

**BOROUGH OF WEST CAPE MAY
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
February 9, 2023**

The regularly scheduled meeting of the West Cape May Historic Preservation Commission was called to order at 7:03 p.m. The Open Public Meetings Statement was read by Chairman, Jim Barnes, who then led those present in the flag salute. Chairman Jim Barnes, Regular Member, Elan Zingman-Leith and Alternates, Barbara Tillman and Giacomo Antonicello were present and answered roll call. Also in attendance, Norman Roach, HPC Administrative Officer, and Stacy McCaney, Deputy Zoning and Code Enforcement Officer. Regular members David DeTorre, Susan Hoffman and Ami Menz were not in attendance. Alternates, Barbara Tillman and Giacomo Antonicello were eligible to vote.

Minutes:

On motion of Elan Zingman-Leith, seconded by Giacomo Antonicello, the Minutes of January 12, 2023, were unanimously approved on voice vote of members present.

RESOLUTIONS

Jim Barnes announced that during his review of the Resolutions, some errors were present and after discussion between the recording secretary, Erin Seer, and HPC Solicitor, Erika Lezama, it was suggested that the following Resolutions be tabled until the following meeting.

23-3 – Issuing Permit for Minor Work to Wesley and Cynthia Kline for Application No. 23-3, 113 Second Avenue; Block 35, Lot 3

23-4 – Issuing Permit for Minor Work to Caroline Bross for Application No. 23-4, 16 East Mechanic Street; Block 9, Lot 9

23-6 – Issuing Permit for Minor Work to Lynne Mastrilli for Application No. 23-6, 523 Broadway; Block 8, Lot 7

23-7 – Issuing Permit for Minor Work to James Labrusciano for Application No. 23-7, 127 Myrtle Avenue; Block 4, Lot 5

22-40 – Issuing a Certificate of Appropriateness to Rob McMahon for Application No. 23-1, 122 Eldredge Avenue; Block 7, Lot 23.01

23-2 – Issuing Permit for Minor Work to Donna and Michael Ladines for Application No. 23-2, 115 & 117 Eldredge Avenue; Block 8, Lot 12

23-5 – Issuing Permit for Minor Work to Paul Burgin Builders OBO Susan Goodwin, Sarah Shapiro, etc. for Application No. 23-5, 151 & 153 Yorke Avenue; Block 5, Lot(s) 10 & 11

HPC APPLICATIONS:

PERMITS FOR MINOR WORK:

Application #23-9 – Reckner – 113 Myrtle Avenue

Jim Barnes introduced the application, noting the structure as being a contributing property to the historic district. He read the description from the application of the proposed work to change wood clapboard siding to cedar shake siding with cedar shake siding as the proposed material and where the application indicated the proposed work will match the other homes in the area.

Jim Barnes went on to describe the historical significance of the property, and asked if anyone was present on behalf of the application. Paul Massing, 1015 Bellbar Road, Plymouth Meeting, PA (the "Contractor"). Jim Barnes swore in the Contractor.

The Contractor explained that the applicants were unable to attend the meeting and that he was attending on their behalf. He explained that the applicants first applied for the clapboard, which was done by the architect, but that upon removing the asbestos siding from the house, it revealed that cedar shake was underneath. Therefore, the applicants are proposing to put cedar shake onto the house.

Elan Zingman-Leith inquired about what was underneath the cedar shake. Contractor responded that Clapboard was beneath the Cedar Shake and that nothing was beneath the clapboard. The Contractor went on to explain that the house was so deteriorated that there was no plywood on the house. Elan Zingman-Leith asked if there were sheathing boards under the clapboard or the shake, to which the Contractor responded that there was not and that the clapboard was applied directly to the studs. Elan Zingman-Leith asked if the asbestos siding left the corner boards exposed or wrapped, to which the Contractor indicated that they were wrapped because there were no corner boards. Elan Zingman-Leith explained that cedar shake siding on a house that's federal, left the corner boards, but in 1890-1900 when they resided a house in cedar shake they would wrap them, which is how to tell the difference.

The Commission further reviewed the application.

Jim Barnes opened the floor to the public to speak on the application. No one came forward to speak.

Elan Zingman-Leith explained that Secretary of the Interior's Guidelines say that if the original materials are still there and you can keep it, that you should, and if you can't, then you can't. He went on to explain that if you know what the original materials were, that you should use such materials. He indicated that in this circumstance, since they know the original materials were clapboard, that they should keep the siding as clapboard. Elan Zingman-Leith noted that cedar shake siding was not impossible for the homes time period and style, especially if the building was an older and more poor home. He went on to explain that in 1790-1800, that clapboard siding was the rich person's sheathing as opposed to cedar shake. Elan Zingman-Leith indicated that according to the Secretary of the Interior's Guidelines the Commission

should not approve the proposed cedar shake siding and that the siding should instead be clapboard, though cedar shake siding would not be the worst alternative.

