

# Historical Commission Meeting Minutes

*East Brandywine Township Building*

*March 9, 2016 @ 7:00 PM*

Members Present: Vice-Chairman John Black, Chairman James Buczala, Mark Myers, Alexandria Proko, Daniel Rhodes, and Carol Schmidt.

Members Absent: Secretary Ashley Harper.

Guests: Chris Yates and Greg Russell of Applecross Country Club, Zoning Officer Frank Newhams and Assistant Township Manager Luke Reven.

Chairman Buczala called the meeting to order. By mutual agreement, the Committee swapped the order of agenda, first addressing the **Revised Historic Resources Impact Study for HR-104**. Chairman Buczala provided reminder of progress to date. Specifically, the Commission's letter to the Zoning Officer recommending denial of the building permit and the letter of the Board of Supervisors recommending they pursue legal action that could result in a court order to restore the springhouse. Mr. Newhams indicated he has not yet written a response letter and has time to respond. Mr. Newhams further indicated he has a building code concern as a result of the application's failure to establish the load capacity of the foundation.

After some discussion, a motion was made and seconded that the revised Historical Resource Impact Study dated February 26 and the letter from Ray Ott & Associates dated February 25 does not change the Historical Commission's recommendations contained in the letters of February 15 and February 17, 2016. The Commission is, however, open to discussing mitigation alternatives with Mr. Risbon at the April Historical Commission Meeting.

Mr. Newhams plans to write two letters, one relating to the building code and one relating to the zoning code--both denials. The zoning letter will reference the February vote of the Historical Commission as well as the conversation and vote of this March meeting.

Chairman Buczala recognized Mr. Yates regarding the **Trego Barn (HR-104.1)**. Mr. Yates indicated Applecross Country Club is back to discuss changes made to the plans discussed in 2015. The changes are the result of a change in design team. In general the plan is smaller in scale. Chris distributed elevation drawings and described the changes on each sheet. The revised approach to re-use of the Barn is summarized, below:

- The overall footprint of the building will be reduced by significantly reducing the size of the addition that will replace the rainbow roof section of the Barn.
- The addition at the southern end of the Barn will retain the rainbow shape of that current section of the Barn and be of similar height. One benefit of this is that the older sections of the Barn will be able to be seen from a Southern perspective (the previous addition would have hidden portions of the Barn from that view). Another benefit is that it will replicate, to some degree, the shape of the Rainbow Roof section of the Barn to be removed.
- The main kitchen will be moved from the Double Decker section of the Barn to a more central location. This will require an addition along the Eastern side of the Barn primarily in the Gambrel Roof section, the base of which will be at the "Main Level" of the structure, and be supported by round stone columns along the Eastern elevation. The benefit of this approach is that it will allow for less modification of the internal structure of the Double Decker section of the Barn and

keep the internal space of the Gambrel Roof section of the Barn intact (enabling patrons to fully experience the space and massive gambrel roof frame structure).

- The elevations of the Sink Mow and Threshing Floor will be maintained, with an extension of the floor on the “Upper Level” across the Eastern Sink Mow. The Western Sink Mow will be left open to the ceiling. To keep the floor elevations unchanged in the Double Decker section of the Barn, the floor of the Gambrel Roof section will be lowered (this will allow a single floor elevation for the “Main Level” and the “Upper Level”, while focusing on keeping changes to the Double Decker section of the Barn to a minimum). This approach has the huge benefit of allowing the patrons to experience the original floor elevations and space of the Double Decker section of the Barn as it was prior to re-use. While it is understood that a ledge of some type is needed at the Threshing Floor level above the Western Sink Mow for noise abatement, the HC would like to keep its size to a minimum (the HC does not think the proposed walkway is beneficial and would like to keep that side of the Barn open to the roof as much as possible). This bullet item is the most important feature to the HC of the new re-use proposal.
- The existing entrance to the Barn on the Western side (immediately to the North of the Gambrel Roof section) will be modified and used as an entrance to the restaurant. The previous concept of adding a new entrance location at the center of the Gambrel Roof section of the Barn on that side has been eliminated. A main entrance on that side of the structure will be included in the design of the addition immediately to the South of the Gambrel Roof section of the Barn.
- Locations for display of historical information regarding the Barn will be provided along the “Upper Level Walkway/Overlook” and along the Western edge of the Threshing Floor looking over the West Sink Mow.
- Applecross’ commitment to other mitigation items previously agreed to will remain intact:
  - Photo documentation (to be performed prior to alteration of the Barn by an historical professional with experience in this type of documentation). (Previously agreed to: the HC will review the report to determine its sufficiency for photo documentation of the Barn prior to any revision/construction work.)
  - Display areas for historical information, including an exterior area near the main entrance (with changes to the interior locations mentioned, above)
  - Storage of trusses from the Rainbow Roof section of the Barn

