

Douglas S. Wright, Jr., chair, opened the meeting at 4:00 p.m., on Wednesday, August 14, 2019, in the Council Chamber, Second Floor, City Hall. Also present were commission members C. Davis, S. McIntire, C. Ploscaru, J. Stone, R. Thomas, and J. Wheeler. The following staff members were present: K. Maher, Director of Planning and Code Administration; S. Bockmiller, Development Planner/Zoning Administrator; M. Flick, Planner; and D. Calhoun, Secretary. (NOTE: Planning Commission revisions are indicated in red text.)

## **REGULAR MEETING**

### **Roll Call.**

All commission members were present.

### **Approval of Minutes:**

**June 26, 2019, and July 31, 2019.**

The minutes were not ready for approval.

### **Development Review:**

#### **Quit Claim Request – Alley 5-71 (Between 8-71 and 829 View Street).**

Jim Bender, Assistant City Engineer, was present.

Staff Report: (See City Engineer’s memo in the meeting file) The City received a request to quit claim Alley 5-71 which is unimproved and situated between 827 and 829 View Street. The owner of 829 View Street would like to acquire the alley right-of-way to create an off-street parking space accessed via Alley 5-70 at the rear of the property. Part of the right-of-way may be paved for a parking pad. Ms. Maher stated that City code requires that the parking pad have a paved surface rather than remain as grass.

Alley 5-71 is an unimproved alley that connects View Street to Alley 5-70. The Hagerstown Light Department owns and maintains utility poles and overhead wires in the right-of-way and requested that an easement be granted for maintenance of their equipment. There are no other identified utilities that use this right-of-way. The subject alley is bordered by two other

properties; both of these property owners have vacated any claim they would have on the alley as long as access is maintained for utility services and maintenance. No other City agencies have objections to the quit claim.

Applicant/Commission Discussion: Mr. Bender stated they could put a condition on the quit claim that no curb cuts would be allowed on View Street for parking. Mr. Stone noted that the Stephen and Debra Hummel (owners of 827 View Street) would like a reservation for water and gas service in this area. The right-of-way reserve should include all utilities. Mr. Bender asked the commission to make a recommendation to the Mayor and Council on whether or not to proceed with the quit claim. If the commission wanted to include conditions (include all utilities in the reservation and not permit a curb cut on View Street), that would be appropriate for the Mayor and Council to consider. Ms. Maher added that undeveloped alleys are a maintenance headache for the Code Enforcement side of the department. Planning and Code Administration would be in favor of relinquishing unneeded rights-of-way. Mr. Bender stated he spoke to the owner of 206 Hillcrest Road (William Fahrney) who expressed his relief that he would not be responsible for mowing his portion of the grass in the unimproved alley in the future.

**MOTION:** (Ploscaru/Thomas) I'll forward a motion, to include no curb cut.

**DISCUSSION:** None.

**ACTION:** APPROVED (Unanimous)

### **NorthPoint – North Side Wesel Boulevard/West Side Edgewood Avenue – ESD and Stormwater Concept Plan**

Staff Report: (Staff report is in the meeting file.) This development involves several properties totaling approximately 190 acres of land. The development area is bisected by Wesel Boulevard, extending from the Ridge Avenue community to the east side of the Harbor Freight building. The properties are located in the IG (Industrial General) zoning district.

The proposed development involves the construction of four buildings containing warehouse and distribution facilities with some support office activity, as follows:

- South Side of Wesel Boulevard: Two buildings are planned: one totaling 969,280 square feet, and the other totaling 865,280 square feet. Three driveway entrances onto Wesel Boulevard are proposed. All entrances will be situated to create four-way intersections with existing and proposed driveway entrances on the north side of Wesel Boulevard.
- North Side of Wesel Boulevard: Two buildings are proposed: One 175,760 square-foot building would be located between the Lowe's distribution facility and the Bricker Mini-Storage facility. This location would contain two driveway entrances, one of which

would align with the center driveway of the proposed development on the south side of Wesel Boulevard. The second building on the north side of Wesel Boulevard would contain 241,800 square feet and would be situated between the Lowe's distribution facility and the Ridge Avenue community. This location would have two driveway entrances, one of which would align with the easternmost entrance to the building on the south side of Wesel Boulevard.

