

TOWNSHIP OF LOWER MAKEFIELD
HISTORICAL ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
MINUTES – JULY 12, 2022

The regular meeting of the Historical Architectural Review Board of the Township of Lower Makefield was held remotely on July 12, 2022. Ms. Stark called the meeting to order at 6:10 p.m.

Those present:

Historical Architectural Review Board: Stephen Heinz, Chair (joined meeting in progress)
Jeff Hirko, Vice Chair
Jennifer Stark, Secretary
Michael Kirk, Member/Code Enforcement Officer
Liuba Lashchuk, Member

Others: Jim Majewski, Community Development Director
Daniel Grenier, Supervisor Liaison

MEETING MINUTES FROM JUNE 14, 2022

The Board did not act on the Minutes from the meeting held on June 14, 2022

PRICKETT PRESERVE BARN (Tax Parcel #20-016-040-001)
915 Antique Alley
Discussion of Building Renderings and Plans
Applicant: DeLuca Homes

Mr. Steve Harris, attorney, was present with Mr. Paul Johnson, architect, Mr. Jeff Marshall, and Mr. Joe DeLuca. Mr. Harris stated he assumes the Board received the updated Power Point presentation. He stated they listened carefully to the issues that were raised at the last meeting, and they hope that at the end of the presentation and after answering any questions, that the Board will be in a position to recommend to the Board of Supervisors approval of the Certificate of Appropriateness. Mr. Harris stated they recognize that the presentation tonight and the request for the recommendation of the Certificate of Appropriateness is limited to the barn. He stated they have not obtained a suitable tenant for the house, and they recognize that they will have to come back to the HARB for any improvements that will be done to the house to accommodate the adaptive re-use of that structure. He added that since they

do not yet have a tenant, they do not know what, if any, improvements will be made to the house; and they recognize that they will have to come back to HARB for the house.

Mr. Johnson stated the Prickett Preserve barn is part of the Prickett Estate which is currently being used as an antiqued store. He stated the Prickett family has owned the property since the 1960's, and they have made improvements to the barn over time and have also lived in the house on the property. He stated the barn from the "1700's/1800's" is a standard stone structure with a minor addition on the front of the building. He showed pictures of the original stone structure and the later additions by the Prickett family which are the wood clad and stone foundations on the front of the building.

An overview of the overall site was shown, and he noted the Prickett home and the barn which will remain. He stated the remaining buildings on the site will be removed as part of the redevelopment. He stated with the re-development, there will be Mixed-Use on the site, and surrounding the barn and the house will be new Retail buildings, a grocer at the far end, and a two-hundred unit apartment complex and clubhouse for residents.

Mr. Johnson showed the Landscape Plan which shows the park setting they are creating with the new development. He stated the goal for the area between the barn and the house is to maintain an open central public space that could be used for events and park space for the residents or anyone who is shopping at the Retail buildings. A close-up view of that area was shown. He stated there are walkways and a stage for possible performances.

Mr. Johnson showed a number of renderings of the house, barn, and the open park area from various locations.

Mr. Johnson stated the intended use of the barn is to use the lay-out that is already there which has been used as the antiques shop and adding an addition around the barn to be used as a restaurant space. The restaurant will be mostly open to the outside with glass connections to upper and lower patios that connect to sidewalks around the building. There will be a new entry into the barn that works off of the park space to create accessible ramps and stairs into the barn.

A rendering was shown of the west elevation of the barn from the park space with the house to the left. Mr. Johnson stated it shows the existing barn in the back with the glass box addition to the restaurant in front of the barn. He added the idea of the glass box is that it would provide a minimal impact on screening the barn from the outside. He stated with the glass being clear and the roof being minimized, the barn is always the backdrop whether you are inside or outside the restaurant, and you will see the stonework of the barn. He noted the openness of the exterior façade with the upper and lower decks for the restaurant patronage. Another view of the west elevation was shown which highlights more of the tiered decks. A view of the barn/restaurant from the drive aisle entering the site was shown.

