

**MINUTES OF THE ST. MARY'S COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING
ROOM 14 * GOVERNMENTAL CENTER * LEONARDTOWN, MARYLAND
Monday, November 14, 2005**

Members present were Larry Greenwell, Chairman; Joseph St. Clair, Vice Chair; Lawrence Chase; Julia King; Steve Reeves; and Howard Thompson. Department of Land Use and Growth Management (LUGM) staff present was Denis Canavan, Director; Jeff Jackman, Senior Planner IV; Phil Shire, Planner IV; Bob Bowles, Planner II; Dave Berry, Planner I; and Keona Courtney, Recording Secretary.

The Chair called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES – The minutes of October 24, 2005 were approved as recorded.

DEVELOPMENT REVIEW

CCSP #04-132-009 – MTA PARK AND RIDE LOT, NEW MARKET

The applicant is requesting review and approval of a concept site plan for a 500-space MTA Commuter Park & Ride lot. The property contains 47.57 acres; is zoned Rural Preservation District (RPD); and is located in the northeast quadrant of the intersection of MD Route 5 and MD Route 6, just north of the recycling/convenience center; Tax Map 4, Grid 16, Parcel 56.

Owner: St. Mary's County Facilities Management
Division
Agent: Mary Anne Polkiewicz, Maryland Transit
Administration (MTA)

Mr. Shire explained that the requested park and ride lot will be operated by MTA. It is intended to replace the temporary park and ride lot located in Charlotte Hall, near Burger King and the Amish Market. He explained that the Charlotte Hall lot has exceeded its capacity and some commuters are starting to park in the overflow areas. The requested park and ride location is one of two prospective sites, and is preferred by both the State and County. Mr. Shire mentioned that the Board of Appeals required the following offsite improvements for the new site: 1) on southbound Rte 235, the left turn lane be extended to allow buses more room to turn left onto eastbound Route 6, and 2) acceleration and deceleration lanes be added to the entrances of the lot.

Ms. Polkiewicz explained that MTA has been working on the New Market site since 2001. Initially there were two prospective sites for the new lot: one at Golden Beach Road, and the other at the New Market location. In December

2002 the New Market location was put on hold by MTA due to budget constraints and MTA moved forward with the Golden Beach Road site. MTA held a public open house for the Golden Beach Road site and public concerns were raised about the traffic on Golden Beach Road. MTA informed the Board of County Commissioners (BOCC) about the findings from the public open house and the BOCC requested that MTA stop pursuit of the Golden Beach Road site and make the New Market site a priority. Ms. Polkiewicz mentioned that she has met with LUGM, State Highway Administration (SHA), and the Department of Public Works & Transportation (DPW&T) to address the traffic concerns for the New Market site.

Mr. Sifuentes, Jacobs Civil Inc., explained that the stormwater management sites have been relocated due to environmental constraints at the site. He noted that MTA is looking at options to minimize impact to the wetlands and wetland buffers, and added that his company has proposed some shelters between the detention basin and west lot parking spaces.

Mr. Greenwell asked if the commuter buses will enter onto Route 6. Ms. Polkiewicz replied that buses will be using Route 6, but that the contractors will be asked to tell their bus drivers to utilize Route 5 as much as possible. She stated that only four or five buses will use Route 6 as an exit to Route 5.

Ms. Polkiewicz provided an update on the traffic study for the proposed site. She explained that the first traffic report was completed in December 2002 and was revised when the project resumed in February 2004. MTA presented the traffic report to the Board of Appeals in August 2004 and concerns were raised about traffic in this area. MTA conducted additional traffic studies at this site and concluded that there is not enough room in the intersection for traffic turning left from Route 5. SHA requested that MTA extend the left turn lane to accommodate the traffic and MTA agreed to this request, and also proposed a signal light time change to allow the traffic in the intersection to clear. All of these findings were resubmitted to the Board of Appeals and they approved the conditional use request in October 2004.

