
MINUTES

The Salisbury-Wicomico Planning and Zoning Commission met in regular session on December 17, 2009 in the Council Chambers of the Government Office Building, Room 301, with the following persons in attendance:

COMMISSION MEMBERS:

Corinne Les Callette, Chairman (Absent)
Donald B. Bounds, Vice Chairman
Gail Bartkovich
James W. Magill
Glen Robinson
Scott Rogers
Gary Comegys

CITY/COUNTY OFFICIALS:

Ed Baker, County Attorney
Henry Eure, Department of Building, Permits, and Inspections
Mary Phillips, County Public Works Department
Gary Hales, Salisbury Public Works Department

PLANNING STAFF:

Jack Lenox, Director
Gloria Smith, Planner
Frank McKenzie, Planner
Beverly Tull, Recording Secretary



The meeting was called to order at 1:34 p.m. by Mr. Bounds, Vice Chairman.

**Minutes:**

Upon a motion by Mr. Magill, seconded by Mrs. Bartkovich, and duly carried, the Commission **APPROVED** the minutes of the November 19, 2009 meeting as submitted.

**COUNTY SUBDIVISION PLATS:****Retrievers Run – Development Plan – 19 Lots – Esham and Bob Smith Roads – M-31; P-65; G-5.**

Mr. Steve Smethurst, Mr. Bill Kenney and Mrs. A.K. Kenney came forward. Mrs. Gloria Smith presented the Staff Report. J. Stacey Hart & Associates has submitted a Development Plan for Retriever's Run subdivision for review by the Planning Commission. The submittal includes a Community Impact Statement, an Environmental Assessment, and a Market Analysis for the proposed subdivision. The Traffic summary is included with the Environmental Assessment. The Wicomico County Zoning Code requires Development Plan approval prior to approval of a Final Plat for an A-1 Cluster subdivision.

Mr. Bounds questioned who would maintain the grass cutting on the SRA areas of the pipestem lots. Mr. Smethurst responded that the property owners would be responsible for cutting the grass.

Mr. Smethurst questioned the 15 ft. strip that connects Lot 13 to the SRA where Lot 12 has a 20 ft. strip. There is no requirement as to what the width has to be. He explained that a 2 ft. PVC pipe would be buried with a trencher and that a 25 ft. strip wasn't needed. Mr. Magill stated that a 15 ft. strip would be sufficient and allow for a u-turn for any maintenance vehicle that needed to turn around. Mr. Smethurst stated that he could accept a 15 ft. strip.

Mrs. Phillips stated that this was a policy standard that was instituted when remote SRA's became acceptable. Mr. Comegys questioned if this was a policy. Mr. Smethurst responded that this had become a policy but that there was

nothing in the Code that required a certain width. Mr. Comegys stated that if this was a policy the policy shouldn't be deviated from. Mr. Smethurst stated that there was a philosophical difference in what the policy meant. Lot 12 can be shrunk by 10 ft. to create a cross easement on the final leg behind Lot 11 going to the two (2) SRA's and it would be 30 ft. instead of 25 ft. This would comply with the 25 ft. strip for the septic line placement so the owners of Lots 12 and 13 would share the last 30 ft. going to the SRA's. The responsibility would be on the owners to maintain this area. Mr. Smethurst requested approval of the modified pipestems to the SRA's.

Mr. Mike Pretl, WET and representing specific property owners, distributed a memo (Protestant's Exhibit A) to the Commission in reference to Retrievers Run as well as Bryer Estates. Mr. Pretl discussed their stance regarding clusters over the last several years. He stated that the issues regarding clusters had been resolved by the Whiton appeals case. The Court states that the Commission has the discretion in these matters. Judge Jackson stated that Section 225-3E controls all of these cases. The Staff said that this development complies with Section 225-52 but the Court states something different. The Commission can't grant cluster zoning unless it supports all the points listed in the memo. The Staff should go through each provision for compliance and these points should apply for all cluster cases.