A rendering of the southeastern elevation was also shown. He noted on the right the retaining wall that maintains the open area into the lower level of the existing barn.

A rendering was shown of the existing barn entry which was part of a later addition by the Prickett family. Mr. Johnson stated they will maintain the look that exists aside from adding the new accessible ramp and stairs to the entry.

Mr. Johnson stated at the last meeting, the Board had commented that there was not a perspective rendering of the north face of the building which they have now provided. He stated another comment was that the barn windows on the rendering did not exactly match what was existing on the site, and they have added any missing existing windows and doors.

Mr. Johnson stated a “big comment” from the previous meeting was about the grading around the building and the screening of the barn which currently appears as a three-story structure with the roof structure. He stated as part of the new land development, the grading will be raised up to a level closer to the first-floor of the existing barn understanding that the new grading will obscure portions of the barn. He stated to create a usable Retail space around the area, sacrifices had to be made to create a level site for the Retail area. Mr. Johnson stated they also felt that the lower level of the barn which only has about a six foot two height was not overly useful for any Commercial tenant other than maybe storage. He stated it is not an access space of usable space as there are a lot of beams and columns that disrupt the interior of the building. He added that the lower level has been modified over the years, and there has not been much that was maintained on the lower level that was original to the building. He added that as part of the addition “with wrapping the building,” they are keeping the addition off the exterior walls of the barn

so the open space below, basement or crawl space, will be pushed out from the existing barn. He stated the existing barn walls are not used as retaining walls for any grade. He stated they will keep the new addition pushed away from the existing barn.

Mr. Johnson stated another comment was whether they could explore an alternate location for the addition to the barn on the site; however he stated there are site constraints and their approved Land Development Plans dictated where they could locate an addition to the barn. He stated part of the approval was to create a visual connection between the existing barn and the existing house and maintaining the open park space between the two. He stated with the new drive aisle around the buildings there was not much opportunity to add to the east side of the building. He stated they also had to respect a historic tree that is required to be maintained. He stated this pushed the barn addition to the western and southern sides of the building to maintain the tree and the connection between the house and the barn.

Mr. Johnson stated another comment was with regard to the southern exposure of the new addition and heat gain and what could be done to shade the glazing without interrupting the clearness of the addition. He stated they have therefore extended the awnings from the previous renderings to a 3' overhang; and they performed sun studies at various times of the July summer sun showing 8 a.m. where most of the southern exposure is shade, 12 p.m. where a majority of the southern exposure is shaded by the extended awnings, and a 6 p.m. western sun where the southern exposure is completely shaded.

Mr. Johnson stated they were also asked to provide a clear picture of what the materials of the building were, and they put together a list of the possible stone, aluminum, stamped concrete, and fiber cement. He stated they have also selected a specific storefront glazing that is good for solar control but still provides an openness and clearness to the glazing. Images of what the materials will look like were provided.

Mr. Grenier asked Mr. Johnson if he will be presenting any Plans and specifications tonight or is he only showing renderings and sample products. Mr. Johnson stated he is only showing renderings as they have not developed the overall building to a level of greater detail beyond schematics. He stated they are working on bringing the actual restaurant tenant on board, and the drawings have only progressed to a schematic level at this point. Mr. Grenier stated he feels some of questions and

concerns from “some HARB members not here tonight” centered around the materials and how they interacted between the new material versus the existing to make sure that they were not “potential for damage at worst and from an aesthetic perspective make sure that things go together.”

Mr. Grenier stated in our Code in order to get a Certificate of Appropriateness it includes the requirement for Building Plans and Specs to be filed as part of the Application for review by the HARB. He stated it is important to maintain the historic integrity of the buildings. He stated as a Supervisor he does not feel he could vote on this without having Building Plans and Specs which is why we wrote the Mixed-Use Overlay District the way we did so that we could insure protection of the historic resources.

