

**WASHINGTON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING – February 5, 2007**

The Washington County Planning Commission held its regular meeting on Monday, February 5, 2007 in the Washington County Administrative Annex, 80 West Baltimore Street, Hagerstown.

Members present were: Chairman George Anikis, Linda Parrish, Bernard Moser, Sam Ecker, Terry Reiber, Clint Wiley and Ex-Officio James F. Kercheval. Staff members present were: Planning Director Michael C. Thompson, Chief Planners Timothy A. Lung and Stephen T. Goodrich, Senior Planners Lisa Kelly Pietro and Jill Baker, Associate Planner Sara Henke, and Administrative Assistant Debra Eckard.

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman George Anikis called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

MINUTES

Mr. Moser made a motion to approve the minutes of the regular Planning Commission meeting of January 8, 2007 as presented. Seconded by Mr. Reiber. Unanimously approved.

OLD BUSINESS

- Antietam Industrial Park, Lot 8 (SP-06-062)

Mr. Anikis noted that Ms. Baker included a memo regarding the historic structure referenced in the Staff Report presented for this site during the January 8, 2007 meeting. According to the memo, the historic site referenced as I-377 is erroneously attached to this parcel in the Permit/Subdivision Tracking Database used by the County. There are no historic sites located on this property.

- Williamsview (PC-06-009)

Mr. Lung presented for review and approval the revised cluster concept plan for Williamsview. A preliminary consultation was held in October 2006 for the 211 lot residential subdivision known as Williamsview, located on the Ebersole tract west of I-81. The developer is proposing to use the "cluster provisions" as allowed in the Zoning Ordinance that allows a reduction in lot areas without increasing density. The intent of the clustering concept requires that the area not used in lot areas be designated as open space. The revised concept addresses several issues of concern noted during the December 4, 2006 Planning Commission meeting as follows: the number of proposed cul-de-sacs, the arrangement of open space areas, buffering of the adjoining properties with historic structures listed on the Historic Sites Survey, more retention of existing forest, and providing a right-of-way for the possible future connection to vacant property east of the site. [Planning Commission members also requested the concept plan for the Britner property for review simultaneously with this concept plan. A concept plan for 294 residential lots was submitted for the Britner property; however, the developer has requested that plan be withdrawn as a new plan using the clustering concept is being developed for review.] The revised concept plan for Williamsview shows a reduction in the number of cul-de-sacs from 8 to 4 and including the two cul-de-sacs at the end of the road abutting the Britner property; open space areas have been consolidated into larger areas; and 11.5 acres of the total 28 acres of existing forest is proposed for retention with the additional 28.6 acres of forest to be planted on site along the western boundary of the parcel and on some of the lots and will provide the additional buffering requested by the Historic District Commission. The Engineering Department has reviewed the revised plan for the number of cul-de-sacs and street layout and they are satisfied with the plan from a conceptual standpoint. The Planning staff expressed their concern that some of the open space areas are surrounded by lots and inaccessible from the road. The Planning Staff recommends closed section streets with sidewalks and pathway connections be provided to the open space areas. If sidewalks are not being used, an interior pedestrian system should be developed to allow a way to get from one side of the development to the other side of the development and connect the open space areas and ultimately connect with the Britner property, when developed.

Discussion: There was a brief discussion regarding connections to adjoining properties and what becomes of the cul-de-sacs when a connection is made to the adjoining properties. Mr. Lung stated that the property within the cul-de-sacs would revert back to the owners of the lots located within the cul-de-sac area.

Mr. Moser expressed his opinion that the streets in a development with this density should be closed section with sidewalks. Mr. Moser made an inquiry regarding access to the open space areas. Mr. Rutter, the developer's representative, stated that most people do not want access provided to those areas due to privacy and safety issues.

Mr. Kercheval made an inquiry regarding the two storm water management ponds. The developer stated that two ponds are necessary due to the topography of the area.

Mr. Anikis expressed his concern regarding the traffic issues on Bower Avenue and believes that traffic studies should be based on the interconnectivity of the two proposed developments. Mr. Moser concurred with Mr. Anikis's comment. Mr. Anikis also inquired if there would be a Homeowner's Association to maintain the open space areas and if there would be signs to designate the Forest Conservation Areas. Mr. Rutter stated that the Homeowner's Association would maintain these areas through a fee simple strip of land used for access.

