CITY OF DOVER HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
AGENDA
THURSDAY, March 21, 2013 - 3:00 P.M.
City Hall – Conference Room

ROLL CALL
APPROVAL OF AGENDA
APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF MEETING on February 21, 2013

COMMUNICATIONS & REPORTS

1. *Historic Preservation Commission Training Session on Design Review* to be held April 27, 2013 at 9:00am-Noon at Lewes City Hall

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

OLD BUSINESS

NEW BUSINESS

1. Presentation:
   a. 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).*

2. Review of Building Permit Referred to Commission:
   a. 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.*

3. Application for Architectural Review Certification:
   a. 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.

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
FEBRUARY 21, 2013

The Regular Meeting of the City of Dover Historic District Commission was held on Thursday, February 21, 2013 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, Ms. Cornwell, and Mrs. Purnell.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Fisher moved for approval of the agenda as amended, 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 JANUARY 17, 2013

Mr. McDaniel moved to adopt the minutes of the regular Historic District Commission meeting of January 17, 2013, seconded by Mr. Salkin and the motion was unanimously carried 4-0. Mr. Jackson was absent.

COMMUNICATIONS & REPORTS

Training Opportunities

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that on the desks were handouts on workshops and training opportunities being held by Preservation Delaware and other partners throughout the State. The next workshop is scheduled for Saturday, March 9, 2013 at 9:30 a.m. in New Castle, Delaware "Design Review: Are You Keeping Up With the Times" and "Connecting With Your Community" follow up. The workshop is free and 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 Workshop scheduled for Tuesday, February 26, 2013 from 4:00 p.m. – 7:00 p.m. at the Dover Public Library, Meeting Room. The intent of the workshop was to discuss the role and scope of the Historic District Commission and Historic District. This was a follow-up of some of the tasking that the City Council Legislative Finance and Administrative Committee did assign. There will be a presentation at 4:00 p.m. followed by a facilitated discussion by a consultant. The same presentation and facilitation will be presented again at 5:30 p.m. The same flyer that went out to members also went to property owners who live within the Historic District and stakeholder groups. It was also advertised in the Wednesday, February 20, 2013 Dover Post.

Responding to Mr. Salkin question on if there were any roles for the Historic District Commission, Mrs. Melson-Williams replied no, other than being a participant sitting in the audience. There will also be an opportunity for written comments to be submitted.

Update on Proposal for The Green as National Monumen

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that City Council took action to support establishing a Preservation and Conservation Easement on the lawn area of The Green. This is one step that needs to be in place for potential designation of the National Monument should the President choose to do so. Along with the Preservation Easement document the City Solicitor and Staff have been dealing with title search and legal issues associated with the easement. Planning Staff and Department of Public Works Staff prepared the baseline documentation that identifies the existing features that currently exist on The Green such as the trees and a background report. The Senator and our Congressional delegation filed a new Legislation (Bill) for designation of various areas in the State of Delaware as a National Park Site.

Responding to Mr. Scrafford question if the National Park was the grass area inside the curb, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated it is the lawn area inside the curb. It does not include State Street, the pavement of the street known as The Green, or any private property.

Responding to Mr. Scrafford question if it included the curb, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated it has been described as the lawn area, she was not sure of the exact legal description.

Mr. McDaniel stated that he never had a chance to read the new document, but he was satisfied.

Responding to Mr. Fisher question as to who owns The Green, Mr. McDaniel stated "the people of Kent County". Also responding, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated she had not seen the complete title work and was not sure of the official designation, but Levy Court took action to support the creation of the preservation easement.

OLD BUSINESS

HI-12-06 Demolition of Building at 509 South State Street – Continuation of Review for Action on Architectural Review Certification for the demolition of the two-and-half story residential dwelling located at 509 South State Street. The property is zoned RGO (General Residence and Office Zone) and subject to the H (Historic District Zone) and the SWPOZ (Source Water Protection Overlay Zone). The property is located on the east side of South State Street just south of the intersection with Water Street. The owner of record is the Rector, Wardens and Vestryman of Christ Episcopal Church. The property address is 509 South State Street. Tax Parcel: ED-05-077.09-05-45.00-000. *Action on this application was deferred at the September 20, 2012 meeting, as the Commission requested additional information.*

Mr. McDaniel recused himself from the application as he is a member of the church that owns the subject property.

Mrs. Melson-Williams gave an overview of the Architectural Review Staff Report dated September 20, 2012 that was included in the packet. She stated that included in the Staff Report were comments and recommendations, and provided were the minutes of the September 20, 2012 Historic District Commission meeting.

Mrs. Melson-Williams also stated there was a listing chronology of events since the September 20, 2012 meeting. On February 11, 2013 some additional information on the project request to demolish the building was provided and was included in the packet.

Mr. Fisher moved to raise the application HI-12-06 from being tabled, seconded by Mr. Salkin and the motion was unanimously carried 3-0. Mr. McDaniel recused and Mr. Jackson absent.

Representatives: Paul Brown and Alan George of Christ Episcopal Church.

Mr. George stated that they went back from the last meeting and sent seven (7) historic architects an email of the information that was submitted to the Historic District Commission requesting them to look at the structure. They requested building plans with complete demolition and new construction of the house verses refurbishing of the house, historical architectural inspection reports structural engineering reports, and construction cost. He stated that three (3) of the seven (7) historic architects responded and they were Homsey Architects, Buck Simpers, Architects and Associates (BSA+A), and Bernardon Haber Holloway Architects. He stated that of the three (3) only two (2) of them followed-up. They met with BSA+A on January 4, 2013 and preliminary input included:

- The back of the house has structural damage to the floor joists.
- The 9”x9” floor tiles in the back section are most likely asbestos tiles based on past renovation experiences.
- The roof was replaced totally at one point since plywood sheathing can be seen when part of the attic ceiling was pulled away (i.e. there are no cedar shakes remaining from the old roof).
- The beams supporting the roof in the main part of the house are structurally sound.
- There was no apparent structural damage in the attic where the leaks are seen at the chimney/roof lines.
- The flooring of the attic under the floor boards is structurally sound and not of current construction dimensions (3”x4” joists).
- The addition of the inner block wall in the basement makes the interior of the main part of the house appear to be structurally sound.
- Depending on the planned use of the building, code requirements may be in conflict with keeping the historic nature of the building and surrounding area (would need to address with variances).

