1. Granite Cliffs, Lots 1-535, Concept Plat, Burlin Road & MD Route 276 (Jacob Tome Memorial Hwy), Frederick Ward Associates, Seventh Election District.

Tom Miners and Lou Schaffer, Frederick Ward Associates appeared and presented an overview of the project.

Mr. Arellano read the comments from the Health Department:
Water and sewer allocations must be obtained from the appropriate utility providers prior to final plat approval. The allocation letter must contain the following information:

1. The amount of dflow allocated. Since development is being proposed in phases, identify the phase of the project the current allocation is for.

2. Identify if the allocation expires if it is not put into use by a given date.

3. Identify if any water or sewer upgrades are needed to provide this allocation (pump stations, new mains, additional treatment) and if any Maryland Department of the Environment permits are required for these upgrades.

Phases cannot obtain final plat approval until Maryland Department of the Environment Permits for any utility upgrades required to provide service to it have been approved.

Final and record plats are required to have the following statements:

1. Public water and sewerage will be available to all lots offered for sale (by owner’s signature block).

2. Use of public water and sewerage is in conformance with the Cecil County Master Water and Sewer Plan (by Health Department’s signature).

Mr. Evans, DPW, summarized the comments of the department. Below is the comments in its entirety:

Roads
1. It appears plan sheets reflect sidewalk on both sides of every road throughout the subdivision. This is acceptable. One detail on CP02 shows sidewalk on one side of the road. Cecil County DPW would prefer sidewalks on both sides of the street throughout the subdivision.

2. Pedestrian interconnection should be made. This should include along Jacob Tome Highway and on Burlin Road.
3. Granite Cliffs Drive shall be shown and constructed to a major collector standard (Cecil County Road Code Standard Detail R-8) from Jacob Tome Highway to Midnight Sun Drive. Granite Cliffs Drive shall also have a monumental entrance per Cecil County Road Code Standard R-22B. The Major Collector entrance with sidewalks shall be provided. Right-of-way for Granite Cliffs Drive (towards Dakota Way) and Midnight Sun Drive shall meet the requirements for a Major Collector road.

4. Due to the traffic volume it appears that offsite road improvements will be required to include accel/decel lanes, etc. Right-of-way shall be dedicated and shown for necessary improvements.

5. Burlin Road shall be a collector road and the full 60 foot right-of-way provided. This shall be dedicated along the Granite Cliffs’ frontage if it is not secured from the adjoining lot. The 30 foot provided is not adequate and a full 60 foot right of way is required. Also, the upgrade of Burlin Road may include stormwater facilities that will impact the open space for the Granite Cliffs Subdivision.

6. The intersection of Burlin Road and Jacob Tome Highway will need to be upgraded. Sight distance and stopping sight distance shall be evaluated to assure necessary improvements are completed and meet AASHTO requirements.

7. A proposed bridge is shown on Midnight Sun Drive. This bridge shall meet all required AASHTO, SHA and Cecil County standards and be acceptable to DPW. The DPW Bridge Engineer shall sign-off on the design during the development phase. The right-of-way will need to be expanded around the bridge to allow for future maintenance and access. Utilities shall not connect to, under or encroach on the bridge.

8. Depending on the width of the road way section, 50’ or 60’ ROW, parking on the roadway, may be an issue by code. Adequate off street parking shall be provided. Emergency access and snow removal should be considered as the design is finalized.

9. Why are the road details on Sheet 2? All roadway details, unless they are seeking a variance, should be contained on the Roads & Stormdrain plan set – not the Concept Plat. If the road details are included because a variance of some sort is being requested, a variance request needs to be submitted for approval.

10. Note 26 needs to be reviewed closely. Driveway paving should be completed prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy for the individual lot – not when surface pavement of internal roads occurs. The remainder of the note regarding 80% build out should not apply to driveway paving.

Sewer

1. Sewer should be built using gravity collection to the maximum extent possible.
2. Sewer, not in roadways, must be in accessible easements with access trails and with drivable slopes.
3. The sewer running between houses is in a narrow easement. The easement must be wide enough to allow for future repairs and access without impacting the house. The deeper the sewer, the wider the easement. The minimum shall be 25 feet from centerline (deeper shall need wider). Side yard setbacks shall apply from the edge of the easement in these cases.
4. Sewer facilities shall be configured to allow future connection to sewer for adjoining parcels. This includes location and depth of manholes and easements.
5. Pump station as shown is sloped downhill, not acceptable.
6. Pump station site appears too small.
7. Pump station road must be accessible for heavy maintenance/ pumper vac trucks to back up to the wet well.
8. Pump station should be sized to allow for some future additional capacity to accommodate adjoining and nearby existing households. In particular this applies to the wet well size.

9. Note 23 indicates that all sewer lines will be in a 20’ wide utility easement. This will not be adequate in areas with steep slopes. Easement shall be developed based on the design and not handled by a standard note.

10. Pump stations are placed in drainage areas that will flood. Storm outfalls are too close. This needs to be addressed.

11. Slopes appear to exceed maximum allowed by code.

Other
1. Will the development have community facilities? No space is currently set aside. If included, sidewalk, necessary utilities, etc. should be shown.

2. Houses encroach on the US water easement. Is the construction feasible?

3. Many of the stormwater ponds/BMPs are not accessible for maintenance as depicted on plans.

4. Drainage easements through adjoining properties to reach receiving drainage ways may be required for some of the BMPs. This should include consideration of larger storms above the BMP design storm.

Stormwater
1. Prior to approval of the Concept Plat, Concept SWM plans must be approved for the project. We (DPW) are at a disadvantage in making any comments related to SWM only having the Plat to review/reference. If SWM plans have been submitted copies can be forwarded to DPW for more substantive comments. If SWM plans have not yet been submitted then our comment is that the Concept Plan should not be approved until SWM Concept plans have been approved.

