

THURMONT PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING

5/28/15 AT 7:00 PM

Thurmont Town Office, Meeting Room

Agenda Topics

- 1.) APPROVAL OF 4/23/15 MEETING MINUTES
- 2.) ZONING INSPECTORS REPORT
- 3.) PRELIMINARY PLAN – RUSSELL E.
DELAUTER PROPERTY – SOUTH CARROLL
& PARK LANE
- 4.) THURMONT ZONING ORDINANCE REVIEW-
CHRIS JAKUBIAK

Minutes from May 28, 2015 Planning and Zoning Commission Meeting

A meeting of the Thurmont Planning and Zoning Commission was held on Thursday, May 28, 2015 at 7:00 p.m. Present were: Chairman, Randy Cubbedge; Planning Commission Members, Randy Waesche, Sabrina Massett, Bryant Despeaux, Brian Boyer and Alternate, Barrett Irons; Commissioner Hamrick; CAO, Jim Humerick; Sr. Administrative Officer, Becky Long; Zoning/Electric Utilities Inspector, Jim Brown; Eileen Waesche, Stephen Waesche, Brian Waesche and Kirby Delauter.

Approval of 4/23/15 Meeting Minutes

Commission Member Despeaux made a motion to approve the 4/23/15 Meeting Minutes as submitted. Commission Member Massett seconded the motion. Vote – all for. Motion carried.

Zoning Inspectors Report

Jim Brown presented the Zoning Inspectors Report (see attached).

Preliminary Plan – Russell E. Delauter Property – South Carrol and Park Lane

Chris Jakubiak (Town Planner) was unable to attend the meeting, so Jim Brown presented for him the Staff Comments on the Preliminary Plan for the Delauter Property (see attached). In concept the plan addresses many of the previous comments from the Commission and Staff. A number of items still need to be addressed prior to the approval of the preliminary plat, which grants the Owner an official right to proceed and subdivide and develop the property as shown on that plat, provided a final plat is later approved. So approval should only be given when the project is found to comply completely with zoning and subdivision standards. Mr. Brown then listed the 15 items that need to be addressed (see attached). Mr. Jakubiak recommended conditional approval; conditioned on applicant addressing the foregoing comments as certified by Zoning Administrator.

Mr. Brown then presented his Staff Comments (see attached). He said in addition to Mr. Jakubiak's comments, he thought the plan generally consisted with the Town Zoning and Subdivision Regulations and seems to have met some of the comments the Board had at the last meeting. He stated that the final locations of utilities would be decided when the Improvements Plans for this project are submitted to the Town Department of Public Works and 14 sets of Improvements Plans would need to be submitted for review. He noted for the Applicant that Detail #114 (referencing sewer/ house connection) shown on the plan is outdated and current specifications and details can be found online.

The Commission Members then went over the items that need to be addressed from Mr. Jakubiak's Staff Comments.

Chairman Cubbedge asked about item #3, if the 4,500 sq. ft. of open space needed to be one big area or could it be smaller sections that would total 4,500 sq. ft. Mr. Brown said it could be broken up, just so the open space totals 4,500 sq. ft. for the entire project site. These areas should be designated on the

plan as "open space". The flood plain area can be counted as part of the open space, because it will have vegetation. Commission Member Massett asked if the paved surfaces counted in the open space measurement. Mr. Brown said that is sort of a grey area. Some paved surfaces can count if there is minimal use of it. Playground areas, tot lots and storm water management are generally open space.

