

MILFORD CITY COUNCIL
MINUTES OF MEETING
December 22, 2008

A Council Meeting of Milford City Council was held in the Joseph Ronnie Rogers Council Chambers of Milford City Hall, 201 South Walnut Street, Milford, Delaware on Monday, December 22, 2008.

PRESIDING: Mayor Daniel Marabello

IN ATTENDANCE: Councilpersons Irvin Ambrose, Michael Spillane, John Workman, James Oechsler, Jr., Owen Brooks, Jr., Douglas Morrow, James Starling, Sr. and Katrina Wilson

ALSO: City Manager David Baird, Police Chief Keith Hudson and City Clerk/Recorder Terri Hudson

COUNSEL: City Solicitor Timothy Willard

Mayor Marabello called the Council Meeting to order at 8:13 p.m.

FY 2008-2009 Budget Amendments

City Manager David Baird read the following five budget amendments into record:

1. GF Capital Reserves Account 101-1110-413-70-44 in the amount of \$16,021.43 to complete contract with Dixie Construction at the Independence Commons Business Park and Tony Silicato Memorial Park.
2. Water Capital Reserves Account 202-2020-432-95-44 in the amount of \$2,206.00 to complete contract with John W. Tieder for work on the VFD project at the Tenth Street Water Plant.
3. Water Capital Reserves Account 202-2020-432-95-45 in the amount of \$3,000 to complete the contract with Curtis Engine for work associated emergency generator project at the Seabury Avenue Water Plant.
4. Municipal Street Aid Account 123-9010-431-70-45 in the amount of \$23,833.80 to complete the contract with Jerry's paving for unexpected subsurface paving that was needed in association with the paving award made by City Council in September 2008.
5. General Improvement Account 122-8510-431-70-58 in the amount of \$23,160 (60% of \$38,600 DBF contract). The remaining balance of \$15,440 (40%) will be paid for by the Community Redevelopment Fund Grant awarded to DMI.

Mr. Baird said the contract was awarded at the last council meeting though the funding source was not specified.

Mr. Ambrose explained that the general fund capital reserve account is used for business park expenses. Any money earned by sale of land or related revenues is put into this fund and used as needed.

Mr. Ambrose asked which paving award is referenced in number four. Mr. Baird explained the city had an initial contract awarded to Jerry's Paving for Fisher, Sussex and Northeast Second Street. In September, paving at city hall, Northwest Fourth Street, Williams Street and curbing work on Fisher Avenue was added.

Mr. Workman referred to the need for unexpected subsurface paving and asked for clarification. Mr. Baird explained the bid was for a simple mill and overlay of the street. Once they got into the millings, they found the subsurface wasn't acceptable which caused additional work to prevent the new road from collapsing.

Mr. Ambrose moved for approval of the five budget amendments as submitted, seconded by Mr. Oechsler. Motion carried by unanimous roll call vote.

Executive Session - Legal Advice-Potential Litigation/Preliminary Discussion-Site Acquisitions*

Mr. Oechsler moved to go into Executive Session reference legal advice regarding potential litigation and preliminary discussions regarding site acquisitions, seconded by Mr. Ambrose. Motion carried at 8:06 p.m.

Mayor Marabello recessed the Council Meeting at 8:19 p.m. to go into a closed session to obtain legal advice regarding potential litigation and preliminary discussions regarding site acquisitions.

Return to Open Session

City Council returned to Open Session at 9:26 p.m.

Kent Land Issue

City Solicitor Tim Willard announced that the matter of Kent Scrap Metal versus the City of Milford was brought before council in executive session which involved the existence and status of a non-conforming use.

Mr. Oechsler moved, seconded by Ms. Wilson, that the city solicitor withdraw the October 29, 2008 letter from the city and proceed with a resolution in the case of Kent Scrap Metal versus the City of Milford.

Mr. Willard further explained this involved a matter of urgency and their attorney is waiting for a response following the conclusion of the meeting.

