

**MAYOR AND COMMISSIONERS MEETING
CITY OF REHOBOTH BEACH**

January 17, 2014

The Regular Meeting of the Mayor and Commissioners of the City of Rehoboth Beach was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Mayor Samuel R. Cooper on Friday, January 17, 2014 in the Commissioners Room in City Hall, 229 Rehoboth Avenue, Rehoboth Beach, DE.

City Solicitor Glenn Mandalas gave the invocation followed by the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL

Present:	Commissioner	Toni Sharp
	Commissioner	Patrick Gossett
	Commissioner	Bill Sargent
	Mayor	Samuel R. Cooper
	Commissioner	Stan Mills
	Commissioner	Lorraine Zellers
	Commissioner	Mark Hunker

Also in attendance was: City Solicitor Glenn Mandalas
 City Manager Sharon Lynn

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Commissioner Stan Mills made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Mark Hunker, to approve the Agenda as written. Motion carried unanimously.

CORRESPONDENCE

Correspondence will be read when the Public Hearing portion of the meeting is held.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Minutes of the December 9, 2013 Workshop Meeting, December 20, 2013 Regular Meeting and January 6, 2014 Workshop Meeting were distributed prior to the meeting.

Commissioner Mills made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Hunker, to approve the December 9, 2013 Mayor and Commissioners Workshop Meeting minutes as written. Motion carried unanimously.

Commissioner Mills made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Lorraine Zellers, to approve the December 20, 2013 Mayor and Commissioners Regular Meeting minutes as written. Motion carried unanimously.

Commissioner Mills made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Toni Sharp, to approve the January 6, 2014 Mayor and Commissioners Workshop Meeting minutes as written. Motion carried unanimously.

PUBLIC HEARING on and consideration of a proposed ordinance amending Chapter 270, Section 270-26, of the City Code that would increase the side yard setbacks for any lot with greater than 52.5 feet of street frontage and a lot area of 5,250 square feet in the R-1 District and for R-1 uses in the R-2 District.

City Solicitor Mandalas noted that the Public Hearing notice was posted in Cape Gazette on November 22, 2013 and November 29, 2013, Coast Press on November 27, 2013 and December 4, 2013 and Delaware State News on November 20, 2013 and November 27, 2013. He read Section 270-26 which is the setback provision for the Residential District. Section 270-26 is to be further amended by adding the word "Minimum" in front of the words "Aggregate Total of Both Side Yards" that head one of the columns in the table contained in Subsection A, adding a superscript "2" with the figure "16" under this column at rows "R-1" and "R-2, Uses in R-1" to denote a footnote and at the end of the table add a new note to read as follows:

When the width of a lot exceeds 52.5 feet and the lot area exceeds 5,250 square feet the "Minimum Aggregate Total of Both Side Yards" shall be increased proportionately by the lesser of:

- (1) The quotient obtained by dividing the width of the lot in feet by 50, or
- (2) The quotient obtained by dividing the area of the lot in square feet by 5,000.

Where for the purposes of this section the width of a lot is defined as the length of the street line between the points where the two side lot lines, or in the case of a corner lot, one side lot line and the street line of the intersecting street, intersect the street line at the front of the lot. In the case of a corner lot where the right-of-way lines of the intersecting streets are joined by an arc the point of measurement is the point at which the extension of the two right-of-way lines intersect.

Mayor Cooper noted that once a lot exceeds 52.5 feet in width and 5,250 square feet, then the side yard setbacks will increase proportionately to that of a 50 foot wide lot. Once a lot is greater than 52.5 feet wide, the 50 is used as the divisor so this would be proportionate to the 50 foot wide lot, not to a 52.5 foot wide lot. This would apply only to the aggregate side yard setback, not the minimum which will still be six feet.