Mr. John Groutt, Cooper Road, stated that the cluster density is a bonus. He stated that he had spoken with the applicants prior to the meeting and understood that they were putting other pieces of agricultural land in an easement but this proposal wasn't consistent with that. This proposal doesn't meet the Stormwater Management Plan of 2007. The pipestem lots are an issue. The proposed subdivision is not in the growth area of the County. This is an inappropriate area for a cluster bonus. There is nothing innovative or creative about the design. Because the development is in a rural area, agriculture isn't being preserved. The A-1 District was designed to protect the agricultural lands. Farming generates the most income in Wicomico County. The proposed parcel is contiguous to a large parcel of land that was purchased by the State of Maryland. He submitted Protestant's Exhibit B, an aerial photo of surrounding forested lands and the MDP letter denying recertification of the County Agricultural Land Preservation Program. Mr. Groutt requested denial of the proposal.

Mr. Bounds thanked Mr. Groutt and Mr. Pretl for their work on clusters over the last few years.

Mr. Smethurst stated that almost everything that Mr. Pretl and Mr. Groutt had spoken of was addressed in the preliminary review. Any development in the A-1 District would be diminution of ag land. The most productive lands are being preserved. The Whiton case is being appealed to the Court of Special Appeals. If the points that the opposition is using are used then it would appeal to any zoning action. If everything was applied strictly, then there wouldn't be the ability to have a

subdivision anywhere. The Zoning Code states that subdivisions are permitted in the A-1 District. The open space of 50 percent has to be on one (1) or two (2) large parcels and not on individual lots for cluster developments. The cemetery has been put on a separate parcel. If the Commission were to use Mr. Pretl's arguments, then they would have to apply them to every subdivision which would create a monster. The Commission can use discretion and added that the Commission had a firm basis to approve this request.

Mr. Comegys questioned Mr. Baker as to where the Staff and the Commission conform – to Judge Jackson's decision or based on the Court of Special Appeals decision when it comes down – what should the Commission do. Mr. Baker stated that the County Attorney's office hasn't been involved in either case so he couldn't address what the Court has said other than the Commission's decision was upheld. Mr. Baker suggested staying with same process until the appellate court overturns it. Mr. Smethurst added that each case stands on its own.

Mr. Smethurst reminded the Commission that there wasn't anything new on the table.

Mr. Lenox stated that there was a favorable staff report in front of the Commission. Findings of Fact have been done in the past when a subdivision is being denied, because such findings are required by the Subdivision Code. He added that in the Whiton case, Judge Jackson concluded that the Commission had the discretion to deny a cluster based upon the provisions of the Zoning Code. He advised that the Commission then also has the same discretion to approve a cluster.

Mr. Magill stated that if this project came in today then it probably wouldn't have gotten this far but the Commission has already approved it so he was prepared to move forward.

Upon a motion by Mr. Magill, seconded by Mrs. Bartkovich, and duly carried, the Commission **APPROVED** the Development Plan, with the Community Impact Statement and Environmental Assessment, as submitted for Retriever's Run.



Retrievers Run – Final – 19 Lots – Esham and Bob Smith Roads – M-31; P-65; G-5.

Mr. Steve Smethurst, Mr. Bill Kenney and Mrs. A.K. Kenney came forward. Mrs. Gloria Smith presented the Staff Report. The applicants propose subdivision of 19 building lots from 68.73 acres.

Upon a motion by Mr. Magill, seconded by Mr. Robinson, and duly carried, the Commission **APPROVED** the Final Plat for Retriever's Run Subdivision, subject to the following Conditions of Approval:

CONDITIONS:

1. The Final Plat shall comply with the County Subdivision Regulations and is subject to further review by the County Department of Public Works.
2. Health Department approval is required prior to the recordation of the Final Plat.
3. Lot numbering shall be consecutive beginning with Lot #4.
4. The SRA pipestems for the lots on Sarge's Court shall be as shown on Exhibit A.
5. The pipestem lots shall have 50 ft. front setbacks as shown on the plat.

**The Plantations – Consent Regarding Lot 37, Phase 2A - Deerfield Road.**

Upon a motion by Mrs. Bartkovich, seconded by Mr. Comegys, and duly carried, the Commission **APPROVED** the Consent Document dated December 16, 2009, regarding release of Lot 37, Phase 2A from The Plantations Homeowners Association as submitted.

**The Plantations – Revised Final – 41 Lots – Old Railroad Road – M-18, P-133 & 134.**

Mr. Steve Smethurst, Mr. Frank Willing, and Mr. Bob Taylor came forward. Mrs. Gloria Smith presented the Staff Report. The applicants propose resubdivision of 20 building lots into 41 lots from two tracts totaling 542 acres.