2. There are several comments, clarifications and errors in the General Notes on the second sheet:
   a. Number 11 – Clarify that the HOA is responsible for maintenance of all proposed swm facilities within the common open spaces. It should also be as clear as possible, in as many places as possible, that the homeowner, not the County, is responsible for swm maintenance for practices on their properties.
   b. Number 13 contains incorrect dates for the design guidance and county code. Note is incomplete or doesn’t read well. Note needs to be corrected, reworded and clarified.
   c. Number 15 indicates that the design and construction drawings for water service will be in accordance with Artesian Water Company design standards for their approval. Although water lines/facilities are private the Standards, Specifications and Detail for Water Mains & Sewer Mains states, “These Standards shall apply to all design and construction of public or private water and sewer main extensions and their appurtenances, regardless of whether same is intended for dedication to the Board of County Commissioners of Cecil County.” Also second to last sentence in the note should change “Purposed” to purposes.
   d. Note 18 – Recommend that the note be revised to indicate that all the plans mentioned in the note be approved prior to Final Plat Approval not recordation of the final plat. The final plat can be signed/approved by all departments but does not have to be recorded immediately. For SWM, the code requires “approval letters received from each applicable agency or department for each phase of the project design prior to progressing to the next phase in the approval process.”
   e. Note 20 indicates that U.S. Government Easement shall be retained except as indicated on the plan. Either the note is wrong or the legend is wrong. The existing easement is shown under roadways and through swm facilities but is not noted or depicted as being eliminated/removed.
   f. Number 21 should indicate that the road improvement plan should be submitted to DPR for review and approval. DPW would like to see and provide comments, but I believe it is DPR’s responsibility to review and ultimately approve the plans. Should the note also establish that the road improvement plan be approved prior to the final swm plan final approval?
   g. Note 24 has the wrong ordinance number/reference.
h. Note 26 needs to be reviewed closely. Driveway paving should be completed prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy for the individual lot – not when surface paving of internal roads occurs. The remainder of the note regarding 80% build out should not apply to driveway paving.

i. Note 32 is blank which throws off the numbering of the remaining notes.

j. Note 35 – Are reviews still valid from 2008?

3. Regulatory Approvals & Permits Requested section on Sheet 1:
   a. Notes 4 and 5 should reference a Plan not a permit.
   b. Note 8 misspelled Artesian.
   c. Note 11 – what type of Access Permit are they referring to? I don’t believe the Roads Division issues access permits for entrance construction at county roads if there are road & stormdrain plans. Note 12 should reference DPR for sewer design approval.

4. Most swm facilities are located immediately adjacent to stream buffers. The plat does not indicate the outfall locations for any of the facilities. The release from these facilities must be discharged at non-erosive velocities to a stable downstream conveyance system. Too often outfalls are not extended into the stream or wetland buffer to avoid permitting requirements without consideration of the erosive potential between the outfall and the conveyance channel (stream). There are elevation differences of 30’ to 50’ from the stream buffer (where facilities are located) to the stream channel. The design cannot just show an outfall pipe stopped at the buffer line with no consideration how that runoff will reach the stream channel in a non-erosive manner. A note which indicates that if downstream erosion occurs then a plan revision may be required will not be adequate to address this issue.

5. Is the stream experiencing degradation today? Remediation may be required based on outfall locations and discharges.

6. The concept plat does not provide enough detail on how the swm facilities will be accessed for maintenance. Access driveways for maintenance will be critical on this site with such steep slopes.

7. Are the swm facilities allowing enough distance from the toe of the outside embankment slope to the stream buffers. Clearing needs to occur 15’ from the toe of slope.

8. Concerned with driveway access to the proposed pump station. How will maintenance equipment and personnel traverse the steep slopes and what types of swm facilities will treat the driveway? Swm facilities associated with the access drives along the sewer line or to the pump station shall be the responsibility of the HOA to maintain and should be noted as such.

9. Soil borings are requested to ensure that the proposed swm facilities are appropriate for this landscape.

10. The plan indicates walking/hiking trails and a pavilion will be constructed in open spaces. Show the locations of these amenities. How will swm for these impervious areas be treated? As noted previously, maintenance for these swm practices will be the responsibility of the HOA.

11. Impervious areas to swm facilities shall be noted on the plan sets. The impervious area is required for the MDE geodatabase. Those numbers shall be shown on the swm plan and are available from the swm reports.

12. It would be helpful to add the Lot Numbers to the Phasing Breakdown table on Sheet 1 (i.e. Phase 1 – 61 lots – Lots 1-61, Phase 2 – 69 Lots – Lots 62 -130).

13. With regard to the proposed entrance location on Burlin Road, are there any existing drainage patterns/ channels that will need to be upgraded or reconstructed?

14. Have the consultants done any coordination with the Soil Conservation District on this tract? They may have files on bmp’s previously installed on this property – such as tile lines which are normally broken during mass grading and can then affect ground water levels.

15. The town and our office have received drainage complaints from Homeowners along Granite Avenue/Rock Run Road. Any opportunities to address issues in this area with this project?
Mr. Dierker read the comments for SHA:

**Regional and Intermodal Planning Division (RIPD) Comments:**

1. This segment of adjacent MD 222 is part of the Lower Susquehanna Scenic Byway. Although development should not directly affect the byway's defining cultural and natural resources within the vicinity, MDOT SHA encourages the design team to coordinate with the Maryland Scenic Byways Program to develop a design approach that integrates architecture, site layout, landscaping, lighting, signage, etc. that provides necessary functionality while maintaining and enhancing the byway's visual quality. For further scenic byways resources, see an overview of the Maryland Scenic Byways Program. For a guide to scenic byway design approaches, see CCS for Work on Scenic Byways”.

