

HISTORIC AREA COMMISSION
New Castle Town Hall
2nd and Delaware Streets
July 11, 2019

Present: Laura Fontana, Chairperson
David Baldini
Marty Wright
Jean Norvell
Mark Chaump

Also Present: Leila Hamroun, Architectural Consultant
Jeff Bergstrom, City Building Inspector

Ms. Fontana convened the meeting at 6:30 p.m. Roll call followed and a quorum to conduct business was declared.

Approval of the Minutes

Ms. Fontana was absent at the June 13, 2019, meeting and asked if the Applicant for 113 The Strand was aware that he would have to get a Resolution from City Council to approve the minor encroachment for the front steps, and Mr. Bergstrom advised that the Applicant did go before City Council and the Resolution was approved.

A Motion to approve the Minutes of the June 13, 2019, meeting as presented was made, seconded and unanimously approved, Ms. Fontana abstaining.

OLD APPLICATIONS

118 East 2nd Street – Cindy Brooks

Ms. Fontana noted that the original Application was approved at the HAC Meeting of October 11, 2018, and the Applicant is now asking for an adjustment to the original Application.

Ms. Norvell joined the meeting at 6:33 pm.

Ms. Hamroun noted that the Application presented, Permit #23664, is for repairs on the existing building with in-kind materials, which is a Tier 1 approval; however the Application is not for the design changes to the original Application for an addition.

The design changes being requested are to have a flat roof over the addition and to increase the footprint of the addition by 20-25% to make the side wall flush with the original side wall of the main house, leaving a recessed niche at the side entrance to the rear addition to maintain the original dining room window. Ms. Brooks added that the change to a flat roof is to provide additional outdoor space, and she left the niche in order to keep the original dining room window intact. The flat roof will have a 41" edge wall formed by the truncated sloped roof with cedar shingle, which will slant at an approximate 75 degree pitch.

Historic Area Commission Minutes
July 11, 2019

Ms. Fontana reviewed the previous Minutes and noted the original Application was approved for cedar wood siding, wood windows and wood doors. Ms. Hamroun noted that the procedural issue is that the Commission does not have the appropriate Application form to review/sign-off on.

Ms. Brooks explained the proposed design changes and the materials to be used. Ms. Hamroun noted that a small part of the new roof line will be visible from the public right of way. During discussion, it was noted that the Board of Adjustment gave approval for the original footprint, and that Ms. Brooks may have to return to the Board of Adjustment for approval of the larger footprint. Mr. Bergstrom advised it would depend on the language of the Board of Adjustment's approval. Mr. Wright asked about the height of the knee wall, and Ms. Brooks advised it would be 42".

Ms. Fontana reiterated that procedurally there is a challenge because the Commission does not have the original Application to review. Ms. Hamroun asked if the original Application was for a building permit or for a consultation, and Ms. Brooks advised it was for a consultation. Ms. Fontana noted that the Commission approved the original Application with the following recommendations:

- The addition will extend 13' from the back of the existing structure
- There will be a 3' access setback all around the house
- No vinyl will be used

It was noted that the Commission did not approve all the materials because the original Application was for the setback and not for the construction of the addition. The original Application would then have gone to the Board of Adjustment and then back to HAC for the Building Permit Application. Ms. Hamroun clarified that the Building Permit currently before the Commission is for the repairs and not for the addition. Ms. Brooks advised that she did not have a Building Permit Application for the addition. Mr. Bergstrom added that Ms. Brooks will probably need a recommendation from HAC to the Board of Adjustment to clarify the original decision. Ms. Hamroun noted that any recommendation should state that the footprint of the addition should not extend beyond the limits of the existing building. Upon approval of the Board of Adjustment, the Applicant would come back to HAC for approval of building materials. HAC could include in its findings that if all proposed materials meet the HAC Design Guidelines, it could be a Tier 1 approval. Ms. Hamroun explained that because the Applicant is requesting a modification of the original Application that changes the footprint of the addition that was presented to the Board of Adjustment and a new Building Permit is required.

Ms. Hamroun suggested that the Historic Area Commission (1) recommend to the Board of Adjustment approval of the modified footprint of the addition which maintains the rear setback of 3' and aligns with the west side of the existing building; and (2) when the Building Permit is submitted if all proposed materials meet the HAC Design Guidelines, that Building Permit can get Tier 1 approval. Ms. Hamroun further explained the process for obtaining approval for the materials. During discussion, Ms. Hamroun explained that the

reason approval for materials could not be obtained at the current time is that no Building Permit application was submitted for approval. Mr. Bergstrom further explained the process of how the Application moves through the system and added that much depended on what the Board of Adjustment approved for the original Application. Ms. Fontana clarified that a 3' setback from the rear of the proposed addition was presented to the Board of Adjustment. Mr. Bergstrom reiterated that whether the Applicant would be required to revisit the Board of Adjustment depended on the language of the original Board of Adjustment approval. He added that because of the modification to the originally proposed side gable roof, a sealed drawing of the new proposed roof on the rear deck addition by a licensed architect or engineer will be required to demonstrate that the structure will hold up trapped snow.

