

**Planning & Zoning Public Hearing
& Meeting Minutes
February 17, 2009**

ATTENDANCE: Commissioner Hansen, Michael Fortner, Matt Oberholtzer, Pete Reich, Bethany Brock, Town Planner Mary Ann Skilling, Town Attorney Keith Baynes, and Planning & Zoning Coordinator Dianna Battaglia.

Public Hearing called to order: 6:30 p.m.

Mr. Fortner started the public hearing.

File No. TA2009-04- Request to amend Section 74-41 A 6 of Chapter 74 of the Code of Perryville for the purpose of clarifying the costs developers/property owners shall be responsible for during the process and review of a site plan or subdivision plan submitted to the Town; **APPLICANT:** Town of Perryville.

Ms. Skilling stated the original ordinance that you have, the Planning office recommended that we try to change this and we would like to present this to the Planning Commission to change the original ordinance. You have a copy of it in front of you, with the changes in red. Keith Baynes, the Town Attorney, helped us redo this and one of the main reasons and the goal here is to add in this ordinance to allow charging basically for fees from personnel from the Town of Perryville, and this ordinance and what is in red here is to allow or at least to recommend that this is changed so that fee schedules can be adopted by resolution, instead of having to go through the amendment process. The words in red are what we are recommending to you to recommend to the Mayor and Commissioners to adopt in lieu of what you had in the original amendment. It will do the same thing except it adds for the ability for Mayor and Commissioners to do changes by resolution. And that is the key to this.

Mr. Baynes stated that it will simply the process in that if application fees go up, you won't have to go through the public hearing process just to change those fees. If you want to change the ordinance you would have to but not to simply change fees. It is adding the ability to the Town to recoup some of the Town's costs, like Ms. Skilling's review, the engineer, and other staff, what that they incur for costs also. Those are really the only two changes and if you recommend approval and the Mayor and Commissioners adopt this then what they will do is adopt a resolution outlining all of the fees that they currently have. I don't know if they will change or not, but they will adopt those fees as part of a resolution and move forward like that.

Ms. Skilling stated so basically all the changes in red are what we are recommending to the Mayor and Commissioners.

Mr. Fortner asked for questions from the Commissioners.

Mr. Reich said so for a resolution they are going to set fees for this size of whatever, and this size, and this size.

Ms. Skilling replied they are going to establish those fee schedules for such things as, some of which are already established, but if they are going to be changed, of which we're making some recommendations for some to be changed, they would be done by resolution from now on.

Mr. Baynes stated the current ordinance has them, has certain fees in there, and what we are proposing is to take them out of the ordinance and put them in resolution so that way if they are going to be changing now or down the road, it could be a much simpler process. For the Mayor and Commissioners to change the fee amounts without changing the wording or intent of the ordinance.

Mr. Fortner asked if there were more questions.

Mr. Reich asked is the resolution to change the fees going to be broadcast in any way; saying that we've now changed the fees.

Ms. Skilling replied that it would be done by resolution.

Mr. Baynes stated it would be at a public meeting for the Mayor and Commissioners but it would not be required to come before your Commission but it would have to be done at a public meeting by the Mayor and Commissioners and they would vote to either approve it or disapprove it or whatever.

Mr. Fortner asked if there were any more questions. We'll go into closing comments and develop a recommendation. I think it makes sense. I think our role is primarily to review site plans and I don't think we really need to get involved with setting fees. That's best done by staff and ultimately in counsel with the Mayor and Commissioners. They should set the fees and everything. That is my view. Any other comments.

Mr. Reich replied I agree. I think we should take this out of the ordinance and let that be established by the Mayor and Commissioners. That in the ordinance there are fees and those fees would be established by the Mayor and Commissioners.

Mr. Fortner asked if there were any public comments. Are there any members of the public to make comment.

