

**Historical Architectural Review Board**  
September 19, 2022 Meeting Minutes  
Hybrid Meeting

In attendance was Larry Peseski (Chair), Scott Minnucci (Vice Chair), Marnie Newman, Steve Young, CL Lindsay, Patrick Strzelec, Zachary Zubris (HARB Administrator/Zoning Officer), Hanna Howe (Board of Supervisors Liaison)

Public:

Absent: Nancy Ruddle and Buz Teacher

**I. The meeting was called to order by Chairman Peseski at 6:00pm and noted HARB did have a quorum.**

**II. Approval of Minutes – August 1, 2022**

**Upon a motion by CL Lindsay seconded by Scott Minnucci the August 1, 2022 minutes were approved unanimously.**

**III. Continued Business**

**a. Action on Mr. Worth**

**2610 Old Carversville Road, New Hope, PA 18938**

**(Phillips Mill Historic District)**

**HARB Application # 2022-15**

Mr. Worth was not present of behalf of the application dated July 6, 2022.

HARB is reviewing the application to recommend approval of demolition of cinder block exterior chimney. It is part of the restoration of the existing building which is in progress.

Ms. Newman questioned if Mr. Worth would restore the window that was originally in the gable after she found a sketch from 1923 that showed the building without a chimney but containing a window in the gable.

Mr. Minnucci, on behalf of Nancy Ruddle, mentioned that Ms. Ruddle suggested that once the chimney was down, the intention would be to repair the stonework and the mortar work to match the existing walls.

Mr. Strzelec commented that Mr. Worth previously mentioned there was a hole cut in the wall and that the fireplace was added to the building and there most likely was a charred surface from the chimney itself.

**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. Remove the exterior cinderblock chimney on the outbuilding.**
- 2. Restore the wall with stone and mortar joints to match existing.**
- 3. Repair any charring that is found after chimney is removed.**

**IV. New Business**

**a. Action on William Holmes**

**3761 Aquetong Road, Carversville, PA 18913  
(Carversville Historic District)  
HARB Application # 2022-18**

Mr. Holmes was present (via Zoom) on behalf of the application.

Mr. Young saw no reason why the Board should not approve of the application as the colors chosen were historical.

Ms. Newman suggested that Mr. Holmes get the appropriate paint for the metal roof instead of just regular paint.

Mr. Peseski questioned what type of finish would be appropriate for the paint.

Mr. Holmes was not sure what finish would be appropriate for all elements of the project.

Mr. Peseski suggested that the Board can approve a range of finishes for the project.

**Upon a motion by Larry Peseski, seconded by CL Lindsay, it was (unanimously) agreed to recommend issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness to TMP# 41-004-032 as follows:**

- 1. Porch Roof is to be painted Benjamin Moore Amber Slate (CW-685).**
- 2. Porch is to be painted Benjamin Moore Harwood Putty (CW-5)**
- 3. Porch Trim is to be painted Benjamin Moore Harwood Putty (CW-5) with the option of a flat or satin finish.**
- 4. Front door is to be painted Benjamin Moore Black (HC-190) with the option of a semi-gloss finish.**
- 5. Other doors and shutters are to be painted Benjamin Moore Black (HC-190).**

**b. Action on Carversville Inn**

**6205 Fleecydale Road, Carversville, PA 18913  
(Carversville Historic District)**

## **HARB Application # 2022-19**

Milan Lint and Mitchell Berlin, as well as John Wolstenholme and Daniel Kimicata (both of Wolstenholme Associates, LLC), were present on behalf of the application.

Mr. Peseski provided a chronological overview of the applicant's project including the development process from the original sketch plan through Zoning Hearing Board and Planning Commission meetings.

Mr. Lint provided a brief introduction of the project.

Mr. Wolstenholme provided an overview of the first few pages of Exhibit A (the plans) which depicted existing conditions and proposed site layouts in comparison to the original footprint. The changes amounted to a net reduction of about 125 square feet.

Mr. Peseski questioned if the changes were a result of input from the community.

Mr. Wolstenholme responded that while some changes were due to input from the community, most were due to code requirements including accessibility.

Mr. Wolstenholme asked that consideration be given to manufacturer options for windows. Larry Peseski noted that would be something the Board would consider if a motion is given.

Mr. Wolstenholme reiterated that windows and shutters that can be reused will be, but if they cannot, the windows will be replaced with historically accurate windows. Mr. Wolstenholme proposed that if the existing roof can be retained, it will and the existing wood, wood trim and brackets will be restored.

Ms. Newman questioned if these materials were to be restored or replaced in kind.

