

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF September 8, 2016

The regular meeting of the Sussex County Planning and Zoning Commission was held on Thursday evening, September 8, 2016 in the County Council Chambers, Sussex County Administrative Office Building, Georgetown, Delaware.

The meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m. with Vice Chairman Ross presiding. The following members of the Commission were present: Mr. Martin Ross, Mr. I.G. Burton, III, and Mr. Doug Hudson with Vincent Robertson, Esquire – Assistant County Attorney, Mr. Lawrence Lank – Director, and Ms. Janelle Cornwell – Planning and Zoning Manager.

Motion by Mr. Burton, seconded by Mr. Hudson, and carried unanimously to approve the Agenda as circulated. Motion carried 3 – 0.

Motion by Mr. Burton, seconded by Mr. Hudson, and carried unanimously to approve the Minutes of August 25, 2016 as amended. Motion carried 3 – 0.

PUBLIC HEARING

Mr. Robertson described the public hearing process.

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND THE CODE OF SUSSEX COUNTY, CHAPTER 115 (“ZONING”), ARTICLE XXI (“SIGNS”).

Mr. Lank advised the Commission that 20 emails had been received in opposition to the Ordinance and that the emails appeared to be mostly from Realtors and Real Estate Agents relating to real estate and development signs.

Mr. Robertson reminded the Commission that previously the Planning and Zoning Commission held a public hearing on the Introduced Ordinance; an Alternate Ordinance was suggested by a sign company and developer group represented by David Hutt, Esquire; the Planning and Zoning Commission created a Planning and Zoning Commission Version of the Ordinance for recommendation to the County Council; the County Council held a public hearing on the Introduced Ordinance and gave consideration to the Alternate Ordinance and the Planning and Zoning Commission Version of the Ordinance; that the County Council discussed the Ordinances on several occasion and it was decided that the Revised Ordinance should be considered after public hearings by the Planning and Zoning Commission and the County Council.

James Sharp, Esquire and Assistant County Attorney, provided a PowerPoint display of a Historical Chart of Changes to the Ordinance; referenced that the Introduced Ordinance Amendments were considered back in April 2016; that an Alternate Ordinance was introduced by the Sign Companies and Developers through David Hutt, Esquire; that the Planning and Zoning Commission review the original Ordinance Amendments and the Alternate Ordinance and established some changes and came up with a Planning and Zoning Commission Version of the Ordinance; that after the County Council held a public hearing and reviewed the ordinances it

was determined by that there was a need to go back to public hearings and consider a final version of the Ordinance Amendments; and then provided an overview of the proposed changes in the sign provisions within the proposed Ordinance Amendments. In summation, the items discussed were: 1) a Purpose statement was included to provide clarity as to the reason we have a sign ordinance which resulted in a re-numbering of 115-157 to 115-157.1; 2) changed definition to state that the on-premises sign is deemed abandoned when the sign no longer advertises an ongoing business and the sign permit has been expired for 6 months which resulted in a slight change to 115-158(j); 3) revised definition of abandoned off-premises signs to state that off-premises signs which are not used as an off-premises sign for 6 months are deemed abandoned which results in a slight change in 115-158(k); 4) inserted a definition of Ground Level as set forth in the Alternate Ordinance in 115-157.1; 5) restored the definition of Multi-faced Signs in the definitions 115-157.1; 6) revised the definition of public lands to strike reference to lands in an Agricultural Preservation District as referenced in 115-157.1; 7) revised the definition of sign area for clarity in 115-157.1; 8) retained the definition of a sign face in 115-157.1; 9) retained the definition of Electronic Message Center (EMC) as set forth in the introduced Ordinance; removed the Electronic Message Display (EMD) definition and all references to EMD; and removed the definitions of “Dissolve”, “Fade”, “Frame”, “Frame Effect”, “Scroll”, “Transition”, and “Travel” and inserted them alphabetically in 115-157.1; 10) removed the phrase “by permit” from the definition of “non-conforming Sign” and “non-conforming off-premises sign” in 115-157.1; 11) added the phrase “ongoing” to business which requires that the business be an ongoing business in the definition of On-Premises Electronic Message Center in 115-157.1; 12) added the phrase “ongoing” to business which requires that the business be an ongoing business in the definition of an On-Premises Sign in 115-157.1; 13) prohibited V-signs where the sign faces are more than 60 degrees at their point of juncture for both on-premises and off-premises signs in 115-158; 14) removed the prohibition in the Introduced Ordinance on signs which have more than 2 faces resulting in removal of 115-158 (n); 15) amended several sections of the Ordinance to read “per side” rather than “per side or facing” relating to both on-premises and off-premises signs to provide clarity in the Ordinance; 16) amended several sections of the Ordinance by inserting “of sign area” where appropriate to better establish the area of the sign subject to sign limitations for on-premises and off-premises signs; 17) restored the language that allows for one sign per street or road frontage for on-premises ground signs; 18) restored the language that allows for one sign per street or road frontage for on-premises Electronic Message Centers in 115-161.1(A)(1)(2); 19) keep Introduced Ordinance as written so that all references to Electronic Message Centers are in 115-161.1; 20) restored and revised the wall sign section to allow for more than one wall sign provided that the total amount of wall signs does not exceed 150 square feet or 15% of the total square footage of the wall area on which the signs are located, whichever is greater; language regarding shopping centers; and dealing with on-premises wall signs only in 115-159.4(A)(5) and 115-194.5(A)(5); 21) distinguishes between 2 lane roads and 4 lane roads for off-premises signs which creates new sections to separate the requirements for these roads in 115-159.5 (B); 22) established that there is no distinction between billboards which are greater than 200 square feet and billboards which are less than 200 square feet in 115-159.5(B); 23) removed language about parallel sign faces no more than 3 feet apart in 115-159.5(B)(2); 24) verified the front yard setback as 40 feet, the side yard setback as 50 feet, and the rear yard setback being the same as a rear yard setback for a building for an off-premises sign in 115-159.5(B); 25) established that the separation distance should be 150 feet from a billboard to the property line of any property which houses churches, dwellings or public lands, and that it

