1	CITY OF NEWARK
2	DELAWARE
3	
4	PLANNING COMMISSION
5	MEETING MINUTES
6	
7	MEETING CONDUCTED IN PERSON AND REMOTELY
8	VIA MICROSOFT TEAMS
9	
10	AUGUST 2, 2022
11	7:30 P.M.
12	
13	Present at the 7:30 P.M. Meeting:
14	
15	Commissioners Present:
16	Chairman: Willard Hurd, AIA
17	Vice-Chair: Alan Silverman
18	Secretary: Karl Kadar
19	Chris Williamson
20	
21	Commissioners Absent:
22	Stacy McNatt
23	Allison Stine
24	
25	Staff Present:
26	Paul Bilodeau, City Solicitor
27	Renee Bensley, Acting Director of Planning and Development
28	Michael Fortner, Planner II
29	Joshua Solge, Planner II
30	Katie Dinsmore, Administrative Professional I
31	

Chair Hurd called the Commission to order at 7:35 P.M.

45

46

47

48

49

50

51

52

53

54

55

56

57

58

59

32

33 34

Chair Hurd: Let me get my microphone set up here, there we go. Alright, good evening everyone. Thank you for your patience as we got the technical stuff worked out. Good evening, everyone and welcome to the August 2nd, 2022, City of Newark Planning Commission meeting. This is Will Hurd, chair of the Planning Commission. We are conducting this meeting through the Microsoft Teams platform. I'd like to provide some guidelines for the meeting structure so that everyone's able to participate. Katie Dinsmore, the department's Administrative Professional, will be managing the chat and general meeting logistics. At the beginning of each agenda item, I will call on the related staff member to present followed by the applicant for any land use items. Once the presentation is complete, I will call on each commissioner in rotating alphabetical order for questions of the staff or presenter. If a commissioner has additional comments, they would like to add later they should ask the chair to be recognized again when all members have had the opportunity to speak. For items open to public comment we will then read into the record comments received prior to the meeting followed by open public comment. If members of the public would like to comment on an agenda item and are in person, they should sign up on the sheet at the entrance so we can spell their name correctly and will be called on to speak at the appropriate time. If members of the public attending virtually they should use the hand raising function in Microsoft Teams to signal the meeting organizer to indicate they would like to speak or message the meeting organizer through the chat function with their name, district or address, and the agenda item on which they would like to comment. All lines will be muted, and cameras disabled until individuals are called on to speak at that point the speaker's microphone and camera will be enabled and they can turn on their cameras and unmute themselves to give their comments. All speakers must identify themselves prior to speaking. Public comment will be limited to 5 minutes per person and must pertain to the item under consideration. Comments within the Microsoft Teams chat will not be considered part of the public record for the meeting unless they are requested to be read into the record. We will follow public comment with further questions and discussion from the commissioners then the motions and voting by roll call. Commissioners will need to articulate the reasons for their vote. If there are any issues during the meeting, we may adjust these guidelines if necessary. While the City of Newark strives to make our public meetings accessible

pursuant to 29 Delaware Code 10006A, technological failure does not affect the validity of these meetings, nor the validity of any actions taken in this meeting.

1. Chair's Remarks

63 64 65

60 61

62

Chair Hurd: That takes us to item 1, Chair's remarks, which I have none because it's too hot.

66 67

2. The minutes of the July 5th, 2022, Planning Commission meeting

68 69

Chair Hurd: That takes us to item 2, the minutes; we have the minutes from July 5th. I've sent Katie my small edits, are there any additional edits or corrections to the minutes? Alright seeing none, the minutes are approved by acclimation.

71 72 73

70

3. Informational Items

74 75

Chair Hurd: That takes us to item 3, informational items. We will begin with the Acting Planning Director's

77 78

76

a. Acting Planning Director's report

79 80

81

82 83

84

85

86

87 88

89

90

91 92

93

94

95

96

97

98

99

Acting Director Bensley: Good evening everybody. Since our last meeting we've had several eventful Council meetings. On July 11th, we had the second reading for 3 of the items related to the Downtown Newark Parking Plan. Those were establishing a Parking Advisory Committee, updating the parking enforcement responsibilities, which was cleaning up the code language that formerly had them under the Police Department and putting them under Planning and Development and changing the on-street parking limit. All three were approved with no amendments. Council also at that meeting discussed the BB/RA draft tenets that were based on the feedback that they gave at the May 23rd Council meeting. They generally were supportive of what was presented and we're moving forward to the next step in the review process which is the joint Planning Commission and Council meeting scheduled for August 25th. Also, as part of that discussion, Council decided not to move forward with the interim building height ordinance that had been proposed by them and discussed by the Planning Commission at the last meeting and instead focused on finishing the BB/RA zoning amendment project as a whole. The July 25th Council meeting, we had a couple of items related to the Code Enforcement side of the house, with the amendments, we call it the Pools etcetera ordinance, which was a couple of items that banned pools in front yards as well as some clean up items for frequently offered property maintenance complaints that we had some enforcement issues with the existing code language at that point. So that was approved unanimously, and we also had a fourth ordinance related to the Downtown Newark Parking Plan which was the residential parking permit program zone process codification. And both of those were approved. We also at that meeting had the first reading for the Comp Plan amendment and rezoning for the 30 South Chapel Street project. That hearing is set for the August 22nd Council meeting for the Comp Plan amendment, rezoning, major subdivision, and special use permit for that project.

100 101 102

103

104

105

106

107 108

109

110

111 112

113

114

115

118

Also, at that meeting the Council provided direction for the date of the BB/RA zoning code workshop. We had some initial issues where surprisingly when you ask 13 different people what their availability is it's hard to get one night to agree on. But thankfully a few Council members were able to change up their availability, so everyone is scheduled to be present on August 25th. For looking forward, the August 8th Council meeting will be bringing back the Comprehensive Development Plan V version 2.0 revisions that Council had requested; there were three specific edits they had asked for. One is adding more about the history of the African American community information in our community profile. The second which is also related was to add language to Focus Area 1 emphasizing Council's desire to preserve the historic African American churches in that area. And the one that was the biggest change was for Focus Area 3, that was the Center Street focus area, they requested that it be shrunk down to just the North Chapel Street corridor, so that change has been made as well. So those will be presented to them and hopefully the plan will be adopted at the August 8th meeting. We're also diving into budget season, so August 15th we'll be presenting as part of the FY 2023 budget review. August 22nd as I previously mentioned will be the 30 South Chapel Street hearing and August 29th is our Planning and Development specific departmental budget hearing.

116 117

Other happenings for the BB/RA district zoning changes I did meet with the consultant on July 21st to kind of finalize our path forward to get ready for the workshop. So, we are making progress on that. The

Downtown Parking strategy implementation we are also, in addition to the bills that have been adopted, we're also working on the Parking plan discussion that Council has asked for as well as working on the additional items that need to come to you all for review. The main one being the design section of the Downtown Newark Parking Plan which we're targeting for your September agenda. The ordinance language that you guys approved at your July 5th meeting regarding the BB zone parking changes, we are, after discussion internally, we are going to be holding the final ordinance for that to run in concert with the other BB/RA zoning changes. So, you should expect to see that come to Council when the remainder of the BB/RA zoning changes com, which we had tentatively set for November.

Property Maintenance code updates and the nuisance properties ordinance. We met internally on July 26th to discuss the latest iteration of that. The draft ordinance for nuisance properties has been sent to other departments for review and input and then it will go to our distinguished solicitor for review before doing some stakeholder outreach then being scheduled for Council. And I updated you on Comp Plan V already and the next Planning Commission meeting is September 6th, which is the day after Labor Day. So, I'm looking to verify that a quorum will be available for that meeting, I know we don't have everyone here tonight, so we'll do some outreach after. But if folks have conflicts, please let me or Katie know so we can make sure we have a quorum for that meeting. As I mentioned we will not have a project application ready to go for that meeting, but we will be bringing the next item from the Downtown Newark Parking Plan and potentially some other minor text amendments for review.

Looking at Plan reviews, items submitted since the last Planning Commission meeting. We got a plan for 178, 182, and 186 South Main Street and 528 Old Barksdale Road. That plan is a Comp Plan amendment, rezoning, special use permit, major subdivision by site plan approval, and parking waiver for a 7-story building with parking on the first floor and 54 two-bedroom apartments on the 2nd through 7th floors as well as 7 three story 6-bedroom townhouse apartments. Existing project updates, 30 South Chapel Street we've talked about, 25 North Chapel Street we're in the process of reviewing the SAC comments and applicant materials to determine what needs to still be submitted in order for them to be scheduled for Council. 1119 South College Avenue is on tonight's agenda. 65 South Chapel Street, we've received SAC comments from all departments and the second round SAC later will go out next week. This project will likely need another round of review prior to being ready for Planning Commission. Submissions that are in our review queue include 339, 341, and 349 East Main Street, 1025 and 1033 Barksdale Road, 515 Capitol Trail, 1115 South College, 249 East Main Street, and 55 Benny Street. Items where we have sent our SAC comments and are waiting for a response from the applicant include 532 Barksdale Road and 244 Kells Avenue. Anticipated to be submitted soon is 1050 South College Avenue which is the former Boston Market site.

