

**City of Cape May Historic Preservation Commission
Monday, September 17, 2018 - 6:00 PM**

Opening: The regular meeting of the City of Cape May Historic Preservation Commission was called to order by Vice Chairman Tom Carroll at 6:00 PM in the City of Cape May Auditorium. In Compliance with the Open Public Meetings Act, adequate notice of this meeting was provided.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Roll Call:

Mr. Coupland, Chairman		Present
Mr. Carroll, Vice Chairman		Present
Mr. Clemans		Present
Mr. Cogswell		Present
Mr. Connolly		Present
Mrs. Pontin		Present
Mr. Mullock		Present
Ms. Hardin	<i>Alt. 1</i>	Absent - excused
Mr. Cataldo	<i>Alt. 2</i>	Absent - excused

Also Present: Robert Fineberg, Esquire – Commission Solicitor
Roger Furlin, Commission Liaison
Tricia Oliver, Assistant

Minutes: June 18, 2018

Motion made by Mr. Connolly to approve the minutes of June 18, 2018. Seconded by Mr. Carroll and carried 6-0. Those in favor: Mr. Connolly, Mr. Cogswell, Mrs. Pontin, Mr. Mullock, Mr. Carroll, Mr. Coupland. Those opposed: None. Those abstaining: Mr. Clemans.

Resolutions:

Caputo, 286 Windsor Avenue, 1023/8 – Resolution #2018-22
Caputo, 288 Windsor Avenue, 1023/7 – Resolution #2018-23
Ludeman, 5 Stockton Place, 1064/7 – Resolution #2018-24
Allison, 905 Beach Avenue, 1081/24 – Resolution #2018-25
Hampton, 645 Lafayette Street, 1060/22 – Resolution #2018-26
Tucker, 1122 Lafayette Street, 1113/4 – Resolution #2018-27
Asterino, 705 Columbia Avenue, 1066/19 – Resolution #2018-28
Sowers, 825 Washington Street, 1092/19 – Resolution #2018-29

Motion made by Mr. Mr. Clemans to approve Resolutions #2018-22, #2018-23, #2018-24, #2018-25, #2018-26, #2018-27, #2018-28, and #2018-29. Seconded by Mr. Cogswell and carried 7-0. Those in favor: Mr. Connolly, Mr. Clemans, Mr. Cogswell, Mrs. Pontin, Mr. Mullock, Mr. Carroll, Mr. Coupland. Those opposed: None. Those abstaining: None.

Applications Approved in Review:

Chalfonte Partners, LLC., 301 Howard Street, 1071/7, Key – Sidewalk
MMCM, LLC., 411 Washington Street, 1043/2, Non-Contributing – Roof
Sucher & Lyne, 124 Decatur Street, 1041/5, Contributing – Roof
Winger, 426 W. Perry Street, 1031/ 13 & 14, Contributing – Fence
Okupniak, 1232 Washington Street, 1128/20, Contributing - Driveway

Motion made by Mr. Clemans to accept all Applications Approved in Review. Seconded by Mr. Connolly and **carried 6-0.** Those in favor: Mr. Connolly, Mr. Clemans, Mr. Cogswell, Mrs. Pontin, Mr. Carroll, Mr. Coupland. Those opposed: None. Those abstaining: Mr. Mullock.

NEW BUSINESS:

**LAWRENCE A. PRAY BUILDERS.....304 HOWARD STREET
DEMO/NEW CONSTRUCTION, BLK 1065/LOT(S) 7 & 8 (NOT RATED)**

* Mr. Mullock recused himself from the application.

Architect, Steve Fenwick, reviewed the current state of the subject property, detailing the required nine (9) points/criteria for the demolition of a structure within the Historic District.

Motion made by Mr. Cogswell to grant final approval for the demolition only (as presented). Seconded by Mr. Carroll and **carried 6-0** Those in favor: Mr. Connolly, Mr. Clemans, Mr. Cogswell, Mrs. Pontin, Mr. Carroll, Mr. Coupland. Those opposed: None. Those abstaining: None.

Mr. Fenwick continued on with his presentation, detailing the proposed plans for a new single family dwelling. As a garage is not proposed with the current plans, Mr. Fenwick explained, a rear shed was included, and ample parking for up to three (3) cars, which did include a front yard space.

Brief discussion was undertaken by the membership and the applicant’s professional regarding changing the driveway slightly and upholding the standards of the Zoning requirements and the Residential Site Improvement Standards (RSIS).

Mr. Fenwick detailed each of the proposed elevations included with the materials presented to each commission member. He also provided streetscape photos. Mr. Fenwick continued to list and detail at length the materials include with the proposed new construction; to include 20-0 series Anderson windows, clapboard siding, a brick foundation with lattice work, and a vinyl fence. Cut sheets were also provided for the exterior lighting fixtures and roofing materials. Members of HPC noted that the exterior lighting fixture presented was a bit too colonial in design for the project and expressed the need to revisit.

