

**Worcester County Planning Commission
Meeting Minutes**

Meeting Date: February 1, 2018

Time: 1:00 P.M.

Location: Worcester County Government Office Building, Room 1102

Attendance:

Planning Commission

Mike Diffendal, Chair

Jay Knerr, Vice Chair

Marlene Ott

Betty Smith

Jerry Barbierri

Rick Wells

Brooks Clayville

Staff

Maureen Howarth, County Attorney

Ed Tudor, Director, DDRP

Phyllis Wimbrow, Deputy Director, DDRP

Jennifer Keener, Zoning Administrator

Robert Mitchell, Director, DEP

Katherine Munson, Planner V, DEP

Bill Rodriguez, Parks Superintendent

I. Call to Order

II. Administrative Matters

A. Review and approval of minutes, January 11, 2018 — As the first item of business, the Planning Commission reviewed the minutes of the January 11, 2018 meeting. Following the discussion it was moved by Mr. Barbierri, seconded by Ms. Ott and carried unanimously to approve the minutes as submitted. Mr. Clayville and Mr. Wells abstained.

B. Board of Zoning Appeals agenda, February 8, 2018 — As the next item of business, the Planning Commission reviewed the agenda for the Board of Zoning Appeals meeting scheduled for February 8, 2018. Mrs. Keener was present for the review to answer questions and address concerns of the Planning Commission. No comments were forwarded to the Board.

III. Public Hearing on the Draft Land Preservation, Parks and Recreation Plan

As the next item of business, the Planning Commission held a public hearing on the draft Land Preservation, Parks and Recreation Plan. Mr. Diffendal opened the public hearing at 1:04 PM. Katherine Munson, Planner V, Environmental Programs, and Bill Rodriguez, Acting Director/Parks Superintendent, Department of Recreation and Parks, provided an overview presentation of the draft Land Preservation, Parks and Recreation Plan.

Ms. Munson explained that every county is required to submit a plan every 5 years in order to continue to receive Program Open Space funds. The 2017 draft provides an update on the recommendations made in the 2012 Plan, an updated inventory, a needs analysis, capital improvement program and inventory and update of agricultural and natural lands conservation programs since 2012. Mr. Rodriguez summarized the inventory and improvements made to parks since 2012. He noted that the county owns and manages 13 parks that are situated to serve the population, which is concentrated in the towns and in Ocean Pines and West Ocean City. He stated that there were 188 responses to the community survey which was available to the public from April to November 2017 on-line and on paper in various locations. While 85% stated the

parcs are in good or better condition, and 47% indicated a weekly use of the parks, some deficits were noted by survey takers, with the top needs being more fields/improvements to fields (58), more trails (37) and additional/improved parking (29). 17% noted that access to water for passive use is inadequate. A proximity analysis shows that while water access is pretty well distributed across the county, and appears for now to be adequate, the total number of trails is in a deficit in the northern end of the county and playing fields are also in a deficit, compared to the southern portion of the county, on a per capita basis.

The priority projects identified in the plan are:

- Northern County: Multipurpose Field Complex—Land Acquisition: \$1,000,000
- Greys Creek Nature Park: Passive Park/trails development: \$500,000
- Bishopville Waterfront Park: \$125,000
- Stockton Park: Playground replacement: \$100,000
- John Walter Smith Park: Field improvements: \$25,000

Ms. Munson provided an overview of natural resource and agricultural land preservation, which are addressed in Chapters 3 and 4 of the draft plan. She stated that the plan reiterates the policies of the Comprehensive Plan, the 2010 Priority Preservation Element and also the Maryland Coastal Bays Comprehensive Conservation and Management Plan (CCMP) adopted by the county and other partners in 2015. She stated that conservation targets are shorelines, headwaters, and contiguous natural areas. She noted that conservation programs that work with landowners to protect and restore land work along with county policies and regulations (such as zoning) to protect the county's natural resources. She stated that the 2010 Priority Preservation Element set a preservation goal of 1,000 acres of farmland annually. While 7,192 acres are protected with MALPF easements and nearly 10,000 acres with Rural Legacy easements, progress since 2012 has fallen well short of the stated goal, with 519 acres protected with MALPF easements and 1,213 acres protected with Rural Legacy easements. She stated that lack of state funding has been the largest barrier. She also noted that less than 0.1% of the A-1 zone was subdivided for residential use during that same period.

