

**EMERGENCY MEETING MINUTES
OF THE
CRANBURY TOWNSHIP
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
CRANBURY, NEW JERSEY
MIDDLESEX COUNTY**

TIME AND PLACE OF MEETING

An emergency meeting of the Cranbury Township Historic Preservation Commission was held in Town Hall, Cranbury, New Jersey, on April 16, 2009 beginning at 6:30 pm.

CALL TO ORDER

With a quorum present Bobbie Marlowe, HPC Chair, called the meeting to order and, Linda M. Scott, acted as recording secretary.

STATEMENT OF ADEQUATE NOTICE

Pursuant of the Sunshine Law, adequate notice in accordance with the Open Public Meetings Act (N.J.S.A. 10:4-5) could not be provided of this meeting's date, time, place and agenda but was faxed and emailed to the news media, posted on the Township bulletin board and filed with the Municipal Clerk.

RESOLUTION

TITLE: Emergency Meeting of April 16, 2009

WHEREAS, this emergency meeting has been called for the following purpose: water leakage and damage to existing roof located at 15 Prospect Street, Cranbury, NJ.

WHEREAS, the normal requirements of the law regarding 48 hours notice have not been met due to lack of time and subject matter, however notices of this Emergency Meeting were e-mailed to the Cranbury Press, the Home News and the Trenton Times on April 15, 2009 at 3:30 pm

- 1-The reason for calling the emergency is water leakage and damage to the existing roof:
- 2-The delay of such a meeting would cause further water damage while the dwelling provides living quarters to residents;
- 3-The need for such adequate notice could not reasonably have been foreseen at a time when adequate notice could have been provided.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that there should be a vote on this Emergency Meeting of 3/5th of the members of the Historic Preservation Commission.

MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE

Ms. Marlowe, Ms. Stasi, and Mr. Ziegler were present for this Emergency Meeting.

MINUTES

No minutes were presented.

APPLICATIONS

15 Prospect Street, (B23,L32) In Historic District, Classified C; Owner Mr. Gilbert Ward and Mrs. Rose Ward, along with Mr. Robert Prutzman were present. Mr. Ward proposed to replace the existing slate roof as soon as possible. He states that recently the roof has begun

leaking water. He brought an asphalt shingle sample board which was displayed for HPC to view; a proposal/contract from F.S.C.P.M. Inc. (12 Pierce Ave., Trenton, NJ; dated 4/16/09) was presented along with 2 pages (5 of 7 and 6 of 7) of the HPC application.

In the past there was discussion regarding the replacement of the roof and it was relayed that HPC is guided by the §93 ordinance. During the applicant's attendance and discussion at the October 2008 meeting, Mr. Ward expressed that he would have a friend, experienced with slate roofing, review and evaluate the condition of the existing roof.

On November 7, 2008, a written estimate was received from Mill Roofing (dated October 31, 2008) in the HPC office which prompted HPC to reply with a letter (dated November 21, 2008) asking that a qualified independent engineer inspect the slate roof to determine the percentage of damage and submit the findings. NPS (National Park Service) #29 Preservation Brief was enclosed with the letter. Applicant states the letter and brief was not received. A copy of the letter was handed to the applicant during this meeting along with the enclosed NPS #29 Preservation Brief.

On April 15, 2009, Mrs. Ward called to say the roof at 15 Prospect Street is leaking. Arrangements were made for the Construction Official, HPC Chair, and HPC Administrative Officer to visit the house to see the condition of the leaking roof. Construction Official climbed up into the attic where a noticeable smell permeated the air. The exposed wood showed evidence of rotten sheathing as well as wetness due to the rainy weather. Photos were taken and displayed during this meeting and will remain on file.

During the meeting, Mr. Ward expressed that he is being treated unfairly and stated that the Historic District was arbitrarily expanded. Ms. Marlowe explained that in 2006, amended changes to Township Code §93 stipulate that when changes to the exterior of houses within the Historic District and the Buffer Zone are planned, application should be made to HPC whether the changes are minor, major, or just ordinary maintenance.

Mr. Ziegler spoke that he was part of the charter members in 1987-88. He explained that the surrounding buffer zone was originally 2400' and because of the amended changes in 2006, it was decreased to 200'. He explained that HPC is here to apply the rules and regulations in an equitable manner.