Commission Member Waesche asked about item #4. He stated the Ordinance says you need (2) parking spaces per unit and an additional (1) for every (5) units. Mr. Brown said that since there are (6) units there would need to be (14) parking spaces. The garage counts as (1) space and the driveway generally counts as (1), if its 20 feet long. The plan is showing (3) additional spaces, so he thinks the farthest townhouse doesn't have a 20 ft. driveway, the other ones may but there were no measurements shown. If the driveways are 20 ft. then they have (14) spaces. Chairman Cubbedge stated it looked like the last (2) units may not have 20 ft. driveways. Mr. Brown said without measurements on the plan it was hard to tell and it is up to the Applicant to provide that. Mr. Waesche then said kind of related to this was Section 14 of the Ordinance, which says that lots shall not include any part of the common driveway. And it looks to him that Lots 1 & 2 does that. Mr. Brown said there again, there wasn't any scaled measurement on that, so he couldn't tell. Mr. Brown then got plans that had measurements and stated that Lot 1 definitely doesn't have a 20 ft. driveway and Lot 2 looks like it has 20 ft. on the eastern corner, but not the whole width of the driveway. Lot 2 could be considered a grey area since parking spaces are only 18 ft. and that driveway does have 18 ft. all the way across. One of the additional (3) parking spaces would definitely have to be for Lot 1. Lots 3, 4 & 5 would have the garage and the driveway, so they are fine. So, if the driveway on Lot 2 is counted there are (14) parking spaces. Mr. Waesche then stated that the Ordinance says the setbacks should be 45 ft. from the center line, but it appears these have 40 and 42 ft. setbacks. Chairman Cubbedge said the parking on Lot 1 is definitely questionable. Mr. Brown said there may be more than sufficient space to shift the whole block to the east somewhat and still maintain a section of open space between the property line along S. Carroll St. and the 20 ft. drive isle. Drive isles can be right on the property line, but parking areas have to be 5 ft. off of it. Mr. Waesche said they had them shifted that way before, but from recommendations made at the last meeting, this is what they came up with. Mr. Brown said with some little tweaks they may be able to get that extra driveway there.

Chairman Cubbedge asked if the access to the driveway and the access to the rear of the property are both big enough for emergency apparatus. Mr. Brown said he thought this plan was submitted to the Fire Marshall, but we haven't received comments back from anyone except the School Board (see attached). And the School Board stated these townhomes would not cause the schools to exceed the State rated capacity.

Commission Member Despeaux asked if they should make a note on this plat that if S. Carroll St. is ever improved, that the driveway be abandoned from Park Lane and the connection be made onto S. Carroll St., this would eliminate coming out of the driveway at an intersection. Mr. Brown said he didn't know if you could put that kind of stipulation on it and that would be something for an attorney to decide. But with the limitations of S. Carroll St., he didn't think it could ever be widened. Chairman Cubbedge stated they could do a # with the possibility of a future connection. Mr. Brown said the Applicant could submit that on the final plat approval so access would be there on the Delauter Property if something were to

change with S. Carroll St. in the future. So this could be stipulated as a condition in your approval tonight in addition to Mr. Jakubiak's recommendations. You could also stipulate that if in the future access to S. Carroll St. is made, then the access at Park Lane would be blocked off.

Discussion was held concerning whether or not this project could be approved since the roadway being labeled as Park Lane is part of the River Run Development and what would happen if that development failed to be completed. Chairman Cubbedge asked how they could approve this plan with a S. Carroll St. address when there is no access to this street and Park Lane has not been built yet. Mr. Brown stated that any work on this project would be contingent on Park Lane being done. And he thought it was stated at the last meeting that this whole project was contingent on the River Run Project being completed. Mr. Brown said this is just a preliminary plat approval; they are not giving the final approval. Chairman Cubbedge asked if they needed a legal opinion on this. Jim Humerick said he would echo what Mr. Brown said and this is just a preliminary plat and right now it is showing a S. Carroll address because that is the mailing address for the property at this point. If the permanent plat is developed and goes to the improvement plan and the final plat, access will be off of Park Lane and the addresses will be Park Lane for these townhouses. In his opinion with the current address being S. Carroll has no bearing on the approval or disapproval of the preliminary plat. Mr. Brown said this is a project to be looked at as a standalone with Park Lane as the address and he believes that all of Mr. Jakubiak's comments reflect that. And the River Run Project is moving forward. This project will be contingent on the completion and dedication of Park Lane. Chairman Cubbedge asked if they needed to put that in any comments. Mr. Brown stated he didn't think so, because it would be a moot point once Park Lane is dedicated and River Run is operational.

Chairman Cubbedge asked if this is approved, would they be able to start digging before Park Lane is complete. Mr. Brown said they could not start anything on this site until Park Lane is dedicated and in place. Access to build on these lots has to come from Park Lane; there will be no access off S. Carroll St. to build on these lots. Chairman Cubbedge stated that it is now known publicly that there is no access off of S. Carroll St. for this project.

Chairman Cubbedge said it looks like in Mr. Jakubiak's comments that a full vegetative plan and lighting plan will have to be developed as they move forward. Mr. Brown said that under #5 on the comments the only screening that has to be shown is in front of the parking area, not for the drive isle. Parking lots have to be screened between residential units. So that 123 ft. property line there will probably have to be screened the whole way. Drive isles and driveways can go right up to the property line, but parking areas have to be a minimum of 5 ft. from the property line, that's why screening is only required for parking areas.

