

TOWNSHIP OF NEPTUNE
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
MEETING OF DECEMBER 12, 2023

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Deborah Osepchuk
Linda Henderson
Lucinda Heinlein
Douglas MacMorris
Jenny Shaffer
Kurt Cavano
Jeffrey Rudell
Kristen Esposito

ALSO PRESENT:

Heather Kepler, Board Secretary
Steven Tombalakian, Esq., Board Attorney
Mark Pavliv, AIA, Architect for the Applicant

TRANSCRIPT ORDERED BY:

,
DAVID E. MAYLAND, ESQ.
(Strasser & Associates, P.C.)

Transcriber: Amy L. Ruplall
Brittany Transcription, LLC
60 Washington Street
Morristown, NJ 07960
(973)285-0411

Audio Recording

I N D E X

PAGE

Transcript of Hearing

3

1 MS. OSEPCHUK: All right. So 7 Ocean Pathway
2 then is next.

3 So Mark, you're appearing on behalf of the
4 applicant for 7 Ocean Pathway, correct?

5 MR. PAVLIV: That's correct. And I'm sit --

6 MR. OSEPCHUK: Anyone else?

7 MR. PAVLIV: I'm sitting here with the -- the
8 owner, Terrie O'Connor, and the perspective b --
9 builder, Gary Simone from Riverside Builders.

10 MS. OSEPCHUK: Okay.

11 MR. PAVLIV: Those are all in my conference
12 room, but we're just sharing one screen.

13 MS. OSEPCHUK: Okay. So --

14 MR. TOMBALAKIAN: Mark, at the prior hearing,
15 did all -- I know that you were sworn and your -- the
16 -- the owner was sworn. Was the builder sworn as well?
17 As -- as long as you acknowledge that you remain under
18 oath this evening, you --

19 MS. OSEPCHUK: No, they were not.

20 MR. PAVLIV: He was just present. He was
21 observing. He's observing tonight as well.

22 MR. TOMBALAKIAN: Okay.

23 MS. OSEPCHUK: Okay. He will not be --

24 MR. TOMBALAKIAN: So if you -- if you want
25 him to testify, we'll swear him in at that point.

1 MR. PAVLIV: I agree. Thank you.

2 MR. TOMBALAKIAN: Thank you, Mark.

3 MS. OSEPCHUK: Okay. So Mark, basically, at
4 the last hearing, there were some items that the Board
5 had quite a few issues with and they asked if there
6 were some changes that could be made. And basically,
7 you have submitted some new drawings and new plans for
8 the Board.

9 So what I would like to do is since we, at length,
10 went through this application the last time, what I'd
11 like to do is have the Board question you on basically
12 those changes that were made. And perhaps you can
13 answer to what was done instead of regurgitating this
14 application from the beginning.

15 MR. PAVLIV: That's fine. I agree.

16 MS. OSEPCHUK: Okay, great. Sounds good.

17 The addition from -- and I'm just kind of going to
18 briefly go over some of the things that were changed so
19 that everybody -- I know everybody's looked at the
20 plans. I'm sure they've observed what's changed.

21 Most of the changes took place at the rear
22 addition, although there were some changes done to some
23 dormers on the roof and also some addition of windows.
24 Correct?

25 MR. PAVLIV: Correct.

1 MS. OSEPCHUK: Okay. All right. So --

2 MR. PAVLIV: The side dormers were
3 eliminated.

4 MS. OSEPCHUK: Side dormers were eliminated
5 on the, I believe it was the west elevation.

6 MR. PAVLIV: On the west elevation.

7 There was an area of an extended blank wall. And
8 it --

9 MS. OSEPCHUK: Correct.

10 MR. PAVLIV: -- was discussed if it would be
11 possible to introduce two full windows in as location
12 -- in that location. It's really an alleyway. And we
13 did add those two windows and they've been bubbled out
14 and called out as full windows.

15 MS. OSEPCHUK: Right.

16 MR. PAVLIV: And they do match the other
17 windows in size and casing.

18 MS. OSEPCHUK: Okay. And I think that was --
19 yeah, and that was something that had been discussed
20 because of the -- the blankness of that wall.

21 MR. PAVLIV: Right.

22 MS. OSEPCHUK: Even though it wasn't --

23 MR. PAVLIV: And we've -- we've done that
24 before on other projects --

25 MS. OSEPCHUK: Yes. Absolutely.

1 MR. PAVLIV: -- where this has been an issue.

2 MS. OSEPCHUK: Okay. The rear addition, has
3 there been any change to the footprint? I know there
4 was a great deal of discussion about the massing of
5 this addition. It has not been pulled back any further
6 than it was after the very first submission of your
7 plans. Is that true?

8 MR. PAVLIV: It's been pulled back three
9 times since the initial, but it has not changed.

10 MS. OSEPCHUK: Okay.

11 MR. PAVLIV: The footprint has not changed
12 since our last hearing.

13 MS. OSEPCHUK: Okay. All right.

14 Now, the one thing that you did change on that
15 rear addition, there were comments that the rear of the
16 building looked very much like the front of the
17 building that you would find on Ocean Pathway. I know
18 that you pulled back the gull wing roof closer to the
19 body of the house and added a shed roof. Is that
20 correct?

21 MR. PAVLIV: Correct. The shed roof extends
22 over the second-floor covered porch and --

23 MS. OSEPCHUK: Okay.

24 MR. PAVLIV: -- incorporates four column
25 posts to match the other wood column posts in the

1 building.

2 MS. OSEPCHUK: Okay. So the column posts
3 that are on the rear are matching the front of the
4 building, correct? Because I know there were comments
5 made about that and that has not changed. They are
6 matching the front, correct?

7 MR. PAVLIV: They have not changed.

8 MS. OSEPCHUK: Okay.

9 MR. PAVLIV: The only change is the addition
10 of the shed roof, which caused -- which also netted the
11 removal of the upper gable which was over that covered
12 porch.

13 MS. OSEPCHUK: Got it.

14 MR. PAVLIV: And it included the arches and
15 other ornamentation so that now the gable portion has
16 been set back approximately eight feet from where it
17 was in the earlier submission.

18 MS. OSEPCHUK: Okay.

19 All right. And I know that there was a window
20 inspection that was done by two members of the Board.
21 Because there were certain windows that were being
22 removed, there was a window that was being added, and
23 there was a doorway that was being moved as well.

24 And so I believe it was determined that the
25 original doorway opening was an original fenestration

1 and I believe there are two other fenestrations, one
2 that was being closed and another one that was being
3 opened on the original structure. Is that true?

4 MR. PAVLIV: Let's -- let's go point by
5 point.

6 The first --

7 MS. OSEPCHUK: All right.

8 MR. PAVLIV: -- point was the door in the
9 alleyway. It's on the east elevation.

10 MS. OSEPCHUK: Right.

11 MR. PAVLIV: We had --

12 MS. OSEPCHUK: On the east elevation,
13 correct.

14 MR. PAVLIV: We had proposed a door and a new
15 door opening in -- and eliminated the original door.

16 After having a few discussions with HPC and
17 looking at this, the applicant, the owner and -- and --
18 and I would not have a problem in retaining the
19 original door. And we -- we would simply not introduce
20 this door that is shown on the plan.

