



2664 Riva Road, P.O. Box 6675  
Annapolis, MD 21401  
410-222-7450

Gustav S. Kurtz, Jr.  
Chair, Planning Advisory Board

---

Planning Advisory Board (PAB)  
Hybrid Meeting  
November 2, 2023  
12:00 PM

**PAB Present:**

Gus Kurtz, Chair  
Lawrence Blevins  
Edward Evans  
Van Mason  
Elizabeth Rosborg  
Dawn Stoltzfus

**Staff Present:**

Jessica Levy, Planner II, Long Range Planning Section, Office of Planning and Zoning (OPZ)  
Michael Stringer, Senior Planner, Long Range Planning Section, OPZ  
Sumner Handy, Planner III, Zoning Administration, OPZ  
Donnie Dyott, Senior Planner, Zoning Administration, OPZ  
Christina Pompa, Deputy Planning and Zoning Officer, Planning Division, OPZ  
Cindy Carrier, Planning Administrator, Long Range Planning Section, OPZ  
Mark Wildonger, Senior Planner, Long Range Planning, OPZ  
Sam Meyers, Planner II, Long Range Planning Section, OPZ  
Patrick Hughes, Senior Planner, Long Range Planning, OPZ  
Desirae Williams, Planner III, Long Range Planning Section, OPZ  
Andrew Lazara, Planner I, Long Range Planning, OPZ

**Others Present, online and in-person:**

Jon Arason, Alec Cronin, Mary Guy, Nancy Guy, Kevin Haines, Len Hamilton, P. Hamilton, Richard Israel, Ruth Jobe, Julie Johnson, Jim Krapf, David Phipps, Owen Smith, Marilee Tortorelli, Bernard Wallace Jr., Benjamin Wechsler, Judy Weigel

**Call to Order**

Mr. Kurtz called the Planning Advisory Board (PAB) meeting to order at 12:18 PM.

Ms. Mason motioned to approve the agenda, and Ms. Stoltzfus seconded. The agenda was approved 6-0.

Ms. Stoltzfus motioned to approve the October 18, 19, and 24 meeting notes, and Ms. Mason seconded. The notes were approved 6-0.

## **Draft Region 2 Plan and Comprehensive Zoning Map**

### *Summary of Testimony*

Each Region Plan had roughly the same public engagement opportunities. Mark Wildonger summarized the public engagement in Region 2 including stakeholder meetings, online questionnaires, and feedback maps.

Mr. Wildonger reviewed the public testimony submitted to the PAB. A total of 15 comments were received including oral testimony. Members of the public commented on the Forest Conservation bill from 2019 and recommendations related to improving the environment. There were also comments on concerns about higher density development and adverse impacts of growth, as well as concerns about the need for affordable housing and child care.

The PAB asked about comments related to Brock Bridge Road. The comments express concern that Brock Bridge Road may not be able to support increased traffic from the proposed high density housing development south of MD 198. There is not a Comprehensive Zoning (CZ) change for this property, this property is currently undergoing the development review process.

### *PAB Deliberation*

Consistency changes are staff recommended changes to zoning to be consistent with the adopted Planned Land Use (PLU), as required by State law. [Table 17 of Plan2040 Volume II](#) provides a crosswalk of which zoning districts are consistent with which PLU categories. Mr. Wildonger summarized some of the updates to PLU that resulted in consistency changes.

There are also CZ changes that are initiated by property owner requests, staff recommendations, or Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC) recommendations to change the zoning to meet a need in the community or address a community challenge or opportunity.

### **Jessup**

There are two DPA, five DPA-Overlay (DPAO), four PLU, and nine CZ changes recommended in Jessup. See the PAB draft of the [CZ Map](#) or the [Region 2 CZ Change Table](#) for more details.

#### **CZ-R2-JSP-001**

The adopted zoning is W1, the adopted PLU is Industrial. The applicant requested W2 zoning on this site. The Office of Planning and Zoning (OPZ) recommends maintaining the adopted W1. The SAC recommends W2 zoning to allow outdoor storage.