Correspondence:

1. Letter dated January 15, 2014 from K. William Scott Esq. of the law firm Scott and Shuman P.A. to Glenn C. Mandalas, Esq. regarding 607 Scarborough Avenue which is owned by Joseph and Kathleen Lenczycki. Mr. and Mrs. Lenczycki had applied for a building permit, but the City declined to consider that application due to the pendency of Resolution No. 1113-01, pursuant to which a public hearing is to be held to consider an amendment to the Code relating to side yard setbacks. Mr. and Mrs. Lenczycki had been designing their proposed addition and interior renovations for some time under the current Code and were unaware of the adoption of the Resolution when they applied for a building permit on December 19, 2013. It is their hope that since the amendment to the Code had not been enacted, that they will not be forced to incur significant additional costs and delay to redesign the proposed addition given that the application was submitted prior to any amendment.

Public Comment:

1. Mr. Joseph Lenczycki, 607 Scarborough Avenue, wanted to make the Commissioners aware of two possible aspects of the proposed amendment which are the intended impact of it and the merits of his particular situation. Mr. Lenczycki's lot is currently 54 feet x 100 feet. The plans he had submitted are compliant with the current Code, but not with the proposed amendment. There is an impact of 16 inches. The purpose of the amendment is to prevent imposing structures of massive size that negatively impact neighbors, streetscape, light, air and view. None of these things apply to the Lenczyckis. They are proposed changes to add approximately 500 square feet to their home, some of which will come from the front screened porch. The proposed side bump-out is on the driveway side of the house where there is ample room between the house and the neighbor's house. The intention is for an entryway, mudroom, laundry, bathroom, and outdoor shower. After the bump-out would be built, there would still be room for a car to be parked between the bump-out and the fence which separates them from the neighbor's property. This will not be a tear down or a structure that may be deemed too big for the lot. The Lenczycki's situation is that they entered into negotiations and a contract in August 2013. First, they had put into the contract of sale an opt-out clause which gave them a certain amount of time to explore the possibility of the changes they wanted to make. The Lenczyckis also retained an architect and consulted with general counsel to get their opinions and check to see if the proposed addition could be done. Everything was alright according to the Code. Consequently, the Lenczyckis let the opt-out clause of the contract of sale go away. They proceeded to close and took title of the property in September. In the period from September to November 2013, there was a series of refinements to the design plan, etc. The Lenczyckis have expended more than \$40,000.00 on the plans in good faith reliance on the Code. When the plans were submitted in December 2013, they first became aware of proposed amendment and found out that their plans would not be processed because the amendment was proposed. The Lenczyckis asked the Commissioners to consider the impact of the amendment with regard to their property and plans, and they would like to proceed with their plans which are compliant with the current Code because of their good faith reliance and the economic harm and delay that would come to them if they cannot proceed.
2. Mr. Walter Brittingham, 123 Henlopen Avenue, noted that his lot is 100 feet wide x 123 feet deep. He asked what the effect will be on his property. The average person has not seen what this amendment will do. Until the commissioners clean up why a person has to go to the Board of Adjustment and spend a lot of money, Mr. Brittingham did not know why the Commissioners are going to change side yard setbacks for many people. The Commissioners need to be fixing other things that they require the Board of Adjustment for before getting into something like this amendment.

Mayor Cooper said that if an entire 100 foot wide lot is used as one lot, then the aggregate total side yard setback would be 32 feet.

3. Mr. Tom McGlone, 118 Laurel Street, asked how many lots will be affected by this amendment and whether there has been any communication to those people. It would be nice to know how many properties would be affected. The Commissioners should consider helping out the people who started the process prior to the Commissioners' consideration in terms of implementing this amendment.

Mayor Cooper said that there has been no determination of the number of lots affected, and the City has followed the procedure on Zoning Code changes.

City Solicitor Mandalas said that the State Code sets up the procedure which is required for any zoning change, which has been followed in this case. The necessary and legal requirements of notice have been given.

