

**Centreville Planning Commission**  
**June 15, 2022**  
**7:00 p.m.**

**MINUTES**

The June 15, 2022 Centreville Planning Commission meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Kara Voight, Chair, in the Liberty Building, second floor meeting room. The following members and staff were present: Kara Voight, Chair; Tim Zuella, Vice Chair; Mitchell Delaney, Secretary; Pat Fox and Nancy Emerick, Members; Steven K. Kline, Town Council President; Chris Jakubiak, Town Planner; Paige Tilghman, Economic Development Manager and Betty Jean Hall, Administrative Assistant.

**Review of Minutes from Previous Meetings**

- a. Ms. Voight moved to approve the May 18, 2022 Planning Commission meeting minutes as amended. Mr. Zuella seconded the motion, which passed with 4 ayes, and one abstention.
- b. Ms. Voight moved to approve the June 1, 2022 Planning Commission work session minutes as submitted. Mr. Delaney seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

**Citizen's Comments**

- No citizens provided comments.

**New Business**

- a. 2021 Annual Report
  - Mr. Jakubiak stated the Land Use Article of the State of Maryland Code requires towns and counties to submit an annual report to the state and to the local legislative body every year. For communities that have issued fewer than 50 dwelling units, the annual report is a very simple completion of a form.
  - Mr. Jakubiak formulated the form into a letter that was distributed in member packets. Number 5 in the letter should be changed to yes prior to sending to the Office of the Secretary at the Maryland Department of Planning.

**Unfinished Business**

- a. Comprehensive Plan Discussion – Chapter III Municipal Growth
  - Typographical changes should be made to the second sentence in paragraph two on page 6 of 7 to read: The 2020 updated Growth Area is larger because it includes the roughly 220 acres previously planned as a “County Business Park” located on the west side of U.S. Route 301 and MD Route 304.
  - Mr. Jakubiak stated everything that is in the growth area, beyond the town’s current boundaries but in the growth area, is eligible for annexation. The Town Council decides whether to annex a property or not and it is purely discretionary. The Comprehensive Plan may have to reference the only exception to the rule is to annex land for the purpose of developing it as land application even when it is outside of the growth area. There needs to be some sort of policy statement that links those parcels that might be beyond the growth area to the town so that amending the comprehensive plan would not be necessary.
  - Mr. Jakubiak also stated the development potential within the town is more than what is likely to happen in terms of total development over the next 20 years. All that growth could be accommodated within the current town boundaries principally on the 5 large parcels shown in the exhibit on page 3. That is premised on the current zoning. If there are any reservations or implications about that growth, such as traffic, we should think through those and possibly change the zoning of the parcels. However, the State will not fund a wastewater system upgrade if the Town has squeezed out any development potential of all the infill parcels. The Comprehensive Plan must embrace the growth.
  - Rather than looking at one projection and looking at the possible impacts of it, what is needed is to have an evaluation of all three. What if the town grew at this higher rate or at the very low rate? How many pupils are generated from each and how are the enrollments impacted relative to the schools’ capacities?

What is the general trip generation for traffic impacts? The level of emergency services that would have to be increased for that growth must also be established.

- Develop the impacts, do an evaluation of the key facilities by each of the growth scenarios and show the historic growth and traffic on Rt. 213 reported by State Highway. Also, make projections of the growth over time and describe how that is related to population. That will provide some context for making some of the land use decisions. Then the question is what the Town does with some of the implications of that. It may be that different land use recommendations for the infill parcels are developed, or keep them the way they are, or be very clear that they are not eligible for growth and development in the future as previously envisioned. The Planning Commission could also state that the Town only embraces those parcels that contribute to the walkable community in downtown.
- Mr. Jakubiak stated a site plan is not discretionary, it is administrative. The Planning Commission ensures that the standards of the code are met and not make judgement about whether it ought to be or not. If the Town Council approved the Growth Allocation, the planned unit development will be sent before the Planning Commission and would be reviewed like any site plan; do they provide enough open space, have they provided the correct setbacks. The review is administrative at that point and the Planning Commission would be reviewing a plan that someone has an entitlement to. The time for raising concerns about whether this should be a mixed development with commercial in the front and small houses has passed.
- Connecting the municipal growth discussion to potential growth allocations and current water and sewer challenges the Town Council has always retained the authority to decide whether an application will connect to water and sewer, which is ultimately a backstop, and the growth allocation is fundamental. The approval of the growth allocation is a signal that the project would move forward. Mr. Jakubiak's understanding is that the Town Council is holding the final card as to whether it makes the allocation decision. It cannot be withheld unreasonably. He stated that he understood the Council has decided that it would pursue the process knowing that it could withhold the water and sewer capacity necessary for the development which is part of why he did not want to go into a more detailed, refined planning that is evolving to say resize these developments if the Town is concerned about the ability to provide water and sewer. The Council still has the operating authority of whether to extend water and sewer. The Town Council can deny the final plan, but their review decisions are then more on if the traffic impact is mitigated or not. If the traffic study shows that the traffic would be mitigated by a signal or a turning lane, then the decision is approval. On a matter of principal whether any member wants this development or not, that decision making criteria is really getting narrowed. Once growth allocation is approved, its all about operations and how to guide the development through the process to ensure this plan complies with the Town's laws. If it complies with the laws, it is an affirmative decision.

### **Miscellaneous Business/Correspondence**

The July 6, 2022 work session was canceled.

### **Citizen Comment**

- No citizens provided comments.

### **Adjournment**

There being no further business, Mr. Zuella moved to adjourn the June 15, 2022 Planning Commission meeting. Ms. Voight seconded the motion, which passed unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 9:41 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

*Betty Jean Hall*

Betty Jean Hall  
Administrative Assistant

### **Action Items**

- Approved the May 18, 2022 Planning Commission meeting minutes as amended.
- Approved the June 1, 2022 Planning Commission work session minutes as submitted.