Mr. Blevins asked about environmental features on this site. Environmental features would be addressed during development review. There is a State Highway Administration (SHA) stormwater retention pond directly north of the property.

Mr. Blevins motioned to recommend W1 zoning on CZ-R2-JSP-001. Ms. Rosborg seconded, the motion passed 6-0.

#### **CZ-R2-JSP-101**

The adopted zoning is SB (Small Business), the adopted PLU is Commercial. Staff recommend C1 zoning for the north side of MD 175 to incentivize redevelopment and to be compatible with C1 zoning to the east. There is also a consistency change on the south side MD 175 to provide W1

zoning on the entire parcel for five parcels in this area. OPZ heard from business owners that SB zoning has not been working as intended despite text amendments that have tried to address their concerns. The PAB received comments that there is not an urgent need to change this area from SB to C1.

Mr. Kurtz summarized public testimony requesting to keep this site zoned SB. The PAB discussed the implications of providing C1 or SB zoning on this site.

The PAB discussed the consistency changes on the south side of MD 175. Currently these properties are split zoned W2 and SB or R1 and SB. In general, OPZ is not recommending split zoning of properties. The PLU for this area is Industrial which is more consistent with the OPZ and SAC proposed W1 zoning. These properties are within the BRAC Mixed Use overlay that would allow additional uses and incentives for several zoning districts, including W1.

W1 zoning is generally office parks, whereas W2 allows light manufacturing and outdoor storage. The north side has been zoned SB for about 20 years, since the Small Area Plans.

Mr. Evans motioned to recommend SB for CZ-R2-JSP-101 and W1 on the south side of MD 175, including W1 for the currently SB zoned parcel on the south side of MD 175. Ms. Rosborg seconded the motion, and the motion passed 6-0.

#### DPAO-R2-JSP-103, DPAO-R2-JSP-104 and DPAO-R2-JSP-302

DPAO-R2-JSP-103 is recommended to go from Village Center Overlay to Mixed Use Overlay.

DPAO-R2-JSP-104 is recommended to go from No Overlay to Mixed Use Overlay.

DPAO-R2-JSP-302 is recommended to go from No Overlay to Transit Oriented Overlay.

Mr. Wildonger provided clarification on the Mixed-Use Overlay. Staff recognized that there were areas that were recommended for Mixed Use PLU or zoning that were not in targeted growth areas, which is not consistent. To address this, staff propose a new Mixed-Use Overlay that can preserve the underlying DPA while recognizing that these areas are recommended for Mixed-Use redevelopment in a way that is consistent with targeted growth.

DPAOs are not Codified and they do not provide additional incentives or allowances beyond what is allowed in the underlying zoning. Cindy Carrier stated that there are base DPAs, and within those DPAs there are special areas that the community may want to target growth in. For example, if there is a transit station the intent may be to prioritize growth in that area even though the transit station is in a Neighborhood Preservation area. It does not have any effect on the adopted zoning, but in the future if a zoning change was explored, it may establish a policy that is supportive of a change.

#### CZ-R2-JES-1009

The adopted zoning is C1 and R1, the adopted PLU is Commercial. OPZ recommends C1 zoning as a consistency change. The PAB received testimony that the owner supports this recommendation.

#### CZ-R2-JSP-104

The adopted zoning is R1, the adopted PLU is Low-Medium Density Residential (LMDR). OPZ recommends R5 as a consistency change, and the SAC recommends R10 to increase housing opportunities. There was one comment from a neighboring property owner, but no comments on this site.

The PAB commented on the need for workforce housing, which is a conditional use in R5 or R10 zoning. Ms. Mason commented that R10 could make it easier to develop affordable housing.

Ms. Rosborg motioned to recommend R10 zoning and Medium Density Residential (MDR) PLU for CZ-R2-JSP-104. Mr. Evans seconded, and the motion passed 6-0.

