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# SALISBURY-WICOMICO COUNTY <br> PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION 

## AGENDA

REGULAR MEETING
March 17, 2022
ROOM 301, THIRD FLOOR
GOVERNMENT OFFICE BUILDING
1:30 P.M. Convene, Chip Dashiell, Chairman
Minutes - Meeting of February 17, 2022
1:35 P.M. SKETCH PLAT REVIEW - Subdivision for Steeplechase Section 8 - Crooked Oak Lane and Pemberton Drive - R20 Residential, M-37, G-21, P-348 (M. Williams)

REVISED SIGN PLAN APPROVAL - Kay Jewelers - 2645 North Salisbury Boulevard - General Commercial Zoning District (H. Eure)

REVISED COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT PLAN - Coventry Plaza - 1495 Still Meadow Boulevard - Planned Residential Zoning District - The Villages at Aydelotte Farm, M-29, P-534 (H. Eure)

PRELIMINARY/FINAL SUBDIVISION PLAN APPROVAL - Johnson's Retreat Johnson Road - R-10 Residential - M-48, G-11, P-288 (B. Wilkins)

DISCUSSION - CITY OF SALISBURY ZONING CODE TEXT AMENDMENT EXEMPTIONS

DISCUSSION - CITY OF SALISBURY - RESIDENTIAL USE IN GENERAL COMMERCIAL ZONING DISTRICTS
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## MINUTES

The Salisbury-Wicomico County Planning and Zoning Commission ("Commission") met in regular session on February 17, 2022, in Room 301, Council Chambers, Government Office Building with the following persons participating:

## COMMISSION MEMBERS:

Charles "Chip" Dashiell, Chairman
Jim Thomas (via Zoom)
Mandel Copeland
Joe Holloway
Jack Heath
Matt Drew

## PLANNING STAFF:

Henry Eure, City of Salisbury, Department of Infrastructure and Development ("DID")
Brian Soper, City of Salisbury, DID
Brian Wilkins, City of Salisbury, DID
Marilyn Williams, Wicomico County Department of Planning, Zoning and Community Development ("PZCD")
Lori A. Carter, MBA, Wicomico County, PZCD
Janae Merchant, PZCD
Laura Hay, City of Salisbury Department of Law
The meeting was called to order at 1:30 p.m. by Chairman Dashiell.

MINUTES: The minutes from the January 20, 2022 meeting were brought forward for approval. Upon a motion by Mr. Heath, seconded by Mr. Holloway, and duly carried, the minutes from the January 20, 2022 meeting were APPROVED as submitted.

## PRELIMINARY/FINAL PLAT - Subdivision for Samuel F. \& Deborah B. Timmons - 8885 Parsonsburg Road - Residential (A-1 Zoning District) - M-22, G-8, and P56 (M. Williams)

Ms. Marilyn Williams presented the Staff Report. George E. Young, III, PC with Hampshire, Hampshire \& Andrews submitted the subdivision plat which proposes the creation of one additional lot created from Lot 2 on the easterly side of Parsonsburg Road. The proposed one-lot subdivision requires Planning Commission approval since the remainder is less than 15 acres in the A-1 zone. In this case, Lot 3 is proposed to contain 7.08 acres. There will be no more rural density lots available from this parcel under current subdivision regulations.

Staff recommends approval of the Preliminary/Final Plat Subdivision for Timmons, with the following four (4) conditions:

1. The site shall be developed in accordance with a Final Comprehensive Development Plan Approval that meets all Code Requirement. Minor plan adjustments may be approved by the Salisbury Department of Infrastructure and Development (DID).
2. Provide a detailed signage plan for approval by the Planning Commission. 3. Refuse disposal areas to be screened on 3 sides.
3. This approval is subject to further review and approval by the Salisbury DID and the Salisbury Fire Department.

Mr. Holloway entered a motion to approve the Preliminary/Final Plat Subdivision for Samuel and Deborah Timmons subject to the four (4) conditions presented in the Staff Report, seconded by Mr. Heath, and carried unanimously, the Commission approved the plan.

Chairman Dashiell stated the motion was APPROVED.

## REVISED CERTIFICATE OF DESIGN AND SITE PLAN APPROVAL - Chesapeake Shipbuilding - 704 \& 710 Fitzwater Street - Riverfront Redevelopment \#2 Zoning District-M-106, G-21 and 20, P-1110 and 1113 (H. Eure)

Mr. Henry Eure, joined by Dwight Miller (Gillis Gilkerson), Morgan Helfrich (George, Miles \& Buhr) and Steven McGee (president, Chesapeake Shipbuilding), presented the Staff Report. George, Miles \& Buhr, LLC for Chesapeake Shipbuilding, LLC submitted a Revised Certificate of Design and Site Plan Approval for the office building for Chesapeake Shipbuilding, to be located at 710 Fitzwater Street.

This revised proposal is a modification to the office building. The applicants made some changes to comply with the Commission's request. The gables will be installed on the north side of the building. The split-faced block has been removed
from the north side due to elevation but will be on the south side. The colors of the office building will match other buildings on the campus.

Staff recommends approval of the revised office building as submitted, and granting of a Revised Certificate of Design and Site Plan for Chesapeake Shipbuilding, with the following three (3) conditions:

1. This site shall be developed in accordance with the approved Site Plan and all requirements of the Salisbury Municipal Code. Minor plan adjustments that do not conflict with the Chesapeake Bay Critical Area requirements may be approved by the Director of the DID.
2. Eliminate the interior lot line between 704-710 Fitzwater Street, combining both properties into one (1) lot.
3. The project is subject to further review and approval by the Salisbury DID.

Mr. Drew said the plan looks great and Mr. Heath mentioned this project was great for the City of Salisbury and is encouraged by the potential growth. Mr. Holloway inquired into how many employees were currently employed. Mr. McGee mentioned there are 122 employees and after the completion of this project, more will be added. Wicomico County thanks you. Mr. Dashiell said the City and County appreciates all that Chesapeake Shipbuilding is doing, it is significant to our economy.

