PETITION TO AMEND AND ZONING DISTRICT
Public Hearing before the
Dover City Council
August 10, 2009

Applicants/Owners:	Bariglio Corporation
Location:	101 Mont Blanc Boulevard
Tax Parcel ID #:	ED05-067.19-04-52.00-000
Size:	2.61 acres
Present Use:	Vacant
Proposed Use:	Commercial
Comprehensive Plan Designation:	Commercial
Present Zoning:	C-PO (Commercial/Professional Office Zone) COZ-1 (Corridor Overlay Zone)
Proposed Zoning:	C-2A (Limited Central Commercial Zone) COZ-1 (Corridor Overlay Zone)
Petition:	The City received a petition in opposition to the rezoning. An analysis of the petition is attached to this report. Based on the staff analysis and the requirements of *Del Code* Title 22, §305, the petition is valid, and **an affirmative vote of ¾ of City Council (7 members) is required to approve the rezoning request.**
Recommendation of Planning Commission:	Following a public hearing before the Planning Commission on July 20, 2009, during which seven members of the public spoke in opposition to the rezoning application, Planning Commission unanimously recommended denial of the rezoning request.
File Number:	Z-09-04

Existing Property
The property is currently zoned C-PO (Commercial/Professional Office Zone) and is subject to the COZ-1 (Corridor Overlay Zone). The parcel is currently vacant. The applicant is proposing to rezone the property to C-2A (Limited Central Commercial Zone) and subject to the COZ-1 (Corridor Overlay Zone).

Surrounding Land Uses:
The property is surrounded by residential properties (Zoned R-8 One Family Residence) of Four Seasons subdivision directly to the west. Other commercial office uses (Zoned C-PO Commercial/Professional Office) are located to the south and east. The Hamlet shopping center (Zoned SC-1 Shopping Center) is located to the north of the subject parcel.

Comprehensive Plan:
The *2008 Comprehensive Plan* depicts the subject area in question as a Commercial land use on the Land Development Plan Map. The C-2A zoning classification is consistent with the Commercial land use classification, as is the current C-PO classification.

Request for C-2A (Limited Central Commercial Zoning)
The following description of the C-2A zoning district is provided from Article 3 §14 of the *Zoning Ordinance.*

> 14.1*Uses permitted.* In a limited central commercial zone (C-2A), no building or premises shall be used, and no building or part of a building shall be erected, which is arranged, intended, or designed to be used, in whole or in part, for any purpose, except the following:
>
> > 14.11 All uses permitted in the neighborhood commercial zone (C-1A).
> > 14.12 Business, professional or governmental offices.
> > 14.13 Banks, theaters and restaurants.
> > 14.14 Apartments, provided that no dwelling units shall be permitted in the first floor and at least one off-street parking space shall be provided in the area for each apartment.
> > 14.15 Hotels, clubs and places of worship.
> > 14.16 Signs shall meet the regulations found in article 5, section 4, supplementary sign regulations.
> > 14.17 All permitted uses and all storage accessory thereto, other than off-street parking, shall be carried on in buildings fully enclosed on all sides.
> > 14.18 Civic institutions.
>
> 14.2*Performance standards.* All uses are subject to performance standards as set forth in article 5, section 8.1.
>
> 14.3*Site development plan approval.* Site development plan approval in accordance with article 10, section 2 hereof shall be required prior to the issuance of building permits for the erection or enlargement of all structures and prior to the issuance of certificates of occupancy for any change of use.
>
> 14.4*Conditional uses.* The following uses are permitted, conditional upon the approval of the planning commission in accordance with the procedures and subject to the general conditions set forth in article 10, section 10.1 [1] of this ordinance and to any specified requirements set forth below:
>
> (a) Social service agencies.

14.5*Multiple establishments permitted.* Due to the mixed use nature of the zoning district, multiple establishments are permitted in individual structures in the C-2A zone. All establishments must conform to the minimum bulk standards of the C-2A zone. This subsection does not relive establishments from complying with any and all applicable building and fire codes.

(Ord. of 7-10-2000; Ord. of 2-12-2001; Ord. No. 2008-33, 8-25-2008)

In addition, the C-2A zoning district includes the permitted uses of the C-1A and C-1 Zones by reference. This allows for a variety of retail, service, and office uses. The reference portions of Sections 11 and 12 for the C-1 and C-1A zones are listed below:

Section 11. Neighborhood commercial zone (C-1).