Mr. Barberri asked how the survey was administered. Mr. Rodriguez explained that it was available on the website and a link was sent to all users the department has e-mails for. In addition, it was available in all libraries, and a press release was issued. Mr. Knerr noted that parking was left out of the plan analysis. Mr. Rodriguez stated that the parking issue is mostly associated with the lack of fields in the northern end of the county. He said it is not an afterthought and the department does have ideas for expanding parking. Mr. Knerr stated he feels there is plenty of water access on the analysis yet people don't use these access points. He questioned that so many people feel there is inadequate access. Mr. Rodriguez stated there may need to be more outreach to the public about water access locations.

Ms. Smith asked if the Berlin Park will be developed as part of this plan. Mr. Rodriguez stated that it is accounted for in the plan and that this is a municipal park that the town of Berlin will develop. Mr. Diffendal asked if the comments from DNR could be addressed. Mr. Rodriguez stated yes and elaborated that the capital improvement table will be updated with more detail to answer their concerns about trail development. Mr. Clayville asked if the recreation department

Delaware boundary. Mr. Rodriguez stated that there have been attempts to reach out to potential Delaware partners. He stated that the landowners of the immediately adjacent land in Delaware are interested in creating amenities that will complement the park. Mr. Clayville also asked for a total acreage of all protected land in the county. Ms. Munson stated that ALL protected land in total is close to 1/3 of the county land area.

Ms. Ott noted that Ocean Pines facilities are included in the plan. Mr. Rodriguez affirmed that Ocean Pines Association manages its own park system. He stated that the plan is required to include Ocean Pines parks as well as municipal parks to give a complete picture of all recreation facilities available to citizens. Mr. Wells asked where parking would be located for the new Bishopville site. Mr. Rodriguez stated that the department is working on that. He stated that the county owns land across the street where parking could be located. Mr. Wells stated that St. Martin's Neck already has a significant traffic problem and this could be a hazard. Ms. Wimbrow noted that businesses are not permitted to locate parking across the street from their places of business.

Following the discussion, Mr. Diffendal asked for public comments on the draft plan. Kate Patton, Lower Shore Land Trust, asked about capital funding for development of the Berlin transfer station. Mr. Rodriguez stated that this opportunity has not disappeared but the Department of Public Works has stated that capping the landfill is still in progress and the timing of completion is unknown. After capping is complete the county can re-visit the idea of trails and a disc golf facility there. Mr. Rodriguez stated this could be noted in the plan. No other public comments were offered.

Mr. Beriberri asked if all Maryland Department of Natural Resources questions have been answered. Ms. Munson and Mr. Rodriguez stated these were mainly minor factual corrections that would be addressed in the document.

Ms. Ott made the motion to recommend approval and adoption of the draft plan, with the minor changes recommended by Maryland Department of Natural Resources, to the Worcester County Commissioners. Mr. Barbierri seconded the motion. Approval was unanimous.

IV. §ZS 1-315 Residential Planned Community

As the next item of business, the Planning Commission reviewed a Step I Residential Planned Community request for the North Gate at Herring Creek, a proposed multi-family and single-family development consisting of 61 units, located on the south side of MD Route 707 (Old Bridge Road), west of Hastings Lane, Tax Map 26, Parcel 191, Lot C, (formerly Parcel 193), Tax District 10, R-4 General Residential District. Hugh Cropper, IV, Esquire and Bob Hand, land planner, were present for the review. Mr. Cropper explained that the subject property abuts a manufactured home park to the west, various residential dwellings to the east, and Mr. Odachowski's personal residence to the south. Mr. Cropper requested that he be able to incorporate and rely upon the Technical Review Committee Report which comprehensively covers all justifications. He stated that they meet all of the requirements of the RPC standards. Regarding the sewer service, Mr. Cropper noted that the whole property is in the West Ocean City service area, with a portion having an additional overlay in the Mystic Harbour service area.

Mr. Odachowski is in the process of transferring the necessary EDU's to the subject property. Mr. Cropper noted that they need to obtain the Step I approval in order to obtain the requisite EDU's. Mr. Diffendal asked about the requirement for a traffic study, and it was noted that it is required during the Step II review.