21 MS. OSEPCHUK: Okay. And the window, the
22 original window that was removed?

23 MR. PAVLIV: Which -- which elimination?

24 MS. OSEPCHUK: That was in the main.

25 MR. PAVLIV: There was --

1 MS. OSEPCHUK: I believe it was on the west
2 elevation.

3 MR. PAVLIV: There's -- there's a window on
4 the west elevation that --

5 MS. OSEPCHUK: That was --

6 MR. PAVLIV: -- that we ad -- it shows it as
7 new. And I'm suspect that there's a window behind it.
8 Because the rhythm of the building is that when there's
9 a window on a first floor, there's a window on a second
10 floor.

11 The window that's there is also noted to be
12 egress. Because the space is big enough for sleeping
13 and code requires you to have egress in any room that
14 could accommodate someone to be sleeping.

15 Now, there's two ways we can handle it. We can
16 approve the door based on what we know the code's going
17 to require or we can eliminate that window, that window
18 on the second floor from the plans. And -- and then
19 during the renovation, if we find an existing window
20 hidden in that wall, we would come back to you to
21 request an administrative approval of putting that
22 window back in this position.

23 Right now, the window is there for code reasons.

24 MS. OSEPCHUK: Okay. All right.

25 So now, what I was trying to do, and maybe not

1 well, was just to kind of give a brief overview of what
2 we were going to be discussing so that we were not
3 discussing the entire application.

4 Can you share a screen, Mark, so that we can have
5 the elevations up so that people can ask questions?

6 MR. PAVLIV: You -- if -- if Heather can put
7 the screen -- I have visual impairment. So if Heather
8 can put the A2 sheet up on the screen.

9 MS. OSEPCHUK: I don't --

10 MR. PAVLIV: And if I hit -- there's -- if I
11 hit a thing here that says share screen --

12 MS. KEPLER: Mark, I had -- I had sent you an
13 email and let you know that I wasn't -- I was not
14 permitted to do that. So I -- I had explained that.

15 MR. PAVLIV: Okay. So if I hit share screen
16 --

17 MS. KEPLER: Unfortunately, I was told I -- I
18 can't be Vanna White tonight.

19 MR. RUDELL: We do all have A2, Mark, in our
20 packets. So if you want to refer to it, we can look at
21 it in our packets.

22 MS. OSEPCHUK: Okay.

23 MR. PAVLIV: If that works. Otherwise, I
24 have to fumble on the screen. Because right now, I see
25 a green dot that has -- says share screen. But if --

1 if you refer to the A2 sheet.

2 MR. RUDELL: Yup.

3 MS. OSEPCHUK: Okay.

4 MR. PAVLIV: The A2 sheet is the elevation
5 sheet, which we've made various changes to over I guess
6 it's been a sixteen-month zoning and HPC review period.
7 And everything that we've made changes to is annotated
8 with -- with a bubble and -- and it has a number. And
9 that number goes back to a date that's in the righthand
10 side title block and that title block indicates the
11 date of that change.

12 MS. OSEPCHUK: Okay. Mark --

13 MR. PAVLIV: The thing that we had --

14 MS. OSEPCHUK: -- just a quick aside, is your
15 contractor who's there able to share a screen? Would
16 he be able to do that so just to make things a little
17 easier?

18 MR. PAVLIV: Gary, can -- can you help me
19 with this?

20 I can -- if you can open it for share screen, I
21 can open the file.

22 MS. OSEPCHUK: Okay. Let's try it. If not,
23 we'll go back to the drawn plans that we have.

24 MR. SIMONE: Yeah, it's not opening the share
25 screen, so.

1 Deb, unfortunately --

2 MS. KEPLER: I have to share it. Give me one
3 second. I'm sharing now.

4 MS. OSEPCHUK: Okay. Hang on one second.

5 MS. KEPLER: There you go.

6 MR. SIMONE: Thanks, Heather.

7 MS. OSEPCHUK: Okay. We got it.

8 MR. PAVLIV: It's just one -- one sheet.

9 MR. SIMONE: All right. Hold on now.

10 So now, we got to go on your computer and where is
11 your --

12 MR. PAVLIV: Oh, hold on. Is this mine?

13 MR. SIMONE: Yeah.

14 MR. PAVLIV: I have to go to -- how do I go
15 to my documents? (Inaudible). And then I'll get my
16 documents. Here, hold on.

17 I apologize for my inability here.

18 MS. OSEPCHUK: No, it's quite all right,
19 Mark. I'm just trying to make it so that it's clear
20 for everyone. I know it's difficult.

21 MR. PAVLIV: It's -- it's coming.

22 7 Ocean Pathway. Okay. If you can open it.
23 Revised set. A2. And the date 11/22. Is that the
24 right date?

25 MR. SIMONE: Yup.

1 MR. PAVLIV: Okay. Did that come up?

2 MR. RUDELL: Not -- not yet.

3 MR. PAVLIV: I have it up on my screen. Do
4 you see what I see?

5 MS. OSEPCHUK: Not yet.

6 MR. PAVLIV: Let me try it again. Go back to
7 the Zoom.

8 MR. SIMONE: Yeah.

9 MR. PAVLIV: It's just not working on our end
10 and I'm getting assistance here.

11 MS. OSEPCHUK: Okay.

12 MR. PAVLIV: I -- I see my sheet on the
13 screen. But I don't know if you're seeing it.

14 MS. SHAFFER: No, we're not.

15 MS. OSEPCHUK: No, we're not, unfortunately,
16 Mark.

17 MR. PAVLIV: And we hit -- and we hit share
18 screen.

19 All right.

20 MS. OSEPCHUK: All right. Then, let's --

21 MR. RUDELL: Let me try.

22 MS. SHAFFER: Oh, here it is. Oh.

23 MR. RUDELL: Did that work?

24 MS. KEPLER: Thanks, Jeff.

25 MS. HEINLEIN: Thank you, Jeff.

1 MR. PAVLIV: That's the screen.

2 MS. OSEPCHUK: Thanks.

3 MR. PAVLIV: Okay.

4 MS. OSEPCHUK: All right.

5 MR. RUDELL: There.

6 MR. PAVLIV: Can we enlarge that at all or
7 no?

8 MR. RUDELL: Sure, I can. Hold on. Is that
9 better?

10 MR. PAVLIV: Okay. I can see that better.
11 And I have it on a big screen in a conference room
12 here, too.

13 MR. RUDELL: You tell me which elevation
14 you'd like to look at. I can zoom in.

15 MR. PAVLIV: Okay. All -- all four
16 elevations are on this -- this sheet. I have a cursor
17 in my finger. I guess it's moving.