Mr. George further stated that Bernardon Haber Holloway Architects had the same findings and opinions when they did the walk through.

Mr. George also stated that there was a public safety issue with the building. One of the doors had been forcibly opened and found that someone had been living in the building. The Police Department was contacted and afterwards the door was boarded up. He stated other public safety concerns aside from the local residents being at risk, were people who used the Parish House, i.e. the Social Hall in the evening including:

- The Delaware Music School where lessons are provided to children who come and go with their parents at night.

- Various support groups such as Alcoholics Anonymous who meet at night midweek.
- Church Choir who rehearse midweek.
- Youth Group at various times.
- The women of the Altar Group who are at the Church alone during off hours to prepare the altar for services, and
- Church Staff who often are leaving the building after dark.

They also looked at the cost impact to the church and this was also discussed with the Historic Architects. There are three (3) options to pay for the project which include a Building Campaign, take out a construction loan and mortgage, and look for grants and tax credits. Christ Episcopal Church funding is primarily based on three sources: pledges from the parishioners, savings from unrestricted endowments, and restricted endowments. As part of the pledges that is used as the budget going into the year the church is already $20,000 in the red.

The input cost from the Historical Architect to do the complete focus study, structural analysis, design and build plans, and construction cost, and to remove the building and build an entire new structure would roughly cost $500,000. To do a renovation it would roughly cost $400,000. The church looked at ways to cover the cost that would add to their already existing budget such as an additional mortgage. They are not sure where the funds would come from. They have looked into the Historical Tax Credit. They are currently sitting on tax credits as they have not been able to sell them off. They have not been able to get potential revenue to offset the cost because the building is land locked so there is no parking, and it would be difficult to meet ADA requirements and maintain the features of the interior of the building (narrow doorway, low headroom, narrow stairwell to second and third floors).

Mr. George stated that in summary the Church did not want to fund a complete historic survey of the building knowing that the cost would be in the $500,000 range. They do have good feedback from two (2) Historic Architects. If the church would take another $47,000 from the church savings every year it would drain our reserves and back up operational funds. While this may seem to be a bit melodramatic it is far from that. He used the Cathedral Vestry as an example of not being the best stewards with their funding and ultimately resulted in the closing of the Cathedral. He stated that the church does not have the funding. He stated that the church supports the following and would not be able to do that if they were not open: The House of Pride, Dover Interfaith Mission, Habitat for Humanity, and upkeep of the cemetery and church yard as a private entity.

Mr. George asked that given the costs and potential options that they continue with the plan and work towards securing their long term presence in the community without the burden of renovating the structure. The Church has always been good historic stewards in the area. He stated that reviving an old house that was left to run down by the previous owner and putting their Church at risk over a property that is old, but not historic; does not seem the way to go. They wish to continue supporting the historical facilities and grounds in the efforts of their Parish to maintain

and nurture not just the building, but the citizens. Christ Church is a 300-year old parish with a historic church dating to 1734 established and sustained by generations of Dover citizens, including a signer of the Declaration of Independence, other founding fathers of the United States, several state governors, ambassadors, and local residents who would end up victim of a derelict house with no historic value. The Church asked that the Historic District Commission approve their request to demolish the building at 509 South State Street.

Responding to Mr. Salkin question if any of the consultants left any documentation of the analysis, Mr. George stated that he had correspondence of emails.

Responding to Mr. Salkin question if the consultants were asked to be more specific, Mr. George replied no, in order to do that it would cost roughly $5,000-$10,000. He could provide the Historic District Commission with the emails.

Mr. Salkin stated that he did not feel that the Church has replied with the request from the Historic District Commission, but agreed to move forward.

Mr. Fisher moved to approve the demolition permit application HI-12-06 Demolition of Building at 509 South State Street to include items #4, 5, and 6 of Staff Comments and Recommendations, that the church work with the Planning Department regarding recordation, seconded by Chairman Scrafford and carried with two (2) yes, one opposed (Salkin). Mr. McDaniel was recused from voting on the application; however, he remained in the meeting. Mr. Jackson was absent.

Mr. George stated that he could provide floor plans for all of the rooms for recordation.

Mr. Scrafford recommended that Mr. George work with the Planning Department on the establishment of what they need in the form of recordation.

Chairman Scrafford questioned if there was any additional discussion.

Mr. Salkin stated that when the Historic District Commission met in September and tabled the motion by majority vote it requested additional information; he expected they would have had more information regarding the house history and analysis of its integrity and value than what was received today. He did not feel that the Historic District Commission received what was needed to act on the intent from the September 20, 2012 meeting.

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that the application was not required to go before the Planning Commission. A notice of decision letter will be issued to the applicant. The applicant would need to provide the documentation element, streetscape plan, and file a Demolition Permit application.

NEW BUSINESS

HI-13-01 Lands of Boyles at 527-529 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. The property is zoned RGO (General Residence and Office Zone) and is subject to the H (Historic District Overlay Zone) and SWPOZ (Source Water Protection Overlay Zone) Tier 3 - Excellent Recharge Area. The property is located on the northeast corner of South State Street and Elm Terrace. The owners of record are William and Lisa Boyles. Address: 527-529 South State Street. Tax Parcel: ED-05-077.09-05-47.00-000. Council District 2. *Associated with Application S-13-03*.

Mrs. Melson-Williams gave an overview of the Architectural Review Staff Report dated February 21, 2013 that was included in the packet. She stated that included in the Staff Report were comments and recommendations. She stated that fences are limited to a height of four (4) feet in the front yard and in the corner visibility area a height of three (3) feet is required.

Representative: Mr. Garth Jones, Site Engineer for Becker Morgan Group LLC.

