CITY OF DOVER HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
REVISED AGENDA
THURSDAY, January 19, 2012 - 3:00 P.M.
City Hall – Conference Room

ROLL CALL

APPROVAL OF AGENDA
APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF MEETING on December 15, 2011

COMMUNICATIONS & REPORTS

1. Summary of Applications 2009-2011

2. Summary of Architectural Review Certifications for 2011

OLD BUSINESS

1. Finalization of Letter pertaining to Role of Historic District Commission

NEW BUSINESS

1. Request for Extension of Architectural Review Certification:
    a. HI-11-01 Building at 326 West Loockerman Street: Building Demolition – Request for one year extension of the Architectural Review Certification granted on February 17, 2011 to allow Demolition of the existing commercial building at 326 West Loockerman Street. The property consists of one parcel of land zoned C-2 (Central Commercial Zone) and subject to the H (Historic District Zone) and SWPOZ (Source Water Protection Overlay Zone). The property is located on the southeast corner of West Loockerman Street and South Queen Street. The owner of record is Dover Realty I. The property address is 326 West Loockerman Street. Tax Parce1: ED-05-077.09-01-74.00-000.

2. Review of Building Permit Referred to Commission:
    a. HI-12-01 Building Permit #12-0018 for Frankfurt Bakery at 323 South Governors Avenue – Referral by the City Planner to the Historic District Commission for Review of Architectural Review Certification for Building Permit application #12-0018 for an exterior renovation project to the existing one story building and site improvements. Property Owner: AJ Bakery LLC. Tax Parcel: ED-05-077.09-04-46.00-000.

ONGOING PROJECTS

1. Project to Evaluate and Update the "*Design Standards and Guidelines for the City of Dover Historic District Zone*"

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
DECEMBER 15, 2011

The Regular Meeting of the City of Dover Historic District Commission was held on Thursday, December 15, 2011 at 3:00 PM with Chairman Scrafford presiding. Members present were Col. Scrafford, Mr. McDaniel, Mr. Fisher, and Mr. Salkin. Mr. Jackson was absent.

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

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

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

ADOPTION OF MINUTES OF THE REGULAR HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION MEETING OF OCTOBER 20, 2011

Mr. Salkin moved to approve the minutes of the Regular Historic District Commission meeting of October 20, 2011, seconded by Mr. McDaniel and the motion was unanimously carried 4-0 with Mr. Jackson absent.

COMMUNICATIONS & REPORTS

Meeting and Deadline Schedule for 2012

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that your meetings will remain on the third Thursday of the month beginning at 3:00 PM. The application filing deadlines are also listed.

Mrs. Melson-Williams further stated that an item that was placed on your desk today is a training opportunity by the Institute of Public Administration at the University of Delaware. They run a series of these training seminars and January's training opportunity is "Planning 101: Planning for your Communities Future." This is a morning class that will be held at the Paradee Center. The topics of these training sessions are broader on zoning and land use; however, it is related to what this Commission does.

OLD BUSINESS

DISCUSSION OF ROLE OF HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

Review of Draft Resolution/Letter pertaining to Role of Historic District Commission

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that the Planning Staff received this letter this morning so you may wish to pursue it or peruse it at your leisure or you can make changes today or defer it to another meeting.

Mr. McDaniel questioned that if the Planning Staff received it today, who wrote it? Responding to Mr. McDaniel, Mr. Salkin stated that he drafted it at the request of the Commission from the last meeting. He was not sure if we were going to actually discuss it today as he thought there was only going to be three (3) members present.

Mr. McDaniel questioned if this was a timely matter that needed to be addressed today? Responding to Mr. McDaniel, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that you do not have to act on it today. The Legislative, Finance and Administration Committee for the City of Dover does not meet again until January 9, 2012.

Mr. McDaniel stated that he thought that the letter was fine and says what we want it to say.

Mr. McDaniel moved to submit the letter as written; however, he would like to see their names on it noting that Mr. Jackson was absent from the meeting and that the Commission would receive his concurrence on it, seconded by Mr. Fisher and the motion was unanimously carried 4-0 with Mr. Jackson absent.

NEW BUSINESS

ANNUAL MEETING OF HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSSION

Election of Chairman and Vice Chairman

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated according to the By-Laws each November is considered your Annual Meeting at which time you formally elect the officers of the Commission which is the Chairman and Vice-Chairman and appoint a Secretary which traditionally has been the Planning Office Staff.

Mr. McDaniel stated that his concern with Mr. Jackson remaining Vice-Chairman with him not being at this meeting is that the last time he was not present we unelected him from being Chairman.

Mr. McDaniel moved to nominate Mr. Richard Scrafford as Chairman and Mr. Charles Salkin as Vice-Chairman, seconded by Mr. Fisher.

Mr. Fisher moved to close the nomination of officers, seconded by Mr. McDaniel and the motion was unanimously carried 4-0 with Mr. Jackson absent.

Mr. Fisher moved to approve the nominations by acclamation, seconded by Mr. McDaniel and the motion was unanimously carried 4-0 with Mr. Jackson absent.

Mr. McDaniel stated that the Planning Staff will act as the Secretary to the Commission.

Building at 22-24 West Loockerman Street – Presentation of Information on the proposed Renovation project to the existing building at 22-24 West Loockerman Street owned by the Downtown Dover Partnership. The renovation project involves proposed changes to the Loockerman Street façade, changes to the North Street façade, and interior renovations to divide the building into multiple spaces. Certain portions of the project are eligible for administrative review of Architectural Review Certification during the Building Permit process; however, other project aspects may require submission of an application for Architectural Review Certification review by the Historic District Commission. *The Historic District Commission requested an informational presentation on this project as it is being designed and planned.*

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that because Mr. McDaniel is a member of the Downtown Dover Partnership who is the property owner for this item, he could remain in his seat. We can deal with recusal later if necessary.

Mr. McDaniel asked that questions not be directed at him as there was ample representation from the Downtown Dover Partnership that was present at the meeting.

Representatives: Mrs. Arden Bardol, Becker Morgan Group, Inc.; and Mr. Bill Neaton, Executive Director of Downtown Dover Partnership.

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that included in your packet is a memo and then a series of three (3) colored drawings. The building renovation project located at 22-24 W. Loockerman Street on your agenda today is presented for informational purposes. Back in your meeting in October there was some questions raised regarding what was going on with the property. At that point, Staff reached out to the design professionals working on the project and requested an information submission to bring to the Commission. The memo that is included in your packet outlines the chronology to date.

Mrs. Melson-Williams further stated that staff has met with the project architect to discuss the building renovation project on several occasions. From the Historic District Commission standpoint, the property is located within the Historic District Zone and as such, any changes to the exterior or affecting the exterior of the building are subject to Architectural Review Certification. The *Zoning Ordinance* outlines the process and procedures for achieving Architectural Review Certification. There are basically three ways. One way is through the Building Permit application where Staff reviews the Architectural Review Certification. The second way is for certain types of projects that are specified in the *Zoning Ordinance* where a formal application to the Historic District Commission is made and reviewed by this Commission and takes final action on the Architectural Review Certificate. The third way is a project that is of a much larger scale typically those involving new construction of new buildings and requires a formal application to the Historic District Commission which makes a recommendation and the final action occurs at the Planning Commission for the Architectural Review Certification.

Mrs. Melson-Williams further stated that the meetings that Staff held with the design professional have determined that the front façade part of the project would be eligible for a Building Permit submission during which Staff could review the Architectural Review Certification. The *Zoning Ordinance* allows for Staff to do that review for specific classes of Building Permits including fences, siding, signs, window and door replacement, roofing and the addition or placement of decorative features, minor demolition, residential additions, and other construction of a minor nature that may be issued by the City Planner's as part of the Building Permit process. Staff felt that what we were hearing for the proposed project for the Loockerman Street side of the building clearly could be done by Staff through Building Permit review.

Mrs. Melson-Williams further stated that the other parts of the project for the building also involve what is the rear or the North Street façade. The project as described to Staff involves new door and window openings, new exterior finishes, and changes to the wall itself on that side of the building. Again, Planning Staff felt that if was certainly eligible for Architectural Review Certification through the Building Permit process; however, Staff anticipated referring the permit to the

Commission for your consultation which the *Zoning Ordinance* allows us to do. Staff felt that the project scope, while still relatively minor, did involve some new elements; however, did not reach the level of a full scale application to this Commission.

Mrs. Melson-Williams further stated that there has not been a Building Permit filed and this comes to you as an informational item. If the Commission is comfortable with the feedback and discussion that is held today, Staff will utilize that in our review of the permit should it come in for both faces of the building both the Loockerman Street side as well as the North Street side of the building which Staff would, in a different process, anticipate bringing to the Commission.

