

**PRINCETON
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION**

Minutes – Regular Meeting

September 21, 2015

The regular meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission was called to order 4:00 p.m. on Monday, September 21, 2015 by Chairman Capozzoli in Meeting Room A of the Municipal Building.

STATEMENT OF ADEQUATE NOTICE

Pursuant to the Sunshine Law, a notice of this meeting's date, time, location and agenda was mailed to the news media, posted on the Municipal bulletin board and filed with the Municipal Clerk as required by law.

ROLL CALL AND DECLARATION OF QUORUM

Present: Julie Capozzoli
Richard Chenoweth
Elric Endersby
Shirley Satterfield
David Schure
Roger Shatzkin
Cecelia Tazelaar
Robert von Zumbusch
Thomas White

Also present: Elizabeth Kim, Historic Preservation Officer; Jenny Crummiller, Acting Council Liaison; Ed Schmierer, Esq., Legal Counsel to the Commission; Kerry A. Philip, Recording Secretary.

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Chair Capozzoli announced that Jenny Crummiller is in attendance as Acting Council Liaison since Council member Butler is unable to attend.

3. MINUTES

- a) July 13, 2015 – Motion was made by D. Schure and S. Satterfield seconded the motion to approve the minutes as amended. The vote was 4-0-1 of those eligible to vote. T. White recused himself. Motion carried.
- b) August 10, 2015 - Motion was made by R. Shatzkin and R. von Zumbusch seconded the motion to approve the minutes as amended. The vote was 6-0 of those eligible to vote. E. Endersby recused himself. Motion carried.

C. Tazelaar recused herself from the following application.

4. APPLICATIONS

- a) Present Day Club
72 Stockton Street

Block 36.02 Lot 4 Zone: R1
New and Repair Windows, Replace Roof, Paint Exterior
Mercer Hill Historic District
NJ/NRHP Princeton Historic District
Project No.: 29HP-2015

E. Kim provided a summary of her report noting that the Architect Charles Steadman constructed the house in 1937. The Present Day Club was founded in 1898 and in 1930 they moved in to this building.

Annabelle Radcliff-Trenner, applicant, stated that the proposal involves roof replacement and issues regarding a material change for the roof. This is a preservation project involving a damaged roof. Slate is being recommended for the roof in the front of building because the roof is very flat but the cost is prohibitive to the Club at this time. The applicant would like to propose an asphalt shingle roof material (black pearl) noting that the material proposed will match what exists. A photograph was provided of the roof and a material board of the shingles was presented. The second roof needing a new roof is viewable from Library Place. The material was proposed to be slate but they wish to change the material to a standing seam copper roof because the load of the existing framing cannot sustain the weight of a slate roof. She advised that the remaining roofs are all built up over a mix of tin and flat pan roofs most of which cannot be seen from the public right of way.

Pertaining to landscaping, some landscaping will be removed but protective measures will be taken for the remaining landscaping. Overgrown Azaleas along Library Place will be cut down to grade. A window facing Library Place will be replaced with shutters to match the others on the building.

R. von Zumbusch asked the original material of the roof and Ms. Radcliff-Trenner stated that she believes it is wood shake. E. Endersby asked if there is any evidence about a standing seam roof originally constructed on the building. Ms. Radcliff-Trenner stated that she does not believe this was done, she believes cedar shake was used for the roof. R. von Zumbusch stated that he has no concern about using shingles on the flat roof. Ms. Radcliff-Trenner stated that slate is cost prohibitive and they would prefer putting money into restoration, the pitch of the roof is very shallow and if the roof were more visible then slate would be considered.

Ms. Radcliff-Trenner advised that the down spouts will be reconfigured. Ms. Kim asked if the discharge will go to a different location and Ms. Radcliff-Trenner said the water will not discharge to a different location, the change is needed because of mulch and mulch build up. Grading work will be done in the future to help with the drainage. E. Kim stated that she is concerned about the water and the water flow. Ms. Radcliff-Trenner stated that they will install landscaping so there is no tripping hazard.

Ms. Radcliff-Trenner asked for code review prior to resolution approval because of weather concerns since wood work and painting is involved. Mr. Schmierer stated that in the past HPC has put together a memorandum that would be from the Chairman to the Building Code Official advising that preservation plan approval was granted. The outstanding recommendations from E.