Mr. Jones stated that the property is owned by Mr. & Mrs. Boyles. There are currently three (3) residential apartments within the house. The owners wanted to construct off-street parking for the three (3) apartments. According to Code, seven (7) parking spaces are required. This includes two (2) parking spaces for each apartment and one (1) for a visitor. The parking lot would take access off the alley. Therefore, there would be no access to the parking lot from Elm Terrace or State Street. The parking lot is proposed to be asphalt paved. There is an existing sidewalk from the rear of the house along the front to South State Street. The applicant is also proposing to install a brick sidewalk and ornamental decorative four (4) feet fence along South State Street, Elm Terrace and along the alley until you reach the parking lot. The fence will be three (3) feet in the corner visibility area. The applicant is also interested in plantings along Elm Terrace to create a hedgerow to block visibility of the parking lot from the street. They plan to install Ink Berry Hollies. A lot of the overgrowth has been removed on the north side and this will allow the shrubs to grow into a hedgerow as well. They plan to keep the other area as lawn throughout the site. There is a place holder for a proposed accessory building that will be handled separately through a Building Permit process. He stated that they were in agreement with Staff Comments and Recommendations.

Chairman Scrafford asked if there were any questions.

Responding to Mr. McDaniel question if they would have the same type of Ink Berry shrubs on the north side of the lot, Mr. Jones stated that they were existing shrubs.

Mr. Scrafford recommended giving the area one (1) year to reestablish growth, instead of disturbing the area and planting new shrubs and then fill in where needed.

Responding to Mr. Salkin question if the eastern boundary of the property was the eastern edge of the District, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that for this property it goes to the alley, but the church

yard is included in the District. The houses on Elm Terrace are not in the Local Historic District, but they do fall within the National Register Historic District.

Responding to a question from Mr. Salkin regarding the fence color and material in keeping with the character of the house if it was something other than black metal, Mrs. Melson-Williams replied there may not have ever been a fence at this location.

Responding to Mr. Scrafford question regarding if a recommendation could be made for the applicant to come back with additional information regarding the fence (for other than the black metal), Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that a recommendation could be made for something other than that. The *Design Standards and Guidelines* recommend wood picket fences, cast iron (black metal) fence, and wire fence, (but that does not mean chain link). She stated that a chain link fence and unpainted wood fence is not recommended.

Mr. Scrafford stated that instead of holding them to a black metal fence, maybe there could be some latitude.

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that a suggestion could be made for them to look at a wooden fence or white vinyl fence option that we typically see installed today.

Responding to Mr. Scrafford question if there were any fences along Elm Terrace, Mrs. Melson-Williams replied no. The closest fence would be the brick wall of the Church and the northeast corner of South State Street and Water Street. It is a split rail fence around the Bradford and Loockerman House that also has a black metal fence for part of its frontage.

Responding to Mr. Salkin question regarding what was the rational for the fence; Mr. Jones stated that it was a request from the owner.

Mr. Scrafford stated that the owner would need to comply with the *Design Standards and Guidelines* if they wanted a fence other than what is required and to have it approved.

Mr. Salkin stated that if there needed to be a three (3) foot fence at the corner, it will need to be lower and have less than an architectural impact on the entire neighborhood and property.

Mr. Jones stated that you would not see the fence because of the height of the Boxwood Holly out front.

Mr. Scrafford declared the public hearing open.

Ms. Kathy Kosior – Resident of the Elm Terrace neighborhood and property owner at 12 Elm Terrace.

Ms. Kosior stated that Elm Terrace is residential and has a very narrow street. She stated that she moved into the area in 2003. She would like for the neighborhood to remain a residential zone. Her concern was parking (trucks parking on the grass) to avoid the vehicle being hit. A parking lot

is not a bad idea and would not be unexpected because the property is zoned residential and office. She questioned the seven (7) parking spaces and having parking stickers to park on the street.

Responding to Ms. Kosior question if with off-street parking would they be entitled to residential parking stickers, Mrs. Melson-Williams replied that it is administered through the City of Dover Customer Services and related to the Police Department. She was not sure of the rules if there was off-street parking on the lot or the eligibility for the residential parking permits. There are various areas in the Downtown where they are utilized and there is no off-street parking options, driveways, or other potential users using the on-street parking. Especially in the areas where there is 2-hour parking that allows for residents with the sticker to park longer.

Ms. Kosior's other concern was if the building was sold in the future. She stated that they do like the idea of the fence along Elm Terrace.

Responding to a question from Ms. Kosior if the fence could be taller than four (4) feet along Elm Terrace, Mrs. Melson-Williams replied that in the Historic District the *Design Standards and Guidelines* recommend a maximum height of four (4) feet all the way around. Under the provisions in the *Zoning Ordinance*, because the property is a corner lot that fronts on two (2) streets, the second front is eligible for fences more than four (4) feet in height. It goes to a side yard height limit which is 6 ½ feet.

Mr. Scrafford stated that there would be a lower fence on the northeast corner of Elm Terrace that would allow visibility and would not restrict visibility of cars exiting onto State Street.

Responding to Ms. Kosior question regarding the remainder of Elm Terrace in reference to Mr. Scrafford's comment, Mr. Scrafford replied that the remainder of Elm Terrace could be four (4) feet or lower. The applicant asked for four (4) feet except at the intersection. He stated that it was explained to him that the *Zoning Ordinance* allows for a corner lot to have one section higher than the other, but the Historic District Guidelines recommend four (4) feet all the way around. He was expecting that the decision to be made by the Historic District Commission is four (4) feet all the way around expect the corner which is three (3) feet.

Mr. Salkin stated that the Historic District Commission would not recommend going any higher.

Responding to Ms. Kosior question regarding run-off, Mr. Scrafford stated that as part of the design review any run-off would need to be as it was prior to the installation of the asphalt.

Mr. Jones stated that when they move through the process with Planning Commission and the final construction documents with the Planning Department they will require an approval from the Kent Conservation District for sediment and stormwater management.

Responding to Mr. Scrafford question if the only issue that had not been discussed was lighting and there was no lighting indicated in the proposal. He asked if this was correct, Mr. Jones replied correct.

Responding to Mr. McDaniel question if lighting was a requirement, Mr. Scrafford replied no.

Mr. Jones stated that included in the Staff Recommendations under Item #3 it notes that any light fixtures and poles utilized on the property for site lighting should utilize a black finish color.

Responding to a question from Ms. Kosior if lighting was a requirement for the parking lot, Mr. Scrafford replied no. He did not want to see a project of lighting that had not been addressed by the Historic District Commission.