Mr. Harris stated while they understand that, a way to address that may be to Condition a recommendation for a Certificate of Appropriateness upon the Applicant presenting detailed Plans and Specs. Mr. Harris stated the problem with having to develop a detail set of Plans and Specs without at least a recommendation of approval is that the “expense is enormous.” He stated while he understands Mr. Grenier’s concern, if the approval was Conditioned upon the Plans being presented, the Applicant would have the “comfort that they would not just spend all this money on a Plan that no one would recommend for approval.” Mr. Harris stated it might be a two-step proceeding. Mr. Grenier stated that is a fair comment, and relative to a two-step process as a Supervisor he would want HARB to agree that they liked what they are seeing and have a level of comfort that the Applicant should go forward with the Plans and Specs required, and they would then recommend the Certificate of Appropriateness.

Mr. Heinz joined the meeting at this time.

Mr. Grenier stated he wants make sure HARB is comfortable and that they are “checking the boxes from a regulatory perspective so the Township is covered.”

Mr. Harris stated one of the comments Mr. Johnson made was that this was designed so that it is not requiring the barn to be physically supporting what is on the outside so that the barn is not acting as a footing or supporting wall. He asked if that is what Mr. Grenier is looking for so that there is an assurance that the construction will not negatively impact the structural integrity of the barn. Mr. Grenier stated that is a big part of it, and the other part is that with the new materials that they make sure that they do not negatively impact the historic integrity of the property as well and not just the structural integrity.

He stated he wants to make sure that HARB is comfortable that they will not negatively impact the barn structurally or negatively impact the visual effects it may have on the historic structure.

Mr. Kirk stated if HARB comes to a consensus that they like the visual of what has been done, there could be a Temporary Certificate of Appropriateness so that once the Applicant gets the okay on the look of the building, they could then start on the Plans; and then come back to HARB for a Final with the type of materials to meet that requirement. Mr. Grenier stated this would be similar to a Preliminary/Final Site Plan review.

Mr. Grenier asked Mr. Harris what that would do for the Applicant if HARB were to “go down this route.” Mr. Harris stated he is not sure what a Temporary Certificate of Appropriateness is. He stated if there is a recommendation Conditioned upon the approval, that way the Applicant has the ability to feel it is worthwhile spending the money to make the formal presentation to the Board of Supervisors. He stated they understand that the Board of Supervisors would not grant the Certificate of Appropriateness unless the Plans and Specs meet the requirements. Mr. Grenier stated they would not then come back to the HARB, and they would go straight to the Board of Supervisors using that approach; and Mr. Harris agreed. Mr. Grenier stated he would have a concern with that.

Mr. Heinz stated they have dealt with this situation in the past, and are also dealing with it with regard to the Miller barn where they are discussing with the contractor/developer as to how to proceed. He stated an initial offering was reviewed and commented on, and there were processes they were going through where HARB was able to assist by being specific in what they would consider a desirable outcome. He stated HARB provided positive feedback and suggestions as to how to proceed. He stated if HARB were to give a Conditional Approval, it would have to be based on the fact that everyone is comfortable with the entire response from the developer and the architect as to what has been discussed in the past.

Mr. Harris asked Mr. Heinz what those Conditions would be. He stated Mr. Johnson tried to address each of the issues that had been raised. Mr. Heinz stated with regard to “the specific little things, he has done a commendable job.” Mr. Heinz stated the one major problem is how to put something very modern against something very old/historic, and there is “a certain amount of comfort that they have with new materials, but if they become overbearing and impose a new structure around the old structure so that you do not really get the feel of

the old structure, that is when some questions were raised and those seemingly were not dealt with.” He stated there was really nothing substantial in the Plan or the elevations that has changed.

