

Wilmington Design Review and Preservation Commission
Wednesday, November 20, 2019
Council Chambers

Commissioners Present: Peter von Glahn, Leo Lynch, Peter Jennings, Stuart Baron, Sandra Dolan, Edie Menser, Jay Macklin (Full Commission)

Staff: Rose Tassone DiNardo, Law; Pat Maley, John Kurth, Herb Inden, Planning

Administrative Business

Reading of the rules of procedure, Peter von Glahn

Minutes deferred until December

Old Business

Permit Referral DR-1603 R:1712 Lovering Avenue. Renovations to existing gas station; specifically remove and replace underground tank system, install a canopy over gas dispensers and install a double pole ID/price sign to meet franchise branding requirements. Forty Acres Neighborhood Conservation District. Resolution 34-19. REVISIONS TO ORIGINAL PROPOSED SIGN.

The presentation was made by Matthew Galasso representing the owner. He provided a handout for clarification of existing materials. In the original, the application had called for and had approved a 20' double pole (as required by the Gulf corporation). The station owner has now changed to an association with the Liberty Brand which necessitates a change in signage.

The application has taken into consideration neighborhood's comments. Liberty has a monument sign that is 6' tall x 4' wide with 19" concrete pad underground. The proposed Liberty sign will not be internally illuminated, and the portion of the sign displaying the price will be the only illuminated section. The sign's illumination will be shut off when store/station is closed. The previous station sign was 25' tall with 15' sq. ft for price sign section. The proposed sign is smaller – 24' sq. ft on each side.

Planning's Power Point slides were shown.

Mr. Galasso corrected the image to show that there is no credit card banner on proposed sign. On the site plan, the curved lot is 9' x 6' feet and they will move the sign as far into property as possible, 4' from the inside curb so that traffic visibility is not adversely impacted.

Peter von Glahn called the application, "straight forward and easy."

Community Comment

Bud Freel asked staff whether the canopy was part of the request and Pat Maley told him that was a ZBA issue. Mr. Freel noted he has been working with Mr. Galasso for several years to get the station revitalized (He elaborated verbally). He noted that the original 14' high original sign wasn't appropriate, and that the community supports this new request.

Peter Jennings read the prepared resolution starting at the 3rd whereas and skipping the litany of old work (17-point list). It was seconded by Leo Lynch and approved unanimously.

Peter Jennings noted typo on resolution number and was told "it shall be corrected".

Permit Referral DR-1624 R: 1015, 1017, 1019, 1021 Park Place. Request for renovation of residential apartment buildings. Cool Spring/Tilton Park City Historic District. Resolution 35-19.

Presentation was made by David Haney (Dave Dalby the architect was in the audience). Motion to raise from case the table was made by Stuart Baron, seconded by Peter Jennings, and approved.

The discussion began with a recounting of the subcommittee meetings. Mr. Haney noted there was to be a total renovation of the 4 units (2 have been combined in the last few months). He further noted the follow up to what was discussed in the meeting, saying he thinks they all came to an agreement.

Planning's Power Point slides were shown by John Kurth (same as July).

Peter von Glahn asked if it would help if he went through the decisions of sub-committee meetings and the Commission responded "yes."

Those sub-committee meetings covered the following areas

- Slate siding on upper floors

- NO new vinyl windows

- Vinyl windows would be acceptable on rear

- Gable compass windows were to be retained with trim to match the existing and infilled with louvers

- Breakthrough—slate and existing sidings in rear (not visible in or from Public Right of Way Hardie plank is ok

- Front there are 2 overhangs

- 2nd floor – original slates replaced with red asphalt roofing shingles – slate on 3rd floor and gable end

- Slate on 3rd floor and on main part of house has the characteristics of the era – flared bottom

Also, characteristic as compass windows

Subcommittee felt that this slate siding and other 2nd floor could be replaced with Hardie shingle that was scalloped – not duplicate but approximate it; Look should be approximately what it is now.

