



**CITY OF PLAINFIELD**  
**HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION**  
 515 WATCHUNG AVENUE, ROOM 202  
 PLAINFIELD, NEW JERSEY 07060



Adrian O. Mapp, Mayor

William H. Michelson, Chairman  
 Lawrence T. Quirk, Vice-Chairman

**MEETING MINUTES- PLAINFIELD HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION**  
**JANUARY 23, 2018, 7:30 PM. CITY HALL 1<sup>ST</sup> FLOOR LIBRARY, 515 WATCHUNG AVENUE, PLAINFIELD, NJ**

**Call to Order and Public Notice**

Principal Planner Scott Bauman called the meeting to order at 7:37 P.M. and in conformance with the Open Public Meetings Act read aloud the following: "In compliance with the Open Public Meetings Act, this is a regularly scheduled meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission of the City of Plainfield. Adequate notice of this meeting has been given in accordance with the Open Public Meetings Act, the annual meeting schedule was published in the Courier-News, and copies of the meeting schedule are posted in the offices of the City Clerk and Planning Division. I ask that everyone including Commission members please turn their cell phones to silence or vibrate and not take or send any electronic messages during this meeting."

**Roll Call**

2018 Historic Preservation Commission Name, Class Designation (Term Ends)	1/23/18	2/27/18	3/27/18	4/24/18	5/22/18	6/26/18	7/24/18	8/28/18	9/25/18	10/23/18	11/27/18	12/18/18
<b>Mario Camino, Class A (12/31/2020)</b>	X											
<b>John Favazzo, Class A (12/31/2017)</b>	X											
<b>William T. Garrett, Class B (12/31/2019)</b>	X											
<b>Sandra Gurshman, Class B (12/31/2018)</b>	X											
<b>William H. Michelson, Class B (12/31/2018)</b>	X											
<b>Lawrence T. Quirk, Class A (12/31/2017)</b>	X											
<b>Gary F. Schneider, Class C (12/31/2019)</b>	X											
<b>Reginald Thomas, Class A (12/31/2018)</b>	X											
Regular Member 9 VACANT (unexp. term ends 12/31/2020)												
Alternate Member 1 VACANT (2 year term)												
Alternate Member 2 VACANT (2 year term)												

*Also present: Historic Preservation Consultant Barton Ross, and Principal Planner Scott Bauman*

**Oath of Office to Reappointed Commission Members**

As an attorney licensed in the State of New Jersey, Commissioner Michelson administered the Oath of Office to Mr. Favazzo. Mr. Quirk was previously sworn in by the City Clerk.

**Nomination and Election of Chairperson**

Commissioner Gurshman made a motion to nominate Commissioner Michelson as Chairman for 2018. Commissioner Schneider seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved by voice vote.

### **Nomination and Election of Vice Chairperson**

Commissioner Gurshman made a motion to nominate Commissioner Quirk as Vice-Chairman for 2018. Commissioner Thomas seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved by voice vote.

### **Appointment of Historic Preservation Consultant**

Commissioner Schneider made a motion to appoint Barton Ross & Partners, LLC Architects, 184 S. Livingston Avenue, Suite 9-140, Livingston, New Jersey, to provide professional consulting services to the Commission Consultant for 2018 for an amount not to exceed \$22,500.00. Commissioner Garrett seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved by voice vote.

### **Nominations and Call to Vote for Commission Secretary**

Commissioner Thomas made a motion to nominate Scott Bauman as Commission Secretary for 2018, for an amount not to exceed \$1,800.00. Vice-Chairman Quirk seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved by voice vote.

### **Resolution Adopting the 2018 Meeting Schedule**

Vice-Chairman Quirk made a motion to adopt the 2018 meeting dates of the Commission, including the first meeting in 2019. Commissioner Schneider seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved by voice vote.

### **Resolution Designating the Official Newspaper for Publication of Legal Notices**

Commissioner Gurshman made a motion to designate the Courier News as the 2018 official newspaper of the Historic Preservation Commission for the publication of official notices for purposes of the Open Public Meetings Act. Commissioner Thomas seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved by voice vote.