Ms. Polkiewicz explained that lighting is a concern for the New Market site. She stated that she spoke to John Groeger, from DPW & T, to find out what kind of lighting should be used for the site. Mr. Groeger recommended a shoe box design for the lighting to reduce glare. Ms. Polkiewicz stated that MTA will work with Mr. Groeger to work out the specifications for this aspect of the project.

Mr. Thompson asked if the parking lot is level property. Mr. Sifuentes explained that the parking lot is a little bit higher in elevation than the neighboring properties. Mr. Thompson asked if the detention basins will be able to catch the water run off from the parking lot. Mr. Sifuentes stated that detention basin #1 should be able to catch most of the run off from the parking lot and detention

basins #2 and #3 should be able to catch the run off from the roadways that enter the parking lot.

Mr. Thompson expressed concern about security at the parking lot. He asked if there would be a wooded buffer between the parking lot and Route 5, and if there will be enough lighting in the parking lot. Ms. Polkiewicz explained that the BOCC requested that MTA maintain a 2,500 feet wooded buffer between the parking lot and Route 5. She explained that the local police normally provides security for park and ride lots. She also explained that the lights are set on a timer, causing them to brighten before the first bus arrives in the morning and dim after the last bus leaves the parking lot in the evening. She noted that the lights never turn completely off. Mr. Thompson asked if there will be payphones available at the parking lot. Ms. Polkiewicz replied that payphones are made available at all park and ride lots.

Mr. Thompson expressed concern about the Amish who use the intersection at Route 5 and Route 6. He asked if SHA considered the Amish during their traffic study. Ms. Polkiewicz stated that SHA did not express a unique concern for the Amish, but MTA did consider the Amish in their traffic studies. Mr. Thompson emphasized the fact that there is an Amish market at this intersection and stressed that there will be many Amish buggies using the intersection. Mr. Greenwell added that Wednesdays are especially busy because of the Amish market. Ms. Polkiewicz stated that the commuter buses begin trips as early as 4:30 am and normally finish their routes by 8:30 am. She did not feel that this would impact the patrons of the Amish market.

Mr. Thompson asked if the Charlotte Hall park and ride lot will continue to be used, or if the New Market lot will replace it. Ms. Polkiewicz explained that MTA plans to fully utilize the New Market location. She stated that MTA has coordinated with a real estate office to discuss continuing a lease for a smaller number of spaces at the Charlotte Hall location.

Mr. Greenwell asked when the last traffic study was performed. Ms. Polkiewicz stated that the last traffic study was completed in February 2004. Mr. Greenwell stated that the Planning Commission wants to see the traffic study from DPW&T. Mr. Greenwell stressed that there is not enough space in the intersection for two buses and that this will cause traffic to back up onto Route 5. He requested that another traffic study be submitted to the Planning Commission before the request is given additional consideration. Mr. Canavan agreed that the applicant should provide an updated traffic study and review the 2004 traffic study, and said that representatives from DPW&T and SHA would be present for the next discussion to answer any questions. Mr. Greenwell requested that the applicant address the following issues before coming back to the Planning Commission: 1) traffic study to include Golden Beach Road, All Faith Church Road, and traffic coming from eastbound Route 6, and 2) heavy use of the

commuter lot in addition to subsequent users accessing Lettie Marshall Dent Elementary School.

Mr. Greenwell mentioned that teachers at Lettie Marshall Dent Elementary School have raised security concerns about the lot being near the school. Ms. Polkiewicz explained that MTA is aware of the school's concerns. She explained that there is a quarter of mile of wetlands between the school's property line and the park and ride lot. She stated that this is a considerable amount of space and MTA does not feel that there will be any security threats to the school.

Mr. Canavan requested that any additional concerns be brought to his attention so that they can be addressed. Mr. St. Clair requested to see a list of the comments made at the public open house. Mr. Greenwell asked Mr. Canavan why the Planning Commission can not have a public hearing for this request. Mr. Canavan explained that the Planning Commission does not have the authority to approve the conditional use since it has all ready been approved by the Board of Appeals. He stated that the Planning Commission is permitted to take public comments at the public hearing regarding the concept plan. Mr. Canavan asked Ms. Polkiewicz to provide the Planning Commission with the comments made at the public open house.

