

Rehoboth Beach Comprehensive Plan Draft #2 - Planning Commission Board of Commissioners Comments

Chapter 1 - Executive Summary Vision

Name	Page	Comment	Notes
PC B. Covington	1-20	"Position of Housing and Growth", line 6 in paragraph, remove "overlay" as this designation is not permitted, as I understand, in Delaware.	Deleted.
BOC S. Mills	1-5	If we include our two US senators then we should include our US Representative, Lisa Blunt Rochester.	Already listed.
BOC S. Mills	1-6	Include Tom West as a city consultant (city planner).	Added.
BOC S. Mills	1-6	RE: Community Organizations. Consider identifying ones that are located inside incorporated city limits (to distinguish from those with physical locations outside the city). I don't disagree with some others' comments about why we are identifying those organizations outside of the city which don't contribute to the level of those that are located within city limits.	Moved entirely to appendix.
BOC S. Mills	1-7	RE: "Particularly important is the provision of 21st century technology to the community so that the best communication access possible is available to government, businesses and neighbors." Maybe expand depending on what is inserted in a later chapter. (If they are completed then why mention in the main body of the CDP. Consider listing all completed 2010 CDP action items in the appendix.	Noted.
BOC S. Mills	1-8	Beginning of third sentence: "While..."	Updated.
PC J. Ellison	1-6	Rehoboth Art League is listed twice. There is no Rehoboth Beach Art League	Moved entirely to appendix.
PC J. Ellison	1-7	The visions have been adjusted/updated from 2010. This should be acknowledged more directly in the text.	Updated.
PC J. Ellison	1-7	The Vision of City Character veers off into amenities (better under Community Services) and inclusivity. Needs more about the physical character of the city, including such thoughts as distinctive character of its buildings, human scale of its streetscapes, etc.	Revised.
PC J. Ellison	1-7	In Vision for Community Services, we should NOT say we are a full service or a self-sustaining community. Neither is true. Where is our urgent care facility, etc.? Also, we should not state that we are the primary supplier of services to Sussex County residents. Not true.	Revised.
PC J. Ellison	1-8	The Vision for Neighborhoods should also include more about the physical attributes of the different neighborhoods.	Revised.
PC J. Ellison	1-8	I am not commenting on the City Positions as I know they will be revised.	Noted.
BOC P. Gossett	1-5	RE: Acknowledgments "created over a five-year period." Add specific start date.	Updated.
BOC P. Gossett	1-5	RE: Board of Commissioners. Consider adding elected/appointed term of service.	No change.
BOC P. Gossett	1-6	RE: Community Organizations. Organizations not based in City of RB OR I question their relevance to the CDP: AIDS Delaware, Cape Henlopen Food Basket, Community Resource Center, Delaware Native Plant Society, Faith United Methodist Church, Friends of Cape Henlopen State Park, Meals on Wheels Lewes-Rehoboth, Metropolitan Community Church of Rehoboth Beach, Rehoboth Art League, Rehoboth Beach Bears, Rehoboth Beach Sister Cities Association, Sussex Family YMCA, West Rehoboth Community Land Trust	Moved entirely to appendix.
BOC P. Gossett	1-6	RE: Rehoboth Beach Art League. Delete "Beach."	Moved entirely to appendix.
BOC P. Gossett	1-7	1st paragraph: Find a better descriptor [for "dynamism"].	Revised.
BOC P. Gossett	1-7	3rd paragraph: Should be identities not identifies.	Revised.
BOC P. Gossett	1-7	RE: Vision of City Character. Delete "and." [character, charm, history and sense of place]	Revised.
BOC P. Gossett	1-7	RE: Vision of City Character 2nd paragraph. What does "self-sustaining mean - balanced budget, adequate public services i.e. fire department?	Updated.
BOC P. Gossett	1-7	RE: Vision for Community Services. Full service?, we have no year round grocery store, dry cleaners, medical facility, gas station - are these considered elements of a "Full-Service" community?	Updated.
BOC P. Gossett	1-7	RE: Vision for Community Services 2nd paragraph, "urgent care facility." This private service has yet to become operational.	Updated.
BOC P. Gossett	1-7	RE: Vision for Community Services 2nd paragraph, "The car..." This sentence may be a goal, but at this time, the vast majority of residents and visitors access the City by automobile.	Updated.
BOC P. Gossett	1-7	RE: Vision for Community Services 2nd paragraph, "The City is not..." I do not understand how we are the 'primary supplier' of services to Sussex County? What services are we talking about?	Updated.
BOC P. Gossett	1-8	RE: Vision for Neighborhoods 2nd paragraph. Mention of 5 distinct neighborhoods in this section? Historic, Pines, South Rehoboth, Country Club Estates, Schoolvue.	Revised.
BOC P. Gossett	1-8	RE: Vision for Business 2nd paragraph, "controlled in architecture and signage." We have no architecture controls, zoning and signage yes, but no architecture.	Keep per PC.
BOC P. Gossett	1-8	RE: Vision for Business 2nd paragraph. Replace "is oriented to pedestrians and cyclists first, automobiles second" with "seeks to accommodate automobiles, pedestrians and cyclists."	Revised.
BOC P. Gossett	1-8	RE: Vision for Business 2nd paragraph, "high-end." High-end is misleading. We have many, many t-shirt shops and beach "trinket" shops. A distinction of retail, restaurants and service providers should be used.	Revised.
BOC P. Gossett	1-8	RE: Position on Population Growth, "relatively stable since 1950." I don't think this to be a true statement.	Updated.
BOC P. Gossett	1-8	RE: Position on Housing Growth. Change to "...smaller, homes with new residential construction having a great impact on the scale and density of the neighborhoods."	Updated.
BOC P. Gossett	1-8	RE: Position on Housing Growth. Change to "...workforce housing is a goal, accomplished by options that may include a mixed-use housing..."	Updated.
BOC P. Gossett	1-8	RE: Position on Expansion of Boundaries. Change to "While the City has no immediate plans for annexation, and the residents do not encourage or desire annexation, the Delaware Code..."	Updated.
BOC P. Gossett	1-9	RE: Position on Development of Adjacent Areas. Change to "... (e.g., traffic, sewage, water)..."	Revised.
BOC P. Gossett	1-9	RE: Position on Community Character. Change to "...unique character, charm, history and sense of place all its own...supporting appropriate development and redevelopment while preserving its status as a premier..."	Updated.
BOC P. Gossett	1-9	RE: Position on the General Use of Land, "new tools." What does this mean? Form Based Codes?	Among others. Unknown what they could entail at this time.

Rehoboth Beach Comprehensive Plan Draft #2 - Planning Commission Board of Commissioners Comments

Chapter 1 - Executive Summary Vision

Name	Page	Comment	Notes
BOC P. Gossett	1-9	RE: Position on Key Infrastructure Issues, "maintained in compliance with current codes." Do we need to recognize there is a need for changes to the zoning code?	Not needed in this section; referenced in later chapters.
BOC P. Gossett	1-9	RE: Position on Key Infrastructure Issues. Change to "...inevitable effects of sea level rise, including the probability of longer Atlantic...powerful storms. As its highest priority, the City needs to develop plans to accommodate its stormwater management needs as well as ways to modernize and harden key infrastructure..."	Updated.
PC R. Macha	1-8	RE: Position on Population Growth. while in-town city numbers haven't changed, significant growth has occurred outside city limits and in Sussex County emphasizing the expectation for services, shopping, restaurants etc... that a city is expected to attract/retain	Updated.
PC R. Macha	1-8	RE: Position on Housing Growth, "Unchecked...continue." not sure why this statement is needed. Housing codes in place do have this 'in check'	That is the intended meaning. No change.
PC R. Macha	1-8	RE: Position on Housing Growth, "that could also...encroachments." what are you referring to here?	Updated.
PC R. Macha	1-8	RE: Position on Housing Growth, "negative impact...quality of life." if this is referencing residents that purchased property abutting commercial property, I highly recommend this statement is removed. Residents knew where they were buying - this should not impact commercial development/redevelopment	Updated.
PC R. Macha	1-8	RE: Position on Expansion of Boundaries, "the area shown." not sure these words are needed - repetitive to previous phrase	Updated.
PC R. Macha	1-9	RE: Position on Development of Adjacent Areas, "careful consideration...and its." can we be more specific and state joint planning should occur?	Updated.
PC R. Macha	1-9	RE: Position on Critical Community Development Issues. The City is disconnected from businesses/resident owners. Surveys to solicit feedback are a great way to get a pulse on issues the City needs to act on. A Customer Service org is essential for the viability of our town. A Quick survey to see how the City responded to a concern or issue and a commitment to provide a high customer/business experience is essential to the viability and successful future of RB.	Updated.
PC R. Macha	1-9	RE: Position on Critical Community Development Issues. Businesses and residents have options ... they expect the City to respond with a cheerful, timely response.	Updated.
BOC S. Gay	1-9	RE: Position on Key Infrastructure Issues. I completely agree with the Vision statement on Water Resources. This critical aspect of Rehoboth Beach was also strongly voiced in the CDP survey. Regarding infrastructure and its impact on water resources, I also agree that this statement should be in the CDP: "Rehoboth must prepare for the inevitable effects of sea level rise. . ." Slide 5 but I would add under "examine stormwater management needs" the urgent need for a comprehensive stormwater management plan.	Updated.
BOC S. Gay	1-8	RE: Position on Population Growth. I agree that population is relatively stable in town, however the current population number is not in sync with data the city has in other documents. Our population in 2020-2021 has been stated as 1606 (census data? See link below). But in the CDP, it's 1495. While that may not be a huge difference, it raises two concerns: first, it's a 15% variance and should be accurate in the CDP and it suggests other data may not be up to date. https://worldpopulationreview.com/us-cities/rehoboth-beach-de-population	Data used is consistent throughout CDP; utilizing 2019 ACS as most recent year. 1606 data referenced is an estimate developed by a private organization utilizing baseline data from 2018 (per website cited). No change.
BOC S. Gay	1-8	RE: Position on Community Character. Please note and include the info in the bullet that begins with "92% want to maintain small town atmosphere" and ends with "92% encourage environmental practices/planning." Response from the community to questions throughout the survey showed strong preferences in these areas. In addition, 96% believe protection of natural areas/open space should be encouraged.	Updated.
BOC S. Gay	1-8	RE: Position on General Use of Land. The line "Future uses should be consistent with residential, pedestrian scale. Heightened concern for environmental protection" should be added to the city's position. This sentiment came up over and over again in the survey and is consistent with most feedback I have heard from citizens. See attached survey results, especially Q 12, 17, 22 and 32. In addition, elsewhere in the survey: 74.48% strongly agree or agree that land use compatibility and zoning enforcement needs more attention in the City.	Updated.
BOC S. Gay	1-8	RE: Position on Development of Adjacent Areas. I agree with the comment that this is not under our control. I think we have to be very careful about what we say here. Everyone wants to hear that we will work with Sussex County to prevent their continued development from adversely affecting the City of Rehoboth Beach, but I don't know if that is realistic. The county will be reviewing this CDP, right? Perhaps they could be asked to respond to numerous statements that our goal is to have some control over their development.	County and adjacent municipalities will have opportunity to review and comment. Updated.
BOC S. Gay	1-8	RE: Position on Expansion of Boundaries. The City has not annexed land in many years and I have heard no one talk about this as a goal. Most of the survey respondents were not in favor of annexation.	Updated.
BOC S. Gay	1-8	RE: Position on Housing Growth. I question the validity of the comment that it is "imperative" for RB to plan with Sussex County. Would the county even allow that? Otherwise, our own housing growth is mostly limited to renovation and replacement of existing houses. As land values rise, there is greater pressure to build a large house on a small lot, either to get rental income to offset the cost or just to maximize the land investment. However, these land values should not be the driving force on housing redevelopment in the City. Survey respondents overwhelmingly responded that they value the scale of the city, and favor controlling growth and development. Those goals should be included in any CDP position statement regarding housing growth. See Question #32 on attached survey results – 91% of respondents think managing future growth and development is an important goal for the City. Growth should be compatible with the City's small-town scale, and not adversely impact the quality of life in adjacent residential and commercial neighborhoods.	Updated.