Mr. Heinz stated Mr. Johnson had stated that the side that has the shed addition/clapboard addition is the one that is least valuable in terms of history because it was a later “practical addition” by the “utility of making it useful as a showroom by the Pricketts.” He stated the majority of the barn except for the east wall is “pretty much occluded by something new and has a pretty thick plane pushed up against it.” He stated if the plane were entirely glass structure that “might have some sensitivity in it.” He stated he feels that the structure that is used in the corner for a “clerestory kind of condition where a piece of the roof is raised above the remaining roof seems to be lacking in generosity or respect toward the old building by taking an even higher plan and putting it in the way of the view from the road and the people coming into the site.” Mr. Heinz stated he would have thought that the suggestions talked about “maybe making some reference to the barn shape and definition maybe even calling to mind out-buildings and then connecting that to the barn by having the outer corner a more sizable pitched-roof that looks like a corn crib or something like that; and then having the glass pieces connect to that.” He stated that might make more sense, but “nothing was done or even considered perhaps because this is the Plan that they want to go with.” Mr. Heinz stated he is “not terribly thrilled about that.” He stated perhaps the utility of the space in order to accomplish the designs of the developer in order to make it more useful as a Commercial space makes it less useful as a historic structure.

Mr. Heinz stated he would rather see a schematic design that “re-thinks the whole thing” but does not come to the level of renderings, but “comes to the level of understanding.” Mr. Heinz stated in dealing with glazing that faces south, putting an overhang “is something of a practical solution,” but it does not really resolve the “whole thing of the relative values of the spaces in regards to the barn that is supposed to be the sponsoring element here.”

Mr. Johnson stated their biggest hinderances are the site restrictions as per the approved Land Development – maintaining the existing historic tree, maintaining the connectivity to the existing house and the existing barn – which really forces them onto these two elevations. He stated they understand that the optimal location would be on the clapboard façade of the building; but to maintain the approval of the Land Development Plan, they need to locate the building where they have shown, and creating it as a separate structure with a connection, it is not necessarily feasible to work

around those restrictions. He stated the closer they would get to the tree, it is more likely that they could hurt it. He stated the functionality of circulating into a building that is at a lower grade when the parking level is higher creates certain difficulties.

Mr. Johnson stated the point about the corner is understood, and they represented a “worst scenario of that view – which is a momentary view.” He showed the rendering from the drive aisle adding that as you are further away or closer to the right side of the image shown, you are not being obstructed by the corner piece. He stated the corner piece creates an area for the restaurant. He stated there are different approaches to this, and their goal was to try to minimize the plane of the roof in general over the entire addition to try to have the least impact of vertical solid surface against the barn.

Mr. Grenier asked if they could remove that corner altogether or lower it. Mr. Heinz stated his suggestion was more to “rethink that whole corner as a piece in itself attached to the main space and maybe complimentary to it” having something to do with an outbuilding that may be found around a barn that would be some kind of shed construction or a peaked, pitched roof construction that is sizable in its own right and connected to the barn but is far enough away from it so that the connection could be a “very gossamer thin type of space.” He stated he understands Development Plans and respects their point of view, but what Mr. Johnson was saying about “here is what we have to do, is more of an excuse for a resolution of how he would like to proceed than a response to ‘maybe you have a point and maybe we should look at this.’”

Mr. Johnson stated his question would be whether Mr. Heinz was looking for something more solid or still more of a glass box. He asked if they did not go in that direction, would lowering the roof to the same plane of the rest of the restaurant roof be an agreeable solution to this elevation. Mr. Heinz stated he was thinking that it could be an enclosed space that steps out from the current wall of glass that is established along the south side so that it steps out toward the walkway but is solid and creates some kind of shadowing effect in the west toward the actual space in the side and the west for when people would be eating and would have the greatest possibility of solar gain and solar impact to the space. He stated a solid, fully-enclosed space with some windows or slats in it would at least have the potential for shading from the horizontal sun that comes in the late summer afternoons and evenings.

Mr. Johnson stated he understands Mr. Heinz' concern, but he feels that conceptually that starts to work away from their glass box idea, although they are open to exploring that. He stated it would be a departure from what their initial goal was of using the barn as a backdrop and trying to impede the views as minimally as possible with the glazing itself.