Motion was made by Mr. Oberholtzer and seconded by Mr. Reich to recommend to the Mayor and Commissioners approval of the Ordinance 2009-04 as amended. **All in Favor. Motion Passed.**

Copy of ordinance is as follows:

ORDINANCE NO: 2009-04

MAYOR AND COMMISSIONERS OF THE TOWN OF PERRYVILLE

An Ordinance ~~repealing in its entirety existing Section 74-41 of Chapter~~ ~~amending Section 74-41 A-6 of Chapter~~ 74 of the Code of Perryville ~~and enacting the following new Section 74-41 of Chapter 74~~ for the purpose of establishing ~~clarifying~~ the costs ~~and fees~~ developers/property owners shall be responsible for during the process and review of a site plan or subdivision plan submitted to the Town ~~and providing that such costs and fees shall be established by resolution of the Mayor and Commissioners.~~

WHEREAS the Mayor and Commissioners of the Town of Perryville previously approved and adopted Ordinance 99-3 which enacted Section 74-41, entitled “Fees” of the Code of the Town of Perryville establishing application, review and inspection fees for site plans and subdivision plans; and,

WHEREAS the Mayor and Commissioners of the Town of Perryville desire to ~~repeal in its entirety existing Section~~ ~~amend Subsection A-6 of Section~~ 74-41 of Chapter 74 and enact the following new section 74-41 of Chapter 74 to establish ~~clarify~~ the application, review and inspection fees a developer/property owner shall be responsible for during the review of a site plan or subdivision plan ~~and providing that such costs and fees shall be established by resolution of the Mayor and Commissioners.~~

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED AND ESTABLISHED by the Mayor and Commissioners of the Town of Perryville that ~~existing Subsection A-6 of~~ Section 74-41 of Chapter 74 of the Code of the Town of Perryville is hereby **REPEALED** in its entirety; and,

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED AND ESTABLISHED by the Mayor and commissioners of the Town of Perryville that Section 74-41 of Chapter 74 of the Code of the Town of Perryville is hereby **ENACTED** ~~amended~~ as follows:

“Section 74-41. Fees.

1. All developers/property owners shall be responsible for the payment of all application, review and inspections fees and costs for all site plan and subdivision plan (Plan) submitted to the Town for review and approval.
2. Should the costs to the Town for the processing of the application, review and/or inspection of the Plan, including but not limited to the costs of engineering, staff time for review and inspection, and legal reviews, exceed the application, review and/or inspections fees previously paid, the

developer/property owner shall be immediately required to pay unto the Town all additional costs/fees incurred prior to receiving any approval.

3. All application, review and inspection fees and costs shall be established by the Mayor and Commissioners by resolution."

~~"6. Should the costs to the Town for processing an application, including, but not limited to, the costs of engineering, staff time for review and inspection, and legal reviews exceed the fees/application deposits specified herein, the applicant shall be required to pay unto the Town all additional costs prior to receiving any approval."; and,~~

~~**BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED AND RESOLVED** that in all other respects Section 74 41, entitled "Fees" of the Code of the Town of Perryville remains unchanged and in full force and effect; and,~~

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED AND RESOLVED that this Ordinance shall become effective upon the expiration of twenty (20) calendar days following approval by the Mayor and Commissioners.

ATTEST:

Mayor and Commissioners of the
Town of Perryville

Denise Breder
Town Administrator

by:_____
James L. Eberhardt, Mayor

Introduced and read during a public Town Meeting of the Mayor and Commissioners of the Town of Perryville on the 6th day of January, 2009.

Ordained, approved and passed **as amended** by the Mayor and Commissioners of the Town of Perryville during a public Town Meeting on the 3rd day of **March** February, 2009.

Denise Breder
Town Administrator

January 7, 2009

Motion was made by Ms. Brock and seconded by Commissioner Hansen to close the public hearing. **All in Favor. Motion Passed.**

Public Hearing was closed.

Planning & Zoning Meeting called to order at 6:40 p.m.

Mr. Fortner started the Planning & Zoning Meeting, and welcomed new members to the Commission, Pete Reich and Bethany Brock.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION was made by Commissioner Hansen and seconded by Mr. Fortner to approve the December 15, 2008 Planning and Zoning Public Hearing and Meeting minutes as written. **Two (2) in Favor. Three (3) abstained (Mr. Oberholtzer was not in attendance, Ms. Brock and Mr. Reich are new members). Due to a lack of a quorum a motion was not able to be made to approve the December 15, 2008 Planning & Zoning minutes.**

MOTION was made by Mr. Oberholtzer and seconded by Commissioner Hansen to approve the January 15, 2009 Planning and Zoning Public Hearing minutes as written. **Three (3) in Favor. Two (2) abstained (Ms. Brock and Mr. Reich are new members). Motion Carried.**

NEW BUSINESS

File No. FP2009-01 – NBRS proposed bank at Principio Health Center.
PROPERTY OWNERS: Perryville Medical Center I, LLC; APPLICANT:
Grubb Contractors, Inc.; LOCATION: 4871 Pulaski Highway, Perryville, MD;
Tax Map 29, Parcels 484/545; Zoned C-2, .5 acre.