Rehoboth Beach Comprehensive Plan Draft #2 - Planning Commission Board of Commissioners Comments
Chapter 1 - Executive Summary Vision

Name	Page	Comment	Notes
BOC S. Gay	1-8	RE: Position on Redevelopment Potential. Our position here should again be based on maintaining the scale of the City, keeping in mind the existing character of the City and surrounding neighborhoods. This is especially important in keeping the small-town charm of Rehoboth and in recognition of the fact that largest land use is residential. We are a very small town at one square mile and our commercial district is tiny compared to most towns. We have a long history of having a vibrant commercial district, which is built on a small scale where local businesses thrive and are not overwhelmed by larger chain stores and restaurants. The scale of redevelopment should be the same as our current scale, which has led to our success over many years. In the Community CDP survey, 91% of respondents think managing future growth and development is an important goal for the City, and 65% think that we should encourage human-scale development (Q32). When asked about descriptions of the City of Rehoboth Beach – while 85.48% believe it is a tourist destination community, and 78.87% believe it is a hometown community, only 20.29% agree that it is a “redevelopment community – a place with high concentrations of housing and commercial development.” Only 33% of survey respondents think the City is managing growth well (Q38), while 58% expressed concern about poor planning (Q34). A forward-thinking CDP should have a goal for Growth that is planned, coordinated and consistent with the scale of the City.	Updated.
BOC S. Gay	1-8	RE: Position on Community Development Issues. The first bullet with the long paragraph about mounting pressures and the goal of supporting development that is within our code, is spot on and should be adopted as the City’s position. See also above re: Housing Growth and Redevelopment Potential.	Updated.
BOC S. Gay		Other relevant findings from the survey: When asked about descriptions of the City of Rehoboth Beach – while 85.48% believe it is a tourist destination community, and 78.87% believe it is a hometown community, only 20.29% agree that it is a “redevelopment community – a place with high concentrations of housing and commercial development.”	Noted.
<i>Due to extent of comments provided by Planning Commission members Nan Hunter and Julie Davis, we will provide a response in that separate "track changes" document.</i>			
J. Dewey	Page 1-16	Position on Redevelopment Potential: Rehoboth has particular parcels, or small groups of parcels, primarily in commercial zones that would benefit from redevelopment. Rehoboth Beach, through recent and ongoing revisions to city code, has made specific changes in order to support the redevelopment of key parcels, for example, removing underground parking from FAR calculations for commercial projects. Housing benefits as current and anticipated market forces make redevelopment of residential properties attractive to individual homebuyers as well as developers. Note on CDP 2010: Consider adapting/modifying language regarding mixed-use, p. 90, for inclusion in this section. A comparison of CDP 2010 with draft CDP 2022 indicates that important protections for adjacent residential neighborhoods have been removed from the draft language. Protections for our fragile neighborhoods abutting commercial zones must be included. See highlights below. Because of the close proximity of many residential and commercial zones, the potential for adverse impacts of commercial activity upon residential neighborhoods is quite strong. A "mixed-use overlay" in Rehoboth could encourage residences above commercial, include restrictions on short-term rentals, establish density controls with on-premise parking requirements, and provide incentives to deliver high quality site and architectural design. An early application of mixed use zoning could be on selected parts of Baltimore and Wilmington Avenues. Assemble a workgroup including representatives from Main Street, Chamber of Commerce, and the community at-large.	Updated.
J. Dewey	Page 1-16	Position on Critical Community Development Issues: The City of Rehoboth Beach, as is true of many smaller communities, is under mounting pressures that make it challenging for homeowners, business owners and developers to maintain the characteristics of the city that brought so many here. Efforts should be made to support homeowners, builders and developers to work within the city’s building code while examining modifications to code that would incentivize the use of designs and features that support the shared vision of a traditional mid-Atlantic seaside town. An architectural design and review process, based on design elements supporting a shared vision of a traditional seaside resort, should be again considered.	Updated.
Jim Ellison	Page 1-16	City Positions: (These are only very preliminary thoughts from me) •Position on Population Growth: Population growth is not an issue within the boundaries of Rehoboth Beach. The city needs to apply pressure on Sussex County to limit population growth and tie it to infrastructure limitations, especially road systems. •Position on Housing Growth: This is too broad a question – what do you mean by growth? •Position on Expansion of Boundaries: I assume you mean possibilities for annexation. I would be in favor of considering the small triangle near the elementary school, small additions to the proposed Canal Walk Park, and some narrow commercial strip on both sides of Rehoboth Avenue Extended between the canal and the intersection with SR-1. I am much less certain about other growth areas shown on Map 9 in the draft. •Position on Development of Adjacent Areas: I don’t know what you mean by this? See my comments on the general use of land, below. •Position on Redevelopment Potential: I am in favor of redevelopment of commercial areas but only in the context of maintaining the overall existing character of the commercial areas and surrounding residential neighborhoods. See next position. •Position on Community Character: There is nothing about this in the draft. Nothing. I would suggest the consultants review the 2010 CDP, beginning on page 78, which does a very fine job of providing a position that I support. •Position on General Use of Land: This is mostly about Sussex County, and the county’s Growth Plan seems appropriate as far as it goes – to allow growth around existing growth and preserve open areas and agricultural lands. I believe the county must restrict any development to the limits of the infrastructure that must be in place to support it. •Position on Critical Community Development Issues: What do you mean? Economic development or what? This is too broad.	Updated.

Rehoboth Beach Comprehensive Plan Draft #2 - Planning Commission Board of Commissioners Comments

Chapter 1 - Executive Summary Vision

Name	Page	Comment	Notes
Rachel Macha	City Positions	<p>Position on Redevelopment Potential: The City must consider redevelopment. 70% of residents want to maintain low property taxes. Commercial owners and commercial redevelopment heavily contribute to low residential taxes. If the City doesn't encourage commercial development and retain businesses, visitors will go elsewhere to spend their discretionary dollars which will impact hotel fees, parking etc....</p> <p>Redevelopment is essential to the vitality of RB's future. Rundown and vacant buildings signal a declining resort town which will turn away visitors and decrease residential home investment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Commercial must be reviewed and updated. This initiative has kicked down the road for many years. It is critical to harmony of our community to remove the confusion and ambiguity of the commercial code. •City Planner must partner with commercial developers to guide and consult on projects. City Planner should ensure that Development projects have momentum and cycle through the City process in a reasonable period of time. •80% of current commercial properties/building need improvement based on the businesses surveyed. The City should enforce code and improvements to existing buildings. •Wilmington/Baltimore streetscape has started and is critical to RB. This project will impact parking. City needs to welcome Redevelopment projects. Developers are looking to invest in RB. We need to welcome these projects as they will keep RB relevant for years to come. (This is a pivot to past CDPs. This is important to emphasize in the CDP. Note: 2 redevelopment projects before the PC today are generational Rehoboth families not outside, unknown entities. These families want to leave a legacy on Rehoboth. If we don't work with them, they will sell their properties to 'big business' or do nothing and the properties will continue to be shuttered or the buildings will continue to degrade. •City ordinances implemented are outdated and don't encourage a vibrant cultural town. •Outdoor dining offered to establishments (not supported). COVID has changed our town. We don't know when/if we will be thru the pandemic. Our new reality is that many people will only want outdoor dining. 	Updated.
Rachel Macha	City Positions	<p>Position on Critical Community Development Issues: •Main Street – must stay in RB. Businesses and residents (56%) want arts, culture & entertainment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Unity in the Community – Develop volunteer opportunities to help less fortunate, more organized process to engage residents and businesses in special projects (e.g. beautification, RB ambassadors) •Focus on improving Customer Experience and measure it with surveys. Residents – when they call City for questions/help. Visitors – experience while in RB. Businesses – what can the City be doing more to help them. 	Updated.
Michael Bryan	City Positions	<p>Position on Redevelopment Potential: The redevelopment of commercial areas should be encouraged, taking into account the need to maintain the existing character of the commercial areas and surrounding residential neighborhoods.</p>	Updated.
Michael Bryan	City Positions	<p>Position on Critical Community Development Issues: As noted in Chapter 1 of the 2022 CDP Draft #1, development of an existing parcel-based land use GIS inventory and adoption of an updated Official Zoning Map (see Chapter 11, Land Use) should be a priority in order to assist the City and its various Boards and Commissions in assessing the direction and needs of the current Zoning Categories. In addition, <u>parcel mapping data for beachfront properties and lake areas should be prioritized for completion.</u></p>	Updated.
Michael Strange	Page 1-16	<p>This is going to be a spirited dialog! My comments are: Population Growth will happen. Housing growth will happen slower for Rehoboth. Expansion of boundaries - opposed, too late now and not good.</p> <p>Development of adjacent areas - not under our control. Redesign Potential - yes in the character of our community. Community Character - essential for success in all dimensions. General Use of Land - we are built out, therefore defend. Critical Community Development Needs - mixed use housing in the Core of the City. Preservation of our unique environmental assets. Key Infrastructure Issues - protection of all of <u>them given sea level rise and climate change.</u></p>	Updated.
S. Kaufmann		<p>I agree with the list of priorities in each focus area, but certain areas should highlighted and emphasized such as a plan to address the lack of and urgent need for affordable, work force, and senior citizen housing alternatives. In the area of land use there should be a strong recommendation to immediately address after the adoption of the new CDP a comprehensive review of the Cities Zoning, Building, and Permitting Codes by retaining a qualified Planning And land Use consulting firm to analysis and recommend both short term (such as the adoption of anew Mixed Use Zoning classification to deal with current projects that can't meet present code requirements); and the long term issue of rewriting the whole zoning ordinance including revisions of all the residential and commercial zones with their respective design <u>criteria, permitted uses, FAR limits, and building restrictions.</u></p>	Reflected in relevant chapters.
S. Kaufmann		<p>With respect to the potential annexation of properties shown as possible expansion on map 11-9 " Future Land Use Composition with in Annexation Growth Areas ", I agree the City should consider annexing land on both sides of Rehoboth Ave from the Canal Bridge to the intersection with Rt.1. I will mark up that map exhibit as part of these comments and forward it along with this outline. The City should also have as one of it early action items: hiring a traffic consultant to review current traffic patterns and recommend changes to implementation a traffic management program that includes traffic calming <u>infrastructure, pedestrian and bike safety measures, and implementation of one way street patterns.</u></p>	<p>No marked up map provided.</p> <p>Comments addressed in Chapter 6.</p>
B. Covington	Page 1-16	<p>Position on Critical Community Development Issues: We need to be more accommodating to our business community by encouraging growth that improves the character and charm of new buildings; including balconies in FAR and preventing Clear Space from being built</p>	Updated.
Nan Hunter	Page 1-16	<p>Position on Redevelopment Potential: Future uses to be consistent with residential, pedestrian scale. Heightened concern for environmental protection.</p>	Updated.

Rehoboth Beach Comprehensive Plan Draft #2 - Planning Commission Board of Commissioners Comments

Chapter 2 - Introduction: The Planning Process

Name	Page	Comment	Notes
PC B. Covington	2-7	"Executive and Vision", the word "effective" should be "effectively"	Revised
PC B. Covington	2-15	"Organization Interviews" line 9, suggest add "as well as those who requested follow-up interviews". A few groups like, SOLA and the Environmental Committee for RBHO Association, specifically requested interviews via phone or virtually in addition to the submitted forms	Revised
BOC S. Mills	2-2	Second sentence to begin "Effectively used,..."	Revised
BOC S. Mills	2-6	RE: Intergovernmental Coordination. Partnership with or better communications with Sussex County is a valid goal but a challenge to achieve. No government wants another government to tell them what to do or how to do it.	Noted.
PC R. Macha	2-2	[Change to] Effectively "used"	Revised
PC R. Macha	2-2	RE: Bullet #4. partnering and providing information that enables both parties to maintain the overall direction of the community.	Updated.
PC R. Macha	2-2	RE: Bullet #6. what does this mean/what is this referring to?	Revised
Trees/GI Comm	2-3	Change to "Preserve, protect, conserve, and restore its abundant trees and plantings, and grow the urban forest."	Language is from the 2004 Plan. No change.
Trees/GI Comm	2-3	Add "Strengthen the connection between trees/plantings and residents of the City."	Language is from the 2004 Plan. No change.
Trees/GI Comm	2-3	Add "Increase awareness of the impacts on climate change on the environment and benefits of planting trees."	Language is from the 2004 Plan. No change.
Trees/GI Comm	2-3	Add somewhere in the text of CDP if not appropriate for Goals section here: 1. Specify native trees and plantings and include pollinator (support birds, bees and butterflies) plants. 2. A goal should be to work to prohibit the application of lawn fertilizers and pesticides which do great harm to the environment. 3. Review all tree-related policies and ordinances periodically. 4. Reduce/remove invasive species. 5. Commit necessary resources (budget money annually!) to support the green environment.	Added as appropriate.
<i>Due to extent of comments provided by Planning Commission members Nan Hunter and Julie Davis, we will provide a response in that separate "track changes" document.</i>			

Rehoboth Beach Comprehensive Plan Draft #2 - Planning Commission Board of Commissioners Comments

Chapter 3 - Community Character Profile

Name	Page	Comment	Notes
BOC S. Mills	3-2	Coordinate references to figures and maps with the figure and map (here and throughout document).	Updated
BOC S. Mills	3-10	RE: Bandstand/Convention Hall/Special Events Committee. Sunset in 2021. Parking Task Force also sunset in 2021. Consider leaving in but identifying as sunset in 2021 at end of description.	Updated
BOC S. Mills	3-10	Within the document it mentions the Law Oversight Committee, consider adding this committee (but identifying it as sunset as noted for two other committees below).	Updated
BOC S. Mills	3-11	RE: Listing of committees. New: Wilmington-Baltimore Avenue Streetscape Task Force. Access description from "Meetings" page on portal: https://cityofrehoboth.civicweb.net/filepro/documents/61705?preview=61719 and https://cityofrehoboth.civicweb.net/Portal/MeetingTypeList.aspx	Added.
BOC S. Mills	3-11	As of December 17, 2021 I expect Commissioners to approve a new Stormwater Utility Task Force. Information on this new task force is yet to be put online. Information can be obtained by making a request of Ann Womack, awomack@cityofrehoboth.com	Added.
BOC S. Mills	3-13	RE: Spreadsheet on public schools serving city and area students. Consider identifying the schools located within the incorporated city limits to distinguish those outside of the city. (Only two: Rehoboth Elementary School and Rehoboth Cooperative Preschool).	Address already contains City.
BOC S. Mills	3-14	RE: Listing of community organizations. Ditto above on giving consideration to identifying which are located physically within the city limits.	Relocated to Appendix C.
BOC S. Mills	3-24	RE: Under September. FYI - The Rehoboth Beach Homeowners' Association is abbreviated RBHA.	Revised.
PC J. Ellison	3-2	Figure should be 3-1, not 2-1.	Revised.
PC J. Ellison	3-4	Historic buildings exhibit architectural detail. Please add the word "rich" as in rich architectural detail. Every building, including bland ones, exhibit plain old detail.	Revised.
PC J. Ellison	3-8	The City Position, goals and actions need to be broader than just addressing historic buildings. An action plan discussed yesterday is to investigate the formation of a Historic Buildings Board, possibly with the cooperation of the Rehoboth Historical Society and Museum, to increase public awareness and appreciation of historic buildings and resources.	Per PC Discussions.
PC J. Ellison	3-9	The text jumps suddenly to City Government and Community Organizations, and then again to Community Profile. These transitions need to be handled differently.	Updated
PC J. Ellison	3-24	Add in the month of May: Rehoboth Beach Arts Festival (with Rehoboth Art League)	Added.
BOC P. Gossett	3-8	What does [GOAL] #4 mean?	Revised.
BOC P. Gossett	3-8	RE: Goal #5. Change to "...cultural and historic resources in the city."	Revised.
BOC P. Gossett	3-10	RE: Bandstand/Convention Hall/Special Events Committee. This Committee has been "sunset" and no longer exists as of November 2021.	Updated
BOC P. Gossett	3-10	RE: Parking Task Force. This Committee was "sunset" in October 2021.	Updated
BOC P. Gossett	3-14	RE: Goal #8. Change to "...provide inclusion to the community organizations within the City."	Changes intended meaning. No change.
BOC P. Gossett	3-14	Add Goal #10. Improve two-way communication with City residents, businesses and visitors.	Added.
BOC P. Gossett	3-14	RE: Action Item f. Change to "Continue to support community services and organizations, within the City, at an appropriate level."	Revised.
BOC P. Gossett	3-14	RE: Action Item h. Change to "Review the City's government..."	Revised.
BOC P. Gossett	3-14	Add Action Item i. "Conduct a comprehensive review of the City code and create recommendations to meet current and future needs of the City."	Addressed in Chapter 4.
BOC P. Gossett	3-24	RE: Community Events. There are additional City events. Please contact Steven Perry at City Hall who can provide an UpToDate calendar of events.	Updated

