

**MINUTES
BUSINESS MEETING
NEW CASTLE COUNTY HISTORIC REVIEW BOARD
DEPARTMENT OF LAND USE – NEW CASTLE ROOM
87 READS WAY, NEW CASTLE, DELAWARE
February 3, 2026
5:00 P.M.**

The Business Meeting of the Historic Review Board of New Castle County was held on Tuesday, February 3, 2026, in the New Castle Room, Department of Land Use and via Zoom meetings.

The meeting was called to order by John Davis, at 5:02 p.m.

Board Members:

John Davis (Chairman)
Barbara Silber
Perry Patel
Karen Anderson
Jean Hershner
Robert Duke
Keith Jackson
Connor Munzert
Lauralee Rappleye (late)

The following Board members were absent:

Perry Patel
Robert Duke

Historic Review Board, Department of Law

Iran Garcia-Domenech

The following Department of Land Use employees were present at the meeting:

Kevin Barni
Chris Jackson
Shane Bailey

RULES OF ORDER

Mr. Barni read the rules of order into the record.

MEETING MINUTES

January 6, 2026 Business Meeting Minutes

Ms. Anderson noted that the dates appeared incorrect on the January 6, 2026, Business Meeting Minutes. Mr. Barni stated he would correct the dates. Mr. Davis made a call for a motion to approve the Minutes with corrected dates.

On a motion made by Ms. Hershner and seconded by Mr. Jackson, the Historic Review Board voted to approve the meeting minutes of January 6, 2026 [In Favor: Silber, Anderson, Hershner, Jackson, Davis; In Opposition: None; Abstention: None; Absent: Patel, Duke, Rappleye]

HISTORIC MARKER PROGRAM

None.

OLD BUSINESS

None.

NEW BUSINESS

[App. 2025-0711-H](#): *1055 Pleasant Hill Road*. (TP 08-029.00-007). West of Corner Ketch Road and north of Pleasant Hill Road. Minor Land Development Plan (App. 2024-0493), including the Syncharpha Solar Project (App. 2025-0120), at the site of the Rocky Hill Farm. Mill Creek Hundred. S Zoning. CD 3.

At a meeting held on February 3, 2026, the Historic Review Board considered the proposed application, public testimony provided at the January 20, 2026, public hearing, and the Department of Land Use Recommendation.

On a motion made by Ms. Anderson and seconded by Mr. Jackson the Historic Review Board voted to **APPROVE** Application 2025-0711-H and release all associated permits with the following conditions:

1. Photo documentation and Cultural Resource Survey Forms to be completed and submitted to the State of Delaware's Cultural and Historic Resource Information System (CHRIS) by a qualified Cultural Resource professional.
2. The Applicant strongly considers conducting an archeological sensitivity study prior to the construction of the Large-Scale Solar Energy System on Parcel 5.
3. The Applicant strongly considers working with the Department regarding a path for long term preservation of the historic structure, such as deed restrictions or Historic overlay zoning.

The motion was **ADOPTED** by a vote of 6-0-0-3 [In Favor: Silber, Patel, Anderson, Hershner, Jackson, Davis; In Opposition: None; Abstention: None; Absent: Patel, Duke, Rappleye]

Discussion preceding the vote included the following:

Mr. Barni read the Department of Land Use recommendation into the record.

There was no additional comment from the Board.

[App. 2025-0784-H](#): 76 Polly Drummond Hill Road. (TP 08-048.00-013). East and west sides of Polly Drummond Hill Road, north side of Capitol Trail. Construct a 6,000 square foot semi-permanent tent structure and associated improvements. Mill Creek Hundred. SR Zoning. CD 9.

At a meeting held on February 3, 2026, the Historic Review Board considered the proposed application, public testimony provided at the January 20, 2026, public hearing, and the Department of Land Use Recommendation.

On a motion made by Mr. Jackson and seconded by Ms. Hershner the Historic Review Board voted to **APPROVE** Application 2025-0784-H and release all associated permits with the following conditions:

1. The Applicant continues to work with the Department to review final color selections to ensure they are compatible with the other resources on the site.
2. The Applicant strongly considers working with the Department regarding a path for long term preservation of the historic structure, such as deed restrictions or Historic overlay zoning.
3. The applicant consults with an engineering firm to avoid and resolve any and all potential drainage issues.