The solicitor then announced there were other issues discussed in executive session that involved Hearthstone Manor and potential litigation issues raised in letters written by Hearthstone Manor's attorney which qualifies the matter to be discussed in executive session.

He concluded by stating that other matters were also discussed that involved signs related to Hearthstone Manor and recent action taken by council on the Final Hearthstone II. No formal action is required and the item will be placed on the first agenda in January.

Adjourn

Motion by Mr. Ambrose to adjourn the Council Meeting, seconded by Mr. Workman. Council meeting adjourned at 9:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Terri K. Hudson, CMC
City Clerk/Recorder

MILFORD CITY COUNCIL
MINUTES OF MEETING
December 22, 2008

The City Council of Milford met in Workshop Session on Monday, December 22, 2008 in the Joseph Ronnie Rogers Council Chambers of Milford City Hall, 201 South Walnut Street, Milford, Delaware.

PRESIDING: Mayor Daniel Marabello

IN ATTENDANCE: Councilpersons Irvin Ambrose, Michael Spillane, John Workman, James Oechsler, Jr., Owen Brooks, Jr., Douglas Morrow, James Starling, Sr. and Katrina Wilson

ALSO: City Manager David Baird, Police Chief Keith Hudson and City Clerk/Recorder Terri Hudson

COUNSEL: City Solicitor Timothy Willard

Mayor Marabello convened the Workshop Session of City Council at 7:55 p.m.

Signage and Parking Issues

Mayor Marabello informed council he is proposing some potential improvements to signage and parking to beautify the city.

City Planner Norris reported that when he was reviewing the zoning and subdivision ordinances, it crossed his mind that landscaping in the parking areas needed improvement. He is presenting a proposal that would require some sort of landscaping in parking lots similar to Walmart or other parking areas with 12 or more spaces.

He said this would break up parking and enhance these parking lots. As an example, if someone proposed a 100-space parking lot, he is suggesting putting in six to eight parking stalls with landscaping. This would prevent an expansive area of asphalt with no breakup or landscaping.

The planner also presented a proposed sign requirement. He prepared some sign design guidelines to be considered. One of the things he recommended at the planning commission is a master sign program which would be included in the preliminary site plan showing all proposed signs, location, size, etc. This is the first step of what council should expect in the future as an amendment to the sign ordinance.

The intent is for signs on businesses to be more beautiful and aesthetically pleasing.

Mr. Brooks confirmed that Mr. Norris is considering placing trees in parking areas and questioned the safety factor and whether it would inhibit visibility in regard to cars traveling in the lot as well as suspicious activity.

Mr. Norris explained that what he is proposing is a small island with some landscaping that would not necessarily involve trees but some form of shrubbery. More landscaping would be added to the entrances and exits.

Mr. Brooks suggested a possible walkway which people would use in lieu of the roadway. Mr. Norris said he has seen some larger stores, such as Target, who have added walkways in their lots to prevent pedestrians from walking in the vehicle area. Mr. Brooks feels that would be a much safer situation particularly considering the number of small children in these parking areas.

Mr. Norris agrees and will ask the planning commission to recommend a walkway with a sidewalk for larger parking lots.

Mr. Norris encouraged council to review what he has prepared under the sign guidelines to see if they are acceptable. The next step would be a proposed ordinance to take the place of the sign section in the zoning ordinance. He explained it is a legislative process which would be reviewed by the planning commission with council having the final say.

Mr. Workman likes the concept but asked how this will impact current businesses. He asked if the city would be willing to help them obtain new signs. He said that signs are expensive and businesses are hurting because of the economy and he would not want this to be an additional burden.

Mr. Norris said that new businesses would be aware of this requirement immediately. With existing businesses, we can provide a period of time before the owner must replace their sign. He feels the city can work with the current business owners. Mr. Workman likes that idea but agrees that a new business should be made aware of the new regulations, but prefers giving an existing business some additional time to come into compliance with the new ordinance.