Mr. Rutter requested comments from the members regarding walking paths and access to the open space areas. Ms. Parrish stated her opinion that designated pathways should be created from the sidewalks to the open space areas. She also noted there are no tot lots or recreation areas proposed for the community.

Mr. Moser made a motion to approve the use of the clustering provisions. Seconded by Mr. Ecker. Unanimously approved.

NEW BUSINESS

- Variances

Earl W. (Jr.) and Maria Brown (SV-07-001)

Ms. Henke provided for review and approval a variance from Section 405.11.B of the Subdivision Ordinance that does not allow lots without public road frontage. The property is located along a right-of-way easement onto Weller Road and is zoned EC – Environmental Conservation. The applicant is proposing to create four (4) lots without public road frontage. The proposed lots would access a private lane right-of-way to Dyer Road via other lands in Pennsylvania owned by the applicant. Thompson Township in Fulton County, Pennsylvania would agree to a right-of-way across Dyer Road. Hancock Fire Department provides fire service in this area. The Washington County Board of Education has stated that currently there are children picked up on Dyer Road that attend the Hancock schools district. They have also stated that children will attend school in the state where their parents pay taxes.

Discussion: Ms. Henke stated that Thompson Township could not make the private lane in Pennsylvania a public road and put in a cul-de-sac due to the amount of money involved in this process. The property owners of the four proposed lots would be responsible for maintenance of the private lane. Mr. Moser asked if the Hancock Fire Department has given any comments regarding this subdivision. Ms. Henke stated that she has not received any information or comments from them. Mr. Moser expressed his concern regarding the street addresses for these lots and believes this could cause safety issues for residents with regard to fire and emergency services.

Mr. Anikis made an inquiry regarding the school bus service for these lots. Mr. Brown stated that the bus currently enters Pennsylvania for a short distance and turns around on Dyer Road. These lots would require the bus to go a little farther on Dyer Road.

Mr. Wiley asked the applicants to explain their hardship in making this variance request. The Browns stated that the property is landlocked. Mr. Wiley expressed his concern regarding the shared right-of-way and future maintenance issues. Mr. Moser expressed his concern that utility companies do not have the right to utilize the right-of-ways to access the property. The Browns stated that they would assure utility companies, etc. the right to utilize the right-of-way to access the properties.

Mr. Reiber expressed his concern regarding future maintenance of the shared right-of-way and access for fire and emergency vehicles.

Mr. Kercheval expressed his support of the request contingent upon a maintenance agreement between the lot owners for the private lane and the right-of-ways deeded for the utility companies.

Mr. Reiber expressed his opinion that more information is needed from Fulton County with regard to access issues.

There was a brief discussion regarding Pennsylvania constructing a public road with a cul-de-sac for these four lots. Mr. Brown stated that in prior discussions with Thompson Township in Pennsylvania, they would not accept or maintain the road because there was no tax base housing on that road.

Mr. Moser made a motion to deny the variance request. Seconded by Mr. Wiley. The motion failed with Mr. Moser and Mr. Wiley voting "Aye" and Mr. Kercheval, Ms. Parrish, Mr. Ecker, and Reiber voting "Nay".

Comments following the vote: Mr. Ecker stated that he would like more information regarding the access to the lots. Mr. Reiber wants clarification, if possible, from Pennsylvania on their position regarding the road issues. Mr. Anikis stated that the Commission members would like a clarification of the subdivision layout showing where the lanes would be, identifying the roads and more information from Pennsylvania regarding what they will or will not accept. Mr. Moser would like written comments from the Hancock Fire Department. Mr. Kercheval stated he would like to see maintenance agreements for the property owners and rights-of-way for the utility companies and fire and rescue services. The lane should be designed to be acceptable for emergency services.

By consensus, the Planning Commission tabled this issue until further documentation and information is received.

- Preliminary Consultations

Hoffman Farm (PC-06-011)

Ms. Baker presented, on behalf of Ms. Wagner-Grillo, the preliminary consultation for Hoffman Farm. The property is located along the north side of Cearfoss Pike within the Urban Growth Area and is zoned A – Agriculture. The developer is proposing to develop 47 residential building lots on 50.84 acres. Ms. Baker stated that the Engineering Department recommends redundant access for subdivisions with 25 lots or greater. The proposed subdivision has been designed with only one access and at this time, the

developer has not found a solution for a redundant access to the property. A recommendation would be needed from the Planning Commission regarding this issue.