Mr. Brad Fox with McCrone Inc. stated I am here tonight on behalf of NBRS and Principio Health Center. Along with me is the design builder, Mr. Eric Grubb representing Grubb Contracting. To start off with the plan, that is the pad site for the overall Principio Health Center that was prepared by George William Stephens. The bank corresponds with the overall plan as approved, the G.W. Stephens plan that was approved. The proposal is for a one thousand eight hundred seventy-seven (1,877) square foot bank including three drive thru lanes and one bypass lane. We have provided nine (9) parking spaces; eight (8) are required by the Code. And in addition there is the proper stacking that is required by Code for the drive thru lanes. The plan is in compliance with your requirements of the zoning ordinance and in addition, based on some comments received by Ms. Skilling and URS today, we adjusted the sidewalk to comply with the prior plan presented and approved by G.W. Stephens. We have also adjusted some landscaping issues and added water meter details that was requested by URS to be noted on the plans. I'll answer questions later but at this time I'll turn the building over to Mr. Eric Grubb but I'll answer questions you may have later.

Mr. Grubb stated the building that we're proposing we believe satisfies the architectural requirements of the existing building architecture that has been approved for the site. The building has also been submitted to the review panel from Stewart Associates who I believe is controlling the overall site and I know they have accepted the building design. It is our intent to have the building, this particular building be complementary of the existing dental clinic that is already on site. You will see the same features. For instance we're using the same brick, the same mortar on the exterior, as well as the same white banding across the top of the brick. We'll be using the same type of hunter green window frame with the same muntins that is on the same existing building as well the same standing seam metal roofing as the existing construction. I do have a photo of the existing building if you would need to see that for a comparison. Are there any questions on the building?

Mr. Reich said we only see the front part of the building. Where is the drive thru structure?

(Mr. Grubb showed renderings of the other sides of the building.)

Mr. Reich asked what are the pillars constructed of.

Mr. Grubb replied masonry with steel columns supporting the structure and then they are clad in a trim material which will be the same banding you see at the top of the masonry walls.

Mr. Fortner stated I'm not seeing the mortar. I'm looking at the design of the buildings that were previously approved and it seems to have more of a layered effect, a different color brick. We don't have the color renderings here but it doesn't look like the buildings that are there.

Mr. Grubb said this is the existing building there and it is our intent to exactly match the mortar that is on that building as well as the brick. You can see the windows are the same thing. The intent is to make sure the building matches its sister building there. I don't think the bank nor the Stewarts want something that would be out of character for that particular location. It's in the bank's best interest as well as the Towns.

Mr. Fortner said so the same as with the windows, they will all match so it's going to look like what's there.

Mr. Grubb said like it's always been intended. The intent is to look the same.

Commissioner Hansen asked what were the changes to the sidewalk.

Mr. Grubb said he would have to defer to Mr. Fox for that.

Mr. Fox stated, correct me if I'm wrong Ms. Skilling, we had missed a slight little walk here that was supplying circulation to the site and we intended to match up with the G.W. Stephens plan. There is a sidewalk over here with a cross walk to come over, so we carried the sidewalk over.

Mr. Oberholtzer asked what were the landscaping changes that you were talking about earlier.

Mr. Fox replied just a mislabeling of a tree.

Mr. Fortner said back to the building design. The top portion, you have the glass area on the building design on the front façade there. It's a triangle shape which seems a little out of character with the rest of the buildings that are there. What are you trying to match that to, it seems like more of a curved arched design would fit in better.

Mr. Grubb replied I don't have that board with me, you can actually make it out a little bit on this one. You'll notice that the existing building does have exactly the same architectural feature across the front. I think there are three locations on the east side which is this particular element on this building as well as there are two other locations where they have actual square pods up on top which is the reason that we put these clipped gables on here to pick up both of those architectural elements. One of the other things that we have done is where this one here is solid, which is what this gable above the drive thru will be, the idea would be by putting glass in up here, you will notice it is a very small footprint for the particular bank and the idea is that it would be an illusion for those who are using it to feel much larger when walking in the lobby. To have the whole thing opened up, all that glass would be inside the lobby.

