

TOWNSHIP OF LOWER MAKEFIELD
HISTORICAL ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
MINUTES – AUGUST 9, 2022

The regular meeting of the Historical Architectural Review Board of the Township of Lower Makefield was held remotely on August 9, 2022. Mr. Heinz called the meeting to order at 6:05 p.m.

Those present:

Historical Architectural Review Board: Stephen Heinz, Chair
Jeff Hirko, Vice Chair
Jennifer Stark, Secretary
Liuba Lashchyk, Member

Absent: Michael Kirk, HARB Member/Code Enforcement Officer
James Majewski, Community Development Director
Daniel Grenier, Supervisor Liaison

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ms. Stark moved, Ms. Lashchyk seconded and it was unanimously carried to approve the Minutes of June 14, 2022.

Ms. Stark moved, Ms. Lashchyk seconded and it was unanimously carried to approve the Minutes of July 12, 2022.

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

Mr. Steve Harris, attorney, was present representing DeLuca ELU Yardley LLC. Also present was Mr. Paul Johnson, architect, Mr. Jeff Marshall, preservation consultant for DeLuca, and Mr. Joe DeLuca, partner with DeLuca ELU.

Mr. Harris stated following the last meeting, the team reviewed the HARB comments, and he feels they have made positive improvements.

Mr. Johnson stated the project is the Prickett Preserve barn at the current Prickett family property where they currently operate an antique store out of the existing barn. He stated the Pricketts have owned the property since the 1960's and have lived in the house and maintained the barn. Photos of the existing barn were shown showing its current condition on the site.

An overview of the overall site of the Prickett Preserve area was shown highlighting the existing house and the existing barn which will both remain as part of the overall Land Development. He stated the Land Development Plans show the existing house and barn surrounded by proposed new Retail buildings, a grocer to the north, and to the east two hundred apartment units with a clubhouse.

A rendering of the complete Land Development Plan was shown including the greenery of the overall site.

Mr. Johnson stated the goal of the Land Development Plan was to create a central public open space within the area between the existing house and the existing barn which could be used by the Retail and the apartments as part of the overall site. A close-up view of the existing barn and house was shown with the park area that will be created within the space between the two. A 3-D view was shown of the relation of the house, barn, and park space within the area between the two. An alternate view from the opposite direction was shown as well as views from other perspectives.

Mr. Johnson stated the goal of the renovation of the barn is to add an addition to the existing barn while maintaining the footprint of the existing barn for a restaurant space. The Ground Floor Plan was shown, and the existing barn would be the square area, and the addition would be wrapping the barn to the south and west sides with terraced patios outside of the envelope of the building and would connect to the park area. The Second Floor Plan was shown, and Mr. Johnson stated that will be maintained as part of the renovation.

Mr. Johnson showed renderings which had been presented at the last meeting showing the Applicant's preferred Option. He stated after the last meeting, the main focus of the HARB comments was on the corner piece of the original rendering and how they were handling that. He stated as a result of the comments, they tried to bring in a little bit more of the elements of the barn itself, bringing in the gabled face with the windows and bringing in some of the stonework to create more of a "storehouse/smokehouse" separate area that ties in more to the barn than it does to the addition. He stated they wanted to

keep the glass to keep the view through the exterior façade, but this option makes the connection not just visually by looking through it, but also “in the language of the architecture” of the barn. Another rendering was shown of a different perspective showing the relation of the barn gable and the addition gable.

Mr. Johnson stated they also decided to keep the roof pitch a little bit lower than the existing barn to minimize some of the impact of screening the barn since if they went higher, they felt it would block the view to the barn a little bit more.

Mr. Johnson stated they also brought the stone into the corner to anchor the roof line of the building tying in with the stone that would match the existing barn.

Renderings of views from different locations were shown.

Mr. Johnson stated at the last meeting comments were also made about the ramp area and stairs which had stone going up to the height of the railing; and in response to those comments, they have scaled down the height of the stone walls to just where the paving would be for the ramps and the stairs and then filled in the rest with a matching railing to the patio areas of the barn which will keep it more open. He stated the stonework is intended to match the existing stonework of the barn.

