

1 **COUNTY COUNCILMEMBER DAVID** * **BEFORE THE**
 2 **YUNGMANN, PETITIONER** * **PLANNING BOARD OF**
 3 **ZRA-200** * **HOWARD COUNTY, MARYLAND**

4
 5 * * * * *

6 **MOTION: Recommend approval of ZRA-200 with amendments.**

7 **ACTION: *Recommend Approval; Vote 4-0.***

8 * * * * *

9
 10 **RECOMMENDATION**

11 On March 3, 2022, the Planning Board of Howard County, Maryland, considered the petition of
 12 County Council Member David Yungmann (Petitioner) to amend the Howard County Zoning Regulations to
 13 allow Age-Restricted Adult Housing in the B-1 (Business: Local) Zoning District as a Conditional Use
 14 (Section 131.0), under certain conditions. B-1 properties would be subject to the following criteria to be
 15 eligible:

- 16 1) The parcel shall be adjacent to an existing age-restricted development.
- 17 2) The parcel shall be located within the planned service area for public water and sewer.
- 18 3) The maximum parcel size shall be three acres.

19 The Planning Board considered the petition and the Department of Planning and Zoning (DPZ)
 20 Technical Staff Report.

21 **Testimony**

22 Councilmember David Yungmann presented testimony stating that the intent of the amendment is to
 23 increase the supply of Age Restricted Adult Housing (ARAH). He stated that as of the date of the meeting,
 24 there are only three ARAH units for sale in Howard County, that empty nesters are frustrated when looking
 25 for retirement homes due to lack of supply and that a lack of turnover creates a logjam of demand for sales of
 26 existing homes. This amendment would apply to a select few parcels, where the dominant adjacent land use
 27 is senior housing. Councilmember Yungmann responded to questions from the Board stating that it was
 28 inadvertent to exclude condominiums or multifamily from the scope of the amendment and he agreed that this
 29 housing type could be included since it would not impact the number of dwelling units or have the potential to
 30 increase density. Mr. Cecil asked about the apparent exclusion of the Moderate Income Housing Units
 31 (MIHU) requirement. Councilmember Yungmann clarified that some of the excluded provisions, for example
 32 MIHU and Open Space, might be disincentives for infill developments. Mr. Coleman asked about the
 33 universal design and Design Advisory Panel (DAP) review requirements for other ARAH developments and

1 spoke in favor of their inclusion in the B-1 criteria. Councilmember Yungmann confirmed that adding these
2 criteria into the Conditional Use process would not constitute an addition burden. The discussion included
3 several questions about whether the amendment requires a B-1 ARAH development to be incorporated into
4 the existing adjacent ARAH development though governance and/or design. Councilmember Yungmann
5 clarified that this would be an option but not a requirement.

6 Six members of the public testified in support of the proposed ZRA. One testified in favor of the
7 amendments as a representative of Ellicott Meadows, an ARAH development adjacent to one of the potential
8 B-1 sites. Other speakers, also neighbors of one of the possible B-1 sites, referred to two favorable surveys
9 by members of the adjoining HOAs that support an ARAH development on the B-1 site. Additional members
10 of the public spoke in favor, testifying about the negative impact of commercial development adjacent to
11 ARAH developments. A final speaker indicated support for this amendment stating that multi-family
12 developments with the density of garden apartments would be difficult to achieve on these smaller B-1 sites.
13

14 Board Discussion and Recommendation

15 In work session, Board members spoke favorably of the proposed amendments and discussed
16 whether to recommend the inclusion of the existing ARAH provisions in Section 131.0.N.1.A.8 – A.18.
17 Some Board members expressed concern about the impact of an open space requirement on the development
18 of these small B-1 sites. The Board also discussed whether there was a clear benefit to include the DAP
19 review and the multi-family use. Several Board members concurred that including an open space provision,
20 as in 131.0.N.1.A.8, would limit the buildable area for projects as the amendment only applies to properties
21 up to three acres in size. They further noted that B-1 projects are not currently required to have an open space
22 set-aside.

23 Mr. Cecil motioned to recommend approval of ZRA-200, with amendments to specify that (1) multi-
24 family housing be included as a use in Sec. 131.0.N.1.a.(7)(b) and (2) the criteria in Sec. 131.0.N.1.A.9-18 be
25 incorporated into the zoning amendment. Mr. McAilley seconded the motion. The motion passed 4-0.

26
27 For the foregoing reasons, the Planning Board of Howard County, Maryland, on this ^{22nd}~~16th~~ day of
28 March _____ 2022, recommends that ZRA-200, as described above, be **APPROVED**.

31 HOWARD COUNTY PLANNING BOARD

32 DocuSigned by:
Edward T. Coleman

33 Ed Coleman, Chair

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11

DocuSigned by:
Kevin McAilley
17D7DFE9D4214A8...

Kevin McAilley, Vice-chair

DocuSigned by:
Phillips Engelke
6C630193965E497...

Phillips Engelke

DocuSigned by:
JEC
7DA1123B1D2D404...

James Cecil

ATTEST:

DocuSigned by:
Amy Gowan
5B4959B8479C4D4...

Amy Gowan, Executive Secretary