

**Town of Milton
Historic Preservation Commission
Milton Public Library
August 7, 2008**

Members Present:

Brenda Burns	Michael Ostinato	Amy Kratz
Gwen Foehner	Sally Harkins	Jack Vessels

Others Present:

Robin Davis	Mary Schrider-Fox
-------------	-------------------

Brenda Burns called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm.

Additions or Corrections to the Agenda

Brenda Burns: Does anyone want to make any corrections or additions to the agenda?

Jack Vessels: I make a motion to approve the agenda.

Amy Kratz: Second.

Brenda Burns: So moved.

Approval of Minutes – July 10, 2008

Brenda Burns: We're onto the minutes of July 10, 2008. Sally, you had a comment concerning that?

Sally Harkins: On the very last page, Item No. 9, is incorrect and should be removed.

Amy Kratz: I also have something. My name is spelled wrong. It's K-R-A-T-Z, not K-R-A-N-T-Z.

Brenda Burns: So now we'll move onto the business portion of the meeting.

Gwen Foehner: I make a motion to approve the minutes from the last meeting, with the corrections noted.

Mike Ostinato: Second.

Brenda Burns: All in favor. Opposed. The minutes from the last meeting are approved.

Business

- 1. The applicant, Bryan Hake, is requesting approval for exterior renovations to his house at 324 Union Street further identified by Sussex County Tax Map and Parcel # 2-35-14.19-68.00.**

Brenda Burns: Is anyone here representing Mr. Hake?

Bill Bell: I am the contractor for Bryan Hake. I assume you all have the pictures, so based on the pictures we can all easily tell that something needs to be done. What we are proposing to do is if you will notice, if you look at any of the pictures you'll notice first the shutters. We will remove all the shutters; repair them; scrape them; clean them; putty them; paint them; and then we're going to re-hang them. You'll also notice the open soffits with the decorative rafter tails; one of the pictures shows that the gable ends are opened; there is some rotted wood in some of those areas. What we want to do with that is we are simply just going to repair the wood that needs to be repaired, scrape, repair and

paint, so that we keep those open rafters exposed. Obviously, we are going to keep the front door and it will be painted. What I have just given you are some samples of the materials we want to use to re-side the house. The white board that is coming across the line is a cellular PVC trim board, AZAK is one of the names it is commonly known as; we want to use AZAK for the corners of the property; around the windows to sort of picture frame the windows and then the vinyl siding sample which is going along there somewhere, is a traditional lap siding, which is what is on this house underneath this old asbestos siding. So we thought it best to try and match that. By using the combination of the exposed rafters; repainting them; fixing them up; using the PVC trim board which is maintenance-free, it doesn't rot, but looks just like wood; will maintain as much of the historical character of the house as we possibly can. I know that colors aren't much of an issue, but they have chosen a dark blue. It's on the back of the sample. It's going to go right over the existing.

Brenda Burns: I have a suggestion and it's merely a suggestion. When you do the corner boards if you know the width, it would be important to make them fairly wide; not as small as this piece.

Bill Bell: Yes, in fact, they are going to be 6" corners.

Brenda Burns: Is that as wide as you can do it?

Bill Bell: On the corner of the house? I've never seen any bigger than 6". We're going to use a 6" wide; 6" on either side of the corner.

Michael Ostinato: Do you still have the originals underneath?

Bill Bell: I'm not sure.

Brenda Burns: Usually they are fairly large. I think it would look better.

Michael Ostinato: Well, the house is done like a pollster, with the brackets and all the open tails on the rafters, it probably is a narrower corner board.

Brenda Burns: Does anyone on the Board have any questions for Mr. Bell?

Bill Bell: The Wedgewood there is the color they have chosen; and the shutters will be black; I think the door is going to be a different color, but they haven't picked that yet.

Brenda Burns: Anyone have any questions? If there are no questions, would someone like to make a motion?

Sally Harkins: I make a motion that we approve Mr. Hake's application.

Jack Vessels: Second.

Brenda Burns: Please may I have a roll call vote.

Michael Ostinato	Approve
Amy Kratz	Approve
Brenda Burns	Approve
Gwen Foehner	Approve
Jack Vessels	Approve
Sally Harkins	Approve

Bill Bell: Thank you very much.

Brenda Burns: You're welcome.

- 2. The applicant, Catholic Diocese Foundation, is requesting approval to demolish the structure at 127 Broad Street further identified by Sussex County Tax Map and Parcel # 2-35-14.19-87.00.**

Brenda Burns: Who is here to represent the Catholic Diocese?

