CITY OF DOVER HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
AGENDA
THURSDAY, July 18, 2013 - 3:00 P.M.
City Hall – Conference Room

ROLL CALL

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF MEETING on March 21, 2013
APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF MEETING on June 20, 2013 (Lack of Quorum)

COMMUNICATIONS & REPORTS

1. Summary of 2013 Activity
    a. Summary of Applications 2013 and 2012
    b. Summary of Architectural Review Certifications for 2013

2. Update on Discussion - Role and Scope of the Historic District Commission and Historic District

OLD BUSINESS

1. Certified Local Government (CLG) Program

NEW APPLICATIONS

1. HI-13-05 North Street Pocket Park at 301 South Governors Avenue – Public Hearing and Review for Recommendation on Architectural Review Certification to allow for the construction of a park consisting of paving and landscape areas to be located at 301 South Governors Avenue. The property is zoned C-2 (Central Commercial Zone) and is subject to H (Historic District Zone). The property is located on the southeast corner of West North Street and South Governors Avenue. The owner of record is City of Dover. Address: 301 South Governors Avenue. Tax Parcel: ED-05-077.09-04-36.00-000. Council District 4. *This is associated with Site Plan Application S-13-10.*

NEW BUSINESS

1. Report on *Historic Preservation Commission Training Session on Design Review* held April 27, 2013 at Lewes City Hall

2. 2013-2017 Delaware's Historic Preservation Plan: *Preserving Our Past for a Better Future*: http://history.delaware.gov/preservation/planning.shtml

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.

CITY OF DOVER
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
MARCH 21, 2013

The Regular Meeting of the City of Dover Historic District Commission was held on Thursday, March 21, 2013 at 3:00 PM with Chairman Scrafford presiding. Members present were Chairman Scrafford, Mr. McDaniel, Mr. Fisher, and Mr. Jackson. Mr. Salkin was absent.

Staff members present were Mrs. Melson-Williams, Ms. Cornwell, Mrs. Townshend, and Mrs. Purnell.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

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

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

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

COMMUNICATIONS & REPORTS

Training Opportunities

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that included in the packet was information regarding the upcoming Historic Preservation Commission Training Session on Design Review to be held on Saturday, April 27, 2013 in Lewes, Delaware. The workshop will be led by Sharon Kennedy, Chairman of the Annapolis Historic Preservation Commission. The workshop is free and formal invitations will be issued, please inform Staff if you would like to attend.

Update on Discussion-Role and Scope of the Historic District Commission and Historic District

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that there was a community outreach meeting that was held in a workshop session by the Planning Office at the Dover Public Library on February 26, 2013. There were two (2) presentations and facilitated discussions led by an outside consultant. There were thirty (30) members from the public that attended. Mrs. Townshend reported to the City Council Legislative Finance and Administrative Committee the ideas regarding how the process could be streamlined and how the City could improve the preservation if it's historic character. There are no specific recommendations to implement at the present time. Planning Staff will continue to conduct additional public outreach on the topic that will include a survey and more refinement of the ideas that were put forth.

Mrs. Townshend stated that she hopes within the next two weeks to have a survey on-line and to send it to all who participated. She hopes the information would be forwarded and looks forward to receiving feedback. There were no comments on eliminating the Historic District Commission.

There was an inquiry to expand the District on State Street.

NEW BUSINESS

HI-13-03 Capital City Trail Project: Phase 2 – Presentation on Phase 2 segment of the Bicycle/Pedestrian Improvements Project for the Capital City Trail. A presentation of the design concepts for bicycle and pedestrian path improvements between Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard (previously known as Court Street) and East Loockerman Street in the area east of the Delaware Public Archives. The segment is located within the Historic District zone. *A Presentation on Phase 1: Court Street Gateway was given in July 2012 (HI-12-04).*

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that in July 2012 a presentation on Phase I of the Capital City Trail Project was given which focused on the segment of Court Street that is now called Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard extending east from Legislative Hall to Route 13 and progressing south along Route 13. Phase 2 of the project is from the Legislative Hall area going over to Loockerman Street. The project is a Bicycle/Pedestrian path improvement.

Representative: Jon Hermes of Century Engineering

Presentation:

Mr. Hermes stated that the Phase 1 work will begin at the end of April 2013. The Historic District Commission approved that a brick pattern be used for the sidewalk from Legislative Hall to Family Court. The same style will continue on Phase 2 that will start from Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard to the Delaware Public Archives and tying into Loockerman Street. Phase 3 will ultimately connect to Silver Lake Park. In the handout was a map of the alignment and path area and the color of brick to be used. The brick path will go around the existing stormwater pond. A wall will separate the Delaware Public Archives parking lot and pathway. There will be a straight alignment and no additional lights will be added. Landscaping, larger trees, and small plantings will be added at the end of the project. Four benches will also be added. Today they wanted to discuss the type of wall between the parking lot and pathway as shown on the plan. The three alternatives presented were: brick walk with brick wall, brick walk with concrete curb-like wall, and brick walk with red colored split-face concrete block wall. He stated that all three will work well, but the cost difference varies yet all fit in the budget.

Responding to Mr. McDaniel's question regarding when the work would start on Phase 2, Mr. Hermes replied 2014. He stated that it would be a ten foot wide path. The plan would begin as soon as Phase 1 was completed. The construction will take at least 120 days.

The Historic District Commission was in agreement with the first alternative: a brick walk with brick wall. Mr. Salkin was absent.

HI-13-04 Building Permit #13-260 for John Bell House at The Green – Referral by the City Planner to the Historic District Commission for Review of Architectural Review Certification for Building Permit application #13-260 for construction of an accessory structure (historic replica outhouse). The project site is zoned RGO (General Residence and Office Zone) and subject to the H (Historic District Zone). The property is located east of South State Street on the southeast side of The Green. The owner of record is the State of Delaware. The property address is 43 The Green. Tax Parcel: ED-05-077.09-05-28.00-000. *Also associated with Building Permit #13-261 for a fence.*

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that because of the location in the Historic District a permit was filed that was referred to the Historic District Commission. The permit filed was for construction of a historic replica outhouse as an accessory structure in the rear yard of the John Bell House. The associated permit is for the construction of a wood picket fence to surround the back yard area. Staff reviewed the submission in regards to the *Design Standards and Guidelines for the City of Dover Historic Zone.* Staff found that the building construction does meet the recommended practices found in the *Design Standards and Guidelines.* Staff had concerns about the building location. The *Zoning Ordinance* requires that accessory structures be a minimum setback of five feet from side and rear property lines. The location of the outhouse building will be less than five feet from the rear property lines of the John Bell House. The Historic District Commission is authorized to waive certain bulk standards including setbacks when issuing an Architectural Review Certificate.

Chairman Scrafford asked if there were any questions.

Representative: Ms. Elaine Brenchley of First State Heritage Park

Responding to Mr. McDaniel's question if there was going to be a fence around the outhouse and it would not be available to the general public, Ms. Brenchley replied correct. It will be for use by Staff and people who are taking tours. In the evening, there are no bathroom facilities for people who are on The Green taking tours. The fence will be locked and access will be through the house and the outhouse will also be kept locked.

