## Planning Commission <br> Department of Planning, Housing, and Zoning

# County Commissioners Hearing Room 400 High Street <br> Chestertown, Maryland 

## AGENDA

Thursday, June 6, 2024
1:30 p.m.
Members of the public are welcome to attend meetings in person or via conference call.
Public participation and audio-only call-in number:

1. Dial 1-872-239-8359
2. Enter Conference ID: 200 996 796\#

Members of the public are asked to mute their phones/devices, until the Commission Chair opens the floor for comment.
Members of the public may also watch the live video feed and view the video after the meeting at the County's YouTube channel at https://www.youtube.com/@kentcountygovernment2757.

## MINUTES

May 2, 2024

## DATE FOR JULY PLANNINING COMMISSION MEETING

## APPLICATIONS FOR REVIEW

```
22-67 Everton Industrial, Lot 1 - Major Site Plan (Preliminary)
    Map 31, Parcel 6, Part 1, Lot 1 near Millington - First Election District - Employment Center (EC)
23-28 Everton Industrial, Lot 2 - Major Site Plan (Preliminary)
    Map 31, Parcel 6, Part 1, Lot 2 near Millington - First Election District - Employment Center (EC)
```


## GENERAL DISCUSSION

Map Change Request for review by Planning Commission

Final version of Official Zoning Map for recommendation

STAFF REPORTS


#### Abstract

ADJOURN

Meetings are conducted in Open Session unless otherwise indicated. All or part of the Planning Commission meetings can be held in closed session under the authority of the MD Open Meetings Law by vote of the members. Breaks are at the call of the Chairman. Meetings are subject to audio and video recordings. All applicants will be given the time necessary to assure full public participation and a fair and complete review of all projects. Agenda items are subject to change due to cancellations.


## MINUTES

May 2, 2024
1:30 p.m.
Video recordings of the Kent County Planning Commission meeting are available online for viewing on the County's YouTube channel at https://www.youtube.com/@kentcountygovernment2757.

The Planning Commission met in regular session on Tuesday, May 2, 2024, in the County Commissioners' Hearing Room at 400 High Street, Chestertown, Maryland. Members of the public were invited to attend in person or via conference call.

The following members were in attendance: Chair Joe Hickman, Vice Chair Paul Ruge, Jim Saunders, Ray Strong, Paula Reeder, Sean Jones, and William Crowding. Planning Commission Attorney Cynthia L. McCann, Esquire, was present. Staff in attendance included William Mackey, AICP, Director; Carla Gerber, AICP, Deputy Director; Mark Carper, LEED Green Associate, Associate Planner; Rob Tracey, AICP, Associate Planner; Beth Grieb, Office Manager, and serving as Acting Clerk; and Tyler Arnold, GIS Coordinator.

Representatives for the Mason Solar project included Ted Hastings; Josh Spencer; and Tony Kupersmith, Esq. Members of the public who spoke regarding the Mason Solar project included Linda O'Connor; Richard James O'Connor; Janet Christensen-Lewis; and A. Elizabeth Watson, FAICP.

Applicants for rezoning requests included Lance Young, Esq.; Robin Brayton; Roy Hoagland;
Chair Hickman called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m.

## MINUTES

Ms. Reeder moved to approve the minutes from the April 4 and April 11 meetings, along with the closed session summary. Vice Chair Ruge seconded the motion. The minutes were approved unanimously.

## APPLICATIONS FOR REVIEW

## 23-51 Minary's Dream Alliance Inc. - Major Site Plan (Preliminary)

The applicant withdrew this application prior to the meeting.

## 24-17 MDL 153 Mason Solar - Major Site Plan (Concept)

Mr. Mark Carper, Associate Planner, provided background information and staff comments related to the proposed 1 MW utility-scale solar energy system on a 335 -acre farm zoned AZD.

Representatives from Pivot Energy and the project's attorney responded to questions and concerns raised by the Planning Commission and members of the public regarding screening, visual impacts, glare, electromagnetic fields, stormwater management, economic benefits, and the eligibility criteria for low to moderate income subscribers.

## DRAFT'

Discussion of the immediately neighboring, historical, African American church led to the recommendation that the applicant utilize berms to screen the view of the proposed solar field from the historic church and cemetery.

Concept site plans receive only comments from the Planning Commission for the applicant's use in preparing for the preliminary site plan. No motion was offered.

## 24-18 MDL 153 Mason Solar - Special Exception

Based on the site plan discussion and after further discussion, Ms. Reeder moved to send a favorable recommendation for the special exception to the Kent County Board of Zoning Appeals with the following conditions: 1) that they provide evidence that the glare or reflection onto adjacent properties and adjacent roadways shall not interfere with traffic or create a safety hazard, and 2) they demonstrate that the proposed energy system will not interfere with the view of or from sites of significant public interest, and that the proposed development integrates into the existing landscape.

The motion was seconded by Vice Chair Ruge. The motion passed 6-1, with Chair Hickman opposed.

## GENERAL DISCUSSION

## Town of Betterton Annexation Request

Mr. Mackey presented the staff report related to the proposed request for annexation by the Town of Betterton.

Mr. Crowding moved to send a favorable recommendation to the Board of County Commissioners for the Town of Betterton's request to annex the American Legion property (Tax Map 4, Parcels 88 and 130), and to include a waiver of the five-year zoning designation. Ms. Reeder seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

## Map Change Requests for Review by Planning Commission

The Planning Commission reviewed several map change requests and made recommendations to the County Commissioners as follows:

Re \#4 Harris / Chandler property (Map 12, Parcel 92), Mr. Crowding moved to send a favorable recommendation to change the zoning of the portion currently zoned Resource Conservation District to Critical Area Residential. Ms. Reeder seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

Re \#15 Lindauer property (Map 28, Parcels 31, Lot 2), Mr. Crowding moved to send a favorable recommendation to change the zoning of Lot 2 and Parcel 97 from Industrial to AZD. Mr. Vice Chair Ruge seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

Re \#33 Mills properties (Map 13, Parcels 109 and 33A), Mr. Crowding moved to send a favorable recommendation to change the zoning of Parcel 109 and Parcel 33A from AZD to Commercial. Mr. Strong seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

Re \#1 Brayton Family properties (Map 37, Parcel 76 and Parcel 97), Mr. Crowding moved to send a favorable recommendation to change the zoning from Intense Village to Commercial. Mr. Strong seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

## DRAFTT

RE \#41 Hoagland property (Map 36, Parcel 24, Parcel 1, re applicant's request), Mr. Crowding moved to send a favorable recommendation to change the zoning from Community Residential to Village. Ms. Reeder seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

Re Map D, the Hoagland property (Map 36, Parcel 24, a portion of Parcel 2, re staff request), Mr. Crowding moved to send a favorable recommendation to change the zoning on a portion of Parcel 2 from Community Residential to AZD. Mr. Strong seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

Re \#34 Kelly property (Map 51, Parcel 378), Mr. Crowding moved to send an unfavorable recommendation to change the zoning from Village to AZD. Vice Chair Ruge seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

Re \#35 Good House LLC properties (Map 27, Parcels 454, 470, 516, 577, and 691), Mr. Crowding moved to send an unfavorable recommendation to change the zoning from Critical Area Residential or Community Residential to Village. Vice Chair Ruge seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

Re \#36, Weinstein property (Map 7, Parcel 15B), Mr. Crowding moved to send an unfavorable recommendation regarding the requested change to the zoning district from Community Residential to Commercial. Vice Chair Ruge seconded, and the motion passed $6-0$ with one abstention by Ms. Reeder.

Re \#37 North property (Map 44, Parcel 110), this request was recommended to be added to the no-change list.
Re \#38 Standiford / Yasinsky property (Map 45, Parcel 48, Lot 2), Ms. Reeder moved to send an unfavorable recommendation regarding the requested change from Resource Conservation District to Critical Area Residential. Mr. Crowding seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

Re \#39 Orr Property (Map 1, Parcel 302), Ms. Reeder moved to send an unfavorable recommendation regarding the requested change from Critical Area Residential to Community Residential. Mr. Strong seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

Re \#42 Kendall property (Map 48, Parcel 48), Mr. Crowding moved to send a favorable recommendation regarding the requested change from Community Residential to AZD. Mr. Strong seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Gerber read the consent list that includes all the applications for which no change in the zoning was requested. The consent list is attached to these minutes including an annotation that was added during the meeting.

Ms. Reeder moved to accept the list of "no change" requests as presented. Mr. Crowding seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously. The list is amended to these minutes with a notation added during the meeting.

Staff also presented a series of proposed map changes to correct zoning designations based on updated Critical Area mapping or due to property line adjustments since 2003. The Commission made favorable recommendations on Map A (Map 51, Parcel 169 Crosby area), Map B (Galena area), Map C (Betterton area), Map E (Golts area), Map F (Massey area), Map G (Chesterville Forest area), Map H (Harmony Corner / Molly's area), Map I (Kennedyville area), Map J (Still Pond area), and Map K (Coleman area).

Re Map A (Crosby area) Mr. Crowding moved to rezone to Village a portion of Map 51, Parcel 169, Lot 1 and Lot 2, to extend the Village zoning boundary from the northeast corner of Parcel 482 to the southeast corner of Parcel 202. Mr. Strong seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

## DRAFT'

Re Map B (Galena area), Mr. Crowding moved to rezone the properties as indicated on Map B, due to changes in the Critical Area (affecting multiple parcels including Map 7, Parcels 4 and 349; Map 15, Parcels 2, 159, and 240, et $a l$ ). Mr. Strong seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

Re Map C (Betterton area), Mr. Crowding moved to send a favorable recommendation to do the clean-up of the Critical Area designations of the parcels on Map C (affecting multiple parcels including Map 4, Parcels 16, 19, 88, 140, et $a l$ ). Ms Reeder seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

Re Map E (Golts area), Ms. Reeder moved to amend the zoning on (Map 17) Parcel 116, owned by DNR in Golts, to make the entire parcel AZD. Mr. Crowding seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

Re Map F (Massey area), Ms. Reeder moved to make all of (Map 16) Parcel 31 Employment Center. Mr. Strong seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

Re Map G (Chesterville Forest area), Mr. Crowding moved to accept staff's rezoning request on (Map 31) Parcel 143 to rezone all of the parcel to Community Residential. Vice Chair Ruge seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

Re Map H (Harmony Corner / Molly's), Mr. Crowding moved to send a favorable recommendation to rezone all of Lot 2 of (Map 14) Parcel 76 to Commercial zoning. Vice Chair Ruge seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

Re Map I (Kennedyville area), Mr. Crowding moved to accept staff's rezoning request to rezone all of Map 21, Parcel 163 to AZD. Mr. Strong seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

Re Map J (Still Pond area), Mr. Crowding moved to accept staff's rezoning request to change the zoning on Parcel 38A to all Commercial. Mr. Jones seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

Re Map K (Coleman area), Mr. Crowding moved to accept staff's rezoning request to change the portion of Parcel 89 that is currently zoned Village to AZD. Vice Chair Ruge seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Gerber presented S\&L Farms, LLC. Mr. Crowding moved to send a favorable recommendation to leave the zoning as is, for the property on Map 44, Parcel 313. Vice Chair Ruge seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

## STAFF REPORTS

Mr. Mackey summarized the role of staff in preparing recommendations for the Planning Commission's review.

## ADJOURN

Vice Chair Ruge made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Jones seconded. The meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

| /s/ Joe Hickman | /s/ Bill Mackey |
| :--- | :--- |
| Joe Nickman, Chair | William Mackey, AICP, Director |

Please note that a small portion of this document was created by Claude 3 from Anthropic, utilizing a transcript created by Microsoft Teams. Due to many highly-detailed motions, these minutes were created mostly by a human.

| MAP \# | OWNNAME1 | LOT | MAP | PARCEL | Current | Change |  |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 11 | F \& S OPERATIONS LLC | 3 | 0037 | 0485 | IV | IV | Owner would like the zoning to stay the same. |
| 11 | HORSEY JOAN OZMAN |  | 0037 | 0180 | IV | IV | Owner wanted to make sure zoning stays the same. |
| 11 | JIMSTOWN LLC |  | 0037 | 0044 | IV | IV | Owner wanted to make sure zoning stays the same. |
| 11 | JIMSTOWN LLC | 1 | 0037 | 0177 | IV | IV | Owner wanted to make sure zoning stays the same. |
| 11 | LANDON WALTER F \& TRACYE S | 0485 | IV | IV | Owner wanted to make sure zoning stays the same. |  |  |
| 11 | SMITH SCOTT O \& SHARI C | 2 | 0037 | 0485 | IV | IV | Owner wanted to make sure zoning stays the same. |
| 11 | SMITH TODD B \& SMITH DIANE H | 4 | 0037 | 0485 | IV | IV | Owner wanted to make sure zoning stays the same. |
| 16 | LINS THOMAS IRVIN \& DONNA <br> MARIE |  | 0027 | 0019 | AZD | AZD | Owners wanted to make sure their zoning stays the <br> same. |
| 17 | MACIELAG JOHN F \& PATRICIA M |  | 0055 | 0088 | CAR | CAR | Owner wanted to make sure their zoning stays the <br> same. |
| 19 | MAYO MARY JANE |  | 0016 | 0006 | EC | EC | Owner wanted to make sure their zoning stays the <br> same. |
| 22 | SCHWARTZ JOHN A \& SCHWARTZ <br> PAMELA M |  | 0020 | 0003 | AZD | AZD |  |
| 23 | SISCO ELIZABETH C | 0046 | 0038 | V | V | Owner wanted to make sure their zoning stays the <br> same. |  |


| 41 | HOAGLAND ROY P |  | 0035 <br> D | 0301 | CC | C | Owner wanted to make sure zoning stays the same |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | TORN Nomtl 7490 QNIL

To: Kent County Planning Commission<br>From: Carla Gerber, Deputy Director<br>Meeting: June 6, 2024<br>Subject: Everton Industrial - Preliminary Site Plan Review

## Executive Summary

## Request by Applicant

Everton Industrial is requesting preliminary site plan review for two proposed manufacturing/warehouse buildings on newly created lots near the interchange of US 301 and MD 291.

## Public Process

Per Article VI, Section 5 of the Kent County Land Use Ordinance the Planning Commission shall review and approve site plans.

## Summary of Staff Report

The parent parcel is bisected by US 301 with 114.499 acres on the west side of the highway and approximately 98 acres on the east side. Two new lots are being created from the western tract via a minor subdivision. Because some setbacks are approved as part of subdivision review for industrial subdivisions, staff is recommending that the subdivision be approved by the Planning Commission at final site plan review. The proposed manufacturing/warehouse buildings will be located on the new parcels. The lots will be purchased from Millington Crossing Associates One, LLC and developed by Everton Industrial Development. Lot 1 will be 20.543 acres and Lot 2 will be 20.665 acres. Both lots have frontage along Edge Road and Lot 1 also has frontage on Chesterville Bridge Road. Both buildings will be 256,924 square feet and will be served by public sewer and water. Parking for employees and visitors will be located in the front of the buildings, and trailer parking will be provided to the side and rear of the buildings. Each building will have 45 loading dock spaces. As suggested by Robert Baldwin, District Manager for the Kent Soil and Water Conservation District, sediment and erosion control and stormwater management will be reviewed collaboratively between the County and the District.

The applicant has sufficiently addressed all preliminary site plan standards as prescribed by the Kent County Land Use Ordinance.

## Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission approve the requested setbacks and waive the requirement that "curb cuts" be at least 3,000 feet apart. Staff also recommends that the Planning Commission grant preliminary approval.

## PRELIMINARY STAFF REPORT

TO: Kent County Planning Commission
SUBJECT: Everton Industrial - Preliminary Site Plan Review
DATE: May 31, 2024

## DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL

Everton Industrial is requesting minor subdivision approval and preliminary site plan review for two proposed manufacturing/warehouse buildings on newly created lots near the interchange of US 301 and MD 291. The parent parcel is bisected by US 301 with 114.499 acres on the west side of the highway and approximately 98 acres on the east side. The western side is zoned Employment Center, Agricultural Zoning District, and Resource Conservation District; the eastern side is zoned Commercial and Resource Conservation District. Two new lots are being created from the western tract via a minor subdivision which staff is recommending be approved by the Planning Commission at final site plan review. The proposed manufacturing/ warehouse buildings will be located on the new parcels and will be within the Employment Center district. Lot 1 will be 20.543 acres and Lot 2 will be 20.665 acres. Both lots have frontage along Edge Road, and Lot 1 also has frontage on Chesterville Bridge Road. Both buildings will be 256,924 square feet and will be served by public sewer and water. Parking for employees and visitors will be located in the front of the buildings, and trailer parking will be provided to the side and rear of the buildings. Each building will have 45 loading dock spaces. The buildings will be constructed as flex space and at this time information on potential tenants is not available.

## GENERAL STANDARDS

I. Permitted Uses and Height, Area, and Bulk Requirements
A. Applicable Laws: Article V, Sections 14.2 of the Kent County Land Use Ordinance establish site plan review requirements for all permitted industrial uses in the Employment Center. The use proposed by the applicant is permitted as follows:

Distribution center and warehousing provided that a single building footprint does not exceed 75,00 square feet in size. The restriction on building footprint does not apply to the Employment Center District in the Route 301 corridor. In reviewing the site plan, the Planning Commission, or where applicable the Planning Director, shall consider the following:
a. The impact of the proposed business or industry on existing or planned public facilities.
b. The impact of the operation of facility on the surrounding area.
c. The health, safety and welfare of employees and residents of the neighborhood.

Article V, Sections 14.5 of the Kent County Land Use Ordinance establishes the density, height, width, bulk, and fence requirements for the Employment Center District.

| Minimum Yard <br> Front - Primary Roads | Standard <br> 100 feet* | Industrial Subdivision <br> Front - Other roads <br> Side and Rear - |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Per subdivision review |  |  |
| Adjacent to I, ICA, and EC |  |  |$\quad$| Per subdivision review |
| :--- | :--- |

*When a side or rear lot line coincides with a side or rear lot line of a property in a non-industrial zone, the required yard shall be landscaped and screened and shall be unoccupied by buildings, structures, or parking area.
$\wedge$ May be reduced or increased during site plan review.
B. Staff and TAC Comments: The minor subdivision is considered an Industrial Subdivision. The parcels do not front onto a primary road. For Lot 1, which is a corner lot, Chesterville Bridge Road is the technical front yard, and the applicant is requesting a 50 -foot front setback. The applicant is requesting a 15 -foot setback along Edge Road which is consistent with the Land Use Ordinance requirement that there shall be a front yard of at least 15 feet on the side street of a corner lot in any district. For Lot 2 , the applicant is requesting a 50 -foot front setback along Edge Road. For the side and rear setbacks on both lots, which abut other land zoned Employment Center, the applicant is requesting a 15 -foot setback which is consistent with the Standard Subdivision requirements. In this zoning district, setbacks are applied to parking as well as buildings.

Staff is requesting that the Planning Commission approve the requested setbacks. Given the location along US 301 and existing screening, a reduction of the front setback requirement is appropriate. In addition, the applicant is proposing to locate the buildings as far back as possible on the lots, with the parking between the road and the buildings.
II. Employment Center and Industrial Performance Standards:
A. Comprehensive Plan: "Insure that future development, redevelopment, and infill is completed in an environmentally and context sensitive manner." (Page 31)
B. Applicable Law: Article V, Section 14.6 of the Kent County Land Use Ordinance establishes the EC performance standards. These performance standards address noise, vibration, glare, air pollution, water pollution, radioactivity, electrical interference, smoke and particulate matter, toxic matter, and odor with compliance certified in an engineer's report.

A Certified Engineer's Report is required to prove that the uses proposed will not cause violations of Federal, State, or County laws or regulations and which must describe the proposed operation, all machines, processes, products and by-products, stating the nature and expected levels of emission or discharge to land, air, water or liquid, solid, or gaseous effluent and electrical impulses, vibrations and noise under normal operations and the specifications or treatment methods and mechanisms to be used to control such emission or discharge.
C. Staff and TAC Comments: The applicant is requesting that the Certified Engineer's Report be a condition of obtaining building and/or use permits. The applicant is aware of the standards and understands that all tenants must comply with the performance standards and submit the report.
III. Employment Center General Standards
A. Comprehensive Plan: "Promote the development of County employment centers." (Page 11)
B. Applicable Law: Article V, Section 14.7 of the Kent County Land Use Ordinance establish the EC general standards as follows:

1. As a part of the site plan review, the applicant shall submit a statement that includes an explanation of the following:
a. The type of raw materials, waste products, and other by-products associated with the process.
b. The identity of all chemicals and solids to be discharged into the sewage system.
c. The type and amount of traffic expected to be generated by the operation.
d. The proposed hours of operation.
e. The proposed architectural design (graphic or narrative) of all structures.
2. The Planning Commission may require additional standards and requirements to those stated in this Article as are necessary for the protection of the environment and the health and safety of the citizens of the County.
3. The use established shall not create or be a continuation of highway "strip" development with multiple access points creating highway hazards and visual clutter in so far as practical. A highway strip is two or more access points or "curb cuts" off of an existing State or County Road within 3,000 feet of each other. Any use in an employment center district shall have access at least 3,000 feet from any highway strip, in so far as possible. The Planning Commission may waive this requirement when the Commission finds all of the following:
a. The proposal complies with the spirit and intent of the Land Use Ordinance and the Comprehensive Plan.
b. That the waiver will not cause a substantial detriment to adjacent or neighboring property.
c. That the waiver will not create a safety hazard or increase traffic congestion.
d. The waiver is the minimum necessary to relieve a practical difficulty and is not sought for reasons of convenience, profit or caprice.
4. Central water and sewer systems may be required by the Planning Commission in an Employment Center District. If a public system is available, use of such system shall be mandatory.
5. Signs in industrial areas shall be permitted in accordance with the regulations contained in Article VI , Section 2 of this Ordinance.
6. In so far as possible, all uses shall be conducted within a completely enclosed structure or be completely screened. Outdoor storage of materials and unfinished products is prohibited unless otherwise approved by the Planning Commission and subject to such conditions as may be determined by the Planning Commission.
C. Staff and TAC Comments:

- §14.7.1: The applicant is constructing a flex space building and no information on potential tenants has been provided. No information is known at this time concerning the types of materials and products that will be handled or hours of operation. Additional information will be required for final review. A traffic study and architectural elevations have been submitted.
- §14.7.3: The applicant is proposing multiple "curb cuts" for each parcel in order to keep traffic separated. Lot 1 will have two "curb cuts." One on Chesterville Bridge Road and one on Edge Road. The entrance on Chesterville Bridge Road will be angled in such a way that all vehicles will be forced to turn toward US 301 when leaving. Lot 2 will have three "curb cuts" with 200300 feet between each one. SHA is in the process of transferring the right of way for Edge Road to the County. However, SHA has reviewed the entrances and "has determined that distances between entrances are acceptable as proposed, provided the sight distance clearing
is approved and performed." The Planning Commission will need to determine if a waiver is appropriate to allow multiple "curb cuts" that are less than 3,000 feet apart.
- §14.7.4: The proposed buildings will be served by public sewer and water. The Comprehensive Water and Sewerage Plan will need to be amended and it is likely that the project will need to be phased based on the tenants. The availability of sewer allocations may limit the amount of initial development and use of the proposed structures.
- §14.7.5: The location of a monument sign for each lot has been noted on the plans. No additional information on signs has been provided.
- §14.7.6: All uses will be conducted within the proposed buildings. If outdoor storage of material or unfinished products is needed, then the Planning Commission would have to approve this change.


## IV. Environmental Standards

A. Comprehensive Plan: "Promote the use of best management practices such as stormwater management" (Page 61)
B. Applicable Law: Article V, Section 14.8 of the Kent County Land Use Ordinance establish the EC environmental standards which include forest conservation, nontidal wetlands, stream protection corridor, stormwater management, and water quality standards.
C. Staff and TAC Comments:

- §14.8.B.3 and Article VI, Section 8: The applicant has submitted a Forest Stand Delineation and Forest Conservation Plan as part of the subdivision application. The applicant will be deed restricting an area of forest for the net tract area being subdivided and for the area to be cleared. The total easement area will be 8.35 acres: 6.41 acres for the subdivision to meet the $15 \%$ forest cover requirement and 1.94 acres to mitigate at a rate of 0.25 acres for each acre cleared for the 7.75 acres to be cleared. The proposed clearing does not include sensitive areas such as floodplain, nontidal wetlands, stream protection corridors, or steep slopes. The field sampling sites did not identify any trees with diameters over 30 inches measured at 4.5 feet above the ground. The proposed clearing does not include any trees, shrubs, or plants that have been identified as rare, threatened, or endangered. The Forest Stand Delineation has a letter from DNR Wildlife and Heritage Service which includes guidelines that should be incorporated into the plan to protect Forest Interior Dwelling Bird (FIDS) habitat. Most of the guidelines are not applicable because the clearing is limited to the forest edge. DNR does recommend that clearing be restricted to within 300 feet of the existing forest edge, and with one exception due to a unique property line, the proposed clearing is less than 300 feet into the forest. The deepest point of clearing is 350 feet into the forest in one small area.
- §14.8.B.4-7: The majority of the existing forest is being retained which will preserve wildlife corridors. The applicant is proposing to create a 200 -foot-wide forested buffer along Mill Branch, and the non-tidal wetlands and steep slopes have been delineated and will not be disturbed. Mill Branch is not considered a natural heritage area or Area of Critical State Concern.
- §14.8.B.8-10: As suggested by Robert Baldwin, District Manager for the Kent Soil and Water Conservation District, sediment and erosion control and stormwater management will be reviewed collaboratively between the County and the District. Preliminary stormwater management plans and calculations and preliminary sediment and erosion control plans have been submitted. Water quality will comply with the stormwater management regulations.