Mr. Smethurst stated that Lot 37 would be one (1) lot and can never be subdivided. There is no stormwater management on this lot. Lot 37 will remain in the Homeowners Association but not part of the covenants and restrictions of the development. Mr. Smethurst explained that there was a part of the Homeowners Association that states that the Homeowners Association is responsible for the stormwater and if the Homeowners Association doesn't maintain it that the County can go in and fix it and bill the HOA. Lot 37 would be exempt from this as well. The elimination of the line on Lot 21 has been taken care of and has been put on Lot 15B. A new document has been prepared for MDE. Parcel AA is 78.17 acres and is all in open space. There are people who have contracted to purchase lots based on the existing plat so it would be nice to proceed. All open space requirements have been met.

Mr. Comegys stated that the Staff had recommended leaving the conditions as they were listed until the new plat could be reviewed. Mr. Smethurst stated that he didn't have a problem with that request. Mrs. Smith added that the Commission had the discretion to drop Condition #8.

Mrs. Phillips stated that a pipestem lot had been created on Lot 1A so the Commission must set the setback line and recommended 50 ft. from the ditch.

Mr. Bounds thanked Mr. Baker for including his comments as part of the Staff Report so that the Commission had adequate time to review them.

Mr. Bounds questioned the release of Lot 37 from the HOA. Mr. Smethurst stated that the County didn't have a problem releasing that lot from the HOA. He added that he believed that it was appropriate for the Commission to offer a favorable recommendation for releasing Lot 37 from the HOA before the Consent Agreement went to Mr. Pollitt for signature. Mr. Baker noted that the HOA on record is for the ease of the County to apply the subdivision law. The Commission requires it so the Commission can authorize the release of the lot due to unusual circumstances that apply here. With the Commission approval, the lot can be released from the maintenance restrictions.

Upon a motion by Mrs. Bartkovich, seconded by Mr. Comegys, and duly carried, the Commission **APPROVED** the Resubdivision Plat for The Plantations, subject to the following Conditions of Approval:

CONDITIONS:

1. The Final Resubdivision Plat shall comply with all requirements of the Wicomico County Subdivision Regulations.

2. The Final Resubdivision Plat shall be amended to provide the 50 percent set aside as required by the Code.
3. Health Department approval is required prior to recordation of the Final Resubdivision Plat.
4. Any new lots shall become part of the Homeowners Association.
5. Forest Conservation approval shall be documented on the Final Resubdivision Plat.
6. The part of Lot 21 located at the end of and with frontage on Canter Lane shall be a separate lot or Parcel or become part of Lot 14H or Lot 15B.
7. A Revised Land Restriction document approved by the Maryland Department of the Environment shall be recorded simultaneously with the Resubdivision plat.
8. All existing landscape buffers as shown on Phase I shall remain.
9. The Lot 1A front setback line shall be consistent with the SRA line.
10. This approval is subject to further review and approval by the Wicomico County Department of Public Works.

Mr. Rogers recused himself due to professional conflicts.



Bryer Estates – Final Plat – 27 Lots – Siloam Road – M-46; P-281, 141, 182, 142; G-18.

Mr. Brock Parker and Mr. Greg Freese came forward. Mrs. Gloria Smith presented the Staff Report. The applicant proposes subdivision of 27 lots from 93.43 acres. Open space/set aside for the subdivision includes 48.3 acres (52 percent). All lots within the subdivision will have access to the interior streets.

Mr. Parker stated that nearly all the approvals have been obtained. The construction plans are under review in Public Works and there are approximately eight (8) notes left to be addressed. The Development Plan has been done and approved. He stated that they didn't have any problems with the Conditions listed in the Staff Report.

Mr. Bounds questioned the frontage on Lot 12. Mr. Parker stated that they had 30 ft. of frontage on the cul-de-sac and that they would work the frontage out with Mrs. Phillips.

Mr. John Groutt, WET and representing 16 neighbors, requested that Protestant's Exhibit A be included as part of the record. He stated that he had only spoken with the neighbors in the last few days and they didn't know that any hearings

had taken place where they could testify. Two (2) neighbors are present today to speak on this development. He discussed how this development doesn't comply with the Maryland Stormwater Act of 2007. Several of the neighbors have voiced concerns regarding fire protection for this development. There is traffic congestion on Riverside Drive now. Mr. Bill Truitt has stated that his property has suffered damage from the Developer cleaning out the ditches. Mr. Groutt requested denial of the subdivision request because it is outside of the Metro Core. He stated that WET is not trying to stop development in the A-1 District. Mr. Groutt explained that clusters are not in the law as it is currently written. This subdivision puts 39 lots in woods and fields and does not preserve ag land. He stated that this development doesn't meet the criteria of a cluster bonus. Mr. Groutt requested denial of the subdivision request.