Almost 1,700 parking spaces are shown on the sketch plan. No railroad sidings are proposed for any of the four buildings.

The development being proposed has no specific users proposed at this time. The developer's business model is to have the project committed with delivery dates before committing tenants. The developer projects that this proposed development will create significant new employment at full build out and occupancy.

Concerning the stormwater management approach for this project, the City Engineer reported that the proposed plan generally meets the intent of the Maryland Stormwater Management Regulations and the City of Hagerstown's Stormwater Management Ordinance (see copy of City Engineer's memo in the meeting file.) The proposed warehouse/distribution center uses for these properties are not a good fit for the preferred ESD techniques due to the size and function of these facilities and the way in which these sites will need to be graded for their intended purposes.

The proposed plan uses water quality and quantity control facilities that while not meeting the "letter of the law" of the current stormwater regulations will provide pollutant removal and flood control benefits that are similar to many of the ESD requirements. The City Engineer stated that with some modifications to the design of the stormwater management design, the proposed design could provide stormwater management to the maximum extent practicable for this project (see the memo for details on the modifications).

Concerning compliance with the Land Management Code, the Planning Commission's review of a sketch plan focuses on three elements; staff analyzed the project with regard to these elements:

Environmentally Sensitive Features. The project engineer identified no wetlands or floodplain within the development area or streams. No rare, threatened or endangered species have been identified. There are steep slopes, rock outcrops, and erodible soils commonly associated with the limestone geology of the area scattered throughout the site, as shown on page 2 of the plan. The property is heavily wooded.

Article 5, Section K of the Land Management Code requires the developer to conduct field reconnaissance of the property and deed searches to verify whether there is any evidence of

human burial sites on the development tract. A report on the developer's findings will be required to be submitted with their first site plan submission. Given the history of the area, staff anticipates no physical or legal documentation of human burial sites will be found.

Based on the above, staff concluded that there appears to be no special or unique environmental features that warrant special attention with this development provided the absence of human burial sites is verified. Verification of compliance with Article 5, Section K will be made during site plan review.

Forest Stand Delineation and Preliminary Forest Conservation Strategy. The developer has provided a forest stand delineation showing an area of 174.19 acres in the delineation area. This area contains 164.06 acres of forest. Staff noted that within this area, CSX (the current owner) received approval of a forest conservation plan (FC-2006-04) for an irregularly shaped 14.6-acre area with sections on both sides of Wesel Boulevard. Trees were removed and compliance was met through a fee-in-lieu contribution. Since it has already been mitigated, this area is not included in this plan.

Roughly 125 acres of delineated forest will be removed due to the nature and scope of this development. The approach to compliance with a forest conservation plan will include several elements: retention of some existing forest (approximately 20 to 25 acres), replanting adjacent to retained forest (where possible); street tree credit along the length of Wesel Boulevard; and a significant amount of fee-in-lieu contribution.

Staff concluded that the delineation is complete and can be signed by staff. Given the wooded nature of this large tract, the industrial zoning, and the nature of development of industrial uses, development would be difficult without a plan that involves use of fee-in-lieu contributions to achieve compliance. Staff pointed out that the Planning Commission has historically been supportive of fee-in-lieu contributions as a method of attaining compliance for commercial and industrial developments. There are 29 specimen trees throughout the site; approximately 15 to 19 of these will need to be removed. Removal will require approval by the Planning Commission of a variance from the requirements of the Forest Conservation Ordinance.

