CITY OF DOVER HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
AGENDA
THURSDAY, April 21, 2016 - 3:00 P.M.
City Hall – Conference Room

ROLL CALL

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF MEETING on February 18, 2016

COMMUNICATIONS & REPORTS

1. Summary of 2016 Activity
    a. Summary of Applications 2015 and 2016
    b. Summary of Architectural Review Certifications for 2016

2. Department of Planning & Inspections Update

NEW BUSINESS

1. Review of Permits Referred to Commission

NEW APPLICATIONS

1. HI-16-02 Carriage House at 2 Kings Highway NE – Public Hearing and Review for Action on the Architectural Review Certification associated with the construction of a carriage house replica to replace an existing detached garage at 2 Kings Highway NE. The proposed 2-story structure would function as a garage, workshop, and pool guest area. The property is zoned R-10 (One-Family Residence Zone) and is subject to the H (Historic District Overlay Zone). The property is located at the corner of Kings Highway NE where Kings Highway and Division Street merge, south of the intersection with Maple Lane. The owner of record is Samuel Ryan Halpern. Address: 2 Kings Highway NE. Tax Parcel: ED-05-077.05-04-44.00-000. Council District 2.

OLD BUSINESS

1. Certified Local Government (CLG) Program –
    a. Update on Application for Grant Funding for FFY2016

ADJOURN

THE AGENDA ITEMS MAY NOT BE CONSIDERED IN SEQUENCE. THIS AGENDA IS SUBJECT TO CHANGE TO INCLUDE THE ADDITION OR THE DELETION OF ITEMS, INCLUDING EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Agenda Posted: April 12, 2016

CITY OF DOVER
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
February 18, 2016

The Regular Meeting of the City of Dover Historic District Commission was held on Thursday, February 18, 2016 at 3:03 PM with Chairman Salkin presiding. Members present were Chairman Salkin, Mr. Scrafford and Ms. Horsey. Mr. Jackson arrived at 3:18pm and Mr. McDaniel was absent.

Planning Office Staff members present were Mrs. Melson-Williams, Mr. Diaz, and Mrs. Purnell.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The approval of the agenda to move item #2 under New Business after approval of the minutes was approved by acclamation. Mr. Jackson and Mr. McDaniel were absent.

ADOPTION OF MINUTES OF THE REGULAR HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION MEETING OF JANUARY 21, 2016

Ms. Horsey moved to adopt the minutes of the regular Historic District Commission meeting of January 21, 2016, seconded by Mr. Scrafford and the motion was unanimously carried 3-0 of the members present.

NEW BUSINESS

Presentation on Capitol Complex Lighting Upgrades (HI-16-01)

Mrs. Melson-Williams gave a brief overview of the informational application that is within the Historic District that proposes lighting upgrades (fixture replacements) in the Capital Complex Area.

Representatives: Mr. Jim Hutchison, Engineer with Studio JAED; Mr. Brian Zigmand, Project Manager with Studio JAED; Mr. Mark Devore, Office of Management and Budget for the State of Delaware.

Mr. Hutchison stated that the older fixtures are not compliant with the current codes due to voltage and there is a need to get better lighting as well as to reduce the amount of energy consumed. The project was designed and presented to the State and is ready for bid.

Mr. Zigmand stated that the initial cause for the project was previously mentioned. The intent is to correct the code conditions. In previous years of the 1970's and 1980's, there were no codes. They presented to change them out to an acceptable 208-240 voltage range. The cost impact would come into effect when you would have to drop the voltage and increase the wiring in absence of finding a more efficient light fixture. The benefit is that LED lights provide similar illuminations at significant lower wattage and essentially becomes the detector change out that most people pursue in this type of project. The light fixtures are normally 50% more efficient than the ones that they are replacing. The LED lights will also meet the recognized criteria for illumination of sidewalks

which the current fixtures do not. They wanted the approval of the Historic District Commission of the actual fixture. Realizing in and around the Legislative Hall and the greater City Hall area there are a few different light fixture styles that are in motion at the current time. This would certainly become the most populist in and around the area once the change has been made. There are roughly 150 fixtures noted on the base bid for this project. They presented a color version of the lighting specifications and location plans that were included in the packet to all members. The bulk of the lighting that they will take account of will be in and around the street lighting near Legislative Hall. The lighting that is being test driven is located near Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard which is the south side of Legislative Hall. Ten (10) fixtures have transitioned over. Not everything currently shown on the drawing is base bid. Given the cost implications of the project, they will try to take down as many of the lights as possible. The lighting is divided up between the ones that are mandatory and need to be replaced due to the code issue.

Responding to Mr. Scrafford's question regarding if the lighting in the parking lot of the Credit Union was a compliance item as he referred to the survey and project sheet, Mr. Zigmand stated that the survey that was strictly done to identify every light fixture in that area. Mr. Scrafford stated that project sheet 9:3 does not show any light work being done in that parking lot, Mr. Zigmand concurred and stated that if it is not shown then the lights are already code compliant. Mr. Scrafford questioned whether that applied to The Green and State Street; Mr. Zigmand stated he believed so. Anything that is not identified fell outside of the scope or it is already code compliant.

