CECIL COUNTY TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, April 1, 2020  
9:00 a.m.  
County Administration Building  
200 Chesapeake Blvd., Perryville Room - Via Teleconference, Elkton, Maryland

Present: Steve O’Connor (LUDS/P&Z); Kordell Wilen, (LUDS/DPR); Teresa Gardner, (DPW); Matt Littlejohn (LUDS/P&Z) and Jennifer Bakeoven (LUDS/P&Z).

Joined via teleconference - Mari Markkula, (CCSCD).

Absent: Ed Arellano, (DEH); Henry Dierker, (SHA); Rob Peoples, (MDE); Philip Cwiek, (USCoE); Jun Ouano, (Delmarva Power); Charles Simpers, (CCPS); Adam Gould, (Artesian Water); Stephen Lord, (Verizon Wireless); Citizen’s Representative and Fire Chief Representative.

1. Part of the Lands of Triumph Industrial Development, LLC, Lots 21-23, Blue Ball Road, Preliminary / Final Plat, McCrone, Inc., Third Election District.

Donny Sutton, McCrone, Inc., presented the plat via teleconference. He explained that all the structures are existing. He stated that he will need to change Lot 21 on the plat to Lot 24 as there is already an existing Lot 21 and that he will be adding a note to the plat explaining the road code waiver that was requested has been granted. The purpose of this plat is due to reasons relating to the owner refinancing the property.

Mr. Littlejohn read the comments from the Health Department:  
The Health Department has no objection to the Preliminary / Final Plat.

Mr. Littlejohn read the comments from the Maryland Dept. of the Environment:  
The plat notes the subdivision is only for the indicated transfer of land solely for adding to adjoining holdings and not for development. On the proposed lot 21, there is a well permitted for use under Water Appropriation and Use Permit No. CE20006G012(03). If the land is sold to a different owner, the water rights transfer with the property. If it is desired to transfer the permit upon transfer of the land, an application for a modified Water Appropriation and Use Permit would need to be submitted.

There is no further indication of any change in use with a correlating change in water demand from an on-site water source (not the Town); however, if there is a desire to withdraw water for beneficial use from a well or other surface water source, please let me know so that I can provide appropriate advice.

Mr. O’Connor stated that there were no comments received from the Army Corp. of Engineers, Verizon, Artesian, Department of Emergency Services. There were also no comments received from citizens.

Ms. Markkula, CSCD read the comments of the department:  
The District has no comments on this plat. Since no earth disturbance is proposed, erosion and sediment control plans are not required.

Mr. Kordell, LUDS /DPR, read the comments of the division:  
1. The proposed Preliminary / Final Plat does not require any stormwater management.
2. DPR does not have any comments.

Ms. Gardner, DPW, explained that her comments were prepared not knowing the purpose of the plat. As such she read the comments of the department:

1.) Multiple stormwater management facilities within Triumph Industrial Park have been inspected by the Stormwater Management Division of the Department of Public Works and found to be out of compliance and in need of maintenance. These facilities are located at:
   - Triumph Industrial Park Lot 6
   - Triumph Industrial Park Lot 17
   - Triumph Industrial Park - Bomba

2.) The Stormwater Management Division of the Department of Public Works has not received an approved stormwater management as-built plan for the stormwater management facilities located at:
   - Triumph Industrial Park Lots 6A and 7B
   - Triumph Industrial Park – Bomba

3.) Impervious areas on Parcels 22 and 23 drain to the stormwater management facility in the southeast corner of Elk Parkway and James Way. Has any consideration been given to requiring the “new” parcels to contribute to the maintenance of the facility since the current owner of Lot 17 appears to bear all of the cost associated with the facilities maintenance?

Mr. Littlejohn read the comments from MDOT / SHA:
The Maryland Department of Transportation State Highway Administration (MDOT SHA) has reviewed the plans and we are pleased to respond.

Based on the information provided, MDOT SHA has no objection to County approval. MDOT SHA may require additional reviews as this industrial development progresses.

Mr. Littlejohn read the comments from CCPS:
1. Cecil County Public Schools does not have any comments to make on the part of Lands of Triumph Industrial Development, LLC agenda topic, since the project does not have any bearing on the school population.

Mr. Littlejohn read the comments from Delmarva:
Existing aerial and underground facilities already feed the lots. It would be nice to see the poles and padmount transformers but not necessary.

Mr. Littlejohn reads the comments of the Singerly Volunteer Fire Company Plans Examiner, Ernie Little:
Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Triumph Industrial Development reuse of facility 23. Singerly Fire Company recommends the following measures be implemented into the building design and construction to ensure that we have the required access and water supply to implement safe and effective fire suppression operations. We are not the authority having jurisdiction and have no enforcement authority to ensure compliance with the recommendations, however failure to implement the recommendations could impact Fire Department operations creating a risk to life and property.

Based on the review of the submitted plans we provide the following comments:
1.) We request that Fire Department access roads provide 26 ft. of clear width curb to curb, a minimum height of 13ft 6 inches and the road surface to support an imposed load of 75,000lbs. The angle of approach should not exceed 10 percent in grade, this is required to permit our aerial apparatus to set up for operations.

2.) The location of the hydrants are not indicated on the plans, please ensure that they are located no more than 12 ft from the access road. If the building is sprinkled please ensure that the hydrants collectively are capable of providing a fire flow for the facility specified in NFPA 1 chapter 18 section 18.4.5.2.1.

3.) If the facility is sprinklered please have the fire department sprinkler connection located no further than 100ft from the closest hydrant marked with a reflective sign and located it so that it is obvious and conspicuous to fire department personnel. Please have the connection type be a 5 inch storz with a 30 deg elbow.

4.) Please install a waterproof exterior fire alarm notification strobe on the address (street side) of the facility to assist the fire department with locating the address of the call when responding to an alarm.

5.) Install a KNOX box located on the exterior of the facility so that it is obvious and conspicuous to fire department personnel to assist with entry to the facility.

Mr. O’Connor, LUDS /P&Z read the comments of the division:
This proposal was found to be in compliance with §3.8 of the Subdivision Regulations regarding public notification.

§6.4.1 of the Subdivision Regulations allows for the elimination of a Concept Plat for commercial and industrial subdivisions per §4.0.1 and 2.0 of said regulations.

§4.0.1 of the Subdivision Regulations allows for the elimination of a Concept Plat for projects with fewer than 10 lots OR 25 or fewer acres.

§2.0 of the subdivision regulations allows for a combined Preliminary-Final Plat if there are 1 to 5 lots.

