

**Historic Preservation Advisory Commission Meeting  
Regular Meeting of February 23, 2011 7:00 pm**

The regular meeting of the Historic Preservation Advisory Commission took place on the above date. Vice Chairman Harry Kaplan read the Open Public Meeting Act and requested Board Secretary Mrs. Citterbart call the roll. Board Secretary Citterbart stated there was a quorum.

**FLAG SALUTE**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Mr. Kaplan, Mr. Wright, Mr. Steinberg, Mrs. Schulte, Ms. Best, Mrs. Diglio

**EXCUSED:** Mr. Read, Mr. Becker

**REORGANIZATION:**

**Mr. Kaplan made a motion to nominate Dennis Becker as Chairman for the year 2011. Mrs. Schulte seconded the motion.** The floor was open for discussion and closed. Mr. Becker was approved by a unanimous "aye" vote.

**Mrs. Schulte made a motion to nominate Harry Kaplan for Vice Chairman for the year 2011. Mr. Wright seconded the motion.** The floor was open for discussion and closed. Mr. Kaplan was approved by a unanimous "aye" vote.

**Mr. Kaplan made a motion to nominate Kathy Citterbart for Board Secretary for the year 2011. Mrs. Schulte seconded the motion.** The floor was open for discussion and closed. Mrs. Citterbart was approved by a unanimous "aye" vote.

**APPROVAL OF MEETING DATES FOR 2011**

January 18, 2011

February 23, 2011

March 21, 2011

April 18, 2011

May 16, 2011

June 20, 2011

July 18, 2011

August 15, 2011

September 19, 2011

October 17, 2011

November 21, 2011

December 19, 2011

**January 17, 2012 (Tuesday)**

**Mr. Wright made a motion to approve meeting dates for 2011. Mr. Kaplan seconded the motion.** The floor was open for discussion and closed. The meeting dates were approved by a unanimous "aye" vote.

**CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES**

December 20, 2010

**Mr. Kaplan made a motion to approve the minutes per the corrections. Mrs. Schulte seconded the motion.**

**AYE:** Mr. Kaplan, Mr. Wright, Mr. Steinberg, Mrs. Schulte, Ms. Best

**APPLICATION**

**#HPC -03-2011 – Happy Valley Manor**

**Block: 611 Lot: 1**

**131 Main Street**

Request to install a handicapped access ramp to comply with the N.J.D.C.A. requirements, Railing to replicate existing porch railing balusters and ramp to have lattice skirting with frames.

**Historic Preservation Advisory Commission Meeting  
Regular Meeting of February 23, 2011 7:00 pm**

**SWORN:** Fe Caliolio, 131 Main Street, Newton, New Jersey and Wayne McCabe, Professional Planner, 83 Main Street, Newton, New Jersey.

Mr. McCabe stated that 16 years ago the HPC approved this same set of plans that are in front of you tonight with a few minor changes. The changes that have been made were structural in nature and also in terms of meeting current codes at that time. The changes that have currently been made are a result of my discussion with the Municipal Construction Official about a month and half ago.

Mr. McCabe referred to the drawing and described the following changes to be made. To have it come up to code a small handrail would be added. It will be a continuous handrail on one side extending down the ramp across the middle platform and down the other ramp. This is required so that anybody coming up in a wheel chair will have a continuous hand grip on there and not just the wood ones on the sides. Again, that is a code requirement.

Mr. McCabe continued: We did change one other detail in terms of the bottom rail. There is a slight chamfer on the top – it's crowned. Where before it was flat and that would have held a lot of water and caused rot.

Mr. McCabe continued: The last change made was the decking. There is another product on the market that we are preparing to use called Aertis. (Aertis sample was passed around). This product has been approved by 17 state HPC offices around the U.S. It is a material that is plastic but it is paintable. It comes in four different colors/textures. It also eliminates slippage. Aertis is guaranteed for at least 50 years. It will not rot. It is designed to have the same grooves as the old fashion oak flooring had. The tongue and groove will be installed the same way modern flooring goes in. It was also passed by Secretary of Interior as an alternate material.

Mr. Kaplan asked: Will there be any additional lighting?

Mr. McCabe stated: No.

Mrs. Schulte asked: Will the lattice work match the existing lattice work?

Mr. McCabe stated: No. What are there now are vertical slats that have been scroll cut and we will not be doing that. I want to make sure there is a visual differential between the original and the new. This is one of the suggestions by the Secretary of Interior's guidelines and also our own design criteria in our ordinance states it as well.

Mr. Kaplan asked: Have you chosen a color scheme?

