

**Planning Commission
MINUTES – Special Meeting**

**July 2, 2014
City of Hagerstown, Maryland**

Douglas S. Wright, Jr., chair, called the special meeting to order at 7:00 p.m., on Wednesday, July 2, 2014, in the Council Chamber, Second Floor, City Hall. Also present were commission members C. Coleman, D. Miller, J. Stone, R. Thomas, and J. Wheeler. The following staff members were present: S. Bockmiller, Development Planner/Zoning Administrator; A. Rohrbaugh, Planner; and D. Calhoun, Secretary. (NOTE: Planning Commission revisions are indicated in red text.)

REGULAR MEETING

Roll Call.

All commission members were present with the exception of M. Brubaker.

Approval of Minutes.

There were no minutes ready for approval.

**18005 Terps Boulevard (Collegiate Acres – Lot 1), Minor Subdivision,
Case No. S-2014-03.**

Staff Report: (Staff report in meeting file.) This minor subdivision plat concerns Lot 1 of the Collegiate Acres subdivision which was recorded in 2006. The property was zoned R2 (Residential) and is now zoned RMED (Residential-Medium Density) which replaced the R2 zoning district in the 2012 Land Management Code text amendments. The former R2 zoning district had more restrictive setback requirements than the RMED zoning district which limited the building envelope for Lot 1 when it was originally recorded. At the direction of the Planning Commission, the applicant's engineer prepared the subject plat for the purpose of allowing the lot to be re-recorded with the current RMED setbacks.

All agencies have approved the plat with the exception of the City Engineer and the Planning and Code Administration Division. Planning staff recommended that the plat be approved, subject to the outstanding City Engineer and Planning comments. Mr. Wright noted that a date line is missing from the Planning Commission's Certificate of Approval. This must be added to the list of outstanding comments. Mr. Bockmiller offered to check the standard template to see if the date line is missing on the template.

**Planning Commission
MINUTES – Special Meeting**

**July 2, 2014
City of Hagerstown, Maryland**

Commission/Applicant Discussion: The commission had no additional comments on the minor subdivision plat.

MOTION: (Stone/Wheeler) I make a motion to approve the plat subject to the outstanding Planning and Engineering and Planning Commission comments.

DISCUSSION: None.

ACTION: APPROVED (Unanimous)

**2012 Church Street, LLC – 358 West Church Street – Pad Site for Future Use,
Site Plan Case No. ZS-2013-09 and Forest Conservation Plan
Case No. FC-2013-01.**

Staff Report: (Staff report in meeting file.) This site plan is for the removal of paving and foundation areas associated with the demolished Manbeck Bakery property on the northwest corner of the intersection of Church Street and Burhans Boulevard, and grading the site in preparation for redevelopment. The entire property containing 2.58 acres will be graded and seeded. No construction is proposed at this time. Impervious area will be reduced from over 99,000 square feet to zero square feet. The purpose of this plan is to improve the appearance of the property and assist in marketing it for redevelopment, as well as to remove safety hazards on the property.

One point of access is shown on the plan. One access point will be on Church Street forming a four-way intersection with the driveway entrance to the shopping center in which the Roy Rogers restaurant is located. All driveway openings along North Burhans Boulevard will be closed; however, it is anticipated that when a site plan is submitted for development of the property, at least one opening will be included on North Burhans Boulevard in that design. Other than installing curb along Burhans and installing the new driveway apron on Church Street, no work in the right-of-way is proposed at this time. New sidewalks and reconstruction of existing deficient elements will be deferred to the site plan that would be submitted for redevelopment.

Plantings in the amount of 16,923 square feet will be necessary to meet the forest conservation requirements. The developer proposes to meet this requirement through the planting of seven street trees. Four thornless honey locust and three shingle oak trees are proposed to address forest conservation requirements. The concept plan for stormwater management was approved by the Planning Commission on December 11, 2013.

Staff recommended approval, contingent upon satisfaction of outstanding comments from the Planning and Code Administration Division and the City Engineer.

