CITY OF DOVER PLANNING COMMISSION
October 21, 2013

The Regular Meeting of the City of Dover Planning Commission was held on Monday, October 21, 2013 at 7:00 PM with Vice Chairman Mr. Tolbert presiding. Members present were Mr. Holden, Mr. Cregar, Mr. Holt, Mr. Baldwin, Dr. Jones, Ms. Still and Mr. Tolbert. Mr. Ambruso and Colonel Welsh were absent.

Staff members present were Mrs. Townshend, Mrs. Melson-Williams (arrived at 8:22pm), Mrs. Harvey and Mrs. Mullaney. Also present were Mr. Gregg Moore, Mr. Ted Henderson, Mr. Russ Huxtable, Mr. Tom Ayd, Ms. Monica Sloan, Mr. Brad Cowen, Dr. Michael Thomas, Mr. Carl Krienen and Dr. Evelyn Edney. Also speaking from the public were Ms. Cora-Marie Yoder, Ms. Valerie Boyer, Mr. Les Blakeman, Mr. Rufus Green and Mr. Gene Montanyo.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mrs. Townshend stated that the revisions to the agenda included the removal of applications C-13-09 Bee Hive Beauty Shop at 27 West Loockerman Street and SB-13-05 Wynsome Oaks Subdivision on White Oak Road.

Dr. Jones moved to approve the revised agenda to include the removal of applications C-13-09 Bee Hive Beauty Shop at 27 West Loockerman Street and SB-13-05 Wynsome Oaks Subdivision on White Oak Road, seconded by Mr. Baldwin and the motion was unanimously carried 7-0 with Mr. Ambruso and Colonel Welsh absent.

Mr. Cregar stated that this was the second month that application C-13-09 Bee Hive Beauty Shop at 27 West Loockerman Street was removed from the agenda. Is there a limit to the number of times the application can be removed? Responding to Mr. Cregar, Mrs. Townshend stated that she spoke to the Realtor who has been assisting the business owner and he assured her that he would complete the public notice this time around and that it would be done correctly. Planning Staff will work closely with him to make sure that it goes appropriately.

APPROVAL OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 16, 2013

Mr. Holt moved to approve the Planning Commission minutes of September 16, 2013, seconded by Ms. Still and the motion was unanimously carried 7-0 with Mr. Ambruso and Colonel Welsh absent.

COMMUNICATIONS & REPORTS

Mrs. Townshend stated that the next Planning Commission meeting will be held on Monday, November 18, 2013 at 7:00 PM in the City Hall Council Chambers.

Mrs. Townshend stated that the next Planning Commission Workshop meeting will be held on Tuesday, November 19, 2013 at noon in the City Hall Conference Room.

Mrs. Townshend stated that the Mayor presented the Planning Office with a Proclamation of National Community Planning Month.

Mrs. Townshend provided an update on the regular City Council and Utility Committee meetings

held on September 23, 2013 and October 14, 2013.

OPENING REMARKS CONCERNING DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS

Mrs. Townshend presented the audience information on policies and procedures for the meeting.

OLD BUSINESS

1) Requests for Extensions of Planning Commission Approval: None

NEW BUSINESS

1) MI-13-10 Nottingham Meadows: Revised Active Recreation Area – Review and Acceptance of the amount of the cash-in-lieu payment of Active Recreation Area construction for the Nottingham Meadows Subdivision. The property is zoned R-8 (One Family Residence Zone) and a portion is subject to SWPOZ (Source Water Protection Overlay Zone) Tier 3 – Excellent Recharge Area. The subdivision is located on the south side of Hazlettville Road and west of Wyoming Mill Road. The owner of record is Siobain-VI, LLC. Address: Nottingham Meadows Subdivision. Council District 2. *The Planning Commission on June 17, 2013 approved a Revised Active Recreation Plan determining that a cash-in-lieu payment was appropriate instead of recreation area construction for this subdivision.*

Representatives: None

Mrs. Townshend stated that this is the final phase of multiple trips to the Planning Commission. The remaining lots located in Nottingham Meadows have been purchased by another developer. The new developer came back with a revision to their Active Recreation Area. In June 2013, the Planning Commission approved cash-in-lieu of Active Recreation Area provided. It then went to the Parks, Recreation and Community Enhancement Committee on September 9, 2013 after the calculation was done to determine the amount. That amount was recommended favorably to the City Council who accepted the amount on September 23, 2013 and now the final step is for the Planning Commission to accept the amount. The proposed cash-in-lieu donation that was determined in accordance with the procedure established in the Code is $14,517. A motion is needed from the Planning Commission to accept the amount.

Mr. Holden abstained from the vote; his employer assisted with this application.

Mr. Holt moved to approve MI-13-10 Nottingham Meadows: Revised Active Recreation Area cash-in-lieu payment of $14,517, seconded by Dr. Jones and the motion was unanimously carried 6-0 with Mr. Holden abstained from the vote due to his employer assisting with the application and with Mr. Ambruso and Colonel Welsh absent.

NEW DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS

1) C-13-11 Dover Christian Church at 1783 Forrest Avenue – Public Hearing and Review of a Conditional Use Site Plan for construction of a one story 9,699 SF place of worship (church building) and associated site improvements. The existing residence on the property is proposed for demolition. The property is 1.5576 acres and is zoned R-10 (One Family Residential Zone) and subject to the COZ-1 (Corridor Overlay Zone). The property is located on the south side of Forrest

Avenue and west of Dover High Drive. The owner of record is Dover Christian Church, Inc. Address: 1738 Forrest Avenue. Tax Parcel: ED-05-075.00-01-04.00-000. Council District 1.

Representatives: Mr. Gregg Moore, Becker Morgan Group; Mr. Ted Henderson, President of Dover Christian Church

Mr. Holden recused himself from this application; his employer assisted with this project.

Mrs. Townshend stated that this was a Conditional Use Site Plan for the Dover Christian Church located at 1738 Forrest Avenue. The property is approximately 1.5576 acres and the property is zoned R-10 (One Family Residential Zone) and subject to the COZ-1 (Corridor Overlay Zone). The proposal is for a 9,600 SF place of worship and other associated site improvements. In terms of the location, this is adjacent to Leander Lakes which is on the west and south side of the project. It is also adjacent to the Capital School District property of the Dover High School project and some residual land maintained by the Capital School District near Dover High Drive. The proposal as presented complies with the requirements of the COZ-1 (Corridor Overlay Zone). The building architecture includes two (2) different colors of split face masonry and metal siding for the walls and a metal roof system for the pitched hipped roofs. Other exterior finish details in the form of banding, windows, trimwork of openings include the use of ground face masonry and translucent panels. Main entrances to the building are located on the north elevation and the south elevation. These entrances are highlighted by a glass and aluminum storefront window/door systems and a metal canopy. There are series of tall arched windows that are used in the sanctuary section on the west end of the building and on the east elevation of the building with aluminum storefront windows. There are sixty-five (65) parking spaces required. The Site Plan includes sixty-seven (67) spaces. There are a minimum of four (4) bicycle parking spaces provided. Bike racks are included near the building's south entry.

There is an entrance off of Dover High Drive, not off of Forrest Avenue that is going to be consistent with the DelDOT requirements. There are a number of easements that are part of the Leander Lakes project that will be utilized as a part of this as well. The coordination with this project, the Dover High School and the Leander Lakes construction are going to be very important moving forward.

Mr. Moore stated that they had no problems with any of the DAC comments. The report is well done and they are able to comply with everything. Two things that he wanted to point out: 1) a steeple is shown on the architectural drawings, the church has decided that they do not want a steeple so that will not be built. Therefore, Mrs. Townshend will not require them to go to Board of Adjustment. This is the desire of the church even before the height issue was raised. 2) DelDOT strongly requested that they have their entrance in the location shown rather than on Route 8.

