

**City of Cape May Historic Preservation Commission
Monday, September 18, 2017 - 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 - arrived at 6:15 PM
Mr. Mullock		Present
Ms. Hardin	<i>Alt. 1</i>	Present
Mr. Cataldo	<i>Alt. 2</i>	Present

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

Minutes: August 2017

Motion made by Mr. Connolly to approve the August 2017 minutes. Seconded by Mr. Cogswell and **carried 7-0**. Those in favor: Mr. Connolly, Mr. Clemans, Mr. Cogswell, Mr. Mullock, Ms. Hardin, Mr. Carroll, Mr. Coupland. Those opposed: None. Those abstaining: None.

Resolutions:

Peter, 1035 Washington Street, 1112/11.01, Resolution # 2017-14
Cape Elmira Owner 2, LLC, 527 Elmira Street, 1061/10, Resolution #2017-18
VT Urban Renewal "Victorian Towers," 1058/1 & 34, Resolution #2017-19
Pray, 1005 New York Avenue, 1102/55 & 56, Resolution #2017-20
Breitenback & Pritchard, 1216 New Jersey Avenue, 1130/9 & 10, Resolution #2017-21
Palavest, LLC "Icona Hotel," 1101 Beach Avenue, 1131/32, 33, & 34, Resolution #2017-22

Motion made by Mr. Cogswell to approve Resolutions #2017-14, #2017-18, #2017-19, #2017-20, #2017-21, and #2017-22 . Seconded by Mr. Carroll and **carried 7-0**. Those in favor: Mr. Connolly, Mr. Clemans, Mr. Cogswell, Mr. Mullock, Ms. Hardin, Mr. Carroll, Mr. Coupland. Those opposed: None. Those abstaining: None.

Applications Approved in Review:

Peel, 1203 New Jersey Avenue, 1131/32,33, & 34, Not Rated - Fence
Kessler, 1232 Washington Street, 1128/20, Contributing - Roof
Asterino, 705 Columbia Avenue, 1066/19, Contributing - Sidewalk

Tiburzio, 923 Washington Street, 1094/11 & 15, Non-Contributing - Fence
Calandrello, 223 North Street, 1031/41 & 42, Contributing - Porch and Roof

Motion made by Mr. Clemans to accept all Applications Approved in Review. Seconded by Mr. Connolly and **carried 7-0.** Those in favor: Mr. Connolly, Mr. Cogswell, Mrs. Pontin, Mr. Cataldo, Mr. Carroll, Mr. Coupland. Those opposed: None. Those abstaining: Mr. Mullock.

OLD BUSINESS:

**MAGRAW.....619 HUGHES STREET
RENOVATIONS/ADDITION, BLK 1058/LOT 29 (CONTRIBUTING)**

Member Carroll recused himself from the application.

Mr. Joe Ross, Architect, summarized the details on the previously granted final approval for the White Dove and conceptual approval for the Little Dove cottage during the April 2017 meeting; conducive to variances sought before the Zoning Board of Adjustment. Now, he stated, the Zoning Board variances were in fact granted, with conditions regarding a second floor rear deck on the Little Dove cottage, earlier proposed to HPC, that had to be removed and is now replaced with a new triple pane window. This application, Mr. Ross continued, is for final approval of the change imposed on the Little Dove cottage.

A lengthy discussion was undertaken regarding construction work that began prior to this particular meeting date requesting final approval. Mr. Michael Walters, of M.A.W. Builders, speaking on behalf of the application, indicated that a paver driveway and walkways were installed (without any prior HPC approvals) and that the addition of a dormer had begun, but was in fact halted when the Construction Official visited the property to enforce a stop work order; no permits were pulled for the current work being done. The membership commented on preserving the original brick that is present on one of the two (2) driveways and the Chairman cited pages 63 and 64 of the design standards to reinforce the issue of installing pavers without approval.

Another topic of discussion amongst the applicant, her representatives, and the membership, was that of the porch railing system not previously brought before the commission that was now in fact being changed/installed. It was explained by Mr. Ross that the railing system was not originally part of the building plan, but now the home owner, Sharon Magraw, wished to duplicate the front railing system on the rear.

Comments from the membership were positive regarding the railing system design.

The driveway opening was mentioned as another concern of the membership; currently at a fifteen (15) foot width. Ms. Magraw stated that this seemingly large width was due to the fact that this is in fact the only way that a car can exit the driveway onto Hughes Street safely. Discussion between the commission, Mr. Ross, and Ms. Magraw ensued regarding the driveway in order to reach a compromise in the width.

A short, five (5) minute recess was requested by Mr. Ross and his client, Sharon Magraw, and granted at 6:50 PM.

Meeting returned at 6:56 PM.

The applicant and her professionals returned to the meeting in agreement that the driveway would be reduced to a ten (10) foot width.

