

**DOYLESTOWN BOROUGH
HISTORIC & ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
MEETING MINUTES
July 26, 2018**

The regular meeting of the Doylestown Borough Historic and Architectural Review Board was held at 7:30 PM on Thursday, July 26, 2018 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, Vice Chairperson Amy Taylor-Popkin, Denise Blasdale, Walter Keppler, Ralph Fey, Andy Happ, Heather Walton, and Karyn Hyland, Director of Building and Zoning.

CALL TO ORDER: Ms. Jacobsen called the meeting to order at 7:34 PM.

MINUTES APPROVAL: On a motion from Mr. Fey, seconded by Mr. Keppler, the June 2018 minutes were unanimously approved as submitted.

SIGN APPLICATIONS:

70 W. Oakland Ave, West Oakland Professional Building, owner

Ms. Liz Bibber appeared before the Board to request approval for a new sign. She proposes to use the existing free-standing sign, but re-paint the side posts and add a new overlay to the top. Responding to questions from the Board, the applicant stated that the new sign would be a composite material, and that there is existing lighting under the “roof” over the sign. On a motion from Ms. Blasdale, seconded by Ms. Walton, the Board voted unanimously to recommend a Certificate of Appropriateness for the sign, subject to final approval from Borough Council.

96 W. State Street, 96 (Nine) W. State Street, owner

Mr. John Wolstenholme appeared before the Board on behalf of the applicant, stating that the former Knight House is now known as State Street Steaks and Seafood (SSSS). The applicant passed out a rendering of the final design, which will be made of shou sugi ban (a burnt wood material). The existing signposts would be re-used, and the sign would be illuminated internally (similar to the sign at 86 West). Responding to questions from the Board, the applicant stated that there would be no sign on the building – just a free-standing one. Responding to a question from Ms. Hyland, the applicant confirmed that the lighting would be a solid white, and not the blueish hue shown in the renderings. On a motion from Ms. Walton, seconded by Mr. Happ, the Board voted unanimously to recommend a Certificate of Appropriateness for the sign, subject to final approval from Borough Council.

1 W. Court Street, Lilly’s Gourmet, business

Mr. Drew Scott appeared before the Board and requested approval for four new signs. One would be a horizontal sign, replacing the current sign on the front of the building; there would also be a projecting sign on the Shewell Avenue side, and a larger oval sign beneath the awning. The applicant was unsure of exactly where the fourth sign would be located;

after some discussion, the Board determined that the sign would likely be mounted directly to the exterior wall on the Shewell Avenue side. Responding to a question from Ms. Taylor-Popkin, the applicant stated that the existing lighting will remain, but with LED rather than incandescent bulbs. Responding to a question from Ms. Blasdale, the applicant stated that they would eventually like to replace / update the existing awnings, but they are not yet ready to do so. Responding to a question from Mr. Fey, the applicant stated that the signs are made of a painted composite material. On a motion from Ms. Blasdale, seconded by Mr. Happ, the Board voted unanimously to recommend a Certificate of Appropriateness for the signs, subject to final approval from Borough Council.

BUILDING/REPAIR APPLICATIONS:

131 S. West Street – Karen Whitney & Howard Gilson, owners

Mr. Howard Gilson appeared before the Board to request approval to replace 17 windows, and to shift a side 3rd floor window (centering it over a bay window below) and double it. He stated that these are likely the original windows; they are wood, with aluminum exterior storm windows. The windows are canted and cracked, with some being nearly inoperable. He is proposing all-vinyl windows as replacements.

Ms. Jacobsen explained that the Board is very sensitive to windows, especially on such a prominent corner in the Historic District; the Board's preference would be to repair and restore the existing windows. The Board also noted that wood windows with aluminum cladding have been approved in the past. Mr. Gilson stated that he was open to any alternatives that would solve their current difficulties with the windows. Ms. Jacobsen summarized the applicant's options: 1.) to restore the existing windows and repair the existing storm windows; 2.) to replace the existing storm window with a triple-track window and screen; and 3.) to use a replacement clad wood window. Mr. Fey noted that a mixture of these methods could be used, depending on the condition of each window.

There was some discussion regarding the shifting and doubling of the 3rd floor window. The Board suggesting doubling both 3rd floor windows on that side, leaving a gap between them and utilizing a single header. This would accomplish the applicants' objective of providing more light, and also preserve the symmetry of that elevation. The Board suggested that the applicants have their plans reviewed by an architect, who could make finishing touches. On a motion from Ms. Blasdale, seconded by Mr. Happ, the Board voted unanimously to table the application. The Board thanked the applicant for his time and flexibility.

35 Bridge Street, Rachele Daniels, owner

Mr. David Markeasey, the applicant's roofing contractor, appeared before the Board and proposed removing the existing three-tab shingle roof, which was damaged by wind in early April. They will replace the roofing with a 50-year architectural GAF shingle roof. They also propose to replace the current K-style gutters with new six-inch K-style gutters, and increase the downspout size from 2x3 to 3x4. The applicant confirmed that they would use the same material on all three levels of roof.