Responding to Mr. McDaniel's question if the building was heated, Ms. Brenchley replied yes.

Responding to Mr. McDaniel's question as to when the four (4) boxwood between the John Bell House and the Sykes House that were removed were going to be replaced, Ms. Brenchley stated that she was unaware; he would need to ask someone at the Courthouse. Also responding, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that Staff visited the site and there was boxwood that had been placed at the rear of the Sykes House. They are not near the fence or between the buildings. The boxwood helps screen some of the HVAC units in that area.

Responding to Mr. McDaniel's question if the boxwood were planted in the correct location, Mrs. Melson-Williams replied they were implemented as shown on the plan.

Responding to Mr. Fisher's question if there was access through the gate in the fence to the outhouse as well as through the building, Mr. Scrafford replied yes.

Mr. McDaniel moved to approve application HI-13-04 at 43 The Green for the location and construction of an accessory structure (historic replica outhouse) and fence as shown on the plans, seconded by Mr. Jackson and carried with four (4) yes. Mr. Salkin was absent.

HI-13-02 Family Dollar at 300 West Loockerman Street – Public Hearing and Review for Recommendation on the Architectural Review Certification for demolition of the existing commercial building and for construction of a new 8,308 S.F. retail building and associated site improvements. The property is zoned C-2 (Central Commercial Zone) and is subject to the H (Historic District Overlay Zone). The property is located on the southwest corner of West Loockerman Street and South New Street. The owner of record is Fisher/Grimes Partnership and equitable owner is Chesapeake Group, LLC. Address: 300 West Loockerman Street. Tax Parcel: ED-05-077.09-01-69.00-000. Council District 4.

Mrs. Melson –Williams gave an overview of the Architectural Review Staff Report dated March 21, 2013 that was included in the packet. The application is a proposal for a Family Dollar to be located at 300 West Loockerman Street. The property is listed on the National Register of Historic places as part of the Victorian Dover Historic District. Staff did preliminary work related to the history of the site. As early as the late 1800's, the property is being utilized as the Dover Machine Works and Auto Junk Yard with auto storage and repair. Sometime between 1929 and 1951 the property was redeveloped with the construction of a new building for auto sales and services. Planning Staff included information from the *Dover Transit Center Neighborhood Plan and Design Book (January 14, 2011).* She stated that included in the Staff Report were comments and recommendations as well as a series of advisory comments.

Representative: Conny Malmberg, Attorney at Young & Malmberg on behalf of the applicant and Mr. Doug Liberman of Larson Engineering Group, Inc.

Mr. Malmberg stated that this project started with a different design and there were a number of concerns raised by Staff in regards to the architecture, materials, site safety from a traffic flow prospective and visibility of parking from Loockerman Street. He stated that they have worked through all of the issues except for the parking. After addressing this in the presentation, he thinks that they will have satisfied most of the concerns. There is not a significant alternative to the building footprint. There is a pattern book that concentrates mainly on the difference of the street parking on the east and west side.

Mr. Liberman gave a presentation and provided copies of a handout book of information to members of the Commission. Referring to the presentation he stated that the building is split into different elevations in the roofline as well as materials. The facades were alternated to look like a couple of different buildings instead of a long blank face that you typically see at other stores. The site going across Loockerman Street is only 100 feet wide. In order to construct the building

and the parking as requested by Family Dollar, it would include the current layout presented. It would exit off of New Street and have parking alongside the building with a drive aisle. There will also be parking spaces along the alley with parking bumpers. Grass curbs islands have been added to the site. The landscaping added does meet the City of Dover Code for tree requirements. Majority of the layout was dictated by Family Dollar. They want a lot of parking oriented to the front door and the truck loading area to be able to pull into the site and back to the door. They did not want to back from an alley into a loading area. Family Dollar safety concern was they did not want trucks backing in from the street or alley as they have done in the past because of a fatality where a pedestrian was hit. He stated that he reviewed photo documentation from the 1960's of the original building when it was occupied by the Volkswagen dealership. He then discussed the layout of the building renovations, window style changes, mansard style roof, doors and parking as it was used by the NAPA Store. Referring to the aerial key map he discussed locations of the site and parking lots throughout the area that included My Place Restaurant, Delaware Health Care, Army/Navy Store, Capital Cleaners, Keen Gas Station, Church and Cemetery area, and Daycare. He also compared how the proposed building looked and related to other buildings in the area. Referring to the presentation, he stated that the height of the building is 20 feet and 4 inches, and the total height at the corner towards Loockerman Street is 26 feet and 8 inches.

Responding to Mr. Scrafford's question regarding the standing seam metal roof and the building shield of the wall on the west side; Mr. Liberman replied yes the wall would be butted up.

Mr. Liberman stated that the proposed site works for the Family Dollar as it is laid out. If a different site plan was proposed, they would probably lose the Family Dollar project.

Responding to Mr. Scrafford question regarding if the layout was approved would there be any screening options for New Street, Mr. Liberman replied no, not for parking. Mr. Scrafford referred to the street on the east side where there are a row of planted trees in the brick work on the outside of the sidewalk, Mr. Malmberg replied that they could do the cut outs on the sidewalk as they have been done on Loockerman Street. Also responding, Mrs. Townshend stated that it would need to be approved by Public Works.

Mr. Malmberg stated that where the building is located part of the Downtown could use some Economic Development.

Mr. Scrafford stated that his thoughts were boxwood hedge on the west side of the sidewalk, but it would interfere with traffic and require maintenance. He suggested it being screened with trees.

Responding to Mr. Scrafford's question on if there was a proposal to screen the parking, Mr. Malmberg stated that this could be done, referring to a photo he stated it looks more suburban than urban having a grassy area to block parking. Their thought to screen the parking was a short brick

wall along Loockerman Street that would urbanize the area a little. Mr. Scrafford asked if they were referring to New Street; Mr. Malmberg replied that New Street is too tight to do anything. Also responding, Mrs. Townshend stated that her concern regarding Loockerman Street is pedestrian conflict of people turning around and backing out of parking spaces coming over the sidewalk.

Mr. Scrafford stated that there was already a place that replicates this concern.

Mrs. Townshend stated that many of the items are nonconforming and at the point and time when they are proposed for development or redevelopment it would be expected to comply with the current requirements. From a Staff point of view, it is not consistent with the Historic District *Design Standards and Guidelines.*

Mr. Liberman stated that on the site plan there would be a curb along the back edge so that vehicles could not go totally onto the sidewalk in that area.

Mr. Scrafford stated that there needs to be something to differentiate between the sidewalk and the parking area.

Mr. Malmberg stated that it is code compliance at the current time. The Public Works Department reviewed the site entrance.

Mrs. Townshend stated that the Historic District Commission *Design Standards and Guidelines* would recommend screening parking from the street.

