

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

TIME AND PLACE OF MEETING

A meeting of the Cranbury Township Historic Preservation Commission was held in Town Hall, Cranbury, New Jersey, on December 4, 2012 beginning at 7:30 pm.

STATEMENT OF ADEQUATE NOTICE

Pursuant to the Sunshine Law, adequate notice in accordance with the Open Public Meetings Act (N.J.S.A. 10:4-5) was provided on November 29, 2011 of this meeting's date, time, place and agenda was mailed to the news media, posted on the Township bulletin board, mailed to those requesting personal notice and filed with the Municipal Clerk.

CALL TO ORDER

With a quorum present, Ms. Marlowe called the meeting to order.

MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE

Ms. Marlowe, Mr. Williams and Mr. Ziegler. Mr. Girardet informed the secretary that he is unable to attend this meeting.

MINUTES

The minutes of the November 20, 2012 meeting was reviewed and approved with a motion by Mr. Williams, second by Mr. Ziegler, all in favor.

APPLICATIONS

Maplewood Avenue/Westminster Cemetery, (B29, L11) In Historic District; First Presbyterian Church of Cranbury representative Mr. Art Ryba was present to discuss the submitted application to install a proposed 6' H fence. He stated that the presented configuration helps with reinforcing stability at the corners of the fence. As the budget allows, eventually the entire cemetery will be fenced and enclosed. The fence would define the neighboring property line and would visually help sell more plots in this area. The fence would also help ease maintenance of their property. Ms. Marlowe asked if the fence would meet up to the existing driveway entrance pillar(s). Mr. Ryba stated no, it would not meet the pillar but an 8' fenced section on Maplewood Avenue will be installed just north of the pillars at this time. At the (northwest) corner, the fence will run west for 400'. At this point, a 90° northern right angle for 16' is proposed. The neighbors to the north are aware of and are fine with the fence installation. They own the wooded buffer area between their property and the cemetery.

The fence brochure description refers to the proposed traditional straight picket fence style as *traditional designs feature points or finials reminiscent of wrought-iron styling of the past, while contemporary designs feature a smooth-top finish with a variety of picket detailing below the top rail*. It is painted black aluminum

Ms. Marlowe opened the meeting for public comments. Ms. Emily Goodfellow, Westminster Place, stated that she lives across from and loves looking at the cemetery. She said that when she moved in her home 17 years ago, the headstones were in bad condition. Recently, dedicated workers have taken much time and energy to repair the headstones which have beautified the cemetery. The addition of the signage where the church once stood gives a good history of this area. She has noted that people read the sign and then wander into and walk the cemetery. She feels that installing the fence would act as a barrier.

Ms. Gail Miller lives at 48 Maplewood Avenue directly across from the cemetery to the east. Ms. Miller stated that while working from home every day, she looks out over the cemetery and feels that the amount of people who visit or walk through the cemetery is not much. She inquired about the cause for installation of the fence. Mr. Ryba stated that they are trying to make the area more attractive. Other cemeteries have similar fence styles which really stand out. He continued that the same style fence, with openings, would eventually be installed around Brainerd Cemetery. He stated that people litter, ride bikes and dog owners who walk or run their dogs don't clean up after their pets; leaving others to pick up after them. The fence would also serve a purpose of keeping the cemetery neat, clean, tidy, attractive and picturesque. It would also add an element of safety. The proposed height of the fence at Westminster Cemetery is to deter people from climbing over whereas a 3' high fence can be easily scaled. He added that they have no intentions of locking the fence at the entrances. Ms. Miller felt that lawn maintenance could be easily performed without a fence to maneuver the equipment around.

Ms. Susan Teeter of 44 Maplewood Avenue resides east of the cemetery as well and also looks across at the cemetery every day. She loves the openness of the cemetery and picks up litter and branches when necessary. She stated that when the cutting back of a tree on church property recently occurred, she was approached and asked if she would help fund this task since it might pull wires down and away from her house. She finds it ironic that a fence is now proposed after being asked to fund a tree. She quickly did a web search for historic cemetery fences. According to one site, historic fences are usually three feet tall.

Ms. Eileen Hawes of Maplewood Avenue stated the four property owners present view the cemetery daily and opine the opposite if beautification is the reason for fence installation. The installation cost could be used towards clean up or maintenance. She also stated that a fence will not keep everyone out, if a private secluded place is desired, where there is a will, there is a way.