Mark Dunkle: For the record, I am an attorney with the law firm of Parkowsky, Gerck and Swayze, 116 West Water Street in Dover. I'm here on behalf of the Catholic Diocese on behalf of Casa San Francisco, which we just refer to as "Casa". Casa has been a resident and a property owner in the Town of Milton since 1981 and they provide a homeless shelter and a food pantry among other services. With me tonight, who will be making part of the presentation in the public hearing, is Rochelle Vibel the Executive Director of Catholic Charities for Delaware; and also Bill Beiler who's a Delaware licensed architect; and part of my remarks really are key to an exhibit package that we've sent in to the Board and I just wanted to give you a short summary and then have the presenters come up. You have a tough job. I've read all the minutes of your meetings for the last several years and it's always a difficult decision, because you are weighing the goal to preserve the historic structures in the Town of Milton; against the wishes of property owners and in this particular case, an institutional owner; an institution that has also been serving the public for the public good and welfare for almost 30 years; and, fortunately, you do have a guide in that evaluation or that balance, and that is your historic code, recently amended. Obviously, some demolitions are granted, or else you wouldn't have these tests in your code. They're not all granted, but there's a reason for these requests. We think this is a very unique request; you've got someone who's been in occupancy for many years; the structure is not meeting their needs. Your Code does put you through a few paces and a few inquiries. And we've tried to assist that in supplying some additional information to you. First, we asked Rebecca Shepherd from the University of Delaware, an architectural historian, to look into the history of 127 Broad Street; because that's one of the factors that you consider. I've summarized that here and given you her report. Essentially, it's a very typical house; a very plain house; it's occupants are very typical of the citizens of Milton, since about mid-19th century; there have been farmers, merchants, sailors, one ship captain owned the house; it's been through a series of owners. I think what was remarkable about the history, is that it was somewhat unremarkable. No significant historical event took place at least that was noted. It wasn't a former governor, as far as we know. It was really a plain, typical house that reflected the people who lived there during the time. Secondly, because this is a very unique application, but again, we think it complies with your requirements for demolition. The proposal is to actually do the reconstruction first. The new building would be constructed before there would be any demolition of the old existing structure. That addresses the criteria of the streetscape, one of the factors that of course you consider is, what affect would the demolition have; the absence of the house have; on the historic properties in the immediate area? One way to approach that, is in this application, is to build the architecturally acceptable structure, first, before you demolish the old structure. We also asked Rebecca Shepherd to address that. She reviewed Mr. Beiler's plans and the details and has made some extra suggestions, but essentially she concludes that the replacement structure, with a garden in the front on Broad Street; with the house then set back from the street; with appropriate architectural detail, fits in with the streetscape of Broad Street; fits in with the historic architecture in the area; and, is not negative or detrimental. In this application, you'll never have a hole, a blank space, at this address. I would guess that in almost all of the demolition applications; at least many

that you've heard; it's a question of what are you going to put there and how do we address that? Ms. Shepherd has given two opinions based upon her research that we think address your issues in the Code; we're open to suggestions; she makes recommendations about the plantings in the garden in the front part of the structure; so we know that there are details that could be embellished. She also mentions adding some details, like fish scale siding to reflect the seafaring nature of the Town. So we've address that as one of the elements and that's all found under Tab 1. We also did some due diligence a year ago with the Milton Historical Society, that's Tab 2; and asked if they would please send us what they knew about this property. They sent us a hand written note that included the National Historic Register Inventory; the narrative of Milton, itself, based upon the inventory; and, then the inventory listing this house itself, which described its age and its structure. But they really did not have any other specific information and again, nothing of a specific, unique historical nature. It's a very typical house of the era. We've attached that. Then, finally, on Tab 3, we've supplied some documents and an opinion from our architect, Bill Beiler, who is here tonight. Bill is the designer of the replacement structure, but he has also looked at one of the requirements of your code, there are several different bases that you could grant a demolition; they are all independent. One is, does the house lack historical significance itself; a second independent basis is, does the house lack architectural significance; and, Mr. Beiler, in his capacity as an architect has addressed that question. He reviewed the exterior of the structure; he's done essentially what the Chamber of Commerce would call a windshield survey; he's gone around and taken photographs of numerous houses in Milton; and that's part of the back half of Tab 3; and, concluded that this existing house at 127 Broad Street really doesn't have architectural significance. It's not disrespect to the house or its builder or the owners, but it lacks those special details that would make it architecturally unique; and, the photographs support his opinion to show you that there are many, many examples of this sort of plain house from around 1860 in Milton. Mr. Beiler's opinion is also that there are many examples of this style of house throughout Delaware. There is a supply of those in Milton. Again, not to say that every house isn't important and valuable; but in applying the tests for demolition, we wanted to address that issue of whether or not this house is architecturally significant. If it was one of a kind, that would be a different question. If it was on Union Street and more detailed, it would probably be a different inquiry. Again it's a very typical house. So Mr. Beiler has supplied that opinion and is also here to answer your questions. And, finally, and I know you all must be familiar with the house; I know you all live in Milton; we just supplied some photos in the beginning of the package, just to show you some current views of the house on Broad Street and on Mulberry Street and, as you know, there were several additions added to the house, as space needs were dictated; they're not really in any kind of architectural style that's distinctive, except probably cost effective, is the best way I could describe it. We also showed a streetscape of Broad Street and there's a beautiful blue house and I'm going to call it red, although I'm somewhat colorblind; it looks like red to me; there's a beautiful blue house and a red house down the street; to sort of offer you a contrast of something that looks architecturally significant. I would ask that the exhibit package that you have be made a part of the record tonight. What I would like to do is ask Rochelle Vibel, the Executive Director, to present some remarks to you in connection with this what I call reconstruction, then demolition application.