Mrs. Melson-Williams further stated that the interior of the building, while it is important to understand what is happening on the outside, is not in the purvue of this Commission.

Mrs. Bardol stated that this past Monday they submitted a Building Permit. The construction documents are done, the project has been bid, and the Partnership is anxious to move forward with the project. A map indicating the project was provided and explained by Mrs. Bardol. On the Loockerman Street side of the building currently has two storefront areas, one of which is more open than the other with two sets of doorways. Their plan is to keep all the existing remaining brick on the façade and at the header point, remove the entire storefront that is down below. The plan is then to infill keeping two (2) distinct storefront areas. Infill would be with a setback from the street similar to what it is in the existing condition with two (2) entry doors and storefront systems. The Bel Boutique store has a recessed door and a storefront that is out from the face of the façade of the building and that is what our intent would be here. They would also have some type of decorative element that would be an applied treatment that would be out of the EIFS (Exterior Insulation Finishing System) that allows an area for two (2) distinct signage locations on the front of the building.

Mr. Salkin questioned if these doors are recessed? Responding to Mr. Salkin, Mrs. Bardol stated that this is correct.

Mr. Salkin further questioned for the building area located to the right on this project, the western storefront, is this what that building looked like when it was originally built or did it have a completely different front with a single entrance? He was wondering what was there when it was built. Responding to Mr. Salkin, Mr. Neaton stated that it was W.T. Grant's back then and probably had one entrance. As you walked through this door on the west side there were doublewide stairs going down to the basement.

Mr. Scrafford questioned if there is a common egress on the east side that is accessed from the east set of doorways. Where is that door in your plans? Responding to Mr. Scrafford, Mrs. Bardol stated that on the diagonal piece of the drawing there will be another door rather than a fixed plate of glass with the intent that it will blend in with the design.

Mr. Salkin stated that the east storefront would not have a display window. Responding to Mr. Salkin, Mrs. Bardol stated that all it would have is small display light.

Mr. Salkin questioned the reason for using EIFS rather than just mounting something or is there a reason to physically attach this permanently to the brick as opposed to putting up something that could be taken down later and something put in its place without destroying the original fabric? Responding to Mr. Salkin, Mr. Neaton stated that given what the future of the building is or that it may potentially be, your comment is well founded because they may not want to do that. This is something, without committing to agree to, they should probably change to a temporary fixture as it may hamper them in the future development of this building. This is something that they will take under advisement.

Mrs. Bardol stated that with regards to the back of the building along North Street comprehensively, this project was looked at as part of the Downtown Dover Partnership work that was involved with the charette process with the MPO (Metropolitan Planning Organization) which was a study of Downtown. This is one of the projects that was included in that study. The North Street Corridor was suggested to be improved. With this back façade, it is setback from the street pretty far; however, it is also a downtrodden elevation as it faces onto North Street. The notion was to try and improve the visual aspects of the North Street Corridor. The proposal on the back side of the building is to take the same vocabulary that is being done on the front of the building and match as closely as possible a brick to the front to create a larger entry piece and then to re-skin the exterior. The notion would be to apply an EIFS color with a scored texture pattern and then punch some windows into that to allow light into that space.

Mr. Scrafford stated that there are not many architectural features on the North Street side of the building. Responding to Mr. Scrafford, Mr. Neaton stated that what the Charette recommended was along the North Street corridor that we attempt to make the backs of the buildings look more like the fronts of the building and we will be the first project to do that. What also disappeared in this project are the communication poles.

Mr. Scrafford further questioned what the access road would become between the fence on the left and the parking lot on the right? Responding to Mr. Scrafford, Mr. Neaton stated that they picture in the future as having some sort of canopy entrance way going back to that building.

Mrs. Bardol stated that as part of the Charette process and with the design concepts that were presented, we are really trying to improve North Street.

Mr. Fisher questioned if there would be any parking? Responding to Mr. Fisher, Mr. Neaton stated that there would be no parking necessary as you will see in the next presentation directly across the street they are going to reconfigure the entire parking lot so that there will be ample parking for this building.

Mr. Scrafford questioned if there is a tenant space #3 that can be accessed from Loockerman Street or just from North Street? Responding to Mr. Scrafford, Mr. Neaton stated that currently it will be both.

Mr. Scrafford stated that you have the common egress area that could be used as an access to a tenant #3 and you also have the back to be used as an access to tenant #3. Are you required or do you

intend to put any parking along that entrance so that people could get closer to the door or is your plan not to do that? Responding to Mr. Scrafford, Mr. Neaton stated that their plan is not to do that.

Mr. Fisher questioned with regards to deliveries, if a tenant needs a bulk delivery would that have to be done from across the street or from the street itself? Responding to Mr. Fisher, Mr. Neaton stated that it would have to be done from the street the same way that it is done now. We do not know who the tenants will be; however currently along Loockerman Street, most of the deliveries are from the front of the building.

Mr. Salkin asked if they could make a motion to encourage Staff to proceed upon their own based on the discussion today and then have a discussion at a later date on how we want to handle these projects procedurally.

Mr. Fisher moved that if there are no substantially changes that this Commission would formally approve of this project, seconded by Mr. Salkin and the motion was unanimously carried 3-0 with Mr. Jackson absent and Mr. McDaniel recusing himself because he is a member of the Board of the Downtown Dover Partnership which owns the property.

HI-11-05 North Street Area Improvement Project – Public Hearing and Review for Recommendation to the City of Dover Planning Commission on the Architectural Review Certificate for the North Street Area Improvement project. The project involves three project areas/phases consisting of the following: a parking lot consolidation project on the south side of North Street; streetscape improvements to the block of North Street between South State Street and South Governors Avenue; and the redevelopment a vacant area in the block between North Street and West Loockerman Street as a plaza with parking lot. The project area consists of multiple parcels of land totaling 4.1635 acres ± of land zoned C-2 (Central Commercial Zone) or RGO (General Residence and Office Zone) and subject to the H (Historic District Zone). The project area is focused on the segment of North Street between South State Street and South Governors Avenue and the area between West Loockerman Street and Bank Lane. The owners of record include Rudolph von Croy c/o Colonial Investment & Management, Delaware State Housing Authority, Collegian Plaza Hospitality Group II LLC, and the City of Dover; the equitable owner (for certain parcels) is the Downtown Dover Partnership. The property addresses include 114, 116, 120, 126 and 128 West Loockerman Street; 100, 104, 106, and 119 West North Street; 309 South Governors Avenue; and 16 and 22-26 The Green. Tax Parcels: ED-05-077.09-04-32.00-000, ED-05-077.09-04-06.00-000, ED-05-077.09-04-31.00-000, ED-05-077.09-04-30.00-000, ED-05-077.09-04-08.00-000, ED-05-077.09-04-09.00-000, ED-05-077.09-04-43.00-000, ED-05-077.09-04-42.00-000, ED-05-077.09-04-51.01-000, ED-05-077.09-04-53.00-000, ED-05-077.09-04-53.01-000, ED-05-077.09-04-07.00-000, ED-05-077.09-04-50.00-000 and ED-05-077.09-04-54.00-000.

Representatives: Mrs. Arden Bardol, Becker Morgan Group Inc., Mrs. Kristen Conway, Century Engineering; and Mr. Jonathan Street, Becker Morgan Group, Inc.

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that this is an application that was filed with the Historic District Commission and regarding this situation you are on recommendation to the Planning Commission for this application. Per your By-Laws, Mr. McDaniel has a conflict of interest because he is a property owner within 200 feet of the subject project and will rescues himself from this application.

He is also on the Board of the Downtown Dover Partnership who is one of the property owners. Mr. Jackson is also a property owner within 200 feet who is not present at today's meeting.

Mrs. Melson-Williams further stated that this was formally called the North Street Area Improvement Project. In the Staff report, it lists the fourteen (14) parcels that are involved in the project in total. This deals with an area that flanks North Street both to the north towards Loockerman Street and then on the south side of North Street as it progresses towards Bank Lane.

Mrs. Melson-Williams further stated that there are multiple property owners involved and there is also a mix of zoning for the properties as well. The Historic District Commission will make a recommendation with regards to the project to the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission is scheduled to hear this application on Monday of next week at their December meeting.

Mrs. Melson-Williams further stated that the project consists of three (3) project areas in phases and you may want to focus your discussions on those three (3) phases or areas to avoid confusion when we get to that point. The three (3) areas involve what we term the Loockerman Way parking lot and plaza. This is a redevelopment area; it is the vacant area of the block that is to the north of North West Street between it and Loockerman Street. It is a proposed development with a parking lot area and then a plaza area. The second project area is North Street itself. For North Street it is a streetscape project for the work within the right-of-way dealing with the street itself, sidewalk, and elements such as street lighting and utilities. The third piece of the project is what has been termed the North Street Parking Lot Consolidation and that is the area to the south of North Street that is held with multiple property owners and consists of a series of parking lots which are not interconnected at the present time. They hope to consolidate those into a much better functioning area with fewer entrances to the parking lot area.