Ordinance Deviations Observed:

- A review of the plan shows all parking areas have the potential to comply generally with the ordinance requirement for number of parking spaces and **will with** all setback and buffer requirements, with three exceptions:
  - 1) Building 4 where it adjoins the Ridge Avenue community, is shown 80 feet from the residential zoning district, which requires a 200 foot setback. Given the unique situation associated with this development, including the fact that the adjacent use

within that residential district is an institutional/office use (Washington County Human Development Council) and not dwellings, the developer has applied to the Board of Zoning Appeals (BZA) for a variance to reduce the required 200-foot setback for this building from the zoning district line.

- 2) In the variance area for Building 4, vehicle parking would be located approximately 25 feet from the property line and about 50 feet from the zoning district line that bisects the Edgewood Avenue right-of-way. A waiver is required to reduce the 60-foot buffer requirement.
- 3) Behind Building 1, trailer parking would be located less than the 60-foot buffer distance to the property line which is adjacent to a residential district. However, the adjacent area is actually the Norfolk Southern Railway right-of-way which is approximately 60 feet wide. Therefore, the trailer parking would be a minimum of 95 feet from the rear property line of the nearest residentially improved properties. A waiver is required from the 60-foot buffer requirements.

Staff concluded that there appears to be sufficient justification to meet the criteria that the BZA uses to evaluate applications for variances (Article 4, Section U of the Land Management Code). The Board is scheduled to hear this case on August 21. Staff asked the commission to consider whether or not to offer a recommendation or comments to the BZA about the variances. In the instance of both waivers, given that the use areas are not immediately adjacent to residential uses, staff suggested that granting waivers in these situations are appropriate given the distance to actual dwellings. As an offset for the reduced setbacks, staff suggested that the commission discuss whether the landscaping in these areas should be more concentrated to offset the reduced widths.

In addition to the above, staff identified additional issues for the commission's consideration:

- Fire Station Lot. The City is selling a two-acre lot it owns along Wesel Boulevard which was obtained from CSX for a possible future fire station. The Mayor and Council determined it to be of no use to the City and to sell the land to the developer to foster and encourage this development. The land will no longer be available for a fire station.
- Sidewalks. Given the adjacent commercial development on the west, and residential uses on the east, the developer will provide a sidewalk or walking trail along one side of Wesel Boulevard. This should address any concerns regarding the ongoing issue of pedestrian safety along Wesel Boulevard.

Staff recommended that this development be permitted to move forward to the site plan review stage, subject to the issues identified and discussed at this meeting. Staff pointed out that per the

Ordinance, approval of a sketch plan does not vest a developer with any property rights. That would come with the site plan.

Applicant/Commission Discussion: David Richard, NorthPoint Development, made a presentation with job projections and background about the company (copy of presentation in meeting file). Most of their projects have been along the I-81 corridor in Pennsylvania. This is their first project in Maryland. The buildings will be built for speculation ~~and~~ which is consistent with their business model. The two larger buildings will support some of the larger corporate users with the smaller buildings used for light manufacturing or smaller users. They plan to build Buildings 1 and 3 initially with Buildings 2 and 4 following as leasing commences. In total there will be 2.2 million square feet of space. Businesses locating in these buildings could employ approximately 1,500 workers. NorthPoint believes this development will help bring jobs to the community. Total capital investment would be \$135 million to \$200 million invested in community. Mr. Richard thanked City staff members for their cooperation on this project.

Concerning the aesthetics of the buildings, NorthPoint is committed to making the buildings visually appealing, including color changes and depth changes. All building are precast “tilt-up” construction. Concerning the users of the buildings, Mr. Richard stated they could be mixed manufacturing and storage. Their engineers are currently working thru the stormwater management and grading issues.

Mr. Stone asked if the developer gave any thought to providing rail access to any of the buildings. Mr. Richard stated that rail access is usually limited. With regard to this project, only Building 4 could potentially have access to a rail siding. Buildings 1 and 2 do not have enough room.