Responding to a question from Ms. Kosior regarding approved landscaping, if it would be done the way it was approved, Mr. Scrafford replied it will be installed according to plans and inspected by the Planning Department to make sure it complies with the plans.

Mr. Alan George – Junior Warden for Christ Episcopal Church

Mr. George stated that they were supportive of the project.

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.

Responding to a question from Mr. Salkin if the proposal of the fence from the house on the State Street side would be four (4) feet and drop down to three (3) feet for the corner, Mr. Jones replied yes it would be four (4) feet all around and the corner visibility area will be three (3) feet unless there was a variance.

Responding to Mr. Fisher question if the fence could be tapered, Mr. Scrafford replied that it would need to be submitted and he would assume that the Planning Department would have the authority to decide if it was acceptable.

Mr. McDaniel moved to approve and to accept application HI-13-01 Lands of Boyles at 527-529 South State Street to include from page four (4), paragraphs #2-10 of the Staff Comments and Recommendations, seconded by Mr. Salkin and the motion was unanimously carried 4-0 (Mr. Jackson absent).

Commission Education Plan Worksheet from the Summary of Training Workshop on November 17, 2012: "Connecting With Your Community: Communication, Education and Outreach"

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that the worksheet was part of the Preservation Delaware Workshop that she attended on November 17, 2012 that discussed communication and outreach of Historic District Commissions. The information gathered will be discussed at the March 9, 2013 Workshop. She was not sure how the information would be used.

Mr. Salkin stated that a lot of this would apply if the Historic District Commission had a budget.

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that Commissions range in how they are funded and staffed. The worksheet plan was developed by people who work with the various Historic District Commissions in Maryland. They have an organization of the Commission that works on training efforts.

Mr. Salkin commented about the upcoming public meeting, and discussion about the Historic District Commission and the future. Most of the discussion has been in regards to the process and upon reviewing the workshop document the Historic District Commission do not do any of the items because of their narrow function. He thinks that the general public thinks that they do (outreach, education). He thought that it would be helpful in the orientation session at the public meeting to explain to the public what a Historic District Commission can be and do and what Historic District Commissions do elsewhere.

Mr. Scrafford asked if someone from the Planning Department could follow-up with Ms. Kosior concern regarding residential parking permits.

Mr. McDaniel stated that many of the people who live on The Green that have parking permits have off-street parking.

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that the Planning Department will have the information in hand for the Planning Commission meeting.

Mr. McDaniel moved to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Mr. Fisher and unanimously carried (Mr. Jackson absent).

Meeting adjourned at 4:20 PM

Sincerely,

Maretta Savage-Purnell
Secretary

MARYLAND ASSOCIATION of Historic District Commissions

Join us for an Historic Preservation Commission Training Session On Design Review

Saturday, April 27, 2013
City Hall
114 E 3rd Street
Lewes, Delaware
9am – noon

Join us for a three-hour workshop, led by Sharon Kennedy, Chairman of the Annapolis Historic Preservation Commission, to discuss a number of design issues as they relate to historic preservation commissions. The workshop is designed to teach a basic working knowledge of relevant subjects, including documentation requirements, the Secretary of the Interior Standards, issues of integrity and significance, and substitute materials.

This on-site workshop builds on MAHDC's on-line tutorial and reference manual, which provides a broad overview of basic principles and terminology of preservation practice. (www.mahdc.org). Participants are strongly advised to review the online training course and reference manual prior to attending the workshop.

While the workshops are targeted to commission members and staff, historic property owners, elected officials, attorneys, contractors, and anyone who is interested in learning more about legal issues related to commission operations are invited to attend.

At the end of the session, we will take some time to review the Education and Outreach Strategies that you may have worked with since we last convened last November.

For questions or comments, please contact Karen Theimer Brown at ktheimerbrown@gmail.com. Looking forward to seeing you there!

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). Phase 1 included the area along Court Street (Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard) east from Legislative Hall to Route 13/South DuPont Highway and then south along Route 13.

- Attachments:
  - Capital City Trail: Legislative Hall to Loockerman Street – Preferred Trail Alternative (Aerial Map View)
  - Capital City Trail: Legislative Hall to Loockerman Street – Landscape Plan
  - Capital City Trail – Phase II – Proposed Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements (View south along Archives Parking Lot)
    - Brick walk with brick wall
    - Brick walk with concrete curb-like wall
    - Brick walk with red colored split-face concrete block wall

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW REPORT
Referral by City Planner to Historic District Commission
Meeting of March 21, 2013

Permit: Permit #13-260 for Accessory Structure
John Bell House

Location: 43 The Green
Located east of South State Street on the Southeast side of The Green

Tax Parcel: ED-05-077.09-05-28.00-000

File Number: HI-13-04

Referral of Permit:
The following application **Building Permit #13-260** is referred by the City Planner to the Historic District Commission for consultation regarding the issuance of the Architectural Review Certificate. Applications for certain types of construction activity within the Historic District Zone (H) are reviewed by the City Planner (or Staff as designated) for Architectural Review Certification as part of the Building Permit application review process. Based on the location of the project on The Green and the structure's placement, Staff is referring the Permit for review under the provisions of *Zoning Ordinance*, Article 10 Section 3.22(A) and (B). See below.

> Section 3.22 Architectural review certification by the city planner.
> (A) An architectural review certificate for specific classes of building permits, including fences, signs, siding, window and door replacement, roofing, the addition or replacement of decorative features, minor demolition, residential additions, and other construction of a minor nature, may be issued by the city planner, after a review and determination that the proposed construction is in general accordance with the standards set forth in subsection 3.25.
> (B) The city planner may refer any permit application for demolition or construction in the historic district for consultation with commission.

Permit Proposal:
Building Permit #13-260 was filed on March 7, 2013 for the proposed construction of a historic replica outhouse as an accessory structure at the John Bell House at 43 The Green, Dover. The permit is associated with another Building Permit #13-261 for construction of a fence which is also subject to the Architectural Review Certification process and eligible for Staff Review of the permit.