The application was considered in three (3) motions.

Motion made by Mr. Cogswell to grant final approval for the Little Dove cottage. Seconded by Mr. Mullock and **carried 7-0.** Those in favor: Mr. Connolly, Mr. Clemans, Mr. Cogswell, Mr. Mullock, Ms. Hardin, Mr. Cataldo, Mr. Coupland. Those opposed: None. Those abstaining: None.

Motion made by Mr. Cogswell to approve the addition of the cornice and railing system in the rear of the home. Seconded by Mr. Connolly and **carried 7-0.** Those in favor: Mr. Connolly, Mr. Clemans, Mr. Cogswell, Mr. Mullock, Ms. Hardin, Mr. Cataldo, Mr. Coupland. Those opposed: None. Those abstaining: None.

Motion made by Mr. Coupland to approve driveways and sidewalk in red brick (to match to existing) and the modification to the driveway width. Seconded by Mr. Connolly and **carried 7-0.** Those in favor: Mr. Connolly, Mr. Clemans, Mr. Cogswell, Mr. Mullock, Ms. Hardin, Mr. Cataldo, Mr. Coupland. Those opposed: None. Those abstaining: None.

Mrs. Pontin entered the meeting at 6:15 PM.

**PRAY.....1005 NEW JERSEY AVENUE
NEW CONSTRUCTION, BLK 1102/LOT 55 & 56 (NOT RATED)**

Steve Fenwick, Professional Architect, summarized the conceptual approval granted by the commission at the August 2017 meeting. He mentioned that since then, the application has been heard before the Zoning Board of Adjustment and modifications were enforced due to public concerns. Mr. Fenwick continued, referencing the new revised plans that include a reduction of the size of the wraparound porch (on the second floor) and also changes made as recommendations from the membership regarding the railing system and the need to make it thicker or "more beefy." The applicant, Mr. Larry Pray and Mr. Fenwick showed the commission a sample of the system that they would prefer to use.

The membership was positive on the changes.

Comments were also made that it should be enforced that the railing system will include a thicker four (4) inch railing. Revisions should be submitted to Review Committee before moving forward with construction permits; to include the reduced porch, the details and dimensions of the railing system, and the elimination of any decorative "ginger bread" style woodwork.

Motion made by Mr. Carroll to grant final approval with a submission of revised plans for review committee. Seconded by Mr. Connolly 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.

NEW BUSINESS:

**952 BOARDWALK INC. "CAPE WINDS".....810 LAFAYETTE STREET
RENOVATIONS, BLK 1092/LOT 4 (NOT RATED)**

Representative for the application, Mr. Steve Nehmad, Esq., summarized the intent of the proposed renovations. He mentioned that the changes are not structural in any way, but were more so to give the motel a "green look."

Mr. David Schultz, Licensed Architect, detailed the existing motel referring to current photos, citing that the proposed application is a part of a complete overhaul of the building and grounds, while not changing the structure of the 1960s concrete building. The overall idea, he stated, is to add character to the streetscape utilizing wood, paint, trellises for vine growth, and lush landscaping. Mr. Schultz cited more specific changes including the addition of a rooftop deck (with railing), solid roof to replace what is currently only second floor canopy, and also signage. Items were detailed from the materials list, submitted to the commission.

Members comments were positive on the application. With the mention of the script proposed for the sign on the building that will face Lafayette Street, the commission stated that it was preferable to choose a script listed within the design standards. The applicant agreed to this change.

Jonathan Hirsch, property owner, reviewed for the commission more details of the proposed roof top deck and the rules and regulations to be enforced with guests.

Motion made by Mr. Clemans to grant final approval as presented with an adjustment made to the script used on signage (must be chosen from Design Standards). Seconded by Mr. Mullock 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.

**FISHER.....277 WINDSOR AVENUE
ADDITION, BLK 1027/LOT 16 (CONTRIBUTING)**

Representative and Architect for the application, Christina Amey, detailed the current property, citing that it is not possible for the proposed addition to extend outside the current building envelope because it is in fact at its maximum. The presented application is a way for the home owner to renovate and add on in the most least intrusive way.

Ms. Amey explained that the proposed addition was only two (2) dormers in the rear of the home and that all other renovations would be same for same materials, including wood clapboard siding.

Members comments were positive on the application.

Motion made by Mr. Mullock to grant final approval as presented. Seconded by Mr. Carroll 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.

**KANE.....817 KEARNEY STREET
ADDITION/RENOVATION(S), BLK 1069/LOT 6 (CONTRIBUTING)**

Simone Kane, home owner, detailed to the commission her reasons for making a second home purchase in Cape May and mentioned that the renovations proposed in this application would make the home more accessible for elderly family members.

