

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55

MINUTES OF THE
August 19, 2010 Meeting of the
Easton Planning & Zoning Commission

Members Present: John Atwood, Chairman, and members, Dan Swann.
Linda Cheezum and Tom Moore.

Members Absent: Steve Periconi.

Staff Present: Tom Hamilton, Town Planner, Zach Smith, Current Planner, Lynn Thomas, Long Range Planner and Stacie Rice, Planning Secretary.

Mr. Atwood called the meeting of the Planning & Zoning Commission to order at 1:00 p.m. The first order of business was the approval of the minutes of the Commission's July 15, 2010 meeting. Upon motion of Mr. Swann seconded by Mr. Moore the Commission voted 4-0 to approve the minutes.

The first item of new business was **110 Hanson Street (Bethel A.M.E. Church)** requesting sketch site plan review for a 5,375 square foot addition to existing Church. The proposed addition is a new sanctuary replacing the existing sanctuary. Bill Stagg with Lane Engineering explained that the existing sanctuary is located on the second floor which presents problems for the operation of the Church. Mr. Stagg explained that there is no improved off-street parking, however, the grass lot adjacent to the Church is often used for parking. The majority of parking is on-street. The Talbot County Health Department has a large off-street lot located nearby and although the County will not enter into a formal agreement to allow the Church to use this parking, Mr. Stagg stated that it is generally understood that the lot may be used for that purpose. The proposed addition and new storm water management design covers the majority of the grass area. Mr. Stagg stated that stormwater will be managed at the rear of the site. The applicant is requesting a waiver of 83 spaces. The Church is located in the Historic District and the applicant is scheduled to go before the Historic District Commission for their review and approval of the proposed addition. The following were comments from the neighborhood.

Joyce DeLaurentis - Resides on South Street and was concerned with the lack of parking proposed, the condition of Thorogood Lane, noise of the proposed air conditioning units and the lack of landscaping.

Michael Brophy- President of the East End Neighborhood Association stated that he is in favor of the Church expansion and was also concerned with the parking and noise generated from the a.c. units.

Barbara Heatly - Resides directly across the street from the Church stated that the Church has always been good neighbors and is in favor of the expansion but has concerns with the proposed placement of the addition and feels that it does not enhance or fit in to the existing neighborhood.

Mr. Sullivan - Member of Bethel A.M.E. stated that Bethel is a small congregation and has been saving for a long time anticipating the proposed addition.

Sam Gale - Trustee at Bethel A.M.E. stated that during inclement weather no one can park in the grass lot.

4
5 Upon motion of Mrs. Cheezum, seconded by Mr. Moore the Commission voted 4-0 to
6 approve the sketch site plan as presented and to forward a favorable recommendation to
7 the Board of Zoning Appeal for the Special Exception, subject to architectural
8 review/approval by the Historic District Commission, landscaping being placed on
9 Thorogood Lane, a waiver of 83 parking spaces, screening of air conditioning units and a
10 fence being placed around the open water stormwater management area.

11
12 The next item was **Lakelands, requesting a PUD Amendment**. Mr. Showalter
13 of Miles & Stockbridge explained they are requesting twenty-four additional units in
14 Block "C" increasing the total units in the block from the twenty-nine currently approved
15 units to a total of fifty-three units. On August 16th the Town Council reviewed another
16 version of the site plan and since the site plan had not been reviewed by the Planning
17 Commission the Staff recommended to President Ford that the Planning Commission
18 review the revised site plan. Mr. Showalter stated Michigan Drive as proposed now has
19 two connections with Beechwood Drive rather than being a cul-de-sac as currently
20 approved. The applicant is proposing the addition of 32 parking spaces referred to as
21 "common parking" which will be paved. They have included a fitness trail and the "tot"
22 lot has been enhanced. The applicant is proposing to improve the pool area of Block
23 "A". Upon motion of Mrs. Cheezum, seconded by Mr. Moore the Commission voted 3-1
24 (Mr. Swann opposed) to approve the PUD Amendment as presented and to send a
25 favorable recommendation to the Town Council regarding consistency of the request with
26 the Comprehensive Plan..