Mrs. Melson-Williams further stated that provided in the Staff Report is some background. Previous applications in the area are listed and most of them are ones that deal with the block that fronts on Loockerman Street and how it became the vacant tract that it is today. Staff also provided some background history on the area from a series of historic maps. It has had a life of both commercial and residential in this area. The project areas themselves fall into two National Register Historic Districts. Part of it is in the Victorian Dover Historic District and the remaining area is within the Dover Green Historic District of the National Register.

Mrs. Melson-Williams further stated focusing on your *Design Standards and Guidelines* you would be looking to judge this project against the discussions which occur in Chapter 3 which deal with the *Design Guidelines* for landscaping and site amenities, paving and bordering, and parking lots. Specifically, your consideration deals with how you treat areas surrounding buildings and dealing with choices of materials. Specifically with parking lots, the *Design Standards and Guidelines* talk about screening it from the street and a landscaping percentage occurring in the area to help mitigate the paved area surface.

Mrs. Melson-Williams further stated as part of the Staff report there is a series of comments and recommendations and we can discuss any concerns regarding those towards the end.

Mrs. Bardol stated that she would provide some history and background beyond what information has already been provided. As part of the MPO (Metropolitan Planning Organization) Study that was done for the Downtown area, this specific project, the North Street Corridor, the parking lot, and the vacant lot were all looked at and there were concepts for them. The thrust of the project in terms of North Street was to try to extend all of the improvements that have been done on State Street further up North Street to make North Street start to feel like a gateway to the Downtown as opposed to a back alley.

Mrs. Bardol further stated that currently, the City as part of one of their projects has done some improvements on the south side of North Street where they have replaced light poles. There is a sidewalk on that side of the street. On the north side backing up to the project we just showed you, there is no sidewalk in that area so the notion was to improve the pedestrian experience along North Street. The next project that was discussed as part of the MPO Study was that if Downtown could start to take lots of series of small parking lots and consolidate them into one larger lot that reconfiguration may yield more parking without actually increasing land and impervious surface area. In this particular case, that was the result by consolidating and co-mingling circulation patterns and parking spaces. Within the land area that was available we were able to increase the parking in this area as well as eliminate a series of driveways that occur along North Street and now only have two (2) driveways.

Mrs. Bardol further stated that there is a proposal to provide some crosswalks. The third project is the vacant lot and on that lot it creates a pedestrian plaza park as well as to augment some parking. On behalf of the Downtown Dover Partnership when they were looking at this particular project, the thought process was that in the future it would be nice to design this plaza so that if the Partnership had an interest in developing buildings on this land in any fashion, that there were areas available to do so in a useable fashion. There are useable footprints available which are why you see a picture of the plaza running straight through on the Loockerman Street side; however, it shifts over to the corner for a number of reasons. One of which was to get a clear connection and landing point at the large parking lot and to also provide some sort of automatic payment system if the City wants to pursue something of that nature so that you would pay out at the landing point which would be clear for the visitors on where you pay and that there is also a clear connection on how you cross North Street. State Street has pavers on it and Loockerman Street has pavers on the sidewalks and Governors Avenue that is a main thoroughfare with a lot of activity going on. North Street is culminating with a terminus at the Townsend Building and then heads out in the other direction towards Eden Hill.

Mr. Street stated that he would speak regarding the parking lot itself. The plan for this consolidated parking lot is with seven (7) different parking lots in this area currently with two (2) different owners. Their thought is to take the existing parking area, the existing paving, to not necessarily overstep our bounds, more of where the paving lines are up next to what is the Delaware State Housing Authority and some residences and make it publicly accessible; however, sticking in those same lines. Some of the pavement lines will be cleaned up. This looks like a lot of paving and when you look at it in this format, it really is. Shown on the map in shaded areas are the existing areas that are not paved which are about and extra 1,300 square feet. The total lot size is 70,000 square feet +/-. It is a rather large existing area of impervious surface and we are only 1,300 square feet of additional paving which is cleaning up those lines and making them straight. We will also be providing a connection with Bank Lane. There are five (5) entrance and exiting points currently on

North Street. They are reducing that to two (2): one main entrance and exit and then one entrance and exit at Bank Lane. We are creating a right-out exit onto North Street towards the Schwartz Center. We felt this was best for traffic flow. They did not want to create a left hand turn out onto State Street and have a waiting time.

Mr. Fisher questioned if central pay would be located at each entrance? Responding to Mr. Fisher, Mr. Street stated that currently, that is being worked out. We are working out the agreement between the Delaware State Housing Authority and Von Croy which owns five (5) of the parcels with the Delaware State Housing Authority owning two (2). This project cannot move forward unless that agreement is agreed upon by both parties.

Mr. Neaton stated that they are not sure how they are going to handle the payment on those parking spaces currently. Currently, the spaces that the Partnership administers are all permit spaces. Whether it be permit and daily parking are permit only, they have not made that determination.

Mr. Street stated that the Water Street lot previously had two (2) central kiosks where all the spaces were numbered and then you paid according the space which could be one option for this parking lot rather than having a gate at each entrance. Responding to Mr. Street, Mr. Neaton stated that it would be preferable if we had a central kiosk.

Mr. Street further stated that their intention regarding sidewalks within each of the projects would match what the Downtown currently uses for both State Street and Loockerman Street. There is a small network of sidewalks in the parking lot. At Loockerman Way we have thirty-five (35) spaces that would fall under the same permitting process. There will essentially be a pathway connecting both projects and Loockerman Street. They are also honoring the agreement that currently the Golden Fleece has with a five (5) foot access way to either Loockerman Street or North Street.

Mr. Scrafford questioned with regards to property acquisitions what are you going to own? Responding to Mr. Scrafford, Mr. Neaton stated that they currently own five (5) of the seven (7) parcels. There is a sliver of land within these parcels that the City currently owns. The Downtown Dover Partnership has written a letter to the City Manager asking that this be declared excess and that it be forward to City Council with consideration that this sliver of land be deeded to the Downtown Dover Partnership.

Mr. Scrafford further questioned what they owned on the south side of North Street? Responding to Mr. Scrafford, Mr. Neaton stated that they will not own any of those parcels. We will have easement agreements. The draft easement agreement was received in his office today for review and will be sent back to our attorney with suggestions for any changes.

Mrs. Conway stated that along North Street, the utilities will be placed underground by the City of Dover. Everything will be located within the existing right-of-way throughout this area.

Mr. Scrafford questioned if everyone was comfortable with the North Street right-of-way? There has always been a concern regarding the size of the right-of-way for North Street. Responding to Mr. Scrafford, Mr. Street stated that there was only one thing that came up when they were going

through the deed research and that was by the Schwartz Center. It was researched and we believe that everyone was comfortable.

Mrs. Conway stated that the existing roadway width will stay the same along with curbing remaining the same.

Mr. Scrafford questioned if the street lighting shown will be the plan? Responding to Mr. Scrafford, Mr. Street stated that yes it will be. There are currently eight (8) poles out there

Mrs. Conway stated on North Street regarding the crosswalks, they show them as the brick paver crosswalks and they are tossing around how they will be maintaining them. There is also the option of stamping concrete.

Mr. Salkin stated that you mentioned 1,300 square feet of additional paving which would all be asphalt. How does this compare to the planters and the green space that is there, is this greener? Responding to Mr. Fisher, Mr. Street stated that no, it is 1,300 square feet less green. There are still planters in and among that.

Mr. Fisher further questioned if they would be required to provide any drainage for those planters? Responding to Mr. Fisher, Mr. Street stated that currently, what they are thinking is that currently, the parking lot is a ridge where everything either goes to North Street or it comes back and drains. There are existing systems within our parking lot and within the rear parking lot. Everything currently either drains to Bank Lane or off of their own properties. We are planning on holding that same drainage pattern to not overload any systems. When you are talking about 1,300 square feet of 70,000 square feet area, we do not feel like it would be a large impact to anyone of those areas.

Mr. Salkin stated that for the parking lot in your Partnership area you do not show any handicap parking does that mean there will actually be fewer spaces? Responding to Mr. Salkin, Mr. Street stated no. The space count for the application is with handicap spaces. The handicap spaces were not shown on the graphics. We have two (2) handicap spaces located on one side of the parking and six (6) or eight (8) located on the other side. The Delaware State Housing Authority has one (1) handicap parking space and he has talked to them on whether or not they would need that closer to the back of their building and if it was for one of their employees. They did not seem to be concerned about it.

