CITY OF DOVER HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
AGENDA
THURSDAY, April 17, 2014 - 3:00 P.M.
City Hall – Conference Room

ROLL CALL
APPROVAL OF AGENDA

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF MEETING on March 20, 2014

COMMUNICATIONS & REPORTS

1. Summary of 2014 Activity
    a. Summary of Applications 2014 and 2013
    b. Summary of Architectural Review Certifications for 2014

2. Department of Planning & Inspections Update
    a. Bicycle & Pedestrian Sub-Committee
    b. Central Dover Community Plan
    c. Citywide Recreational Needs Assessment

OLD BUSINESS

NEW BUSINESS
1. Review of Building Permits Referred to Commission

2. Update on Certified Local Government (CLG) Program Application

NEW APPLICATIONS

1. HI-14-03 at 6 South State Street – Public Hearing and Review for Recommendation on the Architectural Review Certification associated with a Site Plan to permit the construction of a parking lot, handicap access, and the landscape plan. The property is zoned RGO (General Residence and Office Zone) and is subject to the H (Historic District Overlay Zone). The property is located on the southwest corner of South State Street and Division Street. The owner of record is Six South State, LLC. Address: 6 South State Street. Tax Parcel: ED-05-077.05-04-27.00-000. Council District 3. *Associated with Site Plan Application S-14-11*.

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.

Revised Agenda Posted: April 8, 2014 at 3:00pm

CITY OF DOVER
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
March 20, 2014

The Regular Meeting of the City of Dover Historic District Commission was held on Thursday, March 20, 2014 at 3:00 PM with Chairman Scrafford presiding. Members present were Chairman Scrafford, Mr. McDaniel, Mr. Fisher, and Mr. Salkin. Mr. Jackson was absent.

Staff members present were Mrs. Melson-Williams, Bill Cook, and Mrs. Purnell.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Fisher moved for approval of the agenda as submitted, seconded by Mr. McDaniel and the motion was unanimously carried 4-0. Mr. Jackson was absent.

ADOPTION OF MINUTES OF THE REGULAR HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION MEETING OF NOVEMBER 21, 2013

Mr. McDaniel moved to adopt the minutes of the regular Historic District Commission meeting of November 21, 2013, seconded by Mr. Salkin and the motion was unanimously carried 4-0. Mr. Jackson was absent.

ADOPTION OF MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF FEBRUARY 20, 2014

Mr. McDaniel moved to adopt the minutes of the regular Historic District Commission meeting of February 20, 2014, seconded by Mr. Salkin and the motion was unanimously carried 4-0. Mr. Jackson was absent.

COMMUNICATIONS & REPORTS

Summary of 2013 Activity

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that included in the packet was a summary of applications from both 2013 and 2012. The most notable item from 2012 was the demolition of the building at 509 S. State Street that was owned by Christ Church. The Historic District Commission approved the demolition and the Planning Department received the appropriate documentation of the building. The site has been stabilized and a series of trees were planted along the street frontage sidewalk as conditioned.

Responding to Mr. Salkin's question what the documentation entailed, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated there were a series of photographs of the exterior and interior of the building and measured floor plans. As part of their initial application submission, there was an extensive history of the property where the title work was done and the document is also part of the information received on the building.

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that the most notable item from applications in 2013 is the progress made with the Family Dollar site at 300 W. Loockerman Street. The Demolition Permit has been issued as well as the Building Permit. They have finalized the Site Plan and likewise documentation of the building was submitted which included floor plans and a series of interior

photographs.

Responding to Mr. McDaniel's question if it was going to be more or less like what they approved, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated yes. The architecture of the building was presented to the Planning Commission. There were some minor tweaks when they had to move one of the rear employee only doors from the side to the rear of the building. It is a mixture of different finishes and it looks like multiple segments of the building and not one solid blank wall.

Responding to Chairman Scrafford's question whether there were any of the walls from the original building kept in the new design, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that she was not sure because she did not review the final Building Permit application. It may share a party wall with the adjacent building.

Responding to Mr. McDaniel's question when will the work begin, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that they are still working through some of their permitting with outside agencies. She expects them to start relatively soon.

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that the other application from 2013 is the North Street Pocket Park. Final Plans were received for approval of a landscaping and paving project at 301 S. Governors Avenue.

Mrs. Melson-Williams asked if there were any questions regarding the applications and their status.

Summary of Architectural Review Certifications for 2013

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that it is a summary of all the permit activities in the Historic District for the year. Some of which was interior work so there is no certification. A large number of the permits are eligible for staff approval. There were some that were reviewed by the Historic District Commission and the Planning Commission in some cases.

Responding to Mr. McDaniel's question whether the outhouse behind the John Bell's building was going to happen, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that she had not heard that they were moving forward with the project. They have been through the review process through the Historic District Commission. The Planning Department will keep track of how long the timeframe goes before they apply for a permit.

Responding to Mr. Fisher's question whether the timeframe was one year, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated yes.

Responding to Mr. Scrafford's question whether there was anything in the permitting process that could be a problem if everything was going smoothly, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that everything is going smoothly, the Bell House Outhouse has filed a Building Permit application, but it has not been issued. From an overall permit process, most things Staff can work with and sometimes Building Permits are referred to the Historic District Commission for consultation.

