

DEVELOPMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

The Development Advisory Committee (DAC) met on August 19, 2020 virtually at 9:00 a.m. in the Harford County Government Administration Building, 220 S. Main Street, Bel Air, Maryland. The meeting was chaired by Moe Davenport, Department of Planning and Zoning.

The following members were in attendance:

Moe Davenport	Chairman, DAC
Bill Snyder	Volunteer Fire & EMS
Darryl Ivins	DPW Water & Sewer
Steve Walsh	DPW Engineering
Teresa Eller	State Highway Administration
Jen Wilson	Planner, Development Review
Crysta Draayer	Planner, Development Review
Lori Pietrowski	Administrative Specialist
Chelsea Broach	GIS Analyst

Also in attendance:

Tom Miner	Jennifer Leonard
Beth Godfrey	

Moe Davenport – I would like to welcome everyone to the August 19, 2020 meeting of the Development Advisory Committee. We have two plans on today's agenda: Former Lands of Caddie Homes-Preliminary Plan and 807 Pulaski Highway-Site Plan. We are meeting today under the protocol for the Open Meetings Act during the Covid-19 emergency. The public will be able to view and listen to the meeting today via the internet. As always, anyone with questions and comments can forward them via email and or by phone to the Department of Planning & Zoning at any time. Our email address is developmentreview@harfordcountymd.gov. Additionally we will allow some time after each meeting after the DAC members comments have concluded you can type in your questions and concerns and we can provide and place them into the record. We do record today's meeting and we will take minutes from that recording. As soon as those minutes are available, we will place them on our web page. I will go over the protocol for the meeting: There will be a brief presentation for each project by the owner/developer or his representative and then we will go around to the DAC committee members for questions or comments. After that, we will provide an opportunity for anyone to type any questions or comments. We also have received a number of comments, which we will address after the DAC committee members have provided their comments. And, again, I will go over the protocol. This is not a board, we do not render a decision, we do not approve or deny this particular day. This is a technical advisory committee. All of the technical local and state government officials looking at their specific disciplines as they relate to the project and give

Development Advisory Committee Minutes
August 19, 2020
Page 2 of 30

their comments to us, the Department of Planning & Zoning. With that, we will begin today's meeting.

FORMER LANDS OF CADDIE HOMES-PRELIMINARY PLAN

Located north of Bel Air South Parkway and Blue Spruce Road between Route 24 and Route 924. Tax Map 56; Parcel 56 & 60. First Election District. Council District B. Planner: Jen.

Plan No. P298-2020 Consolidate existing parcels 56 & 60 and subdivide into 7 lots
For retail and mixed use center/33.93 acres/B3

Received 07-22-2020 Bel Air Village LLC/ARLS Properties, LLC/Frederick Ward Assoc.

Verbatim Transcript

Tom Miner - Frederick Ward Associates

My name is Tom Miner with Frederick Ward. I am the site engineer for the Former Lands of Caddie Homes project. The site is located at 2014 Emmorton Road in Bel Air, MD. We are proposing 7 lots for this subdivision of the Preliminary Plan. Lot 1 is going to be a mixed-use development we are proposing. Lots 2-7 will be pad sites to be selected by the user. We have submitted our Preliminary Plan, Landscape, lighting and buffer plan along with our Traffic Impact Analysis and we have performed our Community Input Meeting along with the associated other things that are going to be provided for Preliminary Plan submission and approval. For this submission and Preliminary Plan, we were just looking to do our lot subdivision with further detailing to occur in the next components of the development such as the site plan. This is just for the Preliminary Plan for the subdivision component of the project.

Bill Snyder – Volunteer Fire & EMS

No comments on the Preliminary. Just a question. Does this site ever have plans to have access to Blue Spruce Drive?

Tom Miner – At this time we are not planning to connect to Blue Spruce Drive because of the grading differential on the site. It became difficult to make everything work with Blue Spruce being as low as it is and then having to connect to Plum Tree.

Bill Snyder – Ok, Moe as this project moves along what parts would have to come back to this committee?

Moe Davenport – There would need to be a Concept Plan for the mixed use project and then each pad site whether they come in independently or together would have to come back through DAC for the Site Plan approval.

Development Advisory Committee Minutes
August 19, 2020
Page 3 of 30

Bill Snyder – Ok, that is all I have.

Moe Davenport – Is Emergency Operations with us today?

Bill Snyder – I don't believe they are Moe and I did not receive notes from them.

Darryl Ivins – DPW Water and Sewer

A new series of this plan is required to address the following comments, concerns and/or requirements of the Department of Public Works, Division of Water and Sewer, on the above described project:

Lots 4 & 5 shall obtain water service by constructing a single 8" tap and a short section of water main at the common corner of the two lots closest to Emmorton Road. The short 8" main will provide service to both lots. A water service for each lot shall connect to this main. Lots 6 & 7 shall obtain water service using the same method.

There are three existing water services to this property along Plumtree Road. Lot 3 shall either use an existing service or abandon it and construct a new service. In any event, Lot 3 shall connect to the water main in Plumtree Road. Lot 2 must also connect to the water main in Plumtree Road. Lot 2 shall either use an existing water service and abandon the unused service(s).

Water service for Lot 1 shall be obtained by connecting into the main in Plumtree Road. All on-site water and sewer mains on Lot 1 shall be privately owned and maintained. Remove the water main that traverses the site from Plumtree Road to Blue Spruce Drive from the next series of the plan.

The locations of the water meters and backflow preventers for each of the proposed lots will be determined based upon the proposed use at the time the Commercial Service Applications are reviewed.

A new public fire hydrant shall be installed at the intersection of Bright Oaks Drive and Route 924, on the west side of Route 924. The hydrant must be installed whenever either Lot 6 or Lot 7 is developed.

The sewer services for Lots 1 and 3 through 7 shall be obtained as shown on this plan. Sewer service for Lot 2 shall be obtained by connecting to the sewer manhole in Plumtree Road near the northwest corner of the lot.

Development Advisory Committee Minutes
August 19, 2020
Page 4 of 30

Steve Walsh DPW Engineering

1. A sediment control plan and a grading permit will be required for the development of this site. Sediment controls are to be designed to the specifications as set forth in the Maryland Standards for Erosion and Sediment Control, latest edition.
2. Stormwater Management must be provided in accordance with the 2000 Design Manual as amended by Supplement 1.
3. A stormwater management concept plan must be approved prior to preliminary plan approval. An engineered plan shall be submitted and reviewed for approval prior to final plat approval. Comments must be addressed on subsequent stormwater plan submittals.
4. The final stormwater management plan shall be approved prior to the issuance of a grading permit and permitted when areas of the facilities are being disturbed. A stormwater management permit is required prior to the issuance of a building permit.
5. Maintenance of the stormwater management facilities are the responsibility of the lot owner (s) or beneficial user for facilities installed on individual lots.
6. Stormwater management practices designed for and located on individual lots shall be constructed and inspected prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy. Practices located on individual lots are the maintenance responsibility of the owner.
7. This project is located in two different watersheds (Winter's Run and Bynum Run) and the site needs to be designed not to increase the drainage area to either watershed by more than 1 acre. MDE has recently issued a notice that any facility requiring 378 approvals must now obtain Dam Safety Small Pond Approval from MDE instead of the Local SCD.
8. Connection shall be made from MD 924 to the interior site access road.
9. An exclusive right turn lane will be required into the site for the access nearest MD 24.
10. A traffic impact analysis was submitted for the development. Comments are being forwarded to Planning and Zoning.