Mr. Tolbert opened a public hearing and after seeing no one wishing to speak, closed the public hearing.

Mr. Cregar questioned the traffic study that is part of this application. Responding to Mr. Cregar, Mr. Moore stated that there was actually a comment from DelDOT about two options: either doing a traffic impact study or contributing money to the fee-in-lieu of which they have just created. The applicant has told DelDOT that they prefer to pay the fee-in-lieu of. The applicant gives DelDOT cash; they do a regional study and improvements that are based on the regional study.

Mr. Holt questioned the plantings located near the south entrance door and, if they can survive under the proposed canopy? Responding to Mr. Holt, Mr. Moore stated that they plan to eliminate the canopy so that they don't have that problem.

Mr. Cregar moved to approve C-13-11 Dover Christian Church at 1738 Forrest Avenue based on all of the DAC recommendations and the Staff Report, seconded by Mr. Holt and the motion was unanimously carried 6-0 with Mr. Holden recused and Mr. Ambruso and Colonel Welsh absent.

2) MI-13-16 Request for Street Abandonment: Harmony Lane – Public Hearing and Review for Recommendation to City Council of a request to abandon the improved street known as Harmony Lane which serves the Walker Woods development. This request consists of Harmony Lane as it runs north of Walker Road. This request was filed by Milford Housing Development Corporation. Council District 4. *This application is associated with Application S-13-18 Redevelopment of Walker Woods.*

Representatives: Mr. Russ Huxtable, Milford Housing Development Corporation; Mr. Tom Ayd, Green Street Development

Mrs. Townshend stated that the proposal is for the abandonment of Harmony Lane which is a City street north of Walker Road that serves the Walker Woods and the Walker Woods II community. Currently, there are fifty-five (55) lots being served by the City street. Under the development proposal that is next on the agenda, all of the lots will be consolidated to one parcel and Harmony Lane if abandoned, would serve as the interior drive to the apartment complex. There are a number of easements that will be required to be maintained that are addressed specifically in the Public Works Report. In the case of the abandonment because it is an improved right-of-way, the Planning Commission makes a recommendation to City Council. From the Planning Commission, the project will go to the Utility Committee for their recommendation and then City Council will set a hearing once they have that recommendation. The recommendation of the Planning Staff is that there is no objection to the abandonment and they recommend that the abandonment be conditioned upon the completion of the Site Development Plan and the Parcel Consolidation Plan and that the City not give up ownership of the road until such time that the Parcel Consolidation Plan is recorded. The concern is that if the abandonment precedes that and for some reason it (if the project) does not move forward, there will be a private street with fifty-five (55) lots and no one to be responsible for it. Their only recommendation is for the timing of the abandonment.

Mr. Huxtable stated that they were excited to bring this project forward in the re-development process and they do not have any objections to the DAC comments.

Mr. Cregar questioned if the Consolidation Plan was part of the application that will be seen next? Responding to Mr. Cregar, Mrs. Townshend stated yes.

Mr. Tolbert opened a public hearing and after seeing no one wishing to speak, closed the public hearing.

Ms. Still moved to recommend approval to the City Council of MI-13-16 Request for Street Abandonment: Harmony Lane, conditional to the Site Plan Development and the Parcel Consolidation Plan as recorded in accordance with the DAC comments, seconded by Mr. Cregar and the motion was unanimously carried 7-0 with Mr. Ambruso and Colonel Welsh absent.

3) S-13-18 Redevelopment of Walker Woods: The Village of Sherwood – Public Hearing and Site Plan Review to redevelop the property with twelve (12) two story and three story apartment buildings (a total of 77 units in Buildings A-L) and a 3,400 SF Community Building. The properties are zoned RG-2 (General Residence Zone). The project also includes a Parcel Consolidation Plan. The properties known as Walker Woods Phases 1 and 2 are situated on the north side of Walker Road adjoining Harmony Lane. The owners of record are Walker Woods Properties, LLC and Milford Housing Development Corporation. Addresses: 1357-1383 Walker Road and multiple addresses on Harmony Lane. Tax Parcels: multiple parcels on map ED-05-067.18-01. Council District 4. *This property was rezoned from RG-3 and ROS to RG-2 on September 9, 2013 with Application Z-13-01. This Application is also associated with Applications MI-13-16 Request for Street Abandonment: Harmony Lane and MI-13-17 Active Recreation Area Plan for Walker Woods. Waivers Requested: Partial Elimination of Upright Curbing and Elimination of Rear Emergency Access for Two and Three Story Apartments.*

Representatives: Mr. Russ Huxtable, Milford Housing Development Corporation; Mr. Tom Ayd, Green Street Development

Mrs. Townshend stated that this was a project related to the prior application. The street abandonment helps them set the stage for redevelopment of Walker Woods and Walker Woods II. They may recall that in August, the Planning Commission recommended favorably on the rezoning application for this property. That was approved by City Council in September 2013 so the project is zoned RG-2 (General Residence Zone). Currently, there are seventy-two (72) townhomes on fifty-five (55) lots and the proposal is to consolidate everything to one lot and to construct using the existing foundations a total of seventy-seven (77) garden apartments. There are two (2) waivers being requested. One is the elimination of the emergency rear access requirement. The buildings are going to be sprinklered. Planning Commission's role in this is to make a recommendation to City Council and they will ultimately decide upon that waiver. They have also requested partial elimination of curbing. There is a graphic that shows where the applicant is looking to have curbing that is at grade with the sidewalk and the parking area. It is shown in blue in front of the apartment buildings where there is pull in parking. There are one hundred seventy-four (174) parking spaces required. If there is an office on site that will increase the parking required by one space per 200 SF. That information will come forward in a subsequent Check Print after the Planning Commission process. There are nine (9) bicycle parking spaces required. The plan shows eight (8) bicycle racks at various locations throughout the site. This exceeds the required bicycle parking. For the Active Recreation Area Plan, this was reviewed by the Parks, Recreation and Community Enhancement Committee in September 2013. For seventy-seven (77) dwelling units, they are required to provide 150 SF of recreation area per unit for a total of 11,550 SF. They meet this requirement through a Community Center Building with meeting rooms and activity rooms and a playground area adjacent to the Community Center. They also have a small tot lot proposed on the east side of the site. There is an ADA accessible picnic area that is on the east side of the site as well. A five (5) foot wide mulch path connects the picnic area to the end of the cul-de-sac along the east side of the property. There are three (3) 15'x12' exercise stations proposed throughout the development and a series of benches and relaxation stations scattered through the development. The relaxation stations include a bench, trash receptacle, recycling receptacle and smoking receptacle on a concrete pad. The units will be smoke free so the relaxation stations would allow a place for any smoking residents to smoke. In terms of the elimination of the rear access requirement, the *Zoning Ordinance* requires a sixteen (16) foot alley or an eighteen (18) foot secondary fire lane behind the

units. Because the units are sprinklered, there is no objection to the waiver. This has been discussed with the Fire Marshal's Office and they are comfortable that it meets the Fire Code requirements and that it is a safe design. In this case, the other agency comments have been provided and recommendations on the waiver requests.

Mr. Cregar questioned if the Recreation Area that is being proposed exceeds the requirement that they put forth? Responding to Mr. Cregar, Mrs. Townshend stated yes.

Mr. Holden questioned if snow removal was going to be handled by the Milford Housing Development Corporation? Responding to Mr. Holden, Mr. Huxtable stated that there will be an on-site management company that will handle contracting for snow removal.

