

Notes from Concept Team Meeting- 10/21/2020, 1:00 pm, Virtual

Members Present: Mary Lane, Tom Devilbiss, Lynda Eisenberg, Jim Almon, Laura Matyas, and Hannah Weber.

The meeting began at 1:00 pm. The first item on the agenda was approval of the September 9 meeting notes. The meeting notes were approved without any changes.

The next item on the agenda was a discussion of the September 23 webinar, and some of the feedback received. One attendee expressed concern about the changes to the cluster subdivision, particularly the elimination of the requirement for a conventional plan and the potential for the overall yield to be higher. It was agreed that with the 10,000 square foot restriction on lot size and the overall density restriction of the zoning district, the intent of the Master Plan is still being met. Laura will provide examples of how this will work.

The group discussed a proposal that had been submitted for Village Senior Housing. The proposal is in response to the Concept Team recommendation for elimination of multifamily senior housing in the R0-20,000 District, which reflects the changes made in the Adopted 2018 Freedom Plan to the Residential-Medium Land Use Designation. The Village Senior Housing proposal would allow dwellings other than single family in a Senior Village, with flexible bulk requirements, and the possibility of density of 5 dwelling units per acre. It was agreed by the group that any density exceeding 3.5 dwelling units per acre in the R-20,000 District is not consistent with the adopted plans and will not be recommended. The overall concept of a Retirement Village with a density up to 3.5 dwelling units per acre, a mix of single family and attached units and flexible bulk requirements to be determined by the Planning Commission at the time of subdivision was agreed to. Mary will draft language to be reviewed at the next meeting.

The outstanding issues from previous meetings were discussed.

- District Names – Following research of district names in other jurisdictions, it was agreed not to make any changes.
- Bulk Requirements – There was agreement that there needs to be more logic and consistency for bulk requirements among the residential districts, and reformatting to make them easier to locate and understand. There should also be a reduction in the required side and rear yard requirements, which would eliminate the requirement for so many variances. This should apply to accessory structures as well. Following discussion of different options, it was agreed that side and rear yard requirements should be reduced to 10 feet in all four residential districts. A concern was raised regarding rear yards that abut front yards, and whether reducing the requirement would work well in these situations. Tom will reach out to the Zoning Administrator regarding this proposal. Mary will draft a proposal incorporating what was agreed to for further discussion at the next meeting.
- Residential subdivision ingress/egress requirements – There had been a previous

discussion of codifying a policy regarding the number of entrances to a residential subdivision that should be required based on the number of homes served. This is important not only for connectivity and efficiency, but from a public safety aspect. Research of this topic indicates that other Maryland counties' codes do not include such a requirement. However, it was agreed that particularly for public safety, this issue should be explored further. It will be included in a comprehensive package of changes to the development review codes that will follow this effort.

- Other proposed changes by Tom and Jay – These included: private kennels, traffic visibility, seasonal temporary uses, parking of commercial vehicles, accessory building setback requirements and the definition of front yard. Proposals are being formulated and these issues will be discussed at the next meeting.

Future meetings were discussed. It was agreed that the meeting scheduled for November 4 will focus on the outstanding issues discussed above. A second webinar will be held on November 18, during the day, to update interested parties on the changes made since September. Following another Concept Team meeting to discuss the final draft and feedback from the webinar, the draft text changes will be sent to the Planning Commission for their review during regularly scheduled work sessions and possibly business meetings. It is important to have a draft under review as the Board of Commissioners consider the three by-request rezoning proposals. Any unresolved issues, particularly changes to Chapter 155 being prepared by DLRM, will follow the Chapter 158 amendments proposed by the Concept Team. The Planning Commission will also be informed of other proposals submitted by interested that are not in the final recommendations.

The meeting adjourned at 2:45 pm. The next meeting will be held on November 4 at 1:00 pm.