Mr. Salkin further stated that you made reference to the Golden Fleece Tavern. Previously, in an earlier meeting here we had a discussion regarding a fence along the western side of this property (the fence at the back door to the tavern.) There was considerable discussion regarding it and the Commission members agreed to recommend an exception to whatever the standard was because it was temporary. Will everything get cleaned up when this property is cleaned up? He is wondering what both sides of this property are going to look like and is any of that going to be dealt with or is this going to be an ugly fence? Responding to Mr. Fisher, Mrs. Bardol stated that the intent with the design was that this fence would come down and that there would be some sort of lower fence more for keeping the people that are in the Golden Fleece drinking alcohol and eating in there visually creating a barrier; however, to open up this space. The longer big picture is that if other activities do occur there is a lot more synergy happening in activity rather than this wall.

Mr. Salkin further questioned Staff if this was something that would have to come back to this Commission? Responding to Mr. Salkin, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that the Golden Fleece came through as a permit referral because they were putting a fence in place that was taller than the recommended standard in the Historic District which is four (4) feet in height and this fence is more like five (5) feet six (6) inches. If they lower it so that their patrons can view the plaza they would have to ensure that this is going to work with the *Design Standards and Guidelines.* It is a painted wood fence currently.

Mrs. Bardol stated that the other thing that was not covered too much in detail is two-fold. We talked a little about the crosswalks and she feels that it would be good to get some general feedback regarding those crosswalks. The crosswalks, in an ideal world would be nice, we thought, to have the crosswalks to have pavers similar to what is currently located on State Street.

Mr. Street stated that we would try to match the paver colors to what is located on State Street; however, those pavers have been in place for some time now and these pavers will look newer.

Mrs. Bardol stated from an aesthetic point of view this is where we started out. When we started to think about maintenance ability and how it would be constructed. What happens is that the pavers located on State Street wrap up around the corner and the proposal that we have for North Street is for asphalt. When you introduce asphalt with some sort of barrier buffer between the asphalt to get to the pavers, the movement could be an issue especially during snow removal.

Mr. Fisher questioned if they could do a stamp rather than actual pavers to avoid that issue? Responding to Mr. Fisher, Mrs. Bardol stated that this was their next proposal because to actually delineate these crosswalks by doing some sort of stamped pattern at those crosswalks so that it is clear that it is different.

Mr. Salkin stated that you have raised the question regarding color of the pavers and he does not have strong enough feelings to make a recommendation; however, when he looks at the drawings and thinks about what Downtown looks like, he is not sure why this should be red brick at all. You show a new design for North Street that really does not speak to red brick, Federal, or Colonial; it is fairly modern or a turn of the century. There is nothing about this area that really speaks to brick at least from his experience. He is not recommending something in its place; however, it seems to him if you are trying to create a new standard with a modern look in a Historic District, some of these other colors might be more appropriate. He personally does not have any objection to moving away from red brick. Have you given consideration to any other color or are we just going to have more and more red brick sidewalks everywhere in the community even if there is no history of it?

Responding to Mr. Salkin, Mrs. Bardol stated that in terms of where the red brick came from, one of the properties does have a lot of red brick on the sidewalk into the driveway. We were not tying into that specifically; however, it was more a notion of trying to expand and be consistent with what the Historic District is so the red brick does speak to that. From a cost perspective on Loockerman Street, we have a combination of concrete and pavers so it would be a lot less expensive to do concrete and have some accent areas of brick that would be acceptable. In this plaza area, we have looked at both pavers and stamped concrete and both of them have a variety of complimentary paver colors. The thought is in the plaza areas we would have a combination of concrete that is scored and

then some different paver colors. Paver samples were shown. We are not suggesting all three of these; however, that it be either the dark and something a little lighter or the dark and the brown. We are looking to see if this Commission had a preference for this.

Mr. Fisher stated that they are constantly told that they are not to deal with color.

Mr. Salkin stated that he does not feel that they need to deal with color. He feels that the design professionals could deal with that. There have been a number of times that they go with the red brick because we somehow think red brick is Dover's appropriate historic color and sometimes he feels that we have done that inappropriately. He does not have any objection to what you propose. If it is red he is fine with it; he is just trying to find out if there had been discussion on alternatives.

Mrs. Bardol stated that if this Commission would be okay with a combination of concrete and some brick accents this would certainly be something they could entertain or brick with concrete accents.

Mr. Scrafford stated that he does not have a problem with the architectural approach to the street and not a confined approach to the street. By this Commission having a rule, you are confined with what you can do. By this Commission being open, he would leave it to you to address this from an architectural standpoint not from a fixed platform.

Mr. Salkin stated that he is open to alternatives; however, he would want to see the final alternative. When it comes to colors we do not want to police that; however, when it comes to design and a new standard for a whole section of town, he feels that this Commission should see that.

Mrs. Bardol questioned if they were to keep what they have with the red brick would you be good with that? Responding to Mrs. Bardol, Mr. Scrafford stated is there anything that you think adds more character to what it is we are trying to do without adding more expense.

Mr. Street stated that if you want to go with something other than complete red brick, is this something that would be a cursory review or would it be something that would have to go through another application? Responding to Mr. Street, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that it would not be another application. It could potentially come back as more of an informational item since they have tossed that idea out there to you. If it was something very drastic, Staff would most certainly be bringing it forward.

Mr. Scrafford opened a public hearing.

Mr. Joe McDaniel – Property Owner on The Green – Stated that as a citizen and member of this Commission, Mr. Jackson and I have talked about stamped concrete and how ugly it is on The Green. There are certain areas where there is stamped fake brick and to hear the talk of let's get some concrete and score it makes him nauseous. He is violently against it. They are leaning towards what is currently on Loockerman Street. Avoid the stone pavers that people trip over and you can't really walk on around the trees. The stamped concrete is something that he would caution you against approving as it does not seem to be appropriate. He would guess that you would have to have stamped concrete in the streets even though you do not have it now with the way that you are

talking. He does not want to run the cost up on this project; however, he does realize that this is not a Colonial area; however, he does feel that it should tie in. The fact that you came back to red brick sidewalks made him feel better about the project as he feels that this is the color that it should be.

Conny Malmberg – Nearby Property Own on the Green – Questioned if the curbing was all getting re-done along North Street or is the existing curbing being used? It would have to at least be done on one side of the street because you are doing curb cuts. Responding to Mr. Malmberg, Mrs. Conway stated that most of it would be improved. On the south side with the five entrances they would replace the entire thing.

Mr. Malmberg further question if the street would be dug up for utility purposes and be closed for a while? Responding to Mr. Malmberg, Mr. Street stated that for the replacement of utilities we will meet on Monday to talk with the City about placement of those utilities. There are already some existing buried electric lines, the rest of the lines are for communication.

Mr. Malmberg further questioned what the timeline would be as you stated that this would be done in three (3) phases. The parking lot depends on third party agreements. For the street within the right-of-way, what is the timeline regarding that? Responding to Mr. Malmberg, Mr. Street stated that everything is scheduled to move forward together. The three (3) phases speak just to the three (3) separate projects. If the street gets held up for something, it does not have to be done with everything else.

Mr. Neaton stated that it is referred to in phrases because that is the way that the funding came to us in three different phases with x amount of dollars for each phase.

Mr. Malmberg further questioned that on the Partnerships Plaza there are no physical structures planned at this time? Responding to Mr. Malmberg, Mr. Neaton stated not at this time. There is potential future development for that site but nothing currently.

Mr. Scrafford closed the public hearing after seeing no one else wishing to speak.

Mr. Street stated that his only question to Staff is the potential for historic archaeology resources and would you need us to contact them. The south side is currently a parking lot and we are not changing that. The north side was the Dover Hardware and the Dover Newsstand, Capitol Office, and a plaza area. Responding to Mr. Street, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that this is a typical advisory comment that we place any time there is a vacant tract of land. You may not know what was there previously because construction activities could discover these things. If you are using Federal money in your project in any way, shape, or form you are into Section 106 which could have archaeology implications associated with it which she does not believe that you are in this situation.

Mr. Neaton stated for informational purposes, we conducted a Phase II Environmental Study for the property as they were some indications afterwards from Phase I that they needed to move forward with Phase II so that has been done.