Moe Davenport – Did we get a representative from the Sheriff's office, Chelsea?

Chelsea Broach – No, I do not have anyone waiting in the lobby with a phone number.

Development Advisory Committee Minutes
August 19, 2020
Page 5 of 30

Moe Davenport – Is Missy Valentino with us with the Board of Education?

Chelsea Broach – No, she is not on our call. No.

Moe Davenport – How about Paul Magness with Parks and Recreation?

Chelsea Broach – Paul, is not here either.

Teresa Eller – State Highway Administration

An access permit will be required to construct the proposed entrances and frontage improvements on MD 924. The MDOT SHA is currently reviewing the traffic impact study (TIS) prepared for this development. When comments become available, they will be forwarded to all interested parties. We will defer making specific requirements for the entrances and road improvements until our review of the TIS is complete.

Jen Wilson – Planner

1. This plan is subject to the Harford County Forest Conservation Regulations. A Forest Conservation Plan has been submitted and is still under review by the Department.
2. A Landscape plan & lighting plan has been submitted. Detailed Landscape Plans will be required for the development of the individual pad sites and future uses.
3. A Concept Plan will be required for a Mixed Use Center developed under the Special Development Standards and/or any residential subdivision generating more than 500 trips.
4. Site Plan(s) will be required for the development of the individual pad sites.
5. A Traffic Impact Analysis has been submitted and is still under review. Comments will be forwarded to the engineer when available.
6. The Department would like to see interconnectivity, pedestrian access and transit circulation provided throughout the development and to the adjacent properties and road network as the Site Plans are developed. The Developer should also work with Harford Transit on possible solutions to provide transit service within the project.
7. Frontage improvements along MD 924 shall include a shared use bicycle/ pedestrian path separated from MD 924 per the *MD 924 Multi-Modal Corridor Study* completed in 2017.

Development Advisory Committee Minutes
August 19, 2020
Page 6 of 30

Moe Davenport – Are there any additional questions or comments from DAC members that I don't see? If not, we will begin some of the comments. Let me just clarify some things before we begin. This is a Preliminary Plan that shows the subdivision of the lots within this 33-acre parcel. There was a Community Input Meeting for the project that showed a number of uses, a mixture of uses as it was a mixed-use center with several pad sites. Each of those will come back before this DAC committee either with individual Site Plans in addition there will be a Concept Plan required for the mixed-use project shown on Lot 1. While I realize that it is confusing because you went to a CIM that showed a mixture of uses and there is no uses necessarily proposed other than what is shown in the Traffic Impact Analysis. The county is now reviewing the Traffic Impact Analysis with the State Highway Administration as well. Before we get to the questions and answers there, I have several emails and letters that I'd like to put on record.

First from Mr. **William Wehland**: He has comments and questions he has provided to the department and I will read them and try to answer the questions.

Having provided the aforementioned information I wish to make comments and/or ask questions after review of the documents submitted.

1. There has been a great deal of misleading and inconsistent information provided by the owner/developer for this mixed-use center as to land use. The owner readily admits that no specific users have been identified but ensures the highest quality users are procured. Who determines that they are high quality users? I guess that is your question.

Moe Davenport – The department or the county cannot discriminate between one user to the next. We look at land use, retail sales, trade, residential, commercial, and institutional, we have no authority to discriminate between high quality or low quality. Obviously, the developer can chime in here. It is in his best interest to get the highest and best uses that he can find. Tom, would anyone like to comment on this particular question?

Tom Miner – Just that we are ongoing discussing uses and users so, it is the developers best interest to have a good site. A site that has good users and a site that is used by the community.

Moe Davenport – Then Mr. Wehland goes on and says the uses need to be identified. This might clarify a number of things.

From Mr. Wehland - The Traffic Impact Analysis prepared by Traffic Concepts states the following proposed land uses provided by the owner/developer as shown as: 205 apartments, 80 bed assisted living, 60,000 sf medical office, 55,000 sf health and fitness center, 8,000 sf fast food restaurant, 29,000 sf sit down restaurant, 25,000 sf specialty retail

Development Advisory Committee Minutes
August 19, 2020
Page 7 of 30

and 40,000 sf supermarket. This land use is inconsistent with that presented at the CIM. At no time was a 40,000 sf supermarket, 60,000 sf medical building, 29,000 sf high turnover sit down restaurant or 55,000 sf health and fitness club shown or mentioned at the CIM. These changes do not give any credibility to the owner/developer. How can a traffic impact study be approved without knowing the intended use?

Moe Davenport – We have tried to clarify those uses. The Traffic Impact Analysis must show the uses that are proposed. I will try to go over and clarify them. We have had the same questions regarding the study. The 80 bed assisted living and Tom you can clarify if I am incorrect. The 60,000 sf medical office, the 55,000 sf health and fitness center and the 25,000 sf specialty retail are Lot 1 and that is the mixed-use, correct?

Tom Miner – Correct.

Moe Davenport – Then the high turnover sit down restaurant are lots 7, 6, 5 and 4. Is that correct?

Tom Miner – Correct.

Moe Davenport – Then the 29,000 sf of sit down high turnover restaurant is lot 3?

Tom Miner – Yes.

Moe Davenport – The 40,000 sf supermarket retail is lot 2?

Tom Miner – Correct. Now the user-ship is still to be determined.

Moe Davenport – So, those are the uses proposed at this time. They are generally consistent with the CIM and Mr. Wehland or whomever I can go over those questions with you at any time.

From Mr. Wehland – A 40,000 sf supermarket is the average size of a Giant, Shop-Rite, Weis, Wegmans, all of whom are in very close proximity to the proposed site. In addition, there are also one or more Walmarts, Targets, Farm Stores, WaWa's, Walgreens, Aldi, Sprouts, all selling groceries. Why do we need another one in the development envelope? Does the county have any input as to the proposed use?

Moe Davenport – Again, I go back to, we cannot discriminate or control the market or any particular uses. I think this next question might have been answered.

From Mr. Wehland – What is the owner/developer proposing that is a 29,000 sf high turnover sit down restaurant when the average does not exceed 6,000 sf and secondly, what

Development Advisory Committee Minutes
August 19, 2020
Page 8 of 30

fast food restaurant, by name, is intended for the 8,000 sf when typical sizes do not exceed 4,000 sf?

