

TOWNSHIP OF LOWER MAKEFIELD
HISTORICAL ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
MINUTES – OCTOBER 11, 2022

The regular meeting of the Historical Architectural Review Board of the Township of Lower Makefield was held remotely on October 11, 2022. Mr. Heinz called the meeting to order at 6:04 p.m.

Those present:

Historical Architectural Review Board: Stephen Heinz, Chair
Jennifer Stark, Secretary
Michael Kirk, Member/Code Enforcement Officer
Liuba Lashchyk, Member

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

Absent: Jeff Hirko, HARB Vice Chair

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ms. Stark moved, Mr. Heinz seconded and it was unanimously carried to approve the Minutes of September 13, 2022 as corrected.

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

Mr. Steve Harris, attorney, Mr. Paul Johnson, architect, Mr. Jeff Marshall, and Mr. Joe DeLuca were present.

Mr. Heinz stated in spite of the fact that sometimes HARB seems to go beyond what is believed to be the historic effect from the road, it is done with the best intentions. He stated they worked with the developer of the Edgewood Tavern, previously owned by Mr. Miller, and a number of things discussed might have been beyond HARB's limitations from visual effect from the street; but it was done in a way that they hope made it a better project. He stated he hopes HARB

was able to point out issues that the Prickett Preserve developers “took to heart” and made some adjustments because the developers also considered them to be concerns. Mr. Heinz stated they appreciate the participation and discussion with the developer and the architects and hope that they understand that HARB would like to get the “best effect and not short-change the process.”

Mr. Harris stated his clients and consultants recognize that HARB has been acting in good faith; and while they may think that they “stretched their authority a little bit,” they understand their motivation and know that it is in good faith. Mr. Harris stated Mr. Johnson will review the revisions that have been made since the last meeting which they feel address the concerns that were raised.

Mr. Johnson stated the property was previously owned by the Prickett family which had been running an antique store out of the property since they purchased it in the 1960’s. He showed pictures of the existing barn as it stands today and the area around the barn. He showed an aerial of the Prickett site including the existing house and the barn to the left side. He showed the Master Plan of the site with the house, barn, and central park location surrounded by Retail with a grocer and 200 apartment units with a club house to the south of the project. An enhanced Landscape Plan was shown demonstrating the open park area and the landscaping around the general site with the focus being a public, central open space between the existing barn and the existing house. A close-up of that area was shown. Views showing the relationship of the house and the barn were shown.

Mr. Johnson stated they included the approved Land Development Plan for reference.

Mr. Johnson showed the first and second-floor Plans for the barn to be used as a restaurant with outside, terraced seating. They are maintaining the existing entry of the barn. Plans also show the back-of-house service entry to the restaurant area. A general detail of the barn was shown demonstrating the minimal connection they are trying to make to the existing barn by keeping the new structure of the addition off-set from the barn so as to not bear any weight on the existing barn except for the small tie-in at the new roof where it ties into the existing barn. He stated this is a necessity for weather-proofing/water-proofing.

A perspective from the park side of the building was shown demonstrating the terraced seating areas of the outdoor space for the barn with a wall that opens to connect the inside and the outside of the barn with the primary focus being creating a glass box around the barn to highlight that the barn is the backdrop of the building and not that the addition is intended to take over the perspective.

Mr. Harris stated that one of the comments in earlier meetings was that there was a stone facing on the lower levels, and there was appropriate criticism that that took away from the stonework of the barn. He stated all of the lower levels have been changed to stucco as a neutral facing. Mr. Johnson stated they went with the color palette that is similar to the stone, but they did not want to try to match the stone. He showed another perspective with the corner wrapped and screened with landscaping. He stated at the last meeting there was discussion about creating a landscaping buffer to try to soften how the building meets the pedestrian walkways, and they incorporated additional landscaping along the southern portion of the building. He stated this did screen some of the lower portion where it will be a continuation of the stucco around the corner.