Mr. Ziegler asked of the status regarding the Construction Official's opinion after the visit. Ms. Marlowe believes that it was the Construction Official's findings that the roof needs to be replaced. She expressed the existing gutter system should be addressed at this time. Secretary will ask the Construction Official to document his findings.

Mr. Ward said that the existing gutter boxes (gutters that are built into the roof) will be restored. There is an existing visible diverter (wood wrapped with tin) to channel the rain into the gutter box. According to the applicant this diverter will be rebuilt. A proposal/contract was supplied from F.S.C.P.M. Inc. which states that the pole gutter is to be wrapped in a black granulated rubber and all flashing will be white aluminum. Ms. Ward said that the rotten wood will be replaced with wood.

Ms. Stasi stated that materials should be replaced in kind. Chapter 93 -7 E (11) Roofs states that decorative and functional features of the roof shall be preserved or if too deteriorated to repair, shall be replaced with matching the original as nearly as possible in material, size, shape, texture, color and orientation. She sees that a supplied sample shingle board is of asphalt but during past meetings a composite slate material was discussed. Ms. Ward said they cannot afford to replace the slate roof with slate and that the presented shingles match the freestanding garage roof shingles. HPC looked at supplied photos for a clearer understanding of the garage appearance. Only a portion of the garage could be viewed. HPC explained age, style, detachment of structures not associated with the house do not constitute matching shingles. Ms. Stasi explained that the main house usually was different from later additions that may have different roofing fabrics. A flat roof addition annex has a membrane covering.

A sample of EcoStar, a composite slate looking material was presented from the HPC file. Ms. Stasi said that during a previous HPC meeting a synthetic material was discussed and

that HPC is comfortable accepting the Construction Official's opinion as to the condition of the roof. The applicant said he will investigate the cost of reroofing with a synthetic material but he is not sure if he can afford the product.

Mrs. Ward stated that the difference between a slate look and asphalt shingle is \$15,000 to \$20,000 more. Ms. Marlowe asked if she has supporting documentation that she can show HPC. Mrs. Ward indicated that she had obtained these costs from Banner Roofing. There is an application in the HPC file from Banner Exteriors (dated October 5, 2007) but it is for the removal of slate roof and installation of asphalt shingles with 5" K style gutters. Mrs. Ward felt that the information must be at home.

Ms. Stasi stated that if photographic documentation can be presented of the dwelling's roof of earlier days then HPC would consider that material.

Mr. Prutzman said that there are significant additions to this house with a different fabric and asked if HPC would consider whether it would make sense to have like roofing material over the entire structure or have a mish-mash of an artificial product on the top with other materials covering the additions. Ms. Marlowe stated that preservation is a concern and that it might look nice to have the same asphalt material cover the entire structure, but the issue is to preserve certain characteristics of homes within the Historic District. The slate roof on the main house is a characteristic but HPC would consider a slate like product for this application. To go with a different looking product would be a question of consistency for HPC.

Mr. Ziegler explained that to move forward with this application, the applicants should investigate composite/synthetic materials that are not as costly as slate. Ms. Marlowe said that this should be explored and that documentation regarding this cost should be presented to HPC. In the interim, the roof should be addressed or covered to prevent any further damage to the structure. Once the information has been obtained by the applicants, HPC is willing to meet aside from the regularly scheduled meetings to address this issue.

Mrs. Ward said that other historical districts will bend a little bit with the people because of what is affordable for them. Mr. Ziegler addressed the grades of the composite slate; HPC is not looking for the highest or the lowest quality but perhaps a middle grade of the composite/synthetic slate.

A current mailing address was presented to HPC. Ms. Stasi suggested that the Construction Official should document his findings for reference. In closing, a question was raised as to the age of the existing slate roof; Mr. Ward stated that it must be over 100 years old.

ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING

There being no further business, a motion duly made by Mr. Ziegler, seconded by Ms. Marlowe and carried, the meeting was thereupon adjourned.

CERTIFICATE OF SECRETARY

I, undersigned, do hereby certify;

That I am the duly appointed secretary of the Cranbury Township Historic Preservation Commission and,

That the foregoing minutes of the Historic Preservation Commission, held on April 16 2009 consisting of 3 pages, constitute a true and correct copy of the minutes of the said meeting.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto subscribed my name on this 5th day of May 2009.

Linda M. Scott, Recording Secretary