

NEPTUNE TOWNSHIP HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

MEETING OF NOVEMBER 14, 2023

RE: 7 OCEAN PATHWAY
APPLICATION

APPLICANT: MS. TERRIE O'CONNOR

IN ATTENDANCE:

KURT CAVANO
LINDA HENDERSON
DAVID FOX
LUCINDA HEINLEIN
SCOTT MOYER
DEOBRAH OSEPCHUK
JEFFREY RUDELL
JENNY SHAFFER

ALSO PRESENT:

HEATHER KEPLER, ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT
STEVEN TONBALAKIAN, ATTORNEY FOR THE COMMISSION

APPEARING:

MR. MARK A. PAVLIV, ARCHITECT

TRANSCRIPT ORDERED BY:

DAVID E. MAYLAND, ESQ.
(Strasser & Associates, PC)

Transcriber: Patsy J. Handy
Brittany Transcription, LLC
60 Washington Street
Morristown, NJ 07960
(973)285-0411
Audio Recording

I N D E X

PAGE

Transcript of Meeting Excerpt	3
Testimony by Mr. Pavliv	4
Examination by the Board	24

1 MS. OSEPCHUK: we are now going to be hearing
2 the application for 7 Ocean Pathway.

3 MR. RUDELL: I have, I have never been so
4 happy not to be involved in an application. Holy
5 smokes, you guys. Wow.

6 MS. OSEPCHUK: That was tough.

7 MR. RUDELL: Yikes.

8 MR. CAVANO: What, what -- that's not a
9 critique I hope; right?

10 MR. RUDELL: No, it's just I'm so glad I
11 wasn't in the middle of that.

12 MR. CAVANO: Okay.

13 MS. KEPLER: He doesn't want eggs on his
14 house.

15 MR. RUDELL: Oh. I think, Kurt, I think you
16 were very helpful in explaining the reasoning because I
17 do think it has far-reaching consequences if we make
18 exceptions when just last month we were saying no to
19 exceptions. So that's -- it's not that I disagree with
20 anyone, I just -- wow, that was tough. But on to
21 something new.

22 MS. OSEPCHUK: Okay. All right. Who is
23 gonna be appearing this evening for 7 Ocean Pathway?
24 Mark, I see you there.

25 MR. PAVLIV: Is the mic on?

1 MS. HEINLEIN: Yes.

2 MR. TOMBALAKIAN: Yes, it is.

3 MR. PAVLIV: Okay, good. Good to go.

4 MR. TOMBALAKIAN: Mark, shall we swear you in
5 so you can get going?

6 M A R K P A V L I V, APPLICANT'S WITNESS, SWORN

7 MR. TOMBALAKIAN: And you're Mark Pavliv and
8 you're representing the Applicant; correct?

9 MR. PAVLIV: That's correct. The Applicant
10 is here as well as the builder.

11 MR. TOMBALAKIAN: Do you anticipate them
12 testifying? If you want, we can swear -- okay.

13 The lady sitting to your left, we'll swear your
14 in.

15 T E R R I E O ' C O N N O R, APPLICANT'S WITNESS,
16 SWORN

17 MR. TOMBALAKIAN: Can you please identify
18 yourself, spelling your name if it's unusual.

19 MS. O'CONNOR: Terrie, T-e-r-r-i-e, O'Connor,
20 O-apostrophe-C-o-n-n-o-r.

21 MR. TOMBALAKIAN: And would you like the
22 builder to testify, Mr. Pavliv?

23 MR. PAVLIV: It looks like right now he's an
24 observer.

25 MR. TOMBALAKIAN: Okay. So, if you need him

1 to testify let him -- we'll swear him in then.

2 MR. PAVLIV: Very good.

3 MR. TOMBALAKIAN: Thank you, Mark.

4 MS. OSEPCHUK: Okay, Mark. Will you be
5 sharing screen?

6 MR. PAVLIV: I, I missed that, Deb.

7 MS. OSEPCHUK: Oh, I'm so sorry. Will you be
8 sharing screen? Putting up --

9 MR. PAVLIV: No, I'm asking, I'm asking
10 Heather to put the screen up and to be able to guide me
11 through. I'm working with a bit of a handicap, as you
12 know, with only one eye.

13 And that would be helpful, Heather. Okay?

14 And I just want to say two things before we start.
15 We want to do this as succinctly, with clarity and
16 brevity as much as possible at this late hour, and also
17 to announce that I'm very happy that this is actually a
18 project that's been in the making for four years this
19 month through design and approvals and hearings. It's
20 been a long haul. It also happens to be my last appli
21 -- residential application before HPC. So, it's --
22 that's a historic (inaudible) in itself.

23 MR. RUDELL: Yeah.

24 MR. PAVLIV: So, what I wanted to state here
25 is that we have had the, the privilege and the ability

1 to have a number of concept review meetings with the
2 Executive Board over the course of an extended -- I
3 forget how many months if not over a year. But the --
4 in that process there's been a number of things that
5 were changed. The initial concept resulted -- we're
6 looking at the as-built drawings I believe on the
7 screen, existing conditions.

8 This is 7 Ocean Pathway and we had gone through a
9 process with George Waterman, probably at least three
10 versions in that we had to deal with the flare
11 situation on both sides of the street, Bath Avenue and
12 also on Ocean Pathway. We made various changes and,
13 and we went back at least three times. And then we
14 came before HPC Executive Committee and there were a
15 number of comments and observations which we then made
16 additional changes.

17 We made the addition in the rear, which was
18 essentially a 14 by 24-foot footprint addition in the
19 back lawn area of this particular dwelling. To give
20 you an idea, 14 by 24 is basically a large garage, a
21 footprint of a garage. And we began to chisel it down
22 from the front, setting it back. We lowered the
23 ridgeline probably twice to create a differential
24 between the existing structure and a proposed
25 structure.

1 And if, if, Heather, you could jump to our working
2 drawings I believe it's Sheet A-2 that should have
3 elevations. A-2. That is the existing drawing. And
4 this, this would be the full working d -- that's
5 correct -- the full working drawing set. So what we're
6 looking at here, if we go just up, up a little bit to
7 the right. Let's, let's stay with that. Okay.

8 There are four elevations on this sheet. The, the
9 elevation to the left is the existing building on Ocean
10 Pathway. We're proposing no changes there. What we
11 are looking at is those -- the windows, which are
12 existing windows that are going to remain, not be
13 replaced. And there's a lot of detail that's on the
14 structure. There was a question in the comments
15 where's all the detail. Well, we didn't draw all the
16 detail on the front elevation because we weren't gonna
17 be doing anything to the front elevation. That's
18 really a placeholder.

19 The other elevation to the right is indicative of
20 two things, it's first of all showing the east
21 elevation of the existing structure in and beyond, if
22 you look at the roof differential there is a --

23 Heather, I think you have an old plan in front of
24 you here.

25 MS. KEPLER: Yeah (inaudible).

1 MR. PAVLIV: That, that goes back to June.
2 We've, we've had two more sets of plans since then.
3 The most recent one -- there was another one in July
4 and another one in August and another one in I think
5 September. That's 7/25. There should be one that's
6 dated 9/7. It was -- there are quite a bit of -- it
7 looks very much like the 7/5 but it was a full set of
8 working drawings. If you scroll down you'll probably
9 see them because this file is enormous. Full set
10 revised, 9/23, there you go. Okay.

11 What we're looking at now, again, that, that's the
12 east elevation. A couple things to point out. First
13 of all, the owner has this addition in the rear. The
14 addition is, is labeled at the very bottom at the
15 foundation as, as -- it should be saying addition. I
16 don't see it on the screen here, but at the foundation
17 line there is. The windows have been articulated with
18 casing to emulate the original detailing work that was
19 done back in 1857. If you notice the --

20 MS. SHAFFER: But there's nothing here in
21 1857.

22 MR. PAVLIV: Excuse me?

23 MS. SHAFFER: I said 1857? I don't -- there
24 wasn't a, there wasn't a town in 1857.

25 MR. PAVLIV: I -- that was my point.

1 However, the town records indicate in 1857 and in 1856.
2 And I debate those tax records because the town wasn't
3 founded until about 30 years later.

4 MS. SHAFFER: Yeah, right. No, I mean it was
5 1869 but that's crazy. 1857 there's nothing there.

6 MR. PAVLIV: I know, but there -- but we, we
7 have to, you know, we have to be honest and that's the
8 information that we've been given to by the Tax
9 Department. It's a matter of record online when you
10 look it up. So, we, we don't really know. But if I
11 was to guess I would say this is probably a late 1880s
12 structure, the original structure. And then the
13 addition that we're talking about, getting back to it,
14 you'll notice there's a ridge differential. We dropped
15 it two foot, four inches. We have also circled areas
16 where we've made changes. We pushed the porch further
17 back and we're replicating the window patterns of being
18 two over two and so forth.

19 Can we just drop down to the bottom of the sheet.
20 Same sh -- there we go.

21 And what we're proposing here on the left-hand
22 side is what the addition would look like -- on the
23 lower left-hand corner, what it would look like from
24 the Bath Avenue or rear elevation on the structure.
25 You'll notice there's a dashed line at the ridge.

1 That, that is indicative of the building beyond that.
2 So, let's just keep this up for a moment. Everybody
3 may or may not be familiar with this, but we submitted
4 a, a number of photographs.

5 Some of the photographs, Heather, are of the back
6 of this building. That is probably a file that you
7 have. That, that would be fine. Let's just take a
8 look at that.

9 So what, what this photograph is showing is that
10 the upper, upper window there is part of the original
11 structure with an addition that probably occurred after
12 the original building was done. Going through the
13 house, there may have been four or five alterations and
14 additions, and dropping to the bottom of this image
15 you'll see that there's a, a porch, a covered porch
16 that also has been remodeled with a series of
17 alterations; modern era windows, these are aluminum
18 windows; an awning window; various railings. There's
19 an outdoor shower to the right. There's a barbecue,
20 steps down to a lawn area, and so forth but this part
21 of the house is fairly set back from all the other
22 homes on the street.

23 And we do have a series of photos. We
24 photographed every dwelling on this block, did a
25 comparison on both sides, and we'll get to that later.

1 But what I'd like to do is, let's go back to that
2 drawing that I have, the, the drawing which we were
3 looking at with the elevation of the rear. And I would
4 like to run through quickly 15 points which were really
5 the points of discussion for the commission's benefit
6 during all these concept meetings.

7 The first one we addressed was reducing the ridge
8 height from where we were proposing to align it with
9 the existing, two, two feet, four inches lower.

10 The second point was that we had in the first
11 floor of the addition on the rear elevation in the
12 center you'll notice there are two panels, two doors.
13 They originally were drawn as two -- a pair of doors
14 six feet wide. We were asked to narrow those doors
15 down and we did. We brought it down to two feet. So,
16 basically, there are two two-foot doors that swing
17 inward at the center on the first floor.

18 The third point was that the -- there was a pent
19 that we had proposed over the porch area. The pent
20 that's on the front of the dwelling is quite large. We
21 had one that was smaller. There was some comment that
22 the pent was too undersized, it was only 21 inches, it
23 was really not necessary, and should the owner ever
24 want to provide shading -- it's the north side of the
25 house -- there'd be a separate application for an

1 awning, but we're not asking for that today.

2 There was a -- the fourth point was there was a
3 reduction of the overall length of the structure. We
4 kept pushing it back. It was closer to being 30 feet
5 and then 26 and then I think ultimately 24 feet as, as
6 part of the addition. And I believe that -- my eyes
7 are failing me -- at the very bottom it probably says
8 new basement and its dimension there is --

9 Can you see that, Gary?

10 -- 24.

