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

ROLL CALL
APPROVAL OF AGENDA
APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF MEETING on January 17, 2013

COMMUNICATIONS & REPORTS

1) Training Opportunities

2) Update on Discussion - Role and Scope of the Historic District Commission and Historic District
    a. Workshop scheduled for February 26, 2013 from 4:00pm – 7:00pm at Dover Public Library, Meeting Room

3) Update on Proposal for The Green as National Monument

OLD BUSINESS

1) Continuation of Review of Application for Architectural Review Certification:
    a) 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.*

NEW BUSINESS

1) Application for Architectural Review Certification:
    a) 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.*

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

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
JANUARY 17, 2013

The Regular Meeting of the City of Dover Historic District Commission was held on Thursday, January 17, 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, Mrs. Townshend, and Mrs. Purnell.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. McDaniel moved for approval of the agenda with the addition of item #4 The Green as a National Monument under Communications and Reports, seconded by Mr. Fisher and the motion was unanimously carried 4-0. Mr. Jackson was absent.

ADOPTION OF MINUTES OF THE REGULAR HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION MEETING OF DECEMBER 13, 2012

Mr. McDaniel moved to adopt the minutes of the regular Historic District Commission meeting of December 13, 2012, seconded by Mr. Salkin and the motion was unanimously carried 4-0. Mr. Jackson was absent.

COMMUNICATIONS & REPORTS

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that included in the member packet was a Summary of Activities, Applications, and Architectural Review Certifications for 2012. There were seven (7) applications filed for 2012 that were considered by the Historic District Commission. There were forty-seven (47) different permits that required Architectural Review Certification. The number appearing before the Historic District Commission and the Planning Commission number will not match the total number of physical applications this year because some of the permits may be for applications from previous years that have now began their construction phrase of their project.

Responding to Mr. Salkin's question regarding the proposed project at the Woodburn property if any exterior work was included in any of the categories previously mentioned, Mrs. Melson-Williams replied there has been some activity at Woodburn and it has fallen under Staff approval with permits. There was some interior work done at the main house and garage. The solar panel project came before the Historic District Commission and is complete. The only exterior work was an improvement for handicap accessibility on the rear of the Hall House with a ramp system that was Staff Review only because it was not visible from Kings Highway.

Mr. McDaniel commented that when work was being done at the Kirk and Short building (21 The Green) they discovered some walls under the sidewalk with a vault. Responding to Mr. McDaniel's comment, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that the site work for the new sidewalk improvement on the east side of The Green had some preliminary archaeological testing.

Mr. McDaniel also commented that when the temporary sally port and driveway was installed near the John Bell House four boxwoods were removed and the contractor stated that they were replaced, and he wanted to know where the replacement was? Responding to Mr. McDaniel, Mrs. Townshend replied that there has not been a Certificate of Occupancy for the renovation to the old side of the Courthouse. Mrs. Melson-Williams replied that there is less construction fencing around the building.

Also responding, Mr. Salkin stated that there is currently no landscape plan.

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that included in the member packet was a series of information on workshops and training opportunities being held by Preservation Delaware and other partners throughout the State. She stated that Preservation Delaware is in the process of scheduling a second "Connecting with Your Community: Communication, Education and Outreach" workshop. She stated that a workshop may be scheduled for January 19, 2013, but she had not received any additional information. The next workshop would be Saturday, March 9, 2013 in New Castle, Delaware.

Pertaining to an update on the Legislative, Finance and Administration Committee January 14, 2013 Meeting agenda item: Discussion-Role and Scope of the Historic District Commission and Historic District, Mrs. Townshend stated that in the initial draft agendas listed an ordinance to eliminate the Historic District Commission. She stated that very quickly Council members realized that it may have been too specific in terms of what the issues were. She mentioned to Chairman Lynn to revisit the decision and look at how important it is to preserve our history. If everything went before the Planning Commission what would happen if something atrocious happened on The Green. She suggested holding a community meeting to allow people to express all different viewpoints. This would represent Dover as a whole. She committed to having a meeting by the end of February and report back to the Committee in March.

Mr. McDaniel stated that a letter was written a year ago supporting the Historic District Commission. Responding to Mr. McDaniel's question as to who was the first person to state that the Historic District Commission needed to be reviewed, Mrs. Townshend replied it was members of Council.

Mr. Scrafford questioned if the concern should have come from the Council to the Committee and if there was no sustainable vote then why is it being discussed. Mrs. Townshend replied that Code requires something that is an ordinance go on an agenda because the process starts at the Committee level and then goes to Council. According to the Code in order for a member of Council to bring forth an ordinance, it needs three (3) sponsors and it had three (3) sponsors.

Responding to Mr. McDaniel's question as to who the three (3) sponsors were, Mrs. Townshend replied that her recollection was Mr. Anderson, Mr. Bonar, and Mr. Lynn.

Mr. McDaniel stated that having attended the Legislative, Finance and Administration meeting he knows that it will take time. There will be a workshop. He stated that is someone needed to oversee the Historic District.

Chairman Scrafford stated that the preservation was decided a number of years ago and the Guidelines were written and part of the Guidelines was the Commission. He stated that the Historic District Commission is appointed by the Mayor and not the Council. He stated that they serve as a Commission to facilitate the implementation of the Guidelines. Responding to Chairman Scrafford's comments, Mrs. Townshend replied that the Commission is created by Code that is adopted by Council. She stated that there was in-depth discussion in regards to updating the Guidelines. She stated that part of the issue is that a portion of the community sees the Historic District Commission process as an obstacle and want to look at changes that will improve historic preservation and economic development.

Mr. Fisher questioned if examples were needed if the community was focusing on a developer complaint because the project did not break ground in a timely manner. Mrs. Townshend used the example of the Bayard Plaza, where the developer's architecture was approved with vinyl siding, because he made the case that the cost of the Hardi-board would drive up the cost of the building. Later, when the Building Code review determined that with the type of construction proposed, combustible materials were not permitted on the exterior, the developer came back with a proposal for Hardi-board finish. When a reason other than the Historic District guidelines required a change in materials, it was found to be financially feasible.

Responding to Mr. McDaniel's question regarding if the Historic District Commission approved the dry-vit on part of the Bayard Plaza building, Mrs. Townshend replied yes when it was going to be vinyl and the application came back before the Historic District Commission to remove the dry-vit and replace it with Hardi-board.

Mr. Salkin commented that he could not recall on any single case whereas an applicant came before the Historic District Commission properly prepared and did not receive a reasonable answer at the same meeting. There has been an application delay because the no additional information has come back to the Historic District Commission. He stated that the arguments that he has heard and is reading about in the paper don't hold any water. Some of the applications that came before the Historic District Commission with applicants rushing to begin the project have not even started.

Mr. McDaniel commented that majority of the time it is not the appearance of the building, but the economics.

Chairman Scrafford stated that if everyone complied with the Guidelines it would be easy for the Historic District Commission to make a decision. He sees the Historic District Commission as a facilitator as they support the developers, Planning Department, and other commissions to get an agreement between the builder and the Historic District Commission. When the agreement is not reached and the applicant is denied at the Historic District Commission level, then the applicant goes to Planning Commission and is approved. He does not agree that all of the problems are with the Historic District Commission.

Mr. Fisher suggested that the workshop be in a forum setting.

Responding to Mr. Fisher's question if the Historic District Commission meeting timeframe could

be closer to the Planning Commission so that the delay is reduced, Mrs. Townshend replied that there were applications that were fast tracked and special meetings held.
Mr. Salkin questioned as to why Councilman Lynn was only going to contact two (2) of the Historic District Commission members. He did not agree with that decision as the Historic District Commission members have the right to talk with any Councilman individually if they choose in regards to the ordinance and general conduct of the group, Mrs. Townshend replied that it would be business before the Commission for discussion and that it would not be done in the forum of a serial meeting.

Responding to Chairman Scrafford question as to why Councilman Lynn could not come in at one of the Historic District Commission meetings and talk with all the members or hold a lunch meeting, Mrs. Townshend replied that Councilman Lynn could attend a meeting. It would be a FOIA violation if more than three (3) members were present to have a lunch meeting on historic business, but she could contact the City Solicitor to verify.

Mr. Salkin stated that the Historic District Commission needed to have some discussion. He stated that he was very comfortable talking with anyone in the City in any capacity regarding the generic procedural issue and he intended to talk with someone.