Mr. Johnson stated an additional comment was to address the connection of the barn to the addition. He stated one of the recommendations was to create some kind of relief in the corner, and they have recessed an area between the addition and the barn. He stated there is still a tie-in to the barn, but visually it creates more of a break between the two materials by setting it back slightly. He showed the west elevation on the alternate side of the barn, and it does run straight into the barn, but they felt that there was enough of a break in the connection of the two elements.

Mr. Heinz stated Ms. Stark had raised the issue of the relief at the last meeting, and he asked Ms. Stark her opinion of what they have proposed tonight. Ms. Stark stated she feels the relief is successful except that the fascia needs to cut back as well. Mr. Johnson stated that would not be a problem, and he understands that she is trying to create a visual break; and Ms. Stark agreed.

Mr. Heinz stated he had sent an e-mail which he hoped Mr. Majewski would provide to everyone. He asked Ms. Stark if she had seen what he had drawn. Mr. Heinz stated it was another way of addressing a break between the roof line and “hitting the barn.” He stated the way he was suggesting was that they “break the whole thing back a foot to two feet and have a little glass infill that would allow the sunlight to wash down along the face of the barn.” He stated if you saw it from the outside, you would be able to see the profile of the stone, etc. highlighted by a “skylight effectively.” He stated the skylight would be the point of connection which would then tie into the flat plane of the roof. He stated it would also provide some “linear light fixture in there to then be able to shine up at night and create a wash on the face of the upper part of the barn.” He stated that was another alternative to tie in with Ms. Stark’s idea of “breaking it loose and making it a bit more of a stand-alone ‘jewel box’ or glass enclosure.” Ms. Stark stated she feels Mr. Heinz’s solution sounds very “elegant.”

Ms. Lashchuk stated with regard to the “huge expansion joint” between the addition and the old building, she was thinking of carrying that concept further. She stated they have the historic stone barn and the glass addition, and they could have that “totally separated with a very light structure, and the way it would connect, they would watch how that connects to the barn and how that connects to the earth and nature.” She stated connecting to the barn, it could have a total reveal and between the two walls it would give the perspective of the stone and the feel of the barn itself. She stated the “lightness rather than being stuck in stone, which is not a very modern, contemporary light element, would be sitting on a platform. She stated they could think about a decking platform and raised light structure and that “could embrace the land”.

Ms. Lashchuk stated she was looking at the historic tree, and the way the Plans are showing now it is too close to the drip line of the tree. She stated there is a critical zone where the roots are that should not be disturbed when building. She stated a platform would avoid it, protect the ground, and give the feeling of lightness.

Ms. Lashchuk stated with regard to the solar gain, they were talking about extending the canopy 3’ which creates a different look to the design. She asked why they could not extend it more and create a “gallery;” and there could be something that the community could walk by with an art exhibit or something inviting which would also protect against the sun.

Mr. Johnson stated they did come to the locations of the exterior patios by working with the Civil Engineer and the Landscape Architect for the project with consideration of the existing tree's root system. He stated they came to the location intentionally with that in mind, and they feel comfortable with their lay-out relative to the tree. Ms. Lashchyk stated her concern was that if they damaged the roots, it would be life threatening; but if an expert looked at that, that is fine.

Mr. Johnson stated with regard to the solar shading, they looked at perspectives of what the July sun looks like relative to the overhangs; and 3' was a good number to achieve adequate shading for the summer months with the glazing.

Mr. Heinz asked if there are any studies for the low, winter sun and the impact that might have. Mr. Johnson stated there is also a tree in the area that is not being reflected. He stated they expect a little more solar gain during the winter months, but that is not necessarily a bad thing given the amount of glazing and getting a little bit of heat from the sun is not a bad thing in December. Mr. Heinz stated perhaps in October, that may be of concern.

Mr. Hirko stated he agrees with the idea of having the continuous break or glass along the barn roof that would allow light to wash in and up along the front of the barn. He stated he agrees with Ms. Stark about the setback of the fascia of the roof so that everything lines up.

Mr. Hirko stated he had brought up the idea of trying to make it look like a smokehouse; but looking at the new drawing, he feels it looks "like a giant aquarium that you go into a Chinese restaurant that is inside with the giant goldfish in it." He stated it looks out of place. He stated he does not see how that works into the plan, adding that the roof line is not the same; and he feels it was better before than what is shown now.

Mr. Harris stated Option 1 would be the Applicant's preferred Option.

Mr. Heinz noted the e-mail that he had sent out which included attachments, one of which was "a photo-shopped re-do of the brick cornered enclosure." Mr. Heinz stated his thought was that could be "something more substantial and not glazed in between stone columns but actually a stone veneer enclosure that might allow for more intimate dining that is not out in the public eye maybe enough for four or five tables." He stated it would be bigger than what is being shown now, but small enough where it "reads as a separate building." He stated

instead of having a peak roof, he put a shed roof on it; and asked that they consider a shed roof because it provides a lower profile that could act as a clerestory connection. He stated the rest of it would be a little more solid. He stated if it is a shed roof, the stone could go all the way up to the underside of the roof and it does not have to use the clapboard. He stated of all of the parts of the barn that are there now, the clapboard is the “most objectionable to him as a latter addition that speaks more of the simplicity and utility type of installation that might have happened with the barn.”

The attachment that Mr. Heinz had e-mailed was shown. Mr. Heinz stated he hopes that the other Board members received this, and he had hoped that Mr. Majewski would have passed this along to the Applicant’s design team including Mr. Johnson.

Mr. Johnson asked if they were to pursue the shed roof, would it be acceptable to tie in the low point and have it face toward the west instead of facing it toward the north as Mr. Heinz has shown. He stated it could pitch up toward the patio/park area. Mr. Heinz stated it is a design element, and “Mr. Johnson is the designer.” Mr. Johnson stated while he is the designer, he wants to be on the same page. Mr. Heinz stated the idea was a clerestory right above stone or even glass which provides high northern light that is a little softer than the other space, and “this more solid thing might help block a little bit of the solar incidents at certain times of the year and maintain some of the sense of the barn itself.”

Mr. Heinz stated he had sent Mr. Majewski a request to see what were the Applicant’s preservation techniques being used for the tree, and he asked if there is fence now since there is a lot of land moving going on.” Mr. DeLuca stated it is fenced, and it has protection.

Mr. Heinz stated he was also hoping that they could provide a virtual walk-through seeing the addition in the eyes of the person who might be walking around at a normal adult’s head height. He stated there are figures on the drawings, and it seems that they are looking in the windows right at the knee height of the people who will be sitting at the tables. He stated if they saw that and the “quality of the roof and what that would look like from a person’s normal eye height looking up at the barn it would be a visual clue as to how this relates to the barn.” He stated he has that availability on his computer, and he asked if that is something Mr. Johnson’s company has as a standard process. Mr. Johnson stated that is something that he could provide.

Mr. Johnson stated with regard to the corner element if they were going to add any additional stone or blocking to screen someone's eyes from the table height, it does start to conflict with the openness that they have been trying to maintain of the addition using the barn as a backdrop. He stated the more solid walls they introduce to this, the less of that impact will be maintained. He stated they understand that there is a relationship between someone's eye versus the table level, but they wanted to keep the openness. He stated adding more solid walls is conflicting to previous discussions.

Mr. Heinz stated he feels the three-dimensional, virtual model would be something where they could test what impact this might make. He stated he feels the majority of the traffic that comes in the main lane is going to be looking at the north side of the barn and the relationship of that corner "thing" would be separated from the barn by the glass box that is the major part of the enclosure.

Mr. Johnson stated their renderings are all taken from eye level – just set further back from the buildings. He stated he understands that what Mr. Heinz is asking for is something more close to the building, and Mr. Heinz agreed.

Ms. Stark stated they are talking about "modesty because we are looking at people's hem lines." She stated there are two ways to handle this – with glass partitions and shades that roll from the bottom up so that you can adjust the height depending on where the sun is coming in and the lighting interior versus the lighting exterior, and the other way to handle it is to put a film on the glass from finished floor level up 30" or so, and that way there is a little opaqueness going on without having the impact of changing materials. She stated it would still be all glass and light can pass through it but the images behind the film are blurred.

