



**Town of Easton Planning Commission
Final Decision Summary**

Thursday, July 17, 2025 at 1:00 p.m.

Town Hall Chamber 2

14 S. Harrison Street, Easton, Maryland

Archived video of the meeting is available at:

[Town of Easton Agendas and Minutes](http://eastonmd.gov)
 [\(eastonmd.gov\)](http://eastonmd.gov)

Attendance:

Commission Members:

Philip Toussaint, Chairperson
Michael Ports, Vice Chairperson
Tom Klein
Victoria McAndrews
William Ryall

Staff:

Miguel Salinas, Planning and Zoning Director
Lynn B. Thomas AICP, Town Planner
Joseph Mayer, Plan Reviewer
Sharon Van Emburgh, Esq., Town Attorney
Sierra Clem, Engineering Technician
Samantha Smith, Administrative Specialist

Absent:

Commission Members:

Laurie Forster, Alternate

Staff:

Nicholas Johnson AICP, Planner

1. Call to Order — Chairperson Toussaint called the meeting to order at 1:00 pm.

2. Decision Summary Review —

a. June 24, 2025 - The Commission noted the following correction to the draft decision summary:

- i. Line 231: *Strike* “dwelling units”, *Add* “bedroom units.”
- ii. Line 450: Correction to Applicant Presentation.

Commissioner Klein moved to approve the June 24, 2025 Decision Summary with amendments. Commissioner McAndrews seconded the motion.

Vote	<u>5 - 0</u>
FOR:	5 - Toussaint, Ports, Klein, McAndrews, Ryall
AGAINST:	0
ABSTAIN:	0

ABSENT: 0

3. New Business

- a. **Recommendation to the Town Council for Potential Revisions to the Planned Redevelopment Overlay District (PRD) Standards** — At the request of the Town Council, the Commission has been asked to consider potential changes to the Planned Redevelopment Overlay District (PRD) provisions. This request follows the Council's interest in playing a more significant role in the development review and approval process. At their May 15, 2025 meeting, the Commission proposed a revision of the language in the Purpose section of the PR District standards to be redefined as a mechanism to incentivize infill development, redevelopment, and the adaptive reuse of projects by streamlining the review process for specific qualifying small-scale developments on former industrial sites and in older areas within the Town of Easton. The language in the Applicability section was expanded to define the review level threshold for qualifying projects. Additionally, a site plan approval threshold was created in a new Review Process section of the PR District standards to ensure compatibility with adjacent neighborhoods and adherence to the design guidelines of the Comprehensive Plan.

In their discussion, the Commission indicated a desire to encourage creative infill strategies, suggesting that the square footage threshold for site plan projects requiring their approval (residential, commercial or other mixed-use developments) should be established in proportion to the adjacent properties. The Commission recommended a revision to the language in the Applicability section to increase the number of dwelling units in projects eligible to be reviewed to 20 - 25. The Commission further recommended additional clarifying language for administrative reviews and exemptions within the Review Process section.

In response to public feedback related to prior projects in the PR District and the ongoing update of the Comprehensive Plan, the Commission held an in depth discussion regarding a potential amendment to the Zoning Code to improve community involvement in the Town's land use decisions. This proposal would require pre-application meetings between prospective developers or landowners and surrounding residents, and the expansion of public notice requirements in the Zoning Code.

Staff Presentation:

Miguel Salinas, Planning and Zoning Director
Lynn B. Thomas AICP, Town Planner
Sharon Van Emburgh, Esq., Town Attorney

Public Comment:

Maury Schlesinger, 304 Winton Avenue

Public Comment Written:
Maury Schlesinger, 304 Winton Avenue

The recommendation to the Town Council was tabled for further discussion at a subsequent Planning Commission meeting.