27
28 The next application discussed was **8223 Elliott Road (Giant Food)** requesting
29 an amendment to a previously approved PUD Shopping Center (The Shoppes at Easton)
30 to construct a gasoline fueling facility associated with the existing Giant Grocery Store.
31 Mr. Smith explained that in March of 2009 the Planning Commission reviewed a similar
32 request for an 8 pump fuel facility in this same location. The Commission voted 4-1 to
33 approve the project with some modifications and forwarded a favorable recommendation
34 to the Town Council regarding the proposed project's consistency with the
35 Comprehensive Plan. The Council reviewed the project and ultimately permitted the
36 applicant to withdraw the request, however it appeared based on their comments that the
37 Council was not going to approve the project. Ryan Showalter of Miles & Stockbridge
38 explained that the Giant grocery store would now like to construct a 5 pump fuel facility
39 in the existing parking lot of the shopping center. This facility is primarily intended to
40 attract and/or offer a convenience to grocery store shoppers. The proposed architecture
41 would be consistent with the existing shopping center. The design would incorporate
42 brick piers, tan EFIS canopy facing material and a green standing seam metal roofing
43 material. Mr. Showalter explained that the Town's standard for retail parking is one
44 space per 200 square feet of gross floor area equating to a minimum of 566 parking
45 spaces for this site. The plan proposed 525 parking spaces (41 fewer spaces than the
46 current standard). This is 98 fewer spaces than exist on the site today, as these spaces are
47 being displaced by the proposed fuel facility. Mr. Dean Smith of VHB, Inc. explained
48 that the existing center has 3 accesses off of the internal private street between the subject
49 property and Walmart. The applicant is proposing to maintain the 3 existing accesses and
50 does not plan to create additional accesses into the center. The applicant is proposing
51 landscaping around the fuel facility where possible and they plan to persevere as many
52 mature trees as possible.

4
5 They are proposing a 36 square foot monument style sign with a brick base as well as
6 wall mounted signage on the front, and possibly rear, elevation of the proposed canopy.
7 Mr. Smith explained that the existing shopping center has sidewalks only directly in front
8 of the storefronts. The center was not required when constructed to build sidewalks
9 along all adjacent public streets as well as the internal street between this center and the
10 Walmart. The Town's current policy would require sidewalks to be constructed for all of
11 these locations. Mr. Smith stated that the Planning Commission could under their current
12 policy request that this applicant retrofits the center and adjacent street frontages
13 accordingly, or a portion thereof if they feel it is reasonable. Mrs. Cheezum expressed
14 concern that if the Commission allows Giant to have a fuel facility it will open the door
15 for every shopping center/grocery store to want to do the same thing and the Town of
16 Easton would become inundated with fuel facilities. Mr. Swann is concerned with the
17 additional traffic congestion the fuel facility would cause. Mr. Atwood was not in favor
18 of the fuel facility. Upon motion of Mr. Moore, seconded by Mr. Atwood the
19 Commission voted 1-3 to approve the PUD Amendment as proposed and to forward a
20 favorable recommendation to the Town Council regarding the proposed project's
21 consistency with the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Atwood, Mr. Swann and Mrs. Cheezum
22 voted against the motion.

23
24 The next item was **Waterside Village, Phase II** requesting PUD sketch plan
25 review to construct a 233, 500 plus square feet of retail, 72 residential apartments as well
26 as a 138 room hotel. Ryan Showalter of Miles & Stockbridge, Peter Clelland of BET
27 Investments, Greg Gamble, Attorney for BET Investments and Bill Stagg of Lane
28 Engineering were present at the meeting. Mr. Smith explained that in May of 2010 the
29 developers of the Waterside Village Shopping Center were before you with a PUD
30 application for Phase II of their project. The staff had met with the developers in March
31 and provided them with 3 pages of comments recommending improvements to this
32 application. Rather than addressing these comments the developer wanted to hear from
33 the Commission to ensure consistency with the staff's direction. At the meeting the
34 Commission reiterated many of the staff's concerns and introduced a few additional
35 issues. At the conclusion of the meeting the developer indicated that they would consider
36 the input they had received, revise the plans and resubmit accordingly.

