CITY OF DOVER PLANNING COMMISSION
April 18, 2011

The Regular Meeting of the City of Dover Planning Commission was held on Monday April 18, 2011 at 7:00 PM with Chairman Hemmig presiding. Members present were Mr. Hemmig, Mr. Tolbert, Mr. Shomo, Mr. Baldwin, Mr. Nichols, Mr. Holt, and Mr. Ambruso (arriving at 7:04 PM). Mr. Friedman and Colonel Welsh were absent.

Staff members present were Mrs. Townshend, Mrs. Melson-Williams, Mr. Koenig, Ms. Cornwell, and Ms. Metsch. Also present were Mr. Larry Robinson, Mrs. Caroline Romeo, Mr. Troy Adams, Mr. Keith Kooker, Mr. Tim Skibicki, Mr. Jerry Peters, and Mr. Gregg Moore. Speaking from the public was Mrs. Laurie Willet.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Baldwin moved to approve the agenda as submitted, seconded by Mr. Tolbert and the motion was unanimously carried 6-0 with Mr. Friedman, Mr. Ambruso and Colonel Welsh absent.

APPROVAL OF THE REGULAR PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES OF MARCH 21, 2011

Mr. Shomo moved to approve the regular Planning Commission meeting minutes of March 21, 2011, seconded by Mr. Holt and the motion was unanimously carried 6-0 with Mr. Friedman, Mr. Ambruso and Colonel Welsh absent.

COMMUNICATIONS & REPORTS

Mrs. Townshend stated that the next Planning Commission Quarterly Workshop is scheduled for Tuesday, May 17, 2011 at 4:00 PM in the City Hall Conference Room.

Mrs. Townshend stated that the Capital School District withdrew their request for a waiver of right-of-way width. They had requested a right-of-way reduction associated with the new Dover High School for a portion of the road that would go to the south of the property. This request went to the Safety Advisory and Transportation Committee; however, has subsequently been withdrawn.

Mrs. Townshend provided an update on the regular City Council meeting of March 28, 2011, the Safety Advisory and Transportation Committee meeting of March 20, 2011, the regular City Council and the Parks Recreation and Community Enhancement Committee meetings of April 11, 2011.

OPENING REMARKS CONCERNING DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS

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

OLD BUSINESS

S-10-10 Mitten Industrial Park at Lafferty Lane - Request for a one year extension of the Planning Commission approval granted May 17, 2010 for a Site Development Master Plan application to develop an Industrial Park consisting of nine buildings, each 9,600 S.F. for a total of 86,400 S.F. of building area, the associated site improvements and a 4.591 acre Processing

Area. The subject property consists of two parcels of land for a total of 40.0897 Acres +/- of land zoned IPM (Industrial Park Manufacturing Zone) and also subject to the AEOZ (Airport Environs Overlay Zone). The property is located on the southeast side of Lafferty Lane east of Bay Road. The owner of record is Matthew Mitten. Property Address: 141 Lafferty Lane. Tax Parcels: ED-05-077.00-01-26.00-000 and ED-05-077.00-01-27.00-000. Council District 2.

Representative: None

Ms. Cornwell provided an explanation and reasoning for the request for extension.

Mr. Hemmig questioned if there were any changes in the rules or regulations since this application was originally heard? Responding to Mr. Hemmig, Ms. Cornwell stated that there were none.

There were no questions raised from any Planning Commission members at this time.

Mr. Holt moved to approve a one year extension for S-10-10 Mitten Industrial Park located at Lafferty Lane, seconded by Mr. Nichols and the motion was unanimously carried 7-0 with Mr. Friedman and Colonel Welsh absent.

S-09-10 Fordham Brewery at 1284 McD Drive - Request for one year extension between the construction of work authorized for the project at Fordham Brewery (*Zoning Ordinance*, Article 10 §2.491(a)). Following Planning Commission approval of the Site Plan on June 15, 2009 and Final Plan approval on November 11, 2009, the first phase of construction for 4,000 S.F. building addition was constructed under Building Permit #09-1912. The Site Plan indicated two building additions: the first phase consisting of 4,000 S.F. of building and the second phase consisting of 13,370 S.F. of additional building. The property is zoned IPM (Industrial Park Manufacturing Zone) and is subject to the AEOZ (Airport Environs Overlay Zone): Noise Zone C and Accident Potential Zone II. The subject area is located on the south side of McD Drive near the intersection with Horsepond Road. The owner of record is the William H. McDaniel, Inc. Property Address: 1284 McD Drive. Tax Parcel: ED-05-077.12-01-13.00-000 (portion). Council District 2.