Summary Report of Activities 2013

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that this is done as part of the Planning Offices overall Annual Report that includes some overall background of happenings in the district and provides tallies of overall permit activities in the district and how it was involved. The information was included as part of the Annual Report of the Department of Planning and Inspections that was presented to City Council last month. The most significant thing in 2013 that occurred in the district was the designation of The Green as a National Monument.

Mrs. Melson-Williams asked if there were any additional questions regarding the permits. There were none.

Summary Report of Activities 2014

Responding to Mr. McDaniel's question whether Staff was able to approve the sign application for the EZ-Pass located at 22-24 W. Loockerman Street, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated yes.

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that for the Historic District Commission February meeting there was a Permit referred to the Commission for consultation. The Sign Permit application was referred to the Historic District Commission to review, but due to a lack of a quorum and since time was of the essence Staff continued to work with the applicant. The signs were installed and the facility held its Grand Opening two weeks ago.

Responding to Mr. Salkin's question whether they abided by all of Staff recommendations, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated yes.

Responding to Mr. Fisher's question whether it included a sign on the North Street side, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated no. It is not a public entrance.

Mr. McDaniel thanked Staff for moving the process along and getting it done.

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that through the end of February 2014 there were nine (9) permits that were activities in the Historic District. Two (2) of them that were issued were ones that came before this body and both are related to the Family Dollar project because they were issued in that timeframe. Most of the permit activities can be reviewed by Staff and they are seeing sign and roofing permits and building exterior projects.

Update on March 2014 Permits

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that Wesley United Methodist Church has scaffolding in front of the State Street façade. It is a Permit for brick repair and restoration that was approved by Staff in recent weeks. The firm of Paul's Pointing out of Philadelphia will be doing the work. They are repointing the façade, and going back with a mortar that in color more closely resembles what was originally on the building. The mortar lines will not replicate what the building looked like when it was originally constructed because originally the façade had butter joints. A previous brick project on the front of the building removed the butter joint to a much wider mortar joint and the brick cannot be put back. There will be some brick replacement with a new brick. They are hoping to turn around bricks and use the existing bricks; if not, they have a close replacement. (Brick Sample displayed by Staff.) This is a new brick that was formed to use and matches very closely with the

brick on the front of the building. They are expected to be working on the project for two (2) weeks.

Mrs. Melson-Williams asked if there were any additional questions regarding the permits.

Responding to Mr. Salkin's question whether the new sign at State Street Commons was permitted, it is a small black and white free standing V-shape sign, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that it references parking. If it is of a small enough size it is considered a directional sign by the Sign Regulations and would not require a permit. At the current time there are no tenants in the building.

Responding to Mr. Fisher's question whether there was any information regarding the signs on the lamp posts at the Governor's Club, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that she did not have any update.

Department of Planning & Inspections Update
Bicycle & Pedestrian Sub-Committee
Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that the Bicycle & Pedestrian Sub-Committee continues to meet. If the Historic District Commission has anything that would be of interest to the Committee that you have observed as a bicyclist or pedestrian let Staff know so that the information can be forwarded.

Central Dover Community Plan
Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that the Steering Committee continues to meet. There was a meeting last week. They are trying to locate a facility in order to hold the Open House to present the study information that they have gathered to date. She will inform the Historic District Commission of the date and location of Open House.

Responding to Mr. McDaniel's question whether the Central Dover Community Plan Steering Committee was a result that came about from the Wells Fargo Grant, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated yes. This is the Wells Fargo Grant that NCALL, Downtown Dover Partnership, and The Greater Kent County Committee are involved in.

Responding to Chairman Scrafford's question whether the Central Dover Community Plan Steering Committee was a part of the Planning Department, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that the Planning Department and the City have membership on the Steering Committee. It is not a study that the Planning Department is performing. An outside contractor was hired to do the study. She thought that their Open House concept was something that could be open throughout the day and not like a regular meeting that only last for a couple of hours. She stated that it was their initial strategy, but she was not sure where things stood at the current time since they were having difficulty finding a location.

Review of *2008 Comprehensive Plan*
Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that most recently the Planning Office took through the review process for the Planning Commission and City Council a set of amendments to the Comprehensive Plan specifically on two items in order to get them into the Plan. One of them was the amendment to the Transportation Chapter to establish the concept of Transportation Improvement Districts which is necessary to have in place related to the work that is being coordinated with DelDOT

about the establishments of such districts. The district will be focused on Rt. 13 and the Bay Road corridors. City Council adopted the amendment on March 10, 2014. The second amendment also adopted at the same time is related to the Housing Chapter which makes reference to the Central Dover Community Plan is an on-going study and the results of the study may also be amended into that chapter. Once the series of studies are complete it is anticipated that a much more detailed review of the overall Comprehensive Plan will occur.

Responding to Chairman Scrafford's question regarding the traffic involvement of Historic District, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that the Transportation Improvement District was not in this case. She did not believe that any of the areas that have been identified for that district coincide with the Historic District boundaries.

