

MILFORD CITY COUNCIL  
MINUTES OF MEETING  
March 25, 2019

The City Council of the City of Milford met in Workshop Session on Monday, March 25, 2019 in the Joseph Ronnie Rogers Council Chambers at Milford City Hall, 201 South Walnut Street, Milford, Delaware at 6:31 p.m.

PRESIDING: Mayor Archie Campbell

IN ATTENDANCE: Councilpersons Christopher Mergner, Mike Boyle, Lisa Ingram Peel, Todd Culotta, Owen Brooks Jr., Douglas Morrow, Jason James Sr. and Katrina Wilson

STAFF: City Manager Eric Norenberg, Police Captain Gary Bailey and Deputy City Clerk Christine Crouch

COUNSEL: Solicitor David Rutt, Esquire

*Southeast Milford Transportation Improvement District Plan*

City Planning Director Rob Pierce recalled that in 2011, the Southeast Master Plan was adopted which required a Transportation Improvement District (TID). The Master Plan was incorporated into the recently adopted 2018 Comprehensive Plan.

Since that time, the City has been working with DelDOT to establish the TID. Tonight, they will discuss the TID and what is needed to move forward.

He introduced DelDOT Principal Planner Sarah Coakley, who establishes and coordinates TID across the State and will be Milford's primary contact for this project.

Ms. Coakley stated that ordinarily when a development is planned, in addition to the local government, DelDOT reviews them. If there will be an increase of more than 500 vehicle trips per day or 50 vehicle trips during the peak hours, a traffic impact study is required. The TID will replace traffic studies and a more comprehensive way of handling this.

She provided the following information:

A TID is a geographic area defined for the purpose of securing required improvements to transportation facilities in that area. It is a place where land use and transportation is planned in advance and the development is consistent with that planning by paying a readily determined fee in lieu of conducting a Traffic Impact Study.

The purpose is to better provide the transportation improvements needed to support land development in locations identified as appropriate for development in local Comprehensive Plans.

Benefits of the TID:

- \*Comprehensive Infrastructure Planning
- \*TID Projects Advance Faster in DelDOT's Six-Year Capital Transportation Plan
- \*TID Fees Stay Within the TID Area
- \*Equitable Treatment of Competing Developers
- \*Known Costs for Developers and Fees are Proportionate to Development Size
- \*Expedited Development Reviews

\*Characteristics of a Good TID:

- \*Located in State Strategies Level 1, 2 or 3 areas
- \*Locations identified for planned growth in Comprehensive Plans

- \*Several parcels likely to be proposed for development or re-development
- \*Not too big, not too small (proposed Southeast Milford is in middle with nine square miles)
- \*Natural boundaries (rivers, streams, parcel lines) and not roads, wherever possible

A TID starts with an agreement between DelDOT and the City.

The first step is to complete the Master Plan which Milford has already done. In order to model the traffic generated by the Master Plan, it is converted into parcel-specific land use forecast of the number of dwelling units or square footage for non-residential development expected.

Once agreed, DelDOT models it based on future traffic impacts.

DelDOT will then come back with a list of transportation needs and improvements. DelDOT would then create cost estimates and concept plans of the improvements. A fee structure would then be jointly developed to charge the developer(s) to contribute toward the improvements.

Once fee schedule is established, the City can advocate for those projects to be added to DelDOT's capital plan.

She and Mr. Pierce have reached out to Sussex County to partner because there are some parcels that are outside the City because it follows the boundary of the southeast neighborhood plan. Though not presently interested, they are hoping they will eventually join in. However, they want to wait until the Henlopen TID is finalized which should occur sometime in the next six months.

The agreement is between must include the boundaries, the target horizon year, which is the buildout year and rolls and responsibilities. One of the next steps would be to develop service standards for the roads in order to identify the needed facilities.

The agreement is then modified throughout the process and updated to include the list of transportation improvements and cost estimates, concept plans and infrastructure fee program.

Ms. Coakley then presented a map showing the boundaries of the Southeast Milford TID. Development applications that are within the red boundary and within the City of Milford would be required to contribute toward the TID. Also referenced were segments and intersections that will be evaluated by DelDOT against the service standards to bring them up to their functional classification.

She confirmed that in a TID all developments. Presently anything that does not generate at least 50 peak hour/500 per day trips, is not required to do a Traffic Impact Study. However, they would pay into the TID.

DelDOT has already compiled a detailed existing conditions report. Based on Milford's future land use plan, traffic will be forecasted in the TID and identify locations that need improvement, provide a concept plan and cost estimates for the improvements.

The land use forecast and traffic forecast, and any improvements, are combined in the land use and transportation plan for the TID. That will require City review and approval.

Once there is an agreement on the needed improvements, DelDOT would identify a set of specific, buildable projects, develop cost estimates for projects and update as needed which is typically annually, based on inflation.

That is then submitted as the TID-CTP for City review and approval. DelDOT would then grant priority of those projects of the overall statewide program.

Part of the function of a TID is to make sure that development is consistent with the Land Use and Transportation Plan

A development not consistent with the plan would be required to do a traffic impact study. The manner and extent of participation be documented on record subdivision or land development plan. DelDOT would also assist Milford with review and approval of rights-of-way, design, and/or construction by developments in lieu of TID fee payments.

DelDOT would then help determine the value of rights-of-way dedications and review and approve bids received for developer to ensure they are meeting the state permit laws.

DelDOT will develop the infrastructure/fee program which determines what is charged per housing unit for per square footage for not residential, which the City will approve after the list of improvements has been finalized.

DelDOT will continue to monitor traffic volumes and report to the City annually.

She explained that the horizon or target year has to be at least 20 years out which is either 2040 or 2045. Council could change that horizon to 2040 if desired.

The City of Milford would need to re-evaluate TID boundaries, horizon year, service standards, and Land Use Plan when updating the Comprehensive Plan. They will provide DelDOT with a parcel-level land use forecast, which has already been provided.

The City would then review and approve the Land Use and Transportation Plan, the TID Capital Transportation Program and the Infrastructure Fee Program.

They would also recommend which the TID-CTP projects to be included in DelDOT's CTP.

The City would assist DelDOT with determinations of development that are consistent with the Land Use and Transportation Plan and require development participation and pay towards it. The City would need to establish an account for the TID payments and collect fees prior to issuing building permits. Those fees would be held in a TID-only account to be used for transportation permits.

The City would also audit developer payments to contractors for developer design/construction in lieu of fee

The City can also make requests of DelDOT for information in the monitoring reports.

The City would also publicize and host TID-related public meetings, at minimum, for approvals of Land Use Transportation Plans, TID-CTP and Infrastructure Fee Program.

Ms. Coakley emphasized this is an informational session only; she will need to come back for an actual public meeting and ask Council to vote on the agreement at that time.

The service standards include a level of service which is a measure of intersection control delay in terms of the average total vehicle delay of all movements through an intersection. Ms. Coakley explained the various levels of service for both signalized and unsignalized intersections (see corresponding Council packet).

She noted that C & D levels are what is typically adopted as a level of standard. Overall for weekday mornings and evening peak hours, they are propping level D. Specific approaches may be E or even F.

In the agreement, the level of service is aspirational or what they will aspire to in identifying the transportation improvements.

The City will be presented with the information and will decide what is acceptable or whether more funds need to be spent to make all the approaches at least a D or better.

Other acceptable standard traffic procedures were discussed including turn lane lengths and queues. The 95th percentile is the worst back up in the turn lane should not exceed the available turning lane lengths.

Through movements should not queue through adjacent intersections.

All at-grade intersections of one or more State-maintained roads with other State-maintained Roads will be analyzed along with rail lines, city-maintained streets and Commercial or institutional driveways served by traffic signals

Currently there two locations in the TID that do not have a level of service C or better--US 113 and Fitzgerald Road/Johnson Road and State Route 1 and Sharps Road.

The service standards would also include geometric standards and would assume the use of posted speed limits.

DelDOT has been asked to consider potential reduction of speed limits on the following roadways, which will require updated traffic counts and a speed study:

- \*Cedar Creek Road, from Cedar Creek north, to 35 mph
- \*Wilkins Road/Cedar Neck Road, from SR1 overpass to Elks Lodge Road stop sign, to 35 mph
- \* Elks Lodge Road, from Wilkins Road to Marshall Street, to 35 mph

DelDOT Functional Classification Map, design standards, and Complete Streets Policy are assumed including the minimum lane widths for State-maintained Roads.

DelDOT's Development Coordination Manual applies to any access on State-maintained roads.

Any subdivision streets in the TID will be built to City standards and either for municipal or private maintenance.

Crash data, the Delaware Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices, and other criteria as adopted by DelDOT, will be used for intersection control evaluation and design.

Roundabouts shall be considered first as a means of intersection control, along with safety, capacity, and rights-of way/property impacts.

The transit that current exists will remain and the Master Plan will be reviewed to potentially identify different transit facilities.

Aesthetic standards will be considered with the possible exception of Scenic Byways, which includes Cedar Creek Road/Route 1, Southeast Front Street and Cedar Beach Road. The Byway Master Plans will be considered instead.

The drainage issues on Wilkins Road between Elks Lodge Road and Cedar Creek Road will also be examined.

The City's Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan should be referenced when making design decisions related to bike and pedestrian facilities. Existing and proposed pedestrian crossing treatments (at intersections and/or mid-block) will be evaluated and designed using national and local research.