A view of the southeastern corner of the building was shown where they had previously pulled back the addition of the building to expose more of the corner of the barn. He stated at the last meeting it was discussed that this was a “big concrete pad,” and so in continuing with the softening of the landscaping, they took away some of the concrete to create more of a landscaped area and an opportunity to drop in an art piece that will be a focal point for this main thoroughfare of the site at the corner. Mr. Johnson stated they wanted to demonstrate that they are taking into consideration downspouts and rainwater collection, but they wanted to keep it off the corner of the building to expose the quoins of the existing barn and tried to tuck it away to the new addition service entry behind the landscaped area.

Mr. Johnson stated they further evaluated the rendering with the grading with the civil engineer, and they are able to determine that the renderings were misrepresenting the grade to an extent, and in actuality the grade around the barn is at a lower level than what they were previously showing on the slide. He stated they have gained about a foot and a half which exposes a bit more of a barn wall. He stated the well in actuality will not end up as deep as initially expected, and it will be almost at grade at the northern end of the building and dropping to about 42” at the southern end of the building. He stated there had been concern expressed about

the depth of the well with regard to maintenance, and this gives them an opportunity to have a gate access at the north end that is easily accessible for maintenance – trash pick-up, leaf cleaning, etc.; and it also lessens the drop-off into the well.

Mr. DeLuca stated where the gravel is, it is very close, if not, at the existing grade of what is at the barn currently; and Mr. Johnson agreed. Mr. Johnson stated they start at the existing grade at the north end. He stated this is the build-up that they are doing with the approved Land Development Plans to level the site around the building; and at the southeastern corner, they are only losing about 42" of the existing barn's exposure. Mr. DeLuca stated previously they were showing the well at the southern end to be about 7' to 7 ½', and in reality it is 42" or 3 ½'. He stated at the northern end it is 6" to 8", and Mr. Johnson stated they built a slight step-down. Mr. DeLuca stated previously it was 3' at that end. He stated they feel that this is a nice improvement from previous presentations.

Mr. Johnson stated they also previously discussed lowering the curb and raising the railing. He stated they have it at a 42" height and there is a low curb to divert water out of the area, but they wanted to make sure that they do not have a "climbing situation." He stated even though it is a smaller drop, it is still a drop; and they want to protect the well area.

The rendering of the rear service entry area was shown. He stated in previous slides they were continuing the banding on the left side across the rear entry of the building, but they wanted to lighten it up by creating more glass to have less of a solid piece at the barn connection. He stated this now is a lighter feeling that what had previously been shown.

Mr. Johnson showed a slide demonstrating the rainwater control dropping in the rain leaders which are connected to the underground system.

Mr. Johnson showed a diagram of the well with the anticipated grades. He stated they had looked into what it would take to eliminate the well all together and not have a railing but use a sloped grading from the area; but even with the lesser grade, the diagram on the right shows the slope they would need to maintain which would only leave about 3 ½' of sidewalk along the eastern end of the barn; and that functionally will not work given the general requirements of having a 5' sidewalk. He stated this is also a main thoroughfare so it would be a tight area. Mr. Johnson stated they feel that with the grading of the barn and the impact of the well the screening of the barn is not as impactful as what they had previously demonstrated.

Slides were shown which had been seen previously by the Board demonstrating the visual screening at the table level in the restaurant. A rendering was shown of the alternate connection of the glass coming up to the existing barn on the original barn addition toward the front entry of the north end of the building. The night renderings were also shown which have been updated to show the landscaping along the edge and the up-lighting that they want to provide on the roof addition that would shine up on the barn to show the barn wall as a “glowing focal point at a nighttime setting” which is when this will primarily be used.

Mr. Johnson showed the renderings of the sun exposure which had been shown previously.

Mr. Johnson stated they also updated their materials to reflect the stucco versus stone.

