CITY OF DOVER HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
AGENDA
THURSDAY, July 21, 2011- 3:00 P.M.
City Hall – Conference Room

ROLL CALL
APPROVAL OF AGENDA

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF MEETING on May 19, 2011
APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF MEETING on June 16, 2011

COMMUNICATIONS & REPORTS

1. Summary of Applications 2009-2011
2. Summary of Architectural Review Certifications for 2011

OLD BUSINESS

1. HI-09-01 Dover Public Library – Update and Review of the selected exterior finish materials for the Dover Public Library. Previously, the Architectural Review Certification for the project was issued upon recommendation of the Historic District Commission on June 17, 2009 and action by the Planning Commission March 15, 2010. Construction of a two story library building of 46,000 S.F with the associated parking, walkways, landscaping, and stormwater management facilities is underway. The project area consists of 4.67 acres ± of land zoned I-O (Institutional and Office Zone) and subject to the H (Historic District Zone). The property site is located on the north side of Loockerman Plaza between South State Street and Legislative Avenue. The owner of record is the City of Dover. The property address is 35 Loockerman Plaza. Tax Parcel: ED-05-077.05-04-55.00-000.

2. HI-05-03 State Street Commons – Update and Review of Request for use of alternative material for building entrance railings at porches and porticos. Previously, the Architectural Review Certification for the project was issued upon recommendation of the Historic District Commission on March 16, 2006 and action by the Planning Commission on June 20, 2006 for the project known as State Street Commons. Construction commenced on two connected 2 ½ story office buildings of 12,000 S.F. each for a total of 24,000 S.F with a two level parking garage. The existing brick office building at 502 South State Street consisting of 3,222 S.F. will remain. The property consists 35,061 square feet ± of land zoned RG-O (General Residence and Office Zone) and subject to the H (Historic District Zone). The property is located at the southwest corner of South State Street and Water Street. The owner of record is YOZIMA, LLC; request received from Onix-Z, LLC. Tax Parcel: ED-05-077.09-03-70.00-000.

NEW BUSINESS

1. Application for Architectural Review Certification:
   a. HI-11-04 Acme Site Redevelopment Master Plan: Architectural Review Certification - Public Hearing and Review for Recommendation to the City of Dover Planning Commission on the Architectural Review Certificate for Site Development Plan for

the redevelopment of the property at 120 South Governors Avenue (commonly referred to as the Acme Site). This application consists of project that is to include a retail/apartment building and a second apartment building along with the demolition of the existing mid-to-late twentieth century commercial building. The project also includes the associated parking, streetscape improvements, landscaping, and stormwater management facilities. The project area consists of one parcel of land totaling 1.7653 acres ± of land zoned C-2 (Central Commercial Zone) and subject to the H (Historic District Zone). The property site spans the block between South Governors Avenue and South New Street located north of but not adjacent to West Loockerman Street. The owner of record is the Downtown Dover Partnership. The property address is 120 South Governors Avenue. Tax Parcel: ED-05-077.09-01-44.00-000.

2. Certified Local Government (CLG) program

ONGOING PROJECTS

1. Update on Draft Zoning Text Amendment (MI-11-06) Updates to *Zoning Ordinance*, Article 10 §3. Historic District Commission and Architectural Review

2. Discussion of the 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
MAY 19, 2011

The Regular Meeting of the City of Dover Historic District Commission was held on Thursday, May 19, 2011 at 3:10 PM with Chairman Scrafford presiding. Members present were Col. Scrafford, Mr. McDaniel, (arriving at 3:10 PM) and Mr. Fisher. Mr. Salkin and Mr. Jackson were 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 3-0 with Mr. Salkin and Mr. Jackson absent.

ADOPTION OF MINUTES OF THE REGULAR HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION MEETING OF APRIL 21, 2011

Mr. McDaniel moved to approve the minutes of April 21, 2011 as submitted, seconded by Mr. Fisher and the motion was unanimously carried 3-0 with Mr. Salkin and Mr. Jackson absent.

COMMUNICATIONS & REPORTS

Ms. Melson-Williams stated that the Planning Staff put in your packet what are the most recent adopted amendments to the 2008 Comprehensive Plan to place in your notebook. The map enclosed will replace Map 12-1. These updates were adopted in March/April of this year.

Mrs. Melson-Williams further stated that updates on activities from Preservation Delaware include Staff passing on the contact information for members of the Historic District Commission to Preservation Delaware. You may have received an invitation regarding an event that will be held on Saturday, June 18, 2011. Preservation Delaware is kicking off an initiative to work with Historic District Commissions to bring their Staff and members of these Commission across the state together for some activities that will be held in Odessa, Delaware.

Mr. McDaniel stated that for next month's meeting he will be out of the State and Mr. Fisher will be out of the country. Responding to Mr. McDaniel, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that Staff would check on a quorum as there may be something coming forward for that month.

OLD BUSINESS

There was no old business to discuss.

Mr. McDaniel questioned if the Bayard Hotel had taken out a Demolition and Building Permit? Responding to Mr. McDaniel, Ms. Cornwell stated that they have received a Demolition Permit; however, not a Building Permit. They do have plans to fence and stabilize the site within two (2) weeks of the building coming down.

Mr. Fisher questioned if this appears to be the case of not commencing with a Building Permit immediately after demolition? Responding to Mr. Fisher, Ms. Cornwell stated that it would depend on how long it takes to get the building down. They are working through that process as they just received additional comments from DelDOT and she received a revised plan.

NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business to discuss.

ON-GOING PROJECTS

Draft Zoning Text Amendment MI-11-06 Updates to *Zoning Ordinance*, Article 10 §3. Historic District Commission and Architectural Review

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that there was nothing on this provided in your packets this month. Staff just wanted to update you on where we are. Staff is in the process of doing some outreach and collecting information. You looked specifically at the Historic District Commission section and we have gathered those comments. In the meantime, Staff has been working on organization of the new Ordinance to deal with the numbering and getting all of that to work. Staff held a meeting on May 3, 2011 with the development community, engineers that have recently had applications, and the Realtors association to introduce them to this proposed new/change/updated ordinance.

Mrs. Melson-Williams further stated that she, Mrs. Townshend, and Mr. Scott Koenig attended an ACEC meeting which is a consulting engineer's professional group. They use this process on a regular basis with clients bringing them through the development process here in the City to get some feedback from them. At this point, the plan is to present the Ordinance to the appropriate City Council committee which is the Legislative, Finance and Administrative Committee. That Committee's new membership will be appointed on Monday evening in the City Council meeting. Coming out of that Committee, it will move onto City Council for First Reading in late June with a hearing before the Planning Commission scheduled for July and final action by City Council in August.

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 we talked briefly about this at the end of the last meeting and at that point we had lost quorum. What Staff has done is create two (2) versions of one of the element sections that would be in the Chapter that presents the *Design Guidelines* for exterior changes which is currently Chapter 3 in the existing document.

Mrs. Melson-Williams further stated that in Sample Version #1 it is a new page layout; however, it utilizes the same approach that the current document has in that it has an introduction paragraph and then list things that are "recommended," things that are "not recommended," and then things that are "inappropriate."

Mrs. Melson-Williams further stated that in Sample Version #2 it is a new page layout with a new approach to presenting the information about that specific element. What it anticipates doing is an introduction paragraph regarding roofs with some history then information regarding things to consider for maintenance and best practices. The second page of it would go through the *Guidelines* for the roofs with the *Guidelines* written more in the positive of what you should be doing rather than broken into "recommended," "not recommended," and "inappropriate." Hopefully by using this approach, it will be friendlier to the person who has to use it.

Mrs. Melson-Williams further stated that the examples that we have seen from other jurisdictions

especially Raleigh follows the type #2 format of presenting the bullet point list or a numbered list of things that are "appropriate." At this point, Staff worked a little on the text; however, not extensively.

Mr. Fisher stated that he feels that there is a lot of negative impression that people have when they have to go through any application process. He feels that Sample #2 takes some of that negativity out because it does not use a negative approach and does not compound the issue for the applicant. He likes Sample #2 better.

Mr. Scrafford stated that he feels that the way Sample #2 presents itself is good. For instance, and this is not to be construed just for this particular item, it states that "asphalt, fiberglass, composition shingles are not recommended for existing historic buildings." The next sentence says "when used." It needs to say "where approved for use." Responding to Mr. Scrafford, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that what Staff would do is go through with this concept in where in some cases it may be appropriate to use it or it may be okay to use asphalt and if you do, this is how you do it.

Mr. Fisher stated that some of the asphalt is as good looking if not better looking than some of the old material.

Mr. McDaniel stated that the consensus is that we all like this as it reads as well as the tone of it.

Mr. Scrafford questioned who would use this other than this Commission that you could ask and is this a logical thing to do? Responding to Mr. Scrafford, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that Staff could look back at our recent applicants as she knows that there are a couple of architects that have had to use it and we could test it with them.

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that what Staff will do is start bringing this document to you in groups to look at and then ultimately there will be a final document that we will have to address on how you want to consider public outreach for it.

Mr. Scrafford stated that he would like to change the title difference between "roofing" and "roofs." Responding to Mr. Scrafford, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that the hope is that everything ends up on two (2) pages and can be handed out if someone is only doing a window project. It would allow us to incorporate photographs so on one page there will be a blank area for that.

Mr. McDaniel moved for adjournment of the meeting at 3:38 PM, seconded by Mr. Fisher and the motion was unanimously carried 3-0 with Mr. Salkin and Mr. Jackson absent.

Meeting adjourned at 3:38 PM

Sincerely,

Diane Metsch
Secretary

CITY OF DOVER
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
JUNE 16, 2011

The Regular Meeting of the City of Dover Historic District Commission was held on Thursday, June 16, 2011 at 3:00 PM with Chairman Scrafford presiding. Members present were Col. Scrafford and Mr. Salkin. Mr. Jackson, Mr. McDaniel and Mr. Fisher were absent.

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

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that typical quorum for a meeting is three (3) members. We will progress with the meeting today; however, will not take action on any items. The meeting minutes should be deferred until July. She would ask that the Commission recognize and follow the agenda that was posted since you cannot formally adopt it.

ADOPTION OF MINUTES OF THE REGULAR HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION MEETING OF MAY 19, 2011

The May 19, 2011 meeting minutes were deferred for adoption action until the July 21, 2011 meeting.

COMMUNICATIONS & REPORTS

Ms. Melson-Williams stated that as a reminder for Saturday, June 18, 2011, Preservation Delaware is hosting the first of what will be several events that bring together Historic District Commissions from across the State and their Staff. This event is being held in Odessa, Delaware. There will be no Staff attending due to other commitments. She advised Preservation Delaware not to expect anyone from Dover; however, we will work to keep you informed of upcoming events in the future.

Mr. Salkin stated that he received an email a few days ago as a reminder of the event; however, never received anything announcing the event. It would be helpful in the future if they could contact us as early as they schedule it. Responding to Mr. Salkin, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that she thinks that this event has only been scheduled within the last month.

Mrs. Melson-Williams further stated that there are a number of Scenic By-ways that have been designated in the State. Specifically, the Harriet Tubman Underground Railroad By-way is one that runs through Dover. This is a designated By-way as this was achieved in the past year. They are starting what is the next step in that process which is the development of a Corridor Management Plan. The Scenic By-way extends from the Maryland line and continues north up through the state with different segments. Dover is within the first segment and is shown on the map she provided for you. The reason she brings it to your attention is that on June 21, 2011 they are hosting a public workshop at the Camden Friends Meeting from 6:00 PM to 7:30 PM to present information and gather comments and information regarding the corridor and about their planning for the corridor.

Mr. Salkin questioned if this is a DelDOT program? Responding to Mr. Salkin, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that Delaware Scenic By-ways is a DelDOT Program and Preservation Delaware is on one of their planning teams.

OLD BUSINESS
There was no old business to discuss.

NEW BUSINESS

Kirk-Short Buildings at 15 and 21 The Green – Presentation of Information on Exterior Building Improvements to the existing buildings at 15 and 21 The Green. This proposed Restoration and Repair project involves brick and stone masonry, woodwork, windows, roof, and exterior painting. The project is considered eligible for administrative review of the Architectural Review Certification during Building Permit process.

Representatives: Mr. Kevin Rychlicki, Bernardon, Haber & Holloway Architects; and Mrs. Carol Quigley, Frens and Frens, LLC.

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that Staff has looked at their proposal in the way of recommendation of what type of review process they would go through. It currently indicates that they would be eligible for an administrative review which means at the time of filing a Building Permit; Staff could review and issue the Architectural Review Certification. However, given the prominent location on The Green, Staff felt that it would be helpful for them to appear before you and present information on the project.

Mr. Rychlicki stated that he would go over some history of the building. The property currently serves as the main office for the Division of Historical and Cultural Affairs and the State Historic Preservation Office. Previously, the building had been maintained and operated by the Division of Facilities Management. In the past year, the Division of Historical and Cultural Affairs has taken over complete control of the building.

Mr. Rychlicki further stated to give you a little history of the building; it was built in 1859 by Henry Todd who was a surveyor. One half of the building served as a residence and the other half was a business. In the 1870's, Mr. Todd had to sell the property to settle some debts and at that time, the property became offices. The State acquired the property in the 1940's and it served the Bank Commission and Insurance Commission. The Historical and Cultural Affairs took over the building in the late 1980's. The address of 15 The Green retains a lot of its historical fabric especially in the interior and exterior. The address of 21 The Green has seen better days. It has had a couple of renovations over the last couple of years that began with the 21 The Green side on the first level. The floor windows were removed and the larger windows installed. The first floor brick was also removed and a more contemporary brick pattern of the period was applied in the 1950's. The east and north side of the building were vinyl clad on the 21 The Green side of the building. The basement windows also on that side of the building were changed to metal windows just about the same time the Historical and Cultural Affairs took over the building in the 1980's. A fire escape was added around the same time that the State took over the building.

Mr. Rychlicki further stated that last year the Division of Facilities Management, under a different architectural firm, submitted documents to the City of Dover for improvements for the building which consisted of woodwork repairs, pointing, selective window repairs, shutter repairs, and major reconstruction of the east wall of the 21 The Green side of the building and replacement of windows. The contractor started work and they were experiencing a lot of difficulties. The

contractor did not know how to deal with historic restoration and we had to keep pulling scope because they were causing more damage to the building and is the reason the building is in the state that it is in now. Our company was then brought in to do some remedial repairs to the building through the winter months that was mainly window repairs and priming of the exposed woodwork. We did not have time to get the project out to bid so we wanted to get the building through the winter and make it comfortable for the Staff that was in the building.

Mrs. Quigley stated that she would review the scope of work. The bulk of the work is falling into a couple general areas: masonry restoration, architectural woodwork restoration, and restoration of the wood windows. Their focus has also been for the most part, the south and front sides of the building. As you will see, the balance of the building has not suffered as much and we will not go to the extent of full restoration of the exterior. It would be nice to remove all of the vinyl siding on the north and east facades; however, the preservation of the primary façade is what we will be doing for this particular project. We are looking at a large amount of brick pointing on the south façade and there are a number of spalled bricks that need to be patched. The previous contractor had very little success finding appropriate brick replacements for that façade. It is a tight butter joint that is difficult to match and rather than having the same problems with the next contractor, we decided to do more patching of the bricks rather than trying to risk sacrificing or damaging any more of the surrounding bricks. The marble base on the bottom will all be repointed and both facades will be cleaned. Tests were conducted with the chemical that will be used to clean the 15 The Green side of the building with success.

Mrs. Quigley further stated that the windows are not in horrible condition; however, the most disturbing component of them now is that they are unfinished because of the excessive stripping that took place over the last year. They look really rough and we do need to take it back to a smooth finish and correct the damage that has been done. The individual components of the windows are stable and we do have a number of sash replacements. The only major architectural change that is occurring is the large windows on 21 The Green that are picture-like windows. There were a lot of masonry alterations done to the first floor and the horizontal brick bands installed in perhaps the 1950's. We will not go to the extent where we are completely refacing the entire first floor of the building; however, felt it more appropriate if we just changed out the windows to match the balance of what is on the building. The cornice also suffered as it was stripped rather drastically and all the wood has a very rough base at the moment. We do require a number of replicate brackets in areas that are completely rotten and where there are a couple missing on the back side of the building on the north side of 15 The Green.

