

**MINUTES  
OF THE  
CRANBURY TOWNSHIP  
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
CRANBURY, NEW JERSEY  
AUGUST 17, 2021**

**TIME AND PLACE OF MEETING**

The regular meeting of the Cranbury Township Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) was held on August 17, 2021 at 7:00 pm by remote access videoconferencing in response to COVID-19 and the updated Open Public Meeting Act guidelines.

**CALL TO ORDER**

With a quorum present, Mr. Golisano called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

**STATEMENT OF ADEQUATE NOTICE**

Pursuant to the Sunshine Law, adequate notice in accordance with the Senator Byron M. Baer Open Public Meetings Act (N.J.S.A. 10:4-6) was provided on January 8, 2021, of this meeting's date, time, and place, and the 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. Notification of remote access meetings going forward, until further notice, was posted on the Township website on July 3, 2020 and sent to the Trenton Times, Home News, and Cranbury Press on July 3, 2020.

**ROLL CALL:**

Members Present: Mr. Golisano, Chair, Mr. Walsh, Vice Chair, Ms. Marlowe, Ms. Ryan, Ms. Suttmeier, Mr. Szabo, Alt I and Mr. Geier, Alt II

Professionals and Staff Present: Evelyn Spann, Committee Liaison  
Robin Tillou, Historic Preservation Commission Secretary

**APPLICATIONS**

**Minor and Ordinary Maintenance and Repair**

Ms. Tillou, Administrative Officer (A/O), advised the Commission of the minor and ordinary maintenance and repair Certificate of Approval (CoA) applications that had gone before the Chair and the A/O.

The following were deemed ordinary maintenance and repair CoA applications by Chair Golisano and A/O Ms. Tillou:

HPC#110-21 #6 N. Main Street, Block 33, Lot 37, Roof, Fence, Chimney, Brick, Front Steps Repair and Painting of Wood/Shutters.

HPC#111-21, #15 Station Road, Block 35, Lot 16, Roof Repair

HPC#112-21, #21 S. Main Street, Block 35, Lot 7.01, Front Porch, Front Exterior, Porch Roof, Siding and Shutters Repair

HPC#114-21, #107 N. Main Street, Block 25, Lot 29, Side Porch Repairs, approved with conditions.

The following was deemed a minor CoA application and was approved by Chair Golisano:

HPC#110-21, #6 N. Main Street, Block 33, Lot 37, Arch with Gate in Rear Yard.

The following was deemed a minor CoA application and was approved by Vice Chair Walsh due to Chair Golisano having to recuse himself:

HPC #117-21, #40 S. Main Street, Block 23, Lot 81, Garage Roof due to damage, approved with conditions.

**HPC113-21, #17 N. Main Street, Block 23, Lot 109, Front Porch**

Ms. Penny Giannos-Ftikas was present and is the Owner and Applicant for 17 N. Main Street Certificate of Approval (CoA) application.

Chair Golisano explained this application originally came in as an ordinary maintenance and repair CoA application. It had to come before the Commission due to being deviated from the exact installation previously on site of the front porch which is what ordinary maintenance and repair is defined as. The porch piers and lower foundation of the porch is the portion of the application that prompted the applicant to come before the Commission.

Ms. Ftikas explained the reason for the front porch repairs. After rain they had gone to the basement under the building and bricks were falling out from the foundation wall that supports the stairs and front wall of the porch. When doing repairs, it was noticed that all of it had rotted underneath. Initially it was indicated we would be putting trek down. But we were then advised as noted in the application trek would have to be replaced with another material. We did put in all wood. Another detail mentioned is the brick piers need to be visible. So, it was assumed that due to the trellis not being able to be used that brick would be ok to use. The mason came out and laid the brick to which we then were advised of the violation of that portion not being approved. At this point we cannot do anymore masonry work. They would be happy to accommodate putting landscaping and/or trellis in between the piers attached to the wood trim at the bottom of the porch to keep it more in the historic design guidelines.