Mr. Scrafford stated that they would want to create something that would be more secure other than a hedge to prevent a vehicle from backing out of the parking lot onto the sidewalk.

Responding to Mr. Scrafford question regarding the wall to screen parking from Loockerman Street in the twenty (20) foot area, Mr. Liberman stated that they had not decided on a location. He stated that the benches were a part of the wall. With the screening of the wall it screens vehicles from Loockerman Street, but would also present a vertical building type look to the corner and minimize having to set the building away from New Street.

Responding to Mr. Scrafford question if the four (4) foot rule for fence height applied, Mrs. Melson-Williams replied that the four (4) foot rule would apply as well as the corner visibility area limitation that would drop the height to three (3) feet.

Mr. McDaniel stated that the concept is great for the brick wall, but it needs to be higher.

Responding to Mr. Fisher's question if the parking lot elevation for the building will be the rear and the door would be the loading dock area; Mrs. Townshend stated that on the building elevation

the parking lot is from the rear. Also responding Mr. Liberman stated that there will be brick along the alley. The personnel door can be moved to the backside to eliminate any conflict in the area.

Responding to Mr. McDaniel's question if it was regular brick on the back south side of the building; Mr. Liberman replied yes. Also responding, Mr. Scrafford stated that on the plans it indicated block on the parking lot elevation with a brick water table and block on the rear elevation facing the west wall. Mr. Liberman stated that they will be saving as much of the west wall as possible.

Responding to Mr. Scrafford's question regarding the downspouts and if the drainage from the roof will be adjusted to accommodate the adjoining of the two (2) buildings; Mr. Liberman replied yes.

Responding to Mr. McDaniel's question if the windows were decorative windows; Mr. Liberman stated that the windows will not be used to look out of. They may be able to add glass to the windows at the corner on the Loockerman Street side.

Responding to Mr. McDaniel's question regarding metal windows on Loockerman Street at the Bayard Pharmacy; Mrs. Townshend stated that are some that you can see through. Also responding, Ms. Cornwell stated that the windows are real and they are blocked with a gray look.

Chairman Scrafford questioned if there was any additional discussion.

Chairman Scrafford asked if there were any questions.

Mr. Scrafford declared the public hearing open.

Mr. Gary Patterson member of the Downtown Dover Partnership and Economic Development Committee introduced the new Executive Director of Downtown Dover Partnership Mr. Lou Colon. He also invited members to the Ribbon Cutting Ceremony on Loockerman Plaza on March 28, 2013 at 10:30a.m. The Economic Development Committee endorses the new project and hope that any concerns can be worked out. They are happy with the new façade on Loockerman Street and the one that will face New Street.

Mr. McDaniel stated that he is a member of the Downtown Dover Partnership Board and he abstained from voting on the application at their meeting.

Mr. Lou Colon, Director of Downtown Dover Partnership stated that he endorses and support the project. It is designed for Downtown and it is a potential to bringing more employees to the Downtown area.

Mr. Mike Harrington of Harrington Realty in Dover stated that upon speaking with the architect there is an eight (8) foot wide sidewalk. At the entrance there is twenty-six (26) feet from the parking spaces to the curb which is also wide. There is enough space for parking and turning around. He has represented thirty-five (35) years of service to tenants and landlords on Loockerman Street. For the first time in his career, he has seen growth and energy Downtown. The President of Wesley College was also excited about this project for the students and the E-Z Pass project that will bring roughly sixty (60) employees Downtown.

There being no one else wishing to speak, Mr. Scrafford declared the public hearing closed.

Mr. Scrafford questioned if there were any questions, comments, or motion.

Mr. McDaniel commented that he reviewed other Family Dollar sites on-line in different Colonial towns such as Williamsburg, Massachusetts, Chestertown, and Madison, Mississippi. He could not find a Family Dollar that was not on a highway with a flat front. The fact that this project is willing to come into town and use various materials shows a commitment. He stated that he likes the way the building looks and the proposal including the parking.

Mr. Jackson was also in agreement with the proposal of the building. He stated that it was a great start.

Responding to Mr. McDaniel's question if My Place was a part of the project; Mr. Liberman replied no. They responded to Staff comments as how it relates to the project.

Mr. Scrafford suggested a partial screening from Loockerman Street and New Street that will embrace your vision when looking at the parking. This will prevent a car from going into the sidewalk. The main concern is safety.

Mr. McDaniel moved to recommend to the Planning Commission approval of the Architectural Review Certificate for the project as proposed to include demolition of the existing structure, the recordation as specified in Staff recommendations #3 and #4, and with the conditions of possibly planting street trees in the sidewalk area on New Street to provide some screening of parking, include a low brick wall to screen the parking from Loockerman Street, and upright curbing between the parking lot and sidewalk, seconded by Mr. Fisher and the motion was unanimously carried 4-0. Mr. Salkin was absent.

Mr. Fisher moved to adjourn the meeting; seconded by Mr. Jackson and unanimously carried (Mr. Salkin was absent).

Meeting adjourned at 4:19 PM

Sincerely,

Maretta Savage-Purnell
Secretary

CITY OF DOVER
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
JUNE 20, 2013

The Regular Meeting of the City of Dover Historic District Commission was not held on Thursday, June 20, 2013 at 3:00 PM as no quorum of the members was available at the meeting time. Members present were Vice Chairman Salkin and Mr. Fisher. Mr. Jackson, Mr. McDaniel, and Chairman Scrafford were absent.

Staff members present were Mrs. Melson-Williams and Mrs. Purnell.

No formal action was taken on any item, including the minutes of the previous meeting or any votes on any particular item.

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that Staff would answer any general questions regarding the information provided to them.

The next meeting will be held on July 18, 2013.

Responding to Vice Chairman Salkin's question if there was any item on the agenda that was timely and should be discussed such as the "Update on Discussion-Role and Scope of the Historic Commission and Historic District," Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that all items on the agenda can wait until the July meeting. It was a series of updates and there were no formal applications for Architectural Review Certifications that needed to be considered today.

Meeting adjourned at 3:20 PM

Sincerely,

Maretta Savage-Purnell
Secretary

City of Dover Historic District Commission
Summary of Applications 2013
Updated thru June 1, 2013

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. Plan must receive all agency approvals prior to Final Plan Approval.
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 must be submitted for review and Final Plan approval. Documentation of building must occur prior to demolition.
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.
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. Project not started yet.
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.	Review of application pending	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 of Dover Historic District Commission
Summary of Applications 2012
Status Updated thru June 1, 2013