Developer felt that the amount of water damage in interior was due to slate siding, problems with flashings, etc. and felt that removing the slate was the only way to make a water tight envelop

Hardie plank is a mfg. product that comes in 4' sheet and can be nailed up. Half octagonal – problem with trying to replace in kind is that shakes are not standard – need to be cut one at a time.

Slates are not standard as today.

Volume of entire building is huge #

Developer thinks that is a more local design that what would have influenced Hardie plank

Trim at top of octagonal bays would be replaced and mimic the one surviving example

Repointing would be done as necessary with high lime mortar which would match the existing mortar being replaced.

Developer developed an update to the drawings.

Peter von Glahn said that he had looked through it and developed a list that itemizes what needs to be done to the drawings to bring them into line to meet what was discussed at that subcommittee meeting.

Specifically-

Change front façade to mandate the compass windows would be restored

Slate siding would be replaced (not patch)

Thinks it is possible to develop a scallop with Hardie Plank

Detailing of replacement trim/molding below the flare is called out

Peter von Glahn thinking this is where the developer is seeing this list. He asked “Can put this with the resolution with the list and say the corrected drawings need to be approved by Planning before permit will be issued?”

Stuart Baron stated that he appreciated the subcommittee that did all this work – for all those of us who were not part of the subcommittee.

Leo Lynch – for purposes of expediency – asked that Peter’s comments about the necessary changes to the submitted drawings be read aloud, just hitting the list highlights.

Drawings – A2.1-2.3

Rear drawings

Section drawing

Window schedule

Front – mandate the restoration of compass wind

For all for facades – remove all slate siding and replace with Hardie Shingle -

Flare at the bottom of the bays etc. would replace any other language that is there.

Trim profile below will be retained as flared - keeping look of building.

Brick pointing – major change - add the wording “matching the color of the mortar being replaced” (due to unsympathetically replaced sections so color varies over the buildings’ surfaces).

Trim at top above the siding on the octagonal bays (flapping metal).

Details of that trim would call out drawing 5.5

Call out for trim would be replace wood with Azek identical **as needed**

Drawing 5.5 – section

Design must match the single surviving tower trim

Lastly- the window schedule – there are some nits – some things listed on the materials schedules are not on drawings – drawings not labeled;

2 of drawings on that list need to be corrected to reflect the vinyl finish.

10-19 – window; 10-32 is the round compass - material should be wood or Azek

Same note elsewhere.

Option - scope of exterior renovations list needs to be updated to reflect the changes called out- as above. List is for internal consumption

Peter Jennings expressed appreciation to Peter von Glahn for the attention going over those schedules saying, “Thanks for your efforts.”

Dave Haney – “You mentioned in the scope of work – a question, if we could preserve slate - If we get in and identify that the slate is in decent shape, we could retain – questioning? If slate is viable and we are willing to save where we can but cannot save it everywhere – what is your choice between what the plans call out and what we discussed was to save where possible??

Peter von Glahn – “My opinion is that on the front facades it would be better to replace it all.” Leo Lynch agreed.

Front and side facades – replacement-

Further discussion – rear – remembrance is that the back - Hardie plank was encouraged but not mandated

Using the Power Point slides, Leo Lynch pointed out that the front will be redone – saving would be done on not primary facades.

Stuart Baron – “If there is a potential for water intrusion – they would have to be taken off to examine it anyway.”

Peter von Glahn – “The flashing around the windows was done with Tern metal which tends to rot over time. If we left the decision to the developer, you would have plenty of replacement slates. ...hardest part is finding a slate that matches.

Would we need to do anything on the drawings to do that? Call out the façade on the west wall of 1021 and treat that with Hardie shingle and three the other three sides as -

So, if we basically said – that A 2-5 (drawings) A2-2 is the exterior elevation in the rear
A2.5 will read essentially as front
A -2.8 scalloped is optional

Mr. Haney accepted the wording.

Peter von Glahn – “Would the commission as a group be willing to accept this as an approvable application?”

Leo Lynch – “I don’t see other changes. What we have here will cover the areas that are problematic for us...”