Kirby Delauter, representing Russell and Marlene Delauter, said they concur with all (15) of these comments and the recommendation that conditional approval be conditioned upon the Applicant addressing the forgoing comments by the P&Z Administrator. They are trying to time this with the River Run Project and they understand if River Run doesn't happen, then this doesn't happen. He asked that they consider allowing water and sewer connection to be made and capped off if the River Run Project gets to the point of being ready to pave, that way new pavement won't have to be dug up to make

connections later. He also stated if they need to extend the screening down, they don't have an issue with that either.

Commission Member Waesche stated that he is really having trouble with Lot 1 and the setbacks. He wanted to know if there was anything the Applicant could do about that. Mr. Delauter said he would like to address that thru the improvement plan, because they would have to look at how the utilities shift and where they are going to be located. And as Mr. Brown stated they may be able to move a little bit more to the east. They won't know that until they get the alignment charts and start to see how that will play out at the intersection, they just haven't gotten there yet. They don't want to drop the Lot with all of the expenses you have with this small of a development anyway. But if that is what has to be done, then they will just have to do that, but they are going to try and fit it in there just for the economics. They don't want to shove anything in there that is not going to look right and they don't want to have to keep coming back here either. So if they just have to make it simple to get it to work then they will. He will get with an engineer first to see if it can be shifted around to work. Mr. Waesche said it needs to be 45 ft. from the center line of Park Lane, so it's going to push those back 5 ft. and they are going to lose 5 ft. in the back. He would like to see it before the Board moves forward. Mr. Delauter said they were basing that on the same unit they used at River Run and they have a smaller depth unit that might be able to work also. So if they have to shift the units back and adjust the unit size, he could talk to the builder about that, but until they get a little bit further along, he couldn't answer to that.

Mr. Brown stated that with Mr. Delauter wanting to get the water and sewer connections made before paving was done, it would be in his best interest to get the improvement plans submitted as soon as possible for review. So if there is anything that doesn't work the way they show on the plans, it will have to go thru the Water and Sewer Department so they can coordinate it. Mr. Delauter said they were about a month out and they don't need to do it in complete conjunction with River Run, but before the paving begins. But this is a smaller project, so hopefully it shouldn't take long to get those back to the Board.

Commission Member Despeaux asked Mr. Delauter if he understood about abandoning the driveway off of Park Lane if S. Carrol St. is ever improved. Mr. Delauter stated he had no problem with putting that on the plat. But he said he doesn't necessarily agree with cutting off the Park Lane access, since we always want two accesses for a development. But it's not his call, so whatever needs to be done he will do.

Chairman Cubbedge asked Mr. Delauter if he thought after getting with his engineer, would he be able to get a final and continue with it in 30 days or what his timeline would be on that. Mr. Delauter said it would be close, but he would see what he could do. He stated he would be using the same engineer that River Run used.

Commission Member Waesche had a question about the process, not on the Applicants part at all. These plans were submitted weeks ago and Mr. Jakubiak provided comments, when did the comments get done. Mr. Humerick said 4:30 this evening. Since there was so much on the Staff comments, he wishes the Applicant could have seen them before tonight. Chairman Cubbedge stated that it is

unfortunate, but these things listed on the comments need to be done as a condition for approval. And he hopes that they wouldn't have to tie the Applicant up any longer than necessary. This isn't the final plat approval it is just the preliminary.

Chairman Cubbedge said he thinks the Board is pretty much in agreement with what they are looking at. There is a problem with Lot #1 that is going to require some engineering and it seems the Applicant would like it to work, but if it can't then that's ok. The Applicant seems to want to be accommodating. Mr. Delauter doesn't seem to have a problem with anything that has been listed on the Staff comments, so it is up to the Board now for any kind of recommendation they would like to make.

Commission Member Despeaux asked if he needed to include the stipulation about the potential future connections on the preliminary approval motion. Chairman Cubbedge said he didn't think that needed to be on the preliminary, but it would need to be on the final. Commission Member Massett asked if it should be in writing so the Applicant would know to put it on the final. Chairman Cubbedge said it is not necessary, but it would come down to whether or not it would be a deal breaker for approving the preliminary plat for this project. If we put this on the final plat approval, we are just giving them a heads up that if in the future something develops, and then they know what the Board would like them to do. Commission Member Massett said that no one thing is a deal breaker, she wants all the items addressed and she doesn't see the harm in adding it now. Chairman Cubbedge stated that they didn't know if that section of S. Carroll St. would even be part of a development in the future. And again we are just making a suggestion on a piece of paper for the future.