Ms. Stoltzfus motioned to recommend approval of the DPA, DPAO, PLU, and zoning changes as recommended by OPZ for the Jessup community, with the exception of the previously noted recommendations. Ms. Mason seconded and the motion passed 6-0.

### **Hanover**

There are two DPAO, three PLU, and five Zoning changes recommended in Hanover. See the PAB draft of the [CZ Map](#) or the [Region 2 CZ Change Table](#) for more details.

#### **CZ-R2-HAN-001 and CZ-R2-HAN-201.**

The adopted zoning is W1, the adopted PLU is Industrial. The property owner of CZ-R2-HAN-001 applied for R2 zoning. OPZ and the SAC recommend R15 zoning at the applicant site and the neighboring CZ-R2-HAN-201 as the area is developed with higher density residential uses. The SAC also recommends R15 for a development in the same area to the east of Wright Road.

Mr. Blevins asked about the conservation areas adjacent to this site. These are platted floodplains that are recommended to be zoned entirely OS (Open Space).

Ms. Rosborg motioned to recommend R15 zoning and High Density Residential (HDR) PLU for CZ-R2-HAN-001, CZ-R2-HAN-201, and for the parcels to the east of Wright Road. Mr. Edwards seconded, the motion passed 6-0.

#### **Harmans Road.**

This is a new request during the PAB review after the final SAC meeting. The adopted zoning is split R1 and R5 as it is bifurcated by the road. The adopted PLU is split, Low Density Residential (LDR) and LMDR. The property owner requests R5 zoning on the entire site. OPZ recommends maintaining the adopted split zoning as Harmans Road serves as the zoning boundary in this area.

Ms. Rosborg motioned to recommend maintaining the adopted R1 zoning for the parcels north west of Harmans Road. Mr. Blevins seconded, the motion passed 6-0.

#### **CZ-R2-HAN-102.**

The adopted zoning is C4, the adopted PLU is Commercial. OPZ recommends this property be zoned C2 to be consistent with surrounding developments.

#### **CZ-R2-HAN-103**

The adopted zoning is R1, the adopted PLU is LDR. One parcel in this area has an adopted PLU of LMDR. The SAC and OPZ recommend changing the surrounding area to have LMDR PLU and R5 zoning to provide an opportunity for additional housing.

This area is in Planned Water and Sewer service. One property owner in the change area commented that they would like to maintain R1 zoning and one commented that they are not opposed to R5 zoning.

The PAB commented on how this property could be impacted by the proposed Moderately Priced Dwelling Unit (MPDU) legislation that is currently before the County Council. This Bill has not yet passed, so it is too soon to tell if this site meets the specifications of the Bill.

Ms. Mason motioned to recommend R5 zoning and LMDR PLU for CZ-R2-HAN-103. Ms. Rosborg seconded, the motion passed 6-0.

Ms. Stoltzfus motioned to recommend approval of the DPA, DPAO, PLU, and zoning changes as recommended by OPZ for the Hanover community, with the exception of the previously noted recommendations. Mr. Blevins seconded and the motion passed 6-0.

### **Annapolis Junction.**

There are one DPAO, two PLU, and six Zoning changes recommended in Annapolis Junction. See the PAB draft of the [CZ Map](#) or the [Region 2 CZ Change Table](#) for more details. There were no public comments and no disagreements between OPZ and SAC recommendations in this area.

Ms. Stoltzfus motioned to recommend approval of the DPA, DP-O, PLU, and zoning changes as recommended by OPZ for the Annapolis Junction community. Ms. Mason seconded and the motion passed 6-0.

### **Laurel**

There are one DPA, two DPA, six PLU, and seven Zoning changes recommended in Laurel. See the PAB draft of the [CZ Map](#) or the [Region 2 CZ Change Table](#) for more details.

#### **CZ-R2-LRL-105**

The adopted zoning is R1 and OS, and the adopted PLU is LDR. OPZ recommends R1 zoning for consistency with the adopted PLU. The SAC recommends R5 zoning to support an opportunity to increase housing development and potentially workforce housing development. The PAB discussed the location of this request and the surrounding community.

