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