



Neptune
Township - NJ

Where Community, Business & Tourism Prosper

Property Location: **7 OCEAN
PATHWAY**
Application No: **HPC2023-071**
Application Date: **04/28/2023**

HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS - PENDING / REQUEST FOR INFO

- | | | |
|--|---|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> AC UNIT
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ADDITION
<input type="checkbox"/> ARBOR
<input type="checkbox"/> AWNING
<input type="checkbox"/> BALCONY
<input type="checkbox"/> CHIMNEY
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> COLUMNS
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DECK
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DOOR REPLACEMENT
<input type="checkbox"/> DRIVEWAY
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> EXTERIOR ALTERATIONS
<input type="checkbox"/> FENCE
<input type="checkbox"/> FLAGS/BANNERS
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> FOUNDATION
<input type="checkbox"/> OTHER | <input type="checkbox"/> GATE
<input type="checkbox"/> GENERATOR
<input type="checkbox"/> GUTTERS & LEADERS
<input type="checkbox"/> HOT TUB
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> LATTICE
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> LIGHT FIXTURE
<input type="checkbox"/> NEW CONSTRUCTION
<input type="checkbox"/> ORNAMENTATION
<input type="checkbox"/> OUTDOOR SHOWER
<input type="checkbox"/> PAINT
<input type="checkbox"/> PATIO
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PIERS
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PORCH
<input type="checkbox"/> PORCH FAN | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> RAILINGS
<input type="checkbox"/> RETAINING WALL
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ROOF
<input type="checkbox"/> SATELLITE DISH
<input type="checkbox"/> SHED
<input type="checkbox"/> SHUTTERS
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SIDING
<input type="checkbox"/> SIGN
<input type="checkbox"/> SKYLIGHT
<input type="checkbox"/> SOLAR
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> STAIRS
<input type="checkbox"/> VENT
<input type="checkbox"/> WALKWAY
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> WINDOWS |
|--|---|--|

PROPERTY IDENTIFICATION

Property Address: 7 OCEAN PATHWAY

Block: 115

Lot: 6

Qualifier:

OWNER INFORMATION

Name(s): O'CONNOR, TERRIE

Address:

APPLICANT INFORMATION

☐ Check if same as Owner

Names(s): MARK PAVLIV, AIA

Company:

Address: 77 Main Avenue Suite 101 Ocean Grove, NJ 07756

Phone: (732)776-8777

Email: mp77aia@aol.com

PROPERTY INFORMATION

Property Type?(check one)

☒ Single Family
 ☐ Multifamily:
 ☐ 0 Units
 ☐ Commercial
 ☐ Condo
 ☐ Mixed Use

Architectural Period / Year Built: 1857

Architectural Style: Eastlake

Demolition hearing required? ☐ YES ☐ NO

IF YES: you must apply for a Demolition Permit prior to applying for a Certificate of Appropriateness

Zoning Permit Acquired? ☒ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A

Zoning Permit ID# (from Zoning Permit)

DATE APPROVED:

APPLICATION REVIEW NOTES:

The Review Team has deemed this application incomplete, as the Applicant has not submitted all required information to evaluate the project as described on the application and in the information sheet. The Review Team has identified general and specific deficiencies based on Neptune Township Land Development Ordinances and Ocean Grove Historic District Architectural Design Guidelines. Please understand that this is a preliminary review. It includes, but is not limited to, the observations below:

Description of Work

7 Ocean Pathway (1857)

25 July 2023

Tech Review Team — Deborah Osepchuk, Lucinda Heinlein, and Jeffery Rudell

O'Connor/Mark Pavliv. Addition / renovation. Following an earlier meeting with Tech, the Applicant proposes the following modification to their project:

1.Reduction of rear roof ridge by 12 inches so as to be below main ridge height on Ocean Pathway.

HPC: Although this small modification has been offered, the proposed addition is still exceedingly large, so much so that it does not visually read as an addition but more as a full, additional house appended to the back of an existing historic property. The proposed 12" drop in ridgeline of the addition is modest to the point of barely being discernable. The proposed new cross-gable (visible to the east and west), is positioned and sloped to mimic the existing cross gable, however it is sited in a way the causes it to partially intrude on the existing main slope of the historic roof. Non-Conforming.

HPC: The east and west side elevations of the proposed addition do NOT step in at the demarcation line of the original structure but, instead, create and extended flat plane along

both sides almost to the rear. A minimal step-in occurs on the west elevation only near the rear half of the addition. Non-Conforming.

HPC: While the applicant has dropped the ridgeline of the house, the ridge of the proposed new cross cable should likewise drop down. Additions should look like additions; it should be clear what is the original dwelling and what is being added on. The proposed addition works against this idea by trying to alter the original, historic dwelling to appear to be a much larger and more elaborate house than was ever located at this site. In short, the scale of the proposed addition remains oversized. Additions should appear as though they could, at some later date, be removed without disturbing the configuration of the original dwelling. The proposed design does not meet this standard. Non-Conforming.

2. Replacement of rear dining area 30-inch pair of doors with a pair of 24-inch doors totaling 48 inches; each door revised to be 6 inches narrower.

HPD: The pattern of fenestration on additions should replicate the fenestration on the original dwelling as closely as possible. This dwelling has singled doors in all other locations. This rear door should, likewise, be a single and should match the door proposed above it on the second-floor rear porch. Non-Conforming.

HPC: Please explain why a rear addition should have two doors (one at the rear and another at the side) both leading into the same room at the proposed rear first-floor porch.

