

**RESOLUTION HPC 2020-014
TOWNSHIP OF NEPTUNE
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
PARTIAL APPROVAL AND PARTIAL DENIAL
RESOLUTION OF MEMORIALIZATION
MONMOUTH COUNTY, NEW JERSEY
EXTERIOR RENOVATIONS**

**Partial Approval and Partial Denial: March 10, 2020
Memorialized: May 12, 2020**

**IN THE MATTER OF: JOHN T. WINCKELMANN & BETH NOBLE (134 MAIN AVENUE)
APPLICATION NO.: HPC2020-009**

WHEREAS, John T. Winckelmann and Beth Noble (the “Applicant”) have applied to the Township of Neptune Historic Preservation Commission (the “Commission”) seeking approval to undertake exterior renovations consisting of: (1) partial siding and trim replacement; (2) window replacement; (3) porch renovations with new columns, railings, steps and ceiling fan; (4) air conditioning condenser installation; (5) basement hatch replacement; and (6) painting siding and trim, pursuant to Sections 900-914 of the Township of Neptune Land Development Ordinance for lands known and designated as Block 204, Lot 3 on the official Tax Map of the Township of Neptune, and more commonly known as 134 Main Avenue, Ocean Grove, New Jersey 07756 (the “Property”); and

WHEREAS, a complete application has been filed, the fees as required by Township Ordinance have been paid, proof of service and publication of notice as required by law has been furnished and determined to be in proper order, and it otherwise appears that the jurisdiction and powers of the Commission have been properly invoked and exercised; and

WHEREAS, public hearings were held on February 25, 2020 and March 10, 2020 in the Township Municipal Building, at which time testimony and the exhibits attached hereto were presented on behalf of the Applicant and all interested parties having an opportunity to be heard; and

WHEREAS, the following Exhibits were introduced into evidence:

- A-1 Application Package
- A-2 Porch Railing Detail – revised 2-25-2020
- A-3 Porch Ceiling Beadboard Catalog Cut
- A-4 Ceiling Fan Catalog Cut
- A-5 Color photographs depicting windows and existing siding

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED the Commission makes the following findings of fact based on evidence presented at its public hearing at which a record was made:

1. **The Applicant is seeking to undertake exterior renovations consisting of (1) partial siding and trim replacement; (2) window replacement; 3) porch renovations with new columns, railings, steps and ceiling fan; (4) air conditioning condenser installation; (5) basement hatch replacement; and (6) painting siding and trim on the Property.**

2. The subject Property contains 1,800 square feet with 30 feet of frontage along the southerly side of Main Avenue. The subject Property is situated within the HD-R-1 (Historic District Residential) Zone and is improved with a two-story framed dwelling which is designated as a “Key Structure” as defined in the Historic District’s Design Guidelines for Residential Structures (“Design Guidelines”).

3. The Applicant testified that the existing residential home was constructed in 1890 and is a Key Structure. Their research provides that 1890 mapping depicts the original dwelling having both a full-width front porch and an open side porch wrapping around the rear. The formerly open side porch has since been enclosed.

4. The Commission first considered the Applicant’s proposed reconstruction of the front porch, taking exception to non-compliant features such as the proposed rail nosing, rail height and ceiling fan with light. The Applicant agreed to eliminate the proposed mahogany rail nosing, reduce the rail height from 36” to 30”, and to propose a ceiling fan without a light, which are compliant with the Design Guidelines. With respect to the proposed porch beadboard replacement, the Applicant has proposed to use TruExterior wood-composite material, which is also compliant.

5. The Commission next considered the Applicant’s proposed siding and trim replacement. The Commission expressed concern as to the Applicant’s intention to remove the existing clapboard, which the Applicant claimed to be in very poor condition. The Applicant arranged for a site inspection to allow a subcommittee of the Commission to inspect the existing clapboard. The Applicant removed portions of the asbestos siding at three locations to reveal the clapboard and other wood siding beneath. The Applicant pointed to evidence of prior water damage, suggesting earlier repairs of the siding and windows in the distant past. The Applicant further contends that physical inspection confirmed that the siding was installed directly over the framing without the provision of any underlying sheathing boards, which the Commission confirmed was actually consistent with construction throughout Ocean Grove during this period. Nonetheless, the subcommittee that inspected the property acknowledged that the Applicant had accurately depicted the deteriorated condition and that the clapboard was not aligned, which was actually worse than as the Applicant described. The Commission confirmed that the siding was “beyond repair” and warranted replacement. However, the Commission disagreed with the Applicant request to install vertical board and batten on all facades. While board and batten was appropriate for the first floor of the front façade, as well as the entirety of the former open porch that wraps around the rear of the dwelling, the Commission did not find any basis to permit vertical board and batten siding on the front elevation. The Commission pointed to the Design Guidelines requiring replacing “like with like”, finding that there was no evidence that the property originally used vertical board and batten. The Commission advised the Applicant that

they needed to keep the original siding style along the front elevation (except for the first floor elevation/porch, which could use vertical board and batten), but that vertical board and batten could not be installed on the on the front gable. The Commission did note that it could always reconsider this issue if and when the Applicant could produce evidence that vertical board and batten was previously installed on the front gable, but absence such proofs, the Applicant needed to retain the clapboard style. Color to be determined at a later date from the pre-approved color list.