Mrs. Townshend stated that she would correspond with Mr. Nick Rodriguez for clear guidance.

Mrs. Townshend stated that the National Monument is an effort that has been spearheaded by Senator Carper to work to get a National Park destination in the State of Delaware. Delaware is the only state and territory without a National Park Site. The two ways to become a National Park Service Site are a National Park which is a Congressional designation that goes through both houses of Congress. The second is through Executive Order which is the National Monument system. She stated that they are looking to take a number of sites that include the Woodlawn property, the Sheriff's House in New Castle, The Green in New Castle, and The Green in Dover, and Old Swedes Church and it would be called the First State National Park.

Responding to Mr. McDaniel's question if there were any sites downstate, Mrs. Townshend replied no.

Mrs. Townshend stated that the Conservation Fund had purchased the Woodlawn property and there is a February deadline. The Environmental Phase I and Title Search would include the lawn area only. A public hearing will be held at the Council Meeting on January 28, 2013 at 7:30 p.m. to determine if they (the City) will grant the easement to the Park Service.

Responding to Mr. Scrafford's concern regarding a problem when someone wants to do work on the street because there are utility lines, Mrs. Townshend replied that nothing will change in terms of the operation.

Responding to Mr. McDaniel's question if there would be reimbursement from the Federal government, Mrs. Townshend replied that there might be money for programing.

Mr. Salkin commented that the National Park Service does not want to get any more rights or

control to the property than necessary to accomplish the Monument destination. In order for The Green in Dover to be a part of the National Monument System there has to be a Federal property interest, Mrs. Townshend replied that it is a Historic Preservation Easement that would bind the City to manage The Green to the *Secretary of Interior Standards*.

Responding to Mr. Fisher questioned if there were any utilities under the grass area, Mrs. Townshend replied that the easement will need to identify any utility lines. Also responding, Chairman Scrafford replied that there are no utilities under The Green; they are located in the street.

Mr. McDaniel stated that the Historic District Commission is concerned about receiving information from the public in a timely manner and not when Council is trying to pass the bill.

Mr. Salkin stated that this will be written by the Department of Interior and will be signed by the President because it is not a legislative process. He also stated that it will not be in a Bill drafted by Senator Carper.

Mrs. Townshend stated that she spoke with Senator Carper's aide Ms. Lori James and informed her that majority of the property owners are lawyers. She stated that Ms. James would have information before the public meeting January 23, 2013. She also stated that the information is draft until it is signed.

Mrs. Townshend stated that she will keep the Historic District Commission updated.

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. Townshend stated that because of the City Ordinances such as the Historic District Guidelines, the Vacant Building Ordinance, and Building Code requirements they are not altogether. One of the concerns brought to her attention as it relates to the Historic District Commission was the church being better served if the building continued to fall into a state of disrepair and then it could go before Council as a dangerous building.

Chairman Scrafford did not agree with the suggestion and stated that the Historic District Commission could vote to demolish the building.

Mrs. Townshend further stated that the Guidelines do give standards.

Chairman Scrafford stated that additional information was needed to make a decision to the Guidelines.

Mr. McDaniel 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.

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that the application was reviewed at the September 20, 2012 meeting. It is a request for a demolition of a building which requires Architectural Review Certification to demolish. The public hearing was conducted at the September 20, 2012 meeting and closed. The application was tabled until additional information was received regarding historic architecture of the building. Since that time Staff did an outline of what had transpired since September 20, 2012. During that time information was emailed to the applicant because they had requested information regarding Preservation Professionals and specifics about the *Design Standards & Guidelines.* The list of recommended architects was a reference to information that is publicly posted on the website for the State Historic Preservation Office. The entities are qualified under the category Professional Qualifications of Historic Architects that goes to *Federal Guidelines.*

Mrs. Melson-Williams further stated that in early December the property experienced a break-in and as a result several windows and doors were boarded. The incident was reported to the Historic District Commission at the December meeting. Also, in December the Property Maintenance Inspector of the City of Dover issued notice to the property owner regarding the Vacant Building Ordinance. A vacant building must be registered with the City and it also includes a fee. The registration allows for the City to keep track of vacant buildings and to make sure it is properly secured over time. The property is listed on the City delinquent tax list. There has been discussion in regards to the property being tax exempt.

Responding to Mr. Fisher's question if the church would be exempt from taxes, Mrs. Townshend replied that the church would be exempt from real estate taxes if the property is actively used for their charitable purpose and the parcels were consolidated.

Responding to Mr. Fisher's question that the property is not considered actively used at the current time, Mrs. Townshend replied yes.

Mrs. Townshend stated that the Vacant Building Ordinance requires that vacant buildings be registered. The fee for the first year is $250. She asked Code Enforcement Staff to hold the enforcement until a decision has been made regarding demolition or renovation. Also under the Vacant Building Ordinance the buildings are inspected regularly.

Representative: Paul Brown of Christ Episcopal Church.

Mr. Brown stated that the process within the Episcopal Church of administrative affairs is a slow because meetings are held once a month with the Board of Directors. The Church has contacted six (6) of the architects and three (3) of them have indicated an interest in estimating the cost of demolishing, replacing, or renovating the building. At the September 20, 2012 meeting the discussion of an estimated cost of replacing the building meeting current codes and guidelines would be $500,000 that the Church does not have. The Church has received two (2) walk-

through that included Architect and Structural Engineer. The church was told they would receive estimates within four (4) weeks. At the current time the Church as no final estimates, but is in the process of obtaining the information. He stated that the building could be replaced or renovated at an enormous cost. The Church has no use for the building and sees no need to renovate. If the Historic District Commission is still seeking the additional information, the church plans to have it within four (4) weeks.

Mr. Salkin stated that after the Historic District Commission's last meeting he thought in terms of the similarity of the historic addition to the John Bell House. A decision was made by the owner and the Historic District Commission to allow for the simple restoration of the oldest portion of the building. He stated that it would be advantageous to the applicant, City, and Historic District Commission to know the cost to renovate the entire structure, but perhaps there is an alternative that involves a partial demolition and a simple restoration with limited function that would be less expensive.

Mr. Brown stated that the church is gathering new information as they progress. There is a possibility that the rear section of the building is older than the front section. He stated that the rear section has no rooftop. He would like to have the building demolished as it is an eyesore and for public safety.

Mr. Fisher moved to retable the building demolition for application HI-12-06, located at 509 South State Street in order to comply with the previous meeting's decision seeking additional information in order to render a decision, seconded by Mr. Salkin and carried with three (3) yes. Mr. Jackson was absent. Mr. McDaniel was recused from voting on the application; however, he remained in the meeting.

Mr. McDaniel was also in agreement with the City postponing any additional fees for the vacant building.

Mr. Salkin commented that when people sell property that is inside of their jurisdiction there should be some requirement that they are advised they are acquiring property within the Historic District that comes under special ordinances. He stated that the church brought the house knowing it was in the Historic District. Applications come before the Historic District Commission because some other process other than the Historic District Ordinance is failing to intervene before the Historic District Commission. There should be some discussion about the items the Historic District Commission has seen in the last few years if there was a better ordinance, process, or procedure for something else that could eliminate the issue. Responding to Mr. Salkin's comment, Mr. Fisher replied that it would be a disclosure requirement for the Realtor.

Mr. Brown stated that there was a discussion before the house was purchased as to whether or not the potential buyer should come before the Historic District Commission before making the purchase. Responding to Mr. Brown, Mr. Fisher replied that this could have affected the purchase price.

Mr. Brown stated that the lot is configured whereas nothing could be put on it and it cannot be leased as office space. Responding to Mr. Fisher replied that it could not be office space because there are no parking spaces.

Mr. Scrafford stated that saving old properties gets very expensive because of the Guidelines.

Responding to Mr. McDaniel's question if the Historic District Commission as a body should go out and look at the properties, Mr. Salkin replied on occasions. Also responding, Mr. Scrafford replied that you need to appreciate what it is that you are trying to do and the purpose of saving a building.

NEW BUSINESS

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

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that there was a "Commission Education Plan" worksheet from one of the items at "Connecting With Your Community: Communication, Education and Outreach" workshop that she attended on November 17, 2012. The workshop focuses on the Historic District Commission's current outreach and necessary improvements. All members present at the December 13, 2012 meeting was given the handout to review and discuss at a future Historic District Commission meeting as it was also included in their January packet.