Following the discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Wells, seconded by Ms. Ott, and carried unanimously to find that the applicants have addressed the seven standards contained in §ZS 1-315 for the establishment of the floating zone as presented in the Technical Review Committee Report, to find the application consistent with the Worcester County *Comprehensive Plan*, and to provide a favorable recommendation to the Worcester County Commissioners with the following recommended conditions of approval as reflected on Page 8 of the Technical Review Committee Report:

1. As designed, the project does not meet any of the RPC road standards of the Department of Public Works, County Roads Division at this time. Compliance with a road standard shall be obtained during the Step II and Step III reviews.
2. The applicant shall obtain the necessary number of EDUs as stipulated by the Department of Environmental Programs.

V. Text Amendment

As the next item of business, the Planning Commission reviewed a revised text amendment for the proposed cottage courts in the R-4 General Residential District. The Planning Commission last reviewed this request at their December 7, 2017 meeting. Hugh Cropper, IV, Esquire and Bob Hand, land planner, were present for the review. Mr. Cropper stated that he was adopting the Staff's version of the proposed amendment as revised. He identified what those standards were: a total limitation on the square footage of the individual units at 600 square feet not inclusive of an open deck at 200 square feet; establishing the density at eight units per acre; establish a side yard setback of 25 feet; and providing two parking spaces per unit. Procedurally, Mrs. Wimbrow will prepare a bill that reflects the staff's version and her cover memo would explain that the applicant agreed with that version.

Following the discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Knerr, seconded by Ms. Smith and carried 6 to 1 with Mr. Clayville opposed to forward a favorable recommendation to the County Commissioners addressing the staff's findings.

VI. Map Amendment – Case No. 414

This request was postponed by the applicant and will be rescheduled for a future meeting date.

VII. Map Amendment – Case No. 416

As the next item of business, the Planning Commission reviewed a map amendment request to rezone 0.372 acres of land on Tax Map 27, Parcels 309 and 485, Lots 13, 14, & 15 from R-3 Multi-Family Residential District to C-2 General Commercial District. Hugh Cropper, IV, Esquire, Bob Hand, land planner, and Pino Tomasello, property owner, were present for the

request. Mr. Cropper introduced Mr. Tomasello who also owns Sello's restaurant across the street from the subject properties. Mr. Cropper provided photographs of the two existing dwellings on the subject properties (Applicant's Exhibit No. 1). He said that these parcels were a part of the original Ocean City Heights subdivision. He indicated that past property owners further subdivided the lots in half and sold them separately around 1939. He said that these lots are non-conforming; the setbacks are taken from Golf Course Road as a collector highway, and the corner lot also has another front yard setback off of Townsend Road. He alleged that the previous property owner sold the land because the neighborhood wasn't a suitable place to live any longer. Mr. Cropper said that the basis of the rezoning request was a change in the character of the neighborhood. He said that the houses along the harbor area and Golf Course Road are not suitable for housing, and property owners can't rebuild any larger because the lots have such small building envelopes. In 2016, Mr. Cropper and Mr. Hand obtained a rezoning for property along Golf Course Road (Rezoning Case No. 397) from residential to commercial based on an argument for a mistake.

Applicant's Exhibit No. 2 was presented as Tax Map 27 which had the outline defining their neighborhood. Mr. Hand agreed there have been substantial changes in the character of the neighborhood since 2009 as well as since the Land Use Map was adopted in the Comprehensive Plan in 2006. Such notable changes include an expansion of the West Ocean City Harbor and the increase in marine activity it has generated, Sunset Grille restaurant and marina, and Martin's Fish Company added a small restaurant with a liquor license. Mr. Cropper also noted that the Public Service Commission recently issued licenses for off-shore wind energy systems near Ocean City. Mr. Cropper submitted the Findings of Fact from Rezoning Case No. 397 as Applicant's Exhibit No. 3, which modified the 3.5 acres from R-3 Multi-Family Residential District to C-2 General Commercial District. Mr. Hand concurred with Mr. Cropper that the rezoning was an unplanned for change in the character of the neighborhood. Another unplanned change in his opinion included the upgrade of power service by Delmarva Power with very tall power poles, and provided a photograph of the new structures taken from the parking lot of Sello's restaurant to the east of the subject properties looking north (Applicant's Exhibit No. 4).

