Salisbury Planning Commission

August 13th, 2026

MINUTES

The Salisbury Planning Commission met in session on Thursday, **August 13, 2026**. The meeting took place at 125 N. Division St, Room 301, with attendance as follows:

COMMISSIONERS:
David Chiddenton, Chair
Matt Drew, Vice-Chair
Latonia Ayscue, Open Meetings Delegate
Susan Rall (Absent)
Mike Piorunski
Lynne Bratten

CITY STAFF
Judy Kuntz, Acting Director of DID
Gary Pusey, City Planner
Scarlett Liberto, Associate Planner
Heather Konyar, City Attorney
Skip Cox, Assistant City Administrator

---

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.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mrs. Bratten moved to approve the meeting minutes from the July 9th, 2026 meeting. Ms. Ayscue seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

2. DISCUSSION

SIGN PLAN – FOREST GLEN – Forest Glenn LLC rep. by Parker and Associates – Queen Ave – R-5 – M-0029, G-0019, P-0232, #23-027 - (S. Liberto)

Ms. Liberto read the staff report. The commissioners had no questions, comments or concerns and the Chair Mr. Chiddenton asked for a motion. Mrs. Bratten made a motion to forward a favorable recommendation to the city council. Mr. Drew seconded the motion. The motion was **APPROVED** (5-0).

PARKING WAIVER REQUEST – AUTOZONE – AutoZone Development LLC, rep. by MDM Surveyors & Engineers LLC – Nanticoke Rd – M-0037, G-0018, P-0415, #26-003 – (S. Liberto)

Ms. Liberto read the staff report for the AutoZone parking waiver. Ms. Ayscue asked if there was a specific reason for increasing the maximum parking allowed by the code. Mr. Pusey responded that the code is rather stringent on parking in comparison to other municipalities. He discussed how there are many other AutoZone's within the area and their stores require much more parking than the code maximum allows. Mr. Pusey stated how the code also allows for a 20% parking increase to 17 parking spaces when a typical store has around 25 parking stalls, he then discussed how the staff is in support because of this. Ms. Ayscue asked why they needed the extra parking spaces, other than the fact that other stores have more. Mr. Drew stated that often times when he is in or near an AutoZone, many of the patrons will buy what they need and then use a parking space to work on their car or using a diagnostic tool they're borrowing from the store. Carmen DiDiano, from MDM Surveyors and Engineers, civil engineer for AutoZone approached the table. He stated how this is the second AutoZone within City and a third is planned for Summer Drive within the next year. He said how a trip generation study indicates that a store of this size will historically generate 39 trips in an hour at their busiest time. These 39 trips could translate to 30-35 parking spaces, AutoZone prefers 30-40 parking stalls, however AutoZone recognizes the City's desire to restrict parking, as it has been in the code for many years and are willing to comply with it. *It should be noted that Ms. Ayscue was coughing and excused herself for the remainder of this case.* Mr. Drew inquired about the location of the parcel in relation to the adjacent shopping center. He noted that many of these parking spaces near the AutoZone are typically empty and could potentially serve as flex spaces for customers. Mr. DiDiano responded that they recognize these spaces are not within there site and they do not have any right to them and could very well be ticketed or towed if they used those parking stalls. Mr. Drew brought up an advisory comment about the entrance and exit for customers as it is a high traffic area.
Drew made a motion to approve the motion as submitted. Mrs. Bratten seconded the motion. The motion was **APPROVED** (4-0).

