

Mr. Heinz stated the construction of the ramp will require drawings which he assumes Mr. VanHorn will bring before HARB. Mr. Majewski stated he has drawings which he shared with HARB.

Ms. Stark stated they need to see the ramp in relationship to the house and how the landing at the top of the ramp connects to the porch. She asked what will happen to the existing porch railing. Mr. VanHorn stated they could re-use that on the front side where there is big opening. He stated if there is a need for a gate, they could do that as well. He stated the aluminum ramp is one piece that will button up to the side. Ms. Stark stated when there is a ramp, you need to have a flat landing. She stated they have provided the landing at the bottom; but the landing at the top needs to be where someone has a place to rest, turn their chair, and then actually get onto the ramp. She stated what she is seeing currently is a straight run. She asked if it is parallel with the house. Mr. VanHorn stated it is parallel with the street. He added that once they come up on the porch there will be a platform that will go across the front of the door so they have plenty of room inside the railing and on the platform that is level with the door opening, and be able to turn around and roll in. Ms. Stark asked if the ramp is behind the shrubs, and Mr. VanHorn agreed. The location was noted on the slide. Mr. VanHorn stated the bottom of the ramp is behind the post.

Mr. Heinz stated he assumes that this is a pre-manufactured ramp, and Mr. VanHorn agreed. Mr. Heinz stated there seems to be an extension of the handrail of one foot onto the landing at the top, and there might be some impact by the extension of the handrail into the space at the top of the stairs unless he were to make some other accommodation for a 1' flat extension to take that and make it part of the actual ramp construction and keep the extended handrail from impacting the top of the stairs.

Mr. Majewski showed a picture of the railing and noted the area that Mr. Heinz is speaking about which extends out past where the landing is. Mr. VanHorn stated there is a transition plate right there on the right-hand side from the ramp to the plate. Mr. VanHorn noted the area at the top of the ramp where the arrow is which says, "transition plate." He stated that is where it will be level to the porch. Mr. Majewski showed the area where it will hit the porch and the location of the transition plate which is a little area on the porch. There was some confusion as to which side was being referred to.

Mr. Rick VanHorn, father of Mr. Rich VanHorn, stated there is a transition plate at both ends. He stated the one on the screen is the top end which is right on top of the porch, and it transitions the person in the wheelchair from the ramp to the porch without a bump since it is hinged. He added it is tapered at the bottom of the ramp.

Mr. Heinz stated he would advise the Applicant to have a landing attached to it if it is not already there so that the horizontal extension of the handrail will take place as part of the ramp and not impact the clear space at the top of the steps. He stated the columns will be at the end of the horizontal handrail extension.

Mr. Rich VanHorn asked if the concern is for the railing, and that it will stick out and take space from the customer walking in. Mr. Rick VanHorn stated he feels they want to maximize the space where the wheelchair is turning round, and they do not want a piece of the rail coming onto the porch.

Mr. Heinz stated the other concern he has is the edge of the porch then becomes the edge of the landing, and normally that landing would provide some kind of protection or guardrail for the person in the wheelchair so that they would not go off the top tread of the existing steps. He stated they should look at where that is located and have it so that there is enough clearance from the top step so that the top step has at least 1' of "nosing" before someone would be going over the edge of the top step as they turned onto the ramp.

Mr. Rick VanHorn stated they were contemplating putting in that same kind of rail, and they contacted someone who could make them that railing or they could use the existing piece that they are taking out to protect a person from going back down the steps. He stated they will do that but they did not know if a piece of aluminum railing that matches the ramp would be acceptable. He asked if the white railing be preferred for the front.

Mr. Kirk asked about the height of deck, and he asked how high it is off the ground. Mr. Rick VanHorn stated it is 30". Mr. Kirk stated the Code says: "greater than 30" has to have a railing." Mr. Kirk stated if it is 30" or under, you do not have to have a railing in the front. Mr. Kirk stated there are also only three steps, and four or more steps requires a handrail. He stated the way it is constructed right now, it is okay according to the Building Code.

Mr. Rick VanHorn stated it is actually a little less because the top step is less than that. He stated the total 30" mark is at the step of the door. Mr. Kirk stated they are definitely under the 30" mark.

Mr. Rick VanHorn stated what they were going to do on the porch was build a wooden platform large enough to turn around, and the transition plate will go to that platform. Mr. Kirk stated he does not have his ADA Certification; however, he understands that the transition plate will lay flat on the porch area, and the porch will serve as the turn-around point or the landing.

