

Douglas S. Wright, Jr., chair, called the meeting to order at 4:05 p.m., on Wednesday, May 11, 2011, in the Conference Room, Fourth Floor, City Hall. Also present were commission members M. Brubaker; D. Miller; J. Stone; R. Thomas; and J. Wheeler. The following staff members were present: K. Maher, Planning Director; S. Bockmiller, Development Planner/Zoning Administrator; A. Rohrbaugh, Planner; and D. Calhoun, Secretary.

WORKSHOP MEETING

Approval of Minutes: April 13, 2011 - Workshop Meeting

On the top of page 1, a note should be added that Mr. Thomas was late. On page 5, the fourth bullet, Ms. Wheeler clarified her statement. The homeowners on South Prospect Street must contribute an amount toward the cost of resurfacing the sidewalks.

MOTION: (Wheeler/Stone) I'll move approval of the minutes.
DISCUSSION: None.
ACTION: APPROVED (Present, Not Voting - Miller)

Healthcare Family Credit Union - 1741 Dual Highway, Site Plan, Case No. ZS-2011-03

Staff Report: This site plan is for the construction of a drive-through facility on the rear of an existing building and includes minor parking lot reconfigurations. Due to the size of the development, forest conservation is not required. The applicant is requesting one waiver from the landscaping requirements to allow two parking bay end islands to be striped instead of a landscaped area due to circulation issues encountered with the redevelopment of this already developed site. An additional internal landscaped island is planned which is not required but will offset the requirement of one of the two islands. Staff had no objection to the requested waiver. Total net parking is about nine or ten spaces, but the parking on site is considerably less than what the ordinance requires. Collapsible bollards will separate parallel parking along the rear from the drive-through window. All review agencies have approved the site plan.

Applicant/Commission Discussion: Commission members had concerns about the turning radius and traffic circulation on the site. Mr. Shifler noted that there is a drafting error on the site plan. The outside loop is intended for two-way traffic all the way around the site. There is an interior lot line between the two properties and a pending plat will show cross easements. The intention is that both properties will share and maintain the drive area. Mr. Thomas asked if it would be advantageous to remove the last parking bay where the tight turn into the drive-through is located. Mr. Shifler said he also had that concern. As a result, a sign will be posted that directs

customers to make an immediate right when you enter from the Dual Highway if they plan to access the drive-through lane. There is enough stacking space in the drive-through lane for five vehicles. Mr. Brubaker asked the engineer to provide adequate markings or a stop sign to define the intersection where vehicles exist the drive-through. Mr. Shifler indicated they would add something to the plan and run it by the City Engineer.

MOTION: (Stone/Miller) I'll make a motion that we approve the site plan and grant the requested landscaping waivers subject to Mr. Brubaker's requirement that the signage be improved on the southeast corner of the lot to eliminate confusion of people existing the drive-through.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Brubaker asked that the motion be amended to add that the circulation arrows need to be corrected on the site plan.

ACTION: APPROVED (Unanimous)

Herald-Mail Article Concerning Mt. Aetna Farms Road Projects (May 4, 2011)

Commission members discussed whether or not it should send a letter to the Washington County Commissioners expressing its support of the proposed road project discussed in a recent *Herald-Mail* article (see meeting file). Mr. Stone supported the idea of sending a letter because it is his understanding that connecting Professional Court and Eastern Boulevard is one of the City's goals. This road system is an essential part of the City's Transportation Plan. The County Commissioners are reluctant to do this project with taxpayer money. It was noted that the leg of the proposed network from Professional Court over the Antietam Creek is not what is currently under discussion by the County Commissioners. The only issue the County Commissioners are currently discussing is whether to fund a road from Yale Drive to Hagerstown Community College.

The commission, while in favor of the road over Antietam Creek, was split over aspects of the current proposal, and therefore, decided not to send the letter.