**Planning Commission
MINUTES – Special Meeting**

**July 2, 2014
City of Hagerstown, Maryland**

Commission/Applicant Discussion: Mr. Stone questioned whether there will be a site distance issue with the trees on Church Street. Mr. Bockmiller indicated that sight distance should not be an issue based on the traffic patterns. In addition the City Engineer’s office had no concerns with the trees being placed along Church Street. Mr. Thomas questioned where the existing sidewalks are located. Mr. Bockmiller stated there is an existing sidewalk on Church Street; no sidewalk is proposed for Burhans at this time, although curb and gutter improvements will be made under this site plan. Mr. Wright asked that a three-foot wide bituminous pathway be provided for pedestrians to safely walk along North Burhans Boulevard. Jim Bender, Assistant City Engineer, said his office would not have an objection to the installation of a bituminous walkway; however, the ADA requirement for a sidewalk is five feet of width, although four feet is acceptable. Mr. Bockmiller stated that a wider roadway right-of-way would be required to cover sidewalks. It was noted that there is a sidewalk on the west side of North Burhans Boulevard, but it ends at the A C & T gas station. Mr. Coleman pointed out that the sidewalk on the east side ends before it reaches the next property north of the subject property. Mr. Stone asked Trevor Frederick of Frederick, Seibert & Associates, if the applicant could extend the sidewalk to the end of the property line. Mr. Frederick indicated that would not be a problem.

MOTION: (Stone/Coleman) I move to approve both the site plan and the forest conservation plan subject to the outstanding Engineer and Planning comments and also to the condition that the existing paved walkway be extended by some impervious surface to the boundary line with Thomas, Bennett & Hunter—a reasonable safe walkway.

DISCUSSION: None.

ACTION: APPROVED (Unanimous)

**CortPark Apartments – Concept Plan for Expansion of the Number of Units,
Case No. C-2014-01.**

Mr. Wright did not participate in this discussion because his company owns an adjacent piece of property. Mr. Miller did not participate in this discussion because he is a resident of Cortland Villas.

Staff Report: (Staff report in meeting file.) As background, Mr. Bockmiller stated there is a provision in the ordinance that requires a developer to provide an amenities plan demonstrating that the developer will be providing a sufficient amount of outdoor amenities for quality of life for the residents of the development. He stressed that this is a plan of proposed amenities and it provides review agencies a chance to raise issues that might come up at site plan stage.

This concept plan calls for the intensification of this use by converting existing units and hallway

**Planning Commission
MINUTES – Special Meeting**

**July 2, 2014
City of Hagerstown, Maryland**

space in every building in this development to add one dwelling unit on the second floor and one dwelling unit on the third floor. Each building would go from 12 three-bedroom units to 10 three-bedroom units, 2 two-bedroom units and 2 one-bedroom units. The total number of units would increase from 432 units to 504 units. In order to meet ordinance requirements, the existing gravel fire access road off of Eastern Boulevard would be upgraded and improved to create a new full entrance onto Eastern Boulevard with right-in-right-out access only. New amenities proposed include a basketball court, park benches along walkways, an additional tot lot, and a marked exercise loop with interpretive panels that contain health and exercise information. Staff noted that the proposed parking appears to be sufficient to meet ordinance requirements. Almost all of the construction-related changes to the exterior of the site are clustered in the southern portion of the site near the current fire access road.

The concept was reviewed by the Plan Review Committee on April 15. The vast majority of staff comments are issues that would be addressed at the site plan stage; therefore, all agencies have reviewed the attached responses to their comments and have consented to allow the concept to move forward to the Planning Commission for consideration. Staff pointed out that since the City repealed its Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance, the issue of the increase in the number of units is no longer impacted by an APFO requirement.

The City has experienced challenges with this development since its inception. Many liberties were taken with the grading of the site compared to what was required on the site plan, and the unusual topography throughout the site and around the buildings is evident throughout. Numerous issues of noncompliance with the site plan remain outstanding with the City Engineer's office.

The buildings show surprising levels of deterioration given their minimal age. Trash enclosure gates are propped open and never used. The property was subdivided into two land condominium units on assurances that they would never be sold separately; however one of the two land units was threatened with sale as part of a bank foreclosure process, which has since been canceled. While the City's requirement for number of units vs. number of access points is a subdivision issue and not addressed in site plan standards, two or more access points are required for subdivisions over 100 units. This development will have more than five times that number of units accessing off of only two entrances. Given the layout of the site, the only real open space area is occupied by forest conservation. The vast majority of the development contains buildings, roads, parking and forest conservation areas and sloped remnants of land not suitable for open space amenities. The Hagerstown Police Department responds to an unusually high number of calls for service at CortPark.