Mr. Salkin questioned if the applicant has any objections or concerns with the Staff comments and recommendations other than the question that was just asked? Responding to Mr. Salkin, Mr. Street stated that the only other question that was discussed with Mrs. Melson-Williams at the DAC meeting was that we have six (6) light fixtures that are being removed from part of the parking area. We have asked that we be able to reuse them towards the back towards the Delaware State Housing Authority building. We have had discussions with the Delaware State Housing Authority regarding the overall agreement and they have expresses concerns regarding lighting, security, among other things. Instead, in speaking to the cost of the project in which we only have a certain amount of money for the project, we have these light fixtures that are currently very efficient lighting for the parking lot and we could use those towards the back portion of the parking lot. The remainder of the parking lot, North Street, and the plaza area would all be this acorn style fixture. He is unsure whether the Commission would have any objections towards this.

Mr. Salkin questioned what the style of the lamp would be? Responding to Mr. Salkin, Mr. Street stated that it would be a square metal fixture that is a grey aluminum pole that would be inconsistent with the rest of the poles.

Mr. Scrafford and Mr. Salkin both expressed that they would rather not see a mix of colored poles in this lot. You would be detracting from the overall scheme of the project. If you were using something that was similar he would say yes. With regards to the stamped concrete that Mr. McDaniel referred to, he would have a hard time approving stamped concrete.

Mr. Fisher stated that the comment he made regarding putting pavers in the street and them moving, if you use stamped concrete you would not get movement. Responding to Mr. Fisher, Mr. Street stated that the street would be stamped as regular asphalt. Mrs. Bardol was speaking of scored concrete along part of the Plaza area not the stamped concrete.

Mr. Fisher and Mr. Scrafford both expressed the fact that they would not support stamped concrete.

Mrs. Bardol stated that she needed to comment on part of the idea of the reuse of the lighting fixtures in the parking lot that came from the whole funding allocations. This project has very tight funding and what she is concerned about is that those poles are expensive. She would hate for the parking lot not to happen because we could not afford to put new light fixtures in that entire lot.

Mr. Salkin questioned if a ballpark figure could be provided for the additional light fixtures? Responding to Mr. Salkin, Mr. Street stated that they can run anywhere from $10,000 to $15,000 for the complete fixture that includes the pole and the light.

Mr. Neaton stated that they could provide the costs associated with a new light fixture. We also need to find out how much light differential there would be between the new poles and the existing poles. There is concern from the Delaware State Housing Authority regarding security on that side and is where we were proposing to move the permanent fixtures to the back of the lot. Their concern was over the amount of light these smaller acorn fixtures would throw out. We will get all those figures together for this Commission.

Mr. Salkin stated that there may be some alternative type of lighting scheme that is not about lighting the parking lot; however lighting with a different type of fixture.

Mr. Salkin moved to approve forwarding to the Planning Commission a recommendation of approval of HI-11-05 North Street Area Improvement Project endorsing the comments and recommendations made by Staff, seconded by Mr. Fisher and the motion was unanimously carried 3-0 with Mr. Jackson absent and Mr. McDaniel recusing himself as he is a property owner within 200 feet of the subject property.

ON-GOING PROJECTS

Discussion of the Project to Evaluate and Update the "*Design Standards and Guidelines for the City of Dover Historic District Zone*"

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that Staff did not have anything regarding this subject at this time as she has not been working on it due to other responsibilities.

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

Meeting adjourned at 4:31 PM

Sincerely,

Diane Metsch
Secretary

City of Dover Historic District Commission
Summary of Applications 2009-2010
Updated as of January 2012

FILE#	PLAN NAME	LOCATION	TYPE	ACTION	STATUS
HI-09-01 S-10-06	Dover 'Anchor' Public Library	35 Loockerman Plaza: Adjacent to 15 East Loockerman Plaza	2 story 46,000 S.F. library building with site improvements	6/17/2009 HDC Recommendation of Approval with Conditions for ArchRevCert; 3/15/2010 PC Approval of Site Plan and ArchRevCert with Conditions	Final Plan Approval for Bid Pack A (Access Road to Innovation Way) 8/27/2010; Bid Pack A under construction December 2010 and completed May 2011 (Building Permit #11-444). Final Site Plan approval 3/18/2011. Ground Breaking Ceremony held 4/5/2011. Building Permit #10-1904 issued 4/26/2011. Construction underway; as of 10/1/2011 most structural steel is in place. Construction of exterior finishes (walls & roof) underway including brick masonry work as of Dec 2011.
HI-09-02	Fence Permit #09-1634 at new Golden Fleece Tavern	132 West Loockerman Street	Fence Construction along east property line at rear of building	10/6/09 Permit #09-1634 referred to HDC by City Planner for Architectural Review Certification; 10/15/2009 HDC Approval of ArchRevCert; Other building renovation activities covered under Permits #09-1420 for Exterior Finishes of East Elevation and #09-1388 Rear Patio. Permit #09-1634 issued 1/25/2010.	Fence Project Complete.
HI-09-03	Mitten & Winters Offices	117-119 West Loockerman Street	Front façade renovations: removal of buff brick and replacement of brick; pent roof; soffit; doors; window replacement	11/19/2009 HDC Approval with Conditions of ArchRevCert; Window Replacement ARC approval under Permit #09-1800 issued 10/27/09; Other building renovation activities covered under Permits #09-1592 issued 10/8/09 for Interior Renovation -CO issued and #09-1801 issued 10/27/09 for Rear Elevation.	Permit #09-2056 issued for Front Façade Renovations. Project Complete.
HI-09-04	Bayard Hotel	200-216 West Loockerman Street	Consideration of Demolition by Neglect	1/21/2010 HDC Determination of Demolition by Neglect and outlined required steps; 6/10/2010 HDC discussion on status, request return at July meeting; 7/15/2010 Update on status	Redevelopment application HI-10-08 filed. Building Documentation package of plans, elevations, photos received March 2011.
HI-10-01	Building at 301 South Governors Avenue	301 South Governors Avenue (southeast corner of North Street and S. Governors Ave.)	Consideration of Demolition by Neglect	6/10/2010 HDC Determination of Demolition by Neglect and outlined action to be taken within 90 days; 9/16/2010 Status Update indicates no action taken, HDC Recommends Building Inspector begin Dangerous Building proceedings with recommendation of repair. City Council declared it a Dangerous Building on 10/25/2010.	Building Inspections for asbestos completed -- requires asbestos removal. Building Demolished by order of City Council as a Dangerous Building. Demo Permit #11-143 issued 2/07/2011. Demolition complete.

City of Dover Historic District Commission
Summary of Applications 2009-2010
Updated as of January 2012

HI-10-02	Law Enforcement Officers Memorial	South side of Legislative Mall and north of William Penn Street	Memorial of brick plaza, inscribed wall and bronze statue	Information Item presented to HDC on 2/18/2010; Building Permit #10-245 issued.	Project Complete.
HI-10-03	Woodburn: Solar Panels	151 Kings Highway	Installation of Solar Panels on south facing gable roof of main house	3/18/2010 HDC Approval with Conditions. 3/17/2011 HDC granted extension of approval and heard presentation on revised project concept and change in location to roof of addition.	Building Permit #11-960 approved 8/8/2011. ArchRevCert completed by Staff.
HI-10-04	Wesley United Methodist Church: Elevator and Canopy Addition	209 South State Street	Addition of elevator tower and canopy on south side of sanctuary to improve accessibility; construct vehicular exit only onto S. State Street	4/15/2010 Inadequate Public Notice; 5/20/2010 HDC Review and Recommendation of Approval of ArchRevCert with Conditions	Final Plan Approval 1/14/2011. Building Permit #11-113 issued 4/29/2011. Construction underway.
HI-10-05 S-10-17	Duncan Plaza	600 Forest Street (Intersection of Loockerman, Kirkwood, and Slaughter Streets)	4 story 31,710 S.F. office building with coffeeshop	6/10/2010 HDC Review, action to approve setbacks, direct applicant to address Staff Recommendations and reappear for review of revisions; 7/15/2010 Revised Architecture presented to HDC, HDC Recommendation of Approval of ArchRevCert with Conditions; 9/20/2010 Planning Commission approval of Site Plan and ArchRevCert with conditions. 9/19/2011 PC granted one year extension.	Project must submit Check Prints of Site Plan for review and Final Plan Approval. No Action to date.
HI-10-06	Delaware Public Archives: Banner Program	121 Duke of York Street	Placement of six changeable banners using frame attachment system	8/19/2010 HDC Approval of ArchRevCert with conditions; Sign Permit #10-1912 issued 1/7/2011.	First set of Banners installed January 2011 (total of 5 banners)
HI-10-07	Building Permit #10-1263 Referral	408 South State Street	Replacement of Metal Roof	8/19/2010 HDC Approval of ArchRevCert with Conditions on the type of roof: wood shingle recommended for front	Building Permit #10-1263 issued on 11/15/2010. Wood shingle roof installed; Project complete.
HI-10-08 S-10-30	Bayard Plaza	200-216 West Loockerman Street and 208 South Governors Avenue	5 story 54,998 S.F. mixed use building with 5012 S.F. retail space and 48 residential apartments; requires demolition of existing buildings on property	10/21/2010 and 11/4/2010 HDC Review; 11/4/2010 HDC Recommendation of Approval with Conditions for ArchRevCert;11/15/2010 Planning Commission approval of ArchRevCert with Conditions; also BOA Application V-10-15 for parking setback and Active Rec Area reduction	Demo Permit #11-579 issued 5/12/2011 and demolition now complete. Final Plan approval granted 8/3/2011. Building Permit #11-656 issued. Construction underway: foundations, started structural steel in December 2011.
HI-10-09	Biggs Museum: Façade Renovations	406 Federal Street	Renovations to east elevation: moving glass curtain wall system and renovations to connector element	11/18/2010 HDC Approval of ArchRevCert with Conditions	Building Permit #11-636 reviewed for Phase 1-Interior Renovations only. Construction for Phase 1 mostly complete; Temp CO issued 11/1/11.