Mr. McCabe stated: It will reflect the same color combination that is on the porch right now.

Mr. McCabe stated: From where the existing ramp is tying into the existing wood porch the porch comes across to where the door leads to inside, there will have to be ramp on that part of the porch because there is about a 5 inch lip step up to get into the door.

Mrs. Diglio asked: Will there be an extension of the roof area over the ramp?

Mr. McCabe stated: No. That would be a very tricky architecture feature to deal with in terms of providing covered shelter over the ramp. The stairs that are there now will be removed completely and replaced with the 4 x 6 wood ramp.

Mr. Kaplan asked: When will this be done?

Mr. McCabe stated: The end of March.

Mr. Kaplan opened this portion up to the public. With no one stepping forward, he closed this portion of the meeting to the public.

**Historic Preservation Advisory Commission Meeting  
Regular Meeting of February 23, 2011 7:00 pm**

**Mr. Kaplan made a motion to accept this application as presented. Mr. Wright seconded the motion.**

**AYE:** Mr. Kaplan, Mr. Wright, Mr. Steinberg, Mr. Schulte, Ms. Best

**HPC#04-2011- Congressman Scott Garrett**

**Block 716: Lot: 16.01**

**83 Spring Street**

Request to put 18" x 14 ft. or 21 sq. ft sign on building front. 6" injection molded plastic letters, black, cast metal finish.

**SWORN:** Jim Hotchkiss, The New Sign Connection, 177 Stanhope Road, Andover, New Jersey and Gina Diorio from Congressman Garrett's office

Mr. Hotchkiss stated: Congressman Garrett's office contacted me and asked me to make a sign for him. We will be making same letters with the same material that has been on the building prior similar to the Liberty Tax Service letters and the law office. We are going to take the same letters and put them up.

Mr. Kaplan asked: You stated it will be matching the existing letters that are on now.

Mr. Hotchkiss stated: Yes. It will be Times New Roman font.

Mr. Kaplan asked: Are you requesting any additional lighting?

Mr. Hotchkiss stated: No.

Mr. Kaplan opened this portion of the meeting up to the public. With no one stepping forward this portion is closed.

**Mr. Wright made a motion to approve the application as presented. Mr. Steinberg seconded the motion.**

**AYE:** Mr. Kaplan, Mr. Wright, Mr. Steinberg, Mrs. Schulte, Mrs. Best

**HPC#05-2011- Living Waters Fellowship**

**Block: 716 Lot: 17**

**93 Spring Street**

Request to remove existing brick wall section of old ATM wall and install aluminum glass metal door. Replace time and temperature 60" x 44" sign, new window lettering and add rear 12" x 18" parking lot sign.

Mr. Michael Hannifan, Esq., representing Living Waters Fellowship along with Pastor Litteer, and Matthew Miglin, contractor and member of the church.

Mr. Hannifan stated: We will have both sides of the time and temperature sign for our use. We will be putting window lettering and per the Land Use Board, it was recommended we get permission and put a sign down by the stairs that go to the back parking lot about 12" x 18" because that is one of our ingress and egress methods and that will be our main parking area.

**SWORN:** Matthew Miglin, 708 Willow Drive, Newton, New Jersey.

Mr. Miglin stated: I am a general contractor. I have done commercial and residential contracting in New Jersey for the last 25 to 26 years. I will be the general contractor and overseeing the project.

Mr. Hannifan asked: With regards to the removal of the brick wall, what is your intent with the door?

Mr. Miglin stated: We spoke with both the Building Inspector and the Fire Marshal and they recommended that we along with the Landlord, Dan LePore, have an additional egress portion where the old bank was. Where the ATM portion is. It will be for egress reasons for fire. Our hours of operation for the church will be different than the business hours so the doors are locked after hours and on weekends. The landlord felt it

**Historic Preservation Advisory Commission Meeting  
Regular Meeting of February 23, 2011 7:00 pm**

would be better if we had our own entrance and exit so that we wouldn't affect the other tenants and the security for the other tenants at the main doors.

Mr. Hannifan asked: What other advantages would there be to having that type of door with regards to having ingress and egresses and it relates to zero barrier, etc?

Mr. Hannifan asked: Why do you wish to install an aluminum frame door?

Mr. Miglin stated: I did some research and I walked down both sides of the street and noticed that over about 75% of the other locations both retail and administrative were aluminum-glass metal doors as well as the actual front door of the existing building, so with being consistent with the building itself and with the other facilities and retail locations, we felt that would be in the best interest of consistency. It is less maintenance, better security for the location, and it is better for weather stripping.

Mr. Hannifan asked: Did you make any notes on the non-aluminum glass doors that were in the area?