will be measured on a radius from the edge of a sign in 115-159.5(B); 26) off-premises signs must be at least 600 feet apart on all roads and will be measured on a radius on 4 lane roads and lineally on 2 lane roads in 115-159.5(B); 27) retains the separation distance of 50 feet between off-premises signs and on-premises signs with a slight revision to preclude erection of on-premises signs within 50 feet of an off-premises sign in 115-159.5(B); 28) establish a height maximum of 25 feet on 2 lane roads and 35 feet on 4 lane roads, which will be measured from ground level in 115-159.5(B); 29) establish a sign limitation of 300 square feet on 2 lane roads and 600 square feet on 4 lane roads in 115-159.5(B); 30) retains the letter of no objection requirement from DelDOT for all off-premises signs in 115-159.5(B); 31) retains the prohibition on stacked or side-by-side signs on a single off-premises sign structure in 115-159.5(B); 32) re-established that variances for new off-premises signs erected or approved to be erected after August 1, 2016 are prohibited, and that variances for separation distance and setback requirements are permissible for replacement signs in 115-159.5(D)(E); 33) noted that political signs would be address at a later date; 34) noted that 115-160(K) limits signs to 25 feet above ground level except for billboards and only applies to on-premises signs; 35) noted that 115-160(N) is a newly created section that allows the Director to remove an abandoned sign face and fine the owner, and noting that the sign structure could remain; 36) noting that 115-161(B)(4) amends the Introduced Ordinance to provide that light shall be focused only on a sign for both on-premises and off-premises signs; 37) noting that 115-161(B)(5) amends the Introduced Ordinance and applies to both luminance (nits) and illuminance (foot candles) requirements to all signs, suggest adoption of the foot candle measurement standards or to use 750 nits and 0.3 foot candles as the measurements for both on-premises and off-premises signs; 38) removed the Special Use Exception requirement for an on-premises Electronic Message Center; 39) prohibits on-premises Electronic Message Centers in residential districts unless part of a Conditional Use; 40) references that the size of on-premises Electronic Message Centers shall have to be further discussed; 41) 115-161.1(A)(4) references that Electronic Message Centers shall have a separation distance of 50 feet from an off-premises sign where an on-premises sign is less than 101 square feet; that a separation distance of 50 feet plus 1 foot per square foot for an on-premises Electronic Message Center that exceeds 100 square feet; that the distance will be measured on a radius; and that no variances are permitted; 42) 115-161.1(A)(5) references that on-premises Electronic Message Centers will be allowed effects of dissolving, fading, flipping, or window shade movements, and that scrolling, live action video, streaming video, flashing messages, and all other animation is prohibited; 43) 115-161.1(B) allows for off-premises Electronic Message Centers in certain zoning districts, and that Special Use Exceptions and compliance with off-premises sign regulations are required; 44) the separation distance requirements between off-premises Electronic Message Center signs needs to be addressed and referenced a separation distance of 2,500 feet on 4 lane roads and 1,200 feet on 2 lane roads to be measured lineally; 45) 115-161.1(A)(5) prohibits animation and the effects of dissolving, fading, flipping, window shade movements, scrolling, live action video, streaming video, and flashing on off-premises Electronic Message Centers; 46) 115-161.1(C)(1)(c) creates a default provision to require shutdown only if more than 50% of the sign face malfunctions on an Electronic Message Center; 47) 115-161.1(C)(1)(e) amends the Introduced Ordinance to read “shall” rather than “must” and applies to both on-premises and off-premises signs; 48) 115-161.1(C)(1)(f) requires owners who seek a building permit or a Special Use Exception for an Electronic Message Center to provide documentation as to ambient light controls and it applies to both on-premises and off-premises signs; 49) 115-161.1(C)(1)(h) amends the Introduced Ordinance to