Mayor asked if council wishes for Mr. Norris to proceed with these two proposals as they are requirements of the beautification program in the city.

Mr. Baird asked if what has been developed will be presented to the planning commission to develop an ordinance or if further input is needed from council. Mr. Norris welcomes any additional input or suggestions from council. He plans to take the two proposals to the planning commission as well as share that information with council at a future meeting.

Mr. Morrow feels that Mr. Brooks' suggestion to add walkways in parking lots should also be included. Mr. Norris agreed.

Proposed Ethics Policy

Mayor Marabello said he considered this when he ran for mayor and feels this is the right time to present it to council for their opinion. He noted this is not a formal ethics ordinance but only wanted some information included in the packet.

Mr. Spillane confirmed that because we do not have a formal ordinance at this time, the state code applies to Milford. He informed council that we fall under the Public Integrity Commission which he has addressed a couple of times in relation to conflict of interest on council.

City Solicitor Willard explained we could not trump or supercede state law. However, it is an option though he personally has not represented a town with a separate ethics code or policy.

Mr. Brooks suggests that the city clerk provide the copies of local ethic codes to council for their review before the next workshop.

In the meantime, Mr. Willard will speak with Attorney Janet Wright of the State Public Integrity Commission for her input and suggestion to see if it is feasible.

This will be discussed at the next workshop in January.

With no further workshop items, Mayor Marabello declared the Workshop Session closed at 8:13 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Terri K. Hudson, CMC
City Clerk/Recorder

MILFORD CITY COUNCIL
MINUTES OF MEETING
December 22, 2008

The City of Milford held Public Hearings on the following matters on Monday, December 22, 2008 in the Joseph Ronnie Rogers Council Chambers at Milford City Hall, 201 South Walnut Street, Milford, Delaware

PRESIDING: Honorable Mayor Daniel Marabello

IN ATTENDANCE: Councilpersons Irvin Ambrose, Michael Spillane, John Workman, James Oechsler, Sr., Owen Brooks, Jr., Douglas Morrow, James Starling, Sr. and Katrina Wilson

ALSO: City Manager David Baird, Police Chief Keith Hudson and City Clerk/Recorder Terri Hudson

COUNSEL: City Solicitor Timothy Willard

Mayor Marabello called the Public Hearing to order at 7:01 p.m.

Change of Zone-Dominic Balascio on behalf of West Milford Enterprises LLC

The City Council of the City of Milford held a Public Hearing to take public comment and make a final determination on the following matter:

Dominic Balascio was present on behalf of West Milford Enterprises LLC for a Change of Zone of 9.67 +/- Acres from I-1 & R-3 (Industrial/Residential) to I-1 (Industrial) at 775 W. Masten Circle, Masten Industrial Park, Milford, Delaware. Tax Map MD-16-183.00-01-02.00-000.

City Planner Gary Norris advised that the property, located in the northwest corner of Masten Circle, was originally zoned with a split zone of I-1 and R-3. Following a public hearing before the planning commission, their recommendation, by a vote of 7-0, was to rezone the portion of the property zoned R-3 to I-1.

Buck Ing presented the application on behalf of the Putnam Group. He stated the change of zone request to I-1 is needed to accommodate the proposed use for professional offices which include a medical aid outpatient services and a hospital daycare. They currently operate the Smyrna Health and Wellness Center which is a 110,000 square foot medical facility. The tenants offer imaging services, medical aid, physical therapy, cardiac rehab, sleep center, family practice, ob/gyn and chiropractic services. They also have Kidz Ink in Dover which is their third building.

Mr. Ing said the 2007 Comprehensive Plan shows this property as a split zone with urban mix and industrial use. The 2008 draft shows the entire plan as an employment use which is parallel to a medical and daycare use as is being proposed.

Council had no comments or questions. After asking twice if the public had comments, Mayor Marabello closed the public comment portion of the hearing.