## V. Design Standards

A. Applicable Law: Article V, Section 14.9 of the Kent County Land Use Ordinance establishes the EC design standards which address site access, landscaping, screening, and lighting. Site access should ensure vehicle and pedestrian safety and alleviate congestion. The applicant should demonstrate that access to the project is adequate and the roads which will be impacted have the capacity to handle the traffic generated by the proposed project and will not endanger the safety of the general public.

Screening is required to protect adjoining properties and roadways from noise, glare, and uses which are visually incompatible with neighboring land uses. Screening is also required where exterior storage areas are visible from roadways, sidewalks, or nearby residential properties, or where the Planning Commission determines that additional screening is necessary to protect properties in the area. When required, the screen shall be capable of providing year-round screening and consist of coniferous and deciduous trees and plants, species and sizes of which will be chosen to best accomplish an adequate screen (i.e. evergreens used for visual screening, deciduous trees for seasonal screening). Screening may include masonry, or wooden fencing used with or without berms. Screening and fencing shall be maintained in at least the same quality and quantity as initially approved.

Lighting on the site should be sufficient to provide for the safety and security of the business, its employees, and its customers. Lighting should also be designed to avoid glare onto adjacent properties and adjacent roadways and not interfere with traffic or create a safety hazard
B. Staff and TAC Comments:

- §14.9.B.1: The proposed development does not have frontage on a primary road. Given the location of Mill Branch and other site conditions, requiring connections between the proposed lots or adjacent parcels does not contribute to traffic circulation or safety. A traffic study has been provided and approved by SHA.
- §14.9.B.2: Onsite vehicular circulation has been designed to avoid conflicts between large trucks and passenger vehicles. The loading spaces and trailer parking does not block passage of other vehicles and is separated from sidewalks and passenger vehicle parking. Handicap parking is provided. Parking is not located within the proposed front yard setback.
- §14.9.B.4 and 5: Preliminary landscaping plans have been submitted. There is already significant mature screening around much of the property. The rears of both lots back onto the 200 -foot protected stream corridor. Much of the front of the properties is screened from US 301 by existing vegetation on a parcel owned by SHA. The applicant will be providing additional screening where necessary. The landscaping uses native species and has a mix of plant types to provide seasonal interest and to avoid monoculture rows of trees. The road frontages and parking lots will be landscaped and kept in a neat and attractive condition.
- §14.9.B.6: A lighting plan has been submitted. The light poles will be 30 feet tall, and the light analysis shows that the glare does not extend onto adjacent properties.
VI. Parking and Loading
A. Applicable Law: Article VI, Section 1 of the Kent County Land Use Ordinance establishes the parking, loading, and bicycle parking standards.
B. Staff and TAC Comments: The applicant proposes parking and loading spaces that meet or exceed the minimum requirements. Parking for industrial uses and warehousing requires 1 space per 2 employees in the principal shift and 1 loading/unloading space per 20,000 square feet which is 13 spaces per building. The building on Lot 1 is proposed to have 260 employees, which would require 130 parking spaces. The site plan shows 134 spaces, with 5 that are handicap accessible. The loading dock has 45 spaces and there are 112 trailer parking spaces. The building on Lot 2 is proposed to have 230 employees, which would require 115 spaces. The site plan shows 115 spaces, with 5 that are handicap accessible. The loading dock has 45 spaces. Bicycle parking has not been shown on the site plan. One bicycle parking space is required for every 20 required auto parking spaces. Bicycle parking may be met by providing lockers or racks inside a building, adjacent to the building, in an accessory parking lot, or underneath an awning or marquee.


## SITE PLAN REVIEW

A. Comprehensive Plan: "Require developers to engage and inform citizens during the development review process through the incorporation of a participation program." (Page 27)
B. Applicable Law: Article VI, Section 5 of the Ordinance establishes the procedures and standards for site plan review. The Planning Commission shall prepare findings of fact concerning the reasonable fulfillment of the objectives listed below.

1. Conformance with the Comprehensive Plan and, where applicable, the Village Master Plan.
2. Conformance with the provisions of all applicable rules and regulations of county, state, and federal agencies.
3. Convenience and safety of both vehicular and pedestrian movement within the site and in relationship to adjoining ways and properties.
4. Provisions for the off-street loading and unloading of vehicles incidental to the normal operation of the establishment, adequate lighting, and internal traffic control.
5. Reasonable demands placed on public services and infrastructure.
6. Adequacy of methods for sewage and refuse disposal, and the protection from pollution of both surface waters and groundwater. This includes minimizing soil erosion both during and after construction.
7. Protection of abutting properties and County amenities from any undue disturbance caused by excessive or unreasonable noise, smoke, vapors, fumes, dust, odors, glare, stormwater runoff, etc.
8. Minimizing the area over which existing vegetation is to be removed. Where tree removal is required, special attention shall be given to planting of replacement trees.
9. The applicant's efforts to integrate the proposed development into the existing landscape through design features such as vegetative buffers, roadside plantings, and the retention of open space and agricultural land.
10. The applicant's efforts to design the development to complement and enhance the rural and historic nature of the County including incorporating into the project forms and materials that reflect the traditional construction patterns of neighboring communities.
11. The building setbacks, area, and location of parking, architectural compatibility, signage, and landscaping of the development, and how these features harmonize with the surrounding townscape and the natural landscape.

## C. Staff and TAC Comments (and Potential Findings):

1. The proposal is consistent with many strategies and goals of the Comprehensive Plan, such as "Promote the development of County employment centers." (Page 11).
2. To the best of our knowledge, the subdivision and site plans conform with the provisions of all applicable rules and regulations. The Planning Commission would need to grant approval of the setbacks and "curb cuts".
3. Onsite vehicular circulation appears to promote clearly defined access to loading and trailer parking areas and the employee/visitor parking areas. Multiple entrances per parcel help to achieve this separation. Sidewalks across the front of the buildings promote safe pedestrian movement.
4. Provisions have been made for off-street loading and unloading. Adequate lighting is proposed and provisions for safe internal traffic flow have been included.
5. There are no known unreasonable demands on public services or infrastructure. The Planning Commission may wish to consider requiring some type of road maintenance concession.
6. The applicant is working with the Department of Public Works. The Comprehensive Water and Sewerage Plan will need to be amended. DPW is in discussion with the developer regarding available water and sewer service capacity and the extent of off-site improvements to water, sewer, and roads that will be necessary.
7. Stormwater management must be addressed in accordance with Article VI, Section 10. The plan and affiliated sureties must be approved prior to final site plan approval.
8. Sediment control must be addressed in accordance with Article VI, Section 9. The plan and affiliated sureties must be approved prior to final site plan approval.
9. Any proposed use will be required to submit a Certified Engineer's Report and must comply with the standards for noise, smoke, vapors, fumes, dust, odors, and glare.
10. A landscape plan has been prepared which will provide screening protection to abutting properties. The landscape plan must be finalized; sureties must be submitted prior to final site plan approval.
11. No parks or other places of public gathering are in the immediate vicinity.
12. The applicant has tried to integrate the proposed development into the existing landscape through the retention of existing vegetation. Site perspectives showing the proposed development from Route 301 and building elevations have been provided.
13. The landscape plan uses native species and includes a mix of plants to provide seasonal interest.
14. At the request of staff to consider expanding aesthetic elements in the building design that would add visual interest such as incorporating colors of the adjacent forest and interesting patterns to draw the eye across the façades, the applicant added a green and blue "ribbon" across the front of the proposed buildings. The Planning Commission may wish to discuss if this feature is sufficient to address the design standards.
15. A Citizen Participation meeting was held on October 19 ${ }^{\text {th }}$.

## STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission approve the requested setbacks and waive the requirement that "curb cuts" be at least 3,000 feet apart. Staff also recommends that the Planning Commission grant preliminary approval.

Davis, Moore, Shearon \& Associates, LLC
May 24, 2024
Mr. William Mackey, Planning Director
Kent County Department of Planning \& Zoning
400 High Street
Chestertown, Maryland 21620

## RE: MINOR SUBDIVISON PLAT AND FOREST CONSERVATION PLANS ON THE LANDS OF MILLINGTON CROSSING ASSOCIATES 1, LLC KENT COUNTY TAX MAP 31, PARCEL 6-1 DMS \& ASSOCIATES JOB \#2021165

Dear Mr. Mackey,
Attached please find seven copies of the plats for the above referenced project. Based on the latest TAC comments dated May 8, 2024, no revisions were needed. We have modified the configuration of the forest retention area slightly to accommodate the sight distance requested by MDOT SHA. The plats have been signed and sealed by the surveyor of record.

We ask that you review this information for placement on the June 6, 2024, Planning Commission agenda. If you have questions or need additional information, please call me at 443-262-9130.

Sincerely,
DMS \& Associates, LLC


## Enclosures

pc: Mr. Russ Richardson, Millington Crossing Associates One, LLC (via email)<br>Mr. Kevin Vitelli, Esq. (via email)<br>Mr. Dan Gural, Everton Industrial (via email)







# Forest Stand Delineation and Stand Condition Narrative River Road Millington, MD 21651 Kent County, Maryland Tax Map 31 Parcel 6 

## Prepared for:

Everton Industrial Development LLC
266 Atsion Road
Medford, NJ 08055

Prepared By:
Davis \& Associates
Environmental Consulting, LLC
P.O. Box 733

Chestertown, MD 21620

June 8, 2022

## 1. Introduction

On June 7, 2022, Davis \& Associates completed a forest stand delineation (FSD) for the property located on the north side of River Road (MD 291) in Kent County. The purpose of the FSD is to describe forest stands on the parcel for woodland conservation purposes in compliance with the Maryland Forest Conservation Act of 1991.

## 2. Site Description

The site is located on the north side of River Road about 0.28 mile east of US Route 301 in Millington in Kent County in Maryland (see vicinity map). The property is zoned agricultural and is currently undeveloped.

## 3. Methodology

The forest stands were delineated based on topography, soil types, and aspect. Sample points were randomly located within the study area. The delineation was field verified. The sampling was accomplished using a wedge prism with a basal area of 10 . The diameter of each sample tree was measured at breast height. The data sheets completed during the survey are included as Appendix A. The forest structure of each stand was assessed based on canopy coverage, herbaceous groundcover, downed woody debris, invasive plant cover, and the number of shrub species.

## 4. Stand Condition Narrative

Based on the methodology, one forest stand was identified. Sensitive species do occur on the southern portion of the site based on a review of Maryland's Environmental Resources \& Land Information Network (MERLIN). Coordination with the Maryland Department of Natural Resources Wildlife and Heritage Service has been initiated and a response will be incorporated into the report when it is received.

No historic sites or cultural features were found on the site during the field investigation, and none were noted based on a review of information available from MERLIN.
Adjacent land use is industrial, commercial, residential, agricultural, and forest.

## Forest Stand A

Forest Stand A is an uneven-aged mixed bottomland hardwood forest. Dominant overstory species include beech and poplar. Other overstory species include red oak, white oak, hickory, red maple and sweetgum. Shrub layer and ground cover species are moderately dense and is mostly paw paw. Diameters of the dominant trees range from 5 to 25 inches. Canopy coverage averages 100 percent. The basal area averages 70 square feet per acre. The stand includes a perennial stream, Mill Branch, that drains to the Chester River. There are approximately 73 trees per acre. The forest is considered Priority Area 1.

The forest is in good health. Green ash is a small component of the stand and the green ash is dead or dying from the emerald ash borer. No other significant disease or insect infestation was observed on the site.

Soils in Forest Stands
Summary of Soil Map Unit Classifications for Stand A

| Map <br> Symbol | Soil Series |
| :--- | :--- |
| Bs | Bibb silt loam |
| CgC2 | Colts Neck gravelly loam, 2 to 10 percent slopes, moderately <br> eroded |
| MpB | Mattapex fine sandy loam, 2 to 5 percent slopes |
| MtcA | Mattapex silt loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes, Mid-Atlantic Coastal <br> Plain |
| SacB | Sassafras sandy loam, 2 to 5 percent slopes, Mid-Atlantic <br> Coastal Plain |
| SacC | Sassafras sandy loam, 5 to 10 percent slopes, Mid-Atlantic <br> Coastal Plain |
| SaD2 | Sassafras sandy loam, 10 to 15 percent slopes, moderately <br> eroded |
| SfC2 | Sassafras loam, 5 to 10 percent slopes, moderately eroded |
| WdcB | Woodstown sandy loam, 2 to 5 percent slopes, Mid-Atlantic <br> Coastal Plain |

## Appendix



Richardson Fresh Ponds Areas W-1 and W-2 Forest Stand Delineation Map 个N



## Soil Map-Kent County, Maryland

## MAP LEGEND

| Area of Interest (AOI) |  | E | Spoil Area <br> Stony Spot |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Area of Interest (AOI) |  |  |
| Soils | Soil Map Unit Polygons | \% | Very Stony Spot |
|  |  | $\cdots$ | Wet Spot |
| $\cdots$ | Soil Map Unit Lines | y |  |
|  |  | $\Delta$ | Other |
| $\square$ | Soil Map Unit Points |  |  |
| Special Point Features |  | ** | Special Line Features |
| (t) | Blowout | Water Features |  |
| 18 | Borrow Pit |  | Streams and Canals |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | Clay Spot | Transportation |  |
| \% |  | \% | Rails |
| 9 | Closed Depression | $\square$ | Interstate Highways |
| W | Gravel Pit | neal | US Routes |
| 8 | Gravelly Spot | $\cdots$ | Major Roads |
| 8 | Landfill | matio | Local Roads |
| 偊 | Lava Flow | Background |  |
| 4 | Marsh or swamp |  | Aerial Photography |
| \% | Mine or Quarry |  |  |
| (9) | Miscellaneous Water |  |  |
| 0 | Perennial Water |  |  |
| * | Rock Outcrop |  |  |
| 4 | Saline Spot |  |  |
| $\%_{0}^{*}{ }^{*}$ | Sandy Spot |  |  |
| B | Severely Eroded Spot |  |  |
| \% | Sinkhole |  |  |
| 7 | Slide or Slip |  |  |
| \% | Sodic Spot |  |  |

The soil surveys that comprise your AOI were mapped at 1:15,800.

Warning: Soil Map may not be valid at this scale.
Enlargement of maps beyond the scale of mapping can cause misunderstanding of the detail of mapping and accuracy of soi line placement. The maps do not show the small areas of contrasting soils that could have been shown at a more detailed scale.

Please rely on the bar scale on each map sheet for map measurements.
Source of Map: Natural Resources Conservation Service Web Soil Survey URL:
Coordinate System: Web Mercator (EPSG:3857)
Maps from the Web Soil Survey are based on the Web Mercator projection, which preserves direction and shape but distorts distance and area. A projection that preserves area, such as the Albers equal-area conic projection, should be used if more accurate calculations of distance or area are required.

This product is generated from the USDA-NRCS certified data as of the version date(s) listed below.

Soil Survey Area: Kent County, Maryland Survey Area Data: Version 20, Aug 27, 2021

Soil map units are labeled (as space allows) for map scales 1:50,000 or larger.

Date(s) aerial images were photographed: Jun 9, 2020-Jun 13, 2020

The orthophoto or other base map on which the soil lines were compiled and digitized probably differs from the background imagery displayed on these maps. As a result, some minor shifting of map unit boundaries may be evident.

## Map Unit Legend

| Map Unit Symbol | Map Unit Name | Acres in AOI | Percent of AOI |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bs | Bibb silt loam | 29.7 | 38.1\% |
| CgC 2 | Colts Neck gravelly loam, 2 to 10 percent slopes, moderately eroded | 0.0 | 0.0\% |
| MpB | Mattapex fine sandy loam, 2 to 5 percent slopes | 9.8 | 12.5\% |
| MtcA | Mattapex silt loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes, Mid-Atlantic Coastal Plain | 3.8 | 4.9\% |
| SacB | Sassafras sandy loam, 2 to 5 percent slopes, Mid-Atlantic Coastal Plain | 11.8 | 15.0\% |
| Sacc | Sassafras sandy loam, 5 to 10 percent slopes, Mid-Atlantic Coastal Plain | 12.0 | 15.4\% |
| SaD2 | Sassafras sandy loam, 10 to 15 percent slopes, moderately eroded | 0.5 | 0.6\% |
| SfC2 | Sassafras loam, 5 to 10 percent slopes, moderately eroded | 0.4 | 0.6\% |
| WdcB | Woodstown sandy loam, 2 to 5 percent slopes, Mid-Atlantic Coastal Plain | 10.1 | 13.0\% |
| Totals for Area of Interest |  | 78.1 | 100.0\% |

Richardson Fresh Ponds Areas W-1 and W-2 Topographic Map


MD IMAP, USGS, Sources: Esri, HERE, Garmin, Intermap, norement $P$ Corp., GESCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBase. IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnance Survey, Esri Japan, METV, Esri China (Hong Kongl), (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User
Communtly


Davis \&
Associates
Environmental
Consulting, LLC
POBO: 733
Chestertown, MD 21620 410-507-9793

June 17, 2022
Ms. Lori Byrne
Environmental Review Specialist
MD DNR- Wildlife and Heritage Service
Tawes State Office Building, E-1
580 Taylor Avenue
Annapolis, MD 21401

## RE: Environmental Review for Lands of Richardson Fresh Ponds LLC River Rd <br> Millington, MD 21651 <br> Tax Map 31 Parcel 6

Dear Ms. Byrne,
Davis \& Associates is requesting an environmental review for the above referenced parcel. The site is located in Millington in Kent County. There are sensitive species mapped on the site.

A vicinity map of the site location is attached.
Please call me at 410-507-9793 if you have any questions regarding this site.
Sincerely,

Noreen Davis

July 20, 2022
Ms. Noreen Davis
Davis \& Associates Environmental Consulting, LLC
P.O. Box 733

Chestertown, Maryland 21620

## RE: Environmental Review for Lands of Richardson Fresh Ponds, LLC - River Road, Millington, Tax Map 31 Parcel 6, Kent County, Maryland.

Dear Ms. Davis:
The Wildlife and Heritage Service has determined that there are no official State or Federal records for listed plant or animal species within the delineated area shown on the map provided. We would like to point out, however, that our remote analysis suggests that the forested area on this property contains Forest Interior Dwelling Bird habitat. Populations of many bird species which depend on this type of forested habitat are declining in Maryland and throughout the eastern United States. The conservation of this habitat is mandated within the Chesapeake Bay Critical Area and must be addressed by the project plan. Specifically, if FIDS habitat is present, the following guidelines should be incorporated into the project plan (as applicable):

1. Restrict development to nonforested areas.
2. If forest loss or disturbance is unavoidable, concentrate or restrict development to the following areas:
a. the perimeter of the forest (i.e., within 300 feet of existing forest edge)
b. thin strips of upland forest less than 300 feet wide
c. small, isolated forests less than 50 acres in size
d. portions of the forest with low quality FIDS habitat, (i.e., areas that are already heavily fragmented, relatively young, exhibit low structural diversity, etc.)
3. Maximize the amount if forest "interior" (forest area $>300$ feet from the forest edge) within each forest tract (i.e., minimize the forest edge:area ratio). Circular forest tracts are ideal and square tracts are better than rectangular or long, linear forests.
4. Minimize forest isolation. Generally, forests that are adjacent, close to, or connected to other forests provide higher quality FIDS habitat than more isolated forests.
5. Limit forest removal to the "footprint" of houses and to that which is necessary for the placement of roads and driveways.
6. Minimize the number and length of driveways and roads.
7. Roads and driveways should be as narrow and as short as possible; preferably less than 25 and 15 feet, respectively
8. Maintain forest canopy closure over roads and driveways.
9. Maintain forest habitat up to the edges of roads and driveways; do not create or maintain mowed grassy berms.
10. Maintain or create wildlife corridors.

Tawes State Office Building - 580 Taylor Avenue - Annapolis, Maryland 21401
11. Do not remove or disturb forest habitat during April-August, the breeding season for most FIDS. This seasonal restriction may be expanded to February-August if certain early nesting FIDS (e.g., Barred Owl) are present.
12. Landscape homes with native trees, shrubs and other plants and/or encourage homeowners to do so.
13. Encourage homeowners to keep pet cats indoors or, if taken outside, kept on a leash or inside a fenced area.
14. In forested areas reserved from development, promote the development of a diverse forest understory by removing livestock from forested areas and controlling white-tailed deer populations. Do not mow the forest understory or remove woody debris and snags.
15. Afforestation efforts should target a) riparian or streamside areas that lack woody vegetative buffers, b) forested riparian areas less than 300 feet wide, and c) gaps or peninsulas of nonforested habitat within or adjacent to existing FIDS habitat.

The Critical Area Commission's document "A Guide to the Conservation of Forest Interior Dwelling Birds in the Chesapeake Bay Critical Area" provides details on development standards and information about mitigation for projects where impacts to FIDS habitat cannot be totally avoided. Mitigation plantings for impacts to FIDS habitat may be required under the local government's Critical Area Program. The amount of mitigation required is generally based in whether the guidelines listed above are followed.

Please be sure to let us know if the limits of proposed disturbance or overall site boundaries change and we will provide you with an updated evaluation. Thank you for allowing us the opportunity to review this project. If you should have any further questions regarding this information, please contact me at lori.byrne@maryland.gov or at (410) 260-8573.

Sincerely,
Sonia. Bye
Lori A. Byrne,
Environmental Review Coordinator Wildlife and Heritage Service MD Dept. of Natural Resources

ER\# 2022.0961.ke
Cc: C. Jones, CAC

Richardson Fresh Ponds Areas W-1 and W-2 Sensitive SpeciesMap


Table D-4: Forest Stand Summary Sheet

Property Name: Richardson Fresh Gonds Prepared by: Noreen
Date: 6/17/22


## Table D-3: Forest Structure Data Sheet

Property: Richardson Tush Ports Prepared by: Nareen Davis Stand \#: A Plot 䔬: Date: $6 / 6 / 72$

| Forest Structure <br> Variable | sample <br> point 1 | sample <br> point 2 | sample <br> point 3 | sample <br> point 4 | sample <br> point 5 | \% yes |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Canopy <br> coverage | $Y$ | $Y$ | $Y$ | $Y$ | $Y$ | 100 |
| herbaceous <br> ground cover | $N$ | $N$ | $N$ | $N$ | $N / y$ | 10 |
| downed woody <br> debris | $N$ | $N$ | $Y$ | $N$ | $N$ | 20 |
| invasive plant <br> cover | $N$ | $N$ | $N$ | $N$ | $N$ | $D$ |
| number of shrub <br> species <br> $(1 / 100$ acre $)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Forest Structure Sampling Method:

1/10 acre plot. 5 sample points


## Table D-1: Field Sampling Data Sheef

$\begin{array}{lll}\text { Property Name: Richordsan Frush Pands } & \text { Prepared by: ' } \\ \text { Stand \# A } & \text { Plot \# / } & \text { Date: } 6 / 6 / 2\end{array}$

|  | Size Class of Trees Within the Sample Plot |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Tree Species <br> (note dominant and <br> co-dominant species) | Number of <br> Trees 2-6" <br> dbh | Number of <br> Trees 6-10" <br> dbh | Number of <br> Trees <br> $11-17^{\prime \prime}$ <br> dbh | Number of <br> Trees <br> $18-29^{n}$ <br> dbh | Number c <br> Trees <br> dbh |
| Pbolat |  |  |  |  |  |

## Table D-1: Field Sampling Data Sheet

## Property Name: Stand \# A <br> Plot \# 3 Prepared by: Nares Date: <br> 6,6/02



## Table D-1: Field Sampling Data Sheet

Property Name: Richardson Fresh forts Prepared by: Noreen Stand \# Plot \# 4 Date: 4/6182



## Table D-1: Field Sampling Data Sheet

Size Class of Trees Within the Sample Plot


## Table D-1: Field Sampling Data Sheet

 $\begin{array}{lll}\text { Property Name: Richatson fresh lacks } & \text { Prepared by: Noreen } \\ \text { Stand \# } & \text { Plot \# } & \text { Date: } 6 / 6 / \tau 2\end{array}$

## Table D-1: Field Sampling Data Sheet

 Property Name: Richardson Fresh Prods Prepared by: Noreen Stand \# Plot \# Date:6/6/22

## Table D-1: Field Sampling Data Sheet



Prepared by: Noreen
Date: 6/6/13
2


## Table D-1: Field Sampling Data Sheet

 $\begin{array}{lcl}\text { Property Name: Richardsom Fresh Pads/s } & \text { Prepared by: Noveen } \\ \text { Stand \# A } & \text { Plot \# } p & \text { Date: } 6 / 6 / 2,2\end{array}$

## Table D-1: Field Sampling Data Sheet

Property Name: Richardson F. Stand \# A

Plot \# 10

Prepared by: Noreen Date: $6 / 6 / 13$


## Table D-1: Field Sampling Data Sheet

 Stand \# A Plot \#

Prepared by: Noreen *
Date: $6 / 6 / 13$


## Table D-1: Field Sampling Data Sheet



Prepared by: Noreen Date: $6 / 6 / 22$



# Lands of Richardson Fresh Ponds LLC River Road <br> Millington, MD 21651 <br> Kent County, Maryland <br> Tax Map 31 Parcel 6 Areas W-1 and W-2 <br> Wetland Delineation Report 

Prepared for:

Everton Industrial Development LLC<br>266 Atsion Road<br>Medford, NJ 08055

Prepared by:
Davis \& Associates
Environmental Consulting, LLC
410-507-9793
PO Box 733
Chestertown, MD 21620

June 17, 2022

## Introduction

Davis \& Associates completed a wetland delineation investigation for the property located in Kent County, Maryland on June 7, 2022. The purpose of the investigation was to determine the extent, location, and classification of any wetlands or waters of the U.S. on on Areas W-1 and W-2. This report summarizes our investigation and results. The following attachments are included:

- Attachment 1. Vicinity Map
- Attachment 2. Aerial Photograph with Preliminary Wetland Delineation
- Attachment 3. Kent County Soil Survey Map
- Attachment 4: Routine Wetland Determination Data Forms


## Description of the Property

The site is located on the north side of River Road about 0.19 mile east of its intersection with US Route 301 in Millington in Kent County in Maryland (see Attachment 1). The site is undeveloped. The site is owned by Richardson Fresh Ponds LLC, PO Box 546, Chester Heights, PA 19017. The latitude is 39.275981 and the longitude is -75.869152 . The property is not located within the Chesapeake Bay Critical Area.

