

**City of Cape May
Historic Preservation Commission Minutes
December 15, 2025**

Opening: The regular meeting of the City of Cape May Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) was called to order by Chairperson John Boecker at 6:01 pm.

Pledge of Allegiance

Roll Call

Mr. Boecker, Chair	Present
Mr. Testa, Vice Chair	Present
Mr. Carroll	Present
Mr. Stevenson	Present
Ms. Pessagno	Present
Ms. Wilson Stridick	Absent
Ms. Decker	Present
Mr. Hammeran (Alternate I)	Present
Mr. Kurtz (Alternate II)	Present

Also Present: Chris Gillin-Schwartz, Esq., HPC Solicitor, Lauren Emerick, HPC Secretary, Councilmember Lorraine Baldwin.

MINUTES

Motion made by Ms. Testa to approve the November 24, 2025 minutes with the change to the typo and addition of Judy Decker for attendance, seconded by Mr. Carroll and carried 6-0. Those in favor: Mr. Carroll, Ms. Pessagno, Ms. Decker, Mr. Hammeran, Mr. Testa, Mr. Boecker. Those opposed: none. Those abstaining: Mr. Stevenson

PAYMENT OF BILLS

Motion made by Mr. Carroll to pay the bills, seconded by Mr. Stevenson and carried 7-0. Those in favor: Mr. Carroll, Ms. Pessagno, Mr. Stevenson, Ms. Decker, Mr. Hammeran, Mr. Testa, Mr. Boecker. Those opposed: none. Those abstaining: none.

RESOLUTIONS

City of Cape May, Howard Street, Harbor Lane, Virginia Avenue, Reading Avenue – Resolution 2025-46
Ryon, 824 Kearney Street, Block 1068, Lot 5 – Resolution 2025-47
Harner, 1215 Washington Street, Block 1129, Lot 38 – Resolution 2025-48
City of Cape May/Cape May Tennis Center, 1020 Washington Street, Block 1110, Lot 10,11 – Resolution 2025-49
Carneys Inc, 411 & 429 Beach Avenue, Block 1041, Lot 21,22,23 – Resolution 2025-50
Fisher, 1013 Stockton Avenue, Block 1096, Lot 13 – Resolution 2025-51
Cape Roc Condominium Association, 1520 New Jersey Avenue, Block 1174, Lot 5 – Resolution 2025-52
Nowakowski-276 Windsor Irrevocable Trust, 276 Windsor Avenue, Block 1023, Lot 14 – Resolution 2025-53

Motion made by Mr. Hammeran to approve Resolutions 2025-46 through Resolutions 2025-53, seconded by Ms. Decker and carried 6-0.

Those in favor: Mr. Carroll, Ms. Pessagno, Ms. Decker, Mr. Hammeran, Mr. Testa, Mr. Boecker. Those opposed: none. Those abstaining: Mr. Testa for 1020 Washington Street, Mr. Stevenson, Mr. Testa for 1020 Washington Street and 1520 New Jersey Avenue, Mr. Boecker for 1020 Washington Street

APPLICATIONS APPROVED/DENIED IN REVIEW

Carlson, 1239 Washington Street, 1129/31 C – Deck, shower
Cape Todos Santos LLC, 1001 Lafayette Street, 1061/58 NC – Door
Lingg, 110 Jefferson Street, 1068/10 NC – Windows
Mchugh, 1101 New York Avenue, 1117/38,39 C – Fence
Oreilly, 1208 New York Avenue, 1131/3 C – Roof
Schwartz, 1307 Beach Avenue, 1146/25 KC – Roof, siding
Wiederseim, 509 Franklin Street, 1076/6 C - Walkway

Motion made by Mr. Carroll to ratify the applications approved or denied in review, seconded by Mr. Kurtz and carried 6-0. Those in favor: Mr. Carroll, Ms. Pessagno, Mr. Hammeran, Mr. Stevenson, Mr. Testa, Mr. Boecker. Those opposed: none. Those abstaining: Mr. Carroll for 701 Columbia Avenue, Mr. Hammeran for 1023 Washington Street, Mr. Boecker for 1109 Washington Street, Ms. Decker.