eliminate prohibition on change in messages on an Electronic Message Center after sunset and applies to both on-premises and off-premises signs; 50) 115-161.2(a) prohibits periodic maintenance and repair of abandoned signs; 51) 115-161.2(A), (C). and (D) which relate to non-conforming signs allows for periodic maintenance and repair; allows for replacement of non-conforming off-premises signs if a variance is obtained; prohibits conversion of non-conforming off-premises signs to Electronic Message Centers; that the Board of Adjustment must consider the overall non-conforming reduction; and no variances from height and size requirements shall be permitted; 52) 115-161.3 provides for a substitution clause and provides that an owner of a sign may convert commercial copy to non-commercial copy; and 53) 115-161.4 provides for a severability clause and provides that the entire Sign Ordinance is not invalid if one section is declared to be invalid.

There was a consensus of the Commission that they would like to hear the public testimony prior to raising any questions on the Revised Ordinance.

The Commission found that David Hutt, Esquire of Morris James Wilson Halbrook & Bayard, LLP, was present on behalf of a sign company and developer group, submitted a revised version of the Ordinance and referred to it as the Red-Lined Version; stating that there are primarily six (6) issues of concern in the Revised Ordinance referencing animated signs for on-premises signs; that Federal regulations do not allow animation on off-premises signs; that the 2nd Ordinance introduced has a prohibition on animated signs; that the dancing inflatable signs are illegal based on the definition; that a person moving a sign back and forth could be considered an illegal sign based on the definition; that he has never heard of a surveyor say that they could not determine the separation from a proposed sign location to an existing church, school, dwelling or public lands; that an on-premises sign could be considered a ground sign or a wall sign; that the prohibition of variances should be eliminated; that the State Code provides that a process is necessary for variance provisions; that examples of recent and current sign issues relating to setbacks and locations of signs are the Strine sign on Route One, the Lefty's Bowling Lane sign on Route One, and the Eagle's Nest Church and Campground sign on Route One; that DelDOT sign regulations only reference setbacks, height, and separation; that DelDOT grants few to no variances on their regulations; that a lot of the sign issues addressed will bring the Ordinance in line with the activities taking place on 4 lane roads; that a variance process is needed; that on-premises signs need to be addressed; that non-conforming signs need to be addressed; and that real estate signs need to be addressed.

The Commission found that Mr. Hutt's Red-Lined Version included red-lined changes including: 1) that the definition for on-premises sign be expanded by adding "or on a property adjacent to the property on which the sign is located when the adjacent property has an easement for access and/or signage on or along the property on which the sign is to be located"; that 115-158 be amended by deletion of the prohibition "animated signs"; that 115-159 G be amended by changing the maximum area of a temporary real estate sign from "10 square feet" to "32 square feet", and that the last sentence be removed which states "Each sign shall contain no more than two sides or facings, back to back"; that 115-159.5 B (1) be rewritten to read "All off-premises signs shall have a minimum front yard setback of 25 feet, a minimum side yard setback of 50 feet, and a minimum rear yard setback equal to the required rear yard setback for a principal building within the pertinent zoning district. An off-premises sign shall not be erected within 300