Mr. Heinz stated with regard to glass treatment his other major concern which has bothered him from the beginning is the addition that was a "late arrival although he does not know they were advised of the date that it was installed adding he had the impression that it was around the 1930's when the clapboard enclosure of the shed roof that is attached on the north side" was installed. He stated he feels a lot of the problems they are having now with the juxtaposition of parking and people right next to the opening could be solved by having the south side of the barn go all the way down to the ground; "and having a grade-level access back in there and that is one place where they could put these explanation type of tablets or exhibits and maybe even develop a whole thing about farming in Lower Makefield and leave behind as part of their legacy about barns and why they were trying to maintain this

three-story barn which is unique.” He stated the whole south wall could then be in an “area-way” that would step down from the street and have a potential for stadium-type seating for two or three rows that would allow for presentations in that area. He stated this would make the public space wrap around the barn instead of having the side that people are eating at facing a row of parked cars since the glass goes both ways – you can see in, but you can also see out; and what is in front of you is the “nose-end of a bunch of cars which might not be the best view.” He stated he was thinking that a “bunch of the more mundane parts of the existing building which would be the entranceway, the coat room, the bathrooms that are now put into the main barn which he read in the Minutes of the previous HARB meeting that they wanted to keep as open and not impacting that with the attributes of the restaurant then the exterior of it, and if they extend it instead of having clapboard, they could have a glass enclosure that would be lined like clapboard so it would be a re-capitulation of a clapboard idea and wrapping parts of the utility spaces of the restaurant in the area that is on the north side now that would probably help a lot because it is basically plaza-type of space now and it could easily be used as functional space as part of the restaurant and leave the other side so that we can actually see walls of the barn go right down to the ground.” He stated he feels “two out of four walls is not so bad.”

Mr. Johnson stated there is a little difficulty “removing program from the south side and inserting it to the front.” He stated one problem is that they want to maintain the north side as an entry point, whether it is secondary or main, because it does have the connection to the house area and the park space. He stated they are also restricted, as was noted at previous meetings, to the western and southern side based on the Land Development Plans and where the drive aisles needed to be. He stated they cannot really expand the western face of the building any more because that starts putting them in danger of getting closer to the tree area. He stated if they were to simply remove the southern end, he feels they start to lose some of the functionality of the Commercial space because it is really minimizing the usable square footage for the future restaurant space.

Mr. Heinz stated as he has noted, he has “long found this to be one of the major concerns he has had with the way this is laid out.” He stated it would have been helpful to have talked about this “quite a while ago.” He stated covering up parts of the building and then saying they are going to put up a glass wall so you can see it, he questions why they would put it there at all if there is the potential for seeing the barn “in the round.” He stated the whole idea of “making this so that we can have the right kind of drainage and do the parking the way we want it is beyond their pay grade;” and HARB is trying to address

the issue of maintaining the look of a barn that has been deemed to be historic and they are trying to do that in a way that allows for public appreciation of it. He stated those are the reasons he is making his suggestions now because at this point there seem to be “so many concerns that are taking care of an adaptation of an existing Plan, and they are struggling.” He stated he is asking Mr. Johnson to tell him what it is “about what he is doing that is enhancing/highlighting and calling into very strong visibility the actual value of the barn as a historic treasure that we are trying to maintain.” He stated it should “not be that we are trying to minimize the impact, and it should be what are we doing to maximize the look of that barn, and he is not seeing that happening right now.”

Mr. DeLuca stated the barn has not really been seen by anyone for many years because of all of the trees that have surrounded that property. He stated he feels they are doing a lot to preserve the barn and pay homage to its roots. He stated there is connectivity between the house and the barn and having the open space, and a lot of thought was given to make the barn “the gem.” He stated he feels “this will look a lot better than LaStalla, Rocco’s, and the Yardley Inn.” Mr. DeLuca stated he feels Barton and Mr. Johnson have done a really good job “leading the charge and saying how can we make this barn feel part of the community where nobody has gotten to see it in years maybe decades unless you drove down the driveway.” He stated there is a give and take in the Land Development process, and now they have to come up with a good solution which he felt they were at. He stated given the comments at the last meeting, they wanted to give HARB Option 1 and 2 with a little further refinement whether that is facia/setbacks/connectivity and they have taken down the massing of the stone walls coming into the building. He stated they need to make this functional so it is successful for the end user as well. He stated they had hoped that tonight they could come to a conclusion of Option 1 or Option 2 with a few tweaks.