FILE#	PLAN NAME	LOCATION	TYPE	ACTION	STATUS
HI-12-01	Building Permit #12-0018 Referral	323 South Governors Avenue - new location of Frankfurt Bakery	Exterior Wall Finishes for Existing Building; Door & Window Replacement	1/5/2012 Permit #12-0018 referred to HDC by City Planner for Architectural Review Certification; 1/19/2012 HDC Approval of ArchRevCert with Conditions. Material revisions submitted to staff. Permit Issued 2/1/2012.	Construction complete for exterior finishes of brick front façade and vinyl siding on sides and new door and window. Final Certificate of Occupancy issued 12/19/2012.
HI-12-02	Johnson Victrola Museum: Banner Program	375 South New Street	Placement of changeable banners using frame attachment system	4/19/2012 HDC Approval of ArchRev Cert with Conditions on banner installation.	Sign Permit issued on for first banner on building. Banner installed.
HI-12-03	Wesley U.M. Church: Banner Program	209 South State Street: Banner location on Fellowship Hall Building fronting Loockerman Plaza	Identification and Placement of a changeable banner location	4/19/2012 HDC Approval of ArchRevCert with Conditions on banner size and placement.	Sign Permit issued on 4/23/2012 for first banner on the Fellowship Hall Building and Sign Permit issued on 5/29/2012 for first banner on State Street fence. Banners continue to change for events.
HI-12-04	Court Street Gateway	Court Street, east of Legislative Hall	Bike and Pedestrian Improvements	Information Presentation presented at HDC Meeting of 7-19-2012	Project part of Capital City Trail. Public Workshop held 11/14/2012. Groundbreaking and construction started April 2013.
HI-12-05	Enhancements of the East Edge of The Green and Court Street Promenade	The Green	Pedestrian and Landscape Improvements and ADA access to 55 The Green	7/19/12 HDC Consultation on Referral of Permit #12-816 with Recommendation of Approval of ArchRevCert and Information Presentation	Permit issued and construction complete.
HI-12-06	Demolition of Building at 509 South State Street	509 South State Street, property owned by Christ Church	Proposal for demolition of the existing two and-a-half story dwelling	9/20/2012 HDC conducted Public Hearing and deferred action of the project seeking additional information; 1/17/2013 Information Update and HDC retabled application seeking additonal info; 2/21/2013 Additional Information presented and HDC Approval of ArchRevCert for Demolition with consitions	Documentation of the buidling required to be completed. Listed as Vacant Buidling. Must make application for Demolition Permit.
HI-12-07 S-12-20	Rear Plaza Improvements at 22-24 West Loockerman Street	22-24 West Loockerman Street	Proposal for site improvements to rear of property adjoining North street with paving and landscaping	12/13/2012 HDC Recommendation of Approval of ArchRevCert with conditions. Application S-12-20 reviewed by PC and grant Approval of ArchRevCert on 12/17/2012.	Final Plan approval grantes. Permits #13-248, 13-249, and 13-250 issued 3/15/2013. Project under construction and final inspections not requested yet.

Summary of Permit Application with Architectural Review Certification
2013 - Updated Thru 7-1-2013

DATE	PERMIT #	LOCATION	TYPE	ACTION ON ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW CERTIFICATE	NOTES
1/1/2013	12-1699	406 Federal Street, Biggs Museum	Temporary Sign Permit	Staff Approval	Sign installed for First Friday & Family Movie Night 1/1-1/5/13 and removed.
1/18/2013	12-1700	406 Federal Street, Biggs Museum	Temporary Sign Permit	Staff Approval	Sign installed for Family Movie Night and February Sip&Shop 1/18-2/2/13 and removed.
1/17/2013	13-77	414 South State Street, Schmittiger & Rodriguez Law Offices	Roof Permit	Issued without Staff Review	Permit appears to be the same as Permit #13-10 which was reviewed by staff.
2/15/2013	12-1701	406 Federal Street, Biggs Museum	Temporary Sign Permit	Staff Approval	Sign installed for Family Movie Night 2/15-3/2 and removed.
2/27/2013	13-43	401 Federal Street, Townshend Building	Building Permit - Interior Renovations	Staff Approval	Work on 1st and 2nd Floor Offices - construction underway.
2/4/2013	13-118	132 West Loockerman Street, Golden Fleece	Fence Permit	Staff Approval per Director	Replaced wood fence of Permit #09-1634 with decorative black metal fence 7ft. In height. Previous Permit referred to HDC 10/15/2009. Metal fence installed.
2/27/2013	13-211	32 West Loockerman Street Suite 109, Pure Luxury Salon	Sign Permit - Window Sign	Staff Approval	Sign installed.
3/14/2013	12-1560	147 South Governors Avenue, A Touch of Glass	Sign Permit - Wall Sign	Staff Approval	Projecting Sign
3/13/2013	12-1675	501 South State Street, Christ Church	Sign Permit	Staff Approval with conditions	Post and Panel Sign installed with bulb flowers as landscaping.
3/28/2013	13-10	414 South State Street, Schmittinger & Rodriguez Law Offices	Roof Permit	Staff Approval	Replacement of slate roof with a polymeric slate tile roof. Roof completed.
3/4/2013	13-229	202 West Loockerman Street, Bayard Pharmacy	Temporary Sign Permit	Staff Approval	"Now Open" signs installed for 60 days.
3/4/2013	13-234	535 South State Street	Roof Permit	Issued without Staff Review	Existing roof replaced with asphalt shingle roof

Summary of Permit Application with Architectural Review Certification
2013 - Updated Thru 7-1-2013

DATE	PERMIT #	LOCATION	TYPE	ACTION ON ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW CERTIFICATE	NOTES
3/15/2013	13-248	107 North Street	Fence Permit	Staff Approval	Associated with 22-24 West Loockerman Street project (HI-11-07 and S-12-20)
3/15/2013	13-249	22-24 West Loockerman Street	Fence Permit	HDC Recommendation on ARC; PC Approval of ARC; Applications Hi-11-07 and S-12-20; Staff issued permit	Rear Plaza Area Project under construction. Final Inspections for compliance not scheduled yet.
3/15/2013	13-250	22-24 West Loockerman Street	Administrative Building Permit	HDC Recommendation on ARC; PC Approval of ARC; Applications of HI-11-07 and S-12-20; Staff issued permit	Rear plaza area project is under construction. Final Inspections for compliance not scheduled yet.
3/19/2013	13-265	2 N State Street, Offices of Paradee Financial	Building Permit - Renovations	Staff Approval	Renovations to siding, window, & door on rear addition; only partially visible from public way. Construction underway.
3/15/2013	13-274	235 West Loockerman Street	Building Permit - Interior Renovations (walls)	Staff Approval	Tenant space change of use to retail. Project complete May 2013.
3/14/2013	13-278	231 West Loockerman Street, Tresses Hair Studio	Sign Permit - Wall & Window Signs	Staff Approval	Permit issued.
3/15/2013	13-294	34 South State Street	Demolition Permit - Accessory Structure	Staff Approval	Brick Shed demolished in rear yard near alley after damage by vehicle accident.
3/28/2013	13-322	28 North State Street, Wesley College Streetscape Project Phase 1: Parking Lot	Administrative Building Permit	Staff Approval as portion of parking lot project impacts a property within the Historic District but not visible from public way. Project reviewed under Site Plan S-11-13.	Project under construction
3/27/2013	13-353	406 Federal Street, Biggs Museum	Temporary Sign Permit	Staff Approval	Sign installed for April First Friday 4/4-4/5 and removed.
3/27/2013	13-354	406 Federal Street, Biggs Museum	Temporary Sign Permit	Staff Approval	Sign installed for Hair Affair 4/8-4/14 and removed.
3/27/2013	13-355	406 Federal Street, Biggs Museum	Temporary Sign Permit	Staff Approval	Sign installed for May First Friday 5/2-5/3 and removed.