Kim must be addressed before final sign off of the plan. The applicant was advised that the applicant would be proceeding to do work at their own risk.

Sara Hill, applicant, identified the outstanding conditions in the memorandum from the Historic Preservation Officer. #4 requires further discussion; #6 – the roof is a temporal roof which is a metal roof with membrane on top. #7 remains an outstanding item. #8 – Ms. Hill stated that the same material will be used for the wood and the paint.

Motion made by R. von Zumbusch and S. Satterfield seconded the motion to approve the preservation plan for the Present Day Club. The vote was 7-0 in favor. Motion carried.

For: Capozzoli, Chenoweth, Endersby, Satterfield, Schure, Shatzkin, von Zumbusch
Against: None
Abstain: None

C. Tazelaar returned to the meeting.

b) County of Mercer

Washington Road (CR 751) at D&R Canal Towpath

Installation of Flashing Beacons

Delaware and Raritan Canal Historic District

NJ/NRHP Delaware and Raritan Canal Historic District

In R.O.W. adjacent to Block 11601 Lot 2 and Block 11602 Lot 2; Zone: E-1

Project No. 33HP-2015

E. Kim provided a summary of her report. She advised that rapid flashing beacons are proposed on Washington Road because two pedestrians had been struck by vehicles recently, this is proposed as part of a safety plan. The allee of Elms is located in West Windsor and there is significance to this location. She reported that Kristin Appelget, Princeton University Director of Community and Regional Affairs advised that she would like to speak with Greg Sandusky, Applicant, about the traffic function and advised that the University is willing to work with the County. Washington Road is so wide they asked the applicant to consider a reduction of the lanes to slow vehicles down.

George Fallat, applicant, stated that in the area of the Washington Road towpath, two flashing beacons are proposed, one in West Windsor and one in Princeton. The Princeton crossing is the most heavily used and this crossing would provide an extension of the towpath. The only other alternative would be to send pedestrians to Faculty Road but the County did not think that would be feasible. Mr. Fallat stated that “the proposed treatment would be consistent with other treatments along Princeton roads.” When calculating the travel speeds in this area, 85 percentile rate of travel speeds are in excess of 45 mph, close to 50 mph whereas the posted speed is 40 mph.

He stated that the West Windsor Traffic Safety Officer reported no reported crashes in that area but the road is fairly straight and has shoulders so a crossing at this location is recommended.

He advised that a Resolution has been prepared by Princeton and the County Freeholders have adopted an ordinance so there is much support.

Mr. Fallat noted the alternatives considered including a raised crosswalk but this traffic calming measure is best for travel speeds of 30 mph or less. Signage would not be adequate because of the high travel speeds. The proposal is for rectangular rapid flashing beacons, pedestrian activated beacons are preferred. They are seeking an overhead beacon on the south side of Washington Road because of potential utility conflicts. SHPO asked for a slight shifting of the crosswalk but they are unsure if this can be done. The view of an overhead flashing device would not be obscured by traffic but a post mounted device will. A sample of overhead flashing beacon in West Windsor was presented.

He advised that they met with SHPO and they asked the County to look at using a standard pole without a base, instead of a pole with a base. A dual arm is proposed although SHPO asked them to consider a single arm for the beacon. The pole coating will be a black powder coating which was recommended by SHPO. Chair Capozzoli asked if words can be added to advise that the signal is flashing and Mr. Fallat stated that this can be done. Standard yellow is proposed for the sign because this is consistent with other treatments on Washington Road. A second alternative for the sign is green.

Greg Sandusky, applicant, stated that the diameter of a steel pole is greater than their standard pole.

Sgt. Thomas Murray, Princeton Traffic Safety Officer, stated that not many accidents have occurred in the area but this does not account for the number of near misses that occur daily. This is a very dangerous area especially during the Regatta, there are no crosswalks and although this may be an intrusion, this is a State park and many pedestrians frequent the area. He stated that the only way to do this properly is to go with an overhead signal, there is a great amount of vegetation and overhead beacons will be more visible than something on the side of the road. He advised that he is 100% in favor of the County's proposal.