Responding to Chairman Salkin's question that the objective over time is to replace all of the lighting with the new standard as funds becomes available, Mr. Zigmand stated yes. The existing cast iron poles will remain; they will be repainted.

A display of the LED lighting future was presented.

Mr. Devore stated that the lighting was much warmer than the old lighting.

Responding to Mr. Scrafford's question whether the lighting was a common item where consistency could be kept above the heads, Mr. Devore stated that it was being discussed. They were trying to get an approval on a type of light fixture from Spring City Electrical Manufacturing Company of Philadelphia who has been in business for a decade. There is nothing within the device itself that is proprietary.

Mr. Scrafford was thinking if the City of Dover was responsible for anything on State Street or in that vicinity that a similar fixture could be obtained so that they could have some common knowledge.

Mr. Zigmand stated that similarity was being discussed.

Responding to Mr. Scrafford's question if the LED lighting fixture presented was planned for the Capitol Complex, Mr. Zigmand stated absolutely.

Responding to Mr. Scrafford's question whether there were additional fixtures added to the contract or a straight bid with an exact number, Mr. Zigmand stated that in this particular case

there is a base bid and some alternates that were shown. The base bid is 150 lights; with the alternates it would be around 180-190. They plan to do as many as possible in this round and as money becomes available they will try to get the consistency throughout. Once you have 150 lights installed in and around that area you will see the benefit of having the same fixtures throughout.

Mr. Scrafford stated that from a Historic District standpoint commonality is a feature that might be very interesting.

Mr. Devore stated that one of the reasons they were present today before the Historic District Commission was to receive their blessings and that would create a standard that they could use in their bidding process.

Responding to Mr. Scrafford's question whether there was any conversation with the City of Dover Electric Department regarding the fixtures, Mr. Zigmand stated part of the trail that started three (3) years ago was to do a life cycle cost analysis. This would consist of whether or not the City of Dover would take over the light fixtures or have them replaced on their own. Unfortunately, the cost that would be incurred by migrating or moving the light fixtures to the City of Dover was beyond funding.

Mr. Jackson arrived at 3:18pm.

Responding to Mr. Scrafford's question whether the LED lights came in different sizes, Mr. Zigmand stated that this particular lamp comes in a different style.

Responding to Mr. Scrafford's question whether there were various sizes of the same style, Mr. Zigmand concurred.

Responding to Ms. Horsey's question whether this particular lantern is already placed around town, Mr. Zigmand stated that some samples have been placed as shown on the photos. All of the LED lights are oriented downward and is projected to the needed area. They are a direct light source.

Mr. Devore stated that a few years ago some of the lenses were replaced in the old light fixtures and some of them started to get a yellowish glow because they were changing colors due to the UV lighting. It created a situation where some of them were more yellow due to the lens. They have spent a lot of time with Spring City to get the color right so that the lighting would be warmer.

Mr. Zigmand stated that the lights are set as 30/45/70 so that you get an even light cast around the fixture as it all goes to the ground.

Mr. Scrafford stated that the color was nice.

Ms. Horsey stated that the biggest thing is on The Green there are 3-4 different types of lights whereas they have different color pane. She suggested if the City could work with this plan and have the uniform lighting it would make the Capital City beautiful as oppose to the disparate of different lights, lanterns and poles. Now that we are a National Historical Park it is worth it and

they deserve to have good lighting. She suggested that the City would extend the lighting to the entire area of The Green.

Mr. Devore stated if they get the bid with Spring City he would think that the City could work with their existing contractor if the City's contractor officials would be willing to accept and would probably receive the same rate.

Responding to Mr. Scrafford's question if they received more money would it include lighting that would go into The Green, Mr. Zignard stated that they would only be receiving a finite amount of money. Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that the lighting may not be theirs to replace or take care of from the start; they may be City lights. The contractor is replacing the State owned lighting. The survey identified some lights, but that they are not sure who owns them.

Mr. Scrafford stated that from what he has seen in the fixture and illumination it would be appropriate for the complex to make it consistent as the Capital of the State.

Responding to Chairman Salkin's question what the lenses were made of, Mr. Zigmand stated that the lenses were made of poly and UV treated.

Responding to Mr. Scrafford's question that as an aside does this straighten out the voltage issue, Mr. Devore stated it was the goal and the whole point of the project. They are not sure how much of the existing wiring is in good condition to be reused. Part of the project they will do testing. There will be continual funds for cable replacement or wiring.

Responding to Mr. Scrafford's question whether the lighting was used in Philadelphia, Mr. Zigmand stated that he was not sure about that particular model. The last time he spoke with Spring City, they had done an area outside of Reading and in some parts of Lancaster.

Mr. Devore stated that they have Spring City's fixtures in Atlanta, New York, Washington DC, etc. although it may not be the same style.

Chairman Salkin stated that the Historic District Commission responded positively on the lighting presentation.

COMMUNICATIONS & REPORTS

Summary of 2016 Activity

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that included in the packet was a Summary of the 2015 applications that came before the Historic District Commission. The only updated activity change is the completion of the demolition at 312 W. Loockerman Street.