Rochelle Vibel: Thank you, Mark. My name is Rochelle Vibel. I'm the Executive Director of Catholic Charities and I appreciate the opportunity to speak to the Historic Preservation Board. Catholic Charities has actually a very lengthy history in the Diocese of Wilmington. We have done charitable work in the diocese for over 175 years. Catholic Charities, in fact, pre dates the foundation of the diocese itself. Casa San Francisco, and the programs that we run in the Town of Milton, have operated here for over 25 years and we very much appreciate and enjoy being part of the Town of Milton. We have many, many supporters both among the local townspeople and throughout the diocese, as well. We have many, many clients that we have served over many years. In a typical year Catholic Charities serves approximately 80,000 individuals, every year, through direct service. At Casa San Francisco, through our programs that we run through there, we serve probably close to 2,000 individuals a year. That includes some of the shelter residents; but it also includes many other people who are touched by the programs that operate out of Casa San Francisco. We are looking to utilize the property that we enjoy here in the Town of Milton; we're actually looking for an opportunity to improve the quality of our programs, and improve our neighborhood. What we would like to do is construct a new building on the property, which would in fact, fit in with the character of the neighborhood, but would allow us to serve the people in need, with additional dignity and with the respect that those folks deserve. I'm proud to say over the 25 plus years that Casa has operated in Milton, many of the clients that have graduated from our programs, are now contributing citizens in the Town of Milton and throughout the State of Delaware. Many of them, in fact, come back and contribute to Casa because of what Casa has done to improve their lives. We appreciate all of the assistance and the support that we get from the Town and it's a service that we are very proud and pleased to provide to all of you. In your report, from Becky Shepherd, she has made a few interesting comments about what she suggests that we do to honor the history of the Town of Milton; and, some of those include retaining some of the original "surrounds"; the boards around the windows and such; and, utilize some of those features in the new building; and we're willing to do that. Additionally, one of her suggestions is that we work with and ask for assistance from some of the local gardeners, as to what types of flowers we should plant in the garden; we're planning a garden that fronts on Broad Street and I understand there is a very active and highly qualified garden club in Milton; and I wonder if that might be a possibility for someone that we could chat with about the types of flowers that we would put in there. Becky suggested that we take photographs and do a full documentation of the house, before it comes down and we would be more than happy to do that; and, one of her suggestions that I think is in your letter, is that we put maybe a wall of photographs of the old house in the new structure. We would be willing to do that, or alternatively, if that documentation was better utilized by your board, if you would prefer to have that in the museum, we would be happy to donate that as well. I just thank you for all of the years of support that you and all the citizens of the Town of Milton have given to Catholic Charities and to Casa, and I look forward to not just the next 25 years, but the next 175 years; so we'll make history together. Thank you.

Mark Dunkle: Next, I would like to ask Bill Beiler, our architect, to come up and present to you the reconstruction plans. He'll go over them and answer questions; particularly I'm sure you're interested in the features and the detail of the proposed structure and I

think Bill has some boards that he needs to put up and then he's available for questions, as well.

Bill Beiler: Good evening. My name is Bill Beiler and I'm a registered architect in the State of Delaware. I'm currently also registered in Colorado and seeking licensure in Oklahoma and also in the State of Maryland. I've been retained as the project architect for this project, probably about a year ago. We've been in a process to try to determine some appropriate architecture to suit this client's needs that we have here tonight. It's good to be here and thank you for taking this opportunity to hear us and to be part of this process. One of the first things I thought I would do is just give this first board here which represents what we hoped to provide for this client in ways of being able to function within their program and give them those spaces that they need to be able to do that. If I may, I would just like to briefly show this and speak to this a little bit. The first floor plan as you would come off of Mulberry Street; this would be Mulberry Street here; Broad Street would be over in this area over here; and we've opted by site design to be able to or to want to place the house in a fashion like this, along the length of the property. We have a front porch here that we've wrapped around the front and a part of the end of the structure here; we come into an open area here; we have a couple of Administrative offices here; some offices here; public toilet rooms; food pantry; a serving area; and then bedrooms over on this wing here, that would house the temporary residents that come here. We do have a partial second floor space here; that also would be used to house residents and in each of the sleeping areas here we have the bathrooms to accommodate the residents; we also have one office upstairs. This is the proposed floor plan; how we think would best meet the needs of this client here. On the other board that I have here, I have what we're proposing as the front of the proposed structure as it faces Mulberry Street. What we have attempted to do is to look at the surrounding houses and things in the Town of Milton and try to come up with a design that is able to complement what you have in your town. We were trying to do that with the various types of features that we're representing here. We proposed to do a brick foundation down here with the front porch and turn posts and railing that will be the Victoria style with the ornate brackets and fascia and those kinds of things; up above we would like to do windows here that fit into the mid-nineteenth century and also have tried to put a cross gable here with the fish scale and the Victorian style fascia trim there as well. We have a few things suggested here as far as colors and material types and things like that; of course, we certainly want to be able to hear from you on some of these kinds of details and some of those things that are very important to the structure. We're looking at the possibility of an asphalt shingle roof for this area and then we would like to do a metal roof scheme across the porch area there. One of the things that Mark has spoken of just briefly here is the letter that I have written, based on my opinion, as to looking at the existing structure that exists now that this client desires to have demolished to be able to build this new structure, to enhance what they're doing there. I was asked to determine whether in my opinion that the structure at 127 Broad Street has architectural significance and based on my review, I believe that it does not have that particular qualification. One of the things that we noticed as we looked at the existing structure; it is a two story, three bay framed house with a center street level entrance; it has a typical gable roof; gable and chimneys; and there is a pent roof that goes across the front of the house, which you have seen in your pictures. This structure does lack the architectural features such as ornate Victoria

fascia's trim; porches; etc. that would normally be associated with this time era, as represented by other houses on Broad Street and other areas of your Town. So just based on those observations, and those things, it would be my opinion that this house lacks the architectural significance that would be the basis of the request that has been made here by this client to demolish the existing structure. Some of the other things that we would just like to say here, as well, we do feel like the comments and the suggestions that Ms. Shepherd has offered to us, here in her letter, we would like to accommodate those, as much as we can. We do plan to phase the construction of this project in such a way, that we do not leave a hole in your streetscape; that's going to be important; so we would like to leave the existing structure where it is until the new structure is up and in place and then be able to demolish that structure to provide the off-street parking that's required by the Town for this particular use.

Brenda Burns: May I ask a question? Is this siding product vinyl or hearty plank?

Bill Beiler: What we plan to use is hearty plank and let me, I don't have a physical sample of that; but you know what hearty plank is; it's a fiber cement siding and that's what we propose to use as the siding all the way around the house; on all four sides.

Mike Ostinato: Where's the parking lot going to be?

Bill Beiler: Do we have a site plan board? I'd be glad to show that to you. Basically, where the old building is.