Mrs. Quigley further stated that there is a structural issue that is more of a preventative item. On 21 The Green with the horizontal brick bands that were installed in the 1950's, if you stand and look at the building, you can see that this brick band was intended to stand proud of the elevation by about an inch or inch and a half. In the center of the building the wall is buckling so that it becomes flush in the middle and then returns to the inch and a half plane on the east end. We are requesting for a number of anchors to be installed right and left of the center bay of those windows to make a more solid connection between the face brick and the balance of the wall. There is built in gutter on both the buildings; however, we will install new downspouts.

Mr. Scrafford questioned in their submittal letter where you say "replacement" of anything is the intent in-kind? Responding to Mr. Scrafford, Mrs. Quigley stated that yes with the exception of the windows.

Mrs. Quigley stated that there is one more architectural change on the rear elevation. We will be decreasing the size of the windows what would be in the north façade of 21 The Green. There are also water issues with these windows. On the third floor the windows dip down below both the flashing and sometimes the roof line with the addition that was added in the turn of the century in the late 1800's. We are recommending shorter windows be installed in this area; however, they could be constructed as the balance of the windows are with the wood plank frames. This same issue also occurs along the west façade where the windows sit right on the walkway that goes in between 15 The Green and the Ridgely property. They are rotted because for the most part they are sitting in standing water.

Mr. Scrafford further stated that his concern is to ensure that when you talk about replacement those are the things that get replaced with material that is not commensurable with what was there. The term "replacement" means you will replace in-kind. Responding to Mr. Scrafford, Mr. Rychlicki stated that he should have clarified this to state that they are "replacing but replicating" the windows.

Mr. Scrafford further questioned to Staff if they submit for permit, how far they intend to "replicate?" Responding to Mr. Scrafford, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that there are details in the overall plan package of items such as that for windows. If they are having to "replicate" a window Staff is looking at if it is the same lite pattern and does it function the same way.

Mr. Rychlicki stated that they will be using Spanish cedar.

Mrs. Quigley stated that the woodwork is of a better quality; however, we are not doing what was most recently done. There were Pella windows installed on the east façade and that is not what we will be doing. Some will say that these would "replicate" the front windows and we do not agree with that. Other than adding weather stripping it is the exact details.

Mr. Scrafford further questioned with regards to new box gutters and downspouts what material will they be of? Responding to Mr. Scrafford, Mrs. Quigley stated that there are no new box gutters. There is a box gutter that exists on 21 The Green and there are some components of that looking gutter that are being replaced.

Mr. Scrafford further stated to explain to you (the applicant) why you are here, in The Green area those of us who sit on the Committee have a feeling that we needed to protect the Staff. Staff can make decisions and we do not have a problem with that; however, when they make decision on The Green that have not been reviewed by this Commission, then people get nervous about it.

Mr. Salkin questioned with regards to the new front windows on the Plan that look very nice, is this based on historical photographs or assumptions? Responding to Mr. Salkin, Mr. Rychlicki stated that they could not find any historical photographs on this building. We have searched archives everywhere and cannot find anything on this building. For some reason, it is invisible and

unusual being located right next to the State House; you would think that this building would be photographed.

Mr. Scrafford questioned if they were able to determine what might have been left structurally internally? Responding to Mr. Scrafford, Mrs. Quigley stated that they have not taken the windows apart. It will not tell us the lighting configuration.

Mr. Salkin questioned with regards to the two basement window grates; one of them is original cast iron and the other one is a more modern style. He wonders if the modern one could be replaced as part of this project. Responding to Mr. Salkin, Mrs. Quigley stated that she thinks that would be lovely.

Mr. Rychlicki stated that when they started this project, they had a nice budget. Then the State hit the budget crisis and it was determined that they would do just the south façade. We have hope that there may be additional funding available and will run the suggestion of this basement grate by the State. He agrees that they should both mimic each other.

Mrs. Melson-Williams questioned if they would like to talk about painting and what their strategy would be now that it is down to wood and what colors would be reappearing? Responding to Mrs. Melson-Williams, Mr. Rychlicki stated that we have proposed to the State a two color scheme that is very subtle with a Victorian approach. The State has not responded back on what direction they would like to go. Our feeling is that we do not want to see the building white as it is a Victorian structure and should reflect some of that history. We are hoping to pick up some of the coloring that is on the State House and contrast that with another color.

Mr. Salkin questioned whether the two color schemes would be on all of the architecture of both buildings or would it be just for the windows and roof line? Responding to Mr. Salkin, Mrs. Quigley stated that it would be a different color for the sash and the window frame and then for the brackets stand out.

Mr. Scrafford questioned if we did the handrails? Responding to Mr. Scrafford, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that the handrails throughout the Capital Complex were a project a number of years ago and she is unsure if this building was a part of that project.

Mr. Rychlicki stated that one of the things that they would hope to do on this building that is not a part of this phase; however, part of a future phase that is not yet funded, is the requirement for handicap accessibility for the building. Our approach would be that because it is going to be very difficult to do any handicap accessibility in the front of the building, they are looking to go down the sidewalk between the Biggs Museum and 21 The Green properties and come off with a level walkway that comes into the side of the building. It is a steep incline; however, if you start at The Green level we would not have that much further to go up to get a slight ramp into the building. If we get the handicap ramp in, we would also like to revise the steps to raise them up so that they are level with the floor and then put in a landing at that door.

ON-GOING PROJECTS

Update on Draft Zoning Text Amendment (MI-11-06) Updates to *Zoning Ordinance*, Article 10 §3. Historic District Commission and Architectural Review

Due to lack of quorum this item was deferred to the July 21, 2011 Historic District Commission meeting.

Draft Zoning Text Amendment MI-11-06 Updates to *Zoning Ordinance*, Article 10 §3. Historic District Commission and Architectural Review

Due to lack of quorum this item was deferred to the July 21, 2011 Historic District Commission meeting.

Mr. Scrafford moved for adjournment of the meeting at 3:35 PM.

Meeting adjourned at 3:35 PM

Sincerely,

Diane Metsch
Secretary

City of Dover Historic District Commission
Summary of Applications 2011
Updated as of July 7, 2011

FILE#	PLAN NAME	LOCATION	TYPE	ACTION	STATUS
HI-11-01	Building at 326 West Loockerman Street: Building Demolition	326 West Loockerman Street	Demolition of Commercial Building	2/17/2011 HDC Approval of ArchRevCert with conditions for Demolition	No Action Taken to date. Demolition Permit Application must be filed.
HI-11-02	Building at 43 East Division Street	43 East Division Street	Consideration of Demolition by Neglect	3/17/2011 HDC Determination of Demolition by Neglect and outlined actions to be taken. HDC Recommends Building Inspector seek restoration or repair prior to beginning Dangerous Building proceedings. City Council declared it a Dangerous Building on 6/13/2011.	Dangerous Building procedures underway. Permits for repair or demolition must be filed.
HI-11-03	Sign Permit #11-414 Referral	48 The Green	Placement of a third projecting sign on the front façade of building	4/21/2011 HDC Approval of ArchRevCert with Conditions on the location of the third sign and its format	Sign Permit issued and sign installed.
HI-11-04	Acme Site Redevelopment Master Plan (Lands of Downtown Dover Partnership)	120 South Governors Avenue	4 story retail/apartment building and four story apartment building; demolition of existing commercial building	Scheduled for HDC review on 7/21/2011.	Requires HDC review and recommendation on ArchRevCert. Requires Site Plan review by Planning Commission - application filed S-11-11 for August 2011 review.

City of Dover Historic District Commission
Summary of Applications 2009-2010
Updated as of July 7, 2011

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 7/1/11 the building foundation is in place.
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	Documentation of Building is underway by consultant hired by applicant; 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 July 7, 2011

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.	No Action Taken to date. Permit Application must be filed. Potential revisions to placement are eligible for Staff review of ArchRevCert during Building Permit review.
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.	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	Plan progressing through Check Print process for agency approvals. Check Print Comments issued on. Demo Permit #11-579 issued 5/12/2011 but no action as of 7/1/2011 beyond asbestos abatement to demolish yet. Building Permit #11-656 under review.
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 reviewed for Phase 1-Interior Renovations only.
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.

City of Dover Historic District Commission
Summary of Applications 2009-2010
Updated as of July 7, 2011

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.

Summary of Permit Applications with Architectural Review Certification
Updated as of 7-7-2011

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	Approval per HDC action on permit referred for consultation	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 7-7-2011

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	Signs to be 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 to be 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 pending.
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	Permit Issued
6/6/2011	11-723	54 South State Street, Presbyterian Church	Temporary Sign Permit (VBS Banner)	Staff Approval	Temporary Sign installed and to
6/21/2011	11-768	101 West Water Street	Building Permit - Parking Lot	Approval per HI-10-11	Construction underway.
6/27/2011	11-812	101 West Water Street	Building Permit - Fence	Approval per HI-10-11	Construction underway.

City of Dover

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW REPORT
Update and Review of Exterior Finish Materials
For Consideration by Dover Historic District Commission
Meeting of July 21, 2011

Application: Dover Public Library, HI-09-01 and S-10-06

Location: 35 Loockerman Plaza

Current Request for Review:
As part of the ongoing project for the construction of the new Dover Public Library, some design revisions to the exterior finish materials are proposed as a result of design work, construction bidding, and value engineering initiatives. The Historic District Commission was alerted to the potential for changes in materials by the City Manager at their February 17, 2011 meeting; it was noted that a submission would be forthcoming once a revised proposal was determined. The project is now actively under construction (at the foundation phase). In the approval for Architectural Review Certification for the Library project, it was noted that any changes to identified exterior materials could require additional review by the Commission.

A letter with attached documentation (dated 7/6/2011) showing revisions to several exterior finish materials is presented for Review and Recommendation on the Architectural Review Certification by the Historic District Commission. See attached documents. The changes to exterior finish materials focus on three areas specifically:

- Brick at library "bookends": The ends of the building were originally proposed as an ashlar stone pattern. The new material is a dark brown utility size brick.
- Metal standing seam roof: The surface material for the main roof was originally shown as a slate roof in a variety of gray tones. The new material is a metal standing seam roof in a gray color.
- Light Monitors with slate shingles: The surface material was originally shown as slate shingles but consideration was being given to using other materials such as a metal panel system. The new material selected is slate shingles.

The Historic District Commission is to review the selected exterior finish materials for the end walls, roof, and light monitors and then make a recommendation in regards to the Architectural Review Certification. This Recommendation will be forwarded to the Planning Commission for the final action on the revised Architectural Review Certification. The following information provides additional information on the project and request.

Project History:
On June 17, 2009, the Historic District Commission conducted a public hearing and took action to make a recommendation on the Architectural Review Certificate for the Dover "Anchor"

Public Library project. The application consisted of the construction of a two story library building of 46,000 S.F with the associated parking, walkways, landscaping, and stormwater management facilities. The project area consists of several parcels of land totaling 4.67 acres ± of land zoned I-O (Institutional and Office Zone) and subject to the H (Historic District Zone). The property site is located on the north side of East Loockerman Street between South State Street and Legislative Avenue/Innovation Way in an area also known as The Plaza. The owner of record is the City of Dover.

As presented in June 2009 (proposal 4/15/2009), the proposed library building was described as follows in the Architectural Review Report:

- The brick building consists of two main forms: a rectilinear "bar-like" form with a side gable roof and an oval form of predominately glass with a flat roof/green roof system. The ends of the building are 'bookended' by a wide bay clad in ashlar stone with a large chimneylike form extending through the roof line.

- The predominant exterior finish materials for the library building are brick and ashlar stone veneer with the wall detailing provided through the use of brick patterning and sawn stone elements. Brick detailing and changes in the stone veneer mark the watertable on the building with a similar pattern noting the transition to the second floor. A heavy cornice line indicates the transition to the gable roof which is clad in slate shingles. The window openings use clear glass with aluminum framed curtain wall systems construction for the large openings and aluminum double hung windows and single windows for the smaller openings. At the roof level, four sets of paired light monitors bring northern light into the building. These light monitors are also to be clad with slate shingles.

Staff notes that at the time of the original review the cladding and detailing of the roof light monitors was still in design with several material options under consideration.

Architectural Review Certification Review and Action:
Following a presentation on the project, the discussion at the Historic District Commission meeting of June 2009 also included questions pertaining to exterior finish materials of the roof, light monitors, use of ashlar stone, color choices, and the 'bookend' forms. The Historic District Commission recommended approval of the Architectural Review Certificate for the Dover "Anchor" Public Library project finding the overall building to be of a contemporary design yet compatible with the buildings of the Capitol Square context of the Historic District. The Commission accepted the design presented with the conservations/comments from the meeting on exterior finish materials. The Commission noted the compliance of the project with regards to the *Design Standards & Guidelines* and recognized the Staff comments and recommendations (Items #1-12) as conditions. (See the attached copies of the Architectural Review Certification Recommendation Report and Meeting Minutes.)

On March 15, 2010, after a public hearing and review the Planning Commission granted approval of the Architectural Review Certificate for the Dover Public Library project following the recommendations of the Historic District Commission. (See attached excerpt of Meeting Minutes.) The Final Site Development Plan approval was granted on March 18, 2011 and the Building Permit #10-1904 was then issued for construction.

Review of DESIGN STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES

Location within the Dover Historic District Zone requires proposals for demolition, new construction, additions, and certain renovation or rehabilitation activities to existing buildings to receive an Architectural Review Certificate. As stated in the *Design Standards and Guidelines for the City of Dover Historic District Zone,* an Architectural Review Certificate will be granted "if it is found that the architectural style, general design, height, bulk and setbacks, arrangement location and materials affecting the exterior appearance are generally in harmony with neighboring structures and complementary to the traditional architectural standards of the historic district." In accordance with Article 10 §3.2, the Historic District Commission will provide a recommendation to the Planning Commission regarding the revised project's compliance with the architectural review standards.

This revised proposal must be reviewed for conformity with the design criteria guidelines found in Chapter 4: New Construction, Additions, Demolition and Relocation. For the new library building, the applicable review considerations are the design criteria and development guidelines associated with "New Construction" (Chapter 4: pages 4-1 through 4-8). "Materials" is one of the guidelines for new construction to be considered in the review by the Historic District Commission (and Planning Commission) of the project for Architectural Review Certification. Other guidelines focus on style, scale, elevation of the first floor, floor-to-floor heights, bays, windows and doors, absolute size, massing, orientation, proportions, forms, siting and high density/large scale construction.

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The following are Staff comments and recommendations for this submission regarding the revised exterior finish materials for the project and Architectural Review Certification.

1. Staff recommends conditional approval of the revised Architectural Review Certificate pertaining to the selection of revised exterior finish materials for the "bookend" walls, roof, and light monitors of library building project finding the materials selected to be compatible with character of the historic district and appropriate materials as recommended in the *Design Standards and Guidelines*.

2. Any revisions or changes in the identified materials may be subject to further review by the Historic District Commission.

3. For building construction, the requirements of the building code or fire code must be complied with. Consult with the Chief Building Inspector and Office of the Fire Marshal for these requirements and any necessary addendums to the Building Permit as issued which may be necessary with this change in materials.