Responding to Mr. Salkin question if it was mute, Mrs. Melson-Williams replied she was not sure if it was mute because some of the questions asked at the City of Dover Historic District Commission may lead to questions and the issues of the problems they are experiencing.

Responding to Mr. Salkin question if Mrs. Melson-Williams was asking each Historic District Commission member to complete the handout in order to consolidate the information into one response to someone else or is it an internal process to help the Historic District Commission members to think about the items, Mrs. Melson-Williams replied it is both. It will be utilized in the March workshop, but not quite sure how it will be used.

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that the workshop will be held on March 9, 2013 and all members are welcomed to attend as she will be attending. She stated that the handouts should be completed by the next Historic District Commission meeting that will be held on February 21, 2013.

Mr. McDaniel moved to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Mr. Fisher and unanimously carried.

Meeting adjourned at 4:23 PM

Sincerely,

Maretta Savage- Purnell
Secretary

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.*

- At the September 20, 2012 the Historic District Commission began consideration of Application HI-12-06 and held a Public Hearing. Then the Planning Commission voted to table the application and requested additional information from further architectural expert investigation and analysis of the building and further justification regarding demolition of the facility.

    - *See attached:*
        - Architectural Review Staff Report for September 20, 2012 Meeting
        - Meeting Minutes of September 20, 2012
        - Chronology Summary regarding property

- Information Submission from Applicant received February 11, 2013

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

HI-12-06 Demolition of Building at 509 South State Street

September 20, 2012	Public Hearing and Review of Architectural Review Certification Request for Demolition of Building (Application HI-12-06). Historic District Commission tabled application seeking additional information.
October 2012	No meeting of the Historic District Commission.
November 15, 2012	Historic District Commission Meeting cancelled due to lack of quorum. Email sent to applicant's alerting them of meeting cancellation and that Application HI-12-06 remains as an item of Old Business.
November 30, 2012	Applicant requests via email information on preservation professionals and the *Design Standards and Guidelines.*
December 4, 2012	Planning Staff sends email with information on Recommended Architects and copies of Chapter 3 and 4 of the *Design Standards and Guidelines.*
December 4, 2012	Applicant acknowledges receipt of email and notes they will work to have information for January.
December 9, 2012	Email received from applicant noting a break-in at 509 South State Street which resulted in the two front doors and south windows on one story addition to be boarded with plywood on December 8, 2012.
December 12, 2012	City Property Maintenance Inspector issues notice (via letter) regarding Vacant Building Ordinance to property owner.
December 13, 2012	Historic District Commission Meeting: Application HI-12-06 remains tabled as no information has been submitted by the applicant.
January 17, 2013	Historic District Commission Meeting: Applicant gave update on activities regarding property and noted information to be available for February.
February 11, 2013	Applicant submitted Information on Project Request to Demolish Building.
February 12, 2013	Property continues to be listed on City of Dover Tax Delinquent Listing.

City of Dover

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW STAFF REPORT
Before Dover Historic District Commission
September 20, 2012

Project Name:	Building at 509 South State Street: Building Demolition
Location:	East side of South State Street south of the intersection with Water Street 509 South State Street
Tax Parcel:	ED-05-077.09-05-45.00-000
Property Owner:	The Rector, Wardens & Vestrymen of Christ Episcopal Church
Present Zoning:	RGO - General Residence and Office Zone H - Historic District Overlay Zone SWPOZ – Source Water Protection Overlay Zone* (*Exempt from Tier 3 provisions due to Downtown Redevelopment Target Area location. *Zoning Ordinance,* Article 3 §29.79)
Present Use:	Vacant Building (Previous residential use)
Proposed Use:	Vacant site
File Number:	HI-12-06

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The Historic District Commission will act on an Architectural Review Certificate regarding 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, & Vestrymen of Christ Episcopal Church. The property address is 509 South State Street. Tax Parcel: ED-05-077.09-05-45.00-000.

Property Information
This building is located within a National Register Historic District, specifically the Dover Green Historic District. It is a listed as a contributing resource of this National Register Historic District. Provided below is the building summary from the building inventory listing found within the National Register nomination completed for the Dover Green Historic District (nomination completed 1973-76, amended 1979, 1984). The building is identified as K-375 and K-394.75 in the Delaware Cultural Resource Survey.

> *K-394.75 509 S. State St. – 19th century; frame, 2 ½ story, 3 bay. This dwelling has a gable roof and box cornice. There is a large bracketed pediment with a cornice return above the door. The chimney pots are rounded. On the south side is a 1-story, 1-bay addition. The structure is covered in aluminum siding. (c)*

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

A series of historic maps were reviewed by Planning Staff for preliminary information on this block of South State Street. The *1859 A.D. Byles Map of Kent* County (Dover insert) shows a series of dwellings fronting this east side of South State Street with Christ Church further to the east. This building owned by H. Pratt who is also shown as the property owner on the *1868 Beers Map* published by Pomeroy & Beers. This block of residences continues to be shown on the *1885 Bird's Eye View of Dover* and the *1887 Map of the Town of Dover* by W.R. Roe which shows the property owner now as Jno. S. Kiefer.

The series of *Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps* is also a reference source for information on the buildings which occupied this property over time. The 1897-1929 *Sanborn Maps* series show this property with a two-and-a-half story house with a one story addition on the south and a variety of one story additions to east side of the building. This map series also shows the neighboring properties and the changes associated with the neighborhood. In the neighborhood, the first house at the corner of South State Street and Water Street disappears between1910-1919 (location now part of the brick walled cemetery) and the residences along Elm Terrace are beginning to develop by 1929.

The building at 509 South State Street is currently vacant. Previously, a detached garage structure on this property was demolished in 2009 following property maintenance violations identified by the Inspections Department - Code Enforcement Division. The neighboring dwelling to the north was demolished in 2001 following fire damage. The two dwellings to its south were demolished sometime in the mid-twentieth century (prior to 1991 as determined by aerial maps). The only other surviving building of the block is the late eighteenth century building at 527-529 South State Street known as the John Banning House (Old Academy).

SWPOZ (Source Water Protection Overlay Zone)
A portion of the site is located within the SWPOZ (Tier 3: Excellent Recharge Area) found in Article 3 Section 29.7 of the *Zoning Ordinance*. However, this project site is within the downtown redevelopment target area which is exempted from the SWPOZ requirements and restrictions as per *Zoning Ordinance,* Article 3 §29.79.

PROJECT PROPOSAL for Demolition
The applicant has supplied a Report consisting of a narrative and photographs about the property at 509 South State Street. See attached Report. The Report includes the project proposal, property history, property survey, contractor's evaluation of the building, interior and exterior photographs, and seeding plan. The proposal is described below:

1. Demolition of Building: The proposal involves the demolition of the existing two-and-a-half story frame dwelling and its additions with all demolition materials removed from the site and disposed. The building area is proposed for vegetative seeding (grass lawn area). There are no plans to build on the property only to have it become part of the

adjacent undeveloped open space held in church ownership.

Review of DESIGN STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES

The subject property 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 of the *Design Standards and Guidelines*. 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. The Architectural Review Certification process allows for the evaluation of the merits of proposed projects in regards to the goals of the Historic District zone.

The following general recommendation is provided for the preservation of the historic character within The Green Historic Context (page 2-5):

- Demolition of historic structures within the Green historic context should not be permitted under any circumstance and should be avoided unless a threat to public safety.

Demolition

The proposal for demolition of the building must be reviewed for conformity with the design criteria guidelines found in Chapter 4: New Construction, Additions, Demolition and Relocation. The *Design Standards and Guidelines* discuss the issues related to demolition within the Historic District. 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.

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The following are the Staff comments and recommendations for this application regarding project activities for demolition of the Building at 509 South State Street and issuance of 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, as submitted, contains information on the applicant's reasoning for demolition of the Building at 509 South State Street. Additional information may be

received at the Historic District Commission meeting from the applicant's presentation and during the public hearing.

2) Staff does not recommend demolition of this building at 509 South State Street thus recommending that the Architectural Review Certification be denied. The building is one of the few remaining historic buildings dating to eighteenth and nineteenth century in the Historic District south of Water Street. This mid-nineteenth century building is part of the historic streetscape as you approach The Green from the south. The building helps to establish the architectural character of the area. Its removal with impact the streetscape. While some integrity has been lost with the application of modern exterior finishes in the aluminum siding and storm windows, the overall massing, form, and proportions of the building remain. The building could be restored or rehabilitated.