Details of the re-use design were discussed at some length, the items discussed and the views of the HC are as follows:

- The amount of windows along the service corridor (of the Eastern side addition) should be reduced or, if at all possible, eliminated.
- Regarding doors, there are several that suggest cross buck-style doors on the exterior. At the least, the external side of the doors should be simple vertical board doors.
- The curved truss design presented for the roof section for the addition replacing the Rainbow Roof section of the Barn is unnecessary and inconsistent with what has historically been used for barn construction. Barns like this had simple straight timber members (note that we are talking about the curved truss members that make up the interior of the bowstring trusses; the top chord of these trusses will obviously be curved, but the braces should be straight pieces). Further, it would likely be beneficial to NOT expose the timber truss at the South elevation, as barn board siding on that gable end could provide some much needed shade and protection to

the outdoor deck area. If the bow string trusses were allowed to extend down to the floor elevation on both sides it would restore the balanced look of the gable that currently exists.

- The headroom issue at the main stairs will need to be addressed. Hopefully, this can be done without some sort of small protrusion out of the roof. Extending the gambrel roof to gain much needed headroom could be considered to address this issue. Also, if the exterior stairs on the east side need to remain (Mr. Yates indicated that it was possible that they might be able to meet code without them) then maybe they can be tucked in under this gambrel roof extension. If the gambrel roof was extended it would also help the look because it would extend out farther than the proposed lean to roof which currently falls flush with the gable end (which will have the tendency to make it look like one large gable).
- The windows throughout the Barn should have consistent size divided lights (avoid various divided light sizes). Also, the windows should have the appearance of true divided light windows.
- The proposed addition of windows on the East side of the Double Decker section of the Barn is inconsistent with typical barn construction (note that there are almost no windows currently on that wall of the Barn). However, the HC accepts the necessity of the windows to provide natural light to the dining areas of that section of the Barn. The windows have the added benefit of providing a view of the farmhouse that is associated with the Barn.
- The stone veneer should be real stone - not colored concrete simulated stone. It could be 2" thin veneer but should be real, with real 2" stone corners, and match the existing as close as possible.
- The HC needs to be involved with the selection process for exterior materials and colors.

It was agreed by all at the meeting that the HC would provide a letter to Applecross presenting our views on the proposed conceptual plan for re-use of the Barn, including recommendations on design elements.

**Demolition-by-Neglect Concerns:** Several historic resources were discussed where there are still concerns about the protection of the structures against the weather. These include:

- HR-45 (205 Township Road) and HR-49 (414 Creek Road) are both owned by the developer of the Hillendale project. Concerns previously discussed by the HC still remain. Jim will request that Frank Newhams present an enforcement letter to the developer.
- HR-104.1 (Trego Barn): The Barn should be closed up to weather (concerns previously noted). Jim will communicate the concerns of the HC directly to Mr. Yates.

**Historic Resource Research:** Dan Rhodes has made progress in his research efforts on HR-45 and HR-49 over the past month. Of particular note, he finds that the Dowlin family is associated with HR-49 (as well as HR-45). Other current priorities for research include HR-170 (the Weaver Farm at 1234 Horseshoe Pike) and HR-13 (the Animal Resorts property at 301 Jeffries Road) due to the potential for development.

**Hadfield Road Bridge Update:** Jim spoke with Ms. Sandy Martin regarding the status of the Bridge. The design concepts discussed with the HC during the Fall of 2015 have been internally discussed at the County. They are currently in the process of re-budgeting the bridge to consider the design elements that were agreed upon between the Township and the County. With regard to the letter from the Township supervisors requesting the bridge be designed as a one-lane structure, she is not aware of a final decision, but a letter should be forthcoming.

Minutes prepared by Luke Reven and Jim Buczala