Mr. Holden stated that he noticed one recreation trail was a mulch trail which he thinks works well but his concern was if it was not maintained. He questioned if this gave the applicant any concern for maintenance? Responding to Mr. Holden, Mr. Huxtable stated that it would be worked into the operating budget of the project and will be maintained professionally by the property management company. They will make sure that they walk the grounds daily, pick up trash and things of that nature. They are confident in the management company's capabilities.

Mrs. Townshend questioned the applicant in terms of the architecture. The Staff recommendation was that windows be added to the ends of the buildings to break up the expanse of vinyl wall. She knows that the applicant had expressed some concern with that comment so this would be the opportunity to change it. Responding to Mrs. Townshend, Mr. Ayd stated that they do not object to the windows but they ask that they have the option to break it with an architectural detail versus windows. The reason being is to provide a uniform amenity of windows across the whole property.

Mr. Townshend further stated that the Staff has no objection to some other type of architectural relief.

Mr. Holden stated that he believed one of the Staff recommendations was for curb bumpers where there is flush curbing. He questioned if the applicant was okay with that recommendation? Responding to Mr. Holden, Mr. Ayd stated that they didn't have any problems with that recommendation.

Mr. Tolbert questioned if there were an adequate number of dumpsters in the development? Responding to Mr. Tolbert, Mrs. Townshend stated yes, they meet the Code requirement. They are scattered at various locations.

Mr. Cregar questioned if the elimination of curbing was to facilitate drainage? Responding to Mr. Cregar, Mrs. Townshend stated yes.

Mr. Cregar further questioned if the waivers needed to be broken up into different motions or could it be done as one? Responding to Mr. Cregar, Mrs. Townshend stated that it could all be done as one motion but the emergency access elimination would be a recommendation to City Council.

Mr. Tolbert questioned if the Active Recreation Area Plan should be included in the motion? Responding to Mr. Tolbert, Mrs. Townshend stated yes.

Mr. Tolbert opened a public hearing and after seeing no one wishing to speak, closed the public hearing.

Mr. Holt moved to approve S-13-18 Redevelopment of Walker Woods: The Village of Sherwood with the requested waiver of the partial elimination of curbing and the Active Recreation Area Plan. Also to recommend approval to City Council on the waiver request for the elimination of the emergency rear access requirement, seconded by Ms. Still and the motion was unanimously carried 7-0 with Mr. Ambruso and Colonel Welsh absent.

4) S-13-19 Woodmill Apartment Storage Buildings and Garage Building and Revised Active Recreation Area at Woodmill Apartments – Public Hearing and Site Plan Review for this construction of a Phase 1: 6 – unit garage building at 1,632 SF, construction of Phase 2: a storage building at 4,800 SF, and construction of Phase 3: a storage building at 4,000 SF for a total of 10,432 SF. The plan also includes revisions to the Active Recreation Area. The revisions to the Active Recreation Area include the removal of the tennis courts and the creation of a park area with a horseshoe pit and picnic table. The property is zone RG-2 (General Residence Zone). The property is located on the south side of Fairview Drive and east of Mifflin Road. The owners of record are Multiresidential and Multiresidential-M, LLC. Address: 1300 Farmview Drive. Tax Parcels: ED-05-076.10-02-07.01-000 and ED-05-076.10-02-56.00-000. Council District 1. *This Application partially supersedes S-13-11 Woodmill Apartment Storage Building and Revised Active Recreation Area; information on the Revised Active Recreation Area will still be applicable to S-13-19.*

Representatives: Ms. Monica Sloan, North Point Engineering

Mrs. Harvey stated that the review of the Site Plan is for the construction of two (2) storage buildings for a total of 8,800 SF, one 6-unit garage building for a total of 1,632 SF to be completed in three (3) phases on two (2) parcels of land. The plan also includes revisions to the Active Recreation Area. The revisions are to remove two (2) existing tennis courts and replace with the two (2) storage buildings. The creation of the park area with a horseshoe pit and picnic tables would be established on the west side of the property. The revisions of the Active Recreation Area were reviewed and approved by the Parks, Recreation and Community Enhancement Committee at their April 8, 2013 meeting. The apartment complex consists of two (2) parcels of land with eight (8) apartment buildings. The existing Recreation Area which includes the swimming pool, club house, volleyball court and tennis courts will all remain except for the tennis courts. There is also an existing playground located on the west side of the parcel. The complex was constructed prior to the *Zoning Ordinance* requiring an Active Recreation Area. The site is considered legal nonconforming with regards to the Active Recreation Area. The plan for the six (6) unit garage building will be constructed in the first phase in the parking lot on the east side of Apartment Building L on Parcel 3. The construction of the garage building will occupy eight (8) existing parking spaces and two (2) parking spaces will be relocated in the parking lot on the south end of Building N on Parcel 3. The existing cross-striping in the parking spaces will be removed to create two (2) parking spaces. Based on the number of required parking spaces, thirty (30) bicycle parking spaces are required for this site.

Ms. Sloan stated that Phase 1 is going to be the six (6) unit garage building which is on the lower parcel. That will take away the two (2) parking spaces but there are actually three (3) striped spaces that they will be removing the striping from. This will create one (1) additional parking space for that parcel. When Phase 1 is constructed, the landscaping on that lower parcel will be done with that phase.

For Phase 2 they are proposing the lower of the two (2) storage buildings, the 4,800 SF storage building. When that building is constructed all of the landscaping and the Active Recreation Area will be put in with that phase. Phase 3 is going to be the remaining building and they have met with the Fire Marshal to discuss access to that building. On this plan, they have added a fire lane in order to get the accessibility that is required. A submission to the Fire Marshal does need to be made and they will be doing so next.

The only other thing that she wants on the record is that there is a requirement of additional evergreen trees on the north end of the Active Recreation Area. There are quite of few large trees in that area already so they would like to discuss that requirement.

Mr. Holt stated that there was a recommendation from Staff that the building should have a pitched roof with horizontal siding so that everything matches. Responding to Mr. Holt, Ms. Sloan showed pictures of the architectural drawings that were submitted and it will match anything existing on the property.

Mr. Cregar questioned that because the project is legal nonconforming with the existing number of parking, do they have to make sure that there is no further reduction in parking in order for it to remain legal nonconforming? Responding to Mr. Cregar, Mrs. Townshend stated yes.

Mr. Cregar further questioned if the applicant could comply with that requirement? Responding to Mr. Cregar, Ms. Sloan stated yes.

Mr. Holden questioned who maintained the recreation areas? Responding to Mr. Holden, Ms. Sloan stated that there was a property management company that maintains the entire apartment complex and they would maintain the recreation areas as well.

Mr. Tolbert opened a public hearing and after seeing no one wishing to speak, closed the public hearing.

Mr. Cregar questioned if the issue regarding trees could be left to the Planning Staff for a determination? Responding to Mr. Cregar, Mrs. Townshend stated yes, the Planning Commission can include in the motion that if the existing trees provide enough of a buffer that Staff would be able to allow that to count towards the tree requirement.

Mr. Cregar moved to approve S-13-19 Woodmill Apartment Storage Buildings, Garage Building and Revised Active Recreation Area with the caveat that Staff be able to review the existing tree buffer and make a determination about the appropriateness and to also include the DAC recommendations, seconded by Mr. Holt and the motion was unanimously carried 7-0 with Mr. Ambruso and Colonel Welsh absent.