The Chair allowed comments from the public regarding this request.

John Parlett, a local developer, stated that he is not opposed to the development of the park and ride lot, but that he is opposed to irresponsible development. He expressed concern about the Amish community and their ability to travel along our county roads. He expressed concern about the Fifth District Park since it is the only recreational park in that area. He noted that there is a lot of traffic coming in and out of the road at the elementary school because that road also leads to the park, explaining that he feels that the traffic from the park and school will have to compete with the estimated 500 park and ride users. Mr. Parlett mentioned that the environmental issues associated with the site are significant. He felt that the money being spent to build the retaining wells could be spent on a more suitable site. He also expressed concern about traffic at the intersection, and agreed that it would only take two buses to congest the intersection. He stated that park and ride lots in secluded areas have more problems with car vandalism than those located in open areas. Mr. Parlett explained that he felt the Charlotte Hall location is the better location for the park and ride lot, stating that there are three different intersections in Charlotte Hall that would allow commuters more access to the park and ride lot. He noted that the funding for this project is approximately 80% federal and 20% state which means that there is no funding from the local government.

Jack Bailey, resident of New Market Turner Road, agreed with Mr. Parlett's comments. He stated that an updated traffic study is needed for this location. He explained that there are many commercial vehicles that use the

intersection and that there will be a definite impact once there are commuter buses added to the intersection. He closed by stating that the park and ride should be located in a larger area that will better accommodate the citizens of the County instead of wasting money at the proposed location.

Henry Virts, an area resident, stated that the project will be out of date by the time it is completed. He expressed concern for the commuters traveling south on Route 5. He explained that he felt that many of them may choose to utilize the next intersection slightly past the gas station instead of waiting in traffic, and stressed that the next intersection is very dangerous.

The Chair closed the floor to comments from the public.

The Planning Commission voted to table further discussion of this request until the requested information is received from the staff, SHA, and DPW&T.

CCSP #05-132-039 – HUNTING CREEK

The applicant is requesting review and approval of a concept development plan for 100 single family and townhouse lots, in order to proceed with an amendment to the Comprehensive Water and Sewerage Plan. The property contains 20.0 acres; is zoned Planned Unit Development (PUD), 5.0 net dwelling units per acre; and is located on the west side of Willows Road, 5500 feet from its intersection with MD Route 5; Tax Map 51, Grid 16, Parcel 433.

Owner: Southern Maryland Tri-County Community
Action Committee Inc.

Agent: Dan Ichniowski, NG&O Engineering Inc.

Mr. Shire explained that the original Planned Unit Development (PUD) for this location was approved in 1988. He explained that development of this location can occur at a density of five dwelling units per acre. Mr. Shire stated that the applicant needs concept approval before proceeding with an amendment to the Comprehensive Water and Sewerage Plan.

Dan Ichniowski, the applicant's agent, explained that the project was placed in a conservation easement by the property owner. The 20 acres of property was deeded over to the County. He explained that there will be a site plan for the proposed 70 townhouse units as well as a site plan for the community center that is on site. A subdivision plan will be provided to the Planning Commission for each of the 30 proposed single family housing units.

Ms. King explained that she has asked applicants in the past to contact the Metropolitan Commission (MetCom), simply to advise them that they are seeking an amendment to the Comprehensive Water and Sewerage Plan. She

stated that she would like all applicants with similar requests to address MetCom sometime during the development plan process.

Mr. St. Clair moved that having accepted the staff report, dated October 28, 2005, and having made a finding that the referenced project meets concept development plan requirements to proceed with a Comprehensive Water and Sewer amendment to change the water and sewer categories from S-6D and W-6D to S-3D and W-3D, and noting that the subdivision plan must return to the Planning Commission for preliminary approval, the Planning Commission approve the concept site plan, as requested. The motion was seconded by Mr. Thompson and passed by a 6-0 vote.

