

**Aberdeen Planning Commission  
Minutes of the April 9, 2008 Meeting**

The meeting of the Aberdeen Planning Commission was called to order at 7:00 PM in the Council Chambers by Commissioner Swisher.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Commissioners Swisher, Braerman, Craig, Kosko and Tout

MEMBERS ABSENT: Commissioners Landbeck and Schlottman

ALSO PRESENT: Ms. Phyllis Grover  
Director of Planning and Community Development  
Mr. Matthew Lapinsky, Director of Public Works  
Mr. Michael Hiob, Aberdeen City Council  
Chief Eric Reith, Aberdeen Volunteer Fire Company  
Ms. Fran Johnson, Recording Secretary

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Approval of the Minutes of the January 9, 2008 and February 13, 2008 meetings were postponed.

The Minutes of the March 12, 2008 meeting were approved, with two minor corrections.

**PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN  
St. JOAN OF ARC SCHOOL ADDITIONS**

Fr. Sam provided an update on the proposed diversion of Poplar Alley and explained that the church is working with R??? and Associates, as well as Tester Engineering. Mr. Jeff Schwab, Tester ??, civil engineers, presented the site plan of the existing conditions for the property, bounded by Platers and Law Streets, intersected by Poplar Alley running between the paved area currently used as a parking area/play area associated with the school. He explained that the parking lot at the corner of Edmond and Platers will be removed and replaced with a gymnasium and small parking lot. Two small additions to the school are proposed, one of which will be over the Poplar Alley area. He indicated the locations of the two additions on the site plan and explained that a parking expansion will connect the area at the back of the school with Law Street. A portion of the Alley will be diverted and reconstructed, with storm drainage also diverted down Platers Street to connect with the existing storm drain system in Poplar Alley.

In answer to a question from Ms. Grover, Fr. Sam explained that the proposed expansion will be conducted in several phases, the first of which will be the two additions to the gymnasium/auditorium and the school. A later phase would be a small addition to the church to provide a small chapel, depending on affordability. He also noted that future expansion, depending on additional demand as a result of BRAC, might include an

additional eight classrooms. He noted that the school is not currently at capacity; enrollment is now 208 students and the school could accommodate as many as 240 students. He also stated that, at some time in the future, there will be a need for additional office space. He reiterated that the current plans, for Phase I, only include the two additions. Ms. Grover recommended that the General Notes on the Plan should include information on phasing of the development, as well as future plans for the chapel or other additions. She noted that she was concerned for parking for the future chapel. Fr. Sam noted that the chapel would accommodate current uses of the church, which is currently used by 40 persons a day.

Ms. Grover also stated that the Plan should indicate the setbacks for the proposed building as well as details of lighting for the building and the proposed parking area. In addition, a note should be provided indicating the final location for fire hydrants, valves, water and sewer lines, pumping station, etc. She asked about the playground area for the students and Mr. Schwab noted that the gymnasium will take the place of the current paved playground area.

Ms. Grover noted that the current parking requirements are for 1 parking space per every 3 seats, plus 1 parking space for each teacher. She stated that the parking calculations for each phase of the development, including the proposed chapel, should be indicated on the plan. She also asked whether any new sidewalks were proposed and Mr. Schwab stated that a sidewalk along Platers Street will be upgraded, as well as the drop-off area on Law Street. Ms. Grover stated that the new sidewalk should also be indicated on the plan.

Ms. Grover read into the record the comments received from Robin Wales, Division of Emergency Operations, as follows:

“Public safety wireless radio communications inside a building is essential to the safety of those occupying the structure as well as fire, law enforcement and emergency medical providers responding to a call for help. Buildings that are greater than 5,500 square feet, higher than 50 feet, and contain underground storage or parking and are constructed of materials that impede wireless radio signals may adversely affect the response of public safety providers. Please consider including wiring, electrical connections and other infrastructure that may be needed for an in-building 800MHz amplified. Emergency Operations will test coverage in your facility once construction is finished.”

Mr. Lapinsky presented comments based on that the Preliminary Plan Review by the Department of Public Works as follows:

A note is required to be added to the plan indicating the projected water usage and noting that there is currently no water service available. The calculations and wording for the note can be obtained from Mr. Rainey or Mr. Wallace.

