

**Notes from Concept Team Meeting- 8/12/2020, 1:00 pm, Virtual**

**Members Present: Mary Lane, Tom Devilbiss, Clay Black, Lynda Eisenberg, Tim Burke, Paige Sunderland, and Hannah Weber.**

The meeting began at 1:00 pm. The first item on the agenda was approval of the July 29 meeting notes. The meeting notes were approved without any changes.

The next item on the agenda was a discussion of the Planned Unit Development regulations in Chapter 155. Mary and Clay had discussed this topic prior to the meeting and recommended making no changes to the current PUD provisions. It was noted that this development technique is only allowed in the R-10,000 and R-7,500 Districts, and there is no land designated in the Master Plan or Freedom Plan in the corresponding Residential-High land use designation to accommodate a PUD. Furthermore, the specific language in the adopted plans precludes this type of development in the other, less dense residential districts (R-40,000 and R-20,000). Clay added that he has never processed a PUD, and the only one in the County was approved in the 1970s in Eldersburg. There was discussion about removing the entire section from the code, since it is not likely to be used. However, it was agreed that the section should remain in the code unchanged, since there is one existing PUD that would become nonconforming, and future plan updates may revisit its applicability in other residential districts.

Information regarding existing uses that would become nonconforming under the Concept Team proposal was presented. Funeral Homes are proposed to become a prohibited use. There are a number within the municipal boundaries, one in the Ag district, two that were rezoned to commercial in 2019, and one in Westminster that is split-zoned with the County in the R-20,000 District. As requested at the last meeting, information was presented regarding the number of medical/dental clinics in the residential districts. There are four medical office condo buildings in the Westminster area, one which is in the process of being rezoned to the C-2 District. There are 10 single medical offices located throughout the county. Several options were discussed regarding these businesses, which would become nonconforming. It was agreed that following adoption of the new code, these businesses should be given the option of being rezoned to a commercial district. Finally, it was reported that there are currently no approved Country Inns in the R-40,000 District.

The next item on the agenda was review of the draft Chapter 158 text amendment, which includes all the changes agreed to over the past two years, but includes several issues to be resolved.

\* The definitions were reviewed without change.

\*The names of the residential districts in Section 158.015 were discussed. It was proposed that the names of the R-10,000 and R-7,500 Districts (Urban and Multi-Family) are not representative of the actual districts. Staff will report back at the next meeting with proposed changes.

\*It was agreed that 158.036 Private Kennels, should be kept in the code, since it also applies to the Ag District.

\*The Bulk Requirement tables for all districts were reviewed. It was agreed that to clarify the interpretation of bulk requirements for accessory uses, the language in 158.130(C)(2) should be added to the bulk requirement sections for each district.

\*Clay raised the issue of the inconsistency of the yard requirements for “other permitted and conditional uses” in the residential districts. A proposal will be made at the next meeting.

\*Section 158.075 (G), Bulk Requirements in the R-7,500 District, should be amended to delete the reference to stories, and all side yards should be 10 feet.

\*It was agreed to delete the undefined “Rooming/Tourist Home” from the use table.

\*It was agreed that the footnote to “Two-family dwelling” that limits the density yield should be clarified. Clay and Mary will provide suggested language.

Tom asked that the current definition of front yard be addressed. The current definition allows multiple front yards, which is often problematic. Tom will propose revised language at the next meeting.

Lynda raised the issue of including illustrations and graphics to the Code, which has been discussed throughout the process. There was agreement that this would be useful and should be pursued.

The last issue on the agenda was the Next Steps. The next Concept Team meeting will be held on August 26. At that time, the remaining issues will be addressed, and a final draft will be prepared. This will be presented at a virtual meeting in September for an interactive discussion with the public. The goal is to present a text amendment to the Planning Commission in October.

The meeting adjourned at 2:30 pm.