7) MI-13-18 New Dover High School: Revised Parking Justification and Waiver Request for Parking Reduction – Public Hearing and Consideration of Revised Parking Justification for parking associated with the New Dover High School and a Waiver Request for a Reduction in the required parking. The property is zoned R-10 (One Family Residence Zone) and subject to the COZ-1 (Corridor Overlay Zone). The property is located on the south side of Forrest Avenue and east of Dover High Drive. The owner of record is the Capital School District. Address: 1650 Forrest Avenue. Tax Parcel: ED-05-

076.00-02-07.00-000. *The Planning Commission conditional approved Conditionally Use Site Plan C-10-05 on December 20, 2010 and Final Site Plan Approval was granted to S-11-18.*

Representatives: Mr. Gregg Moore, Becker Morgan Group; Mr. Brad Cowen, EDiS Company; Dr. Michael Thomas, Superintendent of Capital School District; Mr. Carl Krienen, ABHA Architects; Dr. Evelyn Edney, Co-Principal for Administration at Dover High School

Mr. Holden recused himself from this application. His employer is the engineer of record.

Mrs. Townshend stated that this application was for the new Dover High School project located at 1650 Forrest Avenue on the west side of the City. The project is 106.5222 acres. The property is zoned R-10 (One Family Residence Zone) and subject to the COZ-1 (Corridor Overlay Zone). Planning Commission approved application C-10-05 in December 2010. That was a Site Development Master Plan and Conditional Use application. The subsequent phase of that application was the Administrative Site Plan S-11-18 which was also known as Bid Pack C where the Final Plan approval was granted through the Planning Office. At this point in time, the school is well under construction. A lot of progress can be seen on the site and some of the aspects of the site are being evaluated that are not necessarily associated directly with the building.

The School District has submitted a waiver request for a reduction in required parking and they have also provided Commission members with a revision to the Parking Justification that was originally reviewed in December 2010. The big change between 2010 and now is that the initial seating capacity of the auditorium was planned to be eleven hundred (1100) seats; it has been reduced to nine hundred (900) seats. That brings down the number of required parking spaces of eight hundred forty (840) to eight hundred (800). In looking at the Report, the best place to look in order to understand some of the changes as it relates to the parking on the Site Plan is on Page 7, Table 3: Summary of Parking Revisions. This shows the number of parking spaces on the approved Site Plan S-11-18, the number of parking spaces by lot area on the Revised Plan for this evening and the difference. There are some parking spaces that were not counted as parking spaces in the 2010-2011 plans that in looking at the reduction they are requesting be considered. The site initially has eight hundred forty-seven (847) parking spaces. If comparing how they reached that number and what the plan is today, it would have five hundred sixty-four (564) parking spaces. So there are two hundred eighty-three (283) fewer parking spaces. However, in addition to those five hundred sixty-four (564) parking spaces there are twenty-four (24) drop off spaces around the front and side of the school. The front being the north entrance and then the east side of the school. There are also twenty-eight (28) bus spaces that were counted as parking spaces before but the bus parking can be converted to one hundred seventy (170) car parking spaces in the case of a large event. If those spaces are added in that were not counted on the previous analysis then there would be a total of seven hundred thirty-four (734) spaces and twenty-four (24) drop-off spaces. There are alternative methods to reaching the parking reduction that is being requested. One way would be to count the drop-off spaces and the bus parking spaces that were not previously counted to help reflect the required parking. What is seen on the Site Plan that was submitted is there are three (3) areas that had been proposed as parking lots that are at this point being asked to be waived. They would be available for overflow parking in the case of a large event. It would be grass parking which technically is not approved parking under the Code but it would be available for a large event. Two (2) of these parking lots are located on the west side of the site for ninety-five (95) spaces and one hundred eight (108) spaces which is two hundred three (203) spaces total. There is a parking lot on the east side by the competition stadiums for baseball and softball that

was supposed to be one hundred eleven (111) spaces. They are showing thirty-one (31) pull-in spaces instead of one hundred eleven (111) which would be an eighty (80) space reduction in that area.

In terms of turning it over to the District, she knows that parking is the matter before the Planning Commission for consideration tonight but they also thought this would be a good opportunity for the District to show the progress on the site. Before getting into the parking request, the District is going to share a Power Point Presentation that has been shared with the School Board to show how the project is unfolding. This is one of the largest projects that has been seen in the City. It is a 315,000 SF school building on 106 acres with the fields and stadiums. It is something that we are all excited to see open next fall. They thought it was a good opportunity for the District to share where things stand with construction, answer the questions and then ultimately request the Planning Commission's indulgence on the parking issue.

Mr. Moore stated that Mr. Brad Cowen from EDiS Company would be giving an update on the construction progress, the budget project process and what is happening out at the Dover High School now. Before doing so, he wanted to bring up one issue. He asked Mrs. Townshend to provide the Planning Commission with the letter from July 12, 2013. Notice on the plan that the connection to Tribbitt Street is shown and that is shown as "by Leander Lakes". They actually have an agreement with Leander Lakes for them to build that connection to Tribbitt Street shown in green on the display. They reached out to them in order to make sure that they do build that connection and because of that agreement, the School District had their attorney reach out to them to make sure they were coordinating. The letter (given to Mrs. Townshend) dated July 12, 2013, basically says that they are progressing towards construction and they believe the road will be done by May 1, 2014. The budget that Mr. Cowen will be speaking about is predicated on them accomplishing that based on the agreement and then based on the follow-up letter.

Mr. Callan stated that he was with EDiS Company, the construction managers for the new Dover High School. He thanked Mrs. Townshend for allowing them the time to go through the Power Point. It is a fantastic project and they are glad to share it with everyone.

Mr. Callan shared the Power Point of the progression for the new Dover High School.

Mr. Callan stated that they were right on schedule. The building is progressing very well and they are pleased with the progress. There has been some favorable weather; the masonry is complete on the building. The mason will be moving off site in a couple of weeks and as you drive by you can see that all fields are being graded and seeded. The curbing is going in all around the building and paving will be taking place in the next few weeks.

Mr. Cregar questioned the square footage of the library? Responding to Mr. Cregar, Mr. Callan stated that it was 2200 SF. It's a large space. It is actually two (2) stories. As you walk in from the rotunda area you walk into the library. As you walk toward the front of the building, it goes up two (2) stories.

Mr. Tolbert questioned how many students they expect the school to accommodate in comparison to the current Dover High School? Responding to Mr. Tolbert, Mr. Callan stated that right now its capacity is eighteen hundred (1800) students. He is unsure of how many students the Dover High School currently has.

Dr. Thomas, the Superintendent of Capital School District stated that the current enrollment is just under seventeen hundred (1700). The school is being built for eighteen hundred (1800).

Mr. Tolbert further questioned how many students are in the current Dover High School? Responding to Mr. Tolbert, Dr. Thomas stated just under seventeen hundred (1700). That number has been rising over the past two (2) years. The school two (2) years ago sat at the average of about fifteen hundred fifty (1550) students on any given year. Over the past two to three years it has gradually increased to just less than seventeen hundred (1700).

Mr. Cowen stated that one of the things they find as they build high schools and they will notice it in Dover is that people tend to move into town so that they can go to that new high school. There will be a dramatic growth in that area which is encouraging.

Mr. Tolbert stated that at this location, there will be considerably more athletic fields than at the old school. Will all of these fields be needed? Responding to Mr. Tolbert, Mr. Callan stated that he was sure they would use every one of the fields.

Mr. Tolbert further stated that his concern was that there is a lot of ground being used for those fields and they will not all be used at the same time. Responding to Mr. Tolbert, Dr. Thomas stated that there are sixteen (16) sports at the high school and about thirty-three (33) teams because most of sixteen (16) varsity sports also have a junior varsity and varsity team and a few sports have a varsity, junior varsity and freshmen teams. There are sixteen (16) sports but thirty-three (33) different teams that can play the sixteen (16) different sports. Obviously, baseball will not be played during the winter time but certainly there will be some activity on that field in the fall and spring. In the interior of the school, there is both a competition gymnasium and an auxiliary gymnasium which is to field all of the physical education classes. Then the two (2) competition fields are set-up for girl's sports as well as boys sports. Right now, school stops every night at 9:00PM for practice of teams. They will now be able to have them practice at a more convenient time with the two (2) fields. Sometimes they stagger the schedule now because they can't play every sport the same day. But those fields will constantly be in use both in the spring and in the fall because in the spring there are double the sports that they had twenty (20) years ago. Every team of the sixteen (16) sports has at least two (2) teams and some have three (3) teams.