Mr. Bockmiller reviewed the criteria the commission considers when reviewing a full development concept plan. Concept plans for multi-family developments address the general layout and "big picture" issues, including the sufficiency of the amenities plan proposed for the

**Planning Commission
MINUTES – Special Meeting**

**July 2, 2014
City of Hagerstown, Maryland**

development. Some of the issues raised during the April 15 PRC meeting have been addressed on a revised concept plan or acknowledged by the applicant as issues that need to be addressed on the site plan; however, many items remain unresolved (see staff report in meeting file). There are a few items of contention that the applicant wishes to discuss with the Commission. The Planning Staff is not satisfied that the amenities and corrections proposed will mitigate the poor design and quality of life challenges in a development of over 500 dwellings at this location, given site layout and existing conditions.

Should the Planning Commission approve this concept plan, staff listed the following conditions that should be applied:

- All issues raised in the review of this concept plan by the Planning staff, City Engineer, Water and Wastewater Departments, the Fire Marshal, and the site plan related comments of the Police Department (see attachment in meeting file) shall be addressed in the site plan to the satisfaction of those agencies;
- Trash enclosures shall be of uniform design, made of masonry, designed to efficiently contain dumpsters without wasted space, have operating gates designed for durability, and a pedestrian access way to each enclosure incorporated into the design to allow residents to deposit materials in the dumpster without having to undo the gates;
- To the greatest extent logical, as determined by the Planning staff, as many of the back entry ways as possible shall be connected to the sidewalk network of the development.

Concerning traffic generation, the typical number of additional trips by an apartment is eight trips per day, multiplied by the number of additional units would be an additional 500 trips per day. Mr. Stone noted that when this was discussed previously he believed this should be a full access intersection. Mr. Bockmiller recalled there were sight distance issues with the intersection of Eastern and Potomac.

Jim Bender, Assistant City Engineer, stated that when this was originally discussed, the emergency access was a crutch. As constructed, this access is suitable for emergency access only. The City worked with the developer before the plan was submitted. The City Engineer's office had concerns with full access. If exiting the property and making a left-hand turn, the site distance to the right is not great. A traffic signal would have to be warranted before one could be installed at this intersection. The City does not want to penalize the heavy traffic flow on Eastern Boulevard with a traffic signal in that the overall goal is to keep traffic flowing on major roads.

Mr. Stone recalled that the sense of a few Planning Commission members was that a full access should be examined. The funeral home has full access, the entrance to Chartridge Drive has a full access intersection. The proposed right-in-right-out will not provide sufficient coverage. If all of the development traffic ends up using the existing entrance because the other access point does not work, it will not meet the purpose. Mr. Bender stated that his office is not opposed to

**Planning Commission
MINUTES – Special Meeting**

**July 2, 2014
City of Hagerstown, Maryland**

additional study, and it is possible that a full access intersection could work. This driveway would not be on center with the funeral home which could be a big problem during a funeral. Mr. Thomas questioned how this intersection is different than the YMCA further down Eastern Boulevard. The YMCA is on a curve. Mr. Bender noted that Washington County has been reconsidering that. When the Y was developed, that area had not been annexed and was under Washington County review. The City did not review that development when it was first proposed.

Hagerstown Police Department Representative, Captain Paul Kifer, stated that this community has historically been a problem for the Hagerstown Police Department (HPD). There were 340 calls for service in the last year which is exorbitant compared to other developments in Hagerstown. Officer Kendle has been working with the developer to lessen that burden. In May there were 33 calls for service which has been reduced to 22 calls in June. Chief Holtzman believes it is too early to say whether the changes requested by Officer Kendle have made a difference. HPD does not see a benefit to allowing the additional units. He added that there is a juvenile problem, which the owner says is being addressed.

Captain Kifer reviewed the number of calls by type. A new City ordinance addressing excessive calls was recently adopted. They are also working with the Fire Marshal's office due to a large number of arson calls. Problems don't stay in this neighborhood—they spill over to the adjacent neighborhoods. HPD is looking for cooperation by the developer in attracting better tenants. HPD has talked with them about a variety of options, but it is too early to tell whether it is a permanent fix. The developer needs to demonstrate that they are making strides toward making a drastic change for the better.

