

March 2, 2009

Mr. Mark Chura
Executive Director
Delaware Greenways
1910 Rockland Road
Wilmington, DE 19803

RE: Stoltz Properties
Greenville Center
Review No. 1

Dear Mark:

In accordance with your request, we have reviewed the conceptual site plan for Greenville Center prepared by KA. The site plan shows a relatively small increase in space but that space will be concentrated in the northern end of the center. At the northern end, a 12 story residential/office building is planned and a parking garage of an unspecified number of parking spaces is planned. A post office is also planned at the corner of Route 52 and Buck Road. The majority of the remaining shopping center including the access and site circulation will remain unchanged.

We have observed site circulation in and around the site on several occasions and find existing deficiencies. While some of the deficiencies are documented in the videos we have been provided, the site plan as proposed will only make all the deficiencies noted in our review worse and not better.

1. Traffic Counts/Trip Generation:

- a. All traffic from southbound Route 52 enters at this access as well as most all of the traffic to and from Jansen's market. All exiting traffic to southbound Route 52 must exit via the Buck Road access. All delivery trucks to the market use the Buck Road access and many times queue up waiting to use the loading dock along the back of the market building where the drive aisle is double loaded with parking slots. According to the data collected by the applicant, on Friday 90% of the 453 vehicles entering and exiting the site enter and exit from the Buck Road access. However, during the Saturday peak hour, of the 228 vehicles counted, only 17% use the Buck Road access. This yields the following comments:
 - i. The count data is suspicious. Typically shopping centers generate more traffic on a Saturday than they do on a weekday peak.
 - ii. The distribution of site access traffic is normally similar over all peak hours. In this case, it is radically different when comparing the Friday and Saturday peaks.
 - iii. During the Friday peak, the existing site operates as if there is only one driveway.
- b. We recommend that the traffic count data even though approved by DelDOT be re-collected. The differences are too great to be credible.

- c. The applicant should provide testimony as to the traffic count data and the differences in the usage of the driveways between the peak hours.

2. Buck Road Access:

- a. The throat of this access is too small for the amount of traffic observed to use the access. The access was observed by Orth-Rodgers on a Friday and on a Saturday. Traffic was constant and most of the traffic seems to use the drive aisle along the side of the building rather than along the back. The new site plan places more square footage to the rear and this will increase traffic along the aisle leading to the loading dock further aggravating truck circulation and loading. We believe as currently configured, with the additional traffic from the reconfigured site plan, that the queues waiting to exit the site would prevent traffic from turning left into the drive aisle paralleling Buck Road. In addition, traffic exiting the site into Buck Road from the aisle parallel to Buck Road will be forced to rely on courtesy gaps given by traffic lined up behind the market.
- b. The Applicant should provide an analysis as to how the access to Buck Road will operate and evidence that the small driveway throat will operate acceptably

3. Truck Loading:

- a. The videos and our observations indicated that there isn't insufficient loading dock space for Jansen's Market. Currently, there is one loading dock and without a place to queue trucks, the drive aisle behind Jansen's Market is where trucks queue awaiting a place at the loading dock. Shoppers must maneuver around waiting trucks blocking parking spaces as well.
- b. It has been observed both on the videos and in person that trucks loading and maneuvering into the loading dock area block the major on site intersection at the back of the loading dock.
- c. The Applicant should present testimony as to how the unacceptable truck loading situation will be addressed prior to plan implementation and improved as a result of the proposed plan.

4. Post Office

- a. The post office, a convenience type operation, is located far from any of the site access points. This increases the vehicles circulating. Further, since it is a convenience operation, vehicles will park as close to the post office as they can and this will be a congestion point.
- b. The site plan does not locate the drop boxes outside the post office building. It should be noted that all post offices have such drop boxes as a convenience to customers that have no need to enter the post office building.
- c. The site plan does not provide a loading space for post office trucks delivering the mail or taking the mail away.
- d. The Applicant should provide site plan details as to how the post office will operate. The plan as it is presented does not discuss customer and post office vehicle operations.

5. Parking Supply/Parking Garage:

- a. The site plan does not note the number of structured parking spaces. The Applicant should be required to prepare a parking study to document the parking needs of the existing shopping center. Such parking study should divide the site into sectors as parking demands and easily accessible parking supply vary greatly. This study will set the base for a parking analysis of the site plan which should be completed on a sector by sector basis and consider shared parking.
- b. Will any parking spaces be reserved for any particular tenant?

6. Route 52 Access:

- a. A cross easement should be explored to the Greenville Crossing site. Without a cross easement, vehicles visiting both shopping centers must use the site driveways which increases traffic on the public roadways. This does not represent good access management.
- b. The Applicant should consider ways to balance traffic access to and from Route 52. For example, consideration should be given to allowing left turn access from the southbound lanes of Route 52. This would reduce the pressure on the Buck Road access driveway.

- 7. Given the magnitude of the above issues, site plan approval should be withheld until the issues are addressed and an acceptable traffic impact study is submitted documenting that the above issues are addressed and the DeIDOT considers the access plan acceptable.

We are available to present testimony on March 3rd if directed. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact Derrick or myself.

Very truly yours,
ORTH-RODGERS & ASSOCIATES, INC.



Jeffrey L. Greene, PE, PTOE
Principal



Derrick Kennedy, PTP
Senior Project Manager