6. The windows the Applicant wishes to replace are non-original 6 over 1 wood, single-glazed windows, including deteriorated wood screens and storm windows for the first floor and aluminum combination storm/screens at the second floor. These existing windows are in poor condition and do not match the remaining, original 2 over 2 wood windows in the dining room, which are to be retained and restored. The Applicant confirmed that 2/2 clad-wood, simulated divided light, with “putty-style exterior mullions would be installed as replacements, which the Applicant explained simulates the mullion profile of traditionally putty-glazed windows.

7. The Applicant further confirmed that they intended to field-construct a replacement for the existing Bilco-type steel hatch, using wood, with the door assembly and sides to be constructed with T&G beadboard cladding. The Commission took no exception to the Applicant’s proposal in this regard. Nor did the Commission take exception to the proposed location of the air conditioning condenser.

8. There were no members of the public who expressed an interest in the application.

NOW, THEREFORE, THE COMMISSION makes the following conclusions of law based upon the foregoing findings of fact:

1. The Applicant proposes to undertake exterior renovations consisting of (1) partial siding and trim replacement; (2) window replacement; 3) porch renovations with new columns, railings, steps and ceiling fan; (4) air conditioning condenser installation; (5) basement hatch replacement; and (6) painting siding and trim on the Property.

2. Under Sections IV.E,F&J of the Design Guidelines, when considering an application to install exterior improvements, the Commission may examine the residential home components’ importance to the Township of Neptune and the extent to which it has historic and/or architectural value, such that their removal would be detrimental to the Historical District and public interests. It is the Commission’s responsibility, acting in a quasi-judicial manner, to weigh all the evidence presented before by both the Applicant and all other interested parties, and reach a decision which is based upon findings of fact and conclusions of law which are not arbitrary, unreasonable or capricious.

3. The Commission concludes that the subject building is a Key Structure which is of significant historic architectural and aesthetic significance. The existing residential home was built around 1890 and has a prominent location in the Historic District.

4. The Commission further concludes that the Applicant recognizes the historic significance of the residential home and has agreed to install the following improvements in accordance with Section IV of the Design Guidelines and the Ordinance:.

5. With the exception of the upper floor and gable portion of the front (north) facing façade, the Commission approves the Applicant's proposal to install vertical board and batten siding as indicated on its plans. There is no dispute however that the Applicant's desire to replace the existing clapboard with vertical board and batten siding along the front facing façade would violate the Design Guidelines. The Applicant has not yet been able to offer any proof that the front facing façade (above the first level/porch) was originally constructed in this manner or ever utilized vertical board and batten siding, such that introducing the same as a replacement for the original clapboard style would be inconsistent with the preservation goals of the Design Guidelines. Whereas vertical board and batten is completely appropriate for the enclosed porch, the same cannot be said for the front facing elevation. There was also an absence of testimony that compliance here is a hardship or even difficult. The Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness is therefore denied in this limited respect, but otherwise approved as to all other proposed exterior renovations as detailed on the Applicant's submissions and as stipulated by the Applicant during the public hearings.

6. There were no members of the public who expressed an interest in the application.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the Historic Preservation Commission of the Township of Neptune on this 12th day of May, 2020 that the action of the Commission taken on March 10, 2020 granting Application No. HPC2020-009 approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness for certain improvements listed in this Resolution and denial of a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed replacement of clapboard siding on the upper front facing elevation and gable, for the Property located at Block 204, Lot 3, 134 Main Avenue, Ocean Grove, New Jersey, pursuant to Sections 900-914 of the Township of Neptune Land Development Ordinance, is hereby memorialized as follows:

Application is granted subject to the following conditions:

1. The improvements proposed by the Applicant herein shall take place in strict conformance with the testimony, Plans and drawings which have been submitted to the Commission with this application.
2. Payment of all fees, costs, escrows due or to become due (if applicable). Any monies are to be paid within twenty (20) days of said request by the Commission Secretary.
3. The Applicant shall comply with all Township Zoning Department requirements.
4. The Applicant shall provide a certification that taxes are paid to date of partial approval.

5. Subject to all other applicable rules, regulations, ordinances and statutes of the Township of Neptune, County of Monmouth, State of New Jersey or any other jurisdiction.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Commission Secretary is hereby authorized and directed to cause a notice of this decision to be published in the official newspaper at the Applicant's expense and to send a certified copy of this Resolution to the Applicant and to the Township Clerk, Engineer, Attorney and Tax Assessor, and shall make same available to all other interested parties.

Deborah Osepchuk, Chairwoman
Township of Neptune Historic
Preservation Commission

ON MOTION OF: Mr. Rudell

SECONDED BY: Mrs. Heinlein

ROLL CALL:

YES: Mrs. Heilein, Mrs. Henderson, Mr. McKeon, Mrs. Osepchuk, Mr. Rudell, Mr. Steen, and Mr. Wierzbinsky

NO: None

ABSTAINED: None

ABSENT: Mr. MacMorris and Mrs. Shaffer

DATED:

I hereby certify this to be a true and accurate copy of the Resolution adopted by the Township of Neptune Historic Preservation Commission, Monmouth County, New Jersey at a public meeting held on May 12, 2020.

Kristie Dickert, Secretary
Township of Neptune Historic
Preservation Commission

