CITY OF DOVER HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
AGENDA
THURSDAY, September 20, 2012 - 3:00 P.M.
City Hall – Conference Room

ROLL CALL
APPROVAL OF AGENDA
APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF MEETING on July 19, 2012

COMMUNICATIONS & REPORTS

1. Training Opportunities

OLD BUSINESS

NEW BUSINESS

1. Applications for Architectural Review Certification:
   a. 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.

2. Presentation: Tax Credits for Historic Properties

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
JULY 19, 2012

The Regular Meeting of the City of Dover Historic District Commission was held on Thursday, July 19, 2012 at 3:00 PM with Chairman Scrafford presiding. Members present were: Mr. McDaniel, Mr. Fisher, Mr. Scrafford, and Mr. Salkin. Mr. Jackson was absent.

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

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

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

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

Mr. Salkin moved to adopt the minutes of the regular Historic District Commission meeting of April 19, 2012, seconded by Mr. McDaniel and the motion was unanimously carried 4-0 with Mr. Jackson absent.

COMMUNICATIONS & REPORTS

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that the first item on the Communications and Reports was a summary of applications being tracked for the last two years. There were three projects considered this year. Construction is still underway and almost completed at the Frankfurt Bakery. They are scheduled to open on Friday, July 20, 2012. The Johnson Victrola Museum has not installed their first banner. Wesley Church installed their first banner which was for the Vacation Bible School. There has been some utility work at the North Street Lot where they are putting underground cable and telephone connections. They are in the final stages of completing the Site Plan review finalization so that they can start the parking lot and plaza aspects of the project.

Mr. Scrafford questioned if there were any problems? Responding to Mr. Scrafford, Mrs. Melson-Williams replied that for some of the older projects such as the Duncan Plaza we have not received anything current. They do have extensions that they can apply for through the Planning Commission. If they don't take action, it will expire.

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that the Bayard Plaza is underway with the exterior and finishes. We have been working with them as items arise with the project.

Mrs. Melson-Williams asked if there were any questions regarding the projects?

Mr. Salkin questioned if the double gate was higher than the fence at the church. The first time the design was not approved and the second time it was not discussed. Responding to Mr. Salkin, Mrs. Melson-Williams replied that it may have happened that way. The initial presentation to the Historic District Commission was that everything was at the same height. The second one was not discussed, but there is an arch. The project has not been closed out; they still have landscaping

issues. The gate does have an arch. Mr. Scrafford also replied by stating that it was not in the gate in the alley way. Mrs. Melson-Williams further replied and said that the gate in the alley has some pickets on the top.

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that the permits that occur in the Historic District are also tracked. Some of them will have to appear before the Historic District Commission while others are Staff approvals. To date, there have been twenty-seven (27) permits involving permits in the Historic District. A majority of them are for signage: eleven (11) Sign Permits and six (6) Temporary Sign Permits. For five of the twenty-seven (27) permits it is noted that while the property is in the Historic District the location of the project may have been interior or not visible from the public way. They technically do not need to have Architectural Review Certification, but they are listed. The few Building Permits that are included on the list are interior renovations, minor porch and deck work.

Mr. Scrafford questioned if the list included items that the Planning Office approves even though they do not have to be reviewed? Responding to Mr. Scrafford, Mrs. Melson-Williams replied that was correct. The Planning Office sees every Building Permit that is filed. Even though it may not require Architectural Review Certification by Staff, it is on the list because the building is in the Historic District.

Mr. McDaniel questioned if the new porch on 16 The Green that is being constructed at the current time was not brought to the Historic District Commission because it was the exact and similar porch? Responding to Mr. McDaniel, Mrs. Melson-Williams replied that was correct. They have done other porch repairs because someone ran in one of the porches at one point.

Mr. McDaniel questioned if the project at the Art League, for example, would come to the Planning Office? Responding to Mr. McDaniel, Mrs. Melson-Williams replied that it depends on what is being done. There should be some things that they will be doing that she is aware of that will require a permit. Mr. McDaniel further questioned if the Planning Office had to make the determination? Responding to Mr. McDaniel, Mrs. Melson-Williams replied that the Planning Office would have to make the determination.

