

Denton Planning Commission

Minutes

Town of Denton

May 26, 2026

Planning Commission Members:

William Quick, Chairperson* (Arrived at 6:03 PM.)

David Burroughs, Vice Chairperson*

Kevin Waterman*

Dona Sorce*

Gregory "Lee" Graham*

James Guay, Alternate**

* Those Present

** Excused

*** Absent

Participants:

Peter Johnston, Town Planner	Travis Hughes
Frank Taylor, Councilman	Adam Ruf
Jim DiDonato	Ashley Colen
Brendan Mullaney	Steve Meehan
Kevin Shearon	Ryan Showalter
Robert Wittig	Chris Breeding
Andrew Turner	

Recording:

Donna Todd, Director of Planning and Codes

Scott Getchell, Town Administrator

PROCEEDINGS

Call to Order:

The Planning Commission Meeting was called to order by Vice Chairperson Burroughs at 6:00 PM, on May 26, 2026, at the Denton Town Office. Vice Chairperson Burroughs led everyone in the Pledge of Allegiance.

This Meeting was made available to the public via Town Hall Video Conferencing, and access to the Meeting was made available on the Town website.

Approval of Minutes:

The Regular Meeting Minutes of April 28, 2026, were unanimously approved.

Old Business #1 – Atlantic Coastal Partners, LLC – Final Site Plan:

Brian Fitzgerald, RAUCH, Inc., (Applicant) presented a final site plan on behalf of Atlantic Coastal Partners, LLC, (Owner) to construct (3) storage buildings containing 120 mini-storage units (Phase I) of assorted sizes and one (1) 20'x35' future building (Phase II) containing (13) commercial rental units, to be located at Legion Road, Tax Map 0108/Parcel 2439, Lot 2, zoned Industrial (I). The Planning Commission granted preliminary site plan approval on October 28, 2025.

Adam Ruf, GIS Specialist at RAUCH, Inc., presented on the 120 mini-storage units on Legion Road in Denton, Maryland. The site plan is divided into two phases, encompassing storage buildings, expansive internal drive aisles, parking facilities, utilities, lighting installations, landscaping, stormwater management systems, and erosion and sediment control measures. The Applicant is requesting conditional final site plan approval, contingent upon the satisfaction of the remaining conditions of approval for the landscaping plan and the addressing of the remaining staff comments. Phase one of the project will provide 20 parking spaces, of which 13 are required.

He pointed out that the parking layout is non-standard because self-storage users typically make short visits and will access their units directly. The plan includes oversized drive aisles to accommodate vehicle circulation, loading, and access. Therefore, they are requesting the Commission's approval of the parking layout as shown and inquiring if a parking waiver is necessary. The project employs an alternative landscaping approach instead of conventional internal parking lot islands. The proposed on-site afforestation and forest conservation area encompasses nearly half an acre and includes 45 trees intended to provide screening, environmental benefits, and potentially enhance the conventional landscaping's intended outcomes. The Applicant pointed out that during a preliminary plan meeting, Peter Johnston recommended adding 9 trees along the south edge of the pavement. This requirement was accommodated in the alternative landscaping plan.

Additionally, the Applicant would like to confirm with the Commission if any formal waivers are necessary for the parking layout or the landscaping plan. They are requesting conditional approval for those items as part of the site plan and landscaping plan approval. The submerged gravel wetland maintenance agreement has been reviewed and updated, and the Applicant is prepared to sign it for finalization. The MDE non-tidal wetland permit has been obtained as a prerequisite. The project meets the 10-year and 100-year storm drain capacity requirements. Additionally, the Applicant is discussing any future phasing, phase grading, and the requirement of a submerged gravel wetland liner with the town as a minor requirement. In summary, the Applicant is requesting final conditional approval of the site and landscaping plans, consistent with the staff's recommendation.

Commissioner Waterman indicated that the parking arrangement is not compliant with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements and asked how the Applicant will address the matter.

Travis Hughes raised concerns that designating an ADA parking spot not related to the unit rented did not make sense. He pointed out that the minimum aisle width accommodates both vehicles passing through and parking in front of each unit. For climate-controlled storage with a single point of access and egress and a designated accessible parking spot, a separate accessible parking designation is required.

Chairperson Quick stated it is a State of Maryland requirement.

Mr. Hughes stated that if an ADA van accessible spot is required, one can be added to the site plan.

Chairperson Quick asked whether the landscape plan meets the intent of Article X.

Mr. Ruf confirmed the trees along the south side have been addressed. This information is included in their alternative landscape plan.