Density does play a part in the problems. There are other developments in Hagerstown with the same density. The service calls to the Bradford Apartments on Manor Drive are nowhere near the number of calls to this development. The Bradford was one of the first communities to embrace the **Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CEPTD)** program. Many developments hold their tenants accountable. By bringing in good tenants, there is less property damage, better long-term tenants because it is a safe place to live. Ms. Wheeler noted that eight of the recommendations that the HPD is making are not necessarily towards the increase in density, just improvements in general. Mr. Thomas asked if the site lighting compares to other complexes. Captain Kifer said there are areas where people can hide in the marshland area of the site. The CEPTD program recommends lights with white lights and high illumination. Visibility makes it easier to see issues going on in the neighborhood. Natural surveillance is a goal. If people see that others are paying attention to what's going on it can deter criminal activity.

Mr. Bockmiller stated that all the buildings have two main entrances. Not every entry door leads to a sidewalk. Staff is requiring that each main entrance have access to sidewalks (front and back). General policy should be to connect the isolated entrances to a walkway. In addition,

**Planning Commission
MINUTES – Special Meeting**

**July 2, 2014
City of Hagerstown, Maryland**

erosion issues have surfaced in the development. There are open-section roads, outstanding storm water management issues, and drainage pipes draining onto the sidewalks. The development itself is showing more deterioration and wear and tear considering its age.

Planning staff has significant concerns with increasing the density at CortPark. The buildings and the parking consume all the available land; much of the land is locked up in forest conservation that is not usable for open space. Open space is limited to remnants of land. The Planning Commission must determine whether the proposed amenities in the concept plan are sufficient for the increase in density. Mr. Bockmiller noted that this development is comprised mostly of buildings and parking lots. If the commission decides to move forward, there are a large number of comments that have been presented, many of which the developer has agreed to do. Significant work will be required to bring the property up to current design standards, including landscaping requirements and buffering from surrounding properties. The emergency access road will be constructed as a closed-section road with curb.

Mr. Thomas asked how parking will be affected by the proposal. Mr. Bockmiller said parking will need to be reconfigured because of new road; and the site plan will need to show two parking spaces per unit, which adds up to 1008 spaces with additional spaces for boats, RVs, etc. The developer is proposing 1048 spaces, but that number could fluctuate. If the developer wants to reduce the number of spaces an appeal would need to be filed and granted by the Board of Zoning Appeals.

Mr. Stone stated that the main issue is whether the proposed amenities are adequate. He asked what amenities, if any, are being proposed that are new and associated with this particular expansion. Mr. Bockmiller said the developer is proposing a new tot lot, basketball court, walking loop with exercise stops. Mr. Bockmiller asked the commission if it believes the existing open space is sufficient since open space is considered an amenity. The development is packed tight and cannot provide additional open space. Mr. Bockmiller stated that the ordinance says open space is judged on a case-by-case basis. Mr. Stone did not feel it was realistic to expect this development to comply with standards that were not in place at the time it was originally developed, but it is fair to look at current standards if an expansion is involved. Mr. Bockmiller said if this development was constructed with the same number of units in five-story buildings it would consume less land and leave more room for amenities. Mr. Thomas observed that the already deteriorated open space areas will degrade further with additional people. Mr. Bockmiller stated that if the walkways that staff is requesting are installed correctly and used properly, residents will walk on the pavement and not degrade the grass. Much of it depends on the design and the quality of the design.

Applicant's Presentation:

**Planning Commission
MINUTES – Special Meeting**

**July 2, 2014
City of Hagerstown, Maryland**

Steve Zoretich of Frederick, Seibert & Associates was present along with David Shaool, developer, and Guy Reed, property manager. The owner's goal is to make CortPark a better development by changing the mix of tenants by focusing on a target tenant composition of couples. Concerning the concerns raised by the Hagerstown Police Department, the owner has already started to implement that agency's recommendations. If the crime rate is high, the owner will have more difficulty finding quality tenants. Mr. Zoretich stated that his firm has been working with the staff to create as many amenities as possible.

With regard to HPD's concerns, more data will be available from HPD as the project progresses. If there is more activity in the southern end, the area will be less desirable for people to act up. Ms. Wheeler noted that most of the amenities are clustered where the new access road will be located; playgrounds are proposed near roads and increased traffic.

Mr. Stone asked Mr. Zoretich if he believes the amenities are sufficient for this expanded project. Mr. Zoretich pointed out that Hager's Crossing contains 1,000 units and fewer amenities but conceded that those yards are bigger. Mr. Coleman asked what percentage of the walkways have been installed. Adam Hager of Frederick, Seibert & Associates stated that the entire sidewalk has been installed except for a small section at the top of the development. The proposed exercise areas would have a play surface like mulch.