Mr. Heinz stated if they took both outer edges – the south side and the north side – and dropped them and made a pitched roof out of them, they would probably see more of the barn especially given the 10' ceiling inside that connected everything with a "glass kind of gossamer connection that is glass on the ceiling even or at least a very thin ceiling and the sides being glass." He stated this would be a very specific solution; and he is only suggesting it because he "does not really like what he is seeing, and does not think it does justice to the barn."

Mr. Grenier stated Mr. Johnson had indicated that the Land Development Approval "squeezed them into certain options," and he asked for more clarification. Mr. Johnson showed the Site Plan and noted the location of the historic tree that they need to maintain as part of the Approval. He stated if tree "went away," it would require a complete revamping of the landscaping to make up for what would be lost by losing that tree. He stated it is around one hundred years old. He stated as part of the Approval, they are also required to maintain an open space between the house and the barn so that there is a visual connection. He stated if they were to put an addition on the northern side of the building, there would no longer be a connection between the historic house and the historic barn, and it would be the historic house "talking to" a modern addition to the barn.

Mr. Grenier asked where is that in the Mixed-Use Overlay. Mr. DeLuca stated a lot of the discussion when this was developed involved having this open space between the house and the barn. Mr. Grenier stated he does not disagree.

Mr. DeLuca stated he feels that the grading has more of an impact to where the new space can be relative to the existing. Mr. Grenier stated he did not see anything from a visual perspective that did not allow them to put "the newer stuff between the house and the barn." Mr. DeLuca stated part of the grading is taking the lower level visual away.

Mr. Johnson stated as part of grading "up to the approved Plans" it was leveling the site around the park area which then starts to build up the areas around the southern and eastern portions of the building which they tried to respect by

creating the retaining wall on the eastern side and using the addition to prevent the existing barn from being the retaining wall. He stated where they placed the decks were to tier down from where the higher grade level is lowered to the open park space with respect to the tree on the western side of the building. He stated putting the addition to the eastern side, they are restricted by the drive aisles and parking to the northern side, and they are impeding on the connectivity of the park area which forced them to the west and southern sides of the building.

Mr. Hirko asked if it is possible to remove the corner glass structure all together and turn that into something that resembles “an old smoke house that would blend in more with the barn or an outbuilding or something along that line with windows or glass in it and that would work and not just stand out so stark like a flat roof with four pillars under it.” Mr. Johnson stated they are open to revisiting the corner area.

Mr. Grenier asked if this is supposed to be a steak house; and Mr. DeLuca agreed adding that they are pretty far in negotiations, and it is planned to be an Italian steak house. Mr. Hirko stated this could fit in with barbecuing. Mr. DeLuca stated they are looking at this to be the high-end feature of the Retail space versus some of the other in-line Retail. He stated while a smokehouse could be high-end, that would probably not fit into the scheme of the potential user. Mr. Grenier asked if that user has provided any design parameters that they need that would impact this. Mr. DeLuca stated they have gone through the schematic that Mr. Johnson has shown in the floor plans, and they have been developed in conjunction with the end user.

Mr. DeLuca stated while he understands Mr. Heinz’ comments with regard to the glass wall, looking at the area which is pedestrian-friendly and people being able to look in from outside would bring the view of the barn to the outside versus a solid structure. He stated they have put in the Nano doors which can open up in the better months of the year and that was done to bring the outside in and inside out and allowing the feature of the barn to show through not just to the people dining inside, but to the people outside as well. He stated he felt they had addressed all of the points from the last meeting.

Mr. Harris stated they have heard the comments and he feels they need to look at this again before they ask HARB to make a positive recommendation. He stated they need to make sure that there is no clash of materials and that they can demonstrate in more detail that none of what is proposed effects the barn structurally. He stated they will also look at the issue that Mr. Heinz has

raised with regard to the corner facility. He stated they would then make another presentation at HARB's August meeting with the hope that they can address the concerns heard and be able to move forward to the next step.