Mr. Heinz stated he has strong opinions “in one direction.” He asked the other HARB members to offer their input as to how they feel we are going to make this a valuable part of the community experience. He stated he understands what the Applicant has done was supportive of responding to the criticisms like removing the stone wall, which he feel was a very practical and reasonable solution.

Mr. Hirko stated he agrees with Mr. Heinz with the different ideas he had and with Ms. Stark with the setback of the reveals on the facia. He stated he likes the idea that Mr. Heinz came up with on the rendering of the

“lantern” which he feels would look better than the “glass pod in the corner with the shed roof on it.” Mr. Hirko stated he likes how they removed the stone from the entranceway.

Ms. Stark stated she feels the railing modification was successful. She stated she feels they understand how they should take the detachment of the new structure to the barn a little bit further to make it work. She stated she would also like them to explore the other side where the glass meets the barn, and she feels they could pull that away as well with the same treatment with the facia and make it look like a box coming against the connector that then joins to the barn. She stated she feels “it was a miss” with the lantern turning into a gabled roof with the multiple materials; and she would prefer that they stay with something similar to what was shown initially. She stated she likes the shed roof better. She stated if it is all contemporary she is fine with that or if it is more toward what Mr. Heinz showed as an alternative, she feels that is more successful than Option 2.

Mr. Heinz stated with regard to the roof structure, he was looking at the thickness of the roof and felt it might be 16” thick; and Mr. Johnson stated that is about where they are. Mr. Heinz stated he was thinking the top bar of the glass enclosure could be about 6” to 8” thick, then the actual overhang could be reduced at the outer edge so that the facia could be “an 8” thick thing.” He stated it would reduce the look of the plane and make it a bit more delicate. He stated whatever “structure has to happen, happens within the 6” or so header height of the glass that wraps around.” He stated if they need that extra space for mechanical or hanging ceiling material, that is one of the ways to make the transition which a lot of Commercial buildings do as do a lot of Residential buildings when they have the outer extension of the eaves or the gable ends and they normally make that a lot thinner than the actual thickness of the roof structure.

Ms. Lashchuk stated she still likes the connection between the new building and the barn. She stated she likes the idea of having that piece of glass between the two as an expansion joint. She noted the area just mentioned about having the “area well” at least one side of the building which will give the depth of the building because you could see it going down creating the well. She stated she feels there is room for that on the east side and that would preserve a lot of the character of the height of the barn.

Ms. Lashchuk stated she is unsure about the corner, and she stated if it is going to be contemporary and light it should be kept that way; however, if it is going to have something heavier, there should be a reason for that as a remembrance of an old historical element that was there and tie it together with the glass or just leave it all glass that way it was “on the first element.”

Ms. Lashchuk stated she does not see the reason for having all of the stone mimicking the barn on the addition. She stated she does not feel they want to mimic the barn, and they want to keep it pure, clean, simple, and light; “and the architect was there about 90%.” She also stated having the steps be floating steps going up would bring a lightening. She stated even the whole addition could have “that floating.” Mr. Heinz stated that seems very consistent with what has been proposed and what we have been talking about as a goal.

Mr. Heinz stated he knows that the Applicants were looking for an approval so that they could “take care of everything throughout the rest of the project and not have to come back to HARB; but he is loath to say that HARB would want to give up the ability, as they have for a number of other projects lately, to look at the working drawings and approve them when the time comes.” He stated we seem to be moving in the right direction, and he hopes with consideration, the Applicant could come back with how to achieve the goals and make a convincing argument HARB could agree with. Mr. Heinz stated the Applicant could then finish their working drawings, and HARB would have the “last look of approval.” Mr. Heinz stated he still does not know what is on the inside as it looks like an enclosure for a kitchen area that is going to be in the way of looking at the stone-type of barn façade that is in back of that. He stated the other wall facing west has what looks like a bar. He stated he does not know how the back bar would be handled, but it seems that most people want to put their liquor selections up on that. He stated they do not have the view of what is happening inside as well, and he feels those things need to be addressed.