Moe Davenport – Tom would you like to address those questions?

Tom Miner – As far as the user-ship we do not know. The traffic study was determined to be a very conservative estimate of traffic flows coming off of this site. Since, we do not know what the user-ship is your square footage can change depending on who goes on each site or each lot, but our goal or attempt was to submit a traffic study so that we can have this ball rolling for the analysis, for permitting and such. And, to provide the county with a scope of what was coming up on this site. If something were to come in substantially different then we would have to update it whether it be one way or another.

Moe Davenport – Let me just clarify. You want to try to produce as many trips as possible so that if you have a user with less trips you don't have to come back and revise the study.

Tom Miner – Exactly.

From Mr. Wehland – The total footprint sf provided on the concept plan at the CIM was 186,630 sf and with the multiple levels for the multi-family units and office the total is 406,130 sf. The total footprint sf in the traffic study was 281,000 sf and assuming the footprint was 38,000 sf and five levels for the apartments, the total square footage is 433,000 sf. The information provided to the Planning & Zoning Department in 2019 to determine the intersections to be analyzed was 230,200 sf retail, 12,500 sf restaurant, 30,000 sf medical office, 20,000 sf general office and 220 apartment units. This shows the inconsistencies and unknowns for the land use and prohibits approval. Does the county agree that approval must be withheld until a definitive site plan is submitted and actual land use is known?

Moe Davenport – Yes, we are trying to clarify what the land uses are in the proposed and coincide what the traffic study shows.

From Mr. Wehland – The total future traffic formula is described on page 3 of the Traffic Impact Report but fails to include the proposed future use of the five pad sites which total 222,050 sf.

Moe Davenport – I know that there is confusion on the CIM plan that was submitted. They have square footages as opposed to acreage of particular lots. I think there is a lot of confusion over what is written on the CIM as square footage of the lot as opposed like on this plan as 1.2 acres, 1.03 acres and not put in square footage. We will make sure that that is all clarified for everyone's sake. Is that correct Tom?

Development Advisory Committee Minutes
August 19, 2020
Page 9 of 30

Tom Miner – Correct and if you would like we can have a table that has the equivalent square footage and acreage right next to each other that is just a math issue.

Moe Davenport – Ok. That may be helpful.

From Mr. Wehland – The total future traffic formula is described on page 3 of the Traffic Impact Report but fails to include the proposed future five-pad site.

Moe Davenport – Hopefully, I have clarified that question. If not, I will do so.

From Mr. Wehland – This square footage is more than the nine buildings proposed at the CIM. Does this additional traffic need to be accounted for now and not later?

Moe Davenport – It needs to be accounted for now and I think everything is clear and if it is not we will need more clarification.

From Mr. Wehland – The Traffic Impact report does not include traffic counts of the existing entrance/exits along Plumtree Road. A sketch is attached showing the distance between traffic lights at 24 and Plumtree and at 924 and Plumtree. In addition, I have shown the existing six business entrances and exits and the two new ones proposed for the project from the concept plan. It can be readily seen that the proximity of each entrance/exit is going to be a major safety issue with people trying to make left and right hand turns from eight intersections between only 0.3 mile between traffic lights. This is already a major safety hazard. Does the county agree that traffic counts (in/out) need to be made a peak times for Towson Orthopedics/Advanced Radiology, SECU Credit Union/professional offices, and Advanced Radiology/professional offices entrances/exits after the coronavirus crisis is over. The Traffic Impact study only included the Plumtree entrance/exit at McDonalds and M&T Bank. Why were these other busy entrances/exits not counted as they are of significant traffic impact and safety concerns?

Moe Davenport – The guidelines for identifying the studied intersections would not include private entrance/exits along the road. The one that is across from the McDonalds and M&T Bank is across from one of their proposed entrances. They have to study their proposed entrances/exits and the affected intersections that are impacted by the proposal. We would not require the Towson Orthopedic of the other entrances/exits along Plumtree Road. We can't by code.

From Mr. Wehland – Why is the Blue Spruce entrance/exit not being considered? The developer said at the CIM the SWM had to be in that location?

Moe Davenport – We are looking at different connections and I think the developer/owner has talked about the topography in that. Do you want to add any more to that Tom?

Development Advisory Committee Minutes
August 19, 2020
Page 10 of 30

Tom Miner – No, it's just that the low point of the site is at Blue Spruce so it makes it difficult. Stormwater wants us at the low point so that's why we have the ponds there. The site grading; we did attempt to make connectivity and we kept fighting it and it was not conducive for the development to have the connection and another component is there; there are wetlands down there so it is preferred to keep it a stormwater feature.

From Mr. Wehland - What is actually intended for the apartment building and what would be the size of a typical apartment space?

Moe Davenport – I guess he is talking about the 205 apartments.

Tom Miner – That is definitely to be determined. We have not determined our unit layout and size at this point.

Moe Davenport – Mr. Wehland also has some issue with the page numbering on the Traffic Study. We can help clarify that. Let's move on. I have comments from Ted Janes.

From Mr. Janes – As a former friend of Arron Dahan, I was with him for several weeks in the Johns Hopkins ICU unit prior to his death. His vision for the Plum Tree property was a mixed-use campus setting, with some apartments on the second level, of small specialty retail stores within the campus. He never spoke of nor envisioned a 5 story apartment building of any kind. He was against hi-volume fast food restaurants in this setting. This was to be a campus setting, well-treed, and not open as a strip plaza to the sight lines of 924. The above was explained to me in person to the developer when he invited comments from the former Walmart group of 924 community leaders whom he invited to 2 preliminary concept meetings. At both meetings we explained that traffic congestion was the main problems then and is worse now. It remains the number one concern. In spite of our multiple warning, the Traffic Impact Report still does not address the 8 entrance/exits on Plum Tree between 24 & 924 and of even more concern does not address the existing reality of stacking distance and problems with traffic lights, turning lanes, between Bel Air Parkway South and Bright Oaks. There is a certain amount of nasty hypocrisy here with the on-line post of a 656 page Traffic Impact Study that does not address, in terms that the public can understand, already known problems and areas of concern that were exposed in the Walmart traffic study. Unlike the Walmart traffic study, I cannot find a single person in the 924 corridor that saw anyone with a clipboard and a counter, or counter road tapes, for the offered Traffic Concepts "report". The proposed use and square footage is inconsistent with what was presented at the CIM. The overtime and piecemeal development of the parcel seems disingenuous and purposefully planned to disguise the final traffic impact and has my neighbors very very upset. Mr. William Wehland has earned the respect of many in Harford County. He does the work and the research and, where possible, has the data to back up his concerns, questions, and comments. When do we get to see who the land users are?