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

City of Dover

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW STAFF REPORT
Before Dover Historic District Commission
June 17, 2009

Application:	Dover "Anchor" Public Library
Location:	North side of East Loockerman Street on The Plaza
Tax Parcels:	ED-05-077.05-04-51.01-000 ED-05-077.05-04-53.00-000 ED-05-077.05-04-54.00-000 ED-05-077.05-04-55.00-000 ED-05-077.05-04-56.00-000
Owner:	City of Dover
Present Zoning:	I-O - Institutional and Office Zone H- Historic District Zone SWPOZ – Source Water Protection Overlay Zone* (*Exempt from Tier 3 provisions due to Downtown Redevelopment Target Area location. *Zoning Ordinance,* Article 3 §29.79)
Present Use:	City Hall and municipal parking lot
Proposed Use:	Public Library, City Hall, and municipal parking lot
File Number:	HI-09-01

Project Description:
The Historic District Commission will act on a recommendation to the City of Dover Planning Commission for an Architectural Review Certificate for the Dover "Anchor" Public Library project. This application consists of the construction of a two story library building of 46,000 S.F with the associated parking, walkways, landscaping, and stormwater management facilities. The project area consists of several parcels of land totaling 4.67 acres ± of land zoned I-O (Institutional and Office Zone) and subject to the H (Historic District Zone). The property site is located on the north side of East Loockerman Street between South State Street and Legislative Avenue/Innovation Way in an area also known as The Plaza. The owner of record is the City of Dover. The property address is 15 East Loockerman Street. Tax Parcels: ED-05-077.05-04-51.01-000, ED-05-077.05-04-53.00-000, ED-05-077.05-04-54.00-000, ED-05-077.05-04-55.00-000, and ED-05-077.05-04-56.00-000.

Property Information:

The subject site consists of several parcels of land predominately currently utilized as the municipal parking lot between the City Hall and the U.S. Post Office. As part of the improvements to site access and circulation for the project, several adjoining parking lots will also be reconfigured.

The adjoining property to the north known historically as the Richardson & Robbins Building (occupied by DNREC) is the southeastern boundary of the National Register of Historic Places listed Victorian Dover Historic District (K-396). The properties along the East Loockerman Street segment (The Plaza) including the existing City Hall, parking lot, and U.S. Post Office are not within the Victorian Dover Historic District of the National Register.

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

PROJECT PROPOSAL (Drawings dated 4/15/2009):

This proposal involves the construction of a two (2) story public library building of 46,000 S.F. on the site of an existing parking lot. The brick building consists of two main forms: a rectilinear "bar-like" form with a side gable roof and an oval form of predominately glass with a flat roof/green roof system. The ends of the building are 'bookended' by a wide bay clad in ashlar stone with a large chimneylike form extending through the roof line.

The space between the library building and East Loockerman Street includes a Reading Garden with lawn area, retaining wall, tree plantings and an access ramp. The main entrance to the new library building is on the south side of the building facing East Loockerman Street. This same entrance lobby is also accessible on the north side of the building from the large parking lot. The entrances are highlighted with the use of a flat aluminum awning and precast stone covered columns supporting a sawn stone lintel. Also on the south elevation, the two tiered oval form portion of the building consists mainly of glass broken by a series of brick piers.

The predominant exterior finish materials for the library building are brick and ashlar stone veneer with the wall detailing provided through the use of brick patterning and sawn stone elements. Brick detailing and changes in the stone veneer mark the watertable on the building with a similar pattern noting the transition to the second floor. A heavy cornice line indicates the transition to the gable roof which is clad in slate shingles. The window openings use clear glass with aluminum framed curtain wall systems construction for the large openings and aluminum double hung windows and single windows for the smaller openings. At the roof level, four sets of paired light monitors bring northern light into the building. These light monitors are also to be clad with slate shingles.

The height is almost 52 feet from the finished first floor to the ridge peak of the roof with the bookend elements and light monitors reaching an overall height of just over 58 feet. Per the *Zoning Ordinance* the height would be calculated as 41 feet 9¼ inches (average between the eave and roof ridge). A series of elevation drawings place this building in comparison with

existing buildings in the immediate area i.e. the City Hall Building and Post Office Building. Most notable is that the cornice line of the new library building is held relatively as the same height as its neighboring buildings.

The location of mechanical equipment for the library appears to be within the building with some below grade exterior equipment.

The project also includes site improvements ranging from parking lot reconfiguration to landscaping. The parking lot improvements include landscaped islands planted with trees or shrubs. The Reading Garden on the south side of the building introduces a patterning of surface materials and landscape plantings (trees and shrubs) with opportunities for outdoor seating. Several existing tress will be retained between City Hall and the new library building. New street trees are also proposed along East Loockerman Street.

See attached elevation drawings, site plan drawings, and project overview booklet for detailed information on building dimensions, locations, and material choices.

Review of DESIGN STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES

The subject project site is located in the Dover Historic District Zone within Capitol Square historic context. The Capitol Square historic context is described on pages 2-8 through 2-9. Location within the Dover Historic District Zone requires proposals for demolition, new construction, additions, and certain renovation or rehabilitation activities to existing buildings to receive an Architectural Review Certificate.

As stated in the *Design Standards and Guidelines for the City of Dover Historic District Zone*, an Architectural Review Certificate will be granted "if it is found that the architectural style, general design, height, bulk and setbacks, arrangement location and materials affecting the exterior appearance are generally in harmony with neighboring structures and complementary to the traditional architectural standards of the historic district." In accordance with Article 10 §3.2, the Historic District Commission will provide a recommendation to the Planning Commission regarding the project's compliance with the architectural review standards.

This proposal must be reviewed for conformity with the design criteria guidelines found in Chapter 4: New Construction, Additions, Demolition and Relocation. For the new library building, the applicable review considerations are those associated with "New Construction." Information on the proposed project and the review considerations is given below.

New Construction

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

- Style
- Scale *(building to reflect dominant cornice and roof height of adjacent buildings)*

- Elevation of the First Floor
- Floor-to-Floor heights
- Bays, windows and doors *(size, relationship, spacing of)*
- Absolute Size *(compare overall size of new building)*
- Massing *(relationship of solid-to-void)*
- Orientation *(location of primary façade)*
- Proportions *(comparison of height to width of building and elements)*
- Materials
- Forms *(shape of building and roof to be complementary)*
- Siting *(location of building on lot and in relation to street)*
- High density/ large-scale construction

The proposed project must also be reviewed for compliance with the standards established by the *Zoning Ordinance*. The standards include items such as setbacks from property lines, lot coverage, height, etc. This Proposal for the new library building appears to conform to the bulk requirements of the I-O Zoning District including setbacks, building height, floor area ratio, and lot coverage. The *City of Dover Zoning Ordinance* authorizes the Historic District Commission to waive certain bulk standards when issuing its recommendation to the Planning Commission for an Architectural Review Certificate if necessary.

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

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

1. Staff recommends conditional approval of the Architectural Review Certificate for the construction of the library building project finding the overall building to be of a contemporary design yet compatible with the buildings of the Capitol Square context of the Historic District.

2. These conditions are recommended by Staff to improve the project's compliance with the recommended guidelines of the *Design Standards and Guidelines*. The following are recommended conditions:
    a. Any revisions or changes in the identified materials may be subject to further review by the Historic District Commission.
    b. The selected brick choices should be compatible to the brick of other existing buildings in the area.
    c. Consider options for the cladding and detailing of the roof light monitors.
    d. Signage identifying the library should be integrated into the building and site design. Consideration of any free standing signage may require additional review.
    e. Light fixtures/poles should continue style of the lighting used in the Capitol Square area or Downtown Loockerman Street areas. A taller two-light style fixture may be more appropriate within the parking lot areas.
    f. Identify the landscaping for the improved parking lot reconfiguration and its entrance from King's Highway.

3. The following items should be clarified regarding the building design.
    a. Clarify the type of system proposed for gutters and down sprouts.
    b. Identify the material of the cornice line on the south and north elevations.
    c. Clarify if there is a color patterning to the slate shingles (as depicted in the color renderings).

4. Some of the site improvements/amenities were not specifically described with the application information. Please provide information for consideration.
    a. Identify the materials for the Reading Garden area including surface pavement, wall detailing, benches or other seating, bicycle parking rack, etc.
    b. Identify the design and materials of the retaining wall along the drive aisle entrance from Innovation Way. Due to the size and scale of the wall, the materials selected must be appropriate for use within the Historic District. This location may be an opportunity for a public art project.
    c. Identify areas where the sidewalks or portions of the sidewalks will be constructed of brick. The use of brick paving materials for sidewalk construction is a key feature found throughout the Historic District area. It appears that several existing brick sidewalk areas will be removed or reconfigured as part of this project.

5. The proposed future development of a building addition and redevelopment of the corner property at East Loockerman Street and Innovation Way (current U.S. Post Office site) is not part of this project review or approval (concept shown on plan sheet A-100A). It will be the subject of a future application review.

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

7. The proposed landscaping including tree plantings should be completed with species appropriate to the site conditions including plantings within the bio-retention areas. Consultation with the City's arborist regarding the tree species selected is recommended especially regarding the street trees.

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

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

10. This site development plan for this project is also subject to the application and review

process for Site Development Plan (Article 10 §2 of the *Zoning Ordinance*) before the Planning Commission. Note: Additional technical items for compliance with the *Zoning Ordinance* and other regulations may be identified during the Site Plan Process. Review comments pertaining specifically to the Site Plan set will be issued at that time.

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

12. The applicant shall be aware that a Sign Permit is required to proceed with the placement of signage on the property.

Historic District Commission Action Required

The Historic District Commission shall consider the proposal and provide a recommendation to the Planning Commission in regards to the Architectural Review Certification for the project site development plan. The recommendation should reflect consideration of the *Design Standards and Guidelines.*

CITY OF DOVER
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
JUNE 17, 2009

The Regular Meeting of the City of Dover Historic District Commission was held on Wednesday, June 17, 2009 at 3:00 PM with Chairman Scrafford presiding. Members present were: Mr. Scrafford, Mr. Salkin, Mr. McDaniel and Mr. Jackson. Mr. McNair was absent.

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

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. McDaniel moved for approval of the agenda as submitted, seconded by Mr. Salkin and the motion was unanimously carried.

ADOPTION OF MINUTES OF THE REGULAR HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION MEETING OF MAY 20, 2009

Mr. Salkin moved to adopt the minutes of the regular Historic District Commission meeting of May 20, 2009, seconded by Mr. McDaniel and motion was unanimously carried.

COMMUNICATIONS & REPORTS

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that Staff did not have any specific items for this month's packet. Planning Staff as well as some of the Planning Commission members participated in a "Creating Walkable Communities" workshop last evening that gave background on pedestrian/bicycle and multi-model aspects of communities. A walk was taken in the Historic District and a discussion held on things that were liked and not liked. Staff may try to have other walk-arounds or things related to this in the future. Some of the good things noted on the tour were the buildings in the Historic District.

OLD BUSINESS

Update on Application for Certified Local Government Status

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that Staff is making progress as everyone's resume has been updated and Staff will now be gathering the other elements of the application process which includes any Ordinances that were done to create the Historic District and the Commission itself. This is a project that Staff will continue to work on through the summer and fall months.

NEW BUSINESS

HI-09-01 Dover "Anchor" Public Library at 15 East Loockerman Street: Architectural Review Certification - Public Hearing and Action on a recommendation to the City of Dover Planning Commission for an Architectural Review Certificate for the Dover "Anchor" Public Library project. This application consists of the construction of a 2 story library building of 46,000 S.F with the associated parking, walkways, landscaping, and stormwater management facilities. The project area consists of several parcels of land totaling 4.67 acres ± of land zoned I-O (Institutional and Office Zone) and subject to the H (Historic District Zone). The property site is located on the north side of East Loockerman Street between South State Street and

Legislative Avenue/Innovation Way in an area also known as The Plaza. The owner of record is the City of Dover. The property address is 15 East Loockerman Street. Tax Parcels: ED-05-077.05-04-51.01-000, ED-05-077.05-04-53.00-000, ED-05-077.05-04-54.00-000, ED-05-077.05-04-55.00-000, and ED-05-077.05-04-56.00-000.

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that there have a been a number of public meetings that both Planning Staff and members of the Historic District Commission have participated in or attended as members of the general public. A few of you who have attended these meetings was concerned if this would be considered a conflict of interest under the provisions in the By-laws. Staff feels that it would not be a conflict of interest.

Representatives: Mr. Zach Carter, Representing the City of Dover, Director of Parks, Recreation and Library for the City of Dover; Douglas Moss, Holzman Moss Architecture; Mr. Eddie Kung, Holzman Moss Architecture and Project Manager; Mrs. Arden Bardol, Principal with Becker Morgan Group, Inc.; and Mrs. Margery Cyr, Library Director.

Mr. Moss conducted an overview of a Power Point presentation regarding the project and its architectural features and provided samples of materials that they are beginning to consider.

Mr. Moss stated that they have gone through a substantial review process not only with the City and with the users of the library, but also with the entire community of Dover. This has been important to not only understand what the community and residents of Dover want in their building, but also what the building's character should be, what it should look like, and how it should be a part of this community. One of the things that we have learned through that process is a great interest in a sustainable building practice known as "green architecture." We think of it as improving the efficiency of a building, improving the health and welfare of a building, and in the long run, a more cost effective building to operate.

Mr. Moss further stated that the site is located just to the east between City Hall and the existing Post Office. The Post Office is actually owned by the City of Dover in the way of the building and the grounds. The City of Dover is beginning to think long term regarding what the ultimate use may be of this building or of this site. As a result, part of the study has been to think through long term what could happen on this site either in terms of renovation of the existing Post Office into a new use or the creation of a new facility and/or how parking would tie into all of that in the future.

Mr. Moss stated that the issues that they are trying to first illustrate, outline, and ultimately resolve include how they make this a stronger urban building in an area because of its location on Loockerman Street with what is a large void with the existing parking lot. We want to make sure that we help extend what is already occurring on the western end of Loockerman Street as a strong urban place. We have tried to address parking and traffic issues in terms of clarity on how people get in and out of the site once the building is developed and how that will continue on how people get in and out of the Post Office and in and out of the City Hall space.

Mr. Moss further stated that they have substantially increased the amount of landscaping both around City Hall and in front of the proposed library where it is proposed to be a reading garden.

In addition to the development of the interior, the program, and functionality of the interior of the building which will not be discussed as a part of this presentation, it deals with the exterior of the building and how this building does front Loockerman Street and how it interacts with the existing buildings in the Historic District, how are we a good neighbor to those buildings, and how do we contribute to the existing urban fabric that is already in Dover. One of the things that we have done is to analyze a lot of the buildings in the community with some that are viewed very positively and some that have a lot of different characteristics to them. One of the extraordinary advantages and opportunities in Dover is not only the strength of the Georgian buildings not only in this region but also the strength of the Victorian houses that are just to the north and west of Downtown.

Mr. Moss further stated that one of the components that are most a-typical of this proposed project is a large reading room and children's area on the first and second floor at the front of the building. Relating to Georgian ceiling patterns and components of buildings, they have had an early part of how they have begun to form a shaping point of view and from a plan point of view develop some of the components for the plan.

Mr. Moss further stated that the north elevation view facing the parking lot is made up of two components. One is a long rectangular building which is primarily brick clad. Off to the left of this is an entry from the parking lot and a similar entry is on the south side of the building facing Loockerman Street as well. It was very important from a planning point that whether you arrive on foot, by bike, or by vehicle, that everyone feels like they are coming into the same primary front door of the building. The second component on the rear side of the building which represents primarily glass components and the magnitude of the glass is office related spaces, support spaces, and technology spaces. With regards to sustainability they have been trying to bring the daylight in as much of the space for as long of a period during the year and as long of a period each day as they possibly can, partly to improve the quality of light and partly to reduce the energy consumption.

Mr. Moss further stated with regards to the Loockerman Street side of the building there are three primary components; however, two of them are the same as what is on the north side of the building. The long rectangular building is the primary two story space of the library and is primarily brick. The punched openings have operable windows with wood mullions that are painted white. In the middle located to the right of that image is the entryway to the building and then the oval shaped area that is one room on the first floor for the children's library and one room on the second floor which will be the adult reading room that also has a green roof in front of this reading room.

Mr. Moss further stated that on the roof of this elevation there are a series of vertical elements on the roof; four that you see very prominently in the foreground and four that you will see on the left side in the background. From a historic point of view, these are similar to many of the roof profiles that are on some of the historic buildings and in many cases were chimneys or cupolas or other types of vertical elements. In this case, we are using them for a functional point of view and in addition to architecturally breaking up the roof line of this roof. The functional aspect deals with bringing in natural light so that on the second and first floor we are able to bring natural light in for the middle of the space as this is a very narrow building.