Mr. Harris stated Mr. Heinz has been the most vocal critic tonight, and he asked if there are any other comments that the Board would like to offer before the Applicant reconsiders some of the things that were discussed. Mr. Harris stated he has always heard that when you adaptively reuse a historic building you are supposed to approach it with modern accoutrements as opposed to trying to imitate the old, although that may or may not be true. He asked if there were comments that other Board members would like the Applicant to consider before they come back again.

Ms. Stark stated her background is historic architecture and her philosophy is that the old and the new should be distinguishable and separate. She stated she is interested in exploring the idea of a "glass jewel box" coming up against the historic barn. She stated she feels the Applicant is "approaching that finesse well." She stated what she would like to see is the glass box coming up to the barn, but she would like to have about two feet of relief between the box attaching to the barn with a different material. She stated she usually indents or creates a distance so that there is a shadow line when you are looking at it so that you can see the two structures coming together, and it could be zinc or "something interesting."

Ms. Stark stated with regard to the ramp and heavy masonry at the door on the other side, she likes the cable railing being shown because it is transparent; but they are showing a lot of heavy masonry, and if all of that were cable, the barn could be seen. She stated the historic stone is what is making the massing of the site for this building versus new masonry which they do have to have at the foundation of the new portion, but they would not need to use it at this entry and at some of the ramps. She stated they may want to explore some of those concepts.

Mr. Harris asked for clarification about the 2' between the glass and the barn, and he asked if this would be a channel. Mr. Johnson stated his understanding of the recommendation is that the area would have a recessed relief indented from the façade of the building that creates a more-pronounced separation of the two, and Ms. Stark agreed. Ms. Stark stated she was considering how wide that would need to be, and she feels that 12" would be too small. Mr. Johnson stated they could explore this.

Mr. Grenier noted the one stairway entrance Ms. Stark was referring to with the stone, and he asked if that is original stone; and Mr. Johnson stated it was adding masonry to try to match. Mr. Grenier stated that is a lot of stone, and he likes what Ms. Stark is suggesting.

Ms. Lashchuk stated she agrees with Ms. Stark's comments about the entrance being heavy. She stated she would tie together that with "the transparency and lightness of the glass box," and that box would be articulated separate and not really competing with the barn itself.

Mr. Kirk stated he likes where the Applicant is going with the glass idea and keeping it open and the backdrop. He stated he feels Ms. Stark's comments were "perfect and her comments and ideas would make it even better."

Mr. Harris stated he feels this has been very helpful, and the Applicant has tried to listen to the Board, and the comments have been refined. He stated he feels they can bring back something that addresses many of the concerns heard tonight, and they will renew their request at the next meeting that HARB recommend approval of the Certificate of Appropriateness. He thanked the Board for their input and their obvious interest in what is a very important element of the development of Prickett Preserve. Ms. Stark thanked the Applicant for the discussion and all of the input from both sides.

Mr. Grenier asked the Applicant if they could provide a short update at the next meeting as to where they are overall with the Land Development process, and Mr. Harris stated they will do that.

1648 LANGHORNE-YARDLEY ROAD (Tax Parcel #20-016-047)

Renovation of Existing Barn Matching Like-For-Like

Mr. Joel Petty was present representing the Applicant. He stated they are moving toward taking the garage door off of the front of the building, and he showed the location on the rendering showing the north and south elevation. He stated they would utilize the void where there is no garage door now as it is an open barn, to create a recessed entry area for the new entrance into the office space that will be created. He stated the goal would be to make that a black storefront arrangement inside of what would be a timber-trimmed recessed paneled opening.

Mr. Petty stated the goal would be to leave the architecture of the front façade in place as much as possible replacing the windows that are damaged with new wood windows to match what was there.

Mr. Petty stated there will be a new entrance on the side of the barn that would then connect to a walkway to the existing stone house.

