, it also becomes a national historic district. The next higher level is a national historic landmark. Both Morven and the Grover Cleveland House are listed as national historic landmarks. State and national historic districts are administered by state and federal government. There are no controls with what is done by property owners. State and national historic districts offer protection for private property owners from publicly funded road projects or encroachments.

J. Constantine also questioned the proposed boundaries and how the study reached its conclusion. He noted that the Sanborn maps indicate that the area north of Hodge Road, Lilac Lane, Cleveland Lane and Library Place (north of Hodge Road) were also developing at the same pace and parallel with the proposed Morven Tract. He further questioned the identification of the proposed district as a coherent whole when he feels that the area is architecturally diverse. J. Constantine would also like to see a bit more context on the development of the neighborhood and the association with Princeton University at that time. Was this unique to Princeton at the time or was this just Princeton's type of "factory town".

R. Hunter replied that based on his review of the maps the proposed district boundaries seemed like a logical first step.

C. Tazelaar noted that one of the things the HPRC needs in their designation process is a strong justification of the boundaries. We need to be sure that we have a very solid argument as to the designation boundaries and properties included within the proposed district.

N. Kerr asked for a clarification as to why the several properties listed as "non-contributing" were included in the study.

Public Comment

Nick Karp, 1 Boudinot Street (aka 34 Bayard Lane) which is located within the proposed district, thanked the Committee for the hearing. He asked that the public remember that the Committee's charge is to assess if this proposed district meets the statutory requirements, not to say whether it is good or bad. N. Karp expects that many people here tonight will be hiring professional experts who will expect to question the testimony and qualifications of any experts that have testified. N. Karp requested an immediate and extended continuance so that the opponents of the proposal could have time to hold discussions with their neighbors and to consult appropriate counsel.

N. Kerr instructed N. Karp that his comments will be entered into the record. However, proper notice had been given for this meeting and we will continue with the public comment portion of the meeting.

N. Karp proposed that that in order to reduce animosity within the neighborhood, an informal, non-binding, open invitation, town hall for interested residents to discuss the issues with the community be held in order to legitimize the very real concerns of the people in the audience. He noted that the Friends of the Western Section organized eighteen months ago and produced a study without actually discussing it with many of their neighbors. He feels that there is evidence that the boundaries in the new proposed district are dubious and based on political considerations. He noted that the north side of Hodge Road, where there is great opposition to this proposed district, has been excluded, while the south side which is more balanced is included. N. Karp also disputed the description of his property excerpted from *Morven: Memory, Myth & Reality*, by Constance M. Greiff and Wanda S. Gunning. He questioned whether the Friends of the Western District funded or produced the study.

N. Karp requested that a one year period of continuance be granted so that the opponents of the proposed district would have an opportunity to hire any professionals they choose and give them adequate time to evaluate the evidence that has been presented here tonight.

J. Faggen stated that not all HPRC members are preservationists. She noted that by Ordinance there are two members who serve by appointment, who live in the community, love the community, are interested in preservation, but by training they are neither architects or art historians or others who are related by field. She and her colleague are two people who keep everything honest in terms of making sure the process is carried out fairly.

Madeline Porcelli, 37 Hodge Road, noted that her property is within 200 feet of the proposed district. M. Porcelli stated that she was shocked at C. Tazelaar's opening statement and she further stated that she thought C. Tazelaar's comments were biased in favor of the district. She respectfully asked that C. Tazelaar recuse herself from these proceedings and from any voting on this issue.

N. Kerr noted that only the Borough Mayor and Council will have a vote on this issue. She further stated that the HPRC would do a concise report and the Borough Council will take that into their consideration.

M. Porcelli quoted C. Tazelaar as saying to R. Hunter "we have been working on this for three years." She asked the Committee to weigh both sides of the issue before making any recommendations to Mayor and Council.

Andrew Erlichson, 144 Hodge Road, stated his property was not included in the proposed district-yet. In response to R. Hunter's description in his report that the neighborhood is uniquely stylish and uniquely well preserved. A. Erlichson thinks the reason the neighborhood is preserved so well is because the homeowners have been able to invest and develop their properties over the years and keep them current with the community. He believes the historic designation will discourage that investment in the neighborhood.