Mr. Heinz stated he was hoping that Mr. Grenier would have been present to add his understanding as a Supervisor on how he would like to proceed with the request to give the go-ahead as he personally is not prepared to do that.

Mr. Harris stated what they are asking for is a recommendation for a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposal. He stated the problem with the request to see all the design drawings is that is a significant amount of money to design “these things without having any comfort level that what will be designed will be acceptable.” Mr. Harris stated the point of asking for a recommendation for a Certificate of Appropriateness is that the Applicant would then go to the Board of Supervisors who will look at the recommendation and decide whether or not to grant the Certificate of Appropriateness. He stated if that is granted, they would then go ahead and spend the considerable amount needed to put together the drawings that are being asked for which makes sense. He stated they are “hard pressed to design all of this stuff without knowing whether ultimately it is going to be approved.”

Mr. Heinz stated HARB members are members of the community, and they want to see positive development. He stated they are providing information to the Applicant in the hope that they can make some positive use of it.

Ms. Stark stated they come from an architectural background and they know what fees are and what effort is. She stated she feels that if they could see some sketches, which would not have to be renderings and a “full-blown add-on,” they could see how they are going to handle the lantern piece, which she feels is the real issue. She stated the development of the way the building progressed and the way it worked through the inside with their prospective Lessor is done, and there is nothing that HARB can comment on about that; however, she would like to see in a general way where this is headed, and then it would be much more palatable for HARB to give a recommendation that the Board of Supervisors would look at.

Mr. Marshall stated specifically with regard to the lantern, Mr. Johnson had commented that his main effort has been to keep it very light, airy, and visible; but he is hearing people say it should look more like a shed which by its nature is not light, airy, or visible. He asked if HARB could indicate which of those two they want rather than take two parallel courses. He stated if HARB wants it to be more barn-like or shed-like with a shed roof as opposed to being light and airy, it is going to block the view. Mr. Marshall stated Mr. Johnson needs to know what is HARB’s highest priority with this.

Ms. Stark stated she is in favor of the glass, and she liked the first image better than Option 2. She stated she wants a contemporary abutment to the barn. Mr. Marshall stated they have gone through an analysis and found that Option 1 was the best option.

Mr. Heinz stated he would like to see them investigate a little further “ala what he put up as a potential and he would be happy to send that to whoever should receive that so that they can look at it.” He stated it is now part of the Record and probably should be included as part of the Minutes.

Mr. Hirko stated he likes the way “Ms. Stark was going.” He stated he would be in favor of Option 1 possibly with a shed roof on that as opposed to the flat piece. Ms. Stark stated she would like to see a “form study with the glass” and some kind of a roof line. She stated the flat one may be appropriate, but it is too heavy, and Mr. Hirko agreed. Mr. Hirko added he feels the whole site line along the roof line is too heavy.

Mr. Heinz stated he feels a virtual presentation would be appropriate so that they could indicate what direction they should move on to see whether it “blocks or not.” He stated Mr. Johnson’s input would be helpful.

Mr. Hirko asked Mr. Johnson if they could have Option 1 with a shed roof on it the same line as the barn which he feels would open it up even more, and they would see more of the barn than just the flat roof in front of it. Mr. Johnson stated that perspective changes depending on where you are viewing it from. He stated from the drive aisle it would block more if it were a higher pitch. He stated there are “couple moments of when that happens and how it would be perceived.”

Ms. Helen Heinz stated she is “speaking as part of the Historic Commission but also her own opinion.” She stated she is aware of what the barn looked like when she went in to look at the furniture that was offered by the Pricketts and what is happening to it now. She stated she remembers the site visit with Mr. DeLuca and “we were assured that the barn would not be touched;” and now she is finding that it is all going to be infill to the level of an entire story underground. She stated she is “appalled,” and that is not what we expected of a three-story stone barn in Lower Makefield. She stated this structure is an old, established barn; and she does not think there is another three-story barn in Lower Makefield other than the one at Grey Nun that is in “terrible condition.” She stated to treat it like this is “distressing.” Ms. Heinz stated Mr. Marshall knows that “a lot of the additions could be worked with.” She stated personally she does not like the clapboard on the stone barn. She stated she does like “using the exterior, but she is appalled that they are using basically the barn for bathrooms; and she asked how that represents our beautiful old stone barn, and that is ridiculous.”