18 Do -- do you see a cursor moving?

19 MR. RUDELL: No, sorry.

20 MR. PAVLIV: You don't --

21 MS. OSEPCHUK: No.

22 MR. PAVLIV: You don't see it. All right.

23 MR. CAVANO: Since you're not sharing, your
24 cursor isn't showing.

25 MS. KEPLER: Yeah, it's --

1 MR. PAVLIV: Okay.

2 MS. KEPLER: It's on Jeff's thing so he'll
3 have to do it.

4 MR. PAVLIV: All right. So let's -- let's
5 take the bottom page, bottom of the -- the sheet.

6 MS. OSEPCHUK: Yeah, let's just look at the
7 rear, the changes to the rear elevation and let's have
8 people -- yeah, I think that's great.

9 MR. RUDELL: Okay.

10 MS. OSEPCHUK: I mean, I think it -- it's --
11 we can see it.

12 Mark, you can see it, correct?

13 MR. PAVLIV: Yeah. A lot -- a lot of
14 bubbles.

15 MS. OSEPCHUK: Okay, good.

16 Yeah. So how about let's start questions from the
17 Board concerning the rear elevation of this property, 7
18 Ocean Pathway.

19 Who would like to start?

20 MR. RUDELL: I'll -- I'll go. This is
21 Jeffrey. Hi, Mark.

22 MS. OSEPCHUK: Thanks, Jeff.

23 MR. RUDELL: I know that you listened closely
24 to our comments from the last meeting.

25 I see that you removed the gable that was on the

1 west side on the addition and that removal of the gable
2 now makes it possible for us to see through your
3 addition to the original roofline. That's something
4 Kurt Cavano had brought up. And I definitely think
5 that's an improvement.

6 I know you pulled back the addition gable eight
7 feet, as you said, which means that sort of open gable
8 that was extending over the porch is now pushed back to
9 the face of the addition and that helps mitigate how
10 large and kind of looming the addition looked in the
11 last set of drawings.

12 MR. PAVLIV: Correct.

13 MR. RUDELL: I do appreciate those changes.

14 And -- and also the faux windows that you put on
15 the west side, I think those help. I know that they're
16 very hard to see. But in Ocean Grove, God forbid, when
17 the building goes to fire, things that we never thought
18 we would see suddenly are visible for twenty years
19 because a neighboring house has disappeared or been
20 torn down. So I appreciate you going through the extra
21 effort to put those faux windows in.

22 I do think that your suggestion of taking the west
23 second floor window, which is an egress window, and
24 withdrawing it from this application until you can
25 determine for sure whether there is an actual historic

1 fenestration makes sense. And I'd certainly support
2 you doing that.

3 I still have some issues with the form that the
4 back of this proposed addition has taken. I know that
5 you've made accommodations and you've tried to mitigate
6 our concerns. But it -- the back of this house still
7 reads very much like a fully fledged front of another
8 house. It doesn't look like a back of a house to me.
9 And that's -- that's exaggerated by the fact that your
10 first and second floor combined have four door -- well,
11 five doors, but four doorways onto two porches, which
12 seems excessive and primary as opposed to a secondary
13 façade to me.

14 There's a lot going on with your rooflines up
15 there, even with the accommodation you made by pulling
16 back the gable. You have a shed. You have a, where
17 you call it the gull wing. You have the original gable
18 behind and the original shed. And then you have a shed
19 off to the side on the first floor down below. That's
20 a lot going on there. It looks -- it looks unusual for
21 what we generally see for additions.

22 To be honest, I'm not exactly sure where my vote
23 falls at this moment, but it -- it's -- it still seems
24 like it has some troubles.

25 MR. PAVLIV: Right.

1 MR. RUDELL: But I do appreciate the -- the
2 accommodations and changes you've made so far. I know
3 you've been working very closely with us and with the
4 client to try to find a middle ground. I don't know if
5 this hits that mark.

6 That's all I'll say for now.

7 MR. PAVLIV: I -- I can help maybe explain.
8 I totally agree with you, there's a lot going on.

9 MR. RUDELL: Yeah.

10 MR. PAVLIV: And the problem with elevation
11 drawings, and I've lectured on this as well, is we --
12 we -- we get -- we look at elevations as if it's a
13 single plane, when in fact there are a series of planes
14 recessing further and further back.

15 MR. RUDELL: Yeah. I agree. We -- I tried
16 very hard to look at this on both the -- the east and
17 west elevations as well to get a better sense of where
18 all those forms start and stop. But yes, I agree.
19 That can be confusing.

20 MR. PAVLIV: The west elevation shows you
21 where the shed roof is and where the gable has been
22 pulled back to. That's what we had just discussed.
23 Because that gable had come to the forefront and -- and
24 the introduction of that shed roof, a three on twelve
25 pitch, mitigated that.

1 Looking at the rear elevation, you see the shed
2 roof there but it's interrupted. There's a -- there's
3 a gap between the shed roof and what's been referred
4 to, I don't know why we call it a gull wing. It's a
5 swale. That's the technical proper term for that.

6 But if we were to take, hypothetically, that shed
7 roof and simply extend it eastward or to the left, you
8 would then create a hip with that covered shed roof
9 which eliminates that so-called gull wing appearance.

10 And the -- the difficulty I had with that, which I
11 thought there might be opposition from HPC, is that
12 you've created an imbalance that the roof actually
13 doesn't have a hip on both sides --

14 MR. RUDELL: Right.

15 MR. PAVLIV: -- but has a hip on the east
16 side and not the west side.

17 MR. RUDELL: This side and not this side.

18 MR. PAVLIV: And if we were to put a hip on
19 the west side, that just further begins to muddle an
20 elevation that has been tortured already with all these
21 little changes.

22 And what we're trying to do, my attempt here was
23 to give it some rhythm and -- and -- and center axis
24 and to replicate a lot of the detailing that we find in
25 Ocean Grove.

1 MR. RUDELL: Okay.

2 MR. PAVLIV: Because I like to -- we keep
3 referring to the guidelines, and I think I know the
4 guidelines better than anyone, is if you look at like,
5 for instance, page fourteen. There's a very clear in
6 bold reference. And if I could read this, I could see
7 it.

8 "The design of all new gable roofs should observe
9 proportions and roof pitch consistent with period
10 prototypes." Which I think we tried to do here.

11 And it also says, "To repeat and replicate
12 existing elements of original design where additions or
13 alterations are proposed."

14 Well, this is an addition that's being proposed
15 and we're trying to, again, emulate and copy to the
16 extent possible so we're not adding a foreign looking
17 element to this structure and this addition.

18 I hope that's made it a little clearer. If not, I
19 apologize.

20 MR. RUDELL: Thank you.

21 MS. OSEPCHUK: No. Oh, thank you.

22 Mark, I -- I kind of agree with everything you
23 said, except I never expected to see it all on one
24 elevation. You know?

25 I mean, we've got one, two, three rooves on that

1 -- the rear elevation of this house. We've got a shed
2 that kind of ends abruptly because it's only, of
3 course, across three-quarters of the building. We have
4 a swaled roof that I -- I think is really what's
5 creating all the problem.