Mr. Fortner said I get the idea of the glass there but the design of the glass doesn't seem to be consistent, at least what I'm seeing here. What I'm seeing here is more of the arched glass designs and maybe, I mean if you were going to do a steeple like that fine, but it's just the glass seems out of character to me. Where it could have more of a design consistent with the buildings that you see on the other buildings and still incorporating the pointed top.

Mr. Grubb replied I think it was the opinion of our architect that the half round would not fit inside of the pitched gable like that. It would be incapable of fitting with the rest of the architectural projects, thus the reason for having the trapezoidal glass.

Mr. Fortner stated it's just one thing that seems to be inconsistent with the rest of the designs. And also the mortar on the bottom, I don't see where it's displayed on there, where there is kind of a, I can't see it on your photos there, but on this, it's not in color, but it's kind of a layer of brick on the bottom. I don't see where it's depicted. It's seems like there should be a, on the ground brick it should be a different color or different kind of design to match what is displayed on their final site design.

Mr. Grubb stated that is their final site design. They only have one color brick on the building.

Mr. Fortner said I see that, but I'm talking about on the bottom. I guess what you call mortar, what you have displayed on the top is also on the bottom of these designs.

Ms. Skilling stated I don't think its brick. I think it is mortar.

Mr. Fortner replied it's a mortar but it looks like brick.

Ms. Skilling said at the bottom, it has various layers and it breaks up the brick. If I'm not mistaken its some type of band.

Mr. Fortner commented that also runs along the bottom.

Ms. Skilling said with the bank building because of the height limit, it's not a very tall building. Those buildings are two stories and there is a little more area to put that band.

Mr. Fortner stated but on one side its one story, on the higher side. And they would have that kind of mortar on the bottom as well as. They have something there and it doesn't look like a brick design on the top. It looks like what I see in the picture, but it looks like they have something, like a brick design below the windows.

Mr. Reich responded in this particular design he has it looks like white brick or light brick. That is below the windows.

Ms. Skilling stated I can only say that in the Highway Corridor Overlay District we do have some ability to make sure that this is consistent with the design and it does say that the architectural design, structures and materials, and colors shall be visually harmonious with the overall structure. That is a decision that you have to make. I'm not really sure. I think the reason we are seeing what you're seeing and not seeing the bands is because of the height of the building. That would be my opinion, because they could do something along the bottom but the actual brick, it gives you more brick now instead of actually having a concrete look, more so. Where you're really getting a nice brick look now. As far as the arch you could do an elliptical in there but I'm not sure in that type how specific we can get with this as long as the architectural design is basically pretty much the way it is to be. It is a decision that you have to make; whether you consider it to be visually acceptable to what's there. Now I do have a question. You said you have submitted this to the Stewarts. Do you have anything back from them.

Mr. Grubb replied that we had no objections from the Stewarts.

Ms. Skilling stated but did they send you anything that you might have from them in writing.

Mr. Grubb replied if I have it on record I would have to go back and find it.

Ms. Skilling said it would be nice to have that just to make sure that you did get that approval from them.. That's some of the conditions that they have to deal with too.

Mr. Grubb stated so we understand, the trapezoidal glass up there follows the interior rake of the ceiling of the lobby, and I would surmise, although I can't say tonight that if there was any way to the change to that glazing other than what is shown right now that it would have to be removed otherwise it would not be in keeping with the inside of the lobby. It's very much a part of the interior architecture of the building.

Ms. Brock said I tend to prefer it that way. I think if you put the banding on the bottom it would look stunted. And I guess, I don't think necessarily the intent of the ordinance is to have cookie cutter buildings, exact replicas. You want a little bit of variety, otherwise its boring. I like the trapezoidal glass so I guess the only other option if you can't fit in a semi rounded glass is to just completely block it off and make it solid but that wouldn't necessarily be esthetically pleasing.

Mr. Fortner said on the site plan, is it your intention to have shared parking component with the restaurant next door. Is it divided in any way or is that going to be one site essentially.