3) Staff notes the opportunities for preservation of the building should be considered. There are tax credit programs and other grants, incentives, or loan programs that may assist in project costs for an adaptive reuse project to restore or rehabilitate the building. The appropriate steps to stabilize and 'mothball' the building or the relocation of the building could also be options for consideration.

4) Staff notes that some documentation of the existing building has occurred in the form of a series of interior and exterior photographs (photos) and in the form of the history research included in the application submission. The Historic District Commission may require additional documentation and recordation of the building if deemed appropriate.
   a) If demolition is unavoidable then, given the mid-nineteenth century age of the building, the building should also have additional documentation completed in the form of measured drawings of the building's floor plans. This should include other data gathering on the building's construction.
   b) A series of photographs of the building's exterior and interior should be systematically completed to include keyed location map of photographs.

5) If approval for demolition of the building is granted, Staff recommends the following conditions pertaining to the building demolition and site stabilization. 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 and site stabilization should be established.
   b) All utilities must be properly capped and/or abandoned.
   c) Clarify the plan for site stabilization of the site.
      i) The building footprint area following demolition of the building and removal of the basement foundation walls must be restored to grade. The disturbed area is to include stabilization with topsoil and seeding to establish a grass lawn area. The grass lawn area is to be properly maintained.
   d) Staff does not recommend installation of solid (opaque) fencing or chain link fencing on the site. If areas need to be segregated on the site, other alternative fence styles may be more appropriate.
   e) Off-street parking is not permitted on the site.

6) As the subject property at 509 South State Street and adjoining properties to the north and south held in the same ownership, it presents an opportunity for planned landscaping. It is recommended that a series of street trees be planted on the property just east of the street frontage sidewalk. The trees will help to create a streetscape edge for the properties which lack buildings. Suggestions of trees species for planting in a urban setting can be recommended by the City's Arborist.

ADVISORY COMMENTS:

1) In the event, that major changes and revisions to the project proposal occur, contact the Department of Planning and Inspections. These changes may require resubmittal for review by the Historic District Commission.

2) The building at 509 South State Street is required to be registered as a Vacant Building under the provisions of *Dover Code of Ordinances*, Chapter 22 Article XII. Vacant Buildings. Contact the Department of Planning & Inspections Code Enforcement Division for information at 736-7010.

3) 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.

4) Any future construction activities such as redevelopment of the site for a building or other facilities are subject to additional review processes for permitting and plan review.

5) 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.

Historic District Commission Action Required

The Historic District Commission shall consider the proposal and take action in regards to the Architectural Review Certification for the demolition proposal. The action should reflect consideration of the *Design Standards and Guidelines.*

CITY OF DOVER
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
SEPTEMBER 20, 2012

The Regular Meeting of the City of Dover Historic District Commission was held on Thursday, September 20, 2012 at 3:00 PM with Chairman Scrafford presiding. Members present were: Mr. McDaniel, Mr. Fisher, Mr. Scrafford, Mr. Jackson and Mr. Salkin.

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

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Salkin moved for approval of the agenda as submitted, seconded by Mr. Fisher and the motion was unanimously carried 5-0.

ADOPTION OF MINUTES OF THE REGULAR HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION MEETING OF APRIL 19, 2012

Mr. McDaniel moved to adopt the minutes of the regular Historic District Commission meeting of July 19, 2012, seconded by Mr. Fisher and the motion was unanimously carried.

COMMUNICATIONS & REPORTS

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that included in the member packet was a series of information on workshops and training opportunities being held by Preservation Delaware.

NEW BUSINESS

HI-12-06 Demolition of Building at 509 South State Street - Public Hearing and 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.

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.

Mr. Scrafford asked if there were any questions regarding the overview of application HI-12-06.

Representatives: Alan George, Lee Ann Walling and Paul Brown of Christ Episcopal Church.

Mr. George stated that the church was built in 1734 and in order to make the church more accessible and fulfill the mission he proposed demolishing the structure and to backfill and seed the area afterward. The house is an eyesore and cannot be rebuilt economically.

Responding to Mr. George, Mr. Scrafford suggested that he address the staff recommendations and make the Historic District Commission aware of his reactions and what he would offer in that regard.

Mr. George stated that their vision was to have a thriving church and to create a buffer against future development. They currently own the adjacent property, but have been trying to purchase the building for years. He stated that it was an extension to the church yard and the pumpkin patch is used to help raise money for yearly mission trips. The property was inspected by Albert Lamberston in which he reported damage due to leaks, termites, down plaster, and the exposed lath. Repairs are also needed on the storm windows, aluminum siding, bathroom, and kitchen.

Mr. George stated that he also spoke with other contractors regarding the cost to demolish and renovate. He was quoted the cost per square footage was $200-$300. The price range estimate for the construction would range from $300,000 to $500,000 in addition to the $25,000 to demolish the building. The cost would also be based on the requirements of the historical code to rebuild verses if it was an office building that would need to meet ADA requirements. There would also be the issue of adequate parking if it was an office building.

Mr. George stated that tax and Archives research on showed the house was sold during 1825-1834 at the Orphans Court. It was very difficult to determine what was on the property as they could not find anything historically significant. He stated that an Architect was not hired to do any schematics to the construction. Depending on the level required he could do the drawing. When questioned about recordation of the building, he stated that he could have the recordation done with the measured drawings of the building's floor plans and photographs of the building exterior and interior to include keyed location maps of photographs if needed.

Mr. George stated that he had spoken with Matt Spong who gave the recommendation on how to seed the vacant lot. In his opinion, the house was not in keeping with the historic streetscape and if the house were removed anyone should be able to see the walls that were built in the 1920s that were part of the 1734 church structure. They also looked at the James Bellach House and the Academy Building and realized that they would not be able to financially renovate them.

Responding to Mr. Scrafford, Mr. George stated that they do own the property.

Mr. George stated that he is sympathetic to the history of the City as he has been a resident for thirty-two (32) years and purchased his first Victorian house on Bradford Street.

Mr. Scrafford had a concern regarding wall and fences. The existing property is walled around what use to be the properties that were demolished. Would you ever want to relocate a wall to the property line to further use the non-incumbent area that you would gain? There was also a recommendation on tree line along State Street; do you have any problems with it, because it may end up on your property, which would be to your advantage?

Responding to Mr. Scrafford, Mr. George stated that he did not have a plan to remove the wall to the property line to further use the non-incumbent area. He would not have a problem with the tree line along State Street because they do not want to block the view of the church. He stated that the old trees attracted him and his wife to the area before becoming a resident.

Mr. Scrafford asked if there were any questions for the applicant from the Historic District Commission.

Mr. Salkin stated that it was not clear to him from reading the history whether the property and the adjacent resident property since being demolished was ever a part of the historic church square that was set aside by William Penn. Is it part of the historic destination or does the wall represent that destination? Did the property ever have any association with the church? Have you had any historic restoration specialist look at the property beyond Mr. Lamberston assessment? Do you have any sense of cost or what the need would be to restore or stabilize the property? He saw in the presentation that the church did not have any plans to do any development to the property, is it just because you don't have any plans or do you have some long range plans to specifically keep it open if it were necessary? If the land was restricted for that use, in other words, you are asking to have the property demolished to maintain open space, or to leave open the possibility that you may change your mind later to put up a church building. Do you have any thoughts about that?

Responding to Mr. Salkin, Ms. Walling replied that the history of the residential property is more of a representation of the wall area. There were houses behind that house in the 1800's, as well as encroaching into the wall. However, the historic church square is even smaller than the church property. The property has never had any association with the church. There were no other restoration specialists other than the assessment by Albert Lamberston Contracting. Also responding, Mr. George replied that they did not see a need to restore or stabilize the property. He stated that there is always discussion within the church to have priorities, but this has not been progressed. He was not aware of what the future vestries are going to do with the property and did not want to restrict what they would like to do, but there are no immediate plans. He did not see them being able to build financially or for the size of the congregation to build any construction on the site at the current time. If there were to be some other structure, he was aware that they would need to come before the Historic District Commission.