Summary of Architectural Review Certifications for 2016

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that there was one (1) flat roof permit for 47 South West Street known as the Holt Distributors Building which required no Architectural Review Certification due to lack of visibility. There was also a permit related to gutter and downspout replacement issued in early February for the Century Club on The Green and there was a permit that the Historic District Commission was made aware of previously relating to brick repair at that

location.

Department of Planning & Inspections Update

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that there were no major projects, but there is ordinance research that the office is working on. The Downtown Dover Development District and Restoring Central Dover various committees continue to meet with implementation projects in the future.

Mr. Scrafford commented that a sign went up on a pole heading northbound on State and Water Street that was related to Downtown Development District.

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that the Downtown Development District boundaries were delineated by signage. It was a State initiative to mark the boundaries of the Development District. It is a traffic related sign that would not require a sign permit. She was not sure who installed the signs or who supplied them.

OLD BUSINESS

Certified Local Government (CLG) Program:

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that placed before the Historic District Commission members was a draft of the report that will needs to be supplied to the State. She asked all members to review for accuracy of their information. The report asks about any specific requests for training or technical assistance within the next year.

Mr. Scrafford stated that they would like to be made aware of any potential training opportunities that are scheduled to be held in the City as they have done in the past.

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that some of the other Certified Local Governments have held workshops and extended the invitation to all.

Responding to Chairman Salkin's question whether there was any training available to help them as they move forward with the CLG process (standards and guidelines), Mrs. Melson-Williams suggested that she would ask if the State Historic Preservation Office could visit the Historic District Commission so they could learn more about the CHRIS System which is an electronic system that houses survey information on all historic properties.

Responding to Mr. Scrafford's question whether the Historic District Commission's *Design Standard and Guidelines* was digital, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that the file exists as a PDF on the City of Dover website.

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that CLG information will be finalized within the next week and then sent to the State. The Historic District Commission became a CLG in May and the report covers May-September 2015.

Responding to Mr. Scrafford's question whether the Staff approvals listed on the CLG report was the Historic District approval, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated yes. Mr. Scrafford stated that they needed credit for what was done. Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that the chart was not stand alone,

but relates to information on a previous page and the Application Review process is described on page 4.

Review of Permits Referred to Commission

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that the office just received an application related to the property at 150 S. Governors Avenue, previously the old shoe repair store. The building is under new ownership. They are expecting to do interior and exterior renovations to the building to establish retail on the first floor. Currently, the building is clad with vinyl siding with a flat roof. In addition, to the interior project they are replacing the front door, window, and vinyl siding. The upper area of the front façade will have more of a shake look to the siding rather than the horizontal view. There are a lot of plumbing and electrical type items on the inside of the building that are not subject to review in the Historic District. The building currently has vinyl and they are replacing with vinyl therefore they can continue to have it; however, if they did not have vinyl and wanted to install vinyl then it would come before the Historic District Commission for review.

Chairman Salkin asked if it could be explained regarding the vinyl siding and if it was a precedent. Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that it is typically like the situation of roof materials; if it already has asphalt it continues as the same. Similar things have been done with the siding.

Chairman Salkin questioned if it was something that was just accepted or is it in the Guidelines. Mrs. Melson-Williams read the Guidelines.

Ms. Horsey commented if they were taking off the old vinyl and replacing with new vinyl, then why the Historic District Commission could not make a recommendation to keep the old clapboard (siding).

Responding to Chairman Salkin's concern and to help the Historic District Commission understand that if they did not raise any of the issues how would this project proceed, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that this would be a Permit whereas Staff would do the Architectural Review Certification judging it against the "*Design Standards and Guidelines"*. Staff could then issue the Architectural Review Certification. If there were any particular concerns regarding whether or not it complied it could be referred to the Historic District Commission for your help in determining the Architectural Review Certification. She has looked at the Permit briefly because the building code review happened late last week and it just came into the Planning Office. Staff had a lot of discussions with the owner regarding her thoughts and plans and to guide her away from things that were clearly inappropriate to the District.

Responding to Chairman Salkin's question regarding the cornice, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that the owner was looking to remove the cornice between the first and second floor and the size of the windows which were early discussions about what she was thinking about doing. From looking at the Permit, the windows are staying the same size and the cornice and door remains.

Ms. Horsey commented that is was a good thing that Staff headed of the owner in the right direction, but she still felt that the Historic District Commission is the one that should pass judgement. There is no point in having the Historic District Commission active if they don't have review or knowledge of projects. She felt that this was a major change.

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that the form of the building was not changing.

Discussion

Members continued to discuss the project and reiterate their same concerns as they have previously regarding reviewing projects that has significant changes to the building or specified color choices, especially with the buildings Downtown. They felt that people should be challenged more to do better by the Historic District Commission other than just by Staff. The Historic District Commission is there to support the Staff.

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that the preliminary review of what she has looked at thus far would be something that Staff could grant approval.

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that on this project and Permit she could note in the comments that it was presented to the Historic District Commission and the concern of the appropriateness of the cedar shake on the upper portion of the front wall and the concern of the continued use of vinyl on the building.