Rehoboth Beach Comprehensive Plan Draft #2 - Planning Commission Board of Commissioners Comments

Chapter 3 - Community Character Profile

Name	Page	Comment	Notes
BOC P. Gossett		<p>From the 1996 Long Range Plan. Rehoboth's six neighborhoods can be described as follows:</p> <p>The Historic District: Maryland, Olive, and Virginia on the north side, Delaware, Brooklyn, Philadelphia, and the first block of Laurel on the south side. This is a varied neighborhood ranging from small camp houses to rambling boarding homes. Most are two-story with wood siding, white paint, and screened or glassed front porches. The brick condominiums present a blatant proportion, rhythm, and scale problem with the rest of the neighborhood. The streets are a straight grid layout with curbs and sidewalks. Setbacks are 10' to 15'. There are well-established trees and the landscaping is mostly natural or minimal.</p> <p>The Pines: Bordered by Lake Gerar/Lake Ave. to Surf Ave. to Henlopen Ave. to Felton, to Columbia, to Kent/Sussex (non-commercial) to Lake Gerar. This neighborhood, as its name implies, is dominated by trees including those in Central Park. The homes are in a variety of styles, ages, and size although the tendency is toward larger homes and lots than in other areas of the City. Most are two-story, wood, and muted in color. There are many front porches and most houses have front entries. The setbacks are 10' to 15' along straight streets with few sidewalks and curbs. The overall proportion and rhythm of the neighborhood is excellent.</p> <p>South Rehoboth: Boardwalk south to Silver Lake to Scarborough, to Philadelphia, to Bayard, to Laurel to Boardwalk. This neighborhood has a "beach-vacation home" appearance with complementary, though very different, architectural styles. There is no threat of monotony. The homes are mostly older with various newer styles mixed in and range from one to three-stories with two-story most frequent. A cottage architectural style predominates with wood facades and screened front porches. The streets are in a straight grid layout with curbs and sidewalks. Setbacks are 10' to 15'. The landscaping is well-established and maintained.</p> <p>The newer residential areas of Country Club Estates and Schoolvue are bounded by Scarborough Avenue and State Road proceeding southwestward to Scarborough Avenue Extended.</p> <p>Schoolvue: A self-contained residential area with distinct boundaries. It has a cohesive, complementary, "suburban" feeling in that most of the homes appear to have been constructed in the same time period and share a one or two-story ranch-colonial style with wood siding, shutters, few front porches, entries facing the street, and a 15' to 20' setback. The streets are straight, curbless, and without sidewalks. The neighborhood is generally well-maintained with established landscaping and trees over 20' in height. Overall the proportions of the homes are complementary, rhythm and scale along the street is good, and the home facades vary enough to avoid monotony.</p> <p>Country Club Estates: This neighborhood is generally random in style with a variety of facade treatments. The neighborhood has a variety of quite distinctive homestyles. Many of the homes were constructed around the same time, however, many lots have been developed recently and are now for sale. Most homes are one-story ranch style but the newer homes tend to be two-story. The dominant materials are plywood siding or vinyl/aluminum siding. Many homes have wide screened porches and many entries are at the side of the house, not the street face. Setbacks are 10' to 15'. Neighborhood streets are straight with curved perimeter streets, sidewalks, sloped curbs, and buried utilities. The landscaping is becoming established with trees over 20' high and most is well maintained.</p> <p>Grove/Camp Meeting Area: State Rd. to Fifth St. to Felton to Henlopen/Grove to canal. This is the most varied residential district. There is a great variety of styles.</p>	Added.
PC R. Macha	3-4	RE: Paragraph 2, "will almost certainly continue if left unchecked." I suggest this comment be removed. Unchecked - the City can't impose their view o personal property rights. If a landowner purchases property and they build to code, the City can't dictate if they keep/rebuild/build on privately owned property.	Updated
PC R. Macha	3-4	RE: Paragraph 4. This is an opinion paragraph ... should this be in the CDP?	Noted.
PC R. Macha	3-4	RE: Architectural Characteristics & Styles. should this be an attachment? good/interesting info but really not pertinent to the CDP requirements.	Addresses Community Character. No changes.
PC R. Macha	3-4	RE: last bullet, "replaced with newer...complete lot coverage." This is the commercial code today. I would remove/reword this statement.	Statement of existing conditions. No changes.
PC R. Macha	3-8	RE: Action Items. Offer incentives in the building code to make it economically feasible to renovate/restore historic dwellings vs tear down/build new.	Added.
PC R. Macha	3-14	RE: Goals. Benchmark against other coastal towns to ensure we are forward thinking and planning to stay competitive in the future as residents/businesses/visitors assess location to buy/open a business/visit RB	Added.
PC R. Macha	3-24	I disagree [RE comment that some people say there are already too many events in town and to reconsider language in Action Item a]. Businesses thrive when we have events in town, RB has become a more year round town - events bring people that will spend \$\$ but also serve our residents that enjoy events that a town offers. Look at the impact of not having SeaWitch, runs, Holiday Tree Lighting during COVID.	Noted.
PC R. Macha	3-8	The goals and actions noted on this page don't all relate to Historic resources.	Noted.

Rehoboth Beach Comprehensive Plan Draft #2 - Planning Commission Board of Commissioners Comments
Chapter 3 - Community Character Profile

Name	Page	Comment	Notes
PC R. Macha	3-8	I disagree with this action item [suggested to enact strong historic preservation law/create historic districts/panel of experts appointed by the Mayor to hear cases and appeals on whether properties should be placed in the district or preserved]. RB has a historical society/museum. I would think historical structures have been ID... why would we appoint a panel of experts when we have a historical society that the City supports.	Updated
PC R. Macha	3-8	is the suggestion that any structure built in or before the '70s is historical (based on a previous slide)? I don't think I agree with this thinking if that is the case.	Structures generally must be at least 50 years old to meet National Register listing criteria (although there are others).
PC R. Macha		[RE: previously submitted comments] Agree with following suggestions: offer more arts, culture, entertainment; bandstand-iconic, continue this tradition; more community events-family focused, create magical memories for kids/families/everyone; don't lose family focus; retain churches.	Updated
BOC S. Gay		Historic resources - Another very challenging subject for the City.	Noted.
BOC S. Gay		Goal #2 – Preserving Rehoboth’s “overall character and small town charm” is not just about historic resources but a value statement about scale and character of the City as a whole. It belongs in a more general/prominent section of the CDP.	Noted.
BOC S. Gay		There are good suggestions regarding architectural review/controls and preservation legislation.	Noted.
BOC S. Gay		Goal #2 and Action item (b) – supporting community organization with monetary donations, marketing website postings. This should not be included in the CDP. We already support a few key organizations such as the library and museum. We should not be obligated to support others. It is not the city’s role to advertise non-municipal services and organizations in the area. This should be done through established marketing channels such as the Chamber and Main Street.	Revised.
BOC S. Gay		I agree with the suggestion to eliminate Community Organizations from the CDP. I was on the PC when this list was compiled. It was created solely for the purpose of publicizing the survey to get as many responses as possible. There was never an intent to interview organizations based outside the city or to profile them in the CDP. In looking at other CDP’s for towns in DE, I note that the only community organizations included are those based in the town.	Relocated to Appendix C.
<i>Due to extent of comments provided by Planning Commission members Nan Hunter and Julie Davis, we will provide a response in that separate "track changes" document.</i>			
Jim Ellison	Page 2-7	I find the population projections for Rehoboth Beach to be excessive (I'm assuming that the numbers are for our 1 sq.mile city only), as the population has remained fairly stable since the 1060s. I just don't see where we would put another 1/3 of our present population in the city, which is already built out with the one exception of the “Baymart” property.	Added disclaimer - do not consider availability of land, household size, etc.
Michael Bryan		Given the fact that the City is already built-out and contains approximately 1.5 square miles, the projected increase in the City population may be too high	Added disclaimer - do not consider availability of land, household size, etc.
Nan Hunter		The section on seasonal population is less useful than it might be because there is no municipal level data from the DPC. The absence of any estimate of peak population specifically for Rehoboth creates a major gap in the data. In the 2010 CDP (p. 20), DNREC data on wastewater flows produced an estimate of a peak Rehoboth population in July 2005 of more than 49,000 persons. Has that increased? Decreased? I would also strongly encourage the team to search for at least some comparable data for Lewes. (I question whether the average of 3.3 persons per seasonal residence is the best estimate for Rehoboth and whether measures based on more similar locales could be found. It's not clear why measures from Florida and Michigan were used.)	The 3.3 persons per seasonal residence is the figure used by the State to project County Seasonal Population (utilizing the FL/MI studies, which are commonly accepted).
Tom West	Page 2-8	In addition to the DPC results, the County commissioned a report prepared by Robert Siegel & Associates, Inc. in April 2017, which indicated that the total population of Sussex County during the peak season may grow even higher than the DPC’s 385,100 estimate in 2045 (County Plan, page 2-4). That report estimates that there is a possibility of 495,810 people by 2045 (351,801 permanent residents plus 144,009 seasonal residents). That estimate hinges on sharp population growth of permanent residents driven by new economic development and employment. Based on those findings the County used projections that were approximately 15% greater than the projections provided by DPC for planning purposes.	Added.
J. Davis	Page 6-7	Goals. The Goals at the end of this chapter include: “Protect historic and characteristic structures,” and “Preserve Rehoboth’s overall character and small-town charm.” But how? These statements are too general to be meaningful. Some of the data in the chapter about the number of historic properties that have been demolished suggests that we are not meeting this goal. And, if historic preservation is to be a goal for the future, the 2022 CDP needs to propose new directions. The four “Action Items” following the Goals are hardly more meaningful. Two are focused on promoting inclusionary events and activities within the City. While laudatory, these Action Items have little to do with historical resources. The other two Action Items encourage owners of historic properties to use federal and state historic tax credits to restore historic buildings, and to urge government agencies to adopt educational awareness and promotions regarding historic rehabilitation grants and programs. Surely, there are other, more effective strategies the City could adopt to preserve and protect its historic structures than simply referring owners of historic properties to federal and state historic preservation programs.	Updated

Rehoboth Beach Comprehensive Plan Draft #2 - Planning Commission Board of Commissioners Comments
Chapter 3 - Community Character Profile

Name	Page	Comment	Notes
J. Dewey	Page 6-7	Action D - Does the term "inclusionary" need further expansion or definition? Needed public facility disability access improvements are continuously deferred in favor of other wants, such as Wayfinding.	Updated
Jim Ellison	Page 6-7	There is no recognition throughout the text and in the goals and actions that the city of Rehoboth Beach lacks a strong preservation interest among its citizens and leaders. Demolitions of historic buildings continue unabated and any attempt to suggest saving these resources is met with arguments about "property rights" – don't mess with them. I believe this should be acknowledged specifically in the text and perhaps in the goals and actions.	Updated
Michael Bryan		The preservation of traditional Rehoboth Cottages should be included as part of the historic preservation of the City, whether by historic architectural controls or incentives to encourage the preservation of these cottages. This issue is not addressed in Chapter 6. Without limiting property rights, an incentive program could be developed to encourage the preservation of old Rehoboth Cottages.	Added
S. Kaufmann		The information and recommendations in this chapter are all good , but with out strong historic preservation legislation enacted by the City there won't be much achieved in the way of Historic Preservation. Accordingly, I suggest that in the Goals lists section an additional one be added proposing consideration of enactment of a strong historic preservation law. It should provide for the creation of Historic Districts and the protection of historically significant structures. A panel of experts appointed by the City Mayor would hear cases and appeals on weather properties should be placed in the district or be preserved. I have no other comments on chapter.	Updated
Michael Bryan		Enactment of Historic Preservation Regulations for Residential Properties should be included, including incentives for preserving old Rehoboth Cottages.	Updated

**Rehoboth Beach Comprehensive Plan Draft #2 - Planning Commission Board of Commissioners Comments
Chapter 4 - Land Use Annexation**