Various items presented on the materials list were addressed by the membership and dictated as items that would need final evaluation by the Review Committee (see motion below). Overall, the members expressed positive feedback for the general design and stated that it did in fact compliment the streetscape well.

Motion made by Mr. Cogswell to approval application with final approval subject to Review Committee evaluation regarding the driveway change, cedar lattice work at foundation, revised light fixture, a standing seam of 1 inch or less, cellular PVC or Azek outdoor shower enclosure, specifics with cut sheets for doors, trims, brackets/railing system(s), and revised 400 series Anderson windows. Seconded by Mr. Carroll and **carried 6-0** Those in favor: Mr. Connolly, Mr. Clemans, Mr. Cogswell, Mrs. Pontin, Mr. Carroll, Mr. Coupland. Those opposed: None. Those abstaining: None.

Architect, Steve Fenwick, addressed the commission, stating that the applicant, also present, Jane and Bill Hand (mother and son respectively), had previously come before the HPC about a year and half ago with a completely different proposal for an addition that was not well received, so they were now back with something that they think is a better alternative to the original project. Mr. Fenwick detailed the surrounding area of the subject property, noting the hotel across the street and the single family's presence within a non-residential zoning district. He mentioned a previous approval for cedar roof materials at the front of the home and asphalt on the rear. Mr. Fenwick continued on detailing each of the provided elevations for the newly proposed addition. The intent, he stated, is to restore the exterior of the current home and to integrate the addition as best as possible, including raising the home to meet FEMA regulations. He also reviewed the plans for the proposed garage.

Mr. Coupland explained to the commission that the current home, according to plans, is a total of about 1100 square feet with the proposed addition of approximately 1700 square feet (totaling approx. 2800 sq. ft.). In response, Mr. Fenwick stated that the Floor Area Ratio (FAR) allowed within this zoning district is roughly 3200 square feet, therefore the proposed FAR is not going to be a zoning issue. It was explained to Mr. Fenwick that the inclusion of vinyl products for the proposed fence, and other elements should be rethought and considered with more appropriate materials.

Overall, Mr. Coupland and other members expressed great concern for the size of the proposed addition. The whole addition seemingly absorbs the existing contributing structure and engulf the nature of the historic value of the structure as it currently exists. Mr. Clemans expressed that it looked as though the structure was "consumed by the addition." Mr. Connolly mentioned that it is not the "relationship of the structure to the land that should be relevant, but the continued relationship of the contributing structure to the Historic District." Members of the commission explained that rear additions are more appropriate for structures within the Historic District, especially for those that are designated as contributing structures.

Mr. Fenwick responded to the concerns of the commission regarding a more appropriate rear addition, stating that the corner lot dimensions did not allow for such. He explained that there is only about eight (8) feet available at the rear of the structure in order to stay within setbacks (he referenced the site plans provided to the membership).

Mr. Carroll made positive commentary regarding the proposed addition and overall design, with slight materials revisions.

Mr. Coupland addressed the applicants and Mr. Fenwick regarding the possibility of exploring alternative planning options, such as a subdivision of the lot. Mr. Fenwick's response was that approximately two (2) years ago that idea was presented to Attorney Lou Dwyer, Esq. who had advised against a residential subdivision within a commercial zoning district, and hence limits the options for the applicant and would in fact create an undersized residential lot requiring variance relief.

Motion made by Mr. Carroll to grant conceptual approval for the application as presented. Seconded by Mr. Connolly and denied 2-5. Those in favor: Mrs. Pontin, Mr. Carroll. Those opposed: Mr. Connolly, Mr. Clemans, Mr. Cogswell, Mr. Mullock, Mr. Coupland. Those abstaining: None.

**ANDERKO.....815 COLUMBIA AVENUE
DEMO/ADDITION/RENOVATIONS, BLK 1075/LOT(S) 8 (CONTRIBUTING)**

Property owner, Ted Anderko, began by detailing elevation page SP of the proposed addition at the rear of the home. He noted some existing non-conformities to the current dwelling and that with his renovations, he was not completely sure if a zoning board hearing would be necessary. Me. Anderko continued to describe the modest approximate 900 square foot addition and listed the proposed materials as presented to the commission.

Brief discussion was undertaken by the membership regarding the visibility of the rear addition according to what was represented in the proposed elevations. It was expressed that the renderings were not very clear. Members also explained to Mr. Anderko that the proposed materials included with his application needed revision to coordinate more with the constraints of the City's Design Standards, as there were too many composite materials included. The members requested clarified plans of the roof line upon return for an approval.

*Mr. Connolly exited the meeting at 8:15 PM.