Chairman Salkin questioned whether the Permit would come before the Historic District Commission after the comments are issued with the Permit as previously stated by Mrs. Melson-Williams; Mrs. Melson-Williams stated no, unless they find that in the Permit there is truly significant items that will need to be formally referred to the Historic District Commission for the review in the Architectural Review Certification process.

Ms. Horsey stated again that all permits with building changes in the Historic District should come before the Historic District Commission. Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that the *Zoning Ordinance* prescribes the Architectural Review Certification process and gives Staff the ability to review certain types of project activities through the building permitting process which is an administrative review.

Chairman Salkin stated that on a previous permit that was approved by Staff, the Historic District Commission respectfully disagreed with the interpretation or definition of that section by Staff. Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that with the situation on the corner, Staff did the reviews and issued the permit with the Architectural Review Certification because it met the *Design Standards and Guidelines and* Staff's interpretation of what they are allowed to do under the provisions of the *Zoning Ordinance*. If the Historic District Commission wishes to challenge Staff determination or the interpretation of the *Zoning Ordinance* that is an appeal to the Board of Adjustment. If the Historic District Commission seeks to change what the Code states, then that would be an amendment to the *Zoning Ordinance* which is a process regarding language that is being proposed to be changed.

Responding to Chairman Salkin's question that the Historic District Commission could appeal to the Board of Adjustment, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated yes and it is specific to provisions of the *Zoning Ordinance* (Article 9).

Chairman Salkin stated that he and the Historic District Commission were not interested in appealing the decision of the building on the corner as that was not his reason for raising the question, but they don't want it to happen again.

Mr. Jackson stated that the history needed to be changed so that the Historic District Commission is not after the fact. We need to come before the fact otherwise there is no point in what the Historic District Commission does.

Chairman Salkin stated that the message would be to ask Mrs. Melson-Williams and the chain of command to look at the *Zoning Ordinance*, recognize their concerns about the building on the corner, and acknowledge that they have raised the same issues on this project. They as a Commission believe that it should not be handled at the Administrative level. If Mrs. Melson-Williams, Mrs. Townshend, and the City Manager disagree then there can be a discussion amongst us at a later date if the Historic District Commission wants to suggest a change in the *Zoning Ordinance*, but in the meantime it is important for people to know that the Historic District Commission believes that those two (2) projects are examples of activities that belong before the Historic District Commission after preliminary Administrative Review, but not a final review. The Historic District Commission understands the process and limitations.

Mrs. Melson-Williams referred to the *Zoning Ordinance* provisions in Article 10, Section 3.2 Architectural Review Certification and 3.22 which outlines what provisions can be done by the City Planner.

Chairman Salkin stated that since the Historic District Commission members present strongly disagreed very strenuously regarding the property on the corner and until they know that they have a common understanding of how it is going to be applied and implemented they would like to see any substantial project (especially an entire façade). He did not believe that the *Zoning Ordinance* was written to enable administrative Staff to bypass that.

Mr. Scrafford commented that during the rewrite of the *Zoning Ordinance* the questions were brought forward. He wondered if the *Zoning Ordinance* was specific enough as to what can or cannot be done. The Historic District Commission was told that certain things would not happen, but they are happening. The Historic District Commission authority has been relocated in certain instances and they object to that.

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that she did not know that and they would have to revisit Article 10 Section 3 read previously. There were adjustments made to clarify procedures in general.

There was additional discussion regarding the project such as photos and painting.

Responding to Chairman Salkin question whether the applicant applied for the DDD grant, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that the Downtown Dover Partnership Design Committee had a meeting on February 17, 2016. The Downtown Dover Partnership Design Committee reviews applications for the Partnership's Façade Grant Program. They reviewed an Application for this project. That Façade Grant Program does not exempt them from any City process. The projects are charged with meeting the *Design Standards and Guidelines for the City of Dover Historic District Zone.*

Responding to Chairman Salkin question regarding if the applicant receives a grant where does the money come from, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that it is money that the Downtown Dover Partnership has acquired through various means. The maximum amount that any small scale project can receive is $2500.

The meeting was adjourned by acclamation.

Meeting adjourned at 4:19 PM

Sincerely,

Maretta Savage-Purnell
Secretary

City of Dover Historic District Commission
Summary of Applications 2015
Updated thru April 11, 2016