The motion was **ADOPTED** by a vote of 6-0-0-3 [In Favor: Silber, Patel, Anderson, Hershner, Jackson, Davis; In Opposition: None; Abstention: None; Absent: Patel, Duke, Rappleye]

Discussion preceding the vote included the following:

Mr. Barni read the Department of Land Use recommendation into the record.

Mr. Jackson asked if the applicant had provided any additional information related to the drainage issue that he had brought up at the Public Hearing. Mr. Barni replied that they did not.

Ms. Hershner stated that she felt this was a lovely and creative example of adaptive reuse, and she commended the applicants for coming up with a great solution to reuse the foundation walls.

Mr. Jackson made a motion to approve Application 2025-0784-H and release all associated permits with the following conditions:

1. The Applicant continues to work with the Department to review final color selections to ensure they are compatible with the other resources on the site.
2. The Applicant strongly considers working with the Department regarding a path for long term preservation of the historic structure, such as deed restrictions or Historic overlay zoning.
3. The applicant consults with an engineering firm to avoid and resolve any and all potential drainage issues.

There was no additional comment from the Board.

[App. 2025-0785-H](#): *2009 Naamans Road*. (TP 06-023.00-110). North side of Naamans Road .25 mile +/- east of the intersection with Fouk Road. Demolition permit request for the circa 1936 Pierce House and outbuildings. Brandywine Hundred. NC6.5 Zoning. CD 2.

At a meeting held on February 3, 2026, the Historic Review Board considered the proposed application, public testimony provided at the January 20, 2026, public hearing, and the Department of Land Use Recommendation.

On a motion made by Ms. Hershner and seconded by Ms. Anderson the Historic Review Board voted to **APPROVE** Application 2025-0785-H and release all subsequent applications with the following conditions;

1. Satisfactory completion of Historic American Building Survey (HABS) documentation Level II completed by qualified cultural resource professionals to include the following:
 - Measured drawings which may include floorplans and elevations with the submission of a digital surrogate of the hand drawn field notes.
 - Outline level report meeting HABS standards.
2. Updated photo documentation and Cultural Resource Survey Forms be completed and submitted to the State of Delaware's Cultural and Historic Resource Information System (CHRIS).

The motion was **ADOPTED** by a vote of 6-0-0-3 [In Favor: Silber, Patel, Anderson, Hershner, Jackson, Davis; In Opposition: None; Abstention: None; Absent: Patel, Duke, Rappleye]

Discussion preceding the vote included the following:

Mr. Barni read the Department of Land Use recommendation into the record.

Ms. Hershner asked if the Department of Land Use would help the owner with identifying qualified Cultural Resource professionals. Mr. Barni affirmed they would.

There was no additional comment from the Board.

[App. 2025-0786-H](#): 2675 Pulaski Highway. (TP 11-026.10-204). North side of Pulaski Hwy, north of the intersection with Biddle Avenue. Building permit to construct Building A, associated signage, and land development plan modification at La Grange Center. Pencader Hundred. CR & H Zoning. CD 5

At a meeting held on February 3, 2026, the Historic Review Board considered the proposed application, public testimony provided at the January 20, 2026, public hearing, and the Department of Land Use Recommendation.

On a motion made by Ms. Anderson and seconded by Ms. Hershner the Historic Review Board voted to **APPROVE** Application 2025-0786-H and release all associated permits with the following condition:

1. Continue to work with the Department to ensure the final design is in compliance with the La Grange Center Guidelines.

The motion was **ADOPTED** by a vote of 6-0-0-3 [In Favor: Silber, Patel, Anderson, Hershner, Jackson, Davis; In Opposition: None; Abstention: None; Absent: Patel, Duke, Rappleye]

Discussion preceding the vote included the following:

Mr. Barni read the Department of Land Use recommendation into the record.

There was no additional comment from the Board.