This project proposes to create three new lots around existing buildings, thus meeting the criteria for the elimination of a Concept Plat and the submittal of a Preliminary-Final Plat.

The site is within the Heavy-Industrial (M2) zoning district.

The M2 zone does not have a maximum base density, rather a Major Site Plan must be approved for any new development in this zone per Article III, Part VI, §39.2 of the Zoning Ordinance.

Since Subdivision Regulations came into effect on April 15, 1976, twenty-one (21) lots have been created through the major subdivision process. A subdivision history is included as appendix A.

A “Lot 21” in this development was created back in 2002. Since there cannot be two lots with the same identification, the lot number must be updated. For the purposes of this review, all notes referring to the 15.522 acre lot will be referred to as Lot 24. For the record, does the applicant intend to have this remedied for the Planning Commission submittal?
This project location is situated within the 2010 Comprehensive Plan’s Employment (EMP) land use district.

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.

This site is located W1 (existing water service) and S1 (existing sewer service) on the 2019 Master Water & Sewer Plan.

Proposed Lot 24 is located within special flood hazard areas subject to inundation by the one (1)-percent annual chance (100-year) flood; base elevations not determined (Zone A). Proposed Lots 22 & 23 are not located within any special flood hazard areas. This is shown on FEMA firm map 24015C0176E with an effective date of that FEMA Panel of May 4, 2015. This is on the plat as General Note 10.

The site is located within the Singerly Fire Company (003) 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.

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

1. Conformance to the provisions of the Cecil County Comprehensive Plan and Cecil County Zoning Ordinance.
2. Conformance to the approved density and layout and any conditions of Concept Plat approval, including, but not limited to, completion of the boundary line survey, completion and review of any Traffic Impact Study by appropriate State and County departments, approval of the Preliminary Stormwater Management Plan, approval of the Preliminary Forest Conservation Plan and/or Preliminary Environmental Assessment.
3. Conformance to the applicable provisions of the Cecil County Zoning Ordinance and these regulations.
4. Protection of wetlands, streams, area of steep slope and shorelines, including but not limited to, the Cecil County Critical Area program and corresponding sections of the Cecil County Zoning Ordinance.
5. Protection of forested, reforested, or afforested areas as required by the Cecil County Forest Conservation Regulations.
6. Conformance to all requirements of the Cecil County Department of Public Works, including but not limited to, stormwater management requirements.
7. Conformance to all requirements of the Cecil County Department of Environmental Health; and
8. Conformance to the requirements of other State and County departments, as may be applicable.

Article III, Part VI, §39.3 of the Zoning Ordinance provides the Bufferyard requirements for the M2 zoning district.

Article VI of the Zoning Ordinance is the Schedule of Zoning Regulations. This site is served by sewer thus the “Served by Community Facilities” applies. In the M2 zone the minimum lot size and lot width are “As required” to meet the requirement of the use. The front setback is 75 feet, which can be reduced to 30 feet when access is from an internal street serving a business park. The rear setback is 60 feet, which can be reduced to 30 feet when the use abuts land zoned “business” or “industrial”. The side yard setback(s) are 50 feet, which can be
reduced to 10 feet when the use abuts land zoned “business” or “industrial”. The maximum permissible height is 75 feet, and the minimum road frontage is 50 feet.

- The applicant is asked to update Note 5 to include the full statement when the site is zoned “business” or “industrial”.
- The rear setback for proposed Lot 22 encroaches into the existing building. Please seek either a setback modification from the Planning Commission per Article VII, §170 of the Zoning Ordinance or a Variance from the Board of Appeals.
- Since the maximum building height is not standard with most other zoning districts, staff requests the height limit to be placed on the plat.
- Please add a note to the plat to stating that road frontage requirements are waived per Article VII, §171.2 due to the granting of a road code waiver by the Board of County Commissioners on November 29, 1984 for the entirety of Triumph Industrial Park.

A 25’ buffer is required around all non-perennial streams and non-tidal wetlands present per the Zoning Ordinance, Article IX, §174.2 & §174.4 respectively. 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 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.

County records indicate that there is a non-perennial branch off of the Little Elk Creek that is within proposed Lot 24. Please either add the 25’ buffer or provide verification that it is not a stream or other wetland prior to submittal to the Planning Commission.

Article IX, §174.5 of the Zoning Ordinance requires that 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.

Article IX, §174.6 of the Zoning Ordinance requires development shall avoid areas of Rare, Threatened, and Endangered (RTE) species as defined by the Maryland DNR, Natural Heritage Program. Has the applicant received notification from the Natural Heritage Program regrading the status of any potential RTE species? Mr. Sutton explained that due to the structures being existing, he did not notify the Natural Heritage Program.

Article IX, §174.7 of the Zoning Ordinance requires that all regulated activities defined by the Cecil County Forest Conservation Regulations shall meet all requirements a prescribed herein. This project is exempt per §3.2N of the Cecil County Forest Conservation Regulations. General Note 17 notes the exemption. A Declaration of Intent (DOI) must be completed and filed prior to recordation of the Plat.

Any tree removal within a public right-of-way requires approval from the Maryland Department of Natural Resources.
Article X, §184 requires that for all Major Subdivisions that all landscaping as provided in Article III shall be required. Again, Article III, §39.3 provides for a Bufferyard and street tree requirements in the M2 zoning district. Since the new lots are not along an arterial or collector road or adjoining a residential zoning district the Bufferyard E requirement is moot. Additionally, since the project does not propose any new streets, the Street Tree requirement is moot.

Article XI, Part III, §230.2(A)(4) of the Zoning Ordinance requires that subdivision proposals of at least 5 lots or 5 acres, whichever is the lesser, that are wholly or partially in a hazard area where base flood elevation (BFE) data is not available shall be supported by determinations of BFE as required in §229.5(A)(5) of these regulations. Therefore, the BFE must be determined prior to submittal to the Planning Commission.

Article XI, Part III, §230.2(B)(1) of the Zoning Ordinance requires for subdivision proposals in flood hazard areas of the non-tidal waters of the state that are below BFE shall not be used for development and be deed restricted, or otherwise protected to preserve it as open space. This deed restriction and/or other open space protection must be in place prior to approval of the record plats.

Please contact Bryan Lightner, CFM in the Division of Planning and Zoning to obtain resources to assist with the last two comments.

Has a boundary line survey been completed? Mr. Sutton said yes.

MDOT-SHA has not required Traffic Impact Study (TIS) for this project. The project does not have access from a County maintained road.

The Preliminary and Final Stormwater Management (SWM) Plans must be approved prior to submittal of the plat to the Planning Commission. If SWM plans are not required, then documentation from the Division of Plans Review (DPR), certifying that SWM is not required, must be provided to the Division of Planning & Zoning prior to Planning Commission submittal.

Please correct all references of Lot 21 to Lot 24 prior to Planning Commission submittal. This includes the labels, acreage charts, title blocks, etc.

Per §4.1.20(b) of the Subdivision Regulations, the block (grid) is not noted on this submittal. This information must be added to the plat prior to Planning Commission submittal.

Per §4.1.20(e) of the Subdivision Regulations, the name and address of the owner(s) must be on the plat. This is missing from this submittal. This information must be added to the plat prior to Planning Commission submittal.

Per §4.1.20(i) of the Subdivision Regulations, “Datum shall be stated in all cases and a reference or benchmark described on plat together with elevation” This information must be added to the plat prior to Planning Commission submittal. Mr. Sutton directed Mr. O’Connor where on the plat he can find said information.

Per §4.1.20(l) of the Subdivision Regulations, “All major subdivisions must be provided with coordinates consistent with the geodetic control requirements approved by the Board of County Commissioners on May 15, 2007.” This information must be added to the plat prior to Planning Commission submittal.
Per §4.1.20(r) of the Subdivision Regulations, “The total number of lots…, the density…shall be indicated in table form.” This information, including density accounting for all previous subdivisions, must be added to the plat prior to Planning Commission submittal.

In regard to acreage, the latest signed plat for Triumph Industrial Park in 2015 indicated that Parcel 52 was 62.052 acres. This proposal indicates that 54.421 acres is on parcel 52 prior to these proposed lots. Please explain what happened to that other 7.631 acres? Mr. Sutton said he would review the acreages.

Per §4.1.20(u) of the Subdivision Regulations, “Perimeter of the entire parcel…” must be on the preliminary plat. This may be accomplished by an inset map, rather than boundary survey, and it must be added to the plat prior to Planning Commission submittal.

The Record Plats shall contain a statement signed by the Health Department, approving authority, to the effect that the 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 offered for sale. Mr. Sutton directed Mr. O’Connor where on the plat he can find said information.

Note the water service provider on the plat.

Note the sewer service provider on the plat.

Notification from DPR that Public Improvement Plans (i.e. street and storm drain plans, water and sewer plans, stormwater plans) have obtained final technical approval must be submitted to Planning & Zoning prior to submittal to the Planning Commission in accordance of §4.2.14 of the Subdivision regulations.

Per §4.2.15 of the Subdivision Regulations, Public Works Agreements and Inspection and Maintenance agreements must be recorded prior to the Chief of DPR signing the record plats.

Please remove General Note 11 and General Note 16. This project does not involve an Add-on or Resubdivision.

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   Gilpin Manor ES Elkton MS Elkton HS
FTE    404   556   983
Capacity   556   712   1380
% Utilization  73%   78%   71%

Preliminary Plat Requirements:
(a) The Preliminary Plat shall be submitted by the developer on paper and shall be clear and legible. The scale shall be no smaller than 1” = 100’ (1” = 200’ where the average lot size is greater than five (5) acres as approved by the Office of Planning and Zoning). When more than one (1) sheet is required, an index sheet of the same size shall be submitted showing the entire subdivision drawn to scale. Each sheet must have the surveyor’s seal. Incomplete plats will not be accepted by the Office of Planning and Zoning. For Planning Commission review only, a Preliminary Plat will be not
considered complete if the boundary line survey has not been completed, the Traffic Impact Study (if required) has not been completed, the documentation of the completed jurisdictional determination (if applicable) has not submitted, and the Preliminary Forest Conservation Plan has not been approved prior to submittal of said Preliminary Plat (if in the Critical Area, a Preliminary Plat will not be considered complete unless the Preliminary Environmental Assessment has been approved prior to submission of said Preliminary Plat). In addition, for Technical Advisory Committee and Planning Commission review, a Preliminary Plat will not be 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. Incomplete Preliminary Plats will be returned to the subdivider within fifteen (15) days of submission for completion and resubmission by the subdivider at a later date.

(b) A vicinity map indicating the location of the property with reference to surrounding property, streets, landmarks, streams, etc. (scale shall be no smaller than 1”=2000’), and conforming to Section 2.4.4 on the designation of the remainder. The tax map, block (grid), parcel number(s) shall also be shown.

(c) The names, liber and folio of all adjoining property. In the event that a recorded subdivision adjoins the land to be developed, the subdivision name, and recording reference shall be indicated. In the event that a historic district or other officially designated historic site adjoins the land to be developed, it shall be identified.

(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 the owner and registered engineer or surveyor licensed in the State of Maryland responsible for the preparation of the plat, signature, and seal of the engineer, surveyor and corporation required.

(f) Northpoint. Indicate if true north.

(g) Boundary of proposed subdivision.

(h) All existing pertinent features either natural or manmade that may influence the design of the subdivision, such as important trees or wooded areas, power transmission towers, existing buildings and structures and water courses.

(i) Existing topography at 2- or 5-ft contour intervals. Contour lines shall be indicated 100 ft beyond the subdivision boundary. Contours shall be based on government bench marks when available within 2000 ft of property or by estimation from USGS quadrangle maps. Data shall be stated in all cases and a reference or bench mark described on the plat together with elevation. Source of contours shall be stated on plat, such as, field run topo, or aerial topo, etc. Interpolation of contours from USGS quadrangle maps will not be accepted unless previously approved by OPZ.

(j) Location, width, 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 with dashed lines).

(k) Location of existing and proposed utilities on or within 200 ft of the tract with approximate pipe sizes and directions of slope indicated (should include electric and telephone poles or towers).

(l) The layout of all proposed and existing lots with approximate dimensions and minimum building line should be indicated. All major subdivisions must be provided with coordinates consistent with the geodetic control requirements approved by the Board of County Commissioners on 15 May 2007.

(m) The preliminary layout of all proposed streets and pedestrian ways, including width of right-of-way, pavements, storm drains, and grades.

(n) The approximate location, dimensions, and area of all property proposed to be reserved or temporarily reserved for public use, or to be reserved for use of all property owners in the subdivision, and the location, dimensions and purposes of any proposed easements, including drainage easements.

(o) Zoning district classification of the tract or parcel being subdivided.

(p) Existing and proposed (schematic) drainage system, including the type(s) of structures, the floodplain, proposed stormwater management facility locations, and any deviations from standards, consistent with Section 7.5.

(q) Locations of the septic disposal area, proposed wells and percolation information are to be indicated in accordance with the specifications of the Maryland State Department of Health and Mental Hygiene when individual sanitary facilities are to be used. If community sewerage and/or water systems are to be used, such notation shall be made on the Preliminary Plat.

(r) The total number of lots, area of lots, the density, the total area of any open space, the total area of any common open space, any add-ons, total area and types of right-of-way dedicated, and total area of subdivision shall be indicated in table form. All acreage shall be accounted for, per the boundary line survey, and the Preliminary Plat density shall not exceed the approved Concept Plat density.

(s) In cases of condominium or multi-family projects (apartments, townhouses, etc.), the following additional items shall be shown:
  1. Approximate location of each building, setbacks from all streets (public or private), property lines and distance between buildings.
  2. Number and types of units in each building.
  3. Total number of Units and sub-totals of each type.
  4. Number of parking spaces in each off-street parking area, and the space to unit ratio.

(t) Soil types shall be shown.

(u) Perimeter of the entire parcel as well as the section requiring approval.

(v) For proposed subdivisions located in the Critical Area, the following additional information will be shown on the Preliminary Plat as applicable:
  1. Computation of the total area within the critical Area District, area within each of the land management classifications (i.e., IDA, LDA, RCA), and number of lots in the Critical Area;
  2. Slopes 15% or greater;
  3. Location and area extent of all soils exhibiting the following characteristics as determined by the Soil Survey, such as:

(a) Wet soils,
(b) Hydric soils and soils with hydric properties, and
(c) Highly erodible soils (soils on slopes greater than 15% or on slope greater than 5 % with “K” values greater than 0.35).
4. Location of all existing or proposed site improvements (including storm drains, culverts, retaining walls, fences, and stormwater management facilities, as well as sediment and erosion control structures);
5. Location of open space, the Buffer and other buffer areas, forested areas and landscaping (the plan shall show all areas to be maintained as landscaping to be provided and the means by which such landscaping will be permanently maintained shall be specified);
6. Location of all Habitat Protection Areas on the site;
7. Location of tidal and non-tidal wetlands on and adjacent to the site and delineation of the watershed thereof;
8. Location of eroding shoreline reaches, the rates of erosion, areas where shore erosion measures are in place, areas to be protected by installation of proposed erosion abatement approaches;
9. Areas to be retained in agricultural use;
10. Areas proposed for reforestation and afforestation;
11. Total area of the site that will be temporarily disturbed during development and area that will be permanently disturbed (disturbed is defined as any activity occurring on a area which may result in the loss of or damage to existing natural vegetation);
12. Proposed natural park areas, as appropriate; and
13. The location of the Critical Area District Boundary, the Mean High Water Line and the landward edge of tidal wetlands.

In addition to the information above, the Preliminary Plan shall be accompanied by the following when the subdivision or development is proposed in the Critical Area, as required:
(a) A Planting Plan reviewed by and addressing the comments of the Bay Watershed Forester;
(b) A Habitat Protection Plan, including comments of the Maryland Forest, Park, and Wildlife Service, the Water Resources Administration, and other agencies as appropriate;
(c) An executed Cooperators Agreement with the Cecil County Soil Conservation District, or a farm plan, as applicable;
(d) A preliminary Stormwater Management Plan;
(e) A preliminary Sediment and Erosion Control Plan;
(f) A Shore Erosion Protection Plan – complete specification for complete shore erosion work;
(g) Natural Park Management Plan, as appropriate; and
(h) An Environmental Assessment, which provides a coherent statement of how the proposed development addresses the goals and objectives of the Cecil County Chesapeake Bay Critical Area Program. At a minimum, the Environmental Assessment shall include:
1. A statement of existing conditions, e.g. amount and type of forest cover, amount and type of wetlands, discussion of existing agricultural activities on the site, soil types, topography, etc.;
2. A discussion of the proposed development project, including number and type of residential units, amount of impervious surface, proposed sewer treatment and water supply, acreage devoted to development, proposed open space and habitat protection areas;
3. A discussion of the proposed development’s impacts on water quality and Habitat Protection Areas; and
4. Documentation of all correspondence and findings.

FINAL PLAT REQUIREMENTS
Required information: The Final Plat submitted for Planning Commission review and approval shall be on paper and be clear and legible. It shall not be considered complete unless the Stormwater Management Final Plan and Final Forest Conservation Plan and Landscape Plan have been approved, and all conditions of Preliminary Plat approval have been satisfied prior to submission of said Final Plat (if in the Critical Area, a Final Plat will not be considered complete unless the Environmental Assessment has been approved prior to submission of said Final Plat). Incomplete Final 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. The Final Plat submitted for recordation shall be clearly and legibly drawn in black waterproof ink on a reproducible linen of good quality or comparable material such as mylar approved by the Cecil County Office of Planning and Zoning. The minimum size of the plat shall be eighteen (18) by twenty-four (24) inches, including a one (1) inch margin along the left hand edge and one-half (½) inch margin on all other sides. Where necessary, the Final Plat may be on several sheets accompanied by an index sheet showing the entire subdivision submitted; however, each sheet shall be signed and sealed and include an approval signature block.

a) Title – The title block shall appear in the lower right hand corner of the plat and shall include the following information:
   1. Name of the subdivision. The name approved by the Planning Department and recorded in the Land Records shall constitute the subdivision’s official and only name. No other name may be used for advertising or sales purpose unless an approved and amended plat is recorded bearing the revised name.
   2. Section & lot numbers.
   3. Scale and date of completion. Scale shall be no smaller than one (1) inch equals one hundred (100) feet (one (1) inch = two hundred (200) feet where the average lot size is greater than 5 acres, as approved by the Office of Planning and Zoning).
   4. County, State & Election District.
   5. Name and address of the owner and registered engineer or surveyor licensed in the State of Maryland responsible for the preparation of the plat, signature, and seal of the engineer, surveyor, and corporation required.

b) Approval blocks in the form required by the Office of Planning and Zoning shall be provided in the lower left hand corner of the plat for signature by the Planning Director, the Public Works Director or Senior Engineer, and the Health Department, approving authority.
c) Tabulation on Final Plat (above approval block) showing the following:
   1. Total number of lots.
   2. Total area of lots.
3. Total area of roadways to be recorded.
4. Total area of subdivision to be recorded and where density restrictions apply, the acreage dedicated to the development, and the total area to be recorded as common open space.
5. Total area of subdivision or parcels to be recorded in the Critical Area District.
6. Total number of lots in the Critical Area District.
7. Residential density in the Critical Area District.
d) A heavy line indicating the boundary of the Final Plat with the distances of courses to hundredths of a foot and bearings relating to and consistent with the geodetic control requirements approved by the Board of County Commissioners on 15 May 2007.
e) Exact locations, widths, bearings, and names of all streets, pedestrian ways within the subdivisions or of adjoining subdivision abutting on the outline of the subdivision as well as any common and community grounds.
f) Bearings & lengths of all arcs, radii, tangents, chords and distances in tabular form.
g) All easements, reservations, or rights-of-way provided for public service or utilities in the subdivision, and any limitations of such easements. All existing recorded easements, if they are in excess of a five (5) foot drainage and utility easement, shall be indicated with recording references if known.
h) All lot lines with dimensions in feet and hundredths, and with bearings to a minimum accuracy of one (1) second.
i) Minimum area of each lot in square feet if under one (1) acre or in acres if lot size is one (1) acre or greater.
j) Coordinates shown for the outside boundary of the plat.
k) Lot numbers in numerical order throughout the entire subdivision. In case there is a resubdivision of lots in any block, such resubdivided lots shall have a number and letter to denote their origin and the original lot lines shown dashed and original lot number dotted.
l) Minimum rear and side building restriction lines, and minimum five (5) foot drainage and utility easements should be given by written note. The front building restriction line and the Critical Area Buffer restriction line shall be drawn graphically with dimensions for each lot.
m) The names, liber and folio of all adjoining unsubdivided property. In the event that a recorded subdivision adjoins the land to be developed, the subdivision name, and recording reference should be indicated. (To be indicated with dashed lines.)
n) The plat shall contain a north arrow, which represents and designates either true or magnetic meridian as of a date specified on the plat or shall be referenced to a recognized coordinate system within the County.
o) Accurate outlines of any areas to be reserved for common use by residents of the subdivision or general public use, with the purposes indicated thereon.
p) A certification that the owner or equitable owner of the land proposed to be subdivided shall be noted on the Final Plat. Such wording as specified by these regulations and the Planning Department shall be utilized.
q) A certification and dedication by the owner or owners of property to the effect that the subdivision as shown on the Final Plat is made with his consent and that it is desired to record the same and shall be noted on the Final Plat. Such wording as specified by these regulations and the Planning Department shall be utilized.
r) When a development is being resubdivided, the owner’s certification shall be noted on the plat. Such wording as specified by these regulations and the Planning Department shall be utilized.
s) References of protective covenants governing the maintenance of undedicated public spaces or reservations.
t) If a community water supply or community sewerage system is to be used in a subdivision, the record plat shall contain a statement signed by the Health Department approving authority, to the effect that use of such community water supply or community sewerage system is in conformance with the Master Water and Sewer Plan. The Final (record) Plat shall also contain a statement, signed by the owner, that such facilities will be available to all lots offered for sale.
u) If a community water supply or community sewerage system is to be constructed to serve any new subdivision, the Final (record) Plat shall contain a statement signed by the owner to the effect that plans for such facilities, including any necessary point of discharge, have been approved by the appropriate Federal, State, or County authority.
v) Location of minimum required septic area and proposed well(s), if applicable.
w) Reservation of road rights-of-way.
x) Exact locations, widths and bearings of any common or reserved areas or portions of lots to be maintained by covenant, easement, or similar approved instrument, in permanent forest cover, including existing forested areas, reforested areas and afforested areas to meet the requirements of the Critical Area Program and/or the Forest Conservation Regulations, as applicable. The bearings and the lengths of all arcs, radii, tangents, chords, and distances in tabular form.
y) Exact locations, widths and bearings of any areas to be maintained as resource protection (e.g., agriculture, natural parks, forest, etc.) to meet the requirements of the Critical Area Program and/or the Forest Conservation Regulations, as applicable. The bearings and the lengths of all arcs, radii, tangents, chords, and distances in tabular form.
z) Exact locations, widths and bearings of any areas to be maintained as permanent wildlife and plant habitat protection areas to meet the requirements of the Critical Area Program and/or the Forest Conservation Regulations, as applicable. The bearings and the lengths of all arcs, radii, tangents, chords, and distances in tabular form.

Appendix A - Subdivision History of Triumph Industrial Park.

Minor Subdivision #1233 – Nov 3, 1983 - Creates one 2.2235 acre lot from the lands of Trinco Inc. This was superseded by Minor Subdivision #1279 which created 2 Lots.

• Frist Lot - 1.0031 acres, Tax Map 305, Grid 17, Parcel 557, Acct ID 03-080560.

• Second Lot was superseded by PC579/3 (P&Z File T-56) and superseded a second time by PC 809/461 (P&Z File C-133) and is now the 4.017 acres, Tax Map 305, Grid 17, Parcel 555, Acct ID 03-079279.


• Lot 4, 2.000 acres Tax Map 305, Grid 23, Parcel 572. Acct-ID 03-084140

• Lot 5 was superseded by Resubdivision of Triumph Industrial Development, Lot 5A – PC 1117/67; P&Z File T-79 – January 26, 2015. Lot 5A is now 4.62 acres. Map 309, Grid 5, Parcel 573, Lot 5A Acct-Id 03-084159.


• Major Subdivision of Triumph Industrial Park - NDS 12/25; P&Z file T-25 – Aug 26, 1987 – Creates 11 new lots:
  • Lot 9 - 4.799 acres, Tax Map 309; Grid 4 Parcel 583 Lot 9 Acct-ID 03-084884
  • Lot 10 – 6.536 acres, Tax Map 309, Grid 4, Parcel 584, Lot 10 Acct-ID 03-084892
  • Lot 11 – 3.978 acres, Tax Map 309, Grid 16, Parcel 585, Lot 11 Acct-ID 03-084906
  • Lot 12 – 1.665 acres, Tax Map 309, Grid 16, Parcel 586, Lot 12 Acct-ID 03-084914
• Lot 13 – 2.832 acres – Tax Map 305, Grid 17, Parcel 587, Lot 13 Acct-ID 03-084922


• Lot 15 – 1.897 acres – Tax Map 305, Grid 17, Parcel 589, Lot 15 Acct-ID 03-084949.

• Lot 16 – 2.516 acres – Tax Map 305, Grid 23, Parcel 590, Lot 16 Acct-ID 03-084957.


Major Subdivision of James E. Waters II, Triumph Industrial Park - P&Z file T-61 – Dec 1, 1998 – creates Lot 21 (0.505 acres) – Never recorded. Superseded by Major Subdivision of James E. Waters II, Triumph Industrial Park – PC 1035/914; P&Z file W-103 – Sep 6, 2002 – creates Lot 21 0.505 acres, Tax Map 305, Grid 18, Parcel 665, Acct-ID 03-115585 – Had to be reapproved since the 1998 approval was not recorded within 2 years.

2. Richmond Hills, Courtesy Review for the Town of Perryville, Lots 1-22, Charles Street, Bay State Land Services, Seventh Election District.

Mitch Ensor and Brian Walker, Bay State Land Services, presented the plat via teleconference.

Dianna Battaglia, Planning Director, Town of Perryville expressed support for this plat.

Mr. Littlejohn read the comments from the Health Department:
Two statements need to be added to the plat

1. Public water and public sewer is available to all lots offered for sale.

2. Use of the community water supply and community sewerage system are in conformance with the county master water and sewer plan.
Mr. Littlejohn read the comments from the Maryland Department of the Environment:
The plat shows water lines. Although not explicitly stated, I assume the plan is to connect to the Town of Perryville. If the plan is to connect to the Town of Perryville community water system, and, as long as the system has determined it 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 stated that there were no comments received from the Army Corp. of Engineers, Verizon, Artesian, Department of Emergency Services, nor MDOT/SHA. There were also no comments received from citizens.

Ms. Markkula, CSCD read the comments of the department:
Concept environmental site design plans for this project were reviewed by Cecil Soil Conservation District and approved 12/20/2019. All issues regarding erosion and sediment control will be addressed on the environmental site design plans.

Mr. Kordell, LUDS/DPR, read the comments of the division:
1. The Stormwater Management (SWM) must satisfy the current Stormwater Management Code. Though it is unclear, if the plan submitted for TAC is a “Concept Plan”, the Concept SWM Plans have been submitted and approved with comments. DPR will issue a recommendation for approval of the Concept Subdivision Plan to the Town of Perryville.
2. Identify all SWM easements on the Preliminary & Final Subdivision Plans.
3. The Preliminary and Final Stormwater Management Plans, and the Mass and Final Grading Plans must be submitted and approved prior to DPR recommending approval of the Preliminary or Final Subdivision Plans to the Town of Perryville.

Ms. Gardner, DPW, read the comments of the department:
1.) Gemcraft Homes, was previously the developer for the nearby subdivision Frenchtown Crossing.
   Several items remain outstanding/incomplete on that property at this time.
   - Multiple stormwater management facilities within Frenchtown Crossing have been inspected by
     the Stormwater Management Division of the Department of Public Works and found to be out of
     compliance and in need of maintenance.
   - The Stormwater Management Division of the Department of Public Works has not received an
     approved stormwater management as-built plan for the stormwater management facilities within
     Frenchtown Crossing at this time.
2.) The Department of Public Works has received multiple drainage and flooding complaints from residents
    in the downslope subdivision of Frenchtown Crossing.
   - Additional attention should be given to ensure that runoff from this proposed subdivision will not
     adversely impact and or increase the amount of runoff that downslope properties receive.
   - The release from the stormwater management facility shown at the southwest corner of the
     project must be designed to discharge in a non-erosive velocity to a stable downstream
     conveyance system. Runoff will be discharged from the facility onto a steep slope – how will
     the runoff be conveyed down that slope and what is the ultimate discharge point?
   - Coordination may be needed between the adjacent property owner, CSX Transportation Inc., to
     ensure the conveyance to a stable outfall area.
3.) It appears that there are stormwater management facilities proposed within the road right of way
    - notably at the southern end of the proposed road. Though the area is generally noted as being “Common
      Open Space (Stormwater Management Area)” it does not appear that there is a clear delineation of the
boundary of the proposed stormwater management facilities. In addition it should be noted that Owner, Developer and or all subsequent owners (lots 1-22) shall be responsible for the maintenance of the stormwater management facilities, not the Town or County.

- Consideration should be given to ensure there is adequate space to perform snow clearing/plowing activities and that debris associated with such activity will not adversely impact the proposed stormwater management facility within the turnaround area. Additional protection may be needed at or near the inflow points of this facility.

4.) Perimeter grass swales are shown at the rear of lots 3, 4 and 8 thru 18 which appear to be intended to capture runoff from the rear of the lots and dwellings.

- Perimeter swales are not shown at the rear of lots 1 and 2. Runoff from these lots should be conveyed safely and in a non-erosive manner so as to lessen the impacts to down slope adjacent properties.

5.) Ensure that there is adequate space for routine maintenance (i.e. mowing) of the perimeter grass swales. This should include space on the outside/backside of the swales/berms.

6.) The plan indicates in Note 16 that the topography is from a survey dated 4/5/13. The County LIDAR topography is more recent and appears to show features, such as a large berm in the Common Open Space near Lot 19 that may impact the proposed grading and the drainage area to the swm facility. Why wasn’t the most recent available topographical information used or did you verify that the 2013 information was more accurate?

Mr. Littlejohn read the comments from CCPS:
1. We have current stops within the neighborhood serving Elementary, Middle and High school. This new addition to the neighborhood would have students walking to the current stops there.

2. Schools in this attendance area Perryville Elementary, Perryville Middle and Perryville High Schools. Please refer to the Capacity Sheet to note the enrollment to these schools.

Mr. Littlejohn read the comments from Delmarva:
Show the pole on both sides of the entrance at Charles St. Previous plat showed the road name as Richmond Ct.

Mr. Littlejohn read the comments from the Community Fire Company of Perryville, Inc., Fire Chief, Bradley J. Willis:
The command staff of the Community Fire Company of Perryville, Maryland Inc., reviewed the concept plan for this development as a part of the review process from the Town of Perryville. Our recommendations were forwarded to Ms. Amanda Hickman (see file). We are happy to see the requests that we made were incorporated into the updated TAC plan that your Agency has forwarded to us for review. Based on that, the Fire Company has no further comments and is satisfied with the development as proposed. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input.

Mr. O’Connor, LUDS/P&Z read the comments of the division:
As a courtesy to the Towns in the County, the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) from time to time reviews subdivision and site plan proposals – such as this.
The comments from Department of Land Use and Development Services (LUDS), Division of Planning & Zoning (PZ) are as follows:

The plan indicates that the northern portion of the site is within the Town’s Single Family Residential (R-1) zoning district and the southern portion is within the Town’s Multi-Family Residential (R-3) zoning district. The zoning districts, and the location of zoning district delineation should be confirmed.

As established by the County’s adoption of the 2012 Sustainable Growth and Agricultural Preservation Act’s tier map, this site is located within a Tier I area.

The project is located within a Priority Funding Area (PFA); and is outside a Priority Preservation Area (PPA).

The site is located within S-1 (existing service) sewer and W-1 (existing service) water service areas, per the 2019 Master Water & Sewer Plan.

A portion of property is located within the Critical Area. General Note 12 states that the portion within the Critical Area is within the “Intensely Developed Areas” district. This should be confirmed.

The location of the Critical Area delineation is different than publicly available digital maps. The location of the Critical Area district should be confirmed with the adopted Critical Area maps on file with the Town.

The site is not located within a Floodplain district per FEMA FIRM panel 24015C0129E effective May 4, 2015. This is noted in General Note 11.

The site is located within the Perryville Fire Company (008) service area. As of September 13, 2019, the Cecil County Division of Planning & Zoning is requesting this information be placed on all subdivision and site plans for the benefit of the State Department of Assessments and Taxation.

It is unclear if this “TAC PLAN” is a sketch plan, concept plan, preliminary plan, or final plan. What is the next step in the review process? Mr. Ensor stated that they will be submitting the Concept Plan for approval from the Town of Perryville’s Planning Commission.

It is advised that the “TAC PLAN” to be submitted to the Perryville’s Planning Commission be retitled for the appropriate step in their review process.

It should be confirmed that single family dwellings are a permissible use in these zoning districts.

The typical R-1 layout shows that there is a 30’ front yard setback, a 30’ rear yard setback, and a 10’ side yard setback. It notes that the minimum lot width is 75’ and minimum lot depth as 134’. These setbacks and lot dimensions should be confirmed.

The typical R-3 layout shows that there is a 15’ front yard setback, a 0’ rear yard setback, and an 8’ side yard setback. It notes that the minimum lot width is 50’ and minimum lot depth as 100’. These setbacks and lot dimensions should be confirmed.

---

1 Cecilmaps.org & MdMerlin.net
General Notes 9 & 10 lists the maximum building height for each district as 35’. This should be confirmed.

General Note 9 is labeled as General Note 0. This should be corrected.

The typical layout shows a “shed” against the rear property line. Does the Town have setbacks for accessory uses and/or structures? Ms. Battaglia stated that the setback for a shed is 5’.

Does the town have different provisions for setbacks on corner lots? Specifically, should the setbacks along the road frontage of Charles Street for proposed Lots 1 & 5 be the same front yard setback along the proposed road? Do the other setbacks change because of the status of being a corner lot? Ms. Battaglia said yes.

According to the Lot Area Table the smallest lot in the R-1 district is 10,040 square feet (0.23ac), and the smallest lot in the R-3 district is 5,000 square feet (0.11ac). Do these meet the minimum lot size requirements for each of these zoning districts?

The Area Summary data appears to be from a different project and does not match to the acreages shown on the plan. The applicant should correct this prior to submitting the project to Perryville’s Planning Commission.

General Note 15 states that all known rights-of-way and easements are shown on the plan. However, the 16.5’ wide AT&T easement found on the 1985 plats of this site is not shown. It is recommended that this easement be shown on the plan.

The adjoining property owner data has a few minor typos, and the deed reference, or valuation map\(^2\) reference in this case, is not noted for CSX transportation.

It is recommended that any Variances with file references should be listed on the plan.

It is recommended that any administrative waivers that have been granted should be listed on the plan. The Town of Perryville and Cecil County have an assigning obligation under the Forest Conservation Act agreement. Therefore, the requirements for the Forest Conservation Act must be reviewed and approved by Cecil County LUDS/PZ.

A Forest Stand Delineation (FSD) must be reviewed and approved by LUDS/PZ\(^3\). It is recommended that the FSD be approved prior to the approval of any Conceptual or Sketch Plat.

A Preliminary Forest Conservation Plan (PFCP) must be reviewed and approved by LUDS/PZ. It is recommended that the PFCP is approved prior to the approval of any Preliminary Plats.

A Final Forest Conservation Plan (FFCP) must be reviewed and approved by LUDS/PZ. It is recommended that the FFCP is approved prior to the approval of any Final Plats.

Deed restrictions for the long-term protection of the Forest Retention/Afforestation and/or Reforestation Areas (FRAs) must be recorded and noted on the plat prior to recordation. The metes and bounds description of the FRA must be shown on the record plat.

---

\(^2\) Valuation Map V-10.1_9

\(^3\) An FSD was approved on 9/10/2004. FSDs are valid for 5 years which may be extend. There has been no extension to FSD #463.
If afforestation and/or reforestation is required to meet FFCP requirements, then:

1. A cost estimate for the installation of plantings, and maintenance of new landscaping must be submitted and approved prior to record plat approval. This will be used for determining the amount of financial surety required.

2. A landscape agreement, with financial surety, must be executed prior to recordation.

Portions of the site inside the Critical Area are exempt from Forest Conservation Regulations but are subject to environmental resource protections and restrictions subject to the Town’s and State’s Critical Area regulations. This may include to preparation of an Environmental Assessment (EA) for portions within the Critical Area.

The soil classifications on the plan are incorrect. However, the soil chart does refer to the most recent soil survey. The applicant should correct the soil boundaries and verify the soils chart prior to submitting the plan to Perryville’s Planning Commission.

General Note 14 states that there are no known wetlands on site. General Note 17 states that there are not any Perennial or Intermittent Streams on site. Yet in the area summary it states that 6.77 acres are wetlands or Waters of the US (WOTUS). The applicant should clarify that discrepancy.

There are areas in the Common Open Space that are crosshatched, which staff infers is to represent steep slopes. However, that symbol is not noted in the Legend on the plan. This should be correct prior to submitting to Perryville’s Planning Commission.

Perryville’s regulations regarding dwellings and impervious surfaces on steep slopes should be reviewed. It is recommended that conditions and/or restrictions regarding steep slopes be added to the plan as the next numbered General Note.

If streams and/or non-tidal wetlands are found on-site, then permits are required from the US Army Corps of Engineers and the Maryland Department of Environment for all non-tidal wetland and stream disturbance activities.

General Note 19 states that there are no known areas of Rare, Threatened, or Endangered (RTE) species on site. As the project moves forward the preparation of the FSD and/or EA will inventory all the on-site environmental resources and will require a review letter from DNR’s Wildlife and Heritage Service.

This submittal proposes 33.34 acres of Common Open Space (COS); however, the total site area is 9.282 acres. This discrepancy should be corrected prior to submitting the plan to Perryville’s Planning Commission.

It is recommended that the required and provided amounts of COS be placed on Plat.

Have recreational opportunities within the COS been considered? Mr. Ensor stated that they would be discussing this with the Town.

If there are to be recreational opportunities or other improvements in the COS, then a financial surety is recommended to ensure the construction of the physical improvements.
It is recommended that a Homeowners Association (HOA) be established for the maintenance of common facilities. The Homeowners Association should conform with the requirements of the Corporate Charter Division of the Maryland Department of Assessment and Taxation.