Pedestrian and Bicycle paths have been recommended at the following locations:

- Shared use path extended along south side of Wilkins Road from Bayhealth property to Elks Lodge Road
- \*Shared use path along Elks Lodge Road from Wilkins Road to Marshall Street
- \*Shared use path along Cedar Neck Road and Bucks Road for any new development, connecting Cedar Creek Road and Route 36
- \*Existing bike lane in shoulder of northbound Cedar Creek Road/South Rehoboth Blvd. that ends abruptly at the SR1 flyover to South Rehoboth Blvd

She will return for the public meeting and ask any questions and ask for approval of the TID agreement.

When asked for comparison TID's, Ms. Coakley stated this will be one of the easier ones to implement because the City's Master Plan is very solid. As soon as they can get an agreement signed, they are ready to proceed after which they be back in approximately six months with a list of recommendations.

She stated that Southern New Castle County and Westown have been in implementation for five and ten years respectively. Eastown is just starting in Middletown and only a few months ahead of Milford. Henlopen has not yet signed the agreement though the future traffic analysis was completed and the concept plans and estimates are currently underway.

Mr. Pierce reiterated that the TID agreement will be on the agenda which will start the process. After that they will return in approximately six months with the finding. She will then return with the proposed improvements and then with the fee schedule.

Ms. Coakley said she hopes to wrap this up with the fee schedule by the end of 2019.

There being no further business, the Workshop concluded at 7:08 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Terri K. Hudson, MMC  
City Clerk/Transcriber

MILFORD CITY COUNCIL  
MINUTES OF MEETING  
March 25, 2019

Milford City Council held a Public Hearing on Monday, March 25, 2019 in the Joseph Ronnie Rogers Council Chambers at Milford City Hall, 201 South Walnut Street, Milford, Delaware.

PRESIDING: Mayor Archie Campbell

IN ATTENDANCE: Councilpersons Christopher Mergner, Mike Boyle, Lisa Ingram Peel, Todd Culotta, Owen Brooks Jr., Douglas Morrow, Jason James Sr. and Katrina Wilson

STAFF: City Manager Eric Norenberg, Police Chief Kenneth Brown and City Clerk Terri Hudson

COUNSEL: Solicitor David Rutt, Esquire

Mayor Campbell called the Public Hearing to order at 7:28 p.m.

*ORDINANCE 2019-09*

*Shawnee Farm LLC for a Conditional Use to allow a Planned Unit Development to be known as Cypress Hall (Residential) consisting of 546 dwelling units (162 single-family detached units, 96 townhouse units and 288 multi-family units) on 91.69 +/- acres in an R3 zone. Property is located on the west side of Route 113 approximately 3,100 feet south of the Shawnee Road intersection, Milford, Delaware.*

*Present Use: Vacant/Proposed Use: Residential Subdivision.*

*Tax Parcels 1-30-3.00-261.01, 1-30-3.00-562.00 thru 659.00*

*ORDINANCE 2019-10*

*Shawnee Farm LLC for an Amended Preliminary Major Subdivision (Phase I Only) to be known as "Cypress Hall" (Residential) consisting of 384 dwelling units (96 townhouse units and 288 multi-family units) on 41.47 +/- acres in an R3 zone. Property is located on the west side of Route 113 approximately 3,100 feet south of the Shawnee Road intersection, Milford, Delaware.*

*Tax Parcels 1-30-3.00-261.01, 1-30-3.00-562.00 thru 659.00*

Planning Director Rob Pierce explained that both of these public hearings will be combined as both involve the Cypress Hall Residential Proposed Subdivision south of Redner's Market at Cypress Hall Commercial Shopping Center.

Mr. Pierce referenced the map and reviewed the information in the ordinance.

He stated that City Council granted Final Major Subdivision for Cypress Hall-Phase I on June 22, 2009. The current record plan is still recorded with the Sussex County Recorder of Deeds. It consists of 96 townhouses and 288 garden apartments, for a total of 384 total units.

A copy of the public hearing minutes and the current record drawings are included in the packet for review.

The applicant proposes to revise the site plan for the project by reducing the number of parking spaces required from 2.5 spaces per unit to 2 spaces per unit and increasing the number of units per building from 12 to 24. Instead of applying for a variance from the Board of Adjustment, the applicant is seeking permission to deviate from Chapter 230 through the Planned Unit Development review process, which is the more appropriate avenue for this type of request.

An analysis of the PUD request is outlined in Section II of the staff report. There are specific criteria in the City ordinance that needs to be evaluated for Planned Unit Developments, which is included in the Council packet.

In addition, the deviations from the Zoning Code and the Subdivision Code are specifically listed in a table and is also listed in Section 2 of the staff report.

The proposed development would include a clubhouse and pool within the multi-family area as a recreational amenity and the applicant is seeking conditional use approval for the planned unit development with those specific requests and

deviations. They are also seeking major subdivision approval for Phase I and the Planning Commission is in the process of reviewing the preliminary site plan for the apartment area, pending any approved changes to the design standard.

The PUD regulations allow off street parking, parking beneath buildings, front, side and rear setbacks, landscaping and buffering, lot coverage, number of units per building and building separation to be determined by the Planning Commission. The maximum height shall not exceed 48 feet/four stories (Section 230-48.1).

The applicant is seeking to deviate from those sections of the zoning code as noted. They are also requesting the reduction of the paving width for single family detached area from 25 feet to 22 feet in width, reduce the paving width for townhouse and apartment areas from 30 feet to 28 feet in width.

For single family detached lots, the applicant is requesting one of the road frontages to be considered a side yard versus the two front-yard setbacks.

Representatives from Milford Grain were at the previous Planning Commission public hearing and those representatives are in attendance this evening to provide comments.

The Planning Commission recommended approval of the Conditional Use/PUD and the Preliminary Major Subdivision with a favorable vote of 5-0 at their March 19, 2019 meeting, with the following conditions:

A 50-foot wooded buffer be provided along the southern boundary line shared with the Delaware Solid Waste Authority property, to remain open space.

They agreed to allow the single-family detached lots, use one of the road frontages as a five-yard setback, an increase in the number of units per building from 12 to 24.

Mr. Pierce stated they did not approve of the reduction in the parking requirement nor did they allow the reduction in the paving width for both the apartment area and the single-family detached area.

In addition, the Planning Commission deferred review of the multi-family site plan until a determination was made by City Council for those design criteria related to the PUD and will be addressed at their April meeting.

When asked about the Planning Commission's deferral of their recommendation, Mr. Pierce explained the application was submitted on March 19<sup>th</sup> and they made recommendations for the PUD under the specific criteria mentioned. The Commission deferred approval of the site plan (only) pending Council's action based mainly on the parking reduction, shown on the site plan, of 2.5 to 2 parking spaces.

He reiterated that they also denied the two reductions in paving widths.

When asked by Councilman James the reason why the Planning Commission did not recommend the reduction in the parking spaces of 2.5 to 2, Mr. Pierce explained their comment was they felt they should meet the parking requirement in the ordinance.

He further clarified the developer is proposing to combine the buildings to make the community more cost effective and reduce the impervious coverage and the amount of parking required. The number of units does not change.

According to the Planning Director, the City zoning code requires 12 units per building under a by right site plan. However, the planned unit development process allows City Council to change that number. This is a three-story structure which is below the maximum four-story.

Councilman Boyle confirmed the project has been on the books for ten years.

Councilman James stated that in 2009, the current record plan consisted of 96 and 288 for a total of 384 total units; Mr. Pierce confirmed that is correct noting that is the townhouse area and the apartment area. As part of the overall PUD master plan concept, they are proposing to add 162 single family units.

Councilman James asked for confirmation the single-family homes were not part of the original plan, Mr. Pierce stated that was submitted at the time, but they did not move forward with the record plan approval. He also pointed out they would only be seeking record plan approval for the townhouse and apartment area preliminary approval this evening. They will not be moving forward with the single-family plan at this time. However, they did provide a master plan of the entire site.

Davis, Bowen and Friedel Principal and Professional Engineer Ring Lardner of 1 Park Avenue, Milford, was representing the applicant.

Mr. Lardner also requested, as Mr. Pierce had implied, that both public hearings be combined for the Conditional Use and Preliminary Major Subdivision, as the testimony will be the same so he understands the votes will be done separately.

He also stated that he would like to include Mr. Pierce's presentation as part of my testimony, as he has covered the zoning designation and comprehensive plan designation and he does not want to duplicate that information.

Bill Krapf, a representative of the owner/developer, is also in attendance.

Mr., Lardner recalled when they first submitted the application on April 18, 2018. Some changes were made through the process, for internal purposes, primarily focusing on the apartment area which he will provide more detail. In addition, the plan includes a few revisions to address some staff comments since October 2018.

He provided the following summary:

In July 2007, DBF's office submitted a preliminary plan for 546 total units to be located on 86.56 acres of land more or less. The units consisted of 162 single family units, 96 townhouses and 288 garden apartments. That preliminary plan is virtually the exact same as the PUD before Council this evening. The only difference is the plan added about five acres of land on the north side for a stormwater management.

After the 2007 submission, the original owner decided not to move forward with the single-family subdivision portion. That is the reason that only the townhouse and apartments went through the approval process. And on June 22, 2009, Phase 1 was approved by City Council that consisted of 96 townhouse units and 288 garden apartments.

On September 21, 2009, Phase 1 was recorded in the Kent County Recorder of Deeds in Plot Book 236, Page 89.

In regards to the Planned Unit Development, the Planning and Zoning Commission recommended approval with eight deviations recommended. Mr. Pierce had mentioned five which was the result of some of them being combined for various reasons and mainly the street width which was a common recommendation that applies throughout the project.