Mr. Fallat stated that solar panels on the poles could be costly and vegetation would interfere with solar installations but trimming of vegetation occurs regularly so there is no sight disruption. The smallest solar panel is being proposed.

Sgt. Murray stated that the technology for rapid flashing beacons has changed so much over the past years, older ones can be a maintenance nightmare and there is a danger of overuse but these are not concerns for him at this location. Beacons work because they make the driver respond and slow down.

D. Schure stated that the historic fabric is being impacted but the proposal is reversible, he noted that he feels that this should be approved.

R. von Zumbusch stated that he worked with the D&R Canal Commission many years, there is no question that there should be crosswalks and warning signs. The Alexander Road flashing

beacon works well, he is not in favor of the overhead flashing beacon. Solar panels are also unnecessary.

R. Chenoweth stated that he travels a lot by car and rumble strips are best way for traffic calming. Sgt. Murray stated that rumble strips do not identify the area as a pedestrian crossing area.

C. Tazelaar stated that regarding the type of pedestrian safety features needed, she defers this to the experts. Safety, life and welfare has to take precedence. The visual impact is minimal; the international arm allows a vertical pole to be narrower. Black powder coating on the pole and keeping the pole as slim as possible is recommended. She stated that this should be taken further, the County, Princeton University and the Town should be working to develop more traffic calming through landscaping and road surfacing. The D&R Canal crossing is not well marked and she is in favor of enhancing the awareness of the towpath.

R. Shatzken stated that he is in favor of this because he uses the towpath and it can be dangerous.

Mr. Fallat stated that bike lanes are being considered along Washington Road.

R. von Zumbusch stated that he recommended reducing the width of Washington Road to be consistent with the width of the bridge. Mr. Sandusky stated that resurfacing had been done recently and a reduction of the width of the road was done in West Windsor. Mr. Sandusky advised that they have to appear before the Sites Council so they are trying to implement the best safety measure for this area.

Chair Capozzoli stated that she is horrified that this intersection is inconsistent with the Harrison Street and Alexander Street crossings but agrees something is needed here. She recommended making this as unobtrusive but as safe as possible and the University should be a part of the discussion because it greatly impacts the entrance. She encouraged the applicant to meet with Princeton University.

Chair Capozzoli stated that the crosswalk and flashing beacon and any traffic calming measure is appropriate for this area. Board discussion took place.

R. von Zumbusch stated that a pedestrian crossing treatment similar to the treatment on Alexander Road is recommended. C. Tazelaar stated that she is in favor of the proposed base and narrower pole with the international dual arm extension. A single arm or a dual arm should not be a big impact. E. Endersby stated that rumble strips could be considered. Councilman Crummiller (Acting Liaison) stated that she is strongly in favor of the overhead signal, safety overcomes all other concerns. S. Satterfield concurs with the comments made by C. Tazelaar.

Motion made by C. Tazelaar and D. Schure seconded the motion to forward our recommendations to SHPO and recommend approval for the application from the County of Mercer. The vote was 7-0 in favor. Motion carried.

For: Capozzoli, Endersby, Satterfield, Schure, Shatzkin, Tazelaar, von Zumbusch
Against: None
Abstain: None

Due to the number of members of the public for the next discussion item, the meeting was moved to the Main Meeting Room.

The following members were in attendance:

Present: Julie Capozzoli
Richard Chenoweth
Elric Endersby
Shirley Satterfield
David Schure
Roger Shatzkin
Cecelia Tazelaar
Robert von Zumbusch
Thomas White

6. DISCUSSION

a) Witherspoon-Jackson Neighborhood Study - Survey Forms

E. Kim stated that the consultants finished their field work.

b) Site and/or Districts for Local Historic Designation Consideration to be Included in the Master Plan

No discussion took place.

c) Presentation to W-J Neighborhood on the Neighborhood Study; Q&A

E. Kim stated that that the public was asked to attend the meeting to provide any questions they may have or identify areas of impact to their property due to the historic designation being considered. The consultant is reviewing all properties and will prepare a survey for each property to determine if that structure would be eligible for historic designation. HPC will then present the consultants findings before Council.