Mr. Moss further stated that the roof which is a gabled roof on the large rectangular portion of the building will be slate. One of the topics that were asked of us in the Staff review was whether this slate would be in a pattern? We are not sure that it will be even though it was drawn and indicated as a pattern. It may be more of a collection of three colors of a red, green, and a charcoal color and would be in a less consistent pattern. Also for the roof, we are looking at a standing seam material as another option. It would not be a painted metal; however, a natural metal color that would age over time. The reason for these two different options is that in the Historic District there are examples of both slate and the standing seam and it deals partly with cost and with how we might ultimately treat the roof in the future.

Mr. Moss further stated that on the red brick that is illustrated the primary brick is made up of two different colors. The majority which is about ninety-eight (98) percent of this wall would be a red brick. We are looking at each of the four colors that are shown (sample boards) and each of them have come from brick manufacturers that have supplied brick in this Historic District so each will match different buildings that are located within this Historic District. The slightly lighter color brick located in the vertical bands of the building and also at the entry may be one of those brick colors as well. They are trying to differentiate from a shade value with these two different colors of brick to help accentuate the vertical and to also help break up the roof line. The building part in the oval shape is primarily glass because of the function that is located inside; however, there is a lot of brick. The brick is seen in the brick piers that are on the first and second floor and those brick piers are outside of the building by four or five feet. They also extend into the building and remain brick by another four or five feet.

Mr. Moss further stated that the size of this building at 46,000 square feet on two floors is slightly smaller than the Townshend Building located directly across the street which is a three story building that is a State building. In terms of physical mass, this is a different scale building than the one that we are in or the Post Office. At the entry of the building, there is a change in brick color as well as the scale of the windows. This image will give you closer detail of some of the sills, lentils on the windows, mullions and muttons that will be on the windows, eave images, and some of the light monitors that will be used in the roof.

Mr. Moss further stated that they will use a green roof and we do anticipate the vegetation on the roof being from eight (8) to fourteen (14) inches in height. You will see a little bit of green depending on where you are as a pedestrian or driving in a vehicle. It becomes very prominent when you are in the adult reading room on the second floor. The green roof also has a lot to do with rain water collection and stormwater management.

Mr. Jackson stated that the slate on the vertical walls of the light monitors is jarring to his eye and questions why this would be slate especially when you look at all the other chimneys in the area that are brick? With the standing seam roof that was mentioned, is it similar to the DNREC building? Responding to Mr. Jackson, Mr. Moss stated that the new library building would have a turn coated metal such as what DNREC has.

Mr. Jackson further stated that he realizes that in a larger sense, regionally, fieldstone is a popular material; however, in the City of Dover there is just precious little of it except when

someone wants to make a front façade of their house a little different than the plastic that is on the other three sides. He feels that this idea needs to be thought about longer.

Responding to Mr. Jackson, Mr. Moss stated that with regards to the skylights and light monitors, he thinks that this is a very good point and they could look at what the vertical surface is on those. Their challenge with brick deals with the magnitude of weight because on the inside of the building, we do not have any enclosed spaces; it is one large loft like space on the second floor. Structurally, there are issues regarding the magnitude of mass. What we need to explore is whatever the roof becomes, we do the opposite on the vertical elements so that there is a very clear differential between the two.

Mr. Moss further stated that with regards to fieldstone, it is typically viewed as stone that is taken out of the field that is not cut and is in random shapes and sizes. In looking at the ashlar cut, it is sliced on the top, bottom, and the sides; however, the front and the back is split face with a rough texture to it. The question of why would we do it deals with scale. One of the things that we did with the lighter brick and the ashlar stone on the end is in regards to the dimension which is one of the longest dimensions you will have in the Historic District. They will break it up in a way so that it is reducing the scale. Even though it is a different material we will try to come very close to matching the color so that we have a different texture.
Mr. Salkin questioned both in terms of texture and color, did you consider completely different materials, texture, or color for either the ends of the building or any portion of it? Responding to Mr. Salkin, Mr. Moss stated that they have looked at a wide variety of options because we knew a topic of this nature would come up. We started with brick which we feel would be the most obvious given the context. Once we started to veer away from that option we looked at a wide range of things that would try to address the scale topic, the color topic, and the material topic. We have looked at slate shingles that are much larger, metal, ashlar stone, and larger brick. We kept coming back to the very same concerns that he previously mentioned and this is how we came to select the stone. To make the stone work well is to make sure that the coloration from a value point of view is going to be consistent with the brick.

Mr. Salkin further questioned where there is color in this building? Are there opportunities to introduce it anywhere that you have not shown this Commission? He would assume that all of the wood trim would be white. Responding to Mr. Salkin, Mr. Moss stated that the building has two very different components. There is the exterior component and then the interior component. When we met with a number of the community groups, one of the things that they were concerned about is that they want to feel welcomed into this building. This is one of the reasons they are not presenting a true Georgian replication of a building that you might have on the Capitol grounds. We tried to make the building very calm and appropriate to the surrounding context. We feel color holds an enormous impact in public buildings so when you walk through the doors, you will be in a very different environment. The inside of the building will have a substantial amount of color depending on which area of the building you are in.

Mr. Jackson stated as a follow-up to his question regarding the end bays, these are pretty large book ends and it stands out to him and appears to be dominant on the building. You have used the overall design of the building to pull away from the rampant Georgian style located along the

mall. He applauds you for doing so in that it is a difficult situation in any job to come to and be a part of the twenty-first century building and not a copy of an eighteenth century building.

Mr. Scrafford questioned if the size of the bookends was determined by the length of the building in that if you made them too small they would look awkward or if made larger they would look worse. Responding to Mr. Scrafford, Mr. Moss stated that it deals with a couple of factors: one, the balance on the exterior looking at the elevation and second, on the bookends the material comes to the inside of the building as well. Just like the brick piers that he discussed on the oval shaped building, when you are in this large loft-like space in the library and look at one end from the other end you see the ashlar stone inside the building. In the width of this we are using it as a functional space. There are small reading rooms on certain levels, technology centers on certain levels, and at the back of the building, they are also used as the emergency egress stairs in this width.

Mr. McDaniel stated that he has sat in on some of the organizational meetings and feels that they tried to capture a functional library that will fit in; however, not be exactly like everything else that is around it. He likes the bookends and the ashlar as someone has to be first with it as he realizes it was not quarried out of Kent County; however, he likes the fact that it is texturally different yet trying to make it somewhat similar with color. They were charged to do something and they did it. The light monitors that have skylights on top of them on the north side are a great idea. The concept of this building is on the mark.

Mrs. Melson-Williams conducted an overview of Staff's comments and recommendations. Staff is recommending approval of the Architectural Review Certificate for the Library Building Project "finding the overall building to be a contemporary design yet compatible with buildings in the Capitol Square context in the Historic District."

Mr. Scrafford questioned with regards to the brick sidewalks, they were not addressed during this presentation, what would the covered areas consist of? Responding to Mr. Scrafford, Mr. Moss stated that the location of the building and the reconfiguration of some of the adjoining parking lot areas will impact some of the existing sidewalk network surrounding this building which is predominately brick until you are out along Loockerman Street and that would be the wide swath of concrete that exists. Concrete sidewalks are permitted in the Historic District; however, brick is an appropriate material in the district as well.

Also responding to Mr. Scrafford, Mr. Moss stated that one of the important components along Loockerman Street is how to extend the sidewalk that is already in front of City Hall. The challenge of what is in front of City Hall is that there are no street trees which you do see in front of the PNC Bank and the rest of Loockerman Street. We are discussing placing trees along the street frontage and then the sidewalk located directly behind the trees.

Mr. Moss further stated that the reading garden is intended to do three primary things: one is to provide a very strong entry into the building and along the pedestrian entry we will manage benches and places where people can sit and play chess at fixed permanent tables. The second component of the reading garden area deals with a large grass space that may be shaped to a degree so that we may have outdoor performances, readings, or public events. The third

component is to have smaller, more intimate reading areas that maybe located around the green space. Around the perimeter of the green space we would place soft landscaping that will help divide the sidewalk from the activity that might be occurring inside the reading garden. The garden area would be a combination of brick and concrete because of cost. Because we would like to decrease the amount of impervious areas, we are also looking at some other alternatives that would reduce the impervious areas and increase the pervious areas in the reading garden area that could be pervious walking surfaces.

Mr. McDaniel questioned if Staff recommended the signage as it has been presented? Responding to Mr. McDaniel, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that in the elevations it gives the name over the entrance to the building. In the Sign Regulations, that would be a component of a wall sign. There was other information that indicated that there may be placement of a free-standing sign on site and this is what Staff identified that could require additional review because it is not what is typically found in this area. There are free standing signs in the Capitol Square complex naming the State buildings.

Mr. Scrafford opened a public hearing.

Mrs. Dorothy Snyder – 9 Douglas Court – Stated that she is a member of the Dover Public Library Advisory Commission and has been involved in this project from the beginning. The first time she saw the picture of the library she loved it and stated that she fully supports this project.

Mr. McDaniel moved to close the public hearing after seeing no one else wishing to speak seconded by Mr. Jackson the motion was unanimously carried.

Mr. Salkin stated that the comments that came from this Commission are clear and does not require anything of the applicant; however, it has offered some guidance or small challenges to what otherwise seems to be a euphoric design. He would be very comfortable supporting this project and moving ahead based on the assumptions that have been presented to us today.

Mr. Jackson moved to approve application HI-09-01 Dover "Anchor" Public Library at 15 East Loockerman Street: Architectural Review Certification and to accept the design colored by the conversations that have been held and comments made and its compliance with regards to the Design Standards and Guidelines and recognizing all Staff comments and recommendations seconded by Mr. Salkin and the motion was unanimously carried of the members present 4-0.

ONGOING PROJECTS

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

Mrs. Townshend stated that because of the length of the first item on the agenda, this item could be deferred to the next meeting. In the past several meetings we have talked about it. In the absence of City funds to hire someone to help us with the Historic District Guidelines that Staff was going to work on it. In-house Staff and the Historic District Commission will work on fixing the challenges that we have experienced over the years.

Mr. McDaniel moved to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Mr. Jackson and the motion was unanimously carried.

Meeting adjourned at 4:16 PM

Sincerely,

Diane Metsch
Secretary

management system in place at the Simpson Log Homes, is that the water has increased tremendously. The picture he presented has been in the paper twice because he has tried to point this out that the City of Dover should be concerned because on the more severe range, the road is completely covered with water. You do not really see it coming so when cars are traveling at excessive speeds there then they come up on this water with a splash there is problems with that. His only concern, like he has said is water. They are pro-development; they can build 100 houses back there if they want. That is not the problem. We just want to make sure, and it does not sound like tonight other than the study that has been made. Realistically, we would applaud if it would that some of the water that is collecting on the Simpson Log Homes site is taken away and the problem it is creating. There is no possible way that any additional homes can be built unless there is a better water management system or retention ponds that were mentioned. He would agree that if all of the findings are not in, he does not feel that you can make a real educated decision without knowing that.

After seeing no one else wishing to speak Mr. Friedman stated that he would leave the public hearing open for the next meeting when that does occur.

Colonel Welsh moved to table Z-10-01 Lands of TLFD until next month or until we have received the State PLUS review comments for the proposal and to also allow time to review the 30 page package that was placed on our desks this evening along with comments this evening, seconded by Mr. Nichols and the motion was unanimously carried 6-0 with Mr. Shomo, Mr. Hemmig, and Mr. Ambruso absent.

S-10-06 Dover Public Library - Public Hearing and Site Plan Review and Architectural Review Certification to permit the construction of a 46,000 SF building and associated site improvements of parking, walkways, landscaping, and stormwater management facilities. The project site consists of five parcels totaling 4.6663 acres ± and is zoned IO (Institutional/Office Zone) and is subject to H (Historic District Overlay Zone) and the SWPOZ (Source Water Protection Overlay Zone). The property site is located on the north side of East Loockerman Street between South State Street and Legislative Avenue/Innovation Way in an area also known as The Plaza. The owners of record are City of Dover and 100 West Street Trust Company. Tax Parcels: ED-05-077.05-04-51.01-000, ED-05-077.05-04-53.00-000, ED-05-077.05-04-54.00-000, ED-05-077.05-04-55.00-000, and ED-05-077.05-04-56.00-000. *The Historic District Commission reviewed the project on June 17, 2009 and has provided recommendations in regards to the Architectural Review Certification (HI-09-01). Waivers Requested: Reduction in Number of Required Parking Spaces, Partial Elimination of Curbing, and Elimination of Required Loading Spaces.*

Representatives: Mr. Gregg Moore, Becker Morgan Group, LLC; Ms. Margie Cyr, City of Dover Library Director; and Mr. Zach Carter, City of Dover Director of Parks and Recreation.

Mrs. Melson-Williams provided an overview of the application including the waivers requested and the Historic District Commission recommendations.

Mr. Moore presented a Powerpoint presentation of the project at this time.

Mr. Moore stated that he would provide an overview of what the parking will be for the project. The Post Office will remain and is located on a separate parcel that the City leases to them. They have reconfigured the parking in the back of the new library and City Hall that would be more efficient and provide more spaces per acre than what currently exists. The biggest change would be the new access way from Kings Highway which would allow people to come from Kings Highway, circulate through the property, and use either City Hall, the Library, or the Post Office from that location and flow all the way through to Innovation Way which allows you to get back to a light at the corner of Loockerman Street and Innovation Way. With regards to the access way along the Post Office, we have kept the parking spots along the edge of the Post Office on the library side. We constructed handicap spots along the building because we believe that it would be best to leave this configuration the same. People can pull in as they do now and use the Post Office as well as the library. Behind the Post Office, there is a parking lot that is designated for the post office only with thirty-seven (37) spaces that includes fleet vehicles and parking.

Mr. Moore further stated that another big change will be on Innovation Way. There are currently twenty-two (22) parking spaces located on the street. These parking spaces have not been counted in their parking space count relative to their waiver request; however, the City has indicated that they will be changing these spaces to fifteen (15) minute parking from undesignated. Undesignated parking means that someone will be able to park and stay there all day long which could be an employee of any Downtown business and that car could be there all day. The purpose of changing these twenty-two (22) parking spaces to fifteen (15) minute parking is to allow them to become turnover spaces for the use of the Post Office. This will help to offset some of the parking that is taking place in the larger parking lot that currently exists without the building being there.

Mr. Moore further stated that there are forty-three (43) parking spaces on Loockerman Street that are off-street again; they did not count it in their parking for the totals of our waiver. This would include parking in front of City Hall, in front of the library site, and in front of the Post Office on both sides of the road which would be a large amount of parking that would be used functionally for this building as well as City Hall.

Mr. Moore further stated that they have picked two spots for the possible relocation of the drop-off mailbox that is currently located in the City Hall parking lot. We want to keep the Post Office operating as it does today and there have been requests that we keep this drop box.

Mr. Moore further stated that the current Library sits on the same property as the Reed Street City office building and is actually larger than City Hall. The parking lot that the two share together is only seventy-three (73) total parking spaces. By Code, sixty-six (66) of these parking spaces are required by Code for the Reed Street offices that would leave only seven (7) designated parking spaces for the library beyond the code. If we were to come before you with this request, we would need to request a parking requirement waiver of close to the maximum of fifty (50) percent.

Mr. Moore further stated that the Library is able to function on this site with this limited amount of parking for a number of reasons. The current Library and the proposed Library are located in the heart of Downtown and this is the most densely populated area in terms of people who live here so a lot of people can walk to the library and bike to the library. It is also in the heart of Downtown where there is transit busing. There is a large pod of parking that surrounds the library with the

municipality, State, and large parking lots with over 1,500 parking spaces. These spaces are also getting used by folks who walk to the library. They are working in other businesses, going to the Downtown area, museums, and City Hall with their cars parked in other lots. You want people to park at other facilities and then walk to the library and use it. The library is being moved into an area that provides more central parking. This is important because the library both today and when it is relocated there, peaks at a different time meaning people come to use the library by car after hours. They do not come to use the library in force during the day time from 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM when people are at work. It starts to pick up at 4:00 PM to around 7:00 or 8:00 PM after school and after dinner time. Proximity to a maximum amount of parking that can be shared is important. Mr. Moore further stated that there was an extensive study done on who is using the current parking lot because there have been questions raised throughout this process of can we relocate the folks who are using the City Hall parking lot and the answer is yes. DNREC has traditionally rented forty (40) to fifty (50) spaces from the City of Dover that included employees and fleet. This is the first year that they did not renew their lease and that has nothing to do with the construction of the library. It is a decision that the State has made that they will not lease additional spaces and have already moved them out. There are now around one hundred (100) to one hundred twenty-five (125) spaces available in this parking lot during the day since DNREC departed.

