

**FRUITLAND PLANNING COMMISSION
TUESDAY, JUNE 2, 2015
MINUTES**

The Fruitland Planning Commission met at City Hall on Tuesday, June 2, 2015 at 7:00 p.m. with the following members present:

Chairman Leland Bonneville, Derek Bland, Jason Pearce and Darlene Kerr.

Also present were:

City Manager John Psota, City Solicitor Andrew C. Mitchell Jr. and Administrative Assistant Linda Powell.

There were no guests in attendance.

Chairman Bonneville called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. and acknowledged receipt of the minutes of the May 5, 2015 Planning Commission Meeting, calling for additions or corrections. As there were none, **Mr. Bland moved to adopt the minutes as presented; Mr. Pearce seconded and the motion was approved by three votes in favor, 1 abstained (Mr. Leland Bonneville).**

OLD BUSINESS

1. Annual Planning Report

Administrative Assistant Powell presented the Commission with a revised copy of the annual planning report and briefly elaborated on the revisions and/or corrections that were made. In addition, Administrative Assistant Powell stated that she had contacted Maryland Dept of Planning to inquire about a list of all Planning and Zoning and Board of Zoning Appeals members who have completed the required training course, however, as of date, had not received a response.

After the briefing, **Mr. Bland made a motion that the Commission adopt the report as presented. Mr. Pearce second and the motion was unanimously approved by a four to zero vote in favor.**

2. Proposed New Home Occupation Definition Review

Solicitor Mitchell stated that as of the last meeting a copy of the proposed new home occupation definition was provided to the Commission and it was requested that each member would take it home for further review. He stated that he had continued to look at the document and, as of the last meeting, wanted to know if anyone had come up with any suggestions and/or comments particularly for those areas of the document in which a blank line existed. A lengthy discussion then ensued.

Mr. Bland suggested for Moderate Impact Home Occupation, Section 5 (d), that the number of customer visits would not exceed 10 visits per week and vendor or delivery visits not exceed 5 visits per week. Mr. Bland also offered suggestions as it related to signage for the high impact home occupations.

After further discussion, Mr. Bland then suggested the following for home occupations under the proposed new definition: all R1, R2, R3 and R4 districts would permit low impact occupations, R1 and R4 districts would permit moderate impact occupations and R2 and R3 districts would permit

moderate impact occupations by Special Exception. No high impact occupations would be permitted in R2, R3 and R4 districts.

As discussion continued, Solicitor Mitchell suggested that outdoor sales be prohibited or maybe permitting no more than 3 vehicle sales per year.

Finally, Solicitor Mitchell, after attaining a general consensus of how the Commission wanted the document revised, asked if they wanted him to prepare a final draft to send to the City Council for review.

Mr. Bonneville then stated that he would like to see a copy of the revised definition before sending it on to the City Council.

3. Possible Text Amendment (Auto Repair and Sales) in Light Industrial Zones

Solicitor Mitchell stated that as there have been several requests to permit auto repair and sales in the various industrial districts, he suggested that it may be a good idea to amend the zoning text, adding language that would specifically allow auto repair and sales as a permitted use by Special Exception. He also suggested that the Commission may want to amend the text in the Industrial Park district as well. After brief discussion among the members, there was a general consensus that a text amendment to the industrial districts would be appropriate. Solicitor Mitchell then asked if the changes to the zoning should be made now or wait until a general overhaul of the Comprehensive Plan was done. There was a general consensus of the Commission to wait until the Comprehensive Plan review process began.

NEW BUSINESS

1. Proposed Fiscal Year 2015-2016 Capital Improvements Budget

City Manager Psota presented the Commission with a copy of the 2015-2016 Fiscal Year Capital Improvements Budget and stated that the plans were straightforward and that there were no capital improvements planned for this coming fiscal year. He then went on to review the proposed five-year capital improvements budget as follows in the next section.

2. Proposed Fiscal Year 2015-2016 Five-Year Capital Improvements Budget

City Manager Psota continued with his briefing on the proposed five-year capital improvements plan asking the Commission to note that the City was currently consulting with George, Miles & Buhr on the proposed North Brown and South Brown Streets reconstruction plans to determine the cost of the project as it relates mainly to stormwater management. Accordingly, at this time, there are no numbers to put to any of the proposed projects. He further stated that in the event that something were to come up within the next fiscal year, and the City Council wanted to pursue it, then the budget could be amended.

It was asked if reconstruction of Brown Street included widening. Mr. Psota replied, yes, however, there are a number of right-a-ways issues that would need to be resolved. He further stated that just utilizing the space available at this time would provide an additional couple of feet on each side of the road and that may be all that is needed.

Mr. Bonneville asked if funds were available for the city hall rehabilitation and two police vehicles (Chevrolet Tahoe). City Manager Psota replied, yes.

Mr. Pearce asked if the City was going to make repairs to Main Street similar to the repairs that were made on North Division Street. City Manager Psota replied that the city does plan to do so at some time in the future as funding permits.

Finally, at the conclusion of the budget review, **Mr. Bland made a motion that the Commission make a favorable recommendation to the City Council to adopt the Proposed Fiscal Year 2015-2016 and the Proposed Fiscal Year 2015-2016 Five-Year Capital Improvements Budget as presented. Mr. Pearce seconded, and the motion was approved by a four to zero vote in favor.**

3. Other

Solicitor Mitchell stated to the Commission that he had two items that he wanted to address. First, he informed the members of the reoccurring signage issues and that there is now an issue with numerous small metal pronged advertising signs that were being posted throughout the city. He stated that the signs were being placed on private property without permission of the owners and that they were being placed on public property and in public right-a-ways, which is not permitted. He further stated that the small advertising signs could be placed on private property if only there for short period of time and then removed once the sale or event has been concluded. Second, Solicitor Mitchell advised that while the State has provided local governments more time to update their Comprehensive Plans, it is very important that the City begins its update process as soon as possible. He further stated that the startup process could be implemented by dedicating approximately 20 minutes of the monthly meeting time for Comprehensive Plan review and then make future meeting arrangements as deemed necessary.

City Manager Psota stated that he has noticed various types of advertising signage being placed and left on utility poles.

Solicitor Mitchell suggested that the Commission revisit the City's numerous zoning designations in an effort to downsize.

General Discussion

Mr. Bland suggested that the Commission start meeting to discuss the Comprehensive Plan.

With no further business to discuss, **Mr. Bonneville moved to adjourn and Mrs. Kerr seconded. The motion was approved by a four to zero vote in favor and the meeting adjourned at 8:05 p.m.**

Submitted by,

*Linda J. Powell
Administrative Assist.*