Mr. Heath made a motion to approve the Revised Design and Site Plan for the office building of Chesapeake Shipbuilding including the three (3) recommendations listed in the Staff Report, seconded by Mr. Drew, and carried unanimously with the exception of Mr. Thomas' recusal, the Commission approved the plan.

Chairman Dashiell stated the motion was APPROVED.

## REVISED COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT PLAN APPROVAL - Grocery Outlet - 2645 N. Salisbury Boulevard - General Commercial Zoning District (H. Eure)

Mr. Henry Eure, joined by Luis Marcelino (Director of Architecture, Design and Construction with Grocery Outlet in the east) and Joshua Hale (Construction Manager with Grocery Outlet in the east), presented the Staff Report. The applicant, GreenbergFarrow Architectural Firm, has submitted a Revised Comprehensive Development Plan for a new Grocery Outlet supermarket, which is to be located in the former Bed, Bath \& Beyond $21,579 \mathrm{sq}$. ft . space of the Lord Salisbury Shopping Center.

The applicants proposed exterior improvements including new primary and secondary building colors, new storefront doors, and minor changes to the loading area at the rear of the building. Also, two (2) "Grocery Outlet" wall signs are proposed to be erected on the front (west) and side (north). The parking and
landscaping will remain as it is currently. There have been no plans submitted for this site since February 19, 2004.

Staff review comments for the Revised Comprehensive Development Plan were presented. These included Building Elevations and Sign Plan. Ownership is supportive of the proposed color changes which include storefront colors of varying shades of gray with red accents, the north wall will be primarily red with gray trim.

Staff has concerns with the color theme of the north wall which is proposed to be primarily red and would be in stark contrast to the remainder of the building with its more muted tones.

Staff recommends approval for the Revised Comprehensive Plan for the Grocery Outlet tenant space in the Lord Salisbury Shopping Center, with the following one (1) condition:

## 1. Obtain a Revised Sign Plan approval for all proposed signs.

Mr. Marcelino said they will be submitting a signage plan separately. The supermarket is primarily out west with 400 stores but it is moving rapidly to the east coast and expanding into Maryland, Pennsylvania and New Jersey. This is not your traditional grocery store; each unit is owned and operated by a local owner, not a franchise model. The store will generate $25-30$ jobs and the operator will be doing the hiring.

Mr. Heath and Mr. Dashiell were concerned about the square footage of red paint on the north wall and asked if something could be done to tone down the red. Mr. Marcelino indicated they can explore how to tame down the color. The rationale behind using the red was to help people driving south on Route 13 to identify the Grocery Outlet and find the entrance into the parking lot. Mr. Holloway asked if the colors were standard for the company, Mr. Marcelino said they use a lot of reds and dark grays but not every store has the exact color scheme.

After visiting the site, Mr. Drew discovered a lot of two-way traffic in the north fire lane. He asked for them to be cognizant of the traffic pattern when trucks are docking as this could be a traffic hazard. Additionally, be aware when installing freezers and refrigeration in this area as it could also affect traffic. Mr. Marcelino said there would be no outside units because they will be installing two (2) fifteen foot rooftop units.

Mr. Heath made a motion to approve the Revised Comprehensive Development Plan for Grocery Outlet supermarket with the recommendation mentioned in the Staff Report and eliminate the red as a primary color on the north wall and allow the approval of the revised color scheme be approved by

DID; leaning towards beige and light brown. The motion was seconded by Mr. Holloway, and carried unanimously, the Commission approved the plan.

Chairman Dashiell stated the motion was APPROVED.

## REVISED SIGN PLAN APPROVAL - 59 Tags \& Title Agency - 1121 S. Salisbury Boulevard - General Commercial Zoning District (H. Eure)

Mr. Henry Eure, joined by Jerry McClymont (Signs by Tomorrow), presented the Staff Report. The applicant submitted a Revised Sign Plan for 59 Tags \& Title, located at 1121 South Salisbury Boulevard.

In June 2014, the Planning Commission approved a Final Comprehensive Development Plan for the existing mixed use building. Then in June 2015, the Commission approved a Sign Plan for the property using red, white, blue and black colors. Since this time, the tenant decided to add the color yellow as part of the corporate branding; this is supported by the landlord.

Staff recommends approval for the Revised Sign Plan as submitted. If approved, sign colors for the property will be expanded to include red, white, blue, black and yellow.

Mr. Dashiell mentioned the "yellow" looks orange and Mr. Heath said it looked like light gold. It was suggested if they add the colors yellow, orange and gold, the applicant would not need to return for Commission approval.

Mr. Heath made a motion to approve the Revised Sign Plan for 59 Tags \& Title to include the following colors, red, white, blue, black, orange, yellow or gold; seconded by Mr. Holloway, and carried unanimously, the Commission approved the plan.

Chairman Dashiell stated the motion was APPROVED.

## REVISED SIGN PLAN APPROVAL - Shah's Halal Food - 111 Truitt Street General Commercial Zoning District (H. Eure)

Mr. Henry Eure, joined by Jerry McClymont (Signs by Tomorrow), presented the Staff Report. The applicant submitted a Revised Sign Plan for Shah's Halal Food, a new restaurant that will occupy the space at Goose Creek convenience store located at the corner of U.S. Route 50 and Truitt Street.

In January 2013, the Planning Commission approved a Site Plan for the existing Goose Creek. A Sign Plan was approved in June 2014 and subsequent amendments were approved in October and December 2014. The current approved colors include red, white, blue, gold, green and black.

This tenant desires to install new signage on the front and north side walls. The front wall sign is 37.04 sq . ft . and will be a combination of individual channel letter, a logo and a smaller "channel case" cabinet sign. The sign on the north wall is 61.34 sq. ft . and the same combination of materials will be used. The signs will read "Shah's Halal Food" using the approved colors but also adding orange and yellow. These colors are supported by the property owner.

Staff recommends approval for the Revised Sign Plan as submitted. If approved, sign colors for the property will be expanded to include red, white, blue, gold, green, black, orange and yellow.

Mr. Heath made a motion to approve the Revised Sign Plan for Shah's Halal Food with following two colors added from the Staff Report, orange and yellow; seconded by Mr. Drew, and carried unanimously, the Commission approved the plan.

