City of Cape May Historic Preservation Commission  
Monday, August 19, 2019 - 6:00 PM

Opening: The regular meeting of the City of Cape May Historic Preservation Commission was called to order by Chairman Mr. Coupland at 6:09 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 Absent - excused  
Mr. Clemans Absent - excused  
Mr. Cogswell Present  
Mr. Connolly Absent - excused  
Mrs. Stridick Absent - excused  
Mr. Testa Present  
Mr. Cataldo Alt. 1 Absent - excused  
Mrs. Ryan Alt. 2 Present  

Also Present: Robert Fineberg, Esquire – Commission Solicitor  
Zach Mullock, Commission Liaison  
Karen Keenan, HPC Secretary

Resolution(s):

Palavest, LLC (Icona), 1101 Beach Avenue, 1115/32 – Resolution #2019-18

Motion made by Mr. Cogswell to approve Resolutions #2019-18. Seconded by Mr. Testa and carried 4-0. Those in favor: Mr. Cogswell, Mr. Testa, Mrs. Ryan, Mr. Coupland. Those opposed: None. Those abstaining: None.

Applications Approved in Review:

Keeler, 513 Elmira Street, 1061/7, Non Contributing – Install Fence, In-ground Pool, and Paver Walkway  
Haney, 336 Congress Street, 1026/10, Contributing – Shed  
Van Syckle, 712 Lafayette Street, 1080/1.02, Contributing – Extension of Existing Fence  
Cape KMT, LLC, 215 Decatur Street, 1049/12 – Contributing -- Masonry Foundation, Reconstruct Porch Flooring  
Van Syckle, 712 Lafayette Street, 1080/1.02, Contributing – Gas Generator  
KKM Properties, LLC, 901 Benton Avenue, 1084/3, Contributing – Front Entry Overhang Roofing Material  
Palavest, LLC (Icona), 1101 Beach Avenue, 1115/32, Not Rated -- Updated Solar Panels Drawing with Dimensions & Measurements  
Melso, 907 Stockton Avenue, 1082/19, Key – Fence  
908 Madison, LLC, 908 Madison Avenue, 1094/13, Non Contributing – Windows and Exterior Door  
Brennan, 1146 Washington Street, 1110/32, Contributing – Roof  
Swain’s Property Management, LLC, 305 Jackson Street, 1040/2.01, Contributing – Roof  
Casaccio, 208 Congress Street, 1025/6, Contributing – Replace HVAC Units  
Peter, 1022 Washington Street, 1110/12, Non Contributing – Final Changes & Drawings per HPC Meeting

Motion made by Mr. Testa to accept all Applications Approved in Review. Seconded by Mr. Cogswell and carried 4-0. Those in favor: Mr. Cogswell, Mr. Testa, Mrs. Ryan, Mr. Coupland. Those opposed: None. Those abstaining: None.
NEW BUSINESS:

THE BASSETT FAMILY, LLC.................................................................701 KEARNEY AVENUE
BATHROOM ADDITION/ROOFTOP DECK, BLK 1063 LOT 9  (CONTRIBUTING)

Architect, Joseph Ross, representing the applicants who could not be present, explained that the existing home is a three bay Georgian Revival, Classical Revival, masonry home with wings on each side. One wing includes a rooftop deck and the other side includes a kitchen wing. The reason for this application is that large family needs more bathrooms than the two and one half bathrooms in this six-bedroom house. Mr. Ross explained that the idea is to build two minimally sized bathrooms over the kitchen wing. Mr. Ross described the proposed addition in his drawings. He stated that the structure is not wooden but a masonry home with stucco including the gabled ends. A clapboard look is proposed and wood could be used but the intent is to ask for Hardie Board in a clapboard finish that looks like wood for fire rating purposes. The window proposed is Jeldwen wood in a simulated divided lights in a similar pattern similar to the rest of the house with front shutters. The wood railing detail would be similar in appearance and wider railings as preferred by the HPC. Mr. Ross noted there are distinctive quarter round windows existing on the gables at the house; two are on the southwest side of the house with one to remain.

The commission members complimented Mr. Ross on his work and sensitivity towards historic preservation but indicated that the proposed addition unbalances a balanced contributing property and their concern when such a house goes out of symmetry.

Mr. Ross stated that classical symmetry is not a mirror image but a balance but stated that clearly there is work to be done. He asked if the additions could be moved to both sides, and the commission felt that would not be encouraging, as the house may lose historical character. Possible solutions were presented by the commission members, including commentary from Mr. Mullock with Mr. Ross’ approval, and Mr. Ross said he will discuss those with the applicants and asked that the application be tabled.