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that Preservation Delaware is holding an event the first weekend in August. There are activities on Saturday and Sunday. The Saturday workshop focuses on the Damaging Effects of Tree Roots on Building Foundations and Sidewalks. The Sunday workshop focuses on New Castle and its History.

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that she received an inquiry from a gentleman who is part of the A&P Historical Society. This was the A&P grocery store. He had some indication that the City Hall building was once the A&P grocery store. He was seeking additional information. If anyone has information regarding the A&P grocery store, please see her after the meeting.

NEW BUSINESS

HI-12-04 Court Street Gateway Project – Presentation on Phase I: Court Street Gateway of the Bicycle/Pedestrian Improvements Project. A presentation of the design concepts for bicycle and

pedestrian improvements to widen the existing sidewalk along Court Street and South DuPont Highway/U.S. Route 13 to serve as a shared use path. The segment located west of the St. Jones River (the bridge on Court Street) is located within the Historic District zone.

Representative: Rich Vetter, Dover Kent County MPO; John Hermes, Century Engineering; Anthony Aglio, DelDOT; Marco Boyce, DelDOT.

(Mr. Vetter utilized maps and graphics to present the information)
Mr. Vetter stated that the project started last fall and the intent of the project came from the MPO Bike Plan. The intent is to connect the Silver Lake existing trail and the trail behind U.S. Route 13 and DelDOT. A lot of funding is needed for this project that will be set aside. The City was involved in the working group and during the six (6) month process we developed different alternatives. The initial Phase 1 is from Court Street to Route 13 to the signal. Phase 2 will be from Loockerman Street to the State Archives property and then connect to the Court Street project. The other part of Phase 2 would connect south in front of Legislative Hall to the St. Jones River. The portion on the west side of the bridge is in the Historic District and the design has not started. We wanted some input from the Historic District Commission before starting the design process. This will be a DelDOT project. The intent is to widen the sidewalk along Court Street and U.S. Route 13 to make it to make it a ten (10) foot wide shared use path. The concrete will have brick accent on the east side of the river. We plan to improve the aesthetics and landscaping and widen and match the sidewalk portion west of the St. Jones River which is in the Historic District. The bridge is Historic and there is no intent to modify the bridge. The sidewalk on the bridge is ten (10) to twelve (12) feet wide.

Mr. Scrafford questioned if the bricks on the photos were existing? Responding to Mr. Scrafford, Mr. Aglio replied one was existing and one was a rendering. The rendering shows the middle crossing in front of Legislative Hall.

Mr. Scrafford questioned if they were going to use real brick? Responding to Mr. Scrafford, Mr. Aglio replied that they were asking the Historic District Commission what they would prefer for them to use. They would use kiln fired brick with a tighter joint to match in color.

Mr. Vetter stated that there is existing brick today all the way to the Family Court then it becomes concrete. There are three different styles of bricks in that short section.

Mr. Salkin questioned if he could clarify where the brick extension would be? Would it be brick to the west of St. Jones River, brick on the existing bridge, and brick all the way to the Family Court corner and then pick up with the concrete? Responding to Mr. Salkin, Mr. Vetter replied yes.

Mr. Scrafford questioned what depth of concrete was being discussed? Responding to Mr. Scrafford, Mr. Vetter replied 4 inch sidewalk concrete.

Mr. Scrafford stated that his suggestion was that in the initial construction that the receptacles for the bollards be installed because if you do not intend to put them in so that when do decide to put them in it will already be there.

Mr. Aglio questioned if cars will park in the location? Responding to Mr. Aglio, Mr. Scrafford replied that he thinks that motorcycles will drive down the sidewalk and you will have people using the ten (10) foot wide concrete strip. Signs will not be in your best interest because they are unenforceable. He suggested thinking about what could happen on the ten (10) foot wide concrete that you could prevent early on.

Mr. Aglio questioned if any of the bollards in the Historic District would need to conform to the Historic District requirements? Responding to Mr. Boyce, Mr. Scrafford replied what was already some in existence you would use the similar item. Also responding, Mrs. Melson-Williams replied that there are some near the Courthouse, but she was not sure of the color. Some of them are collapsible because it is a fire lane situation.

Mr. Aglio questioned if it was acceptable? Responding to Mr. Aglio, Mr. Scrafford replied yes, the bricks sound acceptable.

Mr. Boyce questioned for the existing section (of the sidewalk) that is brick inside the District would the Historic District Commission like for it to stay or to remove the brick and replace with all new? Responding to Mr. Boyce, Mr. McDaniel replied that as a bicyclist he would prefer that all the brick be removed. Also responding, Mr. Scrafford replied that you would like to make it more in line with a smooth surface.

Mr. Scrafford questioned if they would be using existing brick? Responding to Mr. Scrafford, Mr. Hermes replied that there are two options, you can try to use the existing brick, but what we found is that majority of it is broken. It can be incorporated in with the new.

Mr. Scrafford stated that he would not have any objection to removing and replacing it to make it a more acceptable surface.

Mr. McDaniel questioned if they would match the pattern? Responding to Mr. McDaniel, Mr. Aglio replied yes. Mr. Scrafford stated that the pattern should be retained. Mr. Aglio questioned if they would like a clear delineation between the new and the old brick. Responding to Mr. Aglio, Mr. Scrafford replied that he did not have a problem with it; it just needs to be done from an aesthetic point. Try to keep it historic and do not duplicate.

Mr. McDaniel questioned if the strip along and parallel to Route 13 was going to be just a shoulder? Responding to Mr. McDaniel, Mr. Aglio replied that the entire sidewalk will be widened. Mr. McDaniel questioned if the bikes would be away from the road? Responding to Mr. McDaniel, Mr. Aglio replied that the bikes will still be permitted to use the shoulder on Route 13. Mr. Salkin questioned that as a bicyclist he may not want to use that path, he may just want to stay on Route 13, will he still be permitted to do that? Responding to Mr. Salkin, Mr. Aglio replied that the sidewalk will be widened all the way to Route 1.

Mr. Salkin questioned if there was a concept for design and material for Phase 2? Responding to Mr. Salkin, Mr. Aglio replied yes, there is a standard for the urban area. Mr. Salkin questioned if they would go back and redo the items that are currently there. Responding to Mr. Salkin, Mr. Aglio replied no, there was no intention of going back in that area.

Mr. Scrafford questioned if they had come across any studies that had been done in the new area? He stated that he remember Jack Ritcher doing an extensive study on the entire path. Responding to Mr. Aglio replied that he had spoken to Mr. Ritcher and there were some property owners there (at the workshops). Also responding Mr. Vetter replied that they had the previous study. Mr. Scrafford questioned if the boat ramp was still there? Responding to Mr. Scrafford, Mr. Aglio replied yes.

Mr. Hermes questioned if the Historic District would have a problem with them removing the brick that was near the existing bridge and sidewalk area and making it consistent with the rest of the way? Responding to Mr. Hermes, Mr. Scrafford replied no, it would be nice. It would be better to have it all consistent. Mr. Hermes stated that it will be investigated to see how the bricks are actually tied down to the bridge.

Mr. Vetter stated that Century Engineering will begin the design as the next step in the project. The surveyor will be out in the fall. Construction will start summer or fall of 2013. They would like any comments the Historic District Commission has regarding the project.

HI-12-05 Building Permit #12-816 for Renovations for ADA Accessibility at Supreme Court Building, 55 The Green - Referral by the City Planner to the Historic District Commission for Review of Architectural Review Certification for Building Permit application #12-816 for ADA accessibility improvements at 55 The Green (Supreme Court Building) consisting of new ramp and steps to the west entry. Property Owner: State of Delaware. Tax Parcel: ED-05-077.09-05-32.00-000.