A minimum of 3 Grid Tics, in multiples of 250', are required along the design.

Standard signature blocks for Owners and Approvals are required.

All existing and proposed water service, sewer service and utilities are to be indicated on the plan, including proposed connections for water and sewer. Again, Mr. Lapinsky recommended that the applicant contact Mr. Rainey

As noted, all existing and proposed sidewalks are to be indicated on the plans and labeled.

Mr. Lapinsky expressed concern about the proposal to close the Alley, noting that the turning radius would not be adequate for access for trash removal.

The engineer for the project needs to sign, seal and date the plans and include DLLR certification.

Standard notes are also required.

A right-of-way easement will be required for the proposed storm drains and should be shown on the plans, indicating where the storm drains will be private.

Dimensions of the existing paving and right-of-way for Plater Street, Law Street and Edmund Street should also be included on the plan. In addition, the proposed addresses should be identified.

The plan should also indicate that proposed storm drains have adequate outfall. Mr. Schwab noted that the storm drain discharges into the other side of Plater. The stormdrain system should be adequate. Mr. Lapinsky recommended further details and noted that an easement will be needed for any outfall into public systems.

Mr. Lapinsky recommended that the Planning Commission not approve the proposed plan until the various concerns have been addressed. He noted that approving the plan with final resolution would further delay approval.

Fr. Sam noted that Mr. Lapinsky had indicated at a previous meeting that it might be possible to have trash collection on the outside of the site, rather than along the Alley. Mr. Lapinsky noted that a final determination has not been made. Fr. Sam explained that the church uses a private trash hauler service that backs its trucks down the alley. Mr. Lapinsky reiterated that the radius should provide adequate access for emergency vehicles.

Chief Reith also noted concerns for the turning radius into the alley. He agreed that there were a number of issues to be resolved prior to approval.

Ms. Kosko asked whether, in considering the availability of parking, the Planning Commission should review the number of spaces being provided for the school alone, or for the school and church complex as a whole. Ms. Grover noted that when the proposed chapel is added, additional parking will need to be provided; there will be no addition to the main church at this time. Ms. Kosko asked how the parking requirements had been

calculated. Mr. Schwab noted that the parking shown on the plan had been calculated on the basis of the school and is intended to include sufficient space for students to be dropped off and picked up safely. Ms. Kosko noted that the parking spaces in drop off area are on the street and cannot be counted in the parking calculations. She noted that the requirement for the school, without considering the chapel, would be 80 spaces for the students, plus one per teacher, would be a total of 102 parking spaces. Mr. Tester noted that the calculation had been based on the number of teachers and employees, with an additional 15 spaces for visitors; he stated that 50 parking spaces would be adequate as the school is an elementary school and would not have any requirement for parking for student drivers. Ms. Grover explained that it would not be possible to determine the number of parking spaces as there is no striping on the pavement to indicate the location and number of spaces. Ms. Kosko stated that, once the pavement has been striped, and the number of spaces indicated on the plan, the parking in Lot B should also be included.

Mr. Hiob suggested that, once Poplar Alley has been redirected, the two sections of the roadway should be identified as 'North Poplar Alley' and 'South Poplar Alley' for safety. Chief Reith stated that this would not be necessary as there would be no specific addresses on either portion of the alley.

Mr. Hiob also expressed concern that the two existing hard surface play areas would be eliminated, noting the importance of outdoor play for elementary school students. Mr. Sam explained that there is no indoor physical education area at present, so that there is no opportunity for team sports; the school had looked into using other recreational facilities at other schools and had found that it would be prohibitively costly. He explained that the school would like to acquire additional property in the future.

In answer to a question from Mr. Swisher, Mr. Schwab confirmed that Parking Lot "A" shown on the plan would be installed when the gymnasium is constructed and will connect with the small existing paved area. Mr. Swisher asked whether Plater Street would be blocked off and Mr. Schwab stated that there will be a drop-off and pick-up area off the road.

Mr. Swisher stated that the Planning Commission would not vote to approve the plan until the issues noted had been resolved with the staff. Mr. Craig confirmed that he would approve the plan once the engineering issues have been resolved. Ms. Kosko concurred, noting that the parking issues have to be resolved prior to approval; Mr. Braerman and Mr. Tout concurred.

## PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN HOLIDAY INN EXPRESS

Mr. Kathuria, civil engineer for the project, introduced Mr. Hapsis, the contract owner and applicant; Mr. Oishi, the architect; and Mr. Dallas. He noted that a Master Plan had been presented to the Planning Commission at the previous meeting that included development of Mr. Hapsis' properties containing the Holiday Inn site and the other 3

restaurant properties. Because the Commission had asked for further details of the proposed parking for the Holiday Inn development, the plan being presented isolates the Holiday Inn property, which is a .79 acre site at the intersection of Route 22 and Beards Hill Road. The proposed development is a 78 room Holiday Inn Express hotel and will provide the required 80 parking spaces. The existing use is a gas station, with 2 entrances from Beards Hill Road. The plan differs from the previous presentation in that it eliminates one of the entrances to improve the traffic flow. Water and sewer services will be extended to the site and a stormwater quality management facility will be provided so that the site will be self sufficient to support the proposed development.

Chief Reith asked about the locations of the fire hydrant and proposed standpipe for the sprinkler connection. Mr. Kathuria indicated the proposed location of the fire hydrant and explained that details of the sprinkler connection have not been finalized; he confirmed that the Fire Department will be consulted about its location. Chief Reith also expressed concern that the turning radius at the northwest corner of the building might be insufficient and stated that one of the parking spaces may need to be eliminated to provide sufficient turning space. He also asked about the height of the covered entrance to the hotel, noting that it is required to provide 14' clearance. Mr. Kathuria stated that there will be the required clearance height.

Ms. Grover asked for confirmation of the tax map information and parcel number, which appeared to be inaccurate. She also noted that the Development Code requires two access points for hotels larger than 75 rooms. Mr. Oishi explained that the main access to the property will be from Beards Hill Road, with a drive through to the Holiday Inn property. Ms. Grover stated that cross-easements will be required to show access, even though Mr. Hapsis owns both properties; the cross easements should be noted on the plan.

In answer to a question from Ms. Grover regarding the location of the dumpster, Mr. Kathuria stated that the details had not been finalized. She stated that the dumpster needs to be screened from Route 22 and recommended that Mr. Oishi consult with the Planning Department staff. She noted that the building had been reconfigured, with the second story cantilevered over the parking in order to meet the parking requirement. Ms. Grover asked about pedestrian circulation within the site, noting that guests at the hotel will want to walk to the restaurants. Mr. Kathuria stated that a network of 4' wide sidewalks and designated crosswalks could be provided. Ms. Grover stated that a public sidewalk will be required along Beards Hill Road. She noted that comments have not been received from SHA and stated that Mr. Redmond of SHA had asked that approval should be deferred until SHA had had the opportunity to comment.

Mr. Lapinsky also noted that comments on the proposed plan had not been received from SHA. He stated that the plan will be required to include a minimum of 3 Grid Tic's for every 250' and to indicate all existing water and sewer connections, including water meters and cleanouts. In addition, the plan should show an extension of public water and sewer outside the lot areas to the existing manhole in the right-of-way. Ownership for the surrounding properties is to be provided on the plan, as well as the address for the project.

All monitoring wells are to be shown on the plan as well as notes regarding how and when the wells will be removed as part of the clean up of the existing gas station site. Mr. Lapinsky also noted that SHA approval will be required for connection to the existing stormdrain system. Existing services that are not going to be reused must be property abandoned. The plan should also identify the location of the existing sewer manhole adjacent to Kentucky Fried Chicken and the Property Owner Signature Block. Mr. Kapinsky recommended non-approval of the project until the various engineering issues have been resolved.

In answer to a question from Ms. Kosko regarding the number of underground fuel storage tanks, Mr. Kathuria stated that there are 2 or 3 tanks. He confirmed that all tanks will be removed in accordance with State requirements and that any soil contamination will be appropriately dealt with. The monitoring wells will remain in place until the DNR engineers approve their removal.

In answer to a question from Mr. Swisher regarding the size of the parking spaces, Ms. Grover confirmed that the parking spaces are required to be 9' x 18'. Mr. Swisher noted that the parking spaces are immediately adjacent to the building, with no sidewalk space between the building and the parking lot. He expressed concern that guests at the hotel will have to walk through the parking lot to get to their cars.