Motion made by Mr. Cogswell to table the application with the applicants’ waiver of the 45-day timeline. Seconded by Mr. Testa and carried 4-0. Those in favor: Mr. Cogswell, Mr. Testa, Mrs. Ryan, Mr. Coupland. Those opposed: None. Those abstaining: None.

LOTTHIAN.................................................................1146 LAFAYETTE STREET
SUNROOM ADDITION, BLK 1113 LOTS 11 & 12  (NOT RATED)

Architect, Joseph Ross, described this ranch home, that had a renovation a few years ago. The newer owners of this property currently have two uncovered outdoor spaces that they want to change to only one uncovered patio space and replace one with a sunroom addition. Mr. Ross went on to describe the materials list including matching red cedar shingle siding and same coursing, Marvin Integrity windows, architectural shingles to match and a stick built shed with the same materials matching those of the house. The applicant is seeking final approval.

The members of the Commission expressed positive comments of the application.

Motion made by Mr. Cogswell to grant final approval as presented, including the shed. Seconded by Mr. Testa and carried 4-0. Those in favor: Mr. Cogswell, Mr. Testa, Mrs. Ryan, Mr. Coupland. Those opposed: None. Those abstaining: None.
Architect, Joseph Ross, presented the proposed project by summarizing the previously approved project, less garage, which has been used during renovation of the residential space to store construction materials. Mr. Ross described the garage with what is believed to have asbestos siding. The application proposes to retain the foundation and structure of the garage, but to put a steeper roofline on it and deck in the attic for storage space. The new design is to conform to all existing setbacks. Final approval, contingent on zoning approval, is sought. Mr. Ross described the project to start at the top of the existing plates up, removal of the existing roof and a new roof going on. The exterior door is to remain in the existing location with changes only to the passage door and windows locations being swapped. The attic will be six feet tall, uninhabitable and for storage only and the garage will be in use. The materials will be the same as the house: architectural siding, wood siding with clapboard on the bottom and sawn cedar shakes on the dormers for contrast and wood windows.

The commission members made positive comments on the project, discussed the materials to be used for the siding and asked about the light fixtures. Mr. Ross said the exterior light fixtures have not been selected yet and would be presented for HPC for review at a later date.

Motion made by Mr. Cogswell to grant final approval as presented, specifically that the exterior siding to consist of the lower four feet to be fiber cement board with wood clapboard above it and any deviation from the drawings presented will come back to the HPC review committee or full board subject to Zoning Board approval. Seconded by Mr. Testa and carried 4-0. Those in favor: Mr. Cogswell, Mr. Testa, Mrs. Ryan, Mr. Coupland. Those opposed: None. Those abstaining: None.

Architect Adam Crossland presented the application seeking conceptual approval for this project, as the applicants currently have this property under contract for purchase. The proposal is to construct a wrap-around porch on the first and second floors.

The commission expressed concerned about the lack of a plan for them to consider. It was suggested that the application be tabled until more information was presented. There was concern that the inset porch, which is an important feature, was eliminated and the front facade is proposed to be completely changed of this contributing structure. The commission asked for property addresses to be listed on the streetscape photos and more details with size and proportion to be included in the plans presented.

Mr. Crossland said he is seeking information to bring back to his clients and asked if he could meet with one or more of the members after gathering more information for input. The commission did not believe that was in order.

Motion made by Mr. Coupland to table the application with the applicants’ waiver of the 45-day timeline and being placed on next month’s agenda. Seconded by Mr. Testa and carried 4-0. Those in favor: Mr. Mr. Cogswell, Mr. Testa, Mrs. Ryan, Mr. Coupland. Those opposed: None. Those abstaining: None.
Architect Adam Crossland presented the application seeking final approval for this project and showed a rendering of the proposed project to enlarge the porch three feet and add a wrap around porch to the back of the dwelling.

The members said that final approval would not be possible without more detailed drawings and that the drawings should almost be ready for submission to the Construction Office.

Mr. Crossland then asked for conceptual approval.

Board Solicitor, Bob Fineberg, then explained the process by stating that the application should be at the point that the Construction Official would refer it to the HPC for prior approval.

**Motion made by Mr. Coupland to table the application with the applicants’ waiver of the 45-day timeline and being placed on next month’s agenda.** Seconded by Mr. Cogswell and **carried 4-0.** Those in favor: Mr. Mr. Cogswell, Mr. Testa, Mrs. Ryan, Mr. Coupland. Those opposed: None. Those abstaining: None.