Mark Dunkle: I just want to interrupt. As you know, the project has already received site plan approval from Planning & Zoning, May 20, 2008. It's a prerequisite before this application can come to you. So we've put up a board that answers the question about the parking lot and gives you some orientation on that design and layout. The traffic flow is a little bit different than the drawing. It's going to be a one-way traffic flow, so there are a couple of tweaks; but the site plan itself was approved. If you want to address those questions, Bill, you can.

Bill Beiler: We do have a civil engineer in attendance tonight too. But basically, what's proposed is to put the new structure where the existing parking area is, off of Mulberry Street. The new structure would face Mulberry Street. This is the area of the existing structure and this is where we would like to do the parking that's required for this use. On this corner here, would be the proposed garden that Becky Shepherd spoke of in her letter and supports us in this effort to do that.

Brenda Burns: May I ask what the purpose of the garden is? Is it merely a screen or is it a space that is going to be utilized by the residents?

Bill Beiler: Can we speak to that Gary?

Mark Dunkle: Leah is going to speak to that.

Leah Sullivan: I'm Leah Sullivan, Program Manager, Casa San Francisco. We're speaking of the space around the parking area. That was going to be a screen and decorative.

Bill Beiler: Are there any other questions?

Amy Kratz: Have you thought of any other ways to do this, rather than tear down that old house; which is actually kind of typical of the structures in that day? It kind of makes it architecturally significant.

Rochelle Vibel: After working with all of our engineers and our attorneys and the architect, etc. the most cost effective and efficient manner for us to be able to number one, continue operation of our program, is to build the building while the existing

building remains in place; and, obviously we can't have two buildings on the single lot and then demolish that building.

Gwen Foehner: Did you by any chance consider another site to build on so you wouldn't have to demolish this structure?

Rochelle Vibel: This is the site that we own and this is the site that we have operated on for over 25 years; it's also the site that permits our program by zoning. We own a vacant lot on the other side of Mulberry Street. The program that we operate is not permitted there by zoning; and, it is not, according to what I understand from my engineers and architects, it is not suitable for an institutional or commercial use; it's a residentially zoned property. It's not possible for us given the resources and the assets that we have to build on another site. We don't have another site that's appropriate to build on; so we need to build on the site that we have that accepts this type of a program.

Amy Kratz: My thinking when I ask about not tearing down the old structure; was you have a new structure, which is like the kitchen; it's the kitchen of the place in the back, in the parking lot; my thinking was have you thought about tearing down the new structure that's the kitchen.

Rochelle Vibel: Oh, you're talking about the addition on the existing building?

Amy Kratz: The addition; which doesn't really fit the house anyway.

Rochelle Vibel: I'm sorry, but I didn't understand.

Amy Kratz: And possibly building a two-story addition that looks similar to the old house. Has that been an option?

Rochelle Vibel: We looked at renovating the house and Gary, you can jump in if I'm misspeaking, because I'm not an engineer; but my understanding is; that first of all, if we tear down part of the existing house and begin to renovate the house, we need to close our program. So that is a problem for us to be able to continue to do that. My understanding of the building code is, if we begin to renovate the building, remember this is not going to be used as a residence; we need to bring the building up to Code; we can't bring the building up to Code and retain the historic structure and serve the program that we're serving right now. The stairs are too steep, etc. It's not permissible for a commercial use, so it's a residential structure and it's not easily renovated into a commercial use. Did I get it right? Mark reminded me that everything is doable at a price; and, unfortunately we have limited resources which we are bound; we have a fiduciary duty to utilize the resources that we have been entrusted with to carry out our mission; and it's our mission of service. I wish that we could utilize some of our resources to carry out the mission of Historic Preservation, but we need to utilize our resources to carry out the mission of service to those people that we serve. There is a cost element involved.

Amy Kratz: I certainly respect that and I know that Casa does wonderful work with homeless individuals and feeding people; I guess I have another question.

Gary Cuppels: My name is Gary Cuppels. I'm the President of ECI, we're the ones that put together most of the submission package and I'm looking at the information that you have before you that photographs some of the foot prints and the actual site layout. To specifically answer your question, yes we did look at taking a portion of this building; take it down and go ahead and add to it. When we did that, number one, we have commercial code standards to meet; the building won't meet commercial code standards; we performed a structural engineer's report that was prepared by Mr. Retincourt; that specifically addresses the issues related to the structural capability of this building. It's

not good; it truly isn't. The decision, although difficult to make, was to do what we've proposed and what has been approved by your Planning & Zoning Commission. There just did not seem to be a rational approach, other than to propose what we've proposed.

Brenda Burns: I'm going to make a few observations. I've had several calls concerning this project; and one of the issues seems to be the parking facing Broad Street. Broad Street is a one-way street. You're saying that this property has no historical significance or structural architectural significance; well the building has been covered over with vinyl siding; you've got metal railing and an overhang under a porch that obviously is an add on; I would venture to say that if you took all of this vinyl off, you would see the original structure; there were people of significance that lived in this house; a sea captain. I think that the building that you are proposing is quite attractive; but, you're asking to do this at another historic property in this Town; another historic building. It does have an existing summer kitchen; perhaps it does not meet the code for a commercial structure; but it was never designed for that. After looking at your engineer's report, it really states that it's not in that bad a condition. The condition is not deplorable that it would warrant demolition; other than the fact that you want to extend your services.