CCSP #05-132-039 – HUNTING CREEK

The applicant is requesting review and approval of a concept site plan for a minor amendment to the PUD, to allow findings for adequate public facilities. The property contains 20.0 acres; is zoned Planned Unit Development (PUD), 5.0 net dwelling unit per acre; and is located on the west side of Willows Road, 5500 feet from its intersection with MD Route 5; Tax Map 51, Grid 16, Parcel 433.

Owner: Southern Maryland Tri-County Community Action Committee Inc.

Agent: Dan Ichniowski, NG&O Engineering Inc.

Mr. Shire explained that in 1988, when the PUD was first approved, provisions for adequate public facilities were not made. He stated that on December 13, 2002 a Conservation Easement to the Maryland Environmental Trust was created to all but the remaining 20 acres of this property. The 20 acres was singled out for the development of workforce housing. Mr. Shire explained that the minor amendment would allow for the establishment of schools. He stated that all other aspects of adequate public facilities would be found and/or mitigated at final site plan approval or final subdivision approval. He explained that this project is an indirect way to facilitate the relocation of the residents currently living in Lexington Manor, near Patuxent River Naval Air Station.

Dan Ichniowski explained that the St. Mary's County Board of County Commissioners (BOCC) has tasked the Southern Maryland Tri-County Community Action Committee with the development of this property to assist the residents relocating from Lexington Manor. He stated that there is sufficient capacity in the nearby schools to handle this development. He emphasized that this development will not increase school capacity since the current students will simply be relocated. Mr. Ichniowski stated that his company has been placed under a very tight design schedule to further help the relocation effort. He

mentioned that they hope to have building permits to begin construction in Hunting Creek by November 2006.

Mr. St. Clair asked how many residents are located in Lexington Manor. Mr. Shire estimated that there are approximately 100 people who reside in Lexington Manor. Mr. Reeves asked if the residents are retirees or school age. Mr. Shire emphasized that the intention is not to move the residents of Lexington Manor to Hunting Creek but to provide similar housing to those who need it. Mr. St. Clair added that this request will fulfill the needs of the workforce.

Ms. King asked if the property will be available for rental or ownership. Mr. Ichniowski explained that the townhouse units are intended for rental and the 30 single family homes will be available for ownership. He mentioned that out of the 30 single family homes there will be 15 duplex units.

Mr. Shire explained that this request for adequate public facilities was categorized as a minor amendment to the PUD because the St. Mary's County Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance does not define findings for adequate public school capacity under major amendments.

Mr. Thompson moved that having accepted the staff report and all attachments, dated November 8, 2005, and having made a finding that the objectives of Section 44.4.4 of the St. Mary's County Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance have been met; and noting that the referenced project has met the requirements for minor amendments and that school capacity is adequate for 100 residential units to be built within Parcel 433, the Planning Commission approve the minor PUD amendment, as requested. The motion was seconded by Mr. Reeves and passed by a 6-0 vote.

Ms. King asked if there are federal funds involved with this project. Mr. Shire stated that the project will be federally funded. Mr. Anderson, Allstate Property Co., explained that they received a tax credit allocation through the state of Maryland. He emphasized that the 70 townhouse units will be funded using the tax credit allocation. He stated that this is not a governmental subsidy but is a private investment in workforce housing. He explained that the 30 single family homes will be funded by the Southern Maryland Tri-County self help program.

CCSP #05-13200028 – TRITON METALS INDUSTRIAL PARK

The applicant is requesting review and approval of a concept site plan for a 90,748 square foot office building. The property contains 13.95 acres; is zoned Industrial (I); and is located at 43979 Airport View Drive in California, Maryland; Tax Map 34, Grid 7, Parcel 548.

Owner: Kmahl Properties LLC
Agent: Dan Ichniowski, NG&O Engineering

Mr. Bowles explained that the project has successfully gone through the Technical Evaluation Committee (TEC) review process. He stated that the project is consistent with the goals for industrial zoning. Mr. Bowles explained that the site is located within the Airport Environs zone but that it is below the 20 feet transitional plane for the airport. Public water and sewer is available for the site. He stated that the site will generate approximately 40 trips per day from Airport View Drive.