2. When mentioning SHA, change all references to the MDOT SHA.

**Office of Traffic & Safety (OOTS) Comments:**

1. The results of the Traffic Impact Analysis indicate that all study intersections are operating at acceptable levels of service and will continue to operate with acceptable levels of service during each of the peak periods using the CLV and HCM Methodologies under Total Traffic conditions with the exception of the intersection of MD 275 and MD 276 in the AM and PM peak hour. Given that the intersection of MD 275 and MD 276 operates below acceptable thresholds, it is recommended that a free-right turn lane be constructed along the northbound approach of MD 276. With this proposed improvement, the intersection will operate at LOS "B" during both the AM and PM peak hours.

**Travel Forecasting and Analysis Division:**

1. For MD-222 @ I-95 NB Ramp; according to our TMS count, the MD-222 WB right and the EB Left provided in the TIS are 50 vehicles less during the AM peak than our most recent count conducted in 2018. When looking at percentage difference for turning volume it is greater than 20% for both, please justify.

2. The existing volumes are not balanced in Exhibit 3. Minor differences are allowed when there are midblock generators. However, between intersections 2 and 3 going SB, there is a vehicle imbalance close to 200 vehicles in the AM and 115 in the PM. In the opposite direction NB, there is a vehicle imbalance in the AM and PM, of 80, and 180 vehicles respectively. There is a very short distance between these intersections with no mid-block generators, so these volumes should be balanced. These volumes should also be balanced for Background Peak Hour volumes in Exhibit 5B, and Total Traffic (Exhibit 8).

3. There was also a minor balancing problem between intersections 10 and 11, where there was a difference of 30 vehicles in AM, and 40 vehicles in PM. According to Google Aerial imagery this vehicle imbalance does not seem justified, are there new developments in the area that Google Maps wouldn't portray?

4. For background growth rate, since traffic volumes in the last ten years have been impacted by the recession, we do not concur with the assumption of zero future growth on MD 222. Please note that the traffic impact studies of nearby developments (Hollywood Casino, Chesapeake Overlook, and Bainbridge) considered regional annual traffic growth at 2%. TFAD would like to defer to the District regarding the decision of regional growth rate.

5. TFAD is concerned about the queue interaction, please provide queue length analysis for all studied intersections and provide mitigation plans for any queue lengths exceeding the available storage.

6. Noticed that Henry mentioned in his emails, that MD-222 at US-1 was an intersection of interest, and your reasons for omitting were due to distance from site, and traffic projection. Typically access is a bigger issue, than actual distance, and this roadway has minimal access. This would also serve as access to places along the river, like Conowingo Fisherman's park, which could also incorporate a seasonal traffic worry from this development, that hasn't been accounted for.
**District Access Comments:**

1. Material Testing should be done by third party or contractor should be indicated on plans.
2. A surety in the form of a bond, letter of credit, or certified check in the amount of 150% of the estimated entrance construction and accompanied with a W-9 Form, must be submitted.

Further plan submittals should reflect the above comments. Please submit (two) (2) sets of revised plans, a flash-drive containing the plans and supporting documentation in PDF format, (two) (2) copies of the revised study as well as a point-by-point response to reflect the comments noted above directly to Mr. Ken Fender at 615 Morgnec Road, Chestertown, MD 21620, attention of Mr. Henry R. Dierker 111. Please reference the MDOT SHA tracking number on future submissions. Please keep in mind that you can view the reviewer and project status via the MDOT SHA Access Management web page at [http://www.roads.maryland.gov/pages/amd.aspx](http://www.roads.maryland.gov/pages/amd.aspx).

Mr. Harding, LUDS/DPR, read the comments of the division:

1. Development Plans Review has not received the submittal of the Concept Environmental Site (ESD) Plans. The Stormwater Management (SWM) must satisfy the current Stormwater Management Code. Therefore, the Concept ESD Plans must be submitted and approved prior to the Concept Plat being submitted for review by the Planning Commission.
2. Adequate access for inspection and maintenance must be provided from County ROW to all SWM facilities.
3. If stormwater discharge is directed off of the site on to adjacent property it is the responsibility of the Developer to obtain necessary and appropriate easements from the affected property owners per Sections 325-16.D of the Cecil County SWM Code.
4. As stated in the General Notes, #21, a Protocol Two Road Condition Survey of Burlin Road extending from Rock Run Road to MD Route 276 must be completed. The completed survey and an improvements plan for Burlin Road must be approved by the DPR prior to submitting the Preliminary Plat for Planning Commission review. The minimum improvements required will be those associated with Section 3.07.15 of the Road Code, which nominally requires that Burlin Road be reconstructed for a minimum of 100’ either side of the point of intersection to current standards for the appropriate road classification. If the road already meets current standards, no road improvements are required. However with the number of lots and the condition of the existing road additional offsite improvements may very well be required. The road survey and improvements plan will reviewed by DPR with the Department of Public Works (DPW). DPR, DPW and the Applicant must agree to the detail and extent of the offsite improvements required prior to submitting the Preliminary Plat for Planning Commission review.
5. The Developer must provide an intersection & stopping sight distance submittal for the proposed Burlin Road access point. This submittal must be approved by the Department prior to presenting the preliminary plat to the TAC for review. Mark the proposed entrance locations in the field by flagging or stake on the roadside bank.
6. All applicable Road Construction Plans and Road Code variances must be submitted prior to submitting the Preliminary Plat for Planning Commission review.
7. All MDE permitting required for the Midnight Sun Drive stream crossings must be obtained prior to the DPW approving the Road & Storm Drain plans.
8. All sanitary sewer lines which are outside of County ROW must be located in utility easements with a minimum width of 20’. They may need to be wider depending on the size and/or depth of the utilities. The final/record plat must reflect the actual easement widths and alignments therefore if during construction width or alignment changes occur the record plat must be amended.
9. All sanitary sewer lines which are outside of County ROW must provide adequate access for inspection and maintenance.
10. All Sanitary Sewer Pump Stations proposed must be located on a lot/parcel of property dedicated to Cecil County and must be identified on the Preliminary Plat submitted for TAC review. Adequate access for inspection and maintenance must be provided to the sewer pump stations.