Chair Golisano advised what the applicant just discussed is the change from the original individual brick piers below the porch to the continuous brick wall which is there now. Was that a pancake brick product used in between the brick piers?

Ms. Ftikas stated yes.

Chair Golisano advised that the process to follow is the Zoning Officer would have to come out if any work was not approved.

Ms. Marlowe asked if the basement extends out under the front porch.

Ms. Ftikas stated correct.

Ms. Marlowe feels it did need more than just that repair.

Mr. Geier asked the plans for the dirt area between the sidewalk to the brick wall.

Ms. Ftikas wanted recommendations. One idea would be to pave it with flagstone for that area to match the sidewalk pieces that bridge the road to the sidewalk. We can take other recommendations from the Commission.

Ms. Marlowe suggested tables in that area.

Mr. Geier suggested flagstone.

Mr. Szabo stated if the intention was to put tables there the flagstone would make the most sense.

The Commission was in agreeance on the flagstone being placed in the area between the front porch and the sidewalk.

Ms. Ryan asked if the wrought iron railings that were existing will be going back.

Ms. Ftikas stated they will be going back and will be painted.

Vice Chair Walsh advocated the project, and the material is what we would look for.

Chairperson Golisano made the motion to approve HPC113-21 under the condition of also including the use of bluestone hardscape walking surface, matching the existing township sidewalk to be used between the new solid porch brick base and the existing brick sidewalk. Vice Chair Walsh offered a second.

ROLL CALL:

AYES: Mr. Golisano, Ms. Marlowe, Ms. Ryan, Ms. Suttmeier and Mr. Walsh

NAYS: None.

ABSTAIN: None.

**HPC083-21, #24 Maplewood Avenue, Block 33, Lot 20, Addition to Left of Home with Living Space**

Mr. Matt Zaleski, Contractor for Applicant, was present and representing the Owner of the 24 Maplewood Avenue Certificate of Approval application.

Mr. Zaleski explained he was out of commission for a few days and the subcontractor had to take over the project. The difference to what had been proposed is the addition to the left side of the home was not setback two feet across the front. It was squared and the homeowners like it better. That is the reason why we are before the Commission again and are asking for the proper approvals.

Chair Golisano advised to submit a zoning permit as the Commission cannot confirm setbacks and lot coverage.

Chair Golisano stated the exterior trim should be extending down face of that corner. The reasoning is to look like it has a setback and to have it look like there is an addition to the side. It would be to carry the corner trim down the face of the building.

Mr. Zaleski stated after speaking with the homeowner they would have no issue with doing that.

Mr. Geier agreed with Chair Golisano stating pulling the corner trim to the ground would balance the elevation.

Ms. Marlowe agreed.

Chair Golisano asked if there were any other effects to the structure as in the pitch of the roof, side elevation, etc.

Mr. Zaleski stated very minor. The height may have been lowered.

Mr. Geier stated the downspout to the gutter on the side of the building from the higher roof to move it to the left side of the addition. That will help reinforce the addition.

Chairperson Golisano opened the meeting to the public; with no public comment the public forum was closed.

Chair Golisano made the motion to approve HPC083-21 under the condition of the vertical corner trim extending down to split the siding in that location and to keep gutters separated with the one continuous gutter running down the taller mass of the building as with the other side. Vice Chair Walsh offered a second.

ROLL CALL:

AYES: Mr. Golisano, Ms. Marlowe, Ms. Ryan, Ms. Suttmeier and Mr. Walsh

NAYS: None.

ABSTAIN: None.

**HPC115-21, #139 N. Main Street, Block 25, Lot 20, Demo Existing Addition and Construct New Addition CONCEPT REVIEW**

Mr. Bill Gittings, Architect and Applicant, was present for the 139 N. Main Street CoA application. Mr. James and Mrs. Michelle Till was present and is the Owner of 139 N. Main Street.