Mr. Cowen stated that a project of this size always comes with its share of problems. One thing that they wanted to discuss with the Planning Commission is that they have had their share of budget items they have had to deal with throughout the project. During the time of the passing of the referendum there was one item that was not in the referendum; the west entrance along with Dover High Drive. The developer adjacent to the Dover High School was to build the west entrance and also the entrance road. So what the voters voted on was a referendum that did not include any money for that project. The original referendum budget for the west entrance Dover High Drive was $0. All of that money was in the school and their fields. When Leander Lakes was unable to meet their commitment and build the road, the District and Leander Lakes met and struck an agreement and $1.3 million was taken out of the school's budget to build the west entrance and what was then a City street to enter the school. Since that time through the approval process with the City of Dover and DelDOT and their plans on making a connection to Kenton Road and Hazlettville Road, the final cost of that entrance and road is $3.1 million. He thinks that's important to note because in order to absorb $3.1 million into a project, things have to be cut in other areas or they need to be deferred or not designed at all. That is the battle

that they face all of time as construction managers is managing a budget and accounting for these items. In order to do that as they work through the bidding process they establish a "Base Bid". This means that these are the must haves, which are building size, program, function and fields. Next, they develop a field of add alternates which are done if the money is there and they can be incorporated into the project. This is how their strategy works throughout all bid packages that they have had. Keep in mind that they have had to accommodate $3.1 million from somewhere. It does not just come out of contingency; things have to happen on the project. What they call "value engineering," which means things that the School District asked for but they weren't able to afford them or they have had to be deferred until a later date or materials have to be changed to account for the budget. Several things were listed on the Power Point. For example: VCT in lieu of terrazzo flooring, decorative display wall, indoor batting cages, backs to the seats in the main gymnasium and food service equipment. The size of some of the bleachers has been reduced. There has been a lot of back and forth, a lot of value engineering and a lot of compromise in order to absorb the $3.1 million that the District had to spend for that road that was originally $0. So as they manage the budget, a lot of things take place and the value engineering continues. It continues to the two (2) parking areas that were mentioned by Mrs. Townshend. It also went to the east entrance and the baseball parking. It is their desire and the District's desire to build everything shown on this plan; however, what they needed to do was come before the Planning Commission and point out that there have been some budget issues and they are working through those. The building is on schedule; it is ready to open next year but they need to take appropriate measures to safeguard the school's budget. Some of these things either have to be eliminated or they have to be deferred. They understand the critical importance of the east entrance and the road; that is priority number one. Second to that is the baseball parking; they know that is a priority. They would also like to have the west parking areas. But they are here tonight to talk about an approval for waiving those parking areas because they were told to bring this to the Planning Commission's attention sooner rather than later. Not come to them in six (6) months and say they are out of money and can't do it. They want to have an open discussion to tell the Commission members where they are with the project. They are not just asking for a waiver to get rid of some parking so that they can afford more nice things in the building. This has been ongoing for some time now. This is how they manage the budget throughout the entire project. But to absorb $3.1 million is a tough item to do. They are doing it; they are making it work. They certainly want to build the east entrance, the loop road and all of the parking areas but they are asking for a little relief in that area at this point. If at the end of the project there is money available then that is priority number one, to construct those parking areas.

Dr. Jones questioned if the drop-off parking spaces would become part of regular parking during special events? Responding to Dr. Jones, Mr. Cowen stated yes, they are factored into the count.

Dr. Jones further questioned if the drop-off parking was basically utilized for during the school day? Responding to Dr. Jones, Mr. Cowen stated yes, they talked to the Fire Marshal and those spaces are considered parking spaces.

Dr. Jones questioned if that meant that there would be a time limit set for the drop-off parking spaces? Responding to Dr. Jones, Mr. Cowen stated yes.

Mr. Krienen stated both the drop-off spaces and bus parking spaces for event parking would serve as true parking spaces. They are actually lined that way so they will be very clear that they serve as parking spaces when there is an event.

Dr. Jones questioned if the signage would indicate as much for special events? Responding to Dr. Jones, Mr. Krienen stated yes, but that it would either be gated or coned during drop-off/pick-up hours so that the public will be kept away. Particularly for the bus area but signed as well to let people know that flexibility exists.

Mr. Baldwin questioned if the reduction of parking spaces would encourage parking into the nearby neighborhoods? He has been to a lot of schools where a lot of the parking is in the neighborhoods and the neighbors are upset because their driveways are blocked. Is this one of the situations where this activity would be encouraged? Responding to Mr. Baldwin, Mr. Cowen stated that he was not sure that encourage was the right word to use because it would be hard to stop them since they are adjacent to a neighborhood.

Mr. Baldwin stated that a reduction in parking would put more cars in that area. Responding to Mr. Baldwin, Mr. Cowen stated that they have a lot of parking near the stadiums. There is parking all along the loop road and there are spaces by the baseball stadium. There is also some overflow parking available. With all of these spaces available, it is almost triple of what it is at the existing Dover High School.

Mr. Moore stated that the one advantage to this design is the bus layout area is literally right next to the football field and that is the largest event held at Dover High School. The one hundred seventy (170) parking spaces that Mrs. Townshend mentioned that was originally not counted could actually be taken up that event and is there for that purpose. So there is very close parking to the football field so that people don't spill into the adjacent neighbors as much. That bus layout area is literally right next to the stands so it is the most convenient parking, most accessible and the easiest to get to.

From the original time that the plan came to the Planning Commission, there has been a reduction in the auditorium by two hundred (200) total seats. That has brought with it a need for the reduction in parking. Those things along with the things that Mr. Cowen pointed out have been getting cut as they go along to manage the budget. That is why they can come to the Planning Commission and say that they can cut out this amount of parking and actually have adequate parking. The current Dover High School is in the range of two hundred fifty to two hundred seventy-five (250-275) which is much less than the proposed amount of parking spaces for the same amount of students. They have a tremendous amount of more parking spaces than at the current Dover High School.

Mr. Cregar questioned the number of spaces on a given day that the sophomores, juniors and seniors require parking on campus as well as staffing? On any given day at Dover High, what would be the parking requirement? Responding to Mr. Cregar, Dr. Thomas stated that currently there are about one hundred thirty (130) staff parking spaces on the lot at the current Dover High School site. There are an overall total of about two hundred fifty-six (256) parking spaces which would leave about one hundred thirty (130) parking spaces for students parking. If you ride through the current high school at 10:00AM, well after school as started, there are a lot of vacant spots. Will student driving increase or decrease at the new high school? It is very hard for them to predict but the new high school has over double the parking for daily parking than the current high school. When he sees vacant spots during the day it tells him that if they have double to parking at the new high school, there is not going to be an issue with parking during the day. It is more than adequate.

Mr. Cregar stated that he thought students who couldn't get parking permits because of the number available were parking in the adjacent residential area. Responding to Mr. Cregar, Dr. Thomas stated that he was sure there are students parking in this residential area but he couldn't begin to give a number of how many are parking there. He could certainly ask the school administration if they have any idea on the number of students parking in that area. He promised that during the day they would have double the parking available and that it was not a concern today.

