

TOWNSHIP OF LOWER MAKEFIELD  
HISTORICAL ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD  
MINUTES – JUNE 14, 2022

The regular meeting of the Historical Architectural Review Board of the Township of Lower Makefield was held remotely on June 14, 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

Others: Jim Majewski, Community Development Director

Absent: Michael Kirk, HARB Member/Code Enforcement Officer  
Daniel Grenier, Supervisor Liaison

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

Steve Harris, Attorney, was present representing ELU DeLuca, the developer of the Commercial portion of Prickett Preserve of Edgewood. He stated also present is Ms. Lynn Alpert, Richard Grubb Associates, Mr. Paul Johnson, Mr. Vince DeLuca, and Mr. Jeff Marshall. Mr. Harris stated they are requesting a recommendation of approval of the Certificate of Appropriateness for adaptive reuse of the barn. Mr. Harris stated he believes that Mr. Majewski has shared with HARB a copy of the Power Point presentation that will be presented tonight, Mr. Harris' letter of April 1, 2022 to the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) proposing final mitigation measures, the State Historic Preservation Office's approval of those mitigation measures for both the above-ground and archeological resources, and Lynn Alpert's June 8 timeline.

Mr. Heinz asked that the background presentation be brief as HARB has a limited time because they have to adjourn by about 7:10 p.m. as the next Board meets after that.

Mr. Harris stated even though Prickett Preserve at Edgewood is not in the Historic District, the Ordinance that created the Mixed-Use District requires that the Applicant will apply for a Certificate of Appropriateness for the preservation and re-use of any historically-significant buildings; and that is the reason they are before HARB. He stated tonight they are focused on the barn. He stated the root cellar will be preserved, but it will not be adaptively reused for anything. He stated they recognize that they will have to come back to HARB when they have plans for the house. Mr. Harris stated the Final Plan Approval requires that they submit this Application for the adaptive re-use of the house and the barn.

Mr. Harris stated Ms. Alpert has done an enormous amount of work on both the archeological significance of the site and the above-ground resources. Ms. Alpert stated her company has been assisting with the State-level regulatory compliance for this project since early 2020. She stated after some initial consultation the PA SHPO asked for an archeological survey and an architectural survey. She stated as a result of those surveys they identified the Richard Janney House and the Edgewood Barn as being eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. She stated they found that just the house, the barn, and the root cellar contribute to the historic property. She stated there are other buildings on the property but SHPO did not believe they were significant or contributing to the significance of the overall historic property so she did not consider those buildings any further as a part of their studies. Ms. Alpert stated she also identified a Richard Janney House and Edgewood Barn archeological site; and through several subsequent surveys, they narrowed down the site to a small, core concentration of what was actually ultimately found eligible for listing in the National Register. She stated the site contributes to the overall eligible house and barn property under Criteria D of the National Register.

Ms. Alpert stated they then discussed with SHPO what they could do to mitigate the adverse effects that the project would result in, and part of that was recognizing that these adverse effects were already minimized pretty well due to the fact that the house, root cellar, and barn were going to be preserved as part of the project. She stated they discussed the plans for the barn with PA SHPO; and as can be seen in the documentation provided to HARB, specific mitigation measures were proposed. She stated those measures include public interpretation, and they will put together several interpretive signs to be placed around the property which they feel will be effective public outreach because of the number of people who be using the property every day. She stated they will also complete a Contact Study on English Lake District barns, which Mr. Marshall specializes in and will assist in that effort. She stated for archeology, they will do

artifact curation and will prepare a scholarly paper to be presented at a conference to be determined. She stated SHPO also asked them to consider giving a donation to the Historic Barn and Farm Foundation, and they agreed to include that measure in the mitigation. She stated in April of this year the PA SHPO agreed to the mitigation, and it will be completed over the next year.

Mr. Heinz asked that the study information that was submitted to SHPO be made available to the Township, and he asked Mr. Majewski to make sure that is made available to those interested. Mr. Majewski stated he will compile that and try to put it in a format that is easy to digest.

Mr. Paul Johnson stated he is the architect on the barn renovation and addition. He stated the original farm was from the early 1700's, and it has been owned since 1962 by the Prickett family. He stated they used the barn as an antique store, and it is still being used for that purpose currently. Images of the existing barn were shown. He stated it is a basic stone barn with some wood additions on the front of the barn which have been added at different times in the barn's history.

Mr. Johnson showed an aerial view of the property focusing on the area where the existing house and barn are located. He stated other buildings that can be seen on the site are going to be removed as part of the project.

Mr. Johnson showed an overview of the end use of the project with the apartment community to the east, the grocer to the north, and the smaller retail building surrounding the existing barn and house area.