And then a quick staffing update, we have hired our temporary Community Planner I, to fill what was formerly Josh Solge's position since he was promoted to Planner II. Jacob Higgins will be starting with us on Monday, August 22nd, so we're looking forward to having him on board. And then for the director of Planning and Development recruitment, the first round of interviews for that position finished today. So, we will find out what the path forward is after that. Thank you.

 Chair Hurd: Thank you very much. Just wanted to draw attention to the packet this month, the information is heavy on parking requirements articles so that we can just get that into the record and in front of Council so that they're not so scared of the concept. And also, in there, it's always fun to read this, is the Quarterly report thank you for staying timely on that, it makes the (inaudible) so much easier. Alright that closes informational items.

4. Review And Consideration of a Text Amendment Amending the Zoning Code to Expand the Definition of Offices for Professional Services and Administrative Activities in Nonresidential Districts

Chair Hurd: That takes us to item 4, review and consideration of a text amendment amending the zoning code to expand the definition of offices for professional services and administrative activities in nonresidential districts.

Planner Fortner: Good Evening Mr. Chairman and Planning Commissioners. I'm here to present the department's report. Again, this is to amend the definition of offices for professional services and administrative activities for nonresidential districts to include the word "therapist". This came from a list

of a workplan, or a secondary priorities list not on your workplan, we chose something simple to knock out of the way because we had a little time. So, this came up fairly recently, our definitions for professional services and administrative has a list as you look on line 22 there, it includes things like physician, dentist, and optometrist. It doesn't include the word therapist so historically we looked at this and discussed and decided if we had a therapist application it was like this and so we included it in this. But of course, therapist isn't exactly a physician so we would be more clarifying if we put therapist in this definition. We think this is the most appropriate place to put therapist. We think it's related to this kind of land use classifications. By putting it in there it would automatically be in the zoning districts at the bottom of the page and the top of the second page where this zoning classification is allowed. We would use the definition from the Merriam Webster's dictionary, which starts on line 66 there that's the default dictionary on how we define words that aren't otherwise defined. And again, this would be clarifying, we think this would be the appropriate place to put this definition and I'd be happy to answer any of your questions.

Chair Hurd: Thank you.

Planner Fortner: Oh, I'm sorry the recommendation's on the third page, as written there.

Chair Hurd: Ok thank you. We'll start with Commissioner Kadar.

198 Commissioner Kadar: I have no comment on it, I think it's appropriate.

200 Chair Hurd: Thank you. Commissioner Silverman?

202 Commissioner Silverman: Mr. Fortner does this include practices such as independent nurse practitioners 203 and physical therapists?

Planner Fortner: Certainly, physical therapists, yes. That's the intent of this, a nurse practitioner we might be able to, it's one of those things there's so many classifications of employees, but that might be a person who works for a physician's office.

Commissioner Silverman: But you emphasize medically oriented?

Planner Fortner: Medical or physical, a physical therapist would be an example, a speech therapist would be an example, any type of therapist.

214 Commissioner Silverman: Ok, thank you.

216 Chair Hurd: Commissioner Williamson?

Commissioner Williamson: No comment on this. I do have a question whether, sometimes to refresh the zoning code you know look at the American Planning Association definitions and look for things you haven't run into yet but just an idea.

222 Planner Fortner: Thank you.

Chair Hurd: I had just a quick question sir, does this have any impact on residential home occupancy? Does this definition fall for that or is this a use that wouldn't be allowed in residential?

Planner Fortner: Something like that would be a professional, yes it would impact that, it has a professional office that has a classification that can have up to one employee as a home occupation. We would run that through the special use process if it was in the home, there would be different regulations on those.

232 Chair Hurd: Ok. But it would use the same definition?

234 Planner Fortner: Yes, certainly a physical therapist would be able to run out of their home.

Chair Hurd: Ok, thank you that's all I had. Do we have any public comment on the item? Anything submitted? Anyone present? Anyone online who wishes to speak on the item? Ok. Closing public comment and bringing it back to the dais. I'm assuming there's no further comment required from the Commission. So, Secretary Kadar may we have the motion please?

Commissioner Kadar: Ok. I move that the Planning Commission recommend that City Council amend chapter 32 zoning article 2 section 32-4A Definitions by adding the following text for 32-4A 82.1. 82.1 Offices for Professional Services and Administrative activities in nonresidential districts, offices for agents, physicians, dentists, therapists, lawyers, architects, engineers, musicians, artists, teachers, optometrists, photographers, governmental offices serving the public including post offices and utility offices, copy service facilities, and other associated office functions and including sale of products customarily incidental to these services and activities.

Chair Hurd: Thank you, do I have a second?

Commissioner Silverman: I'll second.

253 Chair Hurd: Thank you. Any discussion to the motion? Seeing none we'll move to the vote. Commissioner 254 Silverman?

256 Commissioner Silverman: I vote aye.

Chair Hurd: Commissioner Williamson?

Commissioner Williamson: I vote aye for the reasons stated in the staff report.

Chair Hurd: Commissioner Kadar?

Commissioner Kadar: I vote aye.

Chair Hurd: And I vote aye for the reasons stated in the staff report. Motion carries, thank you.

5. Review and consideration of the major subdivision and special use permit to construct a 6 story 126 room hotel at the property located at 1119 South College Avenue

Chair Hurd: Alright that takes us to item 5, review and consideration of the major subdivision and special use permit to construct a 6 story 126 room hotel at the property located at 1119 South College Avenue. Acting Director Bensley will start.

Acting Director Bensley: Thank you Mr. Chair. This land use application is a major subdivision with a special use permit for the property located at 1119 South College Avenue including demolishing the existing Red Roof Inn hotel structure and constructing a 6 story, 126 room hotel with ground floor parking. An additional future commercial site is designated on the site map however this is not part of the application for this evening's hearing and will be considered separately for review in the future.

And I'm going to go over some highlights from the report and a few questions that were asked before the meeting. For zoning, this property is zoned BC or general business, and this use is allowed in this zoning district. The proposed plan does conform to the Comprehensive Plan V and will not require a comprehensive plan amendment to change that designation. The Board of Adjustment granted two variances for this property on July 19, 2018. One variance for three loading berths resulting in no loading berths being required. And a variance of 15 feet between any access driveway and any residence district resulting in a 35-foot minimum distance being required. With these variances, the proposed development meets all of the requirements detailed in the Municipal Code, Chapter 27, Subdivisions, and does not require site plan approval.

This project proposes a hotel, which is permitted in the BC district with a special use permit. The code generally limits structures in this district to a height of 3 stories and 35 feet but includes an exception allowing a hotel or motel to be erected up to 7 stories or a maximum height of 80 feet. This project is utilizing this exception in proposing to construct a 6 story 76-foot-tall hotel and parking facility. Regarding

the special use permit requirement for the hotel, there are no special requirements for a hotel other than the standard requirements for Zoning Code Section 32-78, Special Use Permits, which stipulates that the Council may issue a special use permit providing that the applicants demonstrate that the proposal will not affect adversely the health and safety of persons residing or working within the City of Newark boundaries or within 1 mile of the City of Newark boundaries and within the state of Delaware, be detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to property or improvements within the City of Newark boundaries or within one mile of the City of Newark boundaries and within the state of Delaware, and be in conflict with the purposes of the Comprehensive Development Plan of the city. While this hotel is replacing the existing hotel, the existing hotel did not have a special use permit since it was constructed in the 1960s. However, staff feels that the proposed hotel is expected to meet the special use permit requirements, particularly since that is the current use on the parcel. Regarding traffic, South College Avenue is a state owned and maintained roadway. A traffic impact study was prepared by Duffield and Associates in December of 2016. The Traffic Impact Review Study letter was issued by McCormick Taylor and accepted by DelDOT on June 23, 2017, finding the TIS to conform to DelDOT's development coordination manual. DelDOT reviewed site plans for the proposed Home 2 Suites hotel at 1119 South College Avenue and on April 28, 2022, issued a letter of no objection to recordation of the project. The plan as submitted proposes a 131-suite hotel generating 562 average daily traffic and replace it with a 126-suite hotel projected to generate 546 average daily traffic. The proposal reconfigures the site's south entrance to exclusively allow right turns in eliminating left turns into the site from Route 896 and shifting right turns out to the current Friendly's opening further north. The impact on traffic in area should therefore be minimal. The traffic impact of development on the commercial pad site will be evaluated when an application for its development is submitted and its future use is known.