Commission Member Despeaux made a motion to conditionally approve the preliminary plat for Russell E. Delauter Property at S. Carroll and Park Lane for Park Place Development subject to Staff and Agency comments on the condition the Applicant addresses the comments from the Town Planner (Chris Jakubiak) as stated in these (15) points. Commission Member Boyer seconded the motion. Commission Member Waesche stated that he thinks the Staff comments missed the required 45 ft. setbacks from the center of Park Lane. He said there is just so much to these comments that he would like to see it come back for later preliminary approval. He is not convinced that there is enough room for (6) units. Chairman Cubbedge said there is a motion and it has been seconded, he then asked for a vote. Vote – 2 for (Despeaux, Boyer), 3 against (Waesche, Massett, Cubbedge). Motion dies.

Chairman Cubbedge asked if there was another motion with a delineation setback or did they just want to carry this over to another meeting. Mr. Humerick stated that they could go either way, try to garnish another motion with the additional requirements that Mr. Waesche or any other member spoke about or you can leave it go. You just have to make sure that if you are going to deny it this evening, you need to articulate on why it was denied based upon our current subdivision regulations and zoning ordinances.

Chairman Cubbedge stated that the first motion that was presented did die for lack of an affirmative vote, because of the setback requirements showing against Lot #1.

Commission Member Despeaux made a motion to conditionally approve the preliminary plan for the Russell E. Delauter Property at S. Carroll and Park Lane known as Park Place Subdivision subject to Staff

and Agency comments on the condition that the Applicant addresses all of the comments submitted by the Town Planner and that the Plat conform to all Thurmont Zoning Ordinances, including setbacks. Commission Member Boyer seconded the motion. Commission Member Waesche asked then if the next time they see the plans it would be the final with the setbacks and have to be in conformance with the Ordinance. Chairman Cubbedge said yes. Commission Member Massett said there were a lot of things she was unhappy with in the process, but she thinks they have enough to move forward. Chairman Cubbedge stated the Applicant is aware of what the Zoning Regulations are and what they can do or not do and they will do what they need to in order to move forward. Vote – all for. Motion carried.

Thurmont Zoning Ordinance Review – Chris Jakubiak

Since Mr. Jakubiak was unable to attend the meeting tonight this item will be continued until the next meeting.

Chairman Cubbedge asked if there was anything from Staff this evening. Beck Long stated they do have site plans for next month's meeting on June 25, 2015.

Jim Humerick stated that he apologized for the lateness in the Board receiving the Staff comments so late and he will try to resolve that. Commission Member Waesche said he was not criticizing the planning contractor, who is a busy man, but he just hates to see our citizens get delayed. And he doesn't know what can be done outside of hiring our own Town Planner, which he knows is expensive and that would be a decision for the Board of Commissioner, but it is kind of frustrating on the Applicants part as well as ours.

Chairman Cubbedge thanked the Board tonight for trying to keep a project moving. And he agrees that you hate to see peoples time being wasted.

Commission Member Massett made a motion to adjourn. Vote – all for. Motion carried.

Without further discussion the meeting adjourned at 8:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Robin Clem', with a stylized, elongated loop at the end.

Robin Clem
Recording Secretary

TOWN OF THURMONT
THURMONT PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
ZONING INSPECTOR'S REPORT
04/23/2015-05/27/2015

PERMIT NUMBER	APPLICANT	LOCATION	TYPE AND USE	APPL DATE
2015-000032	MARK E & MOLLY BUEHN	14526 RODDY ROAD	RESIDENTIAL ACCESSORIES	04/24/2015
2015-000033	PAUL ECHARD	7901 ROCKY RIDGE ROAD	RESIDENTIAL ACCESSORIES	04/24/2015
2015-000034	COZY RESTAURANT	103 FREDERICK ROAD	NO ZONING REQUIRED	04/27/2015
2015-000035	LINDA & WAYNE SMITH	36 TOCATI STREET	ADDITIONS	04/28/2015
2015-000036	MARTIN KENNEDY JR	514 W MAIN ST	RESIDENTIAL ACCESSORIES	04/29/2015
2015-000037	RAYMOND E & RAE SHAFER	28 COLLIERY DRIVE	RESIDENTIAL ACCESSORIES	05/26/2015
2015-000038	THE THURMONT	HISTORICAL SOCIETY	COMMERCIAL ACCESSORIES	05/26/2015