Mr. Brooks moved for approval of the change of zone, seconded by Mr. Morrow. Motion carried by unanimous roll call vote.

Preliminary Major Subdivision-
Charles D. Murphy Associates on behalf of D&F Properties LLC & William Emmert

The City Council of the City of Milford held a Public Hearing to take public comment and make a final determination on the following matter:

Charles D. Murphy Associates on behalf D&F Properties LLC & William Emmert for the Preliminary Major Subdivision of 1.35 +/- Acres located Northeast of East Clarke Avenue 350 feet East of South Walnut Street, Milford, Delaware; R-1 District; Tax Map 3-30-10-08-18.02; 3-30-10.08-15.01.

City Planner Gary Norris explained this is a four-lot subdivision off the north side of East Clark Avenue where the developer intends to construct a cul-de-sac. The planning commission recommended approval by a vote of 7-0 with the condition a note be added to the plat showing the easement to 13 East Clarke Avenue.

Robert Nash of Charles Murphy Associates presented the application on behalf of the owners of the property. He said the property was purchased by the current owners at an auction. The subdivision has been designed with a minimum of four-10,000 square foot lots. There were concerns expressed at the planning commission meeting regarding parking. Since then, Mr. Nash has reviewed and remeasured the area. The entrance was designed as required in the code.

Mr. Nash reported that Mr. and Mrs. Sherwood who live adjacent to the subdivision will be provided with an easement to access the rear of their property as has been done in the past. In addition, they will have access to the front though traditionally, they have used the alley to access their property from the rear.

All sewer issues have been worked out with the city engineer and because this is a small subdivision, a major pump station will not be needed. Stormwater management is through underground storage that will be maintained by the HOA. A fire hydrant will be provided within the subdivision which addresses any concerns by the fire marshal.

Mr. Nash recalled some concern about where area children who have traditionally used this site to play baseball and football. He pointed out the subdivision plan meets all standards in the zoning code. He noted that nice single family dwellings are planned in the price range of \$200,000 which will help address any affordable housing needs within the city.

Mr. Ambrose referred to a telephone pole that is extremely close and asked where it will be moved; Mr. Nash explained it would be relocated to the west toward Walnut Street. Mr. Ambrose confirmed that would be close to the Sherwood property. He asked how the trees and in particular, a very large tree will be addressed as they are very close to this street.

Mr. Nash said that the land is wider than necessary and the plans were to provide a row of landscaping on the Walnut Street side of the entrance going back to the cul-de-sac which will screen the existing homes from the new subdivision. A street will be constructed with curbing and sidewalks.

He advised the HOA will maintain the landscaping noting the strip of land on the railroad track side included in lot 1. Mr. Nash explained that the city planner was concerned that the owners of lot 1 would provide their own access to Clarke Avenue and not use the subdivision street. However, that will be included in the restrictions and covenants. In addition, an agreement will be signed by the new property owners requiring the landscaping be maintained by the HOA and that it cannot be removed which will also preclude them from using it as an access.

Mr. Nash confirmed that lighting is included in the subdivision plan.

City Manager Baird verified the landscaping will be maintained by the homeowners though it will be located along the street. Mr. Nash explained that will be shown in the final design. Mr. Baird asked that the covenants and deed restrictions be provided at the same time.

When asked if anyone from the public wished to speak, Rick Sherwood of 13 East Clarke Avenue, advised that his property is next to this subdivision and he is in opposition of the development. He said they expressed their concern about the extra traffic and its affect on small children in the neighborhood. They also asked about where the parking would be because he feels the lots are small and does not feel there is adequate room for parking.

He also referred to the existing ten trees that would need to be removed. Mr. Sherwood said that the landscaping Mr. Nash referred to will take years to develop when compared to the current trees of which many are full grown. He is also concerned about the 25 feet between lots and the street being closer to his property which would be 0 feet from the side of his house.