Summary of Permit Application with Architectural Review Certification
2013 - Updated Thru 7-1-2013

DATE	PERMIT #	LOCATION	TYPE	ACTION ON ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW CERTIFICATE	NOTES
3/27/2013	13-356	406 Federal Street, Biggs Museum	Temporary Sign Permit	Staff Approval	Sign to be installed for Museum Gala 5/4-5/18 and removed.
3/27/2013	13-357	406 Federal Street, Biggs Museum	Temporary Sign Permit	Staff Approval	Sign to be installed for June Sip & Shop 6/6-6/7 and removed.
4/24/2013	12-1363	35 Loockerman Plaza, Dover Public Library	Sign Permit - Wall Sign	Staff Approval	Sign installed over main entrance canopy.
4/8/2013	13-285	406 Federal Street, Biggs Museum	Building Permit - Phase 3: Exterior Façade Improvements & Interior Renovations	HDC Recommendation on ARC; Application HI-10-09; Permit Issued by Staff	Permit issued. Construction underway.
5/16/2013	13-449	202 West Loockerman Street, Bayard Pharmacy	Sign Permit	Staff Approval	Permit issued.
5/2/2013	13-455	235 West Loockerman Street, Tommy's Second Hand Store	Sign Permit - Wall Sign & Window Sign	Staff Approval	Signs being installed.
5/2/2013	13-496	501 South State Street, Christ Church	Temporary Sign Permit - Banner	Staff Approval	Banner attached to existing posts behind brick wall for 5/2-6/2. Banner removed.
5/8/2013	13-546	121 South State Street, M&T Bank	Building Permit-Door Replacement	Staff Approval	Permit issued.
5/8/2013	13-582	54 South State Street, Presbyterian Church	Temporary Sign Permit - Banner	Staff Approval	Sign Instaled for VBS 5/8-6/15 and removed.
5/16/2013	13-590	315 West Loockerman Street	Building Permit - Roof Replacement	Staff Approval since using same materials as existing	Replace existing asphalt shingles with asphalt shingles.
5/17/2013	13-617	412 West Loockerman Street	Building Permit - Chimney Repair	Staff Approval	Permit issued.
5/14/2013	13-622	9 East Loockerman Street, Treadway Towers	Building Permit - Soffit and Fascia Repairs	Staff Approval	Construction underway.
5/16/2013	13-631	303 West Loockerman Street, Spiritual Botanical World	Sign Permit - Window Sign	Staff Approval	Sign installed prior to permit approval - fee doubled.

Summary of Permit Application with Architectural Review Certification
2013 - Updated Thru 7-1-2013

DATE	PERMIT #	LOCATION	TYPE	ACTION ON ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW CERTIFICATE	NOTES
5/21/2013	13-647	142 West Loockerman Street	Building Permit - Renovations	Staff Approval	Construction underway to repair building corner and exterior wall surface after vehicle accident. Replacement in-kind.
5/22/2013	13-678	235 South New Street	Administrative Building Permit - Wall Repair	No Planning Staff Review (Permit noted as expedited due to emergency repairs.	Permit issued.
6/4/2013	13-601	151-181 Kings Highway SW, Woodburn	Building Permit - Accessibility Ramp & Entry	Staff Approval	Project location of north side of House & Addition in area of limited visibility. Construction underway.
6/4/2013	13-602	151-181 Kings Highway SW, Woodburn	Administrative Permit - Site Improvements to Driveway & Sidewalks	Staff Approval	Project using asphalt paving and brick sidewalks to improve circulation and handicapped accessibility. Construction underway.
6/4/2013	13-603	151-181 Kings Highway SW, Woodburn	Building Permit - Fence	Staff Approval	Metal decorative picket style fence 3 feet in height to be installed along street frontage.
6/3/2013	13-663	207 West Loockerman Street, Zuha Trend	Sign Permit - Wall Sign	Staff Approval	Sign for Tux Rental. Permit Issued.
6/5/2013	13-679	108 East Water Street, First National Bank of Wyoming - Operations Center	Sign Permit - Post Sign & Wall Sign	Staff Approval	Signs installed.
6/5/2013	13-701	144 Kings Highway SW, Governor's Club Café	Building Permit - Interior Renovations	Staff Approval	Project complete.
6/4/2013	13-727	149 South Governors Avenue, Rouge Boutique	Sign Permit - Projecting Sign	Staff Approval	Permit issued.

National Park Service

National Park Service
U.S. Department of the Interior

search go

Program
Search nps.gov



Historic Preservation Grants Home
CLG Home
Become a CLG
CLG Contacts & Statistics
CLG Annual Reporting Forms
CLG Opportunities
State Coordinators Login
State Statistical Reports
Frequently Asked Questions

Grants Training
Audit Information
Site Map
History & Culture
Contact Us

Certified Local Government Program

Frequently Asked Questions

1. What are the Benefits of Being a CLG?
2. Where does funding for CLG grants come from?
3. What types of projects are eligible for CLG funding?
4. What other criteria govern whether a local historic preservation project is eligible for funding?
5. How much money is there in a CLG grant?
6. Do CLG grants require a financial contribution from the CLG?
7. How do SHPOs notify CLGs of the availability of CLG grants?
8. What are the application procedures?
9. Who decides which applications are funded?
10. On what grounds may SHPOs decline to fund an individual CLG grant request?
11. When are proposals selected?
12. When can work begin?
13. How long does the grant last?
14. Can the time be extended?
15. When are the grant funds actually transferred to the CLG?
16. Does the CLG have to complete the project before being reimbursed?
17. Why is matching share required?
18. How can the grant be matched?
19. Can the time spent by CLG staff on the project be counted as match?
20. Can the services of volunteers be counted as in-kind match?
21. When used as match, how are volunteer services valued?
22. If a CLG chooses not to count volunteer services as match, does it still have to provide time records?
23. What other types of in-kind services can be counted as match?
24. What sort of reports must be turned in?
25. What sort of procedures must be followed when a local government uses CLG grant funds to pay for consultants or contractors?
26. Can CLG grant funds be used to buy supplies or equipment?
27. How long must records on grant expenditures be kept?
28. Where can I find additional information on CLG grants?

1. What are the Benefits of Being a CLG?

The benefits to local governments from participating in the CLG program are numerous. While CLG grants generally represent a relatively small amount of funds, they have often been used as seed money to attract funding from local government or other sources. Also, in many cases, the products generated by CLG grants have provided credibility to a fledgling local historic preservation program. Beyond being just a source of funds, the CLG program has helped institutionalize historic preservation and give it legitimacy as a function of local government. Since the local government staff working in the Program are often in the local planning office, the CLG program has helped forge critical connections between historic preservation and land use planning. Similarly, the CLG program has led to increased cooperation between local preservationists and the State Historic Preservation Office and resulted in a strengthened statewide preservation network.