Development Advisory Committee Minutes
August 19, 2020
Page 11 of 30

Moe Davenport – Again, there will be Concept Plans and Site Plans for each pad sites and Concept Plan for Lot 1, which would determine some of the users.

From Mr. Janes – Who get to determine if they are “high quality users”?

Moe Davenport – Again, the county has no input and cannot discriminate between users.

From Mr. Janes – If there are unidentified “future” users how do you expect the public stakeholders to debate and judge the plan or participate intelligently in the DAC process?

Moe Davenport – Again the DAC process is we will take comments; we are not approving this plan. We still have weeks to review the Traffic Impact Analysis and other components to the plan. We will glad to take questions and comments throughout that process.

From Mr. Janes –Until and unless the above is addressed, does the County intend to withhold approval?

Moe Davenport – The County will withhold approval until we find that they have complied with all of the applicable rules and regulations.

From Mr. Janes – How can a reasonable traffic study be completed without knowing traffic volumes associated with known uses that so far have not been identified by name?

Moe Davenport – The uses are identified in terms of land use and they are required to project traffic impacts based on the specific square footage or unit type based on the international transportation user manual as far as traffic generation. It is a universal accepted trip generation manual that uses square footage in determining trip generations.

From Mr. Janes – The Traffic Impact Report fails to include proposed future use of five pad sites (5.1 acres). And if any, or all, are fast food restaurants how is this accounted for?

Moe Davenport – Hopefully, that has been clarified.

From Mr. Janes – The Traffic Impact Report does not include existing exit/entrance counts – a major issue and concern for Plum Tree Road?

Moe Davenport – Hopefully, I have addressed that.

From Mr. Janes – Where is the DATA that supports the Traffic Impact Report conclusions?

Moe Davenport – The data is within that 700 and some odd page analysis.

Development Advisory Committee Minutes
August 19, 2020
Page 12 of 30

From Mr. James – Why have we not seen on site date collection in the corridor for the MANY intersections needing remediation for this proposal to work?

Moe Davenport – All of the required studied intersections are in the analysis and our department and the state are reviewing them at this point in time.

From Laura Bianca-Pruett – Thanks in advance for forwarding my email to the DAC and the planner who works with them. I really appreciated it since I have to work tomorrow and have other meeting and commitments in the morning. My name is Laura Bianca-Pruett and I'm a Harford County resident who live east of Bel Air. I'm emailing in regards to the Former Lands of Caddie Homes consolidation and subsequent subdivision. I've worked as a transportation planner in the past and am baffled by the configuration of the entrances and exits to the seven sites in the plan, particularly Lot 1. I am very concerned with the lack of connection to Blue Spruce Drive and excessive entrance/exit points onto state highway MD 924. This is a circulation nightmare waiting to happen, as many residents patronizing these businesses will be coming from and going to MD Route 24. Connecting to Blue Spruce Drive allows for traffic flow to be divided between 24 North towards Bel Air and 24 South towards Abingdon. This current configuration puts all of the burden onto Plumtree Road, which requires a left turn without a signal! For MD 24 South, it will be much easier for drivers to drive down Blue Spruce, turn right onto Bel Air South Parkway, then left at the signal for MD 24. In addition, the 3 entrance/exit point put a larger burden on 924 than necessary. Anyone who wants to patronize the top site of the Festival of Bel Air shopping center will be forced onto Plumtree Road, then 924, then Bel Air South Parkway, placing an undue burden on Plumtree and 924 when they could have had a direct connection via Blue Spruce Drive. I realize the plan is strictly about the subdivision, but it show the stormwater management for the 7 lots, which plays a huge role in how they are divided. This is why I'd like you to consider moving that facility elsewhere on the site. I am opposed to this subdivision unless the stormwater facilities are moved and the connection open to Blue Spruce Drive.

Moe Davenport – The access point Theresa on 924 have they concluded whether or not they are acceptable to the State Highway Administration?

Teresa Eller – No. The TIS is still under review by our traffic division.

Moe Davenport – So, you haven't made any determination.

Teresa Eller – No, I'm sure there will be required roadway improvements and I know they are not comfortable with 3 access points.

Moe Davenport - Ok, so you have similar concerns.

Teresa Eller – Yes

Development Advisory Committee Minutes
August 19, 2020
Page 13 of 30

Moe Davenport – Ok, thank you. Now, I will try to go through some of these questions.

From Anonymous – Retail spaces are already vacant at the Festival of Bel Air. Why do we need more retail space?

Moe Davenport – Again that is not something that I can address.

From Anonymous – Will this be section 8 apartments?

Tom Miner – Not to my knowledge.

From Anonymous - Do you know what company is considering building the assisted living space?

Tom Miner – I do not. Just to clarify. I am not usually involved in that aspect of the discussion so I could not render an answer even if I knew it. I guess I cannot give you a name because I don't know.

From Anonymous- Why can't this land just be left alone? The residents in the area do not want it. Shouldn't that matter? Bright Oaks community is the most impacted neighborhood. There is no way a light would work out entrance with the one right there at Laurel Bush.

Moe Davenport – Again, we are continuing to review that along with State Highway. We look at the traffic light and signal warrants and so forth.

From Anonymous – Can another meeting be scheduled during non-working hours so the public can participate?

Moe Davenport – There is no plan for an evening meeting. Again, you can contact our department at any time and we will be glad to answer any question that you may have on this project.

From Anonymous – Is it correct that a circular right in/right out turning movements do not count in traffic studies?

Moe Davenport – I am not certain. I believe all of the intersections were counted that were proposed in the study. Is that correct?

Tom Miner – Yes.

Moe Davenport – So Chelsea are there more questions?

Chelsea Broach – Yes, in the publish tab there are more in there.

Development Advisory Committee Minutes
August 19, 2020
Page 14 of 30

From Anonymous – Former Lands of Caddie Homes. Will another DAC meeting be scheduled after a Preliminary Plan is submitted that includes all of the required information?

Moe Davenport – Yes. Again, the mixed-use project requires both a Concept Plan and then a Site Plan or Preliminary Plan. So, Lot 1 will have a Site Plan for the mixed-use project itself and then each of the sites 2-7 can come in together depending on when they get users for them. I'm certain the developer would like to have all of them users done but that is unlikely. So each one would come before the DAC as a Commercial Site Plan.

From DeVinney Family – They include 441,050 square feet of developed building compared to 186,000 square feet of developed building for the formerly proposed Walmart. How can the area handle such a large project when it has already been determined by traffic experts that there is not legal permissible distance between proposed traffic lights?

Moe Davenport – That will be up to the State Highway Administration regarding the traffic signal warrants and determine the entrances and exits and why they are reviewing the study they will come to a determination which exits and entrances will be permitted and which will not.

From DeVinney Family - How will adding 14 buildings and hundreds of thousands daily trips impact traffic?

Moe Davenport – That is what the study is there for.