City of Dover Historic District Commission
Summary of Applications 2009-2010
Updated as of January 2012

HI-10-10	Building Permit #10-1672 Referral	New Jerusalem Baptist Church at 25 Slaughter Street	Siding Replacement on second floor levels of north and south elevations	10/21/2010 HDC Approval of ArchRevCert with Conditions requiring vinyl siding to be horizontal and other trimwork and gutter recommendations; Building Permit #10-1672 issued 11/2/2010.	Project complete. Siding, new gutters/downspouts installed, and some painting completed.
HI-10-11 S-11-03	Parking Lot on West Water Street: Renovation and Addition	101 West Water Street and 439 South Governors Avenue	Renovations to existing parking lot and expansion of lot to total of 152 parking spaces	12/16/2010 HDC Recommendation of Approval of ArchRevCert with conditions; Planning Commission approval of ArchRevCert with conditions.	Final Plan approval 5/24/2011. Building Permits #11-768 issued 6/21/2011 and #11-812 issued 6/27/2011. Construction complete; awaiting final inspection approvals from all agencies.

Summary of Permit Applications with Architectural Review Certification
Updated as of 12-31-2011

DATE	PERMIT #	LOCATION	TYPE	ACTION ON ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW CERTIFICATE	NOTES
1/7/2011	10-912	121 Duke of York St, Delaware Public Archives	Sign Permit - Banner program	Approval per HI-10-06 Delaware Public Archives Changeable Banner program	Set of Banners are in place
2/7/2011	11-055	410-414 Federal Street, New Kent County Courthouse	Building Permit - Installation of Solar Panels, roof mounted	Staff Approval	Solar Panels installed
2/7/2011	11-143	301 South Governors Avenue	Demo Permit - demolition of building	Approval per HI-10-01 Demolition by Neglect determination by HDC and declared Dangerous Building by City Council	Building Demolished
3/16/2011	11-296	27 West Loockerman Street	Sign Permit - Hunter House restaurant	Staff Approval	Signs Installed
3/15/2011	11-300	313 West Loockerman St	Temporary Sign Permit	Staff Approval	
3/21/2011	11-324	140 West Loockerman St	Roof Permit	Not reviewed by Planning Staff. Issued by Admin Staff.	Later review of permit showed no specific detailed info on roof project. Building does have a flat roof that is not visible from the public way.
4/26/2011	10-01904	35 Loockerman Plaza	Building Permit - Library	Approval per HI-09-01 Dover Public Library	Construction underway.
4/29/2011	11-113	209 South State Street, Wesley UM Church	Building Permit - Elevator & Canopy Addition	Approval per HI-10-04 Wesley Church: Elevator & Canopy Addition	Construction underway.
4/12/2011	11-413	424 South State Street	Sign Permit - Computers Fixed Today	Staff Approval	Sign Installed
4/11/2011	11-437	140 West Loockerman St	Admin Permit - new retail tenant	Staff Approval	New tenant occupying building.
4/12/2011	11-440	48 The Green	Sign Permit	Staff Approval	Sign Installed
4/14/2011	11-460	209 South State Street, Wesley UM Church	Temporary Sign Permit	Staff Approval	Temporary Sign installed and now removed.

Summary of Permit Applications with Architectural Review Certification
Updated as of 12-31-2011

DATE	PERMIT #	LOCATION	TYPE	ACTION ON ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW CERTIFICATE	NOTES
4/21/2011	11-491	146 South State Street	Sign Permit - The News Journal	Staff Approval	Sign installed.
5/24/2011	11-306	209 West Loockerman St	Building Permit - Repairs to Block Foundation Wall	Staff Approval	Permit Issued
5/11/2011	11-444	35 Loockerman Plaza	Building Permit - Access Drive for Library	Approval per HI-09-01 Dover Public Library	Access Drive is complete.
5/10/2011	11-558	410 Federal Street, Kent County Courthouse	Sign Permit	Staff Approval	Sign Installed
5/16/2011	11-563	22 The Green	Building Permit - Replace porch column due to accident damage	Staff Approval	Permit Issued
5/12/2011	11-567	501 South State Street, Christ Church	Temporary Sign Permit (VBS/Welcome Banners)	Staff Approval	Temporary Sign installed and removed.
5/12/2011	11-579	200 West Loockerman St, Bayard Hotel property	Demolition Permit	Approval per HI-09-04 and HI-10-08 and due to safety concerns	Demolition complete.
5/13/2011	11-612	136 West Loockerman St	Sign Permit - Beehive Beauty Shop	Staff Approval	Signs Installed
5/24/2011	11-644	54 South State Street, Presbyterian Church	Window Permit - replace two sets of windows	Staff Approval with conditions on the format of new windows	Permit issued
5/25/2011	11-659	30 Loockerman Plaza, Wesley Education Building	Temporary Sign Permit (VBS Banner)	Staff Approval	Temporary Sign installed and removed.
6/21/2011	11-636	406 Federal Street, Biggs Museum	Building Permit - Interior Renovations	Staff Approval, phase of project associated with HI-10-09	Phase 1 Project Complete. Temp CO issued 11/1/11.
6/6/2011	11-723	54 South State Street, Presbyterian Church	Temporary Sign Permit (VBS Banner)	Staff Approval	Temporary Sign installed and removed.
6/21/2011	11-768	101 West Water Street	Building Permit - Parking Lot	Approval per HI-10-11	Construction complete; Final Approval for CO pending.
6/27/2011	11-812	101 West Water Street	Building Permit - Fence	Approval per HI-10-11	Fence installation complete.
7/6/2011	11-813	516 West Loockerman St - Old Train Station	Building Permit - Interior Renovations for HVAC	Staff Approval	Construction complete.
7/7/2011	11-874	406 Federal Street, Biggs Museum	Temporary Sign Permit (Film Series)	Staff Approval	Temporary Signs installed and removed.

Summary of Permit Applications with Architectural Review Certification
Updated as of 12-31-2011

DATE	PERMIT #	LOCATION	TYPE	ACTION ON ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW CERTIFICATE	NOTES
7/27/2011	11-923	139 South State Street - M&T Bank (Wilmington Trust)	Sign Permit	Staff Approval	Signage installed in late August.
7/27/2011	11-924	29 Kings Highway - M&T Bank (Wilimington Trust)	Sign Permit	Staff Approval	Signage installed in late August.
7/26/2011	11-948	43 East Division Street	Demolition Permit	Staff Approval per HI-11-02 Demolition by Neglect	House demolished late July-August 2011
8/10/2011	11-656	200 West Loockerman St, Bayard Hotel property	Building Permit	Staff Approval per HI-10-08 Bayard Plaza	Demolition complete and construction underway.
8/19/2011	11-925	38 The Green, Old Kent County Courthouse	Building Permit (Phase 3 Renovations)	Staff Approval per HI-06-03	Interior Renovations underway and exterior repairs/painting proposed.
8/15/2011	11-960	151 Kings Highway SW, Woodburn	Building Permit - Solar Panels	Staff Approval with reference to HI-10-03	Installation underway.
9/14/2011	11-414	48 The Green	Sign Permit	Staff Approval per HI-11-03.	Signage installed.
9/1/2011	11-1029	144 Kings Highway SW, Governors Club Building	Building Permit - Interior Renovations	Staff Approval	Construction complete; CO issued.
9/22/2011	11-1203	420 South State Street	Building Permit - Porch Addition on Side/Rear	Staff Approval	Construction complete 11/29/2011
9/21/2011	11-1216	3 Loockerman Plaza	Temporary Sign Permit	Staff Approval	Temporary Sign installed and removed.
9/26/2011	11-1084	115 West Loockerman Street	Building Permit - Façade Repairs	Staff Approval	Permit Issued
9/29/2011	11-1197	316 South Governors Avenue, Old Brick Church	Building Permit - Interior Renovations, Brick Walkway Improvements for ADA accessibility	Staff Approval	Construction complete: CO issued 12/22/11.
9/29/2011	11-1261	505 South State Street, Christ Church	Temporary Sign Permit	Staff Approval	Temporary Sign installed and removed.
10/7/2011	11-1259	151 Kings Highway SW, Woodburn	Building Permit - Interior Renovations to Kitchen	Staff Approval	Construction completed ealry Janaury 2012.