Return to Top

2. Where does funding for CLG grants come from?

Funding for grants to Certified Local Governments comes from the Historic Preservation Fund (HPF), a Federal grants program appropriated by the U.S. Congress and administered by the National Park Service (NPS), which provides financial support to State Preservation Offices (SHPOs). Under the provisions of the National Historic Preservation

Act, as amended, SHPOs are required to award at least 10% of their annual HPF monies to CLGs in their State. (Some States have additional State funds for CLGs.)

3. What types of projects are eligible for CLG funding?
HPF grants to Certified Local Governments have funded a wide variety of local historic preservation projects. Projects eligible for funding and the criteria used to select them are developed yearly by each SHPO. CLG project types that have been funded include the following:

· architectural, historical, archeological surveys, and oral histories

· preparation of nominations to the National Register of Historic Places

· research and development of historic context information

· staff work for historic preservation commissions, including designation of properties under local landmark ordinances

· writing or amending preservation ordinances

· preparation of preservation plans

· publication information and education activities

· publication of historic sites inventories

· development of publication of walking/driving tours

· development of slide/tape shows, videotapes

· training for commission members and staff

· development of architectural drawings and specifications

· preparation of facade studies or condition assessments

· rehabilitation or restoration of properties individually listed in the National Register of Historic Places or contributing to a National Register historic district

Return to Top

4. What other criteria govern whether a local historic preservation project is eligible for funding?
There are two other factors: all CLG grants must result in a completed, tangible product and/or measurable result; and all must be carried out in accordance with the applicable Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Archeology and Historic Preservation (a copy may be obtained from the SHPO).

5. How much money is there in a CLG grant?
The amount of money in a CLG grant must be large enough to have tangible results. Otherwise, there are no specific Federal requirements regarding the amount of money SHPOs make available in individual grants to CLGs. Consequently, the dollar amount of the grant depends primarily on the funding policy set by each SHPO. Some States try to award a grant to each CLG in the State every year. In general, the dollar amount of grants in these States tend to be small, particularly if there are numerous CLGs. On the other hand, other States award relatively few but larger grants. On a nationwide basis, CLG grants in 2001 ranged in size from $500 to $60,000.

6. Do CLG grants require a financial contribution from the CLG?
In most states, CLG grants are matching grants, i.e. recipients must provide a certain amount of cash or in-kind services to be used in carrying out the grant project. Each SHPO determines how much, if any, match is to be required. In most States, a 50/50, or "dollar-for-dollar" match is required. This means that for every dollar received the recipient must provide a matching dollar in services, cash, or volunteer hours, as specified by State policy. (See "How can the grant be matched?" below for more information.)

Return to Top

7. How do SHPOs notify CLGs of the availability of CLG grants?
SHPOs makes an annual mailing to each CLG, and each local government whose application for certification is pending, notifying them of the availability of CLG grant funds. Potential CLG applicants are informed of the total amount of funds available. State priorities for funding, criteria to be used in selecting proposals to be funded (see

below), a deadline for submitting requests, and a written description of what must be included in applications for CLG grants.

8. What are the application procedures?
Although application procedures and time frames vary from State to State, in general, the SHPO solicits grant proposals from its CLGs in the Fall. Applicants then submit a Grant Application (or Subgrant or Project Proposal), which describes the project and why it is needed, how the project is to be carried out and what its goals are, who will be doing the proposed work and their professional qualifications, a proposed budget and project schedule, and the specific products to be generated by the project. Applications are generally due at the end of the calendar year. Contact your SHPO and the specific deadlines in your State. (Applicants should also determine what local procedures and requirements, if any, must be satisfied prior to submitting a CLG grant application.)

Return to Top

9. Who decides which applications are funded?
Each SHPO sets its own funding priorities. In some States, greater weight may be given to one type of a project over another. Among the factors typically used to rate grant proposals are compatibility with the broad goals of the SHPO, urgency of the project, significance of the historic properties, geographic distribution of grant funds, education and public awareness potential, and the administrative and financial management capability of the applicant.

10. On what grounds may SHPOs decline to fund an individual CLG grant request?
CLG grants are competitive. While all CLGs are entitled to submit proposals, not all may get funding. SHPOs may decline to fund a proposal that does not adequately address the State's funding priorities, meet its selection criteria, have access to necessary professionals, or be achievable within the time period allowed or the budget proposed. However, States must base grant award decisions on the selection criteria included in the application instructions and notice of grant availability. Additionally, SHPOs may choose not to fund a proposal if they have reason to believe that the applicant does not have the necessary experience or financial resources to carry out the project or has not performed satisfactorily on a previous CLG grant.

Return to Top

11. When are proposals selected?
While time frames vary, successful applicants usually receive notification in the Spring that their proposal will be funded. In some States, recommendations about which proposals should receive funding by the professional staff of the SHPO must be approved by the State Review Board or the State Historical Commission. An agreement between the SHPO and the CLG stipulating the terms of the grant is generally signed in the Spring or Summer.

12. When can work begin?
Applicants for CLG funds must wait until the grant agreement between the SHPO and the CLG's chief elected local official, or his or her legal representative, is signed before starting work on any project. Unless specifically authorized in writing by the SHPO, costs incurred prior to execution of the written agreement will not be paid.

13. How long does the grant last?
The schedule for completing the project will be outlined in the grant agreement. Most CLG grant projects are completed within 9 to 18 months. Projects undertaken with CLG grant funds must be completed in no more than two years from October 1, the start of the Federal fiscal year of the year the funds are appropriated by Congress. Since the grant agreement usually is not signed until the Spring after the start of the Federal fiscal year (depending upon when Congress makes its appropriation), there is usually less than two years in which to complete the work. Multi-year projects require applying for separate grants in successive years and performing the work in phases.

Return to Top

14. Can the time be extended?
If circumstances outside of the control of the CLG make the terms of the grant agreement unachievable, the agreement may be modified or cancelled by mutual agreement between the SHPO and the CLG. For example, if inclement weather interferes with field survey and prevents completion of the work specified in the grant agreement within the time period stipulated, a limited time extension may be granted or the scope of work and budget amended. However, extensions may not stretch the grant period beyond the two-year limit on the expenditure of HPF monies. (See question above.)

15. When are the grant funds actually transferred to the CLG?
Most CLG grants are reimbursable grants. CLGs must first pay the project costs and then submit a request to the SHPO for reimbursement. Consequently, the CLG must have enough money "up-front" to be able to carry the project (including paying contractors) until it gets reimbursed. CLGs should learn the requirements and timing of the State's reimbursement procedures before the project begins.

Return to Top

16. Does the CLG have to complete the project before being reimbursed?
Not always. Depending on the type of project funded, many SHPOs allow CLGs to submit reimbursement claims on an interim "milestone achieved" basis.

