

CITY OF DOVER HISTORIC DISTRICT & PLANNING COMMISSION

OLD POST PROJECT

**55 Loockerman Street
Dover, Delaware 19901**

REVISION #2

August 18, 2026

OWNER OF RECORD / EQUITABLE OWNER

Old Post LLC

[REDACTED]

91 Brenda Lane, Suite A
Camden, DE 19934

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

ENGINEER

Davis Bowen Friedel Inc.

[REDACTED]

1 Park Avenue
Milford, DE 19963

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

ARCHITECT

Moonlight Architect Inc.

[REDACTED]

29003 Lewes Georgetown Highway
Lewes, DE 19958

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

REQUEST FOR CONSIDERATION OF REVISION #2

Dear Dawn and Members of the Historic Commission and Planning Commission:

On behalf of **Old Post LLC**, we respectfully submit Revision #2 for consideration by the Historic Commission and Planning Commission for the Old Post Project located at 55 Loockerman Street, Dover, Delaware.

We are requesting approval of two modifications to the previously approved project. These requested modifications are the result of unforeseen structural and subsurface conditions discovered during additional investigation, testing, demolition planning, and engineering work following the original approval.

It is important to emphasize that the project is **not being redesigned or replaced with a materially different development**. Rather, the requested revisions are intended to address conditions that were not reasonably apparent at the time of the original approval and to allow the previously approved development to be constructed in a safe, structurally responsible, and practical manner.

1. REQUEST TO DEMOLISH THE EXISTING STRUCTURE IN ITS ENTIRETY

We respectfully request permission to demolish the existing building in its entirety, with the possible exception of portions of the existing front foundation footings, where technically feasible and appropriate.

Following the purchase of the property from the City of Dover, extensive testing and investigation revealed significant quantities of garbage, refuse, and other unsuitable materials below grade. Several rounds of additional testing and engineering analysis have demonstrated that these unforeseen subsurface conditions materially affect the structural design and construction methodology for the project.

As a result of these conditions, the project now requires the installation of specialized **rigid-inclusion piles**, representing an additional construction cost of more than **\$375,000**. Additional investigation has also determined that the foundation work necessary to connect the remaining portion of the existing building to the new rear tower would be exceptionally difficult to construct because of the subsurface conditions encountered on the property.

The subsurface conditions have also raised concerns regarding the actual weight and structural behavior of the existing building and the potential for settlement beyond standard construction tolerances. These findings have required the project team to reevaluate the safest and most appropriate method of proceeding with demolition and reconstruction.

Several demolition contractors who have reviewed the project have independently expressed concerns regarding the safety of attempting to retain and selectively demolish a portion of the existing structure.

In particular, the existing building contains substantial steel beams and steel floor trusses. Attempting to cut and remove these structural members in order to separate the existing building from the new construction could create a significant risk of an uncontrolled structural collapse during demolition. Such a condition could potentially result in serious injury or loss of life to workers or others on the site.

This concern is particularly significant at the location where the remaining portion of the existing building would meet and connect with the new tower construction.

In addition, we have recently observed a significant crack in the northeast exterior wall of the existing structure. This condition has further increased our concern regarding the stability of the building and the safety of attempting to selectively demolish portions of the structure while leaving other portions standing.

For these reasons, we believe that complete demolition of the existing structure represents the **safer and more responsible approach** to both demolition and reconstruction.

The additional area proposed for demolition represents less than **25% of the area originally contemplated for retention**. The overall project design, massing, elevations, and architectural intent will remain substantially consistent with the previously approved plans.

We remain committed to maintaining the approved appearance and character of the front façade. Where practical and structurally appropriate, we also intend to salvage and reuse existing architectural and structural elements, including columns and other materials, as part of the reconstruction.

Complete demolition will also provide the project team with the opportunity to properly waterproof and insulate the building envelope at the front portion of the property. This will improve the long-term performance, durability, and energy efficiency of the building.

We respectfully submit that allowing complete demolition will provide a safer construction environment while allowing the previously approved project to proceed in a more practical and structurally sound manner.

2. REQUEST TO MODIFY EXTERIOR FAÇADE MATERIAL TO EIFS BRICK

Our second request concerns the exterior façade materials.

The currently approved plans provide for **EIFS** on the first floor of the residential four-story tower, with thin brick and conventional brick used on other portions of the building.

In response to the structural and subsurface conditions identified during our additional engineering investigations, we respectfully request permission to utilize an **EIFS brick system** in place of conventional and thin brick materials on the portions of the building currently proposed to receive those materials.

The proposed EIFS brick system is intended to provide the appearance and character of traditional brick while substantially reducing the overall weight imposed on the building structure.

This reduction in weight is particularly important given the unforeseen subsurface conditions and the structural and settlement concerns identified during our additional testing and engineering analysis.

The proposed material change will **not change the building elevations, architectural design, massing, height, or overall appearance** of the approved project. The requested revision is limited to the exterior cladding material.

The first floor of the residential tower was already approved with an EIFS system. We also understood during the original approval process that EIFS had been contemplated and approved for the tower as a whole when the tower was three stories.

Given the conditions now identified, extending the EIFS system in a brick appearance would provide a practical means of reducing the overall weight of the building while maintaining the architectural character and appearance contemplated by the approved plans.

The use of an EIFS brick system would also assist the project in maintaining appropriate structural and engineering margins with respect to the anticipated settlement conditions.

We will provide physical samples of the proposed EIFS brick system at the hearings for the Commissioners to review and evaluate.

CONCLUSION

The two requested revisions are being proposed as a direct response to unforeseen conditions discovered after the original approval of the project.

The intent of **Old Post LLC** remains to proceed with the previously approved development while addressing the significant structural, subsurface, safety, and construction issues that have been identified during the project's engineering and pre-construction process.

We believe that the proposed revisions will allow the project to proceed in a **safer, more structurally responsible, and more practical manner**, while preserving the architectural character, elevations, massing, and overall intent of the previously approved project.

The requested changes are not intended to create a materially different development. Rather, they are necessary modifications to the means and methods by which the approved development can be safely and responsibly constructed in light of conditions that were not known at the time of the original approval.

Accordingly, we respectfully request that the **Historic Commission and Planning Commission approve Revision #2**, including:

1. **Permission to demolish the existing structure in its entirety**, with the possible exception of portions of the existing front foundation footings where feasible and appropriate; and
2. **Permission to utilize an EIFS brick exterior cladding system** in place of the conventional and thin brick materials currently shown on portions of the approved plans.

We appreciate the Commissions' time and consideration of this request. We look forward to presenting the additional engineering information, demolition concerns, and proposed material samples at the upcoming hearings.

Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

Francis A. DiMondi

Managing Member

Old Post LLC

91 Brenda Lane, Suite A

Camden, DE 19934

Email: INFO@FADoffice.net

Phone: 302-730-0150