ADDITIONS/DELETIONS:

Mr. Kurtz read the Purpose Statement of the HPC: *To serve as a catalyst for guiding and valuing Cape May's historical, cultural, and natural resources in ways that inspire and unite our community to steward these resources for the benefit of all, so that present and future generations continue to express the unique quality of life in this place we love.*

APPLICATIONS

1246 Lafayette Street LLC - 1246 Lafayette Street, Block 1129, Lot 19, Non-contributing Solar Panels

Lisa Ronca and Nick Markley from Tesla Energy presented a plan for solar panels at 1246 Lafayette Street. Mr. Boecker stated that he visited the property and said the panels would be quite visible from Washington Street. He suggested potentially relocating panels to the roof of the large shed, the small shed, and/or a new structure over the slate patio. Mr. Markley stated that he would get a structural engineer to look at whether these locations would be feasible. Mr. Boecker requested that the applicants depict the locations and sizes of the inverter and related equipment on the drawings for review.

Motion made by Mr. Testa to table the application with the applicant waiving the 45-day period, seconded by Mr. Hammeran and carried 7-0. Those in favor: Mr. Carroll, Ms. Pessagno, Mr. Stevenson, Ms. Decker, Mr. Hammeran, Mr. Testa, Mr. Boecker. Those opposed: none. Those abstaining: none.

Perry Street Associates LLC – 29 Perry Street, Block 1034, Lot 21,22,23, Contributing Seasonal porch enclosure

Project manager for Perry Street Associates, Robert Shepanski, presented a plan for a revised porch enclosure. He stated that there would be clear acrylic panels that will be removed seasonally. They are proposing the panels be in place from

October 15th to about May 15th each year. Ms. Decker expressed concerns about the porch being enclosed, as the standards do not permit enclosed porches. Mr. Carroll also expressed concerns but did understand the reasoning behind seasonal use. He stated he was supportive. Mr. Shepanski addressed the discomfort stating that they were simply keeping the porch usable for a few months and leaving everything intact. Mr. Boecker stated that the standards are written in a way that allows some ambiguity in certain situations and specific circumstances on a case-by-case basis, such as instances where enclosures can easily be removed without affecting historical elements.

Motion made by Mr. Boecker to approve with the conditions that the owner has agreed to remove the enclosure from May 15th to October 15th and bring back to the review committee details confirming that it is easily removable, seconded by Mr. Carroll and carried 5-2. Those in favor: Mr. Carroll, Ms. Pessagno, Mr. Stevenson, Mr. Hammeran, Mr. Boecker. Those opposed: Ms. Decker, Mr. Testa. Those abstaining: none.

Lokal Stockton LLC – 5 Stockton Place, Block 1064, Lot 17, Contributing
Front porch, parking area

Owner Chad Ludeman and architectural historian Kyle Toth presented a plan to make a few changes to the current building. Mr. Toth stated that although the 2009 update to the property survey by McCabe Associates indicates that the building dates from the 1930s, his research indicates that it was actually built about a decade earlier. He discussed how the porch had changed many times over the 20th century. The proposed revised plan significantly decreases the stair width, limiting it to the single central bay, flanked by railings across the remaining porch fronts with a matching rail along the whole first floor of the porch to make it more consistent with the neighboring properties. Mr. Toth stated that they did more research on the breeze block wall around the pool. He discovered that concrete blocks were popular for decorative reasons in the 1920's when the building was built. Mr. Boecker asked for clarification about what the scope of issues for which the application was seeking approval. The applicant confirmed this application's scope is just for the reconstruction of the stairs and to install new paving materials to replace the parking lot's current shells. Discussion among the members found these proposed new design elements favorable. City solicitor, Chris Gillin-Schwartz, stated that he was in Trenton to address the applicant's current appeal during the week prior. He stated that if they would like to make an application for the additional scope of work on the property, they are free to do so. He raised the eight points identified in this litigation for the board to review, as follows: 1) The foundation was approved to be brick but was parged instead with no brick installed, 2) the roofing was approved to be standing seam metal roof, but now asphalt fiberglass shingles have been installed, 3) the applicant agreed to redesign the railing using a Chippendale style but straight square spindles were installed instead, 4) the applicant agreed to retain the original front stair bridge design, which is addressed in the above comments and current application, 5) the approved fencing followed HPC design standards by using vertical board elements, but horizontal board elements were installed, 6) the breeze block wall was not originally approved, 7) the parking area was approved for pavers instead of the currently installed shells, and 8) the HPC Design Standards require HVAC equipment to be screened with wooden lattice. Mr. Gillin-Schwartz did note the HVAC equipment has been addressed. Mr. Toth responded to each item verbally and represented on the record that a revised application would be submitted to address the above-itemized scope with documentation depicting and describing design proposals for each of these eight items. Mr. Testa stated that he would like to see all of these items in an application so that details could be fairly evaluated.