Mr. Miglin stated: Yes. If you notice the ones that are not aluminum glass, you will notice the condition of many of them. Some are in poor condition. They look like they need to be replaced and some are missing panels. My suggestion was if you look at the aluminum glass doors they are in much better shape many years later. I think the aluminum glass doors makes much more sense.

Mr. Steinberg asked: How is the handicap ramp going to come out. Will it be a trip hazard for anyone coming up or down the block?

Mr. Miglin stated: The architectural plans have been done by Charlie Shaffer. The doors will be about 2 to 3 feet in and the ramp will start at that point. It will not be sticking out. Mr. Miglin pointed to the photos to show the ramp. **Exhibit E1, the front of the building, Exhibit E2, the second front of the entire building, Exhibit E3 the exit sign, Exhibit E4 is from an oblique angle, Exhibit E5 will be the direct angle as the point of reference, E6 is Newton downtown, E7 is the other window, E8 is the stair hall, E9 is the interior.**

Mr. Miglin continued: Looking at **Exhibit E5**, he explained where the glass doors will be situated.

Mr. Kaplan asked: Will the lighting remain the same?

Mr. Miglin stated: We didn't address the lighting on the drawings. We will probably keep the lighting the same.

Mrs. Schulte asked: Will the drop box remain?

Mr. Miglin stated: I think we will have to take it out because it falls right where the door is.

Mrs. Schulte asked: Will you rebrick there?

Mr. Miglin stated: Yes.

Mr. Kaplan asked: How much sq. footage inside the building will you be occupying?

Mr. Miglin stated: About the same as where the existing bank was with higher vaults. It will be a big space.

Mrs. Schulte asked: Will the granite remain on the sides?

Mr. Miglin stated: Yes.

Mr. Kaplan asked: On a Sunday when things are slow, will somebody maintain those steps? They don't look in good condition right now.

Mr. Miglin stated: The County is responsible for the maintenance of those stairs according to Mr. LePore.

Mr. Kaplan stated: The question is where they wouldn't have been concerned on a Sunday about maintenance now they will have to.

**Historic Preservation Advisory Commission Meeting  
Regular Meeting of February 23, 2011 7:00 pm**

Mr. Miglin stated: We were told that they normally have them cleaned but in the case they don't they will put the chain up for safety reasons.

Mr. Hannifan stated: What will happen is the Pastor will have to call the emergency number for the County and remind them to come clear the stairs, shovel and salt them. People can walk on the sidewalks in the front but the goal is to use the back entrance.

Mr. Wright stated: I don't have any problem with what you want to do.

Mrs. Schulte asked: Do you meet the requirements for the top sign?

Mr. Miglin stated: We are not changing the dimensions. We are just changing the lettering. We will be using a classic font that will fit the building.

Mr. Kaplan asked: This sign is grandfathered in as an existing sign?

Mr. Miglin stated: Yes. The sign is preexisting and has been used continually. Then the parking sign will match the same font for members to identify the passage way up the back.

Mrs. Schulte asked: Are you taking both sides of the sign?

Mr. Miglin stated: Yes.

Mrs. Schulte asked: What have the other tenants said to that.

Mr. Miglin stated: I believe they are getting a directory sign.

Mr. Miglin stated: That is the nature of the application: Our goal is to be efficient, clean, true to the building and true to the period and I think the signage will be done in a way that is appropriate.

Ms. Best asked: The parking lot sign will be adjacent to the stairs?

Mr. Miglin stated: Yes, right next to it on top of the stucco sign.

Mr. Kaplan asked: That will be consistent with the other one?

Mr. Miglin stated: It will be simple. It will say Living Waters with an arrow.

Mr. Kaplan opened this portion of the meeting up to the public. With no one coming forward he closed the public portion.

**Mr. Wright made a motion to approve the application as submitted. Ms. Best seconded.**

**AYE:** Mr. Kaplan, Mr. Wright, Mr. Steinberg, Mrs. Schulte, Mrs. Best

**HPC-#08-2011-Ruby Orange, L.L.C.**

**Block: 717.01 Lot: 15**

**219 Spring Street**

Request to change façade and replace square 2' x 3' sign to oval 2' x 3' sign.

**SWORN:** Jim Palladino, Triple J Construction, General Contractor, Sara Megletti, Owner of PB&J, and Jim Megletti, Owner of PB&J.

Mr. Palladino gave an overview of what the building will look like once completed. There will be metal framing with a concrete dry bit over the metal framing and dense glass. There will be columns. There will be color in the concrete so you will not have to paint for about 50 years.