Since November 3, 2009, the Worcester County Commissioners have upgraded the Mystic Harbour wastewater treatment plant, and established Resolution 17-19 which provided a method for allocation of those EDUs which were not previously available for purchase. The Water and Sewerage Plan identifies the subject properties as S-1, meaning that they are available for immediate service. Developments that could not have occurred without this expansion include Park Place Plaza and the Hampton Inn hotel which are within the defined neighborhood. Mr. Cropper stated that there are not enough West Ocean City service area EDUs available in such large quantities for uses such as those, therefore they would not have been built without the expansion of the wastewater treatment plant. The subject properties are located in the EDA category (Existing Developed Area) on the Land Use Map in the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Cropper argued that the County should therefore adopt zoning that is consistent with the uses available in the EDA. He contended that a commercial zoning category is more consistent than residential and is more desirable with respect to the Comprehensive Plan.

Greg Wilkins, surveyor, was also present for the review. He surveyed the southerly half of the three lots (green house with the pavers in front of it on Applicant's Exhibit No. 1). Mr. Wilkins

explained the setbacks for these properties. He noted that the dwelling is almost completely in the setback. The dwelling on the north parcel also reflects the same front yard setback on Golf Course Road, but also is subject to a front yard setback off of Townsend Road. Mr. Wilkins agreed that if either house was torn down, there is not a reasonable use that could be put back in its place without variances. Mr. Cropper said that if it is zoned commercial, Mr. Tomasello could put overflow parking on those sites, acknowledging that those spaces would not count towards the parking for the restaurant. Mr. Wilkins also agreed that there is a substantial change in the character of the neighborhood per Mr. Cropper's previous statements, and the subject properties would be difficult places to live. He also agreed that the commercial zoning is more consistent with the area and the current surrounding uses. Mr. Tomasello said that he is not looking to expand his business, rather his concern is the number of staff he has and the need for parking as he stated he doesn't have enough on site.

Mr. Cropper went through the nine findings of fact that the Planning Commission must find. They were as follows:

1. With respect to the definition of the neighborhood, he referred back to Applicant's Exhibit No. 2 which outlined his neighborhood.
2. With respect to the Planning Commission's concurrence with the definition of the neighborhood, Mr. Cropper stated that while he argued for a mistake in zoning with respect to Case No. 397, he had provided the Planning Commission with the same exhibit, and they accepted his definition of the neighborhood at that time.
3. Relating to population change, he noted that there was moderate growth in the area, however much of it was primarily commercial in nature.
4. Relating to the availability of public facilities, Mr. Cropper referred back to his discussion on the Mystic Harbour wastewater treatment plant expansion, and lack of availability of West Ocean City EDUs.
5. Relating to present and future transportation patterns, Mr. Cropper noted that there would be no significant change in the transportation patterns as a result of this requested rezoning, as the parcels are too small to result in additional traffic impacts.
6. Relating to compatibility with existing and proposed development, and environmental conditions in the area, Mr. Cropper stated that the area is mostly commercial and that there are no environmental conditions that would be impacted as a result of this request.
7. Relating to compatibility with the Comprehensive Plan, Mr. Cropper reiterated that the subject properties were EDA (Existing Developed Area) and that this area is more of a commercial corridor rather than a residential one.
8. Relative to the consideration of whether there has been a substantial change in the character of the neighborhood since the last Comprehensive Rezoning, Mr. Cropper argued that there has as a result of Rezoning Case No. 397, additional or expanded restaurants in the harbor area, expansion of the existing wastewater facilities, and the Delmarva Power transmission line upgrades.
9. Relative to whether the change would be more desirable in terms of the Comprehensive Plan, Mr. Cropper stated that yes, it would, as the properties are EDA and therefore they should reflect the commercial nature of the area.

Before the Planning Commission discussed the findings, Mr. Tudor pointed out a few items that they should consider during their recommendation. First, he wanted to draw attention to the fact that the applicant spoke about constructing a parking lot for the restaurant. Once the property is rezoned, they could permit any commercial use in that zoning district subject to any required variances being granted. Second, he cautioned them with respect to the definition of the neighborhood. He said that the majority of the uses in the vicinity of the subject properties, nearly all the way north to US Route 50 are residential in nature. Rezoning creates a self-fulfilling prophecy, meaning that rezoning one property is then justification for the rezoning of the next, and so on.

