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MOTION:  
Amend Section 131.0.N.1 to require Age-restricted Adult Housing Conditional Uses with densities that exceed the base zoning district to have frontage on and direct access to a collector or arterial road.

ACTION:  
Recommended approval; Vote 4-0.

RECOMMENDATION

On April 18, 2019, the Planning Board of Howard County, Maryland, considered the petition of Paul Goldenberg to amend Section 131.0.N.1 to require Age-restricted Adult Housing Conditional Uses with densities that exceed the base zoning district to have frontage on and direct access to a collector or arterial road.

The Planning Board considered the petition and the Department of Planning and Zoning (DPZ) Technical Staff Report and Recommendation. DPZ recommended approval citing that the decrease in the minimum age requirement for age-restricted housing from 60 to 55 in 2001, combined with changing demographic trends warrant additional requirements for higher density age-restricted adult housing within established single family neighborhoods. According to DPZ, these changes suggest that residents in ARAH developments are likely to be more active in the workplace and consequently impact peak hour traffic beyond that originally anticipated. The proposed ZRA to require frontage on and access to collector or arterial roads addresses these changes by reducing the impact of higher density developments on local residential roads. It also locates these developments in closer proximity to public transit, sidewalks, and shopping/community services, which are more frequently found on major roadways.

Leela Malin spoke on behalf of herself and Petitioner Paul Goldenberg. Ms. Malin expressed support for certain residential districts to require age-restricted adult housing to have frontage on and direct access to a collector or arterial road. She explained that new information on the habits and needs of those ages 55 and older, explains why the paradigm that was used to justify this conditional use is no longer valid. Ms. Malin cited the U. S. Department of Transportation 2017 National Travel Safety research that suggests people age 55 – 65 years generally work and drive as much as those in younger cohorts.

Ms. Malin discussed the need for age-restricted households to have access to community services through private vehicles, public transit, and walkability. She also noted increases in dwelling sizes for the
elderly population and the resulting increases to the footprint of the home on the environment, population density and traffic on local roads.

Ten members of the public testified in support of the proposed amendment and one member of the public was opposed. Supporters generally expressed agreement that locating age restricted housing of higher densities on arterial or collector roads would protect neighbors and ensure that residents have access to needed services as they age. One member of the public testified in opposition to the amendment, suggesting that it has a potential unintended consequence of curtailing age restricted housing development by reducing the number of parcels eligible for such development. Another member of the public requested that the proposed amendment apply to floating zones, particularly the Community Enhancement Floating (CEF) zone.

Board Discussion and Recommendation

Board members considered whether the amendment should apply to floating zones. DPZ advised the Board that such an amendment is beyond the scope of the proposed ZRA and would constitute a substantial change that would need to be studied and analyzed. DPZ would need to evaluate the floating zones comprehensively to recommend any changes to them. In work session, the Board expressed support for the ZRA as proposed. One Board member expressed concern about limiting the number of parcels available and consequently restricting age restricted housing supply. Another Board member suggested that age restricted housing is allowed, but at lower densities and in other districts. The Board agreed that any study on the expansion of the regulations to include CEF zones could take place later and under a separate amendment, if desired.

Mr. Coleman made the motion to recommend approval ZRA 187 for the reasons stated in the staff report; that it protects and enhances established communities through compatible infill, sustainability improvements, and strategic public infrastructure investment. Mr. McAliley seconded the motion. The motion passed by a vote 4 to 0.

For the foregoing reasons, the Planning Board of Howard County, Maryland, on this 2nd day of May 2019, recommends that ZRA-187, as described above, be APPROVED.
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