Responding to a question from Ms. Jacobsen, the applicant stated that the owners could consider a half-round gutter, but that they are limited by an open insurance claim due to the damage. Responding to questions from Mr. Fey, the applicant confirmed that there will be a small piece of flashing between these gutters and the neighbor's, and that the neighbor's gutters are, for now, remaining at five inches. The applicant stated that, in the past, both halves of the twin have made upgrades / improvements at the same time; however, this situation is unique due to the insurance claim. On a motion from Ms. Blasdale, seconded by Mr. Kepler, the Board voted unanimously to recommend a Certificate of Appropriateness for the building application, subject to final approval from Borough Council.

187 E. Court Street, William & Laurie Schutt, owners

Mr. Happ recused himself from vote and comment. Mr. Michael Raphael, the project architect, appeared before the Board and stated that the design has been changed to avert some zoning issues and to preserve a large tree on the property. He distributed fresh plans and designs, and explained that the existing garage faces the back yard, resulting in a lot of paved area. They propose to erect a new five-car garage structure facing the street, and also construct a workshop addition to the existing garage. A conservatory addition is also proposed for the back of the house – a product add-on that will be assembled on-site. An existing driveway would be removed and replaced by a hedge. The garage doors would be painted or solid-stained with no windows, and the roof would be standing seam metal. The gate element will be made of the same material as the garage doors. The siding would be a HardiePlank material.

Ms. Taylor-Popkin asked if it would be possible to make a three-car garage with car elevators; Mr. Raphael stated that they are limited by the building height. Mr. Fey expressed concern about having such a vehicle-oriented structure on a street comprised mostly of residences. Ms. Taylor-Popkin suggested an L-shaped garage, which would reduce the large mass of the structure. Ms. Jacobsen suggested shifting the gate element further back, to the interior-most corner of the garage. Responding to a question from Mr. Fey, Mr. Raphael stated that the material of the proposed apron is blacktop with a Belgian block cobblestone edging. Responding to suggestions from the Board on how to break up the massing of the new garage, Mr. Raphael proposed having two bays forward, one bay back, and two bays forward. The Board believed that altering the undulations of the roof would help to break up its massing and make it less barn-like.

Ms. Jacobsen opened the meeting to public comment. Ms. Rebecca Jordan of Mechanics Street suggested having the garage doors open onto the property and providing a green buffer behind the structure. Ms. Joan Doyle of 171 Mechanics Street was concerned about having such a large structure along a narrow one-way street. She expressed additional concerns about the impact on Mechanics Street residents. Mr. Raphael noted that the walls and rooflines could be manipulated, but that the number of bays could likely not be changed. Ms. Nerice Kendter of 195 Mechanics Street offered that the applicants could visit and sit on her porch to understand the visual impact of the structure. Ms. Mary-Jo Baum of 207 Mechanics Street suggested that no vehicles would be able to turn out of the proposed driveway, and that if it was removed, perhaps an alternative plan could be made. Mr. Raphael emphasized that the applicants are moving into the Borough and wish to improve and preserve a very special Borough house. Mr. Mark Crick of 169 Mechanics

Street noted that improvements to the property are positive, but that the five-car garage is more than residents would like to see. It would make the street feel “alley-like.” Ms. Linda Anderson of 161 Mechanics Street stated that the project could be an overall improvement, but expressed concern over the mass of the garage. Mr. Dan Heskett of 179 Mechanics Street stated that having so many garages facing the fronts of other houses makes the street too alley-like.

Mr. Fey noted that the project has many positive points, including its connection to the existing building. Ms. Hyland suggested having a “brainstorming session” with Borough staff. Ms. Jacobsen stated that the issue is the linear massing of the five-car garage, and suggested that it would be best to table the application and revisit the garage structure. Mr. Raphael requested that the Board approve the conservatory feature, if they were so inclined, and that the rest of the application could be tabled to reconsider the massing of the garage and shop addition.

Mr. Fey made a motion to recommend a Certificate of Appropriateness for the greenhouse conservatory structure as presented, and to table the garage / shop addition until a future date. Ms. Blasdale seconded the motion, and it was approved on a vote of 6 – 1 (Mr. Keppler dissenting, Mr. Happ recused).

RENOVATION CONTINUANCE: None.

NEW/OLD BUSINESS:

66 East Oakland Ave

Mr. Tony Trisotti returned before the Board and presented three different proposals, in order to see which was most in line with the Board’s suggestions from the previous month. Ms. Jacobsen thanked the applicant for taking their feedback into consideration. The Board noted that the mansard roof element creates three different layers of materials. Mr. Fey stated that various details and proportions must be present to successfully accomplish a “period” home; with the existing structure, it would be difficult to transform it into that particular style. Ms. Hyland noted that the preference seems to be for a flat roof; the Board found several notable examples throughout the Borough to use as inspiration. Mr. Fey suggested that, without the mansard roof, more attention could be dedicated to the windows and other details that could benefit the structure. The applicant thanked the Board for another round of feedback.

ADJOURNMENT: There being no further business before the Board, on a motion from Ms. Blasdale, seconded by Mr. Keppler, the meeting was adjourned at 10:22pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dirk A. Linthicum

Meeting Minutes Secretary