

Historical Architectural Review Board

August 1st, 2022 Meeting Minutes

Hybrid Meeting

In attendance was Larry Peseski (Chair), Scott Minnucci (Vice Chair), Marnie Newman, CL Lindsay, Buz Teacher, Patrick Strzelec (Associate Member), Nancy Ruddle, Steven Young, Zachary Zubris (Zoning Officer), and Emily Kopach (HARB Administrator)

Absent: Hanna Howe (Liaison)

I. Call to Order

Chair Peseski called the meeting to order at 6:00 pm and noted that HARB did have a quorum.

I. Approval of Minutes, June 6th, 2022, & July 7th, 2022

Marnie Newman stated that she has her edits for the meeting minutes of June 6th, 2022 and to add the edits to the minutes in red. The approval of those minutes has been tabled.

Upon a motion by CL Lindsay, seconded by Marnie Newman, the July 7th, 2022 minutes were approved unanimously.

II. New Business

- a. **HARB 2022-15 – Mark Worth (2610 River Rd, TMP #41-030-002) Demolition of existing greenhouse. Demolition of cinder block exterior chimney. Both are part of restoration of existing building which is in progress. Leads are Larry Peseski, Scott Minnucci, and Buz Teacher.**

Mark Worth was present on behalf of his application.

Larry Peseski opened the floor to the leads of the application for comments.

Buz Teacher stated that neither the chimney nor the greenhouse was original. He believes that they both detract from the original intention of the designers and that it is appropriate to remove both.

Larry Peseski agreed that the greenhouse is in bad shape and obscures an attractive part of the property. He asks when the chimney was installed.

Mark Worth stated it was installed sometime in the late 60s or the early 70s.

Larry Peseski asked why he wants to remove it.

Mark Worth responded by saying its not appropriate. He believes it's a cinderblock chimney, a modern addition on a period house. He is unsure of how well the chimney works, as it is an exterior chimney.

Larry Peseski asked if his intent is to restore the property to the original design.

Mark Worth replied that it is.

Larry Peseski asked Zach Zubris if there are any potential issues for Mark Worth on the zoning side for these demolition projects.

Zach Zubris replied that there is not, as long as he fills out the proper permits.

Nancy Ruddle asked Mark Worth if there is going to be something to replace the chimney after it is taken down.

Mark Worth stated that at the moment he does not have a plan for a replacement.

Marnie Newman asked how Mark Worth would vent the fireplace without a replacement.

Mark Worth replies that there is not going to be a fireplace.

Nancy Ruddle mentioned the demolition component of the maintenance manual, in which it states not to cut off any historic components of the building. She goes on to mention how there are a lot of different historic elements that make up Phillips Mill, and that it is not just one style of architecture.

Nancy Ruddle asked if the chimney was designed by Mr. Brooks.

Mark Worth responded that to his knowledge it was.

Nancy Ruddle said that he is a well-known architect and that is something to consider.

Marnie Newman also stated that from her experience, exterior chimneys do work and so she believes the chimney could work.

Marnie Newman asked what building this was in reference to the property, if it used to be his studio or workshop. She then asked if Mark Worth is sure if the chimney is not original.

Mark Worth confirmed that what was drawn was not what was built.

Larry Peseski said he would like to see the original plans, as the language of demolition in the maintenance manual would suggest as it is now that the chimney should stay other than it's potentially not appropriate.

Patrick Strzelec asked if the fireplace vented the interior hearth.

Mark Worth stated there is no interior unit.

Mark Worth stated that he believes this is a modern looking chimney on a period building. He said he would put it back to how it was originally, using stone.

Nancy Ruddle showed a picture in the Historic Guidelines where the chimney is shown, and under it states how Phillips Mill district is a mixture of different styles, both colonial-Tudor style and gothic-arts and crafts style.

Nancy Ruddle stated that she believes the chimney is historic in the way that the previous owner, who is a well-known architect, put it on in his style, and it adds to the charm of Phillips Mill district.