It is recommended that the developer should:
1. Provide and establish the organization for ownership, maintenance, and preservation of COS prior to recordation of the Plat.
2. Establish an escrow account commensurate to the costs associated with the long-term maintenance, preservation, and improvement of COS.
3. Provide covenants or other legal arrangements specifying that each owner in the development is required to participate in the ownership, maintenance responsibilities, fees, and improvements of COS; and
4. Provide deed restrictions and/or covenants to ensure the purpose for which COS is provided.

It is recommended that the aforementioned items be reviewed by the Town’s counsel prior to review of any final plan by the Perryville Planning Commission.

It is recommended that the establishment of the HOA and recordation of the COS covenants be completed prior to recordation of the Plat.

The submittal indicates that there is a landscaping requirement by the symbol in the Legend and the area of “Landscape Buffer” noted in the Area Table. However, individual landscaping or Landscape Buffer areas are not depicted on the plan.

The “Landscape Buffer” in the Area Table states there is to be 9.13 acres of landscaping. As stated before, this appears to be in error as the entire site is 9.282 acres. This discrepancy should be corrected prior to submitting the plan to Perryville’s Planning Commission.

The landscaping requirements for this project should be verified.

Is a separate Landscape Plan (LP) required for any Buffer Area or Street Tree improvements? Ms. Battaglia said yes, a separate Landscape Plan would be required prior to Final Plan.

If Street Trees are required it is recommended that 10’ planting easements be placed, outside the right-of-way, along both sides of all internal roads. It is also recommended that a note be added to the Plat to the effect that no street trees shall be planted within 20 feet of sewer laterals and cleanouts.

It is recommended that the applicant execute an agreement including financial surety with the Town to ensure the installation and monitoring of required landscape improvements.

The Parking specifications should be verified. Specifically, the required number and stall size of off-street parking for single family dwellings.

A concern is the off-street parking for the R-3 zoned lots which proposes minimal area for off-street parking spaces on each lot. This does not provide off-street parking for visitor or larger vehicles (e.g. large pick-up truck, work van, U-Haul, etc.), and/or larger vehicles could block pedestrian access on the sidewalk. If these kind of motor vehicles park on-street, the ability for emergency services to access the sites becomes
compromised. The Division of Planning & Zoning strongly recommends that additional off-street parking be provided for the community due to the minimal areas off-street parking on each of the R-3 zoned lots.

Sidewalks are proposed on both sides of the proposed street and along on the frontage of Charles Street which Lots 1 & 5 adjoin.
- Does the Town have any requirements about sidewalk maintenance? If so, has a note on the Plat notifying potential owners of the maintenance requirement standards been considered?
- There are existing sidewalks along Mansion Dr. It appears that it would only take the installation of an additional 10’ of sidewalk to cross the proposed Common Open Space so that the sidewalks from this development would connect the sidewalk from Mansion Dr., thus creating a better pedestrian network. Has the applicant or the Town considered making this connection with the development of this site? Ms. Battaglia stated that they are looking into it.

Potential pedestrian-vehicle safety conflicts should be identified. MUTCD signage, other traffic control devices and striping should be considered.

A crosswalk is recommended for connecting the proposed sidewalks parallel to Charles Street.

Has there been consideration of connecting Mansion Drive with the Proposed Road? A connection would provide for secondary access, traffic circulation, and remove a dead-end street.

All street names shall be approved by the Department of Emergency Services. 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. Is there a proposed street name for this subdivision? Mr. Ensor said no.

Is access to Lots 1 & 5 from Charles Street going to be prohibited? If so, it should be noted on the plan. Mr. Ensor said yes, they feel it would be safer for those lots to gain access from the interior road.

It appears the current access for 201 Mansion Dr. will be within the proposed COS. Is this access to be relocated or will an ingress, egress, and regress easement be granted?

Will the Town of Perryville require a Traffic Impact Study (TIS) for this project? If so, by which stage of this project will it need to be completed and approved? Ms. Battaglia said that a TIS would be required at Preliminary Site Plan.

The Division of Plans Review (DPR) reports that the Stormwater Management must be addressed prior to Final Plan approval.

The Division of Plans Review (DPR) reports that the Grading Plan must be addressed prior to Final Plan approval.

A Concept Stormwater Management Plan (Concept SWM) must be reviewed and approved by LUDS/DPR. It is recommended that Concept SWM be approved prior to the approval of any Conceptual or Sketch Plat.

---

4 For example, County Code states: *Maintenance of the sidewalks shall be the responsibility of the Homeowner, Property Owner, and/or Homeowners Association on whose property the sidewalk fronts*
A Preliminary Stormwater Management Plan (Preliminary SWM) must be reviewed and approved by LUDS/DPR. It is recommended that Preliminary SWM be approved prior to the approval of any Preliminary Plats.

A Final Stormwater Management Plan (Final SWM) must be reviewed and approved by LUDS/DPR. It is recommended that Final SWM be approved prior to the approval of any Final Plats.

Any Public Works Agreements required by the County for Stormwater Management must be reviewed, approved and recorded prior to Final Plan approval. It is recommended that the recordation reference for those agreements be on the record plat.

Any Inspection and Maintenance Agreements required by the County for Stormwater Management must be reviewed, approved and recorded prior to Final Plan approval. It is recommended that the recordation reference for those agreements be on the record plat.

It is recommended that water allocation be granted prior to Final Plan approval.

It is recommended that sewer allocation be granted prior to Final Plan approval.

It is recommended that any required Public Improvement Plans (i.e. sewer plans, road plans, water distribution system plans, etc.) be approved prior to Final Plan approval.

It is recommended that any Public Works Agreements required by the Town be reviewed and recorded prior to approval of the final plan. It is recommended that the recordation reference for those agreements should be on the record plat.

It is recommended that any Inspection and Maintenance Agreements required by the Town be reviewed and recorded prior to approval of the final plan. It is recommended that the recordation reference for those agreements should be on the record plat.

It is recommended that the Final plan contain a statement, signed by the owner, to the effect that water and sewer facilities will be available to all lots offered for sale.

It is recommended that that Final Plan contain a statement, to be signed by the Health Department approving authority, to the effect that the use of community water supply and community sewerage system is in conformance with the 2019 Master Water and Sewer Plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School information</th>
<th>Elementary</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>High School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perryville</td>
<td>Perryville</td>
<td>Perryville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTE</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>589</td>
<td>764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Utilization</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

5 Source: FY2020 Education Facilities Master Plan (page 42)
The April TAC meeting ended at 10:11 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

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