Representative: None

Mrs. Melson-Williams provided an explanation and reasoning for the request for extension.

Mr. Hemmig questioned if there were any changes in the rules or regulations since this application was originally heard? Responding to Mr. Hemmig, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that there were none.

There were no questions raised from any Planning Commission members at this time.

Mr. Ambruso moved to approve a one year extension for S-09-10 Fordham Brewery located at 1284 McD Drive, seconded by Mr. Tolbert and the motion was unanimously carried 7-0 with Mr. Friedman and Colonel Welsh absent.

NEW DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS

C-11-01 Because We Care Veteran's Shelter at Healing Wings Christian Center - Public Hearing and Review of Conditional Use Site Development Plan to permit the philanthropic use of an existing 6,344 S.F. building at 1420 McKee Road as a homeless veteran's shelter. The property is zoned R-8 (One Family Residence Zone) and COZ-1 (Corridor Overlay Zone). The property is located on the west side of McKee Road, north of the Emerald Pointe subdivision. The owner of record is Healing Wings Christian Center and lessee is Because We Care Inc. Property Address: 1420 McKee Road. Tax Parcel: ED05-067.00-01-20.00-000. Council District 1.

Representatives: Mr. Larry Robinson.

Mrs. Melson-Williams provided an overview of the application

Mr. Robinson stated that the only comment that he has is that this is a project that his mother came to him with, Pastor Reverend Cherry and her sister Pastor Merchant. We feel that there is a need for our Delaware Veterans to have a place to have resources and lodging if they are homeless or at risk for being homeless. When they came to him with this task, he did some investigation and found out that there are only two (2) facilities: one in Milford and one in Wilmington. Some of the Delaware Veterans are being sent to Coatesville, PA because of lack of facilities in Delaware.

Mr. Robinson stated that being an ex-Veteran himself with twelve (12) years in the Army, he could see the need for this kind of project. We are moving forward with this and will hopefully be able to provide services for lodging for the needs of the Veteran's.

Mr. Nichols questioned if this project would be financed by the Federal government? Responding to Mr. Nichols, Mr. Robinson stated that it is; however, once he was notified of the project by his mother, they missed the window to apply for Federal funds. He called the "Home of the Brave" located in Milford and asked some questions. They are being funded by local donations and grants. We do have a Grant Committee; however, for the first year a lot of our funding would come from sponsors within and outside of the state and through small grants.

Mr. Nichols further questioned with regards to the pump in the pond, how come the pump has been off? Responding to Mr. Nichols, Mr. Robinson stated that it has been off. He put on some waders and went out into the pond as there is a switch on the pump and it needs to be repaired. He had to flip the switch and secure it and then go back the next day once the pond had been drained. He has been assigned this task to make sure that this occurs. He is also trying to find a solution as to why the pump will not automatically kick on.

Mr. Nichols further questioned if the building has a sprinkler system in it; is this correct? Responding to Mr. Nichols, Mr. Robinson stated that this is correct.

Mr. Baldwin questioned if this would be long term residency or short term? Responding to Mr. Baldwin, Mr. Robertson stated that they have not worked out a time limit; however, he would take a guess at between six (6) months to a year.

Mr. Holt questioned how many Veterans they would be able to accommodate? Responding to Mr. Holt, Mr. Robinson stated that the building will hold between fourteen (14) and seventeen (17) residents.

Mr. Holt further questioned if they would come in seven (7) days a week for the Veterans. However, for the church and school for children, the hours are much different there for the children. It is not a permanent deal for them as they are there for church and for school. Responding to Mr. Holt, Mr. Robinson stated that this church/school is in an entirely different building further to the east.