Nancy Ruddle stated that she is in favor of removing the greenhouse; it is in a state of disrepair. The chimney is not, and adds to the historic nature.

Scott Minnucci stated that the chimney is an add on, meaning that the timeline of the chimney does not match the history of the rest of the house. So, it can be removed without taking away from the history of the house.

Mark Worth also stated that there is water infiltration coming in from the chimney. There was a concrete capping that they tried to incorporate that chimney to the existing building. Taking the chimney out is important for him to fix other parts of the building, such as the roof.

Marnie Newman wants more information for the chimney before a motion is made. She wants what he plans to do with the end wall, and when the chimney was put up.

Nancy Ruddle also wants to see a proposal for the wall once the chimney is gone.

Mark Worth stated that once the chimney is gone, it won't be visible from the roadside.

Nancy Ruddle still wants to know how he will patch the hole when the chimney is gone.

Marnie Newman wants to know what date the chimney was installed.

Scott Minnucci asked resident Eleanor Miller, who is sitting in attendance, if she knew what date the chimney was installed.

Eleanor Miller stated that the chimney was previously there, and that Mr. Brooks did not put it on. It was there prior to 1961.

Brett Webber, a resident in attendance, posed the question that this part of the structure predates the Phillips Mill Historical Nomination in 1983, and so does that not make it important and historic, regardless of who made it?

Larry Peseski stated that the bigger view is preservation. If it is an owner's request to properly restore a property, that is very important. And there needs to be some sort of compromise.

Larry Peseski asked Mark Worth to return with more information on the chimney for the next meeting.

Marnie Newman requested if there is a spot where he could take a section of the chimney for an example to see what it is made out of.

Upon a motion by Scott Minnucci, seconded by CL Lindsay, it was (unanimously) agreed to recommend issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness to TMP# 41-030-002 as follows:

1. The demolition of the existing greenhouse has been approved.
2. The demolition of the cinderblock exterior chimney has been tabled until more information is provided.
3. The information requested is as follows: the dating of the chimney, classification of construction, and any photographs and documentation that may be applicable.
4. It has also been requested that the applicant provide a proposal of the restoration of the exterior stone wall after the chimney has been removed.

III. Old Business

a. Concealment of Commercial Dumpsters – Submission for Approval

Reviewing the motion for the Concealment of Commercial Dumpsters before it appears in front of the Board of Supervisors for approval.

Upon a motion by Nancy Ruddle, seconded by Steve Young, it was (unanimously) agreed to move forward to the Board of Supervisors the amendment to concealing commercial dumpsters. It is agreed upon as follows:

1. Wooden fences and stone walls or other appropriate screening materials would be acceptable materials for concealing dumpsters.
2. If the enclosure is damaged, it is to be replaced or fixed.
3. The doors to the enclosure must remain closed when not in use.
4. The enclosure must be large enough for the doors to close.

Larry Peseski asked Zach Zubris if the board would be able to enforce these guidelines and timelines for the dumpster being replaced when they are broken.

Zach Zubris replied that the typical timeline is 30 days and his usual first response would be to send a letter.

b. Develop Final Timeline for Guideline Review and Submission for Approval

Going over the final timeline for the review of the Design Guidelines before they are submitted to the Board of Supervisors for approval.

Larry Peseski said he would be sending the completed guidelines to the Board of Supervisors soon.

Emily Kopach said she would send out the updated guidelines to everyone.

Larry Peseski stated that with how busy the next meeting is, the discussion of the guidelines would wait until October. He stated that it is not being reedited, just reviewed.

Larry Peseski stated that the deadline reading through for any obvious omissions is 30 days, meaning early September, September 2nd. The next 30 days after that would be aiming for a publishable version.

V. Public Comment

There was no further public comment.

VI. Adjournment

Upon a Motion by Marnie Newman, seconded by CL Lindsay, the HARB virtual meeting was adjourned at 7:18 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Emily Kopach

HARB Administrator

Solebury Township