6 I -- I -- I just don't understand it. I think
7 it's -- I think it was trying to fix something rather
8 than redo it.

9 MR. PAVLIV: The sw -- the swaled -- the --

10 MS. OSEPCHUK: And I --

11 MR. PAVLIV: The swaled roof is really
12 replicating the swale that we have on the front of the
13 building and typical of these -- these particular
14 Eastlake and Stick style dwellings. But the --

15 MS. OSEPCHUK: Yeah, but it's typical of
16 those --

17 MR. PAVLIV: If I was not to have a swale --

18 MR. OSEPCHUK: -- on the front of a building.
19 I think you just said it. On the front of the
20 building.

21 MR. PAVLIV: But if we were not to have a
22 swale -- sorry.

23 If we were not to have a swale --

24 MS. OSEPCHUK: I -- I --

25 MR. PAVLIV: I'm interrupting. I apologize.

1 I'm saying if we were not to have a swale --

2 MS. OSEPCHUK: No, that's fine.

3 MR. PAVLIV: -- we could have a flat roof or
4 we can simply have an extension of that angle coming
5 down, which I don't think is appropriate. But a flat
6 roof is even li -- less appropriate in this case.

7 But I think extending the shed roof and coming
8 back with a hip -- you got to remember, that swale that
9 we're looking at is not at the front line of the porch,
10 that shed roof porch. It is way back.

11 MS. OSEPCHUK: No, I realize that.

12 MR. PAVLIV: That you --

13 MS. OSEPCHUK: I realize that. I realize
14 that.

15 MR. PAVLIV: And if you looked at the east
16 elevation, you see where it really is.

17 MS. SHAFFER: Jeffrey, could you also --

18 MS. OSEPCHUK: Jen?

19 MS. SHAFFER: Yeah.

20 Could -- I want to say that I -- I agree with Deb
21 that the -- the swale, the gull wing, whatever term you
22 want to use, is something that you would see on the
23 front of a building. And a -- an issue with this
24 building is that it seems to have two front facades.

25 I think Deb earlier -- I'm pointing to my screen

1 like you know what I'm doing.

2 I think that Deb earlier was talking about the
3 fact that on a west elevation, there were two, Kurt, I
4 think -- I think there were two small windows and one
5 of those was taken off.

6 Is that what you were talking about, Deb?

7 MS. OSEPCHUK: Yes.

8 MS. SHAFFER: Okay.

9 MS. OSEPCHUK: Yeah.

10 MS. SHAFFER: So there is the issue where
11 that is -- yes. That a -- a window which appears to be
12 an original opening is being removed. I just want to
13 make --

14 MS. OSEPCHUK: Removed.

15 MS. SHAFFER: -- clear that that's -- that
16 that was what Deb was talking about.

17 As far as the addition to the building, which I
18 think is what we should -- and -- and this is -- this
19 is the application that we're -- that we're looking at
20 and we're going to vote on. Again, this was another
21 one we've had that kind of kept me up at night.

22 And I agree with what has been said and what has
23 been said all along. That while I appreciate people
24 wanting to have an addition to their home, and in this
25 case, you have to put it to the rear of the building

1 because there is -- there isn't any place else to put
2 it, but this is a prominent structure. And there's a
3 lot that we have to pay attention to in this key
4 structure. And I look at the changes made to the
5 application since the last meeting and I do not believe
6 that they ameliorate what were the core issues that the
7 Board had with this application.

8 I think the addition is -- is really oversized in
9 relation to the house. And I think it's inappropriate
10 in form. I don't remember this Board ever allowing
11 such a huge addition in relation to the size of -- of
12 the house, especially for a key structure. So the size
13 and the scale I think are -- are -- are too large.

14 And also, it would be so prominent visually.
15 There's historic streetscape on -- that's the backside
16 of -- of those seven key structures on Ocean Pathway.
17 It's existed that way for over a century. And this --
18 therefore, the guidelines ask how it would benefit the
19 historic content -- context of the streetscape or
20 district and I -- and I think it does not benefit it.

21 The mass proportions dwarf this key structure.

22 It also, because of the way that it meets the key
23 structure, even though the second gable has been taken
24 off, it really, it destroys the historic form of the
25 building by meeting it and pulling it out. So the

1 narrow back of that building that steps in is now gone
2 and it's just a large addition in that place. And --
3 and if we're supposed to think about the original
4 intent of the structure, this -- this -- this key
5 structure that has these narrow proportions and this
6 complexity, this would all disappear with this large
7 mass coming out of the back of the building.

8 And again, I agree completely with the issue of
9 houses from this time period have a clear front façade
10 and a clear rear and this doesn't read that way.

11 So I -- I -- I -- I think that my take on this is
12 that while changes have been made, I don't think that
13 they address the core issues that are -- are really
14 fundamentally talked about in the guidelines.

15 MR. PAVLIV: We talked about last time how
16 many buildings on this block on both sides of the
17 street actually have rears that look like rears. They
18 -- the -- the entire streetscape for all the homes, I
19 believe it was eighteen homes that we presented to you,
20 all have covered porches of some form, one story and
21 two story and more. And we provided all those
22 photographs in the application. So --

23 MS. SHAFFER: Yeah, I don't think that the
24 issue is having covered porches. I think the issue is
25 the entire form of it. So I do -- I do appreciate

1 that.

2 And I'm talking specifically about the key
3 structures that are the -- the seven that are so well-
4 known on Ocean Pathway.

5 MR. PAVLIV: Well, in some ways, we can't
6 have it both ways. Because we're trying to con -- to
7 be respectful of the rhythm and -- and the patterning
8 and the forms along the streetscape.

9 And then again, we -- we -- we've reduced the
10 width of this. You keep saying how big it is. We took
11 it -- we reduced it from the east. We reduced it from
12 the west. We dropped it two-and-a-half feet from --
13 from the ridge. It's essentially a fourteen-foot-wide
14 addition that is 24 feet in length. It's -- it -- it's
15 not overwhelming.

16 But I think the drawing is the problem because
17 we're looking at the drawing with all of these various
18 layers in the distance, which are misleading, which I
19 have to agree with. But that would not be apparent if
20 we ke -- kept the gables that were on the east and west
21 on the roof because it really hid that aspect. But
22 once those gables were removed, it now exposes and
23 emphasizes this.

24 MS. SHAFFER: (Inaudible).

25 MS. OSEPCHUK: People on the Board, does

1 anyone else like to make comment?

2 Anyone?

3 All right. Basically, I -- I have to agree with
4 Jenny. I think this is a massive addition to this
5 structure. This is a structure that is important to
6 Ocean Pathway.

7 I know you talked about eighteen houses on Bath.
8 But I don't really think we're looking at the houses on
9 the other side of the street when we talk about the
10 streetscape. I think we're talking about the houses
11 that are near and adjacent to this particular
12 structure, all of which present a rear facing façade.

13 I think this looks almost like another house has
14 been added to the original house that's there.

15 I know you've made changes. You've dropped down
16 the ridge. You've pushed in the sides. But it's been
17 minimal, especially the sides. I don't think that
18 there was a great deal. It's basically a box that's
19 been added to the back of this structure.