Chairman Dashiell stated the motion was APPROVED.

## REVISED CERTIFICATE OF DESIGN AND SITE PLAN APPROVAL - Marina Landing - 650 Fitzwater Street; M-106, G-22 and P-1108 (H. Eure)

Mr. Henry Eure, joined by Keith Fisher (Fisher Architecture), presented the Staff Report. The applicant is requesting a Revised Certificate of Design and Site Plan for Marina Landing Apartment complex located at 650 Fitzwater Street. The project will be increased to 76 residential units, with the addition of 20 more units in the former boathouse building.

On February 21, 2019, the Planning Commission issued a Preliminary Certificate of Design and Site Plan approval. A final approval was granted on May 16, 2019 which consisted of two (2) 28 unit apartment buildings with first floor retail/restaurant and a two-story boathouse.

This site is located within the downtown parking authority district. Parking is not required to be provided for sites within this special district. However, the site plan indicates that 108 parking spaces will be provided on site. Typically, 114 parking spaces would be required for an apartment complex of this size. Additional parking is available on the adjoining property to accommodate additional parking for guests and patrons of the retail/business uses. Storage/parking for at least four (4) bicycles would typically be required for the business/retail portion of the buildings, but is not required as it is located within the downtown parking district. However, Staff encourages this amenity be provided as a courtesy.

Staff recommends approval of the Revised Certificate of Design and Site Plan approval, subject to the following four (4) conditions:

1. This site shall be developed in accordance with the approved Site Plan and all requirements of the Salisbury Municipal Code. Minor plan adjustments that do not conflict with the Chesapeake Bay Critical Area requirements may be approved by the Director of the Salisbury DID.
2. The Applicant must obtain a Chesapeake Bay Critical Area Certificate of Compliance.
3. City Fire Marshal approval.
4. The project is subject to further review and approval by the City DID.

Mr. Fisher explained that he is back due to new incentives and the demand for housing in the County. The developer is excited and ready to proceed.

Mr. Justin Schaub, a Managing Partner of Brew River, came forward. He explained that he was concerned about the parking for the apartments and retail space. He discussed the parking lot and spaces dedicated to Brew River. There was discussion regarding the City Agreement with Frank Hanna in 1999. Mr. Schaub asked the Commission to take the time to investigate the parking situation.

Mr. Fisher explained that there is not $25,000 \mathrm{sq}$. ft . of retail space, it is closer to $17,000-18,000 \mathrm{sq}$. ft. The majority of the units in the building are two-bedroom units. The property will most likely have less than two (2) parking spaces per unit. We have no claim to the city parking lot and we are not making any claim to using it.

Mr. Holloway asked about Code requirements and was the parking a concern of Mr. Eure's. Mr. Eure explained it was his concern, this property is in the downtown parking district and parking is not required to be provided.

Mr. Dashiell commented that he was concerned for Brew River but the Code does not require the parking spaces. Though parking is not required in this area, the developer is supplying 108 parking spaces and have exceeded what is required of them. Parking is being created but what happens remains to be seen. The overflow of parking into Brew River's parking spaces is a difficult challenge to resolve. Mr. Dashiell believes the developer and the restaurant owner would want to have conversations on how they can work out the parking situation together so there is sufficient parking for the development and the restaurant.

Mr. Soper indicated the Staff is in complete agreement with no parking requirement and the plan could be approved as submitted. The proposed development is in compliance with the Code. Mr. Dashiell mentions the Commission is not insensitive to the fact of what has been expressed is a reasonable concern. Mr. Dashiell believes there is a way the two parties can have a conversation and at least acknowledge the potential for a problem and determine what they can do together to make for a reasonable solution that will
be helpful until something else is identified. Mr. Fisher added he will facilitate the conversation because he wants it to be a cohesive development, there will be some sharing. Mr. Fisher hopes the retail tenants will be complementary tenants to Brew River.

Mr. Thomas asked if there was excess parking available to the west. Mr. Eure replied, by today's standards there is excess parking. When the adjoining complex was built, there were parking minimums. Today's standards, we have parking maximums, therefore, they are definitely compliant and have more than enough due to the Code change. Mr. Thomas was wondering if the owner of the older development would be interested in opening up a connection into their lot to allow for overflow parking. Mr. Dashiell believe it's a good suggestion and he encourages adding Rivers Edge owner to the discussion process.

It is not within the authority of the Planning Commission to add the discussion between the three (3) parties as a condition of approval. It is only being recommended the parties get together to discuss the parking situation and hopefully reach an amicable solution.

Mr. Drew asked about bike parking and long term storage. Mr. Fisher explained there is significant unit storage within the building as well as on the ground level. There is also amenity space specifically that can be used for bike storage. Mr. Drew asked if a public kayak ramp was easily accessible. Mr. Fisher explained there is green area between the two (2) buildings and the boathouse where there is ample space for someone to pull up there for releasing a kayak.

Mr. Soper inquired if an agreement is reached concerning parking with Rivers Edge to allow ingress and egress does the plan need to come back to the Commission or could it be approved by the City of DID. Mr. Dashiell agrees it does not need to come back to the Commission.

Mr. Heath made a motion to approve the Revised Certificate of Design and Site Plan for Marina Landing apartment complex including the four (4) conditions in the Staff Report adding an additional condition of the submission of the sign plan approval, seconded by Mr. Holloway, and carried unanimously, the Commission approved the plan.

Chairman Dashiell stated the motion was APPROVED.

# PRELIMINARY COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT PLAN/WELLHEAD PROTECTION PLAN APPROVAL - Ocean Aisle Phase 3 - Beaglin Park Drive at Old Ocean City Road - Lots 12AA, 17AA, 18AA and 23AA; Planned Development District \#1 (Robertson Farm) - M-121, G-5 and P-2582 (B. Wilkins) 

Mr. Brian Wilkins, joined by Will Kernodle (Parker \& Associates), LB Steele (Rinnier Development Company) and Brian Soper (City of DID), presented the

Staff Report. The applicant proposes to construct 60 apartment units in three (3) 3-story garden-style walk-up buildings bringing the total units to 240 across all phases of Ocean Aisle. The total acreage of the parcel is 5.77 acres.