11 MR. RUDELL: Twenty-four (inaudible).

12 MR. PAVLIV: Okay. So, that is -- that's the
13 addition that we brought it back to. It's fully
14 compliant with the setbacks, both on, on the sides and
15 in, in the front. The side yards became an issue
16 because even though the existing side yards were
17 compliant the -- we had -- we have had like I believe
18 we were at six and a half feet. We are now seven and a
19 half feet on the east side setback right there where
20 the cursor is. We have narrowed the structure; whereas
21 it was flush before it is now set back. And we did the
22 same thing on the west elevation. So I we go back to
23 the rear elevation to the left -- right. You'll see
24 the circles that -- those, those are where the changes
25 occurred where we've actually moved the structure,

1 making it more narrow. It's more -- I believe it's 14
2 foot wide at this point.

3 There were double-hung windows that were proposed
4 on the first floor and on the second floor. They were,
5 they were proposed at 2/8. The suggestion was made
6 that could we not narrow those windows to become
7 compliant or at least equal to all the other windows in
8 the building, and we did so. So all the windows that
9 we're showing in the addition are now emulating the 2/6
10 width dimension and the same height type to bottom as
11 well as all the casing. That's point number six.

12 Point seven, there was an egress window at the
13 attic level at one point when we had a higher ceiling.
14 Well, now that higher ceiling that was potentially a
15 bedroom, you'll see the circle and it says number 3,
16 that, that has been eliminated. There's no longer an
17 egress window. It's a double-hung window in an attic
18 storage area in mechanical space. The -- therefore it
19 was found to be conforming.

20 Number eight on the list of discussions was the,
21 the question about original windows. We mentioned that
22 the windows in the existing front section, they are
23 wood. They are to remain as wood. The owner has
24 agreed. She has actually restored the conditions on
25 the front of the house. There's been paint. There's

1 been a lot of repair done. Working together with Ocean
2 Grove Hardware of the -- I guess a year and a half or
3 so.

4 MS. O'CONNOR: More than that.

5 MR. PAVLIV: More than that. O-, over I
6 guess a few years. And the windows that we're talking
7 about to be replaced we went and noted on the
8 elevation --

9 If you, if you slide it to the right, Heather.

10 -- every window either says new, replace, or
11 existing, which is self-explanatory. Everywhere it,
12 it, it says new that means we're using the existing
13 opening and just replacing the aluminum window with a
14 solid-core wood Anderson 400 window in the same
15 location, the same size. Where it says replace on the
16 -- I'm trying to follow. This is, this is the --
17 again, I, I apologize. This is the --

18 MS. OSEPCHUK: The west.

19 MR. PAVLIV: -- east? West elevation.

20 MS. OSEPCHUK: Yes.

21 MR. PAVLIV: Okay. All right. So, basically
22 it's self-explanatory. Where it says new that's the
23 addition. Where it says replace we're replacing the
24 existing opening with a new window, solid-core wood.
25 And I believe in this process there's a door that goes

1 to the basement that's a non-original door that's been
2 dashed out and we've provided a new wood door that
3 you'll notice there at, at grade. Right there on each
4 elevation. Right, right, right there there's -- that's
5 a window to the basement. But to the left of that
6 window is a door. So that's a new wood door for access
7 into the basement. There's a stairwell in that area
8 that has access to all levels including the basement.

9 Right. Number nine, the AC units that you see in
10 this location, this alley has -- the neighbor has AC
11 units, we have AC units. The question was are -- can
12 we screen these units. Well, in reality, if you look
13 from one -- from the front or from the rear they are so
14 screened at present because you have a wraparound porch
15 from Ocean Pathway, you have a full lattice wall that
16 exists and existed there for many years even before I
17 started working with Terrie on this. There was a
18 previous owner and a previous potential buyer and as
19 far as I can think that, that latticework was there
20 screening the entire alley.

21 And from the other side, if you look at our
22 elevation on the lower left-hand corner there's a trash
23 -- lower left, it's a trash enclosure. Same image,
24 lower left-hand corner. We still there?

25 MR. MOYER: Heather, I think you need to

1 scroll down.

2 MS. SHAFFER: Scroll up. Or yeah, scroll up
3 or down.

4 MR. PAVLIV: All right. Right there. There
5 it is if you scroll up. The lower left-hand corner.
6 There, see the -- there's, there's latticework and
7 that's another screen on the left. Excuse me. Screen
8 left. And that is screening the AC unit, so virtually
9 the AC units are not seen from either street side.
10 Thank you.

11 Number ten on our list of, of observations, the
12 chimney. We had originally asked for the chimney to be
13 removed, essentially being nonfunctioning. It was
14 suggested that we would not remove it. We -- the
15 builder that we're talking to is going to restore the
16 existing chimney. It is to remain.

17 Number eleven on the list was the, the photos of
18 all the buildings along the street because there was
19 some comment about -- that this, this street had a
20 great deal of uniformity and mass and so forth. And we
21 went back to take a look.

22 And, Heather, there was two, two images that have
23 about nine photos on each one of them. IMG. And, and
24 they have -- they were probably submitted -- it was an
25 eight and a half by eleven with nine images,

1 compilation of all the -- there they are. Okay. And
2 if we could zoom in on that for an example. This is a
3 view -- I've lost the header at the top, though.

4 MS. OSEPCHUK: Mark, isn't that the opposite
5 side of the street?

6 MR. PAVLIV: That's the opposite but we did
7 both sides. Now if you look on -- this is the correct
8 side. If you look on the right-hand corner Number 7
9 Ocean Pathway it's set back from the other buildings.
10 And the other buildings, you know, as far as their form
11 and, and massing and all that, the building to the left
12 is the Whiteman residence which we worked on some 25 or
13 30 years ago. It's, it's quite massive. And then the
14 building to, to the west of it there's a gazebo on the
15 flare line and the structure is protruding fairly
16 outward and, and beyond.

17 But if we just look at all the other buildings on
18 the street, I did them in sequence. And I believe, if
19 we could, from the bottom. Okay. Let's start with
20 Number 8. Number 8 would be -- I believe that that's
21 Ocean Ave.

22 UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yeah, that's towards the --

23 MS. OSEPCHUK: Yeah. But again --

24 MR. PAVLIV: So, that's Ocean Ave. So --

25 MS. OSEPCHUK: -- that's the opposite side of

1 the street.

2 MR. PAVLIV: Opposite side of the street.
3 So, just very quickly, opposite side of the street
4 you'll see that that buildings -- they're v -- it's
5 very similar on both sides. We have the four-story,
6 massive, flat lane building with various porches and
7 balconies. If you look to the, to the right you'll see
8 homes that have covered porches, open balconies, forms
9 that are non-descript. I couldn't even find a name for
10 any of these things. But they're -- they, they
11 probably were well before the Board of Architectural
12 Review.

13 If you scroll upward a little bit or upward,
14 looking at the other images you'll notice that we have
15 a bit of everything. Again, and still going further
16 up, Number 10, Number 12, 13. Again, but the point
17 that we're making here is you have a wide array of
18 structures. And now if we do the other, other set of
19 nine, which is on the same side. Okay. If we were --
20 let's start in the top left corner. The blue building
21 is the building that we're talking about. That's our,
22 our project. And you'll notice the yellow building is
23 the Whiteman residence to the left and the other
24 structure to the, to the right -- if we, if we look
25 just below, that's Number 3, if you look down to Number

1 2, it's a more direct shot of that same situation.

2 There's quite a few garages and driveways. In
3 fact, the Whitemans have a basement garage with a
4 doctor. And that blue structure you see standing there
5 is actually a gazebo that's on the property line and
6 just over the flare that exists. It's not ours but
7 it's there. And the other images on the street, I just
8 want to put them out to show that we've got four-story
9 structures. We have a lot of altered structures. We
10 have a wide array of porches, porticos, covered areas,
11 enclosed porches. So as far as getting a rhythm and
12 (inaudible) in the continuity it really doesn't exist
13 on this block unfortunately.

14 And if anything, to bring, to bring anything into
15 conformity would be to have that cottage extend out
16 further to be more in alignment. Because there is a
17 photograph -- we took photographs on the corners trying
18 to align along the flare line and there was just no way
19 we could even get close to seeing the structure from
20 either the east or west corners. So anyway, enough of
21 these photos. It gives you an extents of the effort
22 that was put in at looking at the massing and so forth
23 to respond to that question.

24 Number 12 on the list of comments dealt with
25 siding. The existing siding we -- it forms several

1 probes. We found that the existing siding in several
2 areas did in fact exist. It is clapboard. It's four-
3 inch. It's the usual wafer thin with a number of nails
4 and so forth. We provided some images I believe also
5 on this grouping of exhibits. But it's been all
6 covered with layers of paper and, and other materials
7 and it actually -- that was the front. Under the
8 covered porch was the actual best example of the --
9 what we feel was the original clapboard.

10 That's an alleyway shot. So we, we looked at the
11 existing condition of this building is all asbestos
12 shingle covering, a few layers of material that come
13 down to the clapboard. We had a, a couple of options
14 here. One was to remove the asbestos and to provide
15 HardiePlank on the building. First it was the entire
16 building then it was what if we kept the covered
17 porch's area and restored the wood on the front porch,
18 which we've done that in other cases in town, and then
19 just take care of the alleyway section with matching
20 four-inch clapboard. And then the addition would also
21 be clapboard.

22 Well, now that e-, evolved into maybe we will not
23 be able to have HPC accept the fact that we're, we're
24 going to be putting in the Hardie board. And in that
25 case we would keep the asbestos shingle that's there

1 and the addition would in fact be treated with cement
2 shingle to match the asbestos. This has been a topic
3 of much discussion because we've also looked at the
4 possibility what if we used Hardie siding on the rear
5 addition, left the asbestos for now -- it would be a
6 matching color in both cases -- and then when monies
7 permit and the energies are there that would still
8 allow someone to remove the asbestos shingle and
9 restore the wood clapboard at least on the front, which
10 we know is in fair condition, and on, on both sides.

11 But I, I believe you're gonna find that the side
12 alleyways, because they're not as protected, are in
13 very poor condition and, as usual, problems are the
14 lack of vapor barrier, no insulation, and leakages, and
15 everything else that goes with it. You've heard this a
16 million times. So we don't have a definitive. The
17 plans call for a cement shingle and we can leave it at
18 that, but I believe the owner, Terrie, would like to
19 have, at the end of this dissertation of mine, have
20 some discussion on the, on the siding topic as the
21 owner.

22 Moving forward on Number 13, the scrollwork is not
23 shown on the front elevation but all the casing that
24 we're proposing is emulating the original casing from
25 the 1880-circa period.

1 Item number 14 was a whole discussion about the
2 building having too much mass with the addition, but
3 when you look at the site plan and the survey we don't
4 come out as far as the Whiteman structure or other
5 structures on, on the street. And our, our building,
6 is anything, is, is set back from the flare line given
7 the discussions with the, the zoning officer.

8 And then lastly, as far as there was a discussion
9 about what are we doing about walkways. We're not
10 showing walkways on our plan. Well, in fact, there's
11 an existing walkway on the east. It's an alleyway,
12 which there was a photograph Heather had up, where
13 trash is maintained and that walkway would be retained.
14 That's where the AC units are, that's where the trash
15 is maintained, and we would, we would keep that. We're
16 not proposing to move or, or construct new walkways
17 across the flare line. It -- there's no new work in
18 that area proposed for clarification.

