

MINUTES

1. Call to Order by Carol Larro

2. Members present: Drew James, Chris Morgan, Brad Slamp, Carol Larro, Jonathan Gremminger

3. New Business
 - a. **27 1st Avenue**
 - i. The chairwoman invited the applicant to present her application. The applicant was not present and the application was not heard.

 - b. **605 WHP**
 - i. Attorney: Damien del Duca
 - ii. The applicant recently purchased the property. The applicant intends to use the property for her interior design business.
 - iii. The applicant testified that the property is in need of repair, including the brickwork. The applicant intends to perform a full exterior renovation (roof, siding, windows, etc.)
 - iv. There will be multiple improvements to the front of the property. The handrail will be replaced. The exterior will remain the same color and the roof will be gray asphalt shingles.
 - v. Windows: white surround with Anderson 400 vinyl. Member C. Morgan asked about the composition of the current windows. The current windows are a mix of wood and vinyl in no particular pattern. The frames are wood. Member D. James asked the applicant to estimate the percentage of wood windows and vinyl windows. About 5-6 wood windows, scattered in no particular order throughout the building. Member D. James asked if there could be wood windows placed in the front of the windows. Applicant would like to keep the windows consistent in light of the overall improvements to the property.

- vi. Roof: The side roof will be aluminum and the same color as the roof.
- vii. Door: Gray. The columns will remain in the front. The lanterns will be 24” on the front and 18” on the side. There was discussion on whether the 24” lanterns were too big. The applicant testified that there was a large gap between the front door and the nearest windows and that the lanterns will not appear too large. Member B. Slamp asked if there was no storm door planned. The applicant responded that there is none proposed and that there is currently a fiberglass door. Member. D. James asked about the proposed door. The applicant responded that it would be a painted fiberglass door.
- viii. Sign: The sign will be in the same position as the current sign. The sign may be smaller in size. The sign would be illuminated with landscape lighting. Member C. Morgan notified applicant that any sign design will also need to conform to Planning Board standards.
- ix. Landscaping: Member C. Larro suggested adding bushes along the left side of the property. The applicant responded favorably to the suggestion.
- x. Siding: Member B. Slamp noted that there is currently cedar shake on the side house above the first floor (driveway side) and whether that style would be preserved. The applicant responded that she would consider retaining the cedar shake above the first floor level as suggested.
- xi. Chimney: Member D. James asked if the chimney would be retained. The builder responded that the chimney would remain as-is except paint.
- xii. Public comment: NONE
- xiii. **Resolution: Motion by B. Slamp to approve the design as submitted with one revision, to maintain the cedar shake on the 2nd floor where there is currently cedar shake. 2nd by D. James. Approved 5-0.**

c. 501-503 Station Avenue

- i. C. Larro read the conclusions of the engineering report prepared by Bach Engineers. C.Larro explained the importance of historic sites to the master plan and other ordinances of the borough.
- ii. Attorney for the applicant Damien del Duca asserted that the focus should be on the economic feasibility of the project. He pointed the HPC to the pro forma prepared and delivered on April 21st. The applicant asserted that many changes have been made to the building over the past decades such that the structure existing today bears little

resemblance to the historical structure. Estimated renovation costs are \$700,000. The applicant provided testimony on the economic feasibility. The applicant testified that the structural costs would be \$170,000, that even if the purchase price would have been \$0 it would not be viable, and the rents that would be required to support a breakeven.

- iii. J. Gremminger commented on components of the pro forma provided and the underlying assumptions in the pro forma. He continued to focus on the economic feasibility factor set forth in 450-110C.
- iv. D. James commented on the role and the limitations of the HPC.
- v. C. Morgan commented on the HPC's role in preserving the overall aesthetic of the historic district.
- vi. Public comment (Demolition)
 1. Bill Lange, 26 First Ave
 - a. Asked applicant if they owned other buildings in HH.
 - b. Asked applicant why they took a chance on the property without assurance that property could be developed?
 - c. Concerns about the "edges" going and demolition continuing inwards.
 2. Bob Bunis, 235 First Ave
 - a. Owns 5 buildings in town, all in the historic district.
 - b. Supportive of application.
 - c. Suggests that if this application does not move forward, it will be another developer proposing a similar project years down the road.
 - d. Wants HPC to guide design of the cornerstone/entrance of the borough.
 3. Kathy Lange, 26 First Ave
 - a. Comments on AT&T lease and the continuing payment of rent.
 - b. Comment on 2 surveyors at the site today.
 - c. Comments on the composition of the HPC and the black of credentials of the members, and the lack of opportunity to consult with professionals unlike the applicant.
 - d. Viewed this as a case of demolition by neglect
 4. Victor Turkot, 503 Station owner
 - a. Bought the property when it was in poor condition.
 - b. Explained the history of the flood damage and tenant history at 501 Station Avenue