Motion made by Mr. Boecker to table the application with the expectation of resubmission of a new application with an expanded scope that addresses the above eight issues, seconded by Mr. Carroll and carried 7-0. Those in favor: Mr. Carroll, Ms. Pessagno, Mr. Stevenson, Ms. Decker, Mr. Hammeran, Mr. Testa, Mr. Boecker. Those opposed: none. Those abstaining: none.

Sokoll – 8 First Avenue, Block 1014, Lot 13.01, Not Rated
New construction house, pool, garage

Owner Dina Sokoll and architect Paul Kiss presented plans for a new home, a pool, and a garage. Mr. Kiss stated that the primary building will be placed near the lot front along Beach Ave., the garage will be located as far back as possible in the corner of the property, and the pool will be in between the house and the garage. They are proposing a landscape hedge row to visually screen the pool from the street. Mr. Hammeran asked for clarification on the streetscape regarding the height of the building. Mr. Kiss explained that it is compatible with buildings around it. There were questions asked about the fence, and it was suggested to maybe use 6x6 instead of 4x4 posts. Mr. Boecker pointed out that page 45 of HPC's Design Standards states that pool should not be located in a rear or side yard and not be visible from the public right-of-way and that this corner site renders front yards along both streets; additionally the definition of "Not Visible" on page 12 of the Standards states that vegetation and fencing are not considered as they may be removed over time. He suggested perhaps installing a brick wall along the setback line that would prohibit visibility of the pool from eye height along the sidewalk on First Avenue, which after discussion appeared agreeable to the applicant.

Motion made by Mr. Boecker to grant final approval with conditions for more substantial fence posts and pickets, recommending 6" x 6" posts with pickets complimentary in size, and adding a solid brick wall (above eye height) extending from the rear of the house to the driveway along the First Avenue setback such that this addition, combined with the proposed fencing and landscaping, would create a sufficient visible barrier that would render the pool not visible and consistent with the Standards. seconded by Mr. Testa and carried 7-0. Those in favor: Mr. Carroll, Ms. Pessagno, Mr. Stevenson, Ms. Decker, Mr. Hammeran, Mr. Testa, Mr. Boecker. Those opposed: none. Those abstaining: none.

Hourihan – 1017 Lafayette Street, Block 1061 Lot 57.02 & 62, Contributing
Rear and side additions, renovations

Project designer, Adam Crossland, presented the project on behalf of the homeowner. He proposed adding a laundry room and bathroom on the first floor at the rear of the property. On the second floor, he proposed putting a second floor above the wing on the left side of the house and replacing a modern quad window with more historically accurate double hung windows. Mr. Carroll commented that a shutter should be designed and sized to cover the entire window when closed and if there's one shutter on one side, it should be a bi-fold shutter accordingly. Mr. Crossland said that he could do that.

Motion made by Mr. Hammeran to grant final approval with the conditions that the chimney be depicted as remaining on the front elevation, that cut sheets be provided for the windows verifying that they are exterior wood primed with simulated divided lites, for the new wood door, and for full width functioning shutters as described above, seconded by Ms. Pessagno and carried 7-0. Those in favor: Mr. Carroll, Ms. Pessagno, Mr. Stevenson, Ms. Decker, Mr. Hammeran, Mr. Testa, Mr. Boecker. Those opposed: none. Those abstaining: none.