Mark Dunkle: Did you want a response to your question about the parking; which is a site plan issue, not related to the historic nature or lack of historic nature of the structure; but I appreciate your comments. I think that in the reports with Mr. Beiler's opinion, that if we stripped away the add-ons and got down to the original house; you would still have a typical house; modest house of that era in this style; that we would still suggest to you is not architecturally significant; and therefore, is suitable to be demolished. Again, it's no disrespect to any of the houses in Town, but there are multiple tests for qualifying to be demolished; even if the house is historic; had historic occupants; lack of architectural significance is an independent basis, under your Code, to grant a demolition permit. And exactly as you said, Ms. Burns, it's a balance. The house was never designed for a commercial property, but the owner's have it in an institutional use for a public good and it's a weighing of those questions before the Board; and we respect your observations, but with Mr. Beiler's opinion, we would hang our hat on that as a legal basis to distinguish the demolition of this house; and in connection with the whole package. There won't be an empty space on the street and you're guaranteed a very nice replacement structure on balance; that's why this entity has made this application and it's a charity, so there is a limit to what they could do. That's part of the basis and I know you understand it.

Brenda Burns: I have had several calls and Mr. Myron Burton who could not be here tonight, has asked me to publicly state that he is very much opposed and he's the neighbor that is directly across the street; and he brought to my attention that historically you have had your tenants sitting in the parking lot; at this point, your existing parking lot; and I guess you have a curfew of about 9:00 p.m. It's quite noisy.

Mark Dunkle: I really have to say that this is a site plan issue for the use; which really isn't before this body.

Brenda Burns: Well he asked me to state this for the record; so I'm doing that. The new parking lot would be facing Broad Street and that is an issue. That's a one-way street.

Mark Dunkle: Again, Ms. Burns, as respectfully as I can the issue of parking and traffic flow was reviewed; Mr. Burton attended the Planning & Zoning hearing and there was debate and discussion and there was actually a compromise reached on the traffic flow

from originally two-way to one-way and then that whole issue was approved by the Town of Milton, so I understand his comments; but in some sense they're not relevant to the matter that is before you on the demolition and the replacement.

Brenda Burns: I appreciate your pointing that out; but I am making this statement. Does anyone on the Board have questions for anyone here; does anyone want to make a comment or ask a question?

Amy Kratz: In 1860, when the house was built, a lot of houses looked exactly like this house. They had summer kitchens; they were built like this; to my mind that makes it architecturally significant.

Brenda Burns: And it did exist on the 1868 Beer's Atlas. It does show this property, but you have confirmed that it is approximately 150 years. So, if no one on the board has any questions or comments.

[Unidentified Female Speaker]: I have a question. While you are building and you're in the process of building this; where are you going to be parking; where are people going to go? I just see a lot of construction and there will be a lot going on at this property at the same time. What are your plans for parking; for people to be sitting around when it's nice outside; you'll have no room.

Mark Dunkle: The Code actually allows off-street parking within a certain distance and the house is practically within that minimal distance to the Municipal Parking Lot by a straight line and the site plan has been approved by Planning & Zoning, so that would allow that; but there's no question that the parking lot that's there would be taken up. The applicant could probably request permission from the Town to park vehicles on its vacant lot on Mulberry Street; that's not really a plan; but if it turned into a problem they could request it. But they don't have an awful lot of vehicles there for the employees; so the employees will walk and get their exercise. What's critical though is your comment. For the mission to continue and not to have the homeless without a homeless shelter; the existing structure needs to be continuously utilized for its purpose. Another reason why it can't be torn down first; why it can't be renovated; why it can't be modified; because the business will stop. I say can't; there's always a can and a can't; but that's the balance; that's the question. We really don't think it's appropriate to put the client's out to renovate the building; we would rather do this other option with the limited resources.

Amy Kratz: I have an idea. If, instead of tearing down that house; like I suggested earlier; tear down the kitchen part and request the Churches to help you have a place to feed the people. Because that one structure; this building right here; is a kitchen. That's what serves as a kitchen and dining area. If you were going to try to just take that part off and make that a two-story house; with a rendering as beautiful as the one you suggested; you would just be interrupting the feeding of the people, but you may ask the Churches in Town and maybe they would be willing to help out; with their space. Has that been a thought?

Leah Sullivan: I'm just going to address, Ms. Kratz, we don't currently feed people in terms of the noon meal anymore. In fact, we stopped that program a year ago, in July of last year. That is still the kitchen and that is still the place where residents go for their meals, but it would not be possible for churches to provide housing.

Amy Kratz: I'm not talking about housing; I'm just talking about that one area. Take that off; so you're not feeding anyone anyway; I'm not talking about redoing the rest of the structure while the people are there. I'm talking about taking that part off; and doing a

whole second story structure like in a house that's kind of attached; with a breezeway, so it's still the same structure.

Leah Sullivan: That is also our entire area for food storage, for our food distribution, for over 300 families in Sussex County; and the place for the food pantry, as well.

Amy Kratz: So you do actually feed people? I don't understand.

Leah Sullivan: We have several nutrition programs; we do not serve hot meals at that location, any longer; we do provide and distribute food products from the Food Bank of Delaware through our food pantry and our brown bag food cooperative.

Mark Dunkle: I think, Ms. Kratz, also just to further answer your question. I think you've sort of crystallized the choice. As the institutional owner of the property, we don't want to choose between keeping the older house over inconveniencing the clients. We don't want to make that choice; we would rather demolish it and to do that demolition is why we supported with an architectural opinion. It's not everyday that you grant demolition permits, but I don't think its every day that you have an institution that supplies these services for you. If it's a choice between the building and the people; we think that our proposal makes the best compromise for the street and for the services. That's why we don't want to make that investment in the existing structure; but are better off with the replacement one that still meets your legal requirements.

Amy Kratz: Okay, let me ask a question about the new structure. How many people do you serve now sleeping; people that sleep there?

Leah Sullivan: There are 10 beds at Casa right now.

Amy Kratz: How many people will you serve for sleeping in the new structure?

Leah Sullivan: We would go back to the original 12.

Amy Kratz: So, basically, the rest of the structure is not for the homeless; it would be used for what?