Mr. Sherwood said he does not understand the 25-foot requirement for a new house but allows only 10 feet for his house. City Planner Norris explained the off-street parking of 2.5 spaces per unit must be met.

Mr. Nash confirmed that the 2.5 space requirement will be met with a potential garage and driveway. He said that though the lots are small, they are large enough to accommodate a 1,500 square foot home and driveway.

He explained the street was realigned to get the 10,000 square feet for all four lots. Between the edge of the street and the back of the curb to the closest point of the Sherwood home is approximately 10 feet. Mr. Nash referred to the Sherwood property line which slightly juts into the lot because a previous survey recognized the fact the house was too close to the line though they allowed a small dog leg to accommodate it. The reason for the tail hanging off lot 1 is to meet the 10,000 square foot requirement. The plan also includes a 38-degree radius which meets the fire marshal requirement for fire equipment maneuvering.

When asked to explain the setback difference for a new house versus an older home, Mr. Norris explained that new homes on corner lots are required to have 25 foot front and side yard setbacks. The original house on East Clarke Avenue and the Sherwood home had sufficient sideyards. However, the property to east of the Sherwood home was sold and subdivided.

Carol Sherwood also of 13 East Clarke Avenue reiterated the concerns her husband expressed. She asked where the cars will park if they do not park in the street or in the cul-de-sac. She also feels that 10 feet from the side of her home is extremely dangerous in her opinion. She asked council to put themselves in their shoes. They purchased the property 24 years ago and raised two children there. She, too, questions how her property is exempt from the required setbacks of the new homes.

Ms. Sherwood said their street is much busier than most people realize noting that traffic comes from various directions particularly because many drivers feel their street crosses over. She said this will only add another dead-end street to this area.

She said if these houses back up to the railroad track, what will happen. She does not feel this land should have been subdivided.

Ms. Sherwood asked council to consider her remarks.

With no other person present to speak, Mayor Marabello closed the public comment period.

Mr. Norris confirmed that the subdivision meets all code requirements though this is preliminary approval that must return for a final which would include engineering designs for water and sewer.

Mr. Spillane said if the house is built 10 feet from the property line and some trees are built on the property line, is that wide enough for a car or truck. Mr. Norris said he believes it may be an 8-foot sideyard setback, but as was stated, they are required to provide 2.5 off street parking spaces for each unit. It may require they build a garage and driveway.

Mr. Workman confirmed the Sherwood home will be 10 feet from the side of the street.

Mr. Nash clarified their westerly boundary is the street right-of-way. From the right of way of the street, there is approximately 10 feet to the traveled area of the street. In addition, there will be landscaping, a five-foot sidewalk and two feet of curbing.

When asked if the proposed subdivision will create any nonconforming lots adjacent to the site, Mr. Norris said that possibly the Sherwood property would become nonconforming.

Mr. Workman asked why we would create a nonconforming lot on a home that has existed for 24 years to allow a new development.

Mr. Nash explained the lot is already nonconforming because the sideyard setback is what is being discussed. The sideyard setback is under separate ownership. The strip of land where the land is being created is already owned by another individual. Mr. Nash advised that this subdivision does not take any of the existing Sherwood property.

Mr. Morrow confirmed the planning commission recommended approval with the condition that a note be added and an easement to 13 E. Clarke Avenue shown on the plat.

City Solicitor Willard advised that the subdivision code includes a provision that deals with preservation of natural features and states that in no case shall a tree over 12 inches in diameter, measured three feet from the base, be removed without prior approval from the planning commission. Therefore, the applicant would need to inventory those trees if they intended to remove them and would not be permitted without the permission of the planning commission.

Mr. Nash was unaware of the requirement. Council believes there are a number of trees that fall would apply to that condition in this subdivision.

Mayor Marabello asked if council preferred to think about this application and wait to take action.