Mr. Bockmiller stated that the developer has been informed that this project will require a full site plan. If a site plan moves forward, it will need to provide information about existing conditions. Ultimately a plat will be associated with this. Originally the initial CortPark parcel was split into two separate condo regimes. The condo regime will be eliminated and put under one lot.

David Shaool, owner and developer, and Guy Reed, property manager were present. According to Mr. Shaool, Mr. Reed has 30 years of experience in property management, including managing over 1,400 units. Mr. Shaool stated that the fact that the number of police calls to CortPark has been dropping since Mr. Reed took over is promising. He realized that they needed to change the unit mix, which was originally all three-bedroom units. By reducing the number of large families and children and increasing the amenities, it reduces the strain on the amenities. If CortPark stays the way it is, it will not get better. They have an opportunity to make improvements.

When the community center and pool were opened, they were very heavily used, including mischief in the locker rooms. Concerning crime, they have implemented a policy and procedure for background checks on all tenants over the age of 18. The juvenile problem is not necessarily from residents. Problems sometimes come from people who are not residents of the community. Single mothers have boyfriends with records crashing on the couch. One of Mr. Reed's responsibilities is to crack down on that. Another issue is crime in the large common area

**Planning Commission
MINUTES – Special Meeting**

**July 2, 2014
City of Hagerstown, Maryland**

hallways. By reducing the size of the common hallways it should reduce the amount of area for mischief. Concerning forestation, they will look into opening up the forested areas by purchasing off-site forestation methods.

Mr. Shaool stated that it his goal to make CortPark a better community. The recession has been brutal in his business with people losing their jobs. This has put pressure on their communities.

Mr. Reed addressed Mr. Thomas’s comments about dark spaces. According to Mr. Reed, the main problem is the hallways. After he was hired, Mr. Reed inspected every building to make certain that lighting is sufficient. The hallway and parking lot lighting has been upgraded. He receives frequent police call logs for the development. They added a Crime Free addendum to each lease, and the owner can break a lease for violations. He indicated that they have used that clause four times in two months. He feels the complex has seen improvement since he started managing it. They need to do everything they can to cut down on the number of families and larger apartments. When a new tenant moves in, background checks are run on the tenant but not on the people that the tenants allow to move in with them.

Mr. Reed said he walks the property twice a day. He finds out a lot just by talking to and getting to know his tenants. Most of the cleanup he has done is as a result of the regular walk throughs. In addition, an off-duty trooper conducts patrols for three hours a night.

Mr. Stone asked about the current occupancy rate. Mr. Shaool stated that 90% of the units are rented. It is their hope that the change in design will result in a higher occupancy rate because CortPark would be a more desirable place to live.

Mr. Bockmiller pointed out that staff comments are not limited to the issues that have been identified for this meeting and it does not guarantee that every issue has been identified.

Mr. Bockmiller stated that a significant number of people are in attendance with concerns, although this is not an official public hearing.

Public Comment:

After a brief recess, the following people spoke concerning this matter. Mr. Stone said the commission normally entertains comments from the public on issues such as this. People wishing to comment were asked to keep their comments reasonably brief.

Sherry ~~K~~Cramer – Cortland Villas. Ms. Kramer was pleased to hear some of the plans. Many of the items could have been done before and she questioned why they were not addressed sooner. She described herself as “gun shy” in that even if all the changes are maintained, who will make sure?

**Planning Commission
MINUTES – Special Meeting**

**July 2, 2014
City of Hagerstown, Maryland**

Elizabeth Krell, President, Board of Directors, Cortland Villas Condominium Owners Association, Post Office Box 3706, Hagerstown, Maryland. Written comments were submitted and are contained in the meeting file.

Doug Sales – Cortland Villas. Mr. Sales indicated that he was treasurer of the Villas HOA. That organization still has not been able to get money from Shaool to help finish the road into Cortland Villas. If CortPark is unable to pay their share towards the road, not to mention other unfulfilled promises, how can they count on CortPark to keep up the promises they are making here.

George Miller – Cortland Villas. Mr. George Miller stated that he agreed with Mr. Sales' comments. He is the current treasurer and has experienced the same problem in trying to get Mr. Shaool to pay his share so that the road that was supposed to be paved is paved. No matter what they do, it does not seem to make a difference. When he hears about all the changes that are being promised, he does not believe it is a real commitment.