### **Resolution Adopting Procedures, Forms, and By-Laws**

Vice-Chairman Quirk made a motion to adopt the procedures, forms, and by-laws of the 2018 Historic Preservation Commission. Commissioner Schneider seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved by voice vote.

### **Presentation of December 19, 2017, Meeting Minutes**

Commissioner Gurshman made a motion to approve the December 19, 2017, meeting minutes as submitted; Commissioner Garrett seconded the motion and it was approved unanimously by voice vote.

### **New Business**

#### **1. Certificate of Appropriateness Application HPC 2017-16. Applicant- Yefry Rodriguez 1213-15 Putnam Avenue. Block 636, Lot 23. Putnam Watchung Historic District**

Chairman Michelson announced that the applicant did not provide notice for the meeting. Commissioner Gurshman made a motion to carry the application to the February 27, 2018, meeting; Commissioner Thomas seconded the motion and it was approved unanimously by voice vote.

#### **2. Certificate of Appropriateness Application HPC 2017-17. Applicant- Elder Alvarenga 911-15 Putnam Avenue. Block 641, Lot 16. Putnam Watchung Historic District**

Mr. Alvarenga introduced himself to the Commission; he received violation notices from the city about the installation of a vinyl picket fence in the front yard without permits. Mr. Alvarenga also replaced wood windows on the third story of the front elevation with two vinyl 1/1 windows. Mr. Alvarenga installed the fence to deter trespassers and he replaced the wood windows because the window panes were broken. Mr. Alvarenga said he was not aware his property is in a historic district.

Vice-Chairman Quirk questioned the fence location and confirmed that the applicant did not obtain a zoning permit for the fence. Commissioner Schneider expressed his opinion about vinyl fences and stated that the fence should be wooden. Mr. Alvarenga offered to paint the fence; Commissioners told him that paint does not stick to vinyl well. Vice-Chairman Quirk said the rest of the windows on the house are vinyl and two more vinyl windows are not

objectionable but he would prefer wood. Chairman Michelson said he sympathizes with the applicant but if he had just applied for a permit he would have discovered that his property is in a historic district.

After further discussion, the applicant said he is willing to remove the fence by the end of April if he can keep the windows. Chairman Michelson opened the meeting to the public. Gerry Heydt of 915 Madison Avenue asked if a wrought iron fence would be permitted. Chairman Michelson said a wrought iron fence would be permitted. With no further comments from the public, Chairman Michelson closed the public portion of the meeting.

Vice-Chairman Quirk made a motion for after-the-fact certificate of appropriateness for two vinyl windows on the top floor of the front of the building and denial of a vinyl picket fence installed in the front yard; the applicant shall remove the fence within 90 days from February 27, 2018. Commissioner Gurshman seconded the motion and it was approved unanimously by voice vote.

**3. Certificate of Appropriateness Application HPC 2017-13. Zoning Board of Adjustment Application ZB 2017-06  
810 Central Avenue. Block 760, Lot 6. Van Wyck Brooks Historic District  
Applicant & Property Owner- Yates Real Estate, Inc.**

The applicant's attorney, Steven Rother, Esq., of Post, Polak, Goodsell & Strauchler, 425 Eagle Rock Avenue, Roseland, NJ 07068 informed the Commission that he plans on introducing two witnesses for testimony: psychologist Dr. Sean Evers, Ph.D., MSCP, and architect William Doran, RA. Mr. Rother said he recognizes it is highly unusual for a historic preservation commission to hear from a psychologist; he asserted there three applicable federal civil rights statutes apply- the Fair Housing Amendments Act of 1988, the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, and the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990. He further asserted these statutes require that individuals with psychological and physical disabilities should be given reasonable accommodation, including individuals with post-traumatic stress disorder, PTSD (a psychological disability), and that accommodation be made so they can reside in an area of their choosing.