20 I have a problem with the gull wing and also the
21 shed. I -- I think it's kind of awkward the way the
22 two read. Plus, there's also a porch that's not going
23 to have a covering on it. The covering is only over
24 three-quarters of the porch, which is kind of unusual.

25 We talked about the double doors on the first

1 floor. I still think it should be a single. It is the
2 rear.

3 I'm confused as to why the stairs are off to the
4 side instead of leading to the doors. But I --
5 whatever.

6 MS. O'CONNOR: That's where they were
7 originally. That's where they were originally.

8 MS. OSEPCHUK: This is a new addit -- this is
9 a new addition.

10 MS. O'CONNOR: Yes, but those stairs -- but
11 those stairs were on the side just like that on the
12 original house.

13 I'm very disappointed in -- in everything. And I
14 -- I -- I don't know, we did everything that you asked
15 us to do, as far as we understood. I've been back
16 before the Board. I met with everybody. We've done
17 the changes.

18 I don't know. I -- I've spoken to my attorney. I
19 guess we're going to come back and really make a -- a
20 big mess of this, which I'm fully prepared to do. I
21 don't mean to be ugly, but I think what we've done is
22 lovely.

23 I love Ocean Grove. I owned 21 Pitman for a
24 number of years.

25 We bought the house on the Pathway. It's small.

1 I wanted to add on to it. I don't think it's a massive
2 addition, as you call it. It sounds like I'm adding
3 something huge. It's smaller than the existing house.
4 We've brought it in, as you requested. We brought it
5 down. We brought it back. Everything that you have
6 said, we have done.

7 I'm -- I'm very, very disappointed. I -- I -- you
8 know, I'm -- this -- my business is real estate. I own
9 a large company. This is not something that we tried
10 to do or push through to be ugly. We tried to make it
11 beautiful. The people who live on the other side of
12 Bath look at the back of my house. They look at the
13 backs of the other houses.

14 My neighbors, the Whiteman's (ph), on the -- to --
15 to the east have a second-floor porch, a first-floor
16 porch, and they have an overhang on it. I mean, they
17 did a big addition a number of years ago when they
18 bought that house.

19 I -- I don't understand the resistance. We have
20 done nothing to endanger or change the main house.
21 We're adding in the back. You wanted it not to look
22 like the main house, although when I read the
23 guidelines in new construction and so forth, it said
24 that we should emulate that, but we brought it in as
25 you suggested.

1 And, you know, I think that you have to give us a
2 chance to -- you have to work with us at this point.
3 We've done everything from each meeting, and even prior
4 to that with the sit-down, to try and accommodate what
5 you told us to do.

6 I don't know what else to do. I'm very, very
7 disappointed in the whole situation. And, you know,
8 I'm -- I'm not going to just sit back and just be told
9 to do it this way and that way, and you can't have this
10 and you can't have that.

11 If I was doing anything wrong to the front of the
12 house or the sides of the house, I would understand
13 what you're saying. But we're not doing anything
14 that's inappropriate and it actually looks, I thought,
15 looked very pretty.

16 Mark's been working in town for years and -- and
17 told me that, you know, as we drew it, that this would
18 be something that would be lovely. It was. But
19 obviously, it's not lovely to all of you.

20 So please, I would like to make this work. You
21 know, we've spent a lot of time, a lot of money and
22 we'd like to make it work. We don't want to wind up in
23 a fight with you, but I'm prepared.

24 MR. PAVLIV: We also are going to be making
25 those changes, both keeping the door, eliminating the

1 window, and the things that have been mentioned this
2 evening. So we're prepared to make those changes.

3 MS. OSEPCHUK: Then, I guess the only thing
4 left to do is to vote.

5 MR. RUDELL: I have to --

6 MS. OSEPCHUK: If there's anyone else on the
7 Board who has anything they'd like to add, I'll open it
8 for public comment.

9 And Jeff, did you?

10 MR. RUDELL: Deb, can you hear me?

11 MS. OSEPCHUK: Yeah, I can.

12 MR. RUDELL: I -- I'm sorry. I just wanted
13 to address one thing.

14 The homeowner and -- and Mr. Pavliv both came to
15 tech early on for concepts. And our position on
16 massing of this project have been pretty consistent
17 since the beginning.

18 The original plan did not have a step down from
19 the ridgeline or steps in. And while we asked for
20 that, we didn't ask for it arbitrarily. It's required
21 for all additions in the district. And we simply asked
22 that the applicant, you know, abide by that, which they
23 did.

24 To be fair, they've come in minimally on both
25 sides and down. The ridgeline has been dropped down

1 substantially. 20 -- 2 -- 2 foot, 4 inches. So that's
2 a nice drop down.

3 But one of the things that we talked about very
4 early on in concept is the original house has a rather
5 relatively narrow area in the back. Essentially, the
6 -- what is, on this picture right here, it's the door
7 and the two windows. It's this area. It has kind of a
8 narrow -- the house narrows at the back. And this
9 addition does the opposite. It flares out and kind of
10 takes up a much bigger space.

11 And we mentioned that early on as being a -- a
12 change in massing, which is unusual for additions.
13 Generally, we ask that they step in and step down, but
14 not just in inches, but visually. And --

15 MS. O'CONNOR: So I -- I have to say, we
16 didn't make it wider. It's narrower. What you see on
17 the plan is the original front of the house, which is a
18 little wider at the front. That's not --

19 MR. PAVLIV: Or the back.

20 MR. RUDELL: We see right here on the side a
21 slight cut in. But the original has --

22 MS. O'CONNOR: But that -- that's the way
23 house was, is.

24 MR. RUDELL: Okay.

25 So my point is simply that we've been talking

1 about what we considered over-massing and inappropriate
2 massing since the beginning. And while you have made
3 some changes, which we have all acknowledged, I think
4 what you're hearing from some commission members is you
5 may not have ad -- addressed the massing enough to
6 their satisfaction. That's for them to --

7 MS. O'CONNOR: Well, is that -- is that an op
8 -- is that an opinion? Is that an opinion? Is that
9 people don't like it? Because that's not what would be
10 an appropriate answer to me.

11 MR. RUDELL: Well, we don't actually deal in
12 opinions here. We try very much to find --

13 MS. O'CONNOR: I think you do.

14 MR. RUDELL: -- appropriately scaled addition
15 to historic houses. And this house in particular is a
16 key structure, so it gets a little extra scrutiny. And
17 appropriate additions, and you're sitting next to an
18 architect there whose done hundreds in this town --

19 MS. O'CONNOR: And was totally in favor of
20 what we did. He designed it.

21 MR. RUDELL: I understand. He designed my
22 own house, if that gives you any comfort.

23 But the point is, even --

24 MS. O'CONNOR: I hope you didn't have as much
25 trouble as I'm having.

1 MR. RUDELL: Oh, we had a fair share.

2 But even Mark is, as he should be, doing what his
3 client wants, which isn't always necessarily what is
4 appropriate for the house or --

5 MS. O'CONNOR: I have to disagree with you.
6 I wanted it to be quite different. And Mark wanted to
7 do it the way Ocean Grove would receive it. So --

8 MR. RUDELL: Okay.

9 MS. O'CONNOR: -- some of these things were
10 not what -- what I chose. I would have chosen it to be
11 wider. I would have chosen it to be taller. I would
12 have chosen it to be longer.