Mr. Holt further questioned that the two would not co-join? Responding to Mr. Holt, Mr. Robinson stated that currently because the Because We Care school was there for eighteen years, they still have an after school program which runs between 2:30 PM and 5:00 PM where we have kids come primarily from William Henry Middle School for help with their homework and provide a good meal and then take them back home.

Mr. Holt further stated that his concern was that some of the Veterans can be homeless and they could have some other serious problems that you do not want to cause you problems especially with these children. Responding to Mr. Holt, Mr. Robinson stated that they would never mix. The kids that are there now are there for only two and a half hours and he is there with them every day along with other supervision.

Mr. Tolbert questioned if the program was exclusively for Veterans and at no time will you have anyone else in there? Responding to Mr. Tolbert, Mr. Robinson stated that yes it is. There will be no one else in there and each Veteran will have an initial screening process to see if they are eligible as far as being a Veteran and their needs.

Mr. Tolbert further questioned that at this time you do not have committed funding for the operation. Do you anticipate any problems with getting the necessary funding to make this a Veterans home? Responding to Mr. Tolbert, Mr. Robinson stated that they do not have funding at this time. He does not feel that this would be an issue as he has had feelers out in the community now with UPS in the Greentree Shopping Center who is ready to commit monies because he is a sponsor of "Home of the Brave" and also various other organizations such as Lowes who would be willing to help. It is just a matter of getting the ball rolling and getting the paperwork started. He thinks that the facility in Milford is only holding twelve (12) currently and between the two this would be a beginning to get more beds.

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

Mr. Ambruso moved to approve C-11-01 Because We Care Veteran's Shelter at Healing Wings Christian Center located at 1420 McKee Road in conjunction with the Conditional Use Development Plan and to accept the parking calculations for the site as fifty-one (51) parking spaces and adding three more bicycle spaces, seconded by Mr. Baldwin and the motion was unanimously carried 7-0 with Mr. Friedman and Colonel Welsh absent.

C-11-02 4-H After School Program at Capitol Green Community Center - Public Hearing and Review of a Conditional Use Plan to permit use of an after school program (Day Care Center) for grades K-6 within the existing community center at 416 Sussex Avenue. The property is zoned RG-1 (General Residence Zone). The property is located on the south side of Sussex Avenue east of River Road. The owner of record is Capitol Green Apartments, LLC. Property Address: 416 Sussex Avenue. Tax Parcel: ED05-077.10-02-08.00-000. Council District 4.

Representative: Mrs. Caroline Romeo.

Ms. Cornwell provided an overview of the application.

There were no questions raised from any Planning Commission members at this time.

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

Mr. Tolbert moved to approve C-11-02 4-H After School Program located at Capitol Green Community Center, seconded by Mr. Holt and the motion was unanimously carried 7-0 with Mr. Friedman and Colonel Welsh absent.

SB-11-01 Lands of Conard at 633 Long Point Road - Public Hearing and Review of a Minor Subdivision to allow for the creation of two (2) new parcels. The parcels will be subdivided into two 2.5 acres ± parcels and one 162.6 acres ± parcel. The subject parcel of land totals 167.6 acres ± and is zoned A (Agricultural Zone) and is subject to the SWPOZ (Source Water Protection Overlay Zone): Tier 2 and the AEOZ (Airport Environs Overlay Zone): Noise Zone A. The subject area is located on the west side of Long Point Road north of North Little Creek Road. The property is part of the Delaware Agricultural Lands Preservation program as an Agricultural Preservation District and Purchase of Development Rights program. The owner of record is Joan L. Conard. Property Address: 633 Long Point Road. Tax Parcel: LC05-069.00-01-07.00-000. Council District 3. *Waiver Request: Elimination of Sidewalk.*

Representative: Mr. Troy Adams, Mountain Consulting.

Ms. Cornwell provided an overview of the application.

Mr. Holt questioned regarding the Land Preservation Program, will this application have any effect on that? Responding to Mr. Holt, Mr. Adams stated that no, it would not. They have spoken with the Preservation Program and she is allowed to create three (3) lots up to eight (8) acres that is why they created them two and half on two lots and three acres on the last one. Under the Preservation regulations, the house would be three (3) acres although there are 160 +/- acres left it is only considered to be three (3) lots under the Preservation Program.