Dan Ichniowski explained that the site is for a proposed 88,000 square feet of flex space; with 10% of the space used for offices and the remaining 90% used for warehouse space. There will be an additional 2,000 square feet of space added to the all ready existing Triton Metals building. Mr. Ichniowski explained that DPW&T did not feel that 40 trips per day from Triton Metals Industrial Park would impact the intersection.

Mr. St. Clair asked if there the site will be used for retail. Mr. Ichniowski replied that the site could be used for small retail. He stated that most likely this site will be used for wholesale business. Mr. Shire added that the St. Mary's County Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance does allow for retail sale in an Industrial zone as an accessory use.

Mr. Ichniowski explained that water and sewer are located across the street from the site and that stormwater management is available and being planned for the site. He stated that the site is located in the Airport Environs zone and that the buildings will not penetrate the transitional plane of the airport. He mentioned that site plan will also need to go through the Federal Aviation Agency (FAA) notification process. FAA will have to review the approved site plan in order to verify the building elevations.

Mr. St. Clair expressed concern about 40 additional vehicles being added to the intersection at Route 235 and Airport View Drive. Mr. Ichniowski stated that the commuters will most likely be employees. He added that DPW&T reviewed the request and did not raise any concerns about the additional traffic at this intersection. Mr. Thompson asked if SHA has to review the request since the site will be utilizing the intersection. Mr. Ichniowski explained that the request does not have to be reviewed by SHA because Airport View Drive is not used as an access out onto a state highway. Mr. Thompson and Mr. St. Clair expressed concern about the intersection. Mr. St. Clair stated that there are many fatalities at this intersection. He expressed concern about SHA not conducting a traffic study unless traffic empties out onto a state owned highway. Mr. Ichniowski explained that if a traffic light is warranted by the State then SHA will require that the traffic light to be constructed.

Mr. St. Clair asked how the State normally determines if a traffic light is warranted. Mr. Ichniowski replied that the County will often review the number of

accidents, traffic delays, and number of pedestrians, at the intersection and request that the State conduct a traffic study. He stated that if the traffic signal is warranted, the State will then work with the local jurisdiction to construct a traffic light at the intersection. Mr. St. Clair asked who would need to submit the request for a traffic study. Mr. Ichniowski replied that the BOCC, LUGM, DPW&T, or Planning Commission could generate a letter requesting the traffic study. Mr. St. Clair asked when the last traffic study was requested for this intersection. Mr. Canavan replied that the last traffic study was requested for FDR Boulevard in Newport, Maryland. He stated that a warrant analysis can be submitted to the State at any time for a traffic study, but that they must approve the request. Mr. St. Clair asked if a traffic study request can be submitted now. Mr. Canavan replied that he will submit a letter to the State requesting the traffic study for this intersection.

Mr. Thompson moved that having accepted the staff report, dated October 28, 2005, and having made a finding that the objectives of Section 60.5.3 of the St. Mary's County Zoning Ordinance have been met, and noting that the referenced project has met all requirements for concept approval, the Planning Commission approve the concept site plan with the condition that if a traffic light is to be erected at the intersection of Route 235 and Airport View Drive that the applicant pay a portion of the cost. The motion was seconded by Mr. St. Clair and passed by a 6-0 vote.

PSUB #04-120-034 – MAZEL SUBDIVISION

The applicant is requesting preliminary review of a 116 lot townhouse and single family major subdivision. The property contains 24.5 acres; is zoned Residential High-Density District (RH) and Residential Low-Density District (RL), Airport Environs (AE) Overlay; and is located on the east side of Old Rolling Road, 1200 foot East of Rolling road and future F.D.R. Boulevard; Tax Map 42, Parcels 18 & 165.

Owner: Thomas Builders at St. Mary's, LLC
Agent: Robert Fernandez, Bowman Consultants Group LTD

Mr. Shire explained that this subdivision was previously reviewed by the Planning Commission in April 2004 as a concept site plan. He stated that the engineering has been finalized and findings have been made for adequate public facilities. He added that grading permits were released to the applicant and they have started clearing and grading the site. Mr. Shire explained that the applicant is proposing to build 109 townhouses and 7 single family lots. The townhouses will be served by an extension, or segment, of FDR Boulevard.