Responding to Mr. George, Mr. Scrafford replied that since the presentation was completed from the applicant and Staff, and questions were asked, the next step would be to open the Public Hearing.

Mr. Scrafford declared the public hearing open.

Mr. William Boyles - Property owner of the John Banning House (the Old Academy Building) located at 527-529 South State Street.

Mr. Boyles stated that he was in support of the church demolishing the building and then backfilling and seeding the area located at 509 South State Street. Upon observing and wanting to purchase the building, he noticed that it is beyond repair. He stated that it is an eyesore, and there are rodents and skunks living in the house. Occasionally, we have observed homeless people in the area around the building. It would be an advantage to the church to have the non-interrupted frontage on State Street in order to have visibility to the historic facility of the church in the rear, but the Historic District Commission would have to make an exception to the *Design Standards and Guidelines*. If trees are added they should be open in order to have visibility.

Mr. Adam Perza - Resident of the Elm Terrace neighborhood and 2nd District Councilman for City of Dover.

Mr. Perza stated that he was speaking on behalf of himself and the people in the community around that area and what they would like to see happen in the neighborhood. He expressed his personal

endorsement for the application that the church has made. This would benefit the City independent of them and independent of the church as it is a doorway to Downtown Dover. Removing the property would actually be beneficial. The property is a core reflection of the City of Dover in the direction that the City is trying to take in making Downtown Dover very attractive and pleasing to the next generation of residents in the City. Sometimes there are public safety concerns with vacant properties Downtown and people gaining access to them. The neighborhood around us has a lot of children. Having that public safety issue is a risk that the community would like to see abated by removing the building. People have looked at the property and it is not likely that it will be rehabbed or refurbished anytime in the future. Even if the City was to flag the building for repair, it is not in the condition that it would happen in the near future. They would be stuck with it in its current condition moving forward. As indicated, it does benefit the church to consolidate the various parcels of land and removes the obstacle of having the tomb in the middle to allow productively use and plan for use of the land in the future. It does not harm the City to remove the building. It appears there is no evidence of significant historical events. No residences have been rebuilt. The City probably does not have the resources to invest and restore the property. The City is protected for future redevelopment. If the church wanted to build a cathedral in the corner it would have to be guided by the City on how it should happen. The City is protected by the improvements that will happen in the future to make sure it is historical, pleasing, and fits in with the surrounding community. His neighbors have no opposition to the church plan. It makes sense for the church to consolidate their holdings. The church is familiar with the historic responsibilities and he believes that they will take the appropriate steps necessary to protect the City's interest and make sure the City is proud of whatever is on the property in the future.

Robin Krawitz - Preservation Delaware Board Member, resident at 106 South Governors Avenue.

Ms. Krawitz asked if before the Historic District Commission made the decision of demolishing a historic building downtown that there would be consideration in getting someone who knows about historic buildings, evaluations, costs, tax credit and other programs before considering the possibility of demolishing the building. She understands that the property is currently an eyesore, but it is not definite that it will always remain the same. The State has a tax credit that the church could take advantage of. Selling credits to people who actually pay taxes is another option. She recommended that more information be obtained before demolishing the building.

Alan George – Representative of Christ Church.

Mr. George stated that the church is currently reviewing the tax credit options and looking into selling some back, but looking at a financial standpoint for the church it is not an even sell back. (one for one dollar) and there would still be necessary investments.

Ms. Krawitz stated that she was not debating, but only to give comments that there are very few historic buildings and they are being lost. Actual details and cost need to be reviewed before the final decision is made.

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. Salkin stated that he appreciates the dilemma of the church and is aware of the commitment to the Historic District preservation within the churchyard property. There needs to be more due

diligence and archaeological investigation before a decision is made to demolish a building in any condition and historical location. The Green area is where the degree of application would have the highest standards. He recommended that the church consider more about their future building need if they decided to expand. He would prefer to think that everyone consider to repurpose and stabilize the building, and deal with the exterior for future use of the interior. He sees the building as a temporary eyesore and there is a big difference between a churchyard and a series of vacant lots. The Historic District Commission does not want to support a demolition today based on the current information. The due diligence may suggest that you are on the right track and move forward with your proposal.

Mr. Fisher questioned if the church did nothing with the property then the City would be back because of demolition by neglect. He stated that the cost of refurbishing is more than what it would be worth in our lifetime.

Mr. Scrafford suggested that there be an investment in an architectural or preservation related person to evaluate the building that may need to be explored in order to solidify or change the position.

Responding to Mr. Scrafford suggestion, Ms. Krawitz stated that she would be willing to help the church locate someone to evaluate the building at a reasonable cost.

Mr. Jackson stated that further investigation would be helpful.

Mr. Scrafford asked if the Historic District Commission would move to table the application until additional investigation has been completed? Responding to Mr. Scarfford, Mr. Jackson replied yes.

Mr. Jackson moved to table the building demolition for application HI-12-06, located at 509 South State Street until there is further architectural expert investigation and analysis, other information and further justification to demolish the facility has been completed at their expense, seconded by Mr. Salkin and carried with three (3) yes, one (1) abstention (Fisher). Mr. McDaniel recused himself; however, he remained in the meeting.

Mr. Scrafford stated that the basic issue is further analysis on the building. He recommended that action be tabled based on the church acquiring additional information that would include preservation of the structure to support or deny their position.

Mr. George questioned the cost of a restoration report if the church decided to come back to the Historic District Commission with revision since the church is already experiencing financial difficulties. Responding to Mr. George, Mr. Scarfford replied that the decision would be up to the church as to whether or not they wanted to come back to the Historic District Commission, but the building would currently remain.

Responding to Mr. George, Ms. Krawitz replied that in the past a restoration letter report under $2000 was completed by an architect and engineer for the Cannon Hall building in Sussex County.

Mr. Scarfford stated that considering the location of the building and the substance involved in the *Design Standards and Guidelines* it is necessary for the Historic District Commission to ask for further justification the demolition of the building.

Mr. Jackson moved to table the building demolition for application HI-12-06, located at 509 South State Street until additional updated information regarding preservation of the structure has been shared with staff and the staff report and application is revised seconded by Mr. Salkin and carried with three (3) yes, one (1) abstention (Fisher). Mr. McDaniel recused himself; however, he remained in the meeting.

Mr. George requested a copy of the minutes, recommendations, and design guidelines to be mailed to his physical address at 616 North State Street, Dover Delaware, 19901.

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that staff along with Ms. Krawitz from Presevation Delaware would be in contact with Mr. George to assist him with suggestions for an expert to investigate the building. She also stated that a Notice of Action will be sent to the applicant. She stated that she was not sure if the application would come back at the October meeting or afterwards. Since it is a vacant building the City of Dover Code Enforcement Officers will make sure the building is secured.

Mr. Scrafford questioned if there was any levy on the church that was not levied on the Bill Vaughn when they did a recordation of that building. There was a list of items in the recordation and he did not want the Historic District Commission requiring more for this building versus the previous buildings. Responding to Mr. Scrafford, Mr. Fisher replied assuming the regulations are the same there would be no difference. Mr. Scrafford stated that he was not aware of any regulation change.

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that with measured drawings the most recent documentation would be the Bayard Hotel and they would have completed measured floor plans and elevation drawings, but it was completed by a preservation architect. There were a lot of photos taken.

Presentation on Tax Credits for Historic Properties

Ms. Robin Krawitz provided a presentation: Tax Credits for Historic Properties **(Attachment #1)** She focused on the Historic Preservation Tax Credit Programs and the activities of Preservation Delaware.

Responding to Mr. Fisher, Ms. Krawitz replied that the 40% tax credit is of the project cost which is 20% federal tax and 20% state tax.

Ms. Krawitz stated that the State government signed the reauthorization in 2010. If you have a property listed in the National Register and it needs repair anyone can take advantage of the tax credit.

Responding to Mr. Scrafford, Ms. Krawitz replied that the tax credit applies to rehabilitation and not restoration and demolition. She also referred to the Secretary of Interior Standards and Rehabilitation.

Responding to Mr. Jackson and Mr. Scrafford, Ms. Krawitz replied that the $5 million per year tax credit for the State of Delaware is annual, not a carry over.

Mr. Salkin stated that the $5 million per year tax credit is not budgeted, but is included in the Delaware Economic and Financial Advisory Council (DEFAC) revenue projection.