Mrs. Best asked: Does it resemble stucco?

## Historic Preservation Advisory Commission Meeting Regular Meeting of February 23, 2011 7:00 pm

Mr. Palladino stated: Yes, but this has more of a fiber glass backing and added the color to the concrete. Right now the brick that is there is leaking because it is very porous. The paint is peeling and we have some problems with the brick. The upper part which is vinyl siding will be changed to the concrete. There will be arches and some lighting.

Mr. Steinberg asked: Will the arches be recessed?

Mr. Palladino stated: The arches will be recessed underneath the soffit that will come out. It will give it a cover and more dimensions.

Ms. Best asked: Did you explore any other options in repairing the existing brick work that is there?

Mr. Palladino stated: The only option with the brick work is to paint it.

Mr. Wright stated: The building has come before us many years ago. They wanted to increase the height of the façade and it was allowed provided they used brick to match the existing and replicate the mission front as you see it. Just as a background observation, this end of Spring Street from Jefferson to Union Place, were the last private homes on Spring Street up until the movie theatre which was built in 1925. When the movie theatre was built they added mission fronted store fronts to the old house. They are built in brick. I am a little bit concerned because under the ordinance, I don't think we can allow you to cover a historic façade. What you are doing would essentially eradicate the historic fabric of the building. The ordinance requires us to maintain the public view of the building and its original architectural fabric and design. For me this is difficult, I would like to see life come back to Spring Street as much as possible but I am not sure this is the correct approach. I would like to see the brick mission façade retained. The sides of the building are stucco already so that is not an issue but I don't believe at least to my understanding of the ordinance that we could allow an entire historic façade to essentially be encased and hidden in a way that would alter the historic character of the building. I don't think we are permitted to do that.

Ms. Best stated: I echo Mr. Wright's concerns. It seems the new façade is not compatible with the history of the building and also with the architectural design of the neighbor and it is not compatible with the ordinances as they are in effect now. That is why I asked the previous question about whether you explored other options in preserving the existing brick work. If there is anything you can do in lieu of painting such as sealing the brick work or other options to retain it rather than resorting to the stucco façade would be much better.

Mr. Palladino stated: (Pointed to the picture) that this part of the building is not original. That is built on top of the roof and it sits back from the mission front and basically we are staying with the mission front we are just going to dress it up.

Mr. Wright stated: But you are covering it with a material that is not appropriate to the period of the store front of the building. I can't say for certain when the peak grew from the back was made. This was a store front that was added to an older building but stood in the back and when they added the store front, they put stucco on the sides of the building to hide the attachment of the store front to the main building.

Mr. Wright continued: When I see this type of material or this type of design, I immediately think of a shopping mall and I don't think it maintains the character of the neighborhood or the historic fabric of the building itself. The mission style, dating back to the 1920's which complements the other buildings that are immediately adjacent to it is what is there. I would love to see this dressed up in any way that brings business to it but I don't believe you can do it based on what the ordinance says. You have to maintain it in-kind with like materials that are appropriate to the structure. I wish I could remember when it was when they wanted to create a more imposing façade; we allowed them, on the condition that they maintain the exact profile and match the existing brick to raise the parapit. I think the best preserved example in this neighborhood is down beyond Rite Aid which is Murch's Auto Body which was built in 1927. This is probably the best example on the street of that mission style. I would also be concerned because, if we allowed it, could you image if they did that to the Newton Theatre?

Ms. Best stated: It sets a precedent.

**Historic Preservation Advisory Commission Meeting**  
**Regular Meeting of February 23, 2011 7:00 pm**

Mr. Wright stated: It not only sets a precedent, but this style and this material is a native material to Newton. What you want to do would so alter the character of the neighborhood and set a precedent and I don't think we are allowed to set this. I don't believe we are allowed to approve an entire façade to be covered.

Mr. Kaplan stated: Especially if it is visible from the street.

Mr. Megletti stated: I did almost the same thing as across the street with Maxwell and Molly's and Charm.

Mrs. Diglio stated: Maxwell and Molly's and Charm are basically very similar in design.

Mr. Wright stated: I don't mean to be discouraging at all. I did not sit on the hearing across the street. It is not a question, when you are dealing with a historic ordinance, of what is attractive but I don't think it is allowable in the district.

Mr. Palladino stated: This isn't the original building. This is done in two stages. The original building was three store fronts and the façade was much lower. Eckert Drugs came into this building and they wanted this (showing picture) put on and this was added on afterwards.

Mr. Wright stated: I was here when they added it. I thought they raised the brick parapit in the front.

Mr. Palladino stated: They raised the brick parapit and put the A-frame over the roof.