Discussion: Mr. Anikis made an inquiry regarding the options the developer has explored to address the redundant access issue. Mr. Greg Barnes of Fox & Associates, Inc., consultant for the developer, stated that the parcel is landlocked by an existing development and floodplains. They have revised the concept plan to eliminate one lot and create a spur to the Albin property in anticipation of future development that could create the second access. Access through property owned by the Hagerstown Soccer Club is not possible because there is a stream located close to the property line. Mr. Jason Divelbiss, attorney for the developer, stated that the existing subdivisions are built out and, therefore, this developer does not have the ability to purchase one of the lots to construct an access. He also explained that the Engineering Department's objective for the redundant access requirement is to alleviate congestion problems and to provide an alternative access if one access point would be closed due to an accident or other emergency situation. Mr. Divelbiss believes that congestion problems would not be an issue since the proposed subdivision has only 47 lots and he believes that having only one access would be an inconvenience rather than a safety issue if one access is blocked. Mr. Divelbiss also stated that re-mapping and actual field studies of the floodplain area would be completed. It is anticipated that some lots may be lost once the floodplain has been delineated. Mr. Anikis suggested two alternatives that would alleviate the redundant access requirement. The first would be to develop the parcel with one-acre lots rather than the proposed ½-acre lots. He also suggested developing only the first 25 lots and develop the remaining lots when the adjoining properties are developed and could provide a second access.

There was a brief discussion regarding water and sewer connections through the City and County. These issues were addressed during the Preliminary Consultation and are part of the consultation summary.

Mr. Moser made an inquiry regarding streets and sidewalks. He stated his opinion that any development within the Urban Growth area should provide closed section streets and sidewalks.

Mr. Anikis recommended revising the proposed concept plan to show access to a property that has potential for development. By consensus, the Planning Commission members requested a revised concept plan to be presented at a future meeting.

Hopewell Manor Apartments Expansion (PC-06-010)

Ms. Pietro presented for review and comment the Preliminary Consultation for Hopewell Manor Apartments Expansion located along the west side of Hopewell Road south of I-70 and is zoned HI-2 – Highway Interchange 2. The developer is proposing to expand their existing 8 residential building complex to have a total of 16 residential buildings on 21 acres. Seven of the proposed buildings will have 16-units and the 8th new building will have 8 units. The developer is also proposing a new community building with a swimming pool. Ms. Pietro stated that the Engineering Department provided the following comments: a traffic impact study would be required; a detailed downstream drainage analysis would be required for the proposed storm water management structures and before any access onto Old Hopewell Road would be allowed, the developer will be required to approach the County Commissioners for abandonment of the existing right-of-way. The City of Hagerstown stated that an annexation review would be required for water service to the property and water mains would need to be extended. The Department of Water Quality stated that there is currently allocation available at the treatment facility and extension of the lines would be required. The Williamsport Volunteer Fire Company would provide emergency services to the proposed development; however, the plat was inadvertently sent to the Halfway Volunteer Fire Company. Mr. DeHaven from the Halfway Volunteer Fire Department reviewed the plat and stated that the proposed layout provides very poor access for emergency services and does not appear to meet the requirements of the Fire Prevention Code. Forest Conservation Ordinance requirements must be addressed. Since the property is located in an HI-2 zoning district, the Planning Commission will review the site plan for visual appearance and will consider design and arrangement of buildings, signs, landscaping and lighting. If any adjacent properties contain buildings, there should be a 25-foot buffer yard between the buildings and lot lines. The buffer must be adequate evergreen plantings or fencing. Ms. Pietro stated that the developer did not have an engineer present at the consultation.

Comments: Planning Commission members expressed their dissatisfaction with the design of the concept plan. They noted that tot lots were not shown, the number of storm water management ponds was excessive, and the design layout is not conducive for emergency vehicles access especially fire trucks. Mr. Anikis expressed his concern that there is only one access for approximately 150 apartments. Mr. Reiber expressed his concern that the apartments are in close proximity to the railroad.