feet of a dwelling, church, school, or public lands as measured on a radius from the edges of the off-premises sign”; that 115-159.5 B (6) should be eliminated in its entirety; that 115-160 B (3) should be rewritten to read “Temporary non-illuminated signs, not exceeding 32 square feet of sign area per side, advertising real estate for sale or lease or announcing contemplated improvements of real estate and located on the premises with one such sign for each street frontage”; that 115-160 B (4) should be rewritten to read “Temporary non-illuminated signs not exceeding 32 square feet of sign area per side erected in connection with new construction work and displayed on the premises during such time as the actual construction work is in progress, with on such sign for each street frontage”; that 115-161 B (5) should be rewritten to read “No illuminated sign, including Electronic Message Centers, must comply with one of the following maximum luminance levels: (a) No illuminated sign, including Electronic Message Centers, shall have a maximum luminance greater than seven hundred fifty (750) cd/m² or Nits at least one-half hour before Apparent Sunset, as determined by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), United States Department of Commerce, for the specific geographic location and date. All illuminated signs must comply with this maximum luminance level throughout the night, if the sign is energized, until apparent Sunrise, as determined by the NOAA, at which time the sign may resume luminance levels appropriate for daylight conditions, when required or appropriate”; that 115-161 B (6) should be rewritten to read “No illuminated signs, including Electronic Message Centers, shall have a maximum illuminance level greater than 0.3 foot candles above ambient light, as measured using a foot candle meter, or similar technology, at a pre-set distance. Pre-set distances to measure the foot candle impact vary with expected viewing distances of each sign size. Measurement distance shall be based upon the sign area using the following formula.”; that 115-161.1 A (4) should be eliminated in its entirety; that 115-161.1 A (5) should become (4) and then rewritten to read “An On-Premises Electronic Message Center may use the following display features and functions of Electronic Message Centers: images and frame effects that appear or disappear from the display through dissolve, fade, flip, or window shade movements. Continuous scrolling left or right, live action or streaming videos, and flashing messages shall not be permitted”; that 115-161.1 C (1) (a) should be rewritten to read “On an off-premises Electronic Message Center, each message remains fixed for a minimum of at least 10 seconds”; that 115-161.1 C (1) (b) should be rewritten to read “On an off-premises Electronic Message Center, when the message is changed, the change must be accomplished in 1 second or less, with all moving parts or illumination changing simultaneously and in unison”; that 115-161.1 C (2) should be eliminated; that 115-161.2 Non-Conforming Off-Premises Signs A through D should be rewritten to read “A. A non-conforming off-premises sign may remain and be periodically maintained as a permitted non-conforming structure unless abandoned. B. Conversion of non-conforming off-premises signs to off-premises electronic message centers is prohibited, unless the applicant is replacing two or more non-conforming off-premises signs with a single electronic message center. C. If a sign is damaged by any natural causes, such as fire, wind or flood, it may be repaired or reconstructed and used as before the time of the damage, provided that such repairs or reconstruction are substantially completed within 12 months of the date of such damage. D. Provided that the owner obtains all necessary variances from the Board of Adjustment pursuant to 115-211, an owner of a non-conforming off-premises sign may replace a non-conforming off-premises sign with a new off-premises sign which does not comply with separation distance or setback requirements. As part of a variance request for a non-conforming off-premises sign under this section, the replacement off-premises sign must comply with the height and size requirements set forth in 115-159.5. The Board of

Adjustment shall ensure non-conformities in the height and size are brought into compliance with the installation of the replacement sign”.

The Commission found that Bob McVey, President of the Sussex County Association of Realtors, was present, read and submitted a letter from Merritt Burke IV, CEO of the Sussex County Association of Realtors (SCAOR) referencing that the Association supports a modern sign ordinance and the majority of the proposed provisions; but that there remains language that the Association does not support, referencing the elimination of movement and animation of Electronic Message Centers; that not-for-profit organizations similar to SCAOR could find this amendment restrictive and costly to implement, specifically after the organization was approved to purchase, install and operate the sign for informative and revenue purposes; that residential and non-residential areas are defined separately in the Ordinance; that a majority of contacts/leads regarding commercial real estate are generated from stand-alone signage along on-premises commercially zoned properties; that reducing the minimum square footage for non-residential area signs could affect the financial welfare of the citizens of Sussex County, will impact the commercial real estate industry and may discourage the positive economic development of the County; that SCAOR supports commercial signage not less than 64 square feet double sided or arranged in a “V” shape, unless otherwise regulated by municipal or State codes; and that SCAOR requests that all for-profit, not-for-profit, private and public organizations and agencies are required to conform to the proposed Ordinance once amended.