Haija – 1149 Lafayette Street, Block 1061, Lot 71, Contributing
Renovations

Owner Anan Haija and project designer, Adam Crossland, presented a plan for renovations. Mr. Crossland explained that they are looking to slightly relocate the building due to the foundation being in bad shape, removing the existing enclosed porch, aligning the five windows equally spaced across the front of the second floor, and removing a first-floor addition that's at the back of the house. Ms. Decker referenced the Design Standards page 13 which states that the historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. She also mentioned on page 32 that removing a porch is not appropriate for contributing properties. Mr. Testa commented that this porch is not original to the building, and he was not troubled by the removal. Mr. Carroll commented on the condition of the porch being poor. Discussion ensued regarding shutters, the need for wood windows, the status of the existing wood front door (which is currently hidden behind the porch enclosure), and landscaping as well, which the applicant agreed to address.

Motion made by Mr. Stevenson to grant conceptual approval with the conditions that cut sheets be provided for all windows and doors verifying that they are exterior primed wood with simulated or full divided lites, a photo of the existing front door which is to be exposed and restored, and a landscape plan for the front façade, seconded by Mr. Kurtz and carried 6-1. Those in favor: Mr. Carroll, Ms. Pessagno, Mr. Stevenson, Mr. Hammeran, Mr. Testa, Mr. Boecker. Those opposed: Ms Decker. Those abstaining: none.

Anderko – 815 Columbia Avenue, Block 1075, Lot 8, Contributing
Addition, siding, windows, trim

Owner Ted Anderko presented his plan seeking final approval for an addition, siding, windows, and trim. Mr. Stevenson questioned the scale of the addition. It was noted that there are no comparable existing vs. proposed elevations clarifying proposed changes being; consequently. Mr. Boecker said it was unlikely that the Commission could evaluate compliance without seeing both existing and new elevations. Mr. Anderko said that he believed he had that as part of his original application, but these were not included in the current documents. There was concern among the commissioners about the size of the addition in relation to the existing house. Ms. Decker noted that the Design Standards states that the roof line is required to be differentiated from the existing a with a ridge no higher than existing. Mr. Boecker invited Mr. Anderko to meet with the Review Subcommittee to work together on this application and provide some direction on how to achieve compliance with HPC's Standards.

Motion made by Mr. Boecker to table the application with the applicant waiving the 45-day period, seconded by Mr. Hammeran and carried 7-0. Those in favor: Mr. Carroll, Ms. Pessagno, Mr. Stevenson, Ms. Decker, Mr. Hammeran, Mr. Kurtz, Mr. Testa, Mr. Boecker. Those opposed: none. Those abstaining: none.

Waxman – 931 Corgie Street, Block 1093, Lot 11, Contributing
Shed, shower enclosure, fence

Owner Gary Waxman presented his plan for final approval of his shed, outdoor wooden shower enclosure, and fence. Mr. Boecker stated it wasn't necessary to fully walk through the application, given the comprehensive nature of the submitted documentation. Mr. Hammeran only commented that the application includes wood siding on the shed that matches the house.

Motion made by Mr. Testa to grant final approval seconded by Ms. Decker and carried 7-0. Those in favor: Mr. Carroll, Ms. Pessagno, Mr. Stevenson, Ms. Decker, Mr. Hammeran, Mr. Testa, Mr. Boecker. Those opposed: none. Those abstaining: none.

OPEN TO PUBLIC

Public comment was opened at 8:46 p.m. and closed at 8:46 p.m. with no comments.

DISCUSSION

Mr. Boecker described the brief presentation made by the Columbia Capstone students. He mentioned that there would be a comprehensive report coming. Mr. Boecker mentioned that there has been huge progress on the Historic Preservation Awards.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion to adjourn the meeting was made by Mr. Boecker at 9:00 p.m. with all in favor.

A verbatim recording of said meeting is available on the City of Cape May website.

Meeting conducted by HPC Secretary Lauren Emerick. Minutes written by HPC Secretary Lauren Emerick.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lauren Emerick
HPC Secretary