## Methodology

The wetland delineation was conducted in accordance with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' Wetland Delineation Manual (USACE, 1987) and the Interim Regional Supplement to the Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual: Atlantic and Gulf Plain Region (USACE 2012). These manuals utilize a three-parameter approach to identifying wetlands, which includes the presence of dominant hydrophytic vegetation, hydric soils, and wetland hydrology. All three parameters normally must be present for an area to be considered a wetland under the USACE jurisdiction in accordance with Section 404 of the Clean Water Act.

The wetland investigation included an evaluation of the Kent County Soil Survey and available topographic maps of the property.

## Soils

A hydric soil is defined as a soil "that formed under conditions of saturation, flooding, or ponding long enough during the growing season to develop anaerobic conditions in the upper part" (Federal Register, July 13, 1994). According to the USACE's Wetland Delineation Manual (USACE, 1987), common hydric soil indicators include a low chroma matrix (chroma less than 2, value greater than 4), concretions, and listing on local or national hydric soils lists.

The following soils were mapped on the property in the Kent County Soil Survey (USDA, NRCS):

Table 1. Summary of Soil Map Unit Classifications

| Map Symbol | Soil Series |
| :--- | :--- |
| Bs | Bibb silt loam |
| CgC 2 | Colts Neck gravelly loam, 2 to 10 percent slopes, <br> moderately eroded |
| MpB | Mattapex fine sandy loam, 2 to 5 percent slopes <br> MtcAMattapex silt loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes, Mid-Atlantic <br> Coastal Plain |
| SacB | Sassafras sandy loam, 2 to 5 percent slopes, Mid- <br> Atlantic Coastal Plain |
| SacC | Sassafras sandy loam, 5 to 10 percent slopes, Mid- <br> Atlantic Coastal Plain |
| SaD 2 | Sassafras sandy loam, 10 to 15 percent slopes, <br> moderately eroded |
| SfC 2 | Sassafras loam, 5 to 10 percent slopes, moderately <br> eroded |
| $\mathrm{SgC2}$ | Sassafras gravelly loam, 5 to 10 percent slopes, <br> moderately eroded |
| WdcB | Woodstown sandy loam, 2 to 5 percent slopes, Mid- <br> Atlantic Coastal Plain |

A copy of the soil map is included as Attachment 3.

## Vegetation

Plant species observed on the property were identified and the wetland indicator status for each species was determined from the US Army Corps of Engineers, North American Digital Flora: National Wetland Plant List, Atlantic and Coastal Plain 2016. The indicator status of a certain species indicates the probability that it will occur in a wetland of the northeast region of the United States. The indicator status designations are presented for each species identified at the property in Attachment 4. The following is an explanation of the indicator status designations:

OBL $=$ Obligate Wetland (greater than $99 \%$ probability of occurrence in wetland)
FACW $=\quad$ Facultative Wetland (greater than $66 \%$ to less than $99 \%$ probability of occurrence in wetland)
$\mathrm{FAC}=$ Facultative
( $33 \%$ to $66 \%$ probability of occurrence in wetland)
$\mathrm{FACU}=\quad$ Facultative Upland
( $1 \%$ to less than $33 \%$ probability of occurrence in wetland)
UPL $=$ Obligate Upland
(less than $1 \%$ probability of occurrence in wetland)




## A Hachment 3



## MAP LEGEND

| Area of Interest (AOI) | Spoil Area |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Soils |  | Srea of Interest (AOI) | Sory Spot |

## MAP INFORMATION

The soil surveys that comprise your AOI were mapped at 1:15,800

Warning: Soil Map may not be valid at this scale.
Enlargement of maps beyond the scale of mapping can cause misunderstanding of the detail of mapping and accuracy of soil line placement. The maps do not show the small areas of contrasting soils that could have been shown at a more detailed scale.

Please rely on the bar scale on each map sheet for map measurements.

Source of Map: Natural Resources Conservation Service Web Soil Survey URL:
Coordinate System: Web Mercator (EPSG:3857)
Maps from the Web Soil Survey are based on the Web Mercator projection, which preserves direction and shape but distorts distance and area. A projection that preserves area, such as the Albers equal-area conic projection, should be used if more accurate calculations of distance or area are required.
This product is generated from the USDA-NRCS certified data as of the version date(s) listed below.

Soil Survey Area: Kent County, Maryland
Survey Area Data: Version 20, Aug 27, 2021
Soil map units are labeled (as space allows) for map scales 1:50,000 or larger.

Date(s) aerial images were photographed: Jun 9, 2020-Jun 13, 2020

The orthophoto or other base map on which the soil lines were compiled and digitized probably differs from the background imagery displayed on these maps. As a result, some minor shifting of map unit boundaries may be evident.

## Map Unit Legend

| Map Unit Symbol | Map Unit Name | Acres in AOI | Percent of AOI |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bs | Bibb silt loam | 29.9 | 31.4\% |
| $\mathrm{CgC2}$ | Colts Neck gravelly loam, 2 to 10 percent slopes, moderately eroded | 1.0 | 1.1\% |
| MpB | Mattapex fine sandy loam, 2 to 5 percent slopes | 14.4 | 15.2\% |
| MtcA | Mattapex silt loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes, Mid-Atlantic Coastal Plain | 4.3 | 4.5\% |
| SacB | Sassafras sandy loam, 2 to 5 percent slopes, Mid-Atlantic Coastal Plain | 12.2 | 12.8\% |
| SacC | Sassafras sandy loam, 5 to 10 percent slopes, Mid-Atlantic Coastal Plain | 14.4 | 15.1\% |
| SaD2 | Sassafras sandy loam, 10 to 15 percent slopes, moderately eroded | 0.4 | 0.4\% |
| SfC2 | Sassafras loam, 5 to 10 percent slopes, moderately eroded | 0.4 | 0.5\% |
| SgC2 | Sassafras gravelly loam, 5 to 10 percent slopes, moderately eroded | 0.0 | 0.0\% |
| WdcB | Woodstown sandy loam, 2 to 5 percent slopes, Mid-Atlantic Coastal Plain | 18.1 | 19.1\% |
| Totals for Area of Interest |  | 95.1 | 100.0\% |

## Attachment 4

## WETLAND DETERMINATION DATA FORM - Atlantic and Gulf Coastal Plain Region

 Project/site: Richardson fresh Ponds W-1 $+W-2$ City/County:Millington/Kent Sampling Date: $\frac{6 / 9 / 22}{5 p 1}$ Appicantowner: Evection IndustrialState: $\qquad$ Sampling Point: $\qquad$ investigators): N. Davis Landform (hill slope, terrace, etc.): $\frac{\text { flood plain a }}{R T}$ Section, Township, Range: Local relief (concave, convex, none): $\qquad$ Slope (\%): $0-10 \%$ Subregion (LRR or MLRA): $\angle R R T$
$\qquad$ 39.27598 Long: -75.869152 Datum: Soil Map Unit Name: B5 -Bibl silt loam NWI classification: pFOIA/C Are climatic / hydrologic conditions on the site typical for this time of year? Yes $\quad \checkmark$ $\qquad$ (If no, explain in Remarks.) Are Vegetation $\qquad$ Soil $\qquad$ , or Hydrology $\qquad$ significantly disturbed? no Are "Normal Circumstances" present? Yes $\qquad$ No $\qquad$ Are Vegetation $\qquad$ Soil $\qquad$ , or Hydrology $\qquad$ naturally problematic? no (If needed, explain any answers in Remarks.)

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS - Attach site map showing sampling point locations, transects, important features, etc.


## HYDROLOGY



VEGETATION - Use scientific names of plants.
Sampling Point: Spl


Remarks: (If observed, list morphological adaptations below).


Remarks:

May 17, 2024

Kevin Shearon, P.E., LEED AP
Davis, Moore, Shearon and Associates, LLC
P.O. Box 80

Centreville, MD 21617

RE: Kent County<br>Everton<br>Millington Crossing<br>23apke003xx

Dear Mr. Shearon:
The Maryland Department of Transportation State Highway Administration (SHA) has reviewed the entrance plans, and we are pleased to respond. SHA has determined that distances between entrances are acceptable as proposed, provided the sight distance clearing is approved and performed. This determination has been formulated through collective review of the SHA Access Manual, proposed plan set, and site visit.

If you have any questions, please contact Henry R. Dierker via email at hdierker@mdot.maryland.gov or via phone at 410-810-3244.

Sincerely,


Henry R. Dierker III
Access Permits Regional Engineer
(STM/HD)

April 25, 2024

Mr. Brad Schmid
Traffic Concepts, Inc.
7525 Connelley Drive, Suite B
Hanover, MD 21076
RE: Kent County
US 301
Millington Crossing Warehouses
SHA Tracking No. 23apke003xx
Mile Point: 0.89
Dear Mr. Schmid:
Thank you for the opportunity to review the Point-by-Point Response and revised Traffic Impact Study (TIS) for the proposed Millington Crossing Warehouses in Kent County. The Maryland Department of Transportation State Highway Administration (SHA) has reviewed the TIS, and we are pleased to advise the TIS is Approved with Comments.

If you have any questions regarding the comments, please contact the Reviewer directly using the contact information that has been provided.

Travel Forecasting and Analysis Division (TFAD): (Elham Shayanfar, 410-545-5642, eshayanfar@mdot.maryland.gov )

- The 445 ft intersection sight distance satisfies the AASHTO guidelines for passenger cars.
- However, under the same conditions, a combination truck requires 675 ft intersection sight distance.
- Ideally, we want to meet the 675 ft sight distance due to the truck traffic for this development.
- As stated in our previous comments, the limited sight distance for the south building truck access raises safety concerns and needs to be addressed.
- We recommend restricting the access to right-in only and directing trucks to exit via the southern access point.


## Access Management:

Plan submittal should reflect the above comments. Any submissions should be made to Mr. Ken Fender at 615 Morgnec Road, Chestertown, MD 21620, attention of Mr. Henry Dierker, III. Please reference the SHA tracking number on future submissions.

Please keep in mind that you can view the reviewer and project status via the SHA Access Management web page at https://roads.maryland.gov/mdotsha/pages/amd.aspx. If you have any questions or require additional information, please contact Mr. Henry Dierker, III at 410-7783061, by using our toll-free number (in Maryland only) at 1-800-637-9740 (x3244), or via email at hdierker@,mdot.maryland.gov.

Sincerely,

Richard Bakeer
Richard Baker
Assistant District Two Engineer--Traffic
STM/(HD)
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## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Millington Crossing Associates One, LLC warehouse project that is planned with two lots along the west side of MD 701A (Edge Road).

Proposed Project: The project consists of two 256,924 sqf warehouse buildings.

Scope of Services \& Methodology: The key intersections listed below define the study area. The intersection counts were conducted on October 25, 2022, when schools were in session.

| US Route 301 (Blue Star Memorial Highway) @ MD 313 <br> (Galena Road) (Unsignalized) | SB US Route 301 (Blue Star Memorial Highway) @ <br> Chesterville Bridge Road (Unsignalized) |
| :--- | :--- |
| SB US Route 301 (Blue Star Memorial Highway) @ MD | NB US Route 301 (Blue Star Memorial Highway) @ MD <br> 701 (Howard Johnson Road) Ramps (Unsignalized) |
| 701 (Edge Road) Ramps (Unsignalized) | MD 291 (Cypress Street) @ MD 701A (Edge Road) <br> (Roundabout) |
| Mnsignalized) Bridge Road @ MD 701A (Edge Road) | Chesterville Bridge Road @ North Building Truck <br> Access (Unsignalized) |
| Road) (Roundabout) | MD 701A (Edge Road) @ South Building Truck Access <br> (Unsignalized) |
| MD 701A (Edge Road) @ North Building Car Access <br> (Unsignalized) |  |
| MD 701A (Edge Road) @ South Building Car Access <br> (Unsignalized) |  |

Analysis Methodology: The traffic study is comprised of an Existing, Background, and Future traffic condition. The key intersections were analyzed under each traffic condition, which is explained with the following formula:

## Total Future Traffic $=\quad$ (Existing Condition - current intersection turning movement volumes + Background Condition - $2 \%$ Growth Rate compounder over 2 years + Future Condition - site generated traffic and passby)

All key intersections were analyzed with the Critical Lane Volume (CLV) methodology and the MD 301 and MD 313 unsignalized intersection was analyzed with the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) software.

New Site Generated (Peak Hour) Trips: The new site generated peak hour trips listed below were generated with land use data contained in the Institute of Transportation Engineers, Trip Generation Manual $11^{\text {th }}$ Edition.

| SITE TRIPS: | AM |  | PM |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | IN | OUT | IN | OUT |
| Warehousing |  |  |  |  |
| ITE Land Use Code 150 |  |  |  |  |
| 513.85k gsf |  |  |  |  |
| New Truck Trips | 8 | 2 | 4 | 11 |
| New Car Trips | 58 | 17 | 20 | 53 |
| Total New Trips | 66 | 19 | 24 | 64 |
| CONCLUSION: |  |  |  |  |
| At the total future build-out condition (2025), the CLV analyses determined that all key intersections would continue to operate at adequate overall level of service " $A$ " condition. |  |  |  |  |
| Based on the tra traffic level of s | nd th | this |  | rove |

## INTRODUCTION

Millington Crossing Associates One, LLC proposed to construct two warehousing buildings in Kent County. The site is located along the west side of MD 701A (Edge Road) just south of Chesterville Bridge Road, as shown on Exhibit 1.

## Project Development

The developer plans to construct 513,848 gsf of warehousing. The site plan is included in the appendix.

## Site Access

The developer plans to create three new full movement access for the south proposed lots along the west side of MD 701A. The north lot will have one new full movement access along the west side of MD 701A and one left-in, right-out, left-out access along the south side of Chesterville Bridge Road.

## Key Intersections

The key intersections listed below were analyzed during the weekday morning and evening peak time periods.

- US Route 301 (Blue Star Memorial Highway) @ MD 313 (Galena Road) (Unsignalized)
- SB US Route 301 (Blue Star Memorial Highway) @ Chesterville Bridge Road (Unsignalized)
- SB US Route 301 (Blue Star Memorial Highway) @ MD 701A (Edge Road) Ramps (Unsignalized)
- NB US Route 301 (Blue Star Memorial Highway) @ MD 701 (Howard Johnson Road) Ramps (Unsignalized)
- Chesterville Bridge Road @ MD 701A (Edge Road) (Unsignalized)
- MD 291 (Cypress Street) @ MD 701A (Edge Road) (Roundabout)
- MD 291 (Cypress Street) @ MD 701 (Howard Johnson Road) (Roundabout)
- Chesterville Bridge Road @ North Building Truck Access (Unsignalized) (Future Only)
- MD 701A (Edge Road) @ North Building Car Access (Unsignalized) (Future Only)
- MD 701A (Edge Road) @ South Building Truck Access (Unsignalized) (Future Only)
- MD 701A (Edge Road) @ South Building Car Access (Unsignalized) (Future Only)


## Study Methodology

The key intersections were analyzed during the existing, background, and future traffic condition. The existing condition determines the baseline intersection levels of service with recent intersection turning movement counts. The background condition includes both regional traffic traveling through the study area along arterial and collector roadways, which is represented with a growth rate, and local traffic generated by nearby approved background developments that are not constructed. The background trips are added to the existing traffic volumes to create the total background traffic volumes.

The future traffic condition determines the site generated peak hour trips. The total background traffic volumes are then added to the future peak hour trips to create the total future traffic volumes.

## Analysis Methods

All key intersections were analyzed using the Critical Lane Volume (CLV) method except for the two roundabout intersections which were analyzed using SIDRA. The US Route 301 and MD 313 intersection was also analyzed with the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) method and a queuing analysis were conducted for dedicated turn lanes at this intersection at proposed future traffic conditions. The existing lane configurations are shown on Exhibit 2.
- Intersection Studied

TRAFFIC CONCEPTS, INC.

7525 Connelley Drive Suite B
Hanover, Maryland 21076 410-760-2911

## EXHIBIT 1

Site Location Map


## EXISTING CONDITION

The existing traffic condition determines the peak hour traffic volumes that represent the base line traffic condition. The intersection turning movement counts, conducted at the key intersections, are provided in Appendix IV. The peak one-hour intersection movements are displayed on Exhibit 3.

## CRITICAL LANE ANALYSIS

|  | AM <br> CLV(LOS) | PM <br> CLV(LOS) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| US 301 @ MD 313 | $348(A)$ | $408(A)$ |
| SB US 301 @ Chesterville Bridge Road | $221(A)$ | $268(A)$ |
| SB US 301 @ MD 701A Ramps | $103(A)$ | $144(A)$ |
| NB US 301 @ MD 701 Ramps | $92(A)$ | $154(A)$ |
| Chesterville Bridge Road @ MD 701A | $22(A)$ | $31(A)$ |

## HIGHWAY CAPACITY MANUAL, UNSIGNALIZED INTERSECTION (TWSC)

US 301 @ MD 313

Eastbound
Westbound
Northbound
Southbound

Approach LOS
AM(PM)
A(B)
A(A)
A(A)
A(A)

SIDRA ROUNDABOUT ANYLSYS
US 291 @ MD 701A
Overall LOS
AM(PM)
A(A)
US 291 @ MD 701
Overall LOS
AM(PM)
A(A)


## BACKGROUND CONDITION

The background condition accounts for regional traffic that travels through the study area that is represented by a growth rate and local traffic generated by nearby background developments.

A 2 percent growth rate to the through traffic volumes over the project build-out period, which is two (2) years. Exhibit 4 shows the traffic volume increase.

Background developments are defined as approved projects that are not yet constructed or are not fully constructed. There are no current background developments in the area that would impact the intersections in this study.

The total background traffic volumes shown on Exhibit 5 were developed by adding the existing traffic volumes (Exhibit 3) with traffic generated by the growth rates. The background LOS results are listed on the following page and the LOS calculations are provided in Appendix I, II and III.

## CRITICAL LANE ANALYSIS

|  | AM <br> CLV(LOS) | PM <br> CLV(LOS) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| US 301 @ MD 313 | $361(A)$ | $424(A)$ |
| SB US 301 @ Chesterville Bridge Road | $230(A)$ | $278(A)$ |
| SB US 301 @ MD 701A Ramps | $103(A)$ | $144(A)$ |
| NB US 301 @ MD 701 Ramps | $92(A)$ | $154(A)$ |
| Chesterville Bridge Road @ MD 701A | $22(A)$ | $31(A)$ |

HIGHWAY CAPACITY MANUAL, UNSIGNALIZED INTERSECTION (TWSC)
US 301 @ MD 313

Approach LOS
AM(PM)
Eastbound
Westbound
Northbound
Southbound

A(B)
A(A)
A(A)
A(A)

## SIDRA ROUNDABOUT ANYLSYS

US 291 @ MD 701A
Overall LOS
AM(PM)
A(A)
US 291 @ MD 701
Overall LOS
AM(PM)
A(A)



## FUTURE CONDITION

The future traffic condition determines the new peak hour trips generated by 513,848 gsf of warehousing. The new site trips were generated with data contained in the Institute of Transportation Engineers' (ITE), Trip Generation Manual, $11^{\text {th }}$ Edition. The ITE trip data are provided in Appendix V .

## SITE TRIPS:

IN $^{\text {AM }}$ OUT $\underline{I N}^{\text {PM }}$ OUT

Warehousing
ITE Land Use Code 150

### 513.85k gsf

New Truck Trips*
$\begin{array}{llll}8 & 2 & 4 & 11\end{array}$
New Car Trips*
$58 \quad 17$
2053
Total New Trips
6619
2464
*The distribution between truck and car trips was taken from the ITE Trip Distribution Data Plots for Trucks using the Peak AM and PM graphs and are located in Appendix V.

The new site trips distribution patterns shown on Exhibit 6 and Exhibit 7 and are based on the existing traffic pattern and information contained and approved traffic studies. The total future traffic volumes (Exhibit 8) were generated by adding the new site trips to the total background trips (Exhibit 5). The key intersections were analyzed with the total future traffic volumes, as reported below and on the following page. The CLV, HCM and SIDRA reports are included in Appendix I, II and III. Autoturn exhibits can be found in Appendix VI and show future truck traffic will be able to safely use the existing roundabouts with no modifications.

## CRITICAL LANE ANALYSIS

|  | AM <br> CLV(LOS) | PM <br> CLV(LOS) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| US 301 @ MD 313 | $383(A)$ | $437(A)$ |
| SB US 301 @ Chesterville Bridge Road | $238(A)$ | $281(A)$ |
| SB US 301 @ MD 701A Ramps | $161(A)$ | $183(A)$ |
| NB US 301 @ MD 701 Ramps | $124(A)$ | $193(A)$ |
| Chesterville Bridge Road @ MD 701A | $35(A)$ | $35(A)$ |
| Chesterville Bridge Road @ North Building Truck Access | $23(A)$ | $24(A)$ |
| MD 701A @ North Building Car Access | $45(A)$ | $66(A)$ |
| MD 701A @ South Building Truck Access | $39(A)$ | $53(A)$ |
| MD 701A @ South Building Car Access | $65(A)$ | $83(A)$ |

## HIGHWAY CAPACITY MANUAL, UNSIGNALIZED INTERSECTION (TWSC)

US 301 @ MD 313

Eastbound
Westbound
Northbound
Southbound

```
Approach LOS
    AM(PM)
    B(B)
    A(A)
    A(A)
    A(A)
```

SIDRA ROUNDABOUT ANYLSYS
US 291 @ MD 701A
Overall LOS
AM(PM)
A(A)
US 291 @ MD 701
Overall LOS
AM(PM)
A(A)




## Queuing Analysis

A queuing analysis was also conducted for the northbound left turn movement at the US 301 at MD 313 unsignalized intersection. The SHA 95 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Percentile Back-of-Queue formula was used to generate vehicle queues for the total future traffic volumes.

SHA Formula - Volume x Cycle Length $\times 1.4 \times 25$ = Queue 3600

US 40 @ Site Access (Unsignalized)

```
Eastbound Left
    AM Peak \(=[(82 \times 1.0) \times 90)] / 3600 \times 1.4 \times 25^{\prime}=72^{\prime}\)
    PM Peak \(=[(89 \times 1.0) \times 90)] / 3600 \times 1.4 \times 25^{\prime}=78^{\prime}\)
    Storage Length = 1500'
```


## CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Critical Lane Volume (CLV) results show that all of the study intersections would operate at "A" levels of service under the total future traffic condition. The Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) analysis determined the key intersections would operate with adequate " $B$ " or better conditions levels of service (LOS) at projected future traffic conditions. Sidra analysis determined the key roundabouts would operate at "A" levels of service under the total future traffic condition. Additionally, the queuing analyses show adequate storage is available at the key intersection where left turn bays exist.

Therefore, based on the study results, we recommend approval of this development from a traffic impact standpoint.