- Site Plans

Western Maryland Parkway Office Complex (SP-06-030)

Ms. Pietro presented for review and approval the site plan for the Western Maryland Parkway Office Complex located along the east side of Western Maryland Parkway. Access to the property will be off of Enterprise Lane. The property is zoned HI-1 – Highway Interchange 1. The developer is proposing to construct a 9,600 square foot office building on a 3.2-acre parcel with no remaining lands. Public water and sewer will serve the site. Lighting will be building mounted. Parking spaces required are 32 spaces and 49 spaces are provided. An office building is proposed; however, the specific use has not been determined. Projected hours of operation are 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. These hours could change depending upon the type of office that would be located in the building. No business signs are proposed at this time; however, future signage would be required to meet the specifications of the Zoning Ordinance. An enclosed dumpster will be provided for solid waste disposal. Landscaping is proposed around the building, throughout the parking islands, and around the perimeter of the site and includes red maple, ornamental pear, spirea, holly, daylilies and ornamental grasses. Forest Conservation Ordinance

requirements were addressed through the subdivision approved in 2002 and were re-approved in 2006. Sidewalks and parking areas are available on all sides of the building. The Department of Water Quality and Health Department approvals are pending. All other agency approvals have been received.

Comment: Mr. Bill Pompeii of Associated Engineering Sciences, consultant, stated that the Department of Water Quality must provide all information necessary for the water adequacy application required by the Health Department. Once this process has been completed, both agencies will be able to give their approvals.

Mr. Ecker made a motion to approve the site plan contingent upon all agency approvals. Seconded by Mr. Moser. Mr. Reiber abstained. Unanimously approved.

Clarification: Mr. Thompson noted that the Health Department has a new policy that became effective January 1, 2007. There is a form that must be completed, prior to Health Department approval, by the agencies that will be providing public water and sewer service to verify the requested usage, capacity of the system that will be used, and remaining capacity at the facility.

Black Rock PUD Recreation Park (SP-06-028)

Mr. Lung presented for review and approval a site plan for the Black Rock Recreation Center associated with the Black Rock PUD located along the north side of Mt. Aetna Road. The Final Development Plan for the 595-planned unit development was approved in 2005. A condition of the approval from the Planning Commission was that the amenities for the development should be completed prior to the completion of the Phase I residential section. The Planning Department has received the preliminary plat for Phase I consisting of 167-lots. The recreation center will be located along the east side of Sasha Boulevard. The recreation center will include a 12,285-square foot community building, a swimming pool and deck, 4 hard-surfaced tennis courts, 1 grass tennis court, basketball courts, a tot lot and a picnic pavilion. There will also be a path system that will connect with the approved overall pedestrian plan. Parking spaces required are 53 spaces and 155 parking spaces will be provided. The plan currently shows one access off of Sasha Boulevard; however, a second access will be constructed when Sasha Boulevard is extended to a proposed roundabout. The outdoor facilities and parking lot will be lit for nighttime use. A photometric plan has been submitted showing zero foot-candle light trespass onto adjoining properties. Mr. Lung has requested that the specific light fixtures should be identified on the plan. The Forest Conservation Plan has not been formally submitted; however, the developer is proposing to meet the Forest Conservation requirements by providing 1.62-acres of forest conservation planting areas along the west and south sides of the site. A screened planting area will also be provided using evergreens planted double-spaced on the center with staggered rows around the tennis courts. Storm water management will be provided by a regional facility. Public water and sewer will be provided by the City of Hagerstown pending approval based on final determination of water and sewer allocation of 3,600 gallons per day. Health Department approval is pending the City of Hagerstown Water and Sewer Department's approval. All other agency approvals have been received.

Discussion: There was a brief discussion regarding the elevation of the parking lot in relationship to the existing homes. There was concern that there would be glare from car lights into the houses; however, the elevation of the parking lot is lower than the houses so glare should not be a concern.

Mr. Lung stated that the recreation park would be privately owned for the use of the residents of the development; however, there will also be outside memberships available. It is not intended to be turned over to the Homeowner's Association. Mr. Kercheval expressed his concern that the amenities are not being open to the residents when amenities are part of a PUD requirement. Mr. Lung stated that other PUD's have provided amenities above the standard tot lots; however, he believes that fees for these amenities (such as swimming pools) are charged through the Homeowner's Association. Mr. Shaool, developer, stated that the residents of the development would pay a reduced rate membership fee for use of the swimming pool and identification would be required to enter the pool area. The recreation area will not be gated and residents could use all of the amenities except the swimming pool without paying a fee.