Ms. Krawitz stated that the tax credit was reauthorized in 2010 by the current governor for ten (10) years.

Responding to Mr. Scrafford, Ms. Krawitz replied that the approval is issued once the work is completed and paid in full.

Responding to Mr. Fisher, Ms. Krawitz replied that a person can sell the credits and she would suggest that the church or Historic District Commission contact Joan Larivee for more information.

Responding to Mr. Salkin, Ms. Krawitz replied that if standards were followed, it was done after 2000 when the Act was authorized, and you have all of your documentation you can go back and get the credits. If you have a long term project you can go back every two (2) years.

Mr. Salkin stated that he was in the process of doing the Tax Credit Program with his house and it is relatively easy. He stated that his house is within the Victorian Dover Historic District. The program is about stabilizing and enhancing historic structures.

Mr. Salkin stated that within the Historic District most people are generally doing the right thing to take care of their property. He expressed concerns about the properties that are just outside of the Historic District in neighborhoods that are 50-100 years old, but have not yet been nominated to become part of the District. He expressed his opinion that the City was losing historic fabric in the community and that the boundaries of the districts need to be expanded. He stated that Mr. George's house was one example of a home that is not protected or eligible for the credit.

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that the northern boundary of that segment (of the Historic District) is Delaware Avenue and it does not include the Middle School or anything moving up towards Pennsylvania Avenue.

Mr. Fisher moved to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Mr. Salkin and unanimously carried.

Meeting adjourned at 4:19 PM

Sincerely,

Maretta Savage- Purnell
Maretta Savage- Purnell
Secretary

Attachment to Original Minutes

- **Attachment #1 – Presentation On Tax Credits for Historic Properties**

City of Dover

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

Application:	Lands of Boyles at 527-529 South State Street: Parking Lot Construction, HI-13-01 Site Plan S-13-03
Project Location:	Northeast corner of South State Street and Elm Terrace
Property Addresses:	527-529 South State Street
Tax Parcel:	ED-05-077.09-05-47.00-000
Owner:	William and Lisa Boyles
Present Zoning:	RGO (General Residence and Office Zone) H (Historic District Zone) SWPOZ (Source Water Protection Overlay Zone)
Existing Uses: Proposed Uses:	Building with Apartment Units Same with Parking Lot
Site Area:	9,775 S.F.

Project Description:

The Historic District Commission will act on a recommendation to the City of Dover Planning Commission for an Architectural Review Certificate for the Parking Lot Construction project at 527-529 South State Street. It is Site Plan project filed for review by the Planning Commission on March 18, 2013.

This application consists of a project involving the construction of a seven space 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.

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

This building is located within the boundaries of a National Register Historic District, specifically the Dover Green Historic District. It is a listed as a contributing resource of this

National Register Historic District. Provided below is the building summary from the building inventory listing found within the National Register nomination completed for the Dover Green Historic District (nomination completed 1973-76, amended 1979, 1984). The building is identified as K-394.76 in the Delaware Cultural Resource Survey.

> *K-394.76 527/529 S. State Street – John Banning House, Old Academy – 1770s; brick 2 ½- story, 4-bay Georgian style dwelling. Currently a double dwelling (two bays each), the structure was built as a shop plus dwelling. Later it was occupied by the Dover academy. Exterior walls are stuccoed. The gable roof features a modillioned box cornice Windows are 6/6 sash. The two entries at the center of the façade are finished with transoms. The house is built on a raised basement. Concrete stairs to the entries have a wrought iron railing. (c)*

A series of historic maps were reviewed by Planning Staff for preliminary information on this block of South State Street. The subject site, the John Banning House (Old Academy Building) is located on the east side of the street. The *1859 A.D. Byles Map of Kent* County (Dover insert) shows this building labeled as the "Academy" as the southernmost building in a series of dwellings fronting the east side of South State Street with Christ Church further to the east. The building is again labeled as the "Academy" on the *1868 Beers Map* published by Pomeroy & Beers. This block of residences continues to be shown on the *1885 Bird's Eye View of Dover* and the *1887 Map of the Town of Dover* by W.R. Roe which shows the building owner now as L.W. Thillson's Estate.

The series of *Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps* is also a reference source for information on the building which occupied this property over time. The 1897-1929 *Sanborn Maps* series show this property with a two-and-a-half story house with later one story porch additions to east side of the building. This map series also shows the neighboring properties and the changes associated with the neighborhood including the gradual disappearance of the residential dwellings fronting South State Street. The two dwellings to the north were demolished sometime in the mid-twentieth century (prior to 1991 as determined by aerial maps). The area of Elm Terrace is developed as a residential neighborhood between 1919 and 1929, as the *1929 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map* show the street Elm Terrace connecting to South State Street and continuing east with a series of houses.

In 2008, a project (HI-08-01) involved the replacement of the two existing brick and concrete street markers at the Elm Terrace development/street entrance from South State Street due to their deterioration. The markers flank the street known as Elm Terrace. Following the original form, the replacement markers are constructed of a brick pillar with a concrete name band and a stepped brick top. Included in the name band are the street names of State Street and Elm Terrace placed parallel to the so-named streets. The northern marker (labeled as brick monument street sign on the plan drawing) is located on the corner of the subject property.

<u>SWPOZ (Source Water Protection Overlay Zone)</u>
The site is located within the SWPOZ (Tier 3: Excellent Recharge Area) found in Article 3 Section 29.7 of the *Zoning Ordinance*. However, this project site is within the downtown redevelopment target area which is exempted from the SWPOZ requirements and restrictions as per *Zoning Ordinance,* Article 3 §29.79.

PROJECT PROPOSAL (Drawings dated 6/29/12):
The application proposes construction of a parking lot in the backyard area of the property. The elements of the project are as follows:

1. Parking Lot: A seven (7) space paved parking lot with a twenty (20) foot width access from the alley off Elm Terrace is proposed. There is no direct vehicular access to Elm Terrace or to South State Street. The parking lot consists of one handicapped accessible space and six regular spaces. As no upright curbing is proposed for the parking lot, a series of parking bumpers are placed at the head of each parking space. All parking spaces are perpendicular to the drive aisle thus facing north.

2. Sidewalks/ Paved Areas: A new sidewalk of brick pavers is proposed from Elm Terrace to the rear of the existing building. The areas at the rear of the building adjacent to the parking lot are to be surfaced with the brick pavers as well giving as to the two porch entrances and the basement access door. The property has existing concrete sidewalks along the public street frontages of South State Street and Elm Terrace.

3. Landscaping: A landscape planting of a row of shrubs is proposed along the Elm Terrace frontage and alley corner of the property. These plantings are shown on the property side of the new fence. The specific varieties of the new plantings are not listed. There are a number of existing trees in the southern portion of the property, a row of boxwoods along South State Street between the building and Elm Terrace, and a row of shrubs along the northern property line.

4. Fences: Black aluminum style decorative fences are proposed along the south property line and portions of the west and east property lines. The fence height is not specified on this plan sheet. A gate opening is shown for the new brick sidewalk leading from Elm Terrace.

5. Site Furnishings: The site includes the addition of a bicycle rack of three (3) bicycle space spaces at the rear of the building.

6. Accessory Building: A shed is proposed in the northeast corner of the property. No additional details of the shed are provided in the submission.

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, Paving and Bordering, and Parking Lots found on pages 3-24 through 3-27. These guidelines highlight the consideration that should be given to the areas surrounding buildings including the choice of materials. It notes that fences in the Historic District should not exceed four (4) feet in height. Also the *Design Guidelines* recommend that 20% of parking lots should be unpaved and planted.

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

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

1) Staff recommends conditional approval of the Architectural Review Certificate for the concepts presented in the Parking Lot Construction on the property at 527-529 South State Street. This recommendation is made subject to the following comments and suggested revisions.

2) The following conditions are recommended by Staff to improve project's compliance with the recommended guidelines of the *Design Standards and Guidelines*. The following are recommended conditions:
    a. The fence should be constructed of the black metal decorative fencing in a picket style pattern not to exceed four (4) feet in height and not to exceed three (3) feet in height within the corner visibility area.
    b. The bicycle parking rack should be black in finish color and of a decorative style. A bicycle rack of modern style (tube form) is not recommended.
    c. The proposed shrubs along the southern fence should be evergreen varieties and a minimum of two (2) feet in height at the time of planting.
    d. The existing shrubs along the northern property line must be maintained at a minimum height of at least four (4) feet and should be an evergreen screen in order to assist in screening the vehicle parking lot. These shrubs appear to be recently pruned; therefore replanting of the shrubs may be necessary to maintain the screening buffer.
    e. Maintain unpaved areas of the property as lawn areas with landscape beds in the areas of shrub plantings for ease of maintenance.
    f. Utilize black posts for any signage elements to be attached to posts i.e. handicapped parking signage and traffic control sign.