Mr. Gittings introduced the application by stating it is a colonial revival house built in the 1930s which has an addition to the right which is an office with plate glass windows. The Owners would like to build a swimming pool to the right. Part of that will be a new kitchen and a flexible addition that can be used in different ways. They will use the space as an office and the bathroom would be used as a bath house for the pool. This can also be used as an in-law suite and can be used as a family room for the house with a pool house bathroom. It will be a flexible design. The approach is to make a gable addition in the cross section with a link to the office addition that is there. He will take the existing foundation and rebuild walls on the roof. He will take the direction of the original office addition but making it into a link. The bedroom/bathroom addition feels more like a separate element/massing linked back to the building. It is secondary and maintains the materials and the slope of the roof. The front façade would have a French casement in the kitchen where the existing office is. Then the cross gable would step forward which would be pilasters and will extend the brick plinth of the current house of the front porch and under the columns of the link and extend that across the front of the house. There will be a picture window with a transom in the center flanked by two smaller casement windows like the side lights of the entry door. The same materials, boral duration for trim which will look like painted wood when done. Matching profiles. The columns being proposed will not be round but will be rectangular pilasters trying to not compete with the front porch. The pilasters allow to continue around the addition, so it feels more pavilion like and not look like a garage. The siding would match. Would match with cedar. Asphalt fiber glass shingles to match roof. The connector will be a flat roof. The flat roof will not be seen from the street as it does not now. The right elevation will be smaller windows, one in the bathroom and two on the right is built ins for the family room/office/bedroom with a door from the bathroom out to the swimming pool. The back of the house that is not visible by the street continuing the same design, so the column wraps the building and matches up to the existing rear entry. It will have the same detailing with French doors and sidelights. A porch on the rear. Those having the retracting screens as well.

Chair Golisano asked if that is what the door is shown on the plan that opens to the patio and pool area for the retracted screen system.

Mr. Gittings stated the idea of that is a gate for compliance around the pool. Whether it is a black fence or how to mix that with the picket fence that goes around the property must be worked out.

Mr. Geier asked the porch on the back that has the two facing seats, would that be screened in.

Mr. Gittings stated it would be motorized screens.

Mr. Geier asked if the swinging section goes out to the pool.

Mr. Gittings stated it would be a fence outside of the screen.

Mr. Gittings went over the changes being done to the existing building is the side elevation which has a very large 4'x4' attic exhaust louver will be removed and in place will be a salvage windows from the original house. On the back façade there is a glass window with brackets over and at the rear entry will add a window on each façade and change a double window to a single window.

Chair Golisano confirmed the widening of the roof over the window added next to the door.

Chair Golisano asked in between the two of the columns if it will be filled in solid.

Mr. Gittings stated a possible piece of trim and painting it out.

Chair Golisano address the flat roof stating the elevation change from Main Street to the house itself and not necessarily showing. This one will be taller and a longer run may impact the windows in the taller mass.

Mr. Gittings stated he will keep it that so the sightline from the street will not be seen as it is now.

Chair Golisano stated the pictures show the pane detail on the side lights, they do not show up on existing drawings. That is the pane detail being carried over, the arched look. That is the look that you are looking over.

Mr. Geier stated the clear stories on the addition are those spaces behind there which is the bathroom and the office space tall spaces that go up to the full height of the roof slopes.

Mr. Gittings stated yes, we will take advantage of verticality in those spaces to have light in that space.

Mr. Szabo confirmed the side elevation has a door now instead of a window.

Mr. Gittings stated that is a connection of the bathroom/dressing area from the pool.

Chair Golisano stated to consider the hardscape visible from Main Street for the fencing and what is visible and what buffers are provided.

Mr. Gittings stated the hardscape will likely be bluestone, but you will not see that from the street. The pool area will be landscaped along the fence line.

Ms. Ryan stated she supports the hyphen idea, and this is a good way to put in an addition.

Chairperson Golisano opened the meeting to the public; with no public comment the public forum was closed.

**HPC116-21, #25 Park Place West, Block 23, Lot 46, Demo Existing Lean, Add Two Story Enclosed Porch with Roof Deck, Add Driveway, Paint Fence and Potential Garage  
CONCEPT REVIEW**

Mr. Bill Gittings, Applicant and Owner of the Certificate of Approval application was present.

