

HISTORIC AREA COMMISSION  
New Castle Town Hall  
2<sup>nd</sup> and Delaware Streets  
May 17, 2018

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

Also Present: Leila Hamroun, Architectural Consultant

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

Mr. Baldini noted instances in the minutes where references to Mr. Baldini should be revised to reference Jeff Bergstrom instead.

**Approval of Minutes –A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes of the 4/18/18 meeting as amended. Motion was approved.**

Ms. Fontana advised that there were two Applications before the Commission.

**OLD APPLICATIONS**

**155 East 2<sup>nd</sup> Street – Mark and Erin Chaump**

Ms. Fontana asked Mr. Bergstrom to provide background as to why the Applicants were before the Commission. Mr. Bergstrom advised that the Applicants made a re-submission of their previous Application to construct a second floor balcony on the back of their house. He noted that the re-submission is a modification to eliminate a first floor screened-in porch and shortening the second-floor deck, which complies with the required setback.

Ms. Hamroun noted that the previous Application indicated the porch would be wood and the revised Application indicates it would be PVC railing and Azek Clad. She indicated the setback and shorter porch is acceptable; however the materials should be wood. Mr. Bergstrom advised that he spoke with the Applicants' contractor regarding materials, and it was agreed that the appropriate materials would be used. Ms. Fontana clarified that the required setback is acceptable, and that the Applicants are agreeable to using wood instead of PVC. She added that there were no other design elements for the Commission to review. Mr. Chaump stated that the only other consideration was the proposed paver patio on the first floor and that they would use whatever materials the Commission recommended. Ms. Hamroun advised the patio would be a Tier One review.

Ms. Fontana clarified that the setback is met, that materials used would be wood, and that the paver patio is a Tier One approval.

**A Motion to approve the proposal as modified was made and seconded.**

**Public Comments:**

**Dr. Bernadette Ruf – 157 East 2<sup>nd</sup> Street**

Dr. Ruf requested clarification on what is being proposed, and whether the construction was being considered to be on the front of the house since there has been a ruling that the

alley is a street. Ms. Fontana advised that it was a 25' setback, which complies with the setback requirement.

Dr. Ruf expressed her concern that a decision on the proposed 2<sup>nd</sup> floor deck was premature because a Ruling had not yet been reached by the Court, noting that the setback rules could change and the proposed structure might have to be removed. Ms. Fontana reiterated that it is the back of a home. Ms. Hamroun advised that if at some point it was considered front of house, the structure would have to be transformed; however, she could only speak to the materials at this time and it is currently considered the back of house. She confirmed the materials and depth of proposed construction are appropriate, and the proposed materials (except for the balcony and railing) would be appropriate for a street front porch, if setbacks were appropriate. Mr. Wright added that the Commission cannot decide on what may happen in the future.

Dr. Ruf also expressed her concern for personal privacy. Ms. Hamroun advised that other residences in the City have a back porch with a 2<sup>nd</sup> floor balcony and that she did not believe it was non-compliant per the building code to have a first floor porch with a deck above in the back yard, asking Mr. Bergstrom to confirm if that is the case. Ms. Fontana noted that the discussion before the Commission is only regarding the balcony outside the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor bedroom and that the Applicants were not building out past the current allowable setback.

**Kathy Thomas – 153 East 2<sup>nd</sup> Street**

Ms. Thomas asked to see the plans proposed for the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor balcony. She noted that the Board of Adjustment's Decision that the right-of-way to the rear of the property is a street might make the location of the proposed addition the front yard which would change the setbacks. She clarified that it was still back of house and what was being discussed by the Commission was approval of a 3' wide balcony on the back of the house.

Dr. Ruf noted that the diagrams of the properties on East 2<sup>nd</sup> Street from Mr. Bergstrom's office in the original application show neighboring houses extend further back than the Chaumps' house, which is incorrect.

**An Amended Motion to approve the changes as proposed and modified by the Commission that the structure and railing be painted wood was made and seconded. The Motion was approved.**

**Bob Calhoun – 153 East 2<sup>nd</sup> Street**

Mr. Calhoun noted that at a previous HAC Meeting it was reflected that the Applicants had contacted the neighbors and showed them design plans; however, he stated that did not occur. He requested that in the future neighboring residences of Applications be given the opportunity to see the proposed plans in advance of HAC Meetings.