PUBLIC HEARING – Text amendment to allow Accessory Dwelling Units as required by HB 1466 (S. Liberto)

Ms. Liberto read the staff report for the record. The Chair, Mr. Chiddenton opened the floor for public comment.
Mr. Stephan Feliciano, City resident, approached the podium on behalf of Habitat for Humanity. He states how he and the company are in full support of the text amendment due to our local housing shortage. Mr. Feliciano states how ADUs are practical, proven strategies to increase gentle density, maximize existing infrastructure and expand attainable housing options.
The chair closed the public comment segment of this hearing and offered the Commission a moment to discuss.
Mr. Drew stated how he would like to keep the ADU size to 75%, he says how the existing houses within the City are already very small and if the size was decreased ADUs may not be obtainable. Mr. Drew asked the Staff about what setbacks would an ADU follow, accessory or primary, and if that text was laid out clearly within the text amendment. Ms. Liberto responded with the location in the text amendment that states what setbacks will be used for Accessory Dwelling Units.
Ms. Ayscue asked if the code covers whether or not ADUs would be permitted to operate as a short-term rental. Ms. Liberto responded that it does not explicitly address short-term rentals. Ms. Bratten asked for clarification on if one of the owners had to live on the property. Ms. Liberto responded that Ms. Bratten was correct, an owner does need to reside in either the primary or accessory dwelling. Ms. Ayscue inquired whether or not the ADU and primary residents could be simultaneously registered as a short-term rental. Ms. Liberto responded that after conversations with the City's attorney this was

something that is not typically listed within the code which is why it was not included with the text amendment.
Mr. Piorunski asked staff for clarification on 17.164.030 as well as if being owner occupied would be included within the text amendment. Staff responded that 17.134.030 is permitting accessory apartments by special exception which according to the amendment are inherently permitted as well as discussing the development standards within 17.170. Mr. Pusey asked the commission if they would like to, not change, but add ADUs to each residential districts' accessory structure section. The commissioners were all on board with this adjustment as well as keeping the 75% size requirement.

Mr. Drew made a motion to approve the motion with the amendment to add clarifying language about accessory structures. Mr. Piorunski seconded the motion. The motion was **APPROVED** (5-0).

PUBLIC HEARING – Text amendment to regulate Vape Shops (J. Kuntz)

Ms. Kuntz read the staff report for the record. The chair opened the floor to the public for comment. Ms. Sharon DeShield, city resident, approached the podium. Ms. DeShield expressed concern over the location and aesthetic of vape shops, she let the commission know that she believes this distance should be raised to 500 feet. Mr. Chiddenton inquired whether there was discussion on creating a 750 ft buffer distance at the last commission meter. Ms. Kuntz responded that this was a discussion but there was no consensus to move forward with 750 ft.
The commissioners discussed inconsistencies within the text amendment regarding public parks and playgrounds as well as the topic of what could be defined as attractive to children and young adults. Mr. Piorunski inquired about the violations and penalties, how later they would be discussing referencing fines and penalties within the code rather than including exact numbers that will eventually change within our code. Ms. Kuntz responded that this would be updated, as the fine and penalty schedule text amendment is still not complete.

Mr. Piorunski asked if the Department of Infrastructure and Development currently issues other business licenses or permits, and if it should be through Housing and Community Development Department. Ms. Kuntz responded that HCDD is typically the department that issues business licenses, however vape shops should be through DID as we have surveyors and engineers to review the locations. She went on to discuss internal conversations about HCDD still enforcing these violations, but DID would be the ones issuing business licenses. Ms. Ayscue asked for clarification on if a vape shop permit is not approved or denied within the time period the application shall be deemed approved. Ms. Kuntz responded there is similar code for adult entertainment business, which prevents inaction from government offices in that regard, and if government offices do not take action in approving or denying permits this would be neglect on their part.

Ms. Bratten made a motion to continue the text amendment as a public hearing next month, Mr. Piorunski seconded the motion. The motion was **APPROVED** (5-0).

WORK SESSION – Text amendment to replace specific fines and penalties from the Zoning Code (Title 17) with references to a Fine and Penalty Schedule. (S. Liberto)

Ms. Liberto read the Staff Report for the record. Ms. Ayscue inquired about whether or not the amendment would change any enforcement authority. She also asked about how fees are currently updated if it won't be expressed explicitly within the code. Ms. Liberto responded that the process currently goes to City Council once a year. The commissioners had no further questions or comments.

regarding this text amendment. Ms. Bratten made a motion to move this forward to public hearing, Mr. Piorunski seconded the motion. The motion was **APPROVED** (5-0).