Name	Page	Comment	Notes
PC B. Covington	4-2	"State Role" line 2, should be "spread-out".	Updated
PC B. Covington	4-3	4th line from top, "The" should match other indents, above.	Updated
PC B. Covington	4-14	"Other Annexation" I haven't heard or any additional annexation concerns other than maybe Rehoboth Ave extended from the Circle to Route 1	Noted
BOC S. Mills	4-6	Table 4-1 (I don't understand this table with blanks in the right column.)	Need PC Input to populate; discussing at next meeting.
BOC S. Mills	4-13	RE: Ch.4 Action Item (d). "Recreate an architectural review procedure...." Consider saying "Examine development of an architectural review procedure...."	Updated
PC J. Ellison	4-11	What is meant by a mixed-use overlay that would "encourage high-quality design by providing both greater flexibility and more control"? This needs further explanation.	Updated
PC J. Ellison	4-11	What, under Redevelopment, are "new desired development trends"? This needs further explanation.	Noted
PC J. Ellison	4-11	On the Municipal Annexation Plan of Service, it is not clear if this is required ONLY if there is an application for annexation, or required regardless of any interest in/requests for annexation. This should be made clear.	Updated
BOC P. Gossett	4-6	RE: Table 4-1. I strongly support the continued use of a different color for EACH zoning classification, including the 3 distinct residential zones, and the 3 distinct commercial zones. Merging distinct zoning classifications into "residential" or "commercial" is not recommended.	Each Zoning does already have its own; Future Land Uses are aggregated. Zoning does not equal future land use. No change.
BOC P. Gossett	4-8	RE: Table 4-5. I would suggest adding an appendix of the actual code language in addition to the brief descriptions provided here.	Available on City website. No change.
BOC P. Gossett	4-13	RE: Action Item d. An architectural design manual was developed by committee in November 2007 and is on file with the City secretary. This should be used as a basis for this action item.	Noted.
BOC P. Gossett	4-14	RE: Action Item i. Gathering stakeholder input is an important part of ANY action of the City including all land use and zoning changes. It does not need to be called out as a separate action item.	Updated
BOC P. Gossett	4-14	Add Action Item k. "Examining and evaluate the effectiveness and applicability of Form Based Codes."	Added
PC R. Macha	4-13	RE: Action Item a. [Add] and review annexation every 12 months going forward.	Noted
PC R. Macha		[RE: annexation and related map] A lot more discussion on the reason to annex land is needed. The PC has not spent any time on this ... I don't think the M&C have either.	Need PC Input to populate; discussing at next meeting.
BOC S. Gay		This section of the discussion guide seems somewhat redundant with earlier sections that address each topic and my comments on them are included earlier in this document. However, I do note the attached maps and numerous notes on actions needed on the maps. I will focus my attention here mostly on those maps.	No map comments provided. No change.
BOC S. Gay		First, I understand that the process of getting accurate parcel information is ongoing and will not have been completed by the time this CDP is finalized. I am concerned about the pair of maps on Future Land Use, the one from the 2010 CDP and the proposed map for 2022. I do not think it's a good idea to have a new color-coding for our zoning map. I understand that the intent may have been to simplify into residential and commercial but it sets a dangerous precedent. With all commercial as one color, the implication is that it is all one zone. C-1 and C-3 are different in important ways, as are R-1 and R-2. Why not just leave the zoning map the way it was in the 2010 CDP?	Not proposing new color coding for Zoning Map; Zoning Map actually cut/pasted from PDF. Future Land Use does not equal zoning. No change.
BOC S. Gay		On other topics in this section, I support the inclusion of architectural review. I don't know what underutilized areas of the City refers to? I thought the term meant vacant properties or undeveloped land. While there are a few single parcels in the city that are undeveloped, they are in private ownership. I do not see any "underutilized areas" in the City.	Updated
BOC S. Gay		Relevant Survey Results. Q12. Would you encourage or discourage the following land uses in the City of Rehoboth Beach? Among the responses for "strongly encourage and encourage" Protection of natural areas/open space 96.23% Residential/single-family 87.58% Public outdoor recreation 84.87% Tourist-based (bed & breakfast, restaurant, gift shop) 69.15% Retail stores 55.82% Mixed use 35.08% Hotels/motels 25.36% (lowest score of all 16 choices)	Noted
BOC S. Gay		Other relevant findings from the survey: 74.48% strongly agree or agree that land use compatibility and zoning enforcement needs more attention in the City.	Noted
<i>Due to extent of comments provided by Planning Commission members Nan Hunter and Julie Davis, we will provide a response in that separate "track changes" document.</i>			

Rehoboth Beach Comprehensive Plan Draft #2 - Planning Commission Board of Commissioners Comments
Chapter 4 - Land Use Annexation

Name	Page	Comment	Notes
J. Davis	Page 11-6	<p>As to specific provisions regarding land use planning for the City, other than a tutorial regarding the zones and uses in our zoning code, the only new material (new to me anyway) is in the "Future Land Use" discussion in which the consultants advocate preparation of a "future land use map," which is referred to as "Map 8 - Future Land Use."</p> <p>The text states that the "Planning Consultants conducted a GIS mapping analysis to compare the City's Official Zoning Map to the future land use categories. Map 8 -- Future Land Use was created using the most recent Sussex County parcel data and the City's Official Zoning Map (Map 10) to create compatibility between the land use and zoning categories. The newly created Map 8 - Future Land Use reflects the methodology used for this comparison, which is further detailed in Table 11-1."</p> <p>Table 11-1 shows the City's Zoning Classifications, which are color-coded and juxtaposed with the City's Future Land Use Classifications, which are also color-coded. According to the text, "All proposed future zoning amendments to the Official Zoning Map would have to be consistent with the assigned future land use classifications. If the request is for another zoning classification than the one assigned, it will require a Comprehensive Map Amendment to Maps 8-Future Land Use and if approved, Map 10-Zoning, as well as the acreage tables shown in Table 11-2 - Future Land Use Composition within City Limits."</p> <p>I find it difficult to evaluate the consultant's proposal for preparation of a "Future Land Use Map" using GIS technology. Leaving aside some obvious questions such as whether preparation of such a map is within the scope of this CDP exercise, I suspect the process of preparing a detailed map of future land uses throughout the City would open a Pandora's box of highly controversial issues, including whether commercial uses should expand into areas now zoned residential and/or vice versa. In addition, there is simply not enough time remaining in this CDP drafting process for the Planning Commission to undertake a subject as broad as future land uses for the City as a whole.</p> <p>Another major issue is Table 11-1, Future Land Use and Zoning Compatibility. Based on the color coding, the Table apparently collapses our three Residential zones and our three Commercial zones into a single zone each for future land use classifications. The line below then states "All proposed future zoning amendments to the Official Zoning Map must be consistent with the assigned future land use classifications."</p> <p>However, the three existing Residential zones and the three Commercial zones were each adopted with separate purposes and provisions to regulate separate land uses. Many current and past members of the Planning and City Commissions, as well as the Planning Commission's attorney, have indicated that they believe there should be more zones, not fewer. In any event, there is no explanation or discussion of why our current Residential and Commercial zones should be collapsed into a single zone each.</p>	Updated
		<p>Goals and Action Items. Many of the Goals and Action Items are about making the maps accurate. However, there are several that need to be clarified and/or made more specific. For example,</p> <p>Goals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "To determine appropriate redevelopment and repurpose of structures and land uses throughout the city limits." What is "appropriate" redevelopment? What is "appropriate" repurposing of structures and land uses? How does this Goal fit within the context of this CDP? Some examples would be useful. • "To increase professional customer service with better planning and redevelopment tools, updated code regulations, and clear procedures for consideration." What is the "professional customer service" that needs to be increased with better planning and redevelopment tools? What "code regulations" need to be updated? What does "clear procedures for consideration" mean? 	

**Rehoboth Beach Comprehensive Plan Draft #2 - Planning Commission Board of Commissioners Comments
Chapter 4 - Land Use Annexation**

Name	Page	Comment	Notes
J. Davis	Page 11-12	<p>Action items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •“Review the City’s Zoning Map for consistency with the Comprehensive Plan’s Future Land Use Map, ensuring compliance within 18 months of Plan adoption” This statement assumes the consultant will prepare a Future Land Use Map for inclusion in the 2022 CDP. For reasons stated above, this should not be a foregone conclusion. Also, as noted above, the consolidation of residential and commercial zoning districts for future land use is troubling. •“Review and update City Code regulations by identifying areas of conflict, clarifications, areas for opportunities, and introducing new regulations in support of the CPD (sic) recommendations.” I understand that the City Manager has already engaged a consultant to manage the City’s code library. Also, I did not see any recommendations in this Draft that suggest a need for specific new regulations. •Identify and promote adaptive redevelopment and underutilized areas for a vibrant community while preserving the character. Is the 2022 CDP going to identify areas ripe for adaptive redevelopment and utilization? If the City actually has areas that qualify for adaptive redevelopment and increased utilization, they should be listed and discussed. •“Create a parcel based existing land use inventory with assigned categories to further determine mixed use structures, non-conforming uses, variances, etc.” I don’t understand what purpose this inventory would serve. Many if not most properties in the City are non-conforming because they were developed either before the zoning code was adopted, or pursuant to code provisions that have since changed. Variances are approved to resolve issues specific to a given property. What is the purpose of including these properties in an overall “land use inventory?” •“Create a parcel based existing business license GIS data layer to include rental properties.” This might be a good idea, but the City’s inventory of rental properties changes every year. Creating and updating this GIS data layer on an annual basis could be very labor-intensive for the City staff. •“Gather stakeholder input on redevelopment demands, trends, accessibility, and potential obstacles for proposed improvements.” What stakeholders? What redevelopment demands? What obstacles? What proposed improvements? This reads like a recommendation intended to facilitate substantial new development within the City. It is not a recommendation that I would support. •“Continue to work with local business organizations to continue to promote local business.” What does this have to do with land use? 	Updated
J. Dewey	Page 11-12	Action Item H - "...classification with clear and transparent regulations, protections for adjacent residential neighborhoods..."	Updated
Rachel Macha	Page 11-10	Further land annexation? Canal to Rte. 1 - RB extended; should discuss this topic when we have joint meeting with PC and M&C	Updated
Nan Hunter		Add comparative description of current codes for commercial development in Rehoboth and other coastal communities. See recent Letter to the Editor from two City Commissioners: https://www.capegazette.com/article/moving-rehoboth-beach-forward/229271?amgee-source=dh	Noted
S. Kaufmann		1-Although the draft indicates the City is mostly built out I, suggest many parts of the City are ripe and under pressure for 2nd generation redevelopment. They include areas that are zoned: R-2,C-1,& C-3. This potential should be better noted and an action item should be added that these areas should be studied by both the PC and a committee of the BOC.	Noted
S. Kaufmann		3-Emphasis again the need for a consultant to draft a new flexible mixed use zone to be applied on a parcel by parcel basis through use of an over lay zoning process.	Updated
S. Kaufmann		5-Also have a Planning consultant review and recommend streamlined procedures for the PC to use when reviewing site plans that include architectural design guidelines set forth in the different individual zoning classifications (all new development applications should be required to go through site plan review. This should also include large subdivision applications and any new City project).	Updated
S. Kaufmann		6-Recommend emphasis of the use of code sections 270-4,21,&35 as incentive for commercial applicants to meet SRA requirements and relieve lack of parking	Noted
S. Kaufmann		<p>7-Finally highlight need for inter jurisdictional coordination on both land use and infrastructure Planning. In this area as I recommend previously a “ Business And Development Committee be appointed by the County Board of Supervisors and the BOC”. This inter jurisdictional group could have up to 9 or 11 members: with 2 form the County Supervisors.; 2from the BOC;2 form each Chamber of Commerce;2 from the Development Community;2 from each Planning Commission; and 1 each from the Citizen associations. They could be charged to suggest ways and tools to be used to further cooperation and joint actions by the County and City. The Committee would be advisory only but would need a place to meet 3 or 4 times a year with funds provided on a pro rata basis but the County and City.</p> <p>Again I understand this is difficult proposal to make, but something along this line is necessary if there is to be any meaningful coordination between the City and County realized in the future</p>	Updated

**Rehoboth Beach Comprehensive Plan Draft #2 - Planning Commission Board of Commissioners Comments
Chapter 4 - Land Use Annexation**

Name	Page	Comment	Notes
Tom West	Page 11-6	<p>Pleased to see that a Future Land Use Map will be included (not in current CDP). Such policy maps provide an important foundation for rezoning applications. The proposed Map-8 was generated using current zoning classifications. Ideally the Future Land Use Map would incorporate proposed land use policies, which may not be consistent with current zoning but sets the foundation for amendments to ensure codes adapt to evolving needs. Some of the possible refinements to consider include:</p> <p>1. Showing generalized areas where mixed use zoning (11-9 / 1) should be considered. Areas to consider initially could include those shown as “design image areas” on Map #7 from the current CDP and currently zoned as C-1 and C-3.</p> <p>2. In addition to areas for revitalization it might be helpful to introduce some residential subcategories. There have been concerns with neighborhood infill that is inconsistent, related to dwelling types, mass, coverage and lot size. Categories similar to the zoning designations (R-1, R-1S and R-2) would be a good start to help manage impacts at different neighborhood levels. There are, however, some additional subcategories worth further consideration. For instance, some residents in neighborhoods (e.g., Schoolvue) report that minimum lot sizes common in R-1 are too small and out of character with their communities. In those neighborhoods, where most current lots would permit further subdivision, residents report that current land use policies would encourage infill development that is inconsistent with their current neighborhood character. Based on initial evaluations these concerns may apply to additional areas.</p>	Need PC Input to populate; discussing at next meeting.
Michael Strange	Map 9 - Annexation	My opinion is that 20 years ago this might have been a good idea. However, that time has long gone and it is now too late and clearly not beneficial to the city from any land use perspective. So no, do not do.	Noted
Michael Bryan		The City Planner should be tasked with consideration fo a new mixed use zoning classification, perhaps as an overlay zone for significant commercial properties located in the City.	Updated

Rehoboth Beach Comprehensive Plan Draft #2 - Planning Commission Board of Commissioners Comments
Chapter 5 - Housing Economic Development and Opportunity

