

HISTORIC AREA COMMISSION
New Castle Town Hall
2nd and Delaware Streets
April 15, 2010

Present: Sally Monigle, Chairperson
Doug Heckrotte
David Bird
Bill Hentkowski*
Robin Hegvik

City Personnel: Jeff Bergstrom, Inspection Department*

Mrs. Monigle called the meeting to order at 5:20 p.m. Roll call followed.

*Mr. Hentkowski joined the meeting at 5:30 p.m.

*Mr. Bergstrom departed the meeting at 6:15 p.m.

NEW APPLICATIONS

B. Winkler, 22 E. 4th Street

Install fence in rear yard.

Discussion: The applicant is seeking to remove the existing fence and replace with a higher fence. She explained the reasoning (applicant's dog) for her selection of fence. Ms. Monigle informed that HAC does not typically approve double-side shadowbox which is a modern-looking fence and has concerns with her selection. The applicant said there is a shadowbox currently in place and she wants to replace with the same. (*The applicant already had a copy of the approved fence drawings.*) She owns the adjacent property and would like the fence on both properties to match. Mr. Heckrotte expressed his concern with approving the applicant's request.

Action: Mr. Heckrotte made a motion to vote on the application as submitted with the strong recommendation the applicant use one of our approved fences, but failing to match the piece of fence she has which includes the dog-ear tops with the main reason being you can't see it from anywhere except from neighbors' backyards there and HAC is trying to relate to what is there, otherwise he would not support her application. Ms. Hegvik seconded the motion.

Disposition: Mr. Bird voted 'no' stating other accommodations could be made for the dog besides going with this type of fence.

Ms. Hegvik voted 'yes'.

Mrs. Monigle voted 'yes'.

Mr. Heckrotte voted 'yes' stating HAC would be much happier if the applicant went with a different fence. There is a suggestion that the stretchers can have a tapered top making it more difficult for the dog to grab which would also be true with an approved fence. He would be happier if the applicant looked at this with her fence manufacturer. He added that on the approved fence litany, fences either go weathered or stained, but if pressure treated they need to be stained or they need to be allowed to weather which would be cedar.

The motion was approved by a vote of 3-1 with one member absent.

NEW APPLICATIONS (Contd.)

N. O'Donnell, 32 W. 5th Street

Replace seven (7) windows in front & twelve (12) additional windows on rear of property.

Discussion: The windows being replaced are the same size as current windows, made to fit the window. Discussion followed about what is being replaced, existing window sash and existing window frame vs. sash only. Mr. Heckrotte said HAC will want to know if they are replacement sash and jam liners or are they replacement windows total. The current storm windows will not be put back up.

Action: Mr. Heckrotte made a motion to vote on the application as submitted with the proviso that the replacement windows are of the replacement sash and jam liner type not to include entirely new frames so that the new sash will be the same size as the old sash. Mr. Bird seconded the motion.

Disposition: Approved by unanimous vote.

C. Alabrudzinski, 111 E. 2nd Street

Replace roof, gutters and downspouts. Remove all cedar siding material to bare sheathing or plank board on entire rear wall and replace per specs attached.

Discussion: Lengthy discussion took place about the type of siding materials being proposed by the applicant. The material being suggested by the applicant is not acceptable to HAC.

Action: Mr. Heckrotte made a motion to vote on the application as submitted with the proviso that the litany be followed which means wood siding. Mr. Bird seconded the motion.

Disposition: Approved by unanimous vote.

Install chimney liner & cap. Replace storm windows in kind.

Action: Mr. Heckrotte made a motion to vote on the application as submitted with the proviso that the litany be followed which means the meeting rails on the storm windows and painting the storm windows to match the trim. Mr. Bird seconded the motion.

Disposition: Approved by unanimous vote.

J. Norvell, 206 Delaware Street

Sign approval.

Discussion: The applicant provided sketches of the sign being proposed and made part of the application. The sign will be 7' above the sidewalk in accordance with code. It will be 30" high, 20" wide, bracket is 24, the actual bracket is 11" and the curve is 7-1/2. It is a silhouette done in black, laser-cut and will not be lighted. There is ample lighting nearby. (*Discussion followed.*) Mr. Heckrotte noted the sign should be made of wood and we should look at the zoning code for guidance.

Action: Mr. Bird made a motion to vote on the application as submitted subject to compliance with the zoning code. Mr. Heckrotte seconded the motion.

Disposition: Approved by unanimous vote.

NEW APPLICATIONS (Contd.)

D. Bungy, 108 E. 4th Street

Replace wooden fence.

Discussion: The applicant is requesting a 5' high wooden fence with a flat top. On the back of the property there is a gazebo and garden and we would like the fence to be 6' to provide privacy. Mr. Bergstrom confirmed there is no limitation on fence height in the historic area. The applicant is aware of a proposal to build next door to his property.

Action: Mr. Heckrotte made a motion to vote on the application as submitted. Mr. Bird seconded the motion.

Disposition: Approved by unanimous vote.

J. Whisman, 411 Delaware Street

Construct 15-½' X 26' addition to rear of property.