11. The forcemain from pump station #2 must be shown on the Concept Plan.

12. The sanitary sewer allocation must be requested prior to submitting the Preliminary Plat for review by the Planning Commission.

13. The location of the proposed forcemain and location of public sewer collection system must be shown on the Preliminary Environmental Site Design Plans.

Ms. Markkula, CSCD read the comments of the department:
Concept environment site design plans for this project were received by Cecil Soil Conservation District on 2/4/20 and are currently under review. All issues regarding erosion and sediment control will be addressed on the environmental site design plans.

Please update the soils information in the soils chart using Web Soil Survey. Currently, outdated soils information is shown in the soils chart.

Mr. O’Connor read the comments from MDE:
The plat notes all water will be provided by Artesian. If the plan is to connect to the Port Deposit community water system and as long as the system has adequate capacity to serve the development, I have no comments. If either assumption is not correct, please let me know, and I will advise accordingly.

Mr. O’Connor read the comments from CCPS:
1. Bus Service: To provide bus service inside of the development, 5 criteria must be met. They are outlined in the attached Bus Stop Guidelines document under “New Developments interior rout extension”.
   o Currently sections one, two, seven and eight coming off of Jacob Tome Memorial Highway do not meet the one-mile requirement coming in at .9 miles.
   o The remaining sections coming off of Burlin Road come in at 1.1 miles and would qualify once all other requirements are met.
     ▪ This is based on a rough measurement from the map. Actual measurements would need to be made upon completion of the development.
     ▪ Based on this information we would look at placing a community stop at each entrance to the development, one on Tome Hwy and one on Burlin Road. Once the county has accepted the roads for maintenance we could then consider providing interior service depending on the needs of the development upon request of homeowners.

2. School in this attendance area are Bainbridge Elementary, Perryville Middle and Perryville High Schools. Please refer to the Capacity Sheet to note the enrollment at these schools. (See file).

Mr. O’Connor read the comments from Delmarva:
Please show the existing poles along Jacob Tome Memorial Hwy and Burlin Rd especially at the two subdivision entrances Granite Cliffs Drive and Azul way.

Mr. O’Connor stated that comments were not received from Verizon, Artesian Water Company or the Fire Chief’s Representative.

Mr. O’Connor stated that the division had received thirteen comments from the public with concerns regarding this project. Mr. O’Connor summarized the concerns for the record. See file for the comments received.
Mr. O’Connor, LUDS /P&Z read the comments of the division:
This proposal was found to have minor deficiencies with §3.8 of the Subdivision Regulations regarding public notification. Several adjoining property owners were not sent notification letters. The list of those missed is being provided to the applicant. Notification that a Concept Plat has been submitted for review must be made by Certified Mail and documentation of that notice must be submitted to the Division of Planning and Zoning prior to the submittal of the Concept Plat.

The site is within the Low Density Residential (LDR) zoning district with a Mineral Extraction B (MEB) overlay and a partial Resource Conservation Area (RCA) Critical Area overlay.

This plat indicates that ten (10) lots are within or partially within the municipal limits of Port Deposit. Therefore, the applicant must coordinate with town officials on plat and procedural requirements for that portion of the development. Any approvals by Cecil County will not include portions within the Port Deposit’s jurisdiction.

The LDR zone permits a maximum base density of 1 du/1 ac without community facilities\(^1\) and 2 du/1ac with community facilities. Density within the RCA overlay district is 1 du/20 ac. This Concept Plat proposes 535 lots served by community facilities on 393.734 acres, for a proposed density of 1.36 du/1 ac.

General Note 10 states that only the portion within Cecil County jurisdiction is being calculated for density. The summation of that acreage is 391.636 acres\(^2\). Please clarify that discrepancy? Additionally, the acreage of development within the municipality must be included in the density calculations.

The portion within the municipality must meet their density requirements. The applicant should verify the density of the portion with the Town of Port Deposit and indicate the permitted and proposed densities on Concept Plat to be reviewed by the Planning Commission.

If only the County portion is to be used for the density purposes, what is the plan for the portion within the town? Mr. Miner stated that he would respond to this question in writing.

A copy of the Concept Plat has been submitted to the Critical Area Commission for their review and comment. No development is proposed within the 24.99 acre RCA portion of this site.

In the MEB overlay zone, mineral extraction activities are permitted per Article II, Part II, §17, Article V, Part II, §67.2, and Article XI, Part II of the Zoning Ordinance. The plan indicates that there is a request to remove the MEB overlay zone. Division of Planning & Zoning records do not have any active rezoning files with this request. The overlay zone designation removal must be completed through the rezoning process prior to Planning Commission’s review of the Concept Plat.

The R2 zoning designation within the municipal limits must be verified with the Town of Port Deposit prior to Concept Plat submission to the Planning Commission.

This plat also indicates that the municipal boundary shown was taken from the Tax Maps. The applicant should verify the location of the municipal boundary with the Town of Port Deposit and indicate the correct location prior to submission of the Concept Plat to the Planning Commission.