Architect, Catherine Lorentz testified on behalf of the application and described each of the seven (7) renovations that are proposed, referring to renderings of both the existing structure and the anticipated changes. Ms. Lorentz described each element, which included the enclosure of a side porch (to mimic the front 3 season room) and the relocation of attached steps from the same area. Other renovations, she indicated as minor, included window replacement, new railing system atop the garage, removal of a brick chimney that is no longer in use, and replacing an outdated vinyl outdoor shower enclosure with wood, and relocation of A/C units to a niche on the side of the home (complete with privacy lattice).

As proposed in the application, Ms. Lorentz went on to describe that the home owner was hoping to utilize the space over top of the existing attached garage. In making this space a deck area for socializing or sunbathing, a door would lead off of the existing kitchen, and as she already explained the railing system would be replaced. The existing kitchen has three (3) windows that look out onto the area above the garage and the applicant is proposing to keep two (2) of these windows and replace one (1) with the new doorway.

Members stated their concerns for the record, mentioning that the existing windows should first be determined as original or not, but that the newly proposed window design was appropriate. Other concerns and negative comments from the commission included the appropriateness of making an entertainment/social type deck above the garage, as well as the proposed enclosure of a back porch, original to the home from time of construction.

A short, five (5) minute recess was requested by Ms. Lorentz and the applicant, Simone Kane, and granted at 8:45 PM.

Mr. Connolly exited the meeting at 8:45 PM.

Meeting returned at 8:51 PM.

Upon return, Mrs. Kane expressed that she could not appease the commissions suggestions on the changes made to the scope of the proposed work without having her husband involved and it was concluded that the application would be revised and that they would return at a later date.

Motion made by Mr. Carroll to grant conceptual approval as presented, with the anticipation that concerns would be addressed before returning for final approval.

Seconded by Mr. Mullock and **carried 7-0**. Those in favor: Mr. Clemans, Mr. Cogswell, Mrs. Pontin, Mr. Mullock, Ms. Hardin, Mr. Carroll, Mr. Coupland. Those opposed: None. Those abstaining: None.

**GIBBS.....1129 WASHINGTON STREET
DEMO/NEW CONSTRUCTION, BLK 1113/LOT 28 (CONTRIBUTING)**

Mr. Coupland, HPC Chairman, addressed the commission regarding his previous discussions with the applicant, Mr. Scott Gibbs.

Applicant and home owner, Scott Gibbs, summarized a previous hearing for renovations given final approval by the commission for the same subject property, and conceptual approval for what he anticipated would be the restoration and repair of an existing shed located at the rear of the driveway. Mr. Gibbs went on to explain that the structure, as it stands, is not sound or safe, and has a significant crack/damage to the foundation. His proposal to the commission is for a wood 14 x 24 structure.

Commission Solicitor, Mr. Robert Fineberg, Esq., assisted Mr. Gibbs in reviewing the nine (9) points of demolition and the board was positive on this topic.

Motion made by Mr. Carroll to grant final approval as presented for the demolition only. Seconded by Mr. Mullock and **carried 7-0.** Those in favor: Mr. Clemans, Mr. Cogswell, Mrs. Pontin, Mr. Mullock, Ms. Hardin, Mr. Carroll, Mr. Coupland. Those opposed: None. Those abstaining: None.

Moving forward with the application, it was explained that Mr. Gibbs did not have any architectural or detailed drawings/renderings of the newly proposed structure. The members expressed that without such information, construction applications and permits will not be able to be submitted and that this commission could not give final approval of the new construction without this information either. Furthermore, it was mentioned to Mr. Gibbs that such details are needed in order to compare and contrast the design of the new structure to that of the home and the streetscape as well.

Mr. Gibbs expressed that he was displeased with this process and after spending well above his budget on the purchase and renovation of the home, he did not think it was necessary to pay a professional architect to draw a small shed. The cost, he stated, was not worth it. Suggestions were given by the commission to possibly have a sketch drawn up by the builder, or to get dimensions and renderings direct from a company that he would be purchasing the shed from.

Brief discussion ensued, but Mr. Gibbs was not pleased with the suggestions given by the commission.

No other motion was made for this application.

Ms. Hardin exited the meeting at 9:30 PM.

**PROGNER.....12 SECOND AVENUE
NEW CONSTRUCTION, BLK 1012/LOT 15.02 (NON-CONTRIBUTING)**

Steve Fenwick, Professional Architect, detailed the current state of the property and stated that the proposed plans brought before the commission are a "minor revision" to the previous approval given to Mr. Progner at the March 2017 HPC meeting. The exterior changes, Mr. Fenwick went on to explain, were only triggered by the client, Bob Progner, wanting to revise the locations of spaces inside the home, i.e. moving the master bedroom from the rear of the home to the West side. The proposed application depicted only a change to the West elevation and none to the East elevation, as shown in renderings (revised July 2017) provided to the members. No changes to the home are visible from the primary façade, approaching the home from road entry.