Mr. Bockmiller noted that the forest stand delineation shows approximately 20 specimen trees, and the developer will need to justify their removal. Most of them appear to be in locations that cannot be designed around. There is a formula in the ordinance for the number of trees being removed versus the number of trees that need to be planted. He suggested increasing the amount of landscaping in the reduced buffer areas.

Jim Bender, Assistant City Engineer, discussed the stormwater management plan proposal. Mr. Bender discussed how the developer needs to address stormwater management to meet the state requirements. Runoff needs to be treated where it is generated. In the City Engineer’s analysis, the proposed plan is probably as close as they can get to meet intent of state ordinance. They are providing water quality treatment which should render the runoff as clean leaving the site even without the water quality ponds at present. Concerning quantity, there are several larger facilities that are more similar to the old-style retention basins that will hold the water and release it at a slow rate. Mr. Wright asked if the stormwater management pond east of Lowe’s could be used. Mr. Bender responded that the water runoff from the southern half of the

development will dump into the undeveloped area behind the existing Lowe's. Many years ago culverts were installed under the CSX line to the west. The developer will not be allowed to discharge any more water than is discharged now. Anything to the north will flow to an existing culvert under the Norfolk Southern Railway. Off-site flow from the north will need to be taken into consideration and diverted to the box culvert under the Norfolk Southern tracks.

Mr. Stone asked if more runoff will be generated by this development. Concerning smaller storms (2- to 10-year storms), Mr. Bender stated that he did not believe the flow rate would increase, however, the retention ponds will hold onto the water for longer periods of time. Concerning larger storms (25-year storms and greater), Mr. Bender stated that his office will need to make sure this development does not create problems and they will be looking at the plan very closely. Extra storage volume will be imperative—the main retention ponds will have to be able to handle more water. If there are known problem areas, the City's ordinance requires them to protect up to a 100-year storm. Rodney Tissue, City Engineer, stated that the City does have concerns about the water on the east side which eventually flows to the South Hagerstown High School area. Mr. Bender noted that the ponds along Wesel Boulevard are mainly for water quality, however, they will provide some detention.

Concerning the requested waiver for reduced landscaped buffer areas around Buildings 1, 2, and 4, the Planning Commission had no issues with granting the waivers but suggested that the landscaping be denser to create a more effective buffer for adjoining or nearby residential uses. Commission members had no concerns with the developer's proposed forest conservation approach.

**MOTION:** (Ploscaru/Stone) Move to approve the concept plan and forest stand delineation.

**DISCUSSION:** None.

**ACTION:** APPROVED (Unanimous)

**Kilpatrick Woods – Between Salem Avenue, Marshall Street, and East of Interstate 81 – ESD and Stormwater Concept Plan.**

Staff Report: (Staff report is in the meeting file.) This development involves approximately 68.8 acres of land, and is in the RMOD (Residential-Moderate Density) zoning district. The development area is irregular in shape, and is bounded by a row of homes on the north side of Salem Avenue to the south, by I-81 and the Salem Avenue cloverleaf on the west, Marshall Street and one single-family dwelling on the north, and a row of single family homes on the west side of Rhode Island Avenue to the east. There is an unimproved right-of-way for Connecticut Avenue that connects the tract to Rhode Island Avenue, as well as the platted right-of-way for a street stub into the property labeled "Young Street" on plats, and an additional lot that provides

frontage on Salem Avenue. The property has extensive frontage on Marshall Street and two points of access on Salem Avenue.

The proposed development is a cluster subdivision. Use of the Cluster Subdivision provision in the ordinance allows for smaller lots in return for setting the difference aside in open space. This development would create 252 single-family dwelling lots (one-story manufactured single-family homes on permanent masonry crawl spaces), a community center, open space, several alleys and streets constructed to City standards which would be dedicated to the City. The average size of the lots is 5,556 square feet. There are six different housing models and setbacks will be varied. The developer's intent is for the community to initially be a rental development with the potential for lots to be sold later. Recent amendments to the Land Management Code require that all single-family dwellings be constructed on individual lots. This development complies with that requirement. While the community may be a rental community to start, each lot will have public street frontage, its own water and sewer facilities, and individual lot lines recorded in the Land Records with a subdivision plat, allowing each lot to be sold fee simple at such time as the developer chooses.