* End of Report: TOWN OF THURMONT *

THURMONT PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

ZONING INSPECTOR'S REPORT

04/23/2015 - 05/27/2015

CUMULATIVE ACTIVITY: 04/23/2015-05/27/2015 05/27/2015 05/27/2014

RESIDENTIAL ACCESSORIES

BARN	0	0	0
CARPORT	0	1	0
DECK	1	4	1
FENCE	1	6	12
GARAGE	0	0	2
GAZEBO	0	0	0
GREENHOUSE	0	0	0
HANDIRAMP	0	0	0
HOTTUB	0	0	0
LEANTO	0	0	0
PATIOCON	0	0	0
PAVILLION	0	0	0
POLEBLDG	1	1	0
POOLAG	0	0	1
POOLIG	0	0	0
PORCH	0	0	0
ROOFCANOPY	0	0	0
SHED	1	9	4
SHEDRELOC	0	0	0
STAIRWAY	0	0	0
STORAGEBLD	0	0	0
WOODSHOP	0	0	0
WORKSHOP	0	0	0

RESIDENTIAL ACCESSO TOTAL:	4	21	20
----------------------------	---	----	----

ADDITIONS

COMMERCIAL	0	0	0
RESIDENT	1	3	2

ADDITIONS	TOTAL:	1	3	2
-----------	--------	---	---	---

COMMERCIAL ACCESSORIES

CONCESSSTA	0	0	0
CONSTTRAIL	0	0	0
DUGOUT ADD	0	0	0
ENR UPGRAD	0	0	0
EQUIPSHED	0	0	0
FENCE	0	0	0
GAZEBO	0	0	0
GUARDOFFIC	0	0	0
LEANTO	0	0	0
MINORUTIL	0	1	0
MONOPOLE	0	0	0
MOTELROOM	0	0	0
POLEBLDG	0	0	0
PORTCLASS	0	0	0
RAMP	0	0	0
RETAINING	0	0	0

THURMONT PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

ZONING INSPECTOR'S REPORT

04/23/2015 - 05/27/2015

CUMULATIVE ACTIVITY: 04/23/2015-05/27/2015 05/27/2015 05/27/2014

COMMERCIAL ACCESSORIES

ROOFCAN	0	0	0
SALESTRAIL	0	0	0
SHED	1	1	0
STAIRWAY	0	0	0
STORAGEBLD	0	0	0
STRIPTOWR	0	0	0
TEMPSHELTE	0	0	0
TEMTRAIL	0	0	0
TICKET BOO	0	0	0
TOILETTR	0	0	0
TRAILTEMP	0	0	0

COMMERCIAL ACCESSORI TOTAL:	1	2	0
-----------------------------	---	---	---

NEW COMMERCIAL

BANK	0	0	0
CARWASH	0	0	0
CHURCH	0	0	0
FIRE DEPT	0	0	0
FUELTANKS	0	1	0
LIBRARY	0	0	0
OFFICEBLDG	0	0	0
POLICE BLD	0	0	0
RESTAURANT	0	0	0
RETAILBLDG	0	0	0
SCHOOL	0	0	0
TRUSSBLDG	0	0	0
VET CLINIC	0	0	0

NEW COMMERCIAL TOTAL:	0	1	0
-----------------------	---	---	---

NEW RESIDENTIAL

APART7	0	0	0
CONDO12	0	0	0
REPLACE	0	0	0
SINGLE	0	0	1
TOWNH4	0	0	0
TOWNH5	0	0	0
TOWNH6	0	0	0
TOWNH8	0	0	0
TOWNHC10	0	0	0

NEW RESIDENTIAL TOTAL:	0	0	1
------------------------	---	---	---

NO ZONING REQUIRED

OTHER	1	11	11
-------	---	----	----

THURMONT PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

ZONING INSPECTOR'S REPORT

04/23/2015 - 05/27/2015

CUMULATIVE ACTIVITY: 04/23/2015-05/27/2015 05/27/2015 05/27/2014

NO ZONING REQUIRED

NO ZONING REQUIRED	TOTAL:	1	11	11
--------------------	--------	---	----	----

TOTAL PERMITS ISSUED:	7	38	34
-----------------------	---	----	----

* End of Report: TOWN OF THURMONT *

Staff Comments

To: Planning Commission
From: Christopher Jakubiak, Town Planner
Date: May 28, 2015
RE: Park Place Subdivision, Townhouse Development

Russell and Marlene Delauter have submitted a combined site plan and preliminary subdivision plat for Park Place, a proposed six-unit townhouse development. The Planning Commission had previously reviewed a sketch plan for the site and offered comments. In concept the plan addresses many of the comments of the Planning Commission and staff.