Mr. Wright stated: The A-frame because it is not very visible from street level but the brick façade is from the 1920's. It has been there all my life and it certainly dates back to the 1920's. I don't ever remember it, although it may have been back before my time the three separate store fronts and I wouldn't object if you wanted to go back to the three separate store fronts. That is not the point of this and it is not an aesthetic judgment. It is not our taste is better than yours; nothing like that. The ordinance requires us to maintain historic character of the architecture, materials to be replace in-kind where possible, or as you saw with Mr. McCabe a material that has been accepted by the Secretary of the Interior according to the standards for historic preservation as authorized as a substitute. We have approved other substitute materials, but I just think this would take a very important building on Spring Street and give it an appearance that is outside of the historic character of the district. That is my interpretation of the ordinance. It is not a reflection on the craftsmen, design or anything else. I think it is required what we are to do.

Mr. Kaplan stated: What Mr. Wright is saying is we are an advisory board and we are governed by guidelines.

Mr. Wright stated: We are governed by an ordinance.

Mr. Megletti questioned: You are saying the ordinance that you are guided by is newer then when Maxwell and Molly's was put together?

Mr. Wright stated: I was not on the Board at that time.

Mrs. Megletti stated: We were trying to design something that fits into the character of the existing buildings and complimented the neighborhood in which the building is there. We are quite surprised.

Mr. Wright stated: I understand what you are trying to do. The problem is the existing character is what exists.

Mrs. Megletti stated: I certainly understand, but it is going to be inconsistent then. It doesn't fit with what is currently on the street to just simply maintain a flat façade that is brick and can really only be painted.

Mr. Wright stated: Well, that is what the character of the neighborhood is that façade. It has been there since 1927. It does match the other store fronts that were added in the 1920's at least in purpose, material and basic design.

**Historic Preservation Advisory Commission Meeting**  
**Regular Meeting of February 23, 2011 7:00 pm**

Mrs. Best stated: Exactly. Charm and Maxwell & Molly's are an aberration in the neighborhood. Mr. Wright and I were not on the Board at the time and did not approve that.

Mr. Megletti stated: But it is there. In other words, which way are we going in the Town?

Mrs. Best stated: That is the whole point of having a Historical Ordinance. In after reading the ordinance, the character of Maxwell & Molly's and Charm is an aberration and it is not in line with the neighborhood, with the buildings, or the materials used in the buildings in the neighborhood. Just because it is there doesn't make it appropriate.

Mr. Megletti stated: We tried very hard to go along with what was there.

Mrs. Megletti stated: With the assumption that they had been approved by this body regardless of who the members were.

Mr. Wright stated: I think the building you are referring to is a much later building; I think it is from the 1950's. Our purpose is not to judge architecturally one building by the one next to it. We are not trying to create a uniform period, or design or appearance for the street. What we are actually trying to do is maintain the individual character of the buildings, a variety of architecturally styles reflecting how the street grew and opened. Of course once you pass Union Place, the district ends and we have no influence or say there. My reading of the ordinance is the guide that I use and try to apply it objectively so is it not a matter of subjective taste.

Mrs. Megletti stated: It's not a question of taste. I am just trying to think creatively and if you are suggesting that it has to be consistent with mission styling then you are also suggesting that there is no adornment whatsoever.

Mr. Wright stated: I am not saying it has to be consistent with mission styling. What I am saying is the mission facade needs to survive. Not something consistent with it.

Mrs. Megletti stated: What I am hearing is that there is no adornment to the building.

Mr. Wright stated: There is an adornment. The parapit is an adornment. (Pointing to the picture) This is a classic adorn mission parapit. It was meant to reflect the missions of the far west and if you go down and look at Murch's Auto Body although that is a little more elaborate; it also has the pilaster front this is characteristic of Mission style.

Mrs. Megletti stated: I understand what you are saying about the ordinance but does this body have any concern about the developing ambience of the entire street because of the fact that this building lacks character in all shapes and forms, regardless of its historical nature. When you drive down Spring Street and you look at the beautiful moldings and the parapits that align the street, this building has none of that whatsoever.

Mr. Wright stated: It is in a much more severe style that reflects the missions of California.

Mrs. Megetti stated: It is an eye sore compared to the beauty of the other buildings. The other buildings have contrast with the materials and the coloring. Short of just trying to paint the bricks.

Mr. Wright stated: Unfortunately, it is not within the ordinance for us to consider those things.

Mrs. Megletti stated: That is what I am trying to get a handle on. What are the parameters?