Responding to Chairman Scrafford's question about traffic in general within the Historic District and if there was an involvement by the Historic District Commission with traffic, because it is going to occur and it has started already. He wanted to know if the Charter included traffic problems within the Historic District, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that the *Design Guidelines* do not speak to road signage for traffic control measures.

Chairman Scrafford stated that when State Street was redone there was a considerable amount of attention paid to the type of signage including the trash cans that would be in that area. Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that it was more of a streetscape project.

Citywide Recreational Needs Assessment

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that the Planning Office and the Parks and Recreation Division have started gathering and mapping some of the information from existing studies. This is an on-going project and they will bring forth any needed information to the Historic District Commission.

Responding to Mr. McDaniel's question of the Transportation Department not being happy about the street cobblestone and the difficulty of determining the left turn lanes at the corner of Loockerman & State and Water & State Streets, and if there needed to be a change, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that there was some discussion when there was a paving rehab project that focused on Loockerman Street because of that one intersection and a similar project on Water Street. They were looking to stripe over the cobblestone, but she has not seen anything on paper.

Mr. McDaniel stated that it is a problem if someone is not familiar with the intersection. They want to turn left, they will be in the wrong lane and back up traffic. He could not imagine the great looking cobblestone and someone going out there and painting a new lane over top of them.

Chairman Scrafford stated that there was a decision made on the selection of the color of State Street and this is the reason the lines are red and not black.

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that she can see where the paving rehab project ended up. She thought that something was supposed to be implemented.

Responding to Mr. Salkin's question whether there were any alternatives, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that she was not aware of any because it was a DelDOT project and State maintained road.

Responding to Mr. Salkin's question whether a citizen or the Historic District Commission wanted to recommend expanding the boundaries of Dover Historic District if there was a particular place in the Comprehensive Plan or is it appropriate to use the process to recommend that a review of the boundary be undertaken and incorporate it into the plan, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that the Comprehensive Plan has a Historic Preservation Chapter and that chapter had a series of goals and potential action items. One of those action items in general terms was to look at the expansion of the Historic District.

Responding to Mr. Salkin's question whether it was 2008, Mrs. Melson-Williams concurred. It is probably an implementation item that would be several years out. The process would need to involve the Historic District Commission, Planning Commission, and City Council because it is a zoning overlay. Part of the process is like doing a Rezoning application. You will need to have the background of the reasons why you would like to draw the lines.

Responding to Chairman Scrafford's question whether there was a process, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that there would be a process. At the current time there is not an active process to review it. There would be a process in the Code to establish how to do it. A citizen could make the request to the Planning Office for an individual property or to look more closely at an area.

Responding to Mr. Fisher's question whether it would start with the Planning Office, City Council, or the Historic District Commission, Chairman Scrafford stated anywhere, but the focus within the City would be the Planning Office. Mrs. Melson-Williams concurred.

Mr. McDaniel recalled the hearings when their role was being examined there were citizens present were in favor of expanding the Historic District.

Chairman Scrafford also recalled the hearing and stated that attempts have been made many years ago to include North State Street.

Mr. Salkin suggested that it be included on a future agenda so that as the Historic District Commission go through their discussion about the plan they will decide to pursue or not to pursue. He did not want another five (5) year plan to go by without addressing that question. He did not have a specific suggestion as to where to start, but in general terms he sees historic fabric of Dover being botched in a lot of places inside and outside the current district. There is absolutely no control or consistency.

Responding to Chairman Scrafford's question whether this was addressed in the Guidelines on expanding or changing the boundaries, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that it will not be necessarily in the Guidelines. There are discussions of the different historic context areas of the City and how it developed. The procedures for expanding the boundary would be in the *Zoning Ordinance*.

OLD BUSINESS

Responding to Mr. McDaniel's question whether there was updated information regarding the role of the Historic District Commission and City Council feelings about the Historic District Commission, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that there has not been anything else as a result of that

public outreach meeting that was roughly a year ago. It has not come up on any Council agenda since that point in time.

Responding to Mr. Fisher's question whether the City was pursuing the status of the Certified Local Government that is required in the Historic District, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that the Certified Local Government program which there is a City Council recommendation to pursue that which happened in late summer of 2013. It would require the Historic District Commission to be in place to participate in the program.

NEW BUSINESS

Review of Building Permits Referred to Commission

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that there were no Building Permits to refer to the Historic District Commission today. The Planning Office has been working with at least one project regarding roofing. They will be looking at an appropriate way of repairing a wood shingle roof. There may be another one if it does file that will come before the Historic District Commission. While there is not a Building Permit application needed or file at this point in time are the activities at 6 South State Street, the southwest corner of Division and State Street. The property has new ownership and they are doing some vegetation clean up on the site. There has been a plan filed that will come before the Historic District Commission next month related to establishing parking on that site. The building was previously used as an office with apartments on the upper floors. The new owners are looking to take the entire building to office space.

Responding to Chairman Scrafford's question whether there was available property between the building and the alley, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated yes. The lot does have a rear addition off the building, but it is not the full width of the main front of the building.

Mr. McDaniel stated that the property also has some sliver of land across the alley. Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that she believed that is the case.