19 So, that addresses the 15 points that really were
20 the points that were the focus of the concept reviews.
21 The, the things that we did do with this proposed
22 edition, we, we indicated Anderson 400 Series. We talk
23 about the siding. We noted that the railing on the
24 addition would be the Dartmouth Intex rail. The stairs
25 would be the mahogany wood. The piers on the covered

1 porch would be true brick piers and the bricks would be
2 the flashed fire coloration. Samples were submitted.
3 The columns would replicate the columns on the original
4 porch on Ocean Pathway and in the upper gable of that
5 elevation we actually are chamfering the vertical six-
6 inch elements, which we've done pretty consistently.

7 You'll see the -- well, maybe you'll see, I can't
8 see, but it's been called out. It's in the narrative.
9 It's in the specification. Those are the columns and
10 that is the -- that's the front elevation on the left,
11 the rear elevation. There we go. So that, that area,
12 those columns and the newel post, all that's going to
13 replicate the front porch. I, I believe that's all I
14 have as far as the presentation. I'm sorry for taking
15 so much time. But I think the, the owner, Terrie,
16 wanted to have some discussion directly with you about
17 the siding and the options, because --

18 MS. OSEPCHUK: Okay, Mark. We need --

19 MR. PAVLIV: -- we've laid out --

20 MS. OSEPCHUK: Before we get into that I
21 think the Board, and I'm looking at the hour -- I'd
22 really like to start asking some questions --

23 MR. PAVLIV: All right.

24 MS. OSEPCHUK: -- before we get into that
25 discussion.

1 MR. PAVLIV: That's fine. I'm happy with
2 that.

3 MS. OSEPCHUK: Okay. Fine. I think that's
4 good. I just have a couple of quick questions for you
5 just clar -- for clarification. When you talk about
6 the rear of this building and, and knowing full well
7 that this is one of the only existing structures
8 original to Ocean Pathway since we've lost so many to
9 fire, I'm very concerned about how it's dealt with and
10 how it's handled.

11 Did you do any research on the Sanborn maps to
12 ascertain exactly when those additions were added to
13 the original structure?

14 MR. PAVLIV: Yeah. You could tell that the
15 porch that was there was enclosed and the 1930 -- the,
16 the enclosure of the porch happened after 1930s.

17 MS. OSEPCHUK: Okay. What about the actual
18 addition that was the porch? When was that -- I mean
19 what's -- I'm trying to figure out what the original
20 footprint was is what I'm trying to do. So did you
21 look back to the Sanborn maps and do you --

22 MR. PAVLIV: Yeah, but the Sanborn map
23 unfortunately doesn't give us gables and doesn't give
24 us (inaudible) --

25 MS. OSEPCHUK: (Inaudible.) I'm, I'm talking

1 footprint. I'm really just talking footprint.

2 MR. PAVLIV: Okay. The footprint is pretty
3 much the same footprint with the exception of the open
4 air porches. The front had, had a -- I believe the
5 open air porch modified somewhat over, over the time of
6 the 1890 to the 1930 period. I don't have the Sanborns
7 in front of me but we, we were not looking to restore
8 or do anything to the front on the porches.

9 MS. OSEPCHUK: No, I realize that. I'm just
10 trying to ascertain whether you're going to be removing
11 -- how much original material you're gonna be removing
12 to --

13 MR. PAVLIV: Oh, zero. There is no original
14 material being removed. The only part that's being
15 removed is that one-story covered bed -- porch. That,
16 that photograph that Heather had up was showing the,
17 the (inaudible) --

18 MS. OSEPCHUK: Well, you are gonna --

19 MR. PAVLIV: -- window --

20 MS. OSEPCHUK: -- (inaudible) to the rear
21 facing gable, though -- I mean, that's where the
22 addition's coming out; correct? That's gonna be
23 obliterated.

24 MS. SHAFFER: The entire wall; right?

25 MS. OSEPCHUK: The entire wall of that

1 particular -- of the original structure will be taken
2 up by this new addition --

3 MS. SHAFFER: Yeah. The --

4 MS. OSEPCHUK: -- is that correct?

5 MS. SHAFFER: -- façade. Yeah.

6 MR. PAVLIV: The attic level arched window
7 that is there in the attic space, there, there's some
8 question whether that in fact was an original or an
9 extension in the rear. There's that one section.
10 Again, if you look at the elevation you begin to
11 question it because there was a side gable. A dormer
12 was added by a bathroom. And what I would suspect is
13 where the fireplace flue is, is that the roof actually
14 didn't come up to that height, that that was added.
15 So, therefore, that little room with that window, is it
16 original to the original, no; but it's probably an
17 older version that was there and, yes, that one window
18 will be obscured.

19 MS. OSEPCHUK: Okay.

20 MR. PAVLIV: I don't like to use the word
21 "obliterated" but it'll be obscured.

22 MS. OSEPCHUK: No. Gone.

23 MR. PAVLIV: With the addition, the addit --
24 it'll be gone with the addition of the new ridgeline.

25 MS. OSEPCHUK: Okay. You also -- and these

1 are just some, some minor things. You said you're
2 gonna be replacing some of the windows with the
3 exception of the front elevation with the Anderson 400
4 Series. Is every window that you are replacing a
5 replacement window or any -- are any of them original
6 wood two over two windows?

7 MS. SHAFFER: Deb, it says that there was an
8 HPC site inspection but I don't -- I didn't do one.
9 Did Kurt do one?

10 MS. OSEPCHUK: I don't know who did one. I
11 didn't.

12 MS. SHAFFER: I don't know.

13 MR. PAVLIV: We requested that quite a while
14 -- that was one of the first things we requested and we
15 were told it was being scheduled.

16 MS. SHAFFER: Okay. Well, there hasn't been
17 one, so that explains why we don't have that --

18 MR. PAVLIV: Yeah.

19 MS. SHAFFER: -- particular bit of
20 information.

21 MR. PAVLIV: But, but I can tell you under
22 oath that these are -- and you can ask the owner and
23 also the builder can be sworn in who's walked the sit
24 -- that these are aluminum and I believe there's even a
25 couple of vinyl --

1 UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Vinyl replacement --

2 MR. PAVLIV: -- vinyl replacement windows in
3 the alley.

4 MS. O'CONNOR: Yeah. I didn't do those.
5 Those windows were like that.

6 MR. PAVLIV: Yeah. When, when --

7 MS. OSEPCHUK: (Inaudible) know, so you are
8 not replacing any original windows to this structure?
9 They are all replacement windows?

10 MR. PAVLIV: Correct. That, that was -- the
11 original request was to replace the old wood windows.
12 The owner has agreed to retain and restore the, the
13 wood windows for our --

14 MS. OSEPCHUK: No, I thought (inaudible) to
15 that. I, I'm not --

16 MR. PAVLIV: (Inaudible.)

17 MS. OSEPCHUK: -- asking about that. Yeah, I
18 know that. Now --

19 MR. PAVLIV: Okay.

20 MS. OSEPCHUK: -- on one of the elevations
21 where you said you're changing that side door --

22 MR. PAVLIV: Yeah.

23 MS. OSEPCHUK: -- you're kind of moving it
24 over, there was also kind of an outline of a window
25 that was there that looks like it's also been kind of

1 rubbed out. Are you closing up any windows?

2 MR. PAVLIV: Yeah. That, that window is also
3 not an original window and that window is going to be
4 lost in the stairwell repair and bringing the stair to
5 code in that location.

6 MS. OSEPCHUK: Why do you say it was not --

7 MS. SHAFFER: Deb, I have to say, I have to
8 say that everybody else -- I mean, we have a policy now
9 that people --

10 MS. OSEPCHUK: Yeah.

11 MS. SHAFFER: -- everybody has to have a site
12 visit. I, I'm not comfortable with, you know, openings
13 disappearing or whatever without the usual --

14 MS. OSEPCHUK: Yeah.

15 MS. SHAFFER: -- process.

16 MS. OSEPCHUK: Yeah.

17 MR. PAVLIV: Well, we've been requesting one
18 for a good year and a half, so I, I haven't -- I don't
19 know --

20 MS. SHAFFER: Well --

21 MR. PAVLIV: -- what happened.

22 MS. SHAFFER: -- I don't know either, but --

23 MS. OSEPCHUK: Well (inaudible) now you say
24 it's a year and a half --

25 MS. SHAFFER: -- I think that's important.

1 MS. OSEPCHUK: -- and yet our first concept
2 with you was May 30th. We had a tech on July 25th. And
3 then we teched your application on September 26th.
4 That's not quite a year and a half, so, I --

5 MS. SHAFFER: So, I think, I think that need
6 to be done and I also think if there's information from
7 Sanborn maps I think that should be included as well
8 to, to try to ascertain. Because this -- I, I see this
9 as a radical change to a key structure, one of the
10 seven on that, that block.

11 MS. OSEPCHUK: Mm-hmm.

12 MS. SHAFFER: And there are a lot of issues
13 that go along with that.

14 MS. OSEPCHUK: The, the other thing --

15 MS. SHAFFER: Don't you think?

16 MS. OSEPCHUK: No, I could -- I totally
17 agree.

18 MR. PAVLIV: Well, I would suggest that if,
19 if someone wants to come out and take a look at the
20 windows we will, again, welcome that. The
21 accommodation is, is -- the doors are open. If you
22 want to come take a look you'll see that the -- what
23 we're testifying here under oath, that you're gonna
24 find the vinyl and the replacement aluminum is what
25 we're trying to address.

1 MS. SHAFFER: That's great. And Kurt, Kurt
2 and I do this for everybody even, you know, when, when
3 we know they're vinyl so I think that needs to be done.
4 But I think also that there are --

5 We didn't get any tech notes on this, Deb. Can
6 we, can we start in on some of these rather large
7 issues with this project beyond --

8 MS. OSEPCHUK: Yeah.

9 MS. SHAFFER: -- windows?

10 MS. OSEPCHUK: Yeah. Oh, no, no --

11 MS. SHAFFER: All right.

12 MS. OSEPCHUK: -- I'm just trying to clarify
13 for myself.

14 MS. SHAFFER: Yeah. No, I hear you, but I
15 was struck by the fact it said there's been a site
16 inspection but there hasn't been.

17 MS. OSEPCHUK: Mm-hmm.

18 MS. SHAFFER: Before, before I ask things
19 like which of the posts from the front, the side do you
20 want to use on the back cause there's two different
21 kinds of posts on the front I have an, an issue with
22 what looks like a huge addition that is making this key
23 structure that is so distinctive look like two houses
24 that are backed up against each other. And that this,
25 this rear sort of extrusion you lose so much of the

1 scale and the form of the key structure from I think,
2 you know, of course you're right the 18-, the 1880s and
3 that the façade, the back façade and those facades on
4 those seven key structures on, on Ocean Pathway are
5 distinctive for being the backs of buildings. They,
6 they are facades but they're, they're backs. And this,
7 this really, really, really changes the character of
8 this building and it changes the --

9 MR. PAVLIV: Well, I, I really disagree with
10 that comment.

11 MS. SHAFFER: -- (inaudible) and, and -- can
12 I -- may I finish? It changes the streetscape and it,
13 it -- that block with those original buildings is, is
14 unique in Ocean Grove. Even across the way, Olin is,
15 is different. But when I look at this I think about
16 the form and intent of the original design and, and
17 this I think is quite against that. And I've never
18 seen a historic building that has this type of
19 roofline. So, I, I don't think this, this board is
20 against additions but this is I think oversized and the
21 design is not something that would be done
22 historically. And I may well be alone in that, but I
23 don't, I don't have tech notes to know if this is
24 something that was discussed and, and the sort of lack
25 of historic precedent for this roofline.

