

**DOYLESTOWN BOROUGH
HISTORIC & ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
CORRECTED MEETING MINUTES
March 23, 2017**

The regular meeting of the Doylestown Borough Historic and Architectural Review Board was held at 7:30 PM on Thursday, March 23, 2017 in the Council Chambers, 57 W Court Street, Doylestown PA. Members of the Doylestown Borough Historic and Architectural Review Board in attendance were: Chairperson Kim Jacobsen, Denise Blasdale, Walter Keppler, Ralph Fey, Marie Kovach, Jennifer Jarret, Andy Happ, Alyson Logue, and Karyn Hyland, Director of Building and Zoning. Not present was Vice Chairperson Heather Walton and Amy Taylor-Popkin.

CALL TO ORDER: Ms. Jacobsen called the meeting to order at 7:35 PM.

MINUTES APPROVAL: On a motion from Mr. Keppler, seconded by Ms. Blasdale, the February 2017 minutes and January 2017 corrected minutes were unanimously approved as submitted.

SIGN APPLICATIONS:

120 S. Main Street, Eli Modechai, property owner / Heather Dugan, applicant

Ms. Dugan appeared before the Board to request approval for two signs – one to hang from a bracket at the front of the building, and one to hang from a bracket by the side entrance. Responding to a question from Ms. Jacobsen, the applicant stated that the sign would be a flat, painted wooden sign in white and black. She added that the signs will be mounted on existing brackets and will be the same size as the previous signs. Responding to a question from Ms. Blasdale, the applicant stated that the “front” sign will hang above the door. On a motion from Mr. Happ, seconded by Ms. Jarret, the Board voted unanimously to recommend a Certificate of Appropriateness for the sign application, subject to final approval from Borough Council.

BUILDING/REPAIR APPLICATIONS:

278 E. Court Street, Scott Johnson, property owner / Tony Dirienzo, applicant

Mr. Peter Batchelor, architect, stated that the drawing in their application was done as simply as possible, since the applicants did not know exactly what their budget would be. Now that the budget is finalized, they realize that the front portion can be improved; therefore, Mr. Batchelor distributed updated plans to the Board. In under a minute, Ms. Hyland transferred the renderings to the screen for everyone to view. The front roof has been made steeper, and some gingerbread embellishments have been made to the front. Responding to a question from Mr. Fey, Mr. Batchelor stated that the foundations and first floor walls will remain from the original building, but the roof will come off, allowing them to add a second floor. Ms. Blasdale stated that the house appears to date from the 1960s. Mr. Batchelor added that there is no basement. Mr. Fey explained that the Board’s first interest is in determining if the existing structure has historical significance, and if it contributes to the overall texture of the neighborhood. The Board confirmed that the structure is not, as they at first believed, a “kit house.”

Mr. Batchelor stated that they will be using HardiePlank siding with solid Azek corners and shutters. They propose a dimensional asphalt shingle roof and a concrete slab porch. Responding to a question from Mr. Keppler, Mr. Batchelor stated that they would use a historic glass door. Ms. Jacobsen suggested a wooden door with a half-light; Mr. Batchelor stated that they may lean toward a solid real wood door, stained gray. Responding to a question from Ms. Jacobsen, Mr. Batchelor stated that they are trying to capture the feel of a late 1800s carpenter's home in a "shingle style." Ms. Jacobsen noted that their design is similar to a "Worthington house" – a simple wood-frame turn-of-the-century home. She noted that the proposed six-over-six windows are more Colonial in style, and that a Worthington house would feature one-over-one, two-over-one, or two-over-two windows. The applicants were agreeable to using two-over-two windows, noting that they would be using a Weather Shield simulated divided light wood-clad window with a spacer bar. They added that the Azek shutters would mimic working shutters with hardware.

Responding to a question from Ms. Jarret, the applicants stated that they had been considering a white color palette, but that is now up for debate. Mr. Keppler and Mr. Happ noted that the Board would prefer half-round gutters; the applicants agreed, proposing white half-rounds. Responding to a question from Ms. Jacobsen, Mr. Batchelor stated that the attic level shingles will be a HardiePlank product. The porch posts will be Azek, with a flat panel to mimic the front door, and will be squared instead of rounded. Responding to a question from Mr. Keppler, the applicants stated that there will be a porch light to one side of the door, and that they will select something appropriate for the time period. Responding to a question from Mr. Happ, the applicants confirmed that the chimney is being removed.

Responding to questions from Ms. Jarret, Mr. Batchelor stated that the attic level gable window will be a fixed single panel. He confirmed that the windows on the left and right elevations would be the same. Ms. Hyland noted that the application must first go to the Zoning Hearing Board, so it is not quite at the building permit stage. Returning to the subject of the front door, Mr. Happ suggested that the Board should ensure it is not a twelve-light, as is shown in the renderings. Ms. Jarret suggested that the door should be similar to the two-over-two windows on the rest of the home; the applicants agreed to use proportional lights for the door window.