FILE#	PLAN NAME	LOCATION	TYPE	ACTION	STATUS
HI-15-01	DRAFT Certified Local Government Application	City of Dover	Application to be designated as a Certified Local Government	Draft Application presented to HDC on 1/15/2015. Draft Application reviewed by Legislative, Finance & Administration Committee on 2/9/2015. City Council on 2/23/2015 approved Application for submission.	Planning Staff completed DRAFT of CLG Application. Application presented to City Council who endorsed its submission. Submission to SHPO with cover letter dated 3/30/2015 from Mayor. Designated a CLG on May 15, 2015.
HI-15-02	Sign Permit #14-1609 Referral	151 Kings Highway SW, Woodburn Governors Mansion	Sign Permit for post and panel sign	Permit #14-1609 referred to HDC by City Planner for Architectural Review Certification consultation; 1/15/2015 HDC Meeting - approved ARC as submitted in permit; Staff Approval of Permit per ARC	Permit issued for post and panel sign. Sign installed.
HI-15-03	Sign Permit #15-15 Referral	6 South State Street, Baird Mandalas & Brockstedt	Sign Permit for freestanding sign and fence	Permit #15-15 referred to HDC by City Planner for Architectural Review Certification consultation; 1/15/2015 HDC Meeting - approved ARC with conditions on height and size; Staff Approval of Permit per ARC	Permit issued. Freestanding sign and fence installed at property corner of South State Street and Division Street.
HI-15-04	Building Permit #15-19 Referral	3 Loockerman Plaza, PNC Bank	Building Permit for Drive-thru ATM structure	Permit #15-19 referred to HDC by City Planner for Architectural Review Certification consultation; 1/15/2015 HDC Meeting - approved ARC with conditions for dumpster enclosure; Staff Approval of Permit per ARC	Permit issued. Construction complete.
HI-15-05	Biggs Museum Sculpture	406 Federal Street	Installation of exterior sculpture of tree and birds	Architectural Review Certification Application granted at HDC meeting of 2/19/2015; Staff Approval of Permit per ARC	Permit issued. Installation of the sculpture is complete.

City of Dover Historic District Commission
Summary of Applications 2015
Updated thru April 11, 2016

HI-15-06	Building at 312 West Loockerman Street	312 West Loockerman Street	Determination of Demolition by Neglect	Determination of Demolition by Neglect by HCD at meeting of 2/19/2015. Property declared a Dangerous Building by City Council on 3/9/2015.	Active Code Enforcement Cases and designated a Dangerous Building. Property owner has until 9/9/2015 to repair or demolish building. City taking action to demolish the building. Demolition Permit #15-1387 issued 10/9/2015. Demolition of building complete.
HI-15-07	Santa House Project	Loockerman Way and other locations	Informational Presentation	Project for a portable temporary structure. Presentation on project at 4/23/2015 HDC Meeting. Staff Approval of Permit #15-1159 per ARC recommendations.	Permit issued. Structure placed 12/17/2015.
HI-15-08	South Bradford Street Streetscape Enhancements Project	Bradford Street segment between West Division Street and West Loockerman Street	Informational Presentation	Project concept for proposed pedestrian improvements including new sidewalks, curb ramps, crosswalks, curbing, pedestrian lighting, landscaping. Presentation on project concept at 12/17/2015 HDC Meeting.	Presentation of project concepts/alternatives. Public Workshop held by DelDOT 1/12/2016. City Council granted authorization on 4/11/2016 to execute Transportation Enhancement Program Agreement to initiate the project design.

City of Dover Historic District Commission
Summary of Applications 2016
Updated thru April 11, 2016

FILE#	PLAN NAME	LOCATION	TYPE	ACTION	STATUS
HI-16-01	Capitol Complex Lighting Upgrades	Capital Complex Area: Federal Street, Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard, Legislative Avenue	Presentation of Information	Presentation at HDC 2/18/2016 Meeting	Project lighting concept for light fixture and bulb illumination positively received by HDC. Project is informational only; no formal action or permitting process required.
HI-16-02	Carriage House at 2 Kings Highway NE	2 Kings Highway NE	Demolition of garage and construction of carriage house building as accessory structure	Consideration of project at 4/21/2016 HDC Meeting for Architectural Review Certification	Upon receipt of Building Permit #16-337 project was identified as requiring application to HDC

Summary of Permit Applications with Architectural Review Certification
2016 - Updated Thru 3-31-2016

DATE	PERMIT #	LOCATION	TYPE	ACTION ON ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW CERTIFICATE	NOTES
1/12/2016	16-35	47 South West Street	Roof Permit	Staff Approval. No ArchRevCert required due to lack of visibility.	Replacement of flat roof system.
2/8/2016	16-64	151 South Governors Avenue, Inkredible Art	Sign Permit - Projecting Sign	Staff Approval.	Hanging sign under pent roof canopy.
2/4/2016	16-65	100 West Water Street	Building Permit - Roof Drainage system	Staff Approval. No ArchRevCert required due to lack of visibility.	Additional downspout drainage system connection on rear/interior parking lot side of building that is not visible.
2/10/2016	16-129	308 South State Street, Law Offices of Sean Lynn	Sign Permit - Projecting Sign	Staff Approval	Projecting sign hanging under pent roof awning. Sign installed.
2/18/2016	16-175	40 The Green, The Century Club	Building Permit - Gutters & Downspouts	Staff Approval. Project information update to HDC on 2/18/2016.	Replacement of gutters using metal half rounds and downspouts on sides of building. Limited visibility.
3/28/2016	15-1702	34 South State Street, Wesley College President's House	Administrative Building Permit	Staff Approval	Brick replacement of brick sidewalk in herringbone pattern along property frontage.
3/7/2016	16-112	150 South Governors Avenue	Building Permit - Exterior and Interior Renovations	Staff Approval with notations about selection of exterior finish materials and formats.	Interior Renovations to retail space. Exterior Renovations of door & window replacements, reclad in new vinyl siding with entire façade in horizontal siding of clapboard style product. Discussion at 2/18/2016 HDC meeting recommended evaluation of alternative finish materials.
3/11/2016	16-237	147 South New Street, Bait N Hook	Building Permit - Interior Renovations	Staff Approval. No ArchRevCert required for interior work.	Interior Renovation for take-out restaurant tenant.
3/18/2016	16-259	11 North State Street, Gunn Wealth Management	Sign Permit - Freestanding Sign	Staff Approval	Reface existing signage on decorative metal fence and wall sign on wall at rear entry for new tenant. Signs installed.