1 MS. OSEPCHUK: Well, I can tell you --

2 MS. SHAFFER: I'm just surprised at this.

3 MS. OSEPCHUK: I'm just gonna read from, from
4 one of the tech notes.

5 MS. SHAFFER: Okay. Thanks.

6 MS. OSEPCHUK: I don't know why you don't
7 have them, but it says, "Tech suggested the massing of
8 the proposed addition may not fit in with the Bath
9 Avenue streetscape. Some neighboring houses clearly
10 read as backs of houses with" --

11 MS. SHAFFER: Yes.

12 MS. OSEPCHUK: -- "step downs, (inaudible)
13 setbacks, and ornamentation that read as secondary when
14 compared to the grander front façade." Tech noted that
15 this 1857 -- which we found out is incorrect -- is not
16 only one of the last original houses on the Pathway but
17 one of the oldest houses in the Grove. They question
18 whether the proposed addition enhances or overwhelms
19 the original house and the history of the site. "The
20 Applicant has included an exhaustive survey of
21 photographs of neighboring houses along Bath Avenue in
22 response to Tech's concerns." But that was definitely
23 a concern and one of the things we questioned quite
24 profusely was the fact that the back looks like a
25 front. And --

1 MS. SHAFFER: It does. And I think that
2 that's, that's against the original --

3 MS. OSEPCHUK: The way houses were built in
4 Ocean Grove you could always distinguish the front from
5 the back. The front was always grander than the back.
6 Even though the back could have a, a rear porch, it
7 could have a second-story porch it still read as the
8 back of the house. This reads as -- this reads almost
9 as a duplicate of the front, which kind of negates the
10 importance of the front facing façade to me, which I
11 found very --

12 MS. SHAFFER: I agree.

13 MS. OSEPCHUK: Yeah.

14 MR. PAVLIV: I, I have to disagree. I mean,
15 I, I've been sitting here listening to this quietly.
16 First of all, the front of the house has a massive wrap
17 around porch and a pent. The rear does not. The
18 buildings on that street, as far as reading as rears of
19 buildings, I challenge anyone to look at the two sheets
20 together with the nine images and tell me that those
21 buildings are rears of any building. They are all
22 distinctly fronts of buildings with front porches,
23 covered porches, covered balconies and a wide array of
24 gables. As far as a historic building setting a new
25 precedent with a roofline, what we're showing is, is

1 the gable with the swale on the one side which is
2 directly out of the guidelines. It's, it's a very
3 traditional form. The fact that we have proposed
4 the --

5 MS. SHAFFER: Not for the back of the house.

6 MR. PAVLIV: The back of the house we
7 proposed the form in a smaller version and a lower
8 ridge high and in a narrower proportion. It's clearly
9 very different. It's not the same as the front and the
10 back and the mirror image. So I would respectfully
11 challenge that, that comment. I, I don't, I don't
12 believe that's correct.

13 MS. SHAFFER: Okay. Thanks. I think that --

14 MR. RUDELL: (Inaudible.)

15 MS. SHAFFER: I think that when you look at
16 this I think that if you look at Ocean Pathway, if you
17 look at historic homes on Ocean Pathway there is a
18 grand façade and there's a visible rear façade and you
19 can tell the difference. I cannot think of an example
20 of a building that has a gull wing of a swale on, on,
21 on the back as well as the front. This literally looks
22 like two houses squished together in that sense. And
23 along the side what happens is this kind of swallows
24 this -- it is a very delicate structure with this
25 double thing that goes like that.

1 I, I cannot think of a historic structure in Ocean
2 Grove where that was the form that was used for an
3 addition. And I, I fear for the -- because this is one
4 of the seven structures that is left on Ocean Pathway
5 on the north side -- so somebody besides me go ahead.

6 MR. RUDELL: I have a comment, if I may.
7 Mark, we were there -- I was there on the day that you
8 came in with the homeowner and we talked about one of
9 the earlier drawings that was a slightly different
10 form. You didn't have a dropdown ridgeline at the time
11 and we talked about dropping it down on the addition
12 and pulling in on the sides, which you clearly have
13 done. But that cross gable in the addition that used
14 to sit at the same elevation as the original cross
15 gable on the house. You've dropped it down a little
16 but it kind of intrudes into the older, original part
17 of the house.

18 I have to go back to something, and I hate doing
19 this, it's something that you told us, which is
20 additions on historic houses should, should as though
21 they could be removed by some later owner and the
22 original structure and the sort of form of that
23 original structure should be there still. This -- the
24 way that you've designed this addition I don't think
25 there's any way to pull it apart again. You've kind of

1 integrated it, which perhaps is a plus if we're looking
2 at it from a design point of view.

3 You're a great architect. You found a way to meld
4 this together seamlessly, but the downside of that is
5 it doesn't look like much of an addition, meaning it
6 doesn't look like it could come off. It doesn't look
7 secondary. It looks primary. It looks integrated.
8 These little setbacks on the side and step downs on the
9 top are required and you, of course, met that
10 requirement but I don't know that it conveys what we're
11 trying to get to, which is this idea that the back of
12 the house reads like a back of a house.

13 Currently you have some very interesting shapes.
14 It narrows very -- to one room. It drops down to a
15 single floor. You get these sort of shapes and forms
16 that step down towards human level at the back. All of
17 that's going to be gone and you're going to have a very
18 large house that comes out not to the setback line,
19 true, but as much as you've made mention as you've
20 brought it back so that it was a little more modest in
21 size you also brought it back, I know, because you
22 didn't want your stairs intruding into the deck of your
23 porch. And if you'd gone further toward the flare line
24 you would have had to squish the stairs in. So, there
25 were other considerations other than just making this

1 modest.

2 But I, I do have some concerns. The gull wing is
3 concerning. The, the sense that the original house is
4 completely lost from Bath Avenue -- you don't see
5 anything of the original house. You don't see the
6 original roofline. It -- and we did bring most of this
7 up during those initial concepts. I now that your
8 client might have a program that leads you in this
9 direction but those concerns are still there for the
10 most part when I look at what you've delivered tonight.
11 And that's all I'll say on that part for now.

12 MR. PAVLIV: Well, you know, there, there --
13 thank you, Jess, for the comments on that. You could
14 take -- if I could take a razor blade and just cut a
15 line down as a heavy line separating the existing from
16 the proposed addition, that is the break line. And if
17 I was a homeowner a hundred years from now and I wanted
18 to remove that addition it could very seamlessly be
19 removed and the original structure, to whatever that
20 original state was, would be there. The only thing
21 that would be lost in this process would be the one
22 window in the gable. The --

23 MR. RUDELL: Hold on. You would lose the
24 (inaudible) --

25 MR. PAVLIV: Just so you understand, there is

1 no rear façade there now. The enclosed porch actually
2 extends into the building so there's no existing rear
3 of the building. That has been long gone. And what
4 we're doing is taking away that enclosed porch. And by
5 adding this addition I think what the issue here is,
6 there are two gables -- originally, we had gables
7 mimicking the existing gables on the east and west.

8 MR. RUDELL: Yes.

9 MR. PAVLIV: We attempted to keep those
10 gables on the east and west in the addition. If we
11 were to eliminate those gables, the secondary gables in
12 the addition, then the gable roof would extend straight
13 in and dovetail underneath the overhand of the
14 existing. That would allow you to see the roof form of
15 the original structure. If you look at the rear
16 elevation --

17 MR. RUDELL: Yup. I see it.

18 MR. PAVLIV: -- where we have the, the dashed
19 lines, you see the dashed line coming down --

20 MR. RUDELL: I do. And (inaudible) --

21 MR. PAVLIV: -- behind the gable. If that
22 gable was not there you would see the structure behind
23 it.

24 MR. RUDELL: (Inaudible.)

25 MR. PAVLIV: There'd be a two and a half foot

1 differential. And --

2 MR. RUDELL: So, so you're suggesting --

3 MR. PAVLIV: -- we'd be able to tell --

4 MR. RUDELL: -- that (inaudible) --

5 MR. PAVLIV: -- that there's a building
6 behind it.

7 MR. RUDELL: So you're suggesting that a gull
8 wing proposed for the Bath Avenue side, if you didn't
9 have that cross gable in the addition, it would be a
10 good design to have a gull wing feeding into a regular
11 straight gable beneath? Cause that's what you would
12 have. You would have this curved gull wing --

13 MR. PAVLIV: The gables would not be there.
14 If, if you look at the -- okay. Here's a good example.

15 MS. SHAFFER: But this is what we have. This
16 is what we have in front of us.

17 MR. PAVLIV: Yeah.

18 MS. SHAFFER: Right?

19 MR. PAVLIV: That's a good example. So if
20 you look at the top right. And you call it a gull wing
21 but basically it's a swale coming off of the, the gable
22 roof. The, the secondary gable, the new gable that's
23 proposed, if we eliminated that gable; right?

24 MR. RUDELL: Yup.

25 MR. PAVLIV: Then you'd have the flat plane

1 with the gull wing or swale extending into the existing
2 house. That would be true if we, if we dropped down to
3 the other side.

4 MR. RUDELL: Yeah.

5 MR. PAVLIV: The west side elevation. That
6 would be true there that that secondary gable, if we
7 dropped that secondary gable and just had the gutter
8 line continue to the right, or southward in this
9 instance, there'd be a differential between the
10 existing and the --

11 MR. RUDELL: Proposed.

12 MR. PAVLIV: -- proposed addition in the
13 rear.

14 MR. RUDELL: Yup.

15 MS. OSEPCHUK: Mark, can we just look at that
16 elevation for just a minute since we're talking about
17 that area and we're talking about taking a razor blade
18 and slicing it down. What happened to the tail of that
19 new gable? Where is it? It's kind of truncated
20 because it feeds into the existing building. And below
21 it, with the exception of that one window, there are no
22 windows. Why are there no windows right there and what
23 happened to the edge of that new gable?

24 MR. PAVLIV: Well, that's where we -- it --
25 I'm trying to understand. We, we had no windows there.

1 We added four windows, which are barely visible from
2 the street, and then there's a flat wall area without
3 windows. That is where we end up having a kitchen on
4 the exterior wall. You know, we have a situation where
5 it's essentially a 14-foot dwelling. Minus the, the
6 walls we really have a 13-foot interior space and then
7 we need a place to be able to put the -- the kitchen
8 exists in that area. So that's where the cabinetry
9 would be placed.

10 MS. OSEPCHUK: So the interior cabinetry
11 placement has determined the exterior window placement,
12 is that --

13 MR. RUDELL: Right. And if need be we can
14 provide a faux window in that location on both the
15 second and first floor which we've done before as well,
16 which, which creates a continuation of windows. It
17 could be done. It, it would be the same window, same
18 two over two, same casing, but they would be faux
19 windows in those locations.

20 MS. SHAFFER: I still think the bigger issues
21 is this strange roof configuration, the size of this
22 what's being called an addition, and a double front
23 façade. Again, I think that the fundamental issue is
24 the, the entire concept of this and I, I wonder what
25 other commissioners besides me and Deb and Jeffrey

1 think about that because I think it's a huge problem,
2 especially for this key structure --

3 MS. OSEPCHUK: I --

4 MS. SHAFFER: -- and especially where it
5 is --

6 MS. OSEPCHUK: I agree.

7 MS. SHAFFER: -- and especially because of
8 that side of Ocean Pathway or even on the other side if
9 you go along the backs of those buildings you always
10 know when you're on the back of, of, of an Ocean
11 Pathway building. It doesn't mean they ignore them but
12 you know it's the back.