A. Erlichson described the painstaking renovations that he has completed on his own property since coming here in 2008. He believes that the neighborhood is working and has been working very well for a long time and doesn't need additional governance that will be an expensive process for the homeowners and the Borough in these difficult times.

A. Erlichson read the report in a cursory manner because he only just received it, but noted that it makes a connection that because the university's name changed at about the same time this neighborhood was developed, that there is some causal connection. He feels that there are millions of events that happen in the United States and the world at the same time and they are not causally connected. It is coincidence.

Elizabeth Bates used to live at 22 Morven Place and now lives at 298 Nassau Street. She described the history of her property at 22 Morven Place and provided anecdotal information about when she and her husband signed the papers to purchase that property and title information revealed that the property was deeded directly from the King to William Penn. One of the things they were told when they bought their house was that the elm tree in the backyard was planted by Richard Stockton, signer of the Declaration of Independence. It was one of many that were planted as an elm lane between Morven and the barn that is over on Lilac Lane. That tree still exists today. E. Bates noted that on Morven Place, the footprint of the houses that were built in the original development has been respected. You, therefore, have the same basic landscape that was present in the 1900's.

Referring to potential problems of living in an historic district, E. Bates noted that it is not a difficult process to deal with the HPRC and she feels the Borough Zoning Officer, Derek Bridger, helps to make any development process absolutely simple.

Beth Covin, 161 Hodge Road (also owns 164 Hodge Road), out of the current proposed district, addressed the HPRC and asked 1.) who funded the Hunter study and 2.) how much did it cost?

N. Kerr answered that the HPRC had no idea because they were not involved in that process.

D. Bridger stated that the document was submitted by the Friends of the Western Section, LLC, and read the names that were on the document; (Wendy Benchley, John and Mary Heilner, Tamara Jacobs, Ann and Craig Mulhauser, Austin Newton, Nariko Ohto, Christopher and Carlotta Rice, Bill and Priscella Russell, Ruth Sayer, Leslie Shear, Dorothy Shepard, David Tollman, and John Wilmerding). D Bridger noted that all of this information was a public record.

B. Covin described the history of her property at 161 Hodge Road and how she and her husband came to own this property and the house at 164 Hodge Road. B. Covin noted that since she last spoke before the Committee on this issue three years ago, she has developed even closer relationships with many of her neighbors as they have supported her through her recent illness. B. Covin stated that her basic plea to the Committee is to consider that the reason this neighborhood is beautiful and so successful is because it is a beautiful quilt of mismatched houses that are lovingly maintained by their owners. There is no particular architectural style in this district. She believes that there is a tremendous sense of community within the neighborhood.

B. Covin described many of the houses on the street that have been transferred to new owners since she moved to Hodge Road. As an example, she noted that the Dilworth house needed to be torn down because it was not maintained, but further noted that a beautiful house was built in its place and the original garden is still there.

While B.Covin commended the HPRC for creating the Downtown Historic District and for their work to maintain the beautiful Steadman houses on Alexander Street and preserve the neighborhood on Bank Street, she urged the Committee to be mindful that there are more people in the proposed district who oppose the plan than there are people who are named as the Friends of the Western District. She further stated that she feels there has been some gerrymandering with regard to the proposed boundaries. She commented that it was ridiculous that the north portion of Hodge Road, including the Grover Cleveland House, as well as the entire west section of Hodge Road is not included in the district. In conclusion, B. Covin asked that the Committee respectfully leave the area alone and realize that for over one hundred years it has been the residents that have made this area great. She is confident that the residents will continue to make it great in the future.

Judy Scheide of 133 Library Place (in the proposed district) distributed illustrations of the evolution of the footprint of her property through the years. J. Scheide stated that her husband bought the property at 133 Library Place in 1952. She further stated that Princeton University is not the only influence in the area. She noted that Library Place itself was named for the Princeton Theological Seminary Library because it runs directly into the library property and to leave the Seminary out of the study is a misstep. There were many seminary professors who lived in the area and had just as great an influence to the development of the neighborhood as the university name change in 1896.

