

HISTORIC AREA COMMISSION
New Castle Town Hall
2nd and Delaware Streets
August 9, 2018

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

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

Absent: Jean Norvell

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

Approval of Minutes

Ms. Fontana was absent from the June 14, 2018, meeting and therefore had no comments on the Minutes from the June 14, 2018 meeting. Ms. Fontana asked for a Motion to accept the Minutes and advised that she would abstain from voting.

A Motion was made to approve the Minutes of the June 14, 2018 Meeting as presented. The Motion was seconded and approved.

NEW APPLICATIONS

116 Delaware Avenue – Jessop’s Tavern – Justin Day

Ms. Fontana expressed the Commission’s appreciation of the documentation provided prior to the Meeting and requested an overview of the Application.

Mr. Day advised that the Application was presented to approve an addition to the rear of the building to enlarge the kitchen, refrigeration, and add storage space. He added that the new refrigerator would be strictly for the kitchen, and the old walk-in would be for beer only. This would allow him to replace the old equipment and make it a long-draw system.

Mr. Marty Wright joined the meeting at 6:34 p.m.

Ms. Fontana noted that the two issues the Historic Area Commission would review are (1) the design element and (2) to send the Applicant forward to the Board of Adjustment for a variance or an easement. Mr. Bergstrom concurred that the HAC would approve the building bulk.

Ms. Fontana asked for clarification of the area where the Applicant wishes to expand. Mr. Day explained that it is an open back yard. Andrew Taylor, Esquire, added that there had

been a deck as well and asked Mr. Day to explain about the structural issues. Mr. Day noted that the back of 116 Delaware Avenue is starting to sag, and the renovation will address that issue. Mr. Taylor added that the current deck is being used to store canisters and empty kegs, and Mr. Day stated that the addition would eliminate using that area for storage as well. He added that neighbors agreed that the renovation would improve the look of the rear of the property. Mr. Taylor clarified that none of the renovations would be visible from the front of the property. Mr. Wright noted that it appeared none of the expansion is "public area." Mr. Day said that the improvements were expressly to the kitchen and storage areas, and that no tables were being added.

Mr. Baldini asked if the expansion was adequate for the long term, and Mr. Day advised that his expectation was that the renovation would increase the kitchen and storage areas sufficiently for the long term (i.e., 20 years). Mr. Wright clarified that the work is being done to the back of the "ice cream" store. Mr. Taylor distributed an aerial view of the property to the Commissioners for further clarification of the proposed addition. Ms. Fontana clarified that the width of the addition would not be the full width of the property. Mr. Baldini noted that from a mutually beneficial point, if the Application is approved, Jessop's Tavern will get the capacity they need and safety issues will be addressed, and the City will get the benefit of a clean-up in the back of the property. Ms. Fontana asked for clarification of the roof line, and Ms. Hamroun referred to Sheet A-201 that shows the property did have a flat roof. Mr. Jeff Stapen of Stapen Construction explained that the addition has a sloped roof that would take all the roof water run-off to where it goes now. Ms. Hamroun asked what the ceiling height of the addition would be at the second floor, and Mr. Stapen advised it would be 8'.

Mr. Wright asked why the Application was coming before the Historic Area Commission if the addition is not in front of the public right-of-way. Ms. Hamroun explained that when it comes to additions to existing buildings that are contributing buildings and new construction, it is always considered a Tier Two and needs to go to HAC for review. Mr. Wright clarified that the depth is parallel with the existing building with the exception of the steps. Ms. Hamroun noted that from HAC's perspective, based on the Guidelines, they look at new additions visibility from the public right-of-way and the relationship between the massing. She added that the Applicant's building and the adjacent buildings are contributing, and the adjacent building already has a fairly long mass in the back next to it, and that impacts the significance and appearance. The Applicant's property is a contributing building and the addition is not visible to the public right-of-way, which does allow some leeway in terms of the renovation. Ms. Hamroun also noted that scale of the addition, in terms of massing, is fairly significant. It is a tall addition and much bigger than what was there, and a deck and a porch is not the same thing as a three dimensional building. That must be taken into account; however, there has already been a fairly large addition next to it and there are others that are adjacent, which allows some leeway. Ms. Hamroun added that it would be preferable if the stairs were included to align with the back of the adjacent building by pulling it back 3', which would mean losing 3' in the addition. From the perspective of the roofline, Ms. Hamroun noted that the corner cricket being proposed could potentially create leaks. She added that the drawings did not show

Historic Area Commission Minutes
August 9, 2018

an elevation that cuts all the way through the street, but it appears the proposed roofline would not be visible from the public right-of-way because it is lower than the peak. She stated that if the massing could be reduced slightly, and the roofline is not visible from the public right-of-way, there should not be an issue.

Ms. Hamroun noted that the addition is in the back and next to an addition that has already impacted the perspective on both, so according to the Guidelines, the use of alternate materials would be acceptable. The siding recommended is engineered wood, which is an approved alternate material, as opposed to fiber cement. Anderson 400 series windows would be acceptable as well.