The essence of the purpose of moving the master bedroom, as per Mr. Fenwick and Mr. Progner, was to have this room "where the view is." That being said, the addition of three (3) windows (a gable) and one (1) door is proposed, but it was also mentioned that the proposed changes also made the roof line cleaner and more symmetrical.

The members expressed positive feedback regarding the application.

Motion made by Mr. Carroll to grant final approval of the application with note that a pool was not presented with current plans. Seconded by Mr. Cogswell and **carried 7-0.** Those in favor: Mr. Clemans, Mr. Cogswell, Mrs. Pontin, Mr. Mullock, Mr. Cataldo, Mr. Carroll, Mr. Coupland. Those opposed: None. Those abstaining: None.

**PETER.....925 COLUMBIA AVENUE
DEMO, BLK 1090/LOT 41.01 (NON-CONTRIBUTING)**

Mr. Scott Peter, owner and developer, described the current state of the property and reviewed the nine (9) points for demolition of the single family home with his intent to return to the HPC for the new construction of a single family dwelling that will be, according to Mr. Peter, more consistent with the designs standards.

Mr. Peter went on to explain that the current home is under Base Flood Elevation and the new home will in fact meet the current requirements.

Members expressed their concerns with the demolition and made comments that new construction of any larger home on the property would seemingly be out of place. Mr. Peter assured the membership that his new construction would in fact have to come back before the HPC and his intensions are to keep in line with the characteristics of the current streetscape.

Motion made by Mr. Carroll to grant final approval as presented for demolition only. Seconded by Mr. Mullock and **carried 4-3.** Those in favor: Mrs. Pontin, Mr. Mullock, Mr. Cataldo, Mr. Coupland. Those opposed: Mr. Clemans, Mr. Cogswell, Mr. Carroll. Those abstaining: None.

**REINERT.....347 CONGRESS STREET
DRIVEWAY, BLK 1031/LOT 82 & 83 (CONTRIBUTING)**

Mr. William Reinert, applicant and property owner, summarized the current parking area on the property, stated that it has "always been used" in the same sense by the home owner. Since Mr. Reinert's purchase of the property in 2001, he has had to add gravel to this area to level off the ground and now he is proposing to add trap rock to this same parking area.

Furthermore, Mr. Reinert explained, he is also looking to subdivide the lot; as it stands, the dwelling sits on lot 82 and the garage is on lot 83. Such a subdivision will in fact require both Planning Board and Zoning Board of Adjustment approvals he noted. Pictures were provided to the membership of the current driveway that sits behind a 6 ft. thick stretch of bushes and shrubs.

Members questioned the appropriateness of the application containing what is essentially front yard parking; as the driveway/parking area depicted as bring both on the front and the side yard, which is against code and current standards. Comments from the membership also addressed the fact that there has been, nor are there no current, permits in process for this parking area and no Planning or Zoning Board Applications have yet been filed for other various approvals.

The meeting was open to the public at 10:21 PM.

Mr. Albert Novino, 351 Congress Street, opposed the application and commented that the applicant never had proper permits for the parking area. Mr. Novino mentioned that a 1995 Planning Board denial (and appeal) for a subdivision was also upheld in the appellate division.

Mrs. Anita Novino, 351 Congress Street, also made negative commentary regarding the application.

The meeting was closed to the public at 10:28 PM.

Motion made by Mr. Mullock to approve the application as presented. Seconded by Mr. Cogswell and **carried 0-7**. Those in favor: None. Those opposed: Mr. Clemans, Mr. Cogswell, Mrs. Pontin, Mr. Mullock, Mr. Cataldo, Mr. Carroll, Mr. Coupland. Those abstaining: None.

Discussion was undertaken regarding City Ordinance #335-2017 and it was mentioned that after several of the HPC members have been involved in numerous meetings about the changes proposed to the ordinance, there is some "helpful headway" being made.

Mrs. Pontin exited the meeting at 10:38 PM.

The next item mentioned to the commission was a rehabilitation project, as provided by Chris Borstel, for 708-710 Beach Avenue. The HPC is dictated by the State of New Jersey to act as an advisory board to review the plans for municipal rehabilitation projects within the city.

Mr. Clemans exited the meeting at 10:47 PM.

Brief discussion ensued regarding the Master Plan Reexamination, with several members interested in focusing on the Historic District and "evening out" certain areas of it. Currently, there are some voids within the district that seemingly do not make sense.

The commission was positive on this matter.

Motion to adjourn the meeting was made by Mr. Carroll, seconded by Mr. Cogswell with all in favor at 11:00 PM.

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

Respectfully submitted: Tricia Oliver - Assistant