Mr. Tolbert questioned if this is farmland? Responding to Mr. Tolbert, Mr. Adams stated that yes, this is farmland.

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

Mr. Hemmig stated that he would agree with the elimination of sidewalks and while he favors sidewalks whenever possible, this is such a remote location and it is farmland that we would not need to worry about sidewalks.

Mr. Tolbert moved to approve SB-11-01 Lands of Conard located at 633 Long Point Road to include approval of the waiver as requested for the elimination of sidewalks because of the remoteness of this property, seconded by Mr. Holt and the motion was unanimously carried 7-0 with Mr. Friedman and Colonel Welsh absent.

S-11-05 DelTech Center for Energy, Education, and Training: Building Addition - Public Hearing and Review of a Site Plan for the construction of a 5,412 SF addition to the existing CEET Building on the campus of Delaware Technical & Community College: Terry Campus. The property is zoned IO (Institutional/Office Zone). The property is located on the west side of North DuPont Highway north of Scarborough Road. The owner of record is Delaware Technical & Community College. Address: 100 Campus Drive. Tax Parcel: ED-05-057.00-01-01.00-000. Council District 4.

Representatives: Mr. Keith Kooker, Landmark, JCM; and Mr. Tim Skibicki, Tetra Tech Architects.

Mrs. Melson-Williams provided an overview of the application.

Mr. Skibicki stated that he would provide an overview of the campus using an architectural rendering provided on the projector screen. The main entrance to the campus would be off of Scarborough Drive. The white building presented on the rendering is the Corporate Training Center, an existing building on campus. Behind the new building was previously a shop area with a dumpster location. It was not originally intended to be the first thing you see when you enter into the campus. One of the things that the college wanted to do was to improve the experience as you come into the college campus. This building has some vegetative roof on the building above the main entrance which is the lobby. Because this is an energy, mechanical, and HVAC training facility, they wanted to highlight and feature the HVAC and some of the green design components within the building. When you come in the main lobby, the mechanical room has a window in it that you can see some of the green technology of the inverters associated with the solar panels, windmills, and rainwater collection system that will be on display.

Mr. Skibicki stated that there are two colors of masonry and brick veneer that blends in with the existing facility as a combination of brick, veneer, and metal panels. A portion of it will be a pitched roof that will be a metal panel system which has some solar panels attached to it on the south face. There are horizontal louvers which will block out direct sunlight reducing the heat gain affect; however, at the same time opening up the space making it a bright daylit space. There is a rainwater collection system. The rainwater will be collected off of the roof and stored and reused for the toilets and urinals. There are three (3) vertical windmills that they are proposing and hopefully will be able to include them in the project if they get good bids on them. There will be demonstration areas where there will be a planter that will contain the plantings and species located on the vegetative roof so that you can see what is up on the roof without having to climb up on the roof. There are native vines that will be planted in this opening as well.

Mr. Holt stated that they just approved vertical windmill specifications a month ago. Will this request meet those specifications that we talked about as far as noise, size and so forth? Responding to Mr. Holt, Mrs. Townshend stated that they have not seen the specifications on this request; however, Staff feels that it will meet the specifications. The main issue is related to setbacks from property lines and these are well within the campus.

Mr. Tolbert stated that he knows very little about green roofs. What advantage do you get from a green roof? Responding to Mr. Tolbert, Mr. Skibicki stated that one of the things that it does is that it cleans the water before it leaves the roof. If you did not have the vegetation on the roof, you would have dirt particles and it would contribute to dirtying the water. It also slows down the water process in a storm event and the runoff from a storm. It also has insulating values for the building.

Mr. Tolbert further questioned if it was difficult maintaining the greenery on the roof? Responding to Mr. Tolbert, Mr. Skibicki stated that there is certain maintenance involved. Every six months to a year you have to go up and weed it; however, once the species that are planted grow in, it is not as intensive to maintain.

Mr. Shomo stated that he thinks that it looks great. His grandson will be starting at Del Tech this fall and he is interested in this program.