11.1 Uses permitted. In a neighborhood commercial zone (C-1), no building or premises shall be used, and no building or part of a building shall be erected, which is arranged, intended, or signed to be used, in whole or in part, for any purpose, except the following, which shall be permitted, conditional upon approval as to use by the planning commission in accordance with the procedures and subject to the general conditions set forth in article 10, section 1 of this ordinance:

11.11 Convenience retail stores such as drug stores, grocery stores, luncheonettes, variety stores or combinations thereof.
11.12 Personal service stores such as, but not limited to, barbershops, beauty parlors, and tailors, provided that where steam pressure is used in clothes pressing, it shall not exceed 60 pounds per square inch.
11.13 Service establishments furnishings services other than of a personal nature, but excluding gasoline filling stations and motor vehicle storage, repair, or service.
11.14 Signs shall meet the regulations found in article 5, section 4, supplementary sign regulations.

Section 12. Limited commercial zone (C-1A).

12.1Uses permitted. No building or premises shall be used, and no building or part of a building shall be erected, which is arranged, intended, or designed to be used, in whole or in part, for any purpose, except the following:

12.11 All uses permitted in the neighborhood commercial C-1 zone, with no limitation on size of establishments.
12.12 Residences conforming to the regulations set forth in article 3, section 2.
12.13 Banks or businesses, professional or governmental offices.
12.14 Other retail and service establishments, but excluding:

12.141 Gasoline filling stations and motor vehicle storage, repair, or service, except that gasoline pumps shall be permitted as an accessory use, subject to conditional use approval by the planning commission pursuant to article 10, section 1.
12.142 Wholesaling, warehousing or storage.
12.143 The manufacturing, printing, assembling, converting, altering, finishing, cleaning or any other processing of goods on the premises, except as permitted in the C-1 zone.
12.144 Excessive traffic generating uses, such as theaters, drive-ins, bowling alleys and other commercial, recreation, restaurants, etc.

12.15 Signs shall meet the regulations found in article 5, section 4, supplementary sign regulations.

Recommendation of the Planning Staff and Planning Commission:
Staff supports the rezoning request from CPO to C-2A. The request is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and the long-term development of the area. The staff recommendation was made prior to the public hearing held by the Planning Commission. Following a public hearing before the Planning Commission on July 20, 2009, Planning Commission unanimously recommended denial of the rezoning request, stating the concerns raised by residents during the public hearing.

An transcription of the testimony presented at the Planning Commission meeting on July 20, 2009 is below:

> **Z-09-04 Lands of Bariglio Corporation at 101 Mont Blanc Boulevard** - Public Hearing and Recommendation to City Council on the rezoning application consisting of one parcel of land totaling 2.61 acres ±. The property is currently zoned C-PO (Commercial/Professional Office Zone) and is subject to the COZ-1 (Corridor Overlay Zone). The proposed zoning is to C-2A (Limited Central Commercial Zone) and subject to the COZ-1 (Corridor Overlay Zone). The subject property is at the southwest corner of Walker Road and Saulsbury Road. The owner of record is the Bariglio Corporation. Property Address: 101 Mont Blanc Boulevard. Tax Parcel: ED05-067.19-04-52.00-000. Council District 1.
>
> **Representatives:** Mr. Gregg Moore and Mike Riemann, Becker Morgan Group.
>
> Mr. Moore provided some history regarding this property. They have been here two separate occasions with a development proposal for this property for a medical professional office project that is two stories which started over four (4) years ago. The owner has been actively trying to execute this project and with the market and other changes in Dover regarding medical offices, it has precluded him from trying to achieve this success for the property. We did re-appear again for this project to get an extension and it was approved and this is where the four years has gone.
>
> Mr. Moore further stated that he and Mr. Bariglio decided that they would downsize his project with a more mixed type of project. He wants to mix some boutique commercial with the professional office to try to market it as a multi-use development. As a result, the belief is that they will have a building that is much less in scale and not two stories. There would be less traffic and parking for the project as a result of downsizing. What they are proposing is the C-2A (Limited Commercial) with Staff recommending approval and it is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.
>
> *There were no questions raised from any Planning Commission members at this time.*
>
> *Mr. Friedman opened a public hearing.*