The project consists of a 7ft. by 8 ft. wood frame building with a gable roof. The outhouse building is to be clad in wood lap siding with wood shingles for the roof. A wood plank door serves as the entry on the west side. The outhouse building is proposed to be located in the fenced backyard area south of the John Bell House. The wood picket fence is proposed for

construction under a separate permit. See permit application form and attachments.

Staff Review of Permit for Architectural Review Certification:
In reviewing the proposed project for Architectural Review Certification, Staff referenced various sections of Chapter 3: Maintenance, Repair, Preservation and Restoration of Existing Historic Buildings and Chapter 4: New Construction, Additions, Demolition and Relocation of the *Design Standards and Guidelines for the City of Dover Historic District Zone* which presents the Recommended, Not Recommended, and Inappropriate approaches to construction of various elements in the Historic District. Staff also reviewed the proposed outhouse building for compliance with provisions of the *Zoning Ordinance.*

Staff findings are summarized as follows:

- Building Construction: The proposed building and its exterior finishes follow the "Recommended" practices of the *Design Standards & Guidelines* and is designed to fit the character of the Historic District.
- Building Location: The requirements of the *Zoning Ordinance* for accessory structures require their placement to be a minimum setback of five feet from side and rear property lines. The proposed location of the outhouse building will be less than five feet from the property lines of the John Bell House parcel. Under provisions of the *Zoning Ordinance*, the Historic District Commission is authorized to waive certain bulk standards such as setbacks when issuing an Architectural Review Certificate.

Historic District Commission Action
The Historic District Commission should consider the proposal for the accessory structure (outhouse) and take action in regards to the Architectural Review Certification for the project.

Advisory Comments

1. The applicant shall be aware that a Permit is required to proceed with construction activities on the property. The permit application must be updated if necessary comply with the conditions established through the Architectural Review Certification process.

2. Staff recommends approval of the Architectural Review Certificate finding that the proposed building construction complies with the *Design Standards and Guidelines.*

3. Staff recommends approval of the placement of the accessory structure (outhouse building) as proposed (less than five feet from property lines). This subject property of the John Bell House and the adjoining property of the Kent County Courthouse are both State owned properties. The location in the corner of the property also allows for better use of the backyard area of the John Bell House for interpretive programming and landscaping.

Attachments:

- Permit #13-260 form
- Project Drawings: Sheet A-01 John Bell House Existing Conditions (prior to restoration project); Sheet A-01 John Bell House Outhouse Floor Plan & Elevation; and John Bell House Outhouse Fence Details
- Letter of Referral dated March 12, 2013

City of Dover - **BUILDING PERMIT APPLICATION**

15 Loockerman Plaza ♦ Dover, Delaware 19901 ♦ (302) 736-7010 ♦ FAX (302) 736-4217

Project Address/Tax Parcel Identification Number ED-05-077.09-05-280.000-000
JOHN BELL HOUSE OUTHOUSE
43 THE GREEN, DOVER DE 19901

Applicant's Name DELAWARE STATE PARKS

Owner Name and Address DELAWARE STATE PARKS
89 KINGS HWY, DOVER DE 19901
Phone # (302) 739-9231
E-mail address: GREGORY.KINDIG@STATE.DE.US

Contractor Name and Address
SAME AS ABOVE
Phone # ( )
E-mail address: Dover Business License #

BUILDING DETAILS

Proposed Occupancy MUSEUM
Type of Construction WOOD FRAME
Change in Occupancy or Use? Yes or (No)
If yes, describe the previous use

Type of work: ( ) New (X) Addition ( ) Demolition
( ) Renovation – Interior ___ Exterior ___
( ) Roof – tear off ___ overlay ___ # of layers
( ) Shed ( ) Siding ( ) Solar panels
( ) Full Building Demolition ( ) Selective Demolition
( ) Fence - Height ___ ( )Pool ( ) Elevator
( ) OTHER

Number of Stories 1
Total Height in Feet 12
Total Land Area to be Disturbed (in SF) 200 ±
Proposed Occupant Load 1
Square Footage All Floors 56
Total Work Area (In SF) 200 ±

Description of Work:
ADDITION OF A HISTORIC REPLICA OUTHOUSE AT THE BACK OF THE JOHN BELL HOUSE.

Sprinkler System? Yes or (No)
Fire Alarm System? Yes or (No)

Estimated Value of Construction: $ 12,000

Before You Dig! Call Miss Utility 1-800-282-8555 or other authorized locator.
Attention! Please post your issued permit on site and visible from the street.

Office Use Only
Permit Number 13-260
Roll Plans Fold Plans CD
Date Received 3-7-13 JW
Date Issued
C/O Required

Review Approvals	
( ) Building Plan	Date ___ Initials ___
( ) Fire Plan	Date ___ Initials ___
( ) Zoning / Site Plan	Date ___ Initials ___

Total Fee 113.00
Fees Paid ( )
Check # Cash
Collected By

Certification in Lieu of Oath

I hereby certify that I am the owner of record or a contractor authorized by the owner of record to make this application, and that all work will be performed in accordance with the applicable Codes and Ordinances.

Signature Gregory S. Kindig

3.7.13
Date

City of Dover

March 12, 2013

Mr. Gregory Kindig
Delaware State Parks
89 Kings Highway
Dover DE 19901

RE: Referral of Building Permit #13-260 to Historic District Commission
Accessory Structure at John Bell House, 43 The Green, Dover DE

Dear Mr. Kindig:

This letter is to inform you that Building Permit application #13-260 has been referred to the City of Dover Historic District Commission for consultation regarding the issuance of the Architectural Review Certificate. Building Permit #13-260 was filed on March 7, 2013 for the proposed construction of a historic replica outhouse as an accessory structure at the John Bell House at 43 The Green, Dover.

The location of the subject property within the City of Dover's Historic District zone requires the review and issuance of an Architectural Review Certificate (ARC) for construction activities. Certain types of activities such as this project are eligible for Staff review of the ARC during the Building Permit application process. Project activities are reviewed for compliance with the *Zoning Ordinance* and the *Design Standards and Guidelines for the City of Dover Historic District Zone* as stated in *Zoning Ordinance,* Article 10 Section 3.25(A).