Peter Johnston, Town Planner, stated for the record that the Commission must find that the proposed alternative is equal to or better than the existing means of meeting the objectives and intent of Article X.

Chairperson Quick explained that they will require written evidence demonstrating that the Applicant believes the alternative meets or exceeds the requirements, as well as documentation to justify the waiver.

Vice Chairperson Burroughs moved to find that the addition of the proposed forest conservation meets the landscaping requirements, including the new plantings along Legion Road. The parking and proposed parking layout are consistent with the nature of the storage facility,

qualifying for a waiver. Finally, a motion to approve the final site plan, accepting the modifications to the interior parking and landscaping requirements, subject to the Applicant satisfying all conditions and requirements, including ADA compliance, by submitting the revised final site plan with alternative landscaping documentation and noting any design waivers.

Commissioner Waterman seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously. (5:0)

Old Business #2 – Other: None.

New Business #1 – JPA Venture, LLC – Preliminary Major Subdivision:

Kevin Shearon, Davis, Bowen & Friedel, Inc, Engineer, submitted a preliminary subdivision plan on behalf of JPA Venture, LLC (Owner & Applicant) to create a public right-of-way for the southern portion of the proposed Commerce Drive, Tax Map 0106/Parcel 2474, zoned Regional Highway Commercial (RHC).

Brendan Mullaney, McAllister, DeTar, Showalter & Walker LLC, Attorney for JPA Venture, LLC, made the presentation on behalf of the Applicant. JPA Venture, LLC, owner of a 40.7-acre parcel of land situated on the northern side of Legion Road and the southern side of Route 404. The applicant is requesting approval of a preliminary subdivision plan. He stated the project, which has been in development for over a decade, aligns with the Town's Comprehensive Plan objective to foster economic development and enhance the surrounding area. Notably, there has been a history of traffic congestion and safety concerns at the intersection of Legion Road and Route 404, which this project seeks to help alleviate. The submittal represents the initial step in the property owner's development plans for their property and the installation of Commerce Drive. JPA Venture, LLC, is collaborating with the neighboring parcel to the north, Denton Site SW LLC. However, Denton Site SW LLC's portion of the right-of-way is delayed by a month or two. Denton Site SW LLC will submit its subdivision plan to the Planning Commission for the northern portion

of Commerce Drive. This submittal focuses on the southernmost portion of Commerce Drive and the subdivision plat required to carve out the right-of-way. The roadway will be developed, and the plan will adhere to Town standards. The completed roadway will be dedicated and fee simple to the Town, becoming a public right-of-way that will connect Legion Road at the Walmart intersection to Route 404 at the northern intersection.

Mr. Mullaney informed the Planning Commission that a letter had been received from the attorney for Dhruvil, LLC, which is a property located on the west side of the subject property. This letter raised a concern regarding an existing easement area that extends from JPA's property off Legion Road and continues westward. Mr. Mullaney has a copy of this easement, which is recorded in the land records. The citation in the letter you received is incorrect. The document is actually recorded at 974 folio 1.

Additionally, there is a long history of all these properties and their difficult relationships, as well as the traffic situation at 404 and Legion Road. In 2011, an agreement was reached between JPA Venture, LLC, and the parcels to the west of the easement. All the property owners entered into the easement, and the Town played a role in ensuring that. The agreement stated that if the Town were to close the left-turn lanes, access into the parcels to the west, access would be maintained for the parcel currently owned by Dhruvil, LLC, and the parcel to the west of that. The rights that Dhruvil, LLC, has to access this easement area are triggered only if the Town were to close the left-turn lanes, which has not occurred to date. It is also important to note that the plans submitted do not conflict with this easement area. If you examine sheet C4 of the construction plans, you can clearly see the easement area as it exists, along with the stormwater on the north and south sides of that area, which is necessary for the construction of Commerce Drive. No way

does this project affect access to and from Dhruvil, LLC, over the easement area, should the Town ever close the left-turn lanes to the west of that.

Chairperson Quick asked for clarification on the left turn he was referring to.

There was some confusion concerning where the left turn provision of the agreement is located. With explanation, it was determined that the left turn trigger did not apply and that the location of the proposed stormwater management features on the Applicant's plans is not an issue.

