



PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

**Minutes of January 12, 2026, 6:00 p.m.
Hybrid (Virtual & In-Person)
La Plata, Maryland 20646**

The Charles County Planning Commission held their regularly scheduled meeting both in-person at the County Government Building and virtually via Microsoft Teams on Monday January 12, 2026, at 6:00 p.m.

The following persons were present:

Kevin Wedding, Chair
Jeffrey Bossart
Ryan Sekuterski
Semia Hackett
Elizabeth Theobalds, Deputy County Attorney
Charles Rice, AICP, Planning Director
Heather Kelley, AICP, Planning Supervisor
Joel Binkley, AICP, Planning Supervisor
Melissa Hively, Planner II
Hunter Zinn, Planner I
Jennifer Edelen, Acting Clerk

Not Present:

Dawud Abdur-Rahman, Secretary
Denard Earl

1. Call to Order:

The meeting was called to order at 6:03 p.m. with four (4) members present.

2. Approval of the Agenda:

A **MOTION** was made by Mr. Bossart to approve the agenda, which was **SECONDED** by Mr. Sekurterski. The vote was unanimous, and the **MOTION** passed.

3. Approval of the Minutes:

None

4. Chairman's Comments:

Mr. Wedding welcomed the attendees back and noted a busy start to the New Year.

5. **Personal Appearances:**

Nancy Schertler provided comment on the importance of public engagement during the development of the Comprehensive Plan update and encouraged updates to the public on the progress of outreach and participation opportunities.

Jacqueline Moore provided comments on various impacts of Data Centers on communities and expressed the need for transparency throughout the Zoning Text Amendment approval process.

6. **Public Hearing:**

6.a Liberty Bell, PSP-250001

Staff gave an overview of the Applicant's request for approval of a proposed Preliminary Subdivision Plan and the related request to modify the requirements of § 80B(1) of the Subdivision Regulations that would require new lots on a private road to be greater than 3 acres, under certain circumstances.(Modification 104) There was one question to the staff from the Planning Commission. Next, the Applicant presented the requests for approval in greater detail and answered additional questions from the Planning Commission. Staff then answered one additional question from the Planning Commission.

Two members of the public provided comment.

A **MOTION** was made by Mr. Sekuterski to deny the Modification 104, which was **SECONDED** by Ms. Hackett. Prior to the vote, Ms. Theobalds requested a motion to close the Public Hearing. A **MOTION** was made by Mr. Bossart to close the Public Hearing and **SECONDED** by Mr. Sekuterski. The vote was unanimous and the **MOTION** passed. Mr. Sekuterski restated his **MOTION** to deny approval of the Modification 104 and Ms. Hackett restated her **SECOND**. Ms. Theobalds requested the Commission state the reasons for denial, which were: 1) the Applicant did not adequately demonstrate the required burden of proof and 2) concern that a precedent would be set if approval were given. A vote was taken, and the results were as follows:

Semia Hackett – Yes
Ryan Sekuterski – Yes
Jeff Bossart – Yes
Kevin Wedding – Oppose

The vote was three (3) in favor to one (1) against, and the **MOTION** passed.

A **MOTION** was made by Mr. Bossart to deny approval of the Preliminary Subdivision Plan, which was **SECONDED** by Ms. Hackett. A vote was taken, and the results were as follows:

Semia Hackett – Yes
Ryan Sekuterski – Yes
Jeff Bossart – Yes
Kevin Wedding – Oppose

The vote was three (3) in favor to one (1) against, and the **MOTION** passed.

7. **Public Meeting:**

7.a Cedar Ridge, CSP-250001

Staff provided a brief overview of the proposed Conceptual Subdivision Plan (CSP) and summarized the CSP process and purpose. Next, the Applicant presented an overview of the project. There were no questions from Planning Commission members. Four members of the public provided comments.

8. **Work Sessions:**

None

9. **Unfinished Business:**

None

10. **New Business:**

10.a Poll of the Planning Commission for new business

The chair polled the Planning Commission for any new business they wished to raise, there was none.

10.b Briefing: Review of the Fiscal Year 2027-31 Requested Capital Improvement Program

In preparation for the upcoming discussion/review of the Capital Improvement Project List for FY2027-2031, Mr. Binkley gave a short presentation highlighting the staff's process of scoring projects for consistency with the Comprehensive Plan and highlighted projects new to this year's review cycle. Next, staff answered several questions from the Planning Commission.

11. **Directors Report:**

Mr. Rice acknowledged the effort Ms. Hackett and others made to attend the meeting despite full schedules and conflicts. Mr. Rice provided an update on Comprehensive Plan public meetings being held in various locations in the County over the next several months to facilitate public engagement. Mr. Rice provided an overview of

upcoming Planning Commission agenda items and announced the addition of two Planning Commission meetings to the schedule to be held on January 26th and February 23rd.

12. **Adjournment:**

A **MOTION** was made by Mr. Bossart to adjourn the meeting, which was **SECONDED** by Mr. Sekuterski. The vote was unanimous, and the **MOTION** passed. The meeting was adjourned at 7:51 p.m.

Kevin Wedding
Kevin Wedding (Mar 3, 2026 15:32:30 EST)

Kevin Wedding, Chair

Jennifer Edelen

Jennifer Edelen, Acting Clerk

Attached and incorporated herein: January 12, 2026, Summary of Planning Commission Decisions



Charles County Planning Commission

200 Baltimore Street, La Plata, MD 20646
301-645-0692

Kevin Wedding
Chair

Vacant
Vice Chair

Dawud Abdur-Rahman
Secretary

Summary of Planning Commission Decisions January 12, 2026

Item: 6.a Liberty Bell, Preliminary Subdivision Plan, PSP-250001 & Request for Modification from § 278-80B(1)

The Applicant requested approval of a Preliminary Subdivision Plan known as Liberty Bell, PSP-250001 and the related request to grant a relief from § 278-80B(1) of the Subdivision Regulations that requires new lots to be greater than 3 acres on a private right-of-way, unless using the cluster provisions of the RC, WCD and AC Zones. Under this section, the Applicant must (1) demonstrate that compliance with the regulations, because of the physical conditions of the property, would present unusual practical difficulties or would present an undue hardship on the property owner and (2) that they have met the burden of meeting the enumerated criteria. The Planning Commission denied the request for the Modification 104 because the Applicant did not demonstrate the requisite hardship (alternatives were available) and did not meet the burden of proof enumerated in §278-104(C). The Planning Commission also noted a concern for setting precedent if granted.

Kevin Wedding

Kevin Wedding (Mar 3, 2026 15:32:30 EST)

Kevin Wedding, Chair

Jennifer Edelen

Jennifer Edelen, Acting Clerk