Architect Adam Crossland presented the application seeking final approval for this project. The applicants have a third floor condo, called the Atlantic Suite, which will undergo an interior renovation and want to replace the deck, which was removed a few years ago to replace the roof. At the rear of the building there is a parking area.

The commission members remarked that the building was a bed and breakfast that was converted to condos about ten years ago and asked about window placement.

Mr. Crossland advised that the windows are dormer windows in the back, left of the chimney and the decking will be hidden from the front and side yards and has been approved in the past.

**Motion made by Mr. Cogswell to grant conceptual approval for this application noting that there have been decks that have been used for fire escape purposes and the HPC must have drawings with all dimensions, size and spacing of the spindles, the type of the top rail, the materials which must be consistent with the standards in the HPC District including windows, and cut sheets for the windows.** Seconded by Mr. Testa and **carried 4-0.** Those in favor: Mr. Cogswell, Mr. Testa, Mrs. Ryan, Mr. Coupland. Those opposed: None. Those abstaining: None.

Architect Adam Crossland presented photos of the existing property from Washington Street and from West Street and renderings of the proposed changes. The applicant proposes to fill in the second story screened porch and add an addition to the left rear of the house. Mr. Crossland described the two floor plans as one without the rear addition and one with the rear addition and requested conceptual approval of the project.

The commission members asked about window placement and stated that they like to see symmetry and balance.
Motion made by Mr. Cogswell to grant conceptual approval for this application noting that the HPC requires construction drawings with all dimensions, cut sheets, a materials list and make the windows more balanced. Seconded by Mr. Testa and carried 4-0. Those in favor: Mr. Cogswell, Mr. Testa, Mrs. Ryan, Mr. Coupland. Those opposed: None. Those abstaining: None.

Discussion was open to the public at 7:50 PM.

Mr. Westin Wardell, 819 Benton Avenue, thanked the commission members for their service to Cape May. Mr. Wardell said he believes that rebuilding should not be built to the detriment of Cape May. He went on to say that he believes the owner of 901 Benton Avenue will be a good neighbor but expressed concerns about water runoff due to the filling in of the basement (as there are riparian rights under the ground) and the Wardell property (with a dry creek bed that runs underneath) across the street. Other concerns were listed by Mr. Wardell to be street parking, 45% coverage rule, noise from the swimming pool and that the 901 Benton home is too big for the neighborhood. Mr. Wardell asked the HPC to look to the future regarding Cape May’s historic status and thanked the members again for their service.

Mr. Coupland thanked Mr. Wardell for his comments and said the HPC is sensitive to his concerns.

Discussion was closed to the public at 8:07 PM.

DISCUSSION:

Chairman Coupland advised the membership that Cape May HPC has obtained permission from the state to develop its own training, so the members do not have to travel to training. Mr. Coupland asked the members to share agenda ideas and stated that he anticipates the training to take place in October and run about four hours, which will satisfy the eight-hour annual state requirement. He asked if the members prefer a morning or evening time. He also advised that, as there will be a quorum, the public can attend. Mr. Fineberg confirmed that this training meeting should be noticed.

Mr. Coupland summarized his attendance at the recent Planning Board meeting and the application for Lokal Stockton that was heard at the meeting. His stated his reason for attending the meeting was there were several things Lokal Stockton agreed to do when they appeared before the HPC, and there were things done that were not discussed when they appeared before the HPC. These items are: a block wall was not presented (they presented wood fences), a metal roof was presented and an asphalt roof was installed, and a bridge step was approved and has been changed. The issue at hand is that the Planning Board has asked that applicant to come back to the HPC to address the issues prior to getting a certificate of occupancy.

The commission members commented in the negative as to the appearance of Lokal Stockton. Mr. Coupland went on to say that the Planning Board had issue with the applicants’ installation of clamshells when pavers had been approved. The HPC did approve the windows, but that Andersen changed the window model number’s material used from wood to wood “or vinyl” clad. The HPC has since gained an understanding of the product change. Mr. Coupland also advised that the architect contacted him to say that he had been called off of the job by the owner who took over the management of the construction. The architect was concerned about his relationship with the HPC.

Mr. Coupland went on to summarize the Planning Board appearance of Broadway Beach who had previously appeared before the HPC. The HPC had recommended that they may apply for a subdivision, in order to save the contributing property, to the Planning Board. The Planning
Board was critical of the HPC for suggesting the applicant apply to the Planning Board. Mr. Coupland suggested that the HPC not deal with the Planning Board or Zoning Board of Adjustment in the future but continue to provide input to applicants when it makes sense.

Motion to adjourn the meeting was made by Mr. Cogswell at 8:20 PM, with all in favor.

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

Respectfully submitted: Karen Keenan – HPC Secretary