Mr. Kurtz read a member of the public's comments on this site requesting the PAB recommend maintaining the adopted OS zoning on this site. Mr. Wildonger commented that the LDR PLU would provide a transition from the higher densities along Brock Bridge Road and acknowledge community concerns about traffic.

Ms. Mason motioned to recommend R5 zoning and LMDR PLU for CZ-R2-LRL-105. Mr. Evans seconded the motion, the motion failed 2-4. Ms. Rosborg motioned to recommend R1 zoning for CZ-R2-LRL-105. Ms. Stoltzfus seconded, the motion passed 4-2.

#### **CZ-R2-LRL-001 and CZ-R2-LRL-201**

The adopted zoning is R1 for CZ-R2-LRL-001 and W1 for CZ-R2-LRL-201. The PLU is MDR for both sites. OPZ recommends R10 for consistency with the adopted PLU. The SAC recommends R15 and HDR PLU for this site.

Ms. Rosborg asked about the sewer capacity. The sewer service area for this site is projected to be over capacity if it were to be fully built out to the adopted zoning. The OPZ recommendations for Laurel focus growth into certain areas and limit growth in other areas to acknowledge the sewer capacity challenge. The Department of Public Works is examining this challenge.

Ms. Mason motioned to recommend approval of R15 zoning and HDR PLU on the site. Mr. Evans seconded, and the motion passed 5-1.

#### CZ-R2-LRL-101

This is the site of the Laurel Racetrack. The majority of this site is zoned W1 to accommodate horse race tracks as a permitted use, with the western portion of the site currently zoned OS. The PLU is Mixed-Use. OPZ recommends changing the OS portion to W1 as a consistency change. Development regulations provide protections for natural features regardless of the zoning. The western portion of the site is in a FEMA 2015 floodplain.

Mr. Blevins motioned to recommend maintaining the adopted split zoning of W1 and OS on the site. Ms. Stoltzfus seconded the motion, the motion passed 5-1. The PAB recommended that the PLU should remain Mixed-Use for the entire parcel.

#### CZ-R2-LRL-104

The adopted zoning is C1 for the western portion of the site and split zoning of C1, OS and MXD-R for the eastern portion of the site. The entire site has an adopted PLU of Commercial. This property has a certified Non-Conforming use that is consistent with C4 uses. OPZ recommends C1 zoning for the entire site as C4 allows expanded uses that may not be supported by the community. The SAC recommends C4 zoning to make the zoning consistent with the current use.

Ms. Rosborg motioned to recommend C1 zoning for CZ-R-LRL-104. Mr. Blevins seconded, the motion passed 6-0.

#### CZ-R2-LRL-103

The adopted zoning is MXD-R, and the adopted PLU is Mixed Use. OPZ does not recommend any changes to the adopted PLU or zoning. The SAC recommends Industrial PLU and W1 zoning for consistency with the development of neighboring parcels to the east. The site is within the BRAC Mixed-Use Overlay zone. The PAB discussed the development in the surrounding area and the best zoning for future uses of this site.

Ms. Mason motioned to recommend Mixed-Use PLU and MXD-R zoning for CZ-R2-LRL-103. Mr. Blevins seconded, the motion passed 6-0.

Ms. Stoltzfus motioned to recommend approval of the DPA, DPAO, PLU, and zoning changes as recommended by OPZ for the Laurel community, with the exception of the previously noted recommendations. Ms. Rosborg seconded and the motion passed 6-0.

#### **Fort Meade, United States Government, Tipton Area**

There are two DPA changes and one Zoning change recommended in Fort Meade. See the PAB draft of the [CZ Map](#) or the [Region 2 CZ Change Table](#) for more details.

#### CZ-R2-FMG-401

The adopted zoning is R1, and the adopted PLU is Public Use. OPZ recommends OS zoning for consistency with the Water and Sewer Master Plan.