Ms. Heinz stated she feels there could be more creativity using the cut-away section, and she likes the idea of using different platform-type seating, and handicap-accessibility seating. She stated there is much more that could be done with the site, and she is “shocked that this seems to be all that we are considering.”

Ms. Heinz stated they should be aware that “there are a lot of other people who have checked into the meeting who are watching this, and she thinks there will be a lot of push-back if it is not done well.”

Mr. Heinz stated he hopes there is an opportunity for the Applicant to present again and show HARB a few things that he had asked Mr. Majewski to request. He stated one of them was a cross-section and the other was the virtual-reality type of walk-through that would give a sense of “what is going on even if it is a pre-packaged one – one that shows relationship of the grades and the height of the people outside looking in and what they are going to do to take care of Ms. Stark’s concern about the idea of looking at somebody’s knees, etc.”

Mr. Heinz stated a cross-section that shows the connections of how this actually goes into the barn would be very helpful even if it is just a sketch.

Mr. Heinz stated unless there is a Motion to move forward with approving this, he feels HARB has done what they can to help out tonight.

Mr. Johnson stated he is still unclear as to Option 1 or Option 2 as he does not know if there is a consensus of HARB. Mr. Heinz stated he feels something needs to be done to allow for a better view of the barn at the very least. Mr. Harris stated it was his impression that a majority of the HARB members liked the glass but there was concern about the roof treatment and whether the roof treatment was too thick or should be a shed or some other configuration and that the openness of the glass area was preferred.

Mr. Heinz stated he assumes they can move along with further adaptations and clarifications, and they will see them in September and hopefully at that point have some means of moving along. He stated he would also like to have Mr. Majewski’s input as to what he feels the process should be.

Mr. Harris stated the process is at some point HARB will have to vote to either recommend or not recommend a Certificate of Appropriateness, and the Board of Supervisors will act on it.

1700 YARDLEY-LANGHORNE ROAD (Tax Parcel #20-21-02) – RECOMMENDATION
OF APPROVAL FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

Dogwood Skate Shop – Proposed Addition to Rear of House

Owner: Richard VanHorn

Mr. VanHorn was present and stated the proposal is to move the handicap ramp. He stated the ramp is currently out front, and they are bringing it to the back on the right-hand side facing the front of the building. He stated that is where the ramp will come in to meet the building. He stated it will be 12 by 12 area for the store and it will accommodate the ramp appropriately.

Mr. Heinz asked if that has any impact on the street façade, and Mr. VanHorn stated it does not. Mr. Heinz stated they will no longer see the ramp, and Mr. VanHorn agreed. Mr. Heinz asked if Mr. VanHorn has checked if that is okay with Zoning since usually they want the handicap entrance to be visible and not “shoved out of the way.” Mr. VanHorn stated it is the entrance to the store in the back, and it will be visible as to where the handicap parking will be on the right side of the building as well.

Ms. Stark showed the Plan.

Mr. Heinz stated there are a number of sheds that are attached to the house, and he stated this would be one more of the traditional way of handling additions up against a higher than usual center section. He asked about the materials and roofing. Mr. VanHorn stated the roofing and siding will be matched. Mr. Heinz stated it does not show matching shingles on the addition. Mr. VanHorn stated the plan was to use the same shingles that were approved on the main part of the building. Mr. Heinz stated if there is a one and a half and twelve pitch those shingles “will not be authorized by the shingle company or any kind of warranty will be available on that kind of installation.” Ms. Stark stated she feels that is why they had to change it.

A gentleman with Mr. VanHorn asked if the Board is saying that the roof that is proposed to be used is not going to be accepted, and Mr. Heinz stated since it is in the back and not visible from the street, HARB would give consideration to the fact that they are trying to make the “whole system” work better. He stated he feels that this is a reasonable resolution to the addition. He stated many of that kind of addition that were installed had black rubber roofs or black bituminous roofing and that was the standard way of handling it so it is not without precedent and it is in keeping with the historic nature of the Village

from his point of view. The gentleman stated there are many houses with rolled roofs/shed roofs, and Mr. Heinz stated he is saying it is a positive thing that there are so many other instances.