This project location is situated within the 2010 Comprehensive Plan’s Low Density Growth Area (LDGA) land use district.

---
\(^1\) Community Facilities is defined as A public, private, or community water supply and distribution system and/or sewerage disposal system severing three (3) or more dwelling units.

\(^2\) If the acreage within the municipality is included it would be a total of 425.382 acres.
The project is located within a Priority Funding Area (PFA); and is outside a Priority Preservation Area (PPA).

As established by the County’s adoption of the Sustainable Growth and Agricultural Preservation Act’s tier map, a portion of this site is located within a Tier I area within municipal limits and the remainder is located within the Tier II area.

This site is located W1 (existing water service) and S1 (existing sewer service) within municipal limits; W-3 (future service, 2-3 years) and S-3 (future service, 2-3 years) for the portion within the County’s jurisdiction on the 2019 Master Water & Sewer Plan.

The property is not located within Floodplain overlay zone or district. The effective date of that FEMA Panel (May 4, 2015) should be include in General Note 6, but it is shown on Note 7 on sheet one.

The site is located within the Water Witch Fire Company (007) service area. As of September 13, 2019, the Division of Planning & Zoning is requesting this information be placed on all subdivisions and site plans for the benefit of the State Department of Assessments and Taxation.

A proposed Planned Unit Development (PUD) was reviewed by TAC on February 4, 2009 and by the Planning Commission on March 16, 2009. The proposal was not reviewed by the Board of Appeals, and did not receive concept plat approval.

A second proposed PUD was reviewed by TAC on February 2, 2011 and by the Planning Commission on March 21, 2011. This proposal was reviewed by the Board of Appeals, and subsequently denied on June 2, 2011.

This is a new application which does not propose a PUD, and is not subject to the requirements outlined in Article XII of the Cecil County Zoning Ordinance.

A boundary line survey must be done in conjunction with the preparation of the Preliminary Plat for density calculation purposes.

§4.0.1 of the Subdivision Regulations requires the preparation of a Concept Plat for projects with more than 10 lots or 25 or more acres, whichever is more restrictive.

§4.0.6 of the Subdivision Regulations requires that the TAC and subsequently the Planning Commission, will, in general, be reviewing the Concept Plat with regard to the following:

(a) Interior street configuration and layout
(b) Proposed density.
(c) Entrance locations (both street and driveway)
(d) Traffic effect on existing and proposed roads.
(e) Water and Sewer facilities.
(f) Feasibility of a subdivision in the area, including:
   1. Total number and size of lots
   2. Effect on school district and school bus service

3 The County may approve a minor or major subdivision only if all lots will be served by public sewer.
4 Tier II areas are those planned to be served by public sewerage systems in locally designated growth areas needed to satisfy demand for development at densities consistent with the long term development policy after consideration of the capacity of land available for development including infill and redevelopment within the County. The County may only grant approval if all lots will be served by public sewer or if a minor subdivision is served by on-site sewage disposal systems.
5 PUD applications must be approved by the Board of Appeals to receive Concept Plat approval. The applicant withdrew this application on April 23, 2009. See BOA File 3449.
6 PUD applications must be approved by the Board of Appeals to receive Concept Plat approval. See BOA File #3550
3. Approximate lot layout and other reserved areas, if any.

(g) New land development technique(s)
(h) The effect on waterways, shorelines, due to run-off, erosion, etc.
(i) Consistency with the Critical Area Program requirements
(j) Consistency with the Cecil County Forest Conservation Regulations
(k) Stormwater Management requirements.

§7.2.12A.2 of the Subdivision Regulations requires that whenever a subdivision abuts a County owned or maintained roads that a dedication for public use is required. The land dedication for Burlin Rd is not clearly shown or noted on the plat.

§7.2.12B.6 requires that all street names shall be approved by the Department of Emergency Services and the Department of Land Use and Development Services (LUDS). Road names shall not be duplicate or analogous those used elsewhere in the County. Further all proposed suffixes and prefixes shall not deviate from the standards adopted by the United States Postal Service. Garth is not an approved USPS suffix. Therefore the road name Guana Green Garth is not approved by LUDS and must be revised.

The following road name approvals from the 2011 proposal are voided by the submittal of this Concept Plat to TAC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amethyst Way</th>
<th>Jasper Ln</th>
<th>Peridot Dr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aquamarine Way</td>
<td>Limestone Way</td>
<td>Quartz Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arundel Aly</td>
<td>Marble Way</td>
<td>Sapphire Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bluestone Dr</td>
<td>Mica Way</td>
<td>Siltstone Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulder Aly</td>
<td>Moonstone Ln</td>
<td>Slate Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citrine Dr</td>
<td>Obsidian Ln</td>
<td>Topaz Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerald Ct</td>
<td>Onyx Ln</td>
<td>Travertine Dr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garnet St</td>
<td>Opal Way</td>
<td>Turquoise Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granite Cliffs Blvd</td>
<td>Pelite Way</td>
<td>Vulcan Aly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jade Ln</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The road name Granite Cliffs Blvd. was approved in the 2011 proposal. This proposal seeks to use the name Granite Cliffs Dr.

The internal road names will need to be approved by the County 911 Emergency Center prior to Planning Commission review of the Preliminary Plat. Road names are required on Concept Plats, per §4.0.13 (h) of the Cecil County Subdivision Regulations.

Please clarify if the southern intersection of Midnight Sun Drive and Marinace Drive is proposed to be a T turn-around or a cul-de-sac? Mr. Miner stated that the southern intersection would be a hard 90 turn.

§7.2.12F.3 of the Subdivision Regulations requires that the access point for Granite Cliffs Drive on MD 276 must receive MDOT-SHA’s approval prior to Planning Commission review.

