



Time: 7:30 p.m.

Location: Hybrid - Newtown Borough Hall / Zoom

Present: Mr. James McAuliffe, Chair  
Mr. Michael Hutchinson, Vice Chair  
Ms. Marcia Lincoln-Heinz, Member *(via Zoom)*  
Ms. Judith Ritter, Member  
Ms. Karen White, Member  
Mr. Kris Bauman, Borough Council Liaison *(via Zoom)*  
Ms. Ana Gindhart, COA Administrator *(via Zoom)*  
Ms. Margaret Newman, Preservation Consultant

Absent: Mr. Robert King, Member

### 1. Meeting Commencement

Mr. McAuliffe called the meeting to order. He explained that this Board's recommendations will go to Borough Council for review at their regular meeting at 7:00 pm on Tuesday, March 10, 2026, in Borough Hall at 30 N. Chancellor Street. Applicants were advised not to begin their projects until they have received final approval by Council and obtained the necessary permits. The review process for larger projects may take two (2) to three (3) meetings. It was noted that the HARB reviews applications using *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties*, and these will be cited in the recommendations.

### 2. Approval of the Minutes

*Ms. Lincoln-Heinz made a motion to approve the minutes of the January 25, 2025, meeting, with the following change: correct the upcoming date of the HARB meeting from February 18 to February 25, 2026. Ms. Ritter seconded the motion, which was approved by the Board. Mr. Hutchinson abstained as he was not at the meeting.*

### 3. Applications Considered

The following applications were considered at the meeting:

25-042	239 Court St.
25-047	110 Lincoln Ave.
26-004	159 N. State St.
26-005	17 N. State St.
26-006	107 N. Chancellor St.
26-007	105 N. Chancellor St.
26-008	110 E. Centre Ave.
26-009	159 N. State St.
26-010	446 Washington Ave.

### 4. Application 25-042

**239 Court Street, residence**

**Applicant: Christine and Tim Deegan**

The applicants seek a Certificate of Appropriateness for the construction of a retaining wall. Christine and Tim Deegan attended the meeting.

The Board considered the application in relation to Ordinance No. 594 of the Borough of Newtown Code and *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties*.

HARB denied the application. Mr. McAuliffe stated that if the application had come before the wall was built, it would have been denied. HARB recommends a simpler, more appropriate stone wall. The stone shouldn't be laid in an ashlar pattern but rather more closely match the irregular and roughly dressed stone of the house's foundation. The cap should be less formal than the existing rectangular, cut-bluestone top. A more appropriate stone cap should be of the same stone as the wall.

*Citing Standards 9 & 10, Mr. Hutchinson made a motion to deny the application with the recommendation that the wall and cap more closely match the house foundation. Ms. White seconded the motion, which was approved unanimously by the Board.*

**5. Application 25-047**  
**110 Lincoln Avenue, Residence**  
**Applicant: Edward Deitzel**

The applicant seeks a Certificate of Appropriateness for alterations to the garage. Benjamin Phillips and Edward Dietzel attended the meeting.

The Board considered the application in relation to Ordinance No. 594 of the Borough of Newtown Code and *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties*.

After discussion about the appropriateness of the arched window in the rear upper gable end, the board concluded that a square or rectangular louvered opening may be more appropriate and asked the applicant to revise and resubmit the application including more detailed construction drawings with more information on overhangs, dimensions, soffits, materials, fishscales on the upper gables and the louver window as discussed.

*Mr. Hutchinson made a motion to table the application. Ms. Lincoln-Heinz seconded the motion, which was approved unanimously by the Board.*

**6. Applications 26-004 and 26-009**  
**159 N. State Street**  
**Applicant: Mike Hutchinson**

The applicant seeks a Certificate of Appropriateness for the repairs to the existing front porch, construction of a three-section addition off the back of the house and the demolition of an existing shed addition on the back of the house and an early 20<sup>th</sup> century shed at the rear of the property. Mike Hutchinson, Jeff Harris, Scott Williams and David Callan attended the meeting.

The Board considered the application in relation to Ordinance No. 594 of the Borough of Newtown Code and *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties*. Mr. Hutchinson recused himself from this application.

Ms. Newman and others expressed concerns about the scale of the additions and their large visual presence along Jefferson Avenue. Ms. Newman thought that the first addition, adjacent to the historic stone house, is not appropriately set off and that a set back or gap between the two would be more appropriate. She also said the window light configuration should be differentiated in the new addition and not match the existing 6-over-6 sash of the historic house.

Many board members were concerned about the dominance and size of the garage, including the three large dormers. Different garage configurations were explored including making the garage a separate building. However, the configuration of the lot, the curb cut and driveway made this less convenient and would require a variance.

Ultimately, the board decided to table the application and requested that the applicant return with revised plans addressing the scale and setback concerns.