Consideration of Historic or Significant Sign

HI-14-02 Kirby & Holloway Sign – Consideration to determine historic or cultural/aesthetic significance of the pylon sign located at Kirby & Holloway Family Restaurant in accordance with *Zoning Ordinance*, Article 5 Section 4.12. Property Address: 656 North DuPont Highway. Tax Parcel: ED-05-0-68.09-01-09.01-000.

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that included in the packet was a background summary. The Kirby & Holloway Family Restaurant sign which is probably the most famous sign along Route 13. This is a pylon sign. The Sign Regulations, when they were most recently changed, included a provision for the Historic District Commission to determine a sign as historic or of cultural /aesthetic significance. It is outlined in the *Zoning Ordinance* Article 5 Section 4.12. The restaurant experienced a fire over the winter. With the restaurant obviously closed there is concern that the sign could potentially be deemed as abandoned under the Sign Regulations. Since it appears to be non-conforming and does not meet the current Sign Regulations that are in place there are provisions that could dictate the removal of the sign because the business is not currently in operation. It is a pylon sign consisting of multiple geometric shapes with lettering reading as "Kirby & Holloway, Family Restaurant, Established in 1948." The sign is Art-Deco style and sits

in a small grass and planter area along the Route 13 frontage of the site. As part of the submission a recent photograph of the sign was included in the packet along with the Advisory Comments and Recommendations.

Responding to Chairman Scrafford's question whether the owner was aware that the Historic District Commission was reviewing the submission, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that the Planning Office met with the owner because of the process to rebuild. They were advised that Staff would move the submission forward to the Historic District Commission. She also spoke with the owner on site when the photo was taken.

Responding to Chairman Scrafford's question whether if there was approval would it level any obligation from the owner other than having a normal sign, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that the only obligation is to keep it in good working condition.

Responding to Mr. Salkin's question whether this just protects the sign, but does not allow them to continue to use it, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated correct. It protects the sign in a sense that the Sign Regulations could not force its removal because of other provisions that would deem it as an abandoned sign.

Responding to Chairman Scrafford's question whether the owner could make a request to change the sign, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated yes.

Responding to Mr. Salkin's question whether the owner wanted to save the sign, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that it was her understanding that the owner wanted to save the sign.

Mr. Salkin and Chairman Scrafford questioned if the owner did not want to save the sign would they need a Demolition Permit to demolish the sign and what action could someone take in the future to destroy the sign. Responding to the question of if the property was sold can the name on top of the sign be changed or does it take it out of the context of being a historic sign, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that it would be considered a reface under the Sign Regulations. If the new owner did not choose to utilize the existing sign and wanted to put a totally new version of a sign they would have to meet the requirements of the Sign Regulations today, which would be a sign that is set back much further from the road, it will be shorter in height, and smaller in overall size.

Responding to Chairman Scrafford's question whether the selling of the operation could force the sign to be removed, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated no. This designation allows any degree of non-conformity that the sign has whether it is the height or location to continue to be okay.

Responding to Mr. Salkin's question whether the approval of the sign would give the current owners the opportunity to continue to preserve the sign as long as it makes sense for them or their successors and beyond that there is no protection, Mrs. Melson-Williams concurred.

Responding to Chairman Scrafford's question whether the Historic District Commission was preventing the owners from being impacted by the Sign Regulations, Mrs. Melson-Williams concurred. Under the Sign Regulations if a business is not in operation for a period of 90-days and the sign is still up that has their name on it, then it is considered an abandoned sign. It becomes a

code violation and the City has to pursue removal of the sign.

Chairman Scrafford wanted to make sure the owners knew the Historic District Commission was protecting the sign.

Responding to Mr. Fisher's question whether the sign change would need to a permit, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated yes, any reface of a sign would require a Sign Permit application. If they wanted to do something electronic it would also require a Sign Permit.

Mr. McDaniel wanted to make sure the owner was okay with the Historic District Commission making the decision and not them and that the owner is aware of all ratifications and they are in favor of the decision, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that it is her understanding. The Planning Office met with the owners in mid-February to talk about the rebuilding process at the site. One of the items that the Planning Staff alerted them too was the specific provisions of the Sign Regulations that allowed for the designation of the sign as a historic and significant sign which would protect the legal non-conforming status of that sign indefinitely.

Responding to Chairman Scrafford's question whether it was for the current owner only, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that the regulation is for the property and not specific to the owner.

Responding to Mr. Salkins question whether the owner was formally notified and invited to the meeting, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that they were supplied with the report.

Mr. McDaniel and Mr. Fisher stated that they would like to have had the owners present asking about the sign or agreeing to the approval.

Mr. Salkins questioned whether this subject could be endorsed to their acknowledgement. Although he knew that the Historic District Commission could, but he would have been more comfortable if it was a request from the owner. If the owners do not like it for any reasons they can follow all the same procedures to take it down. The Historic District Commission is not tying their hands.

Chairman Scrafford stated that the Historic District Commission was allowing the owner to maintain a non-conforming sign as long as they desire.

Mr. Salkin moved to approve that the Historic District Commission endorse the Staff recommendations that allows the Kirby & Holloway sign to continue in its non-conforming status indefinitely, seconded by Mr. Fisher and unanimously carried 4-0. Mr. Jackson was absent.