He said he will talk about each housing type separately, as well as any respective conditions.

The townhouses are located in the north central portion of the project. The proposed number of units is 96 townhouse units which is consistent with the recorded plat. The only change is that the right-of-way for Price Drive, Willis Drive, Zoar Avenue and Kirsten Drive, was increased from 50 feet to 60 feet.

The only deviation being requested for the townhouses is a street width reduction from 30 feet to 28 feet. The Planning Commission did recommend approval of this deviation. He will discuss the road deviation in more detail, after he talks about the housing types, as a result of the plan that shows the various sections and will be easier to review.

The single-family homes are located in the southern half of the project. The proposed number of units is 162. There are no changes to this area from the preliminary plan. Some deviations are being request in the single-family area.

The first is a pavement reduction from 25 feet to 22 feet. The code states the pavement width is measured between face of curb to face of curb or edge of road to edge of road where curb is not present. The single-family streets use suburban roll curb which does not have a true, defined basic curb. When measuring from the flow line to flow line, the pavement

width is actually 24 feet. An odd number pavement width does not make sense and one of the items he has annotated for Rob when he has some free time, to start preparing draft amendments to be fixed and this is one of the areas in the code that he has asked to be considered. That deviation was not recommended though he asks Council to grant the deviation as the 24 feet from flow line to flow line, is consistent with the State Fire Marshal Regulations. In addition, with the roll curb a vehicle is actually able to ride the entire length. With that in mind, that width is extended to 26 feet.

The second deviation is to allow one the yards of the corner lots to be considered a side yard and the other a front yard and only applies to six or so lots. This deviation was recommended by the Planning and Zoning Commission.

The third deviation is to reduce the pavement from 30 feet to 28 feet for a portion of the streets. This deviation was also recommended by the Planning and Zoning Commission.

Lastly, he wants to talk about the recommendation of the City Planner and Planning Commission for a 50 buffer along the houses abutting the Milford Transfer Station. The preliminary plan was submitted and approved in 2007/2008, at which time the transfer station was constructed and in operation, did not have this buffer.

Based on Google Earth, sometime between March 2007 and August 2009, the transfer station was expanded to its current configuration. On March 4, 2019, a map was submitted for inclusion in the Council packet to be part of this presentation. This provides a picture of the site of the transfer station today, which is approximately 15 feet to 20 feet away from the property line. In lieu of that buffer, they are asking to allow a self-imposed 20-foot landscape screen between the property, which in essence provides a 30 to 35-foot buffer between the transfer station and the open area. The reason they do not want to create the open space and a path is because homeowners do not want individuals walking behind their houses and second, if a tree fell or similar incident occurred in that open space, the HOA would not have access because the entire area is wooded.

Also, the buffer only benefits those adjacent to the transfer station but the whole single-family community would be made responsible for its maintenance through their HOA fees. Finally, the potential lot purchaser would know that the parcel is located adjacent to the transfer station and would take more responsibility for that landscaped area behind the houses than the HOA probably would. For these reasons, they ask Council not require the 50-foot buffer but to allow a 20-foot landscape screen be placed on the individual lots for those most affected by the location.

When asked how many houses would be impacted, Mr. Lardner stated ten homes, which is less than 10% of the entire community.

Councilman Boyle referenced the side yard setback and asked if the property on the side of the house is common ground; Mr. Lardner confirmed it is part of the individual lot. It was confirmed it is property line to property line and there is no easement because everything will fit within the right-of-way.

Mr. Lardner clarified there is a 50-foot right-of-way, and off that right-of-way, is an eight-foot side yard, or eight-foot strip of grass than cannot be built upon, but owned by the homeowners and is not part of an easement.

The apartments are located in the northwestern portion of the project and will consist of twelve 24-unit buildings for a total of 288 units. In this area, three deviations are being requested.

The first is that the number of units per building be increased from 12 to 24. This involves combining of the buildings and does not increase the number of units, but allows for efficiency within the construction and operation of the units, which saves money for the residents through a lower rent. This deviation was recommended by the Planning Commission.

The second deviation is the paving width leading to the apartments to be reduced from 30 feet to 28 feet.

The last deviation is a request for a reduction in the number of parking spaces from 2.5 spaces per unit to 1.95 spaces per unit excluding the 55 garages that will be on a for-rent basis for interested occupants.

Mr. Lardner has presented the case on several different occasions that the parking rationale for apartments or multi-family communities is too high. He reported that his client recently completed a parking study for this same request in another jurisdiction and is included in the Council packet.

The projects were located in New Castle County and of a comparative size and nearly 100% occupied. The study revealed that only 1.67 spaces per unit was required. The study found that 1.44 spaces per unit would meet the residents' needs. The parking counts were taken during the highest usage after 11:00 pm on weeknights and Saturday mornings and also during low usage or mid-day during the week. The developer owns or manages nearly 5,000 quality apartments and is extremely concerned about parking and routinely re-evaluates to ensure the parking needs are met.

So much so, Mr. Lardner went through eight different exercises to ensure that in front of every building, they parked at 1.75 spaces in front of their buildings because they knew it was required. They moved parking and drew boxes to verify how in tune they are with this site. It took eight attempts to finally get it right for the developer to say it is right and to submit.

He further stated that the parking study he submitted for those sites, allowed parking at 1.67 spaces, though they only needed 1.44. As a result of the code requiring 2.5 spaces, though only 1.5 is needed and approval is being requested to meet in the middle and request for 2 spaces, which still provides plenty of overflow parking.

There are some vacancies and not everyone works at nighttime and there are spaces at night. There are some vacancies during the daytime when deliveries are made and repairs are made, because that is when most people are away at work. As a result, there is always parking available.

Furthermore, installing the additional parking spaces adds additional impervious area that requires additional maintenance and stormwater management which will affect the rents of the residents. The Planning and Zoning Commission recommended denial of this deviation and they are requesting Council to grant the deviation based on the owner's documented needs for parking and the desire to reduce impervious area.

Mr. Lardner confirmed there is approximately 40 feet between the apartment buildings. The ordinance's minimum number is 30 feet, but they exceed that number.

Mr. Lardner reported that the townhouse section has alleys to the rear of the yards. That will be primarily be used for trash services. This is not a deviation.

Various road sections were then referenced. The code states the face of curb has to be 30 feet. They show 28 feet of pavement with the theory that from face of curb to face of curb is where the other foot comes in play. Curbing has changed over time so to clean the record, Mr. Lardner felt it would be beneficial to ask for the deviation and allow for 28 foot of pavement and the face of curb to face of curb is going to be nearly 30 feet.

He emphasized this is the same street structure that is currently approved in Phase One. All they are asking to do is document this as part of the PUD to legitimize the cross sections. The true deviation is in the single-family residences.

He referred to a drawing where the face of curb is more defined and the area where there is no face of curb and is just a rolled curb that can be driven on. He said there is a flow line in the middle of the curb which is about one foot off edge of pavement. As a result, when you add 11 foot of travel lane and one foot of curbing, that provides 12 feet or 24 feet though the code states 25 feet. However, back of the curb to the back of the curb is 26 feet. Asking for the 24 feet makes it somewhat easier to understand, flow line to flow line, and the pavement width is 22 feet. That has been accepted and adopted by both DelDOT and the State Fire Marshal.

The pool and pool house amenity are for the apartment residents only. In addition, there is an unorganized. open play area and some other picnic benches to be used by the townhouses and single-family residents.

Construction documents were previously prepared for Phase 1 and are approved by the City and remain valid. A pre-construction meeting was held and construction had commenced, but has since stopped for various reasons, within the townhouse area. The erosion and sediment control plans remain valid and the entrance plans were approved in 2018.

He thanked Council for their time in reviewing the request.

Solicitor Rutt asked for clarification as Mr. Lardner had stated the Planning Commission had recommended a reduction from 30 to 28 feet. He said that is not correct and the motion did not include that.

Mr. Rutt stated the motion was to approve the conditional use for the PUD with the following conditions:

- \*maintain the 2.5 parking spaces
- \*increase units in the buildings from 12 to 24
- \*not permit the reduction from 25 feet to 22 feet
- \*require the wooded buffer on the south side of the parcel to 50 feet
- \*accept the one corner as a side yard

He reiterated the 30 feet to 28 feet was not mentioned in the motion.

Mr. Lardner said he stands corrected and thought it was because that is exactly what is on the recorded plan and is approved today.

Mr. Rutt said if Mr. Lardner wants that tonight, it essentially acted as a denial; Mr. Lardner agreed and said that is the reason he mentioned it and he thanked Mr. Rutt for the correction, though he thought it was approved and he apologizes.

Mr. Lardner reiterated they are asking for the reduction from 30 feet to 28 feet, which involves the same cross section on the recorded plan. The deviation for the PUD purposes is only carrying over what has been approved by City Council almost ten years ago.

When asked the breakdown of the apartments in relation to bedroom numbers, Mr. Lardner shared there are 60 units with one bedroom, 180 units are two bedroom and 48 units are three bedrooms. He said they actually have a parking space for each planned bedroom and above. If the City went to a per bedroom account, which he has done in other projects including the Cascades project, this plan meets that with extra parking on top of that.

He also noted that Sussex County allows two spaces per unit and actually start allowing a decrease after the first 75 units and an additional decrease after 200 units. Mr. Lardner does not believe he is asking for something out of the ordinary, but in this case, it is different in the City of Milford and a part of the code that he is anxious to work with Mr. Pierce to update the parking requirements.