WORK SESSION – Text amendment for Data Centers and discussion regarding moratorium recommendation to City Council (S.Liberto)

Ms. Liberto read the staff report regarding data processing and computer centers for the record. The commissioners inquired about whether or not a data processing and computer center would be allowed within a mixed-use or multi-use facility. They also inquired about size requirements for server rooms, staff responded that they will leave that up to their interpretation. Mr. Chiddenton offered the floor for public comment, Ms. Carol Dunahoo approached the podium. She wanted to offer suggestions for workshopping the definition of data processing and computer centers. Ms. Dunahoo brought up the county definition of server room and how it would be cohesive to use a similar definition as the county. Mr. Bob Taylor approached the podium and began to speak about the county's moratorium definition for data centers. He also was in agreement with a one-year moratorium, he felt that six-months may not be enough time to gather information. Ms. Sharon Deshield came back to the podium for this work session. She offered some clarity to the on-going discussion of the commissioners. The commissioners began workshopping possible definitions including the state definition and the county definition and the possibility of their own combination.
The commissioners came to a consensus on using the county's moratorium definition of server room for the City's definition of data processing and computer centers. Ms. Bratten made a motion to move this forward as a public hearing. Ms. Ayscue seconded the motion. The motion was **APPROVED** (5-0).

The commissioners moved forward to discuss proposing a moratorium to send to the City Council. Mr. Piorunski discussed his draft moratorium, he used the template of Howard County's moratorium specifically because it established a task force. He believes this task force will help keep things moving rather than the standstill of a moratorium, he offered that the commission, council and mayor should all nominate people to the task force. Mr. Piorunski believes that this will help keep the topic moving as well as offering assistance to the staff as there are only two people in the planning department currently. Mr. Drew expressed that he would like to see a sunset clause or task force so the moratorium doesn't stop progress towards creating code regarding data centers. The Planning Commissioners came to a consensus on a recommendation for a moratorium, Ms. Bratten made a motion to move it forward to City Council and Ms. Ayscue seconded the motion. The motion was **APPROVED** (5-0).

WORK SESSION – Comprehensive Plan Edits (G.Pusey)

Mr. Pusey began talking about minor updates he had made to the Comprehensive Plan. He also let Mr. Chiddenton know he added in a section on adopt-a-road per his request. Mr. Pusey told the commission about the process of the comprehensive plan review through the state, how after MDP's review it would come back to the commission, the public and council before being finalized. Ms. Bratten was concerned about the names who would be on the front page as the council has changed and the Planning Commission has lost a commissioner. Mr. Drew inquired about changing the date on the Comprehensive Plan from 2025 to 2026 as it will most likely be able to pass in 2026. Mr. Piorunski asked about Table 2-8 and why the percentage adds up to more than 100%.
Mr. Drew made a motion to send the Comprehensive Plan to the state with the minor edits that were addressed during the work session. Ms. Ayscue seconded the motion. The motion was **APPROVED** (5-0).

Discussion:

Ms. Bratten brought up a discussion about a commission email, similar to what City Council has. She discusses how Council has an email where members of the public can message and send in their questions or concerns. She would like to see this for the Commission as she is aware that staff is sent items to distribute to the Commissioners frequently and this would be a way that they would not get lost. Mr. Drew agreed with Ms. Bratten if it was made clear to the public they would not get an email response from the commissioners as they're using their personal emails and it would be an Open Meetings Act violation.

Mr. Drew asked for an update regarding the parking study request that he sent to the mayor. Ms. Kuntz approached the table to address Mr. Drew's question. She responded that she received a letter from administration stating they are not interested in pursuing a parking study.

Adjournment:

Chair Chiddenton entertained a motion to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Bratten made a motion to adjourn, seconded by Mr. Drew. The motion was **APPROVED** (5-0).

Dave Chiddenton, Chair — Date: 10-1-2026

Gary Pusey, Acting Secretary — Date: 10/1/2026