Mr. Gittings introduced the application stating the property is at the end of Park Place West and was previously the Elms Nursing Home. His family has owned the property for the past 20 years. He has restored the inside and three of the facades. This was the parsonage to the second Presbyterian house. In the late 60s the post office was built in the front yard. Park Place West was not built yet and the former landowners sold a portion of their property to the Township for the future expansion of Park Place West which was previously called Petty Road. The entry for the old nursing home was off the driveway through the post office parking lot. The driveway being proposed is from Park Place West and the approval process is underway right now. He is bringing the driveway in right off the property line 5' to meet zoning. There is an existing curb cut there now. It has the least amount of disruption to Park Place West and will bring you in the oval. This will give you a view of the front of the house. Where the two stakes are in picture provided to the Commission, is where we are proposing to bring the driveway in. The front door looks at the back of the post office. The driveway entrance is currently through the post office parking lot. The side porch from Park Place West walks into the music room. There is a lean that was built. The back of the house had all the doors going out to a fire escape when it was a nursing home. These series of additions are of the enclosed porch, a lean and the rare piece that will be the bathroom/mudroom. The proposal is to screen off the post office, finish the back of the house and the driveway. Those are the three priorities with the project. The screening of the post office is to put a barn garage off the driveway. There will be solid fencing and he will go before the Zoning Board for a variance to give time for the landscaping to grow mature and at that point the fence can go away. Possibly a dark green painted fence along the property line to screen the loading dock and the parking lot of the post office and it will be landscape in the front. The garage will be a barn kit to screen the back of the post office. They both require variances which he will apply for. This will not be a part of Phase I. The back façade proposal will be to make a second-floor sunroom and walkout area above mimicking the front porch. There will be a porch and he will be filling it with large wide casement windows. The windows on the outside of the three levels are existing windows. The siding on the back of the house will be removed and replaced to match the existing siding due to needing repair.

Chair Golisano asked about the fence that was stated will be temporarily will eventually be removed over time.

Mr. Gittings stated it will be screened by the vegetation.

Chair Golisano stated the driveway coming off the corner is slightly wider than 90° off the edge. It seems you would like to make it easier to access the center. Does it help to go 90° and have more of an approach to the front of the house.

Mr. Gittings stated the trees would be lost if we did. It is small enough than the drawings perceive.

Chair Golisano is in favor of the proposed barn garage. Mr. Geier agreed.

Chair Golisano asked if he was choosing the two over two double hung casements as opposed to the six over six of the existing.

Mr. Gittings stated yes, we are trying to make the new look different from the old but taking cues from the existing windows.

Chair Golisano confirmed the siding you will be choosing is a more vertical siding underneath those windows.

Mr. Gittings stated yes taking cues from the existing and making it different.

Mr. Geier asked if single family homes are allowed to have two kitchens.

Mr. Gittings stated it makes it a multifamily home due to being pre 1970s and having a separate entry.

Ms. Suttmeier asked what is happening with the existing driveway in the rear of the home.

Mr. Gittings stated we will be keeping the existing graveled driveway there due to being the entry to the mudroom. There will be two different driveways. The one proposed is to come into the front and the back to lead to the mudroom.

Chair Golisano asked if the proposed driveway will be paved or gravel.

Mr. Gittings stated paved.

Chair Golisano suggested a concrete apron as a transition to the street.

Ms. Suttmeier wanted to confirm what was happening with the existing driveway.

Mr. Gittings stated the area being affected is the entrance to the existing driveway from the post office and the proposal would be the landscaping in that place.

Chair Golisano opened the meeting to the public.

Mr. Michael Kaiser, representing the Cranbury Housing Authority (CHA), advised CHA is working with Mr. Gittings for the Park Place West Road to provide ingress and egress through that right of way for the driveway. Over the years there has been an opportunity for the Gittings to access this property since it became a road, and it is through his right to have this driveway. There is a mixed use of a residence and the post office so buffering is important in this case. He would encourage Mr. Gittings to utilize native plant species and plants recommended by the Shade Tree Commission. There is a list of plants that are discouraged as well as encouraged. He would like to encourage Mr. Gittings to continue to work with the Township so this will become a road and the Township will take ownership of that road to improve pedestrian circulation between Main Street and the new library. Lighting in that area would be beneficial. He feels the work Mr. Gittings is putting into this is positive and a great asset. He hopes it evolves into something that is nice for our town.