13 I have a lot of children and grandchildren and we
14 come here. We've been in and out of Ocean Grove since
15 1986. I owned Reverend Stokes' house. I care about
16 Ocean Grove or I wouldn't have come back.

17 But I don't think it's appropriate to say that
18 it's too massive or that it's ugly or whatever it is
19 that you all think. You know, it just --

20 MS. OSEPCCHUK: I don't think anyone used the
21 term ugly. I really don't think anyone has used that
22 term except for yourself.

23 MS. O'CONNOR: Well, then -- then I would
24 think -- my neighbors look across the street at the
25 backs of the house. It's something that would look

1 very nice to them, I would assume. That it would be an
2 additional piece of nice-looking real estate in Ocean
3 Grove as opposed to just something horribly flat and
4 ugly.

5 MR. RUDELL: Okay.

6 MS. OSEPCHUK: Okay.

7 MR. RUDELL: Does anyone else have --

8 MS. OSEPCHUK: Any other comm --

9 MR. RUDELL: -- comments on these drawings
10 before I take the drawings away?

11 MS. HEINLEIN: Jeff? Could you -- could you
12 -- can you scroll -- scroll down to the west elevation
13 one more time, please? Or up, I guess.

14 MR. RUDELL: This is the west right here.

15 MR. PAVLIV: East. Cindy probably wants to
16 see the east.

17 MR. RUDELL: You want to see the east?

18 MS. HEINLEIN: Okay. Just -- okay. I -- I
19 just wanted to verify one thing. Thank you.

20 MR. RUDELL: Okay. Anyone else care to see
21 any details?

22 MR. CAVANO: Yeah. Jeff, can you scroll to
23 the front of the house? Front elevation?

24 MR. RUDELL: Yes. Right here?

25 MR. CAVANO: Okay. So that's the front

1 elevation. And can we scroll to the back?

2 So my -- my only issue is I -- I do believe the
3 addition is -- is big, but I think that you have
4 stepped it in. I think that your elimination of the
5 dormers so that we can see the -- the old roofline does
6 --

7 MS. O'CONNOR: We've kept the chimney. We've
8 done just -- I think -- I thought we were doing
9 everything you asked to do. It's --

10 MR. CAVANO: Ex -- excuse me.

11 MS. O'CONNOR: -- going to be pointless, but
12 we kept it there.

13 MS. OSEPCHUK: Can -- can -- Kurt, can you
14 please finish? Thank you.

15 Let Kurt continue with his thought.

16 MR. CAVANO: Yeah, so and I think the shed
17 roof, it does give it more of a rear look in there.

18 But when you take a look at the front elevation
19 above the back elevation, you can still see what I
20 believe is -- is bothering the commissioners, at least
21 from my observation, is the back looks as much like a
22 front as the front does. And that, you know, the rear
23 of the house is supposed to look like the rear of the
24 house.

25 And that's what I think is one of the challenges

1 here. Particularly when you put them up against each
2 other and look at them. You know, the front -- the
3 front is actually in a lot of ways less ornate and less
4 grandeur than -- less grandeur than the back. And
5 that, I think, is what -- what makes this a muddled
6 issue for us.

7 I like the way that the cut-ins have been done.
8 I'd -- I'd love to see them sm -- bigger, you know,
9 more reduction, but I think at least from a -- from a
10 -- the guidelines of being able to see where the
11 additions are, you definitely can see it.

12 It is a big addition. It is almost doubling the
13 size of the house. But it is in the rear and our
14 guidelines do speak to it needs to be in the rear. But
15 it --

16 MS. O'CONNOR: No, it doesn't double the size
17 of the house.

18 MR. CAVANO: Well, when you look at it side
19 and -- side -- the side elevation and you see where the
20 old one ends --

21 MS. O'CONNOR: My neighbors have no objection
22 to any of this. I have lovely neighbors. They're --

23 MR. CAVANO: I know. And I'm -- I'm sure
24 they're fine -- fine people. It's just I'm looking at
25 it from a guidelines point of view and massing is part

1 of the guidelines.

2 But my biggest issue is still, Mark, while I think
3 you -- you've done a -- a lot of what we've asked, the
4 back of the house still looks like the front of a
5 house. And --

6 MS. O'CONNOR: So do you want no porches?
7 You just want a flat back like it looked before? Is
8 that what you're saying? No one's ever said that.
9 They just said push it back and take -- take the roof
10 down.

11 MR. RUDELL: We're not here to design this.

12 MR. CAVANO: No, no. I'm -- look, I'm not --

13 MS. KEPLER: Nobody's insinuating anything.
14 So the commentary of what your beliefs are for that
15 should not carry through. Okay? They're just giving
16 you their view on this. No need for insinuation.
17 Okay? Thank you.

18 MR. CAVANO: Yeah. I -- I just think that
19 when you look at them side-by-side or above -- one
20 above each other, it's obvious that they -- they both
21 could be fronts of houses. And, you know, if it
22 weren't for the decorative scrolling in the front.

23 MR. PAVLIV: (Inaudible) roof.

24 MS. SHAFFER: So should we just -- what are
25 we going to do now, Deb? What's next?

1 MS. OSEPCHUK: I mean, I -- if there's any --
2 we'll have to open it up to the public, of course,
3 first. And then after that, I -- I don't know.

4 Mark, you're hearing what's going on and I think
5 you're hearing that even though everyone feels that you
6 have made some changes and you really have tried to
7 work with us, there are still some issues that have not
8 been resolved. So it's either you want to continue to
9 see if you can resolve them or do you want to vote?
10 It's basically going to be as simple as that.

11 MS. O'CONNOR: Well, what happens
12 (inaudible).

13 MS. OSEPCHUK: What I'll do --

14 MR. PAVLIV: They're denying and --

15 MS. OSEPCHUK: If you do take -- if there is
16 a vote and you are denied, then you can appeal the
17 decision to the Zoning Board. That would be the next
18 step. So it's -- it's really --

19 MR. PAVLIV: You know, what I'm -- what I'm
20 hearing here is --

21 MS. OSEPCHUK: It's really up to you.

22 MR. PAVLIV: -- part of -- before this denial
23 vote, you know, the -- the -- the big issue that I'm
24 hearing from -- from Jeff and from Kurt and -- and
25 others is there's that swale roof, that gull wing roof.

1 When you do an addition to a -- a gable roof,
2 normally, it's a perpendicular. So you have a ridge
3 going into the -- into the -- the main gable.

4 But the swale roof that's there, if we eliminated
5 that swale roof and we had hit upon this thing about a
6 -- just extending the shed roof and creating a -- a hip
7 roof situation on the left, we could replicate it on
8 the right. And it looks very different from anything
9 in the front. We've eliminated all the vertical sticks
10 and the arches and all the detailing. And, but in --
11 in that case, we've simplified this, but we have a
12 covered second story porch.