Summary of Permit Applications with Architectural Review Certification
Updated as of 12-31-2011

DATE	PERMIT #	LOCATION	TYPE	ACTION ON ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW CERTIFICATE	NOTES
10/3/2011	11-1273	535 South State Street	Window Permit	Not reviewed by Planning Staff. Issued by Admin Staff.	
10/21/2011	11-1279	317-331 South State Street	Sign Permit	Staff Approval	Sign Installed.
10/10/2011	11-1302	121 Duke of York St, Delaware Public Archives	Sign Permit	Staff Approval	Signage to be placed on Legislative Avenue side of building.
10/21/2011	11-1310	209 South State Street, Wesley UM Church	Temporary Sign Permit	Staff Approval	Temporary Sign installed and removed.
10/25/2011	11-1386	131 West Loockerman Street, Wild Side	Sign Permit	Staff Approval	Sign Installed.
11/16/2011	11-1278	34 The Green, Lynn/Perza Law Office	Sign Permit	Staff Approval	Signs Installed
11/28/2011	11-1385	502 South State Street, State Street Commons	Building Permit	Staff Approval associated with S-06-19	Dumpster enclosure
11/2/2011	11-1388	31 West Loockerman Street, Suds Bar	Sign Permit	Staff Approval	Sign Installed.
11/21/2011	11-1427	27 West Loockerman Street	Building Permit - Interior Renovations	Staff Approval	Construction underway.
11/18/2011	11-1508	150 East Water Street, Credit Union Building	Roof Permit	Staff Approval	Misc. Roof repairs.
11/28/2011	11-1521	144 Kings Highway SW, Governors Club Building	Sign Permit	Staff Approval	Sign Installed for Governors Club Café.
12/1/2011	11-1433	132 West Loockerman Street, Golden Fleece Tavern	Roof Permit - Reclad Pent Roof	Staff Approval	Roof Project.
12/20/2011	11-1511	326 West Loockerman Street	Demolition Permit	Approval per HI-11-01 Building at 326 West Loockermans Street	Permit Issued
12/5/2011	11-1542	25 West Loockerman Street	Soffit and Facia Permit	Staff Approval	Woodwork repairs and painting. Permit issed.

Summary of Permit Applications with Architectural Review Certification
Updated as of 12-31-2011

DATE	PERMIT #	LOCATION	TYPE	ACTION ON ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW CERTIFICATE	NOTES
12/9/2011	11-1559	6 South State Street	Building Permit - Porch Structure and Roof Repairs	Staff Approval	Repair in-kind metal porch roof and three wood porch columns with trimwork detailing. Permit issued.
12/6/2011	11-1573	406 Federal Street, Biggs Museum	Temporary Sign Permit	Staff Approval	Temporary Signs installed and removed.
12/12/2011	11-1578	401 Federal Street, Townsend Buidling	Building Permit - Interior Renovations	Staff Approval	Permit issued.
12/16/2011	11-1581	151 Kings Highway SW, Woodburn	Building Permit - Interior Renovations to Garage buidling	Staff Approval	Permit issued.
12/9/2011	11-1598	6 Elm Terrace	Fence Permit	Staff Approval	Permit issued.

SCOTT ENGINEERING, INC.
Consulting Engineers • Surveyors • Land Planners

January 10, 2012

Mrs. Dawn E. Melson-Williams
City of Dover
Department of Planning & Inspections
PO Box 475
Dover, DE 19903

RE: Building Demolition
Dover Realty I Property
326 W Loockerman Street
Dover, DE 19904
City of Dover File No. HI-11-01
SEI Project No. M-3757

Dear Mrs. Melson-Williams:

On February 17, 2011, the City of Dover Historic District Commission granted approval of the Architectural Review Certificate for the demolition of the building at the above referenced location. It is understood that the approval expires one (1) year from the date of the approval, which would be February 17, 2012. Demolition of the building is scheduled to tentatively start on January 24th and it is estimated that it will be completed by February 29th; however, the completion of the demolition is beyond the approval date.

On behalf of our client, Dover Realty I, we are hereby requesting an extension of the approval of the Architectural Review Certificate for the maximum time allowed. Although a year would have normally been ample enough time to complete the demolition, the majority of the delay has been the result of negotiating with a potential buyer of the property that expressed an interest in the building not be demolished. Once those discussions fell through, our client developed an RFP package, solicited for demolition contractor bids, chose a contactor, and has paid the down payment for the work to be performed. The known asbestos in the building has been removed and a building permit has been obtained for the demolition of the building. In addition, all known utilities to the building have been disconnected. Presently, the owner is working out the final Notice of Demolition issues with EPA and DNREC, which is the final item to be completed, and it is anticipated that we will have those issues resolved to meet the projected start date.

Should you have any questions or require additional information please let me know.

Sincerely,

SCOTT ENGINEERING, INC.

Gregory R. Scott, P.E.

Cc: Stephanie Hansen - YCST

22 Old Rudnick Lane • Suite 2 • Dover, Delaware 19901 • Tel: 302-736-3058 • Fax: 302-736-3059
info@scottengineering.com • www.scottengineering.com

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW REPORT
Referral by City Planner to Historic District Commission
Meeting of January 19, 2012

Permit:	Permit #12-0018 for Exterior Renovation
Location:	Proposed new location of Frankfurt Bakery at 323 South Governors Avenue, Dover Delaware East side of South Governors Avenue between West North Street and Bank Lane
Tax Parcel:	ED-05-079.00-04-46.00-000
File Number:	HI-12-01

Referral of Permit:
The following application **Building Permit #12-0018** is referred by the City Planner to the Historic District Commission for consultation regarding the issuance of the Architectural Review Certificate. Applications for exterior renovations within the Historic District Zone (H) are reviewed by the City Planner (or Staff as designated) for Architectural Review Certification as part of the Building Permit application review process. Based on Staff's review of this permit, Staff has concerns regarding issuance of the Architectural Review Certificate and therefore is referring the Permit for review under the provisions of *Zoning Ordinance*, Article 10 Section 3.22(A) and (B). See below.

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

Permit Proposal:
Building Permit #12-0018 was filed on January 5, 2012 for the proposed exterior renovation project to the existing one story building at 323 South Governors Avenue, Dover. The permit also includes interior renovations which are not subject to the Architectural Review Certification process. In addition, the site improvements already completed at the site consist of paving a parking lot area in front of the building and a drive aisle on the north side of the building for loading activities.

The exterior renovation project focuses on new exterior wall finishes and door and window

replacements. For the front (west) facade, the proposal is to cover the concrete block portion of the wall with a grey brick veneer with a traditional lap vinyl siding in the gable area. Also on this façade the existing double leaf wood door would be replaced with a new door with side light combination with decorative glass. The existing twenty-paned paired windows would be replaced with a single pane paired window that is smaller in size. The application also seeks to apply new vinyl siding (traditional lap style siding) in a stone clay color to the south, east, and north elevations of the building. See permit application form and attachments.

Staff Review of Permit for Architectural Review Certification:
The existing building appears to have been constructed mid-to-late twentieth century. The front (western) portion of the building is concrete block and the rear (eastern) portion is clad in vertical wood siding. The building is capped with a gable roof of asphalt shingles. The building was previously used as the Ellis Furniture Works.

While located in the National Register listed Dover Green Historic District area, the building was deemed a non-contributing resource to the district at the time of the National Register nomination due to its post-1945 construction date. Historic maps from 1868 and 1887 show the lot previously occupied by a two story dwelling that was extant into the first quarter of the twentieth century.

In reviewing the proposed project for Architectural Review Certification, Staff referenced various sections of Chapter 3: Maintenance, Repair, Preservation and Restoration of Existing Historic Buildings of the *Design Standards and Guidelines for the City of Dover Historic District Zone* which presents the *Recommended, Not Recommended,* and *Inappropriate* approaches to construction of various elements in the Historic District. Also the section on Storefront Replacement in Chapter 5 pages 5-4 and 5-5 was helpful in considered this project.