Phases 1 and 2 of Ocean Aisle received final Planning Commission approval in April 2013. Access to Old Ocean City Road was eliminated and a reduction in parking was approved in June 2013.

Staff review comments for the Preliminary Comprehensive Development Plan were presented. These included the Site Plan, Building Elevations, Sign Plan, Landscaping Plan, Development Schedule, Community Impact Statement, Statement of Intent to Proceed and Financial Capability, Fire Service, Stormwater Management, Wellhead Protection District, Forest Conservation Program, and Wicomico County Board of Education (WCBOE).

Staff is requesting a traffic impact study for the proposed Ocean Aisle Phase 3 as these were not taken into account in the previous study.

Staff recommends approval of the Preliminary Comprehensive Development Plan/Wellhead Protection Plan for Ocean Aisle Phase 3, with the following eight (8) conditions:

1. The site shall be developed in accordance with a Final Comprehensive Development Plan Approval that meets all Code Requirements. Minor plan adjustments may be approved by the Salisbury DID.
2. Provide a detailed signage plan for approval by the Planning Commission prior to issuance of building permits.
3. Refuse disposal areas to be screened on 3 sides.
4. Colors of the proposed development shall be consistent with the existing Ocean Aisle development.
5. Provide an updated Traffic Impact Study.
6. Provide a parking study to justify additional spaces above the maximum.
7. Provide Development Schedule, Community Impact Statement and Statements of Intent to Proceed and Financial Capability.
8. This approval is subject to further review and approval by the Salisbury DID and the Salisbury Fire Department.

After a brief discussion about the number of parking spaces allowed and the inclusion of refuse disposal areas, Mr. Dashiell indicated these discussions should take place between the City of DID, Rinnier Development and Parker \& Associates. Mr. Drew suggested losing a couple parking spaces for the placement of dumpsters.

Mr. Thomas inquired about the number of parking spaces in Phase 1 and 2 since they also had garages. These phases needed 270 spaces, however they ended up with 454 spaces not including garage space.

It was suggested by Mr. Drew to provide connectivity between Phase 3 and Phase 2 by way of a sidewalk. Mr. Drew asked why a Community Impact Statement had not been completed; Mr. Steele indicated the lack of it was an oversight on his part and one would be provided. Mr. Drew inquired about a traffic study, Mr. Kernodle will complete a traffic study.

Mr. Dashiell discussed landscaping and asked they make it as attractive as possible. He also said the landscaping specifics should be included in the Final Plan. Mr. Dashiell also brought up a consolidation plat needs to be completed for Lots 12AA, 17AA and 18AA prior to issuing building permits.

Mr. Heath made a motion to approve the Preliminary Comprehensive Development/Wellhead Protection Plan for Ocean Aisle Phase 3 including the eight (8) conditions in the Staff Report and adding a ninth condition that a re-subdivision plat consolidation for parcels 12AA, 17AA and 18AA be completed and recorded prior to issuance of any building permits. The motion was seconded by Mr. Thomas, and carried unanimously, the Commission approved the plan.

Chairman Dashiell stated the motion was APPROVED.

Upon a motion by Mr. Heath to adjourn and seconded by Mr. Holloway, and carried unanimously, the Commission meeting was adjourned.

The next regular Commission meeting will be on March 17, 2022.

This is a summary of the proceedings of this meeting. Detailed information is in the permanent files of each case as presented and filed in the Wicomico County Department of Planning and Zoning, and Community Development Office.

Charles "Chip" Dashiell, Chairman

Lori A. Carter, MBA, Secretary

Janae Merchant, Recording Secretary
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## SKETCH PLAT REVIEW

Name of Subdivision: Steeplechase Section 8
Applicant: George E. Young, III, P.C.
1603 Market Street
Pocomoke, MD 21851
Owner: Messick Home Improvements 106 Morris Mill Road
Salisbury, MD 21804
Location: Crooked Oak Lane and Pemberton Drive
Property Data: Election District: \#9 E.D. Name: Salisbury
Deed Reference: 4709/234
Maryland Grid Coordinates:
USGS Quad Map:
DNR Wetlands Map:
Soil Survey Map:
Chesapeake Bay Critical Area: No
100-Year Floodplain: No
Paleochannel Overlay District: No
Subdivision Information:
a. Present use of Land: undeveloped
b. Present zoning: R-20

Surrounding zoning: $\quad$ R-20
c. Approximate total acres in site: $\quad 32.772+/$ acres
d. Proposed number of lots:

27
e. Minimum lot size required by zoning ordinance: $20,000 \mathrm{sq}$. ft . (without water and sewer service)
f. Minimum lot size required by Health Department:
g. Proposed average lot size: $26,215 \mathrm{sq}$. ft. (. 60 acres)
h. Proximity to community facilities: Lots to be served by community water system

1. School districts: Pemberton Elementary School, Salisbury Middle School, James M. Bennett High School
2. Fire district: Salisbury
3. Airport: 8.7 miles
4. Neighborhood recreation: Across from Pemberton Historical Park

Other:
i. Natural features: None
j. Drainage: Well-drained
k. Historic sites: None

1. Comprehensive Plan Relationship: Inside the Metro Core
m. Comprehensive Sewerage and Water Plan Relationship:
2. Water: Lots to be part of a community water system
3. Sewer: not in a planned service area
n. Estimated daily traffic generation: 270 vehicle trips per day
o. Estimated total population: 67.5 people
4. Estimated daily solid waste generation: 237 lbs . per day
5. Estimated total daily water use: 6,750 gallons per day
6. Estimated total sewage: 6,750 gallons per day
7. Recreation demand:
8. School-aged population: 16 children

WICOMICO COUNTY, MARYLAND
DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING, ZONING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
125 N. DIVISION STREET, ROOM 203
P.O. BOX 870

SALISBURY, MARYLAND 21803-0870
PHONE: 410-548-4860 | FAX: 410-548-4955

John D. Psota
Acting County Executive

John D. Psota
Director of Administration

## SKETCH PLAT REVIEW

MEETING DATE - March 17, 2022

Subdivision Name: Steeplechase Section 8 Sketch

| Jurisdiction: $\quad$ Cype of Plat: $\quad$ City of Salisbury | Sketch Wicomico County |
| :--- | :--- |
| Tinal | ___ Preliminary |
|  |  |

Applicant: George E. Young, III, P.C.
1603 Market Street
Pocomoke, MD 21851

## PROPOSAL:

The Applicant proposes the subdivision of 27 lots from 32 acres as a continuation of the Steeplechase subdivision. This parcel is located on the westerly side of Crooked Oak Lane and the northerly side of Pemberton Drive. Steeplechase Sections 8 and 9 received Preliminary approval from the Planning Commission in January of 2005 , but the subdivision was abandoned due to economic conditions. The property is zoned R-20, and it is located on Tier Map III. The proposed lots average approximately .60 acres each.