The Commission found that Bill Lucks, President Elect of the Peninsula Commercial Alliance, a part of the SCAOR, expressing concerns about the proposed Ordinance and stating that their signage is of a temporary nature running the term of the listing that they may have on a particular piece of property; that the Ordinance does not distinguish between residential and commercial real estate, which have very different signage needs; that the Ordinance calls for a 10 square foot sign as a maximum size; that this does not work in practice; that they use two sided 4 x 4 (16 square feet) and 4 x 8 signs (32 square feet); that the larger signs are used in a high traffic speed area; that it could be interpreted in the Ordinance that a permit could be required for a temporary sign that is not lighted, does not rotate or flash, and has a static message; that he annually spends anywhere from \$5,000 to \$15,000 on signage to market his listings; that the sale of commercial real estate generates substantial transfer taxes for the County; that he ask that the Ordinance be changed to address the needs of the commercial real estate practitioner; that they do not see the current signage practices as offensive, nor are they out of line with the norms used across the Country; and that the signs are temporary in nature, and even with the technology of today, commercial properties tend to sell from the signage posted on the property.

The Commission found that Ben Phillips of Phillips Signs was present with concerns and referenced that his business is primarily on-premises signs; that he was on the Sign Ordinance Working Committee; that he did not think that there were that many problem issues; that the sign industry is one of the most regulated industries; that over regulation impact their businesses; that enforcement is the issue; that he questions what is the big deal about animation; that he understood that the County Council supported animation 3-2 in July, why the change; that animation is not a safety issue and that it appears that someone on County Council just does not like animation on signs; that sign company representatives can show staff which signs are legal or illegal; that on-premises signs should have precedent since they support small business; that

separation of on-premises to off-premises should be struck from the Ordinance; that farm markets and similar uses are the biggest offenders based on the number of signs that they display.

The Commission found that Jason Dean of J.D. Sign Company was present with concerns and agreed with Mr. Hutt's and Mr. Phillips' comments, and stated that fees have been increased in the past; that he supports the need for a sign enforcement official; that enforcement is needed; that we all agree on the lighting standards; that brightness is the issue on Electronic Message Centers; that an Electronic Message Center that is too bright is distracting; that he supports continuous scrolling; that he supports either illumination regulations, nits or foot candles; that if the brightness issues is resolved, lighting will not be an issue; that Electronic Message Center should be permitted as wall signs; and that the sign industry does not want signage to be distracting.

The Commission found that Lynn Rogers of Rogers Sign Company was present with concerns and stated that the issued came from the number of application being processed by the Board of Adjustment; that the Ordinance should be enforced; that it seems like the County Council could not grasp the difference between on-premises signs and off-premises signs; that nationwide most billboards are static; that he agrees with the previous speakers; and that he currently has two full-time staff that specialize in sign applications, sign permits, Special Use Exceptions and Variances requests throughout the peninsula.

The Commission found that Charles Towers of Towers Signs was present with concerns and stated that he also agrees with the previous speakers; and noted that sign companies have charts referencing the size of a sign and sign lettering sizes relating to speed limits.

The Commission found that Paul Reiger was present with concerns and referenced sign square footages, the number of signs permitted on a farm and farm operations; and questioning the definition of a farm and the acreage of a farm.

Mr. Sharp advised the Commission that the County Council is scheduled for the public hearing on September 20, 2016 and that the Commission has a regular meeting scheduled for September 22, 2016 and that it is possible that the Commission can make a recommendation prior to the moratorium being lifted.

At the conclusion of the public hearing, the Commission discussed the Ordinance Amendments.

Motion by Mr. Burton, seconded by Mr. Hudson, and carried unanimously to defer action, noting that this Ordinance Amendment needs to be on the next regular agenda, September 22, 2016. Motion carried 3 – 0.

OTHER BUSINESS

Americana Bayside – Shoals at Sunridge (fka Knox Property)
Revised Preliminary Site Plan

Ms. Cornwell advised the Commission that this is a revised preliminary site plan for Americana Bayside Shoals at Sunridge (fka Knox Property). The property is zoned MR-RPC and is located off of Sand Cove Rd. The revised plan shows 97 dwellings that consist of 39 single family dwellings and 58 duplex dwellings. The Planning Commission approved an amendment to condition A at their meeting on August 25, 2016 to allow for the increase of 4 dwellings and the increase in duplexes. The Planning Commission approved the preliminary site plan on September 11, 2014. The plan complies with the other conditions of the RPC. Staff is in receipt of all agency approvals.