Enhancements to the East Edge of The Green & Court Street Promenade Project – Presentation on site improvements within the right-of-way of The Green and Court Street (unopened segment) authorized under City of Dover Public Works Permit 2013-0001.

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that this is a Building Permit application that was filed and the Planning Staff used the section of the Code that allows them to refer Building Permits that are seeking Architectural Review Certification to refer it to the Historic District Commission for consultation. We chose this because of the building's location and they are making some significant changes to the area in front of the building. The permit for the Supreme Court Building focuses on the existing ramp system that gets you into the building. This project actually removes the existing system and builds a new ramp system into the building and reworks the walls and landscaping. It is part of a much larger project which is referred to as "Enhancements to the East Edge of The Green & Court Street Promenade Project". Most of the project is in the right-of-way of The Green and Court Street (unopened segment) authorized under City of Dover Public Works Permit 2013-0001.

Representatives: Mr. Tim Slavin, Division of Historical & Cultural Affairs; Mr. Scott Schurman, Roberts Construction Company; Ms. Lynn Riley, Division of Historical & Cultural Affairs; Mr. Timothy Cassidy, Bernardon Haber Holloway Architects

(A series of presentation drawings were utilized to explain the projects.)

Mr. Slavin stated that these improvements also consisted of the project on 15-21 The Green, the Kirk Short Building. Looking outward from the facade of the building we saw the need to correct some inefficiency and increase the safety in the First State Heritage Park area. There are safety issues related to ADA. The ramp at the Supreme Court Building is dangerous. If you could imagine being someone who relies on a wheelchair then you would need a very good braking system on that ramp. If you did not have good brakes on your wheelchair you could go off the edge of the ramp and down the hill. They also want to improve the steps. They have been working at 15-21 The Green for the last eight (8) years and it looks as if each individual project that has come along over the course of the last thirty (30) years took care of its landscaping in front of the building. There is a patch of items that have occurred that lacks the signature that they want to see on the other side of the green.

Mr. Cassidy stated that in the 1970's there was a large renovation done on the (Supreme Court) Building with that being the curbed portico coming into the ceremonial entrance to the Court along with the planter that runs in front of the entire building. Although the central area is the ceremonial entrance, on a day- to- day basis if the Court is not in session and you need to go there for business you actually have to go to a security door entrance with security cameras and glass if you were to go into the Court. It is also the accessible entrance that has the automatic openers and closers on the doors. For the ramp to the far south side of the building, you will have to go around the corner as if you were going to the new courthouse and start down the hill and then turn around and double back up to go up the ramp. If you needed to use the ramp in a wheelchair you would go to the far side of the building and make a 90º degree turn and go up the side, but there is one step in the middle that you cannot see. It is even dangerous if you are walking. It is a hazard and is not in compliance with ADA standards in terms of the slopes. There is nothing there to indicate that you need to make a turn. In addition to coming up to the front of the Supreme Court Building, there is no way to get into the building if you disabled. There are no signs.

Mr. Cassidy stated that they are proposing to remove the planter wall, expose the front of the building and create a new front stoop with steps in front of it that will lead back out to the walk way. It will make a ramp that is concealed behind the low wall that runs parallel from the ceremonial entrance point in the center back to the secured and accessible entrance. The low wall with a level top will appear to be a part of the watertable of the building and the ramp will be concealed behind it. There will be a stoop with steps coming down and a walkway coming up. The building will then have a more traditional relationship to the street and the sidewalk. When you walk in front of it in the future instead of having planters and shrubs which hide the front of the building and entrance, you will be able walk right up to the entrance. They are also proposing new landscaping. The proposal will be constructed out of brick which will match the building and we plan to remove the granite cap and then reuse them to recap the new cheek wall on the side of the steps.

Mr. Scrafford questioned if they had enough distance to accommodate the ADA ramp? Responding to Mr. Scrafford, Mr. Cassidy replied yes. They have already been before the Architectural Review Accessibility Board and have approval for the project. Therefore there are no ADA issues and they are incompliance.

Mr. Scrafford questioned if they needed ADA access for the ceremonial entrance? Responding to Mr. Scrafford, Mr. Cassidy replied no. Mr. Scrafford asked if the ceremonial entrance would be used? Responding to Mr. Scrafford, Mr. Cassidy replied that the only time the ceremonial entrance would be used is if the Court is open for sessions. Mr. Scrafford questioned if handicapped persons have the ability to access the building through the ramps? Responding to Mr. Scrafford, Mr. Cassidy replied that is correct, that is the actual business entrance for the building.

Mr. McDaniel questioned the signage on the building if the door is locked? Responding to Mr. McDaniel, Mr. Cassidy replied that there is no signage. They are proposing to make it an easy and understandable entrance. This will be more in keeping with the traditional relationship of the building to the street rather than having the planter and shrubs out front.

Mr. Salkin questioned if they could explain if any treatment will be needed on the existing foundation? Responding to Mr. Salkin, Mr. Cassidy replied that it will all get re-pointed. There will be new landscaping with a traditional low hedge of yews about 24" to 30" tall with a grass area that is established on either side of the front entrance. These plants were selected because this is a very high traffic area as well as a place that is not for plant material.

Mr. Fisher questioned if the wide expansion of the walkway will be gone with the new proposal on The Green side? Responding to Mr. Fisher, Mr. Cassidy replied no. This will all be retained completely. Court Street used to come from Federal Street straight up to The Green. Also responding Mr. Slavin replied that the only area where brick will be removed will be in front of the Kirk-Short building. They will be creating some green space in that area.

Mr. Salkin questioned if any trees beyond the six (6) new large trees would remain? Responding to Mr. Salkin, Mr. Cassidy replied correct. They lost a few of the trees since the drawing was made, because the City has a requirement that for any location that has water and storm sewer pipes in the ground you will need to have at least ten (10) feet of clearance between the tree and shrubs. They still have the trees in front and two of the trees were replaced with shrubs instead of trees. Mr. Salkin questioned if anything was being removed? Responding to Mr. Salkin, Mr. Cassidy replied that the three (3) small trees that are currently in front of the Supreme Court will be removed because they are located where the new walk ways are going. The large trees that go anywhere on The Green will not be removed.

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that Staff found the ramp system and the entry steps utilize the compatible materials and the design would be compatible with the *Design Guidelines* that

recommend that you screen the slope of the ramp. The use of the brick is appropriate in the Historic District.

Mr. Scrafford asked if there were any questions for Staff and there were none.

Mr. Salkin made a motion to endorse application HI-12-05 as being consistent with the Historic District Guidelines, seconded by Mr. Fisher and the motion was unanimously carried 4-0. Mr. Jackson was absent.

Mr. Cassidy stated that the gray area shown on the plan is existing walkways that will remain. In the reddish area, there will be new walkways or walkways that are being reconstructed. In front of the State House we will be pulling up the bricks and relaying them because the slope of the ramp is not incompliance with ADA Standards. Today there is no walkway in that area around The Green. On the left side of The Green you have the walkway that goes all the way around and there is roughly a six (6) or seven (7) foot wide grass strip or planting strip between the curb and the sidewalk and the trees are planted around the edge. They are going to continue the historic pattern that would provide connectivity to various buildings as you move around the space. Because there are steps in that location and the slopes are incorrect, they will try to make it as clean and elegant as possible and still be incompliance with Building Codes and ADA Regulations.

Mr. Cassidy stated that in terms of the bigger project there will be a Promenade connection that will be a new brick walkway that will take you from The Green to Federal Street. It will be strictly for pedestrians no vehicles.

Mr. Scrafford questioned how would he stop the vehicles? Responding to Mr. Scrafford, Mr. Cassidy replied with bollards. Mr. Scrafford questioned if they were removable bollards? Responding to Mr. Scrafford, Mr. Cassidy replied yes.

Mr. McDaniel questioned if the bollards would go where the existing walkway is located? Responding to Mr. McDaniel, Mr. Cassidy replied no, it will go in the center of the right-of-way. There are existing light poles in the area that will remain on either side illuminating the walkway.