Kevin Shearon, Engineer at Davis, Bowen & Friedel, Inc., stated that the overall property is 40.7 acres. It is a mixed-use commercial and urban residential zone, with this subdivision exclusively in the mixed commercial section. As previously described, access to the project would be from Legion Road, with the road extending approximately 650 feet to a high point. The entire road has been designed, but it has been divided between two engineering firms. Davis, Bowen & Friedel, Inc. is preparing the southern portion, while Bohler Engineering is preparing plans for the northern portion. These firms have been coordinating since the project's inception. Bohler initially designed the entire road and will now take over the northern portion, meeting the middle at a high point. JPA Venture's proposal is for a preliminary subdivision to reach this high point. This subdivision does not create any non-conforming lots. It establishes the necessary right-of-way and stormwater management for that section of the road and for part of the future development. The right-of-way and the road meet Town standards. The right-of-way is 60 feet wide, with a 40-foot road, curb-to-curb, and sidewalks on the north side. The Town and its engineer are still working on lighting plans.

Additionally, Forest Conservation plans were submitted for the entire parcel. The easement was mistakenly labeled as being extinguished on the second sheet of the subdivision plot. However, their engineering plans clearly indicate they were honoring the easement by dividing the

stormwater on either side of it. Therefore, they are not impacting that easement. During this review, they received review letters from the Town. There are a few minor issues that need to be addressed, but overall, no significant concerns have been identified.

Vice Chairperson Burroughs inquired about the easement in question, and there is a split between the stormwater plan and the stormwater management area.

Mr. Shearon clarified that the access easement, depicted as an inverted “L,” provides access to the wooded area. Stormwater management is situated just north and south of the cursor, while the bottom corner, still owned by JPA, is designated for stormwater management.

Councilman Taylor inquired about the situation, as Wawa is only using half of the road on its property. Consequently, Wawa will need to extend its connection over the applicant’s property to complete the road. Councilman Taylor requested clarification on whether any legal guarantees ensure this action.

Mr. Shearon indicated that a private agreement and an easement will be established between the parties to facilitate the construction. He acknowledges the breach and agrees to address it. The draft documents are currently circulating among the parties to secure cross-construction easements to advance the project.

Robert Wittig confirmed legal agreements are under review.

Vice Chairperson Burroughs motioned to grant the waivers of the new subdivision ordinance requirements outlined in the Town Planner's memo dated April 14, 2026, and approve the combined concept and preliminary subdivision plat for the Commerce Drive major subdivision, contingent on satisfaction of all comments by the Town Planner, Town Engineer, Town Staff, and Town Council approval for all required legal agreements and other approving agencies.

Commissioner Waterman seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously. (5:0)

New Business #2 – Sterling’s Dream/Special Exception Request:

Ashley Colen, Applicant, submitted the attached Board of Appeals application for a Special Exception request for a Planning Commission recommendation for a combination use for property located at the Denton Industrial Park, 65 Engerman Avenue, Denton. Donovan Marine, Inc., owns the property located on Caroline County Tax Map 108, Parcel 2359, Lot 13, zoned Industrial (I). The Applicant is requesting approval to operate a cannabis processing facility at 65 Engerman Avenue, Denton, Maryland. This use is defined as an Industrial use (Denton Town Code §128-81). The existing uses for Donovan Marine, Inc., include two units/uses that are defined as Wholesale, Distribution, and Storage (Denton Town Code §128-80). Per Denton Town Code §128-75 D, when a development proposal comprises two or more principal uses that require different types of zoning review, a special exception permit will be required. The Applicant is requesting a favorable recommendation for the combination use of the cannabis processing facility and the two existing uses, defined as Wholesale, Distribution, and Storage for warehousing and storage, to be located at the Denton Industrial Park, 65 Engerman Avenue.

The Applicant presented to the Planning Commission, outlining the proposed location of their cannabis extraction facility within the Industrial Park. It is a permitted use, and they are seeking a favorable recommendation to submit to the Board of Appeals for a combination use of the facility.

The Planning Commission confirmed it is a permitted use in the Industrial Park and appropriate for the site.

Vice Chairperson Burroughs questioned the traffic impact.

The Applicant stated it would be open during normal business hours and that there would be plenty of parking for employees.

Vice Chairperson Burroughs asked about the mitigation systems in place to avoid odors.

Ms. Colen indicated that carbon scrubbers and other measures are in place to mitigate any odor issues.

Chairperson Quick noted that the Planning Commission's purpose is to ensure that all applicable zoning regulations are satisfied, and he understands they meet all requirements.