Mr. Lardner noted that representatives from Milford Grain are in attendance and he did talk to them last week after he heard their comments. He did share with the developer the concern about the noise, dust, etc. created by the granary and plans to notify potential buyers. In addition, the buyers will understand they are buying next to the transfer station which will be on their plan and visible from the aerial.

There being no further questions, Mayor Campbell opened the floor for public comment. The floor was then closed.

Solicitor Rutt then explained the procedural status on this application.

He stated that under section 230-58(d) of the zoning code states that if the planning commission recommends an unfavorable or denial, City Council will need a 3/4 or six favorable votes.

The recommendation of the Planning Commission was mixed. Some of the requests recommended approval, some conditions the applicant wanted recommended denial. To be clean, Mr. Rutt recommends that on the points of denial, City Council vote on them individually.

The 2.5 to 2.0 parking space reduction and a reduction in street width from 25 to 22 feet and another street from 30 to 28 were recommended for denial by the Planning Commission.

The Planning Commission did recommend approval of combining the apartment units which increased the units from 12 to 24, approved one yard on the corner lot as a side yard setback and the wooded buffer on the south side of the parcel to 50 feet.

Mr. Rutt said Council has the right to accept the recommendation of the Planning Commission which means the parking spaces and the street widths remain as required in the code, along with the other conditions that were approved, or accept the conditions that were in the affirmative and then vote on each individual conditions that was recommended for denial.

With Mr. Rutt's comments, City Council felt the public comment should be re-opened.

Mayor Campbell then reopened the floor to public comment.

Nina Pletcher of South Walnut Street stated she is concerned if Council deviates from the City Code already in place that sets a precedence and this will not be the last time this conversation takes place. The other thing she is concerned about is the public service with the trash trucks, noting the City has new, larger trash trucks which she thinks are great. But she wonders if they will fit in the confined, smaller areas because the last thing the City needs is a complaint that someone's car gets hit. The drivers do their best to avoid issues, but with all due respect, there is not need to make their jobs any more complicated than they already are.

Jennifer Contravo of 207 South Walnut Street stated that when they ask to change it from 2.5 to 2, that would essentially mean all those spaces have 2 spaces available to them no matter how many drivers are then or when they are not. If everyone were to have those secured two spaces, what happens when there are other trash trucks and other people coming in. Nobody is probably ever there all at one time, but they still should be allotted that ability to have that and how far would the walking distance be if they didn't if someone else is in their space because she does not know how it is designated to secure that. She knows in some towns the resident has certain and these are yours. But when come in and wherever you go, what happens to those spaces and what if there is the open community for the playground and there is a pool and what if someone has more people coming to the pool and there are more drivers. She said who is the tenant that do not get their spaces and how far they have to walk.

Sam Passwaters of 319 Columbia Street said he may be wrong but as he noticed that print, the asphalt has several lays of maybe stone, etc. of support under the curbing and it does not show that. If he is asking to have trucks drive on that curbing, that needs to be addressed.

Carl King Jr. stated he is representing Milford Grain and he wants it made perfectly clear that the dust, noise and odor created by the granary is uncontrollable. They harvest over a million bushels every year. Vehicles are in and out and it causes dust and the hours of operation most of the time are daylight, but they do load out and do work many hours late at night and very early in the morning. All of that needs to be taken into consideration, especially where the apartments are planned toward the back of the granary. He feels that they need to understand that when they are living there, there will be dust, noise and odor and thought its not a health issue, or to that severity, but there is noise, dust and odor associated with that facility.

City Manager Norenberg referenced the question about the large trucks traveling through the development and noted there is a representative of Carlisle Fire Company and Public Works who may want to comment on the lane width issue.

Carlisle Fire Company President Kevin Donovan stated the only concern he has if they allow on-street parking in those alleys, that further reduces the width of the road. He agrees their trucks are getting bigger and bigger and harder to maneuver. There is a ladder truck and when it is set up it increases from eight feet wide to about fourteen feet wide. His only concern is the impact of the on-street parking. If that is not allowed, it is not a big deal to reduce the size of the road. If on-street parking is permitted, he would recommend keeping it the same width.

Councilman Boyle asked if the fire company has the appropriate equipment to handle a 48-foot high building. Mr. Donovan stated yes; they have a ladder truck that expands 110 feet. Based on the setback from the curb to the unit on how far they can reach though they can reach up to 110 feet.

Councilman James asked that other than in the alleys and on-street parking, there is no concern about the ladder truck, which he believes would be the largest vehicle in maneuvering in this development. Mr. Donovan said as long as there is no on-street parking, especially when their trucks made a turn, there is a risk of running into a vehicle. It will depend on how and where people park their cars.

Public Works Director Mark Whitfield said from a public services side, when this subdivision was first brought forward in the late 2000's, the City had another means of collecting refuse. With the new automated side loaders, collecting trash on a 20-foot alley is somewhat impractical. His crews would need to use alternate trucks in order to collect from those alleys.

He also echoes the fire company president's sentiments with regard to on street parking. As long as there is no on-street parking, his vehicles do not have a problem with maneuvering that width of street. However, if there is on-street parking, that is an issue.

There being no further comments, Mayor Campbell closed the public comment session.

Councilman Boyle stated he has lived in apartment complexes and has lived in PUD's and have lived in a HOA. He currently lives in an HOA where a lot of the things that are being requested can come back and haunt the homeowner. These are the kind of things that ten years ago got this City in a lot of trouble that we are experiencing now. He said things have changed in ten year and the plan has apparently been tweaked a little bit. He noted that the transfer station is closer and there is a problem with the grain elevator and he does not think a line of trees is not going to help much.

He has to answer the question about parking and knows that on-street parking cannot be controlled no matter what the documents say. People are going to park in the street. He approached the fire department a couple of years ago trying to resolve it when he was president of the HOA. He emphasized that a 22-foot-wide paved area does not work and is not wide enough to extend the equipment that may be needed. Some may be the physical layout but driveways and parking spaces make it almost impractical to park without blocking someone.

His other concern is reducing the parking from 2.5 spaces to 2. He noted that Newark is not like Milford. There is no public transportation and nothing is walkable so everyone needs a car. A family with one child who is a teenager results in three cars. A family with two teenagers may have four vehicles. People share apartments because they can't afford one alone, which means multiple drivers.

He has been in communities where only two spaces were allocated versus 2.5 and in his opinion, it makes a big difference and is often a fight among neighbors to park.

In Milford, it is a necessity to have a car.

Councilman Boyle is willing to accept the recommendations of the Planning Commission as they are responsible for doing that work for the City. Councilman Culotta stated that based on the apartments and the number of bedrooms, if one parking space is assigned per bedroom, he feels that is enough plus some. Councilmember Peel said that is assuming it is a nuclear family which she does not feel is realistic and this will involve a mom, dad and child. She feels there may be several generations of a family and roommates living together.

Councilmember Culotta feels that more than one person to a room is not very common.

Councilmember Boyle pointed out that a two-bedroom apartment with one teenager is three cars. Councilmember Culotta asked where does the teenager sleep; Councilmember Boyle said mom and dad sleep in one room and the teenager sleeps in the second room. Councilmember Culotta said apartments are used by people starting their careers and people in their retirement years. That is possible, but not as much.

Councilmember Boyle said our loyalty and our allegiance has to be with who is going to live in these developments and they will be our citizens. We are going to make their lives miserable before they even move in, or at least complicated. This needs to be considered long term and its not the developer and not the engineering firm or the builder. It will be the people who reside there who will be Milfordians and this Council needs to look out for them.

Councilmember Culotta said to the point about the granary and the transfer facility, he understands that could impact smell and cause dust. When he lived in the DC area, he was near the Dulles Airport and when a home was bought in that area, the buyer signed a waiver stating they know they live next to an airport and that person cannot complain about planes in the middle of the night. He asked if that is up to the developer or the apartment community and how can they be protected ten years from now when the odor really starts to bother them. At least they can be told they know that when they signed the lease.

Councilmember Peel said as long as they do, but she ventures to guess there are a lot of people retiring here that have never smelled cow or chicken manure and simply did not realize they would encounter it because they were quite a distance away.

Councilmember Culotta feels that if it is documented in their agreement, at least they have the opportunity to respond to it.

Councilmember James recalls this site plan from long ago when he was on the Planning Commission and recalled a lot of discussion about the granary. He asked if there were any buffer requirements on the granary side. Mr. Lardner responded by stating that there is a requirement for a 100-foot buffer on the granary side, which is shown on the plan. The buildings are approximately 150 to 200 feet away from the property line and the granary sits a little further back from that. They already meet the 100-foot buffer.

As far as the transfer station, no buffer was required and those lot lines went right to the property line and no landscape screening either. And that is how the preliminary plan was submitted and approved. It never went for recordation for the single-family homes next to the transfer station.

In the landscaped areas, some trees will be planted in those areas.

When discussing the need for potential property owners to sign a document stating they are aware of the potential problems as a result of the granary or the transfer station, Councilman Culotta said that should not be a requirement of the City. He would also like to protect the developer from any possible issues in the future and is willing to address that though he does not feel that should fall under the City.

Solicitor Rutt stated that is clause that would need to go into the lease or into the HOA documents. Councilman Culotta agreed that is not a City issue.

Councilmember Boyle said at the same time, we have the setback requirements and the buffers, and he would try to mitigate that. Councilmember Culotta said the development meets the minimums on the granary side and the transfer station. He also pointed out the transfer station is container in their building.

