| 1 | COUNCIL MEMBER JON WEINSTEIN * BEFORE THE |
|-----------------|--|
| 2 | PETITIONER, * PLANNING BOARD OF |
| 3 | ZRA 158 * HOWARD COUNTY, MARYLAND |
| 4 | * |
| 5 | * * * * * * * * * * * * * |
| 6 | MOTION: To recommend approval of the Zoning Regulation Amendment petition |
| 7 | request to amend Section 128.0.K of the Supplementary Zoning District Regulations |
| 8 | of the Zoning Regulations to permit density from potential infill lots in the R-20, R-12, |
| 9 1 <u>0</u> | R-ED, and R-SC zoning districts to be sent to a receiving parcel in any planning |
| 11 | district, under certain circumstances. Also, to recommend amendments to Sections 103.0 and 128.0 to correct several minor existing errors in the Zoning Regulations. |
| 12 | 103.0 und 120.0 to correct several minor existing errors in the Zoning Regulations. |
| | |
| 13 | ACTION: Recommended Approval; Vote 4 to 0. |
| | |
| 14 | * * * * * * * * * * * * |
| 15 | <u>RECOMMENDATION</u> |
| 16 | |
| 17 | On May 19, 2016, the Planning Board of Howard County, Maryland, considered the petition of Jon |
| 18 | Weinstein, to amend Sec. 128.0.K of the Zoning Regulations to allow density from infill lots to be sent to a |
| 19 | receiving parcel in any planning district, under certain circumstances. The Department of Planning and |
| 20 | Zoning (DPZ) recommended additional amendments to correct minor existing errors in Sec. 103.0 and 128.0. |
| 21 | |
| 22 | The Planning Board considered the petition, the DPZ Technical Staff Report and Recommendation, |
| 23 | comments of reviewing agencies, and testimony from the public. Council Member Jon Weinstein presented |
| 24 | testimony in support of his petition. Mr. John Carney also testified in support of the petition. |
| 25 | |
| 26 | DPZ recommended approval of the petition because it is consistent with General Plan goals related to |
| 27 | compatible infill and growth. The proposed DPZ amendments correct several minor existing errors in the |
| 28 | Zoning Regulations. The Planning Board's work session followed the meeting. During the work session, all |
| 29 | citizen and DPZ testimony was evaluated to develop the Board's recommendations. |
| 30 | |
| 31 | Board Discussion and Recommendation |
| 32 | |
| 33 | The Board's work session focused on the effects of removing the geographic limitation on density |

| 1 | sending. The Board recognized that the proposal encourages density transfer from established communities to |
|----------|---|
| 2 | designated growth areas and provides options for property owners that have additional density. The Board |
| 3 | also noted that the proposal is in harmony with the General Plan. Erica Roberts made a motion to recommend |
| 4 | approval of ZRA 158. Phil Engelke seconded the motion. The motion passed by a vote of 4 to 0. |
| 5 | |
| 6 | For the foregoing reasons, the Planning Board of Howard County, Maryland, on this 5 day of |
| 7 | June, 2016, recommends that ZRA 158, as described above, be APPROVED. |
| 8 | |
| 9 | |
| 10 | |
| 11 | HOWARD COUNTY PLANNING BOARD |
| 12 | Bill Santon 18B |
| 13 | Bill Santos, Chairman |
| 14 | Phil Engelle 43 |
| 15 | Phil Engelke, Vice-Chair |
| 16 17 | Tudy Adler / SP |
| 18 | Absent |
| 19 | Jacqueline Easley |
| 20 | Erica Rafrents Les |
| 21 | Erica Roberts |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| 24 | ATTEST: |
| 25 | Maldin Bella |
| 26 | Valdis Lazdins, Executive Secretary |
| | |