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that by endorsing the Staff recommendations the Historic District Commission has confirmed the sign as a historic and significant sign under the provision of the Sign Ordinance that allows for such designation.

Responding to Mr. Salkin's question if anyone has ever systematically reviewed highway signs under historic corridors to see if the Historic District Commission or owners should be proactive anywhere else in the community, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated no. There are other jurisdictions

that actually have such things in place as an inventory. When the Sign Regulations were most recently revised and this provision included, this was one of the signs that was held up as a potential example for why to include that element in your Sign Regulations. Certainly, there may be other ones not just on the highway corridor, but in other locations throughout the City. If there are any ideas of signs, an inventory type listing can be started.

Update on Certified Local Government (CLG) Program Application

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that as mentioned earlier in the meeting the CLG program is something that City Council has endorsed the City applying for. It has been more of an issue for Staff time to be available to put together the application. This includes supplying the resumes of those who sit on the Historic District Commission. She is hoping that since there is now a full Planning Staff that some of the backlog work will hopefully be completed and this will start to transpire. She did not have a deadline date, but understood that there have been some inquiries as to the status of the application from one member of Council.

Training

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated there was none, but would inform the Historic District Commission of any training opportunities that arise. There have been some training opportunities for the Planning Commission that is related to larger land development type application review. If the Historic District Commission is interested in learning more about that process, Staff can point to those training efforts.

Mr. Salkin moved to adjourn the meeting; seconded by Mr. Fisher and unanimously carried 4-0. Mr. Jackson was absent.

Meeting adjourned at 3:54 PM

Sincerely,

Maretta Savage-Purnell
Secretary

City of Dover Historic District Commission
Summary of Applications 2013
Updated thru April 7, 2014

FILE#	PLAN NAME	LOCATION	TYPE	ACTION	STATUS
HI-13-01 S-13-03	Lands of Boyles: Parking Lot Construction	527-529 South State Street	Construction of parking lot east of existing building	2/21/2013 HDC Recommendation of Approval of ArchRevCert with conditions. Application S-13-03 reviewed by PC and granted Approval of ArchRevCert with conditions.	Check Print of Site Plan submitted 5/28/2013 for review and comments issued. Final Plan submitted 8/22/2013 for review. Final Plan Approval issued 11/6/2013. Project must apply for Building Permits prior to start of construction.
HI-13-02 S-13-12	Family Dollar	300 West Loockerman Street	Demolition of existing commercial building (old NAPA) and construction of 8,308 S.F. retail building.	3/21/2013 HDC Recommendation of Approval of ArchRevCert with conditions. Application S-13-12 reviewed by PC and granted Approval of ArchRevCert with conditions on 5/20/2013.	Check Prints of Site Plan submitted 7/19/2013 for review and comments issued 8/22/2013. Documentation of building submitted 1/10/2014.Final Site Plan approval letter of 1/16/2014. Demolition Permit #13-1428 issued 2/4/2014. Pre-Construction meeting held 2/26/2014. Building Permit issued 2/28/2014.
HI-13-03	Capital City Trail Project: Phase 2	Between Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard (Court Street) and East Loockerman Street	Bike and Pedestrian Improvements	Information Presentation presented at HDC Meeting of 3/21/2013	Phase 2 is currently in design. Construction of Phase 1 trail segment began in April 2013 and appears complete.
HI-13-04	Building Permits #13-260 Referral for John Bell House: Replica Outhouse & Rear Yard Fence	43 The Green	Construction of accessory structure (Outhouse) and Fence	Permit #13-260 referred to HDC by City Planner for Architectural Review Certification: 3/21/2013 HDC Approval of ArchRevCert. Permit approved for issuance	Permit ready to be issued as of 4/11/2013. Project not started yet.

City of Dover Historic District Commission
Summary of Applications 2013
Updated thru April 7, 2014

FILE#	PLAN NAME	LOCATION	TYPE	ACTION	STATUS
HI-13-05 S-13-10	North Street Pocket Park	301 South Governors Avenue	Redevelopment of vacant parcel as park with paving and landscape areas.	7/18/2013 HDC Recommendation of Approval of ArchRevCert with conditions. Application S-13-10 reviewed by PC and granted Approval of ArchRev Cert with conditions on 8/19/2013.	Review by PRCE on 4/8/13 with recommendation. 4/22/13 City Council reviewed and referred back to PRCE. Review by PRCE on 6/10/2013. City Council approved property use as a Pocket Park on 6/24/2013. Check Print documents received on 9/25/13, 10/11/13, and 10/30/13 for review; Check Print letter issued 12/10/2013. Final Site Plans approval granted 3/28/2014. Permits to be applied for and Pre-Construction meeting to be scheduled.