Mr. Reeves asked if access to FDR Boulevard would be built through the Wal-Mart site. Mr. Shire replied that access was not desired through the Wal-Mart site.

The Chair allowed comments from the public on this request.

Greg McHowski explained that he lives in the lot directly beside the proposed site, and that he and the other residents of the subdivision are concerned about the extension of Barefoot Drive to serve lots 6 & 7 and the emergency access road that will lead to the 109 townhouses. He stated that they do not wish to have access to the proposed site.

Mr. Greenwell asked Mr. Shire if Barefoot Drive will only serve lots 6 & 7. Mr. Shire replied that the road is only intended to serve these two lots. Mr. Fernandez explained that lots 6 & 7 will be served by a paved road. He explained that from the end of the lot to the first intersection will be a gravel road in order to provide stormwater maintenance. Mr. Fernandez stated that he does not encourage other residents to access the road to the single family homes. He explained that they plan to construct the proposed FDR Boulevard during Phase 1, along with the townhouses and single family homes. He stated that FDR will serve as the main access road for the subdivision.

Mr. Thompson asked how access is restricted to Barefoot Drive. Mr. Fernandez explained that there are signs and a gravel road to discourage access. Mr. Thompson asked if there is a gate. Mr. Fernandez replied that there is not a gate to restrict access, but that they can look into getting one.

Mr. Greenwell asked how lots 3, 4 & 5 are accessed. Mr. Fernandez explained that they are accessed by Monterey Lane. The Planning Commission agreed that the drawings presented were not clear and that they could not see how FDR Boulevard relates to the subdivision.

Mr. Greenwell asked why lots 6 & 7 can not be accessed by FDR Boulevard. Mr. Fernandez stated that lots 6 & 7 are intended to be kept more a part of Barefoot Drive. He stated that they did not want to encourage a permanent access route between the existing community and the proposed site.

Mr. Greenwell allowed additional comments from Mr. McHowski. Mr. McHowski stated that he and the other residents do not have a problem with the extension of Barefoot Drive to lots 6 & 7 since they don't foresee the two lots generating much more traffic. He stated that they are only concerned about the 109 townhouses being connected to their subdivision, and that there could be over 100 additional cars added to the road. Mr. Greenwell stressed that there needs to be a condition set in place that will restrict access to Barefoot Drive to lots 6 & 7 only which clearly states there will be a dead end and no access between FDR Boulevard and Barefoot Drive.

Mr. Thompson moved that having accepted the staff report, dated November 1, 2005, and having made findings pursuant to Section 30.5.5 of

the St. Mary's County Subdivision Ordinance (Criteria for Approval of a Preliminary Plan), including adequate facilities as described in the Director's report, the Planning Commission approve the preliminary subdivision plan with the condition that lots 6 & 7 only have access to Barefoot Drive and that it be restricted by signage and gate. The motion was seconded by Mr. Reeves and passed by a 6-0 vote.

MSUB #04-120-024 – ST. JEROME'S CROSSROADS, SECTION TWO

The applicant is requesting preliminary review of an 18 lot major subdivision. The property contains 190.2 acres; is zoned Rural Preservation District (RPD) and part Resource Conservation Area (RCA) overlay; and is located on the north side of St. Jerome's Neck Road at its intersection with Camp Winslow Road; Tax Map 68, Grid 2, Parcel 69.

Owner: Daniel S. Capper
Agent: Jerry Soderberg, D.H. Steffens

Mr. Bowles explained that there are no outstanding issues with this project. He explained that the proposed site has met the zoning and density requirements of the surrounding RPD, and that the requirements for clustering have been met. He stated that there is one lot located in the Critical Area, but that the remainder of the lots are outside of the Critical Area.