17. Why is matching share required?
In establishing a partnership between Federal, State, and local governments, the National Historic Preservation Act requires that HPF grants be matching grants. Underlying this requirement is the need for each of the partners to share the costs of historic preservation. Matching grants ensure that there is strong State and local commitment to projects and result in more historic preservation work being performed than if Federal funds alone were involved.

Return to Top

18. How can the grant be matched?
Grants can be matched in two ways: in cash or through in-kind services (often called "soft match") necessary to achieve the required product. Generally, CLGs can combine these two types of match to meet the total amount required. Match requirements, however, vary by State.

19. Can the time spent by CLG staff on the project be counted as match?
Yes. In most States, work on the project performed by the staff of the local government is considered part of the overall cost of the project and can be counted as part of the CLG's match. Copies of time sheets and payroll printouts are required as documentation of employee time devoted to the project. CLGs must include staff time in the project budget, like any other cost, if they plan to claim it as match.

20. Can the services of volunteers be counted as in-kind match?
Yes. Many States allow services provided by volunteers, both professional and nonprofessional, to be counted as match by CLGs. The work performed by volunteers must be a necessary part of achieving the products expected from the project and cannot be more than half its total cost.

Return to Top

21. When used as match, how are volunteer services valued?
In order to claim volunteer services as in-kind match, CLGs must first establish the rate of pay for the type of work performed by the volunteers. Often SHPO pay scales establish the maximum rate allowed for professionals. If a volunteer performs services outside his or her profession, the volunteer time must be valued at the Federal minimum wage rate (for example, an archeologist stuffing envelopes would be valued at minimum wage rate). Also, as evidence that volunteers contributed to the project, time records documenting each volunteer's time must be submitted to the State.

22. If a CLG chooses not to count volunteer services as match, does it still have to provide time records?
No. In most States, documentation of volunteer time spent on a project is only required when the CLG wishes this contribution to count as part of its matching share.

23. What other types of in-kind services can be counted as match?
Most States allow CLGs to claim as match in-kind services such as supplies (i.e., paper or film), developing photographs, photocopying, office rent, clerical support, or certain administrative costs when these are donated to the project by either the local government or a third party. When a CLG chooses to count these supplies or services as match, documentation is required. If grant funds could have been used to pay for a particular item had it not been donated, then the donation will usually be allowable as a matching share contribution.

Return to Top

24. What sort of reports must be turned in?
Progress reports are usually required on an interim basis. These reports must include a description of what has actually been accomplished and spent to date. SHPOs set the format for these reports and require preliminary products, as appropriate. A final project report is also required upon completion of the grant.

25. What sort of procedures must be followed when a local government uses CLG grant funds to pay for consultants or contractors?
Hiring consultants or contractors to perform part of the project must be done in accordance with acceptable State-established competitive procurement procedures compatible with Federal requirements (and with whatever local procedures apply). Frequently, existing State and local government procedures that meet these requirements are used. A certain number of qualified firms or individuals must be contacted to ensure a fair, open, and competitive selection process. Generally, at least three price quotations or bids must be obtained and the process must be documented. Architects, historians, or other professionals must meet qualification standards set by NPS. Selection may be based on experience, qualifications and cost, rather than cost alone. In many States, the SHPO requires that the CLG consult with it before consultants or contractors are selected.

26. Can CLG grant funds be used to buy supplies or equipment?
Yes. Most local, State, and Federal regulations require price comparisons and a competitive selection process in purchasing equipment, negotiating a lease, or procuring nonprofessional services. Generally, State and local procurement regulations apply. Some SHPOs require grantees to request prior approval for purchases greater than $500 in value.

Return to Top

27. How long must records on grant expenditures be kept?
The grant agreement usually specifies records requirements. Documentation relating to the fiscal aspect of any grant project usually must be kept for a minimum of three years after the date of receipt of the last payment (i.e. reimbursement under a CLG grant), or until an audit for the grant period is accepted.

28. Where can I find additional information on CLG grants?
Your SHPO can answer any questions you might have. Many SHPOs have a grants manual describing the procedures used in that State for applying for and administering CLG grants (including any additional State requirements beyond those described in this brochure). Click here to find the **STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICE** in your State.

Return to Top

Freedom of Information Act | Privacy Policy | Disclaimer | Accessibility | USA.gov

City of Dover

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW STAFF REPORT
Before Dover Historic District Commission
July 18, 2013

Application:	North Street Pocket Park at 301 South Governors Avenue Architectural Review Certification HI-13-05 Site Plan S-13-10
Project Location:	Southeast corner of North Street and South Governors Avenue
Property Addresses:	301 South Governors Avenue
Tax Parcel:	ED-05-077.09-04-36.00-000
Owner:	City of Dover
Present Zoning:	C-2 (Central Commercial Zone) H (Historic District Zone)
Existing Uses: Proposed Uses:	Vacant Lot (previous building demolished) Park consisting of landscaping and paving improvements
Site Area:	3,150 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 North Street Pocket Park at 301 South Governors Avenue. A Site Plan has also been filed for review by the Planning Commission.

This application consists of a project involving the construction of a pocket park consisting of paving and landscape areas to be located at 301 South Governors Avenue. The property is zoned C-2 (Central Commercial Zone) and is subject to H (Historic District Zone). The property is located on the southeast corner of West North Street and South Governors Avenue.

Previous Applications:
This property previously included a three story brick and stucco building (pre-1859) that was the subject of applications appearing before the Historic District Commission and other City entities in recent years. The previous building on the property was Declared Demolition by Neglect on June 10, 2010 by the Historic District Commission (Application HI-10-01) and given 90 days to take action to repair the building. When no action was taken by the previous property owner, the Historic District Commission recommended the Building Inspector begin the "Dangerous Building" proceedings. The building was declared a "Dangerous Building" by City Council on October 25,

2010 and ultimately demolished by the City in the Spring of 2011 (Demolition Permit #11-143). Following City Council approval on October 22, 2012 to pursue establishing a pocket park on the property, the City acquired the property in late Fall 2012 at Sheriff's sale due to a City tax delinquency.

The City of Dover Parks, Recreation & Community Enhancement Committee (PRCE) reviewed the proposal for the establishment of the park on April 8, 2013 and recommended approval of a pocket park design with appropriate screening for the neighbors and a recommendation to include a tribute to the victims of domestic violence. Upon review of this recommendation on April 22, 2013 the City Council referred the matter back the PRCE Committee to allow other interested organizations to submit proposals. At the PRCE Committee meeting of June 10, 2013, the Committee recommended approval of the basic design concept for the pocket park and the City Council approved the basic design concept for the pocket park on June 24, 2013. (Note: No action has been taken to approve the installation of tributes, monuments, memorials, etc. in the pocket park.)

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 property is located within the boundaries of a National Register Historic District, specifically the Dover Green Historic District. Provided below is the description of the previous building that existed on the property prior to its demolition in 2011. The description is from the building inventory listing found within the National Register of Historic Places nomination completed for the Dover Green Historic District.