Mr. Rother continued by saying that Mr. Doran will address the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation. Mr. Rother submitted the resume for Dr. Evers (Exhibit A-1) and requested he be admitted as an expert, the Commissioners did not question Dr. Evers' credentials and accepted him as an expert. Chairman Michelson asked if there would be a vote tonight; Mr. Rother said he would prefer a vote tonight. Chairman Michelson asked Mr. Rother if he would waive the 45-day rule if the Commission cannot vote; Mr. Rother replied "yes."

Dr. Sean Evers, 2421 Atlantic Avenue, Manasquan, New Jersey gave Commissioners a history of PTSD and how psychologists now understand its symptoms. The modern interpretation of PTSD includes symptoms of intrusive thoughts, avoidance behavior, avoiding stressful situations, limited/negative view of the future, and social/occupational dysfunction. Dr. Evers said that PTSD is a spectrum disorder. Dr. Evers related PTSD to homelessness. He gave a brief history of veteran homes in the United States. Dr. Evers said the relationship with PTSD is disproportional to the number of veterans that are homeless- on any given night in the United States there are 39,500 veterans that are homeless.

Mr. Rother asked Dr. Evers the advantages of veterans suffering from PTSD living in a group environment, Dr. Evers responded that vets feel comfortable with other vets in group therapy- it encourages relationships through group treatment. Chairman Michelson asked how long would veterans live together; Dr. Evers responded, an extended period of time. Chairman Michelson asked about the prognosis rate; Dr. Evers said the majority of veterans do get better. Chairman Michelson asked how PTSD interacts with drug or alcohol abuse and if so, how; Dr. Evers said there is risk of abuse, but he understands that the applicant's veterans home will be substance free. Dr. Evers added that veterans from Iraq and Afghanistan have lower rates of substance abuse than previous veterans.

Commissioner Thomas asked how this site has advantages to giving relief or solving issues, and what would be the duration of an average stay. Dr. Evers said the veterans center will have a presence in the house with counselling

available to all residents. He deferred to Mr. Rother for the average duration of a stay at the site. Commissioner Thomas asked what is unique about this site; Mr. Rother responded that a veteran should choose wherever he wants to go, anywhere in a community. Dr. Evers replied that some veteran housing is on the fringe of high crime areas- if we are to encourage reintegration, it should start in a regular community. Commissioner Favazzo asked Dr. Evers if he was assuming other areas in Plainfield are high crime areas; Dr. Evers said he has no idea. Chairman Michelson asked if spaciousness of quarters plays any role in how well a veteran's treatment and recovery will go. Dr. Evers said square footage does not play a role- lots of common open space plays a role.

Vice-Chairman Quirk asked Dr. Evers to further explain an external quality evaluation of veterans, as he testified to earlier in the hearing. Dr. Evers explained after Viet Nam, veterans did not want to go to a big Veterans Administration hospital, so the Veterans Administration created "vet center" counselling. Vice-Chairman Quirk asked Dr. Evers how he knew that the Yates House will be substance free; Dr. Evers said Mr. Yates told him. Vice-Chairman Quirk asked if there is some regulation that requires these types of facilities to be substance free; Dr. Evers referred the question to the applicant. Vice Chairman Quirk asked, if someone is in the group setting has alcohol or drugs, will it affect the program. Dr. Evers said the person with drugs or alcohol would be asked to leave the building. Chairman Michelson asked if veterans will be given a lease with notices for termination and eviction process, noting that there is no speedy way to get rid of an offender. Mr. Rother objected to the question, saying it was argumentative. Dr. Evers said he cannot answer the question- eviction laws are not his expertise. Vice Chairman Quirk asked if any other things or situations impact treatment such as diet, recreation, or structure; Dr. Evers said no. Vice Chairman Quirk asked if he was familiar with group facilities like what Mr. Yates is proposing; Dr. Evers said has not worked in a facility like this, he has read up on operations and is familiar with them from an academic sense. Chairman Michelson asked Dr. Evers if there is any licensing by a regulating entity that would apply to this facility; Dr. Evers said the question is beyond his expertise.