4. Mr. Francis Markert, Secretary of Planning Commission, said that the Planning Commission made a recommendation to the Commissioners relative to this amendment. It all comes from the idea that people are building to the maximum on their lots. The Planning Commission felt that there would be more free space, more space for trees, more lot coverage and less massing on the street. The Planning Commission has found that as people desire to build larger houses, there is less space for trees and no space between two houses. The Planning Commission supports this amendment because it will serve the community-at-large to allow maintaining the nature of the neighborhoods, flow and streetscape. A 100 foot wide lot would have a 32 foot aggregate of side yard setbacks which would allow 68 foot of frontage on a house.

Mayor Cooper closed the public portion of the hearing.

Commissioner Mark Hunker said that he supported the proposed ordinance.

Commissioner Sargent said that there are two issues: 1. The proposed ordinance itself and if the Commissioners want to approve it. 2. Proper role of relief. He was happy with the way the mathematics was constructed in the proposed ordinance. This is a good move for the Commissioners to make.

Commissioner Mills provided illustrations (copy attached) for the Commissioners and the public relative to expanding side yard setbacks:

Slide No. 2 – (2) 50 feet x 100 feet lots.

Slide No. 3 – Structures on each lots.

Slide No. 4 – Illustration of preserving light and air which is the rationale under the proposed ordinance.

Slide No. 5 – Larger lot crossing two lot lines which references any lot greater than 52.5 feet. It has the same setbacks as the smaller lots.

Slide No. 6 – Illustration of a façade of a wide building.

Slide No. 7 – Double lot with the structure crossing the center lot line. There are no central setbacks which provide light and air, but the 16 foot aggregate setbacks are retained. The proposed ordinance redistributes the side yard setbacks from the middle to each side of the lot.

Slide No. 8 – Structures on each lots.

Slide No. 9 – The proposed ordinance redistributes the side yard setbacks from the middle to each side of the lot.

Slide No. 10 – The proposed ordinance redistributes the side yard setbacks from the middle to one side of the lot. The rationale of the proposed ordinance is that wide setbacks will cause the building to be narrower.

Slide No. 11 – Illustration of a façade of a wide building referring back to Slide No. 10.

Slide No. 12 – Illustration of a façade of a narrower building referring back to Slide No. 11.

Slide No. 13 – Illustration of components within the definition of structure. Things that are or are not allowed in setbacks. The garage and shed are allowed within setbacks in certain conditions. Other structures outside of the setbacks would be the house, in-ground swimming pool, wood deck, brick patio, fencing, trellis, arbor, gazebo, lawn edging, HVAC, etc.

Slide No. 14 – A reminder that all the structures, except the garage and sheds, are disallowed within the setbacks of a parcel consisting of two lots.

Slide No. 15 – A reminder that all the structures, except the garage and sheds, are disallowed within the setbacks of a parcel consisting of one bigger lot.

Slide No. 16 – Expanded side yard setbacks on both sides as a result of the proposed ordinance

Slide No. 17 – Expanded side yard setback on one side as a result of the proposed ordinance.

Slide No. 18 – Aerial and eye-level illustrations. The focus was on the dimensionality of an in-ground swimming pool, deck, patio, arbor, gazebo, trellis, lawn edging, etc. This is all encompassing with all the structures that do not seem to fit the intent of the rationale of the proposed ordinance. The proposed ordinance is directed towards bulk. The A/C unit, in-ground swimming pool, dimensional garden, low patio, arbor, etc. will not disturb much light, etc.

Commissioner Mills said that the Commissioners need to provide more allowance and set dimensional limits on structures. His concern was with the structures that will be grandfathered because if they are remodeled, they will be severely impacted by the proposed ordinance. The person who has a wider property will be penalized by forcing them to put their deck further away from their property line. Commissioner Hunker agreed.

City Solicitor Mandalas noted that the Zoning Code has a series of provisions which address non-conformities so there would probably be some properties created that will encroach the new side yard setbacks so they will be governed by the non-conformity provisions. Generally for an existing structure, it can be added to as long as it conforms to the new dimensional regulations so the structure could not go further into the setback areas. Discussion ensued as to the proposed ordinance, bulk and the side yard setbacks.