Mr. Ambruso questioned the recommendations that were suggested by Staff, is the applicant in agreement with them along with the seven (7) advisory comments? Responding to Mr. Ambruso, Mr. Kooker stated that yes they were.

Mr. Nichols questioned with regards to the solar system that is on the roof, does this make enough kilowatts to run this building? Responding to Mr. Nichols, Mr. Skibicki stated that no, it would not. We estimate that it is within the three (3) percent range of the power that is required so it is actually very little.

Mr. Nichols further questioned what they would be running with it or are you just adding to the system? Responding to Mr. Nichols, Mr. Skibicki stated that the building will draw the energy that is generated; however, it is nowhere near enough to power the entire building.

Mr. Nichols further questioned how tall the windmills would be? Responding to Mr. Nichols, Mr. Skibicki stated that they would be approximately thirty (30) feet. The windmills that are shown is the basis of design because it is a publicly bid project. We cannot guarantee that this is the style. This is the one that we liked and hopefully the one that is awarded and if not it would be very similar to it.

Mr. Baldwin questioned for future applications, should the deficiency of bike racks be in waiver form or is this a grandfather issue on this particular application? Responding to Mr. Baldwin, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that it is a little bit of a grandfather issue. The Code reads in Article 6, Section 3.10 "Bicycle parking shall be provided for parking spaces at a rate of one bicycle parking space for every twenty (20) parking spaces or a fraction thereof. The Planning Commission may waive the requirement for the bicycle parking if it is demonstrated that bicycle parking would not be appropriate for safety reasons or due to the nature of the use of the site."

One of the things that Staff has found in our recent experience with this new addition to our Code is that once you get into parking lots that have hundreds of spaces, the calculation gets a little on the heavy side for bicycle parking. This may be something we need to go into the Code and do a fix on because this is not the first one that we have done the calculation on that has been a little unreasonable to expect that volume of bicycle parking.

Mrs. Townshend stated that she would say that this is an existing condition. The parking for the campus is not being added. They are adding eight (8) bicycle spaces for this project. So if you look at the parking that would be required for this specific project, they would probably meet it. However, since we are looking at the parking on a Campus Plan, there is a mixture of existing conditions and adding new. For the existing conditions for the remainder of the buildings, there was no bicycle parking requirement.

Mr. Hemmig stated that they would accept the fact that based on the required spaces of the campus of forty-seven (47) bicycle parking spaces, they will be providing thirty-four (34) and is pretty close to what the requirements would be for those calculations.

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

Mr. Nichols moved to approve S-11-05 Del Tech Center for Energy, Education, and Training: Building Addition, seconded by Mr. Tolbert and the motion unanimously carried 7-0 with Mr. Friedman and Colonel Welsh absent.

US-11-01 Bayhealth Medical Center: Comprehensive Signage Plan - Public Hearing and Review of a Unified Comprehensive Sign Plan Approval for the Bayhealth Medical Center campus. The Plan proposes the placement of wall, monument, and directional signs for the campus. The properties are zoned IO (Institutional/Office Zone) and C-3 (Service Commercial Zone) and some are subject to SWOZ (Source Water Protection Overlay Zone) and H (Historic District Overlay Zone). The properties are located along West Water Street, South Governors Avenue, South State Street, South Bradford Street, and Scull Terrace. The owners of record are Bayhealth Medical Center, Kent General Foundation, Central Delaware Surgery Center and, Frederick Townsend II Trust. The property addresses are 208 West Water Street, 540 South State Street, 530 South State Street, 540 South Governors Avenue, 560 South Governors Avenue, 738 South Governors Avenue, 100 Scull Terrace, 640 South State Street, 701 South Governors Avenue, and 804 South Bradford Street. Tax Parcels: ED-05-077.13-01-14.00-000, ED-05-077.13-01-18.00-000, ED-05-077.13-01-18.01-000, ED-05-077.13-01-25.00-000, ED-05-077.13-01-25.01-000, ED-05-077.13-01-34.00-000, ED-05-077.13-01-51.00-000, ED-05-077.13-01-52.00-000, ED-05-077.13-02-01.00-000, ED-05-077.13-02-12.00-000. Council District 2.

Representatives: Mr. Jerry Peters, Bayhealth Medical Center; and Mr. Gregg Moore, Becker Morgan Group, Inc.