Commissioner Gurshman asked if there are any outward manifestations of PTSD that would affect people in public. Dr. Evers said there are no outward manifestations or symptoms that people would notice, but the question is difficult to answer; PTSD sufferers work hard to avoid stressful, loud, uncontrolled situations. Commissioner Gurshman asked about the selection process for the veterans home; Dr. Evers deferred to the applicant. Commissioner Gurshman asked what levels of PTSD are admitted; Dr. Evers said those who suffer from ambulatory (functional) PTSD; those who have non-ambulatory PTSD would be in a veterans hospital. Commissioner Gurshman asked who would be reviewing applications and what would be the role of the 24-hour resident in charge; Dr. Evers deferred both questions to the applicant.

Commissioner Schneider told Dr. Evers that he appreciates his work; he asked Dr. Evers if he would be a counselor at the Yates House; Dr. Evers said he would not be a counselor at the Yates House. Commissioner Schneider asked whether having 26 residents at any facility is good- is there a level of what is good or bad, a critical mass; Dr. Evers said there is no research on critical mass but less than 4 or more than 8 doesn't work in group therapy.

Citing the possibility of legalized marijuana, Commissioner Schneider asked Dr. Evers if he has had experience dealing with veterans on weed, and does he recommend it. Dr. Evers said marijuana is illegal in New Jersey and he cannot recommend it; he has seen it used for withdrawal from OxyContin. Commissioner Schneider asked how one protects oneself inside the house; Dr. Evers deferred the question to the applicant. Commissioner Schneider asked what an ideal living area is for veterans with PTSD- rural versus city or suburban. Dr. Evers said some veterans prefer rural, it is all about where the individual feels comfortable. Commissioner Schneider asked whether the community normally gets involved with veteran's homes; Dr. Evers said community involvement is generally a good thing, but he is not sure if the applicant plans on getting the community involved.

Commissioner Schneider asked Dr. Evers how the 39,500 homeless veterans throughout the United States on any given night compare to the total homeless nationwide? Dr. Evers said he did not know, but he did know 11% of homeless are veterans. Commissioner Schneider asked of the 11%, how many are in New Jersey; Dr. Evers said he did not know. Commissioner Schneider asked what the government is doing to house homeless veterans- are they

setting up houses like the proposed Yates House? Dr. Evers said the Veteran's Administration has programs that provide short term living domiciles, and New Jersey does too, on a short term basis (up to three months). Mr. Rother added that a veteran can stay as long as he or she wants to stay, with a government voucher.

Citing difficulties his relative who is afflicted with PTSD has had, living in a group home out of state, Commissioner Schneider asked how one evaluates if there is a reasonable amount of security for veterans living in a group home. Dr. Evers said as a candidate for independent living, the veteran chooses where he wants to live- a rural or more urban setting. Commissioner Schneider said when you have a mixture of elements, and one or two explodes, what control will the developer have, to protect those inside and outside- are there state guidelines or is it up to the developer? Commissioner Schneider asked how many other developments like this are in New Jersey. Dr. Evers said he was not sure; Mr. Rother said there are two or three in the state, and this would be the first in Union County. Commissioner Schneider asked why aren't there more of these accommodations? Mr. Rother replied there are HUD vouchers with limited funds, but there are little resources to house and find people, with the right motivation to provide housing in the community.

Commissioner Camino asked Dr. Evers if he practices his profession in a group setting; Dr. Evers said it is not common in his area and that the majority of his time is in private practice. Dr. Evers added that the veteran's center will send counsellors for group sessions.

Vice-Chairman Quirk asked Dr. Evers if a veteran living in the Yates House could refuse all treatments; Dr. Evers responded yes, unless under a court order. Dr. Evers opined that a benefit of living in a group home is being able to participate in any treatments with ease of access, but it is their choice- we cannot force people into treatment.

Commissioner Thomas asked if there was a screening process. Mr. Rother said a non-profit entity will be running the facility; the developer is developing the facility, but a non-profit will be running it, there will be a full time apartment resident supervisor. Veteran administration services will be made available to residents. A veteran with a HUD voucher comes with a case manager. Vice Chairman Quirk asked if the only requirement is to be a veteran and have a voucher. Mr. Rother replied no, you have to be a veteran coming out of transitional housing, or homeless and afflicted with PTSD.