Mr. Kaplan stated: We are an advisory committee and you have a right to appeal any decision we make to the Planning Board as it has been done before, just so you know that. I think it is absolutely beautiful what you are showing me but we are governed by the ordinance.

Mrs. Megletti stated: We are certainly open to modifying the existing design but what I am becoming a little alarmed about is from what I am hearing is that if we are true to the historical nature of the building

**Historic Preservation Advisory Commission Meeting**  
**Regular Meeting of February 23, 2011 7:00 pm**

then there is no adornment to it. True to the historical nature of the building is a flat front with a painted color.

Mr. Wright stated: The façade is not flat; it is an adornment. It is a replica of a mission style building. It has raised pilasters, it has a mission style parapit and brick was considered a very wealthy material in its day.

Mrs. Megletti stated: In its natural state and over time it certainly wasn't white painted brick at the time that the building was put up.

Mr. Wright stated: We don't determine colors. That is not within our providence.

Mrs. Megletti stated: I understand.

Mr. Wright stated: I would dispute the fact that we are not concerned with the evolution of Spring Street. I think nothing has had a more positive influence on Spring Street than the Historic Commission over the last 25 years. I think as each building has come up before this commission, we don't force people to do things, but when these buildings come up, each one becomes another key. When I encouraged the adoption of this ordinance in 1988, I made the observation that at that time the greatest shopping and tourist attraction on the East Coast of the United States was Disney World and the core of that is a replica nineteenth century downtown. We have that. What concerns me here is that the uniqueness of the town, of each building as it fits together is found nowhere else. It is a unique evolution and story. If we make it look like any other place, then why would people come here? The evolution, the preservation of each building and what it contributes in scale and size will one day ultimately come when what we have been working towards for 25 or 30 years will pay off. This street will be just as alive as when I remember it as a child.

Mrs. Megletti stated: I am not questioning your logic or your philosophy at all and I think the committee has done great things; I am just concerned with the parameters in which we are working. I have a second question. I need to hang a sign. Is my sign in accordance with the ordinance?

Mrs. Citterbart stated: When PB&J was in the Springboard Shoppe they were approved there and any business from there that went to Spring Street would take their sign. They just want to change it from a square to an oval.

The board stated: We do not have a problem with that.

Mrs. Diglio asked: I was told that we were trying to maintain a Victorian look to the street; somewhere between the 1920's and 1925. That is what Mr. McCabe stated at one of the meetings. I am a little confused because the mission style is not a Victorian style.

Mr. Wright stated: We are not here to impose a style or a unified style on the street. We are here to preserve the existing fabric in whatever period it represents. The "grandeur" of Spring Street is that it is not a uniform style. It is not a shopping mall where everything is of one era or one period. I think a Victorian Spring Street would look funny.

Mrs. Best stated: I would like to address everyone's attention to the Historic Ordinance section 20a-14, it reads "It is not the intent of this chapter to discourage contemporary architectural expression or to encourage new construction which emulates existing buildings of a historic or architectural interest or of a certain period or architectural style but rather to preserve the integrity and authenticity of the Historic Preservation District and to ensure the capability of new structures therein ." When I read that, I do not see stucco.

Mr. Palladino stated: When you allowed that to go on top of the building that is not mission style. You already compromised this building once. This was three separate store fronts with a mission style across then Eckerd Drugs turned around and raised the parapit and put this ugly looking thing on top of it. It changed the mission completely. It is not an original building.

Mr. Wright stated: You have the option of removing that. I don't know what it is.

**Historic Preservation Advisory Commission Meeting**  
**Regular Meeting of February 23, 2011 7:00 pm**

Mr. Palladino stated: It is a room on top of the roof and they raised the parapit. And when they raised the parapit they caused a problem because where the old parapit is that is where it is leaking.

Mr. Wright stated: I could suggest to you to reduce it to the original parapit height. I would be all in favor of that. I assume they did it for some purpose on the interior and apologize that it has been so long that I don't remember why they suggested doing it at the time. I do suggest that we try to be as accommodating as we possibly can to accommodate the needs of business that change from what they were, but I don't think for the money that you will spend for this and I actually think this would take away from the character of the street and the building itself.

Mr. Palladino stated: Just so you know, there is Drivit on that street already.

Mr. Wright stated: There may well be. There was a rush in the year before this Commission was approved to do many things on this street but we can't address what was there before and we can only address as each building comes before us what to do that is best for the historic character of that building. All that I would suggest is think of the journey we have been on here for 25 years and try to understand why we 25 years ago embarked on this very patient journey to keep Newton, Newton because if we make it something else and it looks like everything else that you have driven through or passed, people are not going to come here. It will not be exceptional. It is now.