Cathy Carroll, 167 John Street, asked about restrictions if a historic district is designated. Chair Capozzoli stated that the consultant will make recommendations about what is best for that home or that portion of the neighborhood. But overall it will be up to the homeowner after the report is received. C. Tazelaar stated that the historic preservation ordinance is on line for consolidated Princeton so homeowners can get background information about what is involved and rules that we operate under.

James Floyd, 64 Harris Road, stated that he moved to Princeton in 1946. In his opinion the neighborhood is already a historic district, it is the area where we were designated to live. The segregated patterns were supported by the governing body. He does not see a reason for a lengthy study because he was designated to live in this neighborhood, very few non African-Americans lived there. This neighborhood is a diminishing neighborhood. Citizens were moved

from the Palmer Square area and designated to this location. That was the area for living, worshipping, dining out and social clubs and they do not understand why the governing body is asking if this is a historic district, it is already a historic district.

S. Satterfield stated that she also lived through a segregated Princeton, this area is a place that was neglected. Now she has concerns about people moving into the area and making changes. Residents feel that this is part of their pride and legacy.

A woman who resides on Charlton Street, asked about how her taxes will be affected after designation. Chair Capozzoli stated that Council will look at this as well as other issues. There are 20 historic districts in the consolidated municipality, we are awaiting the preliminary report from the consultant and then a formal presentation is anticipated in November before any recommendations are made to Council. Council review is tentatively scheduled in December. The question about taxes can be made at that time but she does not believe that preservation would raise taxes.

A man, 168 Birch Avenue, asked for data about economic impacts from other historic districts. Chair Capozzoli stated that HPC is asked to look at the historic integrity and respond so we are approaching this on a purely historic purview. There are many historic districts all over the country and there may be data about property values and taxes but this is not what we are reviewing at this time. Council is the governing body that would research this, HPC reviews the historical aspects only. He stated that he is concerned about the tax base rising and asked about tax relief. R. von Zumbusch stated that at this time there is nothing in place for tax relief, all properties are based on market value.

Irving Newlin, 230 Birch Avenue, stated that the Commission members would be remiss if we did not address what Mr. Floyd and S. Satterfield said about the history of this area. Paul Robeson Place is where the African American community ended, he has concerns about the historic designation because it is already a historic district. If the area is designated, the tax base may rise and this would not be a good thing for the African American who is trying to hold on after taxes were reassessed. He stated that we are losing our neighborhood at a rapid pace. If there is something we could do, short of designation, to formally recognize the greatness and cultural diversity of the residents in this area, he believes most residents would be greatly in favor of that.

D. Schure left the meeting at 6:45 pm.

Mr. Floyd stated that there is little protection to maintain diversity in Princeton, we are relying on HPC to designate this area as historic in order to retain the same feel.

Ruth Haynes, 7 Leigh Avenue, stated that we should have a historic district and protection for the long term residents. Unfortunately there is a great deal of properties purchased and torn down and making this a historic district should be done to preserve current property values and perhaps a tax break for residents over 15 years in duration. Ms. Haynes asked if tear downs are banned in historic districts. Chair Capozzoli stated that it depends on the boundary of the

district, there are many districts where just the front façade streetscape that is preserved. C. Tazelaar stated that the ordinance does not prevent tear downs but it makes the process difficult.

Chair Capozzoli advised that the consultant will attend the November 9th meeting and more detail about the boundary and restrictions will be known at that time.

A woman, 168 Birch Avenue, stated that she is also a historian, she does not want someone to tell her what she can and cannot do in her neighborhood. She hopes that requests for development will be considered.

5. OTHER MATTERS

- a) Discussion on Proposed Recommended Amendments to the Historic Preservation Ordinance

Ed Schmierer, Esq., recommended sending all amendments to the State before HPC requests review by Council so we know what they want done. Chair Capozzoli noted that the amendments will be sent to ZARC and then to the State for final revisions before Council review.

7. PUBLIC COMMENT

No comments from the public were provided.

8. STAFF REPORTS

No reports were provided.

9. MEMBERS REPORTS

No reports were provided

10. ADJOURN

Being that there was no other business before the board, motion was made by C. Tazelaar and E. Endersby seconded the motion to adjourn the meeting at 7:15 pm. Motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,



Kerry A. Philip
HPC Recording Secretary