There was further discussion.
NO was left as a hanging answer,

Community Comments

Councilmember Bud Freel began by saying, “Thank you for having both these on the same agenda. These buildings have been eyesores for a number of years – a real challenge by the owners to keep them secure. When I left the building in July, I was pessimistic that these buildings will be rehabbed.
Thank you to planning and law and owners and commission to bring the compromise here. It is a fair compromise and I hope to see work in the very near future. I support the application.”

Peter von Glahn tackled the draft resolution, saying that he thought they had addressed the issues that were discussed by the Planning dept. “We could actually include that list as part of the resolution.” Instructions were given to Reference the PVG list as a separate attachment “A” or “1”

Performance condition #1

Changes to the application drawings that are listed in attachment # 1 will be made by the applicant and must be approved by the Planning dept prior to issuing the permit.

Peter von Glahn then recrafted the above resolution caveat that calls for Planning to review documents before building permit is issued.

All accepted the performance caveat, including the applicant.

The changed resolution was read into the record, it was seconded by Edie Menser and accepted unanimously.

Sandra Dolan expressed that the neighbors and neighborhood would be happy to hear that things are moving forward.

New Business

Permit Referral DR-1636: 708-710 North West Street. Request to replace windows and doors, perform maintenance repairs to wood shutters, trim and cornice, repaint the façade, replace siding, repair stucco and brick, and install a new rear fence. Quaker Hill City Historic District. Resolution 36-19.

Presentation was made by Chris Maserer of Architectural Alliance. Subject building is called the "Quaker Arts apartment building." It will be a 7300 sq. ft apartment building – vacant presently, it will have 8 apartments after work.

Front – replace 2/2 wood with new wood 2/2 Pella architectural series traditional wood home windows.

Replace wood door with 6 panel – Simpson wood door, retain door and window frames and just paint them.

Retain the existing transom & sidelights.

Repaint the brick off white to match existing.

Black shutters

Cornice – frieze trim and brackets – repair, sand and paint

Existing steel fence and gate on right side - paint

Front steps renovation work – with materials that match existing

Repair sand and paint rails on steps

Replace all windows with 1/1 Pella aluminum clad windows

Doors same as front on side – 6 panel wood traditional

Repair sand and paint existing trim and surrounds

Stucco off white – paint and repair as needed

Existing Hardie siding – keep or replace if necessary

Wood sills and headers - repair and paint

Replace vinyl soffits with ones that will match existing

North side – existing wood siding – replace with Hardie Shingle to match exposure

Non-painted exterior brick walls – repaint and repair

Add to replace gutters and down spouts

New roof shingles and EPDM

Chain line in rear that houses condensing – remove and build wood privacy fence

Fence on north – replace with privacy

Same on south façade

Remove half fence – one and half courses of CMU

Steel metal gate in rear – retain

South side of building – ADA accessible ramp - repair sand and paint and add code compliant rails

In rear – concrete staircase – remove concrete pipe rail – and replace with code compliant rail

Repair front sidewalk

Power point slides were verbally annotated by John Kurth.

Peter von Glahn called it a nice job and had no further comments.

Sandra Dolan also called it a very well-done application.

Leo Lynch – “They have been around – I appreciate the cleanliness of it.”

Stuart Baron asked about things replaced, saying he didn’t see materials other than the materials – fencing, roofing, etc. No information here about those.

They responded that the fencing will be wood privacy fence as shown on drawings (no separate cut); Roofing – typical EPDM; Area that has shingles will be replaced in kind with arch shingles same kind, same color.

This answered Mr. Baron’s questions.

Peter von Glahn noted one minor change – the addition of a caveat that existing Hardie Plank may be retained if conditions warrants. This was to give the applicant “wobble room.” All agreed.

Leo Lynch - -reads the prepared resolution – and with the wobble room already in resolution they dropped addendum; it was seconded by Sandra Dolan and approved unanimously.

Staff announced that the updates to Section 48- 428, 429 and 430 were accepted by City Council at the meeting on Thursday November 7th.

Motion to adjourn was made by Peter Jennings, seconded by Leo Lynch and approved unanimously.