Mr. Blevins motioned to recommend OS zoning for CZ-R2-FMG-401. Mr. Evans seconded, and the motion passed 6-0.

The PAB discussed traffic issues associated with Fort Meade. As a federal government agency, Fort Meade is exempt from local regulations. Additionally, the roads the traffic is associated with are State roads maintained by SHA.

Ms. Stoltzfus motioned to recommend approval of the DPA, DPAO, PLU, and zoning changes as recommended by OPZ for the Fort Meade community, with the exception of the previously noted recommendations. Mr. Evans seconded and the motion passed 6-0.

### **Maryland City**

There are one DPA, three PLU, and two Zoning changes recommended in Maryland City. See the PAB draft of the [CZ Map](#) or the [Region 2 CZ Change Table](#) for more details.

#### **CZ-R2-MDC-102**

The adopted zoning is R15, and the adopted PLU is MDR. OPZ recommends R10 zoning for consistency with the existing development and PLU. The SAC recommends maintaining the adopted zoning of R15. The PAB discussed the development on site and the surrounding community.

Mr. Evans motioned to recommend maintaining the adopted zoning of R15 for CZ-R2-MDC-102. Ms. Mason seconded, the motion passed 6-0.

#### **CZ-R2-MDC-101**

The adopted zoning is R5, adopted PLU is LMDR. In a previous version of the map, this property was identified as being recommended for OS zoning. This is a privately owned parcel, and staff recommend the adopted R5 zoning for this site.

Ms. Mason motioned to recommend R5 zoning for CZ-R2-MDC-101. Mr. Evans seconded the motion, the motion passed 6-0.

Ms. Stoltzfus motioned to recommend approval of the DPA, DPAO, PLU, and zoning changes as recommended by OPZ for the Maryland City community, with the exception of the previously noted recommendations. Mr. Blevins seconded and the motion passed 6-0.

### **Region 2**

Ms. Stoltzfus motioned to recommend approval of the Region 2 Plan with DPA, DPAO, and PLU changes as recommended by OPZ, with the exception of the previously noted recommendations. Mr. Evans seconded, the motion passed 6-0.

Ms. Stoltzfus motioned to recommend approval of the CZ changes for Region 2 recommended by OPZ, with the exception of the previously noted recommendations. Mr. Blevins seconded, the motion passed 6-0.

Mr. Wildonger noted that if property owners submit a new zoning change request during the County Council review, they will be required to post signage on the property advertising the proposed zoning change.

**The PAB took a ten-minute break. The meeting reconvened at 2:45 PM.**

## **Draft Region 7 Plan and Comprehensive Zoning Map**

### ***Summary of Testimony***

Patrick Hughes summarized the comments received during the PAB draft period. There were 137 comments on Bay Ridge, and all but one supported the OPZ recommendations. There were 92 comments on the Ridgely Avenue area, with 48 comments opposing the Village Center DPAO and 28 supporting it. There were four comments on other areas including: a letter in support of a



zoning change recommendation at Generals Highway and Housley Road, a letter from the Region 7 SAC Chair in support of the Plan, a letter from the Sierra Club seeking clarification on terms in the Plan, and a comment that addressed revitalization along Bay Ridge Road.

#### *PAB Deliberation*

#### **Riva**

See the PAB draft of the [CZ Map](#) or the [Region 7 CZ Change Table](#) for more details.

#### **PLU-R7-RIV-101**

The adopted zoning is R1 and the adopted PLU is Rural. Originally, staff recommended RLD zoning for consistency with the adopted PLU. Following discussions with the community, OPZ recommends maintaining the adopted R1 zoning in the residential area and updating the PLU to Low Density Residential. This area also has a consistency change that recommends OS on the open space parcel for consistency with the adopted PLU of Conservation.

Ms. Mason motioned to recommend the DPA, DPAO, PLU, and zoning changes for the Riva community as recommended by OPZ. Mr. Blevins seconded, the motion passed 6-0.