From DeVinney Family – Who/what are the tenants leasing sites from this project?

Moe Davenport – I haven't heard that they have anybody.

From DeVinney Family – Why is there a 5 story proposed building when none of the buildings in the community are more than 3 stories?

Moe Davenport – 5 story apartments are permitted in the B3. Both in the B3, conventional or mixed-use project.

From DeVinney Family – What type of senior living is proposed?

Moe Davenport – Right now in the traffic study it was assisted living facility with 80 beds.

From DeVinney Family – What is the access road to and from the proposed facility and how will ambulances access it?

Development Advisory Committee Minutes
August 19, 2020
Page 15 of 30

Moe Davenport – We ask for internal circulations when the Site Plans are produced. Emergency Operations would require in an assisted living facility that the awnings be over 14 feet and that they have access for emergency services.

From DeVinney Family– Is there access from Blue Spruce Drive or the roadway near Joseph A Bank?

Moe Davenport – The plan does not show access at this point in time.

From DeVinney Family – What is the unlabeled structure shown along the stormwater management area?

Moe Davenport – There are no structure on this plan. You might be talking about the CIM. The one that was on the CIM plan but there are no structure shown on this plan.

From DeVinney Family – How big is it? What is its use?

Moe Davenport – The one near the pond was a Health and Fitness Center. I hope that answers your question. Is that correct Tom?

Tom Miner – Yes, near the pond there was a health/fitness center component. Again, that is for concept planning purposes. We do not have a Site Plan ready for it for that location.

Moe Davenport – Another talks about the entrances again. That will need to be determined by the State Highway Administration through the analysis of the study itself.

From Anonymous – The intersection of Plumtree and 924 needs a complete redo.

From Anonymous – Need left hand green arrows off of Plumtree and the MedStar/Walgreens site.

Moe Davenport – We will analyze that intersection and determine the appropriate improvements.

From Anonymous – Need right lane added to Plumtree to enter 924. Need to move the telephone pole to allow for a longer right turn lane.

Moe Davenport – Right, all of that will need to be determined.

From Anonymous – Will these items be in the plan?

Moe Davenport – Future plans will show the particular development of each property.

Development Advisory Committee Minutes
August 19, 2020
Page 16 of 30

From DeVinney Family – Why was a traffic study conducted in July when most people were staying home due to Covid 19 outbreak?

Moe Davenport – The study was done last fall. It was submitted in July. That is correct it was done in the fall?

Tom Miner – Correct.

From Matt – Given the number of living units that are going to be included in the proposed plan what is the projected impact on local school enrollment?

Moe Davenport – Schools are Ring Factory Elementary, Patterson Middle and High Schools. We do have an Adequate Public Facilities ordinance that restricts residential development when the school's capacity is over 110%. Those three school districts are not projected to be over 110% capacity.

From Matt – What responsibility does the developer have to contribute funding to the public school system?

Moe Davenport – Residential units do require a school impact fee.

From Anonymous – Shouldn't there be additional CIM's for the lots, as the exact users are known?

Moe Davenport – Only if they differ greatly from what was initially shown at the original CIM.

From Anonymous – Will the Forest Conservation be met on site in accordance with the "required sequence" of section 267-41 of the Harford County code?

Moe Davenport – We will look for on-site reforestation before we require off-site reforestation.

From Anonymous – Can the 5 building sites along Emmorton Road face to the interior of the site and a landscape buffer be placed along Emmorton Road (a 35' buffer width would count as forest conservation)?

Moe Davenport – If they did a 35' buffer there it would count for reforestation. There is no ordinance regarding how those building front or which direction they front although we would like them finished on all four sides.

Development Advisory Committee Minutes
August 19, 2020
Page 17 of 30

From Anonymous – Will signage and lighting along Emmorton Road be limited to one sign listing all establishments instead of multiple signs?

Moe Davenport – Each site could have since they are developed independently could have individual signs.

From Anonymous – Can there be some enforcement mechanisms to ensure the architecture remains consistently aesthetically pleasing throughout the development?

Moe Davenport – Unfortunately, the mixed-use has components in it that require consistent architecture that is approved by the department however, the bulk of the lots 2-7 would not have any restrictions and we would not have any architectural control over them.

From Anonymous - How do you intend to ensure no one makes left turns into and out of the proposed right in and right out intersections along Emmorton Road? It should be something nicer than the plastic poles.

Moe Davenport – We agree.

From Anonymous - Do the engineers work to determine exactly how that would be constructed right in/right outs assuming they are approved?

Moe Davenport – They would meet the Harford County road code.

From Anonymous – Retail spaces are already vacant at Festival of Bel Air, why do we need more retail space? Will this be Section 8 apartments? What company is considering to build the Assisted Living facility?

Moe Davenport – Unfortunately, we do not have answers to those other than they have indicated it will not be Section 8 housing. Again, we do not regulate the amount of retail only that I can say this plan looks much different than it would 10-15 years ago. There is very little retail in the plan with regard to the overall 33 acres of B-3 zoning that potentially could happen. A lot of this is changing to service uses or residential uses.

From DeVinney Family – What safety improvements are planned to protect school students and other pedestrians walking along 924 and Plumtree Roads.

Moe Davenport – Again, we have a 924-corridor study and we have asked that they get with us to determine the improvements/pedestrian/bike improvements along 924 and work with us and the State to come up with them. We are also currently looking at a bike/ped plan and encourage you to participate in that if you are interested.

Chelsea, have I covered everything?

Development Advisory Committee Minutes
August 19, 2020
Page 18 of 30

Chelsea Broach – There is one more.

From DeVinney Family – How do you propose to fill vacancies on all of these building considering the multiple vacancies and yet to be leased buildings surrounding this area?

Moe Davenport – Fortunately, that is not my job. That is up to the owner/developer as to how they are going to fill those spaces.

Does anyone else have any questions or comments on this plan?

Again, I would like to reemphasize this is not a final approval. There will be subsequent plans submitted to us and we are open to the public and will be glad to answer any questions or concerns or receive any comments you may have on this particular project.

Jennifer Wilson – Moe, looks like there are a few more questions in the new tab.

Moe Davenport – All right, let me go there.

Chelsea Broach – Some of those you have already answered.

Moe Davenport – To the DeVinney's I don't believe I have received your letter but I look forward to receiving it. Also, Tom I have one question. Have you reached out to Towson Orthopedics to whether or not they would be interested in an inter-parcel connection? Because, we would like that option if that is available.

Tom Miner – Plumtree Orthopedic?

Moe Davenport – Yes, I sorry I am not sure which one.

Tom Miner – We have not but if you would like us to we can definitely have a discussion with them.

Moe Davenport – Absolutely, that would be good. Particularly if we are going to try to reduce the amount of intersections or connections to Plumtree. It would help with circulation.

Tom Miner – Sure.

From Anonymous – How are they planning to buffer from adjacent properties?

