

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  
56

MINUTES OF THE  
May 20, 2010 Meeting of the  
Easton Planning & Zoning Commission

Members Present: John Atwood, Chairman, and members, Steve Periconi, and Dan Swann.

Members Absent: Linda Cheezum and Tom Moore.

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

Staff Absent: Tom Hamilton, Town Planner.

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 April 22, 2010 meeting. Upon motion of Mr. Swann seconded by Mr. Periconi the Commission voted 3-0 to approve the minutes.

The first item discussed was **Lot 1, Easton Marketplace**. Mr. Ryan Showalter of Miles & Stockbridge and Pete Clelland of BET Investments, were present at the meeting. Mr. Showalter explained they are requesting sketch site plan review to enclose an approximately 11,000 square foot area adjacent to existing building (former Lowe's Garden Center). They are proposing to divide the existing building into two large stores and enclose the garden center which would be divided into 4 smaller shops for a total of 6 stores. The applicant is proposing new architectural elevations which are compatible with the center. The proposal does not include any site improvements to either the parking lot or drive ways on site nor does it propose any work to Marlboro Avenue which was required for the previous PUD. The applicant is not proposing any additional landscaping to the site. Mr. Smith explained that per the Belk project, improvements were to be done to Marlboro Avenue by the Town, utilizing impact fees collected from the developer and from other projects in the area. The developer was to provide a 10 foot widening strip and construct a right turn lane onto MD 322. The Town did not require a new traffic study for this application as the one for Belk by the Traffic Group seems to adequately cover this project. The Commission discussed at length their concerns over the road improvements that are needed on Marlboro Avenue. The Commission feels as though they are necessary. Dick Whiteford of Mears Properties explained to the Commission that there is a private agreement between Mears and Lowe's that states that no more than 2 tenants are allowed to occupy the site. The Commission is in favor of the project and the revitalization of the site, but feels as though traffic improvements are needed. Upon motion of Mr. Periconi, seconded by Mr. Swann the Commission voted 3-0 to approve the sketch site plan finding it consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and encouraging the applicant to discuss with the Town Council the traffic issues.

The next item on the agenda was **Waterside Village, Phase II** requesting PUD and sketch site plan review to construct 287,000 plus square feet of retail and office space as well as a 138 room hotel. Mr. Ryan Showalter of Miles & Stockbridge and Pete Clelland of BET Investments, were present at the meeting. Mr. Showalter explained that they would like to develop Phase II of Waterside Village which would encompass approximately 112 acres of land and consist of approximately 358,000 square feet of space. The Commission discussed at length the proposed project and the existing development and how it has progressed. The Commission was disappointed in the fact that Waterside Village is not more pedestrian friendly.

5  
6 They would like to see more pedestrian connection between the existing development and  
7 Phase II and the buildings be not so widespread. Mr. Clelland explained that as the  
8 development grows it will become more pedestrian friendly. Mr. Periconi stated that he  
9 would like to see more of a mixed use project with multi-level residential as well as more  
10 parking on the side/rear of the buildings. The Commission was favorable of the proposed  
11 architecture and felt it was compatible with the existing buildings on site. After  
12 discussion the Commission gave the applicants feedback on Phase II and asked them to  
13 revise the plans and return at the June meeting.

14  
15 The next item was **Habitat for Humanity ReStore**. Mr. Thomas explained that  
16 the staff had received a letter addressed to the Mayor from Habitat for Humanity  
17 concerning a zoning issue and thus the Mayor has asked us to consider changes to the  
18 Zoning Ordinance to accommodate what Habitat is requesting. Habitat for Humanity, at  
19 the National or International level, has a venture that they refer to as Habitat ReStore. A  
20 ReStore is essentially an establishment that accepts donated construction and home  
21 improvement materials and resells them to the general public at discounted rates, with the  
22 proceeds going to support the efforts of the local Habitat Chapter. HFH has found a  
23 location to open a ReStore in Easton in the Clifton Industrial Park. The issue is that this  
24 use is a retail sales use, which is not permitted in the I-1 Zoning District. Therefore, HFH  
25 would like the Town to consider an amendment to the Zoning Ordinance. The staff  
26 believes that the Industrial Zoning District has already moved far enough away from a  
27 true industrial zone. In light of this, the staff proposes the creation of a new use “retail  
28 thrift or outlet store operated by a non-profit organization”. This would conceivably  
29 allow the Habitat ReStore without opening the I1 District to too much additional non-  
30 industrial uses. The Commission upon motion of Mr. Swann, seconded by Mr. Periconi  
31 voted 3-0 forwarded a favorable recommendation to the Town Council in favor of a text  
32 amendment making the proposed use a Special Exception instead of outright permitted.  
33 In the General Commercial (CG) Zoning District it would be a permitted use and in the  
34 Industrial (I1) Zoning District it would be a Special Exception.

35  
36 The next item was from staff concerning Site Plan extension for **114 Bay Street**.  
37 Mr. Stagg of Lane Engineering, explained that the approved site plan is about to expire  
38 and asked for a 24 month extension. Upon motion of Mr. Periconi, seconded by Mr.  
39 Swann the Commission voted 3-0 to approve a 24 month extension for 114 Bay Street.

40  
41 The next item was from staff concerning Site Plan extension for **202 Port Street**.  
42 Ms. Joan Derby, Owner explained that the approved site plan is about to expire and asked  
43 for a 24 month extension. Upon motion of Mr. Periconi, seconded by Mr. Swann the  
44 Commission voted 3-0 to approve a 24 month extension for 202 Port Street.

45  
46 The next item from staff was the **2010 Annual Report**. Mr. Thomas provided the  
47 Commission with a final version of the Annual Report. Mr. Thomas explained that the  
48 document will be sent to the State (MD Department of Planning) with a copy filed with  
49 the Town Council. Upon motion of Mr. Swann, seconded by Mr. Periconi the  
50 Commission voted 3-0 to approve the 2010 Annual Report.

51  
52 The next item from staff was a **Zoning Ordinance Amendment regarding**  
53 **Banners**. Mr. Thomas explained that at the Planning Commission’s work session with  
54 the Town Council there was a concern regarding the display of banners in the Town of  
55 Easton. The Council is in favor of loosening the policy to allow banners to be displayed

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

off-site to announce special events for not-for-profit organizations. Don Richardson, Building Code Official had prepared draft changes to banner regulations which the Council reviewed and indicated they wanted to move forward with his suggestion. The Planning Staff believes that two additions or revisions need to be made. The first is a reduction in the number of off-site banners permitted. Mr. Richardson's draft proposes six. The Staff suggested two. The other revision is to add a definition of a special event. Mr. Thomas presented three examples from other jurisdictions. The Commission questioned why we are allowing off site banners at all, but was in favor of the reduction from six to two. With regards to the special events definition the Commission felt like none of the examples were exactly what we needed and instructed the staff to come up with an alternative using the third example as the basis. Upon motion of Mr. Periconi, seconded by Mr. Swann the Commission voted 3-0 to include the language provided by Mr. Thomas and to add it to the packet of Zoning Ordinance Amendments previously sent to the Town Council.

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 3:20 p.m. by motion of Mr. Periconi, seconded by Mr. Atwood.

Respectfully submitted,

Stacie S. Rice  
Planning Secretary