Ms. Hamroun asked about the repairs that are in the Application, and Mr. Bergstrom explained he requested that all documentation be included in the HAC Application.

Ms. Brooks asked for clarification of who would approve the roof change, and Ms. Hamroun explained her recommendation is to have HAC approve the modification to the width of the addition so that it extends so the west wall aligns with the west wall of the building, and to approve the modification to the roof line as noted in the drawings; and to also recommend that when the Building Application is submitted for review, if the materials are as stated by the Applicant, i.e., wood siding, wood windows, and appropriate roof shingles, the Commission is comfortable with allowing it to be processed as a Tier 1 Review.

Ms. Fontana noted that the Commission will:

- Get clarification from BOA about the 3' setback
- Approve the modification of the extension width not to exceed the width of the original building with the proposed setback at the dining room window
- Approve the roof line with the knee wall height to be 42"
- Approve materials as noted by the HAC Guidelines to be wood siding, wood windows and cedar roof shingles

Mr. Bergstrom clarified that this all is relative to a modification of the September 2018 Application.

Mr. Wright asked for clarification that the proposed steps will not extend beyond the existing building, and Ms. Hamroun stated everything is to be contained within the addition footprint. During discussion, Ms. Brooks explained that the proposed steps will extend beyond the structure. During discussion, Ms. Brooks asked if the steps can extend beyond the structure, and Ms. Hamroun stated it would be best to align the steps within the footprint. Ms. Fontana clarified that a recommendation regarding the steps be included in a Motion. Ms. Brooks noted that she felt keeping the steps within the footprint will be too restrictive to get steps up as high as is required. Ms. Hamroun explained that if the steps and landing cannot be kept within the niche the steps will encroach completely on the side yard. Ms. Hamroun explained that the discretion of the side setback is the purview of the

HAC, and her recommendation is to have the steps kept within the niche. During discussion it was noted that an increased addition is being approved of a certain width according to submitted plans, and the Applicant is now requesting to construct steps that will extend beyond the addition; and that detail is not shown on the plans. During further discussion of the steps, Ms. Hamroun explained the rationale for requesting the steps not extend beyond the addition and reiterated her recommendation that the steps be tucked in to the niche. Ms. Brooks noted that the only partial plans were submitted with the Application, and Ms. Hamroun explained that without complete plans the Commission cannot do a full review.

Ms. Fontana stated that the Applicant submitted a modification of an Application that was submitted in September 2018.

The Motion is to:

1. Have clarification from BOA about the 3' setback.
2. Approve the modification of the extension width not to exceed the width of the original building with the proposed setback at the dining room window.
3. Approve the roof line with the knee wall height to be 42".
4. Approve materials as noted by the HAC Guidelines to be wood siding, wood windows and cedar roof shingles.
5. Approve steps that will be constructed within the niche and will not extend beyond the structure's footprint shown in the sketch attached to the application.

Ms. Brooks asked for clarification of Item #1, and Mr. Wright explained that clarification of the 3' setback is required to determine the language the Board of Adjustment used in its Decision. Mr. Chaump noted that a conversation with the Building Inspector, Ms. Hamroun and the City Solicitor could resolve the issue of clarification.

Ms. Fontana re-read the proposed Motion:

Modification of Application from September 2018

- Have clarification from BOA about the 3' setback.
- Approve the modification of the extension with the following three descriptors:
 1. The width not to exceed the width of the original building with the setback at the original dining room window.
 2. The roof line knee wall height to be 42".
 3. The step must remain within the niche of the structure as shown in the drawing.
- Materials as noted by the Guidelines: wood siding, wood windows and cedar roof.

Ms. Hamroun retrieved the original Application which contained some very preliminary sketches hand drawn on graph paper. Mr. Wright asked if there was a requirement on the pitch of the knee-wall and Ms. Brooks stated she was unsure. Ms. Hamroun clarified that all windows would be wood, and Ms. Brooks noted there were several vinyl windows that she would like to reuse. Ms. Hamroun reiterated that all materials need to be appropriate per

the Design Guidelines in order to have a Tier 1 approval, and noted that the previous approval stated that vinyl was not acceptable.

A Motion to approve the modification of an Application from September 2018 was made with the following conditions:

- **Have clarification from BOA about the 3' setback.**
- **Approve the modification of the extension with the following three descriptors:**
 - 4. The width not to exceed the width of the original building with the setback at the original dining room window.**
 - 5. The roof line knee wall height to be 42".**
 - 6. The step must remain within the niche of the structure as shown in the drawing.**
- **Materials as noted by the Guidelines: wood siding, wood windows and cedar roof.**

The Motion was seconded and unanimously approved.