37
38 Mr. Showalter stated that the proposed changes at this time involved the removal
39 of 2 buildings shown on the original submittal (Bldg 'O' – 20,000 square feet of office,
40 and Bldg 'N' 20,000 square feet of retail), and replacing them with two 36 unit apartment
41 buildings (72 units total). The proposed apartment buildings are the same senior
42 buildings proposed as part of the Westport Commons project reviewed by the
43 Commission last month. The developers of the Westport Commons project appear to
44 have decided not to move forward with the Port Street location and feel this location may
45 better accommodate this component of their project at this time. Mr. Smith stated that
46 the staff felt in May, and still feels, the project as proposed is not overwhelmingly
47 consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and that the proposed design does not warrant
48 the entitlement they seek. The proposed incorporation of residential units into this
49 project significantly improves the degree to which the developer complies with the
50 sections of the Comp Plan which encourages mixed use (though he noted that
51 unfortunately to accomplish this all of the proposed office space in Phase II has been
52 removed).

5 The Commission was in favor of the residential component of the project. Mr. Swann
6 would prefer a unique layout of the buildings with the buildings on the street and parking
7 in the rear. The applicants stated that they were only looking for Commission comments
8 with regards to the addition of residential units to the project and were not looking for a
9 decision today. No decision was made.
10

11 The first item from staff was from Mr. Thomas who explained that earlier in the
12 week he had e-mailed the Commission notice of this item and included three attachments
13 for their review. The first of these was simply the Commission's Annual package of
14 **Zoning Ordinance Amendments**. Mr. Thomas explained the changes that the Council
15 had made following their public hearing on the amendments and the subsequent
16 discussion. The Commission was opposed the changes suggested by the Council
17 regarding the use of trailers for storage. They had no problem with any of the other
18 suggested changes. Accordingly, by motion of Mr. Swann, seconded by Mrs. Cheezum,
19 the Commission voted 3-0 to return the proposed Ordinance Amendments to the Council
20 with the Commission's original proposal substituted for the Council's revision (but with
21 the addition of the definition suggested by the Council) with regards to the use of trailers
22 for storage and with all other revisions suggested by the Council.
23

24 The next two attachments to Mr. Thomas' e-mail to the Commission addressed
25 the use of small outbuildings (predominately sheds) as is being practiced at **Easton**
26 **Market Square**. The Council directed the staff a few months ago to draft changes to
27 legitimize this use. One of the attachments contains the Zoning Ordinance changes that
28 would be necessary to accomplish this. Mr. Thomas explained that these were relatively
29 minor changes and that the more significant changes were to the Building Code, which
30 were contained in the third and final attachment. Mr. Thomas stated that the Commission
31 did not need to take any action relative to the Building Code changes, but that he would
32 pass along any comments they may have to the Building Department. The only comment
33 concerned the time-frames specified in the Code revisions. In the matter of the Zoning
34 changes, upon motion of Mr. Moore, seconded by Mr. Swan, the Commission voted 3-0
35 to recommend these changes for approval by the Town Council.
36

37 The next item was from staff concerning the final plat for **Ashby Commons,**
38 **Phase 2**. Mr. Smith asked the Commission to authorize their Chairman to sign the plat
39 once the Town finds the plans acceptable. Upon motion of Mr. Swann, seconded by Mr.
40 Moore the Commission voted 3-0 to authorize Mr. Atwood to sign the plats for Ashby
41 Commons, Phase 2.
42

43 There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 4:35 p.m. by
44 motion of Mr. Swann, seconded by Mr. Moore.
45

46 Respectfully submitted,
47
48
49

50 Stacie S. Rice
51 Planning Secretary
52
53