Mr. Petty stated with regard to the damaged siding they are looking to replace it so that they can make the exterior of the barn more weathertight, and possibly use the siding removed on the inside of the barn. He asked if there is any input from the Board on whether they would be in favor of that. He stated they would replace the siding in kind with wood or switch to a composite board and batten siding. He stated they want to make the exterior weathertight prior to the office installation in the interior. He stated the siding would be difficult to refurbish and it has been patched places which makes it difficult. He stated they are looking for input on whether that could be replaced or should they do their best to refurbish it. He stated whatever pieces of siding that are salvageable, they would like to use on the interior and replace the exterior.

Mr. Heinz stated he feels this is very well conceived, and he likes the idea of the panels with the clapboard. He stated since they are mainly concerned with the front elevation, it might be good to do what they can to utilize the wood that is already on the building in terms of repairing/refurbishing the wood that is on the front elevation, and emulating it with new wood material would be preferable in his view although he understands that there are cost considerations and there are new treatments, especially heat treatments, of wood materials of “a solid species and having it treated by almost baking every drop of moisture out of it which does quite a bit toward making it a long-lived material” and providing some kind of guarantee that it will stay in a manner that it does not require too much in the way of maintenance in order to continue “its pristine appearance.”

Mr. Heinz stated he feels generally it looks “very nice and the approach has some historic merit.” He stated he feels they can look back on the directives of the Secretary of the Interior’s standards and say, “good job.” He stated he feels it is approvable as a historic restoration and an adaptive reuse.

Mr. Petty asked if that is approach that all the Board members would like to see as he feels they would have enough to salvage and refurbish the front elevation if that were a goal. He stated because there is a large opening on the front of the building, they have less longer runs of the materials and some of the places where

there is damage, especially lower on the building, those lengths would not be needed to replace it on the front. He stated if that is a goal, he feels there is a real opportunity to salvage enough pieces to re-do the front with the wood from the barn.

Ms. Stark stated she would be in favor of that. She stated as to the other three sides, she is amenable to the vertical Hardie if that makes more sense. She stated she feels they listened to the Board's comments last time, and responded beautifully.

Mr. Petty asked if there is any opposition to the new entry door on the side as a connection to the existing house which is what the Applicants would prefer. He stated there is an existing window that mimics the one on the other side, but it is damaged. He stated the goal would be to eliminate that window and create the entry door if that is acceptable. Mr. Hirko stated he had no problem with that, and Ms. Lashchuk agreed. Mr. Petty stated beyond that it is replacing the windows with ones that match. He stated at the rear elevation, they would put in windows as that elevation has no windows at all.

Mr. Heinz stated if there were more specifics as to choices of materials and techniques, the window dimensions, the manufacturer, the composition, and a "little harder definition of the specifics and specifications of the dwelling, they could probably approve it." Mr. Petty stated he feels he now has enough direction to get to the final drawings.

Mr. Petty stated the Applicants were talking about having a patio-type area on the back and whether they could get some cover on the rear elevation, and he asked if there would be any opposition to a porch-like structure on the back whether it would be more modern or more like the barn. Mr. Heinz stated it is not a street elevation, and HARB would not "get in their way of making a good fit for their purposes."

Ms. Stark stated in the information provided they have called out the specifics of the windows and the siding. Mr. Heinz stated he feels they can proceed and bring back drawings so that HARB can consider a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors at the next meeting or at the meeting in September.

Mr. Petty stated they are also looking at the Site Plans and options for the parking in the front. He stated they are trying to avoid the look of a parking lot area if possible. He stated they do need ADA access. He stated he feels they will be able to present this at the next meeting.

July 12, 2022

Historical Architectural Review Board – page 15 of 15

AD HOC COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS REPORT FOR THE PATTERSON FARM

The Board did not discuss the Ad Hoc Committee Recommendations Report for the Patterson Farm.

There being no further business, Ms. Stark moved, Mr. Hirko seconded and it was unanimously carried to adjourn the meeting at 8:20 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Jennifer Stark, Secretary