

HISTORIC AREA COMMISSION
New Castle Town Hall
2nd and Delaware Streets
June 8, 2017

Present: Laura Fontana, Chairperson
David Baldini
Lynn Briggs
Jean Norvell
Marty Wright

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

The meeting was convened at 6:30 p.m. Roll call followed. A quorum was declared.

Approval of Minutes – A correction was noted on page 1, ONC Investments. **A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes of the 5/11/17 meeting as amended. Motion was approved.**

NEW APPLICATIONS

18 East Fourth Street, Paul Hannum

Replace 5 front and 2 rear double-hung windows.

Discussion: Applicant Paul Hannum and contractor David Undorf presented. Mr. Hannum said this is an old home and he has done significant renovations over the past four years. He wants to replace five front and two rear windows both six over six, double hung windows. None of the windows are original to the house. (Photo provided.) Mr. Hannum believes that putting an aluminum storm and screen window on top of the muntin destroys the effect of the munion window.

Mr. Undorf has previously used HAC-approved Jeld-wen wood pocket replacement windows, double hung, simulated divided light, wood exterior with interior shadow guard between the glass, and energy efficient. They fit perfectly between the exterior trim. Current guidelines call for true divided light. He has found that all major window manufacturers, except for Marvin, no longer make true divided light windows. Mr. Undorf said the cost of the Marvin windows increased substantially for true divided light. The only other option is to use a true divided, single pane window which requires putting the storm windows back on to be energy efficient. The applied muntins simulate six over six lights. The smallest Marvin true divided light window muntin width is 1-11/16th inches wide. This is not acceptable for a historic house. Mr. Undorf has used Jeld-wen windows on several buildings in the City and noted some of those buildings. He added that looking at the front of those buildings the Jeld-wen windows look good.

Ms. Hamroun noted the guidelines state that windows at street elevation should be wood, true divided light, and should replicate what was previously there. The criteria is more stern in the updated guidelines. There are five windows in the front, the two windows in the back are not visible from the public right of way and can be simulated lights. Regarding the cost, Ms. Hamroun notes that HAC's responsibility is only the appropriateness of an

application and not the cost impact/financial hardship. However, this does not mean HAC should not help applicants to find other, more cost-effective solutions. HAC does not make recommendations as to specific products, but Ms. Hamroun's research revealed 2-3 manufacturers that carry guideline-approved, true-divided light wood windows with insulated glazing. She will provide contact information to Mr. Undorf. One manufacturer of Kolbe windows, others also provide true-divided light windows, with 1-1/8 inch muntin. She said that true divided light has a feel and texture that is more appropriate and warranties are getting better. She is fine with going with a slightly larger muntin if the applicant can get the insulated glazing that gives energy efficiency. It is critical to maintain the main façade of the building.

Mr. Hannum expressed his displeasure seeing asphalt shingles on 18th century houses and aluminum storm and screen windows on 18th century houses in the City. He asked if the muntin size and number of panes of glasses are so critical why allow them to be covered by an aluminum screen window. Ms. Hamroun said in terms of preservation, storm windows with thin aluminum panes and clear glass allow you to maintain the fabric that is behind them. The storm windows are reversible and removable. Mr. Hannum has difficulty understanding the rationale of the guidelines.

Ms. Hamroun explained that accepting storm windows in historic districts was seen as a compromise. People having traditional conforming windows that underperform because of a single glaze that was allowed because it is a modern addition that is clearly stated what it is, but from a preservation perspective it can be easily removed, is easily reversible, and not mean to stay. It is not a perfect compromise, but the threshold in this case is that the front windows should be true divided lights that exhibit the true fabric that should be on the façade on the street. If you want the Jeld-wen windows, then HAC will authorize as long as you keep that historic fabric with the true divided lights.

Energy efficiency windows – Ms. Hamroun said if the applicant goes with traditional, there are traditional materials that work better. What is significant in a historic building is not just the appearance, it is the actual materials that are used.

Mr. Undorf confirmed there are true divided lights on the second floor; they are not the original windows. The first floor windows are covered up with storm windows.

Mr. Undorf asked if Kolbe makes a wood pocket replacement window. Ms. Hamroun believes they do make such a window and will follow up with them.

Mr. Baldini noted that since the supplier can give the applicant a different muntin, can they match it to be historically correct so that all we are trading off is true divided versus simulated, and do we gain something rather than having true divided light. He wonders if we are looking to be historically correct, is this an effective compromise. Ms. Hamroun said there is a question of depth, perception and shadows associated with simulated lights versus true divided.

Ms. Fontana stated the guidelines for contributing buildings like this building do not state that true divided lights are mandatory, rather they are preferred. She believes there is room for conversation about what is appropriate. Ms. Hamroun said it is part of her professional responsibility to lay out the preferred option. It is up to HAC to make a determination.

Mr. Undorf understands Ms. Hamroun's position concerning true divided light. The rules do not specifically state they must be used. Mr. Undorf thinks a 5/8-inch muntin is much

more accurate than a true divided light. He has been permitted to use the former windows for years. Ms. Hamroun underscored that if HAC goes in the direction of simulated lights, they can become the rule. She said HAC should look at other true divided and simulated lights than what we currently have. Kolbe and Avalon manufacturers offer a thinner muntin. She advised that HAC should move cautiously. She will provide the information she has from both manufacturers to Mr. Undorf. Mr. Undorf can get a muntin as narrow as 5/8-inch. An appropriate muntin for this window is something that has evolved over time. Thinner is better. Mr. Undorf said a 3/4-inch muntin is the widest that should be used to replicate these windows. All five windows are six over six and double hung. The width of the windows is 45 inches (upstairs) and 54 inches (bottom).