Ms. Blasdale made a motion to recommend a Certificate of Appropriateness for the building application, with the conditions that the house use white HardiePlank siding, solid Azek corners and porch posts, black shutters to mimic working shutters, a dimensional asphalt shingle roof, two-over-two windows, a stained gray door with half-lights proportional to the windows, and HardiePlank shingle siding on the attic level – all based on the drawing revisions dated 3/9/2017. Mr. Happ seconded the motion, and it was unanimously approved subject to final approval from Borough Council.

89 E. Court Street, Kevin Fitzgerald, property owner / Ellen Happ, applicant

Mr. Happ recused himself from the application. Ms. Ellen Happ, the architect for the renovations, appeared along with Kevin Fitzgerald, the soon-to-be owner. Mr. Fitzgerald explained that the structure was originally the Bucks County Trust building, and was then the town library from the 1930s until 1992. The Bucks County Controller's office was there for a time, but they are now moving out. Dr. Fitzgerald stated that his intention is to convert the building into a family residence on the first and second floors, with a possible office use in the basement.

Ms. Happ explained that they would like to restore the main entrance on Broad Street, and remove the grade-level vestibule. They will also be restoring all of the bricked-up windows to the full-height original openings. Other proposed alterations include removing the roof and ground-level air conditioners, removing the white gutters and replacing them with copper downspouts, and removing the roof ladder. They propose inserting a floor at the current interior mezzanine level to accommodate four bedrooms and three bathrooms on the second floor, while leaving the south corner open to create a two-story space. The proposed Broad Street elevation shows solid wood panel doors with a transom above. They are also proposing a roof deck, centered over the middle bay, to provide some additional outdoor space; the rail would be a nearly invisible cable rail. On the Broad Street elevation, Ms. Happ stated that they propose keeping two windows that were replaced in 2005; they also propose to keep the far left window on the Court Street elevation, while replacing the other three windows with a double-hung sash on the first floor and a double-hung sash on the second floor to provide egress from the bedrooms. Responding to a question from Ms. Jarret, the applicants confirmed that the windows in the building are not historic. Ms. Happ added that there will be an interior stair that goes up to the roof and exits in a small “pilot house” structure. For the rear elevation, the center window will remain and the two side windows will be divided between the two floors as explained above. The lower left door on this elevation will be replaced by a wood-and-glass door. They propose leaving the existing chimney. For the final elevation, the applicants propose changing the right-hand window into a door with a double-hung sash above, which will access a small on-grade terrace. The steps will be similar to the ones on the Broad Street side.

Responding to a question from Mr. Keppler, Ms. Happ stated that they propose using Marvin windows and doors. The applicants confirmed that they will be keeping the transom that reads “Bucks County Trust Company.” Responding to a question from Ms. Jacobsen, the applicants stated that the doors will be similar to the Bucks County Trust originals. The applicants distributed color samples to the Board and stated that they will match the existing white windows. They propose to paint the front door black and will keep all the white trim, highlighting some details in an off-white color. Ms. Jacobsen lamented allowing the replacement windows’ white color to dictate the look of the building. Ms. Blasdale suggested that a darker window may look better. Ms. Jacobsen suggested that darker windows would allow them to blend with the architecture. The applicants agreed with this suggestion, although they assume that means changing all of the white trim as well. Ms. Jacobsen stated that the original cornice appeared to be a sandstone color. Responding to questions from Ms. Jarret, the applicants confirmed that the water table, window sills, and window heads would all be the same material.

Mr. Fey stated that the building is an iconic one in Doylestown, and that the Board is glad that the applicants are investing so much into it. Mr. Fey stated that the original, “darker” building has great texture, subtlety, and elegance; there is no doubt that a darker window is stronger than the proposed white windows. Ms. Happ suggested that the applicants could consult their color specialist for a new palette. Ms. Jacobsen suggested that the palette should bring the building closer to the “bank era” in appearance – a deeper, richer tone. Mr. Fey stated that an earth-tone feel would be appropriate. The Board would like to see a color scheme for the pilot house as well. Ms. Hyland added that everything is still subject to Zoning Hearing Board approval.

Responding to questions from Ms. Blasdale, the applicants stated that centering the terrace on the roof will make it less visible from the street. The Board discussed the view of the roof from the street; after assessing several street views, it was decided that only the pilot house and rails would be truly visible. Responding to a question from Ms. Jarret, the applicants stated that the roofing for the pilot house would be standing seam copper.