Mr. Cregar questioned what kind of parking issue would be created during the Caesar Rodney High School and Dover High School football games? Responding to Mr. Cregar, Dr. Thomas stated that he could not speak with great accuracy on that. On a really big year when both teams are competing for a title, that game draws a huge crowd. Even with the maximum number of parking spots at that stadium which will be three and a half times more than what is available now; he could not begin to speculate on that issue. They are going to have as much parking as they can possibly have and they are working extremely hard to see what funds will be remaining at the conclusion of the project. The priorities have been listed as to what will be completed first as funds allow and parking is in that priority.

Mr. Cregar further questioned if the bus area parking would be marked for cars? Responding to Mr. Cregar, Mr. Moore stated that right now the bus area parking will be chevroned and show the buses where to be. The District hasn't yet decided if whether they will also mark for cars so that it's clear or whether they will use actual staff during the biggest events to park vehicles in order to make sure that they maximize that area.

Mr. Cregar stated that was his question. Whether they would get maximum utilization if the spaces weren't marked? Responding to Mr. Cregar, Mr. Moore stated that he personally thought it was better for the District to use their staff to do that in order to assure that they are utilizing the area properly. Sometimes when you get multiply striping it gets hard for people to understand and they don't park correctly; they won't get full utilization of the pavement.

Dr. Thomas stated that he has seen "dot parking" which is small lines. But even if they have these small lines in this parking area, on a big game night they envision having a large amount of staff available making the most use of parking.

Mr. Tolbert opened a public hearing.

Ms. Cora-Marie Yoder – 920 Yoder Drive Hartly, DE 19953

Ms. Yoder stated that she is a 1969 graduate of Dover High School and she is very proud of the Capital School District. She has two (2) children who have graduated from Capital School District with no problems. She volunteered when her children were in school. She now has four (4) grand-children; one (1) is ready to graduate. She has been with them since they started school and is still at the school volunteering. She has had four (4) heart attacks but if not, she would be running for the School Board because she is so upset at what they are doing to Capital School District. She voted for this referendum; she had her whole family vote for this because they were going to have two (2) roads. She has a grandchild who has a heart problem that needs to have an entrance at that east section that they can get to from either end of the school in an emergency. You cannot fool with a heart attack. Her grandchild has a friend who has a worse problem than he does; who attends the Capital School District. Her number one concern is the students.

Her next concern is that in today's newspaper it said that if you couldn't find parking, go to the surrounding neighborhoods. She has lived Route 8 all of her life, she knows what the traffic is like. Someone is going to get killed if they park along Route 8 or if they are walking across the road in the dark or after the games are over without lighting.

The last issue is that she has a check book; she knows how much money she has to spend. Something should have been done before this school was ever started to know that they had enough money. If not, they should have been watching a long time ago. She has friends who live in the developments on the opposite side of Route 8. They have enough issues with trying to get their own cars parked in the development. They have one parking space in their driveways and one on the street. What is going to happen when people come to park in their neighborhood and there is no place to park due to people from school parking there? When these people cross Route 8, they are going to be hit. What mother, father, child, grandparent is going to be worth that? Also, if she wants to go to football game now, she has to get there between 5:30PM – 5:45PM so that she can get a parking space.

Ms. Valerie Boyer – 3 Somerset Circle Dover DE 19904

Ms. Boyer stated that she was representing Cranberry Run. She has spoken to many people in the neighborhood and they vehemently protest and object to this wavier of parking reduction. They have quite a bit of reasons for it and she has done the research. She knows that if you bring strangers into the community, crime will rise. She knows what has happened to Woodcrest. They don't want the same thing to happen to their neighborhood. If there is a lack of parking at the school then that overflow will come into their neighborhood. As Ms. Yoder just said, parking spaces are going to be taken, driveways are going to be blocked and crime is going to start. Everyone didn't come from a good home. They do not want their community to be the victims of crime. There are a lot of women who live in this community; they do not want problems at night when people are coming home from work. Women are the number one group that is sexually assaulted. They do not need one; one is too many. They have a very nice neighborhood and they want to keep it that way. The School District started the project with eight hundred forty-seven (847) parking spaces so they need to do the eight hundred forty-seven (847) parking spaces. Quite frankly, the School District does not know how many people are currently parking in Woodcrest when students can't find a parking space in those two hundred fifty (250) spots. They may have to knock out a field; someone may have to wait their turn to play because the field had to be used for parking. But don't make them pay the price for it because the School District didn't plan adequately and didn't have the money. The School District said the money may come later. Everyone knows recessions come later too and then what do you do? The neighborhood of Cranberry Run vehemently protests this. They don't want to be a victim of crime or any kind of problems period. They like their neighborhood like it is and they should be able to keep it that way. They should be able to have a school across the road and everyone live in peace and harmony.

Mr. Les Blakeman – 209 Falmouth Way Dover DE 19904

Mr. Blakeman stated that he graduated from the other Dover High School in 1965; the last class out of the previous school before they built the current high school. Fifty years later, he is going to watch the first class graduate from this high school and couldn't be more proud. His concern is that is there are eighteen hundred (1800) students and two hundred fifty (250) staff and if 39% of the students need parking spaces, they are going to need nine hundred fifty (950) parking spaces. If 28% of the students park, they are going to need seven hundred fifty-eight (758) parking spaces. He is not referring to special events; he is talking about everyday parking. There will need to be two hundred fifty (250)

spaces for staff and five hundred eight (508) for the students. If they think less than 28% of the students are going to drive, then he has a surprise for them. So their concern is that there will be overflow, there will be people who can't get parking permits because they can only issue a certain number of spaces. These people are going to park somewhere else. Cranberry Run is the closest neighborhood. People can leave this neighborhood, walk 200 feet, cross Route 8 and be on the school's sidewalk. If they go another couple 100 feet up the road there is a walking sidewalk built for people to use to get to the school. This is how students will get to the school. That represents cars in their neighborhood and a lot of kids, more than the one hundred (100) kids who live in this neighborhood who will be trying to get across that road. It will happen just like it did in Woodcrest. They will be back in front of City Council trying to get parking permits for their neighborhood which is difficult. It is not a desirable thing to do. He thinks that the School District needs to find some way to accommodate at least the minimum number or people who are going to be trying to park at the school. He does not know how else to look at the numbers. 28% is not very many of the students, its five hundred eight (508) out of eighteen hundred (1800) of those students driving.

Mr. Cregar questioned where Mr. Blakeman got the 28%? Responding to Mr. Cregar, Mr. Blakeman stated that he just picked two (2) numbers. He had originally looked at the numbers that they had which had changed. They originally had nine hundred fifty (950) and seven hundred fifty-eight (758). He thought a likely number of students who were going to park there would be a maximum of 39% and a minimum of 28%. He thinks these numbers are reasonable.

Mr. Rufus Green – 305 Chelsea Way Dover DE 19904

Mr. Green stated that they have been given the figures of how many children are in the school and how big the school is but is doesn't seem like there is any planning for traffic lights, the overflow of traffic in the area or sidewalks for the children coming from other developments. He was curious to know with it being as hard as it is now for them to get out of Cranberry Run there is no planning for anything in the future. As far as them parking in their neighborhood during special events such as football games or baseball games and one team loses, the children have a tendency to rebel. They don't know if it will be vandalism and crime. To his understanding one thing is being said but on the other hand something different is going to happen and they are going to have a problem.