City of Dover Historic District Commission
Summary of Applications 2014
Updated thru April 7, 2014

FILE#	PLAN NAME	LOCATION	TYPE	ACTION	STATUS
HI-14-01	Sign Permit #14-148 Referral	22-24 West Loockerman Street - EZ Pass Offices	Sign Permit for two wall signs	Permit #14-148 referred to HDC by City Planner for Architectural Review Certification consultation;2/20/14 HDC Meeting - no quorum present, Staff continued to work with applicant	Staff worked with applicant to revised design and material of wall signs. Revised concept approved and Permit issued. Signage installed.
HI-14-02	Kirby & Holloway Sign	656 North DuPont Highway	Consideration to determine historic/cultural or aesthetic significance of pylon sign	3/20/2014 HDC Consideration of status of pylon sign; HDC Determined Sign to be a Historic & Significant Sign under the provisions of Zoning Ordinance, Article 5 Section 4.12	Sign maintains its legal non-conforming status indefinitely and can remain in its current form.
HI-14-03	Lands of Six South State, LLC: 6 South State Street	6 South State Street	Construction of parking lot off alley and other site improvements	Scheduled for ArchRevCert Review at 4/17/14 HDC Meeting.	Pending Review by HDC. Site Plan Application S-14-11 filed for Planning Commission Review.

Summary of Permit Application with Architectural Review Certification
2014 - Updated Thru 3-31-2014

DATE	PERMIT #	LOCATION	TYPE	ACTION ON ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW CERTIFICATE	NOTES
1/2/2014	13-1735	154 South Governors Avenue	Sign Permit - Wall Sign	Staff Approval	Permit issued.
1/2/2014	13-1736	61 South Bradford Street	Building Permit - Exterior & Interior Renovations	Staff Approval	Project to repair exterior finishes and stucco (after vehicle accident).
2/4/2014	13-1428	300 West Loockerman Street	Demolition Permit - Existing Commercial Building	HDC Recommendation on ARC: PC Approval of ARC; Applications HI-13-02 and S-13-12; Staff issued Permit	Documentation of existing building received as per condition of ARC. Associated with Permit #14-94.
2/21/2014	13-1620	8 West Loockerman Street	Building Permit - Interior Renovations	Staff Approval. No ArchRevCert required for interior work.	Permit issued.
2/7/2014	14-02	205 South State Street	Roof Permit	Staff Approval	Project to replace existing cedar shake roof with new wood shingle roof and replacement of siding on gable end. Project appears complete.
2/19/2014	14-68	102 South Governors Avenue	Building Permit -Exterior Renovations	Staff Approval	Rebuild front porch steps. Permit Issued
2/28/2014	14-94	300 West Loockerman Street, Family Dollar	Building Permit - New Retail Building	HDC Recommendation on ARC: PC Approval of ARC; Applications HI-13-02 and S-13-12; Staff issued Permit	Permit issued. Pre-Construction Meeting held with City Departments. Construction pending demolition of existing building.
2/21/2014	14-136	134 West Loockerman Street, Golden Fleece Tavern	Building Permit - Renovations	Staff Approval	Modifications to outdoor patio areas. Demolish fence and stairs; new railing for upper deck. Permit issued.

Summary of Permit Application with Architectural Review Certification
2014 - Updated Thru 3-31-2014

DATE	PERMIT #	LOCATION	TYPE	ACTION ON ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW CERTIFICATE	NOTES
2/25/2014	14-148	22-24 West Loockerman Street	Sign Permit - Wall Signs	Staff Referral to HDC for 2/20/2014 - lack of quorum at meeting. Staff continued to work with applicant to refine design to comply with DS&G. Staff Approval of revised design.	Signs installed. Two wall signs placed in framed wall area consisting of raised lettering and graphics applied to wall surface.
3/10/2014	13-495	19 N American Avenue	Fence Permit	Staff Approval	Replacement of fence at rear of lot with vinyl. Noted as not visible from public way.
2/6/2014	14-129	409 Federal Street - Biggs Museum	Temporary Sign Permit	Staff Approval	Sign to be installed 5/1-5/10/14 for Biggs Gala event.
3/14/2014	14-156	209 South State Street, Wesley United Methodist Church	Building Permit - Exterior Renovations	Staff Approval	Brick repair and repointing project on front (west) façade of building. Project complete.
3/11/2014	14-191	33 South State Street, Offices	Sign Permit - Post sign	Staff Approval	Installation of Post Sign with three hanging signs for office tenants. Sign installed.
3/27/2014	14-209	136 West Loockerman Street, Shear Dreams Hair Salon	Sign Permit - Window Sign	Staff Approval	Permit issued for signage.
3/5/2014	14-211	315 South State Street	Temporary Sign Permit	Staff Approval	Temporary Sign to be placed in window through 6/4/2014.
3/14/2014	14-237	123-127 West Loockerman Street, Blue Hen Auctions	Sign Permit - Wall Sign	Staff Approval	Wall sign installed in sign band area for first floor tenant.
3/18/2014	14-241	304 South State Street, Dale's Bail Bonds	Sign Permit - Window Sign and Projecting Sign	Staff Approval	Window sign and projecting sign installed for first floor office tenant.
3/31/2014	14-257	29 South State Street	Building Permit - Interior & Exterior Renovations	Staff Approval. No ArchRevCert required for interior work.	Interior renovations to office space and replacement of front entry door.

