

37 Main Avenue

Summary of HPC review from initial Concept to Commission Meeting

Prepared: 2 July 2024

The following summary covers the chronology of this application leading up to the Commission meeting.

20 July 2023

The house that occupied this lot has been deemed structurally unsafe by the Construction Department and is slated for demolition.



18 November 2023

The existing structure is removed.



6 February 2024

Concept Review — Andrea Fitzpatrick of Shore Point Architects met with the Tech Review Team (TRT) including Deborah Osepchuk, Scott Moyer, and Jeffery Rudell.

The applicant discussed concepts for a proposed new house to be constructed on this lot.

Ideas discussed by the architect include:

- 1.) The proposed house will be a 2 ½ story building with a 1st and 2nd floor full-width front porch and a 3rd floor balcony (situated in a ceiling well of the 2nd floor hip-roof).
- 2.) Proposed 5 ½” chamfered columns on 8” square bases, double-hung windows with shutters, and pairs of 30” doors at both the 2nd and 3rd levels are proposed. In discussion with TRT the architect agreed to adjust the column bases to a width of 7” to better emulate the slender profiles found in period style houses of this type.
- 3.) In discussion with TRT the architect agreed to reduce the width of both sets of double-doors from two 30” wide doors per set to two 24” wide doors per set, again to emulate historic dimensions.
- 4.) The architect proposed removing the shutters initially proposed for the front façade of the house.
- 5.) A roof pitch of 10/12 was proposed.
- 6.) Fenestration patterns on both the east and west elevations were discussed and the architect presented a number of possible configurations, all of which appeared, in theory, to be conforming. It was agreed the architect would refine the fenestration placement in the final design.
- 7.) The proposed configuration of the rear of the house included a step-down in massing to a one-story structure, an enclosed shower, and a storage area.
- 8.) TRT suggested single windows at both the 2nd and 3rd floor at the rear of the house would be more historically appropriate than the proposed double window sets. Single windows would provide for better alignment and would be more in keeping with the fenestration arrangement proposed for the rest of the structure.
- 9.) Fenestrations at the west elevation was discussed. Due to setback requirements, Zoning does not permit 1st or 2nd floor windows at the west elevation to the north. The applicant proposed two false/shuttered

windows in this area to honor the historically appropriate rhythm of fenestrations. Also, four small “chicklet” windows were proposed at the west elevation to the south. These windows flank interior fireplaces and built-ins while also offering the homeowners privacy from guests at the nearby Quarter Inn who would otherwise have full view into the home from that inn’s balconies.

5 March 2024

The architect prepared an application incorporating the Tech Team’s feedback and submitted that design to the Zoning Department for review. Zoning denied the application due to, “inadequate setback from the porch roof projection/gutter to the front property line.”

The architect met with the TRT to discuss possible alternative design solutions. The applicant ultimately decided to pursue a Zoning Variance through the Zoning Board of Adjustment (ZBA) for their original proposed design.

14 May 2024

Although ZBA granted the homeowner the requested variance, Tech was unable to review the full application until the ZBA’s decision had been memorialized, causing a short delay.

The design as approved by ZBA:



21 May 2024

ZBA memorialization received. The completed application came for Tech Review by Deborah Osepchuk, Scott Moyer, and Jeffery Rudell.

The TRT reviewed the proposed application in full and felt the application incorporated most of the feedback offered at earlier meetings.

Overall design (i.e., massing, architectural style, articulated details,

configuration of the fenestrations, etc.) appeared to be conforming to the Historic Guidelines. Members of the Commission may feel differently but the TRT felt these components were appropriate and would contribute to the historic streetscape.

The TRT suggested the following items are subject to discussion by the Commission and indicated the applicant should be prepared to discuss whether these items conform to the Guidelines:

1.) Leaders (downspouts) on the house should return to the body of the house instead of being attached to the front porch columns. An explanation of this configuration is needed.

2.) The TRT noted that houses of this style typically had dark, neutral roofs of black, gray, or dark brown. Blue roofs are extremely rare in the historic district and are generally limited to dwellings built in the 1950s. The proposed roof color, "Biscayne Blue," is thus historically inappropriate for a house of this design. Furthermore, matching roof color and trim color is a distinctly modern approach and is likely to be deemed inappropriate in the historic district. Please be prepared to discuss a more historically appropriate roof shingle color.

3.) The overall proposed palette is at odds with the color advice outlined in the Guidelines. Houses of this style would generally have had light tones placed on the body of the house and dark tones used for trim. The proposed palette seems overly pallid, especially for a project located within the district's historic Flare, where special attention to appropriate placement of color should be considered.

Pale houses do exist in the district but are often relegated to secondary streets and homes of less prominent importance. The TRT advised the applicant to be prepared to address this proposed palette.

4.) The TRT noted the architect's inclusion of pierced design at the inset panels beneath the balusters as particularly appropriate period details and suggested that such detail may also be included on stair risers, if desired (though it is not required).

5.) The TRT noted the proposed transition area between the shakes in the gable areas and the clapboard below (especially at the side of the house) includes a trim board. They advised the applicant that such transitions were historically "softer", with shingles either overlapping clapboard without the trim board OR with the trim board painted to match the color of either the clapboard or the shingles (thus mitigating the distinction rather than highlighting its presence with an added trim color). The

applicant is requested to consider modifying this element to better approximate detailing found on historic homes of this style.

The following materials/details were reviewed and deemed conforming. Where applicable, catalogue cuts for these items are on file with the Township office and are available for review by Commissioners:

- a.) Main Siding: Hardy Board.
- b.) Main House Color: Revere Pewter (HC-172).
- c.) Trim Color: Monterey White (HC-27).
- d.) Accent Color: Hale Navy (HC-154).
- e.) Window Frames: Andersen 400 Series in color Canvas.
- f.) Thin Brick Veneer: Glen Gary, Shenandoah 1776 Brick.
- g.) Composite Decking: Aeratis in Weathered Wood color.

The TRT determined these few preceding items are the only remaining matters in need of discussion, clarification, or possibly modification. **However, Commissioners retain the right to review and discuss any aspect of applications before the Commission.**