Mr. Heinz asked Mr. Johnson to discuss his reasoning for his final decisions as to how he adjusted the Plan to respond to previous HARB comments. He noted the Minutes from the last meeting where Ms. Lashchuk had indicated that she saw the corner as being a “positive relationship to the extension of the areaway so that the areaway does not have to end with the south wall of the barn,” and they could extend the space where they have established the “visual highpoint – the sculpture that was mentioned.” Mr. Heinz stated he feels that what they have done is a step in the right direction, but he would ask that they extend the section study from the east wall showing the areaway and the sidewalk beside it, and extend that a little bit and show what it would look like from the south walkway adjacent to the parking, and then what kind of grades would be involved there taking it down to about the same depth at the corner of the barn. Mr. Heinz stated that by doing the “section” you gain a lot of information, and he would like them to proceed with a further study to see what “that would be in the corner.” He stated maybe the walkway from the service door could turn south once you come out to a landing at that door, and it would be a 4’ to 5’ wide walkway that would extend from there to the street and the walkway on the south. He stated if there is space between the trees and the edge of the cars, that might be enough of a walkway, and the trees could be back closer to the building as well and help provide shade for that side of the building.

Mr. Heinz stated he would like a clear explanation including what is entailed by the skylight idea that was discussed to a great extent at the last meeting as a way to separate the edge of a solid construction from the face of the barn so that the glass box is just touching “carefully” against it. He stated

he is very concerned that what is shown in the section is really a full-depth attachment to the side of the barn. He stated even though “there are different conditions that will happen with the doors opening there, the spaces between the doors, and below the window at the west end of the south wall, those conditions all vary and have a lot to do with how to proceed.” He stated his experience with glass roofs is that it is just an upper sill that is attached. He stated he recognizes that it is considerably more expensive, and he understands that there might be some resistance to that; but the real effect to that off-set is going to be “something that sets us apart as what they said it was going to be – something that touches just gently against an older structure and gives it the care and understanding that we would like to be shared with the public.”

Mr. Johnson stated it can be a costly detail and waterproofing is always a concern when putting glass as a roofing material especially against a building. He stated they are attaching some level of flashing to the building to protect that transition point; and from a visual impact, they are really not having a negative impact when you cannot perceive it from the exterior ground of the building. He stated they are not certain that they could achieve what Mr. Heinz is asking for, and they would not want to promise something that they could not deliver on. He stated they know that they can get a solid roof to work with minimal impact on the building aside from flashing. He stated they would have the same flashing for a skylight, but they would have a different thickness to support the glass, and to have to support the back end of the glass against the barn might actually mean more impact and more mounting to the existing barn.

Mr. Heinz stated a section study would be a lot more convincing than just Mr. Johnson’s description; and he feels “being visually-oriented, they could very easily be convinced.”

Ms. Stark thanked the applicants for responding so thoughtfully to a lot of the HARB comments, and she feels it definitely has a lighter look now removing that masonry foundation base. She stated the amount of glass is great.

Ms. Stark stated if they have to have the railing, perhaps it could be the same color as what is being shown on the fascia soffit of the addition so it “goes away more.” Mr. DeLuca stated it could be similar to the color of the downspout, and Ms. Stark agreed. Mr. DeLuca stated it would be more of an earth tone than black, and Ms. Stark agreed.

Ms. Stark stated the landscape architect could explore the “cut-out” and reposition the walkway to the service entrance, although she recognizes that is really beyond what HARB can comment on. She stated adding the green and the public art is wonderful for any public space.

Ms. Lashchuk stated she feels this is a nice improvement and is going in the right direction. She stated she is still concerned about the connection and how the glass is articulating with the masonry with the box structure. She stated when you look at the fascia, it is going straight into the wall. She stated if there were to even be a small reveal going inside, it would create a break so that it is barely attached. She stated they should do the same thing on both sides. She does not feel structurally that would be a major issue having the fascia breaking and then there being an indentation going in and then connecting to the stone.

Mr. Johnson stated they did start with a smaller indentation of a 12 by 12 square to create a smaller recess, and through discussions, it has evolved into something larger through previous input from HARB.

