

CITY OF DOVER
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
NOVEMBER 20, 2025

The Meeting of the City of Dover Historic District Commission was held on Thursday, November 20, 2025, at 3:30 PM as an In-Person Meeting in the City Hall Council Chambers (anchor location) and virtually using the audio/videoconferencing system Webex. With Chairman Czerwinski presiding, the other members present were Mrs. Richardson, Ms. Baker, and Ms. Horsey.

The Planning Office Staff members present were Mrs. Melson-Williams, Mrs. Savage-Purnell and Mrs. Duca.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Ms. Baker moved for approval of the agenda as presented, seconded by Ms. Horsey and the vote was unanimously carried 4-0.

ADOPTION OF MINUTES OF THE REGULAR HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION MEETING OF AUGUST 21, 2025

Ms. Richardson moved for approval of the Meeting Minutes of August 21, 2025, seconded by Ms. Horsey, and unanimously carried 4-0.

COMMUNICATIONS & REPORTS

Summary of Applications 2024 and 2025

Mrs. Melson-Williams mentioned in your meeting packet was the Summary of Applications. This is where we kind of keep a running tally of the Applications that appeared before the Historic District Commission. In 2024, there were a total of nine (9) Applications. Some of them have been completed, some of them are underway, and some have yet to fully start. I will note that the Legislative Hall Parking Garage, which was Application HI-24-04, did receive its final plan approval. We are awaiting submission of a Building Permit for them to move towards construction. My understanding is that they are probably out to bid at this point for that. And then the other one from 2024 for an update is HI-24-08 for the property at 21 North American Avenue. That project is progressing through its construction to convert what was a duplex into a single-family house. And then in 2025, today we will be dealing with our fourth Application of the year and revisiting one from earlier this year. So, we will talk about that in a bit. But so far in 2025, you've only had four (4) Application items.

Mrs. Melson-Williams asked if there were any questions on the Application status. There were none.

Summary of Architectural Review Certifications for 2025

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that this chart is really a tracking of the permit activity within the Historic District Zone of the City. Primarily for the Historic District, you are focused on the outside of the building. This chart is tallied through the end of October based on the calendar year for 2025. There have been 32 Permit Applications in the Historic District. This does not include plumbing, mechanical, or fire protection permits. Of those 32 Permits, 28 were either done with Staff approval or did not require review because of the location or type of project that was under

Permit. There were four Permits that the Historic District Commission was involved in. Staff then issue the Permit on your behalf with those conditions.

Mrs. Melson-Williams asked if there were any questions on permit activity in the Historic District.

Chairman Czerwinski asked for Sign Permit # 25-1390 on 108 West Loockerman Street if it was a lit sign and/or what is the details of that sign? Is it a Sign that just matches everybody else's? Mrs. Melson-Williams replied I believe that was really a change of tenant at that location. There's a projecting hanging sign as the wall sign. I'm not sure if it's on the wall surface or on the roof. There's a pent roof at that location, so I'm thinking it's not. That building does not have a box sign which you are thinking of.

Chairman Czerwinski said I'm just trying to think which building is 108 West Loockerman Street. Mrs. Melson-Williams replied I believe it's the last building next to the park area, the Loockerman Way Plaza. And it's been several different restaurants over time. It's like a two-story brick, has a pent roof, has a storefront, and a take out kind of window at the front of it.

Chairman Czerwinski does anybody else have any questions? There were none.

Department of Planning & Inspections Updates

Mrs. Melson-Williams mentioned that there were no particular updates. We did have a new Code Enforcement Inspector that started this week. It's filling one of the open positions because we had a retirement earlier this fall in that Division of our overall Department. There are still a number of vacancies across the Department in general that we're hoping to fill sooner rather than later. With that I'm happy to move on to the Special Recognition.

Special Recognition

Mrs. Melson-Williams mentioned on your agenda today is a Resolution honoring the service of Mary Mason to the Historic District Commission. Mary was a member and chose to resign her position in late August. So as is the tradition for this body, Staff prepares a Resolution that the Commission then adopts, and we make that Resolution available to the honoree. I don't believe Mary has joined us today. I do not see her virtually, but we'll make sure that she gets the Resolution. Maybe one of her neighbor friends can deliver it to her. The Resolution reads as follows:

RESOLUTION

Whereas, Mary T. Mason became a member of the City of Dover Historic District Commission in February 2018 and has served with diligence and distinction in this capacity as an advocate for implementation of the Historic District Standards and Guidelines to maintain the historic character of the city's Historic District; and,

Whereas, Mary T. Mason has played a key role in ensuring fundamental fairness and careful forethought in the planning and development of the Capital City through her service on the Historic District Commission; and,

Whereas, Mary T. Mason as a resident of the Historic District has shared her knowledge of Dover and The Green and its history in reviewing applications presented to the Historic District Commission; and,

Whereas, Mary T. Mason has influenced the pattern and appearance of development in the Historic District in Dover through her contributions to the development of the Historic Preservation chapter of the 2019 Comprehensive Plan; and,

Whereas, Mary T. Mason completed her service on the City of Dover Historic District Commission on August 23, 2025.