13 MS. OSEPCHUK: Mm-hmm.

14 MR. CAVANO: Jennifer --

15 MS. SHAFFER: Don't call me Jennifer.

16 MR. CAVANO: -- you, you're asking for other
17 comments. So, I, I --

18 MS. SHAFFER: I know. No, my name isn't
19 Jennifer, so.

20 MR. CAVANO: -- there isn't many, there isn't
21 many left that haven't commented. So, so I -- look, I
22 have mixed feelings about this in the sense that we
23 need Department of Interiors standards around
24 identifying additions with clear setbacks and step
25 downs. I think, I think there is enough of as setback

1 and, and step down to be able to identify this as an
2 addition. So I don't have -- I don't really -- I think
3 from an addition point of view it's fine.

4 I do like the idea of getting rid of these rear
5 gabl -- rear side gables because it then would allow
6 you to see from the rear of the house where the old end
7 of the house was and that this is an addition that was
8 stuck on the back of it. And then to, to Mark's razor
9 blade init -- analogy, you could just see, okay, well,
10 I could, I could cut right there and it would, it would
11 take it off. I think that -- so from that perspective
12 I'm, I'm actually okay with that cause when I look at
13 the house from the front and I'm on Ocean Pathway I
14 won't s -- I won't notice the scale of the rear. It'll
15 still look like the house that was on Ocean Pathway.
16 Now, when I'm on the next street north and I'm looking
17 at it the fact that they've been sensitive to the
18 setbacks of the other houses and they don't go past it
19 I think is really good.

20 Them, the question that I, I, I don't have -- I
21 don't know the right answer here is should the back
22 look as much like a front as this back looks like. We
23 do have other examples. I mean, I have two on my
24 street, that go between Abbott and Broadway where we
25 got fronts on both streets, but -- and backs on neither

1 street and they go street to street. And those were
2 one's new construction and one is old const -- one is
3 the Wilden (ph.) house where they took two houses and
4 glued them together, which is a special, which is a
5 special case.

6 And then, you know, so we -- there are other
7 examples that are like that around town, correct or
8 incorrect, I don't, I don't know. I would say that
9 without the side gables and the ability to see where
10 the, where the old where the old and the new meet I
11 think is a, is a good thing. It might make sense to
12 take some of the ornamentation off of the rear to make
13 it look less like a front. But to Mark's point, I
14 would need to walk that street -- the back street, not
15 Ocean Pathway. I, I know Ocean Pathway by heart, but
16 the back street, which I forget -- what is that?
17 It's --

18 MS. HENDERSON: Bath. Bath.

19 MR. RUDELL: What is it?

20 MS. HENDERSON: Bath. Bath Avenue.

21 MR. RUDELL: Bath. Sorry. Sorry. I'd have
22 to walk Bath to see how many of the other houses, you
23 know, really looked like fronts when they are rears.
24 And, I know, I can't say that I walk that street. It's
25 not someplace that I go.

1 MR. RUDELL: Mark's -- Mark provided
2 photographs of the entire street in your packet that
3 shows --

4 MS. SHAFFER: And I walked it today, yeah. I
5 mean, it's --

6 MR. CAVANO: Okay. So --

7 MS. OSEPCHUK: They all look like rears.

8 MR. CAVANO: Well, look, I'm, I'm, I'm one,
9 I'm one voice. So, but I would say that, you know, it
10 does definitely look like the front of a house. It
11 definitely does look like the front of a house.

12 MS. SHAFFER: Mm-hmm.

13 MR. CAVANO: And the question is that, is
14 that appropriate. I, I don't know. The, the other
15 piece of it is, I think, we can very quickly go over
16 and confirm that all the windows that are -- Jennifer,
17 to your --

18 MS. SHAFFER: Absolutely.

19 MR. PAVLIV: That's easily --

20 MS. SHAFFER: My name is not Jennifer.

21 MR. CAVANO: Jenny.

22 MS. SHAFFER: My name is not Jennifer.

23 That's all I'm saying.

24 MR. CAVANO: Jenny, Jenny, Jenny, Jenny.

25 MS. SHAFFER: Thank you.

1 MR. CAVANO: Sorry. So, I'm, I'm still -- my
2 head is still echoing with Jennifer Krimco (ph.) from
3 last night.

4 MS. SHAFFER: Oh, don't say it. Don't say
5 that.

6 MR. CAVANO: So, anyways --

7 MS. SHAFFER: My name is Jenny.

8 MR. CAVANO: -- so, Jenny, we could very
9 quickly go confirm the, the vinyl windows --

10 MS. SHAFFER: Absolutely.

11 MR. CAVANO: -- (inaudible) windows and also
12 the fact that the rear is no longer a rear but it's
13 really an enclosed porch. Those are -- that would be
14 very easy to confirm, which I think would be, you know,
15 would, would be good to do. And then for me, as I
16 said, the only question would be is, is, is do we, do
17 we, do we make the rear look less like a, a front.

18 MS. OSEPCHUK: Mm-hmm.

19 MR. CAVANO: Because I think with a -- as I
20 said, with the side gables off I can actually see now
21 where this all, where this all gets connected together
22 and it does, in my one man's opinion comply with kind
23 of the, the spirit of the Department of Interior's
24 guidelines about additions.

25 MS. OSEPCHUK: Mm-hmm. Yeah, Kurt. I know,

1 I understand your point. I would also like to go one
2 step further and see some Sanborn maps to attest to
3 what the original footprint of this house really looked
4 like so we know what we're removing. We keep talking
5 about, oh, this first-floor, enclosed porch and no
6 consequence, you know it's just -- it was enclosed. I
7 would just like to know what was there and when these
8 additions were added so that we're not taking off
9 something that's really significant on (inaudible).

10 MR. CAVANO: And, and I, I don't, I don't
11 disagree with doing that homework.

12 MS. OSEPCHUK: Yeah. I think it's
13 (inaudible) --

14 MR. MOYER: Heather, didn't, didn't we submit
15 at some point the Sanborn maps? We always do on these
16 applications.

17 MS. OSEPCHUK: Yeah.

18 MS. SHAFFER: I don't -- I didn't see them.

19 MS. OSEPCHUK: I didn't see them.

20 MS. HEINLEIN: No.

21 MS. SHAFFER: I think another thing
22 actually, just before I --

23 MR. PAVLIV: Usually (inaudible) submitted
24 digitals.

25 MS. SHAFFER: Yeah. Before I forget is our

1 guidelines do discourage sticking two houses together.
2 And like Doc Wilden's house is before my time on the
3 board, but --

4 MS. OSEPCHUK: Quite awhile.

5 MS. SHAFFER: --- that is --

6 MS. OSEPCHUK: Yeah.

7 MS. SHAFFER: Yeah. I, I'm sure I was really
8 young when that happened, but --

9 MR. CAVANO: Look --

10 MS. SHAFFER: -- it is something that we
11 discourage, that idea of, of what this is kind of
12 looking like. I'm sorry, Kurt. What?

13 MR. CAVANO: Unfortunately, the first block
14 of Abbott has two houses; one the Goodman house where
15 two houses were stuck together side by side.

16 MS. SHAFFER: Yeah.

17 MS. OSEPCHUK: Yeah.

18 MR. CAVANO: And then next to that the Wilden
19 house where they were stuck together front to back.

20 MS. OSEPCHUK: Front to back.

21 MS. HEINLEIN: Right.

22 MR. CAVANO: And both of those, both of those
23 were repulsive but they're existing, so.

24 MS. OSEPCHUK: Right. But, too, just to
25 clarify, Kurt, neither one of those -- I mean, each one

1 was a complete and total house in and of itself with a
2 front and a back. And the fact that Doc Wilden's house
3 now has two fronts, it originally was two complete
4 houses. I mean, they were -- it's not, it's not an
5 addition that was created with, with a rear that looks
6 like a front.

7 MR. CAVANO: Yeah. The only --

8 MS. OSEPCHUK: (Inaudible) different.

9 MR. CAVANO: The only example that I would
10 say that is different than it -- I'm sorry, Jeff. I'm
11 stepping on you.

12 MR. RUDELL: No, no. Go ahead.

13 MR. CAVANO: -- is also in that same block.
14 I don't know whether it's 6 or 8 Abbott.

15 MS. OSEPCHUK: Uh-huh.

16 MR. CAVANO: Is new construction that goes
17 street to street.

18 MS. OSEPCHUK: Mm-hmm.

19 MR. CAVANO: And it's got really kind of
20 front and front.

21 MS. OSEPCHUK: And this (inaudible).

22 MR. CAVANO: When you see it you can't tell
23 what street it is. So --

24 MS. HEINLEIN: I gotta see that.

25 MS. SHAFFER: You mean the blue one? The one

1 that's --

2 MR. CAVANO: Yeah.

3 MS. SHAFFER: -- blue?

4 MR. CAVANO: Yeah. It's a, a -- not navy
5 blue but grey blue.

6 MS. SHAFFER: Dark blue. Yeah.

7 MS. OSEPCHUK: (Inaudible) construction.

8 Okay. And the reason that I'm asking about these San
9 -- oh, here are some Sanborn maps.

10 MS. SHAFFER: Where's the 1930 one? Yeah.

11 We need the 1930 one.

12 MS. OSEPCHUK: It's a bit early. Yeah.

13 MS. SHAFFER: Cause I, you know, I, I -- you
14 can easily find the first, find the first two.

15 MS. OSEPCHUK: Right.

16 MS. SHAFFER: I mean, I looked at them today
17 but I didn't have a chance to go down the street.

18 MS. OSEPCHUK: Yeah. Now, the reason that
19 I'm even asking is because in our ordinance, which our
20 guidelines are, are kind of subservient to, you know,
21 it states "distinguishing original qualities or
22 characteristics of a building structure or its site and
23 its environment shall not be destroyed." So, I just
24 want to know. I would really like to know. It says
25 the removal or alteration of any and all historic

1 material or distinctive architectural features should
2 be avoided when possible. So it's just a (inaudible) I
3 would just like to know.

4 And I know you said, Mark, that it doesn't go past
5 any rear but I do believe it goes past the house to the
6 -- next door to the west of it. I believe it extends
7 quite a bit. But I would like --

8 MR. PAVLIV: (Inaudible.)

9 MS. OSEPCHUK: -- to -- I'd have to see the
10 surveys of both of those houses to know whether it does
11 or not.

12 MR. PAVLIV: Number 7, very interesting here.
13 This is the 18--

14 MS. SHAFFER: That's 1905.

15 MR. PAVLIV: 1905 Version?

16 MS. OSEPCHUK: Yeah.

17 MR. PAVLIV: You'll notice the one-story
18 piece. That one-story had become a two-story and a
19 piece to the left that's missing became an addition,
20 also ultimately a two story. And then a porch was
21 added further to the rear of that --

22 MS. OSEPCHUK: Mm-hmm.

23 MR. PAVLIV: -- which doesn't show up on
24 this.

25 MS. OSEPCHUK: Mm-hmm.

1 MR. PAVLIV: And that porch was later
2 expanded to a wider porch and then enclosed for two-
3 thirds of that and added to that kitchen.

4 MS. OSEPCHUK: Mm. Yeah. We'll have to grab
5 those 1930 maps, Jen, and take a look at those.

6 MS. SHAFFER: I know. We gotta check that
7 out. But again --

8 MS. KEPLER: I'm pulling them right now.

9 MS. SHAFFER: -- that's still part of the,
10 that's still part of the period of significance.

11 MR. PAVLIV: The, the --

12 MS. OSEPCHUK: Yeah.

13 MR. PAVLIV: -- the point about obscuring and
14 obliterating the original, I think that has been done a
15 few times over over the decades. The building --

16 MS. SHAFFER: It's more what's the historic
17 rather than --

18 MR. PAVLIV: -- has grown.

19 MS. SHAFFER: -- original, but.

20 MS. OSEPCHUK: Yeah.

21 MR. PAVLIV: Yeah. You can tell that also in
22 the basement, that there had been additions --

23 MS. SHAFFER: Mm-hmm.

24 MR. PAVLIV: -- over time.

25 MS. SHAFFER: I'm sure.

1 MS. OSEPCHUK: Yeah.

2 MR. PAVLIV: You know, there was a comment
3 that was made about it looking too much like the
4 front --

5 MS. OSEPCHUK: (Inaudible.)

6 MR. PAVLIV: -- so I guess we can dress it
7 down. And I, I'm not in the practice of doing that
8 usually but in this case I would look at, first of all,
9 the rounded -- half round arches that we added on that,
10 which came late in the game.

