

**Town of Milton
Historic Preservation Meeting
Milton Library, 121 Union Street
Tuesday, February 11, 2014
7:00 p.m.**

**Transcribed by: Helene Rodgville
[Minutes are not verbatim]**

1. Call Meeting to Order
Dennis Hughes: called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

2. Roll Call of Members

| | |
|-----------------|---------|
| Mike Filicko | Present |
| Mike Ostinato | Present |
| Dennis Hughes | Present |
| Kevin Kelly | Present |
| P. D. Camenisch | Present |
| Ted Kanakos | Present |
| Amy Kratz | Absent |

3. Corrections/approval of the Agenda

Dennis Hughes: Are there any corrections to this agenda? Did everybody have time to look it over? If you have, I'll entertain a motion.

Mike Filicko: I make a motion that we approve the agenda.

Kevin Kelly: Second.

Dennis Hughes: I have a motion made and seconded to accept the agenda. Are there any questions on that motion? If not, all those in favor say aye. Opposed. Motion is carried.

4. Approval of minutes of January 14, 2014

Dennis Hughes: Has everybody got the minutes from January 14th?

Kevin Kelly: I make a motion to approve the minutes as published.

P. D. Camenisch: Second.

Dennis Hughes: We have a motion made and seconded to approve the minutes of January 14, 2014, as presented. Are there any questions on this motion? All in favor say aye. Opposed. Minutes are approved.

5. Business – Discussion and possible vote on the following:

- a. The application from Ballybunion, LLC for the replacement of the front windows, siding and exterior molding on the building located at 105 & 107 Union Street further identified by Sussex County Tax Map and Parcel

2-35-20.07-76.00 & 77.00.

Kathy Newcomb, I'm one of the partners of Ballybunion: This is just a project that we have wanted to do for a long time, when we first remodeled 105 Union Street. We thought it was going to be a cosmetic renovation and it ended up being a pretty detailed renovation, so the front windows is one thing that we did not get to at the; but the existing front windows are not even tempered; it's kind of an accident waiting to happen, so we want to get that glass out of there and we've always wanted the two buildings to look the same, so we would basically like it to look, from the street, as one building, even though its two. My husband, Mike, will be doing the construction. If you have any construction related questions for him and Tom Jones, my partner to the right; he's our operations manager and is there every day and more involved in the day to day than we are.

Dennis Hughes: Do we have any questions from the board?

Kevin Kelly: Mr. Chairman, the proposed changes and alterations to the existing structures appear to be supported by four specific categories within the Code and I call my colleagues to attention to Page 220-56, Section H, items 2 and 3; I will read the pertinent section. Relationship of the exterior architectural features of the structure to the remainder of the structure and/or surrounding neighborhood; and in part 3 on that same page, general compatibility of exterior design arrangement, texture, materials, proposed to be used with other structures contributing to the established character of the neighborhood in which the property is located. On the next page, 220-57, parts I-3 and I-7. I-3 deals with siding and siding material. All materials shall be consistent with an appropriate design texture and other visual qualities to the style and period of the structure, and in keeping with the general appearance of other structures in the neighborhood. I-7, Windows, windows, new structures, or alterations to existing designated Historic Sites, the construction and alterations to structures in the Historic District shall have windows that are compatible to those in the existing structures. The existing windows in my judgment, are the open panes are inconsistent with the second floor window where you have 8 over 8's and are more consistent in appearance in a lower floor with that general appearance of the face of the structure. The importance of the brick, maintenance of the brick in the upper structure is significant to that part of the Town, owing to the construction that was done in that area following the fire in 1909. That brick facing is maintained, retained, as is appropriate to that significance of that historic issue and the siding below is consistent with other siding of the type found in the Historic District.

Dennis Hughes: Any other questions?

Ted Kanakos: Just a quick question. In the picture that you submitted, I see brick all the way across. Is this just painted brick on the other side, so that will just be taken off? The paint?

Mike Newcomb: If it's possible to come off without destruction of the

brick face itself, I would like to try and get it off, but I'm not foreseeing that happening. I think it's going to have to be repainted.

Ted Kanakos: So it won't look like the plan that's been submitted?

Michael Newcomb: It's still brick.

Ted Kanakos: Yes, but here it shows to be basically the same as the other side, same color, same everything.

Michael Newcomb: All the way across, it's going to be... it says repaint existing brick to match the face.

Ted Kanakos: So you're only going to paint that side, or both sides?

Michael Newcomb: We're going to paint both sides. The other side says paint, the existing brick to match the left 106.

Ted Kanakos: Well there's no definition of the brick. Once you paint it, it doesn't look like detailed brick. Will it be as detailed as the representation, if you paint the brick; because one side now is brick, the other side is painted.