Commissioner Sargent said that the proposed ordinance will result in the same clear space as if dividing the 100 foot wide lot into two lots. The Commissioners are trying to keep a scale to the neighborhood as opposed to having the wide lot becoming too big.

Commissioner Gossett noted that a pool, deck, patio, etc. are impervious surfaces. The proposed ordinance will preserve the character of the neighborhood. The majority of homes on large oversized lots are cottages, and they have the character and charm of Rehoboth. The proposed ordinance will help to maintain that sense of place and overall streetscape of the neighborhood.

Commissioner Hunker said that what is put in the backyard has very little to do with preserving the face of Rehoboth. This is an infringement, and it is about protecting the air and light. An unintended consequence of making a house smaller will be that people will want to do something outside and in their backyard.

Commissioner Zellers said that the same standards of a 50 foot x 100 foot lot would be applied to a larger lot. The proposed ordinance is fair and reasonable because of the structure and the bulk. This is about striking a balance, not penalizing people. It is important for ordinance to be done for the people who have to be close to these structures.

Commissioner Mills reiterated that every property will still have the 10 foot rear yard setback requirement, 10 foot in the front yard if there is a porch or 15 feet without a porch and the aggregate of 16 feet for the side yard setbacks. Causing the side yards to be expanded will become punitive if all the structures are forbidden in those areas. He requested that the non-dimensional things which do not fit the rationale be considered and allowed in the expanded areas.

Mayor Cooper did not feel that this would be penalizing. It would be treating the lots proportionally to the 50 foot x 100 foot standard lots. People will not be able to do some things after the adoption of the proposed ordinance that could be done before. People with larger lots will not be treated differently than people who own 50 foot wide lots in a proportional way.

Commissioner Sargent said that pools, patios, etc. have a dimensionality which goes up, and that has a visual effect on the charm of the City. The space for two houses should be preserved for one house.

City Solicitor Mandalas said that the proposed resolution not only would address the Lenczyckis' situation, it would address anyone who is in a similar circumstance. Under the resolution, there would be a two week period to come into Building & Licensing and show that certain things have been done with regard to their application. He read the proposed resolution to grant relief. Any property owner who demonstrates conclusively that prior to November 15, 2013, such property owner invested \$5,000.00 or more in pursuit of the construction of a structure that would comply with the then existing Section 270-26 of the Code relating to side yard setbacks, shall be entitled to proceed through the City's approval process under the side yard setback requirements in effect as of November 14, 2013. Any person desiring approval of the exception of this resolution must request such approval through the City's Building & Licensing

Department by January 31, 2014.

Commissioner Bill Sargent made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Patrick Gossett, to adopt the Ordinance before the Commissioners concerning revising the side yard setbacks and the Resolution that relates to the implementation of that Ordinance.

Commissioner Mills was not satisfied with the level of notice beyond what legally needed to be done, and he was not satisfied with the lack of effort to inform those who are impacted. Commissioner Mills did not disagree with the City Solicitor's explanation to grant relief.