Mr. Swisher also noted that the Olive Tree restaurant has been very successful and has outgrown the parking available on the lot. The original agreement was that parking would be in the area now occupied by another building; when the second building had been approved there was to have been a break from the Olive Tree parking lot to the commercial area. That access has now been blocked off and Mr. Swisher asked whether the property owner had received permission from the city to eliminate the access to additional parking. Mr. Kathuria stated that he was unaware of whether approval had been granted to eliminate the access. Mr. Swisher stated that the property owner had proposed installing additional parking spaces adjacent to the Holiday Inn, in the area now being opened up for access to the proposed Holiday Inn Express. He noted that parking for the guests at the restaurant now appears to overflow onto the Kentucky Fried Chicken property. He stated that the parking for the various businesses needs to be resolved.

Mr. Kathuria noted that parking for the businesses is a problem and asked that the Planning Commission consider only the parking to be provided for the Holiday Inn Express project, noting that the required number of parking spaces for the hotel will be provided on the site. He asked the Commission to focus only on the project, while the parking for the larger area is being addressed. Mr. Swisher noted that there small lots with viable businesses; the lots could be sold and would not be able to support the parking for the quality of businesses. If the properties were consolidated and all lot lines eliminated, there would be sufficient space for the required parking. Mr. Swisher suggested that some of the parking for the Holiday Inn Express will be used for the Olive Tree restaurant. He stated that the parking at the Holiday Inn is not clearly designated.

Mr. Kathuria noted that there are ‘scores of parking spaces’ at the Holiday Inn that are not in use. He stated that, overall, the development has sufficient parking, even though there may be a deficiency of parking on the individual properties. Mr. Swisher noted that there is a lot of parking on the entire site, but not sufficient parking on the restaurant site. If one of the parcels were sold, there would not be sufficient parking on the individual site.

Ms. Grover concurred with Mr. Swisher that the parking for Olive Tree Plaza II, the Holiday Inn Banquet and the Holiday Inn Express needs to be resolved. Mr. Swisher noted that, once parking has been approved, it cannot be changed arbitrarily. Ms. Grover stated that a plan had been provided to the Planning Department indicating striping for parking spaces; however, staff had been unable to determine if there was an adequate number of parking spaces, due to the condition of the parking lots, which had not been resurfaced. Mr. Kathuria stated that the owner would abandon plans for the hotel if the Planning Commission could not approve the plans. He reiterated the request to consider the parking for only the specific site for the Holiday Inn Express.

Ms. Grover noted that the Planning Department is holding up the issuance of Use and Occupancy permits for the leases in Olive Tree Plaza II until the parking issue is resolved. Mr. Swisher noted that there are a number of engineering issues to be resolved, as well as approval from SHA for the proposed entrances to the site. In addition, parking for the Olive Tree restaurant and the businesses on the adjoining properties needs to be resolved prior to approval. Ms. Kosko expressed concern for the lack of sidewalk along the back of the building; guests would be required to walk through to parking area to get to their cars, which would be parked immediately adjacent to the building. She stated that, without a sidewalk, the parking area would be both inconvenient and unsafe.

Ms. Kosko moved, and Mr. Braerman seconded the motion, to table consideration of the Holiday Inn Express until the next meeting of the Planning Commission. The motion carried unanimously.

#### PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN

#### WINDY HILL BUSINESS PARK – Medical Clinic and Bank

Mr. Michael Ortell confirmed that he is an engineer with MJ Consulting and a member of Beards Hill/Route 22 LLC, developer of the site. He presented the previous plan that had been submitted in April 2005, showing 3 buildings on the site with a center road connecting Hospitality Way to Beards Hill Road at the entrance to the Klein’s shopping center. Subsequently, in May 2007, KCE had presented another plan showing a reconfiguration of the center road. After approval of that plan, a building permit was approved for Walgreen’s, currently under construction. Mr. Ortell presented a plan showing the Walgreen’s, as approved, with the access road and an additional pad site on Hospitality Way for a medical clinic. Patient First has signed a lease with the LLC and would like to obtain a building permit and site development plan approval. There is a long, narrow, L-shaped stormwater management pond on the site, which will need to be

reshaped and reconfigured to accommodate the proposed pad site development. The outfall would not change, although the shape of the pond would change. Volume and design calculations would be provided and all features would be provided to comply with MD 2000 stormwater management regulations. Mr. Ortell noted that there is sufficient space to reconfigure and reshape the pond as proposed.