Chair Golisano stated the entrance off Park Place West would be just off of and not impacting the parking on the street. The 90° approach would help for any type of clearance for turning into that space.

Mr. Gittings stated we are currently working with CHA to get ingress and egress access from Park Place West and then go for Zoning Board approval.

## **OLD BUSINESS**

### **Proposed Changes to Historic District and Buffer Areas**

Ms. Spann stated in speaking with Ms. Elizabeth Leheny, Township Planner, it has come about that Ms. Leheny is taking into consideration the feedback at the public hearing. She is putting that proposal together for her options and recommendations. She will also give you an indication of the timing to complete each segment of that process. The Cranbury Station Hamlet is complete and ready to go. It is the preference of the Township that the changes to the historic district/buffer and the Hamlet designation to be bundled together. If determined the changes to the historic district/buffer would take long, then it would be recommended to go forth with the Hamlet designation.

Ms. Spann addressed the signage ordinance stating the Zoning Committee has been working with an ADHOC who have been pulling sign ordinances from like Townships. That information has been passed on to Ms. Leheny and she will prepare that sign ordinance in a way to reflect the Zoning Committee's recommendations. The Zoning Committee will meet again on August 31, 2021.

Ms. Suttmeier wanted to know the changes that are being made by the Planner for the changes to the historic district and buffer areas.

Ms. Spann stated it is just the groundwork that must be done that has been done with the Hamlet designation.

Mr. Golisano made a motion for the regular scheduled meeting being held on September 7, 2021 at 7:00 PM to be rescheduled to August 31, 2021 at 7:00 PM. By unanimous vote it was approved.

Chair Golisano opened the meeting to the public, with no public comment the public forum was closed for the proposed changes to historic district and buffer areas.

### **Sustainable Jersey Historic Preservation Element**

Ms. Tillou had put together the program summary for the Commission to look over and submit any corrections.

Chair Golisano stated this will be tabled to the next meeting and we can investigate this further to contribute 10 points to the Township for Sustainable Jersey.

### **New Homeowner Letter – 7 Symmes Court**

Ms. Tillou announced the new homeowner letter, which advises new homeowners of the process when doing exterior work in the historic district/buffer zone, has been sent to 7 Symmes Court.

**MINUTES July 20, 2021** – Chairperson Golisano advised of the one revision made by Mr. Szabo on page 4, the statement on the 200 buffer can stay as is. Ms. Ryan added on page 3 paragraph 5 to correct the last sentence to “National Register of Historic Places includes historic districts”.

Chair Golisano made a motion to approve the July 20, 2021 minutes with revisions. Vice Chair Walsh offered a second.



**ROLL CALL:**

AYES: Mr. Golisano, Ms. Marlowe, Ms. Ryan, Ms. Suttmeier and Mr. Walsh  
NAYS: None.  
ABSTAIN: None.

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

Chairperson Golisano opened the public forum for anything not on the agenda at 8:58 PM. With no public comment Chairperson Golisano closed the public forum at 8:58 PM.

**ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING**

There being no further business, a motion was made by Chairperson Golisano to adjourn the meeting and Ms. Marlowe offered a second. By unanimous vote, the meeting was thereupon adjourned at 9:00 PM.

**CERTIFICATE OF SECRETARY**

I, the undersigned, do hereby certify that I am the duly appointed secretary of the Cranbury Township Historic Preservation Commission, and that this document, consisting of 9 pages, constitutes a true and correct copy of the minutes of the regular meeting held on August 17, 2021.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto subscribed my name on this day of September 1, 2021.

*Robin Tillou*  
Robin Tillou  
Recording Secretary  
Historic Preservation Commission