Now Therefore Be It Resolved That, the City of Dover Historic District Commission does hereby express its sincere appreciation to Mary T. Mason for her faithful and exemplary service to the Citizens of the City of Dover as a member of the City of Dover Historic District Commission.

And upon adoption of this Resolution, it will formally be signed by Eric Czerwinski, who is the Chair of the Historic District Commission and I, Dawn Melson-Williams as the Principal Planner for the Planning Office that supports the Commission as Staff. And it is dated today.

Chairman Czerwinski mentioned that we all very much dearly treasure Mary's service to the Historic District Commission.

Ms. Horsey stated that as the person who recommended Mary to the Mayor to serve, she would like to move that we adopt this Resolution honoring the services of Mary Terry Mason to the Historic District Commission. The motion for the Resolution was seconded by Chairman Czerwinski and unanimously carried 4-0.

Chairman Czerwinski mentioned and again we send her off with our sincerest thanks for the service she's done to this Commission.

NEW APPLICATIONS

Review of Permits Referred to Commission

HI-25-04 Referral of Fence Permit #25-1463 at 55 Kings Hwy SW - Review of Architectural Review Certification as Referred by the City Planner to the Historic District Commission for a Fence Permit #25-1463. The project proposes a 6-foot vinyl fence on the side and rear property lines. Property is zoned C-2A (Limited Central Commercial Zone) and subject to the H (Historic District Zone). The owner of record is RVC Three, LP c/o Colonial Investment. Address: 55 Kings Highway SW. Tax Parcel: ED05-077.05-04-62.00-000. Council District 4.

Mrs. Melson-Williams mentioned that she was not sure if there was a representative in the room representing the Application. We do have a call in-user so let me check with them. She asked if they were there in regard to the Fence Permit Application that was referred to the Commission? If so, if you can identify yourself for the record. I am not seeing anyone here representing this Fence Permit Application that's been referred to you. I certainly can present the Permit if you want to take action as a follow-up to that or defer waiting until an applicant is in place. We can certainly

start the discussion. They were notified by email of all the contacts that we had for that Permit about today's meeting and then provided a copy of the initial Staff Report. At this point in time, if there's no objection I will continue with it.

Mrs. Melson-Williams gave a brief Staff overview of the Application. As noted, this is Fence Permit # 25-1463. It is a Fence Permit for the property at 55 Kings Highway SW. As submitted to the Planning & Inspections Office, it was a permit to construct a 6-foot vinyl fence on the side or north property line of the property and also along the rear or east property line of the property. The subject site is the Merrill Lynch office building that is west of here on Kings Highway.

SLIDE PRESENTATION

We go to the next slide. This shows the presentation of where the building is in relation to the two fence segments. Kings Highway is at the bottom of the page. Highlighted in yellow is where the Permit identifies the placement for the 6-foot vinyl fence. I will note that the office building is existing and there is a parking lot to its rear. On the left-hand side of the building, there is an entrance drive and that is how you reach the parking that is at its rear. The office building is set back 15.3 feet from the front property line. I make note of that because the front yard setback for this property would be 15 feet. With Fence Permits, normally it's a review by Staff as part of the Permit process. However, if there is some concern about the ability to issue the Architectural Review Certification, Planning Staff can refer it to the Commission for additional consultation about the request. Their request is to propose a fence that is 6 feet in height. As you're aware, the *Design Standards and Guidelines for the City of Dover Historic District Zone* note that fences should not exceed 4 feet in height. And then it goes on to recommended, not recommended, and inappropriate practices for fences as related to materials. Also Planning Staff looked at the regular rules for fences that are found in our *Zoning Ordinance*. It does limit fences to a height of 4 feet within the front yard setback. So, that would be the portion of the fence that's immediately at the front of the building. Before it passes it, that would also be limited by our regular code to 4 feet in height and then it could be that up to a fence height of 8 feet.

Today the Historic District Commission should consider this Fence Permit. We can go to the image cause that's probably the best way to address this. In this image the building is kind of in the center as a gray roof. The Kings Highway is to the left-hand side, and this would be a Fence Permit that would place the fence on its north property line kind of just off the entrance drive aisle and then along the back parking lot, on its east side where you see existing evergreen trees.