Mr. Moore further stated that the Parking Authority which is now the Downtown Dover Partnership has approved the library coming forward with this parking plan and with the waiver that they are requesting because they are aware that those forty-five (45) spaces have dropped off. They are not happy that the City is losing the revenue; however, it has opened a considerable amount of parking that can be used. Fifty-six (56) spaces would be required by code for the new library. There are forty-six (46) people who work in this building (City Hall) with ten fleet which means that the City has maxed out this space and is in need of parking for City Office use when you co-join the two together. With the thirty-seven (37) parking spaces for the Post Office, there will be twenty-two spaces designated as fifteen minute spaces which will provide for a turnover use to accommodate the Post Office.

Mr. Moore stated that it would be reasonable to grant a waiver for this project because they have two buildings of scale on the same property and therefore, the peaks of these two buildings are different. Staff from the City starts at 7:30 AM and departs from 4:30 PM to 5:00 PM. Through studies at the library, peaks at the Library would start around 4:00 PM or later when kids get into the library with the real peak in the Library around 6:00 PM. The maximum amount of usage of vehicles coming to the Library would be around that time. At that time, the City lot would not be used because they would be home and there will be a large amount of parking in excess of the zoning code required 150 parking spaces that will be available to the Library. We do not believe that there is a parking problem because of that. The other two peaks are on Saturday and Sunday and again, City staff would not be there and as a result, there would be plenty of parking to accommodate the new Library. The Post Office closes at 6:00 PM just as the library would peak so it is a perfect mesh of timing of the two peaks from both the post office and City Hall. He (Mr. Moore) feels that is why it is a reasonable request to ask for a ten to eleven percent waiver which is much less than the fifty percent that we could have asked for. There is a small area where we could add about ten (10) spaces that is on DNREC property and we will negotiate with them. It is located at the very point of their property and would allow them to complete the parking along the back line

that could be done at a reasonable amount of cost. This would allow our request to fall below ten percent if we are able to do that.

Mr. Moore further stated that the seventeen (17) percent waiver request in the Staff's report is just for the library; however, we are creating a parking lot between the Library and City Hall. It is the joint peak use that allows them to get this benefit that is an eleven (11) percent waiver.

Ms. Cyr stated that they have taken the parking issue very seriously as we have worked with the library project over the last eighteen months. We conducted a parking survey of the library and over the past year, we have taken a look at the library usage to determine the times when people are using the library the most with their children and the programs they are attending.
Mr. Carter stated that one of the things that they have done with this plan as we worked on it is to work very closely with our neighbors, DNREC, Wilmington Trust, PNC Bank, and the Post Office. He started discussions with the Post Office back in 2006 regarding their plan. They know that once we start construction, the parking that they are currently using for their vehicles will have to be relocated. Their lease on the land runs out in 2020 and they are aware that our intentions are not to renew the lease at that point.

Mr. Moore stated that they do not have a stormwater management pond on this facility because we are using what is known as "green technologies." The City has made a big effort to get this building LEED certified. We are proposing a green roof which would have plant life on it. Water will come down and sustain the plant life. That water will then run off and we will catch that water in underground cisterns and then re-circulate it into the toilets and grey water inside the building. In addition, with regards to the curb waiver, we will be catching the rain water in the catch basins in the back parking lot and surround them with grass and plantings instead of letting all the water just flow in so that you actually get cleaning.

Mr. Moore further stated that as they massage the final site plan, because these are very unique ways to handle stormwater, we could relocate some catch basins and place the grass around them and their waiver would then allow them to have the water go into the grass and into the catch basins so there may be some modifications as to where the catch basins would be located.

Mrs. Townshend questioned for clarification if when Mr. Moore stated that they did not have any concerns regarding DAC comments, did you want to mention the DelDOT comments? Responding to Mrs. Townshend, Mr. Moore stated that DelDOT made a comment regarding the Traffic Impact Study and we objected to it in the DAC meeting. We have a meeting scheduled with them this week and hopefully this can be resolved. They have a cash-in-lieu of requirement and there is cash than can be contributed in lieu of a Traffic Impact Study. His point regarding the Traffic Impact Study is that this is a vibrant Library that is operating Downtown, we are relocating it and not creating a new facility and he feels that it is unfair for to existing institutions in our Downtown to have to pay a fee to continue to exist.

Mr. Friedman stated that he has a concern regarding the turn off of Innovation Way behind the parking lot for the Post Office. Have you looked at this very closely to make sure that it would not be problematic? Responding to Mr. Friedman, Mr. Moore stated that the reason they did this is because they want their elderly users to have direct access to the Library from the lighted

intersection so that they can be stopped, use the light signal, then make the turn as it would be controlled. The radius would allow for this turn and it would be at a slow speed.

Mr. Friedman further questioned that, if in fact people would have to park on the other side of Loockerman Street across from the medians, there is a potential hazard for crossing and he does not feel that there would be a controlled way for them to cross. Responding to Mr. Friedman, Mr. Moore stated that there are cross walks at the lighted intersection. Long term it may be best that the median that is now located in front of the reading garden be modified because it does not need to be that wide and is something they will talk to DelDOT about.
Colonel Welsh stated that architecturally, the plan is superior. The plan and parking has been well thought out. He would question what authority we have regarding a Traffic Impact Study? Responding to Colonel Welsh, Mrs. Townshend stated that we do not as it is not our street; it is a State maintained road. Staff has indicated to DelDOT that we do not necessarily believe that in the Downtown core it (a TIS) makes sense because they are limited of any improvements they would make in Downtown.

Colonel Welsh further stated that unless they make some significant in-roads and improvements to their process, this would serve as nothing more than a delay for this project.

Mr. Baldwin stated that he too feels that it is a good plan. His question would be if you expect the Post Office customers that would park on the west side of the building to traverse across the library parking lot? Responding to Mr. Baldwin, Mr. Moore stated that he feels that you will get people who will use both the Library and Post Office. You will get people who use the Library and then happen to use the Post Office in the same visit more so than you get now because fewer people use City Hall because it is day trip or traffic by foot that is not high.

Mr. Holt stated that he too thought that it is a great plan. He is glad to see that they picked up the mail box drop since a lot of people use this instead of going into the Post Office. Responding to Mr. Holt, Mr. Moore stated that the one thing that has to happen is that we will need to go back to talk to the Post Office to make sure that they do not mind us moving it and that we agree on the location which is why we proposed two locations so that we had that option.

Mr. Holt further stated that there has been a lot of rumor regarding the Post Office moving to another location. Responding to Mr. Holt, Mr. Moore stated that they were starting to look before the economic downturn and then they had some budget problems so that process slowed down. One of the issues that they have is that they would like a more suburban location for their trucks and major transit and still have presence downtown for the people who come in. They want to stay Downtown; however, do not like the fact that they have the entire operation that is not best served to be in the Downtown in the Capitol Complex which is what they want to get out of here the bigger trucks and transit pieces.

Mr. Holt further questioned that you are calling this the "Dover Anchor Library;" is this in relationship to the Kent County Library and the Dover Library merging? Responding to Mr. Holt, Mrs. Cyr stated that there is a statewide master plan for library services across Delaware and in the statewide master plan each county in Delaware is to have an "anchor facility." The role of the "anchor library" facility is to serve as the largest facility with the largest, most in-depth collection of

both reference and circulating materials to be able to serve not only the customers in our region; however, also the other libraries. It is Dover's role as an "anchor" facility to provide professional services and support to the people as well as the libraries in the county.

Mr. Tolbert questioned as an "anchor library" does that mean that there would be more people hired? Responding to Mr. Tolbert, Mrs. Cyr stated that we know that we would need 2.5 more people in the building, one custodian, one full time librarian, and one library page to be able to put away materials.

Mr. Nichols stated that the plan shows one hundred fifty-four (154) parking spaces that includes the thirty-three (33) parking spaces on leased property that Wilmington Trust owns. The other figure that is shown is one hundred eight-five (185) spaces which includes the Wilmington Trust parking of thirty-two (32) parking spaces on their lot that comes off of Kings Highway. There are actually forty-seven (47) parking spaces for Staff and employees of City Hall and if you take the forty-seven (47) off of the one hundred fifty-four (154) there would be one hundred seven (107) parking spaces. Is the City Hall and Staff parking going to be in a designated place in this area that you have out here now? Responding to Mr. Nichols, Mr. Moore stated regarding the Wilmington Trust parking spaces that you referred to, we did not count; so they did not get counted in any of the totals that he presented tonight. As for the City Hall, the fifty-six (56) parking spaces that are required by code does cover City Hall and we believe that those same fifty-six (56) spaces that are here will continue to be used by City Hall.

Mr. Nichols further questioned if the twenty-two (22) designated parking spots would be from the entrance to this project to City Hall? Responding to Mr. Nichols, Mrs. Moore stated that there are two numbers for on-street parking. The twenty-two (22) spaces is located on Innovation Way and is what will be reclassified as fifteen (15) minute parking. The forty-three (43) spaces that he referred to are on-street parking on Loockerman Street on both sides of the street. We are counting none of those in our calculations and is part of his request for the waiver because there is concentration of on-street parking that is unusual.

Mr. Friedman opened a public hearing.

Mr. Gary Patterson – President, Downtown Dover Partnership – Stated that his Board asked that he come and express their support for the Library, as we see it as a greater good for Downtown. We will see benefits for years to come just as we have from the existing Library. Our Parking Committee has endorsed the parking redesign as it has long made sense for them to see the connection to Kings Highway and this project brings that to fruition. The Department of Transportation will soon be our partners in several projects in Downtown and we have great respect for them; however, he will tell you that the Partnership was amused by the requirement for a Traffic Impact Study in what we see as a very urban and growing urban area. We thought the goal of the State was to focus development in Downtown areas where there is infrastructure and people.

Mr. Bill Neaton – Director, Downtown Dover Partnership – Stated that he is here to endorse the parking plan and would like to formally read the motion that the Parking Committee made to endorse the waiver for parking. "At its regular meeting on March 2, 2010 the Parking Committee of the Downtown Dover Partnership approved the following motion; Ms. Anita Evans moved that the

Parking Committee accept the proposal for a seventeen (17) percent reduction in the required parking spaces for the proposed Dover Public Library, the motion was seconded by Mr. Ted Nutter and the motion was passed with Mr. Mike Ambruso abstaining."

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

Mr. Friedman questioned if there was any escape plan if we are wrong? Do you think this traffic flow is going to work? Responding to Mr. Friedman, Mr. Moore stated that in their mind they are not wrong. Seven (7) current parking spaces are designated at the existing Library and that facility has been operating there for a long time. What he is saying about the peaking of that facility later and the parking is that it is available to folks in our Downtown area. The sites are too close together for that to change and we are massively increasing the amount of parking available to the Library so it will be a better condition than what they have now.

Mrs. Townshend stated that they focused on the different peaks and you talked specifically about City Hall and the Library because the parking calculation is done in conjunction; however, that same different peak issue would be the same for the Library and DNREC and the library and the State office buildings. The times that the Library is going to receive the heaviest usage is not the time that State office and City offices are not in operation.

Colonel Welsh questioned for a motion, are we making two motions? Are we making a motion for approval of the Site Plan review and then a motion for the Architectural Review Certification? Responding to Colonel Welsh, Mrs. Townshend stated that it could all be done in one motion.

Colonel Welsh moved to approve S-10-06 Dover Public Library Site Plan Review and Architectural Review Certification to include approval of three waivers: reduction of parking space requirements, elimination of loading spaces, and partial elimination of curbing along with all DAC comments seconded by Mr. Tolbert and the motion was unanimously carried 6-0 with Mr. Shomo, Mr. Hemmig and Mr. Ambruso absent.

Mr. Moore stated for the record, he would like to ensure that they have the ability to relocate some of the grass around the catch basins and to also add the parking on the DNREC location on the construction plans as noted.

Colonel Welsh moved to amend his motion to reflect the request to relocate some of the grass around the catch basins, flexibility in curbing, and to also add parking on the DNREC location on the construction plans, seconded by Mr. Tolbert and the motion was unanimously carried 6-0 with Mr. Shomo, Mr. Hemmig and Mr. Ambruso absent.

Meeting adjourned at 8:47 PM

Sincerely,

Diane Metsch
Secretary

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW REPORT
Review of Alternative Materials Request
For Consideration by Dover Historic District Commission
Meeting of July 21, 2011

Application: State Street Commons, HI-05-03 and S-06-19

Location: Southwest corner of South State Street and Water Street, Dover
502 South State Street, 508-518 South State Street, and Water Street

Current Request for Review:
A request from the Onix Group has been received regarding the State Street Commons project. Their request is for the use of an alternative material for the building entrance railings at the porches and porticos on the new building. They are seeking approval to allow the use of a white vinyl (PVC) handrail system for the entrance railings as installed by the project developer. A letter dated July 7, 2011 is presented for Review and Recommendation on the Architectural Review Certification by the Historic District Commission. See attached documents.

The Historic District Commission is to review the request for use of alternative materials and then make a recommendation in regards to the Architectural Review Certification. This Recommendation will be forwarded to the Planning Commission for the final action on the revised Architectural Review Certification. The following information provides additional information on the project and request.

Project History:
In March 2006, the Historic District Commission conducted a public hearing and took action in order to make a recommendation on the Architectural Review Certificate for the State Street Commons project. Construction later commenced on two connected 2 ½ story office buildings of 12,000 S.F. each for a total of 24,000 S.F with a two level parking garage. The existing brick office building at 502 South State Street consisting of 3,222 S.F. also remains. The property consists 35,061 square feet ± of land zoned RG-O (General Residence and Office Zone) and subject to the H (Historic District Zone). The property is located at the southwest corner of South State Street and Water Street. The owner of record is YOZIMA, LLC; request received from Onix-Z, LLC.

As presented in March 2006 (drawings dated 10/14/05 and 1/10/06), the proposed new buildings were shown with elevated first floor entries which necessitated a railing system for the steps and associated porch or portico areas. The specific material is not listed on the elevation drawings presented to the Historic District Commission. Metal railings are specifically shown on the drawings and discussed for the parking garage wall.

There were no exterior changes proposed for the existing brick building at 502 South State Street; it has metal railings at its front entrance. No changes are proposed with this request for the

building at 502 South State Street.

Architectural Review Certification Review and Action:
Following a presentation on the project, the discussion at the Historic District Commission meeting of March 16, 2006 also included questions pertaining parking garage access, siding material choices, finish floor height of the first floor, and the requested waivers for the project. The Historic District Commission recommended approval of the Architectural Review Certificate for the State Street Commons project including the setback and floor area ratio waivers and recognized a series of comments and recommendations (Items #1-12) as conditions. (See the attached copies of the Architectural Review Certification Recommendation Report and Meeting Minutes.)

On June 20, 2006, after a public hearing and review the Planning Commission granted approval of the Architectural Review Certificate for the State Street Commons project following the recommendations of the Historic District Commission. (See attached excerpt of Meeting Minutes.) The Final Site Development Plan approval was granted on June 17, 2008 and the Building Permit #08-1193 was then issued for construction of the building shell (no interior fit-out). The construction plans submitted and approved as part of the Building Permit identifies the railing system for the building entrances as a metal stair railing with the larger columns (one entry with round columns and second entry in square columns) in a molded woodwork product (Fibertech). The railing at the top of the mansard roof on the end units (trim system #1) was identified to be constructed of a molded woodwork product and the railing on the brick wall of the garage was identified as a metal railing. To date the building has not completed construction and a Certificate of Occupancy has not been issued. The applicant has also has other site compliance issues to address.