Mr. Heinz stated looking at where the downspouts come down it seems that it “may be more of a problem.” He stated Mr. Johnson had stated he was keeping it back from the corner to allow for the quoins to be visible; but he feels if it were just to the right of the door on the south wall (the easternmost door), they might achieve the same end as they have now getting rid of the water from the roof which he felt was the main issue “that sponsored this move.” He stated that would also give a possible opportunity to take the eastern fascia and bring it back even if they have the door set back and have the fascia set back just at the wall and continue the line all the way back until you get to that indentation that Ms. Lashchuk was looking for.

Ms. Lashchuk stated she agrees. She stated she does not feel that the downspout there really adds anything to the design.

Mr. Johnson stated he understands the comments with regard to the downspout, but he is still not clear as to the connection detail. Mr. Harris stated they moved that whole section back to expose that section of the wall, but that is the service entrance to get downstairs to the kitchen so there is a limit as to how far it can be set back and still access the stairs now that they have moved the whole section back away from the corner.

Mr. Heinz stated “keeping the door in a section of wall and framing that is set back from the glass makes diagrammatic sense and design sense as well;” but having the fascia be continuous even extending out a little bit over the glass coming out toward the eastern exposure and have it contiguous all the way back to the wall except for the little indentation will make it the same depth back as the door. He stated “the glass wall would be there, the door steps back, but the fascia continues until it gets to the point where they want to highlight the break/intersection; and that becomes that 1’ off-set or 8” off-set whatever it has to be to achieve what they are looking for.”

Mr. Harris asked Mr. Johnson if he understands what they are suggesting. Mr. Johnson stated it sounds like previous renderings that they have shown. Mr. DeLuca stated he understands that they want them to relocate the downspout to the other side of the doors, and they want the “ribbon” to go continuous so that there will be an 8” to 12” overhang in front of the door. He stated there is “no turning back that ribbon to intersect with the building, and that just goes straight across,” and the door remains set back. Mr. Heinz agreed; however, Ms. Lashchuk disagreed and added that there is a little set back of the fascia. Mr. DeLuca stated he was hearing that the fascia was to go all the way across and the glass wall is in one plane, and there is a setback whether it is 8” or 12” where the entrance door is, but the fascia would continue in a straight line and does not have any return and just the door is setback. Ms. Lashchuk stated her point was that the fascia would have a little setback there so that they would create a detachment from the cube, and it would be standing by itself and just barely you see the fascia in the back. She stated it does not have to be anything large. She stated 1’ of the fascia would be breaking in and connecting to the stone.

Mr. DeLuca stated he wants to make sure that they are clear on the fascia and how they want that. Mr. Harris stated there is still confusion. He asked if they are suggesting that the wall should be flat and the door should not be set back and there should not be an 8” glass space between the dining room wall and the door well. Ms. Lashchuk disagreed adding that the suggestion is to keep everything exactly the way they are showing it with the glass and the door. She stated it appears that the fascia over the door is a foot over and “maybe the glass door is recessed.”

Mr. Johnson showed the Plan and stated maybe it is not representing in the renderings, but the door is set back 1’ from the face of the wall. He stated the door to the right is 1’ back from the glass panel he showed on the Plan, and the roof starts to pull back with it to create a visual setback. Mr. Heinz

stated the point is that the roof should not be set back at that point but only when it gets close enough to the barn to make a “statement about we are breaking it back at that point.” Ms. Lashchyk agreed.

Mr. Harris stated he understands that they are to come across and leave a break of the last 6” to 8” before the wall. Mr. Heinz and Ms. Lashchyk agreed. Mr. Heinz stated that would become the setback to the glass that is around the door.

Ms. Lashchyk stated with regard to the well, she is happy that the height has been reduced to be able to appreciate the stone of the barn, but she is not sure that they need to have the well go corner to corner. She asked if the well could be pushed more inside on both sides. She stated it appears to be gravel, and she asked if there could be a step so it would not just look like a “straight well,” and it would have the drain close to the stone, and then having one step and it would slope to the area that is lower or have no step and adjust it according to the topography. She stated she would like it to be less of a well but still showcase the stone and the scale of the barn.