Mr. Johnson stated the goal is to create an open, public center space within the barn and house area to preserve it as it is currently. He stated there is a significant old tree adjacent to the barn which will remain to keep the feel of the area.

Images of the proposed Retail Village were shown, and Mr. Johnson showed the house, barn, and the plaza along with some of the Retail buildings. He noted the historic tree adjacent to the barn.

Mr. Johnson stated the plan is to expand the barn to be used as a restaurant. He showed the floor plan of the barn with the main square as it currently stands stating that everything beyond that would be an addition of either the interior space of the restaurant or exterior decks that tier down to the grade around the building. He stated the goal is to not affect the interior lay-out of the barn and

to not move walls. He stated they are adding to it to create bathrooms and some restaurant space, but the idea is to use it as it is without making major modifications to the building that could not be undone. He stated the barn does have an existing second floor which will remain active and existing stairs, and it will just be used as restaurant space.

Mr. Johnson showed a rendering of the view of the restaurant from the central plaza with the barn in the back. The idea of the addition is to create a glass box around the barn; and if you are outside of the building you are constantly getting a view through the addition with the barn constantly as the backdrop of the entire building. He stated they wanted to try to make the addition “go away as much as possible” to really highlight the barn as the primary feature. He stated this rendering also shows some of the tiered decks that eventually meet with the open plaza area.

Mr. Johnson showed another view of the back of the building with the open decks and the barn as the backdrop and a view from the sidewalk that will surround the barn. He noted again that the goal is to create a glass box around the barn.

Mr. Johnson showed a rendering from the north side of the barn and the Retail area with the same idea being carried through the entirety of the addition of the glass box with minimal obstruction of the barn itself.

Mr. Heinz stated Mr. Majewski provided this presentation to the HARB members.

Mr. Harris stated this concludes their presentation, and they were focused tonight on the adaptive re-use of the barn. He stated they will be back when the plans for the house are a little more focused. He stated they were hoping for a recommendation from HARB tonight for approval of the Certificate of Appropriateness so that they can go before the Board of Supervisors and move forward with this adaptive re-use.

Ms. Stark asked about the materials to be used for the addition. She stated she was pleased to see the distinction between the historic architecture and the contemporary addition and she likes the ability to see through. She stated she would like to know more about the components of the addition.

Mr. Johnson stated it will be aluminum store-front glass with supporting walls that are a matching stone to the barn itself. He stated the lower tiered deck area would be wrapped in that stone as well as along the adjacent sidewalk to try to tie the two together. He stated the main bandings seen are a metal coping that caps the roof which is a flat roof to minimize the impact.

Mr. Hirko asked if the entire glassed area is enclosed, and Mr. Johnson stated it is. He stated while it is entirely enclosed, there will be access points to access the exterior decks from the interior.

Ms. Lashchyk stated she agrees that the glass wrapping gives the illusion to the addition to the barn; and she likes the transparency. She stated in the floor plan it appeared that there was a ramp going to a main entrance with some steps, and she asked to see the perspective of that side. Mr. Johnson stated they do not have a detailed perspective of that side because that entry is a “work in progress.” He stated it will build off of the park area. Ms. Lashchyk stated that is the one side that she would be most interested in because it is the main access to the structure, and she would like to see the main ramp, how they treat the materials, and how they incorporate the main door. Mr. Johnson showed the rendering of the original entry of the barn as well as a picture of what it looks like currently. He stated they will retain the door and some form of the awning, and that is what the ramp will work into. Mr. Lashchyk asked if they intend to keep the wood siding, and Mr. Johnson stated it will be a matching look but would be something more durable for longevity.

Ms. Lashchyk stated with regard to the floor plans it seems that from the main entrance that there is a lobby/reception area. She stated it appears that there is a considerable amount of seating area and tables. Mr. Johnson stated they chose this area because they did not want to punch through the stone part of the barn, and the rectangle to the left is where there were additions added, so they felt that would be a good area. Ms. Lashchyk asked if they feel that is a sufficient connection to the seating area, and Mr. Johnson stated they feel it will be sufficient, and the back entry will function as a separate entrance to the building. Ms. Lashchyk stated later on she assumes they will show the exits; and Mr. Johnson agreed adding that they are early on in the development. Ms. Lashchyk stated the curved ramp looks interesting.