He stated that a third pad site will be developed on the property to the north of Walgreen's. This is intended to be a bank, although there is no committed lease to date. The building will be 3,700 sf. Mr. Ortell noted that a 4,000 sf building could be installed, bringing the total developed area of the three buildings to 25,700 sf; he confirmed that the total area originally approved was to have been 27,350 sf.

He stated that the footprints of the buildings have not increased, not has the stormwater management pond, which is proposed to be reconfigured.

Chief Reith expressed concern that the access road behind Walgreen's does not appear to align with the access point on Hospitality Way. Mr. Ortell explained that DPW staff had advised the developer that there might be existing utility structures and had recommended maintaining the access road. He stated that it could be reconfigured, noting that "we've just done what we've been told." Chief Reith noted that Hospitality Way is narrow and expressed concern for the turning radius into the Walgreen's lot, given the location and configuration of the island. Mr. Ortell noted that the island has not been constructed and confirmed that it can be reconfigured if necessary. He agreed to work with the Fire Department and DPW.

Chief Reith also asked if there are fire hydrants on the property and Mr. Ortell confirmed that the single fire hydrant on the site should be adequate to provide sprinkler connection for the Patient First building. He noted that are other hydrants at the intersection of Hospitality Way and Beards Hill as well as at the north end of the property. Additional hydrants within the site are not proposed as the three hydrants should provide adequate coverage.

In answer to a question from Mr. Swisher, Chief Reith confirmed his concern for the turning radius for emergency vehicles. He stated that the actual width of the roadway should be shown on the plan. Mr. Ortell stated that the width is 35', with 20-25' turning radii. He reiterated that the alignment of the roadway or the island could be reconfigured.

Ms. Grover concurred with Chief Reith and recommended widening the access from Hospitality Way. In addition, the plan should indicate a drive aisle width of 25'. Ms. Grover suggested that patients from Patient First may want to walk to Walgreen's; she recommended including on the plan some defined pedestrian circulation within the site, with sidewalks, cross-walks, etc. Mr. Ortell stated that the crosswalks will be painted on the pavement and will be included on the site plan.

Ms. Grover also noted that the parking requirement calculations for the originally approved plan of 27,350sf would result in 193 parking spaces; the revised reduced plan,

at 25,000, indicates a reduction in parking spaces to 135. She stated that the notes on the plan should indicate additional parking spaces for use of the bank ATM and drive-thru; there should be 4 parking spaces for stacking for each drive-thru and for the ATM.

Ms. Grover also stated that a note should be included on the plan to confirm that the minimum landscaping requirement of 5% of the parking area will be provided. She noted that a landscaping plan will be required to be submitted with the final construction drawings. She noted that comments had been submitted from the Division of Emergency Operations and agreed to provide them for the applicant. She also stated that the proposed medical clinic should have the address of 995 Hospitality Way and that the proposed bank should have the address of 940 Beards Hill Road.

Mr. Lapinsky noted that the Public Works Department would require a change of the project name on the plan from Windy Hill Business Park to Windy Hill Business Park Medical Building and Bank. He noted that the plan should also include the following:

- ~ a minimum of 3 Grid Tic's per 250' multiples
- ~ proposed water and sewer connections (including water meters and cleanouts at the right-of-way or easement)

Mr. Ortell stated that the City had indicated a preference for a single meter; the LLC had asked for separate meters and Mr. Lapinsky stated that this could be provided by the replacement of the existing 6" water main and elimination of the 2" main shown on the plan, with connections to be shown on the plan. Mr. Ortell noted that Patient First has indicated a preference for installing a sprinkler system in the building. He noted that the bank would be served by the existing meter. Mr. Lapinsky stated that the calculations should be provided.

Mr. Lapinsky also noted that the following should be included on the plan:

- ~ ownership of surrounding properties
- ~ addresses for the two buildings, as noted by Ms. Grover
- ~ Property Owner Signature block
- ~ Standard water note regarding water availability
- ~ computations in accordance with current MDE 2000 and COA Guidelines (to complete Note 16)
- ~ MDE tracking number (to complete Note 14)
- ~ Existing/proposed right-of-way as well as existing/proposed paving along Beards Hill Road and Hospitality Way
- ~ Location of existing 6" water main and gas main along Hospitality Way
- ~ Property metes and bounds.