> 3.25 *Architectural review standards.*
> (A) An architectural review certificate may be issued if it is found that the architectural style, general design, height, bulk and setbacks, arrangement, location and materials and structures affecting the exterior appearance are generally in harmony with neighboring structures and complementary to the traditional architectural standards of the historic district as set forth in the historic district design guidelines and standards adopted by the planning commission and as set forth in the United States Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation.

In reviewing the proposed project for Architectural Review Certification, Staff referenced the Chapter 3: Maintenance, Repair, Preservation and Restoration of Existing Historic Buildings and Chapter 4: New Construction, Additions, Demolition and Relocation of the *Design Standards and Guidelines* which present the *Recommended*, *Not Recommended*, and *Inappropriate* approaches to work in the Historic District. Staff findings are summarized in the Architectural Review Report. (See Attached.)

Based on the location of the project site on The Green and the accessory structure's placement, the City Planner is referring the permit application to the Historic District Commission for review. See *Zoning Ordinance,* Article 10 Section 3.22 (A) and (B) listed below.

Section 3.22 Architectural review certification by the city planner.

(A) An architectural review certificate for specific classes of building permits, including fences, signs, siding, window and door replacement, roofing, the addition or replacement of decorative features, minor demolition, residential additions, and other construction of a minor nature, may be issued by the city planner, after a review and determination that the proposed construction is in general accordance with the standards set forth in subsection 3.25

(B) The city planner may refer any permit application for demolition or construction in the historic district for consultation with commission.

The City of Dover Historic District Commission will review this permit at their next meeting scheduled for Thursday, March 21, 2013 at 3:00pm in the City Hall Conference Room, 15 Loockerman Plaza, Dover. You are encouraged to attend this meeting to discuss the project. Staff will provide the Historic District Commission with the permit application materials and other background information for their review and action.

If you have questions or concerns, please contact the Planning Office at (302)736-7196.

Sincerely,

Ann Marie Townshend

Ann Marie Townshend, AICP
Director of Planning & Community Development

DEMW/amt

CC: Dawn E. Melson-Williams, AICP, Principal Planner
Elaine Brenchley, First State Heritage Park
Permit File #13-260
Historic District Commission

City of Dover

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW STAFF REPORT
Before Dover Historic District Commission
March 21, 2013

Project Name:	Dover Family Dollar at 300 West Loockerman Street: Existing Building Demolition & New Construction
Location:	Southwest corner of West Loockerman Street and South New Street 300 West Loockerman Street
Tax Parcel:	ED-05-077.09-01-69.00-000
Property Owner:	Fisher/Grimes Partnership
Equitable Owner:	Chesapeake Group, LLC
Present Zoning:	C-2 Central Commercial Zone H - Historic District Overlay Zone
Present Use:	Vacant Building (Previous commercial uses) to be demolished
Proposed Use:	New Retail Building
File Number:	HI-13-02

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The Historic District Commission will act on a Recommendation to the City of Dover Planning Commission on an Architectural Review Certificate to allow for Demolition of the existing commercial building 300 West Loockerman Street 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 the Fisher/Grimes Partnership and the equitable owner is Chesapeake Group, LLC. Address: 300 West Loockerman Street. Tax Parcel: ED-05-077.09-01-69.00-000. Council District 4.

Property Information
This building is located within a National Register Historic District, specifically the Victorian Dover 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 1977-78).

> K-396.47 300 West Loockerman Street – 1950's, 1-story, yellow brick, commercial edifice; designed as an auto display and sales center with circular showroom and service wings.

The property is located within H (Historic District zone) as established by the City of Dover.

A series of historic maps was reviewed by Planning Staff for preliminary information on this block of Loockerman Street. The *1868 Beers Map* published by Pomeroy & Beers shows only the established street grid of Loockerman Street and Queen Street to North Street surrounding this block; no buildings or ownership are noted on the map. By 1885, the *1885 Bird's Eye View of Dover* shows this block on the south side of Loockerman Street between Queen Street and New Street developed with multiple buildings. The *1887 Map of the Town of Dover* by W.R. Roe depicts the subject site as the Dover Machine Works with a series of other buildings (possibly residential) to the west in the center of the block fronting Loockerman Street.

The series of *Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps* is also a reference source for information on the series of buildings which occupied this property over time. The 1885-1910 Maps series show this corner property as Dover Machine Works with several buildings utilized as a blacksmith shop, paint shop, foundry, machine shop, and office. Then by 1910 the western side of the property also includes a one story "Moving Pictures" building and a cobbler building. On the 1919 Map the eastern buildings are utilized as auto storage, a blacksmith shop and storage and on the west side of the property the "moving pictures" building has disappeared leaving a barber shop. The 1929 Map shows the property used as an auto junk yard with the eastern buildings as auto storage, auto repair, office and storage. Sometime between 1929 and 1951 the property is redeveloped with the construction of a new building for auto sales and services; this building is the current building form with the curved element at the corner. Photo documentation from the 1960s shows this building as a Volkswagen dealership with the circular corner of the building having large storefront display windows for the showroom and an Art Deco style flat canopy wrapping the corner. Additional research using other primary and secondary source documents would provide more information on the history of the property and buildings.

Later, the exterior of the building was renovated reducing the size of the display windows, adding a curved watertable, converting the canopy to a mansard style roof, and other door and window changes. The building was utilized most recently as a retail building (NAPA Store selling automotive parts and products). However, the building is now vacant and is registered as part of the City's Vacant Building program.

<u>PROPOSAL (Site Plan Set, Photographs, and Elevation Drawing of 2/15/13)</u>
The applicant has supplied a Site Plan Set dated 2/14-15/2013 consisting of a Cover Sheet, Existing Conditions Plan, and Site Plan showing the existing building and conditions and the proposed new building with site improvements. A series of photographs of the existing building and its surroundings were submitted. A sheet dated 2/15/2013 showing all four elevations of the proposed new building was provided. The project is described below:

1. <u>Demolition of Existing Building:</u> The project involves the demolition of the existing one story masonry (brick and block) building on the property.