Mr. Rick VanHorn stated they will have to build the porch up in about a 5' by almost 6' area or maybe 5' by 5' to be able to turn around and go right into the door. He stated you will have the two steps seen in the front and then the one step onto the porch, and it will look like another step to go up to the platform; and that platform takes you right into the entrance door and the ADA ramp will go right to that platform. He stated from what was explained to them, the transition plate is designed so that there is not a bump at the top. He stated there is a "piano-type hinge," and the hinge allows for flexibility; and the ramp can flex a little bit if it has to.

Mr. Kirk stated when the Building Code Official looks at this, there is no "wobble" room; and they have to go by the ADA Code requirements. He stated it needs to go through the Building Official and accessibility so that it meets the Code requirements.

Ms. Stark asked about the fourth step that is being recommended. She asked how high it is supposed to be in their preliminary calculations. Mr. Rick VanHorn stated the distance between the bottom of the door/"floor way" where you step up to go into the building was 5 ½" or 6", and he will need to measure that again to be sure. He stated the platform that they are going to build is that distance so that there is a nice transition to go in. He added it will look like a step, but he feels they would still want to put some of the railing there for aesthetics and safety. He stated they are not comfortable with that being that open, and they feel there should be something there. He stated they will paint the platform that they are going to build the same color as the step and porch.

Mr. Hirko asked what is the existing rise on the steps that are there now. Mr. Rick VanHorn stated while he would have to measure it, he stated it is approximately 6". Mr. Hirko stated they want the platform to be uniform with the rise so that people walking up do not trip. Mr. Rick VanHorn stated they will not be walking on that because the platform is only for those in a wheelchair. He stated someone would walk up the steps to

the left of that and then step up onto that on the porch and go in that door. He stated they would step up and turn left to go into the porch where the wheelchair would come from the right side.

Ms. Stark asked if they are taking the steps away so that people cannot come up the steps. Mr. Rick VanHorn stated there will be steps in the front. Ms. Stark stated there are two sets of steps, and she is asking if able-bodied people will not use the steps by the ramp but will be using the other steps. Mr. Rick VanHorn stated they could use the other steps if they want. Mr. Hirko asked what happens if they do not want to use the other steps. Mr. Rick VanHorn stated they could use the steps at the ramp. He stated it is a wide step, and there is enough room to walk right up the steps and not have to walk up to where the riser plate is. He stated there is 36" of steps that are not anywhere near where the platform is to go into the door.

Ms. Stark asked why an able-bodied person would not go up the steps, hit the extra platform level that is the full width of the step, and then enter the door that is also accessible. Mr. Rick VanHorn stated they could still do that and go right up on the steps as there will be plenty of opening on the right to go up and go in.

Mr. Rick VanHorn asked if they are saying that they should make the platform longer to match the steps, and Ms. Stark agreed. Mr. Rick VanHorn stated a person would take one more step onto the platform when facing the house instead of going up onto the porch and turning right and stepping on the platform, and Ms. Stark agreed. Mr. Rick VanHorn stated that can be done. Ms. Stark stated she feels that simplifies the scenario.

Mr. Heinz stated he understands that Ms. Stark is recommending that they have a fourth step that goes up to the landing that is going to be the platform at the top of the ramp. He stated that might necessitate handrails, but it would facilitate and simplify the transition of the ramp and the top landing so that they can all take place at the height of the interior elevation of the first floor, and Ms. Stark agreed.

Mr. Rick VanHorn stated they did discuss making the platform longer. Mr. Heinz stated it would have to be the full width of the opening between the two posts on the side on the right, and then there would be a step up to the landing coming from the porch on the left of that landing.

Ms. Stark stated that would simplify it as it relates to the landing discussion.

Ms. Stark stated she does have real reservations about putting up a ramp parallel with the street when the less-obstructive impact would be to have it run down the side of the house whether it is a straight run or a pre-fab, L-shaped ramp. Mr. Rick VanHorn asked why would it not be a good idea to be parallel to the street if there is foliage in front of it. He asked if her concern is looks or safety. Ms. Stark stated she is talking about aesthetics. She stated the Design Guidelines push forward the idea of doing things to the streetscape view that are unobtrusive and compatible. She stated an aluminum ramp is a modern intervention. She stated it is necessary to have a ramp, and she is looking for a way for it to have a lesser impact.

Mr. Rick VanHorn stated there will definitely be some kind of arborvitaes in front of it. He stated Ms. Stark is saying she would prefer something to go along the side of the house and then have a landing where they would come up to the landing and then turn in. He stated that would almost be a “switch-back” if it went to another ramp. He stated it would be a landing and then onto the porch. Ms. Stark stated she was suggesting an L-shape. She asked if the handicap parking is where the bottom of the ramp lands. She added that the Board does not have a Site Plan so she does not know how they determined the parking lot.