Mr. Wiley made a motion to approve the site plan contingent upon all agency approvals, an approved Forest Conservation Plan and approved light fixtures being shown on the site plan. Seconded by Mr. Moser. Unanimously approved.

- Forest Conservation

Sandy Repp, Lot 2 (S-06-002)

Ms. Baker, on behalf of Ms. Wagner-Grillo, presented for review and approval a request for Forest Conservation mitigation in the form of payment-in-lieu of planting. A subdivision plat for Sandy Repp, Lots 2 – 5, is currently being reviewed by the Planning Department staff. Lot 1 was previously approved and recorded. Lots 3, 4 and 5 are exempt from Forest Conservation Ordinance requirements. The applicant's request is for a 1.32-acre parcel without any existing forest. The applicant is requesting to use payment-in-lieu in the amount of \$1,149.98 to meet the Forest Conservation Ordinance requirement. Due to the question of sensitive area on the site, this request requires approval of the Planning Commission. According to Soil Conservation maps, there is a blue-dot intermittent stream shown along the property line between Lots 2 and 3 and is pending field verification by the Washington County Soil Conservation District.

Clarification: Prior to the meeting, Mr. Anikis made an inquiry regarding clarification of a note included on the plan that states, "Stormwater management will be met by using rooftop and non-rooftop disconnects". Ms. Baker contacted the Washington County Engineering Department for clarification. There are two issues to deal with for stormwater management, one is water quality and the other is water quantity (the amount of runoff). In the case of a smaller subdivision such as this one, quantity is normally

not an issue. The “disconnects” deal with the water quality issue such as dry wells, rain gardens, etc. that help to diffuse the water on your property. The note is a general note used on small subdivisions, especially subdivisions that are less than 5 acres. If a developer requests a subdivision for any additional lots, the storm water management issues would be re-evaluated for water quality and water quantity.

Comments: Ms. Baker stated that the owner is seeking to put the remaining property in Ag Preservation.

Discussion: Ms. Parrish made an inquiry regarding a drainage swale along the road. Ms. Baker stated there is an identified stream with floodplain that does not cross over the road; therefore, there is a drainage swale on the opposite side of the road. She noted that the stream is not defined (does not have a channel).

Mr. Ecker made a motion to approve the payment-in-lieu in the amount of \$1,149.98 to meet the Forest Conservation Ordinance requirements. Seconded by Mr. Reiber. Unanimously approved.

OTHER BUSINESS

Demolition Permit #2006-09956

Mr. Goodrich presented for review and recommendation Demolition Permit #2006-09956 for property located at 12037 Greencastle Pike. The structures located on this property are listed as Washington County Historic Inventory Site # WA-I-353. The property is zoned HI-1 – Highway Interchange 1. On January 10, 2007, the Historic District Commission reviewed the demolition permit application and based on individual members familiarity with the site, the owner’s (Mr. Sherman Stinson) comments and the survey information provided, HDC members stated their opposition to the proposed demolition and voted to recommend against the demolition. HDC members recommendation was based on the following: they believe the structures are worth retaining on the property; as described in the inventory, it is a good example of the typical local vernacular architecture of the late 19th century; it is intact and in good condition and is representative of local building traditions; and the buildings are still serviceable. In addition, no information was provided regarding any attempt to retain or reuse the buildings in future development on the site and at that time, a site plan was not presented showing future plans for the property.

Comments: Ms. Vel Byers, Mr. Stinson’s realtor and representative of LL&R, purchasers of the property, presented the following information. The purchaser is proposing to construct an 86,583 square foot distribution center where the existing house is located. They are also proposing to construct a 9,000-square foot maintenance building, a 5,000-square foot office building and a guardhouse. In addition, LL&R is purchasing a second parcel for a second warehouse. The surrounding properties contain several trucking terminals. Ms. Byers stated that the purchasers have received approval for their access points from the State Highway Administration and have completed extensive environmental studies.

Mr. Anikis expressed his disappointment that the developer is not trying to retain and reuse the structures. He recommended that the owner or purchaser try to donate parts of the barn to be reused. Ms. Byers stated that they have been in contact with several organizations to dismantle and reuse the barn.