Ms. Fontana confirmed that Mr. Bergstrom would call to get clarification from the Board of Adjustment of the 3' setback.

NEW APPLICANTIONS

31 West 4th Street – Jo Brown

Mr. Angelo Rispoli, contractor for the Applicant, came forward as representative for the Applicant. An Application was submitted to replace four 3rd floor windows with Anderson 400 series woodwright double-hung windows.

Ms. Hamroun noted that the Application was submitted without all documentation and reminded Mr. Rispoli of the protocol for submitting a complete Application.

Mr. Rispoli explained that the four 3rd floor windows are in disrepair and need to be replaced and requested approval to use Anderson 400 series vinyl clad double-hung windows. Mr. Wright noted that the Application is for Anderson 400 series vinyl clad windows; however the backup spec documentation is for Marvin wood windows. Mr. Rispoli explained that the Applicant would like to use the Anderson vinyl clad windows instead of the Marvin wood windows due to the difficulty in accessing the windows and the clad windows will be maintenance free. It was explained that pursuant to the Guidelines, vinyl and fiberglass clad are not an appropriate material.

After discussion, it was agreed that the Application would be approved with Marvin wood windows.

A Motion to approve the Application with Marvin wood windows included in the Application was made and seconded.

Mr. Chaump asked if the Applicant was required to use Marvin windows, or if any wood window suffice, and Mr. Rispoli explained that he would use the Marvin windows.

Ms. Fontana restated the Motion:

A Motion to approve the Application with Marvin wood windows included in the Application as presented, no Anderson 400 series windows, was made and seconded.

Ms. Norvell asked why the Motion specifically says “no Anderson 400 series windows”, and Ms. Fontana explained that was because the Anderson 400 series windows were specifically requested in the Application.

On vote, the Motion was unanimously approved.

CONSULTATION

128 East 2nd Street – Bill Hentkowski

Mr. Hentkowski stated that he was here to consult with the Commission regarding replacement of five windows and one French door on the back side of his house. He asked if aluminum clad Pella windows could be used. Ms. Hamroun clarified that the windows are in the back and not visible from the public right-of-way and stated that pursuant to the Guidelines aluminum clad is an appropriate alternate material to use.

Ms. Fontana stated that for a consult, aluminum clad is acceptable in the back for non-public right-of-way for the windows and door, and an Application can be reviewed as a Tier 1.

MISCELLANEOUS

Completed Applications

Ms. Hamroun asked for discussion with the Commissioners for a formal procedure to be followed to ensure all Applications submitted are complete. The Guidelines state on page 77 that a completed application must be submitted “no later than ten days prior to the next scheduled Historic Area Commission meeting to be included on the agenda”. However, too often incomplete Applications are added to the Agenda, which makes it more difficult and time-consuming for the Commissioners to review those Applications.

Ms. Fontana stated that she felt the Commissioners are in favor; however it should be very clear to Applicants of what needs to be provided with the application and at the meeting. After discussion, it was agreed that the Commission supports enforcing the requirement that with the exception of Consultations, only completed Applications submitted within the stated timeframe are to be added to the Historic Area Commission meeting Agenda. It was also recommended that all Applications have a checklist of requirements for both the Applicant and the Building and Code Secretary to ensure that all Applications are complete and correct before being added to the Agenda. Mr. Bergstrom clarified that it is the consensus of the Commission that only completed Applications submitted within the

Historic Area Commission Minutes
July 11, 2019

correct timeframe will be added to the Agenda, and stated that he will confirm this procedural requirement with Ms. Marika Levine, Building and Code Secretary. Ms. Hamroun added that adhering to this procedural requirement will help further streamline the review process which has significantly improved with the Tier 1 approval option. The support of the Commission will be welcomed by City staff as they enforce this provision and discuss it with Applicants.

Ms. Fontana asked if the published Agenda could only show those Applications that will be presented. Mr. Bergstrom noted that the original directive was that all Applications would be added to the working copy of the Agenda and those determined to be a Tier 1 would be removed. He added that there is some flexibility for Consultation Requests. Ms. Fontana also asked that every effort be made to have Applications submitted in legible handwriting.

After discussion, it was suggested that an article could be put into the paper clarifying the process for submitting Applications for Historic Area Commission review.

Ms. Hamroun reminded the Commissioners that the date for the National Alliance of Preservation Commission CAMP® Training Session has been updated to Saturday, August 10th.

There being no further business to discuss, Ms. Fontana called for a Motion to Adjourn.

A Motion to adjourn the meeting at 8:03 p.m. was made, seconded and unanimously approved.

Kathy Weirich
Stenographer