

**Wilmington Design Review and Preservation Commission
Wednesday March 20, 2019**

Commissioners Present: Peter von Glahn, Sandra Dolan, William Krauss, Peter Jennings, Stuart Baron

Staff Present: Planning - Pat Maley, John Kurth, Herb Inden (Director);
Law - Rosemarie Tassone DiNardo

Reading of the rules of procedure was done by Chairperson Peter von Glahn.

Motion to accept the February meeting minutes was made by Sandra Dolan, seconded by Stuart Baron and approved by all except but Peter Jennings who was not present in February.

New Business

Permit Referral DR-1608: 723 North Market Street. Request from Tupp Signs to place a new sign with channel letters for “Boost Mobile.” Market Street City Historic District. Resolution 06-19. APPROVED

Presentation was made by Pietro Augustino Tupp Signs. He summarized the design as a Cloud ACM mount of letters – White letters on black background.

Planning’s Power Point slides were shown by John Kurth.

Peter von Glahn stated that he had no questions or comments – the application was pretty clear about what was being requested. He did ask about the method of attachment and was told the raceway will be attached with expansion anchors to sleeper washer, Top of letters, in mortar joints.

Mr. Krauss, Ms. Dolan and Mr. Jennings had no issues or questions.

There were no Public Comments.

Sandra Dolan reads the prepared resolution to approve the application as submitted; it was seconded by Peter Jennings and approved unanimously.

**Permit Referral DR-1609: 620 North Market Street. Request from 2 East 7th Street LLC to place 4 awnings above the storefront to “Bardea” to cover the outdoor seating area. Market Street City Historic District. Resolution 07-19.
DERFERRED BY OWNER REQUEST**

Permit Referral DR-1610: 837 North Market Street. Request for placement of signage for new business “El Diablo Burritos.” Market Street City Historic District. Resolution 08-19. APPROVED

Presentation was made by Shannon Stephens – partner for El Diablo Burritos. He stated they were asking for the “neon option” to continue the look they have in their other locations.

Peter von Glahn stated that the Commission had read the application

Planning’s Power Point slides were presented. The owner noted that they were thinking of the gooseneck lighting over the sign plate in both options.

Stuart Baron remarked about the “illustration NOT in hd, I presume” (NO). The options presented were paired – either both painted or both sandblasted.

Peter von Glahn reflected that there is no neon on Market Street at the moment. He had no objections because it is an old technology. He noted that the red area was also to be backlit near logo on flat sign, and that the neon was to be on top of the backlit sign.

Peter Jennings expressed that he liked the neon, and he liked this amount of neon on a sign.

Sandra Dolan was concerned about the brightness, but stated that her concerns had been answered. She referenced the small open signs on Market Street, and said she would like to see both used – the neon AND the gooseneck.

The owner clarified that neon used outside dims in the winter due to the temperature compared to outside florescent lights, so they will use both lighting methods. Mr. Krauss stated he had no concerns with the proposal and that it reminded him of when he was a kid and walked Market Street.

Stuart Baron stated that he would personally prefer that the building NOT have a textured sandblasted façade, so the steel backing is ok to him. He further suggested sanding away the steel and let it rust. He thought neon was not great – he does not find them to be attractive – but agreed that lighting is important for a business, and that if there is something that makes thing pop he would be in favor of that. He closed saying that the steel was preferable to the sandblasting for the sign surface.

Peter Jennings liked the history of neon. This led to a discussion of various neon applications in Wilmington being few and far between. The restaurant owner referenced Austin Texas for their signs.

Peter von Glahn had no objection to flat metal blade sign. It was noted that they will try to use joint insertion or existing holes as possible.

The sense of commission was that the neon sign with steel blade was acceptable.

William Krauss who read the prepared resolution raised the question regarding a paragraph in the resolution. It was determined that the answer was to create a second caveat specifying the approval of the neon sign option.

“2. caveat – Neon sign option is approved”

With this caveat, the resolution was seconded by Peter Jennings and approved unanimously.

Permit Referral DR-1611: 109 West 7th Street. Request for demolition of the building to make way for a multi parcel redevelopment for residential use. Referred under the demolition provisions of § 48-36(D). Resolution 09-19. TABLED AS INCOMPLETE

The presentation was made by Sarah Lamb and Mike Hare of Buccini Pollen Group. They summarized the recent acquisition of the three adjacent properties (103-107 W. 7th St), and the illegal expansions over 109 W 7th.

Planning's Power Point slides were shown.

Peter von Glahn noted for the Commission and anyone in attendance the reason this case for 109 W 7th Street is before DRPC is because of its Determination of Eligibility for the National Register of Historic Places status (DofE - NR) . The other adjacent properties fall only under the purview of the Urban Renewal area regarding demolition. He also noted that it was a shame that this building is slated for demo – it has a lot of character based on what the applicant supplied and does not seem to have been badly “remuddled” over the years, especially the front entrance. He noted further that the application had provided a chain of title, so DRPC also had the history to review.

Sense is that the analysis suggests salvage. It was noted that it would be wonderful if we could reuse the first floor element in the new building in some form as has been done on Market Street.

William Krauss stated it was a shame for this building to come down even though in studying this it is obviously necessary for the project that is going to replace it... A tough knot but necessary... We encourage the applicant that the architectural feature be incorporated in the new building main entrance to memorialize what was once there, but he would not necessarily mandate that.

Sandra Dolan stated she felt the same way, saying it would be nice if it could be incorporated in new building – exceptional pediment, detail, cornice and detail underneath.

She noted that at the very least, it could be recycled - would be great if they could make it work as a tribute.

Stuart Baron said the building is suffering unfortunate luck for being where it is and what it is next to. He found that sad because it seems that there is very little wrong with building. Once gone, no one will remember it was there. He had no problem with new design but did have problems with tearing down a perfectly good building. He continued that DRPC has had tougher cases – this is a perfectly solid building but keeping it would stifle redevelopment of the block. Nonetheless, he was disturbed by the tear down.

Peter Jennings observed that the new corner crated by new building is pretty strong - incorporation of the existing entrance elements would be pretty difficult. He did note that he would like to see the entrance element preserved.

Discussion turned to the fact that one of requirements of the Commission was having the discussion of why the building can't be reused. Given the scale of the building compared to what you're doing, the commission was not convinced that this building has to be torn down. They observed that the building is unique – and they were not convinced that they should approve until they have evidence from applicant about what they have done as due diligence for the possibility of reuse. They were not convinced that this building cannot be incorporated into the new use of that block.

The Commission expressed an inclination to table for lack of information because the applicant's packet did not meet the requirements set forth in §49-36.

Mike Hare asked if they (as applicant) could address this here?

This led to a discussion with Peter von Glahn about Planning had put the case on the agenda, so BPG had presumed the materials were sufficient (***NB - staff is required to put a case on the agenda by the time lines within the City Code sections we use or the case can be declared to be approved because no action was taken on it. Likewise, the Commission has the power to declare the case to be incomplete which stops the clock – but that action has to come from Commission, not staff.***)

William Krauss moved that the application be tabled for lack of information; this was seconded by Peter Jennings and the tabling was approved unanimously.

Staff told the applicant that usual procedure was the case would be automatically rolled onto the April agenda unless o further materials were received.

Motion to adjourn was made by Sandra Dolan, seconded by Peter Jennings and approved unanimously.