Regarding parking, the proposed plan reflects shared parking with adjacent businesses, the Candlewood Suites at 1101 South College Avenue and the Friendly's at 1115 South College Avenue. The plans require 133 for the proposed hotel in addition to the 110 spaces at the Candlewood Hotel and 148 spaces at the Friendly's restaurant for a total of 291 required parking spaces between all three properties. A total of 326 parking spaces are provided across the three. In addition, a convenience store with gas pumps has been proposed on the site of the Friendly's restaurant since this application was submitted and the applicant has provided and adjusted future parking rationale at the department's request to account for that proposed use. If the convenience store with gas pumps is approved as proposed, it will have a reduced parking requirement from 48 spaces to 25 spaces and will provide 26 spaces. This reduces the number of required parking across the three properties from 326 to 268 a total of 289 parking spaces will be provided across the three properties if the convenience store with gas pumps is approved as currently proposed. The proposed plan provides, as I mentioned, the required parking in both scenarios; however, the Planning Department does recommend as part of the Subdivision Advisory comments, that a cross access agreement be required between the three parcels to memorialize the shared parking agreement.

For the recommendation, because the major subdivision plan and special use permit with the Subdivision Advisory recommended conditions should not have a negative impact on adjacent and nearby properties and because the proposed use does not conflict with the development pattern in the nearby area, the Planning and Development Department suggests that the Planning Commission take the following actions as listed in the report – to recommend to City Council that they approve the major subdivision for 1119 South College Avenue as well as to approve the special use permit for a 126-room hotel at 1119 South College Avenue. And that concludes my presentation. Thank you.

Chair Hurd: Thank you. And who is presenting for the applicant?

Commissioner Silverman: Chairman are we starting with questions?

Chair Hurd: We just have to do applicant first. We'll do that after (inaudible)

Mr. Tracey: Good Evening members of the Commission. John Tracey from Young, Conoway, Stargatt and Taylor here on behalf of the property owner and applicant. With me in Chambers is Steve Gorski, he's the project engineer from Verdantas formerly Duffield. Online watching remotely are Jeff Ivins, the project architect from Devers Architecture. Peter Bai and Mr. Patel, the property owner as well as perhaps Matt Ott who is the project manager for the project itself. And before I get into the depths of the application, which Ms. Bensley has stolen much of my thunder by saying a lot of the same things that I was planning on saying. I do want to thank the Commission again publicly for helping me to navigate a conflict that was

on my schedule this evening, a hearing in another jurisdiction that was going to be starting at the same time as I explained other reasons, it was too late to change the time, that did not go forward but that was the fault of nobody in this room that it did not move forward.

As is their usual fashion, the department has prepared an incredibly thorough overview of the project that I know has been available for your review for some time. And I will obviously try not to read from the record, read verbatim from that 144-page report but I will probably be touching on some of the highlights. I will also note this project is somewhat, for lack of a better term, less complicated than projects than I think the Commission is used to hearing. As things such as a Comprehensive Plan amendment, or rezoning, or site plan approval, or a parking waiver are not a part of this application. As you heard Mrs. Bensley note we only need two approvals: major subdivision approval as well as Special Use permit. Moving onto the slide show, if we could have the first slide there...

This gives you an aerial of the property in question, the Red Roof Inn is this big "L" shaped type structure that you see there. It is a three story and two-story structure depending on where you are looking at it from. It was also formerly the Howard Johnson's. Friendly's that you heard reference to earlier is this property right here. That is currently closed and is not a part of my client's property, but I am aware that an application was recently filed for development of that property, but that's not part of this application. This is the Jersey Mike's Subs which is here just for reference and then you also have the Candlewood Suites hotel which is also 6 stories high on the left side of the property. This property is zoned BC as you heard, and all of these uses are permitted with the zoning district.

The next slide gives you some current aerial photographs of the property, again I think it is a property that most are familiar with. As you could see this is the old school model of a motor lodge, it was typical in the 1960s, if you ever made some trips up and down I-95 to Florida like I did then you probably stayed in some places that look like this. It's all open with all rooms accessed through external doors. As I mentioned it three stories on the front portion of the hotel and then two stories as you get to the rear and that is because as you can see, is because of the slope of the property. The property itself is accessed by both Route 896 and as well as Welsh Tract Road. And as the department noted, access flows across all of these properties currently. The hotel in the past has been the source of some issues for the city, the Red Roof Inn, previously the Howard Johnson's, as most know has been at this location for the past 60 years and is what I refer to in the past as a transient hotel, again representing the era of highway hotels where folks typically stopped one way north or south or perhaps visiting someone at the University of Delaware. As a result, its clientele, like its use, is transient. Due to the large size, the external access to the rooms, and significant blind areas from the existing construction of the building there is no requirement for guests after checking in to go by a front desk, they can then go back and forth directly to their rooms and visitors can access the rooms without having to go through the front desk as well which again has led to the aforementioned issues.

The next slide shows where the proposed construction is taking place, you can see this cross hatched and "X" ed area is where the construction on the site is going to take. As you heard we are going to be removing the entirety of the nearly 137,000 square foot building as well as substantial amounts of paving associated with parking, walkways and entrances to be reconstructed as part of the new project. Over to the left is the access I mentioned to Welsh Tract Road which is not being touched as a result of this application. To the bottom, you can see the access points off of 896. This one to the right, I guess I'll call that the southernmost is a full entrance and exit, rights in rights out. As well as a rights out over here on the Friendly's property. Off camera, you see this is 896 in front of you — if you're heading south on 896 currently, you can make both a left turn into the property as well as a U turn at this location.

The next slide is the site plan for this project, as you heard in the place of a roughly 131 room hotel, we're proposing a 126 room Home 2 Suites hotel which is a Hilton project. The overall square footage of the building is 74,000 square feet or just over half the square footage of the current Red Roof Inn. The first floor as you heard will be primarily underground parking or under building parking and you can see the access to that over here running through the building while the second floor will be the lobby largely with amenities and a few rooms as well. Floors 3 through 6 are almost exclusively hotel rooms. Access to the hotel with the exception of the front door into the lobby and the elevators from the parking to the lobby will be exclusively through card key access so there won't be free access around the hotel, there won't be free access into the rooms, folks will have to go by the front desk, and they will have to have a room card to get up into the elevator. And the elevators themselves will be controlled by keycards as well. This also

shows additional landscaping that's being added to the site as well as a new stormwater facility that's going to be included on the property. You can see on the bottom the realigned entrances that I referenced earlier. This entrance right here which was the subject of the variance you heard Ms. Bensley talk about is actually 10 feet further away from the neighboring properties then the old access point used to be and again it provides only a right turn into the property as I mentioned. What you did see previously down here on 896 will no longer allow a left turn into the property that was per DelDOT's review. But it will still permit U turns to be made from that location. As noted by Ms. Bensley, this was reviewed by a TIS that was a larger project at the time both a hotel on the property as well as a convenience store with gas pumps, this project has been revised into phases. So we're moving forward with the first aspect of it which is the hotel but there is no current plan for this future development piece that you see here. It's obviously something that can be developed in the future, but it is not something that is in front of the Commission today.

The Friendly's as you heard earlier has been the subject of the newly submitted plan of a convenience store with gas pumps. Again, that is not part of this application that is going to be considered separately if and when it gets to the point of being considered by the Planning Commission and Council. But again, neither of those two potential development options, this development option nor the development of the Friendly's site is in front of the Commission this evening and each will be, as I mentioned, required to submit their plans ultimately to the City for review and approval.

The next slide, or I think there are two slides actually, are the architectural renderings of the property. This is the property as you look in from 896. As you can see, it's 6 stories from 896 similar to the Candlewood Suites. Next, you're looking at it from Cooches Bridge Road and this will be largely 5 stories on the Cooches Bridge Road side again due to the slope of the property. There's no variance or special relief that's required for the height. The code has a requirement for the height if you want to go up to 7 stories is dictated by a ratio of the square footage of the property versus the overall acreage of the property and we are well below the threshold that allows us by right to go to the height that you're seeing here. We also have just after this a couple of the schematic renderings of the height that you can see this is looking at it in the front and the rear and on the next slide is looking at it from, well if we could go back to that slide for just a second? One thing I forgot to mention is along the rear of the property there will be an external patio which will be behind masonry walls; it will not be out in the open. There's also going to be a pool, that pool is an entirely indoor pool, it's not an outdoor pool.

As was mentioned we need two pieces of relief as part of this application, the first is Major Subdivision plan approval as Ms. Bensley noted and the department's report notes we comply with all aspects of the city code and the building code, and we will be compelled to comply with all aspects of the building code when we submit the building permits. So that I believe all aspects for Major subdivision approval have been met for this project. The project also requires a special use permit to permit the construction of the hotel on this property, of course it should not go unnoted that there is already a hotel on this property that's essentially being swapped one for one for this hotel. It'll be a smaller building as I said just a little over half the square footage and roughly 5 to 6 fewer rooms than are currently in the Red Roof Inn. But the standards are it will not adversely affect the health and safety of people in an around Newark, it will not be detrimental to the public welfare, or injurious to property and will not be in conflict with the Comprehensive Plan and again we believe that this meets all of those requirements. The project should have no adverse impact on either surrounding properties, visitors or residents of the city of Newark. Indeed, we think this will be a benefit of those coming to Newark by eliminating a tired and at times problematic hotel that was open on all sides for guests and visitors alike to a fully enclosed more modern hotel with a controlled entrance providing short term and long term stays for those coming to visit or work in Newark. In addition, as I mentioned the entrance to the property was revised to meet with DelDOT's requirements as we could and also to control the ingress and egress of the property and eliminate as I mentioned the left turn movement off of 896 into the property. Finally, as you heard Ms. Bensley mention in the third aspect of the standard for a special use permit is this is consistent with the Comprehensive Development Plan V, it's a permitted use in the zoning district, in fact Comprehensive Plan V promotes the redevelopment of commercial properties along the 896 corridor which certainly this clearly does. And again, no new uses are proposed by this plan, no new operation is proposed by this plan. It's simply taking the old L shape Red Roof Inn and replacing it with a new hotel therefore not increasing the burden on the use on the property while as I mentioned still getting benefits such as stormwater management, and a fully enclosed hotel. So, with that...