The Commission moved to vote on the application, as submitted. On motion of Barbara Tillman, seconded by Jim Barnes the application for a Permit for Minor Work was denied on roll call vote of members present with the votes tallying as Giacomo Antonicello and Barbara Tillman voting to approve the application and Jim Barnes and Elan Zingman-Leith voting to deny the application, for the reasons noted during the application discussion.

Application #23-10 – Zebrowski – 511 Broadway

Jim Barnes described the property as being a contributing property to the historic district, and went on to explain the application to install doors on the house that is under construction with wood as the proposed materials to be used.

Jim Barnes went on to explain the historical significance of the property, and asked if anyone was present on behalf of the application. Adam Zebrowski, 511 Broadway, (the “Applicant”) introduced himself and was sworn in by Jim Barnes.

The Applicant explained that he thought the doors were included in his original application, and since it is a new opening, there was not an original door to use. He explained that he researched doors to find one that he felt seemed appropriate. The Commission asked the applicant to explain the door photos that were supplied to show the Commission which door was being proposed for what doorway. The applicant noted that he was open to changing the doors to fit what the Commission determined.

For clarity purposes Jim Barnes named the doors provided as: Front Door A, being the wood door, all glass, which had the listing price at \$21.17; Front Door B, being the wood panel on the bottom, with the listing price of \$19.70; and the Sliding French Wood Patio Door being the door for the rear of the house.

Jim Barnes requested clarity on if there was a cross section on the door and if the mullions were wood and whether or not they run through the glass. He went to ask if there were four individual pieces of glass or if it was one piece of glass.

Elan Zingman-Leith explained that what was being used as the front door currently, was either an old door that had been very altered, with the top having been cut out and replaced with glass, or that it wasn't an old door and they just put two panels at the bottom. The Applicant advised that the door was replaced in the 90s.

Elan Zingman-Leith explained the all-glass door being proposed was not similar to a historic door, because they would not have all glass doors because they would not have been strong enough and would have fallen apart. He further noted, that since there was no original door and since they did not know what the original door was, he that he would not find the door

offensive, because it was a lot like an original window. He explained that the proposed four pane glass door, for a modern door, was ok in scale, materials and details, but that is wasn't what they would have done. He indicated that the proposed door with the bottom panel, slightly resembled a historic door more, but noted that in the 19th century it was unlikely that a door would have that much glass, because it would have been expensive and not very strong. He explained that the proposed sliding door for the rear on the house, though were not similar to a historic door at all, but since they are proposed for the rear of the home and not visible from the street, he would find them appropriate.

Elan Zingman-Leith indicated that a Victorian style door could be chosen for the front door, but that what was being proposed, in his opinion, was not appropriate. The applicant inquired about a Victorian door style. Elan Zingman-Leith indicated that a Victorian door would have had a lot more wood. He further explained that the door would be at least a Third to 50% wood.

Giacomo Antonicello inquired about the transom that was previously there, and whether or not the applicant would be replacing it. The applicant indicated that they had removed the transom, but will be reinstalling it back on.

The Commission moved to make a motion for the applicant to submit a revised drawing of the proposed door to be signed off on in a Review by Committee. The applicant submitted an additional drawing for the Commission to review. After review of the newly submitted drawing, the Commission determined that the applicant would still need to submit a new drawing of a proposed door. The Commission made a motion pending the submission of a revised drawing of the wood doors from the applicant to be approved as the wood door replacements. The Commission explained the revised drawing for the front door should show the bottom half of the door as wood panel, and the top half as glazed, with true muntins; the back sliding doors to the deck can remain the same, and the side door is to match the front door.

On Motion of Elan Zingman-Leith, seconded by Barbara Tillman the application, subject to the applicant submitting the revised drawing for the front and side door to Norm and receiving Committee approval for the revised drawing, was approved unanimously, with the conditions set forth, on roll call vote of the members present.

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS:

Application #23-8 – Troop – 170 Leaming Avenue

Jim Barnes introduced the application for 170 Leaming Avenue and asked if anyone was present on behalf of the application to install new windows, siding, roofing, 950sq.ft. addition to side and rear of existing house, new screened porch and covered deck with cedar siding, decking and railings, wood windows, asphalt shingles, crushed shell driveway and walkways as the proposed materials and construction methods.

Jim Barnes went on to read the material checklist proposed as asphalt shingle roof; cedar 1x3 over 1x8 fascia; tongue and groove wood with a 2" continuous screen vent for the soffits; cedar clapboard

with 4" exposure siding; wood windows to be true divided lite, 1 ¼" wide muttin, 4/2 design; with the window trim to be 3 1/2" flat trim with extended sill; reeb raised panel wood front door; 6 x 6 wood with 6" base columns; 1 ½ wood balusters for the railings with a cedar 6" newel post and cap; 5/4" x 6 cedar decking; 5/4 x 6 cedar slate with 4 x 4 cedar post for the outside shower enclosure; and crushed shell driveway.