11 MR. RUDELL: This is the 1930.

12 MS. OSEPCHUK: Then -- I'm sorry. What,
13 Jeff?

14 MR. RUDELL: This is the 1930 map.

15 MR. PAVLIV: Yeah. Wow.

16 MS. SHAFFER: And there it is.

17 MS. OSEPCHUK: And there --

18 MR. PAVLIV: Okay. And somewhere between
19 1905 and --

20 MS. SHAFFER: Enough to (inaudible) what it
21 is to now.

22 MR. PAVLIV: -- 1930. And then you have that
23 one-story porch across that was then after 1930 was
24 enclosed based on what we've --

25 MS. OSEPCHUK: Mm-hmm.

1 MR. PAVLIV: -- testified to.

2 MS. OSEPCHUK: Mm-hmm.

3 MS. SHAFFER: Yeah. So --

4 MR. PAVLIV: That the rear had been --

5 MS. SHAFFER: -- (inaudible) yeah. So the
6 form that it has is basically the form that it has had
7 during the period of significance.

8 MS. OSEPCHUK: Mm.

9 MS. SHAFFER: Of course there have been
10 additions but --

11 MS. OSEPCHUK: Mm.

12 MS. SHAFFER: And that weird thing has always
13 been in the next door yard.

14 MS. OSEPCHUK: Yeah.

15 MS. SHAFFER: What the heck, you know.

16 MS. OSEPCHUK: So, I'm, I'm kinda, kinda
17 getting the sense from the board, Mark, that they are
18 hoping that you might go back and do a little bit more
19 work on this and come back to us.

20 MR. PAVLIV: I don't think I'm, I don't think
21 I'm coming back but I can make a few recommendations
22 here.

23 MS. OSEPCHUK: Okay.

24 MR. PAVLIV: One is, again, I was talking
25 about the ornamentation.

1 MS. OSEPCHUK: Mm-hmm.

2 MR. PAVLIV: And I appreciate that the half-
3 round arches that we have on the back --

4 MS. OSEPCHUK: Mm-hmm.

5 MR. PAVLIV: -- are emulating the half-round
6 arches that are part of the, the front gable. If we
7 eliminated -- we're not looking at it right now, but if
8 we looked at that rear elevation we would eliminate --
9 there's two round elements that would first of all
10 change it dramatically.

11 MS. OSEPCHUK: Mark, let me just stop you
12 right there. I don't think we're gonna make a decision
13 based on what might be. I think we're gonna have to
14 see it in reality before we can take a vote on it. I,
15 I -- that's how I feel. We've done this before and it,
16 it never seems to work. You know, suggestions,
17 whatever, I mean, I think all that's wonderful. I
18 think you're getting some feedback from the rest of the
19 board, but I don't think you're gonna get a vote unless
20 they have something in front of them. That's kinda how
21 I feel.

22 I mean, if you want further discussion I think
23 that's great. I know you said that the homeowner was
24 interested to find out what the board found about the
25 new addition having, you know, the tile -- this

1 lookalike asbestos --

2 MS. SHAFFER: Asbestos.

3 MS. OSEPCHUK: -- tile put on. I don't know
4 how the rest of the board feels but I think with your
5 probe that you've done you've shown that it's -- the
6 original siding is clap. We have never approved doing
7 a complete addition being covered in those asbestos
8 shakes. I mean, they've filled in. We might have
9 added a small portion to a building but I don't know,
10 correct me if I'm wrong but I, I don't remember us ever
11 approving something like that for an -- from an -- for
12 an addition.

13 MR. CAVANO: My preference --

14 MS. OSEPCHUK: (Inaudible.)

15 MR. CAVANO: My preference personally would
16 be if they want to leave the cement shingles on the
17 rest of the house and deal with the rest of the
18 clapboard later that's fine.

19 MS. OSEPCHUK: Right.

20 MR. CAVANO: And then do the addition in
21 Hardie to match what would be clapboard in the future.

22 MS. OSEPCHUK: Yeah. That would, that
23 would --

24 MS. SHAFFER: Yes.

25 MS. OSEPCHUK: -- be my suggestion.

1 MR. MOYER: I agree.

2 MS. SHAFFER: Yeah. I think that's, that's
3 what we usually do.

4 MR. PAVLIV: I, I think we agree at this end
5 that that's a reasonable approach for that.

6 MR. CAVANO: And the other thing I can
7 suggest is that Jenny, Jenny, you and I --

8 MS. SHAFFER: Thank you. Thank you.

9 MR. CAVANO: You and I can s -- you and I can
10 go out and take a look as quick as possible.

11 MS. OSEPCHUK: Yeah. I think that would be
12 great. The other thing -- real quick, Mark, cause I
13 know you mentioned this and since we're talking about
14 some possible changes to the rear elevation, I know you
15 narrowed those double doors and you said that part of
16 the reason for having those double doors in the rear is
17 cause the front door is double. And yet I keep seeing
18 a single door in the front. Is, is -- am I mistaken?

19 MR. PAVLIV: Well, the owner can testify to
20 the front door.

21 MS. OSEPCHUK: Okay.

22 MR. PAVLIV: (Inaudible.)

23 MS. O'CONNOR: So we replaced the front door
24 this past year and all the approvals were gotten, were
25 gotten through Bob from Ocean Grove Hardware. And they

1 are replicating the open -- they are the size that the
2 original opening in the front of the house was. What
3 had probably been done somewhere in the 40s, 30s, 40s
4 when they started putting those horrible louver doors
5 on the house --

6 MS. OSEPCHUK: Uh-huh.

7 MS. O'CONNOR: -- somebody closed down the
8 opening and put on the porches those, those louver --
9 you know, those glass crank it out, crank it in doors.

10 MR. PAVLIV: Jalousie.

11 MS. HEINLEIN: Jalousie.

12 MS. O'CONNOR: Jalousie. They were certainly
13 not in keeping with the house nor were they -- they
14 were ugly. And so we found where the original opening
15 was because they had closed the original opening in
16 with wood and the original trim that you would, you
17 know, would say was there. So we had doors made to fit
18 into the original opening and they look quite lovely.
19 They're wood and they're, you know, in keeping with the
20 house.

21 MR. PAVLIV: They're double?

22 MS. O'CONNOR: They're double. They're
23 double, yes. And they fit into the opening.

24 MS. OSEPCHUK: But, but (inaudible) -- did
25 you, did you appear before the board for those doors?

1 MS. O'CONNOR: I'm sorry?

2 MS. OSEPCHUK: Was that part of an approval
3 that was given by the board? I know you had come
4 before the board for a color palette. But I just
5 don't --

6 MS. O'CONNOR: Bob Eastman did that for me.

7 MR. RUDELL: Deb, it may have been a Tech
8 thing.

9 MS. O'CONNOR: I don't know. All I know is
10 that he had the approval to do it.

11 MR. RUDELL: I'll have to look.

12 MS. OSEPCHUK: Yeah. I'll have to look.

13 MS. SHAFFER: And may I? I asked a question
14 earlier. Your front porch has different posts on the
15 first and second floors, so --

16 MS. O'CONNOR: Oh, I don't know that. I've
17 never noticed that. I think they're all the same.

18 MR. RUDELL: Different.

19 MS. O'CONNOR: I, I mean, I live there, I --

20 MS. SHAFFER: (Inaudible.)

21 MS. O'CONNOR: I don't know that they're
22 different. I mean, they all have the little round
23 screwy things that we painted different colors. If
24 they're different it's -- I've never noticed.

25 MS. HEINLEIN: They are different.

1 MS. SHAFFER: They are different. I mean,
2 they have incredibly distinctive ones. I'm sure I took
3 a picture today.

4 MS. O'CONNOR: They're different?

5 MS. SHAFFER: Yeah, they are.

6 MS. O'CONNOR: (Inaudible.)

7 MS. OSEPCHUK: Mark, that might be another
8 consideration. I hate to keep bringing up the door, I
9 know we've moved on to columns. While Jenny's looking
10 for that, you know, that again, you know, the double
11 door on the front which is your kind of grand entrance,
12 perhaps a single door on the back would also speak to
13 the fact that this is the rear.

14 MR. PAVLIV: Well, this is where I have a
15 problem because in each concept something's changed.
16 The first meeting we had six-foot; can we reduced them.
17 We reduced them. Okay. You reduced them and now it's
18 an issue again.

19 MR. RUDELL: No --

20 MR. PAVLIV: So, I, I think this is --

21 MR. RUDELL: -- I, I was there at some of
22 those meetings and you did --

23 MS. OSEPCHUK: I was, too.

24 MR. RUDELL: -- reduce the door and I think
25 that they look great. I don't have an issue with the

1 two small doors but you have a third door on that same
2 first-floor porch. And we did bring that up to you at
3 Tech, why you had three doors going out to the same
4 deck. It seemed a little excessive. And you still
5 have three doors. The two have been reduced in size,
6 which I think looks better, but that other issue --

7 MS. O'CONNOR: I do have on my, on my front
8 porch I have the double doors and then I have a door
9 that goes into the house on the side which seems to be
10 fairly common.

11 MR. RUDELL: It's very common on (inaudible).

12 MS. O'CONNOR: (Inaudible.)

13 MR. RUDELL: It's very common, yeah. But at
14 the rear we, we don't often see that. It's generally a
15 single door at the rear.

16 MS. O'CONNOR: I don't understand why that is
17 problematic. And I'm not trying to be difficult, I
18 mean (inaudible) --

19 MR. RUDELL: Oh, no, no. That's a good
20 question.

21 MS. O'CONNOR: -- comes in was where the kids
22 with their sandy feet (inaudible).

23 MR. RUDELL: Oh, no. I understand.

24 MS. O'CONNOR: And the other door was to go
25 -- open up onto the porch. And, you know, I --

1 MR. RUDELL: To answer your question.

2 MS. O'CONNOR: -- my neighbors --

3 MR. RUDELL: To answer your question as to
4 why it's relevant, we're trying to talk about ways that
5 the design that is before us tonight suggests a front
6 of a full house as opposed to a back. That's one of
7 the things you see at a full front of a house but not
8 generally at the back. So these are indicators that
9 Mark has put in as a design consideration but that work
10 against sort of the sense that you're trying to get to
11 here, which is this is the back of a house. So we're
12 just mentioning any -- mentioning it to you. It's for
13 you and Mark to decide what you want to put before the
14 Commission, but those are the sort of things that make
15 this look like a brand new front house.