Discussion: Mr. Wesley Sessa of 18th Century Restoration presented a concept on behalf of the applicant. They are seeking approval for the next level of the project in order to obtain a building permit. The new roof (on the addition) will be a red, pre-fabricated roof and the remaining roof will be painted to match. (*Additional discussion concerning the roof, windows and siding followed.*) The material below the wood siding is antique, hard building brick. The foundation will rise above grade and period masonry will be used. Mr. Heckrotte would like to see better drawings showing trim, window patterns, gutters, down spouts.

Action: Mr. Heckrotte made a motion to vote on the application as submitted with the proviso that the litany be followed and that we see more detailed drawings which can be half-time with those drawings including window patterns, trim, door choices, etc. Half-time means the applicant can provide the requested information via email, scanner, mail and avoid making the applicant appear at the next meeting. Mr. Heckrotte added another proviso to his motion stating HAC would like to see what brand they are using on the roof. (*Discussion followed.*) Mr. Bird seconded the motion.

Disposition: Approved by unanimous vote.

W. Taylor, 44 W. 5th Street

Install 15' X 30' above-ground pool with deck off back of house and also install fence.

Discussion: It was noted the fence selected is from the approved listing that HAC uses and the pool is not a permanent installation and is on the back side of the house on a side facing away from the historic district and cannot be seen there.

Action: Mr. Heckrotte made a motion to vote on the application as submitted. Mr. Bird seconded the motion.

Disposition: Approved by unanimous vote.

J. Moore, 179 E. 4th Street

Replacing flooring on front porch in kind.

Action: Mr. Heckrotte made a motion to vote on the application as submitted with the proviso that the porch floor be painted and it can be pressure treated. Mr. Hentkowski seconded the motion.

Disposition: Approved by unanimous vote.

EMERGENCY REPAIRS

The Dutch House, 32 E. 3rd Street

Repair garden pergola damaged by snow.

Discussion: A representative from the Arasapha Garden Club presented to HAC. It is believed the weight of the snow on the vine on top of the pergola is the cause.

Action: Mr. Heckrotte made a motion to vote on the application as submitted. Mr. Bird seconded the motion.

Disposition: Approved by unanimous vote.

J. Cannon, 228 E. 2nd Street

Replace roof.

Discussion: Mr. Heckrotte believes the roof is fine; it is the gutter that is falling off. He suggested refusing the application and to inform the applicant to return with something more descriptive of what the house needs. There is no mention about the gutter on the application and they can't replace the roof and leave the gutter the way it is. We have previously approved work to the gutter and told the applicant to put it back where it belongs.

Action: Mr. Heckrotte made a motion to vote on the application as submitted with the proviso that the applicant come back to HAC and inform us how he is going to fix his gutters along with the roof. We approve the idea he will fix his roof but also require that he put his gutter back (it is a built-in internal gutter). Mr. Bird seconded the motion.

Disposition: Approved by unanimous vote.

J. Kirk, 26 W. 3rd Street

Replace roof with weathered wood blend color shingles

Action: Mr. Heckrotte made a motion to vote on the application as submitted. Mr. Bird seconded the motion.

Disposition: Approved by unanimous vote.

K. Mann, 114 E. 4th Street

Remove and replace flat roof

Action: Mr. Heckrotte made a motion to vote on the application as submitted. Mr. Bird seconded the motion.

Disposition: Approved by unanimous vote.

B. Daly, 41 E. 4th Street

Replace back half roof – leaking

Discussion:

Action: Mr. Heckrotte made a motion to vote on the application as submitted. It is our understanding this is a wood shingled roof and we approve it as wood shingles, not shakes. If this is not the case and there is already asphalt on it HAC wants to know. Mr. Bird seconded the motion.

Disposition: Approved by unanimous vote.

EMERGENCY REPAIRS (Contd.)

M. Chesson, 411 Harmony Street

Replace rear flat roof, cedar shingles on front roof and weathered wood blend shingles on upper front roof.

Action: Mr. Heckrotte made a motion to vote on the application as submitted with the proviso that the cedar shingles be replaced with cedar shingles and not shakes. Mr. Bird seconded the motion.

Disposition: Approved by unanimous vote.

R. Briggs, 211 E. 2nd Street

Repair or replace two (2) pieces of cracked siding in kind. Replace flat roof.

Action: Mr. Heckrotte made a motion to vote on the application as submitted. Mr. Hentkowski seconded the motion.

Disposition: Approved by unanimous vote.

R. Vukelich, 33 The Strand

Cover chimney flue with slate/wire. Venting roof with ridge vents under shingles at peak and gutters. Note: both applications voted on in one motion.

Action: Mr. Heckrotte made a motion to vote on the applications as submitted. Mr. Bird seconded the motion.

Disposition: Approved by unanimous vote.

OLD APPLICATIONS

M. Koch, 29 W. 4th Street

Re-pointing house.

Discussion: Multiple descriptions of proposed work were provided on the application that have been dealt with in the past; however, no sample has been provided to date.