Moe Davenport – The mixed-use will provide a buffer yard. There is a required buffer yard required along the major roads. Each pad site will have to do an independent landscaping plan.

Development Advisory Committee Minutes
August 19, 2020
Page 19 of 30

From Mr. Wehland – How long do you anticipate the Traffic Impact Analysis review will take? I have already found errors and will submit them to P&Z. When is the next DAC meeting?

Moe Davenport – I do not know how long it will take. We have already indicated it is over 700 pages and it is very intricate. We are reviewing it and it will take several more weeks before we conclude our review of the traffic study. As far as other DAC meetings, it is kind of up to the developer. When they get some users on board we will see the plans coming in. Tom, do you have anything to add to the next DAC meeting scheduled?

Tom Miner – Nothing at this time. We may have multiple lots coming to one DAC meeting. We will probably have 6-7 DAC meetings at least.

Moe Davenport – And, it may take years.

Tom Miner – Right and that is the reason why we started with this. I know there has been a lot of questions about clarity for this lot or that lot. That is why we have started the Preliminary Plan to get the ball rolling. It is a very complex and large process with a lot of moving parts. And, until you get that ball rolling it is very difficult to have anything locked in. It is a growing process not so much something that is off to the races.

From DeVinney Family – How will the water management issues be addressed? There is already flooding in the residential areas nearby including Old Emmorton Road.

Moe Davenport – They will be required to do a Concept Stormwater Management Plan and meet all of the State and County stormwater management regulations. Our engineering department will analyze those plans for the applicable codes and regulations that apply.

From Mr. Wehland – How can you have a viable traffic study if you do not analyze all entrances and exits along Plumtree Road?

Moe Davenport – The code does not allow us to require those. The code requires their intersections and the affected off-site intersections.

From DeVinney Family – How is the project being funded? Who is paying for this?

Moe Davenport – That would be the owner/developer.

From DeVinney Family – Again, did you receive my letter?

Moe Davenport – No, I did not personally receive your letter.

From Anonymous – What is the next step?

Development Advisory Committee Minutes
August 19, 2020
Page 20 of 30

Moe Davenport – We will continue to review this and receive letters and comments and we will post anything else provided to us on our webpage. There is a link on the webpage now showing the file. When we receive information, we will post it there. That means amendments to the traffic study or amendments to the plan or comments.

From Anonymous – Are these meeting in any way impactful or has Harford County already decided that we are Ritchie Highway North?

Moe Davenport – This is very important site to us. It is the last significant site in the development envelope so we are very concerned about how it is developed and the impact on surrounding neighbors and the community.

From Anonymous – It is the good time to remember the fire station could not get direct access to 924 and Walmart got an exception for one right turn only in/out access. The developer of this project has put even more access points on 924. Also, State Highway nixed the traffic signal at Bright Oaks. They have eliminated Blue Spruce access complex which makes no sense if the bulk of residential or senior housing are close to 24. Unlike Walmart we knew the resident and were able to challenge appropriate requirements for sidewalks, parking etc. At one time the developer at one point said entertainment could be a venue similar to Richlin. This is more a mystery hodgepodge project.

Moe Davenport – What was shown as entertainment is now shown as a Health Club and we will continue to review the accesses and entrances with the State Highway Administration.

I hope the next DAC meeting is in person. We are all tired of this Covid 19 situation so that is yet to be determined.

From Anonymous - Is there going to be active 24 hours. Such as trucks and such coming in?

Moe Davenport – We do not know that is yet to be determined.

From Anonymous - Why are not the 5 lots on Emmorton Road in the mixed use?

Moe Davenport – The owner/developer chose to develop them outside the mixed-use guidelines and regulations.

From DeVinney Family – Do you have my letter?

Moe Davenport – We may have your letter Mr. DeVinney I do not recall seeing it but I will look for it. If not, you can email it to me.

From Anonymous – Keep Harford County rural. More retail is not feasible.

Development Advisory Committee Minutes
August 19, 2020
Page 21 of 30

Moe Davenport – It looks like we are going to have more questions but I am going to have to cut it off at some point.

Chelsea Broach – That was the last new question.

Moe Davenport – Again, we will be reviewing this for several more weeks. We will put the information on our website. We will continue the dialog with the community members and the developer and State Highway Administration and all of the teams here. With that we will conclude the meeting on the Caddie Homes property. We will accept comments via email or mail at any time. With that, we will move onto the next plan on the agenda.

807 PULASKI HIGHWAY-SITE PLAN

Located on the south side of Pulaski Highway (Route 40); on the east side on Pine Road. Tax Map 65; Parcel 155,236, 661, 1062 & 1066. First Election District. Council District A. Planner: Crysta.

Plan No.	S301-2020	15,200 sq. ft. of retail/office & warehouse space with 18 retail Parking spaces and up to 24,999 sq. ft. of loading space/8.44 Acres/B3
----------	-----------	---

Received	07-22-2020	Chesaco Properties/TKC Land Development, LLC/Kimley-Horn
----------	------------	--

Jennifer Leonard - Kimley-Horn

Good morning we are here. I am Jennifer Leonard. I am the project manager at Kimley-Horn working with Beth Godfrey on the development of this commercial site off of 807 Pulaski Highway. It is a 367,500 sf site or approximately 8.4 acres. The existing zoning is B3. We are working within those zoning requirements. The proposed use is commercial retail. It will be an equipment rental facility. We are required to have 16 parking spaces we are proposing 18 parking spaces, 17 standard spaces and one handicap space and one loading space. We are working within the required setback and the proposed building is 15,200 sf total with about 3,200 sf of that office. That is the two-story portion of the building that will be adjacent to Pulaski Highway. There will be approximately 30 employees and we do plan on doing our Forest Conservation on-site. We have provided the required landscaping at this point as well.

Bill Snyder – Volunteer Fire & EMS

- Warehouse/Office Building will require a Knox Box. It shall be keyed for the Harford County Fire Service. Contact wrsnyder@harfordpublicsafety.org to obtain Box.
- Recommend the usage of non-combustible landscaping directly next to the Warehouse/Office. Traditional, wooden-mulch increases likelihood of nuisance fires from outdoor smoking.
- Will entire property be inside a locked gate after hours?

Jennifer Leonard – The entire property will be fenced and we will have gate entrances which will be two on Pine Avenue.

Bill Snyder – And, that entrance will be gated after hours?

Jennifer Leonard – Yes.

Development Advisory Committee Minutes
August 19, 2020
Page 23 of 30

Beth Godfrey – Jennifer is it worth noting that the Rayners Lane access is no longer going to be there.

Jennifer Leonard – Yes, it is. I was going to get to that. We have opted to remove the proposed entrance/exit on Rayners Lane based on its existing condition and the proposed circulation within our site. It just didn't make sense to include that entrance.