Mr. Gene Montanyo – 1526 Fawn St Dover DE 19904

Mr. Montanyo stated that he was former Principal at the Dover High School and wanted to give an overview. With the parking that the current Dover High School has now with facility staff and students, there are very rarely any student spots that have a waiting list. If you walk to school or drive to school there will be at least twenty five (25) spots open at the school. When moving to the new school, there will be so much more additional parking that he thinks will create access parking for students. Even with the one hundred eighty (180) staff members at the new school, there will be quite a bit more. A couple of the reasons why students park off site; they don't get a permit to park. They have to have a valid driver's license, valid insurance and tags. Some of the issues in Woodcrest are students who have issues with presenting these things in order to get a pass. This is why they park in the surrounding neighborhood. This is an issue that the City needs to take care of with them as well. If you look at the distance between the new high school and Cranberry Run, there will be very few people who are going to park there and walk across to any big events. If they don't get the parking spots setup at these new parking lots right now, there will be a huge amount of grass area where they can park quite a few vehicles. There is going to be so much more parking at this new school than at the current high school. They are not going to have very many people parking anywhere other than that. Even if

you look at the connector between Cannon Mill development there aren't any houses on that new roadway. Pretty much everyone will be parking right there at the school site. He thinks they will have plenty of space.

Mr. Tolbert closed the public hearing.

Mr. Cregar questioned if they had a calculation on what some of those grass areas would allow or provide for additional parking for events? Responding to Mr. Cregar, Mr. Moore stated that the two (2) parking lots shown in red on the display are adjacent to the lanes and could be used for overflow parking for events. They are curbed but they are planning not to continue with the construction at this point. They could be used as overflow parking for events without any problem. It would be easy for the staff to direct people there because they already have the curb openings and they are very organized. They would be grassed in order to save money on pavement. These areas are equal to what is being requested for their waiver tonight so they would be there.

Mr. Cregar stated that no matter how many spaces they have on site, the Planning Commission can't control parking on a public road. There is nothing they can do about the fact that people park on a public street but they do have to consider what they need to do as far as the amount of parking. He is interested in those grassy areas.

Dr. Jones stated that numbers were given on the projected number of students who may drive on a daily basis. She understands the scenario about Dover High and the empty spaces. She would be interested in hearing a response to that concern. Do they anticipate a greater number of students driving during the day? Someone had mentioned earlier that because it is a new school it will attract new residents. Responding to Dr. Jones, Dr. Thomas stated that the best they could go on would be historical data. He asked if Dr. Edney could help address this issue, she is the Co-Principal of Dover High School and can give them more insight regarding the parking permits that are requested.

Dr. Edney stated that Mr. Montanyo put it in a nutshell as far as parking is concerned and students requesting parking permits at this time. They have empty spaces on a given day. They call one area where the students park "the pit". There are empty spaces there even during high time. Right now their dynamics are going to change when they move to this building. A lot of the kids who actually ride the bus now may become walkers and a lot of their walkers may be riding the bus. As far as students living in the City of Dover driving, those students don't drive now they walk to school or their parents drive them when they can. They have students who walk home from practices all of the time so now it's a matter of being able to get those buses. She doesn't think that they are going to have a big shift in the number of students who are going to be getting permits to park in the parking lot any more than they have right now.

Ms. Still stated that the request was for the reduction in parking but the east entrance is also outlined in red. Is that at the top of the list of priorities for future construction or it is going to be constructed? Responding to Ms. Still, Mr. Moore stated that they were not eliminating the east entrance with their application. Their application is geared at updating the Planning Commission so they can see the things that have been cut due to the budget problems and it's important that saving money in the parking will help them attribute that money to the other things that are high priority like the east entrance.

Mr. Cregar stated that Planning Staff was running numbers based on a certain justification. Can they share where they ended up versus where Capital School District ended up? Responding to Mr. Cregar, Mrs. Townshend stated that what Staff did was in Table 3 they made it where they were comparing the same things. From the Staff's perspective, they don't have a problem with the applicant counting the bus parking for the car parking as well; however, they do believe that it should be dually striped so that they have clear parking spaces for when it is available for cars. They don't have any objection to them using the twenty-four (24) drop-off spaces as well. They did verify that these spaces are outside of the required fire lane so it's not a matter of having required parking in a required fire lane and therefore a conflict. They did address that issue as well. From Staff's perspective, they were trying to make sure there was a common thread in the numbers that they were looking at. Based on that information, they are looking at seven hundred twenty-four (724) spaces if you count the bus parking plus another twenty-four (24) drop-off spaces which brings them a lot closer to the eight hundred (800) spaces. This would create a sixty-six (66) space difference, which is a differential of 8.25%. The other piece that Staff reviewed was the distribution of parking on the site. When looking at the parking lot that is proposed to be eliminated near the ball field area. There is significant distance between that and the remainder of the parking on the site. One of the concerns Staff has is how that impacts the Village of Westover where there is a bicycle/pedestrian entrance just on the other side of the field that goes in between the two (2) stadiums. There is a multimodal path. The concern is that if they eliminate those one hundred eleven (111) spaces and reduce it to thirty-one (31), that a reduction is eighty (80) spaces. While they may end of with empty lots when there is baseball and softball going on the west side but its a quarter mile away so people are going to park in the Village of Westover. It was not necessarily a concern with the numbers it was more the distribution on the site. The main thing of Table 3 was to make sure they were looking at things consistently rather than saying well now that it benefits us so they are going to count it differently.

Mr. Cregar questioned how the applicant will address the issue of distribution and the concern of people parking in the Village of Westover? Responding to Mr. Cregar, Mr. Moore stated that they and Staff are on the same page with the numbers. There are just different ways to look at the numbers of spaces. As far as the distribution is concerned, they have also made a major cut to the stadiums that are in that area. They have cut them by 50% in the baseball and softball. They have also cut out a building that was going to be there permanently and that building is now not in the plan because of the budget as well. So cutting each of those stadiums by 50% which is hundreds of seats and cutting out a permanent building, they think they have made commeasurable cuts so that they have enough parking. The one thing that isn't noted is that they do have fifty (50) parking spaces along the edge of the loop road that are in that area that allow people to either use the tennis courts or baseball fields and not have to go back to the other side of the school. They think the distribution is actually commensurate with their cuts.

Mr. Tolbert stated that the motion should state explicitly what your thoughts are regarding this matter.

Mrs. Townshend recommended that since there were different ways to look at the numbers that perhaps it be addressed by lot. What is being looked at is a request to reduce or eliminate and reserve the area for Lot C, D and G. The motion should address those specifically so that they are not necessarily looking at a percent reduction and they don't know what the percent is based on. Just look at the request to eliminate the spaces in Lot C – one hundred eight (108), Lot D – ninety-five (95) and Lot G – eighty (80).

Mr. Cregar stated that he wanted to make sure that when talking about these parking areas that are still going to be curbed and still could serve as overflow (grass areas) that at some point could be constructed. Responding to Mr. Cregar, Mr. Moore said absolutely.

Mr. Cregar questioned if they wanted to continue to reserve that? Responding to Mr. Cregar, Mrs. Townshend stated that in all cases, these lots would continue to be reserved.

Mr. Moore stated that all of the spots that they are asking to be removed are reserved in place and are on the plan in terms of be able to put them back in the future. They are not fully eliminating the ability to put those parking areas back.

Mr. Cregar questioned if they were putting them on hold? Responding to Mr. Cregar, Mr. Moore stated yes.

Mrs. Townshend stated for the record that the way the parking reduction works is if there is an issue with an continual parking problem, the City could go back and say okay now you need to go back and construct this.

Mr. Cregar stated that this raises a separate issue. They are talking about dollars to do that. They can say that the parking lot needs to be put in but the District comes back with "I'm sorry I don't have any money." Then what will be done at that time? Responding to Mr. Cregar, Mrs. Townshend stated that this is one of our challenges. Once the Certificate of Occupancy is issued, leverage significantly reduces.