Vice Chairperson Burroughs motioned that the proposed use is permitted in the Industrial Zoning District. The application satisfies the special exception criteria, and the site plan is consistent with zoning and planning requirements, and moves the Planning Commission forward a favorable recommendation for approval to the Board of Appeals, with conditions including final licensing, obtaining permits, and operations to be conducted strictly in accordance with the submitted use narrative. Renovations receive prior approval from the Maryland Cannabis Administration and the Town of Denton. Parking and loading areas to be maintained as submitted.

Commissioner Waterman seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously. (5:0)

New Business #3 – Mill Creek Properties LLC – Zoning Text Amendment:

Ryan Showalter, Attorney, submitted the attached zoning text amendment application on behalf of Mill Creek Properties LLC (Owner & Landlord) and LVL 99 LLC (Tenant) to authorize the operation of assembly and entertainment uses in the Industrial (I) District. Mill Creek Properties LLC owns property at Denton Industrial Park, 75 Engerman Avenue. This amendment would allow a variety of recreational and athletic activities within the 60,000 sq. ft. warehouse that is currently under construction.

Mr. Showalter made the presentation on behalf of his client, who is interested in creating an assembly and entertainment use in the space located in the Industrial Park. Mr. Johnston's staff report was received, and the comments reviewed. Their objective is to obtain a favorable

recommendation from the Commission, enabling them to proceed with a Public Hearing before the Town Council.

Vice Chairperson Burroughs requested information on the types of entertainment.

Mr. Showalter stated that indoor recreational facilities could include batting cages, laser tag, golf simulators, and similar activities. The facility aims to provide a recreational environment with a strong emphasis on athletic components, though it is not exclusively focused on athletics.

Vice Chairperson Burroughs questioned the amount of traffic it would generate.

Mr. Showalter explained that the impact of the activities on traffic will vary depending on the nature of the events. In some cases, if there are games, teams may be present. He suggests that evenings and weekends may attract recreational individuals who engage in games or spend time, thereby generating increased traffic. A traffic study can be conducted to address any concerns regarding this potential impact. He noted that the Industrial Park is conveniently located with excellent access to Route 404.

Vice Chairperson Burroughs observed that the warehouse's design did not accommodate an excessive number of parking spaces.

Mr. Showalter emphasized that the parking facilities would be incorporated into the site plan process and demonstrate sufficient parking to accommodate the proposed usage.

Vice Chairperson Burroughs was reluctant to grant it as a by-right, as other industrial areas that may not be as suitable for it as it is currently written, and the parking and traffic are not really defined right now.

Mr. Showalter clarified that any use, whether permitted or subject to a special exception, would require adequate parking, which would be addressed at site plan review.

Commissioner Waterman inquired with Peter Johnston, Town Planner, regarding the existence of comparable jurisdictions, such as neighboring counties, which have implemented similar treatment measures within their industrial zones.

Mr. Johnston was not aware of any.

A discussion among the Commission focused on similar locations, such as The Edge Arena and Easton Sportsplex.

Commissioner Graham would be more inclined to support the proposal because it is an Industrial Park and does not impact shopping centers or residential areas. The Industrial Park, particularly on weekends, experiences significantly lower traffic than during weekday operations.

Commissioner Graham questioned whether most of the traffic would be in the evenings.

Mr. Showalter indicated that the establishment would be open during the day, but he anticipates that most of its activity would occur in the evenings and on weekends.

Mr. Johnston observed that the category “amusement and entertainment” encompasses a broad spectrum of potential applications, extending beyond the specific proposal, including outdoor events in the parking lot, which could fall under this category. It is not limited to the proposed activities. He also emphasized the importance of distinguishing between large and small venues. Regardless of the venue size, it is crucial to prioritize traffic management and event management. For example, if there is an influx of people into the parking lot, littering can negatively impact the surrounding neighbors.

Additionally, noise control measures are essential to ensure a pleasant environment for all property owners. While the venue may not generate excessive noise, other factors such as lighting and potential disturbances can affect neighboring properties, even industrial ones. It is imperative to implement measures to safeguard these properties, recognizing their significance despite their

industrial nature. Regardless of the intended use of the amusement and entertainment facility, a comprehensive traffic management plan and an event management plan are essential. For larger venues, traffic management should be a primary focus.

Additionally, when recommending this development, the staff has suggested limiting amusement and entertainment use to a specific percentage of the Industrial Park's total land area. This recommendation was based on two key considerations: reserving the Industrial potential of undeveloped properties within the complex, facilitating the conversion of existing buildings, and mitigating the perception of spot zoning. Increasing the percentage of the Industrial Park would avoid potential spot-zoning complaints.