Mrs. Schulte asked: Is this vinyl up here now or is it original clapboard?

Mr. Palladino stated: That is vinyl siding.

Mrs. Schulte stated: So that could be stucco. The sides could be stucco and you could paint the store front and with tones of color and accent the pillars. Are they permitted to have awnings?

Mrs. Megletti stated: One of the reason that we were recessing this was for light protection in the windows. The alternative is if it is a flat façade, I would have to put awnings on it or something because of the light that comes into the window. It fades your projects.

Mr. Wright stated: There is nothing in the ordinance against putting awnings up.

Mrs. Diglio stated: Awnings have been approved on several of the buildings so there should be no problem with awnings.

Mr. Wright stated: I think they are allowable and it would certainly be in keeping with the character of the building. I think you could use deco lighting on the front. It would give it a retro look and the neighborhood is so defined by this style. I don't want you to think that I am insensitive or that I don't think that what you are doing would not be attractive, but in the Historic District, it just does not meet the ordinance requirements. I would hope that you would appreciate that in the character of the street and what other businesses have subscribed to over all these years to try to bring the street up to its architectural maximum. We want you to do something great with this building and I think preserving its historic fabric would be great.

Mrs. Best stated: Under the ordinance for the Historic District signage, awnings shall meet a roof like structure with a vertical base of no more than 12" usually made of canvas extended over a sidewalk. The open triangular areas at the ends of the awning can be filled in with the same material or left open. It can be retractable or in a fixed position and awnings that are in the shape of a segmented dome or segmented barrel shall not be permitted. Those are the restrictions on the awnings.

Mr. Wright stated: A typical old-fashioned awning but not the plastic domes.

Mr. Kaplan opened this portion of the meeting up to the public.

**First public to speak:**

**SWORN: Cathy Smiley, Remax Platinum Group, Realtor**

**Historic Preservation Advisory Commission Meeting  
Regular Meeting of February 23, 2011 7:00 pm**

Ms. Smiley stated: I sold these people the building and my understanding is the brick has already been ruined because it has been painted over so many times and the brick is leaking so while it is nice to say you have to keep the building the way it is but if it is not going to be easily maintainable then don't you have some positive suggestions on how to do this. Covering it with the Drivit would give it some structural integrity.

Mr. Wright stated: You are a realtor. All I can suggest is that you read the ordinance so that when you sell property you will have a full understanding of what we can and cannot do.

Mr. Steinbeck stated: There's a methods of flashing. It is very common. I have done some historical preservation myself. And through flashing is a very common method for taking water from leaking bricks especially when there has been additional brick applied in addition to the original brick.

With no more public stepping forward from the floor, Mr. Kaplan closed the public portion.

Mr. Wright asked: Do you want to stucco the parapit?

Mrs. Megletti stated: No. We want to do a whole new design. We are going to have to reconsider the entire façade.

Mrs. Diglio stated: Can this stucco be applied to make it look like brick?

Mr. Wright stated: I would be cautious because I am not sure that is even allowable.

Mrs. Diglio stated: But if the brick is leaking, there has to be some way to repair the building that is not going to be cost prohibitive but at the same time allow the people to give it the look of the appearance that you want to maintain but still allow them to do the building so that it is "repaired" and there won't be further damage to the building. What is worse than having a building that looks historical but it is damaged and it is going to fall apart in years because the brick is going to fall apart if something is not done to preserve the brick?

Mr. Wright stated: There are brick buildings in Newton that date back far older than this. They are intact and as I have said this brick was manufactured in Newton. I think one of the most damaging things that have occurred in this town was in the 1960's when they covered lovely-old red brick buildings with white brick facades. If you even use a mortar in brick it is harder than the brick and the brick will break off and exfoliate. If you cover it with a surface you will create the same lack of movement between the new covering and the original brick wall. Secondly, covering something does not fix it. All it does is conceal its ongoing condition which may be worse or better but it just conceals it. I would just like to add those observations.

**Mr. Wright made a motion to deny the application as presented except for the sign which we approve as submitted. Mrs. Best seconded the motion.**

**AYE:** Mr. Kaplan, Mr. Wright, Mr. Steinberg, Mrs. Schulte, Mrs. Best

**HPC#06-2011 - Dan LePore**

**Block: 716 Lot 16.01**

**83 Spring Street**

Request for single sided carved & painted wooden 60" x 66" wall sign.

