

Notes from Concept Team Meeting- 9/9/2020, 1:00 pm, Virtual

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

The meeting began at 1:00 pm. The first item on the agenda was approval of the August 12 meeting notes. The meeting notes were approved without any changes.

The next item on the agenda was a discussion of the planned Open Concept Team meeting to inform the public of the progress being made on the residential text changes, and to solicit their input. This meeting will replace the in-person open Concept Team meetings that began early in 2020 and were put on hold because of Covid restrictions. It was agreed that this meeting will be held on Wednesday, September 23, at 1:00, virtually. Lynda will handle arranging for the use of Go to Webinar, and publicizing the meeting through a press release, email blast, Facebook, and carrollrezoning.org.

The remainder of the meeting was spent reviewing the sections of Chapter 158 for which possible improvements have been identified by Tom and Jay from the perspective of the office of the Zoning Administrator.

- 158.033- Nonconforming uses: It was proposed that for residential properties that have had a change in zoning by the County, usually from Ag to Conservation, a variance not be required for bulk requirements. The following option was proposed: allowing the bulk requirements that applied at the time of the original zoning to apply, and allowing the matter to be handled with an administrative action by the Zoning Administrator. There was discussion regarding the difficulty in knowing the full history of the property and the former zoning requirements, but Jay and Tom stated that this information would not be difficult to find. It was also requested that the language should specify that it must be an existing residence, and not simply a residential lot. It was agreed that this change should be made to Section 158.033 (A).
- 158.036- Private kennels: The current definition of Private Kennel specifies the keeping of more than three dogs as personal pets. The Concept Team had previously agreed that this should be amended to between four and six dogs. The proposal was made to increase this to up to 10 dogs. There was concern by some members that this applies to all zoning districts, and it may not be appropriate to allow 10 dogs in the higher density districts. There was also discussion about whether this should be handled as a zoning matter, or if it is the responsibility of animal control. This issue will be discussed further at a future meeting.
- 158.042 and 043- Traffic Visibility: A proposal was made that this issue would more appropriately be handled by the Bureau of Roads Operations, since the complaints received are regarding traffic visibility on publicly maintained roads. The sections would have to be relocated to another section of the County Code, and violation authority be given to another agency. This issue will be revisited.

- 158.048 – Seasonal Temporary Uses: There seems to be a lot of confusion regarding this section, particularly which activities it applies to. This will be discussed further at a future meeting. The subsection regarding dumpsters is of particular concern, specifically the allowance for two 60-day extensions, totaling up to six months. It was agreed that dumpsters and portable storage containers should be limited to 60 days per year with no extensions, and only one should be permitted per property.
- 158.056 and 158.057 – Outdoor Parking of Commercial Vehicles on Residential Properties and Outdoor Storage of Unlicensed Vehicles: These sections are an ongoing enforcement challenge. There was a brief discussion of options; Jay will report back with a recommendation.
- 158.130 (C) (2) – Accessory Buildings setback requirements- Jay and Tom will develop a proposal to improve this section. This will be discussed further at a future meeting.
- 158.002 - Definition of Front Yard: The definition of Front Yard is confusing and unnecessarily restrictive for properties with frontage on more than one public road. It states “all sides of a lot adjacent to streets shall be considered frontage, and yards shall be required”. Since front yard requirements are considerably larger than side yards, this requirement restricts the placement of buildings on a lot. It was proposed that this definition be changed, possibly using the address point only as the front yard. This will be discussed further at a future meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 3:00 pm.