Mr. Johnson asked if she is asking for terracing within the well itself, and Ms. Lashchyk agreed.

Mr. Heinz asked the width of the walkway, and Mr. Johnson stated it is about 10’. Mr. Heinz asked if it would be a problem if it were 8’. He stated the last 2’ could be the step that Ms. Lashchyk is suggesting which might help make it a little less of a drop off. He stated they could continue to have the railing to keep people out. He stated this would let more light into this area. Mr. DeLuca stated the bottom of the window well is following the existing grade.

Mr. Heinz stated getting rid of railings would be a help in a way if it is not too steep of a drop-off and not required for safety.

Ms. Lashchyk stated not starting the well at the corner would also open up the space where they are proposing to have the green area with the sculpture.

Mr. Harris stated Ms. Lashchyk is suggesting that rather than wrap the well around the south corner, they would actually step the retaining wall back toward the window; and Ms. Lashchyk agreed that is correct – on both sides. Mr. Harris stated that would shorten the well. They are suggesting that if they were to remove the well and make it 2’ wider, they might put steps in

rather than a straight-down retaining wall, and then pull it in from both of the corners to reduce it. They would keep the windows, but they would get less of an impact, and Ms. Lashchyk agreed.

Mr. DeLuca stated on the easterly side, they are still going to need to have a retaining wall whether it is part of the wall or a retaining wall. He stated they could create steps coming in from the south side. He stated the north side is 8" and that is a step as it is. He stated they will still need a wall on the easterly side because there is a 3 ½' difference in elevation so they will need some type of railing there to prohibit someone from falling over the edge. He added that the well is a lot more shallow than what it was before.

Mr. Grenier stated as part of the larger development there was discussion about shutting down the street and "doing some stuff on the sidewalks," and he asked if the 10' wide walkway is set up for that too; and Mr. DeLuca agreed. Mr. DeLuca stated all of the parking that is between Building 4 and the barn and Building 2 and all of that sidewalk is at the same elevation. He stated when they were developing the central area, there was discussion that it could be shut down for certain events and everything was on the same grade. Mr. DeLuca stated there could be small festivals, music, street vendors, etc. as community events.

Mr. Heinz stated they have achieved a lot in terms of the setback of the glass wall corner and how the whole corner is developed and it could be open to further discussion and further presentations to HARB and the Board of Supervisors. He stated he feels they are at the point where everyone is on the same page as to how to proceed. He stated he feels it would be helpful to get a sense of the Board with an understanding of the agreement "with the concept and the way of proceeding, and the applicant could then come up with the details so that the Board could do a final sign-off when the Plans are to the point where they are 80% of construction documents."

Mr. Harris stated they have identified several conditions, and the only "no" they have is the glass skylight as they cannot promise something that they do not know that they can deliver. He asked if there could be a Motion tonight to recommend a Certificate of Appropriateness with the revisions that were discussed to the service entrance door, the idea that rather than a flat surface in the well that it be stepped down, that the downspout be moved beyond the wooden doors, that the railing around the well be painted an earth tone to match the downspouts, and that the ends of the well would be pulled in.

Mr. Harris stated they are anxious to get to the Board of Supervisors adding that the Board of Supervisors will also have comments. Mr. DeLuca stated he would accept the conditions outlined by Mr. Harris.

Ms. Stark stated she would also ask that they add that with regard to the opposite side of the building opposite the service door that they make that fascia run straight as well and do the same kind of setback. Mr. Harris stated that would be acceptable.

Mr. Heinz stated with other Plans in the Historic Village, the Plans that are acceptable for Final Approval are ones that have all of the details and are part of the Building Permit process. He stated this development might have a special approach as to how they are to proceed. Mr. Majewski stated this is a process that is somewhat different from what the Historical Architectural Review Board has purview over in the Historic District although the Board of Supervisors did want HARB to have the ability to review this and offer suggestions as they have to come up with a product that was worthy of what would be approved in the Historic District in Edgewood Village. He stated procedurally he feels it would be fine for HARB to make a Motion to recommend approval, but he would suggest that they add a recommendation that when they have the Building Plans finalized, if the Board of Supervisors approves the Certificate of Appropriateness, that the applicant come back to HARB to finalize that and make sure that it complies with what they were looking at.