Chairman Michelson opened the meeting to the public to question Dr. Evers. Gerry Heydt of 915 Madison Avenue asked about veteran's homes and experiences with substance abuse. Dr. Evers said the person would be asked to leave the facility, and he would recommend they return to the Veterans' Administration for treatment. Ms. Heydt asked what recreation veterans will have, in between treatments. Dr. Evers said the individual can stay in his apartment, exercise, visit the library, and stay active in a way that is comfortable for them. Chairman Michelson closed the public portion of the meeting.

Mr. Rother introduced William Doran, 26 Dundee Road, Kendall Park, New Jersey, as the applicant's architect. Mr. Doran distributed revised elevation drawings, and discussed the changes he made to the elevation plan since the last meeting, including adding a mansard roof to the third floor addition, changing the fenestration to the addition, and changing window dormer details at the mansard roof. The floor plans haven't changed. Mr. Doran added that he changed the addition from stucco siding to Hardieplank siding, even though there are examples of stucco buildings in the neighborhood.

Chairman Michelson said there are two important issues to discuss: 1) the old addition is the part of the structure that gives the HPC the biggest problem, specifically its setback distance from Lot 5, and 2) the height of the historic house is 41 feet, so whether the addition should be that high is a concern- should the applicant consider compressing the space vertically to lose the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor addition altogether. Mr. Doran said they have no intention of taking the addition down, and he made an attempt to soften the third floor with a mansard roof and roof line. Mr. Rother added the applicant can't afford anymore within the HUD voucher system- that is the accommodation. Chairman Michelson asked Mr. Doran if he is using the existing floors and ceiling and only adding the third floor; Mr. Doran said yes, but he has not been able to fully investigate the structure, and strengthening may be needed. When

asked if he has analyzed the carrying capacity of the addition, Mr. Doran said he is confident and not worried, adding that he has to show the building department that the plan will work. Chairman Michelson said the Certificate of Appropriateness and any variances approved by the Zoning Board would not make sense if the structure isn't adequate. Mr. Doran commented that the joist size and spacing was designed for a nursing home. Commissioner Favazzo asked Mr. Doran if he has seen it; Mr. Doran said he went through the building in 2012. Chairman Michelson asked about the old addition's foundation; Mr. Doran replied that there is 8 inch block with assumed footings, and if there are no footings, they will put them in. Mr. Doran concluded by saying the building will be structurally sound. Mr. Rother said they are not getting a structural analysis done yet; Commissioner Thomas suggested a preliminary wall section would assist with determining the strength of the addition. Mr. Doran said his approach is to get conceptual, get conditional approval, come back with wall sections, approach the details in a general sense, and address more details as one gets closer to construction.

A discussion ensued over whether the addition should have a Hardieplank or stucco exterior. Commissioners discussed the look and feel of Hardieplank, as well as cost.

Chairman Michelson asked the commissioners how they feel about the use/re-use of the old addition and its proximity to the property line. Commissioner Garrett said he has no problem with it. Commissioner Favazzo said the massing and location of the addition is pre-existing but he doesn't like it. Commissioner Thomas said he agrees with Commissioner Favazzo. Mr. Ross did not offer any comment. Vice-Chairman Quirk said the addition can be seen from West 8<sup>th</sup> Street, and from both Field Avenue and Central Avenue; the building and addition as it exists now is large, out of character, and close to the property line- visually it is a great obstruction. The proposed third floor addition is attractive, but it is adding more bulk to the building. Commissioner Gurshman said she doesn't like it. Commissioner Schneider and Camino both said they have no problem with the addition.