Darryl Ivins – DPW Water & Sewer

A new series of this plan is required to address the following comments, concerns and/or requirements of the Department of Public Works, Division of Water and Sewer, on the above described project:

The existing water and sewer utilities (including manholes) along Route 40, Pine Road, and through the property must be shown clearly on the next series of the plan which shows the proposed work. Easements related to these utilities must also be shown more clearly. Revise the landscaping as necessary so that it is not within an existing or proposed easement.

There are existing water services for parcels 661 and 1062 that must be abandoned as part of the utility work for this project. The work must be shown and described on the utility plans submitted with the Commercial Application.

There is an existing fire hydrant in the proposed entrance to the site on Pine Road. It must be removed as part of the utility work for the project and a new one installed. Show the location of the new hydrant on the next series of this plan.

The Division of Water and Sewer requires an exclusive easement for a future gravity sewer main through a portion of the property. The attached drawing shows the locations of the easement and the future sewer main. The easement consists of a twenty to thirty foot wide permanent easement and a ten foot wide temporary construction easement. The sewer main and the necessary easements must be shown on the next series of the plan. Landscaping and stormwater management may not be placed within the easement area.

There is grading proposed over a ten inch diameter sewer force main which is located at the southern entrance to the site. Prepare a sewer profile drawing that verifies there will be adequate cover over the main after the grading has occurred. Submit the profile directly to the Division of Water and Sewer prior to or concurrent with the next series of the plan.

Sewer manhole MH28 on Contract 6400-1 may be required to be adjusted as part of the utility work for this project. The work should be shown and described on the utility drawings submitted with the Commercial Application.

Development Advisory Committee Minutes
August 19, 2020
Page 24 of 30

The compaction effort for the soil over the existing sanitary sewer mains that cross this property is unknown. It shall be the Developer's responsibility to perform any tests necessary to verify that the soil will support the proposed improvements to the site. Harford County will not be responsible for any structural failures as a result of inadequate soil compaction.

Since there are public utilities within the improvements proposed on this property, the Division of Water and Sewer will require an indemnification agreement for the maintenance of the public utilities. This agreement must be prepared by the developer and reviewed by the County before the record plat may be approved. The agreement must be recorded concurrent with the record plat.

Any sewer cleanouts that are located within the paved area shall be installed using the County cleanout in paving detail S-28. The detail shall be shown on the utility plan and referenced on the plan and/or profile drawing.

The construction contract numbers for the existing utilities shall be shown on the drawing submitted with the Commercial Application.

A Commercial Service Application must be completed by the owner and approved by Harford County before a building permit will be issued for this project. The Commercial Service Application Number 20104 must be added to the title block of the site plan submitted with the Application for approval. Contact the Division of Water and Sewer Administration and Permitting Section at 410-638-3300 for additional information.

Steve Walsh – DPW Engineering

1. A sediment control plan and a grading permit will be required for the development of this site. Sediment controls are to be designed to the specifications as set forth in the Maryland Standards for Erosion and Sediment Control, latest edition.
2. Stormwater Management must be provided in accordance with the 2000 Design Manual as amended by Supplement 1.
3. A stormwater management concept plan must be approved prior to site plan approval. An engineered plan shall be submitted and reviewed for approval prior to final plat approval. Comments must be addressed on subsequent stormwater plan submittals.
4. The final stormwater management plan shall be approved prior to the issuance of a grading permit and permitted when areas of the facilities are being disturbed. A stormwater management permit is required prior to the issuance of a building permit.

Development Advisory Committee Minutes
August 19, 2020
Page 25 of 30

5. Maintenance of the stormwater management facilities are the responsibility of the lot owner (s) or beneficial user for facilities installed on individual lots.
6. Stormwater management practices shall be constructed and necessary information documenting construction shall be submitted prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy. Practices located on individual lots are the maintenance responsibility of the owner.
7. The entrance width shall be 30' with 30' minimum curb radii.
8. Road plans will need to be approved and a Public Works Agreement will need to be executed prior to the issuance of building permits for the site.
9. Pine Road shall be widened to provide a minimum 24' width from US Route 40 past the 2nd entrance.
10. Entrance to the site shall be a minimum of 60 feet from the edge of paving for US Route 40. The distance between the entrances shall be at a minimum of 60 feet.
11. Rayner's Lane is a private road. Any entrance off of Rayner's Lane would need to be agreed upon with the property owners.
12. Curb and gutter shall be provided along the frontage of the property.
13. A traffic impact analysis was submitted for review. Comments are being forwarded to Planning and Zoning.

Moe Davenport for Len Walinski – Health Department

- If the site will be used for the warehousing, distribution, packaging, or processing of food or food products: review will be required by the Maryland Department of Health (MDH), Division of Food Control. If there are any questions regarding this review, please contact their office at 410-767-8400.
- Any buildings to be razed will require a demolition permit that is secured through the Department of Planning and Zoning. All aspects of the demolition work must be reviewed, approved, and completed to the satisfaction of the Health Department. This includes, but is not limited to, the abandonment of any wells and septic systems, the management of asbestos, hazardous materials, and solid wastes, and the removal of underground storage tanks. All documentation concerning the demolition work must be forwarded to this office. If the owner/developer has any questions concerning the demolition work, please contact the Permits and Plan Review Division at 410-877-2300.
- Additional comments from this office will be provided at the time of the building permit, or tenant/occupancy permit. It is the responsibility of the owner/operator to

Development Advisory Committee Minutes
August 19, 2020
Page 26 of 30

be aware of any regulatory requirements for the proposed use, and for obtaining appropriate permits.

- The owner/developer is reminded that during the development of this project when soil moisture conditions are low, measures must be implemented to prevent the generation of dust until a permanent vegetative cover is established and all paving is completed.

Teresa Eller – State Highway Administration

The MDOT SHA has reviewed the **Site Plan** for this project and offers the following comment:

1. The proposed northern access onto Pine Road should be located farther away from US 40 so as not to cause any potential impact with traffic entering or exiting the site. SHA would suggest requiring one access point onto Pine Road.
2. SHA will require an Access Permit for this project to include acceleration and deceleration lanes on US 40. The acceleration/deceleration lanes will require full depth pavement and include curb and gutter, striping and sidewalk. Plans will also be required to show how SWM will be managed. All proposed curb & gutter within the MDOT SHA right-of-way must be 8" Type 'A' curb & gutter (MD 620.02).

To initiate the plan review cycle toward the issuance of the access permit the design engineer must submit access permit plans reflecting the above criteria and details. The plan submittal should include hydraulic computations and all supporting documentation. Plan submittals should be made electronically thru the Salesforce link which can be found at: <https://mdotsha.force.com/accesspermit/login?ec=302&inst=4v&startURL=%2Faccesspermi>
[t](#)

All SHA Policies, Standards and Specifications must be followed when preparing the above plan submittal including but not limited to the following documents:

MDOT SHA Access Manual
MDOT SHA Business Standards and Specifications

The Access Management Plan Review Checklist must be utilized in drafting the SHA Improvement Plans. Please include a copy of the completed checklist when making this submittal. All of these documents along with additional guidance can be found on our web site at www.roads.maryland.gov under Business Center.