16 MS. O'CONNOR: One of the thoughts I had when
17 we were working with this was it's kind of not a very
18 attractive back and it sits recessed deeply in between
19 the two houses that are there. And the people that sit
20 across from me on Bath, my lovely neighbors, are
21 looking at it. It's nothing special. And we were
22 trying to create something that looked pretty from the
23 streetscape. And if you go down where Mira and Dudley
24 have done their house and several others have lovely
25 porches on the back -- my neighbors, the Whitemans to

1 the left have porches. Maybe they're not quite like
2 the ones we designed but neither is our house. And so,
3 you know, we were trying to make something that was
4 pretty and kept --

5 MR. RUDELL: I don't think anyone on this
6 commission --

7 MS. O'CONNOR: -- in keeping with the house.

8 MR. RUDELL: No one on this commission has
9 anything against making the house beautiful and your
10 efforts are going to be incredible. You've done a
11 great job. A lot of your ideas, a lot of Mark's ideas
12 are very appropriate and certainly approvable. But
13 Mark also, he understands exactly the, the issue we're
14 having here and he has with other projects come up with
15 very simple solutions. Not to design this for you, but
16 Mark has on other projects taken a gable like this and
17 put a shed roof on which gives you a sense of step down
18 in mass which makes the back of the house look more
19 like a back instead of a grand gabled area. If he took
20 the gable off and put a shed over that that might solve
21 the problem without any real loss of footprint
22 anywhere.

23 MR. PAVLIV: Yeah.

24 MR. RUDELL: I'm just encouraging you to turn
25 to your architect to trust him to come up with a

1 solution that will get this approved. That's all.

2 MS. SHAFFER: Yeah. And the back of Dudley's
3 house looks like the back of a house. It does. It
4 looks like the rear of a house. And you do have such
5 distinctive porch posts and they're different on the
6 first and second floor.

7 MS. O'CONNOR: I never noticed that so I
8 would have to go home and look at them and see.

9 MS. SHAFFER: Oh, no, but they're just
10 amazing.

11 MS. O'CONNOR: (Inaudible) --

12 MS. SHAFFER: On the first floor they're like
13 tubes with the things. On the second floor they have
14 these interesting swells to them. I don't know of any
15 other examples like them in Ocean Grove which is why
16 I'm asking which ones that you're gonna --

17 MS. O'CONNOR: So, what are, what, what are
18 you asking?

19 MS. SHAFFER: Your application says that on
20 the back you're going to replicate the porch posts from
21 the front of the house and my question was which ones.

22 MS. O'CONNOR: I don't know. I defer to Mark
23 and (inaudible). I like both of them and never noticed
24 it. I sit on my second-floor porch and have
25 (inaudible).

1 MR. PAVLIV: If, if you look at our drawings
2 we're very much -- now I understand what you're saying,
3 that the first floor is different from the second
4 floor.

5 MS. SHAFFER: Yes.

6 MR. PAVLIV: And we -- yes. And that's
7 exactly what we did in the back to be respectful of
8 that. It's very specifically (sic). If you look at
9 our drawing the first floor emulates the first floor
10 and the second floor emulates the second floor. We
11 didn't want to do a mishmash here. So, I mean, that
12 negates that argument. I mean, we, we've done this.
13 I've been doing this for 55 years and, and some of
14 these things come like naturally so I don't even think
15 about it twice. But I, I think that is clear on the
16 drawing that we're (inaudible) --

17 MS. SHAFFER: Good. I was just asking cause
18 you said that. But now -- but then, so what you're
19 saying is you're literally mirroring the front and the
20 back. Okay.

21 MR. PAVLIV: Yes. The columns are going to
22 be respectfully of what is on this house, so there's a
23 vernacular --

24 MS. SHAFFER: Mm-hmm.

25 MR. PAVLIV: -- a, a -- it's more detail that

1 is being repeated. We've gone -- the contractor would
2 much rather put three-and-a-half-inch AZEK on the edges
3 of the windows --

4 MS. SHAFFER: Yeah.

5 MR. PAVLIV: -- and we articulate all those
6 and with a template to, to replicate what's on the
7 original. That's being done also with the wood columns
8 which are being tooled and to replicate the first floor
9 and second floor. The, the side elevations, the front
10 elevations, they all address that. So what I'm
11 suggesting here to get this, this to move forward --
12 and, and I'm, I'm a bit frustrated because we were
13 hoping to have this meeting last month or the month
14 before and last month for some reason something went,
15 went awry, and this is going on for four years.

16 So I'm at my wit's end here trying to get this job
17 done before I die. And, and, and the things that we
18 would change, we would change those arches in the back.
19 That would help. I would eliminate the gables on those
20 both sides which would just give you a flat gable front
21 to back. If the board is insisting on a shed roof --
22 and if you look at the streetscape with the --

23 MR. RUDELL: Not, not insisting.

24 MS. OSEPCHUK: No, Mark (inaudible) insisting
25 on anything.

1 MR. PAVLIV: (Inaudible.) It's ab--

2 MS. OSEPCHUK: What the board is saying --

3 MR. PAVLIV: It's absurd. It's absurd. The
4 discussion is absurd. I'm sorry.

5 MS. OSEPCHUK: Well, I'm very sorry you feel
6 that way. And I -- but I will also reiterate again
7 that we cannot approve or deny something that we can't
8 see.

9 MR. PAVLIV: All right. Let me suggest this,
10 if I make a change and, and remove the arches and
11 remove those gables on both sides, and you're
12 suggesting a shed roof. Do you realize that a shed
13 roof --

14 MS. OSEPCHUK: I'm not suggesting anything.

15 MR. RUDELL: I, I told --

16 MS. OSEPCHUK: I'm not suggesting --

17 MR. RUDELL: It was only suggested as an
18 example of what an architect could do that would change
19 the look from a front of a house to a back of a house
20 without losing any space. I'm not suggesting that --

21 MR. PAVLIV: In appropriate situations, 8 to
22 10 feet, that would work, but when you have a 24-foot
23 run plus a porch you're basically creating a flat roof
24 that doesn't drain and --

25 MR. RUDELL: I wasn't proposing a 24-foot

1 flat roof, Mark. I was only proposing that the second-
2 floor porch that has the open gable area above that --

3 MR. PAVLIV: Just a (inaudible) --

4 MR. RUDELL: -- not be open.

5 MR. PAVLIV: I we cut off the porch, the six-
6 foot section with all the detailing, the finials, all
7 that --

8 MR. RUDELL: Again, I wasn't suggesting --

9 MR. PAVLIV: -- and just put a simple
10 gable --

11 MR. RUDELL: -- you do it here. I was
12 talking to your client and saying that you have the
13 skills to come up with a solution that would --

14 MR. PAVLIV: Yeah.

15 MR. RUDELL: -- solve the problem without
16 altering substantially anything on the inside of the
17 house, no footprint loss, nothing.

18 MR. PAVLIV: All right. So --

19 MR. RUDELL: It's a design solution that I
20 have faith in you being able to solve. That's all I
21 was making the point of.

22 MR. PAVLIV: If we just put a shed roof on
23 that over the porch.

24 MS. HEINLEIN: That's not --

25 MR. PAVLIV: Well, you know, if --

1 MS. HEINLEIN: You don't have to (inaudible).

2 MR. PAVLIV: -- this is what the commissions
3 prefers and if that's the --

4 MS. OSEPCHUK: Oh, Mark, Mark, Mark.

5 MS. SHAFFER: No, no, no, no, no.

6 MS. OSEPCHUK: I mean, this, this is not go
7 -- I'm telling you right now, if you leave this the way
8 it is you are looking at a possible no vote. I think
9 what the board is asking you to do is make some
10 alterations, defer this application, and let's get this
11 thing moving. And four years, I know you keep saying
12 four years, but you have not been hung up with the HPC
13 for four years. I told you the very first time we had
14 a concept, which was May 30th. That's not four years
15 ago. So, I, I don't know where this four years is but
16 it's not four years with us.

17 MR. PAVLIV: Well, it's -- it was four years
18 for me. So (inaudible) is also come to the same
19 conclusion. And now I understand what you're saying.
20 It's not a shed roof that runs from the --

21 MR. RUDELL: No.

22 MR. PAVLIV: -- existing out to the front but
23 it's a shed roof over the porch alone. That would --

24 MR. RUDELL: So, you understand that that
25 concept would drop down the massing visually from the

1 back so it would look more like the back of a house and
2 less like a grand back. You would still have your
3 swale, whatever, it would just -- the shed roof would
4 meet and you would expose that pretty arched window
5 which is currently in the gable of the open porch
6 ceiling, the soffit area, whatever you call that.

7 MR. PAVLIV: Yeah.

8 MR. RUDELL: It would be above the shed roof.
9 That's all I was saying. Simple ways to reduce the
10 massing so it doesn't look like a grand façade on this
11 very historic house.

12 MR. PAVLIV: (Inaudible.)

13 MR. RUDELL: You have many other ideas, Mark.
14 I trust you to come up with something viable. Don't
15 take my suggestion. I'm trying to use an example.
16 That's it.

17 MS. OSEPCHUK: Right.

18 MR. PAVLIV: Well, I think a shed roof for
19 that six-foot piece is a very good suggestion. It
20 drops everything down. It drops the massing down. It,
21 it can be done. You would maintain the same gable we
22 have now. You'd have the same window in the attic
23 space. You almost in that case wouldn't even have to
24 eliminate the two gables on the alleyways.

25 MR. RUDELL: Again, if you draw it up it

1 certainly presents something, yes.

2 MS. OSEPCHUK: But I'm not voting on
3 something unless I can see it.

4 MR. PAVLIV: Fine.

5 MR. RUDELL: I agree.

6 MR. PAVLIV: Fine.

7 MS. OSEPCHUK: So --

8 MR. RUDELL: But what I think I think what we
9 can say, Mark, is no one has said the house is ugly.
10 No one has said your design is inappropriate. They've
11 talked only about the visual impact, the apparent
12 massing, not even the actual massing. It's not a huge
13 space you're talking about 14 feet, 13 feet on the
14 inside. No one has said this is massive in that way.
15 They just said it presents visually as being somewhat
16 overwhelming and the original house looks lost or
17 buried. That's it. That's it.

18 MS. SHAFFER: And we've given suggestions on
19 what, what we see as issues. So go and --

20 MR. RUDELL: And if this commission doesn't
21 want to hear this again they can defer this to Tech
22 with the authority for Tech to work it out with you.

23 MS. OSEPCHUK: That is not --

24 MS. SHAFFER: That is not, that -- I think
25 something this big that is not gonna happen. We can't.

1 MR. RUDELL: I said if the commission wants.

2 MS. SHAFFER: No.

3 MS. OSEPCHUK: That is not gonna happen.

4 Jeff, I'm very sorry. This is a full commission
5 hearing for an addition and I, I don't, I -- no.

6 MR. RUDELL: Well, then I think --

7 MS. SHAFFER: (Inaudible) --

8 MR. RUDELL: I think the architect and the,
9 the client have a choice to withdraw this, table it, or
10 defer it --

11 UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Defer it.

12 MR. RUDELL: -- or vote. They have got that
13 choice. They have to tell us what they'd like us to
14 do.

15 MS. OSEPCHUK: Absolutely.

16 MR. PAVLIV: And, and then when would we be
17 heard again?

18 MS. SHAFFER: Well --

19 MR. RUDELL: Heather, are we free on
20 December?

21 MS. OSEPCHUK: It would have to be December
22 12th.

23 MR. PAVLIV: And this has to be done with a
24 full commission?

25 MS. OSEPCHUK: Yes.

1 MS. HEINLEIN: Yes.

2 MS. OSEPCHUK: That's how it started out.
3 These are major changes that we're talking about, Mark.
4 I would not, as a Tech person who would use these
5 things, want to be responsible for saying, oh, this is
6 fine now. No. This has to come back before the board.

7 MR. PAVLIV: All right. I can take a look at
8 this. We can put some razor blades to it and we'll
9 re-, reconfigure the back so it steps down as you were
10 suggesting. I mean, that's not gonna happen in one day
11 but we need to get the -- I would assume getting the
12 plans back to you in short order --

13 MS. OSEPCHUK: Mm-hmm.

14 MR. PAVLIV: -- so that we can get on the
15 schedule.

16 MS. OSEPCHUK: Mm-hmm.

17 MR. RUDELL: Keep in mind, Mark, that for
18 this purpose this commissions needs generally a site
19 plan and elevations. We don't need the full
20 construction documents that you often prepare.