He noted that the 60" storm line appears to be too close to the proposed building and stated that it should be relocated. Any modification of the existing storm water management facility will need to comply with current MDE and City regulations. Mr. Lapinsky also noted that the storm water management easement access needs to be extended to a public road. He noted that the internal road is not considered a public road; if the roadway is to be deeded to the City of Aberdeen it would have to comply with the

Code. Mr. Ortell stated that the road had been constructed to comply with the Regulations. However, it is not the intention to turn the internal access road over to the City.

Mr. Lapinsky recommended postponing approval of the project until the engineering issues had been resolved.

Chief Reith stated that there appears to be adequate space on the site to designate an ambulance/EMS parking space near the handicap parking area at the rear entrance to the Patient First building.

Mr. Craig noted that he concurred with Mr. Lapinsky's recommendation. Ms. Kosko noted that the word "site" was missing from the plan. Mr. Braerman and Mr. Tout stated that they had no further comments.

Mr. Hiob noted that concerns have been expressed for traffic movements at the intersection of the private road with the exit road from the Klein's shopping center; it has been suggested that a traffic circle should be installed at that intersection. He asked Mr. Lapinsky whether there would be sufficient space to install a roundabout. Mr. Lapinsky stated that a traffic engineer should be consulted. Mr. Ortell noted that Ken Schmeed, of Traffic Concepts, had recommended consideration of a 4-way stop sign to improve the intersection. Ms. Grover recommended updating the traffic study submitted with the original plan, in 2005, to take into consideration the change in square footage of the development and the proposed medical clinic and bank uses. She noted that the City's traffic consultants were reviewing the plans and would welcome the additional data.

Mr. Swisher noted that Patient First would be a welcome use. He asked about the capacity of the storm water management facility. Mr. Ortell explained that 2 sites further along Hospitality Way to the I-95 ramp, as well as the majority of the McDonald's site and the medical office building site are all drained into the pond. He noted that the calculations indicate that the pond can accommodate the drainage from all those areas to provide both water quantity and quality treatment.

Mr. Swisher asked for confirmation that the site will not be subdivided. Mr. Ortell noted that the LLC leases the property from Windy Hill and sub-lets the pad sites to the tenants. Lease lines are provided for the users but it is not intended to subdivide the property. Mr. Swisher suggested installing benches or a picnic area to improve the area in front of the stormwater pond. Mr. Ortell noted that the pond may need to be further reconfigured. Once the third user is identified, additional landscaping or furniture can be installed.

Mr. Swisher recommended approval of the proposed Patient First and bank developments, conditions on resolution of the comments from the Department of Public Works and Fire Department. Ms. Kosko moved to approve the preliminary site plan, conditioned on compliance with the comments from the Department of Public Works and Fire Department and provision of an update of the traffic impact analysis. Mr. Braerman seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

## PETITION FOR ANNEXATION – Glengarry

Following a brief break, Ms. Jackie Seneschal, KCI Technologies, explained that the developer had held a public information meeting the previous week. She explained that the property is zoned mostly for agricultural and low density residential use. The Harford County Master Plan designates the property as agricultural while the City of Aberdeen Master Plan identifies it as appropriate for annexation for low density residential use. She noted that there are currently three design concepts under review, all of which have been evaluated for LEED rating. She reviewed the number of units (single family detached, townhouse units and condominium/apartment units) that would be provided in each option, as well as the school and public facilities impacts and the anticipated tax revenues.

Mr. Robert Price, 615 Gilbert Road, stated that the signatures on the petition provided by the developer had been collected in 2006, when Mr. Simmons had been mayor of the City. He recommended that a later petition should be circulated.

Ms. Sherry Miller, 2410 Oldrobinhood Road stated that the developer had indicated that the project would be developed as low density residential housing. She also noted that Ms. Seneschal had stated that the project would begin in 5 years and asked how long it would take to complete. Ms. Seneschal stated that it would take 5 years to begin the project because the County's Master Plan identifies the property as agricultural and would require that the City maintain that designation for at least 5 years after annexation. Depending on the market for homes in the project, which would depend on which of the 3 options is selected for the development, it could take another 5 to 10 years to complete. She stated that a builder has not yet been selected.