Mr. Wolstenholme replied if any of the brackets cannot be restored, these will be replaced in kind.

Mr. Wolstenholme mentioned that the railing does not meet code so the proposed railing will be taller in height than existing.

Mr. Peseski questioned if the height of the railing shown on the plans reflected the change.

Mr. Wolstenholme replied that the height shown was the code required height. Mr. Wolstenholme detailed that the existing plaster will be restored and resurfaced.

Mr. Wolstenholme proposed that the window trim, shutters, and doors of the northeast façade will be painted Benjamin Moore Black (HC-190). He additionally noted that the trim that is painted on the existing windows, columns, and railing will be Benjamin Moore Amherst Gray (HC-167). The plaster and trapezoidal trim below the eave will be painted Benjamin Moore Wickham Gray (HC-171).

Mr. Wolstenholme continued with description of the northeast façade. He noted that the connector between the existing Inn and the addition was a bit more modern in style with a flatter roof to adhere to HARB and Department of Interior guidelines, which suggest that additions to historical structure stand out as such.

Mr. Wolstenholme noted that the new addition would be about 36% of the existing Inn but that after accounting for the two floors above the existing kitchen area, it would be closer to 40%. Larry Peseski mentioned that he believed the overall rule was a maximum of two-thirds. Mr. Wolstenholme confirmed this.

Mr. Peseski requested clarification regarding the change of the entrance from the front to the side. Mr. Wolstenholme confirmed the change had occurred. Mr. Lint provided further clarification that an entrance was being added on the side and the existing entrance at the front would remain.

Marnie Newman questioned Mr. Wolstenholme on the percentage mentioned. Mr. Wolstenholme mentioned it was square footage. Mr. Wolstenholme further detailed the northeast façade work, noting that the new ridgeline for the addition was 1 foot four-inches lower than the existing Inn.

Mr. Strezelc questioned the stone wall being listed as veneer material and whether stone could be used. Mr. Wolstenholme mentioned the reasoning for the stone veneer was that due to the footprint reduction, it would be difficult.

Mr. Wolstenholme further described the work to be done on the existing Inn and the addition to it.

Mr. Wolstenholme brought forth a change to the plans, which included doors nearest to the parking area, of which would be utilized for the service area and egress from the stairwell, respectively.

Mr. Wolstenholme noted that the exhaust hood would be lower and closer to a viewer looking at the northwest elevation of the Inn. He stated that further behind is the existing stone chimney of the Inn. The existing would be replaced to provide better mechanical draw for the fireplace.

Ms. Newman asked if the change would be solely be the topper.

Mr. Wolstenholme confirmed this.

Mr. Wolstenholme requested that the Board be amenable to having the wood window instead of aluminum clad wood as a replacement.

Ms. Newman questioned if this would to the addition.

Mr. Wolstenholme confirmed this.

Mr. Lindsay questioned if the wood window would be proposed only if supply chain issue affected the availability of aluminum clad wood.

Mr. Wolstenholme replied that it could be a situation where aluminum clad was not available or due to elongated supply chain issues where it could be years before a product is available.

Mr. Wolstenholme spoke about the lowering of eaves for the addition in comparison to the existing Inn. He showed a rendering that depicted the scale has been significantly lowered in the current application.

Mr. Strezelec questioned what the plans were for downspouts.

Mr. Wolstenholme noted that anything being removed from the structure would be recycled and any downspouts installed would be anodized black conductors for both the existing Inn and its addition.

Ms. Newman questioned if the accessible parking would be at the front.

Mr. Wolstenholme said that in addition to those spaces there would be an additional spot at the rear of the building.

Ms. Newman asked if the front door would be accessible.

Mr. Wolstenholme said that it would be accessible via a curb-cut approved through the land development stage.

Mr. Wolstenholme showed a floor plan to the Inn and discussed the new proposed loft designs.

Ms. Newman questioned if there would be partitions between rooms on the balcony and what material these would be made of.

Mr. Wolstenholme stated that the partitions would be wood and that the existing columns were wrapped in wood and that after the restoration occurred, these would be replaced in kind.

Ms. Newman stated that the HARB board should be seeing renderings of the partitions.

Mr. Wolstenholme proposed that each balcony be screened with a flower box with a Manhattan Evergreen.

Mr. Minnucci questioned if the dividers were required by zoning or building code.

Mr. Wolstenholme replied that they were not but were included for the patrons of the Inn.

Mr. Minnucci questioned the Board if flower pots and screening were in the purview of HARB.

Mr. Peseski suggested that there were three avenues forward: require revised plans, discuss vegetative screening, or strike the partitions from the plans.