- c. Supportive of the applicant
- 5. Ken Funkhouser, 414 Second Ave
 - a. Former HPC member
 - b. Concern over the overall size and setback.
 - c. Need to view the application in light of other WHP properties.
- 6. Tony Giorgio, 204 Tenth Ave
 - a. Thought the HPC was viewing the situation myopically; need to view with respect to Station as well as WHP. Massing too large; needs "air".
 - b. Not in favor the "Welcome to Haddon Heights" signage.
 - c. Concern of building on top of WHP; look at apartment buildings in Audubon on WHP.
- 7. Ann McAdams, Kings Run
 - a. Former HPC Member
 - b. Against the application
 - c. Generational problem
 - d. Concern over upkeep at railroad station house, lack of code enforcement
 - e. Parking concerns
 - f. Too much mass
- 8. Mary Rugarber, 32 First Ave
 - a. Seemed like we were in a hurry to demolish
 - b. Pointed out other towns that were able to save dilapidated building (Woodbury [multiple properties]) saved through grants; Camden.
 - c. Concern over other buildings following
- 9. Bob Hunter, 213 2nd Avenue
 - a. Noted that there are two demolitions. Believes 503 must be economically viable by itself.
- 10. Mark Standring, 208 Fourth Ave
 - a. Reviewed design guidelines and noted his house appeared there many times.
 - b. Renovated his house. It was in need of repair when he bought it.
 - c. Not in favor of the demolition.
 - d. Believes it is not the job of the HPC to consider economic feasibility.

- e. Just came off 10 year lease, need time to explore other options.
- 11. Colleen, 29 White Horse Pike.
 - a. Concern over the size
 - b. Asked if anyone has asked about kids walking across WHP.
 - c. Concern over taxing the sewer system.
 - d. Wants to see a nod given to the existing architecture. Project needs to be scaled down.
- 12. Mayor Zach Houck
 - a. Explanation of redevelopment process; process of entering into Memorandum of Understanding and escrow accounts for professional fees.
 - b. When asked responded that he is in favor of the project.
 - c. Deferred questions on HPC governance to the borough solicitor and some questions on redevelopment to redevelopment counsel.
- 13. Bob Hunter, Joan Rosner, Tony Giorgio added comments off camera.
- vii. **Resolution: Motion by J. Gremminger to recommend the demolition of 501 and 503 Station Avenue. 2nd by D. James.**
 - 1. **Yes (4) - J. Gremminger, D. James, B. Slamp, C. Morgan**
 - 2. **No (1) - C. Larro**
- viii. Presentation by architect. The architect walked through the changes from the last presentation. The revised plans compared the height of this project to other buildings in town, as well as architectural details found in other buildings along Station Avenue. Noted that the original design pulled in the first floor to add visibility around the corner. Answered questions about the height of the pilothouses (9 feet above roof).
- ix. Attorney del Duca answered questions about the overall timing of the project and when demolition would take place. He explained that the redevelopment project would need to pass the ordinance and the Planning Board would review for technical compliance. The application could return to the HPC depending on the changes that occur during the redevelopment discussion.
- x. D. James asked why the building has to be this size. Applicant stated that there are few ADA compliant buildings in the borough. The building needs to be a certain size to justify the inclusion of an elevator (plus stairwells).

- xi. B. Slamp asked about water mitigation behind the property. Applicant stated that they are working with engineer to help rectify that problem moving forward. Stormwater will be directed to Station Avenue rather than WHP.
- xii. Public Comments (design)
 - 1. Christine Feese, 1352 Maple Avenue
 - a. Will this be attached to the dentist office or free-standing?
 - b. Applicant: it will be attached.
 - c. C. Larro noted that at one time there was an alley there.
 - 2. Bob Hunter
 - a. Only property on WHP that does not have setback.
 - 3. Ken Funkhouse
 - a. Notes the interpretive sign program from the HH Historical Society
 - 4. Jen, Kings Run
 - a. How do we know they have financial ability to complete the project?
 - b. Attorney del Duca: Impossible to make the representation that there is no scenario where they could not run out of money. Governing body will determine the size of the bond.
 - 5. Georgio
 - a. In every instance when there is a taller building there is a setback, including 500 Station Avenue. The corner buildings are important and respects the corner. Need to think three-dimensionally.
 - b. Concerned over canyon effect like in Haddon Township.
 - 6. Attorney del Duca: applicant has asked for HPC recommendations. They will be filing application with the Planning Board. Asked to deliver written recommendations.
- xiii. **HPC agreed to provide written recommendations regarding the design within 2 weeks of this meeting (May 11).**