Mrs. Melson-Williams made a suggestion that the request has two (2) components to it. One is the consideration of a Revised Parking Justification and that would set the number of required spaces for the campus. So the Planning Commission members may want to address that first. Then the second piece is the waiver request to actually reduce parking on the campus which is what Mrs. Townshend was suggesting be dealt with on a lot by lot scenario.

Mrs. Townshend stated that one motion could be made to accept their Revised Justification, which everyone has agreed that there is no issue with the numbers that have been put forward. So this might be the starting point of a motion which could be broken down into two (2) motions.

Mr. Cregar moved to approve MI-13-18 New Dover High School Revised Parking Justification which was used to arrive at the number of spaces for the school and the accessory uses for that school with it set at 800 parking spaces, seconded by Dr. Jones and the motion was unanimously carried 6-0 with Mr. Holden recused and Mr. Ambruso and Colonel Welsh absent.

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that their second request is related to a reduction in required parking.

Mr. Cregar stated that Mr. Moore was talking about the use of the field and not having the one building. Planning Staff has reviewed this and is still concerned about the spill-over. He is trying to hear how Staff feels Mr. Moore's discussion about that particular item versus their concerns? Responding to Mr. Cregar, Mrs. Townshend stated that from a numbers standpoint, if they take the east drive parking which is forty-nine (49) spaces and what was proposed in a parking lot which was one hundred eleven (111), that's one hundred sixty (160) spaces that were purposed on that side of the

campus. The current request would reduce that number to eighty (80) spaces. So when you have concurrent baseball and softball games which typically do happen at the same time, there is still a concern of is eighty (80) spaces enough? She thinks it's certainly is less spill-over than if you had no parking on that side but there's still the potential for spill-over. Even if they construct one hundred sixty (160) spaces there is still the potential for spill-over but they can't correct everything. She thinks at eighty (80) spaces, could there be two (2) games going on at the same time? Probably, but are some people going to park in the Village of Westover? It's likely. Is it to the point of being intolerable? It's hard to say until it happens.

Mr. Cregar wants to make sure that they get to the correct number. He wanted to review the chart to make sure they have the number of spaces needed. In Lots A and B there is no change? Responding to Mr. Cregar, Mrs. Townshend stated that was correct.

Mr. Cregar further questioned if in Lot C there was a difference of one hundred eight (108) spaces? Responding to Mr. Cregar, Mrs. Townshend stated yes.

Mr. Cregar questioned if that was one of the lots that have the spill-over parking? Responding to Mr. Cregar, Mrs. Townshend stated yes and it will be curbed and grass. While not permanent parking, it would be acceptable for events.

Mr. Cregar stated that in Lot D they had the same situation. They have grass and curbing just not paved, Responding to Mr. Cregar, Mrs. Townshend stated yes, those are in the vicinity of where the majority of the parking on the site is.

Mr. Cregar stated that if the bus area was the same but that there was a difference between one hundred sixty-two (162) and one hundred seventy (170). He asked for clarification. Responding to Mr. Cregar, Mrs. Townshend deferred the question to the engineer because Staff took their calculations to be correct.

Mr. Moore stated that they spent more time analyzing how to park that bus area with actual cars during a big event this time than they originally spent before because they were getting tighter on parking and wanted to make sure they were right. That is the difference, eight spots.

Mr. Cregar questioned if they were agreeing that one hundred seventy (170) spaces would work? Responding to Mr. Cregar, Mrs. Townshend stated yes.

Mr. Cregar stated that Lot F had no change. He questioned if Lot G would have a reduction of eighty (80) spaces? Responding to Mr. Cregar, Mrs. Townshend stated yes.

Mr. Cregar questioned if parallel to the east entrance drive would stay at forty-nine (49) spaces? Responding to Mr. Cregar, Mrs. Townshend stated yes.

Mr. Cregar further questioned if looking at grassed areas as still being available, the total reduction of space ends up being eighty (80) spaces? Responding to Mr. Cregar, Mrs. Townshend stated that in this case it's not curbed. This is different than the other side. In the case of Lot G, it's not curbed and changing it from one hundred eleven (111) to thirty-one (31) spaces affects the drainage because those thirty-one (31) spaces is where a swale would be if a larger parking lot were to be built.

Mr. Moore stated that the applicant is agreeing with the Staff comments not to do those thirty-one (31) spaces along the edge of the road and actually start the basis of that secondary parking lot. That is one of Staff's recommendations and since they did not contest that, they are agreeing with Staff on that recommendation. This allows that parking lot to be started and allows that full parking lot to be available to grass. Their calculation shows they have no net loss in actual spots; there will just be some of them that will be grass as they are in the two (2) red zones (Lot C and Lot D) near the school. All of the spots are still available to use and pave in the future and to use as grass if the need arises.

Mr. Cregar questioned if the net reduction ends up being the auditorium seats? Responding to Mr. Cregar, Mrs. Townshend stated that it factors into the revised calculations. They have forty (40) spaces fewer that are required because of the auditorium reduction.

Mr. Cregar stated that if they look at these areas as being grass but still being able to be utilized, by the reduction in the number of seating in the auditorium is all well within what is permitted to be done.

Mrs. Townshend stated that the concern would be its one thing to use the grassed areas as overflow parking but the code is clear that permanent parking lots are required to be hard paved, dust free surfaces. When they become the regular daily parking for everything, that's when the grass becomes a concern.

Vice Chairman Mr. Tolbert suggested that perhaps the motion would address that concern. That if the grass is being used routinely for parking then that may be when it's required to be paved.

Mr. Cregar stated that what raised the separate logistical issue for him was that because this is a Conditional Use, are they able to go back and revisit this and make it part of what they do or does it need to be done now?

Mr. Tolbert questioned if they were going to use the grass areas for parking, will the people know that? How will they know that they can park on the grass? Responding to Mr. Tolbert, Mr. Moore stated that during events they would have Staff there parking vehicles to maximize the use of parking areas. They don't believe that they will need these parking spaces on a daily basis but if they do they would have to make that clear to those users. They think those grass areas will be used for big events as overflow parking.

Mr. Tolbert further questioned if the school could assure that they would have Staff at these events to direct parking on the grass? Responding to Mr. Tolbert, Dr. Thomas stated that he referenced his earlier comment. If you go to a football game now they probably have eight to ten (8-10) Staff members directing traffic. That number is not going to get less as they move to the new school. Yes, they will have people out there to direct traffic. He thinks that they have a historical record to document that's what they do.

Mr. Tolbert stated that a lot of people will not just ordinarily park on grass areas. Responding to Mr. Tolbert, Dr. Thomas stated that they would have people directing to the curb cuts.

Mr. Cregar questioned the issue of the striping for the bus parking areas? That seems to still be up in the air. Planning Staff had looked at having that area fully striped for cars so those areas will be fully

designated as parking areas. Responding to Mr. Cregar, Mrs. Townshend stated yes, they could stripe in two (2) different colors, one for the buses and one for the cars.

Mr. Moore stated that they think Staff members actually parking people would keep them organized and maximize the parking because of double striping maybe confusing.

Mr. Cregar moved to approve MI-13-18 New Dover High School: Waiver Request for Parking Reduction as specified in Table 3: Parking Lot A and Parking Lot B - no changes; Lot C and Lot D – parking reduction still grassed and can be utilized in that number for parking for events; Lot E the bus parking converted to car parking - one hundred seventy (170) spaces; Parking Lot F - no changes; Parking Lot G – thirty-one (31) spaces; parallel parking - no changes with a total number of eight hundred (800) spaces and the District having to designate the bus area with lines as car parking as well, along with the DAC comments, seconded by Mr. Holt and the motion was unanimously carried 6-0 with Mr. Holden recused and Mr. Ambruso and Colonel Welsh absent.

Meeting adjourned at 9:08 PM

Sincerely,

Kristen Mullaney
Secretary