J. Scheide commented that the current historic rules restrict organic, historically appropriate changes and lean too heavily in the direction of the concept that all physical changes that can be seen from the street are bad. She noted that there have been five major changes to the original footprint of her home since it was built in 1904. There have also been further additions to the front, side and back of the house that have altered the original design. The neighborhood has been declared historic in its present state, therefore any changes that have been made by previous homeowners over the past one hundred years should be codified as part of the historically acceptable range of modifications in the Morven District. This presents a definable, desirable and practical guideline that will prevent inappropriate development without creating unnecessarily restrictive and historically unwarranted limitations on homeowners. J Scheide commented that the HPRC should take the Hunter Report as proof that the residents of this area are serious about maintaining their homes in an appropriate manner. She would prefer to see the HPRC empowered to make a more positive designation such as a Morven Tract medallion or other award for homeowners who take care to restore their homes would be recognized without further government intervention.

Noting the diversity of the styles of homes located within the district, and the changes that have occurred to visible exteriors of these homes, she suggests that while these homes have changed considerably over the past one hundred years, they manage to remain remarkably true to their historical styles. She would prefer that no historic designation be approved if it means taking away the right of the individual homeowners to adapt their homes to their own needs.

J. Scheide also noted that she would like to see the dreadful wood fence on the back side of Morven removed and replaced with a new tasteful fence. She would also like to see the ugly pool house removed.

Fernando Guerrero, of 16 Hodge Road, thanked the HPRC for their efforts, time and patience in listening to the citizens who care to voice their opinion about the area. He stated that most of his neighbors feel it is a privilege to be the stewards of their homes and live and enjoy this wonderful neighborhood and community. F. Guerrero stated that while he has great respect for C. Tazelaar as a member of the HPRC and as a member of the Princeton community, he finds it

disingenuous and a bit troublesome that she made her earlier remark (“we did it”). F. Guerrero feels this puts her in a compromising position to be an honest broker on this proposal.

F. Guerrero questioned the timing of the study and feels that thirteen of the fifty-one neighbors colluded and planned in secret over the Christmas holiday, to deliver this document to the Borough Hall on December 23, 2009. He finds it deeply troublesome that his neighbors would be part of blindsiding their neighbors who are not part of the Friends of the Western Section and that the minority of the people in the neighborhood would try to impose their wishes on the majority.

C. Tazelaar answered F. Guerrero’s comments and read the definition of the word disingenuous. She does not feel that her comments have been disingenuous and if she said “we did it,” then she misspoke. Ms. Tazelaar stated that she received the report at the same time as the other members of the Committee and she had nothing to do with the preparation of this report. She further stated that she feels she has been candid in expressing her opinion based on information in other records and other documentation in this report.

Kim Pimley, 117 Library Place, lives within the proposed district and believes that the neighborhood has always thrived because of the responsible stewardship of all the individual owners. K. Pimley gave a detailed history of her property since taking ownership in 1996 and described the extensive renovations that she and her husband have undertaken since that time. She offered that Ann Martindell, the previous owner, told her that the kitchen of the house had been used as a soup kitchen during the depression before that operation was moved to Trinity Church.

K. Pimley further described the purchase of the property next door on Library Place and her efforts to enlist several of the neighbor’s opinions regarding the development plans for the property. She related how she and her husband tore down the previous structure and replaced it with such a beautiful one which she and her husband have opened up to the Princeton community on several occasions. K. Pimley stated that sometimes tear downs are not bad and described the black mold and inoperable mechanics that made it necessary to demolish the Dilworth house. She noted that a beautiful house was built in its place and the gardens were restored.

Carrie Fullerton of 128 Library Place told the Committee that she went on to the Historical Society website and went into the picture-search. The first house that came up as “unidentified” was her house. Over the time that they have owned this house, they have worked to restore it to look more closely like the original. C. Fullerton stated that nobody buys one of these old homes if they don’t intend to love it and take care of it.