Mr. Bill Gittings gave accolades to the Church for their involvement in the community. He offered from a planning perspective and work experience, this type of fence was installed at a church's playground in Princeton about 16 years ago. He is not impressed how the material held up through the years. The installed product is now cloudy and scratched. Historically, cast iron fences were installed around cemeteries and need maintenance painting. He cautioned that aluminum fences are not quite the same.

Ms. Marlowe closed the public portion and stated that she understands the public's view but HPC's responsibility is to adhere to Chapter 93 and the appropriateness.

Mr. Ziegler commented the proposed fence is not typical for Cranbury. He visited the site recently to view the area and stated that the cemetery is in great condition. He stated that part of Cranbury's charm is that this cemetery is part of the community and not fenced off from the community. Should the fence be installed, it would create a visual barrier which is not in keeping with the town's character. If the ultimate purpose is to enclose the entire area, there are existing private fences of varying heights and styles installed. He is aware of a similar fence style surrounding a neighboring town's cemetery and that fence gives the feeling that he is not suppose to enter. He addressed the fence's maintenance and cemetery landscaping, which would be easier to access without the hindrance of the fence. He cautioned of the quality and gauge of the aluminum to be used and the hollow pickets.

Mr. Williams stated HPC is charged with administering the rules and regulations and read aloud Chapter 93-1 (Purpose and objectives). He explained that the burden on the applicant is to see if the fence meets the historical character of the cemetery that has existed there for many years. The cemetery is located within the Historic District which raises the question is if the fence is sympathetic to the area. He feels that a prefab aluminum fence does not meet the criteria. Mr. Ryba explained that this is the reason why this fence style was selected. Most cemeteries, with the exception of modern cemeteries, would have a cast iron fence of the same design. Now a day, aluminum is used with varying designs. Mr. Williams questioned whether this application meets the intent of Chapter 93.

Ms. Marlowe inquired if there was evidence (picture, photograph) that a fence existed like the proposed fence before? Mr. Ryba said that a locust post style with barbed wire did exist once. Currently, no fence exists. Cemeteries in or near Princeton, Freehold and Allentown were discussed, most of which

have fences. Ms. Marlowe reminded everyone that HPCs concern is the esthetics and appropriateness of the fence for Westminster Cemetery. She is confused for the rationale, the fence is not a replacement and no evidence of such has been provided. The stated reasons for the proposed fence do not solve the stated issues.

A roll call was taken on this application: NAYS; Ms. Marlowe, Mr. Williams, Mr. Ziegler

OTHER APPLICATIONS

1 Prospect Street, (B32,L36) In Historic District, Classified K; Mr. Bill Gittings, architect for the project is present to discuss a proposed change for the approved plans by HPC on August 21, 2012. The project has not begun nor were the approved plans ever submitted to the construction department. There are two small changes. The first change will remove the balconette to be replaced with a triple window 4/4 which was approved for the kitchen area below the balconette leaving the existing two 4 pane windows in the below kitchen area. The other change is to replace the basement windows.

These minor changes were approved by Ms. Marlowe, HPC Chair and three sets of plans were dated, stamped and approved. One plan set will go into the HPC file.

46 North Main Street (B32,L3) In Historic District, Classified C+; after attending the November 20th HPC meeting, Mr. Rak took HPCs advice and visited Mr. Farrington for further discussion to replace his furnace. Shortly after this meeting, Mr. Rak came into the HPC office and verbally withdrew his application. Mr. Rak was thrilled that an easier and more cost effective solution was found. A confirming follow up withdrawal letter was sent. No further action needed.

NEW BUSINESS

A letter was received from Richard Grubb & Associates regarding a Phase I Archaeological Survey and the replacement of the culvert over the tributary over the Millstone River on South Main Street. It is inquiring if any archaeological resources in this area are known of by HPC.

OLD BUSINESS

No update for CLG Grant. Mr. Ziegler has been extremely busy at his day job but will try to dedicate time. This CLG Grant is for a no match required; maximum limit is \$24,999.00, March 31, 2013 is the deadline date. One note is that funds can come from a grant account and should any expenses occur after the grant is secured, the monies will be repaid. However, HPC cannot exceed 2% of their approved budget nor are there enough funds in the budget to hire a professional for completion and submission of the grant on their behalf.

ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING

There being no further business, a motion duly made by Mr. Williams, second 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 December 4, 2012 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 15th day of January 2013.

Linda M. Scott, Recording Secretary