21 MS. OSEPCHUK: No.

22 MR. RUDELL: We just need the elevations,
23 generally.

24 MS. OSEPCHUK: That's it.

25 MR. PAVLIV: Yeah, but we're not even

1 changing the site plan so it would just really --

2 MR. RUDELL: I, I know.

3 MR. PAVLIV: -- would be just the elevations.

4 MS. OSEPCHUK: Fine.

5 MR. PAVLIV: Yeah.

6 MS. OSEPCHUK: That would be fine.

7 MS. SHAFFER: Right.

8 MR. PAVLIV: Okay. So, given, given this
9 understanding, just so we don't have a situation where
10 I'm missing something and then we find ourselves in
11 another month there's another issue that we need to
12 address and, and I don't want to extend the process
13 again and again --

14 MS. OSEPCHUK: (Inaudible) --

15 MR. PAVLIV: -- what else should be addressed
16 in this next redraw?

17 MS. HENDERSON: Mark, may I make a
18 suggestion? I would just like to see you add those two
19 faux windows on that west elevation that you mentioned.

20 MR. PAVLIV: Okay.

21 MS. OSEPCHUK: Okay. And I believe Kurt's
22 suggestion was the elimination of the cross gable in
23 the addition.

24 MS. SHAFFER: I think that was me.

25 MS. OSEPCHUK: Or Jen.

1 MS. SHAFFER: I don't think we should have an
2 "m" on the side of a building.

3 MR. PAVLIV: An "m"?

4 MS. SHAFFER: Hey, Kurt, do you wanna go look
5 at the site? Do you wanna do the site, site thing next
6 Monday?

7 MR. CAVANO: Yeah, let's sche-, let's
8 schedule it right now. Monday at 4:00.

9 MS. SHAFFER: Sounds perfect.

10 MS. OSEPCHUK: All right. So that's
11 (inaudible) --

12 MR. CAVANO: Is the homeowner available
13 Monday at 4:00?

14 MS. O'CONNOR: Monday at 4:00 -- don't live
15 in the house, so.

16 MR. CAVANO: Well, Jenny, do we need to get
17 inside? Yes, we will need to get inside.

18 MS. SHAFFER: We do. Does Bob, does Bob
19 Easton --

20 MS. O'CONNOR: What, what time?

21 MS. SHAFFER: 4 p.m. on Monday.

22 MS. O'CONNOR: I'll make myself available.

23 MS. SHAFFER: Or, sometimes, you know, Bob is
24 -- when Bob -- if Bob does your windows he's been known
25 to let me and Kurt in with the permission of

1 homeowners.

2 MR. PAVLIV: So tha would be much
3 appreciated. We can get the windows behind us. We've
4 already done the probes and we sent photographs. I, I
5 think we're hearing that we can do the back in Hardie
6 and then at a later date we can then address restoring
7 the front --

8 MS. SHAFFER: Mm-hmm.

9 MR. PAVLIV: -- wood clapboard to match the
10 Hardie.

11 MS. OSEPCHUK: Agreed.

12 MS. SHAFFER: Yes.

13 MR. PAVLIV: But to leave the cement board --
14 the cement siding -- the -- sorry -- the asbestos
15 siding as is for now.

16 MR. RUDELL: Mark, may I ask a question?
17 You'll know this more than any of us. And that is --

18 MR. PAVLIV: Go ahead.

19 MR. RUDELL: -- if you change anything to do
20 with that roof will that require zoning to rereview
21 this?

22 MR. PAVLIV: No, because we're not in the
23 setbacks. We're all conforming with that.

24 MS. O'CONNOR: Can I ask a question?

25 MR. PAVLIV: Yes.

1 MR. RUDELL: I think George Waterman is
2 leaving for a week or two on vacation, so if this is
3 gonna trigger zoning I don't want you to get caught up
4 in a zoning hiccup here. If you're certain that any
5 change you're gonna make --

6 MS. OSEPCHUK: Jeff, these are also changes
7 that we're requesting of the Applicant, so.

8 MR. RUDELL: I just want to bring it out
9 there because we --

10 MS. OSEPCHUK: I know.

11 MR. RUDELL: -- don't (inaudible) the whole
12 process and I don't want the homeowner or the architect
13 to leave here thinking they're gonna change a sketch
14 and then it's a done deal. We have to (inaudible) what
15 they're presenting, but I also know when Mark makes
16 changes, especially big changes, they can trigger
17 zoning. If he knows what he has in his head -- I want
18 to make sure he, he understands that he's not gonna
19 trigger zoning or try not to trigger zoning. I don't
20 know (inaudible).

21 MR. PAVLIV: Everything that we just got is
22 reducing --

23 MR. RUDELL: That's what I thought.

24 MR. PAVLIV: -- the footprint.

25 MR. RUDELL: But you're the one who knows so

1 I wanted to ask you.

2 MR. PAVLIV: Yeah. We're reducing the
3 structure. We are not increasing anything.

4 MR. RUDELL: Okay.

5 MS. OSEPCHUK: Okay.

6 MR. RUDELL: Okay. I just -- better to be
7 certain.

8 MS. OSEPCHUK: Yeah.

9 MS. O'CONNOR: The bathroom on the third
10 floor already exists.

11 MR. CAVANO: What we're hearing here is we're
12 gonna defer this application to the December 12th?

13 MS. OSEPCHUK: Right.

14 MS. HEINLEIN: Correct.

15 MR. CAVANO: We need to make a space for it
16 on the December 12th. Sometime in the next week or two
17 you're going to get us some new drawings. On Monday at
18 4:00 Jenny and I will be there to do the inspection on
19 the windows just to validate that so we have all that.
20 We've looked at the Sandborn maps but we'll attach
21 those to the application so that we've, we've got
22 those.

23 Mark, you've got in your head the things that were
24 all suggested and -- but we, we should be able to, we
25 should be able to get this thing finished --

1 MS. OSEPCHUK: Yes.

2 MR. RUDELL: Commission members should know
3 that we currently have applications already on December
4 so we're gonna have a very long meeting in December in
5 order to address this, but hopefully that will then
6 solve it.

7 MR. MOYER: I actually have a question.
8 There, there's been a suggestion to remove the, the
9 side-facing gables. And I guess my question is because
10 we don't like them or is because it's inappropriate.
11 And I think they're two di --

12 MS. SHAFFER: Have you (inaudible) --

13 MR. MOYER: I think they're two different
14 things. Wait a minute. I can't hear. I'm, I'm asking
15 the question, are we saying that it doesn't exist and
16 it's inappropriate or that we just don't like it?
17 That's my question.

18 MS. SHAFFER: I'm the one who brought it up
19 and as I said then, I have never seen a historic
20 building with that roofline. So, my contention is I
21 don't, I don't say things -- I don't reject things
22 cause I don't like them. I am saying that it's not a
23 solution I've ever seen in historic architecture in
24 town.

25 MR. MOYER: Okay. That, that's --

1 MS. SHAFFER: Have you?

2 MR. MOYER: -- that is -- I -- it just -- as
3 a relative newcomer to this group it's important for me
4 to know that what people say is not their opinion but
5 it's based on historical precedent and not saying I
6 don't like it, but is it, is it actually because it is
7 not allowed or it did not exist anywhere else. So, I,
8 I'm just -- I just think --

9 MS. SHAFFER: Yeah.

10 MR. MOYER: -- it's important for me to get
11 that clarification and otherwise I would sit here and
12 simmer and stew about it, so.

13 MS. SHAFFER: Well, I, I did -- that, that is
14 the way I brought it up. I said it's not a solution
15 I've ever, I've seen --

16 MR. MOYER: Okay.

17 MS. SHAFFER: -- in a historic building, so.

18 MS. O'CONNOR: No, it's, it's -- I would love
19 for you to rethink this a little bit because it breaks
20 up a little bit of the long extension and it actually
21 added, I thought, a little bit of character to it. I
22 don't see it as an "m". I've never heard that before.
23 It's on a roof. Who's gonna stand at the side of my
24 house and look up and say that looks like an "m". You
25 won't even be able to see it because from the street

1 with the house you can't see down the alleyway and look
2 sideways.

3 I mean, you're talking about both -- and both of
4 my neighbors are delighted with what we're doing, by
5 the way, so just so you know. I was with Greg Lots
6 (ph.) last night at the Neptune Board Meeting --
7 Council Meeting and --

8 MR. RUDELL: This is the same argument
9 (inaudible) applicant just (inaudible) --

10 MS. O'CONNOR: -- and he wished me good luck
11 tonight. So I mean, no one seems to be offended by any
12 of this.

13 MR. RUDELL: This is the same argument the
14 previous applicant made, which is it's at the back of
15 house, no one's gonna see it, why is it a big deal.
16 And it's a big deal because the guidelines are clear
17 about what is permitted, which are things that are
18 historically appropriate or found in town as examples.
19 There's nothing that prevents a gab -- or a, a dormer
20 being put back there, things like that. That's very
21 commonly found. You see them all over. But this
22 double cross gable is unusual. It might exist but I
23 just haven't seen it. And that's, I think, what Jenny
24 made the point. She hadn't yet seen --

25 MS. SHAFFER: Mm-hmm.

1 MR. RUDELL: -- it in town and wasn't
2 familiar with it as an example of historic architecture
3 here. That's it.

4 MS. SHAFFER: That's all. Okay. Anyway.

5 MR. CAVANO: And the other reason is to a
6 conversation we had a little bit earlier which is if
7 you stand behind the house and you look at the rear of
8 it, without the double gables you can very clearly see
9 the plane of the original rear of the house where it's
10 above and the sides so that you can actually see that
11 an addition was put on, which is all part of the, the
12 Department of Interior's guidelines for when you do
13 additions it should be obvious that they were
14 additions. And that -- removing those gables allows us
15 to see that very clearly from the back of the house.
16 So that's, that's the other, the other reason.

17 MS. HENDERSON: I totally agree with that,
18 Kurt.

19 MS. OSEPCHUK: Mm-hmm. All right. So then
20 I, I, I can open this to the public although I don't
21 think there are any public now and we are basically
22 going to defer this application to the December 12th
23 meeting. So what I really need is a motion to defer.

24 MR. RUDELL: I'll make the motion to defer.

25 MR. CAVANO: And I'll second him.

1 MS. OSEPCHUK: All right. Heather, you want
2 to take roll.

3 MR. RUDELL: She's on mute.

4 MS. OSEPCHUK: Oh, Heather, you're on mute.

5 MR. TOMBALAKIAN: Deb, you don't need really
6 a roll. You could just do an all in favor on this one.

7 MS. OSEPCHUK: Can we do an all in favor?
8 Thanks, Steve.

9 MR. TOMBALAKIAN: Yeah.

10 MS. OSEPCHUK: All right. So, we have a
11 motion. We have a second. All those in favor say aye.

12 ALL MEMBERS: Aye.

13 MS. OSEPCHUK: (Inaudible) opposed to
14 deferring this application? No. All right. So be it.

15

16 (Record concludes.)

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CERTIFICATION

I, Patsy J. Handy, the assigned transcriber, do hereby certify the foregoing transcript of proceedings is prepared in full compliance with the current Transcript Format for Judicial Proceedings and is a true and accurate non-compressed transcript of the proceedings as recorded.

Patsy J. Handy

Patsy J. Handy

670

AOC Number

Brittany Transcription, LLC

Agency Name

April 12, 2023

Date