Mr. Hirko stated they will have to do something because there is not enough pitch for a shingled roof; and while it was originally called out for shingles, that is why it was changed to rubber. He stated it could be rubber or a metal roof. The gentleman with Mr. VanHorn stated a metal roof would be “nice as well,” and he asked what the Board would prefer. Mr. Hirko stated he would prefer seeing a standing seam metal roof but not a corrugated roof. Mr. Heinz stated that would be at a greater expense. Ms. Lashchuk stated this is in the back and HARB is just concerned with the appearance of the home in the front. Mr. Hirko stated the rubber roof that has been called out would be fine since it is in the back.

Ms. Lashchuk asked if this really requires HARB approval. Mr. Heinz stated the sign will “be available for visual impact” coming down Yardley-Langhorne Road, and he feels it is appropriate to vote on this.

Ms. Stark moved and Mr. Hirko seconded to recommend to the Board of Supervisors approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness.

Ms. Stark stated the form, scale, and massing are all in conformance. She stated she feels this is an “elegant solution to a tricky problem.” She stated all he needs to do is to provide a sign indicating where the handicap spot is and where the entrance is located.

Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Heinz asked that the railing that was installed that is not consistent with the other railings be removed and either replaced with something that is similar or otherwise dealt with. He stated since it is only 2’ above the ground, they probably do not even need a railing there. He stated if they take away the step that is outside the door that was there for the handicap ramp to land at in order to have a roll-in door landing, it is not more than 2’ above the ground; and they would not have to have a railing. He stated it has been discussed that this was not exactly in keeping “with the original program but it is not something that they have to include as part of the discussion tonight.” Mr. VanHorn stated he does not really like it either, and that will be removed as well with the project.

1648 LANGHORNE-YARDLEY ROAD (Tax Parcel #20-016-047) – RECOMMENDATION
OF APPROVAL FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
Renovation of Existing Barn Matching Like-For-Like

Mr. Joel Petty was present with regard to the renovations to the barn that were proposed at the last meeting. He stated they have found that they are able to salvage enough siding for the front renovation to maintain it as the existing siding. He stated the proposal is to keep the front façade as renovated with the original siding refurbished and switching to Hardie plank board and batten on the other three sides past the front corner boards. He stated most of the rest of the presentation that they are proposing will remain as proposed at the last meeting with a little more development of moving into the arrangement of the existing building and the front recess. He stated the void that is there is an open barn face, and they are trying to keep the idea of the shadow line there and replacing the garage door on the service bay side of the barn which is also where the circulation and the bathroom and utility areas happen, keeping the main space open office area. He stated they would infill the void with the entry system that maintains the shadow line of the face of the existing aesthetic.

Mr. Petty stated they are able to replace the windows with new windows and adding those to the rear of the building as well, but mainly the front façade will maintain the look of the existing structure of the building. He stated they will keep the recess shadow with the infill of the black aluminum storefront, and most of this was presented at the last meeting.

Mr. Hirko stated he feels they are moving in the right direction. Ms. Stark stated this is exactly how she would like to see this barn move into the 21st Century. Ms. Lashchuk stated she agrees. Mr. Heinz commended them on their response and working with HARB which was seamless, adding the advice was utilized for the purposes that they had hoped that it make “elegant sense and utility as well.”

Ms. Stark moved, Ms. Lashchuk seconded and it was unanimously carried to recommend to the Board of Supervisors approval of the Plans as presented for a Certificate of Appropriateness.

August 9, 2022

Historical Architectural Review Board – page 18 of 18

TABLING DISCUSSION OF AD HOC PROPERTY COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS
REPORT FOR THE PATTERSON FARM

Mr. Heinz stated he would ask for a Motion to Table discussion given the time as he does not feel they have to time to discuss this tonight.

Ms. Stark moved, Ms. Lashchyk seconded and it was unanimously carried to Table discussion.

There being no further business Mr. Hirko moved, Ms. Stark seconded and it was unanimously carried to adjourn the meeting at 7:34 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Jennifer Stark, Secretary