The Planning Commission then discussed each one of the findings to determine whether they had a consensus. They were as follows:

1. With respect to the definition of the neighborhood, they acknowledged Applicant's Exhibit No. 2 which outlined the neighborhood as defined.
2. The Planning Commission concurred with the definition of the neighborhood as identified by Applicant's Exhibit No. 2.
3. Relating to population change, they agreed that there was moderate growth in the area.
4. Relating to the availability of public facilities, the Planning Commission agreed that it is very clear that sewer EDUs are available, and water is as well, though these dwellings are currently served by well.
5. Relating to present and future transportation patterns, Mr. Barbierri noted that Townsend Road couldn't handle any additional traffic, so any improvements would have to be done by the owner at the time of redevelopment.
6. Relating to compatibility with existing and proposed development, and environmental conditions in the area, the Planning Commission agreed that commercial zoning would be compatible and that there are no environmental conditions that would be impacted as a result of this request.
7. Relating to compatibility with the Comprehensive Plan, the Planning Commission agreed that the subject properties were compatible based on the EDA (Existing Developed Area) designation, though Mr. Clayville disagreed.
8. Relative to the consideration of whether there has been a substantial change in the character of the neighborhood since the last Comprehensive Rezoning, Mr. Clayville disagreed, stating that in his opinion, the changes were planned for growth. Mr. Barbierri stated that he had issue with the word "substantial" and whether there was enough change to warrant it. Ms. Smith believed that there was substantial change, as Mr. Cropper had reiterated.
9. Relative to whether the change would be more desirable in terms of the Comprehensive Plan, the Planning Commission agreed that it would, with Mr. Clayville opposed.

Mr. Clayville said that the area becoming busier along Golf Course Road which then makes it difficult for people to sleep in houses located along the roadway does not justify a rezoning in his opinion. Without plans to upgrade Golf Course Road, he is concerned that the rezoning will only make the transportation issues worse.

Regarding the requirement for “substantial” change, Mrs. Howarth said that the Planning Commission has to find that the change is “substantial”, not just that there is change, or that a certain number of items have changed. There must be an overall impact to the area that warrants a rezoning. This made many members vacillate. Mr. Cropper argued that there has been no area that has had more change than the West Ocean City Harbor. Procedurally, Mr. Diffendal asked if everyone was in agreement with eight out of nine standards, how would that affect the motion? In order to meet the criteria for a rezoning, they must find that the applicant meets all nine standards. After further discussion between the members, enough members agreed that there was a substantial change.

Therefore, following the discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Knerr, seconded by Ms. Smith and carried 6 to 1 with Mr. Clayville opposed to find the map amendment consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and forward provide a favorable recommendation to the Worcester County Commissioners based on the findings as previously outlined.

VIII. Map Amendment – Case No. 417

As the next item of business, the Planning Commission reviewed a map amendment request to rezone 7.517 acres of land on Tax Map 26, part of Parcel 274, Lots 1A and 1B from C-1 Neighborhood Commercial District to C-2 General Commercial District. Hugh Cropper, IV, Esquire, Greg Wilkins, surveyor, and Lou Bush, property owner, were present for the request. Mr. Cropper said that the basis for the rezoning request was on a mistake only. For historical perspective, he said that the property was originally developed as a large tennis court. In 1999/2000, the owner wanted to convert the building to a large warehouse. It wasn't allowed in the B-1 District (former C-1 District), so they obtained a text amendment for the use as a special exception. A copy of 1992 Zoning Code excerpt from the B-1 District regulations was submitted as Applicant's Exhibit No. 1. In 2000, they obtained the special exception approval. A copy of the Board of Zoning Appeals opinion was submitted as Applicant's Exhibit No. 2. In 2009, Worcester County retained the C-1 District designation for the subject property, but eliminated the particular use from the zoning ordinance. Therefore, the use is legally existing but non-conforming. Mr. Cropper alleged that the decision to remove the provision from the code was the mistake, therefore the property should have been zoned C-2 General Commercial District.