Mr. Steven Owens – 108 Matterhorn Drive – Stated that his home is located directly behind where this facility has been proposed to be built. We are here today to make sure that City Council honors their agreement with the Four Seasons development. With this new building going there, it would directly affect our housing behind it. There is a privacy issue as well as a safe environment for their families. In early 2000 when this development first started, City Council voted to make it CPO zoning. Now they want to change it to appease the owner of the property. The problem with this is it is going to affect our families. We have bought very expensive houses behind this area that we are afraid would take a dive with regards to resale value. Some of the main issues that we have with it are that we would have a lot more vehicle traffic. Most recently, a daycare was approved for this neighborhood that has kids and a lot of traffic and this will add on to that traffic. There could be increase in crime as well as the appearance of the neighborhood. One of the issues that you had when you did the study in 2000 is that you wanted the west side of Dover to become more of a throughway and most of the commercial business are located on the east side of Dover. He sees more and more development coming on the west side of Dover and it is making Saulsbury Road almost impossible to get on and off of. We are worried about security, safety, and overcrowding. Located across the street is a strip mall that also has a lot of traffic. The bottom line is that we the people of Four Seasons do not want this there. We want to keep it the same zoning proposed as CPO as we do not mind the medical offices there from 9:00 AM to 5:00 PM. We do not want anything late at night or anything past 6:00 PM.

Mrs. Lois Byassee – 104 Matterhorn Drive – Stated that their subdivision consists of forty-three (43) lots in total. This development has taken ten years to develop. Of the forty-three (43) lots there are still fourteen (14) lots that are vacant. She waited two (2) years for her house to be completed and others more or less. She is thinking that if it took this long to do what we have done so far, and Mr. Bariglio has only waited four (4) years to get his stuff done, she feels that equal attention should be paid to both. The problem that they are having in addition to the money matters of value, they downloaded a list of crimes in their neighborhood and they are trying to do something about that with help from City Council. The Staff in the Planning Department, as of eight years ago, that in your wisdom was right on target, was the intent of this CPO development and zoning. In your wisdom, you described in your own words, why CPO was the highest best use of this land. It has already been in contention from the beginning with Mr. Harrington and they resolved the problems and everyone was happy including all of Bicentennial Village and the Hamlet and as a result, we who live there now, are happy. We did not break faith with you and we hope you will not break faith with us. Everything we have is invested in this property and in general, we would hope to be proud for the public of what we have here and that we

have enhanced the value. The other issue is the road that divides the commercial part of the development from the residential part as there is nothing but a road with no barriers. When you talk about developing the corner lot, she would hope it is not before they run out of money because it is affecting our values. Four residents received a letter that this rezoning was taking place so the other thirty (30) people who are in the room did not hear of it until we went around because of the law of the 200 feet limit. Half of the Hamlet Shopping Center has already been vacated and is a crime in progress.

Mr. Charles Martin – 34 Arlberg Circle – Stated that he does not live here; however, has tenants that do and the proximity of this rezoning jeopardizes his property. There was a lot of discussion when this development was approved; however, the CPO zoning is what is appropriate for this property and not retail/commercial. He would hope that this body continues with the thoughts that this is as high of commercial zoning that is needed. Does the commercial zoning that they are asking for allow for any food sales on the property? Responding to Mr. Martin, Mrs. Townshend stated that yes it does.

Mr. Martin further stated that this would bring a whole other problem with rats and such and does not belong next to this residential area. There is plenty of opportunity if someone wants a boutique commercial to go right to the Hamlet and do that.

Mrs. Sherleen Sutton – 101 Matterhorn Drive – Stated that she is located on the corner directly behind where they want to build. If she were to sit out on her deck, she would be facing the trash cans and all the garbage if they were to build restaurants or stores. We spent a lot of time trying to decide where we wanted to live and we picked a smaller neighborhood to make sure that we would not have townhouses or apartment housing. We have invested greatly in our home and resale will not be good for these homes in this neighborhood if they develop this.

Mrs. Ellen Dunn – 35 Arlberg Circle – Stated that they moved here about two years ago from an area that was congested. We wanted to retire to an area that would be small as there are a lot of large developments here in Delaware. Their home is also located directly behind where they want to build and if she sits on her deck to enjoy herself, once this is established, she would also endure the same problems as the previous speaker.