Michael Newcomb: Yeah, both sides are brick, it's just the painted brick and a...

Ted Kanakos: Are you going to paint both sides?

Michael Newcomb: Yes.

Ted Kanakos: Oh, so it won't look as detailed as this representation.

Michael Newcomb: It will have the same detail, it will just be painted, instead of being brick, the red.

Ted Kanakos: It won't be red?

Michael Newcomb: I don't know. We haven't picked a color, no but you're not going to lose any detail by painting the brick.

Kevin Kelly: The color of a structure in the Historic District is not within the purview of an historic house.

Dennis Hughes: You're going to put stuff on back at the same location?

Michael Newcomb: Yes.

Kevin Kelly: If you were going to relocate the sign or signage, you would need to come before the commission for signage, for that purposes.

Michael Newcomb: Yes.

Dennis Hughes: Any other questions? Ted?

Ted Kanakos: Yes, I have one more question. The windows all the way across the top will be the same existing? In other words, will they be 4 over 4? Up and down? Because the windows here appear to be different than the windows on the right, different than the windows on the left. The ones on the left appear to be represented in the plan. The ones on the right I can't see all that well, they're different.

Kathy Newcomb: Yes, we're not replacing any windows, so the grills that you have are a little bit different.

Ted Kanakos: So you have four across on the left and three across on the right, so it's different than the plan as shown.

Kathy Newcomb: Yes. The grills are different, yes.

Kevin Kelly: If you remember, what are the... Is it 8 over 8 or 6 over 6 in

the building as you look at it from the front on the right? Do you know?

Ted Kanakos: I believe it's 6 over 6 on the right and 8 over 8 on the left.

Robin Davis: Yes, there it is. But if you could kind of look at the two different pictures, it looks like the building to the right, which is 107, the upstairs windows are narrower than the windows at 105 and it looks like the architectural design looks like they just...

P. D. Camenisch: They're different sizes.

Robin Davis: But the windows across the whole front, at the top, are the same size.

Ted Kanakos: One's 3 over 3, one's 4 over 4.

P. D. Camenisch: One's 8 over 8, one's 6 over 6.

Robin Davis: Yes, they are. Because they're smaller windows.

Ted Kanakos: I know but I'm just looking at what's been represented, so this doesn't actually represent it, no other detail of the brick. So the top floor is a little different than what we see here. Do any of the members have a comment on that, in relation to what's submitted and...

Robin Davis: Would it be possible for the applicant to have their designer just change that on the plans that are submitted for the building permit?

Michael Newcomb: Absolutely.

Robin Davis: That way the rendering will match exactly what's existing and ensure that they will not be changed.

Kevin Kelly: Have you been able to look at the dental molding at the roof, to see what condition it's in and whether it will need to be replaced or can be restored.

Michael Newcomb: I believe it's questionable right now, at best. I haven't been up there in a while, since we renovated the first time and if I recall, it was in pretty bad shape. The lower section is pretty much gone and is being held up there with little to nothing. And it's actually one piece bent, a piece of metal that's stamped out. If you look at the end piece on 105, if you go up there to the building, you could see that it's one piece of aluminum or some kind of metal that's just stamped out.

Kevin Kelly: According to your application, if that needs to be replaced, it would be replaced with something that is similar?

Michael Newcomb: Yes, we would actually have to put some kind of roofing material on top of that. I think we've spoken about it before. We were thinking about maybe putting a copper roofing on it or something similar, some standing seam metal or something to that nature.

Kevin Kelly: But you will retain or your drawing does not show retention of the center finial, dividing the two buildings?

Michael Newcomb: I think we were talking about maybe making it all one piece; maybe having the two ends and trying to keep the details and the dental molding as best as we can, with available materials today.

Kevin Kelly: That center piece is a distinctive feature of the face of the building and... between the two buildings, on the top. In the drawing, none of those are shown at the top of the building in the detailed drawing, in

your work drawing; they're not shown. There are three of them. One on each side and then one in the center and those are obviously in public view and by Code would need to be retained.

Michael Newcomb: That particular piece, vis a vis... or something right there.

Kevin Kelly: Something to match it. Something that is, obviously if it's structurally unsafe, that's a factor, but otherwise if it is safe and simply needs to be refurbished or restored, that would be preferred. If it's replaced, it would need to be replaced by something that is comparable in appearance and in location.

Michael Newcomb: Ideally I would hope that it's structurally sound and we can paint it and leave it; because that's a huge amount of extra work that I wouldn't really want to have to try and tackle, unless it was absolutely necessary, so if it's possible for us to use that existing top facade up there, that's what we would try to do. That's going to be something we're going to have to actually get up there and see.