Councilman Taylor expressed a desire to expand the area's use. However, they acknowledge that approving a 5,000-seat arena is not feasible. Therefore, if that is part of the special exception, such as a large or small venue, he believes the Council would not object. He believes that granting a special exception for every request could hinder the growth of new businesses. He agrees that new projects must be submitted to the Planning Commission. However, he does not believe that smaller projects necessarily require the Special exception process.

Commissioner Waterman acknowledged Mr. Johnston's recommendation that once a specified square footage threshold is met, further development is prohibited. While Mr. Waterman generally opposes such a restrictive approach, he expressed concerns about potential unfairness. He highlighted the disparity in entry points, suggesting that a later entry should not disadvantage individuals who arrived earlier. Additionally, he raised the possibility of creating perverse incentives for individuals to expedite their development efforts in response to a substantial demand. Consequently, Commissioner Waterman emphasized the importance of ensuring that this recommendation was adequately incorporated.

Mr. Showalter provided the Planning Commission with Mr. Johnston's text verbatim, omitting the explanatory notes. He believed the Planning Commission anticipated pursuing a special exception rather than a permitted use recommendation. However, he considered it more practical to present them with a concrete document for review. He requested the Planning Commission's support to submit the revised proposal to the Town Council. Mr. Showalter outlined two proposed changes. Firstly, the operating hours would be adjusted from 9 AM to 11 PM on Saturdays, as per the staff memo, to 8 AM to midnight. Secondly, practical considerations for paragraph E, specifically regarding buffering, screening, and site design, were addressed. Paragraph E mandates type B or C buffers between any assembly entertainment buildings, parking areas, abutting industrial lots, or public rights of way. The subject parcel already has vegetative screening, which can be presented on a site plan. However, if the requirement applies to adjacent lots and public rights of way, it effectively necessitates a wall surrounding the establishment, obscuring the building and its surroundings. This requirement may pose challenges, especially if only a portion of the building is used. Consequently, Mr. Showalter proposed striking paragraph E, eliminating the bufferyard requirement, and addressing landscaping and screening requirements during the site plan review. He expressed his belief that a complete vegetative wall surrounding the parcel is unnecessary.

Commissioner Graham questioned the hours of operation.

Mr. Showalter clarified that sports teams and activities typically commence at 8:00 AM rather than 9:00 AM, including on weekends. Consequently, they propose extending the morning hours to accommodate these activities. Additionally, they acknowledge that evenings offer opportunities for leisure pursuits, such as axe throwing, golf simulators, and other forms of entertainment. Midnight is not considered excessively late, and given the availability of

entertainment options for others, they believe that extending the closing time to 12:00 midnight would be more beneficial than 11:00 PM.

Vice Chairperson Burroughs asked whether the use was expected to be contained within the building and whether there would be any outdoor use.

Mr. Showalter stated the outdoor use would not apply to them.

Chairperson Quick asked Peter Johnston, Town Planner, whether there would be any potential negative impact from other people coming in. Mr. Johnston indicated that there probably would not be.

Chairperson Quick indicated he supports the establishment of batting cages, rock walls, and golf simulators. However, he acknowledges certain limitations that may hinder the full realization of their intended capabilities.

Mr. Johnston expressed his preference for maintaining the buffer screening and site design. He acknowledged that modifications to these elements could be made in accordance with the Planning Commission's guidelines. However, he did not object to the current design.

Mr. Showalter's primary concern is to ensure the site is easily accessible. He does not want individuals driving through the Industrial Park to become disoriented due to the forest in front of their destination.

Mr. Showalter recognizes the necessity of appropriate screening. He observed that a special exception exists, and the use is presumed valid. However, when presented before the Board of Appeals, the Board must ascertain whether there are unique characteristics of the proposed site or use that would result in an impact exceeding the typical inherent in such uses. For instance, if an individual presented a proposal for a 6,000-seat outdoor concert venue, it would be a distinct and unique proposal warranting further consideration.

Chairperson Quick stated he does not want to send them to the Board of Appeals unless it is necessary.

Commissioner Waterman wanted to clarify that small-scale projects would be permitted by use, while large-scale projects would require a special exception.

Mr. Showalter stated that the small-scale threshold is so low that it is not relevant.

Commissioner Waterman inquired about the possibility of adjusting the figures to a level that is reasonable and feasible within the existing framework, while simultaneously preserving the special exception process for instances that genuinely exceed that threshold. As previously mentioned, a figure of 10,000 is not particularly significant when considering the context of these lists.