The proposed density of this development is 7.84 units per net acre and 3.66 units per gross acre. This density does not require compliance with the open space requirements of the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance. All open space is being provided to meet the additional open space requirements found in the Cluster Subdivision provisions of Article 4. Based on the average size of the lots in the development, this proposal requires 11.25 acres of open space; the plan provides 16.15 acres of open space. Proposed amenities include a community center, a tot lot, and walking trails that circle much of the perimeter of the development.

The proposed "Northwest Connector" depicted on the transportation map of the Comprehensive Plan shows this property being bisected by the connector. In such cases, the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance requires that the development be designed around that area and offered for dedication to the City. The City can also require that the road be constructed as part of the development. The developer has incorporated a 60-foot right-of-way dedication for the connector (shown as "Street A" on the plan) and is constructing the road to serve as the main street through the development. Access to the development would be via three points: one on Salem Avenue, one on Marshall Street, and an extension of Connecticut Avenue into the site from Rhode Island Avenue.

The configuration of the property and engineering needs of the Northwest Connector created difficulties in the northern portion of the property to create lot layouts that complied with the expectation of the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance that rear yards would not face a public street. The developer complied with staff's request to think creatively about this situation, and they responded with the configuration shown on this plan. To create the best design possible and not significantly damage lot yield, Lots 1 through 16 will still be "through"

lots, but their architectural fronts will face Street A. The driveways for Lots 1 through 16 will be from Street B. Lots 34 to 55 will have their architectural fronts face Marshall Street, facing into the open space. A walkway will be located along the property line, and the fronts of the houses will be visible from Marshall Street through the open space and wooded area. These driveways will also be from Street B.

Staff pointed out that this arrangement makes this part of Street B a “glorified alley” in that the driveways and functional rear yards of these houses would be along Street B. To mitigate this visual impact, the developer has proposed that architectural features, such as porches, be added to the rear of the houses that face two streets, and that any sheds and other rear yard structures be limited to the side yards. In addition, any fences proposed for this area would need to comply with the regulations for front yard fences. There will be an open space area to the east of these lots that will serve as a transition area to the houses to the east on Street B. The lots east of Lots 34 and 16 will be more traditional in configuration with their architectural fronts facing Street B.

Staff believed the proposed orientation for houses on Street B goes a long way toward respecting the design expectations of Article 5 while working within the limitations of the area. This layout keeps rears of houses off of two collector roads and employs proposals to keep the impact of their appearance on Street B to a minimum. Staff recommended that measures should be taken to ensure that residents in the homes with their architectural fronts but technical “rear yards” facing the open space and Marshall Street are not permitted to install privacy fencing or other similar rear yard fencing. Staff believed this would disrupt the intent of this design. This issue can be addressed through covenants administered by a homeowner’s association and deed restrictions.

Open space for the development will consist of an area in the middle of the development containing the community center, a tot lot, and play area. There will be a wooded area along Marshall Street and additional lands around the edges of the development. The Ordinance requires open space to be usable, contiguous areas and not remnants. However, in this development, given the lots are smaller and houses closer together than most of the homes on surrounding lots, some intervening space may be warranted, and could be used for a walking trail loop. Most blocks in the more linear parts of the development would be capped by a small open space lot as well. These should have some sort of amenity (at least a bench and landscaping) for them to meet the expectation of being usable.