C. Fullerton noted that the proposed Morven Tract, presented in tonight’s study, is not the same Morven Tract that is included in the Master Plan, mentioned as an historic sites “wish-list” item. She further asked what is the Park Services definition of “key contributing?” C. Fullerton also asked how many historic districts there are throughout New Jersey. She then would like to know how many of these historic districts were installed without the vote of the majority of the people living within the district. With regard to the benefits of an historic district, C. Fullerton stated she believes that as part of the state and national historic registers, most of those benefits have already been accomplished for this district. C. Fullerton commented that there are adequate

zoning laws that prevent people from putting amenities in their front yards and is opposed to the land use laws for properties within historic districts that require approval of paint colors and finishes if one constructs an addition. She also noted that the National Park Service Historic Designation does not allow for “moved “ sites, except under very strict guidelines. Moved buildings do not qualify for historic designation unless they are incredibly significant.

Phil Leone, 7 Hodge Road, stated that his property is not currently in the proposed district. He noted that his property was built in 1950 and he is the second owner of the home. They have made significant changes to the front of the house and the streetscape, all of which have been happily accepted by all the neighbors. His house, which is next door to the Grover Cleveland house, is considered to be a major part of the entranceway to Hodge Road.

P. Leone further noted that the current owners of the Grover Cleveland house have done significant and tasteful renovations to their property; including a separate building that is a three-car garage. All these renovations have been acceptable to the neighbors. P. Leone agreed with earlier comments about how contentious this issue was three years ago, and he feels that is why certain properties were excluded in the proposed designated boundaries. Referring to earlier comments from the HPRC that they make recommendations to Mayor and Council, P. Leone questioned how many times has Borough Council voted to approve or deny any proposal recommended or not recommended by the HPRC over the last ten years.

Mark Solomon, Esq., of Pepper Hamilton, stated he was working with some of the homeowners of the Western Section who have great concerns about the possibility of the proposed Western Section Historic District designation of this area. While they are not opposed to protection of the area and maintenance of the area, he believes that the public comment indicates their commitment to their investments and protecting this part of the community.

M. Solomon asked what kind of time extension would be allowed for these homeowners to do the necessary work to respond adequately to the Hunter Report. He questioned that an argument was made that by 1916, thirty of the fifty odd houses were occupied by university professors, yet if you look at the 1916 map, the area shown was much larger. He feels that the boundaries are very questionable.

M. Solomon noted that it is painful to sit in an audience and watch a neighborhood divide itself over this issue again. He feels it is very important that the process proceeds in a way that will allow neighbors the time to explore alternatives and have further dialogue among themselves. M. Solomon asked that a time extension of at least four months be granted so that experts could be hired and documentation gathered, etc.

M. Solomon noted that it would be interesting to know what the construction pattern has been in this area by investigating building permits issued over the last few years. One point that residents have been trying to make this evening is that there has been a good deal of work done in this neighborhood over the last one hundred years and yet that is not documented in the Hunter Report. He thinks that is germane to whether the proposed district is appropriate.

J. Faggen commented that the real issue here is not over boundaries as much as it is about deep philosophical differences. The people who do not want the district feel that it would be interfering with how they deal with their properties and those who do want the designation are concerned that some construction or changes might destroy their neighborhood. Both sides put forth very good reasons for their opinions. It is possible that the two groups – those in favor of

an historic district design and those who do not – try to work out a compromise solution. Thus, further expenses directed towards defeating or upholding an historic district design could be eliminated.

On the issue of the time extension, N. Kerr noted that a lot of work went into the Hunter Report and she feels it would not take the same amount of time to prepare a rebuttal.

J. Heilner commented that he and N. Karp have a very cordial conversation the day N. Karp received the informational letter that was distributed. Both agreed that they were going to have civil conversations, present facts and respect each other's views without getting into personalities or pointing fingers. He feels that both groups feel very strongly about that.

F. Guerrero asked that the HPRC ask the neighborhood to hold a series of private meetings to find some common ground. He noted that there is a minority that wants a decision and a majority that has a difference of opinion and he fears this will continue to divide the neighborhood. F. Guerrero urged that the intelligent, honest citizens have an honest, candid dialogue to figure out some common ground and deal with their fears without escalating into a legal battle.

J. Scheide offered that Princeton University is a good example of diverse architecture and they have successfully incorporated both modern and historical gothic designs that work together.