(Hunker – aye. The Commissioners need to protect the size and shape of things of the City in fear of what they can become. Unintended consequences will be opened up and some hurt feelings in moving forward. This is completely the right thing for buildings to get done. Zellers – aye. She has been concerned about the size at the street level and the towering houses next to properties. Since the setbacks for 50 foot x 100 foot lots are typical, and it was what was intended by the Code; but with the larger lots, this Ordinance imposes those same types of setbacks on them. It is fair and reasonable. The Commissioners have tried to address the smaller lots by not just the 50 feet or if the front is longer, but by doing the calculations. There will be some properties that come under the radar. The Commissioners tried to determine a fair cutoff. It is about striking a balance. She did not want to penalize people for having a bigger lot, but it is reasonable to ask them to have a similar setback requirement as the 50 foot x 100 foot lots would have. This sets a common sense standard, and it does help to promote the health, safety and general well-being of the community. Mills – no. This is not addressing the Resolution at all. The intent of this is fine and spot on. The Commissioners need to look at adjusting the setbacks that will cause a narrower building footprint which will preserve light and air. He commended Commissioner Sargent and Mayor Cooper for coming up with the formula. It will work well. Commissioner Mills could not reconcile his differences with the lucky property owners that have the wider lots because their setbacks are more restrictive than the standard property owner. He disagreed with prohibiting all structures equally within those expanded setback areas. The dimensional lawn edging, in-ground pools, low level decks, ground level patios, arbors and gazebos that are skeletal structures do not fit the rationale and do not contribute the problem of bulk in preventing light and air to get through to neighbors. There are unintended consequences for those that are grandfathered. Sargent – aye. Rehoboth is primarily characterized to a very large extent by single family 50 foot x 100 foot lots. He would not argue that the City should have nothing but those lots. When there is an occasional wider lot, it adds diversity, but he would hate to see a massive presence. This will put a tendency to build proportionately more in character with the single family lots. This adds to an extension or maintenance of the character of the City. Gossett – aye. This action has a very positive impact on overall streetscape of the City, community and proximity to the neighbors as well as light, air, view, mass and bulk as it impacts the neighborhoods. Sharp – aye, for all the positive reasons previously stated. She would like to applaud the Planning Commission for bringing this up to the Commissioners' attention. Cooper – aye, for Commissioner Sargent's reasoning. This puts the larger lots on a par with the 50 foot lots which is what the Zoning Code is written around. Some recent events have indicated that this is appropriate to bring the larger lots more into proportion with the 50 foot lots. Motion was carried.

REPORT OF THE POLICE DEPARTMENT

(See attached report.)

Police Chief Keith Banks presented the report of the Police Department for the month of December 2013. There were 41 criminal, 138 traffic and no civil charges made during the month. Nine traffic crashes were investigated. The Dispatch Center handled 115 police incidents, 133 ambulance incidents, 36 fire incidents, 146 traffic stops, assisted other agencies five times during the month, and 9-1-1 calls totaling 370 were received. The interview process for seasonal officers has begun. Approximately 24 seasonal officers will be hired this year. The next interview and test date is January 29, 2014.

REPORT OF REHOBOTH BEACH VOLUNTEER FIRE COMPANY

Mr. Walter Brittingham of Rehoboth Beach Volunteer Fire Company reported that the new station along Route 1 is being worked on. A tour can be scheduled through the fire company. Recently, there have been a lot of water flow alarms. The fire company is suggesting that people should consider closing the main water valve if they will not be around the house for extended periods of time.

REPORT OF THE BUILDING AND LICENSING DEPARTMENT

(See attached report.)

Chief Building Inspector Terri Sullivan presented the report of the Building & Licensing Department for December 2013. During the month, 61 permits were issued for a value of work totaling \$2,758,132.60. Fees collected totaled \$67,024.20 for the month. Sixty-three permit processing fees were received in the amount of \$1,260.00. The Board of Adjustment heard two cases in December. No restaurant applications were received in December. Two notices of violation were issued for freestanding signs. There were 37 building inspections, 12 plumbing inspections, no rental inspections, no meetings regarding trees, 17 meetings regarding new projects and one meeting regarding City business. Currently, the street files in the basement of the 306 building are being scanned.

REPORT OF PLANNING COMMISSION

Planning Commission Secretary Francis Markert presented the report of the Planning Commission. The Regular Meeting was held on January 10, 2014. A Public Hearing was held for the property located at 49 Park Avenue. The Planning Commission unanimously approved this application conditional that the existing non-conforming structure (garage) on the new lot created by the partition to either be renovated as to not intrude into the setback area or be demolished in addition to the removal of other adjacent paved areas. The Planning Commission has issued a letter to the Mayor and Commissioners urging the reconsideration of the merger ordinance submitted in June 2012. The letter lists and addresses the Planning Commission's concerns of which the most prominent is the lack of authority by the Board of Adjustment to impose conditions that would protect adjoining property owners from the adverse impact of development. The Planning Commission has reached consensus on most of the major issues studied with regard to the City's trees and has begun formulating ordinance language. It is anticipated that an initial draft of amended Code language will be developed for discussion at the Commission's February 14, 2014 meeting. A Partitioning Application has been submitted for a property located at 50 Park Avenue. The Planning Commission planned to conduct the Preliminary Review at its February 14, 2014 meeting. A Minor Subdivision Application has been resubmitted for a property located at 114 & 118 St. Lawrence Street and 113 Lake Drive. The Planning Commission plans to conduct the continuation of the Preliminary Review at its February 14, 2014 meeting.