Chair Hurd: Alright thank you. We will begin with Commissioner Williamson.

Commissioner Williamson: Thank you Mr. Chair thank you. I have a series of questions...one thought before I start with some specifics you know I recently drove across the country and certainly you see these 5 or 6 story hotels almost on every intersection on every interstate. I guess that is the norm now throughout the country and the reason is security and other reasons that make sense. They are large boxes with many windows, and I haven't seen spectacular architecture yet, but it is what it is right?

Mr. Tracey: Yeah, I think you hinted at it, it's the way that it's been moving, I mean we all me included in the 70s and driving back and forth from Florida. Staying in places like Santi, South Carolina when you had nothing but these two three story open access hotels. And you do find we are moving away from it. And this hotel has struggled with some of the issues that come with having an open hotel. So that's one of the benefits of eliminating that.

Commissioner Williamson: So, I'll just go to some questions I had jotted down. Will this hotel be pet friendly and the reason is if it is then there's a nuisance factor outside which could also affect water quality runoff if there's not doggie stations or something?

Mr. Tracey: I will answer the question as best I can, and I can follow up. I know the Home 2 Suites brand advertises itself as pet friendly, so I would presume that this would be pet friendly. I would also presume with the national standards of these brands that they would have to have the necessary areas or the appropriate places in place to deal with the issue that you're raising.

Commissioner Williamson: The obvious issue, I'm a cat owner so there's only so much I can relate to. The pad site which remain undeveloped for a while, I'm assuming that will have some sort of vegetation coverage, grass or? You don't want erosion and such?

Mr. Tracey: I'll let the engineer answer that. I mean that's what it appears to be on the plan, but I want him to go ahead and answer that question. So, this will be Steve Gorski from Verdantas.

Mr. Gorski: Yeah, I guess John already mentioned that site is a clean slate we don't know what's going in there but there would be landscape islands associated with parking bays or foundation stabilizers.

Commissioner Williamson: And is that a city requirement? That a lot be vegetated? I don't know if that's a Code Enforcement issue, that all lots have to have vegetation for runoff and wind and erosion.

Acting Director Bensley: So, there are requirements around stormwater runoff and being able to comply with the restrictions that the state code requires I believe a 15% reduction in stormwater runoff for sites such as these that are being redeveloped and did not have stormwater management prior to that. So that would be part of the stormwater facility that has been added there. Additionally, we do have rules regarding open space around that. In BC those are, and I'm going to have to look up the exact percentage, but our Parks and Recreation department manages the review portion of the project in regard to open space and landscaping requirements. And they have had their comments included in here which have been accepted by the developer.

Mr. Gorski: And I can add to that, yes it will be stabilized until a development plan comes in for that.

Commissioner Williamson: Ok. The bioretention area next to it, is that fenced off or open? Mr. Tracey: I don't think we're proposing it to be fenced off the bioretention, it's mostly going to be a dry facility it's not going to be a wet pond or anything like that. It's an infiltration facility and Steve I'm looking to you if it'll be fenced or not? It's not proposed to be fenced.

Commissioner Williamson: The reason I ask is, well it rains here a lot, and you get the runoff from the pavement of course will go into that and that grass for a while could be a little bit nasty and you've got to clean it every now and then. And it is one of the green areas I'm getting to outside areas for kids or walking dogs and the large lot, that's going to be an attractive place to maybe walk right? Or the retention area. And just asking whether or not that's an issue to consider; the water quality, people walk on it, or kids touch it or something like that.

Mr. Tracey: We don't believe it will be an issue but it's obviously something we're aware of and can take a look at. And if there's a need for something you know a lot of times you see these facilities have little signs on them that say, "this is a bioretention area, don't go in there" and I don't think that what you see as the bioretention area will necessarily be something that people will want to walk on because it'll be indented for purposes of drainage. But again, with the larger piece, the future development piece, if need be, we can obviously take steps to close that off.

Commissioner Williamson: It could be a liability for your own operations. Do these hotels attract tractor trailer trucks or overnighters?

Mr. Tracey: The old hotel did. I do not believe that is the target audience for this hotel. The old hotel because again of the type of hotel it was you would have trucks coming in there. That is not the target audience for this hotel. And the rooms candidly would not be at the rate that you might want to enjoy if you were a trucker so to speak.

Commissioner Williamson: But you can't really deny someone that drove in. I mean if a truck came off of 95 it conceivably could go in here.

Mr. Tracey: It could, yes.

Commissioner Williamson: How would it park; I mean what would it do?

Mr. Tracey: It would be right now it's a wide-open site I mean I think we've all seen, and I don't know if this has happened on the Friendly's site as well since it's closed. I mean truckers tend to find an opportunity where they can pull over and perhaps grab sleep without having to go into a facility. But obviously this would be policed as a Hilton property as opposed to what the Red Roof Inn property is, that's not the target audience of this hotel, it's a completely different clientele.

Commissioner Williamson: If a truck showed up and it's idling outside the office can you turn them away because you have a vehicle you can't park is that?

Mr. Tracey: Honestly, I don't know the answer to that question.

Commissioner Williamson: Because it could block many parking spaces.

Mr. Tracey: I don't know if the owner wants to raise their hand and comment on that particular question or certainly again this is something we can follow up with. But again, this is not you know the Red Roof Inn for better or worse became that type of facility, but I think it's in part also the rates were just what folks were looking for and this is going to be a different type of facility.

Commissioner Williamson: Ok. The trash pickup in the rear, I can't tell if that's roofed and secured?

Mr. Tracey: It's an enclosure, it's not an open pad it's a full dumpster enclosure.

Commissioner Williamson: Ok, and let's see, the owner owns the Candlewood as well?

Mr. Tracey: Correct.

Commissioner Williamson: I go to the Jersey Mike's and it's kind of a concrete desert.

Mr. Tracey: It is its own property.

Commissioner Williamson: I know it's another property, that used to be a gas station I believe?

Mr. Tracey: Yes, it did.

Commissioner Williamson: Just would be nice if the several owners could get together and dress up a little bit there. Because it's kind of, it would be a nice complete area if you could get everyone to work together.

Mr. Tracey: There might be some, I don't know I haven't seen the plans, but it would not surprise me knowing as I do how certain of the high-end convenience stores are if that proceeds on the Friendly's site you might see some at least over on that side of the property.

Commissioner Williamson: Oh, and will the under-story parking will that have security gates at each end?

Mr. Tracey: It's not planned to have security gates at each end, but the police department has asked for security cameras and again the elevator there that would access the hotel would only go to the lobby, it would not go to the upper floors where the rooms are.

Commissioner Williamson: Thank you, those are all my questions.

Chair Hurd: Thank you. Commissioner Kadar?

Commissioner Kadar: Ok, just a few questions. First of all, on one of the first paragraphs that defines the project, it says that the project is "an extended stay hotel". What does that mean?

Mr. Tracey: It's like if you stayed in a Cambrio which is one of the ones I've stayed in, they're standard hotel rooms, but they include inside a kitchen facility so if you wanted to cook you could cook in there so you could stay there for one night or a week. It's more of the business travelers coming in for instance perhaps working at the STAR Campus or doing something else that will be here more than a day that don't want to have to go out to a restaurant every night.

Commissioner Kadar: Is there a maximum limit?

Mr. Tracey: I believe the city code regulates a maximum limit for stays. I believe it's 30 days.

Commissioner Kadar: Mr. Solicitor?

Solicitor Bilodeau: Yeah, I believe that's right we were having a problem with that over Covid with people staying over 30 days and so yeah there is that in the code.

Commissioner Kadar: Ok, so that would kind of make sure that it wouldn't turn into student housing with maid service.

Mr. Tracey: Oh no no no, the only time my understanding is that you see students in hotels is when and this Commission probably knows better than I, when a developer is unable to complete promised housing in time. And so, they have to find places for students to stay, but that's not what this would be targeted to. Again, and the Candlewood is also a suites hotel, so it has the same ability. And I've stayed when we go to Washington DC to visit my kids, we stay in a Cambrio it's basically the same thing it has a little kitchenette in addition to the bedroom.