Mr. Gary Nock, 3934 Campground Road, stated that he had received a letter and a map taped to his front door on Wednesday. He stated that the proposed development backs up to his property and that he has lived there for six (6) years. Several improvements have been made on the property which have improved drainage on his property. The parcel directly behind Mr. Nock's home is in forest conservation. Prior to the developer purchasing the property two (2) years ago, this property was nothing more than a muddy bog. Drainage has improved dramatically. The ditches have been cleaned and are draining better. There is flooding on Riverside Drive and Campground Road but that has been there forever. Mr. Nock stated that this development would be good for his property values. He stated that he had no problems with the development. Mr. Nock stated that there are six (6) or seven (7) new subdivisions sitting with empty homes within the Metro Core and they have pushed affordability out of the range of the average person.

Ms. Laurie Miller, Campground Road, stated that she lives adjacent to this property. She stated that the Wicomico River is in very bad shape. The ditch banks are in bad shape. She questioned how the traffic would be handled. Ms. Miller stated that she moved to get away from the urban sprawl. She questioned how the runoff would affect the river. Ms. Miller requested that the Commission look at the environment before approving this subdivision.

Ms. Bobbie Mitchell, 26911 Riverside Drive Extended, stated that she had major concerns over the wildlife. She explained that she has a certified wildlife habitat in her backyard. The animals are being pushed away and they were here first. There are empty homes all over Wicomico County. She stated that this development was nothing more than money and greed. She requested that development be stopped so that the animals can keep their home. She added that something should be done with all the empty homes around the State of Maryland.

Mrs. Bartkovich questioned Mrs. Smith if she had received a letter from the Allen Fire Department regarding this subdivision. Mrs. Smith responded that she wasn't sure if there was a letter from the Allen Fire Department in the file. Mrs.

Bartkovich noted that it was her responsibility to listen to the advice of the County Attorney, Mr. Baker, when making these decisions regarding development.

Mr. Magill requested that the developers and Mr. Parker take note of how the Commission will be looking at cluster developments in the future.

Upon a motion by Mr. Magill, seconded by Mr. Rogers, and duly carried, the Commission **APPROVED** the Final Plat for Bryer Estates, subject to the following Conditions of Approval:

CONDITIONS:

1. The Final Plat shall comply with the County Subdivision Regulations and is subject to further review by the County Department of Public Works.
2. New road names must be selected.
3. Visibility easements will be required at all intersections.
4. Lot #12 does not appear to have sufficient road frontage of 100 ft.
5. The Future street should be shown as part of Parcel A, the area of Parcel A adjusted, and the metes and bounds for the entire perimeter of the street right-of-way provided.
6. Health Department approval is required prior to the recordation of the Final Plat.



Mill Creek, Sec. 1 & 2 – Prelim. – Extension – 93 Lots – Pemberton Drive – M-37; P-293; G-20.

Mr. Brock Parker and Mr. Bud Esham came forward. Mrs. Gloria Smith presented the Staff Report. The applicants are requesting a one-year extension of time to submit the Final plat for the proposed subdivision. Engineering plans have been submitted to the Public Works Department and are under review but will not be completed prior to expiration of the Preliminary Plat on December 23, 2009. The Planning Staff also notes that there have been Critical Area issues affecting the submission of the Final plat for Mill Creek.

Upon a motion by Mr. Magill, seconded by Mr. Robinson, and duly carried, the Commission **APPROVED** a one-year extension of time for submission of the Final Plat for Mill Creek Subdivision, subject to the Conditions of Approval listed in the Staff Report. **This extension will expire on December 23, 2010.**



Essex Ridge, Sec. 6 – Prelim. – Extension – 17 Lots – Downing Road – M-21; P-77; G-12.