Mr. Heinz stated they are at a disadvantage because they do not have all of the Plans and elevations showing the changes proposed. He stated he feels this is something they need to Table and ask the Applicant to present at a time when that has at least been reviewed by someone who has ADA capabilities. He stated in the meantime, they can at least consider the signage and make a decision on that. He stated they need to satisfy the requirements for handicap accessibility so it is valuable to have all the information available. He asked if the Applicant would agree to making another presentation after providing some more visual support since that would help the Board make a determination since it is a visual consideration that they are talking about.

Mr. Kirk stated he could work with them to get the Site Plan and put them in touch with the Building Inspectors so that they can get a visual representation. Mr. Rich VanHorn stated they do have information on the ramp including measurements, sizes, and the pitch of the ramp.

Mr. Grenier stated it seems that the parking will probably be closer to the building versus further away toward the road cut; and if they were to come straight off of the porch, they would be going toward their means of ingress or egress versus if they did the “L” and came down the side of the building

it will probably be closer to where they want to put the handicap parking. He stated if they could integrate the handicap spaces where they would be coming on and off the ramp, that may simplify things a great deal. He stated it would also make it safer for the person on the ramp to get in and out of their vehicle and not have to swing wide toward the ingress/egress point and then come up the ramp and do it again on their way out.

Mr. Rich VanHorn stated they did discuss this a little at the last meeting, and it was indicated that they only needed one designated handicap spot. He stated depending on the approval of the ramp and the ADA Application, the object is to have the person pull in and have the first spot and have enough room to get on the ramp and come up to the deck. He stated if it were to come straight down as shown in tonight's idea, they would pull in and be on the right-hand side of the ramp. He stated if it were to go on some kind of switch-back and makes a left going down the side of the house, wherever the ramp lands would be where the parking spot would be. Mr. Rich Van Horn stated the nature of their business is that they never have even four cars parking at the same time. He stated next to where the handicap spot will be, there will probably be another two to three spots. He stated on the other side of the parking would be his personal parking; and if needed, customers could park there as well.

Mr. Heinz stated if they could get the additional information and present that the next time they come before the Board, he would hope that they could get it wrapped up at that time.

Mr. Heinz stated with regard to Ms. Stark's previous comments, there are a number of schools of thought as to how to approach adding new materials and new accommodations to historic structures. He stated one of them is to try to keep the same flavor/style of construction as exists, but a second way of looking at it would be that an aluminum pre-fabricated piece of construction would "state the fact that this is new, and it is recognized as such," and to make it as simple as possible so as not to add a negative impact on the building. He stated he feels they can come up with a full resolution the next time they get together.

Ms. Stark stated with regard to the ramp, the ramp fabricator may have a design service; and they could ask them about an L-shape or a ramp that comes back on itself since they are trying to determine the best lay-out based on the site. She stated they may be able to give them sketches that show several options, and she would suggest they take advantage of any design service they have there.

Mr. Rich VanHorn asked if it still goes down the side of the house, would they still be able to use the aluminum material or should they instead go with a wood ramp.

Ms. Stark stated as noted by Mr. Heinz, there are two schools of thought when it comes to additions to historic structures. She stated you can try to make them compatible with similar materials or you can make them stand out as modern interventions. She stated with the aluminum ramp idea, it is a modern intervention, but she is trying to lessen the impact from the pedestrian right-of-way which is the street.

Mr. Rich VanHorn asked it is felt that parallel with the street is more of an eyesore than going down the side. Ms. Stark stated she feels down the side may put them in a better position relative to the parking. She noted it is small lot. Mr. Rick VanHorn stated he feels that where the vehicle would park, would be that the back of the vehicle would be almost at the bottom of the ramp so that they would get out and get on the ramp there. He stated they have considered both options, but they felt that the other ramp was less of a transition for the person. He stated they will look into this further.

Mr. Grenier asked if there is an existing aluminum roof over the porch, and was wondering if they make a pre-fab ramp so that they could mimic the same color/tone of the aluminum ramp for consistency. Mr. Rick VanHorn stated he believes it is a steel roof. He stated it is a metal roof, but he does not believe it is aluminum. Mr. Hirko stated it is standing-seam metal.

Ms. Stark stated she is in favor of the sign proposed, but she would like to see the wood post painted possibly black or white. Mr. Rich VanHorn stated they could do that, and he asked if it should be black or white. He stated he felt it looked nice natural, but he would agree to paint it.