## APPENDIX I

CLV CALCULATIONS








## CRITICAL LANE ANALYSIS



## CRITICAL LANE ANALYSIS

|  | $=I C$ CEPTS |  |  | TRAFFIC VOLUMES |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | (PM) AM |  |  |  | AM | (PM) |
|  |  |  |  | (2) 9 $\qquad$ <br> (19) |  |  |  | $\begin{align*} & \boxed{-} 0(3) \\ & \boxed{-14}(5) \tag{5} \end{align*}$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | TOTAL VOLUME * LUF |  |  | OPPOSING LEFTS * LUF = |  |  |  | CRITICAL LANE VOLUME | $\begin{gathered} \text { LEVEL } \\ \text { OF } \\ \text { SERVICE } \end{gathered}$ |
| NB | 2 | * | 1 |  |  |  | $=$ | 2* |  |
| SB |  |  |  |  | $=$ |  |  | - |  |
| EB | $(9+10)$ | * | 1 | 14 | * | 1 |  | 33* | $\begin{gathered} \text { A } \\ 35 \end{gathered}$ |
| WB | 15 | * | 1 |  |  |  |  | 15 |  |
| NB | $(14+1)$ | * | 1 |  |  |  | $=$ | 15* |  |
| PM SB |  |  |  |  |  |  | = | - |  |
| EB | $(2+13)$ | * | 1 | 5 | * | 1 |  | 20* | A35 |
| WB | 9 | * |  |  |  |  |  | 9 |  |

## CRITICAL LANE ANALYSIS









## CRITICAL LANE ANALYSIS






APPENDIX II<br>HCM<br>CALCULATIONS

| General Information |  | Site Information |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Analyst | B. SCHMID | Intersection | ROUTE 301 AND MD 313 |
| Agency/Co. | TRAFFIC CONCEPTS, INC. | Jurisdiction | HARFORD |
| Date Performed | $1 / 10 / 2023$ | East/West Street | MD 313 |
| Analysis Year | 2023 | North/South Street | ROUTE 301 |
| Time Analyzed | EXISTING AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | 3906 |  |  |

## Lanes



Major Street: North-South
Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Configuration |  |  |  | R |  |  |  | R |  | L | T | R |  | L | T | R |
| Volume (veh/h) |  |  |  | 105 |  |  |  | 41 | 0 | 77 | 287 | 33 | 0 | 3 | 301 | 29 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  |  |  | 3 |  |  |  | 3 | 3 | 3 |  |  | 3 | 3 |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Critical and Follow-up Headways

| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  |  |  | 6.9 |  |  |  | 6.9 |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  |  |  | 6.96 |  |  |  | 6.96 |  | 4.16 |  |  |  | 4.16 |  |  |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  |  |  | 3.3 |  |  |  | 3.3 |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  |  |  | 3.33 |  |  |  | 3.33 |  | 2.23 |  |  |  | 2.23 |  |  |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service



| General Information |  | Site Information |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Analyst | B. SCHMID | Intersection | ROUTE 301 AND MD 313 |
| Agency/Co. | TRAFFIC CONCEPTS, INC. | Jurisdiction | HARFORD |
| Date Performed | $1 / 10 / 2023$ | East/West Street | MD 313 |
| Analysis Year | 2023 | North/South Street | ROUTE 301 |
| Time Analyzed | EXISTING PM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | 3906 |  |  |

## Lanes



Major Street: North-South
Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Configuration |  |  |  | R |  |  |  | R |  | L | T | R |  | L | T | R |
| Volume (veh/h) |  |  |  | 124 |  |  |  | 39 | 0 | 80 | 381 | 41 | 0 | 9 | 371 | 41 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  |  |  | 3 |  |  |  | 3 | 3 | 3 |  |  | 3 | 3 |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Critical and Follow-up Headways

| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  |  |  | 6.9 |  |  |  | 6.9 |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  |  |  | 6.96 |  |  |  | 6.96 |  | 4.16 |  |  |  | 4.16 |  |  |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  |  |  | 3.3 |  |  |  | 3.3 |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  |  |  | 3.33 |  |  |  | 3.33 |  | 2.23 |  |  |  | 2.23 |  |  |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service



| General Information |  | Site Information |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Analyst | B. SCHMID | Intersection | ROUTE 301 AND MD 313 |
| Agency/Co. | TRAFFIC CONCEPTS, INC. | Jurisdiction | HARFORD |
| Date Performed | $1 / 10 / 2023$ | East/West Street | MD 313 |
| Analysis Year | 2023 | North/South Street | ROUTE 301 |
| Time Analyzed | EXISTING AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | 3906 |  |  |

## Lanes



Major Street: North-South
Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Configuration |  |  |  | R |  |  |  | R |  | L | T | R |  | L | T | R |
| Volume (veh/h) |  |  |  | 109 |  |  |  | 41 | 0 | 80 | 298 | 33 | 0 | 3 | 313 | 29 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  |  |  | 3 |  |  |  | 3 | 3 | 3 |  |  | 3 | 3 |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Critical and Follow-up Headways

| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  |  |  | 6.9 |  |  |  | 6.9 |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  |  |  | 6.96 |  |  |  | 6.96 |  | 4.16 |  |  |  | 4.16 |  |  |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  |  |  | 3.3 |  |  |  | 3.3 |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  |  |  | 3.33 |  |  |  | 3.33 |  | 2.23 |  |  |  | 2.23 |  |  |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service



| General Information |  | Site Information |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Analyst | B. SCHMID | Intersection | ROUTE 301 AND MD 313 |
| Agency/Co. | TRAFFIC CONCEPTS, INC. | Jurisdiction | HARFORD |
| Date Performed | $1 / 10 / 2023$ | East/West Street | MD 313 |
| Analysis Year | 2023 | North/South Street | ROUTE 301 |
| Time Analyzed | BACKGROUND PM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | 3906 |  |  |

## Lanes



Major Street: North-South
Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Configuration |  |  |  | R |  |  |  | R |  | L | T | R |  | L | T | R |
| Volume (veh/h) |  |  |  | 129 |  |  |  | 39 | 0 | 83 | 396 | 41 | 0 | 9 | 386 | 41 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  |  |  | 3 |  |  |  | 3 | 3 | 3 |  |  | 3 | 3 |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Critical and Follow-up Headways

| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  |  |  | 6.9 |  |  |  | 6.9 |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  |  |  | 6.96 |  |  |  | 6.96 |  | 4.16 |  |  |  | 4.16 |  |  |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  |  |  | 3.3 |  |  |  | 3.3 |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  |  |  | 3.33 |  |  |  | 3.33 |  | 2.23 |  |  |  | 2.23 |  |  |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service



| General Information |  | Site Information |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Analyst | B. SCHMID | Intersection | ROUTE 301 AND MD 313 |
| Agency/Co. | TRAFFIC CONCEPTS, INC. | Jurisdiction | HARFORD |
| Date Performed | $1 / 10 / 2023$ | East/West Street | MD 313 |
| Analysis Year | 2025 | North/South Street | ROUTE 301 |
| Time Analyzed | FUTURE AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | 3906 |  |  |

## Lanes



Major Street: North-South
Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Configuration |  |  |  | R |  |  |  | R |  | L | T | R |  | L | T | R |
| Volume (veh/h) |  |  |  | 116 |  |  |  | 41 | 0 | 82 | 305 | 33 | 0 | 3 | 336 | 29 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  |  |  | 3 |  |  |  | 3 | 3 | 3 |  |  | 3 | 3 |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Critical and Follow-up Headways

| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  |  |  | 6.9 |  |  |  | 6.9 |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  |  |  | 6.96 |  |  |  | 6.96 |  | 4.16 |  |  |  | 4.16 |  |  |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  |  |  | 3.3 |  |  |  | 3.3 |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  |  |  | 3.33 |  |  |  | 3.33 |  | 2.23 |  |  |  | 2.23 |  |  |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service



| General Information |  | Site Information |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Analyst | B. SCHMID | Intersection | ROUTE 301 AND MD 313 |
| Agency/Co. | TRAFFIC CONCEPTS, INC. | Jurisdiction | HARFORD |
| Date Performed | $1 / 10 / 2023$ | East/West Street | MD 313 |
| Analysis Year | 2025 | North/South Street | ROUTE 301 |
| Time Analyzed | FUTURE PM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | 3906 |  |  |

## Lanes



Major Street: North-South
Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Configuration |  |  |  | R |  |  |  | R |  | L | T | R |  | L | T | R |
| Volume (veh/h) |  |  |  | 131 |  |  |  | 39 | 0 | 89 | 419 | 41 | 0 | 9 | 394 | 41 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  |  |  | 3 |  |  |  | 3 | 3 | 3 |  |  | 3 | 3 |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Critical and Follow-up Headways

| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  |  |  | 6.9 |  |  |  | 6.9 |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  |  |  | 6.96 |  |  |  | 6.96 |  | 4.16 |  |  |  | 4.16 |  |  |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  |  |  | 3.3 |  |  |  | 3.3 |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  |  |  | 3.33 |  |  |  | 3.33 |  | 2.23 |  |  |  | 2.23 |  |  |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service




# APPENDIX III SIDRA <br> CALCULATIONS 

## SITE LAYOUT

© Site: 101 [MD 291 @ MD 701 - FUT AM (Site Folder: General)]
\#3906
Site Category: (None)
Roundabout

Layout pictures are schematic functional drawings reflecting input data. They are not design drawings.


## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

® Site: 101 [MD 291 @ MD 701 - EX AM (Site Folder: General)]
\#3906
Site Category: (None)
Roundabout

| Vehicle Movement Performance |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mov Turn } \\ & \text { ID } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { JT } \\ & \text { MES } \\ & \text { HV ] } \\ & \% \end{aligned}$ |  | ND NS HV ] \% | Deg. Satn <br> v/c | Aver. Delay <br> sec | Level of Service |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CK OF } \\ & \text { UE } \\ & \text { Dist ] } \\ & \text { ft } \end{aligned}$ | Prop. Que | Effective Stop Rate | Aver. No. Cycles | Aver. Speed <br> mph |
| South: Delmarva Power |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 L2 | 1 | 3.0 | 1 | 3.0 | 0.003 | 3.2 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.27 | 0.11 | 0.27 | 34.4 |
| 8 T1 | 1 | 3.0 | 1 | 3.0 | 0.003 | 3.2 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.27 | 0.11 | 0.27 | 34.5 |
| 18 R2 | 1 | 3.0 | 1 | 3.0 | 0.003 | 3.2 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.27 | 0.11 | 0.27 | 33.7 |
| Approach | 3 | 3.0 | 3 | 3.0 | 0.003 | 3.2 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.27 | 0.11 | 0.27 | 34.2 |
| East: MD 291 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 L2 | 1 | 3.0 | 1 | 3.0 | 0.101 | 3.6 | LOS A | 0.5 | 11.6 | 0.14 | 0.05 | 0.14 | 35.0 |
| 6 T1 | 107 | 3.0 | 113 | 3.0 | 0.101 | 3.6 | LOS A | 0.5 | 11.6 | 0.14 | 0.05 | 0.14 | 35.1 |
| 16 R2 | 16 | 3.0 | 17 | 3.0 | 0.101 | 3.6 | LOS A | 0.5 | 11.6 | 0.14 | 0.05 | 0.14 | 34.2 |
| Approach | 124 | 3.0 | 131 | 3.0 | 0.101 | 3.6 | LOS A | 0.5 | 11.6 | 0.14 | 0.05 | 0.14 | 35.0 |
| North: MD 701 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 L2 | 16 | 3.0 | 17 | 3.0 | 0.048 | 3.4 | LOS A | 0.2 | 5.1 | 0.25 | 0.12 | 0.25 | 34.4 |
| 4 T1 | 1 | 3.0 | 1 | 3.0 | 0.048 | 3.4 | LOS A | 0.2 | 5.1 | 0.25 | 0.12 | 0.25 | 34.5 |
| 14 R2 | 37 | 3.0 | 39 | 3.0 | 0.048 | 3.4 | LOS A | 0.2 | 5.1 | 0.25 | 0.12 | 0.25 | 33.6 |
| Approach | 54 | 3.0 | 57 | 3.0 | 0.048 | 3.4 | LOS A | 0.2 | 5.1 | 0.25 | 0.12 | 0.25 | 33.9 |
| West: MD 291 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 L2 | 34 | 3.0 | 36 | 3.0 | 0.099 | 3.5 | LOS A | 0.4 | 11.3 | 0.09 | 0.02 | 0.09 | 34.3 |
| 2 T1 | 88 | 3.0 | 93 | 3.0 | 0.099 | 3.5 | LOS A | 0.4 | 11.3 | 0.09 | 0.02 | 0.09 | 34.4 |
| 12 R 2 | 1 | 3.0 | 1 | 3.0 | 0.099 | 3.5 | LOS A | 0.4 | 11.3 | 0.09 | 0.02 | 0.09 | 33.6 |
| Approach | 123 | 3.0 | 129 | 3.0 | 0.099 | 3.5 | LOS A | 0.4 | 11.3 | 0.09 | 0.02 | 0.09 | 34.4 |
| All Vehicles | 304 | 3.0 | 320 | 3.0 | 0.101 | 3.5 | LOS A | 0.5 | 11.6 | 0.14 | 0.05 | 0.14 | 34.5 |

Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 6). Site LOS Method is specified in the Parameter Settings dialog (Site tab).
Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Sign Control.
Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio (degree of saturation) per movement.
LOS F will result if $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}>1$ irrespective of movement delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection).
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used as specified in HCM 6).
Roundabout Capacity Model: US HCM 6.
Delay Model: HCM Delay Formula (Geometric Delay is not included).
Queue Model: HCM Queue Formula.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: Traditional M1.
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.
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## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

- 8 Site: 101 [MD 291 @ MD 701 - EX AM (Site Folder: General)]
\#3906
Site Category: (None)
Roundabout

| Vehicle Movement Performance |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mov Turn ID |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { JT } \\ & \text { MES } \\ & \text { HV ] } \\ & \% \end{aligned}$ |  | ND NS HV ] \% | Deg. Satn <br> v/c | Aver. Delay <br> sec | Level of Service | 95\% B <br> [ Veh. <br> veh | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CK OF } \\ & \text { UE } \\ & \text { Dist ] } \\ & \text { ft } \end{aligned}$ | Prop. Que | Effective Stop Rate |  | Aver. Speed <br> mph |
| South: Delmarva Power |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 L2 | 1 | 3.0 | 1 | 3.0 | 0.003 | 3.6 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.38 | 0.19 | 0.38 | 34.2 |
| 8 T1 | 1 | 3.0 | 1 | 3.0 | 0.003 | 3.6 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.38 | 0.19 | 0.38 | 34.3 |
| 18 R2 | 1 | 3.0 | 1 | 3.0 | 0.003 | 3.6 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.38 | 0.19 | 0.38 | 33.5 |
| Approach | 3 | 3.0 | 3 | 3.0 | 0.003 | 3.6 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.38 | 0.19 | 0.38 | 34.0 |
| East: MD 291 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 L2 | 1 | 3.0 | 1 | 3.0 | 0.117 | 3.9 | LOS A | 0.5 | 13.5 | 0.21 | 0.09 | 0.21 | 34.8 |
| 6 T1 | 113 | 3.0 | 124 | 3.0 | 0.117 | 3.9 | LOS A | 0.5 | 13.5 | 0.21 | 0.09 | 0.21 | 34.9 |
| 16 R2 | 18 | 3.0 | 20 | 3.0 | 0.117 | 3.9 | LOS A | 0.5 | 13.5 | 0.21 | 0.09 | 0.21 | 34.1 |
| Approach | 132 | 3.0 | 145 | 3.0 | 0.117 | 3.9 | LOS A | 0.5 | 13.5 | 0.21 | 0.09 | 0.21 | 34.8 |
| North: MD 701 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 L2 | 40 | 3.0 | 44 | 3.0 | 0.061 | 3.6 | LOS A | 0.3 | 6.6 | 0.27 | 0.13 | 0.27 | 33.5 |
| 4 T1 | 1 | 3.0 | 1 | 3.0 | 0.061 | 3.6 | LOS A | 0.3 | 6.6 | 0.27 | 0.13 | 0.27 | 33.6 |
| 14 R2 | 24 | 3.0 | 26 | 3.0 | 0.061 | 3.6 | LOS A | 0.3 | 6.6 | 0.27 | 0.13 | 0.27 | 32.8 |
| Approach | 65 | 3.0 | 71 | 3.0 | 0.061 | 3.6 | LOS A | 0.3 | 6.6 | 0.27 | 0.13 | 0.27 | 33.3 |
| West: MD 291 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 L2 | 68 | 3.0 | 75 | 3.0 | 0.181 | 4.3 | LOS A | 0.9 | 22.5 | 0.17 | 0.06 | 0.17 | 33.8 |
| 2 T1 | 141 | 3.0 | 155 | 3.0 | 0.181 | 4.3 | LOS A | 0.9 | 22.5 | 0.17 | 0.06 | 0.17 | 33.9 |
| 12 R 2 | 1 | 3.0 | 1 | 3.0 | 0.181 | 4.3 | LOS A | 0.9 | 22.5 | 0.17 | 0.06 | 0.17 | 33.1 |
| Approach | 210 | 3.0 | 231 | 3.0 | 0.181 | 4.3 | LOS A | 0.9 | 22.5 | 0.17 | 0.06 | 0.17 | 33.9 |
| All Vehicles | 410 | 3.0 | 451 | 3.0 | 0.181 | 4.1 | LOS A | 0.9 | 22.5 | 0.20 | 0.09 | 0.20 | 34.1 |

Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 6). Site LOS Method is specified in the Parameter Settings dialog (Site tab).
Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Sign Control.
Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio (degree of saturation) per movement.
LOS F will result if $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}>1$ irrespective of movement delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection).
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used as specified in HCM 6).
Roundabout Capacity Model: US HCM 6.
Delay Model: HCM Delay Formula (Geometric Delay is not included).
Queue Model: HCM Queue Formula.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: Traditional M1.
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.
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## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

© Site: 101 [MD 291 @ MD 701 - BACK AM (Site Folder: General)]
\#3906
Site Category: (None)
Roundabout

| Vehicle Movement Performance |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mov Turn } \\ & \text { ID } \end{aligned}$ | INPUT VOLUMES |  | DEMAND FLOWS |  | Deg. Satn <br> v/c | Aver. Delay <br> sec | Level of Service | 95\% BACK OF QUEUE |  | Prop. Que | Effective Stop Rate | Aver. No. Cycles | Aver. <br> Speed <br> mph |
| South: Delmarva Power |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 L2 | 1 | 3.0 | 1 | 3.0 | 0.003 | 3.2 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.28 | 0.11 | 0.28 | 34.4 |
| 8 T1 | 1 | 3.0 | 1 | 3.0 | 0.003 | 3.2 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.28 | 0.11 | 0.28 | 34.5 |
| 18 R2 | 1 | 3.0 | 1 | 3.0 | 0.003 | 3.2 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.28 | 0.11 | 0.28 | 33.7 |
| Approach | 3 | 3.0 | 3 | 3.0 | 0.003 | 3.2 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.28 | 0.11 | 0.28 | 34.2 |
| East: MD 291 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 L2 | 1 | 3.0 | 1 | 3.0 | 0.105 | 3.6 | LOS A | 0.5 | 12.0 | 0.14 | 0.05 | 0.14 | 34.9 |
| 6 T1 | 111 | 3.0 | 117 | 3.0 | 0.105 | 3.6 | LOS A | 0.5 | 12.0 | 0.14 | 0.05 | 0.14 | 35.1 |
| 16 R2 | 16 | 3.0 | 17 | 3.0 | 0.105 | 3.6 | LOS A | 0.5 | 12.0 | 0.14 | 0.05 | 0.14 | 34.2 |
| Approach | 128 | 3.0 | 135 | 3.0 | 0.105 | 3.6 | LOS A | 0.5 | 12.0 | 0.14 | 0.05 | 0.14 | 35.0 |
| North: MD 701 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 L2 | 16 | 3.0 | 17 | 3.0 | 0.048 | 3.4 | LOS A | 0.2 | 5.1 | 0.26 | 0.12 | 0.26 | 34.3 |
| 4 T1 | 1 | 3.0 | 1 | 3.0 | 0.048 | 3.4 | LOS A | 0.2 | 5.1 | 0.26 | 0.12 | 0.26 | 34.5 |
| 14 R2 | 37 | 3.0 | 39 | 3.0 | 0.048 | 3.4 | LOS A | 0.2 | 5.1 | 0.26 | 0.12 | 0.26 | 33.6 |
| Approach | 54 | 3.0 | 57 | 3.0 | 0.048 | 3.4 | LOS A | 0.2 | 5.1 | 0.26 | 0.12 | 0.26 | 33.9 |
| West: MD 291 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 L2 | 34 | 3.0 | 36 | 3.0 | 0.102 | 3.6 | LOS A | 0.5 | 11.7 | 0.09 | 0.02 | 0.09 | 34.3 |
| 2 T1 | 92 | 3.0 | 97 | 3.0 | 0.102 | 3.6 | LOS A | 0.5 | 11.7 | 0.09 | 0.02 | 0.09 | 34.5 |
| 12 R 2 | 1 | 3.0 | 1 | 3.0 | 0.102 | 3.6 | LOS A | 0.5 | 11.7 | 0.09 | 0.02 | 0.09 | 33.6 |
| Approach | 127 | 3.0 | 134 | 3.0 | 0.102 | 3.6 | LOS A | 0.5 | 11.7 | 0.09 | 0.02 | 0.09 | 34.4 |
| All Vehicles | 312 | 3.0 | 328 | 3.0 | 0.105 | 3.6 | LOS A | 0.5 | 12.0 | 0.14 | 0.05 | 0.14 | 34.5 |

Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 6). Site LOS Method is specified in the Parameter Settings dialog (Site tab).
Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Sign Control.
Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and v/c ratio (degree of saturation) per movement.
LOS F will result if $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}>1$ irrespective of movement delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection).
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used as specified in HCM 6).
Roundabout Capacity Model: US HCM 6.
Delay Model: HCM Delay Formula (Geometric Delay is not included).
Queue Model: HCM Queue Formula.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: Traditional M1.
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.
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## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

- Site: 101 [MD 291 @ MD 701 - BACK PM (Site Folder: General)]
\#3906
Site Category: (None)
Roundabout


Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 6). Site LOS Method is specified in the Parameter Settings dialog (Site tab).
Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Sign Control.
Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio (degree of saturation) per movement.
LOS F will result if $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}>1$ irrespective of movement delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection).
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used as specified in HCM 6).
Roundabout Capacity Model: US HCM 6.
Delay Model: HCM Delay Formula (Geometric Delay is not included).
Queue Model: HCM Queue Formula.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: Traditional M1.
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.
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## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

B Site: 101 [MD 291 @ MD 701 - FUT AM (Site Folder: General)]
\#3906
Site Category: (None)
Roundabout

| Vehicle Movement Performance |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { INF } \\ & \text { VOL } \\ & \text { [ Total } \\ & \text { veh/h } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { JT } \\ & \text { MES } \\ & \text { HV ] } \\ & \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DEN } \\ & \text { FLC } \\ & \text { [ Total } \\ & \text { veh/h } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ND } \\ & \text { VS } \\ & \text { HV ] } \\ & \% \end{aligned}$ | Deg. Satn <br> v/c | Aver. Delay <br> sec | Level of Service | $\begin{gathered} 95 \% \text { B } \\ \text { Qu } \\ \text { [ Veh. } \\ \text { veh } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { CK OF } \\ \text { UE } \\ \text { Dist ] } \\ \text { ft } \end{gathered}$ | Prop. Que | Effective Stop Rate | Aver. No. Cycles | Aver. Speed <br> mph |
| South: Delmarva Power |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | L2 | 1 | 3.0 | 1 | 3.0 | 0.003 | 3.2 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.28 | 0.11 | 0.28 | 34.4 |
| 8 | T1 | 1 | 3.0 | 1 | 3.0 | 0.003 | 3.2 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.28 | 0.11 | 0.28 | 34.5 |
| 18 | R2 | 1 | 3.0 | 1 | 3.0 | 0.003 | 3.2 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.28 | 0.11 | 0.28 | 33.7 |
| Appr | ach | 3 | 3.0 | 3 | 3.0 | 0.003 | 3.2 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.28 | 0.11 | 0.28 | 34.2 |
| East: MD 291 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | L2 | 1 | 3.0 | 1 | 3.0 | 0.110 | 3.7 | LOS A | 0.5 | 12.8 | 0.14 | 0.05 | 0.14 | 34.9 |
| 6 | T1 | 118 | 3.0 | 124 | 3.0 | 0.110 | 3.7 | LOS A | 0.5 | 12.8 | 0.14 | 0.05 | 0.14 | 35.0 |
| 16 | R2 | 16 | 3.0 | 17 | 3.0 | 0.110 | 3.7 | LOS A | 0.5 | 12.8 | 0.14 | 0.05 | 0.14 | 34.2 |
| Appr | ach | 135 | 3.0 | 142 | 3.0 | 0.110 | 3.7 | LOS A | 0.5 | 12.8 | 0.14 | 0.05 | 0.14 | 34.9 |
| North: MD 701 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | L2 | 16 | 3.0 | 17 | 3.0 | 0.069 | 3.6 | LOS A | 0.3 | 7.5 | 0.27 | 0.14 | 0.27 | 34.5 |
| 4 | T1 | 1 | 3.0 | 1 | 3.0 | 0.069 | 3.6 | LOS A | 0.3 | 7.5 | 0.27 | 0.14 | 0.27 | 34.6 |
| 14 | R2 | 60 | 3.0 | 63 | 3.0 | 0.069 | 3.6 | LOS A | 0.3 | 7.5 | 0.27 | 0.14 | 0.27 | 33.7 |
| Approach |  | 77 | 3.0 | 81 | 3.0 | 0.069 | 3.6 | LOS A | 0.3 | 7.5 | 0.27 | 0.14 | 0.27 | 33.9 |
| West: MD 291 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | L2 | 35 | 3.0 | 37 | 3.0 | 0.104 | 3.6 | LOS A | 0.5 | 12.0 | 0.09 | 0.02 | 0.09 | 34.3 |
| 2 | T1 | 94 | 3.0 | 99 | 3.0 | 0.104 | 3.6 | LOS A | 0.5 | 12.0 | 0.09 | 0.02 | 0.09 | 34.4 |
| 12 | R2 | 1 | 3.0 | 1 | 3.0 | 0.104 | 3.6 | LOS A | 0.5 | 12.0 | 0.09 | 0.02 | 0.09 | 33.6 |
| Appr | ach | 130 | 3.0 | 137 | 3.0 | 0.104 | 3.6 | LOS A | 0.5 | 12.0 | 0.09 | 0.02 | 0.09 | 34.4 |
| All V | hicles | 345 | 3.0 | 363 | 3.0 | 0.110 | 3.6 | LOS A | 0.5 | 12.8 | 0.15 | 0.06 | 0.15 | 34.5 |

Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 6). Site LOS Method is specified in the Parameter Settings dialog (Site tab).
Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Sign Control.
Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio (degree of saturation) per movement.
LOS F will result if $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}>1$ irrespective of movement delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection).
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used as specified in HCM 6).
Roundabout Capacity Model: US HCM 6.
Delay Model: HCM Delay Formula (Geometric Delay is not included).
Queue Model: HCM Queue Formula.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: Traditional M1.
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.
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## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

B Site: 101 [MD 291 @ MD 701 - FUT PM (Site Folder: General)]
\#3906
Site Category: (None)
Roundabout


Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 6). Site LOS Method is specified in the Parameter Settings dialog (Site tab).
Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Sign Control.
Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and v/c ratio (degree of saturation) per movement.
LOS F will result if $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}>1$ irrespective of movement delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection).
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used as specified in HCM 6).
Roundabout Capacity Model: US HCM 6.
Delay Model: HCM Delay Formula (Geometric Delay is not included).
Queue Model: HCM Queue Formula.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: Traditional M1.
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.
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## SITE LAYOUT

- Site: 101 [MD 291 @ MD 701A - FUT AM (Site Folder: General)]
\#3906
Site Category: (None)
Roundabout

Layout pictures are schematic functional drawings reflecting input data. They are not design drawings.
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## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

® Site: 101 [MD 291 @ MD 701A - EX AM (Site Folder: General)]
\#3906
Site Category: (None)
Roundabout


Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 6). Site LOS Method is specified in the Parameter Settings dialog (Site tab).
Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Sign Control.
Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and v/c ratio (degree of saturation) per movement.
LOS F will result if $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}>1$ irrespective of movement delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection).
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used as specified in HCM 6).
Roundabout Capacity Model: US HCM 6.
Delay Model: HCM Delay Formula (Geometric Delay is not included).
Queue Model: HCM Queue Formula.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: Traditional M1.
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.
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## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

B Site: 101 [MD 291 @ MD 701A - EX PM (Site Folder: General)]
\#3906
Site Category: (None)
Roundabout


Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 6). Site LOS Method is specified in the Parameter Settings dialog (Site tab).
Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Sign Control.
Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio (degree of saturation) per movement.
LOS F will result if $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}>1$ irrespective of movement delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection).
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used as specified in HCM 6).
Roundabout Capacity Model: US HCM 6.
Delay Model: HCM Delay Formula (Geometric Delay is not included).
Queue Model: HCM Queue Formula.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: Traditional M1.
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.
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## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

## $\nabla$ Site: 101 [MD 291 @ MD 701A - BACK AM (Site Folder:

General)]
\#3906
Site Category: (None)
Roundabout


Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 6). Site LOS Method is specified in the Parameter Settings dialog (Site tab). Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Sign Control.
Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio (degree of saturation) per movement.
LOS F will result if $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}>1$ irrespective of movement delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection).
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used as specified in HCM 6).
Roundabout Capacity Model: US HCM 6.
Delay Model: HCM Delay Formula (Geometric Delay is not included).
Queue Model: HCM Queue Formula.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: Traditional M1.
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.

[^0]
## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

## B Site: 101 [MD 291 @ MD 701A - BACK PM (Site Folder:

General)]
\#3906
Site Category: (None)
Roundabout

| Vehicle Movement Performance |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mov Turn } \\ & \text { ID } \end{aligned}$ |  | INPUT VOLUMES |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ND } \\ & \text { VS } \\ & \text { HV ] } \\ & \% \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Deg. Satn <br> v/c | Aver. Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% BACK OF QUEUE |  | Prop. Que | Effective Stop Rate | Aver. Aver.  <br> No. Speed  <br> Cycles mph |  |
| South: Edge Rd |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | L2 | 3 | 3.0 | 3 | 3.0 | 0.006 | 3.6 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.6 | 0.38 | 0.20 | 0.38 | 33.5 |
| 8 | T1 | 1 | 3.0 | 1 | 3.0 | 0.006 | 3.6 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.6 | 0.38 | 0.20 | 0.38 | 33.6 |
| 18 | R2 | 1 | 3.0 | 1 | 3.0 | 0.006 | 3.6 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.6 | 0.38 | 0.20 | 0.38 | 32.9 |
| Appr | oach | 5 | 3.0 | 6 | 3.0 | 0.006 | 3.6 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.6 | 0.38 | 0.20 | 0.38 | 33.4 |
| East: MD 291 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | L2 | 1 | 3.0 | 1 | 3.0 | 0.124 | 3.8 | LOS A | 0.6 | 14.6 | 0.10 | 0.03 | 0.10 | 34.9 |
| 6 | T1 | 96 | 3.0 | 110 | 3.0 | 0.124 | 3.8 | LOS A | 0.6 | 14.6 | 0.10 | 0.03 | 0.10 | 35.0 |
| 16 | R2 | 44 | 3.0 | 51 | 3.0 | 0.124 | 3.8 | LOS A | 0.6 | 14.6 | 0.10 | 0.03 | 0.10 | 34.2 |
| Appr | ach | 141 | 3.0 | 162 | 3.0 | 0.124 | 3.8 | LOS A | 0.6 | 14.6 | 0.10 | 0.03 | 0.10 | 34.7 |
| North: MD 701A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | L2 | 51 | 3.0 | 59 | 3.0 | 0.095 | 3.8 | LOS A | 0.4 | 10.6 | 0.26 | 0.13 | 0.26 | 33.6 |
| 4 | T1 | 1 | 3.0 | 1 | 3.0 | 0.095 | 3.8 | LOS A | 0.4 | 10.6 | 0.26 | 0.13 | 0.26 | 33.7 |
| 14 | R2 | 46 | 3.0 | 53 | 3.0 | 0.095 | 3.8 | LOS A | 0.4 | 10.6 | 0.26 | 0.13 | 0.26 | 32.9 |
| Appr | ach | 98 | 3.0 | 113 | 3.0 | 0.095 | 3.8 | LOS A | 0.4 | 10.6 | 0.26 | 0.13 | 0.26 | 33.3 |
| West: MD 291 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | L2 | 15 | 3.0 | 17 | 3.0 | 0.166 | 4.3 | LOS A | 0.8 | 20.3 | 0.20 | 0.08 | 0.20 | 34.4 |
| 2 | T1 | 165 | 3.0 | 190 | 3.0 | 0.166 | 4.3 | LOS A | 0.8 | 20.3 | 0.20 | 0.08 | 0.20 | 34.5 |
| 12 | R2 | 2 | 3.0 | 2 | 3.0 | 0.166 | 4.3 | LOS A | 0.8 | 20.3 | 0.20 | 0.08 | 0.20 | 33.7 |
| Appr | ach | 182 | 3.0 | 209 | 3.0 | 0.166 | 4.3 | LOS A | 0.8 | 20.3 | 0.20 | 0.08 | 0.20 | 34.5 |
| All | hicles | 426 | 3.0 | 490 | 3.0 | 0.166 | 4.0 | LOS A | 0.8 | 20.3 | 0.18 | 0.08 | 0.18 | 34.3 |

Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 6). Site LOS Method is specified in the Parameter Settings dialog (Site tab). Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Sign Control.
Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and v/c ratio (degree of saturation) per movement.
LOS F will result if v/c > 1 irrespective of movement delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection).
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used as specified in HCM 6).
Roundabout Capacity Model: US HCM 6.
Delay Model: HCM Delay Formula (Geometric Delay is not included).
Queue Model: HCM Queue Formula.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: Traditional M1.
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.

## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

B Site: 101 [MD 291 @ MD 701A - FUT AM (Site Folder: General)]
\#3906
Site Category: (None)
Roundabout

| Vehicle Movement Performance |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mov Turn ID |  | INPUT VOLUMES |  | DEMAND FLOWS |  | Deg. Satn <br> v/c | Aver. Delay <br> sec | Level of Service | 95\% BACK OF QUEUE |  | Prop. Que | Effective Stop Rate |  | Aver. Speed <br> mph |
| South: Edge Rd |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | L2 | 2 | 3.0 | 2 | 3.0 | 0.008 | 3.3 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.8 | 0.30 | 0.13 | 0.30 | 34.6 |
| 8 | T1 | 3 | 3.0 | 3 | 3.0 | 0.008 | 3.3 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.8 | 0.30 | 0.13 | 0.30 | 34.7 |
| 18 | R2 | 3 | 3.0 | 3 | 3.0 | 0.008 | 3.3 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.8 | 0.30 | 0.13 | 0.30 | 33.8 |
| Appr | ach | 8 | 3.0 | 9 | 3.0 | 0.008 | 3.3 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.8 | 0.30 | 0.13 | 0.30 | 34.3 |
| East: MD 291 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | L2 | 5 | 3.0 | 5 | 3.0 | 0.148 | 4.0 | LOS A | 0.7 | 17.9 | 0.12 | 0.03 | 0.12 | 34.7 |
| 6 | T1 | 114 | 3.0 | 124 | 3.0 | 0.148 | 4.0 | LOS A | 0.7 | 17.9 | 0.12 | 0.03 | 0.12 | 34.8 |
| 16 | R2 | 59 | 3.0 | 64 | 3.0 | 0.148 | 4.0 | LOS A | 0.7 | 17.9 | 0.12 | 0.03 | 0.12 | 34.0 |
| Appr | ach | 178 | 3.0 | 193 | 3.0 | 0.148 | 4.0 | LOS A | 0.7 | 17.9 | 0.12 | 0.03 | 0.12 | 34.5 |
| North: MD 701A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | L2 | 34 | 3.0 | 37 | 3.0 | 0.073 | 3.7 | LOS A | 0.3 | 7.9 | 0.28 | 0.14 | 0.28 | 33.9 |
| 4 | T1 | 1 | 3.0 | 1 | 3.0 | 0.073 | 3.7 | LOS A | 0.3 | 7.9 | 0.28 | 0.14 | 0.28 | 34.0 |
| 14 | R2 | 43 | 3.0 | 47 | 3.0 | 0.073 | 3.7 | LOS A | 0.3 | 7.9 | 0.28 | 0.14 | 0.28 | 33.2 |
| Appr | ach | 78 | 3.0 | 85 | 3.0 | 0.073 | 3.7 | LOS A | 0.3 | 7.9 | 0.28 | 0.14 | 0.28 | 33.5 |
| West: MD 291 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | L2 | 18 | 3.0 | 20 | 3.0 | 0.102 | 3.6 | LOS A | 0.5 | 11.7 | 0.15 | 0.05 | 0.15 | 34.6 |
| 2 | T1 | 101 | 3.0 | 110 | 3.0 | 0.102 | 3.6 | LOS A | 0.5 | 11.7 | 0.15 | 0.05 | 0.15 | 34.7 |
| 12 | R2 | 1 | 3.0 | 1 | 3.0 | 0.102 | 3.6 | LOS A | 0.5 | 11.7 | 0.15 | 0.05 | 0.15 | 33.9 |
| Appr | ach | 120 | 3.0 | 130 | 3.0 | 0.102 | 3.6 | LOS A | 0.5 | 11.7 | 0.15 | 0.05 | 0.15 | 34.7 |
| All V | hicles | 384 | 3.0 | 417 | 3.0 | 0.148 | 3.8 | LOS A | 0.7 | 17.9 | 0.16 | 0.06 | 0.16 | 34.4 |

Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 6). Site LOS Method is specified in the Parameter Settings dialog (Site tab).
Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Sign Control.
Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and v/c ratio (degree of saturation) per movement.
LOS F will result if $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}>1$ irrespective of movement delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection).
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used as specified in HCM 6).
Roundabout Capacity Model: US HCM 6.
Delay Model: HCM Delay Formula (Geometric Delay is not included).
Queue Model: HCM Queue Formula.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: Traditional M1.
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.
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## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

B Site: 101 [MD 291 @ MD 701A - FUT PM (Site Folder: General)]
\#3906
Site Category: (None)
Roundabout


Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 6). Site LOS Method is specified in the Parameter Settings dialog (Site tab).
Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Sign Control.
Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and v/c ratio (degree of saturation) per movement.
LOS F will result if $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}>1$ irrespective of movement delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection).
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used as specified in HCM 6).
Roundabout Capacity Model: US HCM 6.
Delay Model: HCM Delay Formula (Geometric Delay is not included).
Queue Model: HCM Queue Formula.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: Traditional M1.
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.
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# APPENDIX IV <br> TRAFFIC COUNT <br> INFORMATION 

184 Baker Rd
Coatesville, Pennsylvania, United States 19320
Serving Transportation Professionals Since 1995

Count Name: Rt. 301 \& MD 313
Site Code:
Start Date: 10/25/2022
Page No: 4


Turning Movement Peak Hour Data Plot (8:00 AM)

184 Baker Rd
Coatesville, Pennsylvania, United States 19320 610-466-1469
Serving Transportation Professionals Since 1995

Count Name: Rt. 301 \& MD 313
Site Code:
Start Date: 10/25/2022
Page No: 6


Turning Movement Peak Hour Data Plot (4:30 PM)


Count Name: Rt. 301 SB \&
Chesterville Bridge Rd
Site Code:
Start Date: 10/25/2022
Page No: 4


Turning Movement Peak Hour Data Plot (7:15 AM)

Count Name: Rt. 301 SB \&
Chesterville Bridge Rd
Site Code:
Start Date: 10/25/2022
Page No: 6


Turning Movement Peak Hour Data Plot (4:00 PM)


Kent County, MD
Chesterville Bridge Rd \& Edge
Rd
Tuesday, October 25, 2022
Location: 39.274795, -75.8651

Coatesville, Pennsylvania, United States 19320 610-466-1469
Serving Transportation Professionals Since 1995

Count Name: Chesterville Bridge Rd \& Edge Rd
Site Code:
Start Date: 10/25/2022
Page No: 4


Turning Movement Peak Hour Data Plot (7:00 AM)

Kent County, MD
Chesterville Bridge Rd \& Edge
Rd
Tuesday, October 25, 2022
Location: 39.274795, -75.8651

Coatesville, Pennsylvania, United States 19320
610-466-1469
Serving Transportation Professionals Since 1995

Count Name: Chesterville Bridge Rd \& Edge Rd
Site Code:
Start Date: 10/25/2022
Page No: 6


Turning Movement Peak Hour Data Plot (4:30 PM)


Kent County, MD
MD 701A \& Route 301 SB
Ramps
Tuesday, October 25, 2022
Location: 39.266222,
75.865035
www.TSTData.com
184 Baker Rd
Coatesville, Pennsylvania, United States 19320
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APPENDIX V SITE PLAN \&<br>ITE TRIP DATA




## Warehousing <br> (150)

Vehicle Trip Ends vs: 1000 Sq. Ft. GFA
On a: Weekday,
Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic, One Hour Between 7 and 9 a.m.
Setting/Location: General Urban/Suburban
Number of Studies:
36
Avg. 1000 Sq. Ft. GFA: 448
Directional Distribution: 77\% entering, 23\% exiting
Vehicle Trip Generation per 1000 Sq. Ft. GFA

| Average Rate | Range of Rates | Standard Deviation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0.17 | $0.02-1.93$ | 0.19 |

Data Plot and Equation


## Warehousing <br> (150)

Vehicle Trip Ends vs: 1000 Sq. Ft. GFA
On a: Weekday,
Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic, One Hour Between 4 and 6 p.m.
Setting/Location: General Urban/Suburban
Number of Studies:
49
Avg. 1000 Sq. Ft. GFA: 400
Directional Distribution: 28\% entering, 72\% exiting
Vehicle Trip Generation per 1000 Sq. Ft. GFA

| Average Rate | Range of Rates | Standard Deviation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0.18 | $0.01-1.80$ | 0.18 |

Data Plot and Equation


## Warehousing (150)

Truck Trip Ends vs: 1000 Sq. Ft. GFA
On a: Weekday, Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic, One Hour Between 7 and 9 a.m.
Setting/Location: General Urban/Suburban
Number of Studies: 21
Avg. 1000 Sq. Ft. GFA: 309
Directional Distribution: 52\% entering, 48\% exiting
Truck Trip Generation per 1000 Sq. Ft. GFA

| Average Rate | Range of Rates | Standard Deviation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0.02 | $0.00-0.69$ | 0.05 |

Data Plot and Equation


## Warehousing (150)

Truck Trip Ends vs: 1000 Sq. Ft. GFA
On a: Weekday,
Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic,
One Hour Between 4 and 6 p.m.
Setting/Location: General Urban/Suburban
Number of Studies: 23
Avg. 1000 Sq. Ft. GFA: 308
Directional Distribution: 52\% entering, 48\% exiting
Truck Trip Generation per 1000 Sq. Ft. GFA

| Average Rate | Range of Rates | Standard Deviation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0.03 | $0.00-0.42$ | 0.03 |

Data Plot and Equation


# APPENDIX VI AUTOTURN EXHIBITS 














## SITE PLAN APPLICATION

| File Number: |  |  | Amount Paid: |  |  | Date: |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Name: | LOT 1 - Evel | Industria |  | arehouse |  |  |  |  |
| District: 1st | Map: 31 | Parcel: | 6-1 | Lot Size: 20.543 ac | Deed Ref: | MLM 892/458 | Zoning: | EC |

LOCATION: west side of Maryland Route 301 near Millington, north of MD Rte 291 and south of Chesterville Bridge Road
PROPOSED USE: Industrial office/manufacturing/warehouse

## OWNER OF LAND:

Name: Millington Crossing Associates 1, LLC c/o Russ Richardson Telephofle-:275-2714
Address: P.O. Box 546, Chester Heights, PA 19017 Email: russ.richardson@rpcrealtors.com

## APPLICANT:

Name: Everton Industrial c/o Dan Gural Telephone: 609-929-6025

Address: 266 Atsion Road, Medford, NJ 08055 Email: dgural@evertonindustrial.net

AGENT/ATTORNEY (if any):
Name: $\qquad$ Telephone:

Address: $\qquad$ Email: $\qquad$

## REGISTERED ENGINEER OR SURVEYOR:

Name: DMS \& Associates, LLC c/o Kevin Shearon Telephone: 443-262-9130

Address: P.O. Box 80, Centreville, MD 21617 Email: kjs@,dmsandassociates.com

Please provide the email of the one person who will be responsible for responding to comments. Only this person will be contacted by staff and will be the person responsible for forwarding the comments or requests for additional information to any other interested parties. EMAL: kjs@dmsandassociates.com

Water Supply: $\boxtimes$ Public System On lot system
Sewerage: $\quad$ ® Public System On lot system
TELEPHONE SERVICED BY: Verizon
ELECTRIC SERVICED BY: Delmarva Power
NOTICE: The Planning Office is not required to make out this Application. If the Planning Department assists you, it cannot be held responsible for its contents.


| $\square$ Concept Plan | Approving Authority: | Date |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\boxtimes$ Preliminary | Approving Authority: | Date |
| $\square$ Final | Approving Authority: | Date |

# PROJECT NARRATIVE 

## Everton Industrial Development Lot 1 of the lands of Millington Crossing Associates 1, LLC Near Millington, Maryland

In accordance with Article VI, Section 5.4.B of the Kent County Zoning Ordinance, we offer the following:

The site is located on the west side of Maryland Route 301 near the Town of Millington. Following a subdivision process, this property will be identified as Tax Map 31, Parcel 6-1, Lot 1. This lot and Lot 2 are being subdivided from an overall 114.499 acre parcel owned by Millington Crossing Associates 1, LLC. Everton Industrial Development is the contract purchaser of Lot 1.

The lot is zoned Employment Center (EC) and will be 20.543 acres. The proposed development includes a 256,924 -sf flex manufacturing/warehouse building with associated parking and loading docks.

The building is proposed to be connected to the Town of Millington / Kent County public water and sewer systems. A 10" diameter water line will be extended from an existing 10 " main at the intersection of Edge Road and West Edge Road. The new main will extend along Edge Road past the two proposed lots to the intersection of Chesterville Bridge Road where it will be capped for future extension (by others) to loop back to the Town of Millington. A service lateral will be installed to connect the building to the new main. Fire hydrants will be provided along the route.

The building will also be served by public sewer. A grinder pump will be installed at the building. A small diameter force main lateral will connect to a new public 2 " force main that will run within MDOT SHA right-of-way to a connection point near Maryland Route 301 and West Edge Road.

Forest Conservation was addressed during the subdivision process and resulted in a deed restricted area of 6.41 acres.

In accordance with Section 14.9.B.1-7 we offer the following relative to standards for site design (responses in italics):

1. Site Access
a. Site access shall be subject to the following regulations to help ensure safety and alleviate traffic congestion:
i. Where property abuts a primary, secondary, or a collector road, access to the property shall be by way of the secondary or collector road. Exceptions to this rule shall be instances where the Planning Commission,
or where applicable the Planning Director, determines that direct access onto the primary road would promote traffic safety.

The proposed development is located just off of US Route 301, but takes access from Chesterville Bridge Road and Edge Road. One tractor trailer access will be located on Chestertville Bridge Road. The orientation of the access is on an angle to the existing road in order to avoid tractor trailers from turning north onto Chesterville Bridge Road. The second access point will occur off of Edge Road. Both roads are owned and maintained by Kent County.
ii. Where one or more contiguous parcels abutting a primary road are under single ownership and any one of the parcels abuts a secondary or collector road, access to the property shall be by of the secondary road. Exceptions to this rule shall be instances where the Planning Commission, or where applicable the Planning Director, determines that direct access onto the primary road would promote traffic safety.
$N / A$ - access to a primary road is not proposed.
iii. Only one direct approach onto a primary road from an individual parcel of record as of August 1, 1989 shall be permitted unless the Planning Commission, or where applicable the Planning Director, finds one of the following:

N/A - access to a primary road is not proposed.
iv. An additional entrance is significantly beneficial to the safety and operation of the highway.

1. One entrance is a safety hazard or increases traffic congestion.
2. The property is bisected by steep slopes, bodies of water, or other topographic feature so as to render some portion of the property inaccessible without additional road access.

N/A - access to a primary road is not proposed.
b. Where a proposed road is designated on an approved County or Town map, site plans for development adjacent to the designated roadway shall include provisions for future access to the roadway.

N/A - no new public roads are proposed.
c. Existing, planned, or platted streets on adjacent properties shall be continued when the Planning Commission or where applicable the Planning Director determines that the continuation is necessary for safe and reasonable circulation between the properties.

To our knowledge there are no existing, planned or platted streets on adjacent properties that would need to be connected through this development.
d. When deemed necessary by the Planning Commission or where applicable the Planning Director, developments shall provide access to adjacent tracts not presently developed.

Given the topography west of the proposed building sites, we request that a requirement to connect to adjacent tracts be waived.
e. Access shall be consolidated whenever possible.

The number of access points has been reduced from three to two.
f. Whenever possible, roads shall be constructed above the elevation of the 100 -year floodplain.

The entire development envelope is above the 100-year floodplain.
g. The applicant shall demonstrate that access to the project is adequate and the roads which will be impacted have the capacity to handle the traffic generated by the proposed project and will not endanger the safety of the general public.

A Traffic Impact Study was completed as part of the subdivision process.
The results show that all of the surrounding intersections will operate at Level of Service A or B following this development.

## 2. On-site Circulation

a. Sites shall be designed to prevent awkward or dangerous vehicular flow.

The site has been designed to separate employee/visitor vehicles from tractor trailers to the extent possible to promote a safer vehicular flow pattern.
b. Loading and unloading spaces shall not block the passage of other vehicles on the service drive or major pedestrian ways or create blind spots when trucks are loading or unloading.

All loading and unloading spaces are located behind or to the side of the building, away from other employee/visitor vehicles.
c. Sites shall be designed to discourage pedestrians and vehicles from sharing the same pathways.

Sidewalks have been provided along the building façade to aid in separating pedestrians from vehicles.
d. Safe, convenient, and centralized handicap parking shall be provided.