Councilmember Wilson stated that when Mr. Lardner spoke about the trend in parking requirements and asked if Mr. Pierce has noticed that in the requests that are coming through. Historically, the City has had requests to reduce our parking requirements on different projects, including Hearthstone Manor in the past, according to Mr. Pierce. There have been some Board of Adjustment variances that have been submitted or site plans approved previously and then reapproved. But in terms of a full analyzation or what an engineering or parking study would show, he has not looked into that. He has not done any research to review the requirements of other municipalities and counties. He does agree the counties do base their parking on bedrooms, may have a minimum standard for apartment units and then increase it with three or four bedrooms.

Councilmember Wilson suggests perhaps this may need to be considered in the future, if their engineer has done the legwork and has determined that our code may be a little more restrictive than needed.

Mr. Pierce said he next section of the code he plans to review is off-street parking requirements once the sign ordinance is amended.

Councilmember Mergner recommended driving through some of the newer neighborhoods including Orchard Hill, Meadows at Shawnee and Hearthstone, if a car is parked on the street, it is very difficult to pass. In his opinion, the

streets are too close and it is a dangerous situation. Residents cannot walk in the street without the risk of being hit by a car. The ordinance in general may need to be reviewed.

Councilmember Peel agreed adding that she thinks of her children riding a bike on that street where the car is parked in the street and how they would navigate that.

Councilmember James said there appears to be two different issues—street widths and parking spaces. He is hearing that at a minimum, a parking space should be assigned for each bedroom ‘plus’. He asked how many parking spaces are there per bedroom and would help in this conversation.

Councilman Boyle said he did a rough calculation and he came up with 564 parking spaces required to meet two per unit and the total they are proposing is 576 or a difference of 12. Councilman Culotta said that does not include the 55 rental garages so that is another 55 spaces. Mr. Lardner pointed out there is also clubhouse spaces that were intentionally removed that could always be used as overflow parking.

Mr. Lardner said some of these reductions were applied at Cascades noting that when you ride by there during the day, it is empty. When you ride through Milford Commons, it is empty. The apartment complexes are not full because they generally house families that are just starting out and could be singles. The goal in this community would to go from apartments to townhouses to single families and maybe inverse and go back as you get older.

He also stressed that if an apartment owner does not meet the client’s parking needs, people will not rent them. And if they clearly have a historical record of being 100% rented out at 1.44 spaces per unit, they must be doing a pretty good job. From that standpoint, they know those needs best.

Mr. Lardner understand City Council’s position in that they have to look out for the greater good of everyone. However, apartments are different from condos and condos are different than townhouses and townhouses are different from single family homes. Each has the potential for different parking rationale. Condos are owned, apartments are rented and some long-term lease them and some are short term leases. If parking is that great a concern, it is permissible in commercial settings, to earmark the land and set aside what can’t be developed on which provides the extra parking. If the homeowner finds out he needs it, that is already set aside.

They are not asking to increase density, but knowing his parking needs, a builder does not want to just pave something because the code says it has to be paved. Now it has to be paved, striped, insured and plow the snow. All those things come into play. It gives the owner the opportunity to know their tenants needs.

If it that much of a concern to Council, he has no problem earmarking the site plan the location of the additional half spaces and it won’t be developed. It will stay in grass in perpetuity because they know the developer will not need to pave it or need the parking.

When asked about a berm, Mr. Lardner explained that a berm will not help with the granary and trees will be the best separator when it comes to noise and dust.

With respect to the granary and considering they have been there all these years, they tried to move the structures away as far as they could and then try to be in harmony together.

Councilmember Wilson said she still has concerns with the street width reduction of 30 to 28 feet.

Mr. Lardner said if it makes everyone uneasy, don’t approve it. He said they already met it because the face of curb to face of curb is 30 foot. He was just trying to clean some of the language up. A pipe free curb and gutter has an eight-inch wide face. He then discussed the various types of curbing adding that he wanted to clean the record up.

Mr. Rutt then added that he has the Sussex County Parking Code that states for multi-family dwellings, two spaces per dwelling unit, plus one-half space for each bedroom over three bedrooms, for a maximum of three spaces, for one-bedroom efficiency unit, requires one and a half spaces per unit.

Councilman Culotta pointed out there are not apartments with more than three bedrooms so it is not an issue.

Councilmember James moved to adopt Ordinance 2019-09, to allow a Conditional Use for a Planned Use Development with the following approved conditions:

- increase units in the buildings from 12 to 24
- require a wooded buffer on the south side of feet adjacent to the Delaware Solid Waste Transfer Station;
- allow one of the two front yards be considered a side yard on corner lots

Motion seconded by Councilmember Peel. Motion carried by the following unanimous roll call vote:

Mergner-votes based on the discussion and motion that was made.

Boyle-votes yes in accordance with the motion.

Peel-votes yes in accordance with the motion and the recommendation of the Planning Commission.

Culotta-votes yes based on the Planning Commission recommendation.

Brooks-votes yes based on the Planning Commission recommendation.

Morrow- votes yes based on the Planning Commission recommendation.

James-votes yes based on the recommendation of the Planning Commission.

Wilson-votes yes for the same reasons stated by other Councilmembers.

Mr. Rutt reminded Council that the following conditions will need a super majority of Council to reverse the denial recommendation by the Planning Commission.

Councilmember Wilson moved to approve the reduction of parking spaces per unit from 2.5 to 2 spaces, seconded by Councilmember Culotta.

Motion carried by the following 6-2 roll call vote:

Mergner-votes yes.

Boyle-votes no.

Peel-votes no.

Culotta-votes yes.

Brooks-votes yes.

Morrow-votes yes.

James-votes yes because he feels that provides adequate parking for the parking.

Wilson-votes yes.

Councilmember Wilson moved to accept the recommendation by the Planning Commission to deny the reduction of street width and that it remains at 30 feet in the townhouse/apartment areas, seconded by Councilmember James.

Motion carried by the following unanimous roll call vote:

Mergner-votes yes to keep it at 30 feet and not deviate from the requirement.

Boyle-votes yes based on the Planning Commission recommendation on the condition.

Peel-votes yes to keep the width at 30 feet.

Culotta-votes yes because of the comments by the developer that it is not a life or death situation.

Brooks-votes yes based on the Planning Commission recommendation.

Morrow- votes yes based on the Planning Commission recommendation.

James-votes yes based on the comments from the developer and dialogue from other Councilmembers.

Wilson-votes yes ditto what Councilmember Peel stated.

Councilmember Boyle moved to reject the request to reduce the street width from 25 feet to 22 feet in the single-family detached unit area, seconded by Councilmember James.

Motion carried by the following unanimous roll call vote:

Mergner-votes yes and agrees with Councilmember Boyle's comments.

Boyle-votes yes to reject the request for the reduction.

Peel-votes yes to keep the width to keep in compliance with the Planning Commission's recommendation to deny the request.

Culotta-votes yes based on the Planning Commission recommendation.

Brooks-votes yes based on the Planning Commission recommendation.

Morrow-votes yes based on the Planning Commission recommendation.

James-votes yes based on the recommendation of the Planning Commission.

Wilson- votes yes based on the recommendation of the Planning Commission.

Councilmember Wilson moved to adopt Ordinance 2019-10, approving the Phase I Amended Preliminary Major Subdivision in accordance with the conditions imposed by Council in the PUD, seconded by Councilmember Peel. Motion carried by the following roll call vote:

Mergner-votes yes.

Boyle-votes yes.

Peel-votes yes.

Culotta-votes yes.

Brooks-votes yes.

Morrow-votes yes.

James-votes yes with the conditions approved by City Council.

Wilson- votes yes.

There being no further business, Mayor Campbell adjourned the meeting at 8:51 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Terri K. Hudson, MMC  
City Clerk/Recorder

MILFORD CITY COUNCIL  
MINUTES OF MEETING  
March 25, 2019

A Meeting of Milford City Council was held in the Joseph Ronnie Rogers Council Chambers at Milford City Hall on Monday, March 25, 2019.

PRESIDING: Mayor Archie Campbell

IN ATTENDANCE: Councilmembers Christopher Mergner, Mike Boyle, Lisa Ingram Peel, Todd Culotta, Owen Brooks Jr., Douglas Morrow, Jason James Sr. and Katrina Wilson

STAFF: City Manager Eric Norenberg, Police Chief Kenneth Brown and City Clerk Terri Hudson

COUNSEL: Solicitor David Rutt, Esquire

#### CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Campbell called the Council Meeting to order prior to the Public Hearing at 7:12 p.m. to recognize the Jefferson Award Recipients.

The Council Meeting resumed at 8:51 p.m.

#### INVOCATION AND PLEDGE

The Pledge of Allegiance as led by Boy Scout Troop 1116, followed the invocation was given by Councilmember Wilson.

#### RECOGNITION

##### *Jefferson Awards/Lead360 Local Project Presentation*

Madeline Milligan announced that the former Jefferson Awards for Public Service, created in 1972, has been rebranded 'Multiplying Good'. That name now encompasses a lot more than simply give out awards. They provide students with the tools and the knowledge to go out and create and impact by educating them on what they can be doing in their community with greater skills. They wanted a name that reflected that and did not only relate to awards. However, the Jefferson Awards are still their main recognition platform and what will be presented tonight.

She spoke about the Lead 360 program and its two phases and how the top project is selected and replicated in various activations.

She provided related information which can be found in the presentation included in the corresponding Council packet.