Mr. Kercheval stated his opinion that this area of the County was chosen for commercial and industrial uses and properties are zoned accordingly; however, he supports Mr. Anikis’s recommendation for dismantling and reuse of the barn, if possible.

Mr. Moser made a motion to recommend approval of the demolition permit. Seconded by Mr. Reiber. The motion passed with Mr. Moser, Mr. Reiber, Mr. Kercheval, Mr. Ecker and Mr. Wiley voting “Aye” and Ms. Parrish voting “Nay”.

Powers Estates APFO Approval

Mr. Thompson presented for review and comment the “DRAFT” APFO Agreement for School Adequacy Mitigation for Powers Estates. The agreement has not been finalized; however, all main issues are incorporated in the Draft. The agreement would allow the developer to move ahead with a phasing schedule as outlined in the agreement to address the school situation. The developer is also providing a monetary contribution over and above the excise tax requirements for the development. The developer is installing a larger sewer line through the area to address water and sewer issues in the area. Additionally, the BOCC required the developer to donate a 5-acre site to the County for “a use to be determined by the County Commissioners” in the future. If changes are not made to the mitigation agreement and/or the preliminary plat, final plats would not need to be presented to the Planning Commission. However, if changes were made to the preliminary plat, Planning Commission approval would be required on the final plat.

Discussion: There was a brief discussion regarding the Planning Commission’s lack of involvement in preparing the mitigation agreements. Planning Commission members expressed their frustration that they have not been receiving updated school capacity and enrollment figures in order to make informative decisions regarding development. Mr. Anikis made an inquiry regarding how this agreement coincides with school enrollment rates. Mr. Kercheval stated that future redistricting and the opening of the new Maugansville School would determine how school enrollments would be affected. Other considerations by the Board of County Commissioners in accepting the agreement are the installation of additional infrastructure, the monetary contribution that the developer is proposing, and the proposed donation of a five-acre site for the County’s use. Mr. Thompson stated that the Planning Commission is the authority of the APFO.

Mr. Jason Divelbiss, attorney for the developer, stated that the terms of the APFO state that the Planning Commission determines the adequacy or inadequacy of the schools. At the time when the final plats were submitted, the Board of Education determined that there is a deficiency at the elementary school level, but the middle school and high school have adequate capacity. Because there was not adequate capacity at the elementary school level, the Planning Commission could not grant approval of the final plat without an approved mitigation agreement from the Board of County Commissioners. The Board of County Commissioners accepted the proposed mitigation agreement in November and now the Planning Commission needs to give their approval of a "determination of adequacy". However, in reality, the agreement is a determination that the developer can move forward despite the inadequacy of capacity at the elementary school level.

Mr. Wiley expressed his concern that the Planning Commission members are not receiving enough information and data on school enrollments. All members agreed that they need additional information before they could make a decision on the proposed Mitigation Agreement. Mr. Thompson recommended that the Agreement should be tabled until the Planning Commission Workshop meeting scheduled on February 19, 2007. At that time, more information would be presented for the Commission as to their role in the approval process when mitigation is proposed.

Comment: Mr. Douglas Bachtell, developer, expressed his frustration regarding the delay in starting his subdivision. He stated his opinion that over the past 20 years the County has neglected the school systems as a whole. He stated that he has worked in "good faith" with the Board of County Commissioners to provide additional funding for schools, to construct additional sewer lines, and they have given a 5-acre site for the County to use as they deem appropriate (which is not required under the APFO).

By consensus, the Planning Commission members agreed to continue discussions regarding the Mitigation Agreement at their Workshop meeting on February 19th.

Rosehill Manor Subdivision (PP-04-007)

Mr. Thompson presented a request from Dan Ryan Builders for a one time 12-month extension for the Rosehill Manor preliminary plat. The property is located between Maryland Route 60 and Longmeadow Road.

Mr. Moser made a motion to grant the extension request for the Rosehill Manor Preliminary Plat for one year. Seconded by Mr. Wiley. Unanimously approved.

UPCOMING MEETINGS

1. Planning Commission Workshop, Monday, February 19, 2007, 1:00 p.m., Washington County Administrative Annex, 80 West Baltimore Street
2. Regular Planning Commission meeting, Monday, March 5, 2007, 7:00 p.m., Washington County Administrative Annex, 80 West Baltimore Street

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Parrish made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 10:00 p.m. So ordered.

Respectfully submitted,

George Anikis, Chairman