Mr. Brock Parker came forward. Mrs. Gloria Smith presented the Staff Report. The applicants are requesting a second one-year extension of time for submission of the Final Plat for Essex Ridge, Section 6. The engineers have indicated that the final septic evaluations are being completed by the Health Department and final revisions are being completed for submission of the Construction Improvements Plans to Wicomico County Public Works. This section includes construction of the service road and design of the road has taken longer than expected. This process will not be completed prior to the expiration of the current extension on January 10, 2010.

Mr. Bounds stated that this subdivision is 11 years in the making.

Upon a motion by Mrs. Bartkovich, seconded by Mr. Magill, and duly carried, the Commission **APPROVED** a one-year extension of time for submission of the Final Plat for Essex Ridge, Section 6, subject to the Conditions of Approval listed in the Staff Report. **This extension will expire on January 10, 2011.**



#SP-9105-09L REVISED SIGN PLAN – South Salisbury Plaza – Gospel Shop – 800 South Salisbury Blvd. – General Commercial District – M-115, G-2, P-469.

Mr. Kim Taylor and Mr. Gary Kleiman came forward. Mrs. Gloria Smith presented the Staff Report. At the November 19 Commission meeting, the Commission considered Mr. Taylor's request to add the word "Parable" in red letters over the front of the second unit occupied by the Gospel Shop.

Mr. Taylor explained that the cost increased by about \$1500 to move the signs closer together. If the sign is moved then the letters sit over the lines that have been painted for aesthetical purposes. Miller Property Management wouldn't

like the lines being covered up. He added that if the business ever went back to two (2) units again that the sign would have to be moved again.

Mr. Kleiman stated that the channel letters are put on a raceway that is then put up with bolts to the dryvit. If the *Gospel Shop* letters were moved, it would be very labor intensive because the letters are individually wired and each letter is essentially a separate sign. He added that it would look awkward to have the sign go over the lines that are there for aesthetics.

Mr. Bounds questioned if the new *Parable* sign is in a box. Mr. Kleiman responded in the negative, explaining that it was being made to match the *Gospel Shop* with individual letters. Mr. Bounds questioned if the letter "P" was too large. Mrs. Smith responded that the letter "P" was too large by about two (2) inches but that the Commission had said from the road it wouldn't be noticeable.

Mr. Comegys questioned if the Code stated only one (1) sign per store. Mr. Eure responded that the Zoning Code states one (1) sign per tenant in a shopping center. Larger tenants or free standing tenants have been given more signage. Mr. Comegys stated that the Commission's intent was to make it look like one (1) sign.

Mr. Rogers questioned the possibility of putting *Parable* over the *Gospel Shop*. Mr. Taylor responded that if *Parable* was placed over top of the existing *Gospel Shop* sign that it would cover the aesthetic lines that had just been painted a few months ago. Mrs. Smith added that the layout of the shopping center includes the sign band for the individual tenants. Mr. Rogers explained that if the sign wasn't centered that it looked less desirable.

Mr. Magill questioned if they could delete the *Gospel Shop* sign. Mr. Taylor responded in the negative, explaining that the name of the store was the *Gospel Shop*.

Mrs. Bartkovich questioned if there was anyway to include a hyphen in the sign between *Parable* and *Gospel Shop* to make it appear as one (1) sign. Mrs. Smith responded that a hyphen could be used to make it appear as a single sign as they were allowed to utilize up to 80 percent of the store front.

Upon a motion by Mrs. Bartkovich, seconded by Mr. Magill, and duly carried, the Commission **APPROVED** the revision to the Revised Sign Plan for the *Gospel Shop* to add the word *Parable* and a hyphen to make the sign look like one (1) sign.



**ANNEXATION – CITY OF SALISBURY – NAYLOR MILL ROAD – MBAS – M-29;
P-100; G-8 – 9.54 Acres.**

Mr. Glenn Aines and Mr. Steve Marshall came forward. Mrs. Gloria Smith presented the Staff Report. The City Administration has referred the Naylor Mill Road – MBAS Annexation located on the northwesterly side of Salisbury to the Planning Commission for review and recommendation of an appropriate zoning designation. The property is located near the southeasterly corner of Naylor Mill and Jersey Roads and consists of 9.54 acres.

Mr. Marshall questioned if the R-10A zoning allowed for the 57 units because his calculations from the code would only allow for 49 units which would make the project no longer feasible.

Mr. Aines stated that if they were to exclude the single family dwelling that it would drop the acreage to less than eight (8) acres which with an R-8A zoning would allow for a maximum of 64 units.