2. <u>New Building:</u> The project proposes construction of a new one story 8,308 S.F. retail building. The building is sited on the west side of the property. The elevations of the building which face West Loockerman Street and South New Street are divided into three sections with different architectural details and finishes for each section. The main entrance to the building faces South New Street in the section located closest to West

Loockerman Street. The building elevation facing the alley, yet visible from South New Street, is a large block (masonry) wall with a brick watertable. The west elevation is a block wall that will be partially visible as it extends beyond the adjacent building. The exterior finishes consist of brick, a storefront window system, siding (horizontal and shake-style formats), EFIS, concrete masonry, and other detailing. A parapet wall system extends at a variety of heights to conceal the low sloping standing seam metal roof.

3. Site Improvements: The siting of the building on the west side of the property creates a setback of 30-40 feet from South New Street. The plan proposes a ten (10) space parking lot in this area between the street and the building. No screening mechanism is shown for the parking lot; only a sidewalk area separates the parking lot drive aisle from the street. Adjacent to the alley in the southern portion of the lot is a loading area, dumpsters, and five additional parking spaces.

4. Landscaping: The site has a small landscape area with one tree at the corner of West Loockerman Street and South New Street. Several small island areas are planted with trees along the southern property line with the alley.

See attached site plan drawings and series of elevations of the proposed new building which detail information on building forms, locations, and material choices.

Review of DESIGN STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES

The subject property is located in the Dover Historic District Zone within the Loockeman Historic Context. The Loockerman Historic Context is described on pages 2-7 through 2-8. Location within the Dover Historic District Zone requires proposals for specific types of construction activities such as new construction, additions to existing buildings, exterior renovations, and demolition of 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 *Zoning Ordinance*, 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 must be reviewed for conformity with the design criteria guidelines found in Chapter 4: New Construction, Additions, Demolition and Relocation. For the demolition of the existing mid-twentieth century building on the site, the review considerations are those associated with "Demolition." For the new retail building, the applicable review considerations are those associated with "New Construction." Information on standards for materials, landscaping, site amenities, and parking lots can also be found in Chapter 3: Maintenance, Repair, Preservation and Restoration of Existing Historic Buildings.

Demolition

The *Design Standards and Guidelines* gives guidance to the Historic District Commission by listing specific criteria to be evaluated when considering applications for the demolition of

buildings (or portions of buildings) in the historic district. (Chapter 4: pages 4-10 to 4-12) These guidelines are summarized below (see *Design Standards and Guidelines* for the complete text).

1. Determine the financial implications of maintaining a property versus demolition.

2. Regardless of economic issues the relative significance of the individual buildings slated for demolition should be evaluated.

3. In development related applications the City should review the schematic plans for the new structures to weigh the virtues of the new structure versus what exists.

4. Determine the extent of adequate recordation of a property the applicant would be required to complete if demolition were approved.

5. Lots left vacant by demolition should be treated in a manner that is sympathetic to the historic context.

<u>New Construction</u>

The *Design Standards and Guidelines* for New Construction (Chapter 4: pages 4-1 through 4-8) provide the design criteria and development guidelines. The guidelines specify the following individual considerations for new construction to be considered in the review by the Historic District Commission (and Planning Commission) of the project for Architectural Review Certification:

- Style
- Scale *(building to reflect dominant cornice and roof height of adjacent buildings)*
- Elevation of the First Floor
- Floor-to-Floor heights
- Bays, windows and doors *(size, relationship, spacing of)*
- Absolute Size *(compare overall size of new building)*
- Massing *(relationship of solid-to-void)*
- Orientation *(location of primary façade)*
- Proportions *(comparison of height to width of building and elements)*
- Materials
- Forms *(shape of building and roof to be complementary)*
- Siting *(location of building on lot and in relation to street)*
    - *The siting of new construction in the Loockerman historic context should conform to the building line of adjacent buildings, to reinforce the sense of the "wall" of buildings, especially along Loockerman Street. New commercial buildings should occupy the full width of their lot at the street line. Free-standing "object" buildings that do not conform to the street and lot lines should not be permitted in the Loockerman historic context. Where a commercial building is built adjacent to a vacant lot, it should be built with a party wall in anticipation of subsequent new construction being built adjacent and up to the property line. Probably the single most damaging siting of a commercial building is towards the rear of a lot, with parking between the building and the street. (DS&G, Page 4-6)*
- High density/ large-scale construction

The proposed project must also be reviewed for compliance with the requirements established by the *Zoning Ordinance*. The requirements include items such as setbacks from property lines, lot coverage, height, etc. in addition to site elements of parking, dumpsters, and tree planting. This proposal for building appears to conform to the bulk requirements of the C-2 Zoning District including setbacks, building height, and floor area ratio.

Dover Transit Center Neighborhood Plan and Design Book (January 14, 2011)

The *Neighborhood Plan* outlined a series of urban design guidelines and strategies to guide development within the Downtown Area including buildings, open space areas, roads, streetscapes, etc. The subject property is included in the study area and is located along one of the gateway streets into the Downtown area. Several of the key principles of expanding the density, character, and urban context for the Downtown include:

- Creating buildings that engage the street and provide a clear edge
- Concentrating parking at the center of blocks and away from the street edges
- Building on the history and character of existing architecture
- Creating vibrant and well-connected streetscapes

The *Neighborhood Plan* outlines more detailed design principles and standards for streets, parking, buildings, and open spaces. New construction in the Downtown provides an opportunity to implement these design principles and standards. A copy of the *Neighborhood Plan* is available in the Planning Office.

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

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

1) The *Design Standards and Guidelines* outline specific criteria to be evaluated in considering demolition applications (page 4-10 and 4-12).
   a) The application's Request for Demolition (letter dated 2/14/13) contains statements on the reasoning for demolition of the existing Building. Additional information may be received at the Historic District Commission meeting from the applicant's presentation and during the public hearing.

2) Staff notes that opportunities for adaptive reuse of the existing building or portions of the existing building should be considered. There are tax credit programs and other grants, incentives, or loan programs that may assist in the project costs.
   a) The circular form of the building at the street corner intersection is a unique feature of the building that presents an engaging first floor element to the streetscape. Historic photographs exist of the mid-twentieth century architectural details of this building element.
   b) It is Staff's observation that the exterior finishes of original building have been changed by the renovation activities of the late twentieth century. It is unclear if any of the original detailing of the canopy or wall/window pattern still exists under the cladding or could be recreated.