Jim Barnes went on to read the Historical Significance of the Property, noting that the base survey was done during a renovation and that the Commission was going to have to determine what was original and what was part of that renovation.

Jim Barnes swore in the Applicant's Architect, James McAfee, from McAfee Architects, 36 East Hollywood Lane, Beasleys Point, and (The "Applicants") William Troop and Kristin Troop, 2465 State Street, East Petersburg, PA.

James McAfee went on to explain the application. He clarified that the windows were a four (4) over one (1) design, and that there was a standing seam metal roof as well as asphalt shingles. He went on to explain that on the front elevation the word "existing" on one of the windows, was incorrect and should not be there. He indicated that the applicants intend to replace all of the windows. He also wanted to clarify that there is a screen door all the way to the left on the front elevation that appears to be a wood door, but it is actually a screen door.

James McAfee indicated that the majority of 950 square foot, plus or minus, addition is in the rear, noting that there is 7 ½ feet or so that is on the left side of the property when looking at the building from the street, on the driveway's side. He referenced that the picture that is on the drawings of the home, when it was under construction, gives a better idea of what was there then and what is there now.

He indicated his belief that whatever work was previously done, it appeared as if the exposed rafter tails were being covered up along with some of the windows, when the replacement windows went in.

James McAfee explained that the applicants are proposing to replace all of the siding with cedar clapboard siding and replace all of the windows and the decks and railings. He went on to note that towards the rear of the building there is a screened-in porch and covered deck and that the air conditioning units are on the back of the house. He explained that they did relocate the door in the photo, that was in the front sunroom. He explained that the applicants wanted to take that front entry door and slide it back on the side of the house, and give it a covered entry and stairs.

James McAfee submitted a photo of a proposed front door, that was not originally submitted with the application packet. Jim Barnes explained that the screen door would need to be wood.

Jim Barnes, indicates that the exterior chimney looks as though it was added on during the renovation of the home for ventilation purposes. Jim Barnes confirmed with McAfee that the applicant wished to remove that chimney.

Jim Barnes asked if there was any submittal for the railings, Elan Zingman-Leith advised yes.

Jim Barnes indicated that he was not sure if the Bay window on the left side of the house was original or not, Elan Zingman-Leith explained that there was no reason for him to think it isn't original on the basis that it had wrapping on it.

Jim Barnes confirmed with James McAfee that the foundation was going to be parged.

Jim Barnes asked if the current window facing the street was mulled together, noting that the applicant appears to be proposing a divided structure. James McAfee indicated that he did not believe what was existing was mulled together.

Jim Barnes expressed his appreciation that the HVAC equipment was in the rear of the building.

The Commission moved to make a motion to approve the application, as submitted, noting the drawings have the correct details other than the screen door that is shown on the drawings will actually be a wood screen door, and including the proposed front door which had been submitted during the meeting. On motion of Giacomo Antonicello, seconded by Elan Zingman-Leith, on the basis that because the proposed changes to the historic structure are in historic materials and are in the vocabulary of the style and because the addition is in the same scale and style as the historic building and uses the same vocabulary of details, like rafter tails and railings, that the proposed work would be appropriate. The application was unanimously approved on roll call vote of the members present.

APPLICATIONS REVIEWED BY COMMITTEE

NONE

PLANNING/ZONING APPLICATIONS

NONE

NEW BUSINESS:

NONE

OLD BUSINESS:

Kay Aspell – 111 Yorke Avenue: Removal and Installation of Appropriate Gutters

Jim Barnes asked if anyone was present to speak on the matter. No one came forth on behalf of that matter.

Norm Roach, Administrative Officer, indicated that the vinyl shutters at 111 Yorke Avenue have been removed from the front of the house and the appropriate wood shutters have gone up. He further noted that the homeowner now reinstalled the inappropriate vinyl shutters on the side of the home. Norm Roach indicated that he explained to the homeowner that the whole house is historic and that she was not approved to put up the vinyl shutters. The

homeowner indicated that she planned to attend the meeting to challenge the matter, but was not in attendance. Norm Roach gave the homeowner until the night of the meeting to remove the vinyl shutter completely, and since the vinyl shutter had not been fully removed from the house it was agreed that a violation is to be issued immediately.

PUBLIC PORTION:

Jim Barnes opened the meeting for public portion.

Recording Secretary, Erin Seer, noted that Earl Cooke, the Architecture for the application for 122 Eldredge Avenue, regarding the additional documents submitted for the application per the conditions for approval. The Commission agreed that the requested documents had been submitted, reviewed and approved.

When no one came forward to speak the meeting was adjourned at 8:27 p.m., on motion of Jim Barnes, seconded by Susan Hoffman.

Respectfully submitted,
Erin Seer, Recording Secretary