City of Dover

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW STAFF REPORT
Before Dover Historic District Commission
April 17, 2014

Application:	Lands of Six South State, LLC at 6 South State Street: Parking Lot & Site Improvements Construction, HI-14-03 Site Plan S-14-11
Project Location:	Southwest corner of South State Street and Division Street
Property Address:	6 South State Street
Tax Parcel:	ED-05-077.05-04-27.00-000
Owner:	Six South State, LLC
Present Zoning:	RGO (General Residence and Office Zone) H (Historic District Zone)
Previous Uses:	Office (first floor) with Apartment Units (upper floors)
Proposed Uses:	Offices with Parking Lot
Site Area:	15,015 S.F.

Project Description:

The Historic District Commission will act on a recommendation to the City of Dover Planning Commission for an Architectural Review Certificate for the Parking Lot and Site Improvement project at 6 South State Street. It is Site Plan (S-14-11) project filed for review by the Planning Commission on May 19, 2014.

This application consists of a project involving the construction of a parking lot, handicap access to the building, and the landscape plan. The property is zoned RGO (General Residence and Office Zone) and is subject to the H (Historic District Overlay Zone). The property is located on the southwest corner of South State Street and Division Street. The owner of record is Six South State, LLC. Address: 6 South State Street.

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 located within the boundaries of a National Register Historic District, specifically the Victorian Dover Historic District. Known as the Dr. Henry Ridgely House, 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-396-119 in the Delaware Cultural Resource Survey. This Italianate- style residence with physician's office includes architectural detailing on the front porch and cornicework.

> *K-396.119 6 South State Street (Dr. Henry Ridgely House, Landmark) – 1869, 3-story, 5-bay, massive brick dwelling; re stone quoins, central 5-sotry façade tower; low-hipped roof with paired bracketed cornice and dentils; mansard roof on tower; (1-story, façade porch, ornate wooden posts with brackets, decorative porch cornice;) wrought iron gazebo in garden; frame privy with ornate cornice, 2/2 double hung sash, moulded lintels, green louvered blinds on 2nd and 3rd floor levels; large 6-pane windows utilized as entryways 1st floor level.*

A series of historic maps were reviewed by Planning Staff for preliminary information on this block of South State Street. The *1859 A.D. Byles Map of Kent County (Dover insert)* shows this subject property as part of a larger tract owned by M.C. Conwell (a civil engineer) consisting of over half the block on the west side of Main Street (State Street). The subject property remains part of a larger parcel on the *1868 Beers Map* published by Pomeroy & Beers listed in the ownership of M.C. Conwell. By 1885 this block on the west side of South State Street consists of a series of residences including this building as shown on the *1885 Bird's Eye View of Dover.* The *1887 Map of the Town of Dover* by W.R. Roe shows the building owner Dr. H. Ridgely.

Other map series such as the *Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps* are also a reference source for information on the building which occupied this property over time. For Dover, this series of maps dated from 1897-1944.

PROJECT PROPOSAL (Drawings dated 3/14/2014 and 4/3/2014):
The application proposes construction of a parking lot in the backyard area of the property accessible from the alley. The elements of the project are as follows:

1. Parking Lot: A ten (10) space paved parking lot is proposed with access directly from the alley which divides the block between South State Street and South Bradford Street. There are no direct vehicular curb cuts to South State Street or West Division Street onto the property. The parking lot consists of one handicapped accessible space and nine regular spaces. As no upright curbing is proposed for the parking lot, a series of parking bumpers are placed at the head of each parking space. All parking spaces are perpendicular to the alley thus facing east and the parking lot spans almost the entire width of the property.

2. Sidewalks/ Paved Areas: An asphalt paved area is proposed at the head of the parking spaces to serve as a sidewalk. Then a new sidewalk of concrete is proposed from the parking lot area to the rear of the existing building. It appears that the handicapped ramp (separate from the sidewalk) will also be of concrete. The property has existing brick sidewalks along the public street frontages of South State Street and Division Street.

3. Landscaping: The Landscape Plan shows a series of ten existing trees to be removed by this project; the trees are identified as being in poor condition or located in areas proposed for the parking lot development. Five other existing trees will be preserved and care maintenance issues addressed including a Japanese maple, two White Pines, a Willow Oak, and an American Holly. Two additional Crepe Myrtle trees are proposed to flank the front entrance walk from South State Street with a series of new shrub plants surrounding the front porch. A row of plantings is shown between the northernmost parking space and Division Street as screening.

4. Fences: An existing wrought iron decorative fence exists along a portion of the north property line adjacent to West Division Street. The fence height is not specified on this plan sheet. A remnant of the wrought iron fence along the alley will be removed to create the parking lot.

5. Site Furnishings: The site includes a metal gazebo between the rear wing of the building and West Division Street. An illuminated sign is proposed at the corner of West Division Street and South State Street. An acorn style light fixture with decorative pole in a black finish is proposed at the rear of the house.

Review of DESIGN STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES

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 provide a recommendation to the Planning Commission 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 3: Maintenance, Repair, Preservation, and Restoration of Existing Historic Buildings. More specifically the sections on Design Guidelines for Landscaping and Site Amenities, Fencing and Walls, Paving and Bordering, and Parking Lots found on pages 3-24 through 3-27. These guidelines highlight the consideration that should be given to the areas surrounding buildings including the choice of materials. It notes that fences in the Historic District should not exceed four (4) feet in height. Also the *Design Guidelines* recommend that 20% of parking lots should be unpaved and planted.

