

**MINUTES  
OF THE  
CRANBURY TOWNSHIP  
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
CRANBURY, NEW JERSEY  
MIDDLESEX COUNTY**

**TIME AND PLACE OF MEETING**

A meeting of the Cranbury Township Historic Preservation Commission was held in second level meeting room, Town Hall, Cranbury, New Jersey, on February 4, 2020 beginning at 7:00 pm.

**STATEMENT OF ADEQUATE NOTICE**

Pursuant to the Sunshine Law, adequate notice in accordance with the Open Public Meetings Act (N.J.S.A. 10:4-5) was provided on December 16, 2019, of this meeting's date, time, place and an agenda was mailed to the news media, posted on the Township bulletin board, mailed to those requesting personal notice and filed with the Municipal Clerk.

**MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE**

Mr. Golisano, Ms. Marlowe, Ms. Ryan, Ms. Suttmeier (2<sup>nd</sup> Alt.), Mr. Szabo, and Mr. Walsh. Mr. Banks (1<sup>st</sup> Alt.), requested to be excused, motion to excuse made by Mr. Szabo, seconded by Mr. Walsh, all in favor. Ineligible, Ms. Suttmeier. Ms. Spann, HPC Liaison, was present.

**APPLICATIONS**

144 North Main Street, (ZBA327-19), (B26.01, L28) within Buffer Area; application was received from the Zoning Board of Adjustment for review of an Endless Pool swim spa. Mr. Walsh stated this application is not under HPC purview (Buffer Area) and continued that where the proposed spa is to be installed will not be visible from the street and will appear as a small patio and not be conspicuous. HPC questioned if a fence around the spa would be required by zoning. If required, HPC would like to review the fence design as this detail would be visible from the street.

Memo will be generated for submission to Zoning Board of Adjustment for ZBA329-19.

HPC041-20, #11 Prospect Street, (B23, L33) within Historic District; owners, Sean and Kate Deverin were present for the field change application from the January 21<sup>st</sup> HPC meeting. Mr. Golisano recused himself. Mr. Deverin explained that the basement windows with wells and a Bilco door have been removed and that Pella windows were previously approved but they are now seeking an amendment to that approval.

Mr. Szabo stated that HPC is interested in the front façade of the house, Mr. Deverin did research and stated that there would be additional costs with the muntins on the exterior, matching vinyl. The owners are proposing to install the same make and series (Pella Architectural Series) windows as installed on their previously owned home on Maplewood Avenue. These windows have a high profile muntin between the glass and a thicker sash.

Hearing no other questions, roll call to approve the changes as stated in the application. AYES: Ms. Marlowe, Ms. Ryan, Mr. Szabo and Mr. Walsh. RECUSED: Mr. Golisano. INELIGIBLE: Ms. Suttmeier.

HPC042-20 (ZBA328-19) #11 Prospect Street, (B23, L33) within Historic District; owners, Sean and Kate Deverin were present for proposed shed, pool and fence installation.

Mr. Golisano inquired if he should recuse himself from participation. Chapter 21-8 A. Conflict of interest/removal was read aloud. It was determined Mr. Golisano had no personal or financial interest, he is eligible to participate.

Mr. Deverin stated that the concept of this plan, shed, pool and fence, is to condense all of the living space closest to the house since the property measures 60'W x 245'L. The plot plan has the addition drawn on it and shows the pool will be located off the covered patio, tucked as close to house as possible. The NE side has a nice view of the adjacent farmland and they want to see it when sitting in the backyard. The shed (12'D x 16' L) will have a vertical board siding (pine) whitewashed or natural with a copper cupola and weathervane. A question was asked about the peak height, 12'x12' roof over the standard 2x4, and would be approximately 14'

or 15' high. The shed size and location will need to conform to zoning. The double shed doors will match the siding and windows will be single pane with 6 divided light wood frame sash in the lower windows and a 4 divided light window in the gable ends. Roofing material will be asphalt shingles to match shingles on house. It will be installed at the point where the 6'H fence ends (85'L from new addition corner). Mr. Deverin stated that it may be placed on a slab to prevent animals from burrowing under the shed.

The proposed 6'H fence will be a solid vertical board with horizontal rail on the top and bottom to frame the sections of the fence. The material will be cedar or pine wood. The zoning code allows a 6'H fence and 25'L which is why they are seeking variance. The proposed 6' fence will be installed from the back corner house (NW) and extend 38'6". The side yard (SW) between the rear corner of house and property will have a 14'L fenced with a matching gate. The (S) side elevation will have 85'L of 6'H fence. The back section has an existing 3 split rail with dog fencing on the inside that will remain. The proposed fence will be natural, not painted or stained.

Mr. Deverin informed HPC that no diving board or slide will be installed on the pool and that the pool filter and shed will require a variance. The fence (NW) in front of garage, where arborvitae are growing, will have a 6'H x 25'L with a 5' transition section with proposed new shrubs. Mr. Deverin stated that the transition will be curved. The top picture frame will need to be considered.