Mr. Hannum said the structure was converted to a market at one time. He has a 10 ft. ceiling on the first floor, which is not common for Colonial homes. The roof was flattened, the size doubled, and the upstairs windows became smaller. The second floor ceiling is less than 6 ft.

If HAC votes to approve simulated lights, Ms. Hamroun would still strongly recommend the applicant to follow up with Kolbe and Avalon or other manufacturers. They may find something more cost effective and possibly a better product.

Mr. Undorf is open to contacting multiple manufacturers that will supply him with different materials that would be approved in the future. As a contractor in the City he will explore all options.

Deliberations by Commissioners and Ms. Hamroun followed.

Action: Ms. Fontana made a motion to approve the application as presented. Mr. Baldini seconded the motion.

Disposition: A roll call vote was taken. The motion was approved by a vote of 4 in favor and one against (Wright).

152 East Second Street, Greg & Susan Fogarty

Replace existing shed with new 14 ft. X14 ft. shed in rear of the property.

Discussion: Mrs. Fogarty was present. Ms. Fontana explained that HAC only deals with scope and size within our limitations, i.e. architectural design and the City Building Department has its own rules and regulations concerning setbacks, easements, etc. The size of the shed does not meet City Code currently. The applicant needs to make a decision about size. HAC will not know the size of the shed tonight because the applicant may make

changes to it. HAC will deal with architectural components tonight. The permit says 14 ft. X 14 ft. and the Mr. Fogarty's letter says 10 ft. X 16 ft. and 12 ft. X 16 ft. Per City Code the shed must be smaller or the applicant needs to go to the Board of Adjustment to request a variance.

Ms. Hamroun reviewed the application. It is located in the rear of the property and is not visible. She expressed her appreciation for the comprehensive application. (*Information provided included the applicants' preferred plan and an optional plan.*) The shed selected is acceptable as it relates to materials and layout. Ms. Hamroun stated the lot is very tight. She prefers a larger setback (option 2 alternate) and the size of the shed to be smaller in order to balance better. Ms. Hamroun strongly recommends going with a smaller shed with a larger setback on the sides. From an architectural standpoint the material and design are all appropriate and it is not visible.

Mr. Wright asked if the building is contributing or non-contributing. Ms. Hamroun said it is a contributing building, the addition (shed) in the back of the property and is not visible from the right of way. It is replacing another shed on the property. Mr. Wright does not see this application as being under the purview of HAC. It has nothing to do with what is visible to the public right of way and it is not connected in any way to the structure; we should not be considering the application. Ms. Hamroun explained that part of the HAC review process states that whenever you have an addition or new construction there is the potential for impact on the historic district; namely, an addition in the back in an area that is not visible from the public right of way may impact the overall appearance of the property and district and is something that HAC does review. The guidelines state that if it is not visible from the public right of way then there is more leeway in terms of material and scale, but HAC does look at not just the individual building but how it affects the whole lot and how it affects the overall district. Whenever there is new construction (i.e., shed replacement) or a new addition that triggers a review by HAC. The determination of what is appropriate or not appropriate is determined by whether it is visible from the right of way.

Ms. Fontana stated the current shed is purple and a certain amount of it can be seen from the right of way. Ms. Hamroun informed that this is because of the shed's location and the setback of the adjacent property's driveway.

Mr. Baldini noted there is no power and no air conditioning in the current shed. They are suggesting both amenities for the new shed. He wonders if the added amenities qualify the shed for something other than a shed. According to Mr. Bergstrom, the definition for an accessory building is storage, shed, garage, or playhouse. Ms. Hamroun added this is a Building Code Official determination and he would need to make sure all criteria are met before HAC looks at it from an architectural and design perspective.

Mr. Wright -- The application is for a 14 ft. X 14 ft. shed. He questioned whether that is something HAC needs to approve or disapprove. Ms. Hamroun reiterated that HAC does have purview. If HAC did take action she suggested we could deny the application because other matters (such as the Board of Adjustment variance) have to be determined. She

added that if the applicant returns after approvals with a shed that meets a Tier I review standards, then the applicant would not need to appear before the full HAC.

Mr. Bergstrom said that HAC could approve the application at a size that meets City Code. He has not seen a survey plan to suggest a size. However, setbacks are roughly 5 ft. away from the property line and 10 ft. from the house.

Ms. Fontana noted that HAC is not approving a 14 ft. X 14 ft. shed. We will approve a shed that fits within City Code. If the applicant wants to go outside City Code they will need to go to the Board of Adjustment for approval. Ms. Hamrout added that HAC is considering approving a shed of this design and material that meets the current requirements for setback. If the applicant wants to go to the Board of Adjustment for a variance then HAC would recommend a shed that meets current Code because the smaller size would be preferable.

Action: Ms. Fontana made a motion to approve the shed design and materials as presented to HAC. We would provide guidance to go with option 2 and make sure the shed fits within the City Code, meaning a slightly smaller shed or look at options for the Board of Adjustment. Ms. Norvell seconded the motion.

Disposition: The motion was approved by unanimous vote.

Adjournment -- There being no further business to address, the meeting was adjourned at 7:25 p.m.

Debbie Turner
Stenographer