Commissioner Kadar: Ok, thank you for that. Now one other observation maybe. I've gone through the Subdivision Advisory Committee letters that were dated April 1st and July 5th if you want to follow along it's Exhibit F one through ten and F twenty-seven through thirty-four. Your responses came back on May 2nd and July 8th F36 and F38-44. Now as I go through them, I see several recommendations from the Subdivision Advisory Committee and the responses from you are "Noted" and "Understood". Are you prepared to go on record to say that when you say "noted" and "understood" you are in fact committing to complying with the recommendation and doing what is recommended?

Mr. Tracey: Can you give me an example; I mean my answer prior to checking is yes but just to get an example. Oftentimes when we get these comments, they aren't necessarily asking for a response they just say you have to do this, and you say "noted" because you know you have to do this. It's not a way to beat around the bush so to speak.

Commissioner Kadar: Ok, it's F13 to F26. Ok...

Mr. Tracey: I'm just looking through these notes added to the plan as required...

649 Commissioner Kadar: On page F16, recommendation 15, no 14. "Individual electric meters will be required 650 for each commercial unit and all meters must be grouped in one location and keys must be provided to 651 access the electric meter room if meters are inside-noted"

652

653 Mr. Tracey: Yeah, that means we understand, and it will be provided with the CMP and then as you look 654 down there-

655

656 Commissioner Kadar: Recommendation 15, understood. Recommendation 16 understood. 657 Recommendation 17 understood. So that means we agree and will comply.

658

659 Mr. Tracey: We are aware of our obligation, and we will be complying with our obligation.

660

661 Commissioner Kadar: Ok, that's what I wanted to hear you say.

662

Mr. Tracey: Yeah, it's shorthand that you see on a lot of these-

664

Commissioner Kadar: No, I understand, but the definition, well ever since what is the definition of "is" right? Noted and understood do not mean accepted and we will comply.

666 667

668 Mr. Tracey: Noted.

669

670 Commissioner Kadar: Alright that's all I have thank you.

671

672 Chair Hurd: Thank you, Commissioner Silverman?

673

- 674 Commissioner Silverman: I'm going to have a number of questions that range across a number of topics.
- And I will try to go from the broad picture to the specifics. The data column references parcel A and parcel
- B, I cannot find a parcel A and parcel B on your drawings.

677

678 Mr. Tracey: Ones the Candlewood, I'm looking over at Steve here I know he wants to respond. One is the 679 Candlewood, and the other is the new hotel I can't tell you as I'm standing here but.

680

Commissioner Silverman: That's what I assumed. They're under management of the SSN is that correct?

682

683 Mr. Tracey: Correct.

684

685 Commissioner Silverman: So, we do have two parcels that are referred to in the parking rationale. So that needs to be clarified on the plan.

687

688 Mr. Tracey: Take your notes.

689 690

691

692 693

694

Commissioner Silverman: It may be visible on the exhibit you have, but there is a very odd shaped parcel for 1101 South College Avenue, Candlewood Suites. Is there any reason that you're maintaining that configuration when you have the opportunity to reconfigure parcel lines? I can understand the two parcels for business purposes, mortgage takedown lines, investment lines, but as I see it right now there appears to be a projection from the front of the building that goes across a property line.

695 696

Mr. Tracey: We saw that. I saw that, it will be addressed; that will not be left there assuming the parcel lines remain. The parcel lines were put into place originally for all of the financing that was associated with the construction of the Candlewood Suites so that the entire parcel wouldn't be encumbered just a portion. I can't tell you what the status of that obligation is.

698 699 700

697

Commissioner Silverman: Ok, but this would be a great opportunity to clean up all of those parcel lines if you can imagine an old-fashioned key across.

701 702

703 Mr. Tracey: I see exactly what you're talking about.

704

705 Commissioner Silverman: Ok.

Mr. Tracey: And I don't remember as I sit here today why it was done that way. That was done back in I think 2015 or 2016 I don't recall why it was done that way.

Commissioner Silverman: In both the, moving onto the next question. In both the variance application and in your presentation tonight, you spoke about an existing cross access agreement. Do we have documentation on that?

Mr. Tracey: There should be, it's referenced on the Candlewood plans and a note on the Candlewood plans, and we can obviously submit it as well but there was a cross access and stormwater easement that was done back in 2012 or 2013.

Commissioner Silverman: For parcel A and parcel B?

Mr. Tracey: And there's three parcels as part of it, it was actually before parcel A and parcel B were subdivided. So, they were one parcel and the Friendly's was another parcel.

723 Commissioner Silverman: Ok, and currently Friendly's is owned by others?

Mr. Tracey: Yes, it's never been owned by us. RRC or something like that is I think the name of it?

Commissioner Silverman: Ok. That brings me to my next point. I notice on the cover sheet drawings that your drawing shows what appear to be, assuming the heavy lines represent improvement, that there are improvements for 1115 South College, the Friendly's property. You're improving somebody else's property, but we can't talk about improvements you're going to make tonight because it's not part of this application. What's happening (inaudible)?

Mr. Tracey: Well, no what you see highlighted in color there to the left of the exit is on the Friendly's site. That's the improvement that's proposed.

Commissioner Silverman: And I'm going to take us right to that improvement. One of the recommendations I'm going to make as an amendment to the proposal from the department is that the common property line between 1115 South College Avenue and 1119 South College Avenue become a denial of access strip that extends from the public right away 896 in an easterly direction to the rear of the 1115 South College Avenue property, that there be no direct access or crosslink near the 896 rights in and rights out. I think this site is busy enough. Particularly with an unknown use in the commercial pad site. That to go into the convenience center; traffic should be pulled as far away from 896 and the conflicts in and out of the entrance as possible.

Mr. Tracey: I appreciate what you're saying Mr. Silverman, this design was reviewed and approved by DelDOT, this design if you recall, could we go back one slide previously?

Commissioner Silverman: But the design is not in the DelDOT right of way. This is on private property.

Mr. Tracey: No, but part of it was also reconfiguring the access into the Friendly's parcel previously you can kind of see on the left side of the, so you can see over here, this used to run straight through from the Red Roof Inn right down through this property, so you had the ingress egress over here and then you had an ingress egress over here and then you had ingress egress over here. When we went through the process with DelDOT and were reconfiguring the entrance they wanted to eliminate this ability to get out onto 896 and instead have the traffic come into the site and into this facility over here as well as having the ability to get in this way which is unrelated to our project. Any change to this would have to be something that would need to be endorsed by the neighboring property owners as well because now in addition to closing off this access point, we're also now reconfiguring the entrance over here.

Commissioner Silverman: As you clearly stated we're not dealing with a neighboring property owner; the property line is part of your property. And I believe we can condition a denial of access as part of the agreement to approve this plan and project that denial of access strip to such a point that it conducts any traffic that's in front of your site to and is going to take access through the cross-access agreements with the neighbor away from the DelDOT required entrances.

Mr. Tracey: I guess what I'll say Mr. Silverman is obviously the Commission can make that recommendation, I'm certainly in no position to speak as accepting that because I don't know what the people who own Friendly's what their reaction is going to be.

Commissioner Silverman: I understand that.

Mr. Tracey: I wanted to just state that on the record, I can't speak for that.

Commissioner Silverman: That goes without saying. Because one of the things I did was I researched the Institute of Transportation Engineers site and its material that deals with automotive trip generation by use and for the adjacent site of some 4000 plus or minus square feet of commercial space and 12 what they call "fueling spaces" literally the hoses that are involved there. The number of automobile trips per day into that site using national standards and I'm sure DelDOT has a very similar number available. For every 1000 square feet of this premier space that's proposed would create 3000 automobile trips in and out of the site each day for commercial use. And ranging from 2000 to as many as 6600 trips for the gas pump activity. That range is there because of locational factors, and I would think that a site like this on State Route 896 with 34,000 automobile trips a day right off an interchange on the interstate with 117,000 trips a day would be towards the higher end of the range of those numbers. So, there are going to be a lot of turning movements in and out of this site and I believe they're transient. They're people that are looking at their Google map reference and not where they're going. They're trying to decide if they're going to the Candlewood Suites or the suite that's subject to this property or whatever's going to be on the commercial path. So, they're not going to be paying a whole lot of attention. I thought that this was also brought to the forefront with the traffic impact study that was done. I've seen a lot of those, and this was the first one that talked about automobile collisions and pedestrian accidents and actually called that out as being a problem. And I understand that resulted in the elimination of left turns from 896 southbound into the site. But that just shows that there's a level of potential there.

 Mr. Tracey: Right and I guess as I said our plan originally had if you recall, it never made it here but it originally had a convenience store with gas pumps on our property which is not part of the application anymore but that was what the TIS evaluated and that's what DelDOT had previously approved. I don't know what the Friendly's site will have to do. I presume they will have to have some type of traffic analysis when they proceed forward with their project. I don't know what DelDOT is going to say as a result of that traffic analysis because again I'm not involved in that project and they haven't, at least to my understanding, they haven't even reached that stage. But what you saw here is the entrance that was proposed and approved when we were showing a potential convenience store with gas pumps on our property and the Friendly's was going to be a Friendly's. The swapping of that, I have no idea how that is going to impact what DelDOT will approve.

