

**WASHINGTON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION  
WORKSHOP MEETING – January 18, 2006**

The Washington County Planning Commission and Planning Staff held a workshop meeting on Wednesday, January 18, 2006 at 1:00 p.m. in the Washington County Administrative Annex, Conference Room #1, 80 West Baltimore Street, Hagerstown, Maryland.

Planning Commission members present were: Chairman, Don Arding; George Anikis; Bernard Moser; Terry Reiber; and Ex-Officio, James F. Kercheval. Staff members present were: Planning Director Michael C. Thompson, Chief Planners Stephen T. Goodrich and Timothy A. Lung, and Administrative Assistant Debra S. Eckard. Commissioner Dori Nipps was also present.

**CALL TO ORDER**

Chairman Don Arding called the meeting to order at 1:05 p.m.

**DISCUSSION**

**Planned Unit Development**

Mr. Thompson distributed copies of guidelines established by various counties throughout Maryland regarding PUD's. Developers usually submit a "phasing schedule" to determine the proposed infrastructure that would be installed by the developer to provide for the development's needs and the impact on other infrastructure in the area. The "phasing schedule" could also include proposed amenities and roads.

There was a discussion regarding the appropriate timeline for the installation of necessary infrastructure and the construction of amenities. Long range planning for the Urban Growth Area could be beneficial in planning for school sites, road improvements, and water and sewer infrastructure needs in various areas throughout the County. Guidelines should be established for developers to use for large subdivisions as well as PUD's. Mr. Thompson recommended that phasing schedules should be based on the number of lots recorded and not the number of permits issued. If the developer does not comply with the phasing schedule, the Commission could withhold the approval of additional phases of the development until all phasing issues have been resolved.

There was a brief discussion regarding the open space/forest conservation area. Open space is required to be no less than 25% of the gross area with a minimum 15% of the total 25% open space being forest cover as required by the Forest Conservation Ordinance. Mr. Kercheval recommended separating the open space and forest mitigation areas by unit instead of percentage.

There was a brief discussion regarding the need for affordable workforce housing in Washington County. Commissioner Nipps expressed her concern that developers want to place affordable workforce housing off-site rather than within their developments and could create a potential for low-income housing. Mr. Goodrich stated that workforce housing would need to be monitored closely under specific Federal guidelines.

Mr. Thompson suggested an architectural review process for PUD's. Mr. Kercheval expressed his opinion that PUD's should follow a uniform design throughout the development.

The Commission recommended preparing a chart using the information available from other jurisdictions to determine more definitive requirements needed for large subdivisions, PUD's, or both. The chart should include the following information: school sites, density, EMS and fire response times, the impact on area law enforcement, public use sites (libraries, firehouses, etc.), amenities, open space/recreation (by percent or per unit) (county owned or HOA owned), forest conservation requirements, housing types and how they are blended together, commercial area to serve the PUD, employment areas, street lighting, architectural control and propane systems. Mr. Thompson is hoping to have the chart in approximately 60 days. The Commission would review the chart and continue its discussion at a future workshop.

No action required.

(Mr. Reiber left the meeting at 3:00 p.m.)

**Consideration of input from parties of interest and notification of adjacent property owners**

Mr. Thompson began a brief discussion regarding concerns from various sources regarding notification of proposed development around the County. The Citizens for the Protection of Washington County have met with Mr. Thompson and have requested notification of Preliminary Consultations. He explained that the Preliminary Consultations are for developers and agencies to work together to address potential problems that would affect infrastructure, roads, schools, and the surrounding area in general. Mr. Thompson stated that amendments would need to be made prior to beginning any type of notification process.

Mr. Anikis expressed his opinion that adjacent property owners should be notified regarding proposed development plans that could have an impact on their property. He believes that the adjacent property

owners have a right to know what is being proposed and should have a limited opportunity to express their views and concerns. Mr. Moser concurred with Mr. Anikis.

Mr. Kercheval expressed his opinion that if a developer or landowner is adhering to all laws, ordinances, etc., then he has the right to develop his property and the adjacent property owners do not have the right to dictate how the property is developed.

Mr. Reiber concurred with Mr. Kercheval. He suggested posting the subject property with a sign or notice indicating a phone number to call to address questions or concerns.

Commissioner Nipps suggested posting a notice on the property indicating the date when the Preliminary Consultation would be presented to the Planning Commission. Mr. Anikis recommended a ten day comment period for the public to provide written comments following the presentation to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Ardinger expressed his opinion that posting the property could add a potential burden on the staff to post the signs, respond to phone calls and/or correspondence, or personally meeting with the public to discuss proposed developments. He believes that by posting the property, the public would expect time during Planning Commission meetings to speak. Mr. Kercheval concurred.

Mr. Ardinger recommended addressing this issue during a future workshop meeting with all Commission members present to vote on the course of action to be taken.

No action required.

### **Requirement for two entrances**

Mr. Thompson began a brief discussion regarding the requirements for two entrances, if possible, for all subdivisions. He explained there are benefits for having two entrances such as disbursement of traffic entering the roadways and safety issues for emergency services. Staff encourages multiple entrances and connectivity to adjoining properties.

Mr. Ardinger expressed his concern that there are no guidelines or standards to follow to provide continuity when requiring two entrances.

There was a brief discussion regarding the requirement for two entrances if a development exceeds a certain number of lots or lot size. Currently there are no regulations requiring the number of entrances for developments. Mr. Thompson will discuss this issue with Mr. McGee, Engineering Department, to review that department's standards for the requirement of two entrances. The Commission may consider adopting a policy to be used as a guideline for developers.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

Mr. Ardinger adjourned the meeting at 3:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Don P. Ardinger, Chairman