Mr. Cropper stated that the area is currently within the EDA (Existing Developed Area) on the Land Use Map of the Comprehensive Plan. He said that the zoning should have been consistent with the land use designation, which would be C-2 General Commercial District. Mr. Cropper noted that the existing building has three times as much square footage as is allowed by the C-1 District regulations. Mr. Wilkins reiterated that the rezoning in 2009 created a legal non-conformity, and that the Comprehensive Plan encourages zoning to avoid creating non-conformities. Mr. Wilkins noted the location of the property with respect to the surrounding development and zoning districts. He noted that C-2 District zoning can be found to the immediate north of the subject property, and that there is C-1 District to the south.

Mr. Cropper went through the nine findings of fact that the Planning Commission must find. They were as follows:

1. With respect to the definition of the neighborhood, he noted that this was not applicable since the argument is based on a mistake.
2. Again, this item is not applicable.
3. Relating to population change, he noted that there was a neutral or a mild increase in population, but not significant.
4. Relating to the availability of public facilities, Mr. Cropper stated that the property was connected to Mystic Harbor water and sewer facilities. There was some debate on that, as Mr. Mitchell's comments (Department of Environmental Programs) reflect that sewer is available, but that it is not tied in at this time. Mr. Cropper stated that regardless, the sewer is available to purchase and the interconnection point is on the property.
5. Relating to present and future transportation patterns, Mr. Cropper stated that the warehouse currently generates some traffic, but that the two commercial entrances are sufficient for the use. Given the size of the property at nearly seven acres, he argued that the C-2 District was more compatible. State Highway Administration would have to approve any modifications based on a new proposal.
6. Relating to compatibility with existing and proposed development, and environmental conditions in the area, Mr. Cropper stated that there is C-2 District zoning all the way from the parcel immediately to the north of the subject property to Route 50, and that C-2 District would be consistent for the subject property. There would be no adverse impacts on any environmental concerns.
7. Relating to compatibility with the Comprehensive Plan, Mr. Cropper noted that the proposed change is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan that encourages the avoidance of creating non-conformities.
8. Relative to the consideration of whether there has been a substantial change in the character of the neighborhood since the last Comprehensive Rezoning, Mr. Cropper noted that his argument is based on mistake, so this item is not applicable.
9. Relative to whether the change would be more desirable in terms of the Comprehensive Plan, Mr. Cropper stated that yes, it would, as the properties are EDA and the C-1 District to the south creates the transition zone between the C-2 District and the agricultural zoning further south.

The Planning Commission then discussed each one of the findings to determine whether they had a consensus. They were as follows:

1. Not applicable.
2. Again, this item is not applicable.
3. Relating to population change, they agreed that there was a mild increase in population.
4. Relating to the availability of public facilities, they agreed that there is water and sewer services available via Mystic Harbor.
5. Relating to present and future transportation patterns, they found the existing State Highway Administration entrances satisfactory at this time, acknowledging that modifications may be made based on a new proposal.
6. Relating to compatibility with existing and proposed development, and environmental conditions in the area, they found that there was adjacent C-2 District and that there would be no adverse impacts on any environmental concerns.

7. Relating to compatibility with the Comprehensive Plan, the Planning Commission found that the property was in the EDA designation on the Land Use Map of the Comprehensive Plan, and that the proposed change is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan that encourages the avoidance of creating non-conformities.
8. Not applicable.
9. Relative to whether the change would be more desirable in terms of the Comprehensive Plan, they agreed that it was.


Following the discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Barbierrri, seconded by Ms. Ott and carried unanimously to find the map amendment consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and forward a favorable recommendation to the Worcester County Commissioners based on the findings as previously outlined.

IX. Miscellaneous

Mr. Diffendal asked Mrs. Howarth about Resolution 17-19 relative to the Mystic Harbour EDU allocations, and at what point projects were being assigned EDUs. She provided some background on the history of the expansion of the Mystic Harbour plant. When Maryland Department of the Environment approved the amendments to the Water and Sewerage Plan that allowed for the expansion of the plant, they required that the County incorporate the environmental report into the Water and Sewerage Plan that has a table showing the areas that the County Commissioners would be designating certain amounts of EDUs. Mrs. Howarth offered to send the Planning Commission a copy of the resolution and table for their information. She noted that the resolution identified the points at which a project must obtain EDUs. She noted that claims made by applicants that EDUs are available aren't always a guarantee that they will be allocated by the County Commissioners to a given project.

- X. Adjourn** – The Planning Commission adjourned at 3:30 P.M.


Betty Smith, Secretary


Jennifer K. Keener