

Subject: Planning Board Recommendation for GPA 2016-01

To: Dr. Calvin Ball, Council Chairperson

Jon Weinstein, Council Vice-Chairperson

Greg Fox, Councilperson Mary Kay Sigaty, Councilperson Jen Terrasa, Councilperson

From: Bill Santos, Chairperson NLS

Howard County Planning Board

Date: April 28, 2016

On February 18, 2016 and April 7, 2016 the Planning Board held a public hearing to consider General Plan Amendment 2016-01 to *PlanHoward 2030*; submitted by the Department of Planning and Zoning. The General Plan Amendment, if approved, would revise the Growth Tiers Designations as required by Senate Bill 236 "*The Sustainable Growth and Agricultural Preservation Act of 2012*." In response to input and concerns raised at the hearing on February 18, 2016 the County Executive revised the Growth Tiers Amendment Proposal. The Department of Planning and Zoning issued an addendum to the February 18th Technical Staff Report and presented the revised amendment to the Board at a continued hearing on April 7, 2016.

In conjunction with Section 16.900 (i) of the Howard County Code, a 30-day notice of the time and place of the original hearing was published in two newspapers of general circulation in the County. An agenda and technical staff report were posted on the Board's webpage two weeks in advance of the original hearing and the addendum to the staff report two weeks ahead of the second hearing.

Written and oral testimony was presented to the Board both in favor and in opposition to the proposal. Individuals who spoke at the first hearing were afforded an opportunity to speak at the second hearing, if the amendment affected their initial testimony. The sign-in sheet, an audio recording of the proceedings, and a copy of all written input are on file in the Department of Planning and Zoning.

Recommendation

Based on public input and Board discussion at the public hearings and worksession, the Planning Board recommended denial of the proposed amendments. In addition, they recommended that the growth tier system be continually monitored to evaluate its economic benefits, as well as fairness to the property rights of agricultural property owners. The motion was passed 4-1.