#### **Greater Annapolis - Heritage Harbor / Riva Road**

There were not any DPA, DPAO, PLU, or zoning changes beyond some consistency changes in this area. This is largely a Planned Unit Development (PUD). See the PAB draft of the [CZ Map](#) or the [Region 7 CZ Change Table](#) for more details.

#### **Greater Annapolis - Parole Town Center**

Due to the existing zoning overlay in the Parole Town Center (PTC) that allows greater flexibility of uses and greater density than the underlying zoning, there are few comprehensive zoning changes recommended within the PTC. See the PAB draft of the [CZ Map](#) or the [Region 7 CZ Change Table](#) for more details.

#### **DPA-R7-GRA-115, DPAO-R7-GRA-115, and PLU-R7-GRA-121**

This site is currently in the PTC. The adopted DPA is Town Center and the adopted DPAO is Transit Oriented. The adopted PLU is Town Center. After receiving community feedback, staff recommend removing this area from the PTC. This includes changing the DPA to Neighborhood Preservation, removing the TOD overlay, and changing the PLU to correspond to the area's existing zoning. The SAC agrees with the OPZ recommendation.

#### **CZ-R7-GRA-104**

The adopted zoning is R1, and the adopted PLU is LDR. Staff and the SAC recommend updating the PLU to Commercial and the zoning to C2 to be consistent with the surrounding area.

The PTC had four owner-requested comprehensive zoning changes: CZ-R7-GRA-010, CZ-R7-GRA-011, CZ-R7-GRA-012, and CZ-R7-GRA-013. OPZ and the SAC recommend supporting the owner requests in all four of these changes.

#### **CZ-R7-GRA-105**

The adopted zoning is C2 on the southern parcels and split zoned C2 and C4 on the northern parcel. The adopted PLU on the entire site is Town Center. OPZ recommends C3 zoning on the southern parcels to simplify zoning across the various properties under common ownership



and to facilitate redevelopment. OPZ recommends C4 on the entirety of the northern parcel. The SAC agrees with the OPZ recommendations.

While the area north of CZ-R7-GRA-105 are residences adjacent to the PTC, the parcels with a recommended zoning change are already zoned C2 or C4, have commercial uses, and are within the PTC and its zoning overlay. Additionally, there are Code requirements for buffers between residential and commercial areas.

Ms. Stoltzfus motioned to recommend approval of the DPA, DPAO, PLU, and zoning changes for the PTC as recommended by OPZ. Mr. Evans seconded, the motion passed 6-0.

### **Greater Annapolis - North Region 7 Area (including Ridgely Avenue)**

Many of the comprehensive zoning requests and the public comments for this area are along the Ridgely Avenue Corridor. See the PAB draft of the [CZ Map](#) or the [Region 7 CZ Change Table](#) for more details.

#### **PLU-R7-GRA-102**

The adopted zoning is C2 and R2, and the adopted PLU is Commercial. While the portion of the site fronting on Ridgely Avenue is established with a commercial use, the two portions of the site extending to the north east into a residential community are undeveloped. After receiving community feedback, OPZ recommends a split PLU of Commercial and LDR to align with and maintain the adopted split zoning of C2 and R2. There was a comment from the property owner that they are opposed to this recommendation.

#### **DPAO-R7-GRA-101**

The Ridgely Avenue area had several PLU change requests during the Plan2040 process that were deferred to the Region Plan process. Additionally, there were nine CZ applications from property owners. The majority of this area is currently zoned R2 with some SB, C1, and C2 throughout the area. The OPZ and SAC recommend retaining the current zoning pending a Village Sector Plan to analyze the area in more depth. A Village Center DPAO identified as DPAO-R7-GRA-101 is recommended to define the area for further study. The community is recommended to retain the adopted base DPA of Neighborhood Preservation.