Kevin Kelly: Now, when you're talking about the facade now, you're talking about the dental molding.

Michael Newcomb: Yes. The lower sections are basically going to have to be redone. They're not structurally sound up there.

Kevin Kelly: You're talking about the facing piece, below the dental?

Michael Newcomb: Yes. The lower section, yes.

Dennis Hughes: Over the top of the windows.

Kevin Kelly: But again, those would be replaced as per your applications, with something comparable.

Michael Newcomb: Yes.

Dennis Hughes: If this is bad, you'll have to take it down and replace it with something comparable to this, that these three also have to be replaced.

Kevin Kelly: Or retained and obviously the preference would be that they be retained, if that's possible.

Kathy Newcomb: Do you want that added to the plans?

Kevin Kelly: I think it needs to be incorporated in the plans that were submitted, that it reflects the existence of those three pieces, those architectural features. Those are prominent architectural features. Mr. Davis, that can be done independent of our commission's work, the additions of those things, based on the conversation?

Robin Davis: Yes, that would be correct. In the motion, just put those two items to be added to the drawings that will be submitted as part of the building permit.

Kevin Kelly: I don't know the correct architectural term for those three structures. Do you know the correct architectural term for that, or does someone know the architectural term for that?

Mike Filicko: Are they finials?

Kevin Kelly: That's what I call them, but I'm not sure that's right. If we

don't know, we can pretend that's right.

Ted Kanakos: Excuse me, let me just get this clear, they are going to be preserved one way or the other? Replaced? Because they don't show on this plan.

Kathy Newcomb: Yes, we'll add that.

Ted Kanakos: You'll add them and they will be replaced.

Kevin Kelly: Right.

Michael Newcomb: Ideally we would like to preserve it.

Ted Kanakos: Ideally you have to preserve it.

Michael Newcomb: Or replace it with something else.

Ted Kanakos: Or replace it, yes, that's fine. It's a nice architectural feature on there. I have another question. Your doors. On here they're going to be the same, changing doors; because they're different as they are now and they're two different properties.

Kathy Newcomb: The door on the restaurant has to remain the same. The door on the left building will be comparable.

Ted Kanakos: Basically the same?

Kathy Newcomb: Yes, so the one that's on the right hand side, let's not rip that out.

Michael Newcomb: The Fire Marshall Code calls that outswing, with panic hardware, so that's something we'll have to replace.

P. D. Camenisch: So the top section of the whole building you're going to try to keep that, with the lower section that's pretty bad off, the section that's rotted out, you're kind of just use a sanding wedge on that?

Michael Newcomb: That was my plan and then build the detail underneath.

P. D. Camenisch: That's this piece right here.

Kevin Kelly: Right. Right. And the effect of that will be to look as nearly as possible as what looks there now, given the fact that it's not salvageable or your judgment is that it's not salvageable.

Michael Newcomb: I'm pretty sure it's not. It looks like 40 years of tar going on top of there; that's basically what's holding that piece of metal up.

Dennis Hughes: Any more questions? If not do you have anything else? I'll entertain a motion.

Ted Kanakos: I'll make a motion we approve the plans, as presented, with the appropriate adjustments and changes to be submitted to the Town.

P. D. Camenisch: Second.

Kevin Kelly: I have a question. Should we specify what those changes are in the motion. I think we should. Will you accept an amendment, a change to your motion?

Ted Kanakos: Yes.

Kevin Kelly: That the changes which need to be noted on the plans and incorporated in the structure include: the retention of or the replacement with like material and like fixture of the three finials; an amendment of the plan to show the windows on the right side of the front elevation to be 6

over 6, not 8 over 8 windows, the three windows on the right side of the front elevation; and that the retention of the dental molding at the roof line, the top of the roof line be retained, if possible, or replaced with like material and similar appearance and that the same be true for the molding at the level of the first floor, and that it also be replaced with something that is similar. Is that acceptable, Mr. Kanakos?

Ted Kanakos: Yes, yes it is. Thank you.

Dennis Hughes: We have a motion made and seconded. Are there any questions on that motion? If not, we'll have a roll call vote starting with Mike:

| | |
|-----------------|---------|
| Mike Filicko | Approve |
| Mike Ostinato | Approve |
| Dennis Hughes | Approve |
| Kevin Kelly | Approve |
| P. D. Camenisch | Approve |
| Ted Kanakos | Approve |

Dennis Hughes: Approved by a unanimous vote, so make your changes and see Robin.

6. Adjournment

Kevin Kelly: I move that the meeting be adjourned.

Ted Kanakos: Second.

Dennis Hughes: Any questions on that motion? All in favor say aye. Opposed. We are so adjourned at 7:23 p.m.