Review of DESIGN STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES

Location within the Dover Historic District Zone requires proposals for demolition, new construction, additions, and certain renovation or rehabilitation activities to existing buildings to receive an Architectural Review Certificate. As stated in the *Design Standards and Guidelines for the City of Dover Historic District Zone,* an Architectural Review Certificate will be granted "if it is found that the architectural style, general design, height, bulk and setbacks, arrangement location and materials affecting the exterior appearance are generally in harmony with neighboring structures and complementary to the traditional architectural standards of the historic district." In accordance with Article 10 §3.2, the Historic District Commission will provide a recommendation to the Planning Commission regarding the alternative materials request and its compliance with the architectural review standards.

This request for alternative materials must be reviewed for conformity with the design criteria guidelines found in Chapter 4: New Construction, Additions, Demolition and Relocation. For the new buildings, the applicable review considerations are the design criteria and development guidelines associated with "New Construction" (Chapter 4: pages 4-1 through 4-8). "Materials" is one of the guidelines for new construction to be considered in the review by the Historic District Commission (and Planning Commission) of the project for Architectural Review

Certification. Other guidelines focus on style, scale, elevation of the first floor, floor-to-floor heights, bays, windows and doors, absolute size, massing, orientation, proportions, forms, siting, and high density/large scale construction.

Porches and Steps are discussed on pages 3-16 through 3-20.Staff notes that the *Design Standards and Guidelines* do not specifically discuss the use of vinyl (PVC) materials and other similar composite materials to replicate features traditionally made of wood.

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The following are Staff comments and recommendations for this submission requesting the use of alternative materials for the project and Architectural Review Certification.

1. Staff recommends conditional approval of the revised Architectural Review Certificate pertaining to the use of alternative materials (white PVC Railing System). While the vinyl materials can replicate the form of railings (handrail and balustrade elements) for porches and porticos, the material may not be appropriate for use in all areas of the Historic District and therefore must be evaluated for each project and property location. This project is located on the edge of the Historic District and is proposed for use on a new, modern building construction project. The following conditions on the use of vinyl materials for this project are suggested:
    a. The existing white PVC railing system may remain for those units where the railing system is integrated with and connected to a column system supporting a porch roof.
    b. The 'free-standing' railing system on the two end units of the buildings (on each frontage) is recommended to be changed to the black metal railing system.
    c. Require the establishment of landscape plantings minimize the visual impact of the vinyl railing system. Careful selection of the plantings will be necessary due to space limitations and to avoid conflicts with utilities and stormwater facilities. On-going care and maintenance trimming will be necessary of any plantings.
    d. The design detail information on the railing system and the landscape plantings proposal must be submitted to the Planning Office for review.

2. Any revisions or changes in the identified materials may be subject to further review by the Historic District Commission.

3. In utilizing the alternative materials, the requirements of applicable the building code or fire code must be complied with. Consult with the Chief Building Inspector and Office of the Fire Marshal for these requirements and any requirements for the submission and review and approval process for addendums to the Building Permit which may be necessary with this change in materials. Proper installation of the materials is also important.

4. In the event, that major changes and revisions to the building design and materials or site plan are proposed contact the Department of Planning and Inspections. These changes may require resubmittal for review by the Historic District Commission.

ONIX
GROUP

150 Onix Drive
Kennett Square PA 19348

484-731-2500 | fax 484-731-1234
www.onixgroup.com

July 7, 2011

Ann Marie Townshend, AICP
Director, Planning & Community Development
City of Dover
PO Box 475
Dover, DE 19901

Re: State Street Commons project
502 S. State Street, Dover, DE
Historic District Commission Architectural Review Certification

Dear Ms. Townshend:

On behalf of Onix-Z, LLC, please accept this letter as a request for an architectural review by the City of Dover's Historic District Commission. The purpose of the request is limited to determine requesting approval by the Historic District Commission for the white PVC handrails at the State Street Commons building located on the corner of S State Street and Waters Street.

On March 30, 2011, Onix-Z, LLC became the secured creditor for the State Street Commons project. We are proceeding to complete all punchlist items so that the building is available for use. The original developer, Yozima LLC, installed a white handrail system throughout the property. The white handrail system has been brought up in discussion as a concern with the Historic District Commission.

I understand that black iron handrails are preferred for properties located within the City of Dover's Historic District. However, the design, architectural style, and appearance of the existing handrails are in general harmony with the property and neighboring structures. The elevations facing both State Street and Waters Street contain an abundance of white surfaces and materials which compliment the white handrails. The white surfaces found throughout the exterior of State Street Commons include, but are not limited to, the window/door trim, soffit, window panes, support bracing/columns and the down spouts; all of the white materials/surfaces allow the existing handrail system to blend in naturally.

Please accept this letter as a request that the Historic District Commission review State Street Commons and issue a certificate permitting the existing handrails as installed.

Sincerely,

Tyler Daviduk
Project Manager
Onix Group

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW REPORT
Recommendation Report of the Dover Historic District Commission
From Meeting of March 16, 2006

Location:	502, 508, 512 and 516-518 South State Street
Tax Parcels:	ED-05-077.09-03-70.00-000 ED-05-077.09-03-71.00-000 ED-05-077.09-03-72.00-000 ED-05-077.09-03-73.00-000
Owner:	YOZIMA, LLC
Present Zoning:	RGO- General Residence and Office Zone H- Historic District Overlay Zone
Present Use:	502 – Office Building (508, 512, and 516-518 Residential dwellings demolished in July 2005)
Proposed Use:	502 – Office Building Two Office Buildings (new construction) and associated two-level parking garage
File Number:	HI-05-03

Project Description:
The Historic District Commission will act on a recommendation to the City of Dover Planning Commission for Architectural Review Certificate for the project known as State Street Commons. This application consists of the construction of two 2 ½ story office buildings of 12,000 S.F. each for a total of 24,000 S.F. The application also includes a two level parking garage providing 73 parking spaces on the site. The existing brick office building at 502 South State Street consisting of 3,222 S.F. will remain. The property consists of four parcels of land totaling 35,061 square feet ± of land zoned RG-O (General Residence and Office Zone) and subject to the H (Historic District Zone). The property is located at the southwest corner of South State Street and Water Street. The owner of record is YOZIMA, LLC. The property addresses are 502 South State Street, 508 South State Street, 512 South State Street, and 516-518 South State Street.

RECOMMENDATION OF THE HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION:
This petition was considered at the March 16, 2006 meeting of the Historic District Commission. The following members were present: Chairman Terry Jackson, Mr. Dick Scrafford, Mr. Robertson, and Mr. Jim McNair. The application was represented by Doug Liberman of Larson Engineering and Gregg Moore of the Becker Morgan Group. Public testimony was received from Joe McDaniel on behalf of the Friends of Old Dover and Ann Baker Horsey.

Action Taken by Historic District Commission: The motion to recommend approval passed 4-0 of those members present. **The Historic District Commission recommends approval of the Architectural Review Certificate for the State Street Commons project with a series of conditions including the changes found in the recommendations and comments (listed below) and the approval of the requested waivers. The following are adopted comments and recommendations for this application regarding project activities and Architectural Review Certification.**

1. **These conditions are the recommended conditions to improve the project's compliance with the recommended guidelines of the Design Standards and Guidelines.**
    a. **Clarify the building footprint versus the building front elevations and entrance door/stairs. The Site Plan indicates an indention in the building façade which does not appear to follow the elevation drawings and there differences in the location of the entry doors to each unit.**
    b. **Clarify the roof pitch on each unit of the proposed building.**
    c. **Windows are recommended to be double hung windows with true divided light panes or stimulated divided light system (not snap-in grills). Clarify the window specifications.**
    d. **The porch-like area (shed roof, columns, and railing) on the east end of the Water Street Building (unit 6) should be extended south to fully cover the access stairs down to the parking garage lower level.**
    e. **Add details such as engaged columns/pilasters to divide the exposed south wall of the parking garage to avoid the large expanse of blank wall. These column elements could be extended higher to become part of the metal railing system.**
    f. **The material choice and details of the metal railing system must be provided. It is recommended to divide it intermittently with a larger support posts inserted at sections of the metal railing and to use a black colored/painted metal railing.**
    g. **The applicant is encouraged to contact the adjacent property owner to the south to discuss removal of the existing chainlink fence with white slats and the opportunity to provide additional landscaping in this area. It is anticipated that site construction activities for the parking garage and wall along this location will affect the fence; therefore, necessitating a construction easement.**
    h. **The west wall of the parking garage should also include greater detail. Additional detailing or ornamentation is recommended in the form of a column, engaged pilaster, etc. to define and provide added protection at the entrance corners. The header across to top of the lower level garage entrance should be detailed.**
    i. **Size and material details must be provided for the Dumpster enclosure on the upper level of the parking garage. Access to this location may be a concern.**

2. **The Project Engineer should re-calculate the total lot coverage for this project to confirm the 84.7%. The plan appears to have greater impervious lot coverage with the buildings, sidewalks, and parking garage areas. If the lot coverage is greater than 85% a waiver is required.**

3. **For building construction, the separation distances and other requirements of the building code or fire code must be complied with. Consult with the Chief Building Inspector for these requirements. The resolution of these items may impact the site design including such items as building setbacks from property line, building dimensions and height, building openings, and fire protection needs, etc.**

4. **The proposed landscaping including tree plantings should be completed with species appropriate to the site conditions especially the planter locations on the upper level of the parking garage and consideration of the impact to the lower level parking garage.**

5. **The location of mechanical equipment should be identified. The mechanical equipment should be enclosed with appropriate screening devices such as appropriately scaled walls, landscaping, roof mounting, or other similar treatments to screen it from the public right-of-way.**

6. **The applicant should be aware of the potential for historic archaeological resources which may include previous building locations, wells, privies, etc. on these properties. The State Division of Historical & Cultural Affairs can provide technical assistance when dealing with archaeological resources.**

7. **Documentation of the cross access easement with the adjacent property owner must be provided for the proposed sharing of the driveway access from Water Street to access to this site and its parking garage.**

8. **The request for a reduction in the required number of parking spaces must be reviewed and approved by the Planning Commission. The Site Plan must comply with the Code requirements unless a waiver is specifically granted.**

9. **In the event, that major changes and revisions to the site plan occur in the finalization of the site plan contact the Department of Planning and Inspections. These changes may require resubmittal for review by the Historic District Commission.**

10. **This site development plan for this project is also subject to the application and review process for Site Development Plan (Article 10 §2 of the *Zoning Ordinance*) before the Planning Commission. Note: Additional technical items for compliance with the *Zoning Ordinance* and other regulations may be identified during the Site Plan Process.**

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

12. **The applicant shall be aware that a Sign Permit is required to proceed with the placement of signage on the property.**

The following waivers were approved by recommendation of the Historic District Commission for the project State Street Commons:

Request	Bulk Standard	Ordinance requirements	Approved	Building
1	**Front Yard Setback**	**30 feet**	**5 feet**	**S. State St. Building** **Water St. Building**
2	**Side Yard/** **Rear Yard setback**	**15ft** **20ft**	**< 3 feet**	**Parking Garage**
3	**Floor Area Ratio**	**0.50**	**0.091 Existing building** **0.684 Proposed buildings** **0.78 Site total**	**Entire site**

The following information was considered by the Historic District Commission in making their recommendation including the initial recommendations made by Planning Staff in regards to the application. Discussion at the Historic District Commission meeting also included questions pertaining to exterior finish materials, garage access, and first floor elevation.

Property Information:

A series of four buildings was located on the west side of South State Street south of the intersection of South State Street and Water Street. The first building (502 South State Street) at the corner currently serves as an office building. The building at 502 South State Street is listed in the National Register of Historic Places as a contributing resource of the Dover Green Historic District (K-394.95 and K-219). The building description from the nomination is provided below.

> 502 State Street-James Bellach House/Christ Church Rectory - 1771; brick-Flemish bond, 2 1/2 story, 5 bay. This Federal dwelling has a gable roof. The cornice has scroll-like modillions. There is a double interior gable end chimney on the south side. The structure has a wide belt course between the first and second floors. The doorway is very elaborate. The door and rising sun fanlight, with curved tracery, are recessed. The frontispiece has fluted columns with elongated capitals and a dental gable with cornice return. Above the fanlight is a rounded arch with a keystone.

The other three residential dwellings buildings fronting on State Street were demolished in July 2005 without the proper permits. A report entitled "Historic Documentation of 508, 512, 516-518 South State Street" dated August12, 2005 is available for review at the Department of Planning & Inspections. It provides information on the ownership, history, floor plans, photographs, etc. of these three buildings. These buildings 508, 512, and 516-518 South State Street were also contributing resources of the National Register Historic District (K-394.96, K-394.97, and K-394.98).

This entire project site is located with the local Historic District Zone (H).

This 35,061 S.F. site (total of four parcels) was the subject of a previous application known as HI-02-06 Water Street Office Plaza II and also Site Plan S-03-09 Water Street Office Plaza II.

PROJECT PROPOSAL (Drawings dated 10/14/05 and 1/10/06):

This proposal involves the construction of two 2 ½ story office buildings of 12,000 S.F. each for a total of 24,000 S.F. One building fronts on South State Street and consists of five units. The units are attached in the appearance of townhouses. Each unit has a first floor entry elevated about four feet above the sidewalk. The exterior finishes consist of brick to a watertable height with either brick, stucco, or horizontal wood siding above and topped with a standing seam metal roof. Details include window trimwork, shutters, door trimwork surrounds, covered entries by pitched roof supported by columns, dormers, etc. The second building fronts on Water Street and also consists of five units following the same exterior material choices and detailing.

This application also includes a two level parking garage providing seventy-three (73) parking spaces on the site. The garage is screened from State Street and Water Street by the buildings. Along the west property line, this project is proposed to share a driveway with the adjacent property for access. The parking garage has a lower level and an upper level each with its own entry point. The upper level of the parking garage is elevated about four feet above the level of the South State Street. This difference in height results in a brick wall along the south property line. This wall is clad in brick with no detail elements or surface changes. It is topped with a metal railing.

The existing brick office building at 502 South State Street consisting of 3,222 S.F. will remain. A sidewalk connection from each street is provided between this existing building and the proposed buildings.

See attached elevation and section drawings and site plan drawings for detailed information on building dimensions, locations, and material choices.

Review of DESIGN STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES

The subject property is located in the Dover Historic District Zone within The Green historic context. The historic context is described on pages 2-3 through 2-5. Location within the Dover Historic District Zone requires proposals for demolition, new construction, additions, and certain renovation or rehabilitation activities to existing buildings to receive an Architectural Review Certificate.

As stated in the *Design Standards and Guidelines for the City of Dover Historic District Zone*, an Architectural Review Certificate will be granted "if it is found that the architectural style, general design, height, bulk and setbacks, arrangement location and materials affecting the exterior appearance are generally in harmony with neighboring structures and complementary to the traditional architectural standards of the historic district." In accordance with Article 10 §3.2,

the Historic District Commission will provide a recommendation to the Planning Commission regarding the project's compliance with the architectural review standards.

This proposal must be reviewed for conformity with the design criteria guidelines found in Chapter 4: New Construction, Additions, Demolition and Relocation. Information on the proposed project and the review considerations is given below.

New Construction

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

- Style
- Scale *(building to reflect dominant cornice and roof height of adjacent buildings)*
- Elevation of the First Floor
- Floor-to-Floor heights
- Bays, windows and doors *(size, relationship, spacing of)*
- Absolute Size *(compare overall size of new building)*
- Massing *(relationship of solid-to-void)*
- Orientation *(location of primary façade)*
- Proportions *(comparison of height to width of building and elements)*
- Materials
- Forms *(shape of building and roof to be complementary)*
- Siting *(location of building on lot and in relation to street)*
- High density/ large-scale construction

The proposed project must also be reviewed for compliance with the standards established by the *Zoning Ordinance*. The standards include items such as setbacks from property lines, lot coverage, height, etc. This Proposal for the new office buildings does not conform to several of the bulk requirements of the RG-O Zoning District and requires waivers from the Historic District Commission. The *City of Dover Zoning Ordinance* authorizes the Historic District Commission to waive certain bulk standards when issuing its recommendation to the Planning Commission for an Architectural Review Certificate.