Leah Sullivan: We have staff office space; food storage; and an a multi-purpose room for food distribution and also eating; and events.

Amy Kratz: What kind of events?

Rochelle Vibel: Rochelle Vibel, Catholic Charities. Part of the program that we conduct with the homeless, is not just giving them a bed and giving them a meal. We work with the homeless individuals to help them transition into permanent housing. One of the things that we have continually struggled with, in our current building, is the lack of privacy; which enables us to work in a dignified fashion with the individual clients that we serve. The clients that we serve currently sleep up to five persons, per room; and when they are in need of one-on-one counseling and assistance for jobs, mental health counseling or various types of services that we provide; it's very difficult to accommodate that in the existing structure. The private offices that we have planned in this new facility, don't give us really sufficient room to increase the size of our program dramatically; what they give us the opportunity to do is improve the quality of our program so that we can, in fact, sit down one-on-one with our of our individuals and work with them in a compassionate and dignified manner.

Amy Kratz: Thank you very much for your answer.

Brenda Burns: I'm going to open the next portion of the meeting to the public.

Mark Dunkle: I would like to make one more comment; I may have misspoken. I just wanted to clarify for the record; we have preliminary approval from the Planning & Zoning Commission for our site plan. We don't have final site plan approval. I don't

know if I stated that. We have a preliminary site plan that was approved. We obviously have to go back for the final dot the i's and cross the t's. I just wanted to clarify that.

Brenda Burns: Thank you for that information. Is there anyone in the audience that would like to speak? Please state your name for the record; and your address.

Stephanie Parker: 113 Broad Street. I guess I just want to voice a word of caution, similar to what Mrs. Burns and Ms. Kratz have already stated. The question before you tonight is a demolition. I agree that the picture of what is being proposed is certainly very nice and appears to have some historical characteristics; it is still a new structure; a replica, so to speak. I haven't heard anything tonight of any physical problems with the current building that would necessitate a demolition; other than they want to have different needs. As has been stated, the house does date back to 1860; that's almost 150 years old. Last year, this town celebrated its 200th anniversary. While the attorney (Mark Dunkle) has stated there's no historical significance to this structure; that it's just typical; to me a home that is almost as old as this town is historically significant. I would also venture to guess that a great majority of the structures in the current historic district are what would be called typical; so you are going to be setting a precedent if you grant this demolition for all of those other "typical structures" in the District and I just want to voice that word of caution to please give this very careful consideration. You could very well be changing the nature of our town.

Brenda Burns: Would anyone else like to make a comment?

Susan Fewell: 206 Mulberry Street. I live across the street from the parking lot that is presently at Casa. I would like to speak in favor of Casa tonight. I've been in my home for 16 years; I've seen people come and go; people who have been in various states of trouble; and, have been greatly helped by this program. It is a small program, but it does a whole lot of good and has done so for many people over the years; the 25 years that it has been there. As much trouble as they may be and they have never been trouble to me as their neighbor; the only trouble I've ever experienced is the huge truck that used to come at 3:00 a.m. to take the trash away every day; which now comes at 3:00 p.m., so that's all right. I think when we're thinking about the Town as a whole, we do need to think about what kind of humanitarian needs we keep in our town; that it's not all about history in the form of architecture; it's our history as a kind and wonderful town that does wonderful things for people. If we're worried about the beauty of our town, I don't think anyone's worried about the unsightly parking lot that is across the street from my house; it's very large; that space would be much better used by a new structure; and would not take away from the beauty of the houses on Broad Street. It might not add historical value to Broad Street; but it would not take away from the neighborhood itself. If I lived on Broad Street, I might be saying different things; worrying about the value of my property; but I think the value of what happens to people in their lives; is more important than this little house on the edge of Broad Street. If it were in the middle of Broad Street, then it might be something different. But I think that the human beings that are served by this program are far, far more important than architecture and the history of the Town should be based more than on its architecture.

Michael Filicko: 111 Bay Avenue. Correct protocol, Madame Chair, if I have a question do I direct it to you? And then you ask the applicant?

Brenda Burns: You may ask directly.

Michael Filicko: Okay. If you're not granted demolition, will you remain there in the present space that you currently have?

Rochelle Vibel: Yes, absolutely, we will continue to operate the program as we have for many years; we'll continue to do that.

Michael Filicko: The addition that's been added onto the original structure is rather unsightly; I believe I'm not speaking out of turn; it's just my opinion. I think you would all agree with that. You do own the land directly across the street, is that correct?

Rochelle Vibel: Yes, on Mulberry Street. Yes.

Michael Filicko: Would you consider moving the historical part of the building across the street to the Mulberry Street lot, as opposed to demolishing the building?

Rochelle Vibel: Well obviously that wasn't part of our original plan; but it's a very interesting idea. I'm trying to think out loud here; the property that we own across on Mulberry Street; is zoned residential. Is that correct? If we were to retain the historic portion of the house, you're saying; the original portion of the house?

Michael Filicko: Yes, the original portion that was built in 1850.

Rochelle Vibel: I don't know what the cost would be, but it sure sounds like something we should consider or we could consider if the goal is to save the house and also serve the needy population. I'm thinking again out loud. If we were to build the new structure and continue to utilize the existing structure, until the new one was completed; move our program into the new structure; the plan at that point was to demolish it; and I suppose if we were instead able to move it; it would accomplish pretty much the same purpose. So I think we would certainly consider that as an alternative.

Larry Adams: Larry Adams. I own the entire length of the side of your property on Mulberry Street. I happen to be a registered architect, but not in Delaware. My license is on retirement. I've made my livelihood for the last 38 years in renovating and owning historic structures. I own the house next door, which I renovated; I think it looks historic. I own a couple of the other houses that were discussed here tonight on Broad Street. My first question to the Board is I think there's a moratorium on demolition. Why are we even considering it?