Has the intersection of Granite Cliffs Drive been coordinated with the intersection of the proposed Bainbridge development? Particularly to ensure that the intersection alignment requirements for both projects meet the requirements of §7.2.12E.4 and §7.2.12E.5. Mr. Schaffer stated that he has attempted to contact the folks for Bainbridge but to no avail. He has reached out to the Town of Port Deposit and the County in hopes of assistance with contacting Bainbridge to start discussions.
An entrance, identified as Pearl Dr., into Homestead Manufactured Home Park off Burbin Rd. is not shown. This is needed to verify that the intersection alignment of Azul Way meets the requirements of §7.2.12E.5

§7.3.1 of the Subdivision Regulations provides that the maximum block dimension is 1,800 feet. Midnight Sun Drive has a distance over that maximum between Granite Cliffs Drive and Azul Way. The applicant may request a modification to this requirement to the Planning Commission under the provisions of §3.5 of the Subdivision Regulations.

§7.3.1 of the Subdivision Regulations also requires that special consideration be given for interior walkways to facilitate pedestrian circulation. The applicant should have this consideration completed prior to Planning Commission review for the following blocks:

- Dakota Way – Between Granite Cliffs Drive and Black Pearl Road.
- Marinace Drive – Between Midnight Sun Drive and Guana Green Garth. On the North and South sides of Guana Green Garth.

The Road Data chart on sheet 2 does not have the corresponding road names from sheet 1. Please revise.

A Traffic Impact Study has been submitted and requires some revisions. The Traffic Study must be approved prior to Planning Commission submittal of the Preliminary Plat.

Per §4.0.13(a) of the Subdivision Regulations, the Forest Stand Delineation (FSD) must (shall) be approved prior to Planning Commission review of the Concept Plat. A FSD was submitted to the Division of Planning & Zoning on January 8, 2020 and comments with items to be corrected were sent on January 27, 2020. Mr. O’Connor explained that a revised copy was received.

The applicant should verify if an Environmental Assessment (EA) for the portions within the RCA is required by the Town of Port Deposit. If so, then various stages of the EA (conceptual, preliminary & final) must be approved prior to review of the various corresponding stages of Subdivision review (Concept, Preliminary, and Final). The Division of Planning and Zoning records indicate that one has not been submitted and it is not included with the FSD.

Per §4.0.13(a) of the Subdivision Regulations, the Stormwater Management (SWM) Concept Plan must (shall) be approved prior to Planning Commission review of the Concept Plat.

§4.0.13 provides the required information to be on the Concept Plat. The following items require correction:

(b) “…show all property owned…if only a part of the property is to be developed…” A part of Tax Map 23, Parcel 15 is shown as an adjoining property owned with the same owner and deed reference as the site. A review of the deed does not show an additional “deed parcel”. Please clarify why this area is not included.

(c) “…a record subdivision adjoins the property to be developed, the subdivision should be indicated by dashed lines.” The following subdivisions are missing from the adjoining properties: Merlyn Park (PC 1023/891), Minor Subdivision #3761; Minor Subdivision #4086, Minor Subdivision #1880; Minor Subdivision #2637 (for Map 23, Parcel 145 only).

---

7 Block is defined in the Subdivision Regulations as an area of land containing one or more lots and bounded by streets providing access to such lot or lots.
8 Per the report of the Plans Reviewer on 1/27/2020.
(l) “Existing zoning of the tract and all adjacent parcels. Any proposed zoning for the tract must be
effectuated by a rezoning prior to the Planning Commission’s review of the Concept Plat.” The
Suburban Residential (SR) zoning district was retired with the adoption of the 2011 Zoning Ordinance.
Any references to that zoning district must be corrected on the adjoining parcels.

The zoning district data on adjoining properties within the Town of Port Deposit is absent. This is
required to be on the Concept Plat.

The removal of the MEB overlay must be completed through the rezoning process prior to Planning
Commission’s review of the Concept Plat.

(q) “Any existing cemeteries or burial sites on the parcel(s) to be subdivided.” Are any burial site or
cemeteries on site? If not, please add a note to the Concept Plat indicating there are not any cemeteries
or burial sites on the parcels to be subdivided.

A Bufferyard Standard C is required, outside the right-of-way, along the road frontages of State and County
roads. This is noted on the Concept Plat by General Note 12.

Rows of street trees with 10’ planting easements are required, outside the right-of-way, along both sides of all
internal roads. In areas with community facilities, no street trees shall be planted within 20 feet of sewer
lateral and cleanouts.

A Bufferyard Standard A will be required adjacent to any adjoining property on which an agricultural operation
is occurring. There is a note on the plat that the Bufferyard A standard can be “Halved” if the dwellings are
setback 300 feet from the agricultural operation. The note is inaccurate, but furthermore, it appears it is not
necessary as the 100’ Bufferyard A is shown on the plat. If there is not a request to modify Bufferyard A, then
the unnecessary note should be removed.

A minimum of fifteen (15) percent of the development envelope shall be landscaped. The Preliminary Plat
should indicate the acreage of the development envelope and this calculation.

Any tree removal within a public right-of-way requires approval from the Maryland Department of Natural
Resources.

Dwellings or impervious surfaces shall not occur on slopes with a grade of 25% or more covering a contiguous
area of 10,000 ft² or more. On slopes between 15 and 25%, good engineering practices shall be used to ensure
sediment and erosion control and slope stabilization before, during and after disturbance activities. ⁹

Slopes greater than 25% must be shown on the Preliminary Plat.

A 110’ perennial stream buffer is required from all perennial streams present. This buffer shall be expanded to
include contiguous areas of hydric soils, highly erodible soils, and soils on slopes greater than 15% -- to a
maximum distance of 160’.