Chairman Michelson asked the commissioners how they felt about putting a third floor onto the old 1950-s era addition. He felt the third floor doesn't matter, as it is not higher than the top of the historic house. Commissioner Garrett said the addition is appropriate to what is there now- the new mansard roofline makes it better. Commissioner Favazzo said adding more mass actually helps camouflage it. Commissioner Thomas said the addition is sensitive to the existing structure. Vice-Chairman Quirk said it is a sensitive design, but adding a third floor increases the bulk and makes it less attractive; he is sure that the applicant's architect could work the proposal into the original building and not keep the addition at all. Commissioner Gurshman said visually it is alright, but she has a problem that a structural analysis has not been done. Commissioner Schneider said the architect did a great job and he loves the look, but he prefers preservation over renovation. In this case, though he understands there are in essence two buildings, it is renovation, not preservation, and that is his sole objection. Mr. Rother said the property has been this way since the 1950s, and since we are preserving a historic structure and making the rest look a lot better, the work we are doing here is reasonable. Commissioner Camino said that as a developer by trade, he embraces all of the work put into the plans, and he has two points to make: 1) the proposal looks better than a two-story addition; and 2) in business, usable space is valuable; he assumes without the third story addition, the project will not add up fiscally. Commissioner Camino continued by saying the applicant has to use every inch of the building, so he is inclined to make sense of the dollar and cents, and understands why it will not be an effective project if it is smaller.

Chairman Michelson opened the meeting to the public to question Mr. Doran. Gerry Heydt of 915 Madison Avenue said she was not sure the building was originally built as a nursing home, using nursing home standards for construction- the building became a nursing home. Mr. Doran said if it were a residence and turned into a nursing home, the building should have been updated at that time. Arne Aakre of 915 Madison Avenue said the economics/size of the building seems to dictate the addition. Is the voucher program the only program that the Veterans' Administration has to deal with homeless veterans? Mr. Aakre cited a case in Massachusetts of veteran housing for 14 units- how did they finance that? Mr. Aakre commented that the property cannot support the size of the development, so they had to add a floor and additional bulk- why not add more stories?

Chairman Michelson called for a five minute recess at 9:58 PM, the Commission reconvened at 10:07 PM.

Chairman Michelson asked Mr. Rother if he was willing to waive the 45-day rule; Mr. Rother said no and demanded that the Commission vote tonight instead. Chairman Michelson informed the Commissioners that they will partake in three votes: 1) grant or denial of a Certificate of Appropriateness; 2) recommending to the Zoning Board whether or not it should grant the bulk and height variances; and 3) recommending to the Zoning Board whether or not it should grant the use and density variances. With regard to the use variance, Chairman Michelson noted that there is not much before the Commission- Mr. Rother's clients did not testify, leaving the Commission with a one-sided analysis. Vice-Chairman Quirk added that if the applicant did not present sufficient evidence, it wasn't the Commission's problem how the vote turns out tonight. Commissioner Thomas said if the applicant wants a vote, does the Commission have to vote or can it wait until the next meeting? Commissioner Favazzo said he takes issue with voting- he has no objection to the details, but does object to the massing, which seems to be an open issue. Commissioner Garrett thinks the vote should be postponed. Commissioner Gurshman said she hasn't heard from the applicant; many questions to Dr. Evers were referred to the applicant, and the applicant is not on our record. Commissioner Schneider said he wants to see everything that goes into a project, but the Commission has not seen anything. If the applicant wants a vote it should present further details. Commissioner Camino said he is inclined to vote, but he would like to see more clarification; he thinks the Commission should defer the vote and get a more practical list of what is going into the building. Vice-Chairman Quirk said he would prefer that the applicant come back next month and Mr. Rother waive waive the 45-day rule.

Chairman Michelson asked Mr. Rother again if he was willing to waive the 45-day rule so the Commission could carry the case to the February 27 meeting. Mr. Rother said there are notes on the revised plans stating historic details will be repaired/replaced in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards so it will appear the way it did. The applicant is ready to come back anytime but only to address architectural details, and they are ready to accept an approval conditioned on details. Mr. Rother added that the Commission has no jurisdiction over use.