[App. 2025-0799-H](#): *239 E Chestnut Hill Road*. (TP 11-006.00-001). South side of E Chestnut Hill Road and west of S Chapel Street. Major Land Development Plan for Arusha Village (App. 2022-0564) on the site of the circa 1846 Frazier Farm (N12872). Pencader Hundred. S Zoning. CD 5.

At a meeting held on February 3, 2026, the Historic Review Board considered the proposed application, public testimony provided at the January 20, 2026, public hearing, and the Department of Land Use Recommendation.

On a motion made by Ms. Silber and seconded by Mr. Jackson the Historic Review Board feels the Frazier Farmstead MEETS the minimum Criteria for Designation pursuant to Section 40.15.110 of the New Castle County Code as an enclosed context site.

Further Historic Review Board voted to **CONDITIONALLY APPROVE** application 2025-0799-H and release all subsequent permits with the following conditions:

1. The applicant continues to work with the Department to rehabilitate and preserve the Frazier Farm Complex. This should include items such as a finalized Preservation Plan that meets the Department's and the Secretary of Interior Standards, working with the Department on informational materials proposed for the interior of the Frazier Farm House, and placing the preserved resources on a separate Historic (H) zoned parcel as outlined in Section 40.15.310 of the *New Castle County Unified Development Code*.
2. The applicant conducts phase II level archeological testing to evaluate the historic significance of sites 7NC-D-288 and 7NC-D-287 to develop appropriate data recovery and/or protection plans to mitigate adverse impacts to these sites. This shall be performed by a qualified archeologist and should meet all professional, State, and Federal standards.
3. Develop an appropriate avoidance and protection plan for 7NC-D-287, for all construction activity including staging or movement of heavy machinery across the archeological site.
4. Ground Penetrating Radar (GPR) survey of the property can be used to supplement the Phase II survey but shall not be conducted in lieu of physical subsurface testing.

The motion was **ADOPTED** by a vote of 6-0-1-2 [In Favor: Silber, Patel, Anderson, Hershner, Jackson, Davis; In Opposition: None; Abstention: Rappleye; Absent: Patel, Duke]

Discussion preceding the vote included the following:

Mr. Barni read the Department of Land Use recommendation into the record.

Ms. Silber took the moment to provide the Board with her interpretation of the findings included in the archeological survey. She first noted that the Frazier Farmstead Site (7NC-D-288) is within the footprint of the limits of disturbance for the proposed construction and will inevitably cause disturbance and destruction of the site. The findings also note there is the potential to find more intact sites related to the historic components still above ground, including wells, privies, and storage spaces. If these pieces of the site are still there, they could also provide information about the history of the farm complex.

The archeologists who completed the report did note there are two distinct soil layers. The first layer is the old plow zone, and a stratum below the plow zone. Below the surface and plow zone there is a chance to have additional information and intact pre-contact deposits and/or sites. Adding that presently there is a site that has a high potential for intact archeological sites with a cultural and historic significance for both the historic and pre-contact periods. She also noted that 7NC-D-287, while outside the limits of disturbance, there is a chance that it will be disturbed due to heavy machinery and construction related activity. She felt that there needs to be regulations and conditions in place to make sure that site does not incur any disturbance through being fully avoided. She stated that data recovery cannot happen until additional testing is completed to better understand what is on the site. At that time a data recovery plan can be created and implemented.

Ms. Silber read out her proposed motion. She proposed a conditional approval with the following conditions:

1. Condition one will stay the same.
2. The applicant conducts additional archaeological testing, the equivalent of a Phase II study, to evaluate the historic significance of 7NC-D-288, as well as [7NC-D-]287. The purposes of these are to, one, locate any subsurface archaeological features and deposits associated with historic, and pre-contact components of both of these sites. Two, evaluate the historic significance of any such features/deposits encountered, and subsequently the sites themselves. And three, develop an appropriate data recovery plan as a treatment measure to mitigate adverse effects that the sites would incur during construction. And then, the last one is to develop an appropriate avoidance plan for 7-NCD-287 that includes protection of the site from any work associated with construction disturbance. This includes actions such as staging, or heavy machinery driving across this portion of the parcel, and develop an archaeological monitoring program that is active during the construction of the project.
3. The GPR survey. However, I do not necessarily believe that it will be able to pick up anything. When you make the motion, you can make that motion however you see fit, you know, the formal.