Concerning the stormwater management approach, Mr. Bender noted that this development is very dense which leaves little room for stormwater management. He recommended that the developer consider rainwater harvesting (rain barrels), however, the burden then falls on the City to inspect the rain barrels every three years. The proposed stormwater management design consists of a detention pond and a constructed wetland and shallow marsh. This is an accepted “old-style” technique, however, the City Engineer’s office is apprehensive about attracting

mosquitoes and other insects. The larger concern is the facility on the southeastern portion of the site. There is a low area behind the houses on Rhode Island Avenue. The City was getting complaints about standing water and flooding to the rear of those properties. Mr. Bender's office wants to ensure that this development does not make the problem worse. Using a storm drain on Connecticut Avenue may help with that issue. The existing City pipe in Connecticut Avenue is small and has a limited capacity. The developer will have to look at that closely and may have to over control the amount of water that is allowed to go into this pipe. The surface area of the facility may have to be enlarged. Mr. Thomas suggested eliminating several lots. Gordon Poffenberger, Fox & Associates, Inc., engineers for the project, said they will consider that at the development plan/site plan stage. Mr. Bockmiller noted that the site plan needs to be in substantial conformance, not detailed conformance with the sketch plan.

Regarding the Northwest Connector and traffic, Mr. Bender stated that Salem Avenue is under the State Highway Administration's jurisdiction. SHA will review the design of the connection point. If the connector is ever built it could potentially carry 7,000 vehicles per day.

Concerning compliance with the Land Management Code, the Planning Commission's review of a sketch plan focuses on three elements; staff analyzed the project with regard to these elements:

Environmentally Sensitive Features. The project engineer has identified no wetlands in the development area. There is no floodplain or streams within the development area. Nor have any rare, threatened or endangered species been identified by the project engineer. There are no steep slopes. The property is partially wooded and partially farmed. Two minor intermittent streams that appear to serve as natural storm drainage are located on the tract (one in the southwest that leaves the site near the Salem Avenue/I-81 interchange and one in the wooded area in the northeast portion of the site). The City Engineer has noted that there is an issue with standing water at times behind the homes on Rhode Island Avenue and the developer needs to craft their stormwater management plan to address this issue. Article 5, Section K, of the Land Management Code requires the developer to conduct field reconnaissance of the property and deed searches to verify whether there is any evidence of human burial sites on the development tract. A report on the developer's findings will be required to be submitted with their first site plan submission.

Staff concluded that there appears to be no special or unique environmental features that warrant special attention with this development, other than ensuring that the drainage issue behind the homes on Rhode Island Avenue is effectively addressed. Verification of compliance with Article 5, Section K will be made during review of the development plan.

Forest Stand Delineation and Preliminary Forest Conservation Strategy. The developer has provided a forest stand delineation showing a delineation area totaling 68.8 acres. In this area, there is 25.3 acres of forest spread across several stands. Roughly 20.6 acres of delineated forest

will be removed due to the nature and scope of this development. The approach to compliance with a forest conservation plan will include several elements: retention of some existing forest (about 4.7 acres); replanting three areas adjacent to the retained forest (about 5.4 acres); establishment of a one-acre forest area in the southeast corner of the property; street tree credit for all the streets within the development and along Marshall Street (17.4 acres); and payment of a fee-in-lieu contribution to address the remaining 3.24 acres. None of the forest conservation easement areas will be located on individual lots.

Staff concluded that the delineation is complete and the approach appears to be reasonable. To qualify as “forest” an area must be at least 35 feet wide. The area behind Lots 201 through 209 is approximately 28 to 30 feet wide which would require a variance. Staff supported a variance in this case since the Ordinance discourages encumbering adjacent residential lots with easements. Three trees have been identified as being 30 inches or greater in diameter. Removal of these trees will require a variance to the provisions of the ordinance by the Planning Commission.

Ordinance Deviations Observed. Staff review of the plan shows all parking areas having the potential to comply generally with the ordinance requirement of three spaces per unit with at least two of those spaces located on each lot. This requirement will be met.