The waivers* requested by the project:

Request	Bulk Standard	Ordinance requirements	Applicant proposal	Building
1	Front Yard Setback	30 feet	5 feet	S. State St. Building Water St. Building
2	Side Yard/ Rear Yard setback	15ft 20ft	< 3 feet	Parking Garage
3	Floor Area Ratio	0.50	0.091 Existing building 0.684 Proposed buildings 0.78 Site total	Entire site

*Note: The overall lot coverage of the site within the RGO Zoning district is limited to 85%. This Site Plan indicates a lot coverage of 84.7%.

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

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

1. Staff recommends conditional approval of the Architectural Review Certificate for the construction of the project. These conditions are recommended by Staff to improve the project's compliance with the recommended guidelines of the Design Standards and Guidelines. The following are recommended conditions:

    a. Clarify the building footprint versus the building front elevations and entrance door/stairs. The Site Plan indicates an indention in the building façade which does not appear to follow the elevation drawings and there differences in the location of the entry doors to each unit.
    b. Clarify the roof pitch on each unit of the proposed building.
    c. Windows are recommended to be double hung windows with true divided light panes or stimulated divided light system (not snap-in grills). Clarify the window specifications.
    d. The porch-like area (shed roof, columns, and railing) on the east end of the Water Street Building (unit 6) should be extended south to fully cover the access stairs down to the parking garage lower level.
    e. Add details such as engaged columns/pilasters to divide the exposed south wall of the parking garage to avoid the large expanse of blank wall. These column elements could be extended higher to become part of the metal railing system.
    f. The material choice and details of the metal railing system must be provided. It is recommended to divide it intermittently with a larger support posts inserted at sections of the metal railing and to use a black colored/painted metal railing.
    g. The applicant is encouraged to contact the adjacent property owner to the south to discuss removal of the existing chainlink fence with white slats and the opportunity to provide additional landscaping in this area. It is anticipated that site construction activities for the parking garage and wall along this location will affect the fence; therefore, necessitating a construction easement.
    h. The west wall of the parking garage should also include greater detail. Additional detailing or ornamentation is recommended in the form of a column, engaged pilaster, etc. to define and provide added protection at the entrance corners. The header across to top of the lower level garage entrance should be detailed.
    i. Size and material details must be provided for the Dumpster enclosure on the upper level of the parking garage. Access to this location may be a concern.

2. Staff requests the Project Engineer to re-calculate the total lot coverage for this project to confirm the 84.7%. The plan appears to have greater impervious lot coverage with the buildings, sidewalks, and parking garage areas. If the lot coverage is greater than 85% a waiver is required.

3. For building construction, the separation distances and other requirements of the building code or fire code must be complied with. Consult with the Chief Building Inspector for these requirements. The resolution of these items may impact the site design including such items as building setbacks from property line, building dimensions and height, building openings, and fire protection needs, etc.

4. The proposed landscaping including tree plantings should be completed with species appropriate to the site conditions especially the planter locations on the upper level of the parking garage and consideration of the impact to the lower level parking garage.

5. The location of mechanical equipment should be identified. The mechanical equipment should be enclosed with appropriate screening devices such as appropriately scaled walls, landscaping, roof mounting, or other similar treatments to screen it from the public right-of-way.

6. The applicant should be aware of the potential for historic archaeological resources which may include previous building locations, wells, privies, etc. on these properties. The State Division of Historical & Cultural Affairs can provide technical assistance when dealing with archaeological resources.

7. Documentation of the cross access easement with the adjacent property owner must be provided for the proposed sharing of the driveway access from Water Street to access to this site and its parking garage.

8. The request for a reduction in the required number of parking spaces must be reviewed and approved by the Planning Commission. The Site Plan must comply with the Code requirements unless a waiver is specifically granted.

9. In the event, that major changes and revisions to the site plan occur in the finalization of the site plan contact the Department of Planning and Inspections. These changes may require resubmittal for review by the Historic District Commission.

10. This site development plan for this project is also subject to the application and review process for Site Development Plan (Article 10 §2 of the *Zoning Ordinance*) before the Planning Commission. Note: Additional technical items for compliance with the *Zoning Ordinance* and other regulations may be identified during the Site Plan Process.

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

12. The applicant shall be aware that a Sign Permit is required to proceed with the placement of signage on the property.

Historic District Commission Action on March 16, 2006

The Historic District Commission considered the proposal and provided a recommendation to the Planning Commission in regards to the Architectural Review Certification for the office buildings, parking garage, and site improvements. The recommendation involved consideration of the *Design Standards and Guidelines.* The specific conditions of the recommendation are noted in the report under the heading "Recommendation of the Historic District Commission."

CITY OF DOVER

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION MINUTES

March 16, 2006 -- 3:00 P.M
Council Chambers

The City of Dover Historic District Commission met on Thursday, March 16, 2006, in the City of Dover Council Chambers. Members present were Chairman Mr. Jackson, Mr. Scrafford, Mr. McNair, and Mr. Robertson. **Roll Call:** All members present.

Staff members present were Dawn Melson, Scott Koenig, and Janelle Cornwell.

Mr. Jackson called the meeting to order at 3:00 P.M. and asked for any additions or deletions to the agenda.

Mr. Scrafford moved to approve the agenda as presented, seconded by Mr. McNair and the motion was unanimously carried.

Mr. McNair moved to approve the minutes of February 16, 2006 with any necessary corrections, seconded by Mr. Scrafford and the motion was unanimously carried.

COMMUNICATIONS

Ms. Melson stated that included in the packet for the Historic District Commission is a notice on the State Preservation Conference that will be held in Dover on Monday, May 15, 2006. The main venue for the conference will be the Schwartz Center. Other venues include Christ Church. If the Historic District Commission members are interested in attending, please contact Staff. If there are any members of the general public that are interested in attending they may contact the Planning Office at the City of Dover.

OLD BUSINESS

Ms. Melson stated that there were no items for Old Business.

NEW BUSINESS

HI-05-03 State Street Commons at 502, 508, 512, 516-518 South State Street: Architectural Review Certification

Ms. Melson stated that Staff will do a brief overview of the project. Then representatives of the application will be invited to come forward to explain the project.

Ms. Melson stated the project is known as State Street Commons and is located at the southwest corner South State Street and Water Street. There is an existing building on the property known as

CITY OF DOVER PLANNING COMMISSION
June 20, 2006

The Regular Meeting of the City of Dover Planning Commission was held on Tuesday, June 20, 2006 at 7:00 PM with Chairman Friedman presiding. Members present were Mr. Friedman, Mr. Baldwin, Mr. Holt, Mr. Tolbert, Mr. von Reider, Mr. Nichols, Colonel Welsh, Mr. Benton and Mr. DiMondi (arrived at 7:15 PM)

Staff members present were Mrs. Townshend, Ms. Melson, Ms. Cornwell, and Mrs. Duca. Also present were Mr. Garth Jones, Mr. Joe Mills, Mr. John Griffin, Mr. Gregg Moore, Mr. Conny Malmberg, Mr. Roger Stanley, Mr. Keith Kooker, Mr. Joseph Carbonell, and Mr. Robert Furman. Also speaking during public hearing was Mrs. Robin Alexander, Mr. Richard Kosior, Mrs. Kathy Kosior, and Mrs. Holly Bradford Johnson.

...
Excerpt of application S-06-19 State Street Commons. Starting on Page 4 through Page 8 of original Meeting Minutes....

S-06-19 State Street Commons – Office Buildings at 502, 508, 516-518 South State Street – Public Hearing and Review of a Site Plan and Architectural Review Certificate to permit the construction of two (2) 2 ½ story office buildings of 12,000 S.F. each for a total of 24,000 S.F. The application also includes a two level parking garage providing 73 parking spaces on the site. The existing brick office building at 502 South State Street consisting of 3,222 S.F. will remain. The property consists of four parcels of land totaling 35,061 square feet ± of land zoned RG-O (General Residence and Office Zone) and subject to the H (Historic District Zone). The property is located at the southwest corner of South State Street and Water Street. The owner of record is YOZIMA, LLC. The property addresses are 502 South State Street, 508 South State Street, 512 South State Street, and 516-518 South State Street. Tax Parcels: ED-05-077.09-03-70.00-000, ED-05-077.09-03-71.00-000, ED-05-077.09-03-72.00-000 and ED-05-077.09-03-73.00-000.

Representative: Mr. Conny Malmberg, principle with the Project; Mr. Roger Stanley of Larson Engineering; and Mr. Gregg Moore, Becker Morgan Group.

Ms. Melson stated that the project itself is two office buildings, one fronting on South State Street, and the other fronting on Water Street with a two level parking garage that is buffered by these office buildings. The office buildings, while in appearance look similar to what are townhouses; they are actually individual office buildings and are not residential in nature. They have a mixture of exterior choices with a brick water table, elevated first floor entry, and either wood siding, stucco or a brick finish to them. Overall, each building is a 12,000 square foot building for a total of 24,000 square feet.

Ms. Melson further stated that when you add in the existing building on site, the total building area in square footage is 27,222 square feet. That calculation is important because it is used to then calculate the parking requirements for the site. The site itself is based on parking of one parking space per 300 square feet of floor area and this would total to a required ninety-one (91) parking spaces. The applicant is seeking a waiver this evening to reduce the parking requirement

by twenty (20) percent. Shown currently is a two level parking garage with a total of seventy-four (74) spaces. There is a lower level that has a distinct entry and then an upper level that has its own entry. The entrance is gained off of Water Street in what would be a shared driveway with the adjoining building. Staff has requested documentation of the cross access easement for vehicles to travel across this other property to gain access to the project site.

Ms. Melson further stated that also related to parking spaces is a waiver request for loading. The project would require one loading space and as none is shown on the plan, they have made a request to waive that requirement.

Ms. Melson further stated that this site did go before the Historic District Commission and the Planning Commission received what is the review and recommendation report for it from the Historic District Commission. In that report, the recommendation of the Historic District Commission was for approval with a series of conditions that were outlined in their review. Some of the items involve clarification of some of the building elements and suggestions for that. One of the improvements that the Historic District Commission did recommend was with regards to the exposed wall parking garage to ensure that this element is not a flat blank wall and that there is a pier system that then extends above the base of the wall up into what is the railing area of the wall itself. Other comments focused on other elements of detail for the site and some of the cautions with the process moving forward. They also reviewed several waiver requests related to the bulk standards for the project and as such, they recommended approval for the following waivers: approval of establishing the front setback at five (5) feet, recommending approval of the rear and side yard setback reflected and show on the plan which is less than three feet due to the location of what is the edges of the parking garage, and to approve the floor area ratio of 0.78 for the site.

Ms. Melson further stated other Planning Office comments and review of the project includes a landscape plan which is a mixture of trees that are proposed along the street sides of the building and then within the parking islands on the upper level of the garage. In addition, our comments focus on the documentation of the cross access easement. This property is currently several parcels so a parcel consolidation plan will be necessary. Action on both the requests for the parking space waiver and the loading space waiver will need to be considered tonight by the Planning Commission. Planning Staff is recommending approval of those two waiver requests. One other recommendation from Staff is that they work with the adjoining property owner to the south which is Kent General Hospital/Bayhealth with regards to what is the existing chain link fence that has the white slat system to hopefully remove this fence and just provide additional landscaping in this area. Construction activities on the site related to the garage and the building will impact this fence so we hope that they do coordinate with their neighbor.

Ms. Melson further stated that other agencies commenting include standard comments from the Public Utilities Department related to sewer and water infrastructure on the site, the Electric Department, and the Fire Marshal's Office related to fire protection elements. DelDOT is asking for some additional information regarding traffic generation to consider what is the entrance along Water Street which is a State maintained road in that area. The Kent Conservation District requires a detailed stormwater and sediment management plan. For this project they are proposing an underground system in the southern area of the project.

Mr. Friedman opened a public hearing.

Mr. Richard Kosior – 12 Elm Terrace – Stated that the question he had was with regards to the parking waiver. The City of Dover, especially the downtown area, has a considerable parking issue as it is and the reduction of the required parking spaces per City ordinance will propose a greater burden on Elm Terrace that already exists. Elm Terrace is a narrow residential street area with numerous families that have numerous small children in the area. We are concerned by reducing the available parking spaces by seventeen (17) from what is required by City ordinance that the overflow parking will find its way onto Elm Terrace.

Mrs. Kathy Kosior – 12 Elm Terrace – Stated that this is her concern as well, the parking waiver. We understand that the Planning Commission granted a waiver in March 20, 2000 for the building next door which also had a twenty (20) percent reduction to save seventeen (17) spaces. She believes that they rent some spaces across the street in the Water Street parking lot because they do not have enough spaces. She does not know when they started renting these spaces; however, they obviously need them. If the same thing is done here now, they are going to need spaces sooner or later whether it is later down the road. At some point in time, the Water Street parking lot is gone, which is what is being proposed and the buses move out to their new site and whether a building goes up or not, that parking is gone. Their question is where is everyone going to park and are they going to park on Elm Terrace? It is a very narrow street and their house was built in 1926. This road was not made for SUV's or mini vans. She had addressed this with the City of Dover and they have told her that fire trucks can get through on this street and she believes them as they told her they use to practice on this street. If you are putting up a parking garage, can you have the ninety-one (91) parking spaces that are required by law? Is this going to be a cumulative affect if you keep granting the waivers and people have to park somewhere.

Mrs. Kosior further stated that with regards to the Downtown Dover Parking report which was completed in February 2004, the policy change included: "One of the problematic processes that is leading to growing concerns of future parking capacity has been the recent allowance of new office developments with fewer parking spaces than typically required by code. This leaves the parking system to absorb the shortfall. To this point, the affects of the downtown parking supply have been manageable due to the preferable locations of recent office developments and the initial surplus of parking. It is evident that Dover is quickly reaching the point of where continuation of current trends would become very problematic for downtown parking supply and consequent downtown business interests." She knows that they are in the development area so the City of Dover would have to absorb those costs to provide parking somewhere.

Mr. Friedman closed the public hearing.

Mr. DiMondi stated with regards to parking and the equation that is used to equate the twenty (20) percent waiver, the other half of the equation is existing parking conditions being more than adequately met. What is staff's position regarding existing parking with regards to the testimony that was just heard?

Responding to Mr. DiMondi, Ms. Melson stated that the application that was mentioned for the adjoining office building did receive a nineteen (19) percent waiver of their parking needs. Some of their increased parking usage may be tied to the types of office facilities that are located within that building. Across the board, we have found that certain types of office users have a higher turn-over of parking needs than what our code currently requires.

Mr. DiMondi further asked Mr. Malmberg who is the proposed occupant of these office buildings? How can they be distinguished between those that are obviously creating problems that warrant securing, by lease, additional spaces across the street in the Water Street lot?

Responding to Mr. DiMondi, Mr. Malmberg stated that he did not know if the building proposed would require parking across the street. His understanding is that the mass transit facility is proposing to move to a different location which should free up this parking lot. Between this lot and the Water Street lot, there would be adequate available parking. The user of that building has a higher demand for parking than the typical office.

Mr. Friedman stated that he believes the reason we are giving up the ability to waive the parking is just for that reason. Usage is different for different tenants.

Mr. DiMondi moved to approve S-06-19 State Street Commons – Office Buildings at 502, 508, 516-518 South State Street. The first part of the motion is action in the affirmative with regard to the Site Plan that is approved as submitted subject to all the DAC comments of record with three sets of waivers being acted on in the affirmative: the first being bulk standards as they passed through the Historic District Commission with regard to front, side and rear yard setbacks as well as the floor area ratios as explained in the tabular chart located on page two of the DAC comments; also subject to an affirmative waiver to the applicant's request for a parking space reduction of twenty (20) percent under the powers granted to us pursuant of Article 6, section 3.9 of the ordinance; and an affirmative action with regards to the applicant's request for a waiver of the one loading space requirement this being an exercise of our discretion under Article 6, Section 4.22 based on the strength of the letters submitted by the applicant's engineer as well as the testimony developed tonight. The second part is action with regard to the recommendation from the Historic District Commission in terms of the Architectural Review Certification that is before us subject to the twelve requirements set-forth on pages two and three of the decision of the Historic District Commission Recommendation Report dated March 16, 2006 which is made a part of this motion, seconded by Mr. Nichols. The motion was carried with Mr. von Reider and Mr. Benton opposed.