Motion made by Mr. Carroll to table the application for revision of construction plans and a revised materials list. Seconded by Mr. Mullock and carried 6-0. Those in favor: Mr. Clemans, Mr. Cogswell, Mrs. Pontin, Mr. Mullock, Mr. Carroll, Mr. Coupland. Those opposed: None. Those abstaining: None.

**KKM PROPERTIES, LLC.....901 BENTON AVENUE
RAISING/RENOVATIONS/ADDITION, BLK 1084/LOT(S) 3 (CONTRIBUTING)**

Jeffrey Barnes, Esq., detailed the current colonial revival style structure located at the subject property. He noted that similar styles of homes exist within the neighborhood, more specifically at 808-811 Benton Avenue and 1501 Beach Avenue. This home, Mr. Barnes continued, is in need of raising to meet FEMA regulations, which is only approximately two (2) feet total.

Architect and Professional Planner, Lou DeLosso, presented a virtual 360-degree elevation rendering/tour of the current home as it stands currently. He stated that the current crawlspace of the home takes on water and is actually below street level, therefore raising the structure to FEMA regulations and providing a new foundation is ideal and necessary. Mr. DeLosso continued with his presentations detailing at length the proposed addition using his virtual tour presentation, mentioning that the proposed additions were minimal and also split up around different areas of the home, not one massive added structure. He detailed each proposed elevation at length.

Mr. DeLosso detailed the proposed materials list at length, mentioning wood shutters and the need to remove the current metal siding to explore what might be underneath. It was stated that the home owner, Mr. Von Seekum, and Mr. DeLosso, preferred to use a wood siding regardless of what might be found under the current metal siding. The commission was happy with this preference.

Overall, members voiced their concern for the general size of the addition proposed at the side elevation, with explanation that this sizeable addition looks to change the character of the existing contributing structure. It was suggested that a more balanced look/symmetry was preferred.

Brief discussion was undertaken by the commission members, the applicant, and his professionals regarding revisions of the side addition and the possibility of adjusting that particular area to present itself at the rear of the structure.

Motion made by Mr. Carroll to grant final approval for raising the current structure, installation of helical pilings, and new brick foundation only (due to time constraints of the applicant) and to grant conceptual approval as presented with further revisions to architectural plans. Seconded by Mr. Mullock and **carried 6-0.** Those in favor: Mr. Clemans, Mr. Cogswell, Mrs. Pontin, Mr. Mullock, Mr. Carroll, Mr. Coupland. Those opposed: None. Those abstaining: None.

**KLOOSTERBOER/ZICARI LIVING TRUST.....25 SECOND AVENUE
NEW CONSTRUCTION, BLK 1014/LOT(S) 22 (NON-CONTRIBUTING)**

Attorney Jeffrey Barnes, Esq., detailed the existing property, which currently stands as a vacant lot after a previous HPC approval for the demolition of what once existed on the property.

Architect Blane Steinman continued the presentation with his renderings of the proposed front elevation, which triggered negative response from the commission members due to the presence of a garage set at the front of the proposed single family dwelling. Mr. Coupland explained that this type of architecture was uncharacteristic to that of Cape May in general and this was not consistent with the surrounding streetscape.

The home owner, Barbara Zicari, expressed to the commission that it was her opinion that the streetscape of Second Avenue was vastly inconsistent due to its proximity to commercial buildings.

A short recess was taken at the request of the client and her professionals at 9:19 PM.

The meeting returned at 9:22 PM.

Mr. Steinman continued, reminding the membership about two previous approvals that he has helped design. One at the corner of Queen Street and Kearney Avenue and another home on Congress Street. He explained that these approvals sparked the current design for his current client.

Mr. Coupland reminded Mr. Steinman and those present that each application received by the HPC is taken on an individual basis, as no two structures within the Historic District are exactly alike.

Brief discussion was undertaken regarding how to rework the structure without the garage at the front.

Members were overall positive regarding the concept and design with the exception of the garage placement/location.

Motion made by Mr. Carroll to approve the application as presented with final Review Committee evaluation regarding garage revisions with the driveway changes, revised materials list, wood railings, Azek outdoor shower enclosure noted on final plans, and revisions to the proposed fence as discussed. Seconded by Mr. Mullock and **carried 6-0.** Those in favor: Mr. Cogswell, Mrs. Pontin, Mr. Mullock, Ms. Hardin, Mr. Cataldo, Mr. Coupland. Those opposed: None. Those abstaining: None.

Discussion was open to the public at 9:54 PM and closed with no one coming forward.

Motion to adjourn the meeting was made by Mr. Clemans at 9:55 PM, with all in favor.

A verbatim recording of said meeting is on file at the Construction/Zoning Office.

Respectfully submitted: Tricia Oliver - Assistant