Action: Mr. Heckrotte made a motion to vote on the application as submitted which in this case is for only the re-pointing that is visible on Foundry Street and wherever else on the property it may be and he strongly suggested that a member of HAC visit the property and be shown a sample. It is noted that the rest of the house has already been re-pointed and this application is for re-pointing. Mr. Bird seconded the motion.

Disposition: Approved by unanimous vote.

D. Walz, 31 E. 4th Street

Returning with details to build front porch.

Discussion: The sketches provided do not have dates on them. It is unclear what the applicant is requesting. Mr. Heckrotte questioned the drawings for the front porch as not being to scale and the sketch for the main roof is not clear either. Commission members do not recall reviewing the sketches provided with the application prior to this meeting. Mr. Heckrotte asked if HAC has any idea of any additional information submitted by the applicant. Mrs. Monigle noted only what is on the agenda.

Mr. Heckrotte said the drawings are unclear as to what the applicant wants and he is not content with the quality of the drawings either.

Action: The application is being continued until further information is received.

OLD APPLICATIONS (Contd.)

D. Walz, 31 E. 4th Street

Returning with details to build front porch.

Action: Mr. Heckrotte made a motion to vote on the application as submitted.

Disposition: Approved by unanimous vote.

J. Selvaggi, 110 E. 4th Street

Returning with additional plans to demolish structure (August, 2009).

Discussion: HAC had requested to see the right-side elevation and there were questions about the sliding glass doors. The house is a close replica to the current house. The length of the house is a bit longer. The main part of the house is the existing footprint with a one-story addition on the back. HAC is concerned with the length and how narrow the building will be. Mr. Selvaggi believes the proportions of the house are not unlike most other row houses in the town. Mr. Bergstrom has seen the plot plan. Mr. Heckrotte raised the issue of the number of windows square footage on the left side (percentage of glass) and distance from the property line. The applicant has discussed same with Mr. Bergstrom and is still unsure whether the windows will be permitted. (*Discussion followed about the distance of both sides of the building to property lines, Code language, and installation of a fire sprinkler system.*) The proposed structure has the same width, if not a little more narrow, than the existing house. The current structure is not parallel to the sidelines (rectangular lot) but the proposed structure will be straightened. The applicant will be working with Mr. Bergstrom on the windows in relation to the fire code.

Action: Mr. Heckrotte made a motion to vote on the application as submitted with the proviso that the applicant will return to HAC if the design changes as a result of the Code. Mr. Bird seconded the motion.

Disposition: Approved by unanimous vote.

(The plot plan and a copy of the August 2009 HAC minutes were placed in a new jacket at the meeting.)

Approval of Minutes – Mr. Heckrotte made a motion to accept the minutes of 3/18/10. Mr. Bird seconded the motion.

Mr. Bird questioned the status of responses from the Library to questions/concerns that this Board has raised. They planned on attending this meeting. Mrs. Monigle has been in contact with Mr. Viola and there is the possibility they may wish to have a separate meeting to go over our concerns. They still have a funding problem. She offered they are working on what they can work on. They have not signed off with the contractor. We will follow up with them before our May meeting.

Old Business

Settlement of a Home on Bull Hill – Some time ago, at the recommendation of HAC, when houses were built at Bull Hill, they would be staggered and the result was that one or two of the homes have their front porch extending on the public way in a minor way. Several of the homes have been sold and resold. This housekeeping matter

Old Business (Contd.)

has come to light during the sale of one of those homes. It is now necessary for HAC to sign a document to be included in the paperwork for the sale of this home, and others, that certifies that HAC took this action some time ago.

Action: Mr. Heckrotte made a motion that HAC approve Mrs. Monigle signing on behalf of all HAC members in this matter. Ms. Hegvik seconded the motion.

Disposition: Approved by unanimous vote.

Tennis Court Sign – Mr. Bergstrom left an aluminum sign (30" X 30") to be displayed at the tennis court that HAC needs to review. It will be affixed to a chain-link fence. The tennis court is in the historic district.

Action: Mr. Heckrotte made a motion to vote for approval of the subject sign with the recommendation that it be smaller and be painted wood. Mr. Bird seconded the motion.

Disposition: Approved by unanimous vote.

Mr. Bird asked about the status of the submittal of a drawing for windows for an application for Toler, 213 Harmony Street that HAC previously reviewed.

Mrs. Monigle has spoken to the applicant's contractor who is now submitting a rendering of a 2 over 2 Marvin window.

Action: Mr. Heckrotte made a motion to approve the 2 over 2 window and we approve the putty-style profile to the woodwork on the exterior surfaces of the window. Mr. Bird seconded the motion.

Disposition: Approved by unanimous vote.

Dressler – Mrs. Monigle asked if Mr. Hentkowski had an opportunity to look at the window trim that has been added to the windows on the Dressler property. He has looked at it and it is better than it was. Photos were shown to Commission members. Ms. Hegvik expressed her concern with the homeowner setting precedent by not doing the work properly that is needed at the property. (*Discussion followed.*)

Adjournment

It was moved and seconded to adjourn the meeting. The meeting was adjourned at 7:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Debbie Turner

Debbie Turner, Stenographer