



MINUTES OF THE
February 21, 2019 Meeting of the
Town of Easton Planning & Zoning Commission

Members Present: Richard Tettelbaum - Chairman, Don Cochran – Vice Chairman, Talbot Bone, Paul Weber and Jennifer Dindinger – Alternate

Members Absent: Vicky McAndrews

Staff Present: Lynn Thomas - Town Planner, Sierra Crist - Current Planner/GIS Analyst, Sharon VanEmburch - Town Attorney, Rick VanEmburch - Town Engineer, Katie Reedy – Assistant Town Engineer, Joe Mayer – Plan Reviewer, Trevor Newcomb - Planner

Approval of Minutes

Upon Motion of Mr. Bone and second by Mr. Cochran, the Commission voted 5-0 to approve the December 20, 2018 meeting minutes.

Old Business: Comprehensive Plan Amendment request from Gannon

1:00 PM

The first item was Greg Gannon's request for amending the Comprehensive Plan to show the Galloway Farm as a Priority 1 annexation area. It has for some time been partially Priority 2 and partially Priority 3. Mr. Tettelbaum asked the question why now versus later for the annexation? Mr. Gannon responded to have it in a Priority 1 prior to an annexation request and planning staff feels it is a good idea. Mr. Thomas explained that if Mr. Gannon anticipates requesting the annexation prior to the Comprehensive plan update which is still three years away before it is completed, amending the Plan now, based on previous policy of the Town Council, would be beneficial for annexation. If there are no immediate plans it is not necessary to do now. The expected completion date of the next Comprehensive Plan is 2022 or 2023.

Mr. Gannon explained that there is focus on the east side of Town and that if the funds were available he would complete Alicia Drive. Ms. Dindinger asked Mr. Thomas to explain the issue raised in his memo concerning Parcel 243 and annexation without that parcel. Mr. Thomas asked what are we annexing or what is upgraded to a Priority 1. Parcel 243 is at the intersection of Route 50 and Chapel Road. Mr. Gannon responded it is Gannon property. Current properties are Priority 2 and would have to be upgraded. Mr. Thomas said Parcel 185 owned by Mr. Foster and 107 owned by Murdoch (now Christian Neely) and Parcel 242 and 243 are Gannon Property. Mr. Cochran asked if Parcel 242 is all residential. Ms. Dindinger asked if Parcels 185 and 107 can come together. Mr. Thomas suggested bringing all four parcels together. Mr. Tettelbaum asked

do we need to change the priority of Parcels 107 and 185. Mr. Thomas answered yes and whether they want to annex in is up to the owner. Mr. Weber asked are there any downsides if we have other areas that are ready for potential annexation (designated as Priority 1). Mr. Thomas does not think there any downsides. Mr. Thomas has looked at what has happened since the 2010 Plan was adopted in terms of growth and where it happened. Seven relatively large undeveloped parcels are identified as the primary focus of development: Area 1 - SSSP site (has been approved for school), Area 2 - Brooks Farm on Dutchmans Lane (no development), Area 3 - Oxford Road Shore Health Site (minimal activity but no development, other than the Temple), Area 4 - Easton Common Site (partial development since plan with hotel), Area 5 - Waterside Village (a lot of activity), Area 6 - Lipidis Property (awaiting on attorney to come back with suggested ways to revise what they submitted in a proposed amendment), and Area 7 Future Hospital site (has been annexed and plans approved). Also in conjunction with the Port Street small area plan adoption, we added an eighth area for the Port Street Corridor. Annexation that has been done are Shore Health, Talbot Commerce Park and JD Oliver were Priority 1 areas. Priority 1 areas were described as those that were primarily already developed and recognized as needed to come into town for town services.

Mr. Cochran asked what is the status of the property that was declined on Rt. 33. Mr. Thomas responded it was a Priority 1. The Planning Commission approved and Town Council denied it. They have not returned. Mr. Weber asked if all four of the properties are vacant land? Mr. Gannon responded that there is a little brick rancher on one of the properties but will be probably be gone eventually. Mr. Weber asked if there are no structures on the four plots it may not pass the definition of Priority 1. Mr. Thomas said for the purpose of this plan at the time it was adopted for Priority 1 we believed areas so-designated would be appropriate to consider for annexation during this comprehensive plan.

Mr. Thomas stated the question really is simply should we be willing to entertain a comprehensive plan amendment. Mr. Weber asked if Mr. Gannon was at a disadvantage in anyway because he does not plan to do any development at this time but if his plans change in a year and he would like to submit an annexation request for a Priority 2 could his request be denied. Sharon Van Emburgh responded there was someone who had been denied but the Priorities were a little different. Ms. Dindinger asked can we handle Priorities on a case by case basis. Mr. Gannon responded when they did Chapel Road everything was already in plan, including future road improvements. Alicia Drive is already in the Plan. Mr. Tettlebaum said does not see any reason not to go forward. Sharon Van Emburgh mentioned that when the Comprehensive plan was prepared it was anticipated to be a six year document and then it became 10 year document. Mr. Cochran asked what the schedule is regarding the next Plan Update. Mr. Thomas stated that the intention in changing to 10 years is so that the Plan can utilize latest and updated census data. Typically we start process at least two years in advance. It could be as soon as next year. Mr. Weber mentioned that a Priority 2 to Priority 1 should be based on plan driven by town and not property owner. Ms. Dindinger said it can be reviewed and updated criteria. Mr. Gannon indicated he does not plan to develop the property right away.

Upon Motion of Ms. Dindinger and second by Mr. Weber, the Commission voted 5-0 to approve advertisement amendment to Priority1 for Parcels 242 and 243.

Upon Motion of Mr. Bone and second by Mr. Weber, the Commission voted 5-0 to approve to consider classification of 107 and 185 as Priority 1 areas.

Discussions regarding Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance Updates

1:55 PM

Discussion is follow up based on PUD options from last week's meeting. Mr. Thomas said the meeting went well and he thought clear direction was given, with one exception and that was how to tackle ways to encourage redevelopment and increased residential density in and around downtown. Mr. Thomas presented two options to the members of the planning commission for their review, a revised PUD and/or the existing PRD with an expanded overlay district to include Downtown. Mr. Thomas asked if there should be a special meeting for the continued work on Zoning Ordinance.

Election of Officers

Upon Motion by Mr. Cochran, nominating Mr. Bone as chairman of planning commission second by Mr. Weber, the Commission voted 4-1 for approval.

Upon Motion by Mr. Cochran, nominating Mr. Weber as Vice Chairman of the Planning Commission and second by Mr. Bone, the Commission voted 5-0 for approval.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 2:40 p.m. by motion of Mr. Cochran and second by Mr. Bone.

The Commission will meet again at their next regular monthly meeting, which they rescheduled to Thursday, March 14 at 1:00 PM, due to multiple members being unavailable on what would be the normal date of March 21, 2019.