

**Wilmington Design Review and Preservation Commission**  
**Wednesday, May 15, 2019 Meeting**  
**City Council Chambers**

**Commissioners Present:** Peter von Glahn, Stuart Baron, Peter Jennings, Leo Lynch

**Staff Present:** Rose Tassone diNardo, Law; Pat Maley, Herb Inden, & Dorian Snyder, Planning

**Administrative Business** - Reading of the procedures and deferral of April minutes.

**New Business**

**Permit Referral DR-1614: 802 West 11<sup>th</sup> Street. Request for replacement of windows front and rear. Trinity Vicinity City Historic District. Resolution 12-19.**

Theresa Tursi, homeowner, presented the request for replacement of windows on 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> floors, front and back. Because they have vinyl on the rear left over from previous owner, they wish to replace the deteriorated widows with vinyl. They will replace the front windows with clad wood if required.

Planning's Power Point slides were narrated by Pat Maley, showing the existing conditions in front, and the non-visibility from the street of the rear section where the vinyl windows are.

Commission discussion

Peter von Glahn - the window in the front bathroom – can have frosted glass to provide privacy. He noted that the Commission has never approved vinyl on front facades – rarely on rear facades except when there is no visibility (as is here, where they are invisible from the street, making vinyl in the rear acceptable).

Leo Lynch – in being consistent, the rear due to lack of visibility is not a problem – the front is the issue. Vinyl is unacceptable in the front.

Stuart Baron – the only question he had was whether the rear windows could be seen from adjoining street – but slides show that is not the case.

Peter Jennings expressed that he wanted to see wood windows in the front which led to a discussion about the clad windows.

Petr von Glahn led the discussion about the geometry of the clad windows. He further covered keeping the stained-glass window – but it is not our purview. We are not

concerned about the type of glass in the windows – any option (stained, pebbled, etc) is acceptable. Only the material of the windows and the geometry is within our purview.

Theresa – can the front be a wood composite or a clad window? (elaborated extensively).

A teaching discussion at a level the applicant could understand about such alternatives ensued.

Theresa says she only asked for clad because there are so many options. She stressed that she is “not planning in living in this home until she is 95.”

Peter von Glahn suggested that she stay with a brand that the Commission had approved because the previously approved products had been vetted for elements such as matching the geometry of historic windows. He noted that Pella had put out one such product. He explained that there are many companies that make windows, but most are for new construction and that is “a different animal” than what they were talking about (historically accurate windows for placement in an historic building). There is a smaller number of vendors that make replacement windows that match the geometry and tensile strength needs that are historically correct.

Stuart Baron stated that he did not “know where we are now” because of the non-specificity of the discussion, and that without the specificity or sticking with the brands the application had specified, he is not comfortable supporting the application.

Peter von Glahn harkened back to the previous cases in which a product was specified with the descriptor “or equivalent” which allowed the case to move forward. This seemed to satisfy the need for a benchmark in the resolution of this case.

Rose Tassone diNardo agreed that this was acceptable.

Public comment

Jessica Moleni - President of Trinity Vicinity Neighborhood Association

Noted that she was not presenting a specific view from TVNA but stating the need for a publication that could provide specifics for a homeowner when shopping for windows. Discussion ensued.

Per von Glahn – an interesting thought. It should be possible to come up with a guidance document.

Pat Maley – are you looking for a doc with specifics to take into Lowe’s and say “I am buying this document.

Jessica - something to help those who don’t have the skill set to determine like for like

Pat – you would not always end up back in this room. Planning is the first filter.

Discussion at length of the specific and the or equal to concept.

“We shouldn’t have to come to the meeting and ask thousands of questions.”

Pat noted that because it is a CHD we do not want to turn over a final say...

“We are not here to constrain, we are here to protect – we are public servants.”

Pat offered to work with Jessica to create a guidance document. This offer was accepted.

Peter von Glahn – sense of the Commission is that we will accept the application. We will add the following caveat:

Caveat –

1. Other manufacturer’s replacement windows may be substituted for DR 200 with approval of Planning Department. If agreement cannot be reached the decision must return to DPRC for their decision.