Staff findings are summarized as follows:

- Exterior Wall Finishes (New Brick Veneer and Vinyl Siding): The *Recommended* practice for exterior finishes typically is to retain and repair the existing finishes. One option is to repair then repaint the concrete block and also to repair and refinish/restain the wood siding on the building. However, given this building is a modern intrusion in the Historic District other options could be considered for the exterior wall finishes that would fit the character of the Historic District.

    - Brick Veneer: The use of brick veneer on a portion of the front façade could be considered. The process of installation of the brick including the detailing around the door and window openings (headers and sills) and how the brick is ended or ‘turns’ the building corner is key to appropriate implementation of this material.

    - Vinyl Siding: The use of vinyl siding is deemed *Inappropriate* in this area of the Historic District as per the *Design Standards & Guidelines*. However, a series of steps related to the installation of vinyl siding is given to mitigate its effects if approved for installation. The use of a horizontal siding product (wood, fiber-

cement board, or vinyl siding) could occur with consideration given to the siding profile, exposure width, and trimwork detailing at openings and corners.

- Entrance Door: The current double leaf wood entry door appears to have been crafted for the opening in the spirit of the previous building tenant. With this new commercial tenant a more durable door system is required. For commercial establishments, the *Guidelines* recommend a panel door with glass inset in the upper part of the door or a storefront door system primarily of glass. The door and sidelight presented in the permit submission is a residential style door and sidelight with decorative glass.

- Windows (Replacement of Front Façade Windows): The proposal is for replacement of the existing windows with a new single lite paired window set in a reduced sized opening. If full replacement of the existing windows is necessary due to window condition, the *Guidelines* recommend that the replacement windows replicate the existing windows in pane configuration, operation, and window opening size.

- The building appears to lack a gutter and downspout system on the north and south elevations to assist in moving water away from the building.

- Parking Lot & Landscaping: With the entire area between the street frontage sidewalk and the building paved with asphalt for site access and parking, there is no space designated for landscape screening of the parking lot as Recommended in the *Guidelines*. The rear yard area of the property should also be stabilized with grass planting. The placement of an exterior cooler and freezer on the east end of the building will be visible from adjoining properties and nearby Bank Lane. The *Guidelines* recommend screening of mechanical equipment.

Historic District Commission Action

The Historic District Commission should consider the proposal for exterior renovations and take action in regards to the Architectural Review Certification for the project.

Advisory Comments

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

2. A series of Staff recommendations are provided for each project activity in order to allow for contemporary design elements compatible with the visual character of the Historic District and for project activities to comply with intentions of the *Design Standards and Guidelines.*
   - Exterior Wall Finishes:
     a. Brick veneer on the front façade should include appropriate detailing of a header over the door opening and a header and sill at the window opening.
     b. Brick veneer should wrap around the building corner on both sides in order to provide a clear transition to the secondary wall finish (the siding).

c. Any necessary repairs to the concrete block wall should be made prior to installation of the brick veneer.
d. The siding product (vinyl or composition siding) should be installed in a horizontal format. The clapboard style is recommended with a minimum exposure of 4 inches.
e. A shingle style product could be utilized within the gable area rather than the horizontal siding.
f. Add trimwork detailing at the transition points between materials such as cornerboard posts at corners of the wall and trimwork around door and window openings, etc.
g. Install a louver vent to maintain attic ventilation.
h. The gable area is the appropriate location for a wall mounted sign of the business name.

- Entrance Door replacement:
  a. Recommend using a commercial style door with glass inset in the upper portion of the door and a solid panel below or a storefront door system primarily of glass.
  b. Glass inserts in the door and sidelight should be plain glass.
  c. Consideration could be given to a reduction in the width of the door opening to accommodate a single width door with no sidelight.

- Window replacement:
  a. Retain the large sized window opening as it proportioning fits the façade better than the smaller opening proposed in the permit submission. Since it appears that repair/replacement work is necessary below the window, some of the block work could be replaced so that two full courses of concrete block exist below the opening (thus slightly increasing the sill height from the ground/floor level.
  b. The paired window format is appropriate for the large opening. Also paired windows with transom windows above could be considered.
  c. The window light configuration could replicate the divided light pattern of the existing or an alternative pattern of dividing the glass area. If simulated divided light windows are utilized then exterior gridwork should be utilized to give dimension to the mullions/muntins.
  d. The two vinyl clad paired single lite windows replaced on the north elevation may remain as they have limited visibility from the public street. Trimwork needs to be added around these windows to finish the appearance.

- Site Landscaping:
  a. Recommends the additional landscaping in any unpaved areas between the building and the street such as shrub plantings.
  b. All unpaved areas of the property must be stabilized and grass lawn area established.

3. The following items should also be addressed with the project:
   a. Recommend the addition of a gutter and downspout system for the north and south elevations of the building. This will assist in moving water away from the

building. The recommended forms are the half-round or plain rectangular metal gutter placed at the roof edge (along the trimwork) and plain (not corrugated) rectangular or round metal downspouts.

b. Recommend the screening of the exterior cooler and freezer through landscape plantings of evergreen trees on the south side of the property or a wall/fence system.

Attachments:

- Permit #12-0018 form, project drawings
- Photos of Existing Building
- Letter of Referral dated January 10, 2012

Copy

City of Dover - BUILDING PERMIT APPLICATION

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

321-

Project Address/Tax Parcel Identification Number 323 S. Governors Ave Dover DE 19904 ED-05-077-09-04-460-000-000

Applicant's Name Andreas Jauhe 15 Acorn Forest Dr Felton DE 19943 302 5357766

Owner Name and Address

E-mail address: Frankfurtbarkery@Comcast.Net

Contractor Name and Address Andreas Jauhe 15 Acorn Forest Dr Felton DE 19943 Phone # ( ) 302 5357766

E-mail address: Dover Business License #

BUILDING DETAILS

Proposed Occupancy BAKERY F-1

Type of Construction EXISTING

Change in Occupancy or Use? Yes or (No)

If yes, describe the previous use N/A

Number of Stories 1

Total Height in Feet APPROXIMATELY 15' +or-

Total Land Area to be Disturbed (in SF) N/A

Proposed Occupant Load 15 +or-

Square Footage All Floors 1,716 SF

Total Work Area (in SF) LEVEL 2 - 40%

Sprinkler System? Yes or (No)

Fire Alarm System? Yes or (No)

Type of work: ( ) New ( ) Addition ( ) Demolition
(X) Renovation – Interior X Exterior X
( ) Roof – tear off ___ overlay ___ # of layers ___
( ) Shed ( ) Siding ( ) Solar panels
( ) Full Building Demolition ( ) Selective Demolition
( ) Fence - Height ___ ( ) Pool ( ) Elevator
(X) OTHER SELECTIVE RENOVATION LESS THAN 40%

Description of Work:
Framing, Insulation, Electric, Renovation of Restroom, Kitchen ~~Exterior~~ Exterior Façade.

Estimated Value of Construction: $ 30.000,-

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

Office Use Only
Permit Number 12-18
Roll Plans / Fold Plans
Date Received 1/5/12
Date Issued
C/O Required

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

Total Fee 257.00
Fees Paid ( )
Check # Cash
Collected By

Certification in Lieu of Oath

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

Signature

01-05-12
Date









City of Dover

January 10, 2012

Mr. Andreas Janke
15 Acorn Forest Drive
Felton, DE 19943

RE: Referral of Building Permit #12-18 to Historic District Commission
Proposed location of Frankfurt Bakery at 323 South Governors Avenue, Dover DE

Dear Mr. Janke:

This letter is to inform you that Building Permit application #12-18 has been referred to the City of Dover Historic District Commission for consultation regarding the issuance of the Architectural Review Certificate. Building Permit #12-18 was filed on January 5, 2012 for the proposed exterior renovation project to the existing one story building and site improvements at 323 South Governors Avenue, Dover. The application seeks to apply a brick veneer and new vinyl siding which now consists of concrete block and vertical wood siding; replace the entry doors and windows on the front of the building; and other interior renovations.

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

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

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

Based on the findings, Staff has concerns regarding issuance of the Architectural Review Certificate for the project as presented in the permit application. As a result the City Planner is

referring the application to the Historic District Commission for review. See *Zoning Ordinance,* Article 10 Section 3.22 (A) and (B) listed below.

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

The City of Dover Historic District Commission will review this permit at their next meeting scheduled for Thursday, January 19, 2012 at 3:00pm in the City Hall Conference Room, 15 East Loockerman Street, Dover. You are encouraged to attend this meeting to discuss the project. Staff will provide the Historic District Commission with the permit application materials and other background information for their review and action.

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

Sincerely,

Ann Marie Townshend

Ann Marie Townshend, AICP
Director of Planning & Community Development

DEMW/amt

CC: Dawn E. Melson-Williams, AICP, Principal Planner
Permit File #12-0018
Historic District Commission