All ADA compliant spaces have been located closest to pedestrian entrance doors.
e. Trash boxes must be accessible to collection trucks when all vehicle parking spaces are filled.

Trash corrals will be located to the rear of the buildings to avoid conflict with employee/visitor vehicles.
f. Parking shall not be permitted in the required front yard.

With approval of the requested 50-ft width, no parking is located within the front yard.
3. Floodplain
a. In order to prevent excessive flood damage and to allow for the protection of the natural and beneficial floodplain functions, all development, new construction, and substantial improvements to existing structures in all floodplain zones shall comply with the requirements of Article VI, Section 7 of this Ordinance, including but not limited to the following:
i. Elevation of all new or substantially improved structures;
ii. Compliance with venting and other construction standards; and
iii. Submission and recordation, where applicable, of Elevation Certificates, Declaration of Land Restrictions, deed restrictions, and venting affidavits. $N / A$ - development area is not within the floodplain.
b. Placement of buildings and materials. In general, buildings and accessory structures should be located entirely out of the floodplain, out of the flood protection setback, or on land that is least susceptible to flooding. All structures permitted in the floodplain shall be oriented so as to offer the least resistance to the flow of floodwaters.

The proposed building is located out of the floodplain.
c. General development shall not occur in the floodplain where alternative locations exist. Before a permit is issued, the applicant shall demonstrate that new structures cannot be located out of the floodplain and that encroachments onto the floodplain are minimized.
$N / A$ - development area is not within the floodplain.
4. General Landscape Requirements
a. The front yard shall be landscaped and shall be maintained in a neat and attractive condition.

The front yards will be landscaped and maintained in a neat and attractive condition.
b. Sites shall be permanently maintained in good condition with at least the same quality and quantity of landscaping as originally proposed.

So noted.
c. The landscape plan shall be prepared by a registered professional forester, landscape architect, or other professional with equivalent experience and qualifications.

The landscape plan will be designed by a licensed landscape architect.
d. The Planning Commission, or where applicable the Planning Director, may waive the landscape requirements when it is demonstrated that the spirit and intent of the requirement is accomplished through other means or the nature of the change is one that does not require additional landscaping.

So noted.
5. Screening
a. Screening is required to protect adjoining properties and roadways from noise, glare, and uses which are visually incompatible with neighboring land uses. Screening is required:
i. On sites which involve loading or unloading (including the storage of vehicles and boats), trash, or disposal areas and where accessory buildings and structures are adjacent to residential properties.

The site layouts have been designed to have all loading / unloading areas facing away from adjacent properties and public roads to the extent possible. Screening has been provided where areas may be visible.
ii. Where exterior storage areas are visible from roadways, sidewalks, or nearby residential properties.
$N / A$
iii. When noise not typically occurring in residential areas is expected to project onto nearby properties.

It is not anticipated that excessive noise will occur at this site. Once an end user is identified, we will provide information relative to the Industrial Performance Standards.
iv. To screen parking areas from motorists, pedestrians, and adjoining residential properties.

Natural screening exists for these properties between Edge Road and US Route 301. Additional screening has been added along Chesterville Bridge Road near the existing residential homes.
v. Where the industrial district abuts a residential district or a primary or secondary road.

The property abuts agricultural fields and a few residences, and a service road. Additional screening has been added along Chesterville Bridge Road near the existing residential homes.
vi. Where the Planning Commission determines that additional screening is necessary to protect properties in the area.

So noted.
b. Landscaped screens shall be designed to complement other landscaping occurring naturally on the site, planted previously, or approved as a part of a site plan review. Whenever possible, existing vegetation and landform shall be used to create screens.

Natural screening exists onsite as well as on adjacent properties between Edge Road and US Route 301. Additional screening has been added along Chesterville Bridge Road near the existing residential homes.
c. The screen shall be capable of providing year round screening.

Screening added is evergreen to provide year round screening.
d. When noise is likely to be a factor, the screen shall be of sufficient construction to be an effective noise buffer.

So noted.
e. Screening shall consist of trees and plants and may include masonry, or wooden fencing used with or without berms. Screening shall consist of a functional and well-designed combination of the following:
i. Vegetative ground cover
ii. Coniferous and deciduous shrubs

1. Specimens of which will reach and maintain a minimum height of 5 feet of full vegetative growth.
2. Plants which measure a minimum of 3 feet in height at the time of planting and are expected to attain a 5 -foot height within 3 years.
3. Coniferous and deciduous trees Species and sizes of which will be chosen to best accomplish an adequate screen (i.e., evergreens used for visual screening, deciduous trees for seasonal screening)

So noted.
f. Natural slopes and existing vegetation may be substituted for some or all of the requirements above, provided that these features serve to screen the area from adjoining properties and roadways. The Planning Commission, or where applicable the Planning Director, shall determine the acceptability of using existing slopes and vegetation for this purpose. The Planning Commission, or
where applicable the Planning Director, may waive screening where it is physically impossible to accomplish.

So noted.
g. Screening and fencing shall be maintained in at least the same quality and quantity as initially approved.

So noted.

## 6. Lighting

a. Lighting on the site shall be designed to avoid glare onto adjacent properties.

All site lighting will be dark sky compatible and will be directed downward to avoid glare onto adjacent properties.
b. Lighting on the site shall be sufficient to provide for the safety and security of the business, its employees, and its customers.

A lighting plan will be developed to provide a safe and secure environment for the business, its employees, and its customers / guests.
7. Site Planning External Relationship: Site planning within the District shall provide protection of individual lots from adverse surrounding influences and for protection of surrounding areas from adverse influences existing within the District. In particular:
a. Principal vehicular access points shall be designed to encourage smooth traffic flow with controlled turning movements and minimum hazards to vehicular or pedestrian traffic. Storage, turn lanes, or traffic dividers may be required by the Planning Commission where existing or anticipated heavy flows indicate need. In general, streets shall not be connected with streets outside the District in such a way as to encourage the use of such streets by substantial amounts of through traffic.

One tractor trailer access is located on Chestertville Bridge Road. The orientation of the access is on an angle to the existing road in order to avoid tractor trailers from turning north onto Chesterville Bridge Road. The second access points is off of Edge Road.
b. Yards, fences, walls, or vegetative screening shall be provided where needed to protect residential districts or pubic streets from undesirable views, lighting, noise, or other offsite influences. In particular, outdoor storage, extensive offstreet parking areas, and service areas for loading and unloading vehicles, and for storage and collection of refuse and garbage shall be effectively screened.

Additional screening has been added along Chesterville Bridge Road near the existing residential homes.

This project is consistent with the Kent County Comprehensive Plan. The following are excerpts from the plan that show consistency with the proposed subdivision:

- Promote the development of the County employment centers.
- The subdivision is proposed in the Employment Center zoning district which allows a variety of industrial scale developments.
- The County can encourage potential employers to locate in areas where employment and industrial uses are desirable and compatible.
- The County can also provide a stronger commercial/industrial tax base to help balance County tax revenues.
- Expand regulatory flexibility for the creation of and location of employment centers and industrial uses...Theses efforts will especially focus on the Worton area, and the US 301 corridor with a priority that the area between the Town of Millington and the lands surrounding the Route 291-Route 301 intersection be guided by the desired expansion of services and land use identified by Millington's municipal growth element.

Following recordation of the subdivision plats, Lots $1 \& 2$ will be owned, developed, and maintained by Everton Industrial Development, LLC, 266 Atsion Road, Medford, New Jersey, 08055. The balance of the parcel will be owned and maintained by Millington Crossing Associates 1, LLC, P.O. Box 546, Chester Heights, Pennsylvania, 19017.

Stormwater management has been addressed using Environmental Site Design to the Maximum Extent Practicable. A Stormwater Management Report has been provided.

# INDUSTRIAL PERFORMANCE STANDARDS 

## Everton Industrial Development <br> Lot 1 of the lands of Millington Crossing Associates 1, LLC Near Millington, Maryland

In accordance with Article V, Section 15.6 of the Kent County Zoning Ordinance, the following will be addressed once an end user has been identified:

1. NOISE
2. VIBRATION
3. GLARE
4. AIR POLLUTION
5. WATER POLLUTION
6. RADIOACTIVITY
7. ELECTRICAL INTERFERENCE
8. SMOKE AND PARTICULATE MATTER
9. TOXIC MATTER
10.ODOROUS MATTER











B.4.C Specifications for Micro-Bioretention
10. Moterials Specifications

 The plonting soil sholl be tested ond sholl meet following criteria:





11. Compaction

 reace
foive.
fine.
 the engineer. Rototiliers
trom heouy equipment.
Rototitil 2 to 3 inches of sand into the bose of the biberetention facility before bockiling the
optional sond laye. Pump ony ponded woter before preporing (rototiling) bose.



12. Plant Material

See Landscope Plans.
5. Plant Instollation



 Trees shall be broced using 2 " by 2 " stokes only as neessary ond tor the first frowing season
only. stakes ore to be equally spoced on the outsidide of the tree boll.


 6. Underdrains

Undercrians should meet the folowwing criteria (See profilies for modifications to specifications
belown:





 square feet of surfacie

## The bioretention focilin

| materal | specificaton | SIIE | notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Plantings | SEE LANDSCAPE PLANS | SEE PLAN | Plantincs are ste-specifi - SEE LANOSCAPE PLAN |
|  |  | N/A | USDA SOLL TTPES LOAMY SAND OR SANOY LLAM: CLAY Content < 5\% |
| organi content | Min. 108 EYY DRy Melicht |  |  |
| pea gravel diaphram | PEA GRavEL; ASTM-0-448 |  |  |
| CURRENT DRAN | ORNAMENTAL STONE; WASHED COBBLES | STONE: $2^{\prime \prime}$ to $5^{\prime \prime}$ |  |
| GEOTExTLE | SEE APPENDIX A, TABLE A.4 | N/A | PE TYPE 1 Nowwoven |
|  | AASHTO M-43 | No. 57 or No. 6 <br> $\left(3 / 8^{4}\right.$ to $3 / 4^{\text {Ach }}$ ) |  |
| underoran Pipng | F 758, TTPE ${ }_{\text {PS }}^{\text {P-278 }}$ 28 or AASHTO |  | SLOTTED OR PERFORATED PIPE; 3/8" PERF. @ 6" ON CENTER, 4 HOLES PER ROW; MINIMUM OF $3^{\prime \prime}$ OF GRAVEL OVER PIPES; NOT NECESSARY UNDERNEATH PIPES. PERFORATED PIPE SHALL BE WRAPPED WITH $1 / 4$ " <br> GALVANIZED HARDWARE CLOTH |
|  |  | N/A | 28 DAY ST-SIIE TESTNG OF POURED-IN-PLACE CONCRETE REOURED: <br>  <br>  <br>  |
| sano | -33 | $0.022^{\prime \prime}$ to 0.04" | SAND SUBSTITUTIONS SUCH AS DAAASE AND GRAYSTONE (AASHTO) \#10 ARE NOT ACCEPTABLE. NO CALCUM CARBONATEO OR DOOMMTIC SAND SUBSTITUTION ARE ACCEPTABLE. NO "ROCK DUST" CAN BE USED FOR SAND |


| MIC |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DEscripton | метноо | frequen | TME OF THE |
| soll |  |  |  |
| NSPECT AND REPAR R RRSSON, ReSEED | nsual | моптни | моیтHY |
| organc later |  |  |  |
| TOPSOIL MEDIA SHALL BE REMOVED AND REPLACED WHEN PONDING | vsUaL |  | WEENEVER |
| plants |  |  |  |
| REMOVAL AND REPLACEMENT OF ALL DEAD AND DISEASED VEGETATION CONSIDERED BEYOND TREATMENT |  | tMce A Y Ear |  |
| MSSECT FRR DIEEASE/PEST | usual |  |  |
| DEEREMNE II TREAMENT IS WARRRNTEL USE LEAST TOXXC TREAMENT APRROACH | ${ }^{\text {BY }}$ | N/A |  |
| WATERING OF PLANT MATERIAL SHALL CONSECUTIVE DAYS AFTER PLANTING IS SUFFICIENT NATURAL RAINFALL | BY HA | IMMEDIATELY AFTER COMPLETION OF PROJECT | N/A |

BIORETENTION AND SUBMERCED GRAVEL WETLANDS SYSTEM SCHEDULE


INSPECTION REQUIREMENTS DURING CONSTRUCTION









STABILZATINOL LTOON OF FINAL GRPOUNG AND ESTABLSHMENT OF FERMANEI


| materal | specificaton | SIIE | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| plantings | SEE Plan | SEE PLaN | PLANTINS ARE STE-SPECGIC - SEE LANOSCAPE PLAN For Plant Spegies |
| wetand meda |  | N/A | USDA SOIL TYPES LOAMY SAND OR SANOY LOAM: CLAY CONTENT < $5 \%$ <br>  |
| PEA gravel diaphrag | PEA Graveli ASTM-D-448 |  |  |
| Underoran stone | AASHTO M-43 | No. 57 or No. 6 <br>  |  |
| underoran pring | $\text { F 758, TTPE PS } 28 \text { O2 or AASHTO }$ |  | SLOTTED OR PERFORATED PIPE; 3/8" PERF. @ 6" ON CENTER, 4 HOLES PER ROW; MINIMUM OF $3 "$ OF GRAVEL OVER PIPES; NOT NECESSARY UNDERNEATH PIPES. PERFORATED PIPE SHALL BE WRAPPED WITH $1 / 4$ <br> GALVANIZED HARDWARE CLOTH |

TE OUNER OF MAINTENANCE SCHEDULE

 inspecton ano mantenance:

 waterng plants as necessary durng the frsst crowng season
 RE-VEEETATNG Poorly Establishe areas
ourarigli nspecton of sol ano reparng erooed areas,





 Mspect to ee cerran semmentaton foreaay drans minn 24 to









 ENTIRE SITE

| No. | reuureuer | voume ne. | voume roo. | notrs |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | (Matick | --- oc.-ct | --- oc-th | sumerecim menel |
| 2 |  | --- oc.-ft | --- oc--7. | sumpege deanal |
| ${ }^{3}$ |  | --- oc.-ft | --- oc-fth |  |
| 4 |  | --- oc.-ft | --- oc-th |  |
|  |  | N/A | N/A | Roor meume or |


 TYPICAL BIORETENTION SECTION




TYPICAL SUBMERGED GRAVEL WETLANDS SECTION

 TYPICAL SUBMERGED CRAVEL WETLANDS SECTION













## D-Series Size 1 LED Area Luminaire



Intoduction



 The photomentic epefomancer esultisis sistes





## SITE PLAN APPLICATION

File Number: $\qquad$ Amount Paid: $\qquad$ Date:
Project Name: LOT 2 - Everton Industrial office/warehouse
District: 1 st Map: 31 Parcel: 6-1 Lot Size: 20.665 ac Deed Ref: MLM 892/458 Zoning: EC

LOCATION: west side of Maryland Route 301 near Millington, north of MD Rte 291 and south of Chesterville Bridge Road
PROPOSED USE: Industrial office/manufacturing/warehouse

## OWNER OF LAND:

Name: Millington Crossing Associates 1, LLC c/o Russ Richardson Telephone: 410-275-2714

Address: P.O. Box 546, Chester Heights, PA 19017 Email:russ.richardson@rpcrealtors.com

## APPLICANT:

Name: Everton Industrial c/o Dan Gural Telephone: $\qquad$
Address: 266 Atsion Road, Medford, NJ 08055 Email:_dgural@evertonindustrial.net

AGENT/ATTORNEY (if any):
Name: $\qquad$ Telephone: $\qquad$
Address: $\qquad$ Email:

## REGISTERED ENGINEER OR SURVEYOR:

Name: DMS \& Associates, LLC c/o Kevin Shearon Telephone: 443-262-9130

Address: P.O. Box 80, Centreville, MD 21617 Email: kjs@,dmsandassociates.com

Please provide the email of the one person who will be responsible for responding to comments. Only this person will be contacted by staff and will be the person responsible for forwarding the comments or requests for additional information to any other interested parties. EMAL: kjs@dmsandassociates.com

| Water Supply: | $\Delta$ Public System On lot system |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sewerage: | $\Delta$ Public System On lot system |

TELEPHONE SERVICED BY: Verizon
ELECTRIC SERVICED BY: Delmarva Power
NOTICE: The Planning Office is not required to make out this Application. If the Planning Department assists you, it cannot be held responsible for its contents.

$\square$ Concept Plan
$\boxtimes$ Preliminary
$\square$ Final

Approving Authority: Date $\qquad$
© Preliminary
Approving Authority: Date $\qquad$
Approving Authority: Date

## PROJECT NARRATIVE

## Everton Industrial Development Lot 2 of the lands of Millington Crossing Associates 1, LLC Near Millington, Maryland

In accordance with Article VI, Section 5.4.B of the Kent County Zoning Ordinance, we offer the following:

The site is located on the west side of Maryland Route 301 near the Town of Millington. Following a subdivision process, this property will be identified as Tax Map 31, Parcel 6-1, Lot 2. This lot and Lot 1 are being subdivided from an overall 114.499 acre parcel owned by Millington Crossing Associates 1, LLC. Everton Industrial Development is the contract purchaser of Lot 2.

The lot is zoned Employment Center (EC) and will be 20.665 acres. The proposed development includes a 256,924 -sf flex manufacturing/warehouse building with associated parking and loading docks.

The building is proposed to be connected to the Town of Millington / Kent County public water and sewer systems. A 10 " diameter water line will be extended from an existing 10 " main at the intersection of Edge Road and West Edge Road. The new main will extend along Edge Road past the two proposed lots to the intersection of Chesterville Bridge Road where it will be capped for future extension (by others) to loop back to the Town of Millington. A service lateral will be installed to connect the building to the new main. Fire hydrants will be provided along the route.

The building will also be served by public sewer. A grinder pump will be installed at the building. A small diameter force main lateral will connect to a new public 2 " force main that will run within MDOT SHA right-of-way to a connection point near Maryland Route 301 and West Edge Road.

Forest Conservation was addressed during the subdivision process and resulted in a deed restricted area of 6.41 acres.

In accordance with Section 14.9.B.1-7 we offer the following relative to standards for site design (responses in italics):

1. Site Access
a. Site access shall be subject to the following regulations to help ensure safety and alleviate traffic congestion:
i. Where property abuts a primary, secondary, or a collector road, access to the property shall be by way of the secondary or collector road. Exceptions to this rule shall be instances where the Planning Commission,
or where applicable the Planning Director, determines that direct access onto the primary road would promote traffic safety.

The proposed development is located just off of US Route 301, but takes access from Edge Road, a secondary road. Two combined tractor trailer and employee entrances are proposed to create a loop to the rear loading docks, and one dedicated employee/visitor entrance is proposed.
ii. Where one or more contiguous parcels abutting a primary road are under single ownership and any one of the parcels abuts a secondary or collector road, access to the property shall be by of the secondary road. Exceptions to this rule shall be instances where the Planning Commission, or where applicable the Planning Director, determines that direct access onto the primary road would promote traffic safety.
$N / A$ - access to a primary road is not proposed.
iii. Only one direct approach onto a primary road from an individual parcel of record as of August 1, 1989 shall be permitted unless the Planning Commission, or where applicable the Planning Director, finds one of the following:
$N / A$ - access to a primary road is not proposed.
iv. An additional entrance is significantly beneficial to the safety and operation of the highway.

1. One entrance is a safety hazard or increases traffic congestion.
2. The property is bisected by steep slopes, bodies of water, or other topographic feature so as to render some portion of the property inaccessible without additional road access.
$N / A$-access to a primary road is not proposed.
b. Where a proposed road is designated on an approved County or Town map, site plans for development adjacent to the designated roadway shall include provisions for future access to the roadway.

N/A - no new public roads are proposed.
c. Existing, planned, or platted streets on adjacent properties shall be continued when the Planning Commission or where applicable the Planning Director determines that the continuation is necessary for safe and reasonable circulation between the properties.

To our knowledge there are no existing, planned or platted streets on adjacent properties that would need to be connected through this development.
d. When deemed necessary by the Planning Commission or where applicable the Planning Director, developments shall provide access to adjacent tracts not presently developed.

Given the topography west of the proposed building sites, we request that a requirement to connect to adjacent tracts be waived.
e. Access shall be consolidated whenever possible.

Tractor trailer and employee access points on either end of the building have been consolidated.
f. Whenever possible, roads shall be constructed above the elevation of the 100 -year floodplain.

The entire development envelope is above the 100-year floodplain.
g. The applicant shall demonstrate that access to the project is adequate and the roads which will be impacted have the capacity to handle the traffic generated by the proposed project and will not endanger the safety of the general public.

A Traffic Impact Study was completed as part of the subdivision process.
The results show that all of the surrounding intersections will operate at Level of Service $A$ or $B$ following this development.
2. On-site Circulation
a. Sites shall be designed to prevent awkward or dangerous vehicular flow.

The site has been designed to separate employee/visitor vehicles from tractor trailers to the extent possible to promote a safer vehicular flow pattern.
b. Loading and unloading spaces shall not block the passage of other vehicles on the service drive or major pedestrian ways or create blind spots when trucks are loading or unloading.

All loading and unloading spaces are located behind or to the side of the building, away from other employee/visitor vehicles.
c. Sites shall be designed to discourage pedestrians and vehicles from sharing the same pathways.

Sidewalks have been provided along the building façade to aid in separating pedestrians from vehicles.
d. Safe, convenient, and centralized handicap parking shall be provided.

All ADA compliant spaces have been located closest to pedestrian entrance doors.
e. Trash boxes must be accessible to collection trucks when all vehicle parking spaces are filled.

Trash corrals will be located to the rear of the buildings to avoid conflict with employee_visitor vehicles.
f. Parking shall not be permitted in the required front yard.

With approval of the requested 50-ft width, no parking is located within the front yard.
3. Floodplain
a. In order to prevent excessive flood damage and to allow for the protection of the natural and beneficial floodplain functions, all development, new construction, and substantial improvements to existing structures in all floodplain zones shall comply with the requirements of Article VI, Section 7 of this Ordinance, including but not limited to the following:
i. Elevation of all new or substantially improved structures;
ii. Compliance with venting and other construction standards; and
iii. Submission and recordation, where applicable, of Elevation Certificates, Declaration of Land Restrictions, deed restrictions, and venting affidavits.
$N / A$ - development area is not within the floodplain.
b. Placement of buildings and materials. In general, buildings and accessory structures should be located entirely out of the floodplain, out of the flood protection setback, or on land that is least susceptible to flooding. All structures permitted in the floodplain shall be oriented so as to offer the least resistance to the flow of floodwaters.

The proposed building is located out of the floodplain.
c. General development shall not occur in the floodplain where alternative locations exist. Before a permit is issued, the applicant shall demonstrate that new structures cannot be located out of the floodplain and that encroachments onto the floodplain are minimized.
$N / A$ - development area is not within the floodplain.
4. General Landscape Requirements
a. The front yard shall be landscaped and shall be maintained in a neat and attractive condition.

The front yards will be landscaped and maintained in a neat and attractive condition.
b. Sites shall be permanently maintained in good condition with at least the same quality and quantity of landscaping as originally proposed.

So noted.
c. The landscape plan shall be prepared by a registered professional forester, landscape architect, or other professional with equivalent experience and qualifications.

The landscape plan will be designed by a licensed landscape architect.
d. The Planning Commission, or where applicable the Planning Director, may waive the landscape requirements when it is demonstrated that the spirit and intent of the requirement is accomplished through other means or the nature of the change is one that does not require additional landscaping.

So noted.
5. Screening
a. Screening is required to protect adjoining properties and roadways from noise, glare, and uses which are visually incompatible with neighboring land uses. Screening is required:
i. On sites which involve loading or unloading (including the storage of vehicles and boats), trash, or disposal areas and where accessory buildings and structures are adjacent to residential properties.

The site layouts have been designed to have all loading / unloading areas facing away from adjacent properties and public roads to the extent possible. Screening has been provided where areas may be visible.
ii. Where exterior storage areas are visible from roadways, sidewalks, or nearby residential properties.
$N / A$
iii. When noise not typically occurring in residential areas is expected to project onto nearby properties.

It is not anticipated that excessive noise will occur at this site. Once an end user is identified, we will provide information relative to the Industrial Performance Standards.
iv. To screen parking areas from motorists, pedestrians, and adjoining residential properties.

Natural screening exists for these properties between Edge Road and US Route 301. Screening has been provided where areas may be visible.
v. Where the industrial district abuts a residential district or a primary or secondary road.

N/A - this lot does not abut a residential district.
vi. Where the Planning Commission determines that additional screening is necessary to protect properties in the area.

So noted.
b. Landscaped screens shall be designed to complement other landscaping occurring naturally on the site, planted previously, or approved as a part of a site plan review. Whenever possible, existing vegetation and landform shall be used to create screens.

Natural screening exists onsite as well as on adjacent properties between Edge Road and US Route 301. Screening has been provided where areas may be visible.
c. The screen shall be capable of providing year round screening.

Screening added is evergreen to provide year round screening.
d. When noise is likely to be a factor, the screen shall be of sufficient construction to be an effective noise buffer.