Brenda Burns: Because they applied before the moratorium.

Mark Dunkle: So there was an exception made.

Larry Adams: Okay. This is changing the character of Broad Street by demolishing this structure. Yes, it is a plain Jane in the way it looks now; but if it had Victorian features, which it probably did, they have probably been stripped off; before the plastic siding was put on. I invested in this historic site in this historic neighborhood. This new proposal would adversely affect the property value and absolutely limit my resale value; because who would want to live in a historic house next to a new modern site; that's an institution and not a residential use. Once you crack a historic district, there is no going back. Milton has come a long way in the past 30 years and one of the main reasons for the value of the increase is the historic district; which I purchased the property and spent many thousands and thousands of dollars within this City. I rely on the integrity of this town government to enforce the historic district rules and regulations. I clearly recognize the compelling reason of services provided by Casa San Francisco; but perhaps a more fitting site would be proper. I have a picture; it's from the museum at Broad Street; taken in 1903 which shows the character and texture of Broad Street. The white house on the end is the Casa house. I think Mr. Vessels is quite familiar with demolition and

rebuilding structures and they lose something in translation. I looked into moving the house here in Milton and it becomes very costly with the new fiber optic cables that have been strung around town. I don't know about moving a house across the street; it's a great idea; but it becomes prohibitively expensive.

Unidentified Female Speaker]: It's \$10,000 just to get rid of the cable. That's why that house was demolished. There was an historic house there and it was demolished because they couldn't afford to move it.

Larry Adams: I was talking about the one on Union Street that is in contention now.

[Unidentified Female Speaker]: But there was one right where the Casa owns that land now.

Larry Adams: I know. I was in the house.

Judy Fisher: I live on Federal Street. I'll first say that we did save an historic structure that was 1880's by picking it up and moving it across the street; and you're very right; it's very expensive with fiber optics; but we were able to lower the top enough to squeeze 1" under the fiber optics line and save the \$10,000. It's expensive, but not prohibitive. In the process, we saved an old house that would have been demolished; we would never have torn it down; we offered to give it away to many people; and nobody could afford to move it somewhere else, but because we could move it across the street, as you would be able to; it was doable. I want to talk about Broad Street and why I would be opposed to that house being torn down. I don't think it's a beautiful house, particularly, but I've been here for 30 years; not as a full-time resident; but I married somebody whose family has been here forever. I just remember meeting Elsie Wagamon, who lived to be about 95 years old; and she always talked about in her childhood, so you would have to do the math; she said that Broad Street was absolutely one of the most gorgeous streets in Milton. It was very, very hard for some of us to see that and understand how it could have been, because when I started coming here it was in pretty bad shape. A lot of the Victorian's had really deteriorated and even though people could say, you know there's a Myron Burton house; that they remember it and all that; I remember one of the most impressive things was Stephanie Parker and Matt Dotterer redid a house that I did know; and, it blew me away to see how you could save a gorgeous old house that had been in bad repair. If we tear that house down; what I think I don't quite get is why we need to have large commercial or institutional space in the middle of one of our oldest historic neighborhoods. I have been the biggest fan of Casa San Francisco for over 20 years, we think. My husband and I were so impressed when the Catholic Charities because it seemed to us that you were doing more for the people of Milton, than anyone else in Milton was doing; and, so we have supported you grandly over the years and I would die if you pulled out. However, I've also been involved with a lot of the clients that you have; I've been involved with them just because I can't walk down the street without getting involved with people, unfortunately; and, I've spent a lot of time at our downtown Memorial Park, where we've seen many of the clients and there can be some problems with that. I mean I would be concerned about some children being around some of the clients, just because they have problems; not because they're homeless; not because they're poor; but because they have emotional problems; and, I know well because I got very involved with someone trying to help them. One of the things that I have done, when I have been involved with people, they need money; but they also need transportation; they always need to get out to Happy Harry's or Food Lion for something;

and I have felt for some time that you would better serve your clients if you were a little closer to where commercial stuff is. Being close to Kings' Ice Cream is not what helps them; they need to be able to get things from Happy Harry's. I just wish there was some way that Catholic Charities could afford some property along Route 16 that would be near the Dollar Store; the Drug Store. This may be a dream, but it just seems that you could serve people better that way and while I don't live right there on Broad; I would be concerned about all of my friends who live there, in terms of what Mr. Adams said. Resale value of your house; it's what's most important to many of us in terms of retirement. Ms. Kratz had some excellent points. Sorry to talk so long. I just wanted to weigh in as somebody who truly loves and supports Casa San Francisco, but I've come to believe that after 20 years, you've grown so that you might be better served going to a different area, than an old neighborhood like that. Thank you.

Mark Dunkle: Madame Chair, my client has asked me to respond because there was a question; and also to follow up on another legal point. The answer about why the institutional use is there is because it's a town center district. So the town center district allows a variety of these types of uses and the location is the location where they want to be and they feel it works for them. They don't have any plans of moving. I did look quickly at your zoning ordinance, Section 4.9.8, Criteria No. 4. Criteria No. 4 says that when an application is made to demolish a structure or any part thereof, the impact of its removal from the area in which it is located, which we've already addressed through Becky Shepherd, is its structural condition, and you've already gotten through the structural report; but then it also says you are to look at the economic feasibility of alternatives to the proposed demolition. My client's advised me that these proposed suggested alternatives of moving the historic part of the structure to the property they own across the street to Mulberry Street, is in their opinion an economically feasible alternative, if it's a condition that you want to consider. They've given that some thought tonight and it's a suggestion that allows them to continue their service of their clients, to the last moment. It allows them to construct a compatible structure as the Shepherd Report has already confirmed and they do have that lot; it's simply across the street; so they believe that the money not spent on demolition could be spent on the move. I did note that that is an element of your legal criteria and review and wanted to put on the record, that the applicant then does agree with that suggestion if our application for demolition and reconstruction is not accepted. Thank you.