Mr. Fisher questioned if the walkway would be further south? Responding to Mr. Fisher, Mr. Cassidy replied yes, it will be center line of the right-of-way.

Mr. Cassidy stated that they will be using real brick pavers.

Mr. McDaniel questioned if they were doing the parking lot behind the O'Neil Building? Responding to Mr. McDaniel, Mr. Cassidy replied that in order to extend the walkway out they need to remove the entrance from Federal Street. Once that is done, you can no longer have the parking lot function as a one way parking lot. The new entrance and exit from the parking lot will be to the south. The number of parking spaces will remain the same.

Mr. McDaniel questioned who uses the parking lot? Responding to Mr. McDaniel, Mr. Slavin replied that there are two reserved spaces for the Supreme Court and two reserved spaces for people who work in the O'Neil Building, one (1) for Counsel, one (1) for the Analysis Center, four (4) handicap spaces, and eight (8) unassigned spaces.

Mr. Scrafford questioned if the base bid line includes out into the curb and if any work will be done in that area or is all the work behind the curb line. Responding to Mr. Scrafford, Mr. Cassidy replied that there are three (3) locations and there is no accessible curb cut ramp to come in off the street to any of the area. There are depressed curb cuts today in the area, but they don't go anywhere. The walkways were never built.

Mr. Scrafford questioned if it was the Blue Mountain Stone curb with the four (4) or six (6) foot length? Responding to Mr. Scrafford, Mr. Cassidy replied that currently the entire curb line along the edge is concrete. They will be saw cutting it in a few places to put the new depressed curbs areas in to make the excess ways. When it gets replaced the area will also be concrete. They had talked about the possibility of doing all out of granite, but when we looked at the area there is no elegant way to end it. If you take the granite around you would never get back to the granite, you would only run into concrete. There is concrete everywhere. Therefore, they are matching what is there.

Mr. Fisher questioned if currently the walk out from the Supreme Court building just went to the curb and that there is no ramp? Responding to Mr. Fisher, Mr. Cassidy replied that is correct. There will be three (3) areas of depressed curbs. If you are disabled you will be able to get in off the street regardless of the location.

Mr. Fisher questioned if they would need to redo the extension to the Biggs Museum as part of the walkway? Responding to Mr. Fisher, Mr. Cassidy replied that there will be an extension and they will be connecting to the existing walkway that is remaining to the Biggs Museum. Mr. Fisher questioned if it would all be brick until you get to the steps? Responding to Mr. Fisher, Mr. Cassidy replied yes.

Mr. McDaniel stated The Green is a treasure of Dover. When you come to The Green there are no street signs that state The Green. When you turn off of State Street towards The Green either direction there is only a one way sign. The only sign that states The Green is when you come from west to east at the Bank Lane intersection.

Mr. Scrafford stated that there were a lot of problems with signage in the past when they did State Street and The Green and trying to arrive at signs that were acceptable to the State of Delaware, the Historic District, and the City of Dover.

Mr. Slavin stated that part of our historic preservation concerns is not just about the building environment, but also the archeological environment. They have tested these sites and we know that there are some sensitive areas. They will have monitoring during the construction. Part of our

vision for the area which may not be in the Historic District Commission's jurisdiction is a more safe and meaningful cross over on Federal Street where the long sidewalk will be terminated. The other vision is the circle in front of the Biggs Museum. It is not of the highest utility and they feel that they could reconfigure it into more of a civic space that you typically see around an Art Museum.

Mr. Scrafford questioned if there was a plan regarding the circle in the past? Responding to Mr. Scrafford, Mr. McDaniel replied that when the Downtown Dover group did their parking lot it was supposed to be supervised.

Mr. Slavin stated that he thought the project was a great plan.

Mr. Scrafford stated that the area needs to be more user friendly.