The submitted plan is generally consistent with the Town zoning and subdivision regulations but a number of items still need to be addressed prior to approval of the preliminary plat. Preliminary plat approval grants the owner an official rights to proceed subdivide and develop the property as shown on that plat—provided a final plat is later approved--so approval should only be given when the project is found to comply completely with zoning and subdivisions standards. Here are my comments:

1. A series of standard notes is required to be placed on the plan.
2. The submittal should contain the required improvement descriptions as detailed in Article VI of the Subdivision Regulations.
3. Open Space: The amount of open space on the plan should be shown and it should equal or exceed 750 square feet per dwelling unit or 4,500 square feet. This area should be designated on the plan as "open space".
4. The driveway and parking area shall meet with Town specifications for construction and surfacing.
5. Screening needs to be shown to be provided between the vehicle driveway and parking area in the back of the site adjoining the residential use. Existing trees should be shown.
6. Lighting should be provided on the plan for the drive along the side and rear of the site.
7. Landscaping --vegetative planting -- should be located between the drive and S. Carroll Street. Trees (lawn or street) and planting location on the lots should be shown.

8. Doubtful the rear parking for Lot 2 has adequate turning / back out room. This may need to be reconfigured or the applicant needs to demonstrate it works, or the overall project may need to be reduced by one unit if that is necessary to secure access.
9. If a development sign is to be used, it should be located on this site plan and the sign should be approved along with the site plan.
10. No building elevations accompany the site plan. These should be submitted.
11. At the intersection of Park Lane and the private street for River Run Farms, a cross walk on Park Lane should be provided connecting the project side of the street to the south side of the street.
12. An easement should be ⁴plated over the 50-ft buffer from the floodplain to indicate that the area shall remain in vegetative open space.
13. The plat/plan document itself is still not ready and needs items such as a signature block for the Planning Commission signature, etc. technical notes on tract area, and density, parking, zoning, open space, landscaping by types and number of trees, floodplain buffer, etc. The boundaries of the tract should be shown in heavy line and the boundaries for each new lot should be shown in a darker line too.
14. Soils type information should be shown on the plat per Section 6.2 E of the Subdivision regulations.
15. The project should be transmitted to the Fire Marshall for comments related to access to Lots 1 and 2. No parking signage and striping may need to be provided along the rear drive and in the area of Lots 1 and 2 in particular to ensure that emergency vehicle access is secured.

Recommendation:

Conditional approval; conditioned on applicant addressing the foregoing comments as certified by Zoning Administrator.



THE COMMISSIONERS OF THURMONT

Thurmont Planning and Zoning Commission Staff Comments Preliminary Plan – Park Place May 28, 2015

The final locations of utilities including water and sanitary sewer laterals will be decided when Improvements Plans for this project are submitted to Town Department of Public Works. Fourteen (14) sets of Improvement Plans will be needed for review.

Note: The Detail #114 shown on plan is outdated, current specifications and details can be found online.

Jim Brown
Zoning/Utility Inspector

May 22, 2015

Thurmont Planning Commission
Attn: Becky Long
10 Frederick Road
P.O. Box 17
Thurmont, MD 21788

Re: Park Place Preliminary Plan

Dear Commissioners,

FCPS staff is in receipt of the Preliminary Plan for Park Place. The parcel is approximately 0.697 acres in size and is located near the center of Thurmont at South Carroll Street and Park Lane.

According to information provided by the Thurmont Planning and Zoning Department, the development consists of six townhomes. The attendance areas and enrollment capacities for the schools serving this project, as well as expected project student generation are shown in Table 1 below. Students generated from this project would not cause the schools to exceed state rated capacity.

Table 1: Project Attendance Areas and Capacity Analysis

School Level	School Attendance Area	Percentage of State Rated Capacity as of March 30, 2015	Students Generated by the Project
Elementary	Thurmont Primary/Elementary	62%, 69%	2
Middle	Thurmont Middle School	63%	1
High	Catoctin High School	79%	1

Park Place is located within the non-transport zone for all three schools, thus it is important that pedestrian and bicycle access are considered for this site. The proposed sidewalk along Park Lane appears to be an adequate width, but the buffer between the sidewalk and roadway is narrow and may pose a safety concern. There is no existing sidewalk along South Carroll Street, which poses a barrier for children accessing the primary walking and bicycling routes to the schools.

FCPS has no further comments at this time. Please let us know if you have any questions or require further information.

Sincerely,

Holly Nelson

Holly Nelson