Ms. Cornwell stated that she will be providing a Power Point presentation of pictures that were provided in the Commission member's packet. This application is for a Unified Comprehensive Sign Plan for the Bayhealth Medical Center. The application includes ten (10) parcels with the

properties located in the Downtown area. A Sign Plan was recommended as part of the Master Plan in 2006. The site qualifies for a Sign Plan as it is considered a campus and there are more than three (3) properties owned under a common ownership.

Ms. Cornwell further stated that the road classifications for the site are an urban minor arterial which is Governors Avenue. The rest are considered urban local collectors which is South State Street, Hope Street, South Street, and the rest of the others.

Ms. Cornwell further stated that Staff met with the applicant last week to discuss some of the recommendations in the report. There are twenty (20) existing signs throughout the site. The applicant is proposing forty (40) signs to be located throughout the site on the ten (10) different parcels. The applicant is proposing seven (7) new wall signs. These include three (3) new Bayhealth-Kent General signs and also includes several emergency, ambulance only, and the name of the emergency department signs. These will all be located on the new building that is currently under construction. There are also ten (10) existing wall signs that will remain as part of the Plan. These signs are located on the older part of the hospital or on the other buildings surrounding the property.

Ms. Cornwell further stated that there are a number of free-standing signs throughout the site. There are five existing monument signs. There are three (3) monument signs and two (2) post and panel signs. The post and panel signs are proposed to remain along with one of the monument signs. There are also two (2) monument signs that are to be replaced. These signs are located at 540 and 560 South Governors Avenue. The current signs are approximately seventy-two and a half square feet in sign area. The proposal is to max them out at one hundred and twenty (120) square feet which would be for each sign. The applicant has agreed to attempt to keep them under the one hundred and twenty (120) square feet if at all possible.

Ms. Cornwell further stated that there are six (6) directional signs that are located on the site that are existing which will be replaced with fourteen (14) new directional signs. The location of those can be found on the large plan sheet that has been provided as a part of the application. The existing directional signs are all about twenty (20) square feet in sign area. The new directional signs are twenty-three (23) square feet or fifty-seven and half (57.5) square feet. Staff has noted some concerns with the larger signs. The applicant has agreed to reduce the sign area of Signs #6, #8 and #14. The sign area for these signs will be somewhere under fifty-seven and half (57.5) square feet; however, larger than the twenty-three (23) square feet. Staff has noted concern with the larger signs of #1 through #4. The applicant would like to keep the signs as proposed at the fifty-seven and a half (57.5) foot size. Signs #1, #2, and #4 are located on urban collectors and Staff has concerns with the size while keeping in the character of the neighborhood. The minimum letter size for local collectors is four (4) inches and all of the signs are proposed to be at five (5) inches.

Ms. Cornwell further stated that Staff also recognizes the uniqueness of the hospital in an urban setting. Staff also notes that Sign #4 which is located at the corner of South State Street and Hope Street may need to be relocated as there is a possible sight distance issue with Hope Street. There is a number of parking regulatory signs running at clearance height for the parking garage; valet parking, and signage for who is authorized to go onto the bridge to get over South Street. These are all internal to the site; however, are all included with the Sign Plan. Staff has made

their recommendations in the report and the other agencies reviewing the Plan have provided their comments.

Mr. Moore stated that as you know, we have made a substantial increase in square footage in the number of stories and a new parking garage. This Sign Plan covers not only the hospital property; however, it also covers a number of properties that the hospital occupies around the hospital. This is not just hospital property and this is why there are so many signs.

Mr. Moore further stated that the hospital is currently having problems with signage. The signs that identify the localized main building are a bit narrow and are not readable. The hospital has told him repeatily that these signs are not getting noticed by the people coming to the hospital. Now that we have made significant increases in our square footage and moved the main component of the hospital to the other side which is the Emergency Department, it is now very important for us to identify where the parking is, where the facilities are, and make sure people coming to hospital completely understand. We think the size of the signs is necessary. The firm that designed this sign package has done about fifteen (15) packages throughout the east and one of them is John Hopkins Hospital. We are comfortable with the size of the package.