Mr. Heinz asked for clarification on the grading as it appears that there are six steps going up to a landing level with the entrance for handicap-accessibility, and he asked if that means that some or all of the front that currently has a long ramp will be filled in and brought up to a higher

grade. Mr. Johnson stated there will be fill around the building, and that is why they placed the addition where they did. He stated it creates a buffer between the existing barn and the addition that they are adding. He stated there is a basement to this area that is used for the restaurant, but any soil that is being added to the area around the barn will be kept away from the existing barn so that structurally they are not effecting the existing barn. He noted on the floor plan to the north where there is a retaining wall to keep away from the existing windows that are on the lower level. He stated they do not intend to lose any of the existing openings of the barn and will be hidden within the addition.

Mr. Heinz noted the openings that are currently on the west side, and he asked if they will be covered with the floor level and will not be visible or accessible; and Mr. Johnson agreed. Mr. Johnson stated they will likely become openings to connect the existing basement of the barn area. He stated the future grade will come to the top of the windows; and he showed this on one of the images.

Mr. Heinz asked if that does anything to lessen the validity of this way of developing the building. Ms. Alpert stated they did assess that the project is an adverse effect in terms of working with SHPO, and some of the alterations that they are making to the barn contribute to that. She stated while they worked very hard to be respectful of the building, they are altering the building. She stated that is where a lot of their mitigation came in, in addition to the archeological site and any potential impacts there that need to be mitigated in terms of the barn and the overall land that is associated with the building. Mr. Heinz stated he understands that there will be a lot of impact on the overall stone structure, and the only wall that appears to be unaffected entirely is the east wall with the exception that there will be an “areaway” for access to the lower level; and Mr. Johnson agreed.

Mr. Heinz stated with regard to the visual impact he feels, and he has had some input from others including Mr. Grenier, their Supervisor Liaison, that the glass and steel is such a big, flat part that is being added on, and the large, plane roof that is coming up hard against the side is really what you can see from the road. He stated if they are going to highlight the stone, they should find a way to make a bigger glass wall with a slope on it or maybe an adjacent building that is part of the restaurant that helps to define the exterior court and put a glass connection that is the new part that is being built with 2,000 square feet of eating area and then the barn where people will sit and “look at during their meal.” He stated it seems that right now everyone is outside looking in, and he is not sure that is the way to highlight the historicity of this space. He stated he is thinking of an enclosure of stone or stone with modern materials – glass and steel as well; and

the western exposure would be more generous with its view of what is happening in that space. Mr. Heinz stated he is also wondering what happens in the glassed-in section on the southern exposure as it will be exposed to “solar incidents” because they took down all of the trees. He stated it might be uncomfortable to the point where they have to put up something on the inside to keep it from getting too hot and thereby reducing the access to the “visual thing which is the main exhibit here.” Mr. Heinz stated he felt they could make it a little bit lower and put “sod on the roof to bring it back and relating it to the ground that we have taken away from farming now or in general exterior pleasant aspects of the site and putting it back up there and maybe even putting in some seating area up there,” and have that be a second level that is above the ground. He stated on the ground they could still have their windows and doors that go into the lower space. He stated that lower space is “actually nice.” He stated he did a survey when they walked through the site, and it was “unbelievably carefully done with concrete and new supports for the spaces above.”

Mr. Heinz stated his main concern is with the juncture to the barn as he feels it looks like it goes right “into the side of it all around and you are left with one wall that is exposed and the other wall that is not really the historic part of the barn with a shed addition that was put on it at a later time and probably by people who were using it for Commercial purposes.”

Mr. Heinz stated on the south side there are big doors that look to be enclosed with stone although he does not feel it has been “portrayed very well because you cannot see much of it from the level of the rendering.” Mr. Johnson stated the doors are within the existing building still although they are not showing in the rendering.

Mr. Heinz stated for most of the projects that come in for review, HARB “demands some pretty stringent” documentation of what the materials are that are going to be used, and it has been indicated that this is a work in progress. He stated they need to consider what the siding will be on the shed addition and how they will deal with the “actual quoins that are going up on the corner that is exposed in the current view, and the details of how it is going up against the barn.” He stated those are critical things in terms of the architecture of the space. He stated they could indicate that they would use a certain type of glass that would have a “photo-electric internal screen that shuts off the lighting to the space instead of having a blind or a drape” so that looking in as they have in the current view, they would have the glass; “and what that does to the whole project in terms of the visibility and being

able to see the stonework.” Mr. Heinz stated his biggest concern is that he does not think that what is being requested tonight of a recommendation for “historic authenticity” can be given because they do not have all of the details.

Mr. Harris stated a recommendation on the Certificate of Appropriateness was what they were requesting, and he understands that Mr. Heinz has indicated that in order to make that recommendation, he would like more detail about the materials, how the materials are being connected to the existing barn, and some consideration of the concerns he had regarding the lower level.