Mr. Marshall stated that the R-8A zoning would allow for what the development plan called for and that the R-10A zoning would significantly drop the number of units causing major concerns.

Mr. Comegys stated that there had been negotiations going on with Mr. Chris Jakubiak for quite some time and the negotiations were done to allow the developer to get the number of units that was needed. Mr. Marshall added that the negotiations had been going on for three (3) years with Mr. Jakubiak regarding the annexation agreement.

Mr. Lenox stated that by the time an annexation request gets to the Commission that there is a development plan of sorts in the works. The development has been reviewed based on the number of units. The concessions up to this point dictate an R-10A zoning but the Commission has the right to recommend an R-8A zoning. When the City Comprehensive Plan is completed, the densities could change and if the zoning is changed then it could back up with what happens to the lands to the right or left of this property.

Mr. Lenox stated that the zoning needs to be evened out a bit in this area.

Mr. Marshall stated that his concern was dropping the number of units down to 49 and making this project no longer feasible.

Mr. Lenox stated that the Staff was looking at a density that would fit this development.

Mr. Bounds stated that the Commission could put a cap on the number of units with the R-8A zoning. Mr. Comegys stated that putting a cap on the number of units would be a good solution.

Mr. Magill questioned if the Commission was capping the number of units or the density. Mr. Lenox suggested capping the number of units at 60 and including the existing house.

Upon a motion by Mr. Magill, seconded by Mrs. Bartkovich, and duly carried, the Commission forwarded a **FAVORABLE** recommendation for R-8A Residential zoning to the City Council for zoning of the annexation area upon the effective date of annexation to the City of Salisbury. This zoning recommendation includes a recommendation for a unit cap of 60 units plus the existing residential unit for development of the site.



Mr. Lenox handed out the future land use plan to go with the Elements that were placed at the Commission's place today. These are generally consistent with what the Commission has seen in the past. There have been meetings with the City Council in work sessions. The Commission can expect a work session in January. The City's Comprehensive Plan will be sent to the Clearinghouse for their 60 day review. After that takes place, a public hearing will be scheduled. He stated that the City has a preference for single family detached neighborhoods but has made provisions for properties in the growth areas. Mr. Comegys noted that he liked having clusters with high densities but with more open space. Mr. Lenox stated that the Comprehensive Plan will introduce clusters for the first time in the City of Salisbury.



Mr. Lenox stated that the Critical Area Commission has become a little overzealous with regulations lately. A letter regarding their latest round of regulations must be ready for Mr. Pollitt's signature by Monday. Mr. McKenzie and Mr. Lenox explained some of the proposed regulations and what they would mean to the County.



Mr. Comegys stated that the stormwater runoff issue that is being presented by Senator Cardin is having a major effect on the rural areas. The proposal will take a lot of acres out of the farming community. The regulations would require that you manage 75 percent stormwater management on site. Mr. Comegys added that these new regulations may change how the Commission reviews businesses.

Mr. Lenox added that the farmers are facing severe regulations not only for streams but also for ditches. A 10 ft. buffer around ditches may be required as well as not being allowed to put fertilizer within so many feet of the buffer area.

Mr. Comegys stated that if the EPA puts out numbers that the State will adopt it. The proposal has been to the Senate but has not yet made it to the House. He added that he believed that this was all a reaction to the Chesapeake Bay.



Mr. Lenox noted that the State cut the Governor's budget in the summer and that it was likely that we would be seeing cuts at the local level. These types of cuts could get down to the point of whether a tree can be cut, which will cause an enforcement nightmare. He added that at this point there are not many people applying for variances. The Wicomico County Land Use Plan will match well with the regulations on the Critical Area.



Mr. Comegys explained that the WRE requirements were enacted because of the Piedmont area because they don't have enough water.



Mr. McKenzie explained that one (1) of the new provisions in the Critical Area law would be that the cost per acre if mitigation couldn't be handled on site would jump from \$700 to \$65,000.



There being no further business, the Commission meeting was adjourned at 4:46 p.m. by Mr. Bounds.



This is a summary of the proceedings of this meeting. Detailed information is in the permanent files of each case as presented and filed in the Salisbury-Wicomico County Department of Planning, Zoning, and Community Development Office.

Donald Bounds, Vice Chairman

John F. Lenox, Director

Beverly Tull, Recording Secretary