Mr. von Reider stated that he had a problem regarding the parking situation. It would seem that what we are doing here is maximizing the amount of floor space and not leaving enough parking. The buildings are rather deep; whereas, if the buildings were not so deep, reducing floor space, you would have more space for parking and with your parking requirements being less, you could meet the parking requirements. There is at least a perceived parking problem in this area.

Mr. Benton stated that he was also opposed to this project because of the same reasons as Mr. von Reider.

City of Dover

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW STAFF REPORT
Before Dover Historic District Commission
July 21, 2011

Application:	Acme Site Redevelopment Master Plan
Location:	West side of South Governors Avenue over to South New Street, north of West Loockerman Street
Tax Parcel:	ED-05-077.09-01-44.00-000
Owner:	Downtown Dover Partnership (previously known as Downtown Dover Development Corporation)
Present Zoning:	C-2 - Central Commercial District Zone H - Historic District Zone
Present Use:	Commercial building with a retail tenant and a day care center tenant with a parking lot
Proposed Use:	Retail/Apartment Building #1: 11,874 SF commercial/retail space and 27 apartments Apartment Building #2: 24 apartments with ground level parking in building
File Number:	HI-11-04

Project Description:
The Historic District Commission will act on a recommendation to the City of Dover Planning Commission for an Architectural Review Certificate for the Acme Site Redevelopment Master Plan project. This application consists of a phased project that is to include a retail/apartment building and second apartment building with the demolition of the existing mid-to-late twentieth century commercial building. The project also includes the associated parking, streetscape improvements, landscaping, and stormwater management facilities. The project area consists of one parcel of land totaling 1.7653 acres ± and zoned C-2 (Central Commercial Zone) and subject to the H (Historic District Zone). The property site spans the block between South Governors Avenue and South New Street located north of, but not adjacent to, West Loockerman Street. The owner of record is the Downtown Dover Partnership. The property address is 120 South Governors Avenue. Tax Parcel: ED-05-077.09-01-44.00-000.

Property Information:
The subject site consists a twentieth century commercial building currently divided into two tenant spaces: a retail tenant and a day care center facility. A portion of the existing parking is managed by the Downtown Dover Partnership as a permit parking lot.

The property is located within the boundaries of the National Register of Historic Places listed Victorian Dover Historic District (K-396) but the existing commercial building is considered a non-contributing building. The description of the building from the district nomination describes it as a one story masonry food chain establishment circa 1970. Historically, this block of Downtown was part of an area known as the Comegy's Lots laid out in the 1850s with development occurring 1859-1885. The *1868 Beers Map* shows the subject site primarily vacant with one building owned by L. Geiser and a school building. By 1885, a series of residential dwelling fronting on both Governors Avenue and New Street are in existence. The subject site is just north of the original building location of the Robbins Hose Fire Company building. The *1887 Map of Dover* published by W.B. Roe continues to show a public school in the southern portion of the site with dwellings to the north. Review of the *Sanborn Fire Insurance Map Series* from 1885 – 1944 with updates also documents the history of buildings on the subject site. The 1885 Map shows a two story school building and a Sunday School & Meeting House building with a series of two story residential dwellings with accessory buildings (garages, sheds). By 1897 the school building is replaced by a Methodist Protestant Church building with the residential dwellings remaining. These uses for the subject site continue through the early twentieth century. By mid-twentieth century, the church building is replaced by a one story cinderblock store building adjacent to Governors Avenue. In the late 1960s, the subject site is redeveloped with the existing masonry commercial building setback in the middle of the block; its construction appears to have eliminated approximately nine residential dwellings.

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

PROJECT PROPOSAL (Drawings dated 6/14/2011):

This proposal involves the construction of two buildings each addressing one of the street frontages of the subject site. The project has the potential to be developed in phases. The existing multi-tenant commercial building will be demolished.

The first building is the Retail/Apartment Building #1 fronting on South Governors Avenue. This is four story masonry building. The building overall has three main sections: first section giving the appearance of one building; section two as the main entry to the apartment building is setback and utilizes an alternative material pattern and taller roof line; and then the third section which mimics the commercial first floor of section one but has an alternative design of the upper floors which step back and provide a difference format to the balcony placements for the apartment units.

The east/front façade of the commercial retail on the first floor consists of display windows in a glass storefront window system with the glass entry doors for each tenant space. A series of awnings are placed on the building to shade each space. The upper floors, where the apartments are to be located, have grouped sets of windows and balcony areas. The balconies on the top floor are shaded by awnings. On the north and south elevations of Building #1, the first floor storefront windows are continued for part of the side. There are single windows in the stair tower elements as well. These elevations are also divided by changes in the exterior finish and selected

detail elements. The west elevation of Building #1 faces the interior of the block and is designed in a similar fashion as the east/front façade. On the first floor smaller awnings shade rear entries to the commercial units and the upper floors continue the window and balcony systems.

The predominant exterior finish materials for the building are brick, a stucco treatment, and Hardie-board (a fiber-cement product). Variation in the wall detailing is provided through the use of multiple brick colors, use of different materials for different sections of the building, and multiple colors of Hardie-board. Brick detailing and changes in the veneer mark the foundation/base on the building and the transitions between the floors with banding. A multi-part cornice line indicates the transition to the flat roof. The storefront window openings appear to use clear glass. At the apartment level, the windows are matched to transom windows above and are divided light windows set in groupings of three to five windows.

The second building is the Apartment Building #2 fronting on South New Street. It is also considered a four story building (not three story as labeled on the plan drawings). The first floor or ground level is a parking garage of twenty-three spaces. Then there are three floors of apartment units. The first floor of Building #2 is clad in brick with decorative grillwork in the window-like openings which allow light and air into the parking level. On the west elevation (façade facing South New Street) the main entry is centered under a covered area with a gable front roof. Also on this façade are two sets of false garage doors in a double carriage style door design .The upper floors are clad in Hardie-board laid in a horizontal pattern with some banding details. The windows are paired in sets of two with matching transoms above. The balconies are accessed by sets of double doors and a located in the four bays of the building which step out towards South New Street. Overall, Building #2 is topped with a large turned gable roof with a single ridge running the length of the building. Four smaller gable roof topping the balcony bays punctuate the large roof at its eaveline. Standing seam metal roofing is utilized for these smaller roof structures. The north and south elevations on the sides of this building continue the exterior finish pattern of brick on the first floor with Hardie-board above but with single windows. The rear elevation facing the interior of the parcel uses the same exterior finish pattern; however, the window and balcony pattern is slightly different. For this elevation, the projecting bays include windows only and the balconies are located in the plane of the main building wall. Again a gable roofed entry is centered on the elevation and is flanked by the larger parking garage entry openings (two-way traffic).

The project also includes site improvements ranging from parking lot reconfiguration to landscaping. The mid-block space between the two buildings is designed to serve as the parking lot for the buildings and includes several islands planted with trees. The parking area is accessible from both South Governors Avenue and South New Street. There are two areas of landscaping and hardscape which serve as recreation areas for the apartments. The area near South New Street includes a fence parallel to the street. The gazebo shown in this submission has been removed from the project due to lack of compliance with setback requirements for such structures as associated with recreation areas. The location of mechanical equipment to serve the buildings is not shown on the plans/drawings.

See attached concept site plan drawing and series of color renderings of each proposed building, detailed information on building forms, locations, and material choices.

Review of DESIGN STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES

The subject project site is located in the Dover Historic District Zone within the Loockerman historic context. The Loockerman historic context is described on pages 2-7 through 2-8 . Location within the Dover Historic District Zone requires proposals for demolition, new construction, additions, and certain renovation or rehabilitation activities to existing buildings to receive an Architectural Review Certificate.

As stated in the *Design Standards and Guidelines for the City of Dover Historic District Zone*, an Architectural Review Certificate will be granted "if it is found that the architectural style, general design, height, bulk and setbacks, arrangement location and materials affecting the exterior appearance are generally in harmony with neighboring structures and complementary to the traditional architectural standards of the historic district." In accordance with Article 10 §3.2, the Historic District Commission will provide a recommendation to the Planning Commission regarding the project's compliance with the architectural review standards.

This proposal must be reviewed for conformity with the design criteria guidelines found in Chapter 4: New Construction, Additions, Demolition and Relocation. For the demolition of the existing mid-late twentieth century building on the site, the review considerations are those associated with "Demolition." For the new retail/ apartment building and the apartment building, the applicable review considerations are those associated with "New Construction." Information on the proposed project and the review considerations is given below.

Demolition

The *Design Standards and Guidelines* gives guidance to the Historic District Commission by listing specific criteria to be evaluated when considering applications for the demolition of buildings (or portions of buildings) in the historic district. (Chapter 4: pages 4-10 to 4-12) These guidelines are summarized below (see *Design Standards and Guidelines* for the complete text).

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

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

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

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

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

New Construction

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

- Style
- Scale *(building to reflect dominant cornice and roof height of adjacent buildings)*
- Elevation of the First Floor
- Floor-to-Floor heights
- Bays, windows and doors *(size, relationship, spacing of)*
- Absolute Size *(compare overall size of new building)*
- Massing *(relationship of solid-to-void)*
- Orientation *(location of primary façade)*
- Proportions *(comparison of height to width of building and elements)*
- Materials
- Forms *(shape of building and roof to be complementary)*
- Siting *(location of building on lot and in relation to street)*
- High density/ large-scale construction

The proposed project must also be reviewed for compliance with the standards established by the *Zoning Ordinance*. The standards include items such as setbacks from property lines, lot coverage, height, etc. This proposal for Building #1 and Building #2 appears to conform to the bulk requirements of the C-2 Zoning District including setbacks, building height, floor area ratio, and lot coverage. The *City of Dover Zoning Ordinance* authorizes the Historic District Commission to waive certain bulk standards when issuing its recommendation to the Planning Commission for an Architectural Review Certificate if necessary to achieve architectural compatibility in the Historic District.

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

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

1. Staff recommends approval of the Architectural Review Certificate for the demolition of the existing commercial building on the property finding that the building is not significant as it is a modern intrusion into the historic area.
    a. As the building has a Cultural Resource Survey record (K-396.203) from the survey completed associated with the National Register nomination for the Victorian Dover Historic District, the appropriate survey forms should be completed to record its demolition (when it occurs).
    b. The building footprint will need to be appropriately stabilized if project site construction is not progressing at the time of its demolition.

2. Staff recommends conditional approval of the Architectural Review Certificate for the construction of the Retail/Apartment Building #1 finding the overall building to be of a contemporary design yet compatible with the buildings of this block of the Historic District which includes larger multi-story commercial buildings, the Dover Fire Department building (across Governors Avenue), and existing parking lots.

3. These conditions are recommended by Staff to improve Retail/Apartment Building #1 project's compliance with the recommended guidelines of the *Design Standards and Guidelines*. The following are recommended conditions:
    a. The actual height measurements of the building should be confirmed to ensure compliance with the height (in feet) limitations for the zoning district.
    b. Signage identifying the commercial tenants and the apartment building main entry should be integrated into/attached the building.
    c. Confirm materials and design of the balcony railing system as a black metal system compliant with the requirements of the Building Code.
    d. Confirm the materials for the awnings and their compliance with the clear height provisions.
    e. Any revisions or changes in the identified materials or refinement of the building design may be subject to further review by the Historic District Commission.

4. Staff recommends that action on the Architectural Review Certificate for the construction of the Apartment Building #2 be deferred to allow additional information and an alternative design to be submitted. This multi-unit residential building with its contemporary design must strive to be compatible with the nearby single family detached dwellings and duplex dwellings of predominately two story buildings. The current design appears to be very large in overall form, scale, and proportion.
    a. The submission does not provide information on the proposed building heights (eave, ridge, mean) or streetscape views to assess its compatibility with nearby residential dwellings and other nearby buildings.
    b. While the building design attempts to address the pedestrian level scale with the choices of materials and detailing of the first floor, the overall massing of the building is a concern. The main roof design appears to add significant additional height to the building which may only cover a large attic space.
    c. The building has a very suburban design feel and not one that is responsive to the neighborhood around it other than its placement close to the street.
    d. See also the statements in Comment #5.

5. These conditions are recommended by Staff to improve and achieve the Apartment Building #2 project's compliance with the recommended guidelines of the *Design Standards and Guidelines*. The following are recommended conditions:
    a. This is a four story building with the first floor occupied by the ground level parking area then floors 2-4 as apartments.
    b. Recommend an alternative design of the building roof form to divide into smaller areas (multiple ridgelines) to look more residential than commercial. This could also provide an opportunity for mechanical equipment areas.

c. Recommend additional design changes to present a building of small parts such as setbacks of upper two floors, greater stepping of the building front façade wall planes, etc.
d. Recommend the use of architectural shingles for the main roof surface.
e. Signage identifying the apartment building main entry should be integrated into the building. It currently appears to be located as a projecting sign over the gable roof of the entry which may be difficult to see.
f. Confirm materials and design of the balcony railing system as a black metal system compliant with the requirements of the Building Code.
g. Any revisions or changes in the identified materials or refinement of the building design may be subject to further review by the Historic District Commission.

6. The following items should be clarified regarding the Building #1 and Building #2 design in order to confirm compliance.
    a. Clarify the type of system proposed for gutters and downspouts.
    b. Clarify the size of the balcony areas to ensure they are sized for usable space.
    c. Clarify the installation format of the Hardie-board siding i.e. exposure width, etc.
    d. The applicant should be aware of the implications regarding the type of construction for the building.
    e. With the building design, the height of the finished floor elevation in relation to the sidewalk and parking lot must be considered in order to achieve accessibility into the building. If additional building elements are required to achieve accessibility, they may require further review by the Historic District Commission.

7. Some of the site improvements/amenities were not specifically described with the application information. Please provide information for consideration and discussion.
    a. Light fixtures/poles utilized along the streetscape should continue style of the lighting used in the Downtown Loockerman Street areas. A taller two-light style fixture may be more appropriate within the parking lot areas.
    b. Identify the materials for the open space areas including surface pavement, benches or other seating, bicycle parking rack, etc.
    c. Identify the design and materials of the fence including pillars along South New Street. The materials selected must be appropriate for use within the Historic District. Staff recommends the use of a black metal picket style fencing with a maximum height of four feet.
    d. Identify areas where the sidewalks or portions of the sidewalks will be constructed of brick or a grass landscape strip will be implemented. The use of brick paving materials for sidewalk construction is a key feature found throughout the Historic District area.
        i. The grass strip should be implemented in the areas of South New Street were the existing curb cut will be removed.
        ii. The City's standards for sidewalk format must be met.
    e. Any unused curb cuts along the two street frontages must be removed.

8. Since the gazebo originally proposed for the area north of Building #2 is to be removed from the plan, Staff recommends consideration of a design for a pergola attached to the north wall of building which could provide a shaded area in proximity of the open space/recreation area.

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

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

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

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

13. This site development plan for this project is also subject to the application and review process for Site Development Plan or Site Development Master Plan (Article 10 §2 of the *Zoning Ordinance*) before the Planning Commission. Note: Additional technical items for compliance with the *Zoning Ordinance* and other regulations may be identified during the Site Plan Process. Review comments pertaining specifically to the Site Plan set will be issued at that time.

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

15. The applicant shall be aware that a Sign Permit is required to proceed with the placement of signage on the property.

<u>Historic District Commission Action Required</u>
The Historic District Commission shall consider the proposal and provide a recommendation to the Planning Commission in regards to the Architectural Review Certification for the project site development plan. The recommendation should reflect consideration of the *Design Standards and Guidelines.*