Commissioner Silverman: I agree with you and with the commercial gas pump operation on your site, you very eloquently demonstrated in your variance proposal the splitting of traffic coming into your site off the interstate with the decel lane and highways reinforced that with no left turn into the site that works on your site. But we're talking about a site that's adjacent to yours, that's going to take its access off of yours, and the kind of conflicts I believe will occur based on my experience when those decisions are taken as far away from a major traffic intersection as possible it helps to minimize both the confusion of both motor vehicle and pedestrian conflicts.

 Mr. Tracey: I mean I know you understand completely what my position is in regard to this.

Commissioner Silverman: Yes, I do, I'm just raising this, and I believe it's something for Council to consider since the Newark Police Department is the group that's going to go down there to investigate everything.

Mr. Tracey: And they did for what it's worth, they didn't have a negative comment about the entrance configuration.

Commissioner Silverman: Well, that was the other thing I was going to bring up to the acting director – I was very surprised that the Police Department did not comment on the number of incidents at this particular intersection.

Mr. Tracey: Yeah, and if you notice I don't think, and I look at Steve for corroboration I don't think we received any comments from the Fire Marshal on this either.

Commissioner Silverman: Moving on to some lesser global issues. I would like to see the square footage of the commercial site be labeled on here.

Mr. Tracey: Of the parcel?

Commissioner Silverman: Of the schematic here.

Mr. Tracey: It's just a placeholder, it may be smaller, it may be bigger, it's going to have to go through the process. We just designated an area without I think, we certainly didn't do any calculations I'm looking at Steve. It's parked I think for general commercial. Steve you've got to come up and answer.

Commissioner Silverman: Ok thank you.

Mr. Gorski: It's just a blank slate again, it's not part of this application.

Commissioner Silverman: I'm a little nervous in reviewing a project with a hole in the middle of it where I don't know what's going to happen.

Mr. Gorski: We don't know either.

Mr. Tracey: And to be fair I did actually revise that language to as it says "potential and future development" because we don't know what's going to, all it is essentially blocking off an area depending on who the user is the building could be bigger, it could be smaller it's going to be dictated as you know, largely by parking as to what can go onto the property.

Commissioner Silverman: And just to point out something that we were talking about, the police reference. The police would like a 6-foot black fence around your retention basin.

Mr. Tracey: We noticed that, and we did respond.

Commissioner Silverman: Before you agree to that, my colleagues talked about your response. We might want to make it clear that the bioretention area will not function as a wet retention pond, and not be an attractive nuisance therefore the police request for a 6-foot fence may not be...

Mr. Tracey: Correct, and I think we did respond to that comment with no fencing, and we did note in that comment that it was not going to be a wet pond, that it was going to be an infiltration facility.

Commissioner Silverman: When this parcel came up in previous discussions, I don't know whether there's anyone from the public here who will address this, but the Lloyd property and the Kimmy property had representatives speak and they were very concerned about runoff from this site being concerned by curb and storm sewers so there is no running onto their residential sites. And I assume that's going to continue. I couldn't find any details showing inverts or raised curbing, there was some discussion of fencing along there?

Mr. Tracey: There is going to be fencing along there.

Commissioner Silverman: And the same goes with light wash from floodlights and all?

Mr. Tracey: Yeah, there's comments again in the report and I think the staff report noted we gave them lighting locations and things like that. It is going to be fenced, Steve did you want to comment at all, is it still going to be raised curb along that side or has it not been fully engineered yet?

Mr. Gorski: Yeah, according to the plans it's going to be completely curbed along the basically the whole perimeter of the parking lot.

Commissioner Silverman: I studied the landscape plan, and I didn't see any curbing.

Mr. Gorski: There's a double line, there's a symbol. And it'll be more detailed during construction approval.

Acting Director Bensley: Commissioner Silverman I'd also note that the recent changes approved by Council to the Property Maintenance Code do address exterior lighting and not having it directed at other properties.

Commissioner Silverman: Ok thank you. So, we did the detail on stormwater management...the discussion about trucks on this site and I can address this to the city. Can this site be restricted for having truck parking other than delivery? Picture a trucker with a refrigerated unit running underneath your window most of the night and within a residential area. I don't know whether that can be done.

Acting Director Bensley: I will defer to the solicitor for that.

Solicitor Bilodeau: You're all looking at me. Ok well I don't know the answer 100% but I think you could restrict your customers.

899 Chair Hurd: As a private entity?

901 Solicitor Bilodeau: Yes.

Commissioner Silverman: Well, we'd be depending on the owner for that, would we be able to make this a condition of the subdivision agreement? That the only trucks permitted on the site would be for servicing the site?

Solicitor Bilodeau: Well, you need to define "trucks" what type of trucks, are you talking about 18 wheelers? I mean you could, and you could put signage up as well.

Commissioner Silverman: We could come up with a performance definition that there be no diesel running for an extended period of time which gets into the air pollution standards for the city and noise pollution standards for the city.

Solicitor Bilodeau: The idling ordinance?

916 Commissioner Silverman: Yes, there's an idling ordinance.

918 Chair Hurd: Sir, we are going to.

920 Solicitor Bilodeau: We could build something there.

Commissioner Silverman: And I have a few more comments written down here. I think that pretty much is my comments. Oh, and incidentally in spite of the criticism I am going to support this project. And on a very positive note, I think this is a prime example of how cross access agreements and shared parking work so instead of requiring 100% of the parking, your parking will be on your site, your parking is distributed in concert with others. So, it's a good example of some of the code changes we're talking about. How the cooperation can come about, and I thank you for that. And one last thing, I see my note here. I've stayed on sites very similar to this, and something that's helped me out greatly if I'm at your entrance and if we could bring that picture back up, please. And its University of Delaware homecoming weekend, and I decide I want to go back home to Baltimore, I found in similar circumstances that the property owners put up...

933 Mr. Tracey: Internal direction signs?

935 Chair Hurd: Yes.

937 Commissioner Silverman: Yes, I was trying to think of it there was a technical term for wayfinding signs.

Mr. Tracey: I think they're actually called directional.

Commissioner Silverman: Right, wayfinding signs for southbound, traffic light-controlled intersection to take me from the convenience store or the hotel back over to Welsh Tract Road and extend it so I can come out of a traffic signal-controlled intersection rather than coming out where I came in and figuring out how I'm going to get across two or three traffic lanes and the left turn lane make my U turn. So, it's not a code requirement, it's just something to look at on the site.

Mr. Tracey: We can certainly look at that.

Ommissioner Silverman: That's the end of my comments, thank you.

Mr. Tracey: Understood.

Chair Hurd: Ok thank you. I will say I'm in general approval of the hotel, I mean it's sort of a hotel kind of place. I did want to talk a little more about the entrances. Because I'm confused by what's written by DelDOT and what has sort of been talked about and what's being presented in the drawings. So, I don't know if the drawings haven't caught up or where we are. So that drawing and the rendering both show that as being a left turn in, the second entrance as being available for left turns in. And my understanding was that it was going to be a right in, right out if that was staying, correct?

Mr. Tracey: Would you care to respond to that Steve?

Mr. Gorski: Yeah, the southernmost entrance is just a right in.

Chair Hurd: Right, but the one after it, I thought was going to be right out only?

966 Mr. Gorski: There will be a right in and a right out.

Chair Hurd: So why do we need two right in entrances because the way that is now, people are going to make a U turn and left turn into there across traffic.

Mr. Gorski: That was actually the intent, that's what DelDOT preferred versus, the elimination of the left turn into the first entrance. They didn't want to negate the second access.

Chair Hurd: The way I read DelDOT's comments, they wanted the left in gone from the second entrance from either entrance, correct?

Mr. Tracey: You can't make a left in it doesn't align, so you can't make a left turn into the site that entrance.

Chair Hurd: So, by making the U turn you have to make the right turn, ok.

Mr. Tracey: You have to, you can't make it, the left turn previously and it doesn't show it well, it kind of aligns with where you see that isolated right turn in, but that's kind of where the left turn is now, and that's being closed off now so the left turn would essentially go into the island there.

Chair Hurd: I can see it. Alright so they would U turn, cross traffic and come in that way. Which still doesn't excite me, it worries me a little. I will say generally this project would have been better understood if those site plans were a little larger and went a little farther towards 95. Because a lot of this conversation was about 95 and the exit off of it and you can't see as much of that so a broader picture would have helped, I think in the discussion about the alignments of things. Because it sounded also like Mr. Tracey had said talking with DelDOT that they wanted the entrance from Friendly's to, you know, basically not be there and to not have. So, I personally would think that we get rid of that second right in right out entrance and you're using the second entrance from the Friendly's site as the getting out and now there's separation between your entrances and there's a little better instead of having everything sort of stacked up. I'm sure and we're coming in late but just sort of looking at it from this way.

Mr. Tracey: We actually went back and forth many times for about 6 years with this and it died about 4 years.

Commissioner Silverman: Oh, they fast tracked you.