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 concepts presented in the Parking Lot & Site Improvements Construction Plan on the property at 6 South State Street. This recommendation is made subject to the following comments and suggested revisions.

2) 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. Staff recommends the removal of the northernmost parking space in order to better accommodate the landscape screening of the parking lot from Division Street. Currently, there is approximately two feet between the edge of pavement and the existing fence for landscape planting. Along with this parking space's proximity to the intersection of the alley with Division Street, potential conflicts with accessing the parking space and getting out of the vehicle and grading issues in the area, the elimination of the parking space appears to be a better solution. (It is noted that the application is requesting a parking reduction waiver from the Planning Commission.)
    b. The proposed shrubs along the northernmost parking space and fence should be evergreen varieties with the ability to grow to screen the car parking. The specific planting was not identified. A minimum height of two feet at time of planting is recommended.
    c. Retain and maintain the wrought iron fence and the metal gazebo on the property.
    d. Staff recommends relocating the proposed Crepe Myrtle trees from the front sidewalk area to the lawn area north of the building. The location in front of the building will obscure the decorative front porch and main façade of the building.
    e. Maintain unpaved areas of the property as lawn areas with landscape beds in the areas of shrub plantings for ease of maintenance.
    f. Utilize black posts for any signage elements to be attached to posts i.e. handicapped parking signage.
    g. If the sign is to be illuminated, it must be externally lit and the lighting fixture should be screened from view. The sign may not require additional lighting due to existing street lighting in the area.

3) Some of the site improvements/amenities were not specifically described with the application information. Please provide information for consideration and discussion.
    a. Clarify if a retaining wall will be utilized or just re-grading of the site in the northwest corner of the site near the parking lot will occur. If a retaining wall is proposed this should be constructed of brick (not concrete paver block).
    b. Clarify the construction format and materials of the handicap access ramp. A larger landing at the entrance door may be required.
    c. While the asphalt sidewalk and the concrete sidewalk connecting to the building have limited visibility to the public way, it is recommended that the developer

considered the use of brick paving materials for these items to be more compatible with the historic character and architectural features of the building.

d. Clarify the surface treatment (lawn areas, plantings, type of mulch, etc.) between the building and Division Street. The plan currently includes several "landscape bed" labels.
e. The required bicycle parking rack should be black in finish color and of a decorative style. This may be an opportunity to adaptively reuse the wrought iron fence segment being removed along the alley.
f. All mechanical equipment should be located so as to not be visible from the streets. Appropriate screening by plantings, lattice, etc. must be implemented.
g. Additional information on the size and materials of the proposed sign will be required for submission and review of the required Sign Permit.

4) 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 for side yards, rear yards, and the second front yard on corner lots. Within the Historic District, fences shall not exceed four (4) feet in height. If the existing wrought iron fence exceeds this height, it may be retained as an historic element of the property.

5) In addition, for corner lots such as this, fences, landscaping, signage etc. are limited to a maximum height of three (3) feet within the corner visibility area (triangle) as per *Zoning Ordinance,* Article 5 §1.3. It is noted that in consideration of the Architectural Review Certification, the Historic District Commission cannot grant relief from the corner visibility height limits. The proposed sign at the corner will need to comply with this requirement.

6) The design of any proposed dumpster enclosure or screening method for trash/recycling collection items should be compatible with the character of the Historic District. Currently, no provisions are shown on the plan.

7) The plan does not present information on any exterior improvements or repairs to the building. Any exterior improvements and/or repairs, if visible from the public way, are subject to Architectural Review Certification and must comply with the *Design Standards and Guidelines for the City of Dover Historic District Zone.* Permits and other review processes are required to confirm compliance.

8) 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 archaeological resources including previous studies at the subject location. Survey information indicates a privy was previously located on the property.

9) In the event, that major changes and revisions to the design, materials, or site layout occur in the finalization of the plan and/or construction drawings contact the Department of Planning and Inspections. These changes may require resubmittal for review by the Historic District Commission.

10) The plan for this project is also subject to the application and review process for Site Development Plan (Article 10 §2 of the *Zoning Ordinance*) before the Planning Commission. Note: Additional technical items for compliance with the *Zoning Ordinance* and other regulations may be identified during the Plan Review Process. There are a number of items presented on the plan on the drawings and data information tables to be corrected.

11) The applicant shall be aware that the Building Permit is required to track the construction activities for the site improvements on the property. The permit applications must comply with the approvals and conditions granted through the Architectural Review Certification and Site Plan Review process. Separate Permits are also required for building construction activities and signage.

12) The City of Dover offers a *Tax Credit Program for Historic Properties* as an incentive for the preservation, restoration, and/or rehabilitation project involving exterior improvements to the architectural facades of building. Contact Planning Staff for more information on this program. In addition, there is *State of Delaware Historic Preservation Tax Credit Program* and a *Federal Rehabilitation Tax Credit for Historic Properties* program.

Historic District Commission Action Required

The Historic District Commission shall consider the proposal and provide a recommendation to the Planning Commission in regards to the Architectural Review Certification for the project site development plan. The recommendation should reflect consideration of the *Design Standards and Guidelines.*