Peter read the resolution with the caveat.

It was seconded by Leo Lynch, and approved unanimously.

**Permit Referral DR-1615: 704 West Street. Request from Ministry of Caring for modifications for handicapped access and updating of facility. Quaker Hill City Historic District. Resolution 13-19.**

Mike Fiella of Architectural Alliance made the presentation for the Ministry of Caring. The project seeks to do minor renovations within the building, replacing and repairing materials as needed and on the exterior to introduce a new handicapped ramp to the front facade to allow creation of a handicapped unit on the first floor. Planning’s Power Point slides were shown.

Commission chairperson stated there was good documentation on all elements except the ramp and that lacking that, he had trouble approving this. Architect pointed out the plan view on page 18 of the application and the elevation view on cover sheet, and the commission accepted an additional copy of ramp view to meet the documentary needs.

Leo Lynch called it “Honesty well done – documented clearly and it is not an enormous ramp. Railing will fit in with neighborhood.”

Stuart Baron said it sounded good.

Leo Lynch read the prepared resolution, it was seconded by Peter Jennings and approved unanimously.

**Permit Referral DR-1616: 1711 Delaware Avenue. Request to modifications of front façade for new restaurant. Forty Acres Neighborhood Conservation District. Resolution 14-19.**

Andrea Sikora, the restaurant business owner and tenant made the presentation, referencing the submitted documentation for the modifications to the commercial building.

Planning's Power Point slides were narrated by Pat Maley.

Peter von Glahn called the proposed work all improvements and said he had no comments on the current proposal. One "going forth" suggestion he made was when they come back for the sign, ask about the installation of a gate for the alleyway. Overall, he had no objections.

Leo Lynch had no comments he wished to express.

Peter Jennings voiced approval of the proposal.

There were no community comments.

Peter Jennings read the resolution, requesting that they drop wording about the sign for now. With this modification, it was seconded by Stuart Baron and approved by all.

**Permit Referral DR-1617: 501 West Street. Request for installation of a mini-split system. Quaker Hill City Historic District. Resolution 15-19.**

Chris Gays, vendor, made most of the presentation, accompanied by homeowner Fr. John McVoy in the audience. They seek to install the condenser unit of a mini-split air conditioning system on the rear second floor deck of the home to supply cold air to the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor of the building.

Planning's Power Point Slides were narrated by Pat Maley.

Peter von Glahn requested that the line set cover be painted to blend into the mansard background to visually make it disappear (a dark gray). He specifically mandated that they not make it more visible by using the off-white line hide.

Pat Maley of Planning staff describes why and how to do as the chairperson had just asked.

Peter von Glahn talks about how to match color properly.

Peter Jennings also called for the fixing of the top of the chimney which was shown in their photos to be damaged and needing repair.

Stuart Baron started to read the resolution as prepared, and then the discussion turned to the need for a clarification of exactly where the unit will be placed. Referred methodology to document such placement was called out as a plan view of the roof to scale showing exactly where the unit will be, showing where the bump outs for the windows will be and where the unit will sit.

Discussion ensued touching on exterior unit color (white) – should DRPC require the unit to be painted/blended if visible from the street (yes), discussion of changing photo vantage point to assess visibility (should be done), discussion of color. For this application, the Commission called for the need to have an elevation view of that wall - straight on. TO move the project along, they stated that because they did not have that info (mentioned above), they would ask the applicant to paint the unit to do a visual hide.

Caveat to the resolution - Commission requires change in color of line hide to blend/fade in to the wall background, specifically - “Paint the line set and the unit dark charcoal grey.”

Peter Jennings stated that the applicants should have been told to present this information or it would be considered an incomplete application. (Staff had expressed the documentary needs several times to the vendor who was the first contact for the project and the applicant’s vendor just seemed utterly lost. It was the applicant himself who grasped the concept of necessary documentation and agreed to what the commission requested).

Peter von Glahn discussed how to get the images that will show the dimensions for the commission consideration.

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