Name	Page	Comment	Notes
PC B. Covington	5-5	"Median Rental Values" should state this is weekly	This is monthly. Added definition to Appendix A. https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/note/US/HSG860219
PC B. Covington	5-12	"Architectural Design Manual" – I think that this whole section seems to imply that "all" tear-downs and destruction of cottages is all bad. Think we need to mention that in 2017 (?) Mayor and City Council passed stricter ordinances limiting the FAR and therefore this concern has been addressed.	Addressed elsewhere.
BOC S. Mills	5-11	RE: Table 5-7 Residential Building Permits. Consider clarifying that this is referencing new construction (versus remodeling)? Consider (for RB only) distinguishing between new construction of a single-family home on an empty lot and new construction after demolition of the existing structure versus extensive remodeling only (also helps identify number of demolitions taking place).	Already noted in text.
BOC S. Mills	5-19	RE: Identification of "City Redevelopment Businesses." Needs clarifying: "new business occupants" means what time period? In the last 3 years? Last 10 years? And are the businesses listed new businesses that 1) went into an existing restaurant space with minor renovations (e.g. Cooter Brown's)? Or 2) took over a space requiring major renovations (e.g., Rise Up Coffee shop taking over a 7-11 store)? What about a restaurant like Nicola on the Avenue that converted two retail stores into a restaurant in 2010?	Removed table.
BOC S. Mills	5-22	RE: Ch. 5 Economic development, action item (e) "Support outdoor dining businesses." Consider "Evaluate opportunities for dining establishments to expand outdoor dining including utilization of public space and of neighboring spaces. (This mirrors what B&L currently is developing which the Commissioners will be addressing the first of the year.)	Revised.
PC J. Ellison	5-11	Architectural Design Manual: This is not the proper place for this. This chapter discusses the quantity and types of housing, not the design and physical attributes of the housing. The Manual should probably be in Chapter 3.	Noted.
PC J. Ellison	5-14	Somewhere in Economic Characteristics the report should state that one of the problems in attracting doctors and other young professionals with families to the area to practice is the lack of top tier K-12 education opportunities/alternatives for their children.	Noted.
BOC P. Gossett	5-14	RE: Goal #1. How do we define "Characteristic" structures?	Revised.
BOC P. Gossett	5-14	RE: Goal #2. Delete entirely. I don't feel this is a priority item for the City, as we have no control on this issue.	Deleted.
BOC P. Gossett	5-14	Replace Goal #3 with: "Examine establishing a mixed use zone or a mixed use overlay zone allowing a blend of residential and non-residential uses in the City's commercial zone. This should also be examined within the context of Form Based Codes."	Updated.
BOC P. Gossett	5-14	RE: Goal #4. I don't know how this would be accomplished without a mandate for affordable housing.	Noted.
BOC P. Gossett	5-22	RE: Goal #6. What is the City's role in encouraging redevelopment of "selected properties"? Is that not the job of the property owner?	Not necessarily. Incentives? Priority redevelopment areas? No change.
BOC P. Gossett	5-22	RE: Action Item d. Change to "...and support appropriate economic development..."	Updated.
BOC P. Gossett	5-22	RE: Action Item e. Change to "...businesses where physically appropriate and where pedestrian traffic and ADA access can be maintained."	Updated.
BOC P. Gossett	5-22	RE: Action Item h. I do not think this is the City's role.	Deleted.
PC R. Macha	5-14	RE: Goal #1. [Add] Incentivize to protect	Updated.
PC R. Macha	5-14	RE: Goal #4. #4. In theory, this is a good goal. Realistically, with the cost of land far outweighing the value of a dwelling, I don't see how this is attainable. More discussion is needed on how to plan/address this goal in the CDP	Updated.
PC R. Macha	5-14	RE: Action Item c, "with thresholds." I would remove this .. infringing on personal property rights. City of RB has no right to tell someone what thresholds they must build their own to look like. Our housing code establishes standards that ALL owners must adhere to get an occupancy permit	Updated.
PC R. Macha	5-22	It is critical that the City of RB visibility support our businesses and business district. They are several actions to be inserted here to demonstrate their support and willingness to listen to our businesses ... which is key to retain/attract business to RB.	Updated.
PC R. Macha	5-22	This is a critical part of the CDP. A lot of work is needed to establish goals, actions, commitment to our bus community.	Noted.
PC R. Macha	5-22	We need to address the impact of online shopping and the viability of sustaining small, mom/pop shops in RB. We can't afford to lose our merchants. We must find ways to change the current relationship b/w the City and our business community.	Noted.
PC R. Macha	5-22	Businesses don't feel valued or heard by the City. The City doesn't respond to their needs/ideas/concerns. Landlords are raising rents and not maintaining their properties which also impacts merchants decision to stay in RB.	Noted.
PC R. Macha	5-22	I recommend that the M&C's/Dan Slagle to hold business community meetings monthly to more closely connect with our businesses, develop a strategy to retain/attract new businesses, state an occupancy goal in the CDP (e.g. ensure 90% occupancy in our business district), The City should survey the business community at least 2x/yr to solicit honest, direct feedback.	Noted.
PC R. Macha	5-22	The CDP should have a goal with actions to commit to 1) a concerted effort to connect with the business community 2) strategy to retain/attract high end merchants 3) plan to extend more shopping/restauratns/eateries during shoulder seasons 4) ensure landlords maintain upkeep of properties/keep leases at an affordable rate so merchants stay in RB.	Noted.

Rehoboth Beach Comprehensive Plan Draft #2 - Planning Commission Board of Commissioners Comments
Chapter 5 - Housing Economic Development and Opportunity

Name	Page	Comment	Notes
PC R. Macha	5-22	We don't want RB to become OC crime in OC escalated to an all time high this past season. The clientele in OC has continued to degrade .. we need the City committed to maintain an upscale, unique, clean, safe, crime-free business district.	Noted.
PC R. Macha	5-22	This summer we saw a higher incident level of people changing behind their cars, disrespect for shop workers, trash on the beach, etc.... a commitment to high end shops, controls on crime/behavior in the business district will weed out unwanted people in our town and maintain and grow our business district.	Noted.
PC R. Macha	5-22	This is cooperative effort with our Chief of Police, M&C, PC and Business community.	Noted.
PC R. Macha	5-22	RE: Action Item e. Adopt outdoor dining for restaurants that want to offer it	Updated.
PC R. Macha	5-22	RE: Action Item g. for workers AND for shoppers, especially in-town residents to have transportation to downtown and back to their homes instead of driving/parking on RB Ave/Baltimore Ave/Wilmington Ave	See related comments.
PC R. Macha	5-14	RE: Goal #1. Provide incentives to renovate older homes. Protect is a strong word. Encourage is better.	Updated.
PC R. Macha	5-14	RE: Goal #2. Not sure what we are increasing awareness of ... maybe a word missing here?	Deleted.
PC R. Macha	5-14	RE: Goal #3. agree but we need to be open to re-development	Noted.
PC R. Macha	5-14	RE: Goal #4. this is difficult. RB become a high income, affluent resort town. There is a variety of housing today but land is finite. I doubt anyone would support partitioning single family housing into multiple dwellings .. that isn't the character of RB nor should it ever be.	Noted.
PC R. Macha	5-14	RE: Action Item a. vacationer reinforcement is important but our code enforces noise and conduct of owners/renters too.	Updated.
PC R. Macha	5-14	RE: Action Item b. feels like this is encroaching on personal property rights. Incentives to preserve older homes allows owners to make a decision on if they build or renovate. I disagree that the City can enforce thresholds/guidelines to get building permits. Our code provides building regulations today. It's personal preference on what type/color home someone wants to build.	Updated.
PC R. Macha		what does special needs residents mean? A suggestion that we consider owners who may be looking to stay in their home as they age and may require special building requests to allow for aging care is something we should consider. The population is retiring sooner, living longer and affluent people want to stay in their homes as they age and pay for in-home care.	Explained under "Special Needs Housing"
PC R. Macha	5-22	RE: Action Item e. important to call out .. the silver lining of COVID. Outdoor was opposed for a long time but well received by patrons ... something we should allow going forward.	Noted.
PC R. Macha	5-22	RE: Action Item d. we should gather info from other towns like RB that experience traffic/parking during seasonal/peak times. Think creativity / Try new ideas.	Noted.
BOC S. Gay	5-14	Goal #2, "increase awareness with new housing developments" in the county. Huh? What does this mean? I think are all well aware of the new housing outside the city!	Deleted.
BOC S. Gay	5-14	Goal #3 – I agree with the comment that we need to add mixed use zoning "while protecting the character of adjacent residential neighborhoods."	Updated.
BOC S. Gay		It should be noted that only 35% of survey respondents said Mixed Use is a land use we should encourage in the City, far below others such as open space, single family residential, and retail. (Q 12 on attached survey results.)	Noted.
BOC S. Gay		Re: suggestion of maintenance "standards" for existing properties – RB is not an HOA! We already have safety and general property maintenance standards. Not sure that we need anything else.	Noted.
BOC S. Gay		It is unclear to me how the residential code should be updated, except as part of an overall review of our zoning code.	Updated.
BOC S. Gay		I agree with all the comments that affordable housing in RB will be a challenge. How and where? Specific action items should be listed, for evaluation if details are not yet known.	Noted.
BOC S. Gay	5-22	Action item (b) – "Support outdoor dining." See comment on this slide for revision, which includes important background on this topic. It would be better to say "evaluate possibilities to add more outdoor dining capabilities for local restaurants." We already have a number of restaurants with outdoor dining, even before the pandemic.	Updated.
BOC S. Gay	5-22	Action item (c) – Removing "barriers and hurdles" for redevelopment is unclear and has no practical meaning in our CDP. I agree with the suggestion to revise by adding: " by providing clear and transparent code, regulations and definitions." The original wording is an open invitation to ignore code and expect that exceptions will be made.	Updated.
BOC S. Gay		Regarding suggestion of a business council – we already have two – the Chamber has a Downtown Council within its board that focuses on City of RB and Main Street's board serves a council.	Noted.

Rehoboth Beach Comprehensive Plan Draft #2 - Planning Commission Board of Commissioners Comments
Chapter 5 - Housing Economic Development and Opportunity

Name	Page	Comment	Notes
BOC S. Gay		Regarding city planner role: “ensure development projects have momentum.” To me, this implies advocacy of projects. I don’t think that is the role of the planner. The city planner’s role, as written when the City announced his hiring includes: “West will provide plan compliance review of all subdivision applications and applications that require a site plan review. In addition, he’ll analyze applications to determine if they meet zoning code requirements and the vision and intent of the city’s comprehensive development plan, are compatible with existing nearby uses, and if the proposed use is the highest and best use for a particular location.”	Noted.
BOC S. Gay		Relevant Survey Results. Q17. What attributes make a residential community appealing to you? Of twenty options listed, the top five ratings for “Extremely Appealing” or “Very Appealing” were: Pedestrian friendly 92.37% Sidewalks 85.67% Attractive Landscaping 84.55% Trees 83.84% Common Open Space 82.03%	Noted.
BOC S. Gay		Q28. How important is it to offer the following economic development strategies in the City of Rehoboth Beach? Responses for very important and important Continue to ensure infrastructure is built and maintained to serve existing businesses 87.79% Support local food, services, goods – “buy local” 89.62% Support natural and cultural resource-based tourism (eg hiking, biking, birding, arts) 81.66% Support recreational-based activities and tourism (eg sports) 72.87%	Noted.
BOC S. Gay		Other relevant findings from the survey: 76.33% feel it is extremely important or important for the City to establish architectural design standards for commercial uses.	Noted.
<i>Due to extent of comments provided by Planning Commission members Nan Hunter and Julie Davis, we will provide a response in that separate "track changes" document.</i>			
J. Davis	General	<p>This is another data-driven chapter. It contains lots of information comparing the City with the County, the State and neighboring communities (Dewey Beach and Henlopen Acres). However, some of the data can be misleading. For example, I believe that rental housing in this context refers to year-round rentals, not short-term seasonal rentals. This should be clarified. Moreover, if the rental housing information is limited to full-time rentals without consideration of short-term summer rentals, I’m not sure how useful these comparisons are for the reasons discussed below.</p> <p>This chapter also contains a lot of generic text about affordable housing, special needs housing and the resources available to address them. I suspect this material is largely a “cut&paste” from CDPs prepared for other cities and counties, most of which is not relevant to Rehoboth.</p> <p>I suggest that this chapter instead focus on two data points that are extremely important to the City’s daily life and future goals. One is the number of second homes, many used throughout the year, by families who do not rent those houses at any time during the year OR only rent them for a short time and use them themselves the rest of the year. The other is the true impact of the summer population on city infrastructure and services. These issues are discussed below.</p>	Updated.
J. Davis	Page 4-2,	<p>The term “vacant housing units” is used by census and other general population studies to denote houses that are not occupied by a full-time owner or renter. But for the City, it is misleading and highly inaccurate because it does not take into account the second homes that are used by their owners periodically throughout the year. This is a population that must be accounted for in the 2022 CDP since these property owners use City facilities and need City services when they are in town.</p> <p>This section also does not specifically address an even bigger issue – the impacts of summer vacation rental housing on the City -- even though City government continues to hear repeated public concerns about overcrowded units, large numbers of cars at rental units, cars blocking sidewalks, and associated loud and unruly behavior. The City does work to ensure safe habitation through enforcement of rental licensing and the periodic inspection of all properties. However, summer rental properties, particularly those that can and do accommodate large numbers of vacationing renters, continue to be an area of concern given the levels at which their renters also use City facilities and need City services.</p> <p>In 2017, now Commissioner Susan Gay wrote a letter to the Cape Gazette commenting on the draft CDP then in progress for Sussex County. In her letter, she discussed the impact of summer tourism on County facilities and services, but the analysis holds equally true for the impact of summer tourism on the City. https://www.capegazette.com/article/sussex-comp-plan-should-consider-tourism-data/131940. Her letter also pointed out the discrepancy between household size for homes that are not rented and those that are rentals, and noted that the much larger household size for rental homes put even greater demands on City services and facilities.</p> <p>Comparing City occupancy and vacancy rates with the County, State and neighboring cities also fails to focus on impacts summer rental houses have on City resources. What is missing is LOCAL data regarding the two elements of vacation rental housing required for an impact analysis – the number and type of rental units in the City as shown through rental license data, and an estimate of summer population based on bedroom count of the rental units. These local data elements, which the City in fact collects, would be much more relevant than any data from census figures or the American Community Survey.</p>	<p>Updated.</p> <p>Updated.</p>

**Rehoboth Beach Comprehensive Plan Draft #2 - Planning Commission Board of Commissioners Comments
Chapter 5 - Housing Economic Development and Opportunity**