In order to put this matter to a vote this evening, Mr. Ambrose moved for approval of the preliminary plan with the condition that if the Sherwoods want an easement, an easement will be granted and shown on the subdivision plat, seconded by Ms. Wilson.

Motion failed to carry by the following 2-6 vote:

No - Ambrose, Spillane, Workman, Oechsler, Brooks, Starling

Yes - Morrow, Wilson

Mr. Ambrose votes no based on his review of the area. There is a comment in the planning commission minutes from Dave Covington that the area appears larger on a map but is much smaller when seen in person and Mr. Ambrose agrees. He feels it will be squashed in between two properties. Mr. Ambrose does not feel it will be appropriate for the area and votes no.

Mr. Spillane is voting no based on Mr. Ambrose' comments.

Mr. Workman votes no based on the information provided this evening. He does not feel it is fair to those residents who lived there before the subdivision was planned in addition to the code requirement about the removal of large trees.

Mr. Morrow votes yes based on the recommendation of the planning commission and believes these matters could be worked out with the property owners.

Ms. Wilson votes yes based on the recommendation of the planning commission and the work of the city planner which ensures the subdivision meets our zoning and subdivision ordinance. In particular, she likes the blending idea of older neighborhoods with new neighborhoods. She feels it would be beneficial to have a new subdivision planned in an older area of town which she feels will help keep Milford's neighborhood alive.

Ordinance 2008-18/Zoning Code Amendment/C-1 & C-2 Density

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND Chapter 230, Zoning, of the Code of the City of Milford Relating to Residential Density in Commercial Districts.

The City of Milford hereby ordains:

Section 1. Section 230-12 C-1 Community (Neighborhood) Commercial District.

Amend Section 230-12 D. by inserting a new subparagraph (11) therein as follows:

§ 230-12 C-1 Community (Neighborhood) Commercial District.

In a C-1 District no building or premises shall be used and no building shall be erected or altered which is arranged, intended or designed to be used except for one or more of the following uses and complying with the requirements so indicated.

D. Area regulations.

- (1) *Minimum lot area shall be 3,500 square feet.*
 - (2) *Maximum lot coverage shall be 80%.*
 - (3) *Minimum lot width shall be 30 feet.*
 - (4) *Height of buildings shall not exceed three stories or 35 feet.*
 - (5) *Minimum building setback shall be 10 feet.*
 - (6) *Side yards shall be at least five feet in width.*
 - (7) *Minimum rear yard shall be 25 feet.*
 - (8) *Parking shall comply with the requirements provided in Article IV of this chapter.*
 - (9) *Landscape screening shall comply with the requirements provided in Article V of this chapter.*
 - (10) *Signs shall comply with the requirements provided in Article VI of this chapter.*
- ADD: (11) Maximum density for multifamily dwellings shall be 12 per acre.*

Section 2. Section 230-13 C-2 Central Business District.

Amend Section 230-13 B. subparagraph (2) by adding the following language:

§230-13 C-2 Central Business District.

In a C-2 District no building or premises shall be used and no building shall be erected or altered which is arranged, intended or designed to be used except for one or more of the following uses and complying with the requirements so indicated.

B. Permitted uses. Permitted uses for the C-2 District shall be as follows:

(1) Those uses permitted in the C-1 District.

(2) Residence apartments in conjunction with any nonresidential use. ADD: Notwithstanding (1) herein, all multifamily dwellings in C-2 shall be in conjunction with non residential use. Maximum density for multi family dwellings shall be 12 per acre. Whenever a structure of multifamily residential use is built in conjunction with a commercial use, the residential square footage shall not exceed two times the commercial square footage.

Section 3. Synopsis. This ordinance clarifies that residential density in C1 and C-2 districts could not exceed 12 units per acres.

Section 4. Dates.