So noted.
e. Screening shall consist of trees and plants and may include masonry, or wooden fencing used with or without berms. Screening shall consist of a functional and well-designed combination of the following:
i. Vegetative ground cover
ii. Coniferous and deciduous shrubs

1. Specimens of which will reach and maintain a minimum height of 5 feet of full vegetative growth.
2. Plants which measure a minimum of 3 feet in height at the time of planting and are expected to attain a 5 -foot height within 3 years.
3. Coniferous and deciduous trees Species and sizes of which will be chosen to best accomplish an adequate screen (i.e., evergreens used for visual screening, deciduous trees for seasonal screening)

So noted.
f. Natural slopes and existing vegetation may be substituted for some or all of the requirements above, provided that these features serve to screen the area from adjoining properties and roadways. The Planning Commission, or where applicable the Planning Director, shall determine the acceptability of using existing slopes and vegetation for this purpose. The Planning Commission, or where applicable the Planning Director, may waive screening where it is physically impossible to accomplish.

So noted.
g. Screening and fencing shall be maintained in at least the same quality and quantity as initially approved.

So noted.
6. Lighting
a. Lighting on the site shall be designed to avoid glare onto adjacent properties. All site lighting will be dark sky compatible and will be directed downward to avoid glare onto adjacent properties.
b. Lighting on the site shall be sufficient to provide for the safety and security of the business, its employees, and its customers.

A lighting plan will be developed to provide $a$ safe and secure environment for the business, its employees, and its customers / guests.
7. Site Planning External Relationship: Site planning within the District shall provide protection of individual lots from adverse surrounding influences and for protection of surrounding areas from adverse influences existing within the District. In particular:
a. Principal vehicular access points shall be designed to encourage smooth traffic flow with controlled turning movements and minimum hazards to vehicular or pedestrian traffic. Storage, turn lanes, or traffic dividers may be required by the Planning Commission where existing or anticipated heavy flows indicate need. In general, streets shall not be connected with streets outside the District in such a way as to encourage the use of such streets by substantial amounts of through traffic.

Two combined tractor trailer and employee entrances are proposed to create a loop to the rear loading docks, and one dedicated employee/visitor entrance is proposed.
b. Yards, fences, walls, or vegetative screening shall be provided where needed to protect residential districts or pubic streets from undesirable views, lighting, noise, or other offsite influences. In particular, outdoor storage, extensive offstreet parking areas, and service areas for loading and unloading vehicles, and for storage and collection of refuse and garbage shall be effectively screened.

Additional screening has been added.
This project is consistent with the Kent County Comprehensive Plan. The following are excerpts from the plan that show consistency with the proposed subdivision:

- Promote the development of the County employment centers.
- The subdivision is proposed in the Employment Center zoning district which allows a variety of industrial scale developments.
- The County can encourage potential employers to locate in areas where employment and industrial uses are desirable and compatible.
- The County can also provide a stronger commercial/industrial tax base to help balance County tax revenues.
- Expand regulatory flexibility for the creation of and location of employment centers and industrial uses...Theses efforts will especially focus on the Worton area, and the US 301
corridor with a priority that the area between the Town of Millington and the lands surrounding the Route 291 -Route 301 intersection be guided by the desired expansion of services and land use identified by Millington's municipal growth element.

Following recordation of the subdivision plats, Lots $1 \& 2$ will be owned, developed, and maintained by Everton Industrial Development, LLC, 266 Atsion Road, Medford, New Jersey, 08055. The balance of the parcel will be owned and maintained by Millington Crossing Associates 1, LLC, P.O. Box 546, Chester Heights, Pennsylvania, 19017.

Stormwater management has been addressed using Environmental Site Design to the Maximum Extent Practicable. A Stormwater Management Report has been provided.

# INDUSTRIAL PERFORMANCE STANDARDS 

Everton Industrial Development<br>Lot 2 of the lands of Millington Crossing Associates 1, LLC<br>Near Millington, Maryland

In accordance with Article V, Section 15.6 of the Kent County Zoning Ordinance, the following will be addressed once an end user has been identified:

1. NOISE
2. VIBRATION
3. GLARE
4. AIR POLLUTION
5. WATER POLLUTION
6. RADIOACTIVITY
7. ELECTRICAL INTERFERENCE
8. SMOKE AND PARTICULATE MATTER
9. TOXIC MATTER
10. ODOROUS MATTER











B.4.C Specifications for Micro-Bioretention
11. Moterials Specifications

 The plonting soil shall be tested ond sholl meet following criteria:





12. Compaction

 reace
foive.
fine.
 the engineer. Rototiliers
trom heouy equipment.
Rototilil 2 to 3 inches. of sond into the base of the bioretention focility befire backfiling the
optional sond layer. Pump ony ponded Moter before preporing (rototiling) bose.



13. Plant Material

See Landscope Plans.
5. Plant Instollation







 saure feet.
6. Underdrains
Undercrioins should meet the folowing criteria (See profilies for modifications to specifications
below):





 7. Miscelloneous

The bioretention focility may not be constructed until al contributing drainoge orea has been
statilized.

| MATERIAL SPECIFICATIONS FOR MICRO-BIORETENTION. |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RAL | specificaton | SIzE | NOTES |
| plantiges | SEE LANOSCAPE PLANS | SEE PLAN | PLANTNCS ARE SITE-SPECGFIC - SEE LANOSCAPE PLAN |
| (pantiges sols |  | N/A | USDA Soll TTPES LOAMY SAND OR SANOY L |
| organc content | Min. $10 \%$ EYY DRY MEICHT |  |  |
| pea gravel olarhragm | PEA gravelic astm- |  |  |
| Current dran | ORNAMENTAL STONE; <br> WASHED COBBLES | STONE: $2^{\prime \prime}$ to $5^{\prime \prime}$ |  |
| ¢EOTExTLE | SEE APPENDIX A, TABLE A. 4 | N/A | PE TYP 1 Nownoven |
|  | AsSHTO M-43 | No. 57 or No. 6 <br> AGGREGATE $(3 / 8$ " to $3 / 4$ ") |  |
| UndERDRAN PPING | F 758, TTYE ${ }_{\text {Ps }}^{\text {M-278 }}$ 28 or AASHTO |  | SLOTTED OR PERFORATED PIPE; 3/8" PERF. @ 6" ON CENTER, 4 HOLES PER ROW; MINIMUM OF 3" OF GRAVEL OVER PIPES; NOT NECESSARY UNDERNEATH PIPES. PERFORATED PIPE SHALL BE WRAPPED WITH $1 / 4 "$ <br> GALVANIZED HARDWARE CLOTH |
|  |  | N/A | ON-SITE TESTING OF POURED-IN-PLACE CONCRETE REQUIRED: 28 DAY STRENGTH AND SLUMP TEST; ALL CONCRETE DESIGN (CAST-IN-PLACE <br>  <br> STANDARDS REQUIRES DESIGN DRAWINGS SEALED AND APPROVED BY A PROFESSIONAL STRUCTURAL ENGINEER LICENSED IN THE STATE OF MARYLAND - DESIGN TO INCLUDE MEETING ACI CODE 350.R/89; VERTICAL LOADING - DESIGN TO INCLUDE MEETING ACI CODE 350.R/89; VERTICAL LOADING [H-10 OR H-20]; ALLOWABLE HORIZONTAL LOADING (BASED ON SOIL PRESSURES); AND ANALYSIS OF POTENTIAL CRACKING |
| SAND | AASHTO M-6 or ASTM-C-33 | $0.02^{\prime \prime}$ to 0.04" | SAND SUBSTITUTIONS SUCH AS DIABASE AND GRAYTTONE (AASHTO) \#10 ARE NOT ACCCPTABLE. NO CALCIUM CARBONATED OR DOLOMTIC SAND SUBSTTUTION ARE ACCEPTABLE. No "ROCK DUST" CAN BE USED FOR SAND |

MICRO-BIORETENTION MAINTENANCE SCHEDULE

| DESCRPRTON | МЕННоо | freouencr | TME OF THE Year |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| sol |  |  |  |
| INSEECT AND REPAIR ERosion, Ressed | vsual | моптни | моптни |
| organc Laver |  |  |  |
| TOPSOIL MEDIA SHALL BE REMOVED AND REPLACED WHEN PONDING DRAWDOWN EXCEEDS 48 HOURS | vsual |  | WHENEVER NEDED |
| PLants |  |  |  |
| REMOVAL AND REPLACEMENT OF ALL <br>  |  | tMCE A Y EAR | $\xrightarrow{3 / 15 \text { to }} 10 / 30$ AND |
| NSPECT For DisEASE/PEST | usual | $\underset{\substack{\text { ONCE A MONTH } \\ \text { (AVERAGE) }}}{\text { and }}$ | INSPECT MORE FREQUENTLY IN WARMER MONTHS |
| DEERERMME IF TREAMENT IS TREAMENT APPROACH | BY Hand | N/A | VARIES, DEPENDS ON DISEASE OR INSECT NFESTATION |
| WATERMG Of PLANT MATERALL SHALL <br>  <br>  | BY Hand | IMMEDIATELY AFTER COMPLETION OF <br> PROJEC | N/A |

BIORETENTION AND SUBMERGED GRAVEL WETLANDS SYSTEM SCHEDUL


INSPECTION REQUIREMENTS DURING CONSTRUCTION











|  | BMP MATERIAL SPECIFICATIONS FOR SUBMERGED GRAVEL WETLANDS |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| materal | specificaton | ${ }_{\text {sIIE }}$ | Notes |
| planting | SEE PLan | SEE PLaN | PLANTINS ARE STt--specific - See lanocaipe plan for plant species |
| wetand meda | LOAMY SAND COMPSI SANOY COAMM CORESE SAND \& COMPOST | N/A | USDA SOIL TYPES LOAMY SAND OR SANDY LOAM; CLAY CONTENT < $5 \%$ ORGANIC MATER CONTENT SHALL BE GREATER THAN $15 \%$ HYDRAULIC CONDUCTVVITY SHALL BE BETWEEN 0.01 AND $0.10 \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{day}$ |
| PEA gravel diaphracm | PEA Graveli astu-D-448 |  |  |
| Underroan stone | AsSHTO M-43 |  |  |
| UnoEroral Pring | F 758 , TTYE Ps 28 or or AASHTO |  | SLOTTED OR PERFORATED PIPE; 3/8" PERF. @ 6" ON CENTER, 4 HOLES PER ROW; MINIMUM OF $3 "$ OF GRAVEL OVER PIPES; NOT NECESSARY UNDERNEATH PIPES. PERFORATED PIPE SHALL BE WRAPPED WITH $1 / 4$ GALVANIZED HARDWARE CLOTH |
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 Materng plants as necessary durng the frest croung season
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STORMWATER MANAGEMENT SUMMARY TABLE

| Ete No . | Requewert | volum Rea | voume pro. | notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | (miticr | -- oc.-ft | --- oc--7t. | Sunurecof ceavel |
| 2 | ${ }_{\text {Recaingec }}^{\text {Rece }}$ | --- oc.-7t | -- oc.-ct | sumpere menel |
| ${ }^{3}$ | $\substack { \text { citame } \\ \begin{subarray}{c}{\text { chatcrion } \\(0,0){ \text { citame } \\ \begin{subarray} { c } { \text { chatcrion } \\ ( 0 , 0 ) } } \end{subarray}$ | -- oc.-ct | -- oc--th | VOLUME REQUIREMENT DETERMINED AFTER ESD |
|  | coick | --- oc.-ct | --- oc.-f. | O-TVAR |
|  |  | N/A | N/A | Not mederi dr |

[^1]
 TYPICAL BIORETENTION SECTION




TYPICAL SUBMERCED GRAVEL WETLANDS SECTION

 TYPICAL SUBMERGED CRAVEL WETLANDS SECTION











## LANDSCAPING SPECIFICATION
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## planting detalls



## PLaNt SCHEDULE
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MILLINGTON, MARYLAND
MILLINGTON CROSSING - LOOKING SOUTH

# PLANNING COMMISSION <br> FOR KENT COUNTY, MARYLAND 



EVERTON INDUSTRIAL, LOT 2 MAJOR SITE PLAN (PRELIMINARY) MAP 31, PARCEL 6, PART 1, LOT 1 * NEAR MILLINGTON

CASE NO. 23-28
*

## Legal Argument regarding Section 14.8 of the County's Zoning Ordinance

Section 14.8 of the County's Zoning Ordinance provides that "contiguous forest that connects the largest undeveloped or most vegetated tracts of land within and adjacent to the site" "shall be left in an undisturbed condition unless the applicant demonstrates, to the satisfaction of the Department of Planning and Zoning, that reasonable efforts have been made to protect [the contiguous forest] and the plan cannot be reasonably altered. ZO § 14.8(B)(3)(d)(ii).

Here, the forest on the Subject Property is contiguous forest subject to the preservation requirements of Section $14.8(B)(3)(\mathrm{d})(\mathrm{ii})$. The Applicant proposes to remove 7.75 acres of forest on the Subject Property. See Forest Conservation Plat (FCP \#023-03). Accordingly, the Applicant proposes to remove 7.75 acres of contiguous forest subject to the preservation requirements of Section $14.8(B)(3)(d)(i i)$.

Therefore, the Applicant has the burden of proving, and the Department of Planning and Zoning has the duty of finding, that the Applicant has taken "reasonable efforts...to protect [the contiguous forest] and the plan cannot be reasonably altered." See ZO § 14.8(B)(3)(d)(ii).

However, nowhere in the Applicant's application materials does the Applicant address the efforts it has taken to protect the contiguous forest, nor does the Applicant address why the plan cannot be reasonably altered to avoid impacts to the contiguous forest. Similarly, at no point during the TAC review of the application did Planning Staff raise or address this issue.

As a result, the only appropriate action is for the application to be remanded to TAC so that the Applicant and the Department of Planning and Zoning can address this issue as required by the zoning ordinance.

Respectfully submitted,
Q. Macy Nelson

AIS No. 8112010268
Law Office of G. Macy Nelson, LLC 600 Washington Avenue, Suite 202
Towson, Maryland 21204
(410) 296-8166
gmacynelson@gmacynelson.com

## MEMORANDUM

| TO: | Macy Nelson |
| :--- | :--- |
| FROM: | Lawrence Green, PE, PTOE |
| DATE: | May 30, 2024 |
| SUBJECT: | Millington Crossing - Trip Generation/Site Access Assessment |

The purpose of this memorandum is to examine the trip generation rates utilized in the Millington Crossing Warehouse development Traffic Impact Study report prepared by Traffic Concepts, Inc. dated December 2023, and to assess the proposed site access system for the development.

## SITE TRIP GENERATION

The proposed development is a 513,850 square foot Warehouse development with 490 employees (separated into 2 parcels - see attached site plans) in Kent County, Maryland. Traffic Concepts chose Land Use 150 - Warehousing trip generation rates as contained in the $11^{\text {th }}$ Edition of the Institute of Transportation Engineer's (ITE) Trip Generation manual to generate trips for this development. The description of Land Use 150 in the Trip Generation Manual is as follows:

- Land Use 150 Warehousing - A warehouse is primarily devoted to the storage of materials, but it may also include office and maintenance areas.

As noted in the description of this land use, the specific uses of the warehouse can include storage of materials, office uses, and/or maintenance uses. ITE allows the calculation of the anticipated trips generated to be determined from a square footage basis or an employee basis. Traffic Concepts chose to use the square footage basis even though the actual uses within the warehouse could vary significantly, and the number of employees for the development was a known quantity. The submitted site plan for this development anticipates a total of 490 employees (see attached site plans showing employee numbers) that would be a more accurate parameter for the trip generation of the development since the number of employees is main trip generating characteristic for Warehouse developments.

Shown below is a table of the trip generation calculations using both the building square footage and employees for Land Use 150 Warehousing development in the $11^{\text {th }}$ Edition of the ITE Trip Generation Manual.

## 513,850 SQUARE FOOT WAREHOUSE DEVELOPMENT WITH 490 EMPLOYEES

| Land Use Assumed | Daily Trips | AM Peak Hour | PM Peak Hour |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Warehousing (Land Use 150) - Square <br> Footage Basis | 850 | 85 | 88 |
| Warehousing (Land Use 150) - Employee <br> Basis | 2475 | 299 | 323 |

As noted above, the calculated trip generation for Millington Crossing varies greatly depending upon the input variable utilized in the calculation. The employee-based trip generation calculation will generate 1,625 more Daily Trips (a 191\% increase), 214 more AM Peak Hour Trips (a $252 \%$ increase), and 235 more PM Peak Hour Trips (a $267 \%$ increase) than the trip generation assumption based upon the square footage of the building. Since the number of anticipated employees to work at Millington Crossing is a more representative trip generating characteristic, the employee-based trip generation characteristic should have been used in the calculation. As noted in the description of Land Use 150 Warehousing, the uses varied greatly in the development of the trip generation rates based upon building square footage.

## SITE ACCESS ASSESSMENT

Lot 1 Site Plan proposes one (1) full movement driveway on Edge Road and one (1) full movement driveway on Chesterville Bridge Road. Based upon the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) A Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets, $20187^{\text {th }}$ Edition (AASHTO Green Book), indicates that junctions of minor roads (such as driveways) should intersect with more important roadways with less than a 15-degree skew (see attached reference). In addition, The Traffic Engineering Handbook states that: "Crossing roadways should intersect at 90 degrees if possible, and not less than 75 degrees." It further states that: "Intersections with severe skew angles (e.g., 60 degrees or less) often experience operational or safety problems. The proposed site driveway for Lot 1 on Chesterville Bridge Road intersects at an approximate 45 -degree skew and should be removed for safety and operational reasons.

The Maryland Department of Transportation State Highway Administration (SHA) examined the proposed development and the site access system. Lot 2 includes 3 driveways on Edge Road (MD 701A). Due to a horizontal curve on Edge Road, SHA has determined that the northern driveway serving Lot 2 does not provide adequate sight distance for vehicles to safely egress the driveway to Edge Road. Therefore, SHA recommended that this driveway be redesigned as a right-in only driveway. However, the submitted site plan for Lot 2 does not show this restricted operation.

The ramps to/from northbound US 301 and the ramps to/from southbound US 301 that are located north of the MD 291 bridge over US 301 provide the highest capacity access for the Millington Crossing site and would be least impactful to the more local roadway network. Therefore, measures to encourage the usage of these ramps to/from US 301 should be encouraged.

## CONCLUSIONS

A review of the December 2023 Traffic Impact Study prepared for the proposed Millington Crossing Warehouse development revealed that the trip generation for the site has likely been underestimated by a factor of 3-4 times than was indicated in the traffic report. A re-evaluation of the traffic impact of this development should be done.

The proposed site access on Chesterville Bridge Road intersects at a 45-degree angle and violates the guidelines stipulated in the AASHTO Green Book and should be removed. All access for Lot 1 should be provided on Edge Road (MD 701A). The northern site access driveway for Lot 2 should be redesigned as
a right-in only to address sight distance limitations as identified by SHA. The best access for the site is provided by the ramping system to/from US 301 located north of the MD 291 bridge. Ways to encourage the usage of the access to/from US 301 should be sought. One way to encourage the usage of this ramping system to/from US 301 would be the removal of the site access driveway on Chesterville Bridge Road that would provide all access for both lots along Edge Road.

253
LOT 1


## intersection design with 45 <br> degree approach



### 9.3.1 Three-Leg Intersections

### 9.3.1.1 Basic Types of Intersections

Basic forms of three-leg or T intersections are illustrated in Figures 9-5 and 9-6. The most common type of three-leg conventional intersection, as shown in Figure 9-5A, has the normal pavement width of both roadways maintained except for the paved corner radii or where widening is needed to accommodate the selected design vehicle. This type of unchannelized intersection is generally suitable for junctions of minor or local roads and junctions of minor roads with more important roadways where the angle of intersection is not generally more than 15 degrees from perpendicular (i.e., from approximately 75 to 105 degrees). In rural areas, this intersection type is usually used in conjunction with two-lane roadways carrying light traffic. In suburban or urban areas, it may be satisfactory for higher volumes and for multilane roads. Where speeds or turning movements, or both, are high, an additional surface width or flaring may be provided for maneuverability, as shown in Figure 9-5B and 9-5C, but such provision should consider the effects of widening on pedestrian crossing distances.


# Right-Turn Lane and Bypass Lane 

- B -

Figure 9-5. Three-Leg Intersections

Least Desirable Access To/From US 301 that Should Be Removed for Safety \& Operational Reasons And To Encourage Desirable US 301 Access
45-Degree Skew Intersection
that Should Be Removed for
Safety \& Operational Reasons
And To Encourage Desirable US
301 Access
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NEAR MILLINGTON
```

EVERTON INDUSTRIAL, LOT 2 - *
MAJOR SITE PLAN (PRELIMINARY)
MAP 31, PARCEL 6, PART 1, LOT 1 *
CASE NO. 23-28
NEAR MILLINGTON
CASE NO. 23-28 NEAR MILLINGTON

RECUSAL MEMORANDUM
We represent Kent Conservation and Preservation Alliance ("KCPA") and certain citizens. We are submitting several memoranda in accordance with the Planning Commission Bylaws, Section 7 - Rules of Procedure, which states in relevant part that " $[\mathrm{i}] \mathrm{f}$ any Person wishes to bring to the Board's attention complex data, reports, or arguments, that Person should submit the material in writing one week before the hearing...." This memorandum concerns a matter of what we view as mandatory recusal under Title 18,

Chapter 18 of the Maryland Rules for Judges and Judicial Appointees. We first lay out applicable statutory and case law and then discuss that as it applies to a factual circumstance regarding a member of the Planning Commission, Paula Reeder.

Rule 18-102.11, "Disqualification," states that a judge shall disqualify themselves in proceedings where their impartiality "might reasonably be questioned." There are several enumerated circumstances where recusal is required, but for the purposes of this controversy, we cite Subsections (a)(1) and (a)(4). Subsection (a)(1) states that a judge shall recuse themselves where they have "a personal bias or prejudice concerning a party or a party's attorney, or personal knowledge of facts that are in dispute in the proceeding," and subsection (a)(4) states that the judge shall recuse themselves where "the judge, while a judge or a judicial candidate, has made a public statement, other than in a court proceeding, judicial decision, or opinion, that commits or appears to commit the judge to reach a particular result or rule in a particular way in the proceeding or controversy." The case of Regan v. State Bd. of Chiropractic Exam'rs, 355 Md. 397 (1999) establishes that these rules also bind all quasi-judicial administrative bodies, because " $[\mathrm{t}]$ he doctrine that every person is entitled to a fair and impartial hearing applies to an administrative agency exercising judicial or quasi-judicial functions, and is specifically applicable to issues of disqualification . . . " See id. at 408; see also Kenwood Gardens Condominiums, Inc. v. Whalen Properties, LLC, 449 Md. 313, 339 n. 9 (2016). Likewise, the Supreme Court of Maryland has stated that "[p]rocedural due process, guaranteed to persons in this State by Article 24 of the Maryland Declaration of Rights, requires that administrative agencies
performing adjudicatory or quasi-judicial functions observe the basic principles of fairness as to parties appearing before them." Maryland State Police v. Zeigler, 330 Md. 540, 559 (1993). While many other cases stand for the same principle, in summary, if there is an appearance of impartiality that would trigger recusal, a quasi-judicial arbiter should preemptively recuse themselves but also shall recuse themselves upon motion.

The development contemplated at the Subject Property is longstanding and contentious. It is uncontroversial to state that there are people opposed to this development such as our clients, as well as people who are supportive of it. Such opinions are cherished and welcomed in good governance, but not by factfinders, who are expected to remain neutral and objective in their determinations. Among our concerns to be presented in opposition to this case is the concern of truck traffic impacts on the $291 / 301$ overpass bridge as it relates to both motorists and cyclists, particularly with regard to cyclist safety along the bridge. To this end, on December 6, 2022, one of our named clients Janet Christensen-Lewis, the chair of the KCPA, wrote a letter to the editor of the Chestertown Spy, providing her lay argument about cyclist vulnerability along the bridge and how it may be impacted by the then-nascent development at the Subject Property.

We stress at this moment that it is fine to disagree with this analysis, and that several people did disagree and made public comments to that effect. But questions of recusal are analyzed under objective "reasonable person" standards, and the comment made by Paula Reeder subsequent to and directly addressed to this letter to the editor demonstrated not only an unalterably closed mind to the mere argument about bicycle access at the bridge,
but personal animus against the entire KCPA. We have attached the letter and this response as Exhibit A to this memorandum, and quote it in excerpts here that she believed Mrs. Christensen-Lewis's comments "couldn't be further from the truth," that " $[t]$ his is just more baseless, anti-any development harem-scarem from KCPA," and that it was "enough already!" At this point in time, Paula Reeder had been appointed to the Planning Commission and was therefore actively sitting as a quasi-judicial member of that body. Thus, not only did she demonstrate clear and obvious "personal bias or prejudice" against our clients and their argument regarding at least this one potential impact of the Subject Property development, but she demonstrated a broader prejudice against the entire operational procedure of the KCPA, and made these public comments while "as a judge" outside of a court proceeding "that commit[ted] or appear[ed] to commit the judge to reach a particular result or rule in a particular way in the proceeding or controversy."

It is possible that Paula Reeder has had a change of heart since the time of this post and is committed to a more objective analysis of cases going forward. Nevertheless, in accordance with Maryland case law, "a party must file a timely motion in order to initiate the recusal procedure." Miller v. Kirkpatrick, 377 Md. 335, 358 (2003). "A timely motion ordinarily is not one that represents 'the possible withholding of a recusal motion as a weapon to use only in the event of some unfavorable ruling.' Consequently, the motion generally should be filed 'as soon as the basis for it becomes known and relevant.'" Id. (quoting Surratt v. Prince George's County, 320 Md. 439, 468-69 (1990)). Therefore, and also in accordance with the Planning Commission Bylaws, we are not given the lenience
of waiting to file a motion of recusal so as to take Ms. Reeder's proverbial pulse and see if she will act differently in the forthcoming Planning Commission Bylaws. We are obliged to file this motion for recusal preemptively based on prior comments made by Ms. Reeder as the administrative equivalent of a judge that foreclose her from further participation in this case. Such recusal is non-discretionary under Rule 18-102, as it states that a judge shall disqualify themselves in any of the enumerated circumstances such as having personal bias or making public comment, while a judge, with regard to a particular controversy. See generally MD. RULES JUDGES 18-102.11, et seq.

Consequently, we expect Ms. Reeder to recuse herself from any further proceedings related to the Subject Property, so as to protect our clients' procedural due process rights and ensure an objective hearing process regarding the submitted site plan and associated documents. As stated in our opening paragraph, we will submit other distinct concerns via separate memoranda for organizational purposes.

Respectfully submitted,


Law Office of G. Macy Nelson, LLC 600 Washington Avenue, Suite 202
Towson, Maryland 21204
(410) 296-8166
gmacynelson@gmacynelson.com

## EXHIBIT A

# Letter to Editor: Cycling, Safety and Development 

December 6, 2022 by Letter to Editor