## WICOMICO COUNTY HEALTH DEPARTMENT:

The Health Department is confirming that the soil work previously completed matches the new sketch plat.

## DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS COMMENTS:

No comments to date. Stormwater facilities have already been installed.

## BOARD OF EDUCATION COMMENTS:

Based on current and projected enrollments, we anticipate minimal impacts. The current educational facilities have the capacity to handle the anticipated number of students.

## MARYLAND STATE POLICE:

No conflict of interest in the projected proposal. Roadways in and out of the area are already preestablished. The only concern would be the amount of increased traffic in the area due to the new homes, but with that said, non-new roads are being added to the current topography which would inflict increased risk to the community. The added homes do not add conflict for our level of expertise.

## MARYLAND DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION (SHA):

The subdivision plat as proposed will have no negative effect to the surrounding State roadway network. Based on the assessment, we have no further comments at this time.

## SOIL CONSERVATION/SEDIMENT \& EROSION CONTROL:

This section of the development was previously reviewed and approved as a portion of Steeplechase Section 7. The developer has addressed the requirements of this office based on the checklist available on our website under Erosion and Sediment Control.

## RECREATION, PARKS AND TOURISM COMMENTS:

There are no concerns from the Recreation \& Parks perspective with regard to the proposed development. There are existing recreational facilities nearby (Pemberton Park, Cedarhurst Park, Centennial Village) with various types of amenities. Additionally, the proposed West Metro park on Levin Dashiell Road could be another future asset that could serve residents on this side of town in the future.

## PLANNING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS:

Zoning allows for $20,000 \mathrm{sq}$. ft. lots in the R-20 Zoning District. This request has an average lot size of 26,215 sq. ft. Remaining lands are proposed at 14.45 acres.

Planning Department review of the proposed Sketch Plat was completed by Technical Staff Marilyn Williams.

The Code requires a front building setback of 45 ft . which should be shown on Lot 10,11 and 13 in Block ' K '.

The building envelopes are reasonable for the size houses already built in previous sections of Steeplechase.

Direct access to Crooked Oak Lane and Pemberton Drive will be denied for all lots with frontage along these road.

These lots should become part of the existing Steeplechase Homeowners Association.

COORDINATOR: Marilyn Williams, Land Development Coordinator
DATE: February 28, 2022





# Infrastructure and Development Staff Report <br> March 17, 2022 

## I. BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

Project Name: Kay Jewelers
Applicant/Owner: Chris Dailey for VERIET MT Salisbury MD, LLC
Infrastructure and Development Case No.: 202200174
Nature of Request: Revised Sign Plan Approval
Location of Property: 2645 N. Salisbury Blvd.
Existing Zoning: General Commercial

## II. SUMMARY OF REQUEST:

A Revised Sign Plan has been submitted for a new Kay Jewelers, which is to be located in the satellite building that was previously occupied by Next Day Blinds. (Attachment 1)

## III. DISCUSSION:

The applicant is proposing to install three (3) new "Kay Jewelers" wall signs on the existing tenant space. (Attachments 2 \& 3) Additionally, six (6) "Kay Jewelers" vinyl decals are proposed for several window exteriors. (Attachments 2 \& 4) There are no proposed exterior changes to the existing building. All parking and landscaping will remain as is as well.

## IV. APPROVAL HISTORY:

The Planning Commission approved a Final Comprehensive Development Plan for the existing shopping center on February 19, 2004. On March 4, 2004, the Salisbury Board of Zoning Appeals granted a special exception for the Lord Salisbury Shopping Center. Subsequent approvals include Revised Comprehensive Development Plans for the satellite buildings and Revised Sign Plans for various tenants. The most recent approval was on February 17, 2022 for a Revised Comprehensive Development Plan for the Grocery Outlet grocery store, located in the primary building.

S
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## V. SIGN PLAN REVIEW:

## A. Building Elevations

Three (3) wall signs are proposed; one (1) each on the west (front), north (side) and east (rear) walls. (Attachment 2) Each sign is an $8 \mathrm{ft} . \times 5 \mathrm{ft}$. ( 40 sq . ft.) black cabinet with white lettering. The lettering will protrude from the cabinet to provide a three-dimensional effect with relief. (Attachment 3) Additionally, six (6) white vinyl decals are proposed for the exterior side of several windows. (Attachment 2) As the decals are on the exterior of the windows, they are classified as wall signs. The decals are 19 -inches $\times 7.5$-inches (approximately 1 sq . ft.) in size. (Attachment 4) There are NO standards for decals placed on the inside of the windows, and would not be subject to Planning Commission review or permit requirements. The property management team has indicated that ownership supports all signage as submitted. (Attachment 5) The proposed colors of black and white are part of the approved color palette for this shopping center, which allows the following colors: blue yellow, green, black, white, red, plum, and gold.

## B. Pylon Sign

No information was provided regarding a tenant panel on the pylon sign, but it is assumed that a sign that is similar to the wall signs would be proposed. Proposed signage for the pylon sign will need to be submitted for review prior to the installation of a new tenant panel. Planning Commission review and approval will be required if the sign does not comply with approved colors. The pylon sign currently displays both black and white. (Attachment 6)

## VI. PLANNING CONCERNS

The City's Zoning Code indicates that shopping center tenants be limited to one (1) sign for each tenant. However, the Planning Commission has typically permitted a second sign for tenants where warranted. Currently, three (3) primary wall signs and six (6) secondary signs are proposed. Approval of all signs as proposed would be unprecedented. Additionally, all other tenants within the shopping center have signs that primarily consist of individual channel letters with only secondary "channel case" or pillbox-style signs that have been approved. Furthermore, some tenants have individual channel letters with a colored background to provide additional contrast.
VII. RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval of a Revised Sign Plan for Kay Jewelers with the following conditions:

1. A maximum of two (2) wall signs shall be permitted. Locations shall be at the choice of the owner/tenant.
2. Signs shall be individual channel letters with a contrasting background.


Attachment 1



Attachment 3


## RE: Building Signage Approval <br> Kay Jewelers - Lord Salisbury Center 2300 N. Salisbury Blvd., Salisbury, MD 21801

To whom it may concern:

We are in receipt of the proposed sign design for the building signage at the Shopping Center and approve the signage as attached, subject to the following conditions:

1. Manufacturing and installation shall be completed in a good workmanlike manner and in compliance with all applicable covenants, restrictions, statutes, regulations and ordinances.
2. Appropriate governmental permits, Owner's Association and Business Park approvals as necessary must be obtained by Tenant and provided to Landlord prior to installation.
3. All signage must be manufactured and installed by a Maryland State licensed contractor. Installer must have liability insurance and worker's compensation insurance in an amount appropriate for the scope of work.
4. The sign materials and installation methods must conform to the Sign Criteria as defined in the Lease.
5. Said approval is based on measurement as provided by sign contractor and has not been field verified. If measurements are inaccurate causing a sign violation, the Tenant and/or contractor shall be responsible to rectify.

The Tenant shall be responsible to contract for said work and installation is contingent upon Tenant's authorization and approval. Should signage not be installed as approved, Tenant will be required to remove and replace at its own expense.

If you have any questions or need further clarification, please do not hesitate to contact me at 407.378 .2489 or via email at ddeleon@cimgroup.com.

Sincerely,


## Denice DeLeon

Regional Property Manager
VEREIT MT Salisbury MD, LLC

[^0]
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# Infrastructure and Development Staff Report <br> March 17, 2022 

## I. BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

Project Name: Coventry Plaza
Applicant/Owner: Stanley Markofsky for Coventry Plaza LLC
Infrastructure and Development Case No.: 202200186
Nature of Request: Revised Comprehensive Development Plan
Location of Property: 1495 Still Meadow Blvd.
Map: 0029; Parcel: 0534: Lot: Par. D
Existing Zoning: Planned Residential District \#7 - The Villages at Aydelotte Farm

## II. SUMMARY OF REQUEST:

The applicant has submitted a Revised Site Plan for the Coventry Plaza Shopping Center for the Planning Commission's review and approval. (Attachment 1) No other changes are proposed for the shopping center.

## III. DISCUSSION:

The applicant is seeking approval for the installation of a 6 ft . tall privacy fence to enclose an outdoor play area for the "Heights to Heights Learning Center" daycare.

## IV. APPROVAL HISTORY:

The Villages at Aydelotte Farm (PRD \#7) has an extensive history, dating back to October 1993. The most recent approvals include a Preliminary Comprehensive Development Plan for The Villas at Aydelotte in January of 2019, Coventry Square Apartments Sign Plan in November of 2019, the Comprehensive Development Plan Approval of this shopping center in February of 2020, and Sign Plan Approval for the shopping center on March 18, 2021.

## V. REVISED SITE PLAN:

The City's Department of Infrastructure and Development issued a fence permit for the site in August of 2021. (Attachment 2) The permit application indicated that a 4 ft . tall fence was to be constructed in order to enclose the outdoor play area for the Heights to Heights Learning Center. The site plan indicated that a portion of the fence would be located within the 25 ft . front yard setback, at a distance of 13 ft .6 -inches from the curbline. (Attachment
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3) Fences are permitted to be erected within the front yard setback, but are limited to a maximum height of 4 ft . Since the time that the permit was issued, it was decided to increase the fence height to 6 ft . tall in order to provide additional privacy and protection. (Attachment 5 \& 6) This increase in height is supported by the property owner. (Attachment 6)

## VI. PLANNING CONCERNS

None. Section 17.180.040 of the Zoning Code indicates that the Planning Commission, as part of a Comprehensive Development Plan Review, "... may consider deviations from strict compliance with the standards for the development proposed..." This give the Commission permission to waive the fence height standards if deemed appropriate.

The fence's increased height does not impair motorist's visibility when entering Still Meadow Boulevard from access points located both east and west of the site. However, as mentioned previously, the fence's increased height will provide additional privacy as well as added protection for children attending the daycare.

## VII. RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval of the Revised Site Plan with a 6 ft . tall fence enclosing the outdoor play area as submitted.
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City of Salisbury, Maryland
Member:
Department of Infrastructure \& Development
125 N. Division St., Room 202
Salisbury, MD 21801
ICC
NFPA
MBOA
(410)548-3130 Fax (410)548-3107
www.salisbury.md

## FENCE PERMIT

| Application Number | 202100742 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Property Address | 1493 STILL M |
| Land Key | 05129828 |
| Application Description | FENCE |
| Tenant Name | COVENTRY PL |
| Property Use | BUSINESS |
| Property Zoning | PRD \#7 |
|  |  |
| Owner | Contractor |
| COVENTRY PLAZA LLC | GLADDEN CO |
| 105 CAMDEN ST | 105 S. DIVISION |
| 63158 | 19283 |
| Permit Type |  |
| Permit Fee | 117.75 |
| Plan Check Fee | 0 |
| Issue Date | $08 / 06 / 2021$ |
| Valuation | 6500 |
| Expiration Date | $02 / 02 / 2022$ |

NOTE: Fences shall be constructed so that any supportive structures, such as bracing or posts are constructed on the fence facing the property that the fence is located on (the good side of the fence faces neighboring properties). Fence height shall not exceed four-feet in height within the front yard setbacks and not to exceed six-feet in height in the side and rear yard set backs.

## Attachment 2

1493 STILL MEADOW BLIND
SALISBURY. Mb, 2184




# Coventry Plaza IIC 

1400 East Oakland Park Blvd., Suite 103
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33334
954-567-5161

2/15/2022

City of Salisbury
Dept. of Infrastructure \& Development
Henry Eure- Project Manager
125 N. Division Street, Room 202
Salisbury, MD 21801
Reference: Coventry Plaza - Heights to Heights Daycare

Dear Henry,

As you know we are fortunate to build a daycare center in our new property Coventry Plaza. This is a needed business in our community for working families. In order to meet all of the state of Maryland criteria for the daycare center; we must have adequate outdoor play area for the children. We did not realize that their will be an issue with a 6 -foot-high fence in our PUD. For the safety of the children in regards to climbing a short fence and possible child abduction. We are requesting permission for this 6 -foot fence. All concerned with this new state of the art daycare center feel that a 6 -foot fence would be a benefit for the reason stated above. Per our conversation, we would like to get our CO so that the business can fulfill their obligation to their clients.

We would appreciate the city understanding. As we continue to improve Aydelotte Farm PUD.

Thank you for consideration.


Attachment 6

City of
Salis Jacob R. Day, Mayor l y

# Infrastructure and Development Staff Report 

Meeting of March 17, 2022

## I. BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

Project: Johnson's Retreat - Subdivision
Applicant: Parker \& Associates, Inc.
528 Riverside Drive
Salisbury, MD 21801
Infrastructure and Development Project No.: 21-024
Nature of Request: Preliminary/Final Subdivision Approval
Location of Property: Johnson Road, Salisbury, MD
Zoning District: R-10 Residential
Tax Map and Parcel: Map 48, Grid 11, Parcel 288
Area: 24.34 Acres

## II. EXPLANATION OF REQUEST:

The owner requests approval of the revised Johnson's Retreat Subdivision. This subdivision was previously approved by the Planning Commission in June 2007. The new proposed subdivision has revised the lot configuration to increase the lots from 71 to 72 and accommodate new stormwater management regulations. All lot dimensions meet zoning code requirements for $\mathrm{R}-10$ Residential zoning and will have frontage on new proposed public streets with City services available. A Preliminary/Final Subdivision Plat with narrative has been submitted (Attachments 1-6). For reference, the previously approved subdivision plat is included (Attachment 7). Per City of Salisbury Subdivision Regulations, this subdivision plat requires Planning Commission approval.

## III. PLANNING STAFF COMMENTS:

The applicant has requested a waiver to the turnaround required at the south end of Retreat Circle.
Staff notes the following with regard to this turnaround:

1. The note from the previously approved subdivision states: "Turnaround to revert to property owners of lot $21 \& 22$ (proposed lots $19 \& 20$ ) if and when the street is extended to adjoining property."
2. The utility easement across lot 19 and building setbacks for lot 19 are shown with the turnaround in place.
3. A process for reverting the portion of the turnaround area to lots 19 and 20 is not provided; consideration was not given to the preparation of a new plat and deed for the impacted lots, potential access improvements to lot 19, and the relocation of private utility easements.
4. Staff has requested the Dept. of Field Operations to review the proposed turnaround and maneuverability of vehicles. The Planning Commission has the ability to waive this requirement per 16.40 .150 . Staff recommendation will depend on comments from Field Operations.

## IV. RECOMMENDATION:

The proposed subdivision conforms to development standards for R-10 Residential as stated in the City of Salisbury Municipal Code (Chapter 17.156.060.A.1) for lot size (min. 10,000 sq.ft.), lot width ( 70 ft .) and corner lot width ( 85 ft .) Planning Staff recommends granting Preliminary/Final Subdivision Plat Approval for Johnson's Retreat Subdivision, subject to all conditions of approval being met.

## V. SUBDIVISION STATUS:

## 1. WAIVERS REQUESTED:

The applicant has requested a waiver to 16.40.020.B. 4 of the code requiring dead end streets have a turnaround. The applicant has requested a waiver under 16.40.150 of the subdivision code.

Staff has requested comments from the City Department of Field Operations on the turnaround. At the time of this report those comments had not yet been provided.
2. FOREST CONVERSATION:

A Forest Conservation Plan was approved by Wicomico County Planning \& Zoning in 2007 (FCA \#2006-07).
3. CHESAPEAKE BAY CRITICAL AREA:

N/A

## 4. PROPOSED CONDITIONS:

1. The Final Plat shall comply with all requirements of the Salisbury Subdivision Regulations.
2. Health Department approval is required prior to the recordation of the Final Plat.
3. This approval is subject to further review and approval by the Salisbury Department of Infrastructure and Development.

Department of Infrastructure 8 Development
125 N. Division St., \#202 Salisbury, MD 21801 410-548-3170 (fax) 410-548-3107
www.salisbury.md


March 9, 2022

City of Salisbury, Department of Infrastructure \& Development
Attn: Brian Wilkins
RE: Johnsons Retreat Final Resubdivision and Corrected Plat

Dear Brian,
On behalf of Salisbury Aydelotte LLC, we are hereby respectfully requesting to be placed on March's Planning Commission agenda for the above referenced project. The objective of this request is to obtain final approval on the Resubdivision and Corrected plat, titled "Resubdivision and Corrected Plat of Johnsons Retreat" for final recording. The property is located on Tax Map 48, Parcel 288 and it consists of 72 lots, replacing the previously recorded final plat containing 71 lots and titled "Johnsons Retreat Final Subdivision Plat" in Plat Book Liber 15, Folio 367.

Additionally, I would also like to respectfully request a waiver from the code requirement to construct a cul-de-sac at the end of retreat circle, between lots 18 and 19. We feel as though a cul-de-sac in this location does not serve any real purpose and will lead to confusion and complications (with respect to setbacks, easements, utility construction, access/driveway) if and when that cul-de-sac is abandoned. We would like to simply construct the road to the property line to provide access to lot 19 . We've left this on the plat currently, but can easily remove same should this waiver be granted.

Sincerely,

Elise Steele<br>PARKER \& ASSOCIATES, INC.<br>528 RIVERSIDE DRIVE, SALISBURY, MARYLAND 21801<br>PHONE: (410) 749-1023 FAX: (410) 749-1012<br>E-MAIL: elise@parkerandassociates.org


.






To: Salisbury - Wicomico County Planning and Zoning Commission
From: Brian Soper, City Planner
Date: March 17, 2022
Re: Zoning Code Text Amendment Discussion - Exemption

A text amendment to Section 17.04 .04 of the Salisbury City Code, entitled "Method of Regulation," to add language exempting Federal, State and Local Governments from Title 17 Zoning has been proposed. The draft ordinance is attached. The language will provide clarity to the current code and is similar to exemption language in Wicomico County's code.

In accordance with Section 17.228.020.A the Planning Commission shall hold a public hearing and submit a report and recommendation to the City Council within six months of receipt of the text amendment application.

Proposed next steps:

1. Public Hearing at the next Planning Commission meeting; April 21, 2022.

## ORDINANCE NO.

## AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF SALISBURY AMENDING SECTION 17.04.040 OF THE SALISBURY CITY CODE, ENTITLED "METHOD OF REGULATION", TO ADD CONFIRMATORY LANGUAGE EXEMPTING FEDERAL, STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS FROM TITLE 17 OF THE SALISBURY CITY CODE.

WHEREAS, the ongoing application, administration and enforcement of Title 17 (Zoning) of the City Code of the City of Salisbury (the "Salisbury City Code") demonstrates a need for its periodic review, evaluation and amendment, in order to keep the provisions of Title 17 current, comply with present community standards and values, and promote the public safety, health and welfare of the citizens of the City of Salisbury (the "City");

WHEREAS, the Mayor and Council of the City of Salisbury (the "Mayor and Council") are authorized by MD Code, Local Government, §5-202 to adopt such ordinances, not contrary to the Constitution of Maryland, public general law or public local law, as the Mayor and Council deem necessary to assure the good government of the municipality, to preserve peace and order, to secure persons and property from damage and destruction, and to protect the health, comfort and convenience of the citizens of the City;

WHEREAS, the Mayor and Council may amend Title 17 (Zoning) of the Salisbury City Code pursuant to the authority granted by MD Code, Land Use, § 4-102, subject to the provisions set forth in § 17.228 .020 of the Salisbury City Code;

WHEREAS, it is widely accepted in Maryland that a local government, when it owns, leases, or otherwise controls property in that locality and puts the property to public use, is not subject to its own zoning laws, absent an explicit legislative provision manifesting an intent that the local government be subject to those laws;

WHEREAS, the Mayor and Council find that the health, safety and general welfare of the citizens of the City will be furthered by amending Section 17.04 .040 of the Salisbury City Code to add confirmatory language that Federal, State and Local governments are exempt from Title 17;

WHEREAS, pursuant to § 17.228.020 of the Salisbury City Code, any amendment to the Salisbury Zoning Code requires the recommendation of the Salisbury Planning and Zoning Commission (the "Planning Commission") prior to the passage of an ordinance amending Chapter 17.04;

WHEREAS, a public hearing on the proposed amendment was held by the Planning Commission in accordance with the provisions of $\S 17.228 .020$ of the Salisbury City Code on

WHEREAS, at the conclusion of its $\qquad$ meeting, the Planning Commission recommended, by a vote of ___ , that the amendment to Section $1 \overline{7.04 .040 \text { of }}$ the Salisbury City Code set forth herein be approved by the Mayor and Council; and

WHEREAS, the Mayor and Council have determined that the amendment to Section 17.04.040 of the Salisbury City Code set forth shall be adopted as set forth herein.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ENACTED AND ORDAINED BY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SALISBURY, MARYLAND, that Title 17 of the Salisbury City Code is hereby amended by adding the bolded and underlined language and deleting the strikethrough language as follows:

Section 1. By amending Section 17.04.040 of the Salisbury City Code, entitled "Method of regulation" as follows:

The method to be used for carrying out the legislative intent shall be by ordinance of the city council dividing the city into districts of such number, shape and area as may be deemed necessary to carry out the purpose of the grant of powers in Article 66B the Land Use Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland to promote health, safety, morals and the general welfare of the community. Within such districts the city may regulate and restrict the erection, construction, reconstruction, alteration, repair or use of buildings, structures or land. All such regulations shall be uniform for each class or kind of buildings throughout each district, but the regulations in one district may differ from those in other districts. The regulations herein are intended to carry out the mandate of the Acts and Articles expressed in the legislative authority above.

This Title (Title 17) shall not apply to land, buildings or other structures owned by or leased solely to the Federal Government, the State of Maryland, Wicomico County, or the City of Salisbury, provided that such land, buildings or other structures are used for a public purpose.

BE IT FURTHER ENACTED AND ORDAINED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SALISBURY, MARYLAND, as follows:

Section 2. It is the intention of the Mayor and Council of the City of Salisbury that each provision of this Ordinance shall be deemed independent of all other provisions herein.

Section 3. It is further the intention of the Mayor and Council of the City of Salisbury that if any section, paragraph, subsection, clause or provision of this Ordinance shall be adjudged invalid, unconstitutional or otherwise unenforceable under applicable Maryland or federal law, such adjudication shall apply only to the section, paragraph, subsection, clause or provision so adjudged and all other provisions of this Ordinance shall remain and shall be deemed valid and enforceable.

Section 4. The recitals set forth hereinabove are incorporated into this section of the Ordinance as if such recitals were specifically set forth at length in this Section 4.

Section 5. This Ordinance shall take effect from and after the date of its final passage.
THIS ORDINANCE was introduced and read at a Meeting of the Mayor and Council of the City of Salisbury held on the $\qquad$ day of $\qquad$ , 2022 and thereafter, a statement of the substance of the Ordinance having been published as required by law, in the meantime, was finally passed by the Council of the City of Salisbury on the
$\qquad$ day of $\qquad$ , 2022

## ATTEST:

Kimberly R. Nichols, City Clerk

## John R. Heath, City Council President

Approved by me, this $\qquad$ day of $\qquad$ 2022.

[^1]
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[^1]:    Jacob R. Day, Mayor