Name	Page	Comment	Notes
J. Davis	Page 4-6	Affordable Housing. The lack of affordable housing, especially for the City's workforce, is obviously a major challenge for the City. This section now states: "Provide additional housing opportunities within the existing housing stock such as permitting accessory dwelling units in residential areas as a matter of right. This can help residents age in place and address some of the need for seasonal housing." If housing for the seasonal workforce is intended, that should be stated specifically. It should also be clear that the City will need ordinances in place to prevent ADU's from becoming just additional vacation rentals.	Noted.
J. Davis	Page 4-12	These include "Thorough enforcement of the vacation rental housing regulations, health and safety inspections, and licensure," and "Reevaluate an architectural review procedures and guidelines with thresholds for building permit approval." These are both strong action items, which deserve greater emphasis.	Noted.
J. Dewey	Page 4-12	Goal 2 - This item seems unclear. Who's awareness of what, exactly?	Deleted.
J. Dewey	Page 4-12	Goal 3 - Add "while protecting the character of adjacent residentially zoned neighborhoods" at the end of the sentence.	Updated.
Jim Ellison	Page 4-5	Figure 4-4 and accompanying language need clarification. First, I assume rental in this context means fulltime and value means per month. These need to be clarified in the text.	Added clarification. Also provided new table "vacancy status."
Jim Ellison	Page 4-6	I do not believe that the provision of affordable housing in the 1 sq.mile Rehoboth Beach is possible or realistic. If this section is referring to the Rehoboth Beach AREA, that is more realistic, but I don't see much in the language to distinguish the city from the area. There is nothing in the goals and action plans in this chapter that addresses affordable housing and the city's responsibility to apply pressure in the context of Sussex County and neighboring communities in our area.	Updated.
Jim Ellison	Page 4-7	While this section describes the difficulty of providing workforce housing within the city, there is no tie between this dilemma and the goals and actions that follow.	Updated.
Jim Ellison	Page 4-8	While "Attainable Housing" and "Special Needs Housing" are well described as issues facing the country, there is no attention to what if anything can be done about these in the City of RB. Once again, there is nothing about these in the goals and actions at the end of the chapter.	Noted.
Jim Ellison	Page 4-9	Again, the "Fair Housing Act" is well described, but so what? No tie to RB.	Noted.
Jim Ellison	Page 4-10	The "Housing Needs Analysis" statement is pathetic. Says nothing.	Updated.
Jim Ellison	Page 4-12	The goals and actions are very weak. Action Item B is in poor grammar and addresses the potential architectural review process that is not discussed at all in the chapter.	Updated.
Michael Bryan		Given the built out status of the City and the limited area of the City, the discussion about affordable & workforce housing, affordable housing, workforce housing, attainable and special needs housing, while informative, does not present problems that have solutions in the City. These would appear to be issues best addressed by Sussex County.	Noted.
Michael Strange	Page 4-6	Bullet No. 1 - provide additional housing... given this is a resort city where the majority of the housing stock in residential neighborhoods are seasonal rentals, this is as terrible recommendation and the bullet should be eliminated.	Updated.
Michael Strange	Page 4-7	Attainable Housing - needs far better structure and reduced verbiage	Updated.
Michael Strange	Page 4-7	Attainable Housing and Special Needs to the end of the chapter needs better contextual reference instead of just boiler plate throwaways.	Updated.
Michael Strange	Page 4-7	Table 4-8 needs more consideration and analysis. The housing stock limitation is what sets the tone and value of property in Rehoboth Beach and sense of place of what we are. This table by itself is meaningless.	Noted.
Nan Hunter		Most of the information in this chapter pertains to the County rather than to Rehoboth Beach.	Updated.
Nan Hunter		The most significant concerns about housing in Rehoboth Beach relate to vacation rental housing, which the draft explicitly does not address. The 2010 CDP and the 2015 update memorandum both note problems related to "mini hotels"; the 2022 CDP should directly address these problems.	Updated.
Nan Hunter		In addition, the 2010 CDP (p. 21) states that only 38 per cent of the rental units in 1994 were registered. What is the current status of registration for rental units? The City may need to take additional steps to secure missing revenue from taxes due on rentals. See 2010 CDP at pp. 83-84.	Noted.
S. Kaufmann		This chapter provides very good background information and highlights the issues of affordability, high cost of housing and a lack of significant diversity of housing types. What it doesn't do is recommend specific actions that should be pursued to address these issues. Accordingly, the following are a few specific actions I believe should be taken in the near term once the PDC is adopted.:	Noted.
S. Kaufmann		1-In order to begin addressing both affordable and lack of diverse housing type issues this chapter in the goals and action item lists should recommend that the City retain a highly regarded planning and architectural consulting firm to draft and propose the adoption in the interim before there can be a complete review and amendments to the city zoning codes a " New Mixed Use Zoning Classification " to be applied in the form of an over lay zone on a case by case basis on the Cities identified high priority commercial properties and areas such as Wilmington & Baltimore avenues as well as other significant properties that afford the opportunity to increase the # of different housing types and address the affordability issue. The zone should identify not only a range of uses that could be applied but also provide a range of densities, FAR classifications, development guidelines, and architectural standards, etc. Once approved on a specific property or identified area an application for site plan approval would be required to be considered by the Planning Commission. It should also be noted a zone of this type could relieve the need for frequent zoning variance requests.	Updated.
S. Kaufmann		2-Another new zoning tool that should be created is the use of "Cluster Development" which would provide for a range of housing types in the residential classifications including townhouses, multifamily, missing middle, senior citizen and other unit types at an increased density based on a rang of permitted unit #s set forth in a table in the cluster option for each of the residential zones. Use of the "Cluster Option" would also require a site plan review before the Planning Commission	Updated.

Rehoboth Beach Comprehensive Plan Draft #2 - Planning Commission Board of Commissioners Comments
Chapter 5 - Housing Economic Development and Opportunity

Name	Page	Comment	Notes
B. Covington	Page 4-3	Is there any evidence, such as noise complaints, housing inspection violations, police reports to support this statement? I have not seen this problem and want some evidence to make this statement	Updated.
B. Covington	Page 4-11	2016 – no residential building permits???????? (re: Table 4-7)	None per the cited report.
Tom West	Page 4-2	Add further clarification that the CDP uses estimates most accurate available data for 2021 but that the City may want to review the material following the release of 2020 Detailed Counts [scheduled 2022] during its annual review of the CDP.	Added clarification. Also provided new table "vacancy status."
Tom West	Page 4-3	Not sure data in Table 4-3 on rental vacancy rates provides useful insights. The rental vacancy rates for 2000 and 2010 (based on census counts) differ dramatically from vacancy rates in 2019 based on census estimates. Can the values be verified (using other sources) or qualified until 2020 census counts are available?	Confirming figures.
Tom West	Page 4-3	Add statement that recent zoning changes have included provisions to limit dwelling size and increase green space. Any data building permits that could be used to validate trend of dwelling size increases? Or use for vacation rentals?	Updated.
Tom West	Page 4-4	Any data that can be used to describe housing replacement (demolition of older dwelling and construction of new)? Building Dept?	Noted.
Tom West	Page 4-11	4. Support and encourage a variety of housing stock for all ages and income levels. Add special needs residents – discussed in Chapter.	Updated.
J. Davis	Page 5-6	<p>Redevelopment Activity Within the City. According to the draft, "More local businesses are extending or keeping their businesses open year-round based on the growing number of popular events in fall and winter months." This was a major goal of the 2010 CDP, and it's reassuring that this is already happening. This section also includes an incomplete list of significant new businesses that have located in the City since the 2010 CDP.</p> <p>While noting that some major new and existing businesses have located outside the City in recent years to allow for structure and parking expansion, the discussion also notes that the City is fortunate in that vacant buildings in its downtown business area fill up fairly quickly due to more year-round activity and a growing population.</p> <p>However, an Action Item at the end of the chapter states: "Continue to reevaluate the code and regulations of the city to remove barriers and hurdles for redevelopment by providing flexible standards." This statement is entirely too broad in that it assumes that the City has in fact erected barriers and hurdles to new development and redevelopment.</p> <p>Moreover, discussions during the recent M&C meeting concerning adoption of GFA standards for commercial development show that the development standards in the City zoning code are significantly less restrictive than those for Sussex County, Lewes, Henlopen Acres and Dewey Beach.</p> <p>Including this Action Item in the final 2022 CDP could encourage developers seeking to avoid compliance with the City zoning and site plan codes to cite the CDP as evidence that the current codes are rigid and inflexible, and thus cause hardships in the development process. This Action Item should be deleted from the Draft.</p>	Updated.
J. Davis	Page 5-9	Actions Items. The "Action Items" at the end of the chapter includes the following: "Support outdoor dining businesses." Anyone who followed the discussions at the M&C workshops and meetings last spring and summer knows that outdoor dining is a complex topic involving space limitations, ADA access, and numerous other variables. Urging the City simply to "support outdoor dining businesses" without more specific recommendations does not recognize these complexities. The Draft might say something like "evaluate the best ways to accommodate outdoor dining," or words to that effect.	Updated.
Rachel Macha		Encourage redevelopment of properties; remove barriers/standards for redevelopment; Actions - adopt outdoor dining (not support)	Updated.
Michael Bryan		The proposal to continue the re-evaluation of the City Code to remove barriers and hurdles for redevelopment by providing flexible standards is important. An overhaul of the City Code, particularly the Building and Zoning sections will constitute a significant amount of work and should be initiated by COmmittee appointments right away. Input from the business and development community, as well as the public, is needed. In addition, the need to address parking during peak season is a continuing problem that should be reviewed and appropriate proposals be put forth for consideration, discussion and action.	Updated.
Nan Hunter		Describe the status of commercial entities and opportunities in Rehoboth, using comparisons to Lewes and other comparable locales. For example, it was recently reported that downtown Rehoboth has a zero per cent commercial vacancy rate. Also, see comments on "Land Use" chapter with respect to comparison of zoning codes for commercial uses in Rehoboth compared to those in Lewes and other towns.	Updated.
Nan Hunter	Page 5-9	Delete Action Item C - implies a need "to remove barriers and hurdles for redevelopment by providing flexible standards" – There is no basis in the text for this assertion. (Again, this point cross references the "Land Use" chapter.)	Updated.
S. Kaufmann		Once again this chapter provides a wealth of good back ground information and identifies where various resources can be found. However there should be a much stronger emphasis on the possibilities of the City partnering with Sussex County, the State, and the private sector to address the lack of parking and other infrastructure needs. For example, I recommend including in the Goals and Action items lists a proposal that the City " Explorer a JOINT VENTURE with the County and State of Del. To Construct just out side or in close proximity to the City a Parking Structure with up to 1500 to 2000 spaces." Along with such a facility a frequent shuttle service at 10 to 15 minute intervals could be provided by DelDot into and out of the City during the tourist season to release both traffic congestion and the lack of parking.	Updated.

**Rehoboth Beach Comprehensive Plan Draft #2 - Planning Commission Board of Commissioners Comments
Chapter 5 - Housing Economic Development and Opportunity**

Name	Page	Comment	Notes
S. Kaufmann		<p>Obviously the cost of construct and day to day management for such a facility is a major issue. If such a facility could be located on either private or state and county land. The initial construct cost could be paid for through the issue of State and County Transportation Bonds. In turn the amortization of the Bonds and operation costs could be paid for by parking fees charged at the facility that would also cover the operating costs of the shuttle service. In the off season the parking fees could be significantly reduced or totally eliminated if revenues during tourist season are sufficient to pay annual costs. State, County, and City subsidies could also be required.</p> <p>I know this suggestion is a reach, but with out inter jurisdictions partnerships of this nature the problem of traffic congestion and the need for parking will just get much worse over time</p>	Noted.
S. Kaufmann		I also recommend in the Goals and Action lists there be a strong suggestion of greater coordination between the Chambers of Commerce in the City and the County alone with the Building and Development Community in general. This coordination should also include the elected leaders of both jurisdictions.	Updated.
S. Kaufmann		In order to have consistent coordination between these groups a working Inter Jurisdictional Committee should be established with members appointed by the Board of Supervisors of the County, the City Mayor, The Chairs of the-respective Chambers of Commerce, and the leadership of the Building Industry. Appointed members could have terms of 2 to 3 Years. It would need an annual budget and a place to hold its meeting. Again funding would have to be provided or a prorated basis by the participating groups.	Updated.