13 That, in my opinion, is a meeting place or a
14 halfway point where we can address the gull wing
15 concern. And we've done everything else, as -- as
16 Terrie had mentioned.

17 But the issue of massing, that it's too big, when
18 you look at -- just -- just look at the east elevation,
19 the addition actually is -- it -- it's about a third of
20 the entire existing building. It's one -- it -- it --
21 it really falls into three parts. So we're not
22 doubling this in size.

23 MS. O'CONNOR: No.

24 MR. PAVLIV: We're -- we're not tripling it.
25 It's -- I'm just -- I'm just taken aback trying to

1 understand this thing about massing. And -- and I did
2 write it -- write the massing into the guidelines. And
3 I understand that. And rhythm and everything else
4 we've talked about. And I think we've accomplished
5 that.

6 The one weak link here is this dislike, which is
7 very subjective, I may say, of the gull, of this swale
8 roof or the gull. And then I can respect that, if
9 that's an opinion. Let's go with a hip roof and that
10 will accomplish making the back look very different
11 from a front.

12 MS. SHAFFER: Deb, I think that we're just
13 going in circles. I think it's more -- it's more than
14 -- it's more than this gull wing roof. We've talked
15 about the massing. We've talked about the way that it
16 -- this -- this would destroy the original massing of
17 the narrow back of the building. It is not arbitrary
18 to say that a swale on the back of a house is
19 inappropriate.

20 I -- I -- I -- I feel like we're spinning our
21 wheels. We're -- we're talking about the massing and
22 the size and the forms. And this is -- we have said
23 this. And -- and what you guys did in -- in -- in your
24 reviews when a group of you would meet were
25 suggestions. They were not, you always say it's not

1 what the whole Board is going to think. So it's been
2 brought before the Board and these -- these issues
3 appear to have come up again. So it seems that there's
4 a consistency. There's nothing arbitrary.

5 So if we've all -- if we've all -- if we've all
6 said what we have to say, and I -- I hear people
7 talking about the guidelines and I hear people talking
8 about this key structure and its historic value and
9 precedent. I -- I think that unless there's someone on
10 the Board who has something more to ask, we've heard a
11 lot.

12 MS. OSEPCHUK: Yeah.

13 MS. HENDERSON: Can I -- can I add --

14 MS. O'CONNOR: We tried to do everything that
15 you asked us to do and Mark heard you. He re -- he
16 redrew the plans as he thought we understood you. And
17 each time we come back, it's ridiculous.

18 MS. HENDERSON: Can I add one thing, please?

19 MS. OSEPCHUK: Yeah. Go ahead, Linda.

20 MS. HENDERSON: I just want to say that if
21 you look at the design of the front and the rear, the
22 -- the rear looks like a front of a house.

23 Just from an emergency services perspective,
24 should there ever be a fire in that particular house
25 and you were on the rear elevation and trying to report

1 it, what address would you use? It looks as though --

2 MS. O'CONNOR: Well, the house has two
3 address -- the house has two addresses. It's 7 Ocean
4 Pathway, but the back of the house is 8 Bath. And they
5 are two addresses. So actually, it goes through as a
6 second lot. I mean, so it -- 8 -- 8 Bath is the back
7 and 7 is --

8 MS. HENDERSON: Okay.

9 MS. O'CONNOR: -- the front.

10 MS. HENDERSON: Thank you. That clears that
11 up. But it definitely looks like two frontages of
12 homes.

13 MR. MACMORRIS: Right.

14 MS. O'CONNOR: Well, I guess that depends on
15 how you -- how you interpret it and, you know, some of
16 the -- to me, it's definitely my back. My front has a
17 whole different ornamental element that you asked us to
18 remove, which we did.

19 MR. RUDELL: So I think the question is --

20 MS. O'CONNOR: The doors are different in the
21 front. Yes.

22 MR. RUDELL: The question is whether the
23 applicant and -- and the architect would like us to go
24 forward or if they would like us to do something else.

25 MS. O'CONNOR: Well, I think you need to

1 explain to me as the applicant what that means.
2 Because I don't quite understand if we vote and you
3 vote it down --

4 MR. RUDELL: There are three options. We can
5 --

6 MS. O'CONNOR: Thank you.

7 MR. RUDELL: -- you, the applicant, can ask
8 to carry it to the next meeting and do what you did
9 this last time, which is consider some changes. You
10 get them reviewed by tech and you come back to another
11 meeting.

12 This commission can empower the tech committee to
13 actually make a decision based on the feedback we've
14 given you tonight and you can come back to tech for an
15 actual meeting. But that -- that's unlikely to happen
16 because this is a key structure. And generally, in key
17 structures, they come before the full commission.

18 And the third option is we could vote on it and if
19 it passes, you can go on and build your house as
20 designed, and if it's denied, then you have the option
21 to appeal to the Zoning Board of Adjustment.

22 MS. O'CONNOR: Well, I'll be --

23 MS. SHAFFER: So which should -- should we
24 take a vote or no?

25 MR. RUDELL: We're -- that's for them to

1 decide what they'd like us to do.

2 MS. SHAFFER: Absolutely.

3 MR. RUDELL: Yeah.

4 MS. SHAFFER: Which would be your choice.

5 MS. O'CONNOR: So what is it that you --
6 excuse me. I -- I don't still understand. What is it
7 that you want changed? Is it the roof? Is it the --
8 the --

9 MR. PAVLIV: Make it shorter?

10 MS. O'CONNOR: I'm not -- you know, we're not
11 doing that.

12 What is it that you want changed? I -- I -- I
13 don't -- I still don't understand. I hear (inaudible).

14 (Everyone Speaks Simultaneously).

15 MR. RUDELL: I know I can answer your
16 question pretty quickly.

17 We -- we can't and aren't permitted to actually
18 sit here and design it for you. All we can say is when
19 an applicant, anyone, in this case, Mark and you, bring
20 an application to us, we look at it and see if, to our
21 best understanding, it meets the guidelines. And in
22 this case, the feedback you're getting is that this
23 comes close but doesn't in fact meet those guidelines
24 for a variety of reasons.

25 You have a world class architect sitting to your

1 right and he has endless ideas, I guarantee you, far
2 better than anything we have on ways that could
3 mitigate the feedback he's gotten. I wouldn't presume
4 to second guess him. Mark pulls out some pretty
5 extraordinary designs in the past and I expect he could
6 do it again.

7 But you as the homeowner have the right to say I
8 want a vote. And if that's what you want, we can give
9 you a vote. If you'd rather put this back into the
10 hands of your architect, we can do that, too. But the
11 choice is yours.

12 MS. O'CONNOR: I'm not sure what else we'd
13 change.

14 MR. RUDELL: Okay.

15 MS. O'CONNOR: Each time we left you, we
16 changed what we understood you were looking for.

17 MR. RUDELL: I guess that's your decision
18 then. You'd prefer a vote.

19 MS. KEPLER: Kurt has something to say.

20 MR. CAVANO: Well, I -- and I -- Jeff, I'm
21 not designing. I just wanted to reiterate -- reiterate
22 what I heard -- what I said and also what I heard
23 others say.