Ms. Blasdale made a motion to recommend a Certificate of Appropriateness for the building application with the following conditions: that the windows not be white in color, with the applicants to return with a finalized color selection; that Marvin windows and doors be used, and that the doors be similar to the Bucks County Trust building; that the doors be black, the pediment dark, and the parapet natural in color; and that the pilot house feature a standing seam copper roof – all based on the application featuring the aforementioned changes. Mr. Kepler seconded the motion, and it was unanimously approved (with Mr. Happ recused and abstaining) subject to final approval from Borough Council.

66 – 68 S. Hamilton Street, Don Ventresca, property owner / Ralph Fey, applicant

Mr. Fey recused himself from the application. Representing the property owner, Mr. Fey passed out updated elevations to the Board, stating that they have received Zoning Hearing Board approval. Mr. Fey noted that the property is the former loading/storage area for Histan Roofing. Their original proposal featured a driveway that would turn in to a garage at the rear, but this created some issues; they have pulled the garage off the back of the building and are using the existing walls of the block warehouse as the rear walls of the garage. This allows them to have a main house that is more accessible in terms of light, but have a smaller overall mass for the project.

Mr. Fey displayed their preferred plan, which features a 7'4" deep, 25' wide front porch and presents as a two-story stone building with the door on the side. There will be a simple roofline of imitation cultured slate, featuring two dormers with two-over-two windows. Behind the stone portion, there is a slight setback to create shadow and separation as the building transitions to a clapboard aesthetic in HardiePlank. There is also an enclosed glass breezeway that connects the main house to the garage and upstairs studio. The garage and studio take their cues from the clapboard portion of the structure. The applicants propose "thin stone," which is real stone cut to 2 ½ inches in thickness with a "pinnacle mica" coloring. They were also considering a painted white brick, but the applicants selected the stone look just that morning. Responding to a question from Mr. Happ, Mr. Fey stated that they are very open to feedback regarding the stone product.

Responding to Mr. Happ, Mr. Fey stated that the east elevation of the breezeway would feature windows but would not be all glass like the west elevation. He added that, on the east elevation, the setback between the stone and clapboard portion will only be the difference in thickness between the materials. Mr. Fey presented samples of the front porch flooring (which is a heat-treated wood product) and noted that they propose Anderson 400 Series windows, while the porch roof would be standing seam copper. Responding to a question from Ms. Jacobsen, Mr. Fey stated that no shutters are proposed for now. He also noted that the height and depth of the windows is not truly represented on the renderings; they will have to be tweaked and embellished with trim details. Mr. Fey confirmed that 156 E. Court Street is the "model" they are using for the façade details, as it fits in terms of scale, proportion, and general attitude.

Responding to a question from Ms. Jarret, Mr. Fey stated that they are proposing six-over-six windows in the stone portion and two-over-two windows in the clapboard portion. Mr. Fey noted that he is being very careful in not referring to the structure as a “fieldstone house” – the look they are seeking is that of a home assembled by skilled masons. He does not believe it is a Colonial Revival style, and does not want the stone portions to appear as rubble. Ms. Hyland stated that Mr. Phil Ehlinger did some research on stone homes several years ago, and it was concluded that in more regularly-stacked stone homes, it is more likely that there was *no* stucco originally. Irregular stone that does not look professionally stacked is more likely to have had stucco applied.

Responding to a question from Ms. Jacobsen, Mr. Fey stated that the breezeway roof is proposed to be flat. Ms. Jacobsen stated that, since the stone selection is an open issue, the Board can 1) table the application or 2) make a recommendation with the majority of finishes included, and request that the applicant return later with stone samples to get final approval for that element. She noted that the Board would want to see the color and shape/size/pattern of the stone.

Ms. Blasdale made a motion to recommend a Certificate of Appropriateness for the building application as presented, with the majority of finishes as submitted in the packet A-1.0 dated 3/20/17 that shows an offset on the west elevation and a material offset on the east elevation, and with the following conditions: that the applicant will return for approval of the stone finish; that the stone portion have six-over-six windows, with the clapboard section having two-over-twos; that the materials be as specified in the packet originally dated 9/11/12 but hand-marked 3/23/17, which includes porch and soffit details, window details, HardiePlank specifications, porch decking, columns, roofing shingles, the standing seam copper porch roof and side pent roof; and that half-round copper gutters and downspouts be included on the stone portion, with white aluminum gutters and downspouts in the rear. Mr. Keppler seconded the motion, and it was unanimously approved (with Mr. Fey recused and abstaining) subject to final approval from Borough Council.

RENOVATION CONTINUANCE: None.

WALK-INS: None.

NEW/OLD BUSINESS: Mr. Keppler suggested that, in situations like the last application where many drawings may be referenced, it may be cleaner to table the application and have the applicants return to finalize everything in a more formal and clear way.

ADJOURNMENT: There being no further business before the Board, on a motion from Ms. Blasdale, seconded by Mr. Happ, the meeting was adjourned at 9:44 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dirk A. Linthicum

Meeting Minutes Secretary