Mr. Scrafford questioned what type of impact does the depressed sidewalk have on parking? Are we losing parking spaces around the area because you now have handicap access from the curb cuts? Responding to Mr. Scrafford, Mr. Cassidy replied that there will probably be a net loss of one (1) space. That is something that they will have to coordinate with the City in terms of how that area get line striped. It is at their discretion to either elect to respect those as areas where people are not to park or whether or not they would just allow people to park there.

Mr. Scrafford questioned if they would ask for handicap parking on The Green in the vicinity of the depression? Responding to Mr. Scrafford, Mr. Cassidy replied at the discretion of the City. We will continue to have discussions with the City and make some recommendations of how it could work. Also responding, Mr. Fisher replied that there is handicap parking on one side.

Mr. Fisher questioned that there was nothing that could prevent the City of having a handicap parking space in front of the building? Responding to Mr. Fisher, Mr. Cassidy replied correct because it is their right-of-way.

(*This project was an informational presentation to the Commission and did not require formal action.)*

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

Meeting adjourned at 4:19 PM

Sincerely,

Maretta Savage- Purnell
Maretta Savage- Purnell
Secretary

We're Here to Help!
Another Year of Workshops and Training for Delaware's Historic Commissions

Preservation Delaware continues its commitment to provide ongoing training to members and staff of Delaware's historic commissions. Once again, PDI is extremely fortunate to partner with one of Delaware's Certified Local Governments Thanks to the City of Lewes and their efforts in securing a Certified Local Government grant, we will offer a series of free-of-charge or discounted workshops. Please plan to attend this 2012/2013 series. Your participation is important so that the network of Delaware's nine historic commissions can continue to grow.

You may remember that at the organizational meeting of Delaware's historic commissions in Odessa we asked you to tell us the biggest challenges you've faced as historic commission members/staff. We also asked you to indicate topics and issues you wanted to see addressed. We have taken your suggestions and developed a very strong offering that will help you do your jobs even better than you already do.

Please put the following on your calendars. More details to follow

Call Preservation Delaware at 302-322-7100 or email admin@preservationde.org to register for any and all of these workshops.

Using Substitute Materials on Historic Buildings. Yes or No?
and
Painting Historic Buildings: Best Practices

Presenter: Steve Jordan, Contributing Editor, *Old House Journal*

Saturday, October 27, 2012

Substitute Materials
9.30 to 11:30 p.m.
Best Paint Practices:
1:00 to 3:30 p.m

Net House
Lewes Canalfront Park
Lewes, Delaware
Free for Delaware's Historic Commissions and Local Government Officials
$15 for both workshops - Preservation Delaware members
$25 for both workshops - non-members

****

Windows, When to Repair and When to Replace: Dispelling the Myths

Presenter: Steve Jordan, Contributing Editor, *Old House Journal*

Sunday, October 28, 2012
12:30 to 5:00 p.m.
Brecknock Park
Camden, Delaware
$15 for Delaware's Historic Commissions, members of Preservation Delaware and Friends of Historic Camden
$25 for non-members

****

Connecting with Your Community: Communication, Education and Outreach

Presenters:
Karen Theimer Brown, Director, Maryland Association of Historic District Commissions
Elizabeth Beckley, Eastern Shore Field Director for Preservation Maryland

Saturday, November 17, 2012
9.30 a m. to 12:30 p.m
Biggs Museum of American Art
Sewell's Studio
406 Federal Street
Dover, DE 19901

Free for Delaware's Historic Commissions and Local Government Officials

****

Design Review: Are You Keeping Up with the Times?
and
"Connecting with Your Community" Follow-Up

Presenters:
Sharon Kennedy, Chair, Annapolis Historic Preservation Commission
Karen Theimer Brown, Director, Maryland Association of Historic District Commissions

Saturday, March 9, 2013
9.30 a.m. to 2.00 p.m.
Buttonwood School & Community Hall
111 Buttonwood Avenue
New Castle, DE 19720

Free for Delaware's Historic Commissions and Local Government Officials

These workshops other than the window workshop at Brecknock are sponsored by the City of Lewes in partnership with Preservation Delaware through a Certified Local Government grant Our thanks to the Welfare Foundation for supporting the window workshop

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.*