Mr. Davis asked Ms. Silber if there was a way that she could streamline the motion, noting he appreciates the time and effort she put into it.

Ms. Silber asked if she was supposed to make a motion. Mr. Davis asked if Mr. Barni could read back what Ms. Silber had said. Mr. Barni asked Ms. Silber to repeat what she had suggested and consider rewording condition 2. She repeated condition 2, saying the applicant conducts a Phase 2-level archaeological testing to evaluate the historical significance of 7NC-D-288 and 7NC-D-287. The purpose, in addition to evaluating the subsurface integrity of these sites, will also be to develop appropriate data recovery plans as

treatment measures. This also includes developing an appropriate avoidance plan for 7NCD287, and any staging or temporary work associated with construction. The site should not be allowed to be driven on top of as these are secondary impacts. She added GPR may be conducted to facilitate Phase 2, but it cannot be conducted in lieu of subsurface physical testing.

Mr. Garcia-Domenech acknowledged that Ms. Anderson had her hand raised. Mr. Davis stated that he was hoping to limit comments until there was a formal motion on the floor. Mr. Barni was asked to read the motion back. Prior to this he asked if Mr. Davis would like to let Ms. Anderson speak as she provided language for a motion prior to it being formally introduced in the past. He was advised by Mr. Davis to read back what Ms. Silber had said. Before re-reading he advised the Board that he had broken Ms. Silber's second condition into two conditions.

Mr. Barni read back the proposed motion that the site meets the minimum criteria for designation pursuant to Section 40.15.110. The New Castle County Code is an enclosed contact site adding this would be to conditionally approve application 2025-0799-H and release all subsequent permits with the following conditions

1. The applicant continues to work with the department to rehabilitate, so one remains the same.
2. The applicant conducts Phase 2 level archaeological testing to evaluate the historic significance of sites 7 NCD228 and 7 NCD28. 7 To develop appropriate data recovery and or protection plans to mitigate adverse impacts to these sites. This should be performed by qualified archaeologists and should meet all professional state and federal standards.
3. Develop an appropriate avoidance and protection plan for 7 NCD287 to avoid construction activity, including staging or movement of heavy machinery across the archaeological site.
4. Ground-penetrating radar GPR survey of the property can be used to supplement the Phase 2 survey, but should not be considered in lieu of physical subsurface testing

Ms. Silber asked if Phase II level testing was included in condition 2. Mr. Barni confirmed it was included.

Ms. Silber made the motion as read by Mr. Barni.

Ms. Anderson asked to speak before offering to second the motion. She stated that her comment was that there should be a condition that the applicant work with the former building occupants on the administration of the interior furnishings, adding that it was a major comment that had come up during the public hearing. She stated that since the furnishings were likely over 50 years old, they would fall under the purview of the Board,

and that condition should have been included in the motion. Mr. Barni responded that he did not know if the Board's purview extends to the interior furnishings, and that the applicant provided supplemental information stating that the furniture brought up during public hearing was not present in the house. Mr. Garcia-Domenech agreed with Mr. Barni.

Mr. Jackson asked if "should" in the motion could be changed to "shall". The change was made.

Mr. Davis asked for a Second, and Mr. Jackson seconded the motion.

Ms. Anderson disagreed with the concept that the Board's purview does not include interior furnishings. She stated that if you go to any historic museum, it includes furniture. She added that furnishings are an important artifact. They are preserved and restored and are used in order to document how people lived during certain periods of time. They have used utensils like they used tools in daily life. She reasserted that she did not agree that interior furnishings are not part of their historical purview. She stated that the fact that the Board is discussing archeology to look for objects that were used by human beings validates that the Board has purview over furnishings that occur inside of a building.

Ms. Silber asked if they had done any HABS documentation on the building. Mr. Barni responded they had. She added that archeologists often use local informants to interpret a site, and it might be something the Board wants to consider moving forward.

Mr. Jackson stated that Ms. Anderson's interpretation blurs the line between preservation and interpretation, which are two different things. He added that he understands what she has said and doesn't disagree but thinks when you start stepping into a private organization's business it opens a can of worms.