Planning Staff first gave some basic findings regarding the Fence Permit, and I've kind of described the kind of the facts of the case, if you will. The fence would likely be very visible from Kings Highway for the side fence segment with only a portion of the rear fence being visible. So, I'm going refer to you to page three of the Report for that summary. Planning Staff have made a Recommendation and that's found on page four. And, in that we have made some recommendations regarding the side fence and the rear fence. I am happy to try to address any questions that you may have. At this point, the Commission could seek questions, answers to questions, and could actually consider making a Recommendation on this at which time we would inform the Applicant of that. You could certainly defer action and request that the Applicant appear before you, in order to sort this out.

Chairman Czerwinski said thank you very much, we appreciate it.

Chairman Czerwinski mentioned right off the top, I have obviously a lot of problems with this one. I'm not sure if we should just defer it or turn it down because there's so many changes. We know right off the top of the head that the height of 4 feet, putting a 6 feet fence right onto the sidewalk like that's pretty extreme. So, without talking to the owners or the project manager on this one, I'd almost think we'd have to defer it or just turn it down altogether.

Mrs. Richardson agreed with Chairman Czerwinski.

Mrs. Richardson said normally with these requests there is a letter accompanying, explaining the need and that's my question, why? Why are they? I don't like it at all with the 6-foot vinyl fence, and certainly not out to the curb in the front. In the back, there appears to be a line of trees which already provides visibility, but I just can't understand why they are putting this fence up. I think we need somebody to represent.

Ms. Horsey mentioned she agreed. I couldn't agree more. Unless there is a lot of mischief, I do know that the Governor's House, which is just north of here had some mischief, but they did put a fence in, and it's curbed a lot of that trespassing of walking through and between properties. And perhaps that's the reason, but I certainly agree that we need to be consistent in the Historic District and require the metal fence instead of vinyl because it is just not appropriate period, especially on the street front.

Chairman Czerwinski stated because in this case the materials are wrong. We have approved vinyl fences in the past, but those were very limited visibility. In this case it is extremely visible. It's 6 feet. They should go with the metal fence and it's a metal 4-foot fence that fits in with the area. This is extreme.

I don't know if you want to defer action to talk to the members or if you want to get a motion to do that or if you want to just decline it all together.

Ms. Horsey mentioned that she did not think the Commission could approve it today without questions being answered. So, can I get a motion to defer?

Mrs. Richardson made a motion to defer Application Hi-25-04 until the Applicant can provide someone who can answer some questions. The motion was seconded by Ms. Horsey and unanimously carried 4-0.

Mrs. Melson-Williams mentioned that Planning Staff will attempt to have them here before the Commission at a future time. We did have an early conversation with their fence contractor, but to advise referring it to the Commission. We have not heard since that point in time. But we will follow up.

NEW APPLICATIONS

Revised Application

HI-25-01 Revised The Old Post at 55 Loockerman Plaza - Public Hearing and Review for Recommendation on Revised Architectural Review Certification for redevelopment of the Old Dover Post Office property consisting of 1.267 acres for a mixed-use project known as The Old Post as revised. This application previously came before the Historic District Commission at their February 20, 2025 Meeting. The project involves the demolition of the rear warehouse portion of the existing building and adaptive re-use of the front 4,560 SF portion of the building for commercial retail and business space. In this Revision are proposed increases in apartment unit count from 36 to 42 units and architectural changes consisting of a second-floor addition to the front wings of the building and a four-story 43,092 SF building addition proposed for forty-two (42) residential apartment units and with parking and other site improvements. The property is zoned C-2 (Central Commercial Zone), subject to the SWPOZ (Source Water Protection Overlay Zone), and subject to the H (Historic District Zone). The property is located on the north side of Loockerman Plaza and adjacent to Innovation Way. The owner of record is The Old Post, LLC. Property Address: 55 Loockerman Plaza. Tax Parcel: ED-05-077.05-04-53.00-000. Council District 4.

Mrs. Melson-Williams gave a summary of Application HI-25-01 Revised.

Mrs. Melson-Williams mentioned that the Commission saw the Application back in February of this year. The development team has slightly changed, and they have in moving forward with this Application have made some revisions to the project. Those revisions necessitate it to be returned to the Historic District Commission for a revised Architectural Review Certification. And also to the Planning Commission, which will happen after you all deal with this. So, our Report really focused on just really updating the original report that was issued back in February. We did include a copy of that in your packet for reference since we have at least one new member since that time.

But this is for the Old Dover Post Office building site. The project itself retains the front building area and would demolish the rear kind of warehouse portion of the Post Office building. With their new project, they are looking to add a second story to what I call the front wings or the pieces that are outside of the columned central portion there. The rear addition where the bulk of the apartments are located would go from a three-story addition to a four-story addition. The parking lot still continues to generally be in the same place, and the site has some lawn areas and landscaping around it and of course their sidewalks.

The biggest portion of their project is the change in the number of stories and then these additional wings at the front. So, the Historic District Commission has to make a Recommendation on the project involving consideration of the partial demolition and the Architectural Review Certification for the new construction. As noted previously, you did grant approval to an Architectural Review Certification for this project. With this addition or revisions, Planning Staff and with the help of our Planning Consultant has gone through and developed a series of Staff comments and recommendations. Those began on page nine and continue for several pages. What I will note is your initial packet included a series of their architectural graphics package. This is the opening slide to that, and then one sheet of their Site Plan. What you found on your desk today, they are updates. The Applicant has in reading some of the Staff comments clarified some things on their Revised building elevations. There are two sheets that present all four sides of the proposed building project and then also there is a more complete Site Plan set, if you will, that helps to

answer, if you look at the Site Plan and then the Landscape Plan, some of the questions about what's happening around the building in particular.

Planning Staff have not fully gone back through our comments to see which ones were addressed, but a number of the comments that we have made about the architecture do appear to have been at least provided with additional information. The Applicant may actually share some more of that with us today. Staff will be more than happy to address questions, but I think at this point I would like to turn it over to the Applicant and their project team. I'm not sure which of them is going to be the lead speaker to talk about the project and the changes that have been proposed here, including the most recent round of revisions.

Representatives: Mr. Sal Leone, Old Post LLC; Mr. Freddy Bada, Moonlight Architecture Inc., Mr. Chad Warren, Engineer; Davis, Bowen and Friedel.

Mr. Leone stated that he was a project manager for the Old Post LLC and Frank is one of the owners available on Webex. Frank can answer any questions you might have. Also, basically, as Dawn was saying, we just took the project that's been approved previously and added the two-story on the two wings and the fourth floor on the back. Everything else has pretty much remained the same. There were several pages of comments that we received this week that we responded to. I believe everybody has our responses to them. We brought some brick samples and everything too. So, the architects are here and the engineers are here. If you have any questions for them, we are more than happy to answer them.

Chairman Czerwinski asked if there were any questions.

Mrs. Richardson said she did not have any questions but stated that she agrees with the Recommendations that the Planning Staff has recommended.

Ms. Horsey mentioned that she was going to ask the same basic question. Do you agree with all the Staff comments that are in the packet? Mr. Leone replied yes.

Ms. Horsey had a question about the Landscape Plan. Are any of the existing trees or landscapes going to be kept? Is it all going to go away and new ones planted? Mr. Leone replied as far as I know, maybe Chad can help out on this one. There are just three trees in the front, right, that we were going to replace.

Ms. Horsey said they are mature trees, so do they have to be replaced? Mr. Leone replied that they are very low hanging trees though. They're kind of like you run into them when you walk under them, so we were going to replace them with maybe not something that large, but something that narrower and taller. Ms. Horsey said it's going to take a while to grow. Mr. Leone said they don't have to be replaced. Ms. Horsey said okay. Mr. Leone said it would look better for the site.

Ms. Horsey said it's going to take several years to get to the size that's shown. I also have a question on the boxwood that's planned. I know there's this boxwood moth that's eats every single boxwood it encounters. Unless this is immune from that boxwood moth, it's going to eat those plants and you

might want to consider like a holly instead of the boxwood, just as an FYI. Mr. Leone replied definitely.

Ms. Baker mentioned that she is also a Master Gardener. And yes, the box tree moth just arrived this year. And at the end of last year, it just took my boxwood and my neighbor's boxwood. It can be treated if you wish. And the treatments I understand from my colleagues have been effective. And indeed, my boxwood is now starting even at this time of year to rebloom. So, this is a positive thing. I have a question about ceiling heights and other things in the interior for optimally whoever wishes to respond.

Mr. Freddy Bada of Moonlight Architecture replied I am the project architect for the project. Ms. Baker asked how high the ceilings are in the apartments. Mr. Bada replied 9 feet. Thank you.

Ms. Baker commented that she sees a lot of wonderful things in what was on the desk today. It has the effect of making me feel as though you are understanding the role of this building, which is may be bigger than we all know because this is a consequential building here in Dover. This is the opening to Downtown. It is a gateway building. It must say something. It must welcome; it must be beautiful. Now, do you have some comments about how that has informed your designs? And do you have comments about the relative size. Well, it's going be a lot of people, right? People who live there, people who want to live there, people who are starting out, people who are doing well. If you have comments about how the apartments are managed; are they rented, are they sold? What is the situation? It would be very nice to know because this is really about people. It's not just about a storefront. It's about people coming and it's a 24-hour building, and that's one of the reasons it's so important to all of us. Thank you for all your hard work. Mr. Bada said sure, thank you.

Mr. Bada replied that you know the project's going to be run once it's constructed, but to answer part of your question about being the gateway and the interest of the City of Dover. We understand it's a very critical part because you're right, it is one of the first buildings that you will see when you come into Dover. Some of the initial thoughts when we had a single-story building from the original Old Post Office building was how the new building in the back of it would stand out or maybe take presence or be predominant over the front building. So partly by putting a second story on the wings of this building, we're actually using that building to kind of mask part of what might be the new building. Now the new addition is definitely aesthetically pleasing. We're definitely trying to keep up the historic feel with the brick and the EIFS match sort of cast stone and stuff like that, but I think this is also going to make it more present as you first come down that drive and split and see that front of that building. So, it's going give it a little more predominant, a little more aesthetic feel than what it has even now. And it's also going to be more in harmony with a lot of the existing State Buildings that are around the capital. So, that's how the building is going to look and feel when you first enter Dover. You also mentioned that the building's going be used and you know it's going be a centerpiece and people are going live there. As I said we are looking to get different tenants in this building. We want some business here. We wanted to draw people back down to Downtown Dover. You know, we want it to be a community, so people can live here, eat here and enjoy themselves here. We have in the Building Plan an area for storage, bikes, and other things, so people who live here can enjoy and ride around town and enjoy the town, and

enjoy the city. But like I said, it's all walking distance to everything so those are the things that we are trying to bring to the Downtown core with this project.

Mr. Leone mentioned that they have a project in Clayton called Railroad Square Apartments that we manage. So, we'll be managing these apartments ourselves also with our management team. We keep everything in house; we don't farm anything out.

Ms. Baker said thank you. She asked, are these rental apartments? Mr. Leone said yes.

Ms. Baker asked, can you give a range? Mr. Leone replied sorry, offhand I believe, \$1200 to \$2000.

Mr. Bada mentioned that there is a mix of apartments. We have studios, one bedroom, two bedrooms and three bedrooms. We are not just focusing on one crowd. We are focusing on a lot of different groups. So, you know, the rent, you know, as Frank and Mr. Leone mentioned it will vary in a pretty wide spectrum.

Mr. Frank Dimondi mentioned that the range right now I think is for a studio is like \$1500-\$1550 up to I think and we've got three bedrooms here up to like \$1900- \$1950. So as Freddie mentioned, we're trying to, you know have a mix, for the single person that maybe is a nurse working at the hospital that may want a studio up to somebody that may be working Downtown or works and lives in the City of Dover and has a kid or kids for a couple of bedrooms for a total of three bedrooms. So as Freddie said, we are trying to hit all cylinders when it comes to being welcoming to singles to basically families there.

Ms. Horsey mentioned that she has some additional questions about the building itself and since we are talking about apartments and businesses, is the main entrance for the apartments off the parking lot as opposed to the front on Loockerman? Or can apartment people also go into the front door, for instance, and access business before they go to their apartments?

Mr. Bada replied, depending on who the future tenants are, we don't really have a tenant for the lower level, first floor at the front building right now. But depending on who that tenant is, there is the possibility for a connection. That floor is continuous right across through the building as it was in the original Post Office building. So, we could put a doorway to the back that connects through. The main entrances for the residential will actually be as you said, off the parking lot. And we have kind of two main entrances: one off of the side street and then of course one off the parking lot. So those will be the predominant ways that most people would probably funnel into the building. But you know depending on who goes in there, whether a coffee shop or someone gets in there, it'd be nice to run downstairs, go grab up the front and go get a pastry or if it's a restaurant run downstairs, go up front, go grab dinner or something. You know, I think a lot of buildings that you do go into that have the combo with the businesses downstairs that there is access, so you don't have to go outside if you do want a cup of coffee or maybe if there's a little grocer or whatever in there. The other comment I want to make is I like the massing that you have done. The addition of the fourth story really works because you've got dormers on the front which really makes a difference and keeps it in design relationship with the other State buildings, for instance. And I like the addition of more dental work in the cornices. I think overall it makes a good presentation. So, thank you.

Ms. Baker mentioned that she lived for many years in Washington DC, Arlington Virginia and Alexandria Virginia. And I just want to mention that the studio apartment I rented in 1974 in Foggy Bottom was \$150 a month and it's now \$2,595. There's Trader Joe's a block away. Everything alters and everything changes and there's just nothing but a possibility for us. But the other thing that I've noticed in Alexandria is there's a quartet of huge buildings that are apartment buildings. And they look so unseemly from the outside, you know, they look great together, right? But you walk in and it is a welcoming place.

There are places to sit or have a conversation with somebody without an obligation to buy something. There is a concierge desk and the taking of the mail. I would love you to address that; how you are going to distribute the mail in the building? But, at any rate, I just wanted to mention that.

I think that notion of welcome is extremely important and I thank you for paying attention to it. I urge the continuation of attention. And I like the fact that you are keeping the window on the tip of the pediment in the front and that is terrific. I would also invite you to consider "the" 18th century script hand and then Post below in Caslon Baskerville or some other kind of print expression. I'm very hopeful. Thank you.

Mr. Leone mentioned that they have definitely considered the name, but they just have not actually come up with where they were going to put that or what style.

Chairman Cserwinski asked how many additional units did those additional floors add? Mr. Leone replied six.

Chairman Cserwinski asked if there was adequate parking for this because there's been a lot of projects that have been waived and we've had major parking problems. So, is this going to be adequate for this building? Mr. Leone replied that between what we have on site and the agreement we have with the City, we actually have more parking than we need.

Chairman Cserwinski said awesome.

Ms. Horsey said I have just another quick question. I think there was a comment that this parking lot would not connect to the library parking lot. Is there a reason for that? Just curious.

Mr. Chad Warren, Engineer with Davis, Bowen and Friedel for the project answered. Currently the way the grade is between the existing Post Office parking lot and the Library, there is about 4 feet elevation difference between the two. There is currently an existing ramp to get from the Post Office down to the Library and that will remain in place along with the sidewalk to carry you through to where the proposed easement is with the City of Dover for their additional parking spaces.

Ms. Horsey asked, is that in the back towards the north? There is access now. Mr. Warren replied yes. On this screen it would be at the bottom of the screen. At the bottom right of the screen, there's a cut through to come down to the Library and then there's a sidewalk between the two properties.

Ms. Horsey asked if that would stay. Mr. Warren replied yes.

Chairman Cserwinski asked if there were any more questions? There were none.

Mr. Frank DiMondi, who joined virtually, mentioned that he did not have any comments. He certainly appreciates the opportunity to bring the project before the committee here. You know, I just want to remind everybody that our ownership group was one of a dozen bidders for the property. One of the reasons why I was told why we won the ability to be able to buy the properties was because of our commitment to keep the old Post Office look from the front of the building. And we committed that from day one and that obviously fit well for what we were trying to do and what the City wanted to see in that location. We understand its importance. We're excited about the project. You know, we're excited about a professional team that we put together, our Architectural Plan and our Site Plan. We appreciate your time tonight in hearing about the project and hopefully getting your approval to hopefully move this forward as quickly as we can. Thank you.

Mrs. Melson-Williams mentioned as noted earlier, the Applicant has responded to a number of the Staff comments in making their Revised Architecture submission, as what we will call it. I just want to highlight some of those items for the record. I was taking a look through it quickly this afternoon. The change to the use of Hardie siding on the dormers that are added to the front of the building. Some clarification on the gutter and drained downspout systems for the building that has the pitched roof. The introduction of a brick row lock at the brick transition. So, once you take the roof off the existing one-story portion, how do you make that transition to now continuing that brick wall? We had made a suggestion to do something at that point because it'll help alleviate any question of brick color and making that transition much smoother. There were updates to the window style to match the window light configuration that is currently present on the building, which appears to be twelve over twelve when you can see them through the screens and/or storm windows that are there. There was some clarification for the rear addition on how the EFIS would be scored. The rendering seemed to make it look like more of a brick pattern with a heavy grout to it. It appears that's going to be a different approach there. The round window in the pediment has returned. It's actually a pretty cool feature and I think there's still space there to get the name of the building in whatever appropriate font script you deem for your project marketing. There were some things that could more clearly identify the different building entrances. And the one thing that I did have concern about was the connection of, we'll call it the existing building to the rear addition, and how those roofs interconnect. Because the last thing we want to do is create a place for water to live. So, it looks like they're proposing a roof cricket system, which is a way to make that transition. I think that's going to be a key detail as they move into more complex drawings for the project site overall. This project will have to go to the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission, in addition to looking at the Architectural Review Certification, will be looking at greater details in their parking strategy for this project. That's called out in the *Zoning Ordinance* about how that review process works and for their active recreation component. Their Landscape Plan is showing labeled areas on the east and west side of the building as a Zen Garden. I'm not sure really what that consists of because right now it looks like there's a lot of evergreen trees because I think there were holly's and depending on which type of Magnolia it was on the other side of the building and how those spaces will function. I just wanted to make those notes.

I do believe I did see a brick sample walk in the door. So, if the Applicant wants to show that to the Historic District Commission. This is a building built in Dover, so I'm more than guessing that the brick company has probably figured out what it originally was.

Mr. Leone said believe it or not, it is still available.

Mrs. Melson-Williams said that's why for brick in Dover when you buy local, you can probably still find it or know exactly what it is. If you want to share what that is, I don't know if it is a Glen Gary brick or something?

Mr. Leone said yes, it is a Glen Gary. It is called Rose Red Range.

Chairman Czerwinski mentioned he's never seen or heard of a brick rowlock. Is that just like an end on belt course? It presents as a belt course sort of thing, basically that is what it's doing, right? Mr. Leone replied yes.

Chairman Czerwinski said alright. He asked if anybody else had any questions? Alright, thank you very much. I appreciate it.

The Applicants said thank you.

The public hearing is open.

Chairman Czerwinski asked if there was anyone wishing to make a comment?

Mr. Zach Prebula with Kent Economic Partnership. We are the Economic Development Organization covering Kent County. We focus on business attraction and supporting businesses that are here, growing and planning on staying here. We are in support of this project. This project will do two things for us. One will create space to help us attract those businesses and support local businesses looking to expand and also create places for those employees to live and reside Downtown and help us revitalize the area. So, we ask you to support this project. Thank you.

Mrs. Melson-Williams mentioned that there are no other online participants that have joined us this afternoon and the Planning Office has not received any written correspondence to enter into the record as part of the public hearing.

The public hearing was closed seeing no one else wishing to speak in the room or virtually

Mrs. Richardson moved for approval of HI-25-01 for the Recommendation of the Revised Architectural Review Certificate for redevelopment of the Old Dover Post Office property consisting of 1.267 acres for a mixed-use project known as The Old Post to include Staff comments as presented on pages 9-12. The motion was seconded by Ms. Horsey and unanimously carried 4-0.

NEW BUSINESSElection of Chair and Vice-Chair

Mrs. Richardson asked how long Eric has served. Mrs. Melson-Williams replied that he is completing year five. Per the Bylaws, the Chair and Vice Chair can serve two appointed terms, which is basically a period of six years after which time they would have to rotate off of that particular office before returning to it. He is eligible to serve for an additional year in that position if you desire.

Ms. Horsey made the nomination that Mr. Czerwinski remain Chair for the next calendar year. Ms. Baker seconded the nomination for Mr. Czerwinski to remain Chair of the Historic District Commission. All members agreed by acclamation.

Chairman Czerwinski made the nomination that Mrs. Richardson remain Vice-Chair for the next calendar year. Ms. Horsey seconded the nomination for Ms. Richardson to remain Vice-Chair of the Historic District Commission. All members agreed by acclamation.

Mrs. Melson-Williams mentioned that we will make sure all our records show the continuation of your Chair and Vice-Chair in those positions. And as you can see, we still have a vacant seat. I have not heard anything out of the Mayor's office as of yet for any potential applicants for that. So, if you know of someone, or would like to suggest someone, there is an application process or application form that you can download from the city's website in order to be considered or just reach out to the Mayor's office with your suggestion and I'm sure they could follow up.

Chairman Czerwinski mentioned that he was still working on his angle, so hopefully at some point we get that fifth person.

Meeting and Deadline Schedule for 2026 DRAFT

Mrs. Melson-Williams mentioned that Staff has prepared a Draft of the Schedule. Your meetings remain on the third Thursday of the month, with a deadline that's established in the month prior. Those tend to fall on either the second or third Friday of the month depending on how the calculations work out. An application has to be filed a minimum of 30 days prior to your meeting. So, this sets out the meetings for all of 2026. We align the filing deadlines of the Historic District Commission and our Board of Adjustment just so our office doesn't go too crazy.

Ms. Baker mentioned that she thinks that the last meeting date needs to read 2027.

Mrs. Melson-Williams mentioned that there's no formal action needed for that. We'll make that correction. Thank you.

OLD BUSINESSCertified Local Government (CLG) Program

Mrs. Melson-Williams mentioned that the State Historic Preservation Office issued information on the Certified Local Government Grant application process. We gave you in your packet a copy

of the application guidelines and then the actual Grant application that we submitted. It was due October 31, 2025. That was a Grant application for Federal Fiscal Year 2024. There's been some timing issues with receipt of Historic Preservation Fund monies from the federal government to the State office and then their ability to regrant out the required monies.

What we did was for that FFY'24 Grant is basically send back in the application that focuses on the addendum to your *Design Standards and Guidelines* to focus on modern materials and technologies. The plan would be to hire consultant services once we have a grant agreement in place to focus on that. The application itself for use of this grant money requires a match. It's a 60/40 split. The Planning Office does have that match in cash in our current budget, and we have also entered that into our Proposed Budget for the next City fiscal year that we're preparing for. But you can see the description to focus on some of those things that our *Design Standards and Guidelines* really haven't addressed since they were written in the mid-nineties. This would involve, as I noted, consultant work, they would work both with Staff, and the Commission and some public outreach opportunities as part of this endeavor. The exact deliverables would be more outlined as part of bringing that consultant on board. So that application was made on your behalf, I think since I didn't change it up and you worked on it previously, I think that was a good attempt there. What is also noted is they also put forth information about the FFY'25 Grant Application. That application is due by the end of March. I did not file an application for that as of yet because I did not know the direction as to what type of application the Commission might be interested in doing next. The first one that we submitted would have to be completed by September of 2026. It's probably a nine-month project. The other one would not have to be completed until September of 2027. It gets confusing, cause their fiscal years are different than ours. With the grant application guidelines, I would suggest looking through those if there are things that you think we could potentially target for making that grant request. It is not a bricks and mortar type of grant program. It's for studies, planning efforts, education opportunities, and training opportunities; that's what these grants are typically used for.

So, with that, I'd be happy to entertain any kind of discussion or thoughts on that. I figured at least early next year we'd have to really delve into what a proposed strategy for that Application submission would be.

Mrs. Richardson asked didn't the Commission want to update our Historic District Guidelines? Chairman Czerwinski replied yes, that's the Addendum that we have been talking about.

Chairman Czerwinski asked do we actually submit a Grant request for that project?

Mrs. Melson-Williams replied yes. We actually submitted that Addendum to the Design Standards and Guidelines as the project for the Grant Application FFY'24 (Federal Fiscal Year). This would at least get us the document materials and in draft format. The formal process to adopt them might extend beyond that grant timeframe, but this would at least get us the document in place. It does not go back into necessarily the existing *Standards and Guidelines* and redo them totally, but we might see what those opportunities are in some of the discussion that happens with looking at the Addendum for modern materials.

Chairman Czerwinski mentioned that would be a big project. That's a complete rewrite. Thank you very much for submitting the Request for the Grant, appreciate it.

Chairman Czerwinski asked if anybody else had anything?

Ms. Baker mentioned that she just wanted to commend the Staff and her senior colleagues for the tremendous hard work.

Mrs. Melson-Williams mentioned definitely be thinking about what that second grant opportunity could be. There was some notation about emphasis of looking at projects that may be related to the Americas 250, even though that would the grant funding cycle/implementation timeframe may be a little beyond that but that's something to keep in mind as well.

Implementation of 2019 Comprehensive Plan

Mrs. Melson-Williams mentioned if you'll remember, there is a Historic Preservation Chapter that has a series of goals and recommendations. We can certainly look to that for ideas for grant application materials or ideas, but there's no specific Implementation item that I need to bring to you today related to the Comprehensive Plan.

Mrs. Richardson asked if the *2019 Comprehensive Plan* was online? Mrs. Melson-Williams replied it is. When you first joined the Commission, you may have received a hard copy of it. If you have not, we can certainly get you that. It is posted on the city's website, which would be www.cityofdover.gov, and if you use the directory to go to the Planning and Inspections page, there is a page devoted to the City's Comprehensive Plan. It's posted in two different ways. There is the text document and then also the series of maps. The preservation chapter is Chapter 6, so you can look for that and there are a couple of maps associated with that. It basically identifies where the Historic District is and the various National Register Districts here in Dover for kind of data reference as part of the plan. The next time the Comprehensive Plan comes due for kind of a rewrite, would be 2029. So 2029, the start of 2030, so probably in late 2028 throwing out all these crazy years, is when we would be planning for how we're going to approach that rewrite for the next Comprehensive Plan.

Chairman Czerwinski asked if there were any questions or comments before we adjourn?

Mrs. Horsey moved to adjourn the meeting seeing no other items of business, seconded by Ms. Baker and unanimously carried 4-0 of the members present.

Meeting adjourned at 4:43 PM

Sincerely,

Maretta Savage-Purnell
Secretary