The following groups were recognized:

Phase II-  
Buckets of Love  
4H Foundation of Delaware  
Milford Central Academy & Jobs for Delaware Graduates

The top three winners, in order, were:  
Sammi Mitchell and MOT Charter were the top winners in Phase II  
Charter School of Wilmington  
Bank of America

Phase I:  
Boy Scouts Troop 116-Records Rescue

Girl Scouts of the Chesapeake Bay Troop 352-Interact to Impact  
Jessica Donovan-Be Safe Milford Food Pantry  
Milford High School Jobs for Delaware Graduates Program-Raised Garden Beds  
W.T. Chipman Middle School-Chat and Chew Lunch with Veterans and Holiday Toy Drive

Mayor's Top Project Selection:

Harrington Sunshine 4-H Club-Veterans Care Packets & Monthly Nursing Home Visits

Ms. Milligan invited those present to the Delaware Salute to Service at which time all the Mayor's Top Projects will be recognized. In addition, the next year's phase 2 project will be selected.

*Proclamation 2019-06/National Service Day*

Mayor Campbell presented the following proclamation to National Service Expert Nancy Greene and National Service Member Melissa Stevenson Enck:

*Proclamation 2019-06/National Service Day-April 2, 2019*

*WHEREAS, service to others is a hallmark of the American character, and central to how we meet our challenges; and WHEREAS, the City of Milford is increasingly turning to national service and volunteerism as a cost-effective strategy to meet their needs; and*

*WHEREAS, AmeriCorps and Senior Corps participants address the most pressing challenges facing our communities, from educating students for the jobs of the 21st century, to fighting the opioid epidemic, to responding to natural disasters, to supporting veterans and military families; and*

*WHEREAS, national service expands economic opportunity by creating more sustainable, resilient communities and providing education, career skills, and leadership abilities for those who serve; and*

*WHEREAS, AmeriCorps and Senior Corps participants serve in more than 50,000 locations across the country, including Sussex County, bolstering the civic, neighborhood, and faith-based organizations that are so vital to our economic and social wellbeing; and*

*WHEREAS, national service participants increase the impact of the organizations they serve, both through their direct service and by managing millions of additional volunteers; and*

*WHEREAS, national service represents a unique public private partnership that invests in community solutions and leverages nonfederal resources to strengthen community impact and increase the return on taxpayer dollars; and*

*WHEREAS, national service participants demonstrate commitment, dedication, and patriotism by making an intensive commitment to service, a commitment that remains with them in their future endeavors; and*

*WHEREAS, the Corporation for National and Community Service shares a priority with local leaders nationwide to engage citizens, improve lives, and strengthen communities; and join with the National League of Cities, the National Association of Counties, Cities of Service, and local leaders across the country for National Service Recognition Day on April 2, 2019.*

*NOW, THEREFORE, I, Arthur J. Campbell, Mayor of the City of Milford, Delaware, do hereby proclaim April 2, 2019, as National Service Recognition Day in the City of Milford and encourage all residents to recognize the positive impact of national service in our community, to thank those who serve; and to find ways to give back to their communities need.*

Both recipients thanked Mayor Campbell and City Council for the acknowledgment.

*ICMA Fellow Evan Miller*

Mr. Norenberg announced that Mr. Miller will be moving on to the next step of his career in Milford to accept a position with the City of Rehoboth Beach. He recalled that Mr. Miller, was hired by the City as an International City/County Management Association (ICMA) Local Government Management Fellow. His fellowship was a shared position with the City of Rehoboth Beach that began in June 2019.

The City Manager provided a long list of accomplishments that can be attributed to Mr. Miller's expertise.

Mr. Miller then spoke stating that he is honored to have worked for the City of Milford and the staff who have been very helpful the past two years.

He will be starting with the City of Rehoboth Beach as their Project Coordinator, continuing to do a lot of the duties he currently does such as grant administration, policy implementation, capital improvement plan, budgets, assisting the Parks and Recreation Department with the transition to new software.

Mr. Evan thanked everyone for providing the opportunity to work here.

Mr. Norenberg announced that Mr. Miller is currently assisting with his replacement whom the City of Milford will share with the City of Lewes.

#### COMMUNICATION & CORRESPONDENCE

Included in packet.

#### UNFINISHED BUSINESS

##### *Authorization/Downtown Development District Boundary/Expansion*

Planning and Economic Development Director Pierce recalled at the last meeting Council discussed the proposed expansion of the Downtown Development District (DDD) area from 170 acres to 185 acres. Two options were proposed. Council asked him to provide some additional statistics based on code violations, building permits, rental licenses and vacant land. He has included that information in the Council packet.

Maps/exhibits of the area were presented showing properties since 2017 with code violations, parcels that received the building permits for construction, vacant land available for new construction and finally a map showing registered rental properties.

Also received were some written requests from property owners to be included in the DDD.

Two are on North Street, where the property owner is interested in constructing new single-family homes. The same owner constructed two new homes on Marshall Street as part of the DDD program.

Another request was from Mobius Investments, who owns several properties including the old firehouse and some of the state buildings. They are requesting the Gods Way facility be incorporated into the DDD to redevelop it as mixed use.

The First Presbyterian Church on South Walnut has also submitted a request to be included in the DDD area for some refurbishments to their church building.

A request was received from the property owner on Southeast Second Street which is outside of the proposed DDD area and involves an existing unit that needs some renovation work. That is owned by the same gentleman interested in building the two homes on North Street.

He also referenced the two options discussed at the previous meeting.

Option one includes land adjacent to the northwest portion of the District and includes parcels north of NW Fifth Street between Truitt Avenue and North Street. Within this area, there are 91 tax parcels containing approximately 19 vacant lots. This area has had 12 building permits issued since 2017, 32 properties with code violations since 2017 and contains 16 registered rental properties. This area contains two vacant properties that requested to be considered for the DDD expansion for the construction of new residential dwellings.

Option two includes land along South Washington Street between Southeast Second Street and Ball Park Lane, including those lots north of the Little League fields and Parks & Recreation administrative building. Within this area, there are

76 tax parcels containing approximately 4 vacant lots. This area has had 16 building permits issued since 2017, 41 properties with code violations since 2017 and contains 7 registered rental properties.

Based on the information analyzed, staff recommends moving forward with Option 1 in terms of opportunities for new construction and the need of the community.

Councilmember Culotta thanked Mr. Pierce for all the work he has done. If he had to pick one, it would be the area where he lives.

Councilman James recalled that his recommendation was based on the facts presented to Council at that time and with the additional information presented this evening, the pros of option one clearly outweighs the pros for option two.

Councilman Culotta said he has had a lot of feedback from his constituents asking questions about the DDD. His recommendation is to send it back to the committee level to take public comments so those constituents have a say in how this is handled. He is basing this on the large number of calls and feedback he has received and those residents would like to have a say in how this is decided.

Councilmember Wilson confirmed that those constituents are not basing their concerns on what is being presented to Council, but other areas in the community. Councilman Culotta said that is correct and because he represents the people that have these concerns, they want input on where to extend the DDD.

Mr. Norenberg said that normally this would go to the Community and Economic Development and based on that schedule, their next meeting would be in May. He asked if there is a deadline that needs to be met and if so, a special meeting may need to be scheduled.

Mr. Pierce explained the expansion request typically occurs with the annual review of the DDD and is based on related statistics and information with the Office of State Planning which is due by June 1<sup>st</sup>. He explained that would only provide him the guidance and it would not be adopted until after the Cabinet Committee for State Planning approved it. It would then be adopted by City Council.

He explained this opportunity is the result of an increase in acreage for all population ranges for existing municipal DDDs. This could be a one-time possibility to increase the area by fifteen acres. If this does not proceed, he thinks it may be done a little later though he was attempting to get out in front to give Milford the most opportunity to take advantage of the increase.

Mr. Pierce clarified he does not know if there will be a future expansion, though he knows they are planning to add two more municipalities to the program that currently has eight participating. However, the same total of funds will be used so each town will receive less funding.

Councilman James stated that Council has had the time to absorb the information considering the previous discussions even after Mr. Pierce as asked to provide additional information.

He further stated that if he was making his recommendation on his constituents in his ward, he would have informed those concerned persons to attend the meeting on March 25<sup>th</sup> to hear the conversation.

Councilman James feels that after all the work that has been, he feels it is the duty of Council to make a motion tonight. Dragging it out does not appear beneficial to him.

Councilmember Wilson agrees adding that this information was not on individual wards, but instead based on facts. She said that Mr. Pierce looked at the City as a whole and made a decision based on those statistics. It should not be about wards and instead Council needs to consider the Planner's recommendation and move forward.

Councilmember Culotta agrees with his fellow Councilmembers and if this is decided by our City Planner, there has not had any public input from constituents.

Councilman James disagreed stating that the decision is not being made by the City Planner and instead made by Council through a motion and a vote.

Mr. Pierce then responded by saying that he would like to take a sliver of the river out, and when he asked the State of Delaware, they informed him he could not remove the river. However, he could ask to remove a small area to get the other written request to include the church.

It was confirmed items like this are typically made by Council and public comment is not normally taken.

Councilman Boyle asked if the boundary is flexible based on information and after going through the proper channels and asked if the flood plain can be removed; Mr. Pierce explained that there must be serious justification for removing properties or change the area in the DDD area. That is due to the investments and decisions being made by property owners based on the DDD.

He clarified there is an avenue to remove areas from the DDD, but it must be based on a significant reason.

Councilman Boyle asked if there would be any interest in building in the floodplain. Mr. Pierce said that is the reason for the mixed-use property, shown on exhibit B in the packet, was not included. It could be expanded in that area but a lot of land is being eaten up on large chunks of land that are primarily in the floodplain. Councilman Boyle said he was considering the properties on Front Street that are in the floodplain.