3. Set leading edge of rear dwelling inward 20 inches which would allow a 21-inch deep "PENT" roof.

HPC: The proposed rear pent appears undersized and incongruent with the dimension of the front pent. Why does the repetition of this element at the proposed addition in the rear not mimic more closely the slope and dimensions of the historic front porch pent? Variations of this sort reinforce a sense that the proposed addition is, in fact, a separate, full-sized house at the rear rather than a subordinate addition to the historic, primary structure. Non-Conforming.

4. The rear porch steps revised to project northward (outside of the porch deck) and make the porch space more useable while satisfying Zoning's minimum 3.1-foot setback with a 3.3 foot setback from the Bath Avenue Flare Line;

HPC: The modification of the placement of the addition at the rear allows for a more historically correct configuration of the proposed new stairs. Conforming.

5. The rear main body of the proposed addition has been reduced from 16 feet to 15 feet 6 inches; The narrowing of the proposed addition now allows the addition of two (2) west elevation windows in the dining space as well as in BR#3 on the second floor (avoiding HPC's concern for long spans of siding and no windows while meeting the fire code);

HPC: The addition of windows at the rear portion of the addition is an improvement and does address the prior issue of a windowless span. Conforming.

However, the narrowing of the width of the addition is again, minimal. More importantly, the narrowing (as noted above) does not occur at the junction of the addition to the original dwelling, but rather, further back. The result is the original dwelling appears to have been extruded to the north. As already mentioned, additions should be demarcated in such a manner as to clearly signal where the original house ends and the addition (i.e., a secondary configuration appended to the original) begins. The proposed narrowing, in addition to being minor, seems to occur only on the west elevation. Non-Conforming.

6. The two (2) family dining Bath Avenue facing double-hung windows have been reduced to 2 ft 6 inches wide so as to match all other original windows.

HPC: Consistency in the proportion of fenestrations is appropriate. The modification to the width of proposed new windows is Conforming.

7. The attic "Egress" window to be a full opening casement for fire egress but without a complex recessed detail and utilizes "fire rated ceramic glass".

HPC: The proposed changes to the attic egress window is Conforming.

HPC: The application proposes the removal and replacement of existing windows. A site inspection is required before such changes can be addressed. (Note to Inspection team: On the east elevation the plans suggest the addition of new windows and one door, the closing of an existing window and door, and the replacement of three existing windows. On the west elevation the plan suggests the replacement of four existing windows, and the closing of one window.)

9. The plan proposes the placement three A/C condensers on the east elevation toward the front of the original dwelling. Condensers are usually placed at the rear of historic structures to mitigate their visibility from the street. The proposed addition leaves no room at the rear of the property for such location of the AC condensers. It is recommended the condensers be placed further back (toward Bath Avenue) and properly screen with a conforming framed-lattice structure. Non-Conforming.

10. The drawings indicate the proposed removal of an existing chimney. Removal of an historic chimney is non-conforming. If there exist conditions that merit the removal of such an historic element, a site inspection is be required to determine such conditions. Non-Conforming.

11. The proposed rear addition does not fit in with the Bath Avenue streetscape. The backs of neighboring houses meet Bath in a manner that indicates they are the "backs of houses": the designs are more modest than their related facades, the houses step-down and step-in in massing and proportion, are generally less ornamented than the front facades, and are overall simpler and plainer. The proposed addition does not replicate these attributes: it steps-down and steps-in only minimally, it is highly ornamented, and it presents as a full height dwelling better suited for the Pathway than to Bath Avenue. It bears noting that this 1857 house is not only one of the last original houses on the Pathway but one of the oldest houses in the Grove. The proposed addition overwhelms and, for all intents and purposes, obliterates the back of the original house in a manner at odds with the history of this house and this site. Non-Conforming.

12. The plans indicate the applicant plans to put Hardie Board or Clapboard on the entire structure. Please indicate what sort of cladding, if any, exists beneath the asbestos tile in which the building is now clad. Incomplete.

13. Original scroll work on the front facing façade is not indicated on the plans. This might simply be a drafting oversight. Please confirm that all existing decorative details on the original dwelling will be maintained. Incomplete.

14. Page 5 Letter 7C: Streetscape. Page 6 , 7E:

15. Please indicate any proposed pathways/sidewalk configurations and materials. Incomplete.

Submitting Required Information:

Emailed submissions will not be accepted. The requested information can be submitted to the Commission Administrative Officer, Heather Kepler, via hand delivery or standard mail. Please include a cover letter stating the reason for the submission or write "Response to Application Review" at the top of all your documents, be sure to also include your application number. The mailing address is as follows:

Heather Kepler HPC Administrator
Engineering/Planning Offices
2201 Heck Avenue
Neptune, NJ 07753.

Date: _____

Heather Kepler HPC Administrator

IMPORTANT INFORMATION:

This application will remain incomplete until all requested information has been submitted. Once this office receives the required information, the Applicant Review Team will review your application again. If it is determined that some or all of the proposed work does not demonstrate compliance with the current Ocean Grove Historic District Architectural Design Guidelines for Residential or Commercial Structures, you will be scheduled to appear before the full Historic Preservation Committee.

In accordance with Ordinance No. 16-32 Any person, firm or corporation that shall violate any provisions of this Ordinance shall, upon conviction thereof by any court authorized by law to hear and determine the matter, be fined such sum not exceeding \$2,000.00 as such court in its discretion may impose; or if the parties so convicted be a natural person, such person may be imprisoned for such term not exceeding 90 days as such court in its discretion may impose, or appear at community service not exceeding 90 days or any combination thereof as such court in its discretion may impose. Each day that such violation exists shall constitute a separate offense.

CC: