



Salisbury Planning Commission
February 12, 2026

MINUTES

The Salisbury Planning Commission met in session on Thursday, **February 12, 2026**. The meeting took place at 125 N. Division St, Room 301, with attendance as follows:

COMMISSIONERS:

David Chiddenton, Chair
Matt Drew, Vice-Chair (Absent)
Latoria Ayscue, Open Meetings Delegate
Susan Rall
Mike Piorunski
Lynne Bratten
Anthony Dickerson

CITY STAFF

Nicholas Voitiuc, Director of DID
Betsy Jackson, City Planner
Zachary White, Associate Planner
Scarlett Liberto, Associate Planner
Henry Pearson, Associate Planner
Laura Ryan, City Attorney

1. CALL TO ORDER & ROLL CALL

Mr. Chiddenton called the meeting to order at 4:00PM. A roll call took place for the members of the commission. It was noted that Matt Drew was absent from this meeting.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Chiddenton introduced a motion to approve the minutes from the meeting held on January 8, 2026. Mr. Mike Piorunski motioned to approve and the motion was seconded by Mr. Anthony Dickerson, and duly carried.

The minutes from the January 8th, 2026 meeting were **APPROVED (6-0)**.

3. NEW BUSINESS

PUBLIC HEARING – TEXT AMENDMENT – Amending Title 17 of the Salisbury City Code to add a definition of a “Large Family Child Care Home” and to designate the zoning districts in which the various types of child care homes can be established (B. Jackson)

Laura Ryan read into the record the notice of a public hearing that was published, offering to swear in anyone that would like to testify.

Ms. Betsy Jackson presented the staff report.

Planning staff are recommending a text amendment to the City of Salisbury Zoning Code. Currently, the College and University District, the Office and Service Residential District, and the Residential Districts including R-5A, R-8A, and R-10A, R-5S, R-8S, and R-10S Residential Districts, allow Family Day Care Homes which are limited to (8) children as accessory uses. Adding a Large Family Child Care Home as an accessory use would allow a maximum of (12) children. They will be allowed on a site-by-site basis. The proposed amendments are summarized below:

- Replace the term “**Family day-care home**” with “**Family child care home**” and amend the definition to be consistent with the State definition.
- Add the term “**Large family child care home**” along with its definition to be consistent with the family child care home licensing options with the State.
- Wherever **family child care homes** are permitted as an accessory use in residential zones, **large family child care homes** shall be permitted by special exception. In the College and University District and the Hospital District they are proposed to be an inherent accessory use.

Chair Chiddenton opened the meeting to the public for comment.

Mr. Robert Taylor approached the stand, expressing concern over the operation hours of these Family child care homes. He believed the hours for these home businesses should be specified. He was also concerned about the R-5, R-8, R-10 districts. He questioned how many of these neighborhoods do not have the road capacity for heavy rush hour traffic. He stated that the commission should hold this amendment and send it to city council for feedback before making a recommendation.

Ms. Jackson stated that her office had received a letter via email regarding the amendment, which was opposed to the amendment. She also stated that the letter was distributed to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Chiddenton thanked Mr. Taylor for comments.

Ms. Ryan clarified for the commission that the amendment will go to city council whether it's approved or not. She stated that for a text amendment the city council are the ultimate decision makers.

Ms. Jackson inquired about the time-of-day issues and stated that she did not know if we could impose hours of operation because the state does all licensing and decides what each person is allowed to do.

Ms. Bratten agreed that there is always a need for trustworthy childcare, however these districts are not equipped to handle commercial business.

Ms. Rall stated that she is in favor of the amendment because child care homes will be evaluated on a case by case basis with strict rules. She said that they have to show that there is parking available, that there is ample space within the home, and must have an additional staff member. Ms. Rall also gave an example to clarify for the group that allowing 12 children doesn't mean that there will be 12 separate cars coming in and out of neighborhoods because it could be 4 families of 3 children. She believed that this would be good for the community because there is a lack of childcare.

Ms. Bratten stated that it will take away the peace and quiet from single family neighborhoods. She stated that the city has so few homeowners and that the city shouldn't be taking away from single

family homeowners. She expressed concern about property values and how this may make it harder for people to sell a home. She continued to express concern over the use being approved forever on the property and not requiring a special exception for each new owner.

Mr. Piorunski asked if there are any other places within the zoning code that define operating hours for certain types of commercial activity or if the special exception process gives opportunity to define operating hours.

Ms. Jackson clarified that the special use exception could define operating hours but since family child care is state licensed, she was unsure if the city had the ability to limit operating hours.

Ms. Ryan stated that in code for special exceptions there are conditions that can be placed on the special exception cases. She said the commission should take these conditions up with the state before placing them, to make sure that we can meet them.

Mr. Piorunski asked if the city would be required to install ADA facilities on streets to accommodate the childcare homes. He also questioned whether or not the property owner is also the person running the home child care.

Ms. Jackson responded that with that particular example we should be revamping all sidewalks to be accessible, not just in front of home businesses. She also clarified that no person would be allowed to get a permit or special exception without having the owner's consent.

Ms. Bratten again asked if the special exception stays with the address or if it stays with the individual.

Ms. Ryan clarified the issue stating that the special exception is for the use of that property and is linked to the property.

Mr. Piorunski asked the Chair if they could reopen the podium for Mr. Taylor to comment again. Chair Chiddenton allowed Mr. Taylor to return to the podium. Mr. Taylor stated that the zoning permissions go with the property and not the owner. He also stated that if a new owner came in and wanted to open a home childcare, they too would have to do all state required licensing. He again expressed disapproval with the use of the word day within the amendment and that it should be defined. He advised the commission to add specific times or provisions before sending it to city council.

Chair Chiddenton asked for a motion to approve. Susan Rall entered a motion for a favorable recommendation of the text amendment as drafted. Mr. Dickerson seconded this motion.

Susan Rall, David Chiddenton, Anthony Dickerson voted in approval.

Mike Piorunski, Lynne Bratten, and Latonia Ayscue voted nay.

Chair Chiddenton stated that the motion died **(3-3)**.

Ms. Bratten moved to send the text amendment with an unfavorable recommendation to the city council. Ms. Ayscue seconded this motion.

Susan Rall, David Chiddenton, Anthony Dickerson voted nay.

Mike Piorunski, Lynne Bratten, and Latonia Ayscue voted in approval.

Chair Chiddenton stated that the motion died **(3-3)**.

Ms. Ryan read the city code that states that the commission's indecision or failure to forward a recommendation within 6 months shall be considered on balance as favorable to the proposed amendment and a favorable recommendation shall be forwarded to city council.

PUBLIC HEARING – TEXT AMENDMENT – Amending chapter 17.04.120 of the Salisbury City Code to revise the definition of a “Specialty Shop.” (H. Pearson and B. Jackson)

Ms. Ryan read the text amendment. Mr. Henry Pearson reads the staff report.

The proposed definition of “specialty shop” reads: “Specialty shop means a retail store that sells a specialized line of merchandise related to a specific category or brand of products but does not include adult entertainment businesses, cannabis dispensaries, or alcohol and tobacco sales. No outdoor storage is permitted as part of this use.”

Chair Chiddenton opened the meeting to the public for comment.

Mr. Taylor approached the podium and started to discuss the three districts. He suggested to allow all shops to stop potential arguing that may occur. He stated that the term is too loose and it should allow all retail instead.

Ms. Bratten was unsure about signage on residential properties where they are conducting business within their home. She felt as if this signage would be inappropriate within the residential districts. She also inquired whether or not there were any limitations on square footage of the specialty shops within residences.

Mr. Pearson clarified that this amendment would solely change the definition of the stores that are allowed within those districts. He also stated that specialty shops would not be allowed within residences, the amendment is only changing the language for the type of stores allowed.

Chair Chiddenton asked for a motion to approve.

Mr. Piorunski gave a motion for a favorable recommendation for the text amendment as submitted. Mr. Dickerson seconded this motion.

The commission had **CONSENSUS (6-0)** to move this text amendment forward.

FINAL COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT PLAN – VILLAGE AT CANAL PARK PHASE 1 – Canal Park LLC, rep. by PLITKO Engineering – Canal Park Drive, R5-A Residential – M0117, G-0014, P-0181, Lots 3B & 3C - #23-030 (Z. White)

Mr. Zachary White & representatives from PLITKO Engineering approached the table.

Mr. White read the staff report summary, offered history on the lot, and discussed the comprehensive development plan review.

Chair Chiddenton asked whether or not there would be recycling containers on the site.

Mr. White responded that he did not believe that they were going to include recycling on the site, as recycling is not mandatory.

Mr. Ernie from PLITKO Engineering stated that he had nothing left to add to Mr. White's thorough report.

Ms. Rall inquired about stormwater management, as there is a lot of flooding along Canal Park.

Mr. Ernie responded that he went through the submission process through the concept storm water. They included microbiomes for the treatment of the water into the pond, which also has a line for excess water to Tony Tank Pond. They have also regraded part of the site in case of flooding but it is not within the 100-year floor plane.

Ms. Bratten asked what the impact to current neighborhood residents would be.

Mr. Jason Saravi, the developer representative, stated that, because the project is phased in two parts, there should be no major interruptions for the existing residences. They will also have everything staged on their site, including all trucks and materials, so the only interruption could be some large trucks making deliveries. He assured the planning commission that they will be following all city noise requirements as well.

Ms. Bratten inquired about the 2024 impact statement. She asked if there is any reason for a more current impact statement.

The PLITKO Engineering representatives responded that originally, they had another impact study and were asked to produce the 2024 statement as an update.

Ms. Rall expressed concern about the citizens that live there, that it is a rather quiet neighborhood. She would like to know if they had heard any concerns.

The representatives responded that they are working to create a welcoming environment with amenities for the community. They would like to make an open community for both the site and surrounding homes.

Ms. Bratten would like to know about the egress of the property, will there be more than one way in and out.

The PLITKO Engineers state that they have two access points into the property following the second phase of the project. He said that through their traffic study they didn't believe there was a reason to add another road from Route 13.

A member of the public asked permission to speak. He stated that he had a petition with over ten signatures.

Chair Chiddenton opened the floor for public comment to hear residents' concerns.

Justin Hemel approached the podium; he is a resident from the neighborhood. He expressed concern about construction noise and asked for them to have enforced hours. He asked about environmental protections that are taking place, as there was once an old community center and pool on the site. He would also like if there was a timeline posted for phases 1 and 2. He had many concerns about parking on the site. He expressed more concern about each of their HOAs and whether or not the new

development would be a part of the community master HOA. He also stated that he has a petition from multiple neighbors expressing their concern as well.

Mr. Shahriar Khan says that he was completely unaware that this development was happening. He stated that many of the people he has talked to within his community also have concerns about this project, as their front doors open up to the development site. He believes that this development could be more thoughtfully done, including notifying the community members.

The PLITKO Engineers responded to community members concerns by saying they will only be working within the hours that the city allows for minimal noise disruption. They addressed the environmental concerns, stating they have established a forest conservation easement that will not be disturbed during construction. They also stated that during construction there will be a silt fence constructed around the site for environmental concerns and to help with water runoff. He also specified that the number of units in phase two will 16 units, making the total number of units under the threshold required by the city. The developers also expressed that according to law there will be an HOA within the condominium to handle stormwater and snow removal, and that it will be up to the client if they will join the master HOA and will get back to the community members after they speak to the client. They assured the commission that they will be following all state and local laws during the construction of the development.

Ms. Bratten expressed concern about the pool and building that was previously on the site. She stated that the pool was probably painted with lead paint and most mechanical heating was done with oil back then.

The representatives responded that they had an environmental study done on the property already and it came back okay. The said that if something is found during construction, they would follow whatever protocol necessary to keep the community and workers safe.

Ms. Rall inquired about the estimated completion date for phase one.

The representatives responded with a rough answer of about six months on the site work and another few months before they are ready to sell.

Chair Chiddenton asked for a motion with the listed conditions.

Mr. Piorunski gave a motion for approval. Mr Dickerson seconded this motion.

The commission had **CONSENSUS (6-0)** to approve phase one of the comprehensive development plan for village at canal park.

REVISED FINAL COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT PLAN – 1313-1315 S. SALISBURY BLVD – Piraeus Realty Group, rep. by Parker and Associates – 1313- 1315 S. Salisbury Blvd., GC General Commercial – M-0117, G-0009, P-3123 - #23-018 (H. Pearson)

Mr. Pearson and Piraeus Realty Group, rep. by Parker and Associates approach the table.

Mr. Pearson presents the staff report.

The applicant has proposed removing two parking spaces within the parking lot, wall them off with concrete planters to create an outdoor patio area that is safe to use. As well as removing the existing rear patio and replacing it with landscaping approved by DID.

Chair Chiddenton asked for a motion subject to the recommendations of the Department of Infrastructure and Development.

Ms Bratten gave motion for approval subject to the recommendations of the DID. Ms. Ayscue seconded this motion.

The commission had **CONSENSUS (6-0)** to approve the comprehensive development plan for 1313-1315 Salisbury Blvd.

REVISED FINAL COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT PLAN – PARC CIRCLE – Aydelotte Villas LLC, rep. by Parker and Associates – Still Meadow Blvd., PDD#7 Planned Residential District No. 7, Parcel L – M-0038, G-0006, P-0162AA - #19-043 (Z. White)

Mr. White and Aydelotte Villas LLC, rep. by Parker and Associates approached the stand.

Mr. White presented the staff report and approval history for the property.

The applicant wants 300 unit duplexes, 160 unit triplex redesigning the original project for a third and final time. He assured the commission that phase one of the project is already in the constructed, including water, sewer and asphalt.

Mr. Chiddenton inquires about the idol lines, how long had they been idol before

The applicant clarifies that all the pipes loop around and meet at the rear of the property. At the current moment there is no water flow, and when they finish they were recommended by the city to flush the lines before they can test them. Mr. Markowski also clarifies for the commission that they are zoned for 300 units but for now they are only building 161 units. They will go back in after a year or two, to add in either the same product or with small improvements to the townhouses. The applicant also clarifies that these will be rental units and describes the amenities included within the community.

Mr. Piorunski asked for clarity on the building heights for the property, stating they were not included initially.

Mr. Dickerson gave motion for approval subject to the recommendations of the DID. Ms. Bratten seconded this motion.

The commission had **CONSENSUS (6-0)** to approve the comprehensive development plan for Parc Circle, Aydelotte Villas

WORK SESSION – Presentation of Chapters 9 and 10 of the Draft Comprehensive Plan (Center for Watershed Protection and Z.White)

Mr. White and Ms. Amanda Pollack approach the commission.

Ms. Pollack is an engineer with the Center for Watershed Protection here to discuss Chapter 9 of the Comprehensive Plan, Water resources. She discusses the goals of the chapter as well as goals determined by MD Department of the Environment. She first discusses the drinking water goals, then moves onto wastewater goals and storm water goals, rounding out the goals with green infrastructure.

Mr. White discussed Chapter 10, Environmental Resources and Sustainability, of the Comprehensive Plan. He went over the goals of this chapter, as well as discussing the Sustainable Maryland criteria.

The chair opened the podium to the public to discuss Chapters 9 and 10 of the Comprehensive Plan.

Jessica Cook approached the podium stating that her drinking water is not drinkable. She believes she is paying for the sewer infrastructure, noting that the city is planting trees and inquires whether or not she's paying for tree planting as well.

Carol Donahue approached the podium. She stated how she has been at many focus groups for the Comprehensive Plan since they have began last spring, even working on their own task force long before that. She proposed a more ambitious goal to be stated in the vision plan, saying that "we will meet the future by making Salisbury a healthier, more livable community with a vibrant downtown core and thriving neighborhoods by ensuring adequate access to affordable housing, green spaces, public transportation and other services, protection of our water and other natural resources, and other measures to strengthen both our environmental and economic resilience." She also believe that the plan needs an implementation plan and a comprehensive plan director to help coordinate with stakeholders and adjacent jurisdictions.

Dr. Michael Folkoff states that he likes many of the ideas within the plan draft however he has some overarching ideas on how they should be laid out. He says that each part has to work together, the plan should have a section laying out how all these components work and come together.

Mr. Robert Taylor approached the podium. He discussed the lines being replaced at the well in the city park. He offers to clarify for Ms. Cook that these lines are apart of county projects that are within the city, funded by state grants, it should not be any upcharge other than the regular service charge. He states that for the past 54 years the city has had tremendous flooding problems, especially within the downtown area where two prongs of the river meet. He goes on to say how filling in and bulkheading has just made this area narrower and more prone to flooding within the downtown.

Brooke Orr came to represent the city's Green Team. The team wanted to comment on the importance of invasive control, recycling awareness and PFAS in the water regarding fish consumption.

The chair opened for the commission to discuss.

Ms. Rall inquired about the problems with littering within the city.

Mr. White states that it is not specifically in the draft, and explains how the green team helps with this but it's not stated within the plan or its goals.

Mr Chiddenton inquires about when the MS4 permit expires.

Ms. Pollack responds that it expired in 2023, the state administrator administratively extended the MS4 permit. The state recently issued a draft and held workshops on the new draft permit. It should be finalized by next spring, so the next permit will come out in 2027 with many of the same goals as the existing permit.

Mr. Chiddenton also mentions the Adopt a Road Program was not within the community clean up section in Chapter 10. He states that the city council passed an ordinance last summer and the project should be starting within the coming weeks.

Mr. Piorunski inquires whether or not there is unmetered water in historic or industrial buildings or sprinkler systems.

Ms. Pollack responds that sprinkler systems are not typically metered. The water department estimates how much of this water is used, that is why it's not included in the unaccounted for water

Mr. Piorunski asks if there is a fee or permit for water discharge.

Ms. Pollack responds that she is unsure if there is a fee but she assured him that there is a permit for industrial users. She also explains that the city has a pretreatment program. They have two staff members that go around and test these systems to make sure they are compliant.

Mr. Piorunski inquired about water resources within older neighborhoods. He states that many homes are pre-1931, before the city sewer was installed. He is wondering how many of these homes have sewer lines going into septic and also going into the city sewer, including his own. Also asking about lead water lines, where these may still be, and who's responsibility they are. He also discusses the automatic water meters, how we are planning to implement them and how much it might cost to replace them.

Ms. Pollack responded urging Mr. Piorunski to call water works to do a dye test to see where it comes out. She also clarifies that the lead service line replacement is underway all over the country. She responded to the automatic water meters saying how the current meters being put in are equipped. The system is not yet in the towers but all water meters are ready for the automatic system.

Mr. Piorunski moves to the sustainability chapter of the comprehensive plan. He would like to establish a light fixture standard for parks, streets and the urban core. He also described setting a goal for light pollution within these areas and using the light fixture standard to potentially help. He also would like a prohibition of invasive landscaping plants within the city. He then states how he would like to see a section, within the sustainability chapter about equity and environmental justice. He discusses how there are active and abandoned industrial sites, he believes the plan should have goals in place to help mitigate active pollution and promoting air quality for the surrounding residents. He also believes that a LEED certified or passive house standard incentives such as property tax bonuses could help reduce the overall impact on the community.

Other Business

Discussion – Next Comprehensive Plan Work Session

Ms. Jackson proposed a Special Meeting for the Comprehensive Plan, for staff to bring forward all public comments. She then offers to give the commission multiple dates and times for them to choose when they are available.

Department Update – Upcoming agenda items

There will be two zoning recommendations for the March Commission meeting. There will be one public hearing for political signs, as well as one, possibly two, preliminary comprehensive development plans. They will also have work sessions for more text amendments.

Adjournment:

Chair Chiddenton entertained a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Dickerson entered a motion to adjourn, seconded by Mr. Piorunski



Dave Chiddenton, Chair

3/12/26
Date



Betsy Jackson, Acting Secretary

3/12/26
Date