63 : 2/21/08
14 : 10675
204096

Community Input Meeting Minutes
For the Proposed
James Run Site Plan
MD Rt. 543 & I-95
Bel Air, Harford County, Maryland

The following is a summary of the Community Input Meeting for the above-referenced project, which meeting was held on Tuesday, July 31, 2007, at 6:00 p.m. p.m. in the Cafeteria at the Church Creek Elementary School, 4299 Church Creek Road, Belcamp, Maryland 21017

In attendance: Joseph F. Snee, Jr., Esquire
Gessner, Snee, Mahoney & Lutche, PA
Suzanne M. Turner, Paralegal
Gessner, Snee, Mahoney & Lutche, PA
Megan Virts, RLA, Morris & Ritchie Associates
Paul Muddiman, Vice President, Morris & Ritchie Associates
Kevin Carney, Developer
See attached sign-in sheet for attendees

Meeting opened at 6:00 p.m.

Mr. Snee introduced himself and the other participants to the attendees and briefly summarized the proposed development as well as the county's process for review of the developer's proposal and a brief history of the property itself. The attendees were advised this is a corporate development project not a shopping mall. Morris & Ritchie ran a power-point presentation of the proposed development and the meeting was then opened to the public for questions. The following items were noted from the discussion:

- The height of some of the buildings were shown higher than what is currently permitted by Harford County; however, the final development will be in full compliance all existing regulations.

- Water and sewer would be likely be obtained from a main currently located in/on Route 7 with an onsite pumping station. The attendees were advised that they could contact Joel V. Caudill, Deputy Director of Public Works, at the Department of Public Works for more information on the water/sewer issues with this property.

- There will be extensive landscaping done along Route 543 so that the parking lots within the development will not be as visible to vehicles traveling on that roadway. It was also explained that there is an approximate 40 ft. grade differential on the property in relation to the roadway. As many live, green

trees as possible would be saved; however, much of the center of the property would be bulldozed. The location and saving of springs currently on the property was also discussed.

- Traffic issues with Rt. 543 were a major concern for most of the attendees. They were advised that a traffic study has been completed and the plans have taken into account the results of that traffic study. Attendees believed that traffic study should have been a part of the subject meeting as well as representatives to answer specific traffic questions. The attendees were advised that plans are in place to accommodate the increase in traffic by increasing a portion of Route 543 to eight lanes. The roadway will taper down to two lanes just prior to the I-95 bridge. The traffic study will be submitted to the County for review and approval. Attendees were encouraged to contact the County to review the traffic study and to attend the DAC meeting when it is scheduled.

- A ramp off I-95 directly to the property was considered, but the Maryland State Dept. of Transportation said it was not possible. There are plans in place by the State to rebuild that particular intersection, the details of which were not public yet and therefore unavailable at the meeting. These plans will help to alleviate current and expected traffic issues. The attendees were advised that their contact at DOT is Melissa Williams. To date, a point person at SHA has not yet been assigned.

- The utilities connected to this site are planned to service this site only and not be connecters for other potential future developments.

- The expected timeframe for commencement of grading is 9 months to a year from the date the CIM was held.

- The attendees were assured that a summary of the meeting would be posted online by the Department of Planning & Zoning for their review. They were also provided with all contact information for Gessner, Snee, Mahoney & Lutche (410-893-7500), Morris & Ritchie Associates (410-515-9000) and the developer, Kevin Carney (410-740-5335) and were advised to contact any of these parties with any questions at any time. Further, the developer's website was provided – *www.thomasbuilders.com*. Mr. Carney assured the attendees that he would speak with anyone about their concerns.

- An attendee inquired as to whether this would be the only opportunity for input as to the development and was advised that other than the DAC hearing, there would be no further official public meetings.

- The purpose of the MO legislation was discussed. A concern was raised that maybe Harford County needs to clarify the interpretation of the calculation of office and retail space.

- JFS explained the direct access issue as well as the legal requirements for same.

- Mr. Carney explained to the attendees that the businesses within the development would be serviced and supported not only by the people working within, but by the outside community as well.

- The attendees questioned what would be built first and were advised that the market will determine that, but likely an office building would be erected first.

- At the time of the meeting, a parking garage within the development was not planned for purely financial reasons – structured parking is much more expensive. Attendees voiced their concerns with regard to the environmental issues of expanded surface parking rather than a garage.

- Attendees raised safety concerns with regard to co-mingling vehicle and pedestrian traffic. In response, Mr. Carney explained that the development will be designed to be pedestrian friendly and to encourage people to stay within the development for whatever they need. Vehicle traffic will be directed away from pedestrian areas as much as possible.

- Mr. Carney further explained that they are planning to build walls to hide service areas.

- An issue was raised with regard to "green" engineering and whether that had been considered with regard to the development. Mr. Carney admitted that he had not considered it, but would look into it. The attendee believed that "high end" markets would respond positively to an environmentally-friendly development. Mr. Carney responded that to the extent he can match reality with what the market wants, he will do so.

- An inquiry was made as to what types of stores would occupy the development and Mr. Carney advised that mostly "Class A" type retail stores, but could not give more detail than that at this time as negotiations were still in process.

- Discussion was heard as to whether this property was in the "development envelope", Mr. Snee confirmed this property is in a designated growth area.

- The issue of the 2005 rezoning application for this particular property was raised and the belief that the Hearing Examiner simply granted the request on a procedural error, not because an actual "mistake" had been found. Mr. Snee

addressed the legal reasoning behind the "mistake" issue and explained the basis for the hearing examiner's decision.

- Some of the attendees felt that there would be bias on the part of the law firm hosting the meeting and preparing the summary of same to be submitted to the County. The hosts of the meeting tried to assure the attendees that there were certainly no intent to mislead anyone during this process and that all notes and summaries would be submitted as accurately as possible.

- Some of the attendees further felt that a representative from the Department of Planning & Zoning should have attended the Community Input Meeting.

Meeting was adjourned at apx. 9:00 pm