Rehoboth Beach Comprehensive Plan Draft #2 - Planning Commission Board of Commissioners Comments
Chapter 6 - Transportation Infrastructure

Name	Page	Comment	Notes
PC B. Covington	6-19	"Action Items" - Our sidewalks are in dire need of repair with tree roots lifting up many of our sidewalks creating a dangerous situation for walking and tripping particularly with an older population – a solution that some use is to walk on the streets rather than the sidewalk to avoid stumbling and falling.	Added sentence about issues and continual review for recommended improvements.
BOC S. Mills	6-2	Second paragraph: The City is developed primarily in a block grid pattern with most street perpendicular..." Edit "street" to plural.	Revised
BOC S. Mills	6-3	RE: Wayfinding Sign Improvement Project. FYI (for here or elsewhere?). There is a phase 3 underway. Phase 3 signage will identify each park, provide helpful information to the users/visitors and reduce existing sign clutter. The following sign types are being considered: Park Identification; Pedestrian Directional Signage; Amenity and Building Identification/Informational Signage; Rules and Regulatory Signage; Interpretive Signage	Revised
BOC S. Mills	6-3	RE: Paving Program. Check with city manager on whether or not the second block of Maryland Avenue is also part of this year's paving program?	Listed were those identified for the FY22 program.
BOC S. Mills	6-8	Figure 6-3 Jolly Trolley Route Map is out of focus. Consider acquiring clean electronic map directly from Jolly Trolley through city manager's office.	Updated.
BOC S. Mills	6-8	RE: Under "Parking" tab. The Commissioners are voting on December 17 to approve new maximum sizes, very likely to pass. Change to "Parking vehicles longer than 22'3" in length or wider than 8'1" in width is restricted."	Updated.
BOC S. Mills	6-8	RE: Under "Parking" tab. Set of four bullets. For consistency consider inserting "(on the island) in the second bullet: "First Street & Rehoboth Avenue (on the island)."	Updated.
BOC S. Mills	6-9	Under heading "Nonmotorized Transportation, Pedestrian." Consider describing ADA Transition Plan and work accomplished over the decade or so since the plan was first developed. Something like: The City developed an ADA Transition Plan in (year?) to serve as a guide in addressing deficiencies in ADA code compliance with respect to sidewalks at intersections. Since (same year) the city has methodically targeted specific intersections prioritized in the transition plan to bring those sidewalks into compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). (Mention number or projects? List projects? Other? Mention that a new ADA transition plan is in the works? –check with Sharon on that. Bob Palmer could best provide the proper language for this section. Let's pat ourselves on the back and mention that we've invested a significant amount of resources to upgrading sidewalks bringing them into compliance with ADA and that this ongoing endeavor.	Updated.
BOC S. Mills	6-?	New somewhere in the CDP? (Was in the 2010 CDP but maybe I have overlooked it in the new draft? The filling in of discontinuous sidewalks has been addressed in the past but failed to make any progress, and some discontinuous sidewalks still exist within the city leaving voids in the sidewalk system. Consider an action item: "Evaluate the need to address discontinuous sidewalks."	Updated.
BOC S. Mills	6-26	Under header "Stormwater." New Stormwater Utility Task Force is being formed – refer back to my notes under page 3-11 above.	Added.
BOC S. Mills	6-31	Under header "Public Space Recycling." First sentence continued from previous page on "Boardwalk Recycling," says "Implementing this project resulted..." in past tense denoting that the project has been implemented. Yet this project is not yet started (bins and labeling purchased and ready to go but not implemented) but is expected to start and be in place for the summer of 2022.	Revised
BOC S. Mills	6-31	Under header "Public Space Recycling." In third sentence correct committee name to "Boardwalk and Beach Committee."	Revised
BOC S. Mills	6-31	Under header "Refuse." Consider editing last line to: "The City also does not pick up hazardous waste such as wet paint of any kind and batteries. In the past the Delaware Solid Waste Authority (DSWA) has conducted Household Hazardous Waste collection in the city hall parking lot open to all members of the public regardless of their residency within the state. This service was discontinued when the parking lot was in disuse during city hall reconstruction, and the service has not resumed." Consider mention plus action item: "Investigate the return of conducting household hazardous collection events within the city."	Updated.
BOC S. Mills	6-31	Also, FYI. "In years past the city facilitated drop off of refuse at the Public Works yard but his practice was discontinued because of state permitting challenges. The opportunity to dispose of refuse on days other than collection days benefited non-residents who travel back to their primary residences out of town and are unable to put refuse curbside for collection and retrieve emptied bins timely. This service was regulated so that only in-town property owners and residents could participate." Consider mentioning plus adding action item: "Investigate restoration of refuse drop off at a satellite location within the city."	Added.
BOC S. Mills	6-31	Under header "Valet Trash Service." Consider including a better description of what valet service is by editing/including something like: "Valet trash service is an add-on to regular trash collection whereby trash bins are rounded up on private property, emptied and returned onto the property. This service is an amenity that benefits residents and resolves problems with trash bins being put out curbside too far in advance of collection day and being put back onto a property too long a time after collection.	Revised
BOC S. Mills	6-31	Under header "Yard Waste." Update to mirror recent code change: "City leaf collection starts the first Monday of October and lasts to the second Friday in May every other week."	Updated.
BOC S. Mills	6-31	Under header "Yard Waste." First paragraph, last sentence make "branch" plural.	Revised

Rehoboth Beach Comprehensive Plan Draft #2 - Planning Commission Board of Commissioners Comments
Chapter 6 - Transportation Infrastructure

Name	Page	Comment	Notes
BOC S. Mills	6-31	Under header "Yard Waste." Add at end: "The City's leaf vacuum machine picks up only clean, loose leaves and pine needles left curbside in the street."	Updated.
BOC S. Mills	6-32	Under "Telecommunications Initiatives." Already noted in draft CDP – much information still to come.	Noted.
PC J. Ellison	6-2	2nd paragraph: Northern area of the city is NOT separated by residential/commercial/industrial located south of Silver Lake. Where did this come from?	Updated.
PC J. Ellison	6-2	Table 6-1: Where is Clayton Avenue? I found that it is on the edge of Dewey but this should be explained.	Revised
PC J. Ellison	6-25	Wastewater EIS: The city no longer discharges treated effluent into the Canal; this should be rephrased in the past tense.	Updated.
BOC P. Gossett	6-32	RE: Action Item h. Change to "...funding alternatives for infrastructure improvements and maintenance."	Revised
PC R. Macha	6-16	Add Goal #4. Develop in-town public transportation option (eg jolly trolley) for residents/renters to move around the city w/o using their car	Previous attempt by JT rejected; not desired by residents.
PC R. Macha	6-16	Add Goal #5. Work with DART to improve/increase public transportation to/fr RB service is limited/unreliable but could help eliminate some traffic.	Added.
PC R. Macha	6-16	Add Goal #6. Work with outside contractors to establish parking areas with public/private landowners to develop close but out of town parking. (e.g. RB elementary school, parking lot where Thrift Shop is behind Bin 66, etc...	Updated.
PC R. Macha	6-16	RE: Goal #1, "reduce." address traffic congestion at peak periods. (eg July 4th .. can we really reduce congestion?)	Updated.
PC R. Macha	6-32	RE: Goal #6, "when feasible." Need a plan - use infrastructure federal \$\$	Updated.
PC R. Macha		[RE prior comment to incorporate additional language from the 2010 CDP] unbearable congestion? This only occurs 1 day a year for July 4th fireworks. I would not recommend pulling in language from the 2010 CDP.	Noted.
PC R. Macha		[RE: prior comment on a stronger emphasis on partnerships with the County, State, and private sector to address lack of parking and other infrastructure needs] another reason/opportunity to have representation/relationship with Sussex County which we don't have today	Noted.
BOC S. Gay		Re: Jolly Trolley – proposal to extend service with a route through residential neighborhoods was rejected two years ago, with extensive citizen disapproval. Any expansion of the JT service should remain in the commercial district.	Noted.
BOC S. Gay		Re: "new infrastructure and utility fund to pay for costs related to transportation and other utility needs which may be funded through a yearly assessment of all residential and commercial properties." We are already developing a stormwater utility fee to fund this critical part of our infrastructure. I do not support another tax related to transportation and assessed on residential properties. Instead, I think we need to look at assessing higher impact fees for all large developments in the city, including commercial and multi-parcel residential projects.	Updated.
BOC S. Gay		Impact fees are included here – this is the appropriate place, not in Transportation.	Noted.
BOC S. Gay		I strongly support a stormwater management plan, as well as burying overhead lines.	Noted.
BOC S. Gay		I question the need for free wifi throughout the city because of technology readily available through Xfinity public wifi and cellphone hot spots (with 5G on the way).	Noted.
BOC S. Gay		Green infrastructure should be added to the CDP as an important component of infrastructure in the City. Following a discussion at the February 2019 workshop, the Mayor & Commissioners agreed that green infrastructure would be added to all City projects going forward. These include: tree trenches, bioretention planters, bioswales, and permeable hardscaping.	Discussed in Chapter 7.
<i>Due to extent of comments provided by Planning Commission members Nan Hunter and Julie Davis, we will provide a response in that separate "track changes" document.</i>			
J. Davis	Introduction	The first paragraph includes incorrect information about roads accessing the City. It states "Primary access to the City of Rehoboth Beach is from Rehoboth Avenue (SR 1A) and SR 1. Rehoboth Avenue is the primary corridor providing direct access to the commercial area of the City. Access to and from the south of the City is provided via SR 1B via Silver Lake Drive/Bayard Avenue/2nd Street. Most local streets provide access to residential, commercial and some industrial properties." However, there are three routes into the city -- Rt 1, Rt 1B as noted, and the exit off Rt 1 that connects to State Rd.	Updated.
J. Davis	Page 8-2	Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT). 2020 is not a good year from which to use traffic data, especially since there is 10-year data is available on DelDOT site that should be included. Also, the Chamber of Commerce prepares local traffic analyses each year.	Updated.
J. Davis	Page 8-4	Paddling. This is recreation not transportation. If it's included at all, it should be in that Chapter.	Moved to Chapter 7.
J. Davis	Page 8-12, 13, 14	Plans & Programs. All this data and text are at the State level! There needs to be a focus on local plans and programs.	Noted.
J. Davis	Page 8-14	Evacuation Plan. This is a very important topic; however, State and County plans are the only ones discussed. This is a critical issue for the City, because we are at the dead-end of a highway servicing many communities and growing in population every year. There is only a brief mention of the Emergency part of our code and CodeRed with no specifics. There was a detailed discussion of emergency evacuation plans in the 2010 CDP.	Updated.

Rehoboth Beach Comprehensive Plan Draft #2 - Planning Commission Board of Commissioners Comments
Chapter 6 - Transportation Infrastructure

Name	Page	Comment	Notes
Jim Ellison	Page 8-2	The second paragraph at the top of the page is a mess. The statement "The northern area of the City is separated by residential, commercial and industrial areas located south of Silver Lake" is not accurate. Separated from what? There are no city residential, commercial and industrial areas south of Silver Lake. All areas south of Silver Lake are outside city limits. Also, the phrase "Access to and from the south of the city" should read "Access to and from areas south of the city". Also, the draft says "Most local streets provide access to residential, commercial and some industrial properties." What industrial properties? Finally, in the third paragraph, final sentence, "Finally, given the City's located along the Atlantic Ocean" would be better stated "Finally, given the City' location along the Atlantic Ocean".	Updated.
Jim Ellison	Page 8-2	Under "DeIDOT Roadways", there is a reference to the DeIDOT CTP. The acronym CTP should be spelled out since this is the first use of it. Also, Table 8-1 is highly confusing. The first road segment is OK. The second is poorly described. What segment is this? "South of Lake Drive to Rehoboth Avenue" would suggest to me that it is referencing the Silver Lake Bridge (and who knows how far beyond that to the south) north on Bayard Avenue to Rehoboth Avenue. But then it is described as "SR1A Coastal Highway". Something's amiss here. Finally, regarding the third entry, I found Clayton Street (in or nearly to Dewey Beach). This could be better described so readers don't have to search a map.	Updated.
Jim Ellison	Page 8-4	Under "Water Taxi/Eco Tours", the draft says the city received proposals that were presented for consideration at the June 2021 Commission Meeting. Any updates for CDP?	Updated.
Michael Bryan	Page 8-2	Please revise the second full paragraph in order to delete any reference to industrial properties located south of Silver Lake. The last sentence of the third full paragraph should also be revised.	Updated.
Michael Bryan	Page 8-2	The reference to "DeIDOT CTP" should be defined. The reference to "Clayton Street" in Table 8-1 should perhaps be "Town of Dewey Beach."	Updated.
Michael Bryan		Please update the status of the Blueprint for a Bicycle-Friendly Delaware which was created in April, 2018 and the 2019 LRTP Innovation in Motion, if any changes have been made. In addition, please advise to whether any updates have been made to the City's Bicycle Plan.	Updated.
Michael Strange		Entire chapter reads too much like a DeIDOT advertisement. Bits and pieces of data are relevant but the focus misses the mark on what we need to do, with or without DeIDOT! For example on CH 8 page 14 on the STIP program they show how DeIDOT "rates" projects but no information is given on how and why they arrived at the percentages allocated to safety, environmental stewardship, etc. I happen to know since I was Director of Planning at DeIDOT in 2011 when I pushed for, and procured software to automate the evaluations using the Analytical Hierarchy Process (AHP). AHP is what the City of Rehoboth Beach needs, not just for transportation issues but to help clarify all the competing quantitative and qualitative issues facing the City. Conceptually we are doing limited 19th century types of analyses for 21st century problems!	Updated.
Nan Hunter		Especially given how much the other chapters rely on data, I was surprised by the small amount in this chapter. One short paragraph on page 8-2 provides average vehicular counts from 2020, but there are no comparisons to similar traffic arteries in other nearby cities (e.g., Kings Highway and Savannah Road). Also, there is no longitudinal data showing numbers from 10 or 20 years ago, so it is impossible to have a sense of how much the traffic within Rehoboth or on Highway 1 has increased. It would also be important to have a sense of the traffic flows during peak periods, such as the month of July.	Updated.
Nan Hunter		Overall, I was struck by how much less urgency this CDP attaches to transportation issues than was true in the 2010 CDP. The earlier CDP devoted several pages (pp. 60 ff) to the "unbearable congestion" on Rehoboth streets and stated early in the text that "Making [streets] more pedestrian-friendly is the closest thing we have to a silver bullet for improvement ... Transportation budgets are one of the best tools we have for making positive change." (pp. 14-15)	Updated.
Nan Hunter		I'm not sure how to fix the sense of discontinuity between the tone of the 2010 CDP and that of the current draft with respect to transportation issues.	Noted.
S. Kaufmann		This chapter has a # of good suggestions to help make the various transportation modes safe and convenient for both pedestrians and bicycle users. Both the transportation and bicycle plan recommendations should be strongly emphasized.	Noted.
S. Kaufmann		The Jolly Trolley route through the City should be expanded to serve more areas including at least 1st Ave. With a stop at Wilmington and a few additional stops along the way to the bridge at Silver Lake and 2nd street	Previous attempt by JT rejected; not desired by residents.
S. Kaufmann		See my comments in chapter 5 concerning the construction of a structured parking facility just outside the City or on the surface parking lot next to the new City Hall	Noted.
S. Kaufmann		The City should also assume responsibility and maintenance of all sidewalks in the City for both safety and uniformity	Added.
S. Kaufmann		The establishment of a new infrastructure and utility fund should be explored in order to pay for costs related to these and other needs such as undergrounding of utilities. They all could be funded through a yearly assessment on all residential and commercial properties in the City. This of course would have to be legislatively added to current utility assessments being charged by the BOC. The rates for different types of properties could be established yearly or semiannually based on the City's infrastructure budget.	Discussed stormwater utility in Chapter 7.
J. Davis	Page 10-14	Solid Waste. This discussion should be updated to reflect current discussions about mandatory recycling and operational changes that are different from those in the text here.	Noted.
J. Davis	Page 10-16	Goals. These should include one about ensuring equitable distribution among consumers of utility costs and services based on usage. Action Items. These should include one ensuring that appropriate impact fees are in place to reflect commercial development's impact on existing infrastructure.	Added
J. Dewey	Page 10-16	Action Item F - Support the needs of an inclusive community and an aging population by promoting and incentivizing the voluntary use of accessibility "best practices", which may extend beyond ADA requirements, when commercial buildings are renovated or newly constructed. The City of Rehoboth Beach will act as a model for this practice as significant renovations or new projects are designed.	Added