Mr. Fox replied they share the parking lot, the future restaurant and the bank. The space we provided for the bank, are for the bank. Now if you're talking about after five and the restaurant picks up and people park there they will get the benefit of having the extra parking spaces there. Regarding some sort of curbing or something along that line there is no separation.

Mr. Fortner stated so that is open between.

Mr. Fox replied the drive in is shared to minimize impervious areas, and you don't want to have a buffer between every site you know you would be doubling up on drive aisles and things like that and increasing pedestrian use. If you want to go to the bank and go to lunch you can park once.

Mr. Fortner asked can you explain the pedestrian amenities that you are including there about how people from the health clinics, the main buildings, are going to get to the bank site and is there a cross walk there and where else are there sidewalks beside aligning Route 40.

Mr. Fox replied there is a, what I would call an interior pedestrian circulation plan. We just brought it back to the bank site at the cross walk, to align with the plan from G.W. Stephens. There will be a cross walk out here and that will be the responsibility, once the final paving is in, of the overall development. The ramp here connects with the side walk on the other side and that would provide access to the rest of the site and the cross over.

Ms. Skilling stated I had this same question. It appears that sediment erosion, storm water management, was done purposefully for this site to allow for two things: the storm water so there would be this impervious area but it would allow it to go to that area where it is going to pick up that storm water and that there would be definitely circulation with shared parking and its obvious that that is what was wanted here. Because the parking in the restaurant eventually will be backed out into this travel lane from the bank. So it looks like that was originally part of the whole process and it also looked like maybe they used this for shared parking eventually. Because the bank obviously may not be in use the same time as the restaurant. A couple other things that I mentioned in my report, I know the bank is looking to do signage and it has been brought up and I did bring it up to Mr. Fox that there has not been a master signage plan done for this project, and that no signage could be approved until such is done for the whole project. And that is not on this particular site, it's not their responsibility, it is the responsibility of Stewart Associates for the entire site and I will be writing a letter to them to say in fact that they have to have that master signage plan before any signage is approved for this site and any other site. So, we will be writing a letter to that effect. I did mention also about fine grading plan, they are going to check with the County. They may need one. All the grading plans have been done as far as approval of the original. Just for your information and I wanted to go through all the things that have been approved on this whole project.

The following approvals were received for development of the entire site. The development pad for the bank building is not required to seek additional approval for the following:

- *Sediment and Erosion Control – Approved 4/26/07.*
- *Stormwater Management – Approved 6/15/07.*
- *Forest Conservation – Approved for the entire site 9/28/07.*
- *Landscape Plans – for entire site approved. It has been bonded but obviously nothing has been done yet.*
- *Water Plans, Hydrant Locations and Internal circulation plans – Town Fire Chief Letter of concurrence received 2/12/07.*

Ms. Skilling said all of those plans had prior approval for the entire site and that's why the plan is coming in as such, because it really is this pad that you are looking at right now. There will be a public works agreement that will have to be done for water and sewer capacity. It is at this point on site. It is private but to capture water we know there will be a public works agreement done for water and sewer.

Mr. Fox asked why a public works agreement has to be done since the system is private.

Ms. Skilling replied it is a private system. There was a public works agreement done for the private system for building two. We'll do another one for this one because it's only for recapturing, for knowing how much water and sewer is out there and the Town has some responsibility there. Not necessarily on site for that, but actually the water and sewer itself. So we did a public works agreement for building two and we will be doing one for this building as well. And it really is to recapture costs.

Mr. Reich asked they are going to be on our water and sewer, correct.

Ms. Skilling replied that is correct. It's already laid out. It's private within the interior of the site, it's where it comes into, the Town is responsible for bringing it there and for metering. That was already done and approved. The water allocation is part of that. That is what this is all about; you have to get the water allocation and the sewer allocation. That is done by each pad when it comes in.

Mr. Reich asked do they need to give you an estimate of what they expect the water and sewer usage to be.

Ms. Skilling replied that is one of the things in here that is part of it. We have to have an estimate of what their needs are going to be so it can be put in the public works agreement. The landscape plan, whatever landscaping you are going to be doing we will have to have information on the cost of that so we can do a landscape agreement and bond that. A cost estimate for the proposed landscaping. Then on Section 256 of the Zoning Ordinance, that is the last one and probably the most important is the signs. We need to have the master signage plan done. And it would behoove you to also make sure they start working on that.