J. Constantine encouraged both halves of the neighborhood to come to a compromise. He suggested some time between three and six months as an adequate time extension to provide a buffer period for the neighborhood to hold their neighborhood meetings and hopefully go forward to reach an end result that works for all parties involved. J. Constantine urged residents in the audience who are suspicious of the HPRC process to come to HPRC meetings and monitor and observe for themselves the stewardship with which the HPRC provides guidance in much the same dedicated manner and commitment to community that many of them have.

W. Benchley agreed that this issue is a philosophical argument. She feels, however, that philosophical differences should be worked out at Borough Council by elected officials who look at the town as a whole and come up with decisions.

As a clarification, D. Bridger stated that the Hunter Report was submitted to him on December 22, 2009. At that time there was not sufficient time to notice properly for the January HPRC meeting. In February there was a large site plan hearing so this report could not be placed on the agenda for that meeting. The first available hearing date was the March meeting.

M. Solomon questioned whether or not the Hunter Report is flawed, and noted again that some people in the audience had only just received the report and not had adequate time to look at the report. He stated that the process set forth in the Ordinance is to look at this report and not just accept it at face value. While the report makes some very good arguments, it is not an open and shut case and perhaps this issue may well have to be decided by Mayor and Council.

Ruth Sayer, 162 Library Place, noted that when the State of New Jersey was beginning to widen the intersection of Nassau Street, Bayard Lane and Stockton Street, the only way this development could be stopped was through historic designation and by engaging the State Historic Sites Committee. This appeal was successful and the potential for increased truck traffic was averted by the many people who worked hard to prevent this widening of the roadway prior to the Kings Highway designation. There were over one hundred fifty historic monuments,

buildings and structures identified within a half mile radius of this intersection. R. Sayer's interest in getting involved in preservation of this neighborhood is to assure that those proposed changes to Bayard Lane will not occur in the future. She feels that historic preservation district designation is one of the strongest combative tools at your disposal when you are up against the state, federal government, the trucking industry and various other people who are imposing on our community.

C. Tazelaar noted that as a certified local government any development or undertaking, as was previously described, would be subject to review by the State Historic Preservation Office.

J. Constantine made a motion to have a special meeting in June but members of the audience voiced concern that a June meeting may interfere with school holiday schedules and prevent some residents from attending.

N. Karp agreed that there are serious issues about Route 206 and requested that the Committee allow ample time for neighbors to meet and discuss these matters in an atmosphere that is not stressful. He further stated that the actual boundaries of the area included in the proposed designation matter legally. As this process goes forward to Mayor and Council there will be an appeal process and the precise delineation and what properties are included is what will ultimately matter.

There was discussion about an appropriate meeting date on which to hold the special meeting. D. Bridger suggested a time frame of not less than three months and not more than six months. In that time we will be able to schedule an appropriate meeting room and notice the meeting properly.

J. Faggen amended the previous motion made by J. Constantine. A special meeting will be held no sooner than three months and no later than six months and notification of this special meeting will be given as soon as possible. C. Tazelaar seconded.

There was continued discussion and K Thoft motioned to amend the motion to "not longer than seven months". Any material to be submitted to the Committee from all parties, must be received by D. Bridger, at Borough Hall, two weeks prior to the meeting date. C. Tazelaar seconded the amended motion and the motion was approved.

Administrative Waivers

HPRC Waiver Request – Signage
The Present Day Club, owners/applicant
Location: 72 Stockton Street; Block 36.02, Lot 4
CBD Zone/Central Business Historic District Overlay Zone

Application was approved by Kirsten Thoft on January 29, 2010

HISTORIC PRESERVATION REVIEW COMMITTEE
Regular Monthly Meeting No. 322
Wednesday, March 3, 2010

Page 14

HPRC Waiver Request – Signage
Mike’s Barbara Shop/Michael Zingaro, applicant
Benson Henderson Enterprises, owner
Location: 33 Witherspoon Street; Block 27.01, Lot 9
CBD Zone/Central Historic Overlay District

Application was made to place another sign on the window and a barber pole.
Approved by Kirsten Thoft on February 3, 2010.

D. Bridger noted that he found an illuminated sign at this location and has issued a violation notice.

At 10:51 p.m. C. Tazelaar moved to adjourn the meeting. The Motion passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Pegi Johnson, Acting Recording Secretary