Ms. Karen Heves, 634 West Bel Air Avenue, asked whether the options had been presented in their order of preference. Ms. Seneschal stated that the owner/developer has not indicated a preference; the options were being presented to the Planning Commission for their consideration. She explained that the minimum score for a project to be LEED Certified is 40; at present only one of the concepts meets that minimum level, although the scores would likely be higher as the project development proceeds. Ms. Heves expressed concern about the density of the proposed projects, noting that having single acre lots might be preferable as this would be more consistent with the size of nearby developments. Ms. Seneschal noted that the State standards for SMART Growth indicate a density of 35 units per acre. She suggested that having 1600 new units grouped on 500 acres would have less impact than 1600 units on 1600 acres. Ms. Heves noted that planners and developers often have a different perspective than the people who live near a development of this type.

Ms. Debra Ellers, 616 Locksley Manor, also expressed concern that the plan does not take into consideration the wetlands on the property. She also noted that the properties within Locksley Manor are subject to deed restrictions that prohibit their subdivision. She stated that the same R-1 minimum lot size should be retained for the proposed development to be consistent with those in Locksley Manor. She also expressed concern

that a more detailed fiscal report should be provided to assure that the taxpayers of Aberdeen would not have to incur additional costs for improvements, such as an additional elementary school, fire station, etc., to accommodate what would be a 30% increase in population for the City.

Chief Reith noted that three large annexations are currently being proposed and expressed concern for continuity of the road system to provide integrated and effective emergency response. He expressed concern for water pressure for the proposed development, noting that the City of Aberdeen requires sprinkler systems for residential units. Ms. Seneschal noted that a storage tank will be installed on the northern portion of the site. She stated that the project will also identify the location for community uses, such as a library branch of a fire station. She confirmed that consideration will also be given to improving the road network, depending on requirements from the City. Ms. Grover concurred with Chief Reith, noting that there are major transportation issues to be resolved. The City's transportation consultants are reviewing plans for all three proposed annexations and will report to the Planning Commission in June. She noted that annexing the project before annexation of the proposed Paradise Meadows project would create enclave issues. Other concerns were noted for the zoning designation of the property to be annexed. Mr. Grover recommended that the calculations identifying the priority funding areas should be provided by the next Planning Commission meeting. Ms. Seneschal noted that it would be premature to make those calculations until it had been determined which plan would be developed. Ms. Grover stated that the plan needs to include provision for access for police and emergency service.

She also asked whether the Board of Education had been consulted regarding a possible school site. Ms. Seneschal stated that the site would probably not meet the state guidelines for location of a school.

Ms. Grover also stated that the metes and bounds description would need to be corrected. She noted that the 10' 'spite strip' between the subject project and the Noblock property should be eliminated from the site plan; Ms. Seneschal agreed to have the applicant's surveyor review the property boundaries.

Mr. Braerman noted that both Gilbert Road and Maxley Road would need to be widened. He expressed concern for adding 3,000 cars to a road system that needs improvements.

Mr. Hiob also noted the enclave issues referred to by Ms. Grover and Chief Reith. He suggested that these could be resolved if the proposed Paradise Meadows property were to be annexed at the same time as the Glengarry site. He noted that stream crossing permits to create a roadway across Swan Creek could be obtained from MDE. Mr. Hiob also noted that the concerns for adequate water could be addressed by on-site wells or by the Big Inch. He noted that the additional property taxes and water connection fees would be of benefit to the City and suggested that R-1 zoning designation does not necessarily restrict development to single acre lots.

Mr. Craig concurred with Mr. Braerman's concerns regarding retention of the R-1 zoning.

Mr. Swisher stated that the City would want to provide a wide spectrum of housing opportunities for new residents. At present, Aberdeen provides low-end and medium housing; in addition, it would be desirable to attract some of the senior managers from the Proving Ground to live in the City. He stated his personal preference for the golf course option, noting that 3 or 4 golf courses in other areas of the County are closing. However, Mr. Swisher noted the concern for the water supply as well as the roadway issues. He suggested that a group comprised of representative of the various interests, including owners of the other proposed annexation properties, should get together to propose solutions.

The meeting adjourned at 10 PM.