Ms. Silber asked if the Board would get to see the Phase II report or data recovery plan. Mr. Barni replied that if the Phase II survey turns up any significant findings the application should be returned to the Board for review and input.

He added that Ms. Rappleve had joined the meeting.

Mr. Davis asked Mr. Barni to re-read the motion as proposed.

There was no further discussion

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Mr. Davis noted that everyone should have gotten the updated language from Mr. Garcia-Domenech.

Mr. Jackson asked why this proposed language was added. Mr. Garcia-Domenech explained that some of it was added to make it compliant with the county code other language was suggested and he felt it was good to incorporate. Mr. Jackson followed up, asking if some of the changes might have

been precipitated from specific event or application. Mr. Garcia-Domenech stated that no event or application was the cause of any of the changes.

Mr. Domenech-Garcia read the proposed changes into the record.

Mr. Davis opened the floor for discussion from the Board.

Mr. Davis began and questioned if things, like the speaker's time limits were necessary within the bylaws since they were related to the rules of order and not bylaws that governed the Board.

Mr. Barni stated that all other boards laid out things like this within their Rules of Procedure.

Ms. Rappleye asked if vice Chair should be added to the language in Article 5 Section 5. Mr. Garcia-Domenech said he could change the language to Chairperson or acting Chairperson.

Ms. Anderson asked if they would now have an acting Chairperson, since she thought that was the reason they were including language related to a vice Chairperson. Mr. Davis stated that if they are formally appointing a vice Chair in the instance that neither the Chair nor vice Chair could be present the Board would have to appoint an acting Chairperson. Ms. Rappleye asked if there was a way to clearly lay out the mechanism to appoint an acting Chair. Mr. Davis explained he always felt the Rules of Procedure were written this way to avoid multiple layers. Mr. Garcia-Domenech read Article 4 Section 6 "in the absence of the Chairperson and the vice Chairperson. The members present shall elect one of their members to be temporary shared person for that meeting." Mrs. Rappleye offered adding language to explain the role of Chairperson or the delegation of power one and then continuing to use Chairperson throughout the document. Mr. Garcia-Domenech explained that he would use acting Chairperson and that would refer to Chair, vice Chair or anyone appointed to serve in that capacity. Ms. Rappleye replied that, that solution would just get them back to the issue they are trying to resolve. Mr. Davis responded that he felt this issue is why the bylaws were written to say Chairperson or Acting Chairperson to avoid this confusion.

Ms. Silber stated that other committees have vice Chairs. Mr. Barni added that other boards have a single appointed vice Chair and reminded the group that they had suggested the idea of a rotating vice Chairperson that would be appointed every meeting by Mr. Davis. He continued stating that this is not something he had seen other boards do and questioned the feasibility of it. Mr. Garcia-Domenech stated there was nothing in the code prohibiting it. Mr. Barni replied that it was a question of feasibility.

Ms. Anderson stated that she didn't think they should use the Chairperson or vice Chairperson since the article covers that definition, and the bylaws can just read Chairperson and the only time anything would happen is in Article 4 which states that the vice Chairperson would serve in the absence of the Chairperson. She questioned if they needed to keep stating anything other than Chairperson. That is the purpose of Article 4 and it is applicable to the bylaws. Mr. Garcia-Domenech said he had no concern about that suggestion and would make the change to the language and read the changes into the record at the next business meeting.

There was no additional comment.

REPORT OF THE PRESERVATION PLANNER

Mr. Barni noted the next public hearing would be held February 17, 2026.

REPORT OF THE CHAIRPERSON

None.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

Lucille and Pamela Quarles asked what the timeline for additional archeological work at the Frazier Farm was. Mr. Barni responded that there was no timeline as the applicant was just told of the approval conditions. Ms. Quarles stated that she felt this would take time, but noted the next meeting was scheduled for March 17th. Mr. Barni stated that this item would not be on the next meeting agenda.

ADJOURNMENT

On a motion made by Mr. Patel and seconded by Mr. Jackson, the Historic Review Board voted unanimously to adjourn the business meeting.

The meeting ended at 6:41