Mr. Bruce Morris – 60 Eiger Court – Stated that he has a few concerns with what is taking place in his development as it is getting to be an eyesore. First, he is frustrated with how people come through their development and use it as a shortcut to avoid the red light at Walker Road. There is a four way stop sign in their development and no one stops. He walks his dog every night because it is peaceful and there have been a few times where he and

his dog have almost been run over because people come through there in a hurry. Traffic is too much with most of it being people who do not even live in the development and there are other houses that are not even built yet. His second concern is he tries hard to teach people to respect this land that we live on because he grew up in this town in the 50's and 60's and it was a nice place to live. Route 8 barely had fifty (50) people come down it and he knows that things change; however, it is getting out of control now. We do not need all of these stores and shopping centers around as we have enough. He is concerned with the children that live in the area and now with the new daycare a child could go out into the street. He carries two trash bags one for the dog and one for trash from the developers that build the houses from items such as roofing paper. Kids make a short cut and come through their property and throw broken beer bottles after coming over from the Hamlet and throw whisky bottles. Enough is enough our development is nice and we want to keep it that way.

Mrs. Terry Medlin – 32 Arlberg Circle – Stated that when she was looking for a house she chose this particular area because it is quiet. One of the reasons that she would not like to see a change in the zoning is because the traffic would flow through their development to get to the businesses. If there are restaurants there, we would have rats and their property values would go down. There is a daycare center in our neighborhood that was recently built and the parking from that daycare center overflows into their neighborhood. She is concerned about safety and security. There is a bank in the Hamlet Shopping Center that has been robbed several times. She has a signed petition from the neighborhood that everyone has signed in opposition of this zoning change. She would like to see it stayed zoned the way that it is currently zoned and not C-2A.

The petition of names was submitted at this time for submission for City Council's action.

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

Mr. Tolbert questioned if the developer had any contact with the residents regarding this issue and were you aware that the residents were opposed to this? Responding to Mr. Tolbert, Mr. Moore stated that no there was no contact; however, they did have a call from one of neighbors and they returned the call. We believed that there was opposition and problems that were happening at the shopping center (The Hamlet) located across the street. We are not asking for the same zoning as that shopping center; however, a different zoning.

Colonel Welsh stated that when the proposed development was brought forward and the terminology for these was luxury retirement homes with a nice peaceful quiet setting, this was primarily to appease the residents of

Bicentennial Village. Then came the commercial development along the frontage of Saulsbury Road and the discussion that ensued pertaining to that development, he specifically recalls as being office structures only. One that was of particular concern was a drug counseling center that was going to open. There was never any kind of discussion regarding retail/commercial establishments going in there. He could see how homeowners coming in could be led to believe that since everything that is there now fronting Saulsbury Road is a commercial office facility that this is what would go in at the corner site. For this reason alone, he is opposed to this application. As he looks across the street at the Hamlet he sees a lot of empty storefronts and wonders what the need for any retail type of establishment would be across the street from the Hamlet Shopping Center. He sympathizes with the residents and opposes this application.

Mr. DiMondi stated that he too remembers the dialog that was established safeguarding this neighborhood. The forecast and projection that was made at the time was for a retirement home approach. While we have from time to time considered other applications to relax certain density requirements on the front side of the development cycle as opposed to one that is fairly mature, except for the fourteen lots that have yet to be developed. He too shares the same concerns that Colonel Welsh has regarding tonight's application.

Colonel Welsh moved to forward to City Council a recommendation of denial of application Z-09-04 Lands of Bariglio Corporation at 101 Mont Blanc Boulevard for the rezoning request to C-2A, seconded by Mr. Tolbert and the motion was unanimously carried.

City of Dover

Department of Planning & Inspections

Application No.: Z-09-04



Plan Title: Lands of Barigilo Corporation
Location: 101 Mont Blanc
Plan Type: Rezoning
Tax Parcel: ED-05-0067.19-04-52.00-000
Current Zoning: CPO & COZ-1
Proposed Zoning: C-2A & COZ-1
Owner: Barigilo Corporation
Date: 7-10-09

Legend

- Dover Parcels
- Zoning
- Corridor Overlay Zone

0 250 500 1,000 Feet

MEMORANDUM

Department of Planning & Inspections
P.O. Box 475
Dover, DE 19903
Phone: (302) 736-7010 Fax (302) 736-4217

DATE: July 29, 2009

TO: City Council

FROM: Ann Marie Townshend, AICP

SUBJECT: Z-09-04 Petition by adjacent residents objecting to the rezoning of 101 Mont Blanc Boulevard

Correspondence received from the residents of Four Seasons Homeowners on July 20, 2009 contained a petition with 32 signatures from numerous properties in the area objecting to the proposed annexation and rezoning of 101 Mont Blanc Boulevard.

Title 22 §305 of *Delaware Code* is clear in regards to determining the viability of a petition opposing a rezoning request and how a legislative body of a municipality is to proceed in processing the petition.