Ms. Hamroun stated that she would recommend approving the Application if the depth were adjusted. Mr. Baldini asked if the Application needs to move to the Board of Adjustment if the depth is adjusted, and Ms. Fontana explained that the Application would have to go to the Board of Adjustment regardless. Ms. Hamroun added that HAC would make recommendations, but in terms of the Code, the Board of Adjustment would still have to approve. Ms. Fontana asked how pulling the stairs back would impact the addition. Mr. Stapen explained that the architect moved the steps and landing to the rear because the entire project is being done by hand since the only access-way through which materials and equipment can be brought into the back yard is a 3' wide alley. If the stairs and landing are moved back, the contractor cannot get to the 3' wide alley behind the existing building. He added that the landing will line up with the height of the concrete alleyway in the back and that there is also a hardship with the HVAC since it is located in a 4' 10" high area underneath the addition. Ms. Hamroun asked how long the construction would take, and Mr. Stapen advised it would take approximately 60 days. Ms. Hamroun explained that she understood Mr. Stapen's concerns, but added that for 60 days he would have logistic issues bringing in equipment and materials vs. building a permanent stair and a permanent structure that is 3' deeper or wider. She did not feel the hardship puts into question the implementation of the project. Mr. Day explained that he needs as much space as possible to accommodate the necessary equipment, and moving the stairs would cause the loss of production and refrigeration space. Ms. Hamroun suggested shifting the refrigeration over and possibly going with a slightly smaller stainless steel table to accommodate the necessary clearance between the table and the existing sink as required by the Code. She added that the relocated rack might be able to be moved, and she did not think losing the square footage would put into question the whole functionality of the kitchen. She suggested that was a question to be discussed with the architect. Ms. Hamroun added that she would like to see drawings that right-size the addition before approving the Application.

Ms. Hamroun asked about the 3-1/2" step showing on the drawings between the existing kitchen and the addition, and Mr. Stapen noted that all the elevations are going to be changed and the floor foundation will be level. She added if that area is flush and the addition is right-sized, the prep table could be flipped to be parallel to the sink rather than perpendicular; and that would also give some leeway to keep the same size table, but right-size the addition.

Historic Area Commission Minutes
August 9, 2018

Ms. Fontana clarified that with the steps located as shown in the drawings, it brings them right up to the property line, and the only difference is that the steps extend beyond the existing building. Mr. Wright asked about the door on the second floor that appears on the A-201 elevation, and Mr. Day explained it was access to the second floor storage area. Mr. Wright asked if the height difference in the open storage is an 8' ceiling vs. the existing building. Ms. Hamroun noted that the ceiling height is not designated on the drawings, but they show that roof will be significantly higher on the addition. She added that it appears from the drawings the roof will be 2' higher on the back addition. Ms. Briggs asked Mr. Day which neighbors he spoke with regarding the addition, and he explained that he spoke with most of them, including the Museum, the Wismans, Ms. Joanne Mundy, and Barbara Kuczarski in back of the property, as well as property owners down the road. He added that he wanted to ensure the neighbors were comfortable with the proposed renovation.

Ms. Fontana clarified that engineered wood and Anderson 400 Series - clad windows would be used on the addition and that those materials are acceptable according to the Guidelines.

Ms. Fontana asked if the Commissioners had any additional questions or concerns regarding the location of the stairs, and Mr. Wright noted that he had no concerns with the stairs as they are shown in the drawings. Mr. Baldini stated that he was more concerned with the Code issues in the interior of the addition. He added that he felt it was essentially a go/no-go situation; however, Ms. Hamroun advised that was not the case. She added that would be an architectural conversation about right-sizing because there is nothing in the Code that mandates this particular size. During discussion, Ms. Hamroun explained that from an architectural perspective, reducing the square footage would not make the project a no-go, and that certain elements could be moved in order to right-size the addition. Mr. Day noted that it would be very helpful to have the additional 3'. Ms. Hamroun noted that Mr. Day would be losing 36 square feet. She added that the overall proposed addition is 25' long x 12' deep and reducing the square footage would make it 22' long x 12' deep, which does not right-size the addition to a point where it is non-functional.

During a discussion of the stairs, it was explained that there are two egress staircases; one leading into the kitchen and one leading into the open storage area. It was also noted that the stairs extend to the property line and the back fence, which is owned by the property owner to the rear. Mr. Wright clarified that maintenance of the fence was the responsibility of the property owner in the rear. Ms. Hamroun asked Mr. Bergstrom if there were any Code issues from an architectural perspective associated with the stairs going all the way to the property line and allowing full access to the rear elevations and having an area to be able to get through. Mr. Bergstrom advised that if the Board of Adjustment approves the Application, the stairs can be built to the specs.

In summary, Ms. Hamroun recommended that the Application be approved with a smaller addition that would tuck the stairs to match the rear line of the adjacent addition, and that the materials used be engineered wood for the siding and trim and Anderson 400-series windows.

Ms. Fontana clarified that if the Historic Area Commission approved the Application as is and the Application moves to the Board of Adjustment, the Board of Adjustment would have final say regarding any setback. Mr. Bergstrom concurred and Mr. Day noted that he understood that the Board of Adjustment could require the stairs be moved back.

Ms. Hamroun added that because it is not clearly stated and the whole elevation showing the section of the building on the street is not shown, it should be noted that it is clear that the top of the addition will be lower than the peak of the public/private way elevation and will not be visible.

Ms. Fontana clarified that the stairs, banister and balcony will all be engineered wood and no other materials will be used. It was noted that the drawings indicate pressure treated wood will be used and Ms. Hamroun stated that pressure treated wood was acceptable for the utilitarian stairs.

Ms. Fontana asked if the Commissioners had any additional questions or comments. There being no questions or comments from the Commissioners, Ms. Fontana asked for a Motion on the Application.

A Motion was made to approve the Application as presented with the stipulation of materials as follows:

- **Engineered wood will be used for all siding and trim**
- **Windows will be Anderson 400-Series - clad**
- **The top of the addition will be lower than the peak of the public right-of-way**
- **The exterior stairs are approved as presented on the drawings provided**

The Motion was seconded and unanimously carried.

Ms. Fontana noted that the Application would be sent to the Board of Adjustment.

As the original Application was not available, Mr. Bergstrom requested Ms. Fontana make notes of the specific material requirements on a copy of the Application for his records.

There being no further business, Ms. Fontana adjourned the meeting at 7:17 pm.

Kathy Weirich
Stenographer