Mr. Pierce considered removing certain areas because of that, but they discouraged that and prohibit enclaves and the reason they did not pull out some of the park areas and the river to allow more opportunity for other property owners.

When asked about the Gods Way site, Mr. Pierce explained they want to redevelop the site into a mixed-use project that would include apartments with commercial uses or all residential use. The owner also has other properties available for redevelopment that are still vacant, including the old firehouse.

Councilwoman Peel asked about two properties on North Street and Mr. Pierce confirmed that Joe Wiley had gone through the minor subdivision process previously, and he is interested in new housing options there.

The Planning Director stated that if our plan is to increase home ownership in the downtown area, option one provides more options for new housing. Infill development should be encouraged by the municipality versus sprawling out into the communities due to utilities being available and services within walking distance.

Councilman James moved to recommend to the State of Delaware Office of Planning with option one, seconded by Councilmember Peel. Motion carried.

## NEW BUSINESS

### *Authorization/AT&T Water Tower Lease*

Deferred until April 8, 2019 Council meeting.

### *Bid Award/Shawnee Acres Pump Station Replacement*

Public Works Director Mark Whitfield reported that bids were opened for this project. This pump station also serves as the receiving station for the new Southeast Regional Pump Station, which serves the new Bayhealth Hospital. It is under capacity and there have been numerous maintenance issues over the past several years, due to the type and size of the pump currently used.

The project will be funded through a USDA Loan/Grant. The award must also be approved by the USDA. The project budget for the construction project was \$1,432,925.

The low bidder was Kuhn Construction Company of Hockessin, DE, in the amount of \$1,398,750 with funding through the USDA Loan/Grant, which is his recommendation.

Councilmember Wilson moved to award the Shawnee Acres Pump Station Kuhn Construction Company of Hockessin, DE, in the amount of \$1,398,750 with funding through the USDA Loan/Grant, seconded by Councilman James. Motion carried.

*Bid Award/Sidewalk Replacement Project*

Mr. Whitfield recalled that when this was bid last year, the City only received on bid which was extremely high. They talked with various contractors to ask why they did not bid and most indicated they had no idea what the quantity was going to be.

He explained the new bid provided various ranges based on the quantity of sidewalks repaired. The more sidewalks completed under the contract, the less expensive the square foot price. Additionally, separate prices for 4” thick sidewalk and 6” thick sidewalk (at driveways) were obtained.

Bids for the project were opened on March 14 and of the two bids received, one bidder failed to submit a bid surety, and therefore was disqualified.

Based on the lowest responsible bid, the replacement of sidewalks under the City’s responsibility would be as follows:

	<u>at \$17.95/sf</u>	<u>at \$15.70/sf</u>	<u>at \$13.55/sf</u>	<u>at \$12.95/sf</u>
Water	\$37,246	\$32,577	\$28,116	\$26,871
Electric	\$16,155	\$14,130	\$12,195	\$11,655
Sewer	\$ 897	\$ 785	\$ 678	\$ 648
Streets	\$29,617	\$25,905	\$22,358	\$21,368

Costs to property owners for a single sidewalk block (approximately 25 sf) would be as follows:

<u>Price</u>	<u>Cost for 1 block</u>
\$17.95/sf	\$448.75
\$15.70/sf	\$392.50
\$13.55/sf	\$338.75
\$12.95/sf	\$323.75

When this information is provided to the property owners, they will be provided with the range which can be used for comparison purposes.

As part of this project, 3,500 square feet is the amount of sidewalk the City is responsible where water meter pits, utility poles, street signs, hydrants, street tree roots, and sewer cleanouts, have caused damage. The range the City will be responsible for will range from \$60,000 to \$83,000, depending on the total quantity.

He recommends City Council award the Sidewalk Replacement Project-Year 1 to Diamond Materials of Newport, Delaware, at a not-to-exceed price of \$660,537.50. This price covers all sidewalks that need repairs and is the maximum price as a result.

Councilman James referenced the language in the code that states ‘in regard to all sidewalks within, adjacent to or parallel to an owner’s property line though it may be partially in a City right-of-way or easement is considered he property owner’s responsibility’.

He asked if a portion of the sidewalk is not within the legal boundary line, what happens because section of the code he read states the sidewalk is their responsibility though technically they are city-owned.

Mr. Whitfield said his understanding is the property owner owns to the center of the street. The City owns a right-of-way and the thought is the property owner is responsible for anything within your property including the right-of-way in front of your property and deferred to the solicitor.

Mr. Rutt said in a perfect world that is correct. When reviewing deeds in the City of Milford of which many go back to the 1700's and early 1800's, the land dimensions have changed and some of the property lines do not go to the curb. Some go out into the street. Therefore, they do fluctuate. There is a presumption that if there is a city sidewalk in front of you, the property owner is responsible for the maintenance and care because it benefits your property.

He agrees that the property line may fall in the sidewalk, behind the sidewalk or on the other side of the sidewalk.

Councilman James said using himself as an example, he owns some of each and he has properties with the marker in the sidewalk. He also has a property marker that is several feet away from the sidewalk. He has heard from many residents from throughout the City who complain about their sidewalk not being part of their property. He understands the presumption, but does not know how to explain that to the citizens.

Councilman Culotta said he also understands that the code says the homeowner is responsible. But to take that code and send a letter out to everyone saying the City is going to start enforcing this and the property owner will be responsible. He said we have not notified them that there may be public money available if they qualify for it. But we have gone so far as to send letters stating the property owner will get another letter directing them but this letter is only preparing them.

Councilman Culotta said that was not decided by him or any elected official. It may have been before he came along, but he thinks this is two parts. He feels we need to start about the City sidewalks and the financing that is needed. And then Council needs to talk about the homeowners and how that will be handled and not go by what the code says. He recalled when Councilman Brooks stated the code can be changed by Council at any time.

Councilman Culotta said he does not like how it started, how it was communicated and the level of negative feedback from as Councilman James alluded to, not just from his ward but all wards.

The other problem is there is only bid again despite the reason the other contractor was disqualified.

Councilman Culotta appreciates what the City is trying to do by getting a better per square foot cost. The contractors are bidding even though they have no idea what they may be adding it is somewhat of an expensive amount for a sidewalk repair.

Councilman Brooks said he asked Council and the City Manager about concerns over an inch drop and an inch and a half here and if the code needs to be changed. Basically, he was told and he thinks Council was also told, it was going to be put in the hands of the Public Works Committee and after it was reviewed, it would be brought back to Council. He said no one every got back to him and asked Doug if that is correct.

Councilman Morrow believes the Public Works Committee last met in August during which time they asked for more information related to total number of sidewalk slabs. His point at that meeting was to figure out the assistance package before letters were sent out. He feels Council should have answers before the questions are asked. The first question his constituents ask if where the homeowner can get financial help and what is the cost if the City handles it, though that has been presented tonight.

Councilman Culotta asked if Council ever decided this is an issue they don't want to take with residents.

Councilman Mergner recalled at one time, the plan was to do a savings plan, but that was denied by some Councilmembers. He feels that savings plan could have been used to pay for these types of repairs. Councilmember Peel agreed that was included in the budget two years ago. She said that was because the Councilmembers were in disagreement about the way the code was written and who was going to be fiscally responsible.

She continued by recalling that there was a discussion about going away from what the code says to start a savings program and they began discussions about who would be funded initially.

Councilman James agrees the code needs to be addressed because the City Manager and the Director of Public Works says they are doing what the code says. Council agreed they are doing the work based on an ordinance that Council approved at some point. However, he does not like the code.

Councilman Brooks said he asked and he was told they would get back with him.

Councilman Morrow also pointed out there are some areas that do not have sidewalks and that was a problem.

Councilman Culotta said if he asks someone in the Mayor's neighborhood if they feel the sidewalks need to be fixed in Milford, they are going to say yes. If he asks people in his neighborhood, they might say but not want to pay for it.

When asked how the proposed savings fund was going to be funded, Councilman Mergner recalled that money was going to be put aside each year for the project.

Councilman Morrow said Council gave it back to management to review what funding was available.

Mr. Norenberg recalled at one point, and based on the complaints he had heard about the conditions of Milford's sidewalks for many years, the Finance Director proposed putting money in the budget each year to do some in an attempt to start getting the sidewalks repaired. However, that did not go anywhere.

He recalled that last year, City Planner Pierce put together a plan and applied for CDBG funds. That was denied even though it involved a low-income area with extremely damaged sidewalks, gaps or no sidewalks. Other than CDBG, he is unaware of any other funding available unless many years ago there was some streetscape money available for the downtown area.

The City Manager pointed out that they are trying to adhere to the code which is very similar to other municipal codes that put the sidewalk responsibility on the property owners and sets standards of criteria related to trip hazard or other safety issues. The last time this was discussed was last October and there have been numerous conversations in the Public Works Committee and several times by Council over the past two years.

He thinks it would be helpful if each individual Councilperson would provide direction about specific concerns about the code and whether it is the ownership responsibility, the standards or is there a problem with the trip hazard.

The City Manager recalled sending an email, though this was prior to Councilman James being on Council, with information about health benefits and property value benefits that are the result of having sidewalks. When in a walkable area, sidewalks become an amenity and is part of the price of a house when it is purchased. He will forward the email to Councilman James.

It could also be a negative if someone were to sell a house that had sidewalks in front that were in very poor condition. Either way, some concrete feedback is needed so that Council and staff can stop spinning on this.