Mr. Grubb stated he will mention that.

Ms. Skilling said we need a construction cost estimate submitted, reviewed and approved by the Town, so again that goes into the public works agreement. Sidewalk plans, which I think they did, mirrored the original and Mr. Fox did put that on there. It will be on the Final plan as well. As you well know, the Mayor and Commissioners decided in Phase II of Principio that a sidewalk will be put in prior to occupancy of Principio Phase II.

Mr. Reich asked who is doing that, Stewart Associates?

Ms. Skilling replied Stewart Associates is responsible for that. Kevin Pampuch from URS also sent some information. I think you have his comments.

Mr. Reich asked if they have URS comments.

Ms. Skilling replied yes I sent them to Mr. Fox. I'll just go over these:

URS comments dated February 11, 2009: URS has reviewed the MBRS at Principio Health Center plans dated January, 2009 as received by URS February 2, 2009. We have reviewed the plans with regard to technical engineering concerns only and have not considered planning or landscape technical related comments. URS assumes that the Town of Perryville will provide planning and Landscape related comments. URS would be pleased to provide technical Landscape related comments if requested by the Town. Our review is general in nature as this application is for a private property site

and does not include public improvements.

We offer the following comments and suggest that the Town include these comments in the response from the Town to the applicant:

- 1. All work must be in accordance with the Town of Perryville Supplemental Specifications attached hereto. All notes and details on the proposed plans must be revised accordingly. The general notes must reference the Town of Perryville Supplemental Specifications. The details should be replaced accordingly. The developer has been informed of this previously.*
- 2. The proposed water meter pit location must be shown on Sheet C-2. The proposed pit should be located within the grass area adjacent to the "existing 6" sewer stub w/ cleanout ".*
- 3. The applicant should verify that all as-built conditions that were modified from the original Medical Center Phase 1 plan are accurately depicted on this plan, such as the as-built location of the sanitary sewer pump station, etc. (Please recall that the Town has not received as-builts for the Medical Center Phase 1).*
- 4. The sidewalk required by the Medical Center Phase 2 PWA must be shown on Sheet C-2 to ensure consistency between all phases of this site.*
- 5. Due to the nature of the above comments, URS may have additional comments upon further review.*

Mr. Fox stated to address some of those comments, we did add in the water meter for this evening and show the grass area to address that. We also did a site survey and we located it horizontally to the pump station as it exists today and that has been shown on the plan.

Ms. Skilling said so you basically located it, or you followed the as-builts and found where it was. We don't have the as-built plan as yet but you have located it on site, officially located it.

Mr. Fox stated in addition they marked the existing cleanout on site and we found the water stub was marked on site so we were able to find where they were. To elaborate on the public works agreement I'm still slightly unclear because essentially the only sanitary water and sewer that will be provided to the bank is from the water meter to the bank. The service lateral and the sanitary service lateral to the bank.

Ms. Skilling replied again, when we, apparently when the project was done each building, they did an overall analysis of what they thought the water and sewer would be for the entire site. But as each one comes in, each pad comes in, it is run through the water model to ensure the water is based on what the needs are going to be for the specific site. Because as Principio I came in, they did the analysis of what they thought it was going to be and then it changed a lot. So each site that is coming in, we have to

determine your needs for every site. Because the total has not been, we just don't know the total. We just had an estimate for the entire site. Now we're trying to come up with a little more information.

Mr. Grubb said it's not a problem, we will provide it.

Ms. Skilling commented that would be incorporated in the public works agreement.

Mr. Fox said so basically the water service and sanitary service will be allocated as part of that.

Ms. Skilling replied that's exactly what it is. Its just to cover the Town to realize that you are using x amount of the Town water through a private system and its just a recapturing type clause showing that is what is being use.

Mr. Grubb stated we do that with mechanical engineers all the time. It is not a problem.

Mr. Fox said in addition we did provide our estimated flows on the site plan as seventy-five (75) gallons per day. Regarding the cost estimates to go along with that, do you need a cost estimate regarding the water and sewer services.

Ms. Skilling replied it's going to have to be the total project cost. That is going to have to go into that.

Mr. Grubb replied no problem, the costs for the proposed landscaping and construction costs.

Mr. Fox said I understand the landscaping costs for the landscape bond but I'm a little unclear of the requirement of the total project cost.

Ms. Skilling stated it's going to be the costs of what it's going to cost you to put it in. The roads, all the other improvements because that's how we base our fee.

Mr. Fox replied that makes sense then.

Ms. Skilling said it's the total project cost to you, what it's going to cost, and then we base a fee on that.

Mr. Reich asked what is the size of the entrance going in and out.

Mr. Fox replied twenty five (25) feet. That's what it is now. We don't have an exact.

Mr. Reich asked why did the bank want three pull thrus. You obviously have two stationed away from the building and one at the building.

Mr. Grubb replied the bank has decided that the vast majority of their business anymore is through automobiles. The first drive in, the one that is closer to the building would have an ATM as well as a night depository. So people don't have to get out of their car in order to access money. The second two lanes would be for an interior teller to provide access through pneumatic tubes.

Mr. Reich stated what is concerning me here is you've got some forty nine (49) feet of traffic pulling into fifteen (15) feet of exit. That's an awful lot of crowding there at one time. Because of the existing wall that's the only place you could exit, right.

Mr. Fox replied yes, the elevation to that site is high. The fifteen foot width was actually to deter cars from entering the wrong way, of making a wrong turn into it.

Mr. Reich said I'm not worried about that, I'm worried about four cars, one of which is going around not doing anything and the other three are about to pull out and smash into the guy who is getting crowded going around the corner, which is not anywhere close to circular. How do you propose to stop that accident from happening.

Mr. Fox replied the traffic that enters the site will be staggered because the same teller will be waiting on them, much like a stop condition, you pull up, you stop, at that point as the driver reenters the traffic flow, it is the driver's responsibility to look for other cars to merge into the exit.

Mr. Grubb said it has typically not been a problem at all their other locations.

Mr. Reich said I've never seen one where I pull out and automatically have to turn. I've seen a lot that go straight out but I've never seen one that turns like that. I'm concerned that the one person who decides he wants to do thirty miles an hour while talking on his cell phone to bypass the bank, whoops I made a wrong turn, I'm going to have to go around.

Ms. Brock asked what are you suggesting would happen. Someone will pull out of the drive thru and go around the turn.

Mr. Reich replied I'm just saying that if you look through the drive thru, you have forty-three feet of space of which four cars are going to be going through, when they make that corner they turn into fifteen feet of space.

Mr. Oberholtzer asked so you think all those cars are going to be going through there at the same time. I've never gone through a bank that is that busy.

Mr. Reich said I'm just saying that there is the potential that there could be a real hang up there with cars.

Mr. Oberholtzer responded there is always a potential for that given the way people drive, but given the layout of the site and the building pad location and the existing landscaping

and the fact that you are probably not going to have simultaneous traffic coming through there, I don't personally see a problem.

Mr. Grubb replied it would be my understanding that the staffing there that a single teller would be running both of those tubes, it would be impossible for both cars to leave at the same time on most occasions. Because usually when one tube is going into the building the other tube is coming out.

Ms. Brock said I've seen a lot of banks like this. My old bank used to be exactly like this.

Mr. Grubb commented this is pretty typical for bank construction.

Mr. Reich asked you made a turn around the bank like that.

Ms. Brock replied yes. My main concern though is not so much about the bank customers coming out but the restaurant customers because there is no divide between the two lots. Maybe coming around quicker than someone who is pulling out of the drive thru from the bank. Do you know what kind of a restaurant that is going to be?

Mr. Grubb replied I have no idea. The only thing that I can tell you about the restaurant is that it is my understanding that the bank wanted to be a good neighbor to the restaurant and that they would share when they are closed.

Ms. Brock said so the bank is aware that there is shared parking.

Mr. Reich stated and that is two way traffic there.

Mr. Grubb replied that is correct.

Mr. Fox said the restaurant is not shown on this plan, but it also has another entrance on the other side, so circulation around the restaurant, there is two way here, two way here, and two way out of here. The easiest way for the restaurant to exit is out the other way.

Ms. Brock commented which is actually the other way.

Mr. Fortner asked if there were more questions or comments. Just back to the design of the building again, we have the top portion of the window. Does that go all the way through? What is on the façade of the other side, the drive thru end.

Mr. Grubb responded the underside of the drive thru has to be flat because that is where all the mechanical units for the pneumatics go up inside of there.

Mr. Fortner asked what goes on the façade on the other side.

Mr. Grubb stated the intent for the façade, which would be the opposite side of the glass window would be a full panel gable and the bank is hoping to have a sign that would be under thirty (30) square feet on that gable.

Mr. Reich questioned under thirty (30) square feet?

Mr. Grubb replied that is correct.

Ms. Skilling replied that is part of the Code for sign requirement. But again, all of that will need to be looked at, when we do the master signage plan.

Mr. Fortner said so we will see a plan again, it will have this building.

Ms. Skilling replied that you will have signage for this building that will be something that we will have to have prior to final approval. It's going to be a condition that that get done. The master signage plan is going to have to be done. We're just going to include this building, and how it will be put on. And they will be addressing that with Stewart Associates when they do their master signage plan. You're going to have to give them what you want based on code so they can get it included in that plan. And you will actually get to see the master signage plan and you will have to approve that.

Mr. Fortner asked this is the Final Site plan for this.

Ms. Skilling replied that you may have conditions here that are still going to have to meet before we actually sign off on this.

Mr. Reich asked we can approve this outright, we can approve it with conditions, or disapprove it. Those are the three options to us.

Ms. Skilling replied that is correct.

Mr. Oberholtzer said so they are looking at signs for just this site or the entire site.

Ms. Skilling replied for the entire medical center site. The master signage plan has to incorporate how they are going to have signage on buildings and/or on the street. There is supposed to be a big sign out front similar to what is in front of Perryville Station, where Food Lion is. We will approve that but they will also be potentially be signs on the buildings and you will have to approve that. I did notice in your plan something about eliminating signs, I think it was in your plans about illuminated signs, you may want to address that.

Mr. Fox said I thought I saw in your Ordinance that they were allowed in the C2 district.

Ms. Skilling replied make sure the Stewarts know to have it as part of the master signage plan.

Mr. Reich asked where is the lighting for the outside lighting of the bank.

Mr. Fox replied that goes back to the G.W. Stephens site plan. One of the poles already exists on site and is located, here and there is another one in this section of trees down here.

Mr. Reich asked so you are not putting any lighting on the bank site beyond what has already been approved.

Mr. Fox responded there is another pole here and I don't know if the Stewart plan has another pole closer to this site or not. There maybe more on this other side also. But that was all approved with the preliminary site plan.

Mr. Reich said but under the canopy that you have, are you going to put lighting under there.

Mr. Grubb replied but of course. We would also have soffit down lights.

Mr. Reich stated the main reason is to light where they are doing business.

Mr. Grubb replied one is to illuminate for patron security and secondly, and that is to highlight the building. They like their buildings to be visible. They don't like dark locations. But ideally it's to keep the lights shining down so it doesn't create light pollution.

Mr. Reich said especially with being that close to Route 40.

Mr. Fortner asked if there are more questions from the Commission. Any public comments on this proposal. Without any more questions, would someone make a motion. Do you want to outline the conditions, and it is for site plan approval.

Mr. Baynes stated you can say with conditions as outlined by Town Staff and URS.

Motion was made by Mr. Reich and seconded by Mr. Oberholtzer to approve the Final Site Plan with conditions as specified by comments made by Town Planner Ms. Skilling and Town Engineer, URS. **All in Favor. Motion Passed.**

Mr. Fortner stated that our previous chairman has retired, Jack Heimberger, and the Planning Commission has to select a new chairman. So we'll open up to nominate someone.

Mr. Reich said I would like to nominate you, Mr. Fortner, being you are the oldest on the Board and the most experienced. You have the most recent experience and I like the way you conducted the public hearing.

Motion was made by Mr. Reich and seconded by Mr. Oberholtzer to nominate Mr. Fortner as chairman of the Planning Commission. **All in Favor. Motion Passed.**

Motion was made by Mr. Reich and seconded by Mr. Oberholtzer to close the meeting at 7:30 pm. **All in Favor. Motion Carried.**

Respectfully Submitted,

Dianna M. Battaglia
Planning & Zoning Coordinator