Staff evaluated the petition along with property tax records to determine the adjacency of signatories' properties to 101 Mont Blanc Boulevard as it relates to the requirements of Title 22 §305. The petition is evaluated based upon the presence (or lack thereof) of signatures from the 10 eligible surrounding properties. The attached map shows these properties.

Delaware Code requires that when 20% of eligible properties participate in a petition, the legislative body for the municipality must achieve a three-fourths favorable decision to proceed with the rezoning of the property.

The results of the petition analysis are as follows:

- 3 out of 15 eligible property owners signed the petition.
- The total number of eligible and verifiable petitioners is 3.
- 3/15 eligible and verifiable petitioners equates to 20%.
- **The petition is valid. Any action to approve the rezoning requires a three-fourths majority of City Council.**

If you have any questions regarding the information provided, please contact me at (302) 736-7196.

Petition Analysis
Properties adjacent within 100 ft.
101 Mont Blanc Boulevard



City of Dover
Department of Planning
Application for Mailing List
'Property within 200' of applicant'
File Z-09-04
July 29, 2009

0 180 360 720 Feet

List of properties eligible to petition the rezoning at 101 Mont Blanc Boulevard

PARCELID	OWNER	Property Address		Petition?
ED05-067.15-03-10.00	RAMSEY,LESLIE C & DANIEL M	5	MCKEE RD	NO
ED05-067.19-04-42.00	ROSEMARK DEVELOPMENT LLC	31	ARLBERG CIR	NO
ED05-067.19-04-41.00	ROSEMARK DEVELOPMENT LLC	33	ARLBERG CIR	YES
ED05-067.19-04-40.00	DUNN,BENNIE L SR &	35	ARLBERG CIR	NO
ED05-067.19-04-01.00	ZHENG,XIU LAN	100	MATTERHORN DR	NO
ED05-067.19-04-43.00	SUTTON,GREGORY H & SHERLEEN D	101	MATTERHORN DR	YES
ED05-067.19-04-02.00	MONROE,MARY E	102	MATTERHORN DR	YES
ED05-067.19-04-51.00	DELAWARE GUIDANCE SERVICES	103	MONT BLANC BLVD	NO
ED05-067.19-02-02.02	NATIONAL COUNCIL ON AG LIFE &	363	SAULSBURY RD	NO
ED05-067.19-02-02.06	NACRELLI,CHRISTOPHER A & C A	385	SAULSBURY RD	NO
ED05-067.15-03-11.00	RIDDLE PATRICIA A	915	WALKER RD	NO
ED05-067.15-01-41.00	HAMLET SHOPPING CENTER ASSOC.	1003	WALKER RD	NO
ED05-067.19-01-25.00	HAMLET HOMES ASSOC		HERITAGE DR	NO
ED05-067.19-02-02.01	CITY OF DOVER		SAULSBURY RD	NO
ED05-067.19-04-44.00	FOUR SEASONS HOMEOWNERS ASSOC		MONT BLANC BLVD	NO

RECEIVED
JUL 24 2009
CITY OF DOVER
PLANNING & INSPECTIONS

July 20 2009

Rezoning in District #1

Category: Four Seasons Homeowners Concerns

Target: City of Dover Planning Commission and City Council

Homeowners, in the immediate vicinity of 101 Mont Blanc Boulevard, Dover Delaware, received a notice in reference to the rezoning this area. The notice indicates that the proposed zoning for this property is C2-A (Limited Central Commercial Zone). Currently this area is zoned C-PO (Commercial/Professional Office Zone).

Should this rezoning take place, the homeowners in the Four Seasons Development R-8, will be subjected to the following:

FOUR SEASONS CONCERNS

- ✓ **Vehicular Traffic Volume (increased)**
- ✓ **Pedestrian Traffic Volume (increased)**
- ✓ **Crime (increase)**
- ✓ **Property Value (decrease)**
- ✓ **Rodents**
- ✓ **Appearance**
- ✓ **Security**
- ✓ **Safety**
- ✓ **Over crowding/Congestion**
- ✓ **Parking**

Questions

Why weren't all of the homeowners informed of proposal?
What are the current plans?