It was also noted that most cities in Delaware are struggling with this as well with most having similar codes, other than Wilmington.

Councilman Culotta said that Georgetown announced they are putting a fund together to improve sidewalks. Councilman Mergner said that was the attempt in Milford a couple years ago.

Councilman Culotta appreciates what the City Manager is saying, but the choice to enforce it in a shotgun approach to everyone that needs to repair their sidewalks, as opposed to looking at the worst offenders first. He also recommended taking care of the City's first and then the City can go to the homeowners and inform them there is a need to improve sidewalks or if buying a new home, the sidewalks need to be included as part of the condition.

Councilmember Peel pointed out that was done and recalled the project to prioritize the severity.

Public Works Director said the priority was set to look at streets that service the downtown areas as well as streets that service the schools where students walk. That was the direction as first priority.

Mr. Rutt read from the code:

In all instances, property owners shall be responsible for maintaining, repairing, or replacing sidewalks and for keeping sidewalks in good repair, in safe condition and free of vegetation and shall not permit hazards to either pedestrian or vehicular traffic to exist. All sidewalks within, adjacent to, or approximately parallel to an owner's property line, although it may be situated partially or wholly in a City right-of-way or easement, shall be considered the property owner's responsibility.

Councilman James and Wilson agree there is a problem with the language if you are not the owner of the land the sidewalk is on. He recalled working on the sidewalk ordinance and when a developer built, a sidewalk fee needed to be paid, or sidewalks had to be installed, etc. He believes the code was in placed though they wrestled with the property.

He is concerned about a property owner who is aware their property stops before the sidewalk and now receives a letter from the City saying they are responsible and they need to pay to have fixed.

Councilman Boyle said we first need to decide if we want to proceed with repairing the sidewalks, and in what order, and how to handle properties where the sidewalks are not part of their property. If it is half on, perhaps the City can pay half and the property owner pays half. Everyone knows there are exceptions and perhaps they need to be considered individually.

He said that everywhere he lived he had a sidewalk and there were never questions about the responsibility being his.

Councilman Culotta feels the code needs to be reviewed and make changes if needed. He appreciates the sidewalk repair project and it will slow that down. He does not think the entire Council will agree to tell a homeowner they need to fix their sidewalk and if not, the City will handle and bill them.

In lieu of a committee meeting, Councilman Morrow preferred having a workshop where all eight Councilmember were in attendance. Otherwise, it could involve multiple meetings.

Councilmember Peel said because we have done these steps that are being recommended such as the eight Councilmember talking about it and the inventory and priority has been done, consider what information is needed. Council left this before knowing that winter was coming and this will provide another delay. In thinking about that, Council needs to ask for the exact information so that we can be prepared.

Mayor said where he lived the homeowner was responsible and if it did not get fixed, the City would pay for it with no interest.

All those items need to be addressed.

It was agreed that a workshop needs to be scheduled. Mr. Norenberg said he will need to talk to the City Clerk this week because there are a number of workshops already scheduled, in addition to the regular committee meetings. He again asked for each Councilmember to make a list of those specific concerns in the code and get that to either him, the Solicitor or the City Clerk so it can be pulled together and all of us better prepared.

Councilmember Peel moved to defer action on the Sidewalk Project, seconded by Councilman James. Motion carried.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Councilmember Boyle moved to go into Executive Session reference the below statutes, seconded by Councilmember Peel:

*Pursuant to 29 Del. C. §10004(b)(9) Personnel Matter*

Motion carried.

Mayor Campbell recessed the Council Meeting at 9:50 p.m. for the purpose permitted by the Delaware Freedom of Information Act.

*Return to Open Session*

Council returned to Open Session at 10:47 p.m.

City Manager Norenberg returned at this time.

*Employee Evaluation*

Councilmember Wilson moved to approve the City Manager’s contract for one year with a 3% increase, including the cost of living, seconded by Councilmember Peel. Motion carried by the following roll call vote of 5 to 3:

Yes:

Mergner, Boyle, Peel, James, Wilson

No:

Culotta, Brooks, Morrow

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, Councilmember Wilson moved to adjourn the Council Meeting, seconded by Councilmember James. Motion carried.

The Council Meeting adjourned at 10:51 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Terri K. Hudson, MMC  
City Clerk/Recorder

Attachment:

Jefferson Awards/Multiplying Good/Lead 360 Program Presentation

# LEAD 360

## City of Milford Awards Ceremony

March 25th, 2019



# JEFFERSON AWARDS

MULTIPLYINGGOOD

## THE POWER OF SERVICE TO OTHERS

We believe individuals are transformed through service to others. Applying service as a tool for personal growth, we help people discover their ability to bring about positive change, deliver the skills they need to do it well, and, by validating their impact, inspire them to do more. We've proven this continuum of activation, training, and recognition generates ripples of good.



## LEAD360 is an initiative of Multiplying Good

- One of the largest youth service contests in America
- Taps into the energy and idealism of young people
- Encourages them to share their stories of service with millions

### Phase One:

LEAD360 makes service easy-to-do, fun and accessible by seeking outstanding youth projects and replicating the best statewide. We then celebrate those who activate the most. LEAD360 starts with a contest for young people to submit their projects to solve problems they are most passionate about. We look for any type of service-big or small

### Phase Two:

After a winner is selected, Multiplying Good activates the winning idea across the state through our constituents and partners. Participants share their impact on our online platform, and those who activate the most throughout the year win Jefferson Awards!

## To date Delaware LEAD360 has seen:

- ❖ 785 projects and big ideas
- ❖ Engaged over **230K** individuals in community service
- ❖ Over **1M** hours of community service
- ❖ Generated over **\$25M** worth of impact in Delaware



This year we had 7 mayors in Delaware commit to host and promote LEAD360 in their communities.

City of Dover: Mayor Robin Christiansen

Town of Georgetown: Mayor Bill West

City of Lewes: Mayor Ted Becker

City of Milford : Mayor Archie Campbell

City of Newark: Mayor Polly Sierer

City of Seaford: Mayor David Genshaw

City of Wilmington: Mayor Mike Purzycki



## State of Delaware Phase 2 Buckets of Love Results

30 Activations  
3,376 Buckets of Love  
=  
\$33,760 value

## Thank you to everyone who participated in activating Buckets of Love!

### 4-H Foundation

All Saints Episcopal Church  
Bank of America (Newark)  
Bank of America (Wilmington)  
Barclays  
Belfint, Lyons & Shuman, CPAs  
Buccini Pollin Group  
Charter School of Wilmington SGO  
City of Wilmington  
DAEOP

DE SIA Fall Leadership Conference  
Delaware State University  
Duffield Associates (Dover)  
Duffield Associates (Wilmington)  
H.B. DuPont Middle School  
Jobs for DE Graduates Staff  
Journey Church

### Milford Central Academy & JDG

Multiplying Good Advisory Board  
New Castle County PAL

Newark High School JDG  
Oberod  
MOT Charter K-8 Academy  
Sammi Mitchell  
Seaford Middle School  
Smyrna High School JDG  
Multiplying Good Interns  
Sussex Tech High School  
Western Sussex Boys & Girls Club  
Wilson Elementary School





## Congratulations Buckets of Love Activation Winners!



Sammi Mitchell & MOT Charter

**807** Buckets of Love =  
**\$8,070** Financial Value



Charter School of Wilmington  
Student Government

**647** Buckets of Love =  
**\$6,470** Financial Value



Bank of America

**325** Buckets of Love =  
**\$3,250** Financial Value

**Milford  
Phase 1 Results**

**8 Projects**

**393 Volunteers**

**4,543 Volunteer Hours**

**32,015 Lives Impacted**

**Over \$115.6K of Financial Impact in  
Milford**

# Boy Scout's of America Troop #116 Records Rescue



## Girl Scout of the Chesapeake Bay Troop #352 INTERACT to IMPACT



## Jessica Donovan Be Safe Milford Food Pantry



Milford High School  
Jobs for Delaware Graduates  
Raised Garden Beds



## W. T. Chipman Middle School Jobs for Delaware Graduates Chat and Chew Lunch with Veterans & Holiday Toy Drive



# Mayor's Top Project: Harrington Sunshine 4-H Club Hospital Care Packets



Monthly Nursing Home Visits

# State of Delaware Phase 1 Results

175 Projects

38,713 Volunteers

155,037 Volunteer Hours

164,660 Lives Impacted

**Over \$3.9M Financial Impact**



YOU'RE INVITED TO  
**MULTIPLY GOOD**  
AT  
THE JEFFERSON AWARDS

**DELAWARE SALUTE TO SERVICE**

Monday, April 29, 2019  
The Queen Wilmington

Awards Ceremony  
6:00pm

Formal Invitation and  
Award Recipients to Follow

For sponsorship opportunities or questions contact  
**Daniel Condoluci-Smith**  
(302) 295-0527 | [daniel@jeffersonawards.org](mailto:daniel@jeffersonawards.org)

Private Donors cover our operating and fundraising costs.  
100% of your sponsorship goes to impact in Delaware.

The 2019 Delaware Top Project will be announced at Delaware Salute to Service.

Throughout 2019 we will track the collective impact of this project across the state of Delaware.

We invite individuals, organizations, schools, companies, and communities to participate in LEAD360 through our new project when it is announced.

Jefferson Awards will be given to those who make the biggest impact in Delaware.

# LEAD 360

## City of Milford Awards Ceremony

Thank you to all of our participants, families,  
parents and Mayor Campbell for supporting  
youth service.