A 25’ buffer is required around all non-tidal wetlands and intermittent streams present. Permits are required
from the (US Army) Corps of Engineers and MDE for all non-tidal wetland and stream impacts prior to
recordation. JD’s are required in conjunction with permitting. If no permits are required, and if the proposed

⁹ The Cecil County Subdivision Regulations define steep slopes as “15 percent or greater incline.” The Cecil County Zoning Ordinance defines steep slopes as
consisting of a grade of 25% or more covering a contiguous area of 10,000 ft² or more. The Cecil County Forest Conservation Regulations define steep slopes as “areas
with slopes greater than 25 percent slope.”
project meets the policy standards established on 3/20/1995 and revised on 1/16/1996; or if the FSD/Conceptual Environmental Assessment finds that there are to be no impacts to field-delineated wetlands or stream impacts; or if the FSD/Conceptual Environmental Assessment finds that there are no wetlands or streams and that finding is consistent with the details of County wetlands maps and USGS quad maps, then no JD is required. If required, then a JD is recommended to be done prior to Final Plat review by the Planning Commission, but required to be completed prior to recordation.

The habitats of rare, threatened, and endangered species must be avoided. General Note 35 states no rare, threatened, and endangered species were found on site in 2008. Since twelve years has passed since that time, an updated Wildlife & Heritage Letter must be submitted prior to Concept Plat submittal.

The Soil Survey used on the concept plat is not current. The soils should be updated to reflect the 2009 Soil Survey. Additionally General Note 3 should have the date updated from 1973 to 2009.

A minimum of fifteen (15) percent common open space is required. The Concept plat proposes 185.529 acres of the 393.734 acre site or 47.12% of the site be used for common open space.

Except in the NAR and SAR zones, at a minimum, 15% of the required open space shall not consist of perennial or intermittent stream buffers, nontidal wetlands or buffers, steep slopes, or habitats of rare, threatened and endangered species. No more than 40% of the common open space required shall consist of those areas designated as nontidal or tidal wetlands (except in the NAR and SAR zones). The C.O.S. sensitive areas thresholds must be calculated for inclusion on the Preliminary Plat.

Per §187.2, the Planning Commission may require bufferyards to separate different zoning districts from one another. Verification of the zoning district within the Town of Port Deposit is required prior to submittal of the Concept Plat, so that the Planning Commission can determine if this provision is to be enacted.

Sidewalks along one side of all internal streets is required. Sidewalk locations must be shown on the Preliminary Plat.

General Note 32 is blank. Please remove it and renumber notes 33 and beyond.

The Preliminary Forest Conservation Plan (PFCP) and SWM Preliminary Plan must (shall) be approved prior to Planning Commission review of the Preliminary Plat (§6.2.B(1), Cecil County Forest Conservation Regulations; §251.12, 2009 Cecil County SWM Ordinance).

The final Forest Conservation Plan (FCP)/Landscape Plan and SWM Final Plan must (shall) be approved prior to the administrative review and possible approval of the Final Plat (§6.3.B(1)(a), Cecil County Forest Conservation Regulations; §251.12, 2009 Cecil County SWM Ordinance).

A Landscape Agreement must be executed prior to recordation.

Deed restrictions for the long-term protection of the street trees and Forest Retention/ Afforestation Areas (FRAs) must be recorded and noted on the plat prior to recordation, with the metes and bounds description of the FRA being shown on the Final and Record Plats.

All proposed lots shall not exceed the 3:1 length to width ratio established in §7.4.2.

Access to common open space between lots must be marked with concrete monuments.

Prior to recordation of the final plat, there shall be some form of surety acceptable to the County, in an amount specified by the County, or the execution and recordation of a subdivision agreement, which shall be submitted
with the final plat which subdivision agreement or surety shall secure an agreement to construct required physical improvement identified for Open Space Improvements.

Has the applicant considered coordination with the Lower Susquehanna Heritage Greenway about the proposed trails? Mr. Miners said no.

A Homeowners’ Association for maintenance of common open space must be established with $50 per recorded lot being placed in escrow for improvements prior to recordation.

The Record Plats shall contain a statement signed by the Health Department, approving authority, to the effect that use of the community water supply and community sewerage system is in conformance with the Master Water and Sewer Plan.

The Record Plats shall also contain a statement, signed by the owner, to the effect that such facilities will be available to all lots/homes offered for sale.

General Note 9 states that water service will be provided by Artesian Water. Documentation of water allocation must be provided by the applicant prior to the submittal of the Final Plat.

A franchise area must be granted by the County to Artesian and approved by the Public Service Commission (PSC) prior to Final Plat review.

General Note 9 states that sewer service will be provide by Cecil County DPW. Documentation of sewer allocation/capacity must be provided by the applicant prior to the submittal of the Final Plat.

Pump Station #2 does not show an associated force main line to show the location of how the sewage will get to the plant. Can you please clarify?

Has the applicant considered providing stubs and/or connections of public utilities for adjoining property owners? Particularly for the ones that have frontage on MD RTE 276 and the Homestead Manufactured Home Park. Mr. Miner stated that there would need to be further discussion on that possibility.

Please remove Note 3 from sheet 1. That note could be interpreted by the public that subdivision process is complete and cause an inadvertent violation of Section 3.4 of the Subdivision Regulations. Renumber additional notes accordingly.

Note 5 on sheet one states that the Cecil County Comprehensive Plan was last amended on 12/20/2011; that should be corrected to 12/20/2016.

General Note 20 states that the Existing U.S. Government Easement and Pipe shall remain except for those portions that will be relocated to avoid structures. The locations of the relocation must be shown on the Preliminary Plat; a draft copy of the agreements must be submitted and reviewed prior to approval of the Final Plat; and agreements must be recorded prior to recordation the Final Plat.