Jean Walsh – Cortland Manor. Ms. Walsh supports and agrees with the letter received from the Villas. She reiterated that there was an agreement between the three property owners and only two-thirds have participated. She believed that reflects on the true nature of the other developer. The component that contributes the most wear and tear has not contributed anything. She supported the Police Department's recommendation to wait and see how things play out before allowing an increase in the number of units.

Brian Bandy – Cortland Villas. Mr. Bandy was impressed with Mr. Shaool's interest in bettering the community. He asked the commission to also compare crime statistics from the other two neighboring developments.

Vince Scheck – Cortland Villas. Mr. Scheck was concerned about the increase in the numbers of people residing in the apartments at CortPark. He did not understand how increasing the number of residents will benefit anyone but the owner. He stated that he is opposed to increasing the number of units in the apartment complex.

(End of comments.)

Ms. Wheeler thanked everyone for their input. The commission is really looking at the amenities plan, but there are concerns about the development. There is a leap of faith she is struggling with. Her gut feeling is that the amenities are not sufficient. On the other hand this could be a way to facilitate changes but there is always a risk. In looking at the site there is not much that can be done to increase the amenities. In addition, there is nothing to say that a person who rents a one bedroom will not move her criminal boyfriend into the unit. It all depends on the management.

**Planning Commission
MINUTES – Special Meeting**

**July 2, 2014
City of Hagerstown, Maryland**

Ms. Wheeler said she has mixed feelings. Clearly there needs to be a real improvement but there are no easy answers.

Mr. Thomas agreed with Ms. Wheeler. He did not believe there are enough amenities that will support the people there right now, regardless of adding additional units.

Mr. Coleman agreed with Ms. Wheeler. There are many remaining question marks. Mr. Coleman felt that more studies must be done. The letter in opposition says there is excessive traffic and speeding and questioned whether the entrance is adequate. The potential is to add more children to the area or will it reduce the number of children? Regarding the number of police calls to the development, Mr. Coleman thought a higher density of families will exacerbate the problem, but that could be looked at with further study. Lighting needs also need to be addressed and whether reducing the size of the hallways would really help with a reduction in vandalism and crime. There are too many question marks that need to be addressed by a professional. A parking study would be helpful. Parking, engineering, and police studies need to be done.

Mr. Stone recalled that one of the things the applicant said in response to Mr. Bockmiller is that the forest conservation limitation reduces what they are able to do. The applicant indicated that one possibility was to convert some of the areas to recreation areas and buy off-site forestation areas that would free up some of the dedicated areas. That idea is not on the concept plan, but it would be one way to incorporate more space and would allow the applicant to provide more amenities. That also dovetails with what Captain Kifer said in that he is encouraged with the progress so far, but it is still too soon. He would like to look at this in the context with what is being done to address neighbors' concerns. He suggested not approving the concept plan in its current form and requiring a new plan with the changes suggested by the owner. This would also buy more time to see how the crime rate is doing.

Mr. Coleman stated that approval of an amenities plan is by no means a guarantee that it would ever be approved as a site plan. The best way to improve the design would be to gather additional professional input, although Mr. Coleman was not sure how much more could be wedged in because it is really a confined development. More playgrounds are needed for the children in the development.

MOTION: (Thomas/Wheeler) I move that we not approve this concept plan and have it come back in a revised form.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Coleman wanted to see additional studies. Further discussions will be needed with City staff and he feels it will take months or a year. He would also like to see more crime data for the development. Mr. Stone added that the concept plan does not show additional land taken out of forest conservation and dedicated and developed into amenities. Mr. Zoretich stated his client would be open to a revised concept plan. Mr. Stone stated

**Planning Commission
MINUTES – Special Meeting**

**July 2, 2014
City of Hagerstown, Maryland**

that a denial does not prevent the developer from coming back with another concept plan that is sensitive to the comments received. There would be no time constraint if the developer comes back with a completely different concept.

ACTION: APPROVED (YES – Stone, Thomas, Wheeler; NO - Coleman; ABSTAIN – Miller, Wright)

Mr. Wright and Mr. Miller rejoined the commission.

Update on Urban Partners Project.

This item was not discussed.

Review of Proposed Amendments to Land Management Code (2014).

This item was not discussed.

Adjourn.

It was moved and seconded that the meeting adjourn at 9:40 p.m.

10/8/2014

Approved



Debra C. Calhoun - Secretary