Please sign to show that you oppose this proposed rezoning

Ineligible Elisible

Addresses for attached Petitioners

(1) Mary Monroe	102 Matterhorn Drive
(2) Eyrl Byassee Lois Byassee	104 Matterhorn Drive
(3) Gregory Sutton Sherleen Sutton Danielle Sutton	101 Matterhorn Drive
(4) Rebecca E. Batson	134 Matterhorn Drive
(5) Richard Dunning Cecelia Dunning	114 Matterhorn Drive
(6) Miguel Wallace	118 Matterhorn Drive
(7) Doreen Zentmeyer	116 Matterhorn Drive
(8) Steve Owens Tara Owens	108 Matterhorn Drive
(9) Anas Ben-Addi Tamara Ben-Addi	110 Matterhorn Drive
(10) James Whitmore	112 Matterhorn Drive
(11) Arrie Parker	130 Matterhorn Drive
(12) Roy Griffith Jacqueline Griffith Amber Dawn O. Griffith	132 Matterhorn Drive

(13) Terry Medlin	32 Arlberg Circle
(14) Charles Martin Tristen Loviello Faith Maziarz	34 Arlberg Circle
(15) Bennie Dunn Ellen Dunn	35 Arlberg Circle
(16) Sitta Gombeh-Alie	36 Arlberg Circle
(17) Clement Nettles Larnyce Nettles	54 Eiger Court Ct.
(18) Nancy Nechay-Johns	52 Eiger Ct.
(19) Cheryl Jenkins	214 Mont Blanc Blvd.
(20) Hogan J. Lee	51 St. Bernadino Circle

Ineligible Eligible Duplicate Eligible

	PRINT	SIGNATURE
#15	BENNIE L. DUNN	Bennie L Dunn
#15	ELLEN E. DUNN	Ellen E. Dunn
#14	Tristen M. Caviello	Tristen Caviello
#14	Faith Maziarz	Faith Maziarz
#10	James Whitmore	James Whitmore
#1	Mary E Monroe	Mary E. Monroe
#18	Nancy Nechay-Johns	Nancy Nechay-Johns
#14	Charles Martin	Charles Martin
#6	Miguel Wallace	Miguel D Wallace
#3	Gregory Sutton	Gregory Sutton
#3	DANIELLE J. SUTTON	Danielle J. Sutton
#16	SITTA B. GOMBEH-ALIE	SBGAlie, MD

July 20 2009

Ineligibe Eligible Duplicate Eligible

	PRINT	SIGNATURE
#9	James Ben Addi	James Ben Addi
#9	Tamara BenAddi	Tamara LBenAddi
#8	STEVEN OWENS	Steven Owens
#8	TARA OWENS	Tara Owens
#3	Sheleen Sutton	Sheleen Sutton
#2	Lois A. Byassee	Lois A. Byassee
#2	Eyrl L Byassee	Eyrl L Byassee
#5	Richard Dunning	Richard Dunning
#5	Celia Dunning	Celia Dunning
#20	HOGAN J LEE	Hogan J. Lee
#12	GRIFFITH ROY	Roy A Griffith
#12	GRIFFITH JACQUELINE	Jacqueline Griffith
#12	Amberdawn Griffith	Amberdawn Griffith
#4	Rebecca E. Batson	Rebecca E Batson
#11	Merrie Parker Jr	Merrie Parker Jr
#19	Cheryl L Jenkins	Jenkins
#17	Larnyce Nettles	Larnyce Nettles
#17	Clement Nettles	Clement Nettles
#13	TERRY MEDLIN	Terry Medlin
#7	Doreen Zentmeyer	Doreen Zentmeyer

July 20 2009

NOW LEASING: NORTH WILMINGTON

(Limited ownership opportunities for office users)

RETAIL, MEDICAL/OFFICE, RESIDENTIAL









MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT

Convenient access to
North Wilmington, + PA
via I-95 and Rt. 202.

Near intersection at Marsh
& Naamans Roads

73,000 Sq-ft +/- Total.

BRANDYWINE
PAVILION

Please contact:
Harold D. (Dan) Lesher
Office: 302-622-3520
Mobil: 302-622-3520
dlesher@pattersonwoods.com

3801 Kennett Pike D-100
Greenville Center
Wilmington, Delaware 19807
302-622-3500

* Product available "subject to" plan approval by local authorities.

CORFAC International

Patterson Woods & Associates is the Exclusive Agent for the Owner. The above information is believed to be accurate but the users must verify it for their own satisfaction. Price availability and design elements are subject to change without prior notice. The Seller's broker, any cooperating broker, and any salesperson working with either, are representing the Seller's interests and have fiduciary responsibilities to Seller, but are obligated to treat all parties fairly.

PATTERSON WOODS
COMMERCIAL PROPERTIES