3) The Historic District Commission could require additional documentation/recordation of the existing building if deemed appropriate. Staff notes that some minor

documentation/recordation of the existing building has occurred in the form of a series of exterior photographs included in the application submission.

4) If approval for demolition of the building is granted, Staff recommends the following conditions pertaining to the building demolition. These conditions are presented in an effort to improve the project's compliance with the recommended guidelines for consideration of demolition in the *Design Standards and Guidelines* and other code provisions:
   a) A specific timeframe for demolition activities, site stabilization, and redevelopment activities should be established.
   b) All utilities must be properly capped and/or abandoned in accordance with City of Dover requirements.
   c) The building footprint will need to be appropriately stabilized and brought to grade if project site construction is not progressing at the time of its demolition or if the site will be left vacant for an extended period of time. Other elements of landscaping, fencing, etc. could be required as part of the site stabilization.
   d) Provide information on any environmental provisions related to demolition activities such as copies of any agency approvals/permits for regulated activities.

5) Regarding the proposal for site construction, Staff recommends the Architectural Review Certificate **be denied** for the project finding that the siting of the building does not comply with the Design Standards and Guidelines and the design principles for development in the Downtown area as outlined in the Neighborhood Plan.
   a) The application could be deferred to allow submission of an alternative site plan design which revises the building location and parking lot layout.
   b) The proposed building does not create a 'building wall' along the South New Street frontage or extend the full length along West Loockerman Street appearing to lack orientation to the street. The distance that the building is setback from the street does not improve the pedestrian experience. The setback distance is equal in width to many buildings fronting on Loockerman Street.
   c) The surface parking should not located between the building and the street but rather be located interior to the parcel such as off the alley and screened from South New Street.
   d) The location of the building and proposed site layout has a suburban design feel (like a strip shopping center of in-line tenants and adjacent parking lot) and not one that is responsive to the Downtown urban area around it.
   e) The submission does not clearly provide information on the integration of the proposed building in the streetscape in order to assess its compatibility.
   f) Related to the accommodation of parking on the site, the project is eligible for consideration of a waiver request for parking reduction by the Planning Commission that could potentially set the parking requirement at seven (7) spaces for the new building.

6) The following conditions regarding the site improvements are recommended for compliance.
   a) The parking lot is recommended to be screened from the street. The current site layout precludes the ability to implement any type of screening along the South New Street frontage.
   b) All unused curb cuts and depressed curing along the street frontage must be replaced with upright curbing and new sidewalk which continue to implement the format of the brick strip area and concrete areas. The new or replacement sidewalk should continue to implement the sidewalk patterns of the streetscape improvements of the Downtown.

7) The following items should be clarified regarding the building's architectural design or the architectural design that need to be revised in order to confirm compliance.
   a) Clarify the proposed elevation design. The Elevation Sheet (black & white linework drawing) dated 2/15/2013 is different than the color rendering drawing (forwarded to staff) dated 3/4/2013.
   b) Clarify if the display windows on the West Loockerman Street frontage will be clear glass allowing visibility into the building's interior.
   c) The proper clearance height must be provided for the awnings. Additional approvals may be necessary for any awnings which extend over the property line into the street right-of-way.
   d) It appears that the parking spaces conflict with door locations on the South New Street frontage of the building.
   e) The parking lot (alley) elevation wall of the building as designed presented a very large blank wall. This must be revised to include additional detailing beyond the brick watertable element.
   f) The west elevation includes several gutter downspouts that cannot be implemented due to the location of the adjacent building to the west.
   g) The applicant should be aware of the implications regarding the type of construction for the building.
   h) With the building design, the height of the finished floor elevation in relation to the sidewalk and parking lot must be considered in order to achieve accessibility into the building. If additional building elements are required to achieve accessibility, they may require further review by the Historic District Commission.

8) Some of the site improvements/amenities were not specifically described with the application information.
   a) Light fixtures/poles utilized along the streetscape should continue style of the lighting used in the Downtown Loockerman Street areas.
   b) Identify the materials for the landscaped areas including surfaces (grass, mulch, stone), bicycle parking rack, etc.
   c) Identify areas where the sidewalks or portions of the sidewalks will be constructed of brick strip will be implemented. The use of brick paving materials for sidewalk construction is a key feature found throughout the Historic District area and in areas of the Downtown with streetscape improvements.
      i) The brick strip should be implemented in the areas of West Loockerman Street and South New Street were the existing curb cuts will be removed.
      ii) The City's standards for sidewalk format must be met.

9) Any revisions or changes in the identified materials or refinement of the building design may be subject to further review by the Historic District Commission.

ADVISORY COMMENTS:

1) Additional evaluation and review of the project site may be necessary due to the potential for environmental contamination due to previous uses of the property and/or the site's potential participation in any environmental remediation program.

2) This site development 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 Site Plan Process. Review comments pertaining specifically to the Site Plan set will be issued at that time.

3) The proposed landscaping including tree plantings should be completed with species appropriate to the site conditions of an urban area. Consultation with the City's arborist regarding the tree species selected is recommended especially regarding any new street trees.

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

5) For building construction, the requirements of the building code and fire code must be complied with. Consult with the Chief Building Inspector and Office of the Fire Marshal for these requirements. The resolution of these items can impact the site design or building exterior finishes or design in some instances.

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

7) The applicant shall be aware that a Demolition Permit is required to proceed with any demolition activities on the property should Architectural Review Certification be granted for the demolition proposal. The Demolition Permit application must comply with the conditions of approval granted through the Architectural Review Certification process. A certificate of asbestos survey and abatement must be submitted with the Demolition Permit application.

8) The applicant shall be aware that Building Permits are required to proceed with any construction activities on the property. The permit applications must comply with the approvals granted through the Architectural Review Certification process.

9) The applicant shall be aware that a Sign Permit is required to proceed with the placement of signage on the property. Compliance with the sign regulations will be reviewed with the Sign Permit application. Any depiction of signage on these plans is considered conceptual and approval of the plans does not constitute approval of the signage.

<u>Historic District Commission Action Required</u>
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.*