Crysta Draayer – Planner

1. This plan proposes to develop 15,200 square feet of retail/office and warehouse space with 18 retail parking spaces and up to 24,999 square feet of loading space.
2. A new series of the Site Plan is required. The appropriate 25' front yard setback must be applied to the property frontage along both Pine Avenue and Rayners Lane. Per the Harford County Zoning Code, the outside storage of material or equipment "shall be permitted in the B3 district, provided that such storage does not cover more than 35% of the lot area and shall not be within the required front yard." According to the plan, a total of 135,400 square feet of equipment parking and staging area is proposed. This exceeds 35% of the total site area of 367,500 square feet. Also, both the 25,900 square feet and 97,800 square feet areas are within the required front yard(s).
3. The new series of the Site Plan should also include the following: the zoning of adjacent properties, the identification of the designated handicap parking space, and the identification of the designated loading parking space.
4. A preliminary plan to consolidate the multiple existing lots shall be submitted for review and approval by the Department of Planning and Zoning. The Final Plat shall include all required easements and be recorded in the Land Records of Harford County prior to the issuance of a grading and/or application of a zoning certificate.
5. This project is subject to the Harford County Forest Conservation Regulations. A Forest Stand Delineation (FSD262-2020) has been submitted and approved by the Department of Planning and Zoning. A Forest Conservation Plan (FCP302-2020) has been submitted, but cannot be approved. The intermittent stream in the southern forested area on-site requires the appropriate 75-foot Natural Resource District buffer. This area shall be labeled as "Natural Resource District" (NRD) on the final plat. The intermittent stream located in the western portion of the site is piped in a stormdrain. Any specimen trees to be removed shall require the approval of a specimen tree waiver prior to removal.
6. A Landscape Plan (L303-2020) has been submitted, but cannot be approved. The following information shall be addressed on a new series of the Landscape Plan. A Type C Bufferyard is required along property boundaries shared with R1-zoned properties where there is not proposed Forest Conservation/Retention Area at least twenty (20) feet in width. The proposed landscaping shall be revised to provide the required number of trees & shrubs within both the Type C Bufferyard and the delineated five (5) foot landscape buffer between paved areas and adjacent

Development Advisory Committee Minutes
August 19, 2020
Page 28 of 30

properties. The notes listed on the Landscape Plan Application Checklist under “Notes to be included on the Plan” must be included. Foundation plantings are also required.

7. All proposed signage shall conform to the Sign Code. Permits shall be obtained from the Department of Planning and Zoning

Beth Godfrey – I would like to clarify the square footage. The building footprint as shown is correct. There is also a mezzanine that they are going to have above the office area, which is about 3,000 square feet. I just wanted to make sure you all were aware of that. We can update the plan accordingly. It will be a total of about 18,000 square feet.

Moe Davenport – Thank you Beth. Any other questions or comments from DAC members?

Chelsea are you able to determine which comments are for Pine Road?

Chelsea Broach – For the most part yes. Jennifer helped me with that. If you stay in the new tab most of those should for this plan.

From Anonymous – Buffering adjacent properties?

Moe Davenport – Crysta from Planning & Zoning discussed about the landscape plan and the buffer yards that are required. We will require a revised landscaping plan and we will try to make sure that is available on our website.

From Anonymous – Is this going to bring public sewer to my property on Pine Road?

Moe Davenport – Darryl can you talk about that?

Darryl Ivins – Do you have the property address?

Moe Davenport – It just says Pine Road.

Darryl Ivins – Actually the properties that are the 4 property immediately south of there have the best chance but the short answer is no. Not right now. When the sewer is extended in the future through this development that I mentioned earlier in my comments they will have an opportunity but not until that occurs. That is probably between 4-5 years at the earliest.

Moe Davenport – Thank you Darryl.

Development Advisory Committee Minutes
August 19, 2020
Page 29 of 30

From Anonymous – Note that Pine Avenue is incorrect it should be Pine Road

From Anonymous – As of today there is a lot of overgrowth, weeds, trees affecting my property and not allowing me to do projects on my property.

From Anonymous – How are they planning to buffer from adjacent properties?

From Anonymous – Are they going to be active for 24 hours such as trucks coming and going?

Moe Davenport – Do you know that Beth?

Beth Godfrey – It will not be 24 hours. There will be limited times.

From Anonymous – What are the plans for the lots between Pine Road and Raynor Lane?

Moe Davenport – So, you own other lots Beth.

Beth Godfrey – No, what you are seeing on the screen is all we will be purchasing and what is under contract now.

Moe Davenport – So, this is all storage between Raynor Lane and Pine Avenue back here?

Beth Godfrey – Correct.

From Anonymous – When schools are in session children wait for the school bus in that area Route 40 and Pine. Will this remain the same with the development?

Moe Davenport – There are no proposed changes at this point in time.

From Anonymous – It is 1003 Pine Road.

Moe Davenport – I believe you answered the question Darryl. 5 years out.

Chelsea Broach – There are no more new questions. But, I do need to read one out to you. It is from anonymous – Where is the access road to said property going to be? How is this going to affect the traffic on Pine Road?

Moe Davenport – There were two proposed accesses for the project. One to Pine Road and one to Raynor. They have eliminated the access to Raynor Lane and the access to Pine Road the State Highway Administration has asked them to move that further to the south. Right now it is shown on Pine Road. Two access points so there may be some changes to the first access point right at the intersection.

Development Advisory Committee Minutes
August 19, 2020
Page 30 of 30

Chelsea Broach – There is one more new question that says storage of what?

Moe Davenport – Can you talk about the contractors equipment Beth?

Beth Godfrey – Sunbelt is probably better to talk about the actual equipment. They don't have a lot of customer visiting. It is all to the clients. So there is not a lot of traffic shall I say.

Moe Davenport – This is a rental.

Beth Godfrey – Yes.

Moe Davenport – Construction rental. So what was the question again?

Chelsea Broach – It just says storage of what?

Moe Davenport – I imagine there will be construction equipment stored.

Beth Godfrey – That is right.

Moe Davenport – Scissor jacks, construction lifts...

Beth Godfrey – Exactly.

Moe Davenport – I hope that answers that question.

Again, as with the other plan you can email us if you have questions. We will try to answer them and get you the information that you may need. We will be glad to take more questions at any time. Again, we are not approving the plan at this point in time. They will be submitting a revised plan, which we will put on the web page as well.

That concludes our meeting for today. I want to thank everyone for their patience and attendance. Stay safe. Thank you.

Meeting adjourned at 10:45 am.