3) Some of the site improvements/amenities were not specifically described with the application information. Please provide information for consideration and discussion.
    a. Clarify the paving surface material for the parking lot.

b. Clarify the surface treatment (lawn areas, plantings, type of mulch, etc.) between the parking lot and Elm Terrace.
c. Any light fixtures/poles utilized on the property for site lighting should utilize a black finish color.

4) The *Zoning Ordinance* limits the height of fences to four (4) feet within the front yard setback (Article 5 §1.55) with other provisions for increases in height for side yards, rear yards, and the second front yard on corner lots. In addition, for corner lots such as this, 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.

5) The design of the proposed shed must be compatible with the *Design Standards and Guidelines* and must be placed a minimum of five (5) feet from the side and rear property lines. It is subject to Architectural Review Certification as part of a Building Permit process.

6) The design of any proposed dumpster enclosure or screening method for trash/recycling collection items should be compatible with the character of the Historic District.

7) 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.

8) 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.

9) 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.

10) The applicant shall be aware that the Building Permit for the fence installation and 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.

<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.*

RECEIVED
FEB 11 2013
CITY OF DOVER
PLANNING & INSPECTIONS

Christ Episcopal Church Dover Request to the City of Dover Historic Commission

RE: Request to demolish the building at 509 S. State Street, Dover DE

Actions Taken Following the Meeting with the Historic Commission

Following the meeting with the Historic Commission on September 20, 2012, the Historic Subcommittee of Christ Episcopal Church sent requests for quotes to seven Historic Architects. These names were taken from the Preservation Delaware website based on input from the City of Dover's Historic Planning Commission Staff.

The firms contacted include:

- Homsey Architects
- Buck Simpers, Architects and Associates (BSA+A)
- Bernard Haber Holloway Architects
- Staikos Architects
- Whiteside Meocel and Carbone]
- Kitchen and Associates
- DCI Architects

The information that was submitted to the Historic Commission in our application to demolish the building was sent to each firm along with a request for the following estimates:

1. Historical Architectural Inspection and report
2. Structural Engineer Inspection and Report
3. Building plans for:
    a. Complete demolition and new construction of the house assuming it is in too poor of a condition to refurbish, or
    b. Refurbishment of the house assuming the house is structurally sound enough to re-habilitate
4. Construction costs either as a complete price or per square foot (+/-25% if an estimate) assuming:
    a. Complete demolition and new construction is required, or
    b. Refurbishment of the house is possible

Three of the seven firms responded that they were interested. These include BSA+A, Bernard Haber Holloway, and Homsey Architects. No other Architects responded to our request for quote.

Note that while Homsey Architect stated that they were interested in coming down and providing us with a quote, they have not provided a date that they would be available.

Meeting with BSA+A

On January 4, 2013 we opened the house for Simpers Architects. Also in attendance were representatives from Richard Y. Johnson & Sons (General Contractors &

Construction Managers), Macintosh Engineering (Structural Engineer), and the Christ Episcopal Church Dover Historic Subcommittee.

The purpose of the meeting was to allow the group to walk through the 509 S. State Street Property in order to support their developing a bid to either demolish the structure, renovate the building or totally rebuild the house. We opened the walk through with an explanation of Christ Church's desire to demolish the building and the meeting with the Historic Commission where additional information was requested.

Preliminary input received during the walk through included:

- the back of the house has structural damage to the floor joists,
- the 9" x 9" floor tiles in this 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" x 4" 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,
- a question was asked if the termites were still active (Paul. LeeAnn and Alan noted that we did not know but that we have not treated for termites). No one tried to punch into the beams to see ifthere was still termite activity,
- the low ceiling heights and narrow stairs and doors are evident of older structures (no guess at the possible date),
- the back portion of the house appears to be older than the front given the construction techniques (no basement/low crawl space, direction of joists and construction of same) and,
- 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).

After the walk through Chuck Simpers, LeeAnn Walling, Paul Brown, and Alan George had a side discussion regarding the path forward. Chuck noted that additional investigation would be needed to formalize the historical age and relevance of the house. This would include support from Landmark Engineering for a detailed survey/property inspection and review. The result of this would be a report that the structure is historical or not. We also agreed to send the minutes from the meeting with the Historic Commission to BSA+A and asked for a complete project estimate, not just next step.

<u>Meeting with Bemardon Haber Holloway</u>

On January 7, 2013 the house was opened for Bernardon Haber Holloway.

Attendees included representatives from Bernardon Haber Holloway (Architect), Ingrahm and Associates (Structural Engineer), and the Christ Episcopal Church Dover Historic Subcommittee.

Discussion topics included:

- » We started with a reiteration of the phone conversation that Alan George had with Bill Holloway (Architect) before we scheduled the walk through, i.e. an overview of how we came about buying the property, the meeting with the Historic Commission and that outcome, and our desire to demolish the structure
- » B. Holloway noted that the building is old but he didn't see anything "historic" about the building. We discussed the input from the city and that the building is in the Historic District.
- » It was noted that the main part of the building is most likely structurally sound (can not tell completely without a detailed, i.e. funded, inspection) given the new block and modem floor joists.
- » In their opinion it appears that multiple renovations have been made over the years. These include in the 1930s based on the light fixtures and windows/window sills; since the 1970s given the siding, hardwood floors, block work in the basement/ floor joists on the first floor, and heating system.
- » 9" x 9" floor tiles in the first floor, back portion of the house have asbestos (based on past experience)
- » It was offered that even if we did renovate the building it would be almost impossible to bring it up to code for anything other than residential use

Public Safety

One of our Parishioners who leads our Buildings and Grounds Committee went to the building the first week in December 2012 to close a window that he noticed was open. When he got to the building, he noticed that the building was forcibly broken into. After going in to investigate he saw that a homeless person had his belongings there.

The Dover Police Department was called and responded but no one was in the house at the time. A note was left for the homeless person to vacate the premises and after going back in and seeing that their possessions were gone it was at this point (December 8, 2012) that plywood was applied to the doors and first floor windows.

Leaving the building empty posses the potential threat to our local community of someone coming back and this time resulting in an innocent person being injured.

Aside from the local residents being at risk, there are people who use our Parish House, i.e. our Social Hall. These include, but are not limited to:

- » 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,
- » our Church Choir who rehearse midweek,
- » our Youth Group at various times,
- » the women of our Altar Guild who are at the Church alone during off hours to prepare the altar for services, and
- » our church staff who often are leaving the building after dark.

Cost Impact to Christ Church Dover

The quotes/estimates that we received were entered into the spreadsheet attached with this input.

There are three options for attempting to pay for a project to remove and replace the building. These include raise the funds via a Building Campaign, take a construction loan/mortgage for the project, look for grants/tax credits.

Before going into these options, it is important that the Historic Commission understand how Christ Church Dover funds·its operations.

Christ Episcopal Church Dover's funding is primarily based on three sources. These include pledges from our parishioners, savings from unrestricted endowments, and restricted endowments.

Restricted endowments are bequests to the church with specific instructions on how they are used. This includes items such as maintaining the cemetery, the music program, and altar linens for example. We are prohibited from touching these funds for anything else. We have no endowments that would be applicable for use in rebuilding or remodeling the 509 S. State Street dwelling.

We are already having to transfer funds from our unrestricted Endowments (i.e. savings) to support our operating budget for 2013. also, our Pledges for 2013 are already approximately $20,000.00 less than in 2012. As such, we are starting the year in the red.

Christ Church Dover would normally not share the details of our finances outside of our parishioners. However, it is imperative to show the Commission this background so that you can see what a financial hardship it is for the church to meet our basic obligations to our church and our community let alone build another structure that we have no use or plans for.

Capital Campaign Option

As you can see from the budget details provided, we would need to raise capital funds in the range of$500,000.00 to reconstruct a building on this site. We have 250 plus regularly attending, active members. These folks range from minimum wage jobs to

those with typical middle class incomes. We also have a large number of retirees living on fixed incomes.