```
4] Share/Save & [ |
```

In a recent hearing before the Kent County Planning Commission (November 3, 2022) a representative for Everton, INC, a New Jersey based corporation, presented a plan for a distribution warehouse on the corner of Edge and Chesterville Bridge Road.

Let us set aside for the moment the cost to the environment, water, and air quality that over 1 million-sf of impervious roof and asphalt surface, 132 truck bays, and the 400 parking spaces proposed for the new distribution warehouses will create, instead focusing on another problem related to the mammoth sized project; the impact on the safety of cyclists.

The access and egress for the proposed warehouses will involve the 291/301 overpass, the two roundabouts, Howard Johnson, Edge, and Chesterville Bridge Roads. The Kent County overpass was built in 1989 before Maryland's State Legislature mandated that the safety of bike and pedestrian modes of transportation be incorporated in the Maryland Transportation Plan. Current Maryland regulations for shoulder widths on overpasses calls for $4-5-\mathrm{ft}$ dependent on speed and percent of truck traffic. The 301 overpass on 291 is already a roadway that cyclist feel vulnerable on, documented in the Maryland Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan 2019.

## 三 MENU

on the current traffic flow, with shoulder widths which are narrow, varying between 0 - and 29inches of uneven, cracked, and crumbling asphalt edges. The safety of cyclist which is already problematic will, as vehicular traffic increases and skews towards tractor-trailers, deteriorate further unless mitigation is required. The 291 overpass and the 290 underpass are the only alternatives for cyclists to avoid tangling directly with 301 traffic on at grade crossings in Kent County all of which are rated F by the state.


Strava Global Heat Map

Kent County has a large and growing number of cyclist which the State has an interest in promoting. The county's rural roads attract cycling clubs, races, events, and tours, as bicycle tourism is becoming a fast-growing economic factor. Cycling data compiled and published in the form of a heat map, based on users from the widely used cycling APP Strava, gives a vivid picture of where bicycles travel. The 291 overpass, the roundabouts and Howard Johnson Rd show up as the most heavily traversed roads in the county, with Edge and Chesterville Bridge Rd used to a lesser degree.

## 三 MENU

Ordinance (LUO). However, the LUO gives no one permission "by right" to jeopardize the life of cyclists and pedestrians. Kent County cycling residents and tourists should not face deteriorating road conditions caused by development.

State Highway, the Kent County Planning Commission and Commissioners must seriously consider the safety everyone including vulnerable cyclist and pedestrians by ensuring their protection from injury or death on the county and state roads through proper mitigations and upgrades before development is approved.

For concerns about the road conditions for cyclists in Kent County contact Nate Evans, Active Transportation Planner, MDOT, nevans1mdot.maryland.gov

For information/concerns about this project contact Mr. William Mackey, Director of Planning, Zoning and Housing wmackey@kentgov.org

## Janet Christensen-Lewis

Millington

The Spy Newspapers may periodically employ the assistance of artificial intelligence (Al) to enhance the clarity and accuracy of our content.

Filed Under: 8 Letters to Editor
$\leftarrow$ Silent Auction Fundraiser at Tish Gallery

## Letters to Editor

## Michael Bitting says

December 15, 2022 at 9:57 AM
This is absurd. Our local NIMBY-in-Chief ceaselessly objecting to any attempt to improve the economic conditions in Kent County. The utter pretentiousness of Janet ChristensenLewis always amazes me. I would love to know what qualifies her to speak against any attempt to inch into the 21st century. From renewable energy expert, zoning expert, economist, and now master cyclist, she wears many hats. I think she might be better off

## 三 MENU

## Deirdre LaMotte says

December 16, 2022 at 6:50 PM
Curious. I see nothing wrong with NIMBYism, why would residents not be able to voice a concern?
I know nothing about a mega warehouse but she is correct. Why use prime farmland and pave over it like
beautiful Middletown? I jest about "beautiful", but that town had arguably the best soil of all.

And you think hourly wage at a warehouse is worth destroying land??

## Paula Reeder says

December 18, 2022 at 1:19 PM
Anyone who drives on Chesterville Bridge Road knows that the road is in poor shape, has no viable side bars for bicyclists and is one of the least traveled roads in Kent County. Mrs. Christensen's contension that that road and the bypass are main thoroughfares for bicylists is pure bunk. Further, her claim that bicyclists utilization of the route that would serve traffic going to and from the proposed warehouse facilities represents a major economic contribution to Kent County that would be threatened by completion of the warehouse installation couldn't be further from the truth. The proposed warehouse location is smack in the middle of one of the few areas in Kent County specificall designated in the County Comprehensive Plan for industrial development. This is just more baseless, anti-any development harem-scarem from KCPA. Enough already! It's time for the County to embrace and move forward on clean development project proposals that will increase tax revenues necessary to support our ability to fund Kirwin related improvements to our school programs and other sorely needed economic development priorities.

## John Lysinger says

December 22, 2022 at 12:08 PM
It's unfortunate that any member of Kent County's Planning Commission, to which Paula Reeder has recently been appointed, should announce her decision regarding any

## $\equiv$ MENU

equally clear that she embraces development with few, if any, boundaries. Thankfully, she will not be the only decisionmaker.

## Write a Letter to the Editor on this Article

We encourage readers to offer their point of view on this article by submitting the following form. Editing is sometimes necessary and is done at the discretion of the editorial staff.

PLANNING COMMISSION<br>FOR KENT COUNTY, MARYLAND

| MILLINGTON CROSSING | $*$ |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| ASSOCIATES ONE, LLC - | $*$ | CASE NO. 22-68 |
| MINOR SUBDIVISION | $*$ |  |
| MAP 31, PARCEL 6, PART 1 | $*$ |  |
| NEAR MILLINGTON |  |  |
| $* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *$ |  |  |
| EVERTON INDUSTRIAL, LOT 1- | $*$ |  |
| MAJOR SITE PLAN (PRELIMINARY) |  |  |
| MAP 31, PARCL 6, PART 1 | $*$ | CASE NO. 22-67 |
| NEAR MILLINGTON | $*$ |  |

## SPECIAL LAW MEMORANDUM

We represent Kent Conservation and Preservation Alliance and certain citizens. We are submitting this memorandum in accordance with the Planning Commission Bylaws, Section 7 - Rules of Procedure, which states in relevant part that "[i]f any Person wishes to bring to the Board's attention complex data, reports, or arguments, that Person should submit the material in writing one week before the hearing . . .." This memorandum concerns a previous legal matter we had presented last year concerning an underlying

Zoning Text Amendment ("ZTA") that was heard before the Kent County Commissioners on June 13, 2023. Specifically, the ZTA contemplates raising the maximum height of certain types of industrial buildings in specific districts-Industrial, Commercial, and Employment Center-in the County, but only if constructed within the 301 Corridor. While the definition of "301 Corridor" has been a matter of some debate, the government's proposed definition when approving the ZTA was that it would encompass all land extending one mile to the east or west of any portion of U.S. Route 301.

We believe that the ZTA was wrongly approved due to the nature of how it was constructed as it first passed through the Planning Commission and then to the County Commissioners. Under the Maryland constitution, "special laws" are illegal, and the method of determining a special law is governed by a six-factor test:
(1) "whether [the underlying purpose of the legislative enactment] was actually intended to benefit or burden a particular member or members of a class instead of an entire class";
(2) " $[w]$ hether particular individuals or entities are identified in the statute";
(3) "[t]he substance and 'practical effect' of an enactment";
(4) "[i]f a particular individual or business sought and received special advantages from the Legislature, or if other similar individuals or businesses were discriminated against by the legislation";
(5) " $[t]$ he public need and public interest underlying the enactment, and the inadequacy of the general law to serve the public need or public interest"; and
(6) "whether [the legislative enactment is] arbitrary and without any reasonable basis[.]"

See generally Howard Cnty. v. McClain, 254 Md. App. 190, 198 (2022). We will briefly present our analysis with regard to this test.

The first two factors are analyzed concurrently. The second of the two factors is a de minimis issue according to courts that have reviewed special laws, see generally id. Nevertheless, in the Proposed Zoning letter for the ZTA, its owner Russ Richardson was clearly identified by name. Likewise, as to the first factor, the ZTA was narrowly tailored to only apply to a specific small band of land in Kent County, and then only to specific zoning categories in the County.


As seen in the chart above, the ZTA only applies to Industrial, Employment Center, and
Commercial zoning, which results in a hypothetical application to a dozen properties.
However, the properties in the northern part of the 301 Corridor do not have any existing
water and sewer service, which narrows the developable area that is able to take advantage of the ZTA to the few properties at the southern end of the County. These parcels are further limited by the developable envelopes of each, which makes construction of a Distribution Center-styled warehouse infeasible on the southerly Commercial properties. The only property owner in the entire area who both owns property large enough for development and has that property located in an area that is meaningfully capable of taking advantage of the ZTA is Russ Richardson, the owner of Millington Crossing Associates One, LLC.

The third special law factor speaks to substance and practical effect, and in this regard the ZTA is also a special law. The law, considered outside the context of comprehensive rezoning, affects one stretch along one roadway as opposed to being applied to bulk regulations of development generally, and thus it would permit a type of development 33\% larger than previously allowed in only that one area. The specific stated goal of the ZTA and its associated submitted documents before this Commission and the County Commissioners was to permit this larger height scale for Distribution Center-styled warehouses, and no other types of industrial uses were defined by name or general parameter. Lastly, in accordance with typical development practices of Distribution Centers in Maryland and elsewhere, building multiple such centers in close proximity to each other simply never occurs, which means that even if the other properties east of 301 were to somehow consolidate under one deed and create a parcel large enough for a "competing warehouse," it would never practicably occur. In essence, the ZTA permits a
single use in a single parcel for the benefit of a single developer to be larger than bulk regulations would allow for any other similar use anywhere else in the County.

The fourth factor, as the Commission might note, cascades from the first, second, and third. The history of the ZTA was that it came about at the behest of a specific named individual to increase the developable size of his property in a manner that would financially benefit him, in such a way that other individuals or businesses looking to develop properties under the same general law would suddenly be at a commercial disadvantage, if not fully foreclosed from any meaningful competing use in the area affected by the ZTA. It has the effect of stratifying Mr. Richardson's parcels to acquire development advantages that are disallowed anywhere else in the County. And procedure is as important as function in this case; had this same type of law been contemplated as part of comprehensive rezoning it may have been legally sufficient even if it had a similar practical effect to the "first in time" developer, but because it came about due to the specific actions of that first developer, he therefore received a special advantage.

The fifth factor is one that the Planning Commission was previously familiar with, given that it voiced similar concerns about the ZTA as passed in 2023 and had instead proposed a broader ZTA that would apply generally to commercial and industrial zones. Simply put, there is no obvious public need to permitting a larger development size in this specific area for a specific type of use. While the Commission may find that there is an arguable public need for "marketable properties" in the County at large that is served by looser bulk regulations, this would clearly be a public need for the County at large. To
suggest that there is a public need for one specific developer in one specific area to have special bulk regulations for his project alone is contrary to any notion of a general public need, and a general law would have sufficed to provide such a need were it extant. Furthermore, any argument that a Distribution Center could not exist without the proposed ZTA would necessarily carry with it the underlying proposition that Distribution Centers are not actually compatible by right in the applicable zones and that the ZTA would be adding a new use by right only in a specific location.

As to the sixth and final factor, case law holds that the arbitrariness calculation is not a determination of whether the underlying purpose is arbitrary, but whether the restrictions are arbitrary. ""By narrowing [the bill] to such extent that it only applies to one property, the Council rendered [the bill] unreasonable." McClain, 254 Md. App. at 20304. There appears to be no specific reason ever provided as to why the ZTA would only apply to a specific small area of the County (and consequently apply new de facto bulk restrictions to other I, C, and E-C zones County-wide), excepting that that's where the ZTA's primary advocate happens to own land that he wants to use in the specific manner permitted by the ZTA.

For the reasons stated above, we believe it is clear that the ZTA that is enabling the current size of the contemplated development is constitutionally illegal, and that the development cannot go forward with a maximum height greater than the baseline of 45 feet for a use of its type and location. As stated in our opening paragraph, we will submit other distinct concerns via separate memoranda for organizational purposes.

G. Macy Nelson

AIS No. 8112010268
Law Office of G. Macy Nelson, LLC 600 Washington Avenue, Suite 202
Towson, Maryland 21204
(410) 296-8166
gmacynelson@gmacynelson.com

William and Anne Norris, 24904 Chestertown Rd, Map 37, Parcel 12, Lot 1
S and L Farms, Map 44, Parcel 313


## Respondent

<

1. Name: *
```
Joyce Rogers
```

2. Mailing Address: *

103 Patton Way elkton md. 21921
3. What would you like to do: *Propose a text change to the Land Use Ordinance.Request a rezoning of your property.
4. In order to request a rezoning please provide the property address or location. If your property doesn't have an address, please include the Map and Parcel number as found on your tax bill.

Use this link if you need to look up your Map and Parcel Number: https://sdat.dat.maryland.gov/RealProperty/Pages/default.aspx (https://sdat.dat.maryland.gov/RealProperty/Pages/default.aspx) *

```
44/313
```

5. What is the current zoning of your property?

Use this link to a mapping application if you need to find your zoning: http://kentcountymd.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html? id=def6d57892b740fcbaa7dc9afdf3ef33 (http://kentcountymd.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html? id=def6d57892b740fcbaa7dc9afdf3ef33)

Once you find your parcel, just click on it to find your zoning.

```
Rural Character
```

6. What zoning district would you prefer? *
```
Commercial Residential (C/R)
```

7. Would you also like to request a text change?Yes
( No
8. Please provide your email address if you would like to be notified when new information is added to the Land Use Ordinance Update web page.
```
jrogers3017@yahoo.com
```

| From: | Lamie Rogers |
| :--- | :--- |
| To: | William Mackey |
| Subject: | S \& Farms Zoning District |
| Date: | Monday, May 20, 2024 3:39:47 PM |

## ATTENTION!

This email originated from an external source. DO NOT CLICK any links or attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

- KCIT Helpdesk

Good afternoon Mr. Mackey,
As per our conversation regarding new zoning designation for S \& L Farms, MAP 44, Parcel 313 — I am submitting this letter as clarification.

We are requesting Community Residential .. in lieu of Commercial Residential as stated on our submitted form.

Thank you for your assistance and sorry for any confusion.

Joyce Rogers

Sent from my iPad

| $\begin{gathered} \text { PDF } \\ \text { MAP \# } \end{gathered}$ | Owner | Tax Map | Parcel | Lot | Acres | Current Zoning | Requested Zoning | PC Recommendation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Brayton Family Limited Partnership | 37 | 76 | 1 | 11.800 | IV | C | Favorable |
| 1 | Brayton Family Limited Partnership | 37 | 97 |  | 10.000 | IV | C | Favorable |
| 1 | Wesley Brewer Properties LLC / Alden Yetman | 37 | 38 |  | 0.996 | AZD / IV | IV | Favorable |
| 2 | Olga Brooks | 16 | 16 |  | 1.730 | V | AZD | Unfavorable |
| 3 | Diane Lee Carey \& Sandra A Ealy | 51 | 105 |  | 0.720 | CAR |  | No change |
| 4 | Anne Chandler \& Arthur Harris III | 12 | 92 |  | 118.000 | AZD/RCD | CR / CAR | Favorable |
| 5 | John E Sr \& Donna Marie Dottellis | 7 | 339 | 5 | 6.000 | CAR/RR | CR | No change |
| 5 | Leon K \& Jo Ann M Hurlock | 7 | 294 |  | 0.371 | CAR | CAR | No change |
| 5 | Leon K \& Jo Ann M Hurlock | 7 | 296 |  | 0.375 | CAR | CAR | No change |
| 6 | Barbara A Edwards | 52 | 106 |  | 1.612 | RCD/M | RCD | Favorable |
| 6 | Charlotte L Edwards et als | 51 | 188 |  | 1.870 | M | M | No change |
| 6 | Charlotte L Edwards et als | 51 | 189 |  | 3.690 | M | M | No change |
| 6 | Tillers Cottages LLC | 51 | 187 |  | 0.501 | M | M | No change |
| 7 | Walter \& Cora M Gould | 43 | 10 |  | 10.010 | RC | RR | Favorable |
| 8 | John R Graziani | 52 | 169 |  | 1.500 | CR | AZD | Unfavorable |
| 9 | Haven Emporium LLC | 50 | 69 |  | 1.030 | CAR/M | M | Favorable |
| 9 | Haven Emporium LLC | 50 | 141 |  | 0.860 | CAR | M | Favorable |
| 9 | Haven Emporium LLC | 50 | 23 |  | 7.090 | CAR/M | M | Favorable |
| 9 | Haven Emporium LLC | 50 | 142 |  | 0.258 | CAR | M | Favorable |
| 10 | William Stevens \& Ssuan Kelly Ingersoll | 53 | 44 |  | 1.750 | AZD | RR | Unfavorable |
| 11 | F \& S Operations LLC | 37 | 485 | 3 | 0.571 | IV | IV | No change |
| 11 | Joan Ozman Horsey | 37 | 180 |  | 4.710 | IV | IV | No change |
| 11 | Jimstown LLC | 37 | 44 |  | 0.830 | IV | IV | No change |
| 11 | Jimstown LLC | 37 | 177 |  | 21.504 | IV | IV | No change |
| 11 | Walter F \& Tracye S Landon | 37 | 485 | 1 | 0.942 | IV | IV | No change |
| 11 | Scott O \& Shari C Smith | 37 | 485 | 2 | 0.664 | IV | IV | No change |
| 11 | Todd B \& Diane H Smith | 37 | 485 | 4 | 1.670 | IV | IV | No change |
| 12 | Russ Richardson / Millington Crossing |  |  |  |  |  |  | Favorable |
| 12B | Charles W Jones Jr et als | 32 | 36 |  | 0.700 | CAR | CAR | No change |
| 13 | Kevin G Kimble | 37 | 7 |  | 331.000 | AZD | CR | Favorable |
| 13 | William H \& Anne J Norris | 37 | 12 | 1 | 127.740 | RC | CR | Favorable |
| 13 | S \& L Farms LLC | 44 | 313 |  | 10.100 | RC | C/R |  |
| 14 | Kinlaw Security Group LLC | 35A | 249 |  | 0.092 | CR | C | Unfavorable |
| 15 | Alberta Frances \& James E Lindauer | 28 | 31 | 1 | 72.770 | I | AZD | Favorable |
| 15 | Alberta Frances \& James E Lindauer | 28 | 31 | 2 | 2.000 | 1 | AZD | Favorable |
| 15 | Michael Vargo \& Milton P Glazer | 28 | 160 |  | 46.000 | AZD | EC | Favorable |
| 15 | Michael Vargo \& Milton P Glazer | 28 | 103 |  | 23.000 | AZD | EC | Favorable |
| 16 | Thomas Irvin \& Donna Marie Lins | 27 | 19 |  | 26.500 | AZD | AZD | No change |
| 17 | John F \& Patricia M Macielag | 55 | 88 |  | 25.540 | CAR | CAR | No change |
| 18 | Massey Properties LLC | 24 | 7 |  | 50.582 | AZD/EC | AZD | Favorable |
| 18 | Massey Properties LLC | 24 | 15 |  | 258.572 | AZD/EC | AZD | Favorable |


| $\begin{gathered} \text { PDF } \\ \text { MAP \# } \end{gathered}$ | Owner | Tax Map | Parcel | Lot | Acres | Current Zoning | Requested Zoning | PC Recommendation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 19 | Mary Jane Mayo | 16 | 6 |  | 198.363 | EC | EC | No change |
| 20 | Phillips Station LLC | 21 | 158 |  | 2.660 | V | EC | Favorable |
| 22 | John A \& Pamela M Schwartz | 20 | 3 |  | 9.550 | AZD | AZD | No change |
| 23 | Elizabeth C Sisco | 46 | 38 |  | 0.500 | V | V | No change |
| 24 | James H Smith |  |  |  | 0.000 | RC | AZD | Unfavorable |
| 24 | James H Smith | 44 | 144 |  | 9.780 | RC | AZD | Unfavorable |
| 24 | James H \& Elizabeth R Smith | 44 | 68 |  | 6.000 | RC | AZD | Unfavorable |
| 24 | James H \& Elizabeth R Smith | 44 | 187 |  | 6.000 | RC | AZD | Unfavorable |
| 24 | James H \& Elizabeth R Smith | 44 | 330 |  | 32.000 | AZD | AZD | Unfavorable |
| 25 | Francis E \& Georgia May Sweetman et als | 17 | 10 |  | 0.300 | CC | CC | No change |
| 25 | Francis Eugene Sweetman | 17 | 58 |  | 1.450 | CC | CC | No change |
| 25 | Francis Eugene Sweetman | 17 | 81 |  | 0.200 | CC | CC | No change |
| 25 | Francis Eugene Sweetman | 17 | 125 |  | 0.200 | V | CC | No change |
| 27 | Richard David E Walters \& Dennis S Walters | 15 | 8 |  | 79.580 | AZD | CR | Favorable |
| 28 | Thomas E Weisenfels Trustee | 8 | 83 |  | 0.893 | CAR | RR | Unfavorable |
| 29 | William A Jr \& Virginia I Wilson | 31 | 21 |  | 5.000 |  |  | No change |
| 30 | Chester River Yacht and Country Club - waterfront | 44 | 15 |  | 0.000 | CAR | M | Favorable |
| 31 | H And A Farm LLC | 24 | 12 | 1 | 180.553 | AZD/EC | EC | Unfavorable |
| 33 | Edward \& Yvonne P Mills | 13 | 109 |  | 2.324 | CC/AZD | C | Favorable |
| 33 | Vonnie P Mills | 14 | 33A |  | 3.500 | AZD | C | Favorable |
| 34 | Franklin A Kelley | 51 | 378 |  | 1.706 | V | AZD | Unfavorable |
| 35 | Good House LLC | 27 | 470 |  | 0.344 | CR | V | Unfavorable |
| 35 | Good House LLC | 27 | 691 |  | 0.350 | CR | V | Unfavorable |
| 35 | Good House LLC | 27 | 444 |  | 0.379 | CAR | V | Unfavorable |
| 35 | Good House LLC | 27 | 577 |  | 0.355 | CAR | V | Unfavorable |
| 35 | Good House LLC | 27 | 516 |  | 0.435 | CAR | V | Unfavorable |
| 35 | Good House LLC | 27 | 58 |  | 2.000 | V | V | No change |
| 36 | Bram Weinstein | 7 | 15B |  | 0.000 | CR | C | Unfavorable |
| 37 | John D North | 44 | 110 |  | 8.000 | CR | CR | No change |
| 38 | John W Standiford \& Karen A Yasinsky | 45 | 48 | 2 | 4.590 | RCD | CR | Unfavorable |
| 39 | John T \& Deborah L Orr | 7 | 302 |  | 3.000 | CAR | CAR | No change |
| 40 | Hoagland Farm LLC | 36 | 24 | 1 | 105.510 | CR | V | Favorable |
| 41 | Roy P Hoagland | 35D | 301 |  | 0.278 | CC | C | No change |
| 42 | Rebecca Anne \& George H Kendall | 48 | 48 |  | 2.000 | CR | AZD | Favorable |
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