Rehoboth Beach Comprehensive Plan Draft #2 - Planning Commission Board of Commissioners Comments
Chapter 6 - Transportation Infrastructure

Name	Page	Comment	Notes
Jim Ellison	Page 10-5	What are the implications of the city having no contro0l over how the county operates the Dewey Beach water tank? As written, readers are left to wonder?	Updated.
Michael Bryan	Page 10-16	Please revise the second sentence at the top of the page, in order to describe how the business model changed due to the relaxation of the vaccine mandates.	Unsure of desired revisions.
Nan Hunter		I would add the question of whether the city should provide freely accessible high quality wireless capacity in public spaces. I believe that this could create a strong draw for tourists to choose Rehoboth over other resorts.	Added
Tom West	Page 10-13	If the City is designated as a MS-4 Community, it will need to conduct evaluations to determine how to manage point and non-point sources. A regional approach, similar to those adopted in other regional communities described in the draft, should be evaluated to address solutions and improve efficiencies.	Added
Tom West	Page 10-16	Preparing a Citywide stormwater management plan was listed as a priority action item in the 2010 CDP – is that still a valid action?	Added

Rehoboth Beach Comprehensive Plan Draft #2 - Planning Commission Board of Commissioners Comments
Chapter 7 - Environmental Protection

Name	Page	Comment	Notes
BOC S. Mills	7-4	Last two sentences refer to a "railroad bridge" in Rehoboth Beach. FYI – while this is quoted directly and correctly from the USACE July 2021 report please note that this reference is in error as there is no railroad bridge in Rehoboth Beach. Mention same?	Removed reference.
BOC S. Mills	7-11	Somewhere we might want to mention that "the trees planted during Rehoboth Avenue Streetscape are now up to X years old and many are rootbound and have lifted and cracked portions of the concrete sidewalks and border pavers." Consider action item: "Investigate how to and fund replacement of trees and restoration of the sidewalk system."	Added.
BOC S. Mills	7-13	Under "Tree Ordinance Update." Consider adding final sentence: "Formal tree code review by the Board of Commissioners is expected to begin in early 2022."	Added.
BOC S. Mills	7-14	Under "Smoke-Free Initiatives. Consider expanding last sentence to: "In addition, Ordinance No. 0314-01 was approved to expand the public areas where smoking is prohibited to include the bandstand area, the boardwalk and beach (but for designated smoking areas on the beach)."	Added.
BOC S. Mills	7-15	Under header "Action Items" (a). Unsure of use of "refurbish." We constantly maintain which to me is different from refurbishing.	Updated.
BOC S. Mills	7-16	Under location of Lake Gerar Park consider clarifying: On the east and west sides of First Street at Lake Avenue."	Revised.
BOC S. Mills	7-16	Under description for Stockley Street Park add that this park includes a picnic pavilion.	Revised.
BOC S. Mills	7-21	Under Action items. RE: (p) "Pursue the feasibility of developing a dog park." This topic has already been addressed and rejected by the Animal Issues Committee. (Check past minutes of the Animal Issues Committee or past chair former Commissioner Dick Byrne.) You could consider a mention somewhere in the CDP that it was examined and rejected so it can be deleted as an action item.	Revised.
BOC S. Mills	7-21	Under Action items. RE: (q) "Consider adding pickleball courts to existing or new recreation facilities. The tennis courts at Deauville Beach already have been modified to facilitate pickleball play. There are no other locations feasible for installing new pickleball courts.	Revised.
PC J. Ellison	7-15	Chart should be labeled Chapter 7, not Chapter 9.	Revised.
BOC P. Gossett	7-21	RE: Goal #8. Delete entirely.	Revised.
BOC P. Gossett	7-21	Add new Action Item. "Prepare a long-range development, renovation, and maintenance plan for the City's parks and recreation spaces." I think this an action item, not a goal.	Revised.
BOC P. Gossett	7-21	RE: Action Item n. Change to "...promote and publicize City's recognized and permitted recreational events."	Revised.
BOC P. Gossett	7-21	RE: Action Item q. Change to "Consider the feasibility..."	Updated.
PC R. Macha	7-15	RE: Action Item c. what dos silver lake recovery mean? Is there a plan? who review this plan or determines that recovery is needed?	Updated.
PC R. Macha	7-15	RE: Action Item e. I agree with this in concept but practically/financially speaking requiring this seems unrealistic. Perhaps offer incentives to go green as a first step.	Noted.
PC R. Macha	7-13	Master Tree Plan - This has been talked about but not much progress made. I think this master tree plan, planting plan and priorities should be posted on the City of RB website. While on the tree committee, we collected lots of \$\$ in fees and, although I asked for a report, never saw a recount of how the dollars were used and how many \$\$ were still in the account.	Noted.
PC R. Macha		Proposals for Oceanfront structures - they already are .. not sure why someone thinks they aren't. [RE comment, all proposals should be subject to site plan review.]	Noted.
PC R. Macha	7-21	we need to look at survey data here ... dog parks have become 'expected' in community planning we should consider a dog park in RB. We do need an park/recreation plan ... what else is on the City agenda? How do they make these decisions? revisit the process? do we have a committee responsible for this?	See comment from Mayor Mills above.
BOC S. Gay	7-21	In "Goals," #4. "preserve, protect conserve, and grow the abundant trees and forest." Omit the word "existing." Add "and grow."	Revised.
BOC S. Gay	7-21	In Action Items, (e) investigate city policy requiring all municipal projects follow green building principals, add Green Infrastructure.	Revised.
BOC S. Gay	7-21	I like the addition of the Dark Skies initiative and developing standards for lighting in our zoning code.	Noted.
BOC S. Gay		Overall, environmental protection is the highest priority of our citizens, as shown in various survey results, with nearly 100% believing it's important to protect our water resources and our natural environment. See attached details on Question # 12, 22, 24, 32, and 38.	Noted.
BOC S. Gay	7-21	Goal #3 regarding a "long-range development, renovation and maintenance plan" for city parks and the related comment that such a plan should be presented by January 1, 2023 – our parks are mostly natural areas, part of our uniqueness and highly valued by survey respondents as one of the most desirable aspects of the city (see below). While I think it's important to have a long-range maintenance plan, I am not sure what "development" means here. A plan to develop Gerar Park was rejected several years ago and should not be revisited.	Noted.
BOC S. Gay	7-21	Likewise, dog parks have been considered in the past and rejected because we do not have enough public land to build one in an environmentally safe way. If this action item is included, it should only say "investigate" not "identify" an area for a dog park.	Updated.
BOC S. Gay		Open space scored very high in survey results – 96% believe we should encourage protection of natural areas/open space in the City; 89% believe common open space is an appealing attribute of a residential community; and 93% think our parks and city forests are extremely or moderately important. See attached, Questions 12, 17, 22, 24, 32, and 38.	Noted.

**Rehoboth Beach Comprehensive Plan Draft #2 - Planning Commission Board of Commissioners Comments
Chapter 7 - Environmental Protection**

Name	Page	Comment	Notes
BOC S. Gay		Relevant Survey Results. Q22. What level of importance do you place on the following natural and environmental issues? Of the seven options listed, these are the top four for "Extremely important or "Moderately Important" were. Protect drinking water quality 98.78% Quality and quantity of water resources 97.92% (eg ocean, lakes, canal) Air quality 97.73% Parks and city forests 92.51%	Noted.
BOC S. Gay		Relevant Survey Results. Q24. What level of importance do you place on the following actions the City of Rehoboth Beach could take to improve and/or protect the natural environment in the city? Three options given; responses for "Very Important" or "Important" were: Improve water quality by filtering stormwater before it reaches local water bodies or other water bodies, and by keeping the water free of trash. 94.09% Preserve/maintain infrastructure that allows easier access to natural resources such as woodland trails. 89.02% Improve air quality and urban temperatures by planting more trees around the City 84.52%	Noted.
Trees/GI Comm	7-11	Add "Educate residents and business owners on the connection between green infrastructure and climate change."	Added.
Trees/GI Comm	7-11	Replace "Develop a more strategic approach to new planting" with "Plant and maintain trees and all landscaping in the City's public green spaces."	Revised.
Trees/GI Comm	7-12	RE: Commemorative Tree Program. [Should be] \$44,000 [not \$24,000].	Revised.
Trees/GI Comm	7-13	RE: Urban Tree Canopy. Change to "Using new technology, the Delaware Forest Service's..."	Revised.
Trees/GI Comm	7-13	Delete existing paragraph under City Forest Canopy Goal as it is outdated. It's not that our canopy goal was reached 7 yrs ago. The technology has changed and measures more green space than previously possible. ALL tree canopy measurements go up as a result, and communities are setting new goals based on the modern technology. In addition, our canopy varies widely between different neighborhoods, with some likely 70% canopy and others 20%! If there is time, I can try to get more info from state forestry service and provide an update here.	Revised.
Trees/GI Comm	7-13	RE: Tree Tenders Group. Change to "...ad hoc committee formed under Rehoboth Beach Main Street...Program members currently have a goal to care for trees..."	Revised.
<i>Due to extent of comments provided by Planning Commission members Nan Hunter and Julie Davis, we will provide a response in that separate "track changes" document.</i>			
J. Davis	Page 7-7	Goals. These state "Build a healthier community by enhancing the health and wellness of City patrons through innovative and diversified parks, arts, recreation, leisure, and cultural opportunities." The text should add the word "with" in front of "arts" to make it clear that these activities are being encouraged in our parks and that this not a general goal for all parts of the City since Parks are the focus of this chapter.	Updated.
J. Davis	Page 7-7	Action Items. These include "Continue to effectively promote and publicize area recreational events." Some people will tell you that there are already way too many events in town, especially road races. I do not have an opinion but a blanket statement like this isn't helpful. "The more, the merrier" is not necessarily a desirable strategy.	Updated.
J. Dewey	Page 7-7	Action D - "Representatives of appropriate city offices and functions will develop and present a long-range development, renovation and maintenance plan for the City's parks and recreation spaces by January, 1, 2023 for consideration in the development of the next budget cycle.	Updated.
J. Davis	Page 9-6 to 9-9	Climate Change. This section includes only state-level information. However, I understand that mapping data on sea level rise specific to the City is available, and that the Planning Commission had a workshop in July 2019 on the subject. There is no reason this material can't be more specific to the City.	Some local information added.
J. Davis	Page 9-10 to 9-13	Trees. The section on the Community Forest Plan says that the Plan is "under discussion" with State forestry officials, and that the Plan will be the basis for a comprehensive review of codes. However, the City Tree Ordinance was the subject of two years of study by the now sunsetted Law Oversight Committee, which ultimately drafted a new ordinance that will be brought to the M&C soon. The discussion of the Tree Ordinance in this chapter needs updating. It is also questionable whether the section on the "Public Tree Inventory Management Plan" is very useful inasmuch as the inventory was conducted in 2010 and only covered public trees, many of which are probably long gone with more new trees planted since. In addition, there should be more discussion on developments regarding improvements to the City's "green infrastructure" initiatives. For example, the Mayor's Advisory Committee on Trees was sunsetted last year, and the new Trees and Green Infrastructure Committee has taken its place. I understand that the City has added a "process improvement" to planning for any City project (e.g., streetscape) whereby consideration is given to adding trees and tree preservation techniques as part of the project. In addition, the City Arborist recently gave a presentation to the new Committee regarding various forms of green infrastructure.	Updated.
J. Davis	Page 9-13, 9-14	Delaware Greenhouse Gas Emission Inventory. Most of the Greenhouse Gas information does not apply to the City.	Noted.
J. Dewey	Page 9-14	Action Item F - Consider an action item related to the Dark Skies Initiative? Investigate ways to strengthen the impact of the Dark skies initiative in reducing the impact of light pollution on our visual environment	Added.
Michael Bryan		Completion of the Master Tree Planting Plan and Priority Street Plan by the City Arborist and Tree and Green Infrastructure Committee is important and should be emphasized	Updated.

**Rehoboth Beach Comprehensive Plan Draft #2 - Planning Commission Board of Commissioners Comments
Chapter 7 - Environmental Protection**

Name	Page	Comment	Notes
Michael Bryan		Please consider adding some information about the anticipated rise in sea level and its impact on future development in the City	Updated.
Nan Hunter		One current policy gap that stands out is the lack of regulation or zoning policies oriented to sea level rise issues for ocean front or ocean block properties. I would reiterate the recommendation from the 2010 CDP (p. 36) that all proposals for oceanfront structures be subject to site plan review.	Noted.
Nan Hunter		Other examples of future policy development that carry over from the 2010 CDP include LEED certification requirements and other green building practices for major new construction, installation of additional electrical vehicle chargers, and jitney service to reduce traffic congestion.	Updated.
Tom West	Page 9-6	Expand on discussion about hazard and mitigation planning. Many resources and grants available. Start with Resilient Communities through DNREC - https://dnrec.alpha.delaware.gov/coastal-programs/planning-training/resilient-communities/ AND the Del. database for funding resilient communities https://www.bidenschool.udel.edu/research-public-service/ddfrc	Noted.