Brenda Burns: Is there anyone else who has any comments or suggestions?

Charles Jones: I own 105 Front Street, downtown, which is at the corner of Federal and Union; my family has been there since 1880; I own 15378 Lavinia Street, down on Lavine and Pond; and I currently live at 127 Morris Avenue. My family has been here a very long time and I wish to share a different opinion with some of the things that were expressed here tonight. One of them being that the parking lot facing Broad Street has no historic value. Well, when I walk down Broad Street, I see that there are no parking lots facing Broad Street and it has always been that way. I have old post cards that date back to the turn of the century and it has always been house, house, house, house, house; always fairly close together, facing Broad Street and if you were to change the nature of that, you're changing the historic way the land has always been laid out. Whether or not it meets the site plan criteria or not, I don't know, but it certainly changes the historic significance of the area; because you're going to have a parking lot facing that street,

rather than the face of a house. The second thing that I differ with is that you say that the house has no historic significance, I guess because the gingerbread, lightning rods and scrolls have been taken off of it; but in my opinion that house has historic significance. When I look on the 1868 Beer's Atlas, I see that H. B. Lingo resided there, which was Henry Bates Lingo; one of my great-, great-grandfathers and he shipped quite a bit of lumber out of this town on Milton built ships; so when you have someone that lives there; that did significant things in this Town; that makes it historic in my mind; and if you were to take a house and tear it down and then take the Holly House and tear it down; and Doc Hopkins' house, it might not have any historic significance and tear it down; and the Ponder Mansion, oh well; what do you have left if you tear everything down one-by-one-by-one; because they're missing their scroll work and their lightning rods? Eventually, you're going to destroy all the history and then what do you have left? In my mind, if this Board is here to maintain and preserve history; then I would recommend that you deny demolition. I guess I'll stop at that.

Brenda Burns: Thank you, Charlie. Is there anyone else?

Susan Fewell: Again, it's just then, I think, the problem is the parking lot.

Brenda Burns: Not at all, but we will take that into consideration. Thank you. Would anybody on the Board like to make a motion?

Amy Kratz: I would like to make a motion that we not demolish the house.

Brenda Burns: Deny the applicant.

Amy Kratz: Yes.

Mike Ostinato: Second.

Brenda Burns: We're going to do a roll call vote and we'll start with you Mr. Ostinato.

Michael Ostinato	Deny
Amy Kratz	Deny
Brenda Burns	Deny
Jack Vessels	I'll just abstain at this point
Gwen Foehner	Deny
Sally Harkins	Abstain

Brenda Burns: So we have a majority vote that..., is that correct.

Mary Schrider-Fox: That's correct. I think for all those who voted and did not abstain, it would be a good idea to place your reasons for your vote on the record. You've already lodged your vote but we would go through again and each person discuss or state your reasons why you voted the way you did.

Michael Ostinato Denied – I don't think the structure should be torn down.

Amy Kratz Denied – I believe in 1860 when that structure was built, there are many structures in this town that look very similar; and I think that alone gives it historical and architectural significance. I don't want to create a precedent for tearing down old structures that look typical to the surrounding houses that are also just typical

structures; I don't want to create that precedent in this town.

Brenda Burns

Denied – My reason is that the house does have significance. I think the streetscape would completely be interrupted with the parking lot facing Mulberry. While I admire what Casa does for the community, I think that we are losing our historic structures in this town and I think it's very important to maintain them, to keep them, because once they're gone, and I think your building is quite attractive; but you're building something new at the cost of something that is historic and I just don't think that it warrants that; I think, yes, you might have more office; you're actually going to serve two more clients, which I don't think justifies demolishing a historic structure.

Gwen Foehner

Denied – I don't think the fact that some of us don't want that house demolished is in any way a denial of the great work that you're doing there; we don't want you to think that anybody is saying that. But what we feel is that we don't want to see a structure demolished. For instance, in reading through your structural inspection I don't see anything major here; a lot of the things I see in here were things I had to have corrected in my 1868 house when I moved into it. These are all correctable things. So I don't see any real reason to demolish it.

Jack Vessels

Abstains – I think the work they do probably offsets any value that that house has. I abstain because in my lifetime I have moved 30 or 40 houses and restored them and this was one I never would have considered to be worth the money to do it; just from walking by; I've not been inside; I've not seen details; I haven't stripped it down to see the framework; it just has never excited me architecturally and I don't see where its that valuable a house; I understand it was on the Beer's Atlas; or at least a house was on the Beer's Atlas at that location. I think maybe the work they do here is more important than the house and if they could possibly save it by moving it across the street; that would certainly be a good alternative.

Sally Harkins

Abstains – I really am going both ways. I see reasons to tear the building down; I see good reasons why they need better office space; I don't find the building attractive; but then it is historical; so I'm really torn from which way to vote.

Amy Kratz: Can I say one more thing about the reason that I voted?

Mary Schrider-Fox: Sure.

Amy Kratz: I don't want to create a precedent for tearing down old structures that look typical to the surrounding areas or the surrounding houses that are just typical structures. I don't want to create that precedent in this town. Thank you.

Brenda Burns: Thank you.

Amy Kratz: Thank you very much. I know that you all put everything together. I would like to say that I appreciate what you do, also in this town; and I'm glad that you're not going to move.

Adjournment

Amy Kratz: I would like to make a motion to adjourn this meeting.

Sally Harkins: Second

Brenda Burns: All in favor. Opposed. Motion carried.

Meeting adjourned at 8:29 pm.