The Bainbridge Development Corporation (BDC) is the custodian of aforementioned easement. The Division of Planning & Zoning encourages the applicant to begin discussions with the BDC at this early stage to effectuate the relocation of the easement.

General Note 27 states that the numbers for address shall be at least 12” in height to meet the County’s Addressing Ordinance. This is incorrect as the minimum is 4” in height as required by the Ordinance and
building code. This note is not necessary for the Subdivision process, please remove it and renumber accordingly.

The “Typical 12,000 square foot layout” on sheet 2 graphically shows that the front setback is 40’, whereas the note on sheet 1 states its 30’. The minimum front setback in the LDR zoning district is 30’. Please revise the typical layout on sheet 2.

For subdivisions proposed on property contiguous to operating farms, notice shall be provided on the plat that an agricultural operation is being conducted on a contiguous property and said agricultural operation is protected from nuisance claims provided the conditions of Article I, § 4 are being complied with.

§4.0.2 of the Subdivision Regulations “If, for any reason, after Technical Advisory Committee review, a Concept Plat is revised to propose fewer lots but the same layout, said revised Concept Plat does not first have to be re-reviewed by the Technical Advisory Committee before being scheduled for subsequent review by the Planning Commission”. Therefore, if after today’s meeting there is a change to the layout then a re-review by the TAC will be required.

The applicant is reminded of the 4:30 p.m. submission deadline on the 3rd Thursday for review by the Planning Commission the following month.

School information:  
9/30/2019  Bainbridge ES  Perryville MS  Perryville HS  
FTE  284  590  789  
Capacity  449  860  944  
% Utilization  63%  68%  85%

CONCEPT PLAT REQUIRED INFORMATION:  
(a) Concept Plats shall be submitted on paper and shall be clear and legible. Illegible plats will be discarded and the subdivider notified. Incomplete plats will not be accepted by the Office of Planning and Zoning. For Planning Commission review only, a Concept Plat shall be not considered complete if the Forest Stand Delineation and Stormwater Management Concept Plan have not been approved prior to submission of said Concept Plat (if in the Critical Area, a Concept Plat will not be considered complete unless the Conceptual Environmental Assessment has been approved prior to submission of said Concept Plat). In addition, for Technical Advisory Committee and Planning Commission review, a Concept Plat shall be not considered complete if the public notification sign(s) have not been properly installed, if the electronic version of the plat has not been submitted for posting on the County’s website, and if the submission fee, established in Appendix A, has not been paid prior to submission of said Concept Plat. Incomplete Concept Plats will be returned to the subdivider within fifteen (15) days of submission for completion and resubmission by the subdivider at a later date, and the submission fees shall be forfeited.  
(b) A vicinity map indicating the location of the property with reference to surrounding property, streets, nearest major intersection, north point, landmarks, streams, etc. Show all property owned according to the tax maps if only a part of the property is to be developed. The tax map, block (grid), and parcel number(s) shall also be provided.  
(c) In the event that a record subdivision adjoins the property to be developed, the subdivision should be indicated by dashed lines.  
(d) Title information:  
1. Proposed name  
2. Scale of Plat (feet and meters).  
3. Location by election district, County and State.  
4. Date.  
(e) Name and address of owner or person representing owner who is responsible for preparation of the plat.  
(f) North point.  
(g) Boundary of proposed subdivision. This can be a deed plot.  
(h) Location, widths, and names of all streets and/or alleys on or adjoining the subdivision; this should include plats which have preliminary approval as well as those recorded but unimproved and all existing easements. (to be indicated by dashed lines).  
(i) Location of existing utilities on or within two hundred (200) feet of the parcel.  
(j) The layout of all proposed and existing lots with appropriate dimensions and minimum area.  
(k) The approximate location and area of all property proposed to be reserved to public use or to be reserved for use by all property owners in the subdivision, also the purposes of any proposed easements.  
(l) Existing zoning classification of tract and all adjacent parcels. Any proposed zoning for the tract must be effectuated by a rezoning prior to the Planning Commission’s review of the Concept Plat.  
(m) If community sewerage and/or water systems are to be used, such notation shall be made on the Concept Plat. The proposed providers of public water and/or sewer shall be cited on the plat, as applicable.  
(n) In the case of multi-family projects (apartments, townhouses, etc.) the following additional items shall be shown:  
1. Approximate location of buildings.  
2. Total number of units in each building.
3. Total number of off-street parking spaces and the space to unit ratio.

(o) General location and areal extent of the following when the subdivision is proposed in the Cecil County Critical Area:
1. Tidal and non-tidal wetlands;
2. Streams (perennial and intermittent);
3. Areas of steep slopes, highly erodible and other soils with development constraints;
4. Shore and stream Buffer (110-foot or 200-foot minimum);
5. Natural resource protection areas, Habitat Protection Areas, forests and developed woodlands on or in the vicinity of the proposed subdivision;
6. The Critical Area Boundary and the applicable land management classification(s), i.e. Intensely Developed Area (IDA), Limited Developed Area (LDA), or Resource Conservation Area (RCA);
7. Computation of the amount of acres in the Critical Area District; and
8. The location and extent of existing and/or proposed shore erosion abatement approaches.

(p) All existing easements on the parcel(s) to be subdivided.
(q) Any existing cemeteries or burial sites on the parcel(s) to be subdivided.
(r) Additional information as required by the Forest Conservation Regulations and/or the Forest Conservation Technical Manual.

Motion to adjourn was made by Mr. Arellano; Seconded by Mr. Harding.

The February TAC meeting ended at 10:15 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jennifer Bakeoven
Administrative Assistant
Department of Land Use & Development Services
Division of Planning & Zoning