Mr. Moore further stated that they have agreed to reduce three (3) signs basically in half and those signs are #6, #8, and #14. Those signs do not have the volume of wording on them. The third sign is actually a sign that sits on Governors Avenue that addresses the MOB and Rehab Center and is a large sign that identifies the many functions that are in those buildings. They have agreed to try and maintain those signs a bit smaller than as presented in the package by reducing the letter size to four (4) inches. There are a number of other signs that they want to be clear on that we are not changing now and are why there are photographic images of signs that are going to remain. What they are trying to do is pull them into the sign package and if there needs to be wording changes to them as the hospital matures or as functions move around, we are able to get them permitted under the sign package. At this time, there are a number of signs that we do not know what they will say on them. Some of them are on the building and some of them are on free-standing signs.

Mr. Nichols stated that when you go to Christiana Hospital they have a lot of signs to get you around to exactly where you are going. This campus has also grown into a huge parcel which is great. It will need a lot of signs in order to keep the people moving.

Mr. Ambruso stated that he would agree with Mr. Nichols along with the fact that the more lit signs that you have, the safer it is going to be in the evening. If they have to light up the campus this is a nice way of doing it plus it informs the patients as to where to go.

Mr. Hemmig questioned if any of these signs are internally lit or are all of them externally lit signs? Responding to Mr. Hemmig, Mr. Moore stated that they are all externally lit. Some of the wall signs for Bayhealth on the wall are back lit. The monument signs identifying the building are externally lit.

Mr. Holt stated that he agreed with the size of the signs. He has some visual problems and he needs plenty of signage that is big enough to see. If you are in a situation where you have to go to the hospital and are in a hurry because of health reasons or maybe to see someone, the more

signs and the larger they are he would recommend them. Responding to Mr. Holt, Mr. Moore stated that they agree. When people are coming there they are under stress, do not feel well, or coming to visit someone who is under stress so it is harder for them to get a vision of where they are going and signage would be very important to them.

Mr. Hemmig questioned with regards to Sign #4 has this been looked at to see if the visual sight line interferes with traffic coming out of Hope Street? Responding to Mr. Hemmig, Ms. Cornwell stated no; however, that is something that is required and will be requested before Staff finalizes the Plan. This will be determined. This may actually need to be moved because the sign cannot be within the corner visibility and it cannot interfere with the sight distance. If it does either of those it will be moved to ensure that there is appropriate visual distance.

Mr. Hemmig opened a public hearing.

Mrs. Laurie Willet – Local Resident within 200 Feet (South State Street) – Stated that she would like to ask that you mentioned that other agencies review for safety and possibly make comments. Did any of these other agencies consider requiring the hospital to add speed limit signs, additional pedestrian signs, or make recommendations for additional lighting in the area? Since she lives and walks there day and night the area is quite dark especially at Hope Street and perhaps other streets. Could you summarize what the other agencies commented on?

Responding to Mrs. Willet, Ms. Cornwell stated that the other agencies include DelDOT who did review the Plan. What they were concerned with were the location of the signs and the fact that they needed to ensure that they are not located within the right-of-way. There was the issue with sight distance between Hope Street and State Street for one of the signs. They did not look at street lighting or speed limit signage because it was not a part of this proposed Plan. They only looked at signage that was proposed for the hospital itself.

Mrs. Willet further stated that she would like to request that the Commissioner's consider asking the hospital to work with DelDOT and perhaps install additional signs: wheelchair crossing, personnel crossing, and handicap crossing because pedestrian traffic there with the increased size of the campus has increased. The speed limit always is exceeded and we continue to have issues. Responding to Mrs. Willet, Ms. Cornwell stated that crosswalks, street lighting, and other things would have been looked at as part of the Master Plan on each phase of the development process. Some of that might not be installed yet as they are currently still under construction.

Mr. Holt stated that the speed limit would be considered public safety and should be addressed by the Police Department. Maybe they should take a look at the speed limits in those crosswalks.