OLD BUSINESS

There was none.

NEW BUSINESS

Mayor Cooper called to consider accepting the recommendation of the City's engineer to reject all bids received for the Fire Hydrant Painting and Maintenance Project for which bids were received and opened on November 21, 2013. A subsequent item of the Agenda was to discuss with the City's engineer, Bob Palmer, budgeting and contracting for inspecting, flow testing and painting of the City's fire hydrants and inspecting and exercising the in-ground valves within the water system.

Mayor Cooper noted that he and Mr. Bob Palmer, City Engineer, were in agreement to reject the two bids that the City received for the reason that they far exceeded the budgeted amount available to the City.

Commissioner Sargent made a motion, seconded Commissioner Hunker, to reject the two bids related to fire hydrant painting. (Sharp – aye, Gossett – aye, Sargent – aye, Cooper – aye, Mills – aye, Zellers – aye, Hunker - aye.) Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Bob Palmer gave his presentation. He presented the need for the project, project scope, construction budget, construction costs, recommendations and pricing scenarios. Approximately eight years ago, there was a city-wide effort to evaluate and paint the fire hydrants. The methods which were used and the order in which things were conducted, caused the project to end in the City, and it was never continued on. The only hydrants that have been formally painted have been within the City limits. A lot of hydrants outside of the City limits have only been have been touched up, and some hydrants have never received any paint. The main part of that project was to restore the hydrants so that they were visually pleasing to the eye. A lot of the hydrants were painted shut so when the maintenance contract was issued, the maintenance company went into open up the fire hydrants and conduct the flow tests. The paint chipped, and they had to cut the chains off. The main part of the proposed project is to correct those situations. In addition to bringing the fire hydrants into good working order and good appearance, it is important to look at the isolation valves. In order to respond to emergencies, it is important to exercise and make sure that all of the isolation valves in the distribution system are in good working order also. The project scope is to paint all the hydrants inside and outside of the City limits, perform an evaluation on all those hydrants and make sure that all the hydrants are operable. Some hydrants located on side streets that are on four inch water mains which are original to the distribution have parts that have been discontinued, and they have been left in the distribution system so that in the event of an emergency, these

hydrants are used to reduce the pressure enough so that the repairs can be made without widespread shutdowns. The intent for the majority of the hydrants in the City is to sandblast and clean them, and also bring the hydrants outside of the City limits up to good working condition. The first part of the work would be to do the hydrant maintenance. The construction budget that was set aside was in the amount of \$175,000.00 which did not include the isolation valve inspection and exercising. The average project cost for hydrant testing and inspection is \$51,000.00, and the best price is \$39,000.00. The average project cost for performing the valve inspections is \$67,500.00, and the best price is \$63,000.00. The average project cost for hydrant painting which includes sandblasting all the hydrants in the City and power tool cleaning all the hydrants outside of the City limits is \$162,000.00, and the best price is \$136,000.00. In order to do all of the work laid out, there is not enough monies budgeted for this project. This would not include hydrant repairs. The project cost for hydrant repair is \$30.00 to \$1,500.00 per hydrant. The recommendation Mr. Palmer made was that there are some components of the project which can be conducted by the Public Works Department. The primary recommendation is to separate the project into a minimum of two contracts. One contract would be for the hydrant inspection, and the other part of the project could be the valve inspection and maintenance. Those two tasks can be done separately. Fire hydrants need to be inspected at least annually. There has only been one formal inspection done of the fire hydrants in the City. There are approximately 200 fire hydrants located in the City and 150 hydrants located outside of the City limits. The 150 hydrants would not include hydrants in the Dewey Beach system. Based on the inspections conducted, it is recommended to power tool clean to bare metal the fire hydrants outside of the City limits, and later to hand tool and touch up those hydrants. It is recommended that the fire hydrants in the City should be sandblasted. A set of performance specifications was put together for this project. Worker protection requirements were written into the specifications. It is recommended to do a presence/absence of lead test on each hydrant. In normal wear, a representative number of fire hydrants are supposed to be flow tested every five years. It is anticipated that the fire hydrant coating will perform 10-15 years before coating is required. Maintenance could then be performed in-house approximately every 3-5 years. Various pricing scenarios were provided in Mr. Palmer's presentation.