Summary of Permit Applications with Architectural Review Certification
2016 - Updated Thru 3-31-2016

DATE	PERMIT #	LOCATION	TYPE	ACTION ON ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW CERTIFICATE	NOTES
3/21/2016	16-282	147 South New Street, Bait N Hook	Sign Permit - Wall Sign and Window Signs	Staff Approval	Wall sign to be mounted in signboard area of upper wall and placement of window signage.
3/21/2016	16-292	316 South Governors Avenue	Fence Permit	Staff Approval	Replacement of fence segment with decorative metal fencing.
3/29/2016	16-369	527-529 South State Street, Lands of Boyles	Fence Permit	HDC Recommendation on ARC 2/21/2013; PC Approval of ARC 3/18/2013; Applications HI-13-01 and S-13-03; Staff issued Permit	Construction of fence along Elm Terrace frontage as part of Parking Lot construction project.
3/29/2016	16-360	527-529 South State Street, Lands of Boyles	Administrative Building Permit - Parking Lot construction	HDC Recommendation on ARC 2/21/2013; PC Approval of ARC 3/18/2013; Applications HI-13-01 and S-13-03; Staff issued Permit	Construction of Parking lot at rear of property with access from alley.

Preservation50

1966-2016

Historic Preservation Workshop

In conjunction with the 83rd Annual Dover Days Festival

Saturday, April 30, 2016 | 8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

with Cocktail Reception to follow

Register online after March 1st at www.doversdaysfestival.com

Deadline to Register is Friday, April 22 at 5 p.m.

Do you own an historic house? Do you care for an historic building?

This workshop is for you! This workshop offers a range of historic preservation techniques and provides practical training and experience that benefits those in renovation trades as well as home-owners seeking to improve do-it-yourself skills. It will also provide guidance about resources available for those actively participating in historic preservation in Delaware.

Space is limited so reserve yours now!

The Smyrna Opera House

7 W South St, Smyrna, DE 19977

Cost: $20

includes Continental Breakfast, Lunch and Cocktail Reception

Kent County & Greater Dover Delaware Convention and Visitors Bureau

DELAWARE Economic Development Office

First State Heritage Park

Saving Delaware History

Historical and Cultural Affairs

Delaware Celebrates the 50th Anniversary of the National Historic Preservation Act

OUR LEGACY, OUR FUTURE



Preservation50

1966-2016

8:00 — 8:30 am	Registration & Continental Breakfast from the Inn at Duck Creek
8:30 — 8:35 am	Welcome - **Mayor JoAnn Masten**, City of Smyrna
8:35 — 8:45 am	Welcome - **Tim Slavin**, Director of Delaware Historical and Cultural Affairs
8:50 — 9:30 am	National Register of Historic Places **Jim Gabbert**, National Park Service
9:40 — 10:05 am	National Register of Historic Places in Delaware **Madeline Dunn**, Delaware State Historic Preservation Office
10:05 — 10:30 am	Historic Tax Credits **Joan Larrivee**, Delaware State Historic Preservation Office
10:45 am -12 noon	Historic Window Care, A Hands-On Approach **John Lindtner**, Building Preservation Services
12 noon - 1:30 pm	Lunch from the Inn at Duck Creek
12:30 — 1:30 pm	The State of Historic Preservation in Delaware **Robin Krawitz**, Delaware State University
1:30 — 2:15 pm	Mortar and Roofing **Kevin Rychlicki**, AIA, Delaware State Parks
2:30 — 3:15 pm	Historic Paint Analysis **Catherine Adams Masek**, Historic Preservation Consultant
3:30 — 5:30 pm	Walking Tour of Historic Smyrna Preservation Inn at Duck Creek and Drunk'n Baker Restoration, **Ed Ide**, Ide Associates Opera House Restoration, **Jay Cooperson,** AIA, Cooperson Associates Steeple Repair at Asbury Methodist Church, **Reverend Dale Brown**
5:30 pm – 7:00 pm	The Painted Stave Distillery Renovation **Ed Ide**, Ide Associates

Reception to follow: Tastings, hand crafted cocktails, hors d'oeuvres & meet the owners

OUR LEGACY, OUR FUTURE

City of Dover

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW STAFF REPORT
Before Dover Historic District Commission
April 21, 2016

Application:	Carriage House at 2 Kings Highway NE, HI-16-02
Project Location:	Corner of Kings Highway NE where Kings Highway and Division Street merge, south of the intersection with Maple Lane
Property Address:	2 Kings Highway NE, Dover
Tax Parcel:	ED-05-077.05-04-44.00-000
Owner:	Samuel Ryan Halpern
Present Zoning:	R-10 (One Family Residence Zone) H (Historic District Zone)
Previous Uses:	Single Family Residence with accessory structures
Proposed Uses:	Single Family Residence with accessory structures

Project Description:
The Historic District Commission will conduct a Public Hearing and Review of an application for an Architectural Review Certificate for the Carriage House project at 2 Kings Highway NE.