Mr. Heinz stated that is correct as well as the visibility of the stone work and the use of the flat plane that goes into the side barn without differentiation or a break which “upsets him the most,” and is what Mr. Grenier pointed out to him as well. Mr. Heinz stated there have also been comments on social media about that issue.

Mr. Harris asked Mr. Johnson if he has any questions about what the Chair has been speaking about so that they can come back and answer those questions. Mr. Johnson stated he understands what Mr. Heinz is saying.

Ms. Lashchuk stated she appreciates all of the suggestions Mr. Heinz made.

Ms. Stark asked if SHPO has seen the concept design, and Ms. Alpert stated it was presented it to them. Ms. Stark asked if they commented on the fact that they were going to create an illusion that the building is actually not as tall as it originally was, and Ms. Alpert stated they did not comment on that. She stated they did not offer much and did not seem that engaged with giving detailed feedback on the design, and they were thinking more about larger mitigation.

Mr. Heinz asked how the restaurant will handle trash, and Mr. Johnson stated there are trash areas further away for the Retail site.

Mr. Heinz asked Mr. Majewski to comment on the process. Mr. Majewski stated they have made their presentation and Mr. Heinz has come up with a number of issues that they need to address specifically with regard to the materials and how things are connected which are things that are typically looked at for a Certificate of Appropriateness. He stated if they are ready they could come back to the HARB meeting next month which would be July 12 at 6:00 p.m.; and if they need more time it could be scheduled for August.

Mr. Majewski stated there is also another Application coming in which is the modifications to the barn at David Miller's property, and that will be on the next Agenda.

Mr. Majewski stated the Applicants for Prickett Preserve should let the Township know how long they will need to refine their design and renderings. Mr. Harris asked if the HARB meetings always terminate at 7:10 p.m., and it was noted that while the Park & Recreation Board normally meets right after HARB, they do not usually meet in July so that may not be an issue next time. Mr. Majewski stated it is also possible that the meeting date for HARB could be moved to another time so they have as much time as needed to go through this more thoroughly.

Mr. Heinz stated he will be unavailable on July 12, but he has provided his input; and he would ask that they take another look at their lay-out and "what happens with the solar impact on the southern wall which is quite striking in terms of restaurant lay-out and he personally tries to shy away from that." He also stated that if they could conceive of something that would be more on the west side that might give some afternoon shading to an outdoor space that would also incorporate some indoor space as well and "come up on the Plan something like an outbuilding that is related to the barn."

There was no one from the public wishing to speak on this matter.

Mr. Harris thanked the Board for the time they have taken to review the presentation and stated they appreciate the comments which will be considered. He stated they hope to be back on July 12 and work to make this project a wonderful adaptive re-use of the barn. Mr. Heinz thanked them for their presentation which was in keeping with the kind of things historic architecture is expecting to see these days.

#### APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM 4/12/22 MEETING

Mr. Hirko moved, Ms. Stark seconded and it was unanimously carried to approve the Minutes of April 12, 2022 as written.

OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Heinz stated he sent an e-mail about the video screen signage that has been attached to the charging port in front of Giant, adding they did not “bring in any kind of Sign Permit.” Mr. Majewski stated that is not located within the Historic District, and HARB’s only purview for the two shopping centers as part of the Development Agreements is for the buildings. Mr. Heinz stated it was also for the signs; however, Mr. Majewski stated it is just the signs on the buildings.

TABLING DISCUSSION OF AD HOC COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION REPORT FOR THE PATTERSON FARM

Mr. Majewski stated Mr. Heinz had indicated that he had wanted to make recommendations on the Ad Hoc Committee Report, and Mr. Heinz stated he does not feel there is time to do that this evening. Mr. Heinz stated he did review this, but he is not sure that the rest of the Board had the opportunity to do that. Mr. Heinz urged the other Board members to review the “three important directives at the beginning,” and they can consider it at a later meeting. He suggested that we request a meeting since HARB knows about architecture and they possibly could be part of the planning for the use of the space at the Patterson Farm in particular.

Mr. Heinz moved, Mr. Hirko seconded and it was unanimously carried to Table this matter.

Mr. Majewski stated the Board of Supervisors earmarked money to do a Master Plan for the Patterson Farm, and they will be looking more closely into how they could adaptively re-use any or all of the buildings that are on the Patterson Farm and the Satterthwaite Farmstead. He stated this relates to the fact that if they can find a use for a building, then they can determine what needs to be done and what is needed to be spent to modify the buildings for any kind of use.

Mr. Heinz moved, Mr. Hirko seconded and it was unanimously carried to adjourn the meeting at 7:05 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Jennifer Stark, Secretary