Motion by Mr. Burton, seconded by Mr. Hudson and carried unanimously to approve the revised preliminary site plan and as a final site plan. Motion carried 3-0.

Windmill Wood – CU Revised Preliminary Site Plan

Ms. Cornwell advised the Commission that this is a revised preliminary site plan for the Windmill Wood development. The property is zoned MR and is located on the east side of Windmill Rd. The Planning Commission recommended approval for 106 multifamily dwellings at their meeting September 25, 2003 and County Council approved the Conditional Use on December 16, 2003. The Planning Commission approved the preliminary site plan on June 24, 2004 with final approval subject to staff. Construction commenced and 16 townhomes along with the amenities were constructed. The applicant is proposing a reduction in the overall number of units and to change the unit types. The applicant proposes to construct 51 single family units and 5 duplex units. There will be a total of 73 dwellings. This is a reduction of 33 units. The street layout did not change from the original approval. The site will still have to comply with the original conditions of approval. Staff is awaiting updated agency approvals.

Motion by Mr. Hudson, seconded by Mr. Burton and carried unanimously to approve the revised preliminary site plan. Motion carried 3-0.

Riverside Plaza – CU #2045 Preliminary Site Plan

Ms. Cornwell advised the Commission that this is a preliminary site plan for Riverside Plaza. The property is zoned B-1 and is located on the southwest corner of John J. Williams Hwy. (Rt. 24) and Oak Orchard Rd. The use is for 142 multifamily units. The Planning Commission recommended approval of the Conditional Use on March 10, 2016 and County Council approved the Conditional Use on May 3, 2016. The plan complies with the conditions of approval. Staff is awaiting agency approvals.

Motion by Mr. Burton seconded by Mr. Hudson and carried unanimously to approve the preliminary site plan with the final site plan subject to staff upon receipt of all agency approvals. Motion carried 3-0.

Peninsula Lakes – Phase II Preliminary Site Plan

Ms. Cornwell advised the Commission that this is a final site plan for Phase 11 within the Peninsula Lakes development. The Planning Commission approved the preliminary site plan. The plan is for the construction of 72 multifamily (duplex) units with site improvements. The property is zoned MR-RPC and is located off of Legion Rd. The plan complies with the conditions of approval for the MR-RPC. Staff is in receipt of all awaiting agency approvals.

Motion by Mr. Burton, seconded by Mr. Hudson and carried unanimously to approve the final site plan. Motion carried 3-0.

Lands of Barry Grise

Minor Subdivision off 50 ft. Easement

Ms. Cornwell advised the Commission that This is a minor subdivision for the creation of one new parcel of land and the expansion of an existing easement. The property is zoned AR-1 and is located north of the Swann Cove development. The property has access off and existing 25 ft. wide easement. The applicant is expanding the easement to 50 ft. The new parcel will be 2.150 acres and the residual will be 2.233 acres. The lots comply with the requirements of the Conservation Zone section of the Code. Staff is awaiting approval from DelDOT.

Motion by Mr. Hudson, seconded by Mr. Burton and carried unanimously to grant conceptual approval with final approval subject to staff upon receipt of agency approvals. Motion carried 3-0.

ADDITIONAL BUSINESS

Discussion regarding Comprehensive Plan

Ms. Cornwell advised the Commission that an e-mail was sent to the County Council and Planning Commission regarding the updated list of potential invitees and discussion points for the Conservation Focus Group; that staff is looking at holding the meetings on September 26, 2016; that there will be two sessions; that the Press Release regarding the upcoming public meetings was sent out; that staff informed the Commission that the public meetings will be an open house format with a PowerPoint presentation, survey that can be taken on a computer or paper; that flyers are at the libraries and will place at other locations.

Opportunity for public comment regarding Comprehensive Plan

Jeanette Akhter stated that she recognizes that she is part of the problem as she just moved to Delaware; that it is a wonderful place; that she is concerned with the rapidity and density of development; that she is concerned that the quality of life will be diminished; that natural resources (especially water quality) are no longer good; that traffic is a concern; that she does not want development to stop; however, she is concerned that there is a point where development will cross the tipping point of protecting quality of life.

Meeting adjourned at 9:02 p.m.