As noted above, we have difficulty in raising funds to cover our operating expenses so expecting our Parish to provide any dent in this sizable sum is unrealistic. If we were overly ambitious and say that we would target raising $50,000.00 per year in fundraisers, auctions, etc we would be 10 years in getting to the amount needed to cover the costs at today's prices let along the increases in construction costs in 2024. Pick any number instead and it is still clearly not feasible to believe that this is a viable option.

Construction/Mortgage Option

Using a mortgage payment calculator, the monthly payment on a $500,000.00 loan at 3.5% interest for 30 years is $3306.39 per month (with taxes included). The total interest paid is $440,028.92.

Property taxes, as stated in the Delaware Economic Development Office 2010 – 2011 Delaware Property Tax Rate publication would be $2.5467 per $100 Assessment. Since this would be a brand new building it is assumed that it would be assessed at $500,000.00. As such, the taxes would be $12,733.50 per year.

The annual, ongoing cost based on borrowing the monies needed to build and then maintain the dwelling amount to $46,552.00 per year. This includes the monthly mortgage cost times 12, estimated utility costs, and maintenance of the building (see the spreadsheet included with this submittal). Once again, this is money that we do not have nor do we see how these added annual costs could be covered.

At the end of 30 years, $1,396,560.00 would have been spent on this project.

Historical Tax Credit

Pursuing a Tax Credit option also comes with added costs and is not a panacea for recouping spent monies. Christ Church has already been involved with the Historic Tax Credit program when we worked with this process for the historically correct, shingle roof that we put on our sanctuary. Not only did we have to front the cost of the project, we are still sitting on these tax credits as we have not been able to sell these off.

Potential Revenue to Offset Costs

It is unlikely that revenue could be generated from the building based on the following input we received:

- The building is land locked so there is no parking,
- There is a glut of unrented, ADA compliant office space with ample parking, and

- It would be difficult to meet current ADA requirements and maintain the features of the interior of the building (narrow doorways, low headroom, narrow stairwell to second and third floors)

Summary

From the cursory input that we received we have confirmed that the house is old but of no apparent historic value. The bottom line is that we have no use for the building, no funding to support a renovation project, and being forced to go down this path would put the existence of Christ Episcopal Church Dover at risk of existing.

If we were to take another $47k from our savings every year, the church would drain our reserves/back up operational funds. This would ultimately lead to our having to close our doors. While this may seem to be a bit melodramatic it is far from that.

As mentioned at our initial meeting with the Historic Commission this is the exact path that the Cathedral Church of the Episcopal Diocese of Delaware took. Quite frankly, the result of the Cathedral's Vestry not being the best possible stewards with their funding resulted in the closing of the Cathedral and a massive effort to try and sell the property as you may have read in the News Journal.

Again, without trying to be melodramatic, think about what would happen to our community if we were to risk bankrupting Christ Episcopal Church Dover:

- The Spiritual support of the House of Pride,
- Direct support of the Dover Interfaith Mission by parishioners,
- We are getting ready to Volunteer thorough our Church for the Habitat for Humanity project in Frederica DE,
- The doors of the Church would close and the upkeep of the cemetery and the church yard would end from a private standpoint leaving this to be taken over by the City or State or sold to some private investor

Given these costs and potential options, it would seem the prudent thing to do is to allow Christ Church Dover to continue to plan and work toward securing our long term presence in our community as we have in the past without undue financial burdens that do not really serve the best interest of the church, our parishioners or the city of Dover. As such, it is in the best interest of everyone that the structure at 509 S. State Street be approved for demolition.

Christ Church Dover has proven that it has the historical interest of the church and the City of Dover in its heart and soul and we respectfully request that you agree that we be allowed to continue to be the best stewards possible of our church property.

We sincerely ask you to consider, what is more important

- reviving an old house that was left to run down by the previous owner with no public complaints showing that there was a concern for the state of disrepair

for that building and risking the future of the truly historical property that 509 S State Street is blocking, or

» supporting the historical facilities and grounds that are Christ Episcopal Church Dover and the efforts of our Parish to maintain and nurture not just the building but our 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 scores of local residents would end up the victim of a derelict house with no historic value. As such, and with all due respect, we again request that you approve our request to demolish the building at 509 S. State Street.

Respectfully,

The Historic Sub Committee for Christ Episcopal Church Dover Delaware

Description	*Work Description*	*Option 1 Cost*	*Option 2 Cost*	*Option 3 Cost*	*Comments*
Historical Architect Inspection and Report		$10,000.00	$10,000.00	$10,000.00	
Structural Engineer Inspection and Report		$5,000.00	$5,000.00	$5,000.00	
Construction Administration		$2,000.00	$2,000.00	$2,000.00	
Option 1 -Total Rebuild	demolish existing structure and remove	$25,000.00			assumed will need to do site work after construction vehicles tear up property
	develop plans				included in construction costs
	permits				included in construction costs
	construction costs	$500,000.00			based on historical construction requirements
Option 2 - Renovation	demolish part of existing structure and remove debris		$18,750.00		assumes any structural damage to main part of house can be repaired/replaced, remove existing kitchen (structurally unsafe) and side porch since added after 1860, remove aluminum siding, assumed 75% the cost of complete demolition
	develop plans				included in construction costs
	permits				included in construction costs
	construction costs		$400,000.00		based on historical construction requirements
Option 3 - Demolition				$25,000.00	
Total Construction Cost		$542,000.00	$418,750.00	$25,000.00	
Budget		$25,000.00	$25,000.00	$25,000.00	
Delta Cost to Parish		-$517,000.00	-$393,750.00	$0.00	

On qoinq operational costs	Utility costs during use	$3,000.00	$3,000.00	$0.00	$250.00 per month
	Maintenance	$3,875.00	$3,875. 0	$0.00	painting exterior every four years ($2000.00), cleanina ($75 x 25 weeks= $1875.00)
	annual mortgage cost	$39,676.68			based on $500k loan & assessment value
Potential Revenue from building		$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	land locked property, no parking so of no interest to any potential buyer or renter for offices. Other parking behind church rented and can not pave remaining open grass adjacent to existing parking lot. Using this or other open property not in long range plans of the church
On going annual cost		$46,551.68			sum of C22, C23, C24; without cost increases in utilities, taxes

Commission Education Plan

Name of Commission _____

Purpose of your commission: _____

Other history or preservation organizations and agencies that are active in your community: _____

Major non-profit organizations in your community (chamber of commerce, main street, neighborhood organizations): _____

Major employers in your community (include industry, government, universities):

_____

MC;ljor private funding sources in your community _____

_____

What programs and services are provided by your commission:

- o Award programs
- o Downtown revitalization
- o Grants
- o Historic resources survey
- o Loan fund(s)
- o Publications
- o Tours
- o Design assistance
- o Easement programs
- o Lectures
- o National register nominations
- o Special events
- o Website
- o Pre-application review
- o Education for commission members
- o Newsletter
- o Technical assistance

---u- --Histori-c-designati-on-- _____

What funding sources are available to your commission?

Which organizations and agencies does your commission have an active working relationship:

- o City/county attorney
- o City/county administration
- o Cityfcountycountil
- o City/county planning department
- o Design review board
- o Local building officials
- o Tourism bureau
- o Zoning board
- o Chamber of commerce
- o Civic associations
- o College/university
- o Historical society
- o Main street program o Merchant association
- o Neighborhood groups
- o Preservation organizations
- o NAPC
- o NTHP
- o Preservation Action
- o Statewide preservation organization
- o SHPO

Does your commission have dedicated staff? Are they professional staff trained in preservation? How much of their time is dedicated to the commission? _____

Do you have a comprehensive architectural survey of your community? Is your survey up-to-date? _____

What materials do you have for commission operations?

- o Ordinance
- o Rules of procedure
- o Design guidelines
- o Tax incentives program
- o Website
- o Guide to the process
- o Online survey records

What media coverage have you had over the past year? _____

Has the commission been involved in any controversial issues this past year?

How do you want to improve your public education program? _____

How do you want to improve relations within the eommttttity'?_____

Recognizing limitations, what programs or services can be adopted over the next year to combat a negative image and to promote a more positive one?

What are your immediate short-term goals for the next six months? _____