**NEW APPLICATIONS**

**Robert Davis - 24 East 3<sup>rd</sup> Street**

**Application 01539-119 – Permit #23529**

**Construction of screened-in porch.**

Mr. Andy Consiglio of Bluewing LLC appeared for the property owner. Ms. Fontana asked Ms. Hamroun for an overview as to why this was not a Tier One Review. Ms. Hamroun advised that normally an addition or new construction is by default meant to be a Tier Two Review. Ms. Hamroun advised the choice of materials conforms with HAC Guidelines; however, when dealing with new constructions or additions, a site plan showing the relationship of new and existing, and pictures are required. Mr. Consiglio stated that Mr. Bergstrom had advised him of this requirement, and he provided the Commission with copies of additional supporting documentation. He provided pages pulled from the New Castle County website: Page 1 shows the location of the property on the lot. Page 2 shows an actual outline of the footprint of the existing property and the dimensions. He drew a 10'x14' addition off the back of the house and showed the lot depth. The depth is 106' front to back, with 62' existing of the structure. The Application proposes an additional 10', which leaves 34' from the back of the existing structure to the property line. The back of the house is 21' wide, and the structure will be centered on the back of the house. Mr. Consiglio submitted additional sketches for the record. Mr. Consiglio explained that the proposed structure would be a screened-in porch centered on the back of the house with decorative millwork, and a 36" screen door on one side. The site currently has a herringbone design brick patio. Mr. Consiglio advised that the bricks would be removed and numbered to ensure correct placement when they are replaced. The design calls for eight posts. The porch will have cedar wood siding on the gable ends to match the house and the shed, with cedar shake shingles on the roof. The elliptical archways will have fluted columns made from Mahogany. Ms. Hamroun stated that with the additional information and sketches provided, the proposed work complies with the Guidelines. Ms. Hamroun confirmed that she had reviewed the description of the proposed work, including the scope of work, choice of materials, description of the work and details of the porch materials, and it complies with the Guidelines. Ms. Hamroun added that the additional information received shows the exact location of the structure and the relationship with the existing building and confirmation that it is not visible from the public right-of-way. Mr. Wright asked what material was proposed for the ½" round gutters. Mr. Consiglio advised the gutters would be aluminum with one round downspout. A discharge flex-pipe on the right side will be buried to expel water away from the house. Mr. Consiglio asked the Commission regarding the use of PVC in the City of New Castle and was advised it was not suitable in the Historic District especially if it can be seen from the public right-of-way.

There being no further questions, Ms. Fontana asked for a Motion to approve the Application.

**A Motion that the Application as presented and with additional information be approved was made and seconded. The Motion was carried.**

Mr. Consiglio will work with Mr. Bergstrom to move forward. Ms. Hamroun made a point of order that she mis-spoke regarding the Guidelines noting that on contributing buildings

if it is not visible from the public right of way a Tier One Review is acceptable. The application as submitted did not have enough information to make a determination; this could have been a Tier 1 review if information on the location (not visible from the public right-of-way) had been provided. Mr. Bergstrom asked what would touch the bricks. Mr. Consiglio explained the plinth block would be decorative woodwork, and the weight would be supported by the footer. The plinth block will be at grade level. Mr. Bergstrom suggested that some borrell be placed at the base of the plinth blocks to deter insects. Ms. Hamroun suggested that when Mr. Consiglio brings the actual building permit back a discussion can be held to determine if an alternate material at the low base that is not really visible but is more moisture resistant, or a termite shield, would be acceptable.

#### **412 Delaware Street**

Ms. Fontana asked for an update on the Application for a new sign in front of the building for Park Salon at 412 Delaware Street. Mr. Bergstrom advised that the Application was to replace a sign that had been destroyed over time. The new sign is wood and mimics the original sign, and this was considered a Tier One Review. Ms. Fontana noted that the new sign looked much bigger than the original sign. Ms. Hamroun stated that the Applicant had been asked to reduce the size of the sign, and she and Mr. Bergstrom will inspect the sign to ensure the size was reduced.

**A Motion to adjourn was made and seconded.**

**Adjournment** -- There being no further business to address, the meeting was adjourned at 7:08 p.m.

Kathy Weirich  
Stenographer