Mr. Grenier stated when they wrote the Ordinance, the intent was to mimic the Historic District with respect to HARB's review of the site/buildings. He stated in terms of conditional approvals, he sees this as similar to a conditional approval of a Site Plan. He stated they wanted to make sure that HARB played a key role in this in order to maintain the visual aesthetic of the historic resources that are here so that there is not a negative impact on the viewshed even if they are doing something that is more modern and to insure the integrity of the buildings in the long term. He stated there has been great back and forth between HARB and the developer team and everyone has benefited from that. He stated he feels it would be appropriate to vote to recommend approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness with the Conditions that Mr. Harris, Ms. Stark, and Mr. Majewski added; and he believes that the Board of Supervisors would be willing to address that. He stated he also feels that these issues should be addressed when the developer comes before the Board of Supervisors so that everyone can see it, and HARB members could indicate that this is what they wanted to see.

Mr. Majewski stated the way Mr. Grenier has laid it out is how he would envision it that HARB would make a Motion to recommend the approval of the Certificate of Appropriateness subject to the changes as outlined by Mr. Harris and Ms. Stark. He stated they could also include that the developer come back to them with the final details or if they are comfortable that they could circulate those informally.

Mr. Heinz stated from the beginning one of the things that was discussed and was a major “sticking point” was how the new building comes up against the existing barn; and it was noted a number of times that they would like to see it done in a way that would make the barn sacrosanct in a way and whatever we did could be undone. He stated that is something that has led to a number of things visually and functionally. Mr. Heinz stated the number one issue that he would want to be addressed by the final drawings would be how they “flash” this into the barn; and if a glass reveal would be doable and worth the effort which he feels it is. He stated if they have a “section at that point that says here is how we are touching the barn and this is how it could be undone, that would be a critical part of the answer that we would have to have in order to make the recommendation and it is an understood caveat.” He stated the second part of that is that “since pulling back the corner of the glass box that would have a story underneath it most likely and having the stairs go down would keep whatever structure earth surcharge away from the wall of the building that cannot be said about the earth that they would put in there to create the green space that we have said is very desirable and saying that is a nice solution for that corner.” He stated the idea of dropping whatever grade level there is in that area down to almost the grade of the existing earth as it is now, then we would be taking away any possibility of having a side load on those stone walls below the new grade. He stated if that can be addressed in what they do for the resolution of the corner, he feels that “would also go forward.” Mr. Heinz stated “rule number one” would be to respect the consideration that they do no damage and leave no trace and leave it as pristine as it was before.

Mr. Heinz stated he feels the other suggestions made tonight are very valid and as Mr. Harris put “it together, it makes some sense,” and he could ask for a Motion to approve the design as it is with the conditions that we have stated, and that be circulated in terms of the Minutes; and any other documentation that Mr. Harris may want to present to HARB as the understanding by DeLuca so that we can move along with a vote on the project.

Ms. Stark asked Mr. Heinz if he is suggesting that the glass connection along the entire length of the addition is what he wants to add to the Conditions. Mr. Heinz stated he would like a study to say what the difference would be between putting the actual roof/roof structure up against the barn and what that would look like in terms of “a simple solution with readily-available materials not coming up with something custom but something that says here is what the impact would be if we had the glass and what the impact would be now that they are going with the idea of a roof tied to the wall.” He stated this is something that HARB has been asking to be addressed, and he would like to see it addressed. He stated it will not change the look, and it should not “have anything to do with what we decide tonight.”

Ms. Stark stated she did not know if she could add that to a Motion because the way that the interior space is treated and what is happening at the ceiling, they are expecting someone standing inside the space to be able to look up, scan the stone wall, and see through at the glass connection. Mr. Heinz stated that would be the point of doing the exercise of seeing if it were possible. He stated this should be a simple design idea that could be easily investigated in half a day’s work.