*Ms. White made a motion to table the application. Ms. Ritter seconded the motion, which was approved by the Board. Mr. Hutchinson abstained.*

For application 26-009 and the demolition of the shed addition and the rear shed, the applicants received JHC approvals, HARB had no concerns.

*Citing Standard 5, Ms. Lincoln-Heinz made a motion to approve the application for demolition noting that neither the shed addition nor the rear shed has architectural or historic significance. Ms. White seconded the motion, which was approved by the Board. Mr. Hutchinson abstained.*

## **7. Application 26-005**

### **17 N. State St.**

#### **Applicant: Karoline and Janine Elise, Klassen Trust**

The applicant seeks a Certificate of Appropriateness for the installation of a fence. Austin Ball, from the property management company, attended the meeting via Zoom.

The Board considered the application in relation to Ordinance No. 594 of the Borough of Newtown Code and *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties*.

The board discussed that the fence has already been installed and that it is PVC, not a recommended material in the District. The fence should have been constructed of wood to match the previous fence.

*Citing Standard 6, Ms. White denied the application emphasizing that if the PVC fence had become before HARB before its construction it would have been denied. Ms. Ritter seconded the motion, which was approved unanimously by the Board.*

## **8. Applications 26-006 and 26-007**

### **105 and 107 N. Chancellor St.**

#### **Applicants: Christopher Grimes and Charles & Barbara Lewis**

The applicant seeks a Certificate of Appropriateness for repairs to the shared front porch of this twin house. Chris Grimes, owner of 107, attended the meeting and Charles and Bobbi Lewis, owners of 105, were on Zoom.

The Board considered the application in relation to Ordinance No. 594 of the Borough of Newtown Code and *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties*.

HARB and the applicant discuss the extent of the deterioration of the existing porch elements. HARB emphasized that priority should be given to repair over replacement of all materials. Where possible, the existing features should be repaired with wood dutchman or epoxy ("consolidant"). Where elements are beyond repair, they should be matched in material, dimension and profile. Mr. Hutchinson felt it was especially important to repair the three posts as new ones would be similar but not exact. The rail may be able to be reused as may most of the balusters. Those balusters that are too deteriorated should be turned to match the existing exactly. If necessary, the handrail should be replaced exactly in dimension, cut out and material.

*Citing Standard 6, Mr. Hutchinson approved both applications for 105 and 107 N. Chancellor St. with the following changes: the main three posts will be repaired using dutchman or epoxy. The railing will be salvaged if possible or replaced in exact kind in terms of proportion and detailing. The balusters will be salvaged. Necessary new balusters will be turned to match the existing. Ms. White seconded the motion, which was approved unanimously by the Board.*

**9. Application 26-008**

**110 E. Centre Avenue**

**Applicant: Peggy and Doug Levin**

The applicant seeks a Certificate of Appropriateness for alterations to the rear porch. Peggy Levin attended the meeting.

The Board considered the application in relation to Ordinance No. 594 of the Borough of Newtown Code and *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties*.

The applicant stated that she wants to create a three-season porch at the second floor of the rear addition by enclosing it with window sash. Mr. McAuliffe noted that the porch is in an addition to the original house.

*Citing Standard 10, Ms. White made a motion to approve the application as presented. Mr. Hutchinson seconded the motion, which was approved unanimously by the Board.*

**10. Application 26-010**

**446 Washington Ave.**

**Applicant: Matthew Neuman**

The applicant seeks a Certificate of Appropriateness for adding an EV charging pillar in front of his house. Mr. Neuman attended the meeting via Zoom.

The Board considered the application in relation to Ordinance No. 594 of the Borough of Newtown Code and *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties*.

HARB discussed Mr. Neuman's proposal for an EV charging station installation. The applicant clarified that the existing post installed is temporary and the proposed post would be different. The board expressed concerns about safety and about the visibility of the charging cable (which was included in the application), and recommended that it be completely enclosed, when not in use, within the proposed post. After much discussion, the board decided to deny the current application but offered the opportunity to resubmit with an enclosed cable design as well as more detail about how the pillar's details including cap and door. Mr. Neuman said the post would likely be 8" x 8". The board emphasized that their recommendation was based on historic review and aesthetics, not the functionality or need for the charging station which is up to Borough Council to decide.

*Ms. White made a motion to deny the application and stated that the cable cannot be left outside the post and should be concealed when not in use. Mr. Hutchinson seconded the motion, which was approved unanimously by the Board.*

**11. Upcoming Meeting**

The next HARB meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, March 25, 2026 in person and via Zoom.

**12. Adjournment**

On a motion by Mr. Hutchinson and seconded by Ms. White, the meeting was adjourned at 9:15 pm.

Respectfully submitted,  
Margaret Newman, Recording Secretary