4. Old Business

- a. File No.:** 2025 - 1456
- Applicant:** Lane Engineering, LLC
on behalf of Easton Sunrise Partners, LLC
- Location:** 9684, 9778, 9783, 9687 Technology Drive &
29001, 29004 I-Way Court, Easton, MD 21601
Tax Map 0025, Grid 0004, Parcels 0090 & 0092, Lots 1-4, 9, 10

Current Zoning: BC

Requested Zoning: PUD

Request: The Applicant is seeking sketch subdivision approval, and a Planning Commission recommendation to the Town Council for a Planned Unit Development (PUD). The proposed development on the Easton Technology Center Phase II Subdivision includes 61 single-family detached dwellings, 47 neo-traditional single-family detached dwellings, 65 three-story 20' wide townhomes, 72 three-story 22' wide townhomes, and features four (4) four-story multifamily buildings with a total of 120 units. The development also incorporates two (2) two-story commercial buildings, which will house amenities such as a clubhouse with a pool and pickleball courts. Additional facility improvements include parking, stormwater management, and landscaping.

Staff Presentation:
Miguel Salinas, Planning and Zoning Director
Lynn B. Thomas AICP, Town Planner
Joseph Mayer, Plan Reviewer
Sharon Van Emburgh, Esq., Town Attorney
Sierra Clem, Engineering Technician

Applicant Presentation:
Lawrence Scott, Esq. on behalf of Easton Sunrise Partners LLC
Brett Ewing, Lane Engineering

Public Comment:
Thomas Ledvina, 7585 Pollis Hill Lane

Bettye Maki, 7448 Jeffreys Way
Steve Ball, 10 St. James Court
Calvin Yael, Londonderry On The Tred Avon
Barbara Lane, Goldsborough Neck Road
Jane Pullman, Londonderry On The Tred Avon
Tom Alspach, Talbot Preservation Alliance
Maury Schlesinger, 304 Winton Avenue
Bruce Harrington

Public Comment Written:

Maury Schlesinger, 304 Winton Avenue
Thomas Ledvina, 7585 Pollis Hill Lane
Carin Starr
Nanny Trippe, 27386 Trippe Road
Bettye Maki, 7448 Jeffreys Way
Dave Perry, 7418 Michael Avenue
Betty B. Hartmeyer, 17 Shannon Terrace
Diedra Lyngard
Patricia Bradley, 700 Port Street
James Van Ness, 28656 Clubhouse Drive
Clare Kettell
James M. Bent, Chairperson of the Affordable Housing Board

Vice Chairperson Ports moved to forward a recommendation to the Town Council to deny the PUD application. The Planning Commission determined the project to be inconsistent with the Town of Easton Comprehensive Plan based on the following findings:

- 1. Diversity and Integration of Housing Types and Commercial Uses: The PUD application does not demonstrate the diversity and integration of housing types and commercial uses as outlined in the design principles of the Plan.**
- 2. Future Land Use Map: The proposed mixed uses in the PUD application are incompatible with the established industrial development as classified in the Future Land Use Map.**
- 3. Connectivity: Considering the surrounding industrial, commercial and hospital zoning uses, the proposed PUD application does not align with the Comprehensive Plan's vision for connectivity to adjacent properties.**
- 4. Health and Environmental Impacts: The proposed PUD's close proximity to the airport presents potential health, safety and environmental concerns for prospective residents.**

5. **Uniqueness of Easton:** The project's design is inconsistent with the Plan's vision for community character; reflecting an "Anywhere USA" aesthetic.
6. **Affordable Housing:** The Affordable Housing Board determined that this development would not fulfill the Town of Easton's need for affordable housing. Additionally, the absence of affordable covenants on units designated as affordable fails to guarantee their long-term affordability.

Should the Council grant approval for the PUD application, the Commission respectfully recommends that the specifics of the affordable housing be explicitly addressed to the satisfaction of the Town of Easton Affordable Housing Board. Furthermore, any units designated as affordable ought to be deed-restricted to ensure their continued adherence to this provision.

Chairperson Toussaint seconded the motion.

<u>Vote</u>	<u>5 - 0</u>
FOR:	5 - Toussaint, Ports, Klein, McAndrews, Ryall
AGAINST:	0
ABSTAIN:	0
ABSENT:	0

5. **Discussion Items** — None
6. **Adjournment** — Vice Chairperson Ports moved to adjourn. Chairperson Toussaint seconded the motion. The meeting was adjourned at 3:33 p.m.