Mr. Tracey: Yeah, it was a review with about four years dead zone there. But the Friendly's entrance they want to move to shift it, so it aligns with the straight shot back to the hotel site, in a better fashion (inaudible) you have to make a semi-U-turn to get around the existing Friendly's entrances now. And they also wanted the ability to get out of that second entrance for traffic flow onsite trucks coming and going. For instance, the trucks that come into pump gas pumps. At that time there was a concrete pad with the fill tanks right there so the truck could come in and go out without too much issue.

Chair Hurd: I got you.

Mr. Tracey: That's kind of (inaudible) from that but it still serves a purpose.

Chair Hurd: Because it seems like from the conversations that DelDOT was kind of saying that this entrance based on one sort of use, that use is now not you know there, and it may not come back so you know is that entrance still the best entrance for the hotel or is the hotel better served by the long right turn in something further down and then exiting on Welsh Tract and not having that entrance so close. That's just sort of my, and I don't know if you remember the Springhill Suites, we had some issues about how they had originally configured their entrances in that conversation at that intersection.

Mr. Tracey: And to be fair as I mentioned, I don't know whether DelDOT's review on what will ultimately happen on the Friendly's site they may have made some suggestions but again I don't know. I'm not involved in that project, and I can't comment on any discussions that they've had. I know again as I said they see this entrance design and my understanding was that the sketch plan was submitted to the city shows this entrance design.

Chair Hurd: Obviously we can't control this, but it would be lovely to look at this more holistically and go alright we have this collection of 4 or 5 things, let's have a logical entrance, exit, through way, through traffic, make it make sense instead of hodge podge is the word I would use.

Mr. Tracey: Yeah, and to my knowledge nothing's happening on the Jersey Mike's sub shop site so you're safe so that's not part of this and isn't controlled by either of the two owners that we've been referencing.

Chair Hurd: I will echo the concern about the property lines in your projection there because certainly here you've got something in the other property.

Mr. Tracey: As I said that will be corrected.

Chair Hurd: Yeah, so that's going to be a problem. I think that was it, otherwise I think the hotel makes sense, I think this location makes sense working with the grade. I guess when you were working with this you had something in mind for that sort of pad closer to 896 and that's why the hotel didn't go there.

Mr. Tracey: Correct, the logical place for the hotel was in where the bulk of the Red Roof Inn section was. Chair Hurd: Ok. I believe that is my comment. Thank you. We will move now to public comment, Katie have we had any public comment submitted online or?

Ms. Dinsmore: Online no Mr. Chairman but we do have someone present that would like to speak.

Chair Hurd: Ok, thank you then we'll move to public comment in the chamber. Just please identify yourself at the microphone this one here. You just need to come to this microphone and identify yourself for the record.

Mr. Gaines: I wasn't going to say one solitary thing, I have to commend you guys first of all, I'm a resident of Old Cooches Bridge Road-

Chair Hurd: Sorry sir, could I have your name for the record? Thank you.

Mr. Gaines: Donald Gaines. I'm a 47-year resident of Old Cooches Bridge Road, I live right behind this project. And you guys make me feel like you're my neighbors, but I don't recognize any of you. I really do appreciate how knowledgeable you have been, and I don't say that lightly; in terms of what's going on with this particular project, I feel sorry for you guys that is because what you're trying to do is to change

the culture of this hotel as a result of building a new hotel and that's yet to be seen, as to whether or not you can change the culture. The culture has not been good at all as you guys know, the police know me personally, they're there 5 times a day sometimes and even more than that at night. So, you have summed it up in terms of the kinds of things that we have been dealing with. I would appreciate it if you would put the map back up there that shows the building because one of the things that has been happening is that no attention has been given to the neighbors who live in the neighborhood. All the attention has been given to the building. We understand as neighbors that there was nothing that was going to be rebuilt here with the exception of a hotel. So, we've accepted that fact and we were happy to hear that an upgrade hotel was going to be built and at the same time this has been in some form three years now. We all up and down 896 are suffering from the same kind of thing, and that is vouchers have been given to people to be residents of this hotel. So, on the one hand we're on a balancing act here. The attorney general doesn't like the idea of enforcing the law like it should be enforced so that puts our police department at a particular disadvantage. And at the same time, we as the citizens who live, who pay our taxes every single solitary day, are just being disregarded.

This tree line that you have in the back of the hotel here affects me directly. And we've brought this up. People come and go from this hotel, I don't know how they do it, but everybody's got a dog. Everybody's got a dog, 8 or 9 people living in one room but they've got a dog. And the dogs walk up and down, and I'm a lawn guy. And so, to come across the street and crap on your lawn or pretend your lawn is their lawn is a daily kind of experience which just keeps something going all the time. So, I appreciate the fact. One of the meetings I attended a while back was that they were going to do something behind this hotel, a tree line, we talked about a fence, they talked about a couple of things. And I think the answer was pretty similar to the answer that you gave, it was noted but nothing has happened. So, one of the things I'm most concerned about is that what's going to happen behind the hotel that separates the hotel from the residents on Old Cooches Bridge Road? Something more concrete than some bushes. You're talking about putting a parking area underneath the hotel, and I like that idea because people can't climb in and out of the windows in the back like they do right now. And at the same time someone was asking, and I get it out of term, there is an ordinance as a matter of fact I've got it posted on my wall in my garage, for trucks that idle. And the hotel hasn't followed too many rules, but they have followed that rule if a truck is out there idling and I've called the police, they've got to move right away. A comment that one of you made with what do you do with trucks that end up coming, you can't control who's actually going to come, but there should be a designated area for trucks to go just in case trucks do show up in your parking lot. There should be a designated area where they end up having to go.

I heard some comment about fencing. There is a fence on the south side which is made of plastic, and what happens is that the cars back up to the fence and put a hole in the fence and the fence is halfway down most of the time. So, any barriers that you're talking about putting around here, as fencing, it needs to be substantial fencing, not just fencing that's going to be (inaudible) it needs to be something substantial. I think that part of changing the culture of your hotel has got to be extending also to your neighbors. Howard Johnson was one of the best neighbors we ever had. One of the best neighbors we ever had; they took care of the property, we didn't have the kind of police interference like we're having right now, so any things that you guys can think of that you can use that lends itself not just to the hotel property, but to the neighbors who live along Old Cooches Bridge Road will probably get you a long way to changing the culture.

I had a number of other things that I wanted to mention, but you guys have done such a good job, that I really feel like I better get to know my neighbors a little bit better. Thank you so much.

Chair Hurd: Thank you sir. Is there anyone online that wishes to comment?

Ms. Dinsmore: No Chairman.

Chair Hurd: Alright, seeing none we're closing public comment. And bringing it back for the last round. So, we'll start with Commissioner Kadar, any follow up questions or comments?

Commissioner Kadar: I have none.

1118 Chair Hurd: Ok, Commissioner Silverman?

1120 Commissioner Silverman: I have none.

Chair Hurd: Thank you, Commissioner Williamson?

1124 Commissioner Williamson: None from me.

Chair Hurd: Ok, I'll just add I think dialogue with the neighbors about what kind of separation and security they're looking for along that, especially that common property line on the south side I think will go a long way. I don't know how feasible it is to secure it from Cooches Bridge Road because that's a little more transparent and such, but I think certainly something durable and such. And I know there's great issues there as well, that and the runoff is just sort of coming together. Ok. Alright if there are no further comment I think we are ready to move to the motion. Secretary Kadar?

Commissioner Kadar: Because it fully complies with the subdivision ordinances, the building code, the zoning code, and all other applicable ordinances of the city and the laws and regulations of the state of Delaware the Planning Commission recommends that City Council approve the 1119 South College Avenue major subdivision as shown on the Duffield Associates record Major Subdivision Plan and Special Use Permit site plan for 1119 South College Avenue dated December 22nd, 2021 and revised through July 27th, 2022 with the Subdivision Advisory Committee conditions as described in the July 26th, 2022 Planning and Development report.

Chair Hurd: Thank you, do I have a second?

Commissioner Williamson: I'll second.

Chair Hurd: Thank you. Any discussion to the motion?

Commissioner Silverman: I'd like to propose an amendment.

Chair Hurd: Ok, may I have your amendment, yes what is the amendment.

Commissioner Silverman: There's a reference to the site plan as submitted. I'd like to propose an amendment that in addition to the site plan as submitted that the southerly property line connecting 1115 South College Avenue and 1119 South College Avenue where there are current cross access agreements to the property formerly known as Friendly's restaurant, a denial of access be established on that property line to such a point extending from the public right away and the property line at South College Avenue 896 in a generally easterly direction toward the rear of the Friendly's property to a point where traffic crossing from the subject property into 1115 South College can take access beyond that, denial of access line.

Chair Hurd: Ok. Do I have a second? Commissioner Kadar: Second.

Chair Hurd: Alright thank you, any discussion to the motion?

Commissioner Williamson: With all due respect I would not support that, you know it's gone through a process of good transportation people and my experience is they usually know more than we do, with all due respect. And even if, keep in mind when that Friendly's project comes through review, if they build these curves and gutters and so forth, they could all get torn out again because of what Friendly's is doing and it'll just happen. I mean not likely, but it could happen to make it work. So, I think we're ok in a sense, I trust the process. That's my point.