This application consists of a project involving the demolition of the existing garage building and construction of a carriage house replica to replace the existing detached garage. The proposed two-story carriage house structure would function as a garage, workshop, and pool guest area. The property is zoned R-10 (One-Family Residence Zone) and is subject to the H (Historic District Zone). The property is located at the corner of Kings Highway NE where Kings Highway and Division Street merge, south of the intersection with Maple Lane.

Property Information:
The project site is located with the local Historic District Zone (H) and subject to the provisions of the *Zoning Ordinance*, Article 3 §21 and referenced sections.

This building is also located within the boundaries of a National Register Historic District, specifically the Victorian Dover Historic District. It is a listed as a contributing resource of this National Register Historic District. Provided below is the building summary from the building inventory listing found within the National Register nomination completed for the Victorian Dover Historic District (nomination completed 1978-79). The building is identified as K-396.434 in the Delaware Cultural Resource Survey. The nomination notes the early twentieth century Georgian-revival style residence but does not include information regarding any outbuildings/accessory buildings on the property.

> *K-396.434 2 Kings Highway East – Early 20th century, 2-story, frame dwelling; clapboard with flat shingle board belt course; hip roof, modillion cornice; 8/8 sash, shuttered; entry porch, modillion cornice, railing above, supported by four columns.*

A series of historic maps were reviewed by Planning Staff for preliminary information on this area of Kings Highway. The *1859 A.D. Byles Map of Kent County* (Dover insert) shows this subject property as part of a larger tract owned by Daniel Cowgill with the only residence on the property being the dwelling now known as Woodburn. The subject property remains part of the same larger parcel on the *1868 Beers Map published by Pomeroy & Beers* listed in the ownership of Daniel Cowgill Sr. The *1885 Bird's Eye View of Dover* and the *1887 Map of the Town of Dover* show several residences in this area north of the Richardson & Robbins facility but does not include a building at this corner location.

Other map series such as the *Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps* would be a likely reference source for information on this dwelling given its early twentieth century construction date. For Dover, this series of maps dated from 1897-1944.

PROJECT PROPOSAL (Drawings dated 3/4/2016):
The application proposes demolition of an existing garage building and the construction of a detached carriage house building in the backyard area of the property accessible from the alley. A series of photographs show the existing structure and other example carriage house buildings. The new building is presented in a Site Plan, elevation drawings, floor plans, and color renderings. The elements of the project are as follows:

1. Demolition of Existing Garage: The proposal is for demolition of the existing one story two car garage building (accessory structure). The garage fronts the rear alley including the large entry door on the east elevation.

2. Carriage House: The proposal is for construction of a new two-story carriage house building with garage parking of two cars, workshop, bath, outdoor kitchen/patio area, and upper floor family room with deck. The Carriage House is to have a brick veneer foundation and watertable, be clad in painted fiber cement horizontal siding, and an asphalt shingle roof. Windows are one over one on the north elevation and arched windows are on the east (alley) elevation and west (yard) elevation. Other details include arched top carriage style entry doors to garage and workshop, cornerboards and other trimwork surround the windows, wood trellis supported by columns, aluminum railing on deck and stairs.
    a. Bulk Requirements for Accessory Structures: The building is to be located four (4) feet from the rear property line and to be approximately twenty-seven (27) feet in height. Accessory building are required to be five (5) feet from the rear property line and are limited to fifteen (15) feet in height.

3. Access/Parking: The Carriage House (serving as garage parking) has access directly from the rear alley. There are no direct vehicular curb cuts to Kings Highway SW or the Kings Highway NE/Division Street onto the property. The property is required to have a

minimum of two off-street parking spaces which is satisfied with the carriage house interior parking.

4. Existing Landscaping: The Site Plan drawings shows a series of existing mature trees along the alley and the Division Street/Kings Highway NE frontages which screen the backyard area of this property.

5. Existing Site Features: In addition to the residential dwelling, there is a second accessory structure called a studio located on the property that will remain. The backyard includes a swimming pool. The property is also surrounded by a variety of types of fencing including a vertical picket style fence, chain link fencing with screening slats, and chain link fencing. Most of the existing fencing appears to be over four feet in height. There are fencing requirements related to swimming pool safety per the Building Code.

Review of DESIGN STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES

In the Historic District Zone, the uses and bulk requirements are governed by the provisions of the *Zoning Ordinance* related to the zoning of the property. In this case, these are the provisions of the R-10 zone (Article 3 §1 and Article 4 §4.1) and other supplementary regulations including Article 5 §1.1 for accessory buildings in residence zones. The Historic District Commission can consider alternatives to the bulk requirements relating to building height, bulk, and setbacks as related to the Architectural Review Certification process.

The subject project site is located in the Dover Historic District Zone within Victorian Historic Context. The Victorian Historic Context is described on pages 2-5 through 2-7. Location within the Dover Historic District Zone requires proposals for demolition, new construction, additions, and certain renovation or rehabilitation activities to existing buildings to receive an Architectural Review Certificate.