Land Management Code - Review of Article 4 (through Section G)

Page 4-17 - Staff explained why it changed lot area requirements for the RMED and RH districts. Under the current lot area requirements there is no differentiation among the various lot sizes in the residential districts. Staff questioned whether the City wants to continue to require large lot sizes in the RMED and RH districts. If the lot sizes were reduced in the RH district, the City might attract some single-family developments in RH districts. This change would also bring much of the city into compliance with the current zoning ordinance requirements. The city's

current RMED/R2 areas are much smaller than what is required in the Zoning Ordinance. This brings the density and lot area requirement for new development more in line with modern development. This amendment would also meet a Comprehensive Plan recommendation. Mr. Rohrbaugh stated that these proposed lot sizes are based on research on existing neighborhoods in the City and research on other comparable cities in the region. Staff also researched housing trends which indicates that home sizes are becoming smaller, mostly because of energy costs. Ms. Maher stated that staff has been approached by developers about doing more dense single-family detached developments. This amendment would not preclude a developer from providing larger lots. Also, the proposed changes do not affect the RMOD district. The commission also questioned why shouldn't RMOD developments also conform to the established line in the neighborhood in the case of infill. Staff was asked to look for a way to standardize the language about established line of front yards. Staff was also asked to look at the 1,000 square foot minimum for mansion house apartments. Some commission members believe that 1,000 square feet might be too small.

Page 4-18 - Staff was asked to check into whether private schools need to meet state requirements for school sites. Mr. Wright asked the commission to reconsider "none" for the lot area requirement for schools.

Page 4-18 - Add note to mobile home parks to see Section D, Subsection 5, g, of this Article.

Page 4-19, c, (3) - Ms. Maher asked if the commission would be willing to consider allowing a larger percentage of an open deck to be constructed outside of the rear setback. The commission did not have an issue with a deck on the back of townhouses and agreed to change the percentage from 25% to 35%.

Page 4-19, c, (4) - Second line, add "of the addition" for clarification. Mr. Wright had concerns about the requirement that a three-foot easement be provided on an adjacent property for buildings located closer than three feet to the lot line. The commission decided to delete the easement requirement (everything after "each side lot line" in the second line. In addition, semi-detached dwellings should be added to this provision.

Page 4-20, (4) - The idea behind this amendment is to increase the quality of the development by doing away with the blank walls on the side of a townhouse facing a public street. Commission members were not enthusiastic about this proposal and asked staff to reword it to address side facades and come back.

Page 4-20, (f), (1) - Mr. Stone stated that every new building should front on a public street. With separate lots you could have different owners, which could be sold off to different owners. Staff will revisit this idea. (Mr. Miller left the meeting.)

Board of Zoning Appeals Agenda - May Hearing

Staff explained the concept of Go-Green Recycling, which is asking for a special exception for a remediation service. Go-Green Recycling takes waste from poultry slaughter houses and separates it into a natural oil that can be used for biofuel. The remainder of the product is suitable for fertilizer. All of the company's operations are contained indoors. Mr. Bockmiller noted that the City's industrial districts contain industrial performance standards to protect against odors. Staff will be responsible for enforcing the odors and noise restrictions contained in the industrial performance standards. Mr. Bockmiller does not foresee a site plan review because all of the operations will be indoors. Mr. Brubaker asked if staff had talked to any other communities where this type of facility is located. Because this operation is fairly new, Ms. Maher said there are not many other locations for this type of business. Staff will clarify in the BZA report that there are industrial performance standards.

Planning Commission members were skeptical about claims that the product will never touch air. Staff stated that nothing will go into the City's wastewater system. The process ends up using everything. Commission members expressed concerns that the advertising for this project was misleading. People need to know what is being recycled at the facility. Concerns were also raised about odor and truck traffic in the area.

The commission did not forward any recommendations on to the Board of Zoning Appeals..

Adjourn: It was moved and seconded that the meeting adjourn at 6:20 p.m.

6/29/2011
Date

DC Calhoun
Debra C. Calhoun - Secretary