Mr. Majewski stated originally there were two signs proposed – the mountable sign that is being shown on the post and a longer sign that was going to be put on the railing or, as previously suggested, where the lattice is. He asked if they are still considering using that sign, and Mr. Rich VanHorn stated they are not. He stated they are proposing just one simple sign similar to what a lot of other properties have with posts.

Mr. Heinz stated with regard to the color of the post, he should consider how it makes a statement with the existing posts that are supporting the porch roof. He stated he does not feel white would be a bad solution. He stated as shown the unpainted the wood surface disappears into the shrubbery although when the shrubbery is green, that will not appear that way as much. He stated if feels it would call more attention to itself if it was a white post, and Mr. Rich VanHorn agreed to do that.

Mr. Hirko suggested waiting at least a month to paint it so that the treatment on the post will evaporate out and dry.

It was noted that the sign will be lit at night.

Ms. Stark moved, Ms. Webber seconded and it was unanimously carried to accept the hanging sign with the recommendation that the post be painted black or white to make it appear more finished.

Mr. Majewski stated this will go to the Board of Supervisors at their next meeting on January 20, and they will vote on the recommendation given by HARB this evening for the sign.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ms. Webber moved, Ms. Stark seconded and it was unanimously carried to approve the Minutes of July 14, 2020 as written.

Ms. Webber moved, Mr. Kirk seconded and it was unanimously carried to approve the Minutes of September 14, 2020 as written.

Mr. Hirko moved, Ms. Webber seconded and it was unanimously carried to approve the Minutes of December 17, 2021 as written.

REORGANIZATION

Ms. Stark nominated Stephen Heinz as Chair of the Historical Architectural Review Board. Motion to elect carried unanimously.

Mr. Heinz nominated Kathleen Webber as Vice Chair of the Historical Architectural Review Board. Motion to elect carried unanimously.

Ms. Stark nominated Jeff Hirko as Secretary of the Historical Architectural Review Board. Motion to elect carried unanimously.

NEW BUSINESS

Ms. Webber asked if they need an additional Committee member, and Mr. Heinz agreed, adding that it has been advertised. Mr. Grenier stated HARB is different from other Committees because there are specific positions by regulation. He stated he understands that this position calls for a Real Estate Broker. He stated he would be happy to do his best at the Board of Supervisors meeting and through social media to see if they can get someone to apply.

Mr. Heinz stated information had been provided by Dave Miller, and he asked if they should ask Mr. Miller to attend one of their meetings to describe his vision. Mr. Heinz stated he feels Mr. Miller's vision makes a lot of sense for the area depending on who owns the area Mr. Miller was discussing. Mr. Heinz stated he believes that some of it is part of Patterson Farm. Mr. Majewski stated a portion of that area is Township property. He noted the stretch between the VanHorn house that was just discussed. He noted an area where there was previously a house that burned down. He also showed the location of Dave Miller's property. Mr. Majewski showed the location of the property that is owned by the Township as part of Patterson Farm.

Mr. Heinz asked if the Subdivision and sale of that would be an asset for the Township to consider. Mr. Majewski stated he would have to check to see if there are any restrictions on it when they put the Conservation Easement on it, and whether that parcel could be removed from that or not. He stated different Conservation Easements are written in different ways, and he does not recall if that was part of the property or not. Mr. Heinz asked if Mr. Majewski could do that research. He added that he would be willing to speak to Mr. Miller to see if he would be willing to make a presentation before HARB to explain his proposal in his own words. He stated he understands that this would be infill; and he does not see that as a negative aspect, and it would be worthwhile to consider.

Mr. Majewski stated the next meeting of HARB is scheduled for Monday, February 8 at 6:00 p.m. Mr. Heinz stated he will contact Mr. Miller to see if he would be willing to attend that meeting if that is acceptable to the Board members.

Mr. Grenier stated if that section of Patterson Farm is under Easement, and it is the type that he believes it is, it would be very difficult to remove that Easement. He stated if Mr. Majewski finds out that it is under a specific type of Easement that would be very difficult to remove, Mr. Miller should be aware of that. He stated if it is not, it could be an interesting presentation. Mr. Grenier suggested they wait until Mr. Majewski looks into this further. Mr. Heinz asked Mr. Majewski to let them know what he finds out. He added that he feels Mr. Miller's idea of how to approach infill might be something that they could advertise to developers.

There being no further business, Ms. Stark moved, Mr. Hirko seconded and it was unanimously carried to adjourn the meeting at 7:10 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Jeff Hirko, Secretary