As stated in the *Design Standards and Guidelines for the City of Dover Historic District Zone*, an Architectural Review Certificate will be granted "if it is found that the architectural style, general design, height, bulk and setbacks, arrangement location and materials affecting the exterior appearance are generally in harmony with neighboring structures and complementary to the traditional architectural standards of the historic district." In accordance with Article 10 §3.2, the Historic District Commission will take action regarding the project's compliance with the architectural review standards.

This proposal should be reviewed for conformity with the design criteria and development guidelines found in the *Design Standards and Guidelines* of Chapter 4: New Construction, Additions, Demolition, and Relocation. More specifically the sections on Demolition found on 4-10 through 4-12 and the *Design Guidelines* for Secondary Structures found on pages 4-7 and 4-8. For Secondary Structures, it recommends placement at the rear of the lot especially when served by an alley and that the structure be freestanding and subordinate to the primary structure. The secondary structure should also have limited visibility from the street. These *Guidelines* also highlight the consideration that should be given to the proportions, massing, materials, form, orientation, and siting as described on pages 4-4 through 4-6.

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The following are Staff comments and recommendations for this application regarding project activities and Architectural Review Certification.

1) Staff recommends conditional approval of the Architectural Review Certificate for the secondary structure (accessory building) based on the proposal presented in the Carriage House plans for the property at 2 Kings Highway. It is contemporary design of a secondary structure inspired by the historic carriage house form, massing, and siting on the property. The materials selected of brick veneer foundation and watertable and the exterior finish of horizontal siding (cement fiber siding) and trimwork fit the character of the Historic District. This recommendation is made subject to the following comments and suggested revisions.

2) Staff recommendations regarding the Architectural Review Certification of the use and bulk requirements of the *Zoning Ordinance* are as follows:
    a. The use of the new structure is an accessory building to the existing single family dwelling located on the property. It is noted that the Carriage House cannot serve as a second dwelling unit (i.e. apartment) on this property. The R-10 zoning district limits the use to one dwelling per lot.
    b. While the existing garage is located four (4) feet from the rear property line and considered legal non-conforming as to the five (5) foot setback from property lines for accessory structures, the new building can be placed with the same setback of four (4) feet. Staff encourages placement of the new structure at a five (5) foot setback if possible.
    c. Accessory structures are limited to fifteen (15) feet in height per the *Zoning Ordinance*. This proposal is for a structure that is approximately twenty (20) feet to the eave with an overall height of approximately twenty-seven (27) feet due to the second floor area and the gable roof framing structure. Staff recommends approval of the increased height for the accessory structure (Carriage House) as the overall building form is characteristic of historic carriage houses that included two floors of use and steeper pitched roof systems.

3) The following conditions are recommended by Staff to improve project's compliance with the recommended guidelines of the *Design Standards and Guidelines*. The following are recommended conditions:
    a. Recommend the use of architectural asphalt shingles for the roof as this type give greater visual dimension and variation in the roof surface.
    b. Recommend the use of half-round gutters and round downspouts in metal. Corrugated downspouts are inappropriate.
    c. Retain existing trees and/or replant trees to maintain the existing landscape plantings as screening from the adjacent street of Division Street/Kings Highway.

4) Some of the site improvements/amenities were not specifically described with the application information. Please provide information for consideration and discussion.
    a. Clarify if any portion of the existing garage will be utilized in the new construction.

b. Clarify the surface treatment between the alley asphalt pavement and the garage entry doors on the carriage house structure.
c. Clarify if any of the existing chain link fence in the vicinity of the proposed carriage house location will be removed and/or replaced.
d. All mechanical equipment should be located so as to not be visible from the streets. Appropriate screening by plantings, lattice, etc. must be implemented.

5) The *Zoning Ordinance* limits the height of fences to four (4) feet within the front yard setback (Article 5 §1.55) with other provisions for increases in height to 6.5 feet for side yards, rear yards, and the second front yard on corner lots. However, within the Historic District, fences shall not exceed four (4) feet in height. The existing fence (of various materials) on the property exceeds this four foot height; it may be retained.
    a. Staff encourages the owner to evaluate future replacement of the chain link fencing on the property with an alternative material. Chain link fencing is not recommended for use in the Historic District especially along street frontages. Limited installation can occur in rear yard areas.

6) The applicant should be aware of the potential for historic archaeological resources which may include previous building locations, wells, privies, etc. on the property. The State Division of Historical & Cultural Affairs can provide technical assistance when dealing with found archaeological resources or previous studies at the subject location.

7) In the event, that major changes and revisions to the design, materials, or site layout occur with the project contact the Department of Planning and Inspections. These changes may require resubmittal for review by the Historic District Commission.

8) The applicant shall be aware that the Building Permit is required demolition of the existing garage building and construction of the Carriage House on the property; a Building Permit application #16-337 has been received for these activities. The permit applications must comply with the approvals and conditions granted through the Architectural Review Certification and Site Plan Review process.

<u>Historic District Commission Action Required</u>
The Historic District Commission shall consider the proposal and take action in regards to the Architectural Review Certification for the project reflecting consideration of the *Design Standards and Guidelines.*