Planning Commission Public Hearing: November 17, 2008, December 16, 2008

Introduction Date: December 8, 2008

Projected Adoption Date: December 22, 2008

Projected Effective Date: January 1, 2009

Mr. Norris advised the planning commission has reviewed this and though the public hearing is scheduled this evening, based on the city solicitor's recommendation, his recommendation is to table action until a later meeting.

Mr. Willard recalled that council has previously reviewed this ordinance. He said the ordinance is designed to make clear what the density should be in C-3 and C-2 along with a commercial mix in the C-2.

He noted a couple of technical issues that still need addressing. In addition, Mr. Norris has a suggestion that also needs to be considered. Last Tuesday, the planning commission asked that the ordinance be revised and he and Mr. Norris have been unable to work on the amendment. However, it was noticed for a public hearing and he suggested the mayor ask for public comment though he recommends the matter be tabled until the revisions are completed.

Mayor Marabello asked twice if anyone from the public wished to comment on the ordinance. No one responded either time.

Mr. Oechsler asked if residential housing should be prohibited in C-3 zones because it is a commercial highway district.

Mr. Norris explained that during the planning commission hearing, making the residential component in either the C-2 or C-3 a conditional use was considered. He believes there may be the possibility of a mixed use development where commercial and residential are present and encouraged by council. He prefers having that option.

The city planner has discussed such mixed uses with developers of whom many are interested.

According to City Solicitor Willard, he believes Sussex County removed residential uses from their highway commercial zone. The question is whether to downzone the existing zones or have it no longer exist. Council can downzone property if making any change to a zoning district is affecting it. Those that have residential uses in a C-3 have a vested right which cannot be taken away. However, it can be made no longer available for new applications.

It was confirmed that Mr. Norris prefers it be a conditional use which the planning commission and council would have to approve.

Mr. Willard said that he and Mr. Norris are having a debate about whether a blanket conditional use for residential is appropriate. He feels that conditional uses are more designed for special exceptions for public uses. It gives more discretion on what and how it can be done.

Mr. Baird said that as far as direction is concerned, the C-3 zone permits anything and everything. From a planning standpoint, the comprehensive land use plan, any areas listed as future land use are commercial. Based on the way our zoning code is written today, that could include a number of residential lots which change the way the city needs to plan its use of resources today.

With no further business, Mayor Marabello then adjourned the Public Hearing at 7:51 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Terri K. Hudson".

Terri K. Hudson, CMC
City Clerk/Recorder

*MILFORD CITY COUNCIL
MINUTES OF MEETING
December 22, 2008*

On December 22, 2008, the City Council of the City of Milford held a Public Comment Session in the Joseph Ronnie Rogers Council Chambers of Milford City Hall at 201 South Walnut Street, Milford, Delaware, prior to the commencement of the official City of Milford Council Meeting in order to allow the public to comment about issues of interest that impact the City of Milford.

PRESIDING: Mayor Daniel Marabello

IN ATTENDANCE: Councilpersons Irvin Ambrose, Michael Spillane, John Workman, James Oechsler, Jr., Owen Brooks, Jr., Douglas Morrow, James Starling, Sr. and Katrina Wilson

ALSO: City Manager David Baird, Police Chief Keith Hudson and City Clerk/Recorder Terri Hudson

COUNSEL: City Solicitor Timothy Willard

Mayor Marabello declared the Public Comment Session open at 7:51 p.m.

Joe Palermo of 5 Misty Vale Court, Meadows at Shawnee said his neighborhood had another problem with garbage pickup during Thanksgiving week. He said that over 80% of their residents were not aware of it. As a result, they were given a courtesy pickup the following Monday. He said this happened the year before as well. Because the state and the city are giving off, they will have some people come in and pick up their garbage over Christmas week. He said at least put a notice in their bill even if it is a normal situation. He feels it should say when normal pickup prevails and a phone number of someone residents can call to find out what day their garbage will be picked up.

With no else signed up to speak, Mayor Marabello closed the Public Comment Session at 7:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Terri K. Hudson, CMC
City Clerk/Recorder