Mr. Wolstenholme further described the plans shown.

Ms. Newman requested clarification on the windows shown on the northeast elevation.

Mr. Wolstenholme stated that if a window is to be restored, antique glass would be installed. For new windows on the addition, straight glass would be installed.

Ms. Newman requested that an emphasis should be placed on repairing the existing windows first, and if not possible, replacement may be in order.

Mr. Berlin mentioned that economic impact should be taken into consideration.

Discussion ensued amongst the Board and the applicant regarding the window and siding materials.

Mr. Wolstenholme suggested a change to the windows on the proposed southwest elevation. The new windows on the second floor would match those on the first floor.

Ms. Newman questioned if the three siding options were all going to be used.

Mr. Wolstenholme noted that the options would be determined by the cost and long-term maintenance. He noted that the applicant's first choice would be painted, smooth-finished cedar lap siding for the new addition. The second choice would be a smooth-finished fiber cement siding, such as a fly-ash.

A discussion ensued regarding the possibility of having board and batten siding. Mr. Strezelec and Mr. Young preferred the clap board siding.

Mr. Peseski mentioned that in addition to the items before the Board, there were other outstanding issues that needed clarity.

Mr. Wolstenholme noted that the dumpster would be screened as discussed during the land development stage. Additionally, he noted that the parking lot would stay as stone and that the propane tanks preferably would be buried.

Mr. Minnucci asked if the Board would be able to see renderings for the railings that depict specific dimensions.

Mr. Wolstenholme noted that the railings would be installed to meet code requirements.

Ms. Newman reiterated that this is something that should be submitted before the board for review.

Mr. Minnucci noted that the motion could be enforced by Mr. Zubris.

Mr. Zubris stated that typically the building code official is given the specifics of a motion when it comes to a HARB application.

Ms. Newman questioned if the addition could be made shorter.

Mr. Wolstenholme stated that the addition was brought down in size to maximum extent.

Ms. Newman asked what the railing for the new addition would be made of.

Mr. Wolstenholme stated that it would be a powder-coated metal.

**Upon a Motion by Larry Peseski, seconded by CL Lindsay, it was agreed to recommend issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness to TMP: #41-004-010 as follows:**

**The application as submitted along with the Exhibit A (EA) version reviewed in the meeting, which provided details is approved with the following conditions and clarifications:**

- 1. Only wood and painted Kolbe and Kolbe or Marvin manufactured windows as will be used for the existing portion of the Inn**
- 2. Painted wood or black aluminum clad wood Kolbe and Kolbe or Marvin manufactured windows will be used for the addition to the Inn. Paint colors per the EA.**
- 3. Deck separator walls will be stricken from the plans.**
- 4. Windows and shutters will be repaired/restored first (if possible) in all cases or replaced, per specs in the EA.**
- 5. Kolbe and Kolbe or Marvin wood manufactured windows will be installed on the west façade of the stairwell.**
- 6. The applicant be allowed to utilize either Cedar Lap siding or Dutch lap siding with a smooth finish, horizontally positioned.**
- 7. Any wood replacement for the existing portion of the Inn must be replaced with wood of the same profile and dimension.**
- 8. Pointing color must match the existing as closely as possible and adhere to existing profile.**
- 9. The handicap railing will be an Amherst powder-coated metal to match the color of siding, Amherst Grey.**
- 10. The paint sheen will be as follows: satin for the siding, semi-gloss for the trim, and stucco will be flat.**
- 11. Five-inch black (to match the trim) or Amherst Berger manufactured aluminum gutter and downspouts will be used on the existing portion of the Inn.**

12. Five-inch black (to match the trim) or Amherst Berger manufactured aluminum gutter and downspouts will be used on the new addition to the Inn.
13. The applicant will provide the site plan as approved by the Planning Commission that depicts site lighting and dumpster location along with Motion to the Board of Supervisors.
14. The approval is NOT FOR board and baton siding on the new addition.
15. In all circumstances, applicant agrees to repair/restore windows, doors, and shutters before replacing.

**Ms. Newman voted against the recommendation to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application.**

#### **V. Public Comment**

Ryan Viehweger commented on the Carversville Inn application and stated that it might be beneficial to review windows on a subjective basis instead of a blanket approval.

Kurt Leasure commented on the Carversville Inn application and stressed the importance of protecting the historic windows and shutters.

#### **VI. Adjournment**

**Chair Peseski motioned to adjourn the HARB hybrid meeting at 8:38 pm.**

Respectfully Submitted,  
Zachary Zubris  
Zoning Officer/Permit Department Administrator  
HARB Administrator  
Solebury Township