Mr. Harris stated they are concerned about promising something that they cannot accomplish and the whole point of washing the wall with light in the evenings is to highlight the barn to the entire area around that barn; and he feels that is accomplishing what Mr. Heinz is seeking to achieve that the structure of the barn and the masonry is going to be featured in the design development of this adaptive re-use. Mr. Heinz stated while he understands Mr. Harris’ point, the reason he started out with “do no damage to the existing structure” was to look at those techniques – one where you take a roof structure and you run it tight to the wall or the other to have a glass separator, or even a metal separator. He stated he is looking for a study that says if they put a solid roof up against the wall of the barn, they are not going to create a problem if they decided in the future to remove this.

Mr. DeLuca stated whether it is glass, metal, or something else, there is a connection to the barn. He stated whether it is a metal or glass connection to the barn it will be fastened to the barn through some type of reglet and flashing detail. Mr. Harris stated he feels that Mr. Heinz is indicating that the design should minimize any impact to the barn so that in the event that the building was removed, the damage to the barn would be minimized; and he feels that is a reasonable goal. Mr. Heinz stated that is the reason he would suggest the study. He stated each of those processes have a different manner of construction, and

his experience is that one does not have a greater impact than the other. He stated he is asking that be looked into as part of the whole process of keeping the impact on the side walls of the barn, especially on the south side, to be studied thoroughly until they finally build it. He added that right now the rest of the structure is going to be approved if the members go along with it tonight. He stated he would like to see that review before they “give it the final blessing” once they have all the drawings done.

Mr. Grenier stated two main things they are concerned about are maintaining the visual aesthetic of the barn and maintaining the structural integrity of the barn and doing no damage. He stated when they come before the Board of Supervisors and discuss the connection to the barn, they should explain how it is connected, what it looks like, how they are minimizing potential impacts to the physical structure of the barn, and explain why they are doing it that way. Mr. Grenier stated if it is a study like Mr. Heinz is talking about, that may be the best way to do it. He stated the “basic comment they would make is prove it to me,” and let the Board understand exactly how they are going to minimize any potential impact to the barn in the event that the new structure is separated from the barn at some point in the future.

Mr. Harris stated there will be the necessity of a connection, and he understands that they are looking that that connection be the minimal connection that they can propose and still have everything being structurally-sound; and Mr. Grenier agreed.

Mr. Marshall stated it is not a conversation between glass and roof – it is the least intrusive method possible that Mr. Heinz is interested in, and Mr. Heinz agreed. Mr. Marshall stated that is a different conversation from what we had earlier, and he feels it is a much more important one based on reversibility. Mr. Majewski stated he believes that Mr. Harris summarized it well earlier about making it the minimal impact on the building, and Mr. Heinz agreed.

Mr. Harris stated they would appreciate a Motion to recommend to the Board of Supervisors approval of a Certificate of Approval based upon the Conditions that he outlined and were supplemented by the continued discussion.

Ms. Stark moved and Ms. Lashchyk to recommend to the Board of Supervisors approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness conditioned on revisions to the service entrance door that were discussed, rather than a flat surface in the well that it be stepped down, that the downspout be moved beyond the wooden doors, that the railing around the well be painted an earth tone to match the downspouts, that the ends of the well be pulled in, with regard to the opposite side of the building opposite the service door that they make that fascia run straight as well and do the same kind of setback, and that the connection of the new structure to the barn be the minimal connection that they can propose and still have everything being structurally-sound.

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

Mr. Grenier thanked HARB for their diligent review and thoughtful comments and ideas.

Motion carried with Mr. Heinz opposed.

Mr. Heinz stated while it has been a process, he feels HARB has highlighted a few things that have been nicely addressed.

There being no further business, Ms. Stark moved, Mr. Heinz seconded and it was unanimously carried to adjourn the meeting at 7:25 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Jennifer Stark, Secretary