Chair Hurd: Ok, so moving to the vote, Commissioner Kadar on the amendment.

1174 Commissioner Kadar: On the amendment?

1176 Chair Hurd: Yes.

1178 Commissioner Kadar: Nay.

1179	
1180	Chair Hurd: Thank you, Commissioner Silverman?
1181	
1182	Commissioner Silverman: Aye.
1183	
1184	Chair Hurd: Ok, Commissioner Williamson?
1185	
1186	Commissioner Williamson: No.
1187	
1188	Chair Hurd: And I am no as well, so the amendment fails. Returning to the original motion, any further
1189	discussion or amendments to the motion? Ok seeing none we'll move to the vote. Commissioner
1190	Silverman?
1191	
1192	Commissioner Silverman: Aye. For the reasons stated in the Director's report.
1193	
1194	Chair Hurd: Thank you, Commissioner Williamson?
1195	
1196	Commissioner Willaimson: Aye for the reasons in the staff report and presented at the hearing.
1197	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
1198	Chair Hurd: Thank you. Commissioner Kadar?
1199	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
1200	Commissioner Kadar: Aye for the reasons for the reasons stated in the Planning and Development
1201	department report dated July 26 th , 2022.
1202	
1203	Chair Hurd: Thank you. And I vote aye as well for the reasons stated in the report and as presented at the
1204	meeting. Alright motion carries. Letter B?
1205	
1206	Commissioner Kadar: Because the proposed use does not adversely affect health and safety, is not
1207	detrimental to the public welfare, and is not in conflict with the purposes of the Comprehensive
1208	Development Plan, the Planning Commission recommends that City Council approve the 1119 South
1209	College Avenue special use permit for a 126 room hotel as shown on the Duffield Associates record
1210	Major Subdivision Plan and Special Use Permit site plan for 1119 South College Avenue dated December
1211	22 nd , 2021 and revised through July 27 th , 2022 with the Subdivision Advisory Committee conditions as
1212	described in the July 26 th , 2022 Planning and Development report.
1213	
1214	
	Chair Hurd: Thank you, do I have a second?
1215	Chair Hurd: Thank you, do I have a second?
1215 1216	Chair Hurd: Thank you, do I have a second? Commissioner Silverman: I'll second.
1216	
1216 1217	Commissioner Silverman: I'll second.
1216 1217 1218 1219	Commissioner Silverman: I'll second. Chair Hurd: Thank you, any discussion to the motion? Alright seeing none we'll move to the vote. Commissioner Williamson?
1216 1217 1218 1219 1220	Commissioner Silverman: I'll second. Chair Hurd: Thank you, any discussion to the motion? Alright seeing none we'll move to the vote.
1216 1217 1218 1219 1220 1221	Commissioner Silverman: I'll second. Chair Hurd: Thank you, any discussion to the motion? Alright seeing none we'll move to the vote. Commissioner Williamson? Commissioner Williamson: Aye for reasons in the staff report and presented in the hearing.
1216 1217 1218 1219 1220 1221 1222	Commissioner Silverman: I'll second. Chair Hurd: Thank you, any discussion to the motion? Alright seeing none we'll move to the vote. Commissioner Williamson?
1216 1217 1218 1219 1220 1221 1222 1223	Commissioner Silverman: I'll second. Chair Hurd: Thank you, any discussion to the motion? Alright seeing none we'll move to the vote. Commissioner Williamson? Commissioner Williamson: Aye for reasons in the staff report and presented in the hearing. Chair Hurd: Thank you. Commissioner Kadar?
1216 1217 1218 1219 1220 1221 1222 1223 1224	Commissioner Silverman: I'll second. Chair Hurd: Thank you, any discussion to the motion? Alright seeing none we'll move to the vote. Commissioner Williamson? Commissioner Williamson: Aye for reasons in the staff report and presented in the hearing. Chair Hurd: Thank you. Commissioner Kadar? Commissioner Kadar: Aye for the reasons stated in the July 26 th , 2022, Planning and Development
1216 1217 1218 1219 1220 1221 1222 1223 1224 1225	Commissioner Silverman: I'll second. Chair Hurd: Thank you, any discussion to the motion? Alright seeing none we'll move to the vote. Commissioner Williamson? Commissioner Williamson: Aye for reasons in the staff report and presented in the hearing. Chair Hurd: Thank you. Commissioner Kadar?
1216 1217 1218 1219 1220 1221 1222 1223 1224 1225 1226	Commissioner Silverman: I'll second. Chair Hurd: Thank you, any discussion to the motion? Alright seeing none we'll move to the vote. Commissioner Williamson? Commissioner Williamson: Aye for reasons in the staff report and presented in the hearing. Chair Hurd: Thank you. Commissioner Kadar? Commissioner Kadar: Aye for the reasons stated in the July 26 th , 2022, Planning and Development department report.
1216 1217 1218 1219 1220 1221 1222 1223 1224 1225 1226 1227	Commissioner Silverman: I'll second. Chair Hurd: Thank you, any discussion to the motion? Alright seeing none we'll move to the vote. Commissioner Williamson? Commissioner Williamson: Aye for reasons in the staff report and presented in the hearing. Chair Hurd: Thank you. Commissioner Kadar? Commissioner Kadar: Aye for the reasons stated in the July 26 th , 2022, Planning and Development
1216 1217 1218 1219 1220 1221 1222 1223 1224 1225 1226 1227 1228	Commissioner Silverman: I'll second. Chair Hurd: Thank you, any discussion to the motion? Alright seeing none we'll move to the vote. Commissioner Williamson? Commissioner Williamson: Aye for reasons in the staff report and presented in the hearing. Chair Hurd: Thank you. Commissioner Kadar? Commissioner Kadar: Aye for the reasons stated in the July 26 th , 2022, Planning and Development department report. Chair Hurd: Thank you, Commissioner Silverman?
1216 1217 1218 1219 1220 1221 1222 1223 1224 1225 1226 1227 1228 1229	Commissioner Silverman: I'll second. Chair Hurd: Thank you, any discussion to the motion? Alright seeing none we'll move to the vote. Commissioner Williamson? Commissioner Williamson: Aye for reasons in the staff report and presented in the hearing. Chair Hurd: Thank you. Commissioner Kadar? Commissioner Kadar: Aye for the reasons stated in the July 26 th , 2022, Planning and Development department report.
1216 1217 1218 1219 1220 1221 1222 1223 1224 1225 1226 1227 1228	Commissioner Silverman: I'll second. Chair Hurd: Thank you, any discussion to the motion? Alright seeing none we'll move to the vote. Commissioner Williamson? Commissioner Williamson: Aye for reasons in the staff report and presented in the hearing. Chair Hurd: Thank you. Commissioner Kadar? Commissioner Kadar: Aye for the reasons stated in the July 26 th , 2022, Planning and Development department report. Chair Hurd: Thank you, Commissioner Silverman?

6. New Business

1233 sir.

1237 Chair Hurd: Item 6, new business which is items of introduction and new items for discussion by city staff 1238 or Planning Commissioners, new items requiring public notice will be added to a future agenda. Anything 1239 on people's minds?

1240 1241

1242

Commissioner Williamson: Mr. Chair I have something. In the current edition of the Newark post dated July 29, page 3 which is free. There's a couple of interesting pieces of information. The Newark Free library received 4 million dollars and it will be building a new building. So, I will expect somehow that it will...

12431244

Chair Hurd: Does it say if it's at the same site or?

124512461247

Commissioner Williamson: At its current location on Library Avenue or if the County will seek to acquire a different site. Which makes it sound like it's a county project?

1248 1249

1250 Chair Hurd: It is a county project.

1251 1252

1253

1254

Acting Director Bensley: Yes, so in New Castle County, all libraries whether they're in a municipality or not, are managed by the county. For that particular project they are still very much in the early stages and looking into if there's an available site where they can construct something larger or if it would be more cost efficient to build an expansion or demolish and rebuild on the existing site.

125512561257

1258

1259

Commissioner Wiliamson: And then the other item on there which talks about the Bond Bill, the Bond Bill also includes millions in road projects, local projects include \$900,000 to improve South College Avenue as a gateway into Newark. Not sure where along South College but it's good news. And that's all those items.

12601261

1262 Chair Hurd: You're good? Ok.

12631264

7. General Public Comment.

1265 1266

1267

Chair Hurd: That takes us to item 7, general public comment regarding items not on the agenda but related to the work of the Planning Commission. Have we had anything submitted online or previously to the meeting?

126812691270

Ms. Dinsmore: No Chairman.

1271

1272 Chair Hurd: Is there anyone attending the meeting who wishes to make general public comments? Ok 1273 seeing none we close general public comment and having reached the end of our agenda the meeting is 1274 adjourned.

1275

Chair Hurd adjourned the meeting at 9:14 P.M.

12761277

1278 Respectfully submitted,

- 1281 Karl Kadar, Secretary
- 1282 As transcribed by Katie Dinsmore
- 1283 Planning and Development Department Administrative Professional I