Mr. Hemmig stated that most of what Mrs. Willet is requesting would come under the Public Safety Committee which is a sub-committee of the City Council. He would urge her to address that Committee for these kinds of concerns. He agrees with Mrs. Willet that this is a serious issue as he has witnessed the crosswalk over to Scull Mansion in the morning when it is winter time and dark. People step out and it is hard to see someone coming across. He feels that there are concerns that do need to be addressed in that area.

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

Mr. Nichols questioned are most all of the vehicular directional signs going to be lighted for night time? Responding to Mr. Nichols, Mr. Moore stated that yes they would.

Mr. Hemmig stated to review the Staff's recommendation was to reduce the size of several signs. Signs #1 through #4, #6, #8, and #14 were the recommended signs to reduce the size and the applicant have already agreed to reduce #6, #8, and #14. The only signs of contention are Signs #1 through #4.

Mr. Tolbert moved to approve US-11-01 Bayhealth Medical Center: Comprehensive Signage Plan and said approval shall be conditioned upon the applicant adhering to all of the DAC comments of record and recommendations and that the applicant further collaborate and cooperate with the Staff with respect to Signs #1 through #4 with regards to reduction of those signs, seconded by Mr. Nichols.

Mrs. Townshend questioned that what the motion maker is suggesting is that you support the Staff comment to reduce the size of Signs #1 through #4? Responding to Mrs. Townshend, Mr. Tolbert stated that yes this is his intention. Also, if you have other recommendations he would consider those too.

Mr. Moore stated that we believe very strongly that if we reduce Signs #1 through #4 we are creating safety issues for our users and for the general public because those are the key signs that identify our key entry areas, South Street, main entryways, and their corners. As a result of that, we have agreed to reduce two (2) signs which are #6 and #8. We do not agree with reducing the others because of safety issues.

Ms. Cornwell stated that Staff was happy to see the reduction in Signs #6, #8, and #14. We still had some concern with the rest of the signs; however, we understood the applicant wanted to keep the signs as they were presented. Responding to Ms. Cornwell, Mr. Moore stated that we physically can't given the size of the lettering to get our message on a smaller sign because the size of the letters are controlled by Section 4.4 of the *Zoning Ordinance.* If for example you look at Sign #3 on one side where we have to identify our main entrance and the Emergency Department which is the south orientation, it appears on the north orientation that we could actually cut that sign in half because on the back side of that sign we actually do not have the full use of it. The most important part of that is where we identify the Emergency Room. If you ask us to cut down Signs #1 through #4, we will actually have to take off wording that would identify the Emergency Room which we feel is a significant issue in terms of safety in identifying how to get to that especially when we are moving it from one side to the other. The same is true on Sign #4.

Mr. Hemmig questioned if on Signs #1, #2, and #4 you were going to reduce the lettering size to four (4) inches? Responding to Mr. Hemmig, Mr. Moore stated that the reduction in the lettering size was for the signs on the MOB building which are the monument signs that are existing. They are the monument signs at 540 and 560 South Governors Avenue and are not the directional signage which is what he is referring to.

Mr. Moore further stated that the existing signs are already significant in size and are not the main hospital signs so in terms of the need for the size, they are not quite as important. The other Signs #1 through #4 are very important to them.

Mr. Hemmig stated that there is a motion on the floor to approve the package with reduction of the size of Signs #1 through #4, seconded by Mr. Nichols. At this time a roll call was taken on the motion.

NAY	**AYE**
Mr. Holt	Mr. Shomo
Mr. Baldwin	Mr. Tolbert
Mr. Nichols	
Mr. Ambruso	
Mr. Hemmig.	

Mr. Hemmig stated that the motion has been defeated by a vote of 2-5.

Mr. Ambruso moved to approve US-11-01 Bayhealth Medical Center: Comprehensive Signage Plan and that the plan proposes the placement of wall monuments and directional signs for the campus and that we would accept the Plan proposed placement of their wall, monument, and the reduction of Signs #6, #8, and #14 for the campus as presented by the applicant. Signs #1 through #4 would not be required to be changed as presented by the applicant and not accepting Staff recommendation to reduce them, seconded by Mr. Nichols and the motion was unanimously carried 7-0 with Mr. Friedman and Colonel Welsh absent.

Meeting adjourned at 8:13 PM

Sincerely,

Diane Metsch
Secretary