The Ordinance permits minimum setbacks for single family homes in cluster subdivisions as follows:

- Front: 5 feet
- Rear: 20 feet
- Side: 4 feet
- Aggregate Sides: 10 feet

The exception for front and rear porch encroachment into the setbacks does not apply in cluster developments. All of the houses shown on the sketch plan appear to have the ability to comply with these requirements.

Staff concluded that the only issue appears to be the width of the one forest conservation area and how these areas can be utilized as legitimate community open space through walking trails, etc.

In addition to the above, staff identified additional issues for the commission’s consideration:

Refinement of Details. A sketch plan is a generalized representation. Staff noticed a number of details that will need to be discussed with the developer, however, they were minor changes and staff did not believe the commission needed to discuss them at this stage. Minor changes to this plan may appear in the development plan that will be put before the commission at a future date.

Sidewalks. Given the site’s immediate proximity to public schools, the developer will provide a sidewalk on Marshall Street and all streets within the development in accordance with Article 5.

Staff recommended that this development be permitted to move forward to the development plan stage, subject to the issues discussed at this meeting. Staff asked the commission to discuss ways to ensure that open space, in general, is not a collection of remnants and the best way to incorporate a walking circuit throughout the development’s open space. Per the ordinance, a sketch plan does not vest a developer with any property rights.

Applicant/Commission Discussion: In general commission members had no concerns with the overall concept. Mr. Poffenberger stated that there are a few specimen trees that will be lost. Mr. Ploscaru wanted to ensure that students will have safe places to walk to get to school and that the runoff issue be addressed. Planning Commission members were willing to grant a variance for the width of the forest conservation area, had no concerns with a fee-in-lieu arrangement for the balance of the forest conservation planting, and loss of the specimen trees.

**MOTION:** (Stone/Davis) I move we accept the sketch plan with the comments we made.

**DISCUSSION:** None.

**ACTION:** APPROVED (Unanimous)

## **Planning Commission Business:**

### **2018 Annual Report to Maryland Department of Planning.**

Staff Report: (Staff report is in meeting file) Ms. Flick presented the draft 2018 Annual Report to the commission, noting that the format has changed from years past. Commission members made these comments:

Third Page – Under “Setting clear expectations for the public and investors,” the second bullet, Mr. Wright stated he attended a meeting recently with the City Engineer. New federal stormwater requirements will entail reducing the amount of impervious surfaces. Mr. Bockmiller stated that depending on visibility, the ordinance does allow for gravel parking areas in the back portions of properties.

Last Page – In reference to Hub-Bub on the last page, Ms. Maher explained this is the name of the podcasts done by Planning and Code Administration staff. The purpose of the podcasts is to portray a business friendly image for the Code Administration side of the department. It also includes a presence on Instagram and Facebook by thanking investors and to persuade the community to think differently about us.

**Planning Commission  
MINUTES – Regular Meeting**

**August 14, 2019  
City of Hagerstown, Maryland**

---

**MOTION:** (Wheeler/Thomas) I make a motion to approve the report.  
**DISCUSSION:** None.  
**ACTION:** APPROVED (Unanimous)

**Board of Zoning Appeals Agenda – August Hearing.**

Case No. Z-2019-08 for NorthPoint Development. Commission members were amenable to submitting a letter of support to the Board of Zoning Appeals stating that the commission has seen a preliminary sketch plan and that it would have no concerns if the variance is granted. Mr. Bockmiller will craft a letter for the chair’s signature.

**2019 Land Management Code Amendments.**

Due to the hour, commission members postponed resuming their discussion of the proposed amendments until the August 22 meeting.

**Announcements.**

Ms. Maher announced that the City will be sending an official request to Washington County to amend the County Water and Sewer Plan to include the City’s Growth and Utility planning language from the Comprehensive Plan.

**Adjourn.** It was moved and seconded that the meeting adjourn (5:47 p.m.)

9/25/2019  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Approved

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Debra C. Calhoun - Secretary