> K-394.30 - 301 South Governors Avenue – Mid 19th century; brick, 3 story, 3 bay. This structure has a low pitched gable roof with a dentiled cornice. There is a 2-story, 1 bay south section with a lean to roof. The exterior is stuccoed. There is a protruding pediment above the door. On the second floor is a rectangular oriel. It has elaborate cornice brackets and modillions, as well as three support brackets with pendants. The Sanborn insurance maps indicate that the oriel was added between 1897 and 1919. (c)

A series of historic maps was reviewed by Planning Staff for preliminary information on this corner of South Governors Avenue. The *1859 A.D. Byles Map of Kent* County (Dover insert) shows at the southeast corner of the intersection of South Governors Avenue and North Street a large building directly at the corner with a smaller detached building to the east. It is labeled "Delewarian." The *1868 Beers Map* published by Pomeroy & Beers also shows a large building at the corner and a smaller building to the east along North Street (no label as to property owner). The *1885 Bird's Eye View of Dover* shows a multi-story building at the corner with a smaller one story building to its east. The series of *Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps* would also be a reference source for information on the series of buildings/building additions which occupied this property over time. Additional research using other primary and secondary source documents would provide more information on the history of the property, previous buildings, and the owners.

PROJECT PROPOSAL (Drawings as updated 6/10/2013):
The Site Plan proposes improvements to the existing vacant lot to create a small park. Improvements are proposed as paving system of concrete and brick pavers along with landscape planting areas. The elements of the pocket park project are as follows:

1. Sidewalk: A new brick sidewalk is proposed along the street frontage of South Governors Avenue. The sidewalk along the North Street frontage of the property was part of the improvements (new brick and concrete surfaces) constructed as part of the North Street Area Improvement Project (HI-11-05, C-11-07, S-12-04).

2. Paving: Improvements are proposed to consist of a patterned system of concrete and brick pavers to create a paved plaza-like area that is accessible from both streets. A circular brick area with alterative colored wedge is set in a concrete paved area.

3. Landscaping: A raised brick planter is proposed at the property corner at the intersection of South Governors Avenue and North Street. A curved raised brick planter with four trees is centered on the site framing the western edge of the landscape planting area is proposed on the southeast side of the property along the east property line. The landscape planting area appears to consist of hedge shrubs and low ornamental plantings. Another curved raised brick planter forms the northern edge of the landscape planting area near North Street. The type of ground cover (grass, mulch, plantings, colored stone, etc.) for the landscape area is not specified. The specific varieties of plantings are not listed.

4. Site Furnishings: Several light bollards are placed at the edges of the landscaped area. There are existing street lights along both adjoining streets. There appears to be a brick cube/pillar (unknown dimensions) at the northern end of the center curved planter.

The overall project for this pocket park strives to follow the design and planning strategies outlined in the *Dover Transit Center Neighborhood Plan and Design Book.* The *Neighborhood Plan* suggested that a network of civic squares, open spaces, and public gathering places be created to provide greater connectivity between activity centers and for design concepts focus on improvements to the pedestrian movement and experience. The *Neighborhood Plan* suggests paving improvements, trees, benches, etc. throughout the Downtown.

Review of *DESIGN STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES*
The subject project site is located in the Dover Historic District Zone within The Green Historic Context. The Green Historic Context is described on pages 2-3 through 2-5. 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, and Paving and Bordering found on pages 3-24 through 3-27. These guidelines highlight the consideration that should be given to the setting and 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 while not specific to park areas, the *Design Guidelines* recommend that 20% of parking lots (another type of paved area) 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 for the North Street Pocket Park (plan drawing dated 6/10/2013). 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. The brick sidewalk areas along the streets must maintain an accessible width to allow pedestrian travel around items such as street lights, signage etc. Adjustments to the raised planter bed at the corner may be necessary to allow for safer and better circulation on the adjacent sidewalks.
    b. Any light fixtures/poles utilized on the property for site lighting should utilize a black finish color.
    c. Utilize black posts for any signage elements to be attached to posts.
    d. A clear edge for any mulch, stone, etc. areas must be established along the property lines.
    e. Add benches for seating. Several curved benches could be placed along the edge of the brick circle facing west/northwest. This will also assist in preventing misuse of the raised planter bed edge in this area.
    f. Remove the brick cube/pillar element as it does not seem to fit the character of this park.

3) Some of the site improvements/amenities were not specifically described with the application information or need to be clarified. Please provide information for consideration and discussion.
    a. Clarify the paving surface material for wedge area of brick circle.
    b. Clarify the height of and the flat surface dimension of the raised planting beds. An edge treatment may be necessary to limit misuse of the planters.

c. Clarify the surface treatment (lawn areas, plantings, type of mulch, stone, etc.) within the landscape areas.
d. Clarify the status of the existing curb cut on North Street.
e. The plan provides limited information on the project's strategy for stormwater management. Any changes to address this may impact the park's paving and landscaping designs.
f. Ensure that tree planting locations and landscape plantings do not conflict with existing or proposed utilities. There are several utility cabinets near the northeast corner of the site.
g. Provide adequate grading on this site for drainage ensuring drainage is away from the adjacent structures on adjoining properties.

4) Staff recommends the addition of a bicycle parking rack on the property to provide a parking location for this type of transportation mode. It will also help to avoid the impromptu chaining of bicycles to other site features like trees, fences, or signs. The bicycle parking rack should be black in finish color. The post and loop style parking bollard utilized in other areas of the Downtown would be appropriate.

5) For corner lots such as this, walls and fences 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.
   a. Additional information is needed to confirm if the raised planter and its plantings are in compliance.

6) Coordination with the adjacent property owners regarding any remaining fencing or landscaping along the adjoining property lines will be necessary. Documentation of their concurrence with the installation or removal of such elements, provisions for shared usage, and/or any maintenance agreements may be required.

7) Staff recommends the addition of a black metal decorative fence three to four feet in height along the southern property line to connect the wooden gate and the existing wooden fence. The applicant may wish to discuss other options for this fenceline with the adjoining property owner. Any fences must comply with the *Design Standards and Guidelines.*

8) The proposed landscaping including tree plantings and landscape plantings should be completed with native species appropriate to the site conditions of an urban area and for ease of maintenance. Consultation with the City's arborist regarding the tree species and plantings selected is recommended.

9) 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.

10) 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.

11) 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.
    a. Currently, the project is only presented in a graphical format. A Site Plan including the appropriate data column, plan drawing, and details must be provided to complete the Site Plan review process.

12) The applicant shall be aware that the Building Permit for the project is required to track the construction activities on the property. The permit applications must comply with the approvals and conditions granted through the Architectural Review Certification and Site Plan Review process.

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.*

2013-2017 Delaware's Historic Preservation Plan:
***Preserving Our Past for a Better Future*:**

http://history.delaware.gov/preservation/planning.sthtml

- A copy of this document was forwarded to the Historic District Commission members for the June 20, 2013 meeting.

- If you have questions or required additional copies of the materials, please contact Planning Staff at 736-7196.