Commissioner Hunker suggested getting all 300 fire hydrants done, and then maintenance can be scheduled for the next 10-15 years.

Mayor Cooper said that for the most part, all the fire hydrants should be sandblasted, and then have a program for maintenance.

Mr. Walter Brittingham, 123 Henlopen Avenue, noted that the valve on the hydrant and the isolation valve are two different valves, and it should be explained. The maintenance work should be done early, then do the painting. The City can do a lot of the maintenance in-house annually.

Mr. Palmer referred to the isolation valves which are buried in boxes, and these inspections could be deferred. The fire hydrant valve is recommended to be inspected before any painting work is completed. There are approximately 350 fire hydrant valves. Isolation valves include main line valves and hydrant valves. All of the valves in the system need to be exercised.

There was consensus for Mr. Palmer to put together two bid packages, one for everything but the painting. He will send a letter to the Commissioners with the tabulations, timeline and cost by the next meeting.

CITY MANAGER'S REPORT

City Manager Sharon Lynn reported that she has been attending many meetings in the past two weeks and getting to know her way around in the City. She commended the staff for their work and professionalism in assisting her. The staff in place is very good. Ms. Lynn looks forward to working with them. She thanked the Mayor and Commissioners for selecting her as city manager. Ms. Lynn is working on communication and getting that up to speed, and getting all staff members lined up to work better on that.

Commissioner Zellers commended the men at the Public Works Department for the work they had done on the Christmas lights on Rehoboth Avenue. At that time, Mr. Mel Craig, Director, proposed keeping the lights up in the median strips all year round. Maintenance would be minimal. There may be issues with the trees when blooming and pruning. Commissioner Zellers will get input from the City Arborist as to how and where the lights are attached to the trees. Mayor Cooper said that he did not see a problem with leaving the lights up through January and into February 2014. Maintenance may be far greater than anticipated with regard to the cords.

Mayor Cooper recommended the approval of Street Aid expenditures:

01/01/14	541	Delmarva Power	\$ 8,324.20 (Street Lights)
01/15/14	542	Delmarva Power	\$ 324.64 (Street Lights)

Commissioner Mills made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Sargent, to approve the Street Aid expenditures as presented. Motion carried unanimously.

COMMITTEE REPORT

There was nothing to report.

CITY SOLICITOR'S REPORT

There was nothing to report.

COMMISSIONER ANNOUNCEMENTS/COMMENTS

Commissioner Mills said that the Online Support Document Program has been inaugurated on the City website. This is a new program which is voluntary. Monitoring of this program will be done for a while.

DISCUSS ITEMS TO INCLUDE ON FUTURE AGENDAS.

Items to be included on the Agenda for the February Workshop Meeting are reconsideration of the lot merger ordinance prepared by the Planning Commission, the fire hydrant project and an update of the city-wide reassessment.

CITIZEN COMMENT

There was none.

The next Workshop Meeting will be held on February 10, 2014 at 9:00 a.m.

There being no further business, Mayor Cooper adjourned the meeting at 9:18 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

(Lorraine Zellers, Secretary)