Chairman Michelson made a motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness based on sheets A-1, A-2, and A-3, as prepared by 3D Architecture, William J. Doran, Architect, and dated 1-23-2018. The drawings include plans and general notes related to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, for all work conducted on the historic building, allowing for the removal of a handicap ramp and a sidewalk leading to it; allowing construction of a third floor mansard and hip roof addition on the 1950s-era two-story addition, and acknowledging that the footprint of the old addition will not change. No one seconded the motion, the motion fails.

Chairman Michelson asked the Commission if there was a sense to deny the Certificate of Appropriateness; he asked for a motion to deny. Hearing no one from the Commission, Chairman Michelson made a motion to deny the Certificate of Appropriateness. No one seconded the motion, the motion fails. Commissioner Thomas cited a list of items that the Commission asked for that are non-structural, which will assist in the applicant achieving his objective.

The Commission discussed how to work with the applicant on a time frame for providing architectural details and incorporating that as a condition of Certificate of Appropriateness. The applicant and the Commission agreed that the Commission through the Architectural Review Committee will submit to the applicant within 45 days from the date of the Certificate of Appropriateness a list of required details, and within 45 days of an approval by the Zoning Board, the applicant will submit to the Commission for review the appropriate architectural details including: Hardieplank variety, AZAK product information, windows, cut sheets, door/window details, wall section, sill details, corner details, stair details, rear deck materials, panel details, porch details, column cut sheets.

Chairman Michelson noted the time was 11:00 PM and asked for a motion to continue the meeting in 15 minute increments. Vice-Chairman Quirk made a motion to extend the meeting by two increments to 11:30 PM, Commissioner Gurshman seconded the motion and it was approved unanimously by voice vote.

After further discussion, Chairman Michelson made a motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for plans to renovate the existing historic building and to add a third floor to an existing nonconforming addition, according to the applicant's submitted drawings sheets A-1, A-2, and A-3, as prepared by 3D Architecture, William J. Doran, Architect, and dated 1-23-2018. The drawings include plans and general notes related to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, for all work conducted on the historic building, allowing for the removal of a handicap ramp at the northeast corner of the property and a sidewalk leading to it; allowing construction of a third floor mansard and hip roof addition on the 1950s-era two-story addition, and acknowledging that the footprint of the old addition will not change. All materials and architectural details will be subject to further review by the Commission. As a condition of approval, a list of required details will be compiled by the Architectural Review Committee and submitted to the applicant within 45 days from the date of the Certificate of Appropriateness. Within 45 days of approval by the Zoning Board of Adjustment, if it occurs, the applicant will submit the appropriate architectural details, material samples, and associated specifications to the HPC for review. These architectural details, material samples, and associated specifications will be reviewed by the ARC, and returned to the applicant within 10 days from the date when the details were submitted to the HPC. Vice-Chairman Quirk seconded the motion. Chairman Michelson asked for a roll call vote:

Mario Camino (YES)	John Favazzo (YES)	Bill Garrett (YES)	Sandy Gurshman (YES)
Lawrence Quirk (YES)	Gary Schneider (NO)	Reginald Thomas (YES)	William Michelson (YES)

Chairman Michelson made a motion to inform the Zoning Board of Adjustment that the Historic Preservation Commission has no objection to the proposed seven (7) variances from R-VWB-2 bulk requirements, which deal with lot size, setbacks, and site coverage- these are all pre-existing conditions. With respect to the height variance, architectural revisions discussed at the last HPC hearing may have cured, and have at least lessened, the height issue caused by adding a third floor onto the old addition. With respect to the width of the driveway, the ZBA is requested to determine if it can be reduced. Commissioner Thomas seconded the motion. Chairman Michelson asked for a roll call vote:

Mario Camino (YES)	John Favazzo (YES)	Bill Garrett (YES)	Sandy Gurshman (YES)
Lawrence Quirk (YES)	Gary Schneider (NO)	Reginald Thomas (YES)	William Michelson (YES)

Chairman Michelson made a motion to recommend to the Zoning Board of Adjustment that the use and density variances be denied for the following reasons:

1. The City's 1998 Master Plan and 2009 Reexamination Report set forth a policy of maintaining and enhancing the residential qualities and relatively low densities in Historic Districts found in the "Objectives and Policies" sections 1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 2.2 and 4.3, and the "Historic Preservation Goals", restated in the 2009 Re-Examination Report.
2. The project disregards ambiance and quality of life in the surrounding neighborhood. The density of the proposal is 36 units per acre and the zoning ordinance limits density to 2 units per acre. The R-VWB-2 zoning calls for almost 1 acre lot sizes. The element of quiet and dignity is what we are trying to preserve, and this is damaged by a 25 unit apartment building which would have far more people than most, and given the other services to be provided, would create an unreasonable and intolerable impact.
3. In 2005, Lots 4 and 6 were merged; previous Lot 4 has been ignored during this hearing, which creates concern.
4. Parking. The project is based on residents not owning cars, or cars to be parked elsewhere- this is a concern. Additional cars from the proposed apartments would greatly damage the neighborhood ambiance. Residents in nearby apartments already park on the street. Relying on residents not owning cars is unenforceable, if not impossible. The applicant cannot assure that there will not be an increase in vehicles. There will also be an impact from visitor parking. If residents are not permitted to own cars, then why is there a parking lot for 11 cars? The Commission would welcome a reduction in the size of the parking lot. The plan calls for a 20 foot wide driveway, the Zoning Board could allow for a narrower driveway- the Commission would support this.



5. Regarding signs and flagpoles, the Commission recommends that the Zoning Board apply the existing sign ordinance and deny any larger signage. Flagpoles should not be allowed at all.
6. The operation of the facility as proposed constitutes a boarding house under the previous land use ordinance, and the current ordinance cites boarding houses as a prohibited use. No licensing or regulatory entity has jurisdiction over the proposed facility, meaning there would be no one to complain to, if the facility is not well-managed.
7. Once allowed to reside, it is impossible to evict the tenant for drug activity. There is nothing that precludes family members, children, and caretakers from moving in with the veterans. Should the operator declare bankruptcy or change its business model, or if the property falls into the hands of a subsequent owner which wants a different use, how does the city revoke an approval that is given now- we cannot enforce conditions, there are too many risks.
8. The units are less than 500 square feet- this is not a historic preservation issue, but it goes back to the units per acre, and the intensity of the use.
9. The master plan table appendix lists all of the social services already in the City of Plainfield- 55 providers. Everyone wants to dump their social services on Plainfield because property is cheap, and their residents are folks with problems that can affect Plainfield’s neighborhoods.
10. This Applicant bought this property knowing of the restrictions upon use, the property in question is in a zone that requires a minimum 40,000 square foot minimum lot size, and permits one- and two-family dwellings, and bed and breakfast uses only- not apartments. The property is in a historic district. The variances reflect self-created hardships.
11. Other applicable laws. Mr. Rother has made reference to three federal statutes: the Federal Fair Housing Act Amendments of 1988, the Americans with Disabilities Act, and the Rehabilitation Act. Chairman Michelson did legal research into these statutes, and New Jersey zoning law including the “inherently beneficial” cases, and could not find any authority identifying veterans in general, or homeless veterans in particular, as a class entitled to the “reasonable accommodation” remedy. Nonetheless, the Commission made a reasonable accommodation by approving a Certificate of Appropriateness, and citing no objection to height or bulk variance requests.

Vice-Chairman Quirk seconded the motion. Chairman Michelson asked for a roll call vote:

Mario Camino (YES)	John Favazzo (YES)	Bill Garrett (YES)	Sandy Gurshman (YES)
Lawrence Quirk (YES)	Gary Schneider (YES)	Reginald Thomas (YES)	William Michelson (YES)

**Adjournment**

There being no further business, Commissioner Gurshman made a motion for adjournment, seconded by Commissioner Thomas; all voted in favor, none opposed. The meeting adjourned at 11:42 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

*Scott Bauman*

Scott Bauman, AICP, PP  
 Principal Planner / HPC Secretary, Plainfield Planning Division  
 Prepared: April 5, 2018

**Approved by the Historic Preservation Commission: April 24, 2018**