**SWORN:** Jim Hotchkiss, New Sign Connection, Andover, New Jersey.

Mr. Hotchkiss stated: There was a comment made about what to do with the tenants of the 93 Spring Street building. Mr. LePore called me in the other day and said that tenants don't know where they are going in the building so I looked at the ordinance and saw there is some extra square footage available. He wanted to have two signs. I told him he could probably have one sign. I took the square footage and looked at the other buildings that have tenant type signs. They are wooden signs. Basically it is a sign base

**Historic Preservation Advisory Commission Meeting  
Regular Meeting of February 23, 2011 7:00 pm**

and then the tenant sign in put on top of it. We are proposing a wooden sign with 93 Spring Street on it so people can understand that is the building.

Mrs. Schulte asked: Is there any way to give it a more Victorian flare to the sign?

Mr. Hotchkiss stated: Absolutely.

Mr. Wright stated: This is a building from the 1920's. I like the arch top because it matches the classical arch over the windows and the doors. We don't have to give the sign a certain style.

Mr. Kaplan asked: Will the signs slide out?

Mr. Hotchkiss stated: They will be screwed in.

Mr. Kaplan asked: There will be no additional lighting, correct?

Mr. Hotchkiss stated: Correct.

Mrs. Citterbart asked: The tenant text will be vinyl?

Mr. Hotchkiss stated: The text will be vinyl.

Mr. Steinberg asked: Will the landlord maintain the painting?

Mr. Hotchkiss stated: Yes, or he will call us.

Mr. Wright stated: It meets all the sign ordinance requirements.

Mr. Steinberg asked: Is 12 tenants the maximum for that building?

Mr. Hotchkiss stated: You can change the inside of the building to have more or less tenants and you can adjust the signs on it to make it fit.

Mr. Steinberg stated: The only thing I would be concerned about is if there is 16 tenants in there one day, then will there be a need for another sign?

Mr. Hotchkiss stated: You would have to reshuffle all the signage and make it smaller for everybody. Whenever someone wants a tenant sign, I always ask them what is the maximum about of tenants you could have and then I work my way in that way.

Mr. Kaplan opened this portion of the meeting up to the public.

With no one coming forward from the floor, the public portion is closed.

**Mr. Wright made a motion to approve the application as submitted. Mr. Steinberg seconded the motion.**

**Aye:** Mr. Kaplan, Mr. Wright, Mr. Steinberg, Mrs. Schulte, Mrs. Best

**HPC#07-2011- Liberty Tax**

**Block: 715 Lot: 7**

**40 Park Place**

Request to approve A-Frame Sandwich Board sign 36" height x 24" wide

**SWORN:** Michael Trombetta, Lafayette, New Jersey

**Historic Preservation Advisory Commission Meeting  
Regular Meeting of February 23, 2011 7:00 pm**

Mr. Trombetta stated: I use this because I am inside 40 Park Place and it lets people know we are open. We are across from the Newton Post Office and McGuire Chevrolet.

Mr. Wright asked: Does this meet the sign ordinance?

Mrs. Citterbart stated: For an A-Frame it does.

Mrs. Best asked: Do you intend to display this every year?

Mr. Trombetta stated: Not every year. I plan on being here awhile.

Mr. Steinberg asked: You fold it up and it goes inside every night?

Mr. Trombetta stated: Every night.

Mrs. Best asked: Is that what it says "W-2's file now"?

Mr. Trombetta stated: No, we put different things on it. We always have the "Open" on it.

Mr. Trombetta stated: It is right next to the building. It is not in the way of anyone.

Mr. Kaplan opened up this portion of the meeting to the public.

With no one stepping forward, this portion is closed.

**Mrs. Schulte made a motion to approve the application as present. Mr. Steinberg seconded the motion.**

**AYE:** Mr. Kaplan, Mr. Wright, Mr. Steinberg, Mrs. Schulte, Mrs. Best

**ADJOURNMENT**

**Mr. Kaplan made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Steinberg seconded the motion. The meeting was adjourned with a unanimous "aye" vote. The meeting adjourned at 9:20 PM.**

The next regular scheduled meeting will be held on March 21, 2011 at 7:00 pm in the Council Chambers of the Municipal Building.

Respectfully submitted,



Katherine Citterbart  
Historic Board Secretary

**Historic Preservation Advisory Commission Meeting  
Regular Meeting of February 23, 2011 7:00 pm**

**Exhibits**

- Exhibit E1**, the front of the building
- Exhibit E2**, the second front of the entire building
- Exhibit E3**, the exit sign
- Exhibit E4**, from an oblique angle
- Exhibit E5**, will be the direct angle as the point of reference
- Exhibit E6**, Newton downtown
- Exhibit E7**, the other window
- Exhibit E8**, the stair hall
- Exhibit E9**, the interior