24 The -- the major sticking issue amongst the
25 majority of us is the fr -- the back looks like a

1 front. And --

2 MS. O'CONNOR: But the amazing architect that
3 you praised designed it. It was never my idea to make
4 it look like a front. That was what he felt --

5 MS. KEPLER: And -- and just so we're clear
6 that is Jeff's -- Jeff's view on that. That is not the
7 whole Board. Okay?

8 MS. O'CONNOR: Thank you.

9 MR. CAVANO: So what -- what I heard is from
10 a major -- from a -- a -- other members of the Board
11 and myself is for this to be approved, at least from my
12 perspective, is the fr -- back can't look like a front.
13 And what you heard from others, it included you would
14 not have double doors on the back of the house, for
15 example. You heard that from -- you heard that from a
16 member of the Board.

17 And, you know, whether it's the swale roof or
18 whatever, I leave that to Mark to decide what -- what
19 that looks like. But from my perspective, for this to
20 be passable, it just has to -- the back has to look
21 less like a front.

22 MS. SHAFFER: And -- and I think Kurt also --

23 MR. PAVLIV: It's nearly impossible to make
24 the back of this house look like -- like a back of a
25 house. Because you've got the gable. You have the

1 width.

2 If you eliminated the porches, you'd have just a
3 flat plane. I think that -- that's -- that might
4 satisfy HPC if we just had a -- have windows on a flat
5 plane with no porches, no doors.

6 MS. O'CONNOR: Well, I wanted to have some
7 way for my children and grandchildren, 20 of them, when
8 they're in the residence to be able to get out if there
9 was a fire. I took my one-and-a-half-year-old
10 daughter, two-year-old daughter, out of a second story
11 burning home that was about -- built in about 1920,
12 crawled on my knees and take -- took her out. I want
13 my children to be able to get out of this house.

14 I'm -- so to be able to have a window and a porch
15 to get to is very important to me. They can do it in
16 the front. They can do it in the back. If you've ever
17 had to go into a fire yourself and save one of your
18 children when nobody else made it in, you will
19 understand how important that is to me.

20 And it's not ugly. It's nice. It's safer. Just
21 to have windows where kids can't get out is crazy.
22 There's no fire escapes. I don't understand.

23 MS. OSEPCHUK: No one -- no one on this Board
24 said anything about the elimination of porches. I did
25 not hear that at all this evening.

1 MS. O'CONNOR: Well, what are they saying
2 about -- about --

3 MS. OSEPCHUK: What I heard is --

4 MS. O'CONOOR: -- trying to make it look like
5 a front.

6 MS. OSEPCHUK: --- the house -- the house
7 looks like a front. There are ways to design porches
8 and there is a way to design your rear of that
9 building, which I'm sure Mark can do, so that it looks
10 like the back of the structure as opposed to the front.

11 We're not going to be able to design it tonight.
12 That's not what we're supposed to do. So either we
13 vote on the application that is before us now, or if
14 you'd like an opportunity, Mark, to work your magic,
15 that's up to you. But that's where we're at right now.

16 And I believe that the issues were, and they
17 haven't changed from the very beginning, the massing of
18 this addition is quite large, quite large. The back
19 looks like the front elevation of a house. Maybe it's
20 just the swale. I don't know.

21 MS. O'CONNOR: No, I won't do that. I won't
22 do that.

23 MS. OSEPCHUK: All I know is that --

24 MS. KEPLER: Okay. So at the end of the day,
25 we're just going to have to vote then. If you don't

1 want to withdraw, if you don't want to move it back to
2 tech. If you want the vote, we'll vote. If we vote
3 and deny --

4 MS. O'CONNOR: But we've already -- we've
5 moved it back several times already. We've already
6 done that.

7 MS. KEPLER: Okay. So again, this is why we
8 have the meeting --

9 MS. O'CONNOR: But I guess, what do you want
10 it moved back to where it's like so tiny --

11 MS. KEPLER: Okay.

12 MS. O'CONNOR: -- it doesn't -- I mean, I
13 don't understand you all.

14 MS. KEPLER: At the end of the day, we're
15 going to vote. We're going to vote then. If this is
16 -- we're not going to keep going in circles. We have
17 two other to hear this evening.

18 MS. O'CONNOR: Well, I'll be making (audio is
19 muted).

20 MS. KEPLER: So we're to go to a vote because
21 we have not moved to go back to tech and we're not
22 going to keep circling. This has gone on for thirty
23 minutes now.

24 So Deb, do you agree?

25 MS. OSEPCHUK: Yes. No, I do agree. I -- I

1 -- I left the decision up to you.

2 MS. KEPLER: Mark, you're on mute.

3 MS. OSEPCHUK: I think you're -- you're
4 asking for a vote. That's kind of what I'm hearing.

5 MR. RUDELL: Okay.

6 MS. O'CONNOR: Am I asking for a vote?

7 Mark says I'm not asking for a vote.

8 MS. SHAFFER: Do we have to ask for people in
9 the audience if they have -- audience, so to speak --

10 MS. OSEPCHUK: Yeah.

11 MS. SHAFFER: -- in -- the the public? The
12 audience.

13 MS. OSEPCHUK: Public. I know, the audience.

14 Let me ask -- open the meeting to the public. Is
15 there anyone in the public who has anything to say?

16 MR. RUDELL: I don't see any.

17 MS. OSEPCHUK: Okay. If there is not, I'll
18 close the public portion.

19 MR. CAVANO: Are you sure you want to -- you
20 sure you want to vote on this?

21 MR. PAVLIV: No, we don't want to vote on
22 this. I would like to put a -- a --

23 MS. KEPLER: Okay. I need to -- I need an
24 answer. Either we're pulling this to go back to tech,
25 you're withdrawing the application or it's going to a

1 vote. I'm not doing --

2 MR. PAVLIV: We're -- we're going back to
3 tech. I would like to have an appointment.

4 MS. OSEPCHUK: Okay.

5 MR. PAVLIV: I'm going on record that I would
6 like to have an appointment with tech. I will draw a
7 new scheme --

8 MS. KEPLER: Okay. We're going back to tech
9 then.

10 MR. PAVLIV: -- to present to the committee
11 and we'll carry the meeting.

12 MS. OSEPCHUK: All right. Mark, thank you.
13 All right. What I need is a motion to defer.

14 MR. RUDELL: Motion to defer.

15 MS. HEINLEIN: I'll make it.

16 MR. TOMBALAKIAN: Second?

17 MS. OSEPCHUK: I need a second.

18 MR. MACMORRIS: Second.

19 MS. OSEPCHUK: Thanks, Doug.

20 All in favor?

21 ALL: Aye.

22 MS. OSEPCHUK: So moved.

23 Thank you, Mark.

24 (Record Concluded.)

25

26

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

CERTIFICATION

I, Amy L. Ruplall, 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.

Amy L. Ruplall

708

Amy L. Ruplall

AOC Number

Brittany Transcription, LLC

April 14, 2024

Agency Name

Date