Mr. Kevin Golisano, next door neighbor located to the north, was present and stated that he is fine with the solid 6'H fence in the rear yard but spoke of his concern of the same fence style (6'H x 25'L with a 5' transition fence) section proposed in front of the garage and down the driveway, between the two properties and of the impact of such a high fence within the Historic District. He stated that there are not many fences around Cranbury with fences of that height in the front/side yard and of the few, they're near a street and buffered with landscaping/shrubbery. The Cranbury Inn has a six foot alternating board fence but that is to screen a private residence. Another is on Station Road, which is a multi-family house. Mr. Golisano opined that the current mature arborvitae can be trimmed back, which will grow thicker and are a more appropriate buffer within the historic district. Mr. Golisano addressed that there is current construction on this property but it is a temporary situation. Mr. Deverin responded with his concerns.

The pool cannot be seen from the street, located in rear yard. HPC did not review for this reason.

Hearing no other questions, roll call to approve HPC042-20 (ZBA328-19) with board and batten siding or tongue and groove, shiplap, siding (with setback) and the fence design and appearance, per approval from Zoning Board. AYES: Ms. Marlowe, Ms. Ryan, Mr. Szabo and Mr. Walsh. RECUSED: Mr. Golisano. INELIGIBLE: Ms. Suttmeier.

Memo will be generated for submission to Zoning Board of Adjustment for ZBA328-19.

HPC043-20 #15 Prospect St. (B23, L32) within Historic District; Mr. Kevin Golisano, owner, present to discuss an amendment to the front porch that was approved by HPC in March 2018. Record will reflect that Mr. Steven Golisano recused himself.

Mr. Walsh stated that it was exciting to see a photo of the house without the aluminum siding and asked Mr. K. Golisano to explain his application. Mr. Golisano stated that the plan back in 2019 was to restore the porch but when removing the aluminum siding, evidence was that the original porch was larger than the current one was discovered. Research found on a 1933 Sanborn map, a footprint of a larger porch. He stated that the current porch with fluted Doric columns is not very common on a 5 bay house. His plan is to restore to the original three bay front porch. He plans to install brick piers, Azek or Boral product on the trim work, mahogany decking and EPDM roofing material that will help recreate a yankee gutter on the porch roof. The design of the columns are to reflect the 1852 period when the house was built. Column examples were found in *Cranbury, Images of America, Vol. 1*. The two columns against the house will be engaged, between the window shutters. Yankee gutters will be built with a downspout installed near a column. The pole gutter on the roof top, front of the house, will be maintained. The original clapboard is in good condition and will remain, however there are some areas that need attention. An edge trim detail was uncovered that Mr. Golisano will keep to remain in keeping with the integrity of this historic house. An uncovered shuttered-in window will be opened and match the other previously approved windows.

Hearing no other questions or concerns, roll call to approve HPC043-20 was taken. AYES: Ms. Marlowe, Ms. Ryan, Mr. Szabo and Mr. Walsh. RECUSED: Mr. Golisano. INELIGIBLE: Ms. Suttmeier.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

2020 Budget Item was addressed for any anticipated expenses that may require engineering, litigation or other item that require resources. Additional funds could be inserted the HPC budget for such expenditures.

Mr. Golisano stated that preservation of Cranbury Station depot or the Danser Property at 147 Plainsboro Road could require inspections or review by an outside expert. The Danser Property has a preservation easement within the deed. HPC is not aware of any updates or the cost if this is addressed. Should a demolition permit be filed, HPC could require a professional engineering report of its structural soundness and integrity. It may require a historic preservation expert to review the property for maintenance of the property. The facts are unknown as of this meeting as to what the anticipated costs would be. There is an approximate deadline of April 1<sup>st</sup> for this to be investigated.

Ms. Suttmeier stated that Effective Easement Monitoring (webinar) was attended by a couple HPC volunteers, including herself. She said that the webinar provided information that if a house has a preservation easement, the HPC should be monitoring it. There is a process and the first step is to send a letter informing the owner of violation(s) then move forward from there.

A question was raised as to who handles the property maintenance notices, it is handled through the DPW. A maintenance complaint must be submitted in writing which would be fielded through the proper channels. A maintenance complaint was verbally communicated at the TC meeting, Mr. Cook, TC Member, committed to filing a complaint where it was stated that it would move forward.

Mr. Golisano raised a concern of the details that are falling off the house that can be seen from the street. These deteriorating details alter the architectural characteristics of the structure. Ms. Suttmeier stated funds should be put in the budget to give attention to this property and to see what the deed states. Is this an HPC or the Township responsibility and what can the HPC do to support preservation of this building or maintenance of the structure. What is the process, procedure, or initiation to address this property? Ms. Spann will liaison back to the HPC.

HPC Application Page 6 of 7; Secretary asked HPC to amend the page to insert the application box as found on Page 3 of 7. HPC was in favor. Motion to accept was made by Mr. Golisano, seconded by Mr. Walsh, all in favor. Ms. Suttmeier was ineligible.

Employee Manuals were distributed to the volunteers with return slips signed stating they have been received.