Ms. King asked what structures currently exist on the property. Mr. Soderberg explained that the historic farm house remains on this property, and will be preserved. He explained that the owner has hired a real estate agent who is a specialist in historic structures. Mr. Soderberg explained that he has re-routed the private right-of-way to contain the structure. He explained that the structure is approximately 28 feet off of the easement edge of the road.

Ms. King asked Mr. Soderberg to verify where the farm house is located. Mr. Soderberg pointed out that the farm house is on lot #29. Ms. King asked when the farm house was built. Mr. Capper stated that he estimates it was built in the 1800s but that he does not know a definite date. Ms. King asked what condition the farm house is in and about its use. Mr. Capper replied that the farm house is in poor condition and is only used for storage. Ms. King asked for assurance that the farm house will be sold with the lot. Mr. Soderberg explained that Mr. Capper is making every effort to ensure that the structure is sold with the lot. Ms. King stated that the Planning Commission should ensure that the farm house survives, since it is such a historical structure within the County. Mr. Capper explained that he has been in contact with Nancy McGuire of Maryland Heritage Property Company to coordinate signing a listing agreement for the property. He stated that Ms. McGuire has assured him that she can market the property. He stressed that he can not guarantee that the farm house will be restored.

Mr. Bowles explained that Terri Wilson, LUGM Historic Planner, documented and photographed the farm house. He stated that Ms. Wilson made a record of any work that needs to be done to restore the structure, in case it ever needed to be demolished. Mr. Bowles mentioned that Ms. Wilson dated the house back to approximately 1785 or the 1800s.

Mr. Reeves moved that having accepted the staff report, dated November 1, 2005, and having made findings pursuant to Section 30.5.5 of the St. Mary's County Subdivision Ordinance (Criteria for Approval of a Preliminary Plan), including adequate facilities as described in the Director's report, the Planning Commission approve the preliminary subdivision plan, as requested. The motion was seconded by Mr. St. Clair and passed by a 6-0 vote.

DISCUSSION

Planning Commission Agenda Deadline and Meeting Schedule for 2006

A handout was provided showing the proposed Planning Commission meeting dates and deadlines for 2006. There was no further discussion.

Progress of the Comprehensive Zoning of the Lexington Park Development District

Mr. Jackman explained to the Commission that there are changes to the text and map for the Lexington Park Development District because staff found errors on the map. He added that there will be a public hearing in January 2006 to review the zoning of the district. He asked that the Planning Commission initiate public involvement in the review process.

Ms. King asked Mr. Jackman if there was ever anything in writing about Route 235. Mr. Jackman replied that north Three Notch Road is being considered for a Residential Mixed Use District (RMX). Mr. Canavan explained that the current zoning for the area is RMX, with limited community use. He stated that the newspaper publication did not clarify this. Mr. Canavan stressed that LUGM is focusing on zoning for this district only. He explained that the current plan will give flexibility to the district, and that it could be considered for a Corridor Mixed Use District (CMX). Mr. Canavan suggested that the Commission consider a zoning text amendment to modify the CMX zone where it joins the RMX. He stated that LUGM will draft a zoning text amendment for review by the BOCC prior to drafting zoning maps. Mr. Canavan stressed that the Planning Commission has already approved the Lexington Park Development District and that the BOCC adopted the Lexington Park Development Plan. Therefore the

Planning Commission needs to recognize this as an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan.

Traffic Light at Airport View Drive and Route 235

The Planning Commission agreed that they are not opposed to the development of Triton Metals Industrial Park but stressed that the intersection is a safety concern. Mr. St. Clair asked staff to find out what makes the State recognize the importance of a traffic light, other than fatalities. Mr. Canavan agreed with Mr. St. Clair that there is a safety issue and stated that he will direct a letter to the District Engineer expressing this concern. He stated that the letter will trigger a review of this location. Mr. St. Clair stressed that the State should not only look at recorded fatalities, but should consider other accident statistics such as fender benders. Mr. Canavan stated that if SHA reviews his letter and determines that the traffic light is not justified, he will find out exactly why it is not justified.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

Keona L. Courtney
Recording Secretary

Approved in open session:
November 28, 2005

Larry Greenwell
Chairman