Mr. Showalter proposed implementing a limitation applicable to all outdoor activities. The maximum permissible area for such activities, if conducted entirely indoors without amplified music or outdoor activities, is 60,000 square feet. Any activities exceeding this limit or involving outdoor elements necessitate a special exception.

Mr. Johnston suggested keeping the 200 persons and 300 trip generation in the peak hours. Mr. Showalter asked for 400 and 500 trips.

Mr. Johnston asserted that granting excessive latitude could lead to errors. In rare instances where the number of trips exceeds 300, there is no expectation that individuals will diligently monitor the number of vehicles. However, if the frequency of 300 trips is consistent, it is imperative to take action, especially if there is a traffic issue that requires attention or should have been addressed.

Mr. Showalter clarified that, as he comprehends the amendment, the traffic impact study is mandatory irrespective of the venue's size. However, for large venues, the traffic mix may be more

stringent. Consequently, even if a venue is 5,000 square feet, as he interprets the text, a traffic impact study is required.

Commissioner Waterman raised an inquiry about peak-hour vehicle trips. Within the existing framework, is there a way to increase the number of peak-hour vehicle trips while simultaneously imposing a cap on their frequency?

Mr. Johnston indicated that the peak hours are likely to coincide with the Saturday PM peak, and that the traffic impact assessment will be confined to the immediate vicinity, encompassing the Industrial Park. The traffic impact on a Saturday at 300 vehicles will be comparable to Level A of service, posing no significant inconvenience.

Vice Chairperson Burroughs questioned whether they are deciding between two different text amendments.

Chairperson Quick stated that it is their job to ensure it is a good fit for everyone.

Mr. Showalter clarified that there is no restriction on the number of trips permitted. However, it is important to note that the academic distinction lies in the fact that our proposed facility will exceed 10,000 square feet, which necessitates the application of the measures outlined in paragraph H.

Commissioner Waterman clarified their intention to revise the delineation between small and large-scale venues, ensuring that large venues retain special exceptions. However, they propose cordoning off certain areas within these venues. This would involve increasing the square footage and subsequently evaluating whether traffic flow numbers need to be revised.

Mr. Showalter stated that the occupancy capacity will be based on the fire code.

Mr. Johnston expressed his reluctance to be associated with the term “small venue” as it has been redefined to encompass a wider range of sizes, now classified as “medium-sized venues.”

Consequently, they require a by-right venue and a special exception venue to eliminate the “small venue” designation and identify the threshold point between the two categories.

Chairperson Quick questioned whether they would need to rewrite the text amendment.

Mr. Johnston stated that they can verbalize what they want to see, and he can make the changes.

Chairperson Quick asked whether the Council's consensus is that this should be by right.

Councilman Taylor, yes, for smaller establishments. If a venue is clearly designated as large, and there is a valid reason for the issue, it is understandable. Generally, the Council would prefer that smaller enterprises have the right to open in the Industrial Park. They are leaving the criteria up to the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Waterman suggests reviewing the list, examining each item in detail, and determining whether each is acceptable or requires modifications.

- 1 – Hours of operation on weekends and holidays: 8:00 AM to 10:00 PM on weekdays and 8:00 AM to 12:00 midnight on weekends and federal holidays. Outdoor amplified sound, outdoor performances, and outdoor fee-based patron activity shall cease by 9:00 PM on all days. Patron access to outdoor areas of the premises may continue until the general closing hour applicable under this subsection, provided no amplified sound or active programming occurs outdoors after 9:00 PM.
- 2 – Noise Standards: All amplified music, public address systems, or performances shall comply with the Town's noise ordinance.
- 3 – Traffic and Event Management Plan: No change.
- 4 – Parking and Loading: No change.

- 5 – Buffering, Screening, and Lighting: Perimeter buffering and screening shall be provided in the type, quantity, and location required by the Planning Commission as a condition of site plan approval. All exterior lighting shall be fully shielded, downward-directed, and dark-sky compliant. No light spillover onto adjacent properties is permitted.
- Section 1 – Define ASSEMBLY AND ENTERTAINMENT USE — Rewrite the section as indoor in the by-right and indoor and outdoor Special Exception.

Commissioner Waterman moved to make a positive recommendation to the Town Council on the Zoning Amendment with the changes discussed.

Vice Chairperson Burroughs seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously. (5:0)

New Business #4 – Other: None.

Staff Item #1 – Other: None.

Adjournment: The Meeting adjourned at 7:10 PM.