## **OLD BUSINESS**

New Homeowner Letters: no report supplied.

2019 Year End Memo and Report: Mr. Golisano and Ms. Suttmeier reported omitted webinars that they had viewed. These will be added to the report. Mr. Banks and Mr. Walsh will be attending the February 24<sup>th</sup> TC meeting to present the report.

## **DISCUSSION**

Question was raised on 82 North Main Street. Secretary informed the HPC that a Certificate of Appropriateness application was delivered to the HPC office. A request for owner to attend the February 18<sup>th</sup> or the March 3<sup>rd</sup> HPC meeting be confirmed. No response from that email as of this date. Photos were not included with the application, secretary took a couple photos of the outbuilding from the public street.

Ms. Marlowe to invited Mr. Kilbride, Railroad Historian, to the February 18<sup>th</sup> HPC meeting. Ms. Marlowe suggested that approximately 20 minutes will be needed for his presentation. The HPC is looking forward to hearing Mr. Kilbride speak of the Cranbury Station area.

Cranbury Station Hamlet: Ms. Suttmeier compiled information of this area. With the help of Mr. Golisano, she was able to access pictures and geography from the GEO website. This info along with a brief history taken from a scanned pdf file, old photos and a newspaper article was presented. More info will be gained from the future meeting with Mr. Kilbride. Through conversation it was discovered that the railroad right-of-way site

was considered as a SHPO Opinion (March 23, 2016), it does not include the freight station. Ms. Suttmeier color coded some maps in her presentation showing ownership, historical significance and non-significance. Halsey Reed Road is the dividing line between Cranbury and Monroe Township. She highlighted a parcel of land that had a house as of 2 years ago but has since been demolished. The goal is to educate others and to have the same understanding of the area.

Mr. Walsh identified two matters here, one being the adoption of the houses within Cranbury Station on the Cranbury side into the HD. Mr. Golisano stated that this was identified in the Master Plan. Mr. Walsh continued to say the second issue was to whether or not consider pursuit of reuse or preservation of the freight station for possible active recreation. He asked the HPC of their opinions to pursue. Ms. Marlowe felt that immediate need is to secure the district since this area is not the only houses that should be added to the register. Mr. Walsh agreed. Ms. Szabo suggested that an expert do a survey of the area. Funds might be required, even if minimal, the funds would need to be there.

Mr. Golisano stated the freight terminal is more of threat to removal, than the privately owned houses. Mr. Szabo stated that the rail lines have been designated as a Historic District and the depot is next to it. Perhaps it would possible to annex this structure into the rail line designation? Mr. Walsh proposed a scenario that should this private property sell in the future, how would HPC engage presale and make evident their interest in the property. What would be the next step? It would be suitable to address the houses within a HD first. There could be a possibility to address both at the same time.

Ms. Spann read an excerpt from the Master Plan *'consider adding Cranbury Station Hamlet as an historic district and subject to review by HPC. At the community meeting on April 2019, a contention of residents of the hamlet and the surrounding area indicated that the hamlet area was indeed historic. As a means to protect and preserve this historic resource, the Township should work with the HPC to determine whether the hamlet should be designated as an historic district similar to the downtown historic district'*. She expressed that the Master Plan will be receiving attention and that the TC (Township Committee) will be looking to HPC for direction. Mr. Walsh feels the first matter will be the easiest to address while the depot may not. He foresees this as speaking with the TC and suggesting the plan. Should the TC offer support, the next step would be to address the property owners for their feedback. Once this step is complete, then the HPC would address the depot. Embracing the historic homes within the hamlet should be our vision going forward. There are four historic houses on the Cranbury side of the Cranbury Station Hamlet. HPC anticipates a visual impact as the LI (light industrial) zone can allow a warehouse. Question was raised to the entrance/exit should a warehouse be located there. Halsey Reed is the only access road. Buffering the historic properties would need to be addressed.

Secretary stated that Chapter 93-3 Designation of historic sites and districts outlines the procedures for designation. Secretary asked Ms. Suttmeier to email the slide presentation for the HPC file.

## **MINUTES**

The minutes from the January 7, 2020, meeting was reviewed. Minutes of January 21, 2020 were reviewed with a minor correction. Roll call to approve minutes were taken. AYES: Mr. Golisano, Ms. Marlowe, Ms. Ryan, Mr. Szabo, and Mr. Walsh. INELIGIBLE: Ms. Suttmeier.

## **ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING**

There being no further business, a motion duly made by Mr. Walsh, seconded by Mr. Szabo and carried, the meeting was thereupon adjourned.

## **CERTIFICATE OF SECRETARY**

I, undersigned, do hereby certify;

That I am the duly appointed secretary of the Cranbury Township Historic Preservation Commission and,

That the foregoing minutes of the Historic Preservation Commission, held on February 4, 2020 consisting of 4 pages, constitute a true and correct copy of the minutes of the said meeting.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto subscribed my name on this 5<sup>th</sup> day of May 2020.

---

Linda M. Scott, Recording Secretary