The Ridgely Avenue area received a number of comments supporting the OPZ and SAC recommendation to not provide higher commercial zoning in this area. There were also 48 comments opposing the Village Center Overlay, DPAO-R7-GRA-101, due to concerns about environmental impacts, traffic impacts, and negative impacts on the character of the area. Twenty-eight comments support DPAO-R7-GRA-101. Some comments in support and against both referenced the need for more specifics about what the Sector Plan will entail.

Mr. Hughes outlined three options for the PAB to consider based on public input. The first was to retain the adopted zoning, recommend adding a Village Center on DPAO-R7-GRA-101, and recommend a Sector Plan while providing more detail on the planning process. A second option would be to retain the adopted zoning, eliminate DPAO-R7-GRA-101, and add a strategy to conduct a Sector Plan process for the area. The third option would be to retain the adopted zoning, eliminate DPAO-R7-GRA-101, and eliminate the recommendation for a Sector Plan. Mr. Hughes recommends maintaining DPAO-R7-GRA-101 to highlight the priority for a Sector Plan process in this area. He does not recommend the third option as it ignores challenges that were brought forth by applicants and the community. Mr. Hughes explained some of the items that a sector plan could

address including protections for historic properties, more tailored zoning change recommendations, and additional community engagement.

Mr. Kurtz noted that on CZ-R7-GRA-001 through CZ-R7-GRA-102 there were a number of comments from the public. The PAB is not in favor of supporting these zoning changes at this time.

The PAB discussed the need for community engagement to ensure redevelopment of this area is supported by the community. It was noted that without this guided effort the area could suffer from an unplanned piecemeal development, without many benefits to current residents.

The PAB discussed the implications of removing DPAO-R7-GRA-101 but still recommending a Village Sector Plan. Mr. Hughes noted that the DPAO could bolster the need for the Village Sector Plan. There is no public sewer and the public water is served by the City of Annapolis and there are challenges with the water pressure in this area; however, this area could be served by well.

The PAB noted that a Village Sector Plan should consider sidewalks, traffic, environmental concerns, the Water and Sewer Master Plan, and other comments brought forth by the public. The residents of Ridgely Avenue do not trust that they will be adequately involved in the Village Sector Plan. Mr. Hughes noted there is a broad outline of the Village Sector Plan process in the Region Plan that could include further detail to address community concerns. The PAB discussed that communities grow and change over time, and that this should also be considered in the Village Sector Plan. The PAB recommends that there be a name to the Village Sector Plan that reflects the surrounding community, such as the Weems Creek/Ridgely Avenue Sector Plan.

Ms. Rosborg motioned to recommend maintaining the adopted zoning for CZ-R7-GRA-001 through CZ-R7-GRA-009 and CZ-R7-GRA-102. The motion included a recommendation to eliminate DPAO-R7-GRA-101, and included a recommendation to support the Weems Creek/Ridgely Avenue Sector Plan. Ms. Stoltzfus seconded, and the motion was approved 6-0.

Ms. Stoltzfus motioned to recommend a split PLU of Commercial and LDR for PLU-R7-GRA-102 to be consistent with the adopted zoning (C2/R2). Mr. Evans seconded, the motion was approved 6-0.

### **Greater Annapolis - MD 2 Area**

See the PAB draft of the [CZ Map](#) or the [Region 7 CZ Change Table](#) for more details.

#### **CZ-R7-GRA-103**

The adopted zoning is R2, the adopted PLU is LDR. This property is protected under a conservation easement and is recommended by OPZ and the SAC for a zoning change to OS and PLU change to Conservation.

#### **CZ-R7-GRA-022**

The adopted zoning is R1, and the adopted PLU is LDR. The owner initially requested R10, but updated their request to R2. Staff and the SAC recommend R2 zoning. The property owner asserts that this property has not been attractive for potential buyers as R1, and R2 is consistent with the surrounding area. The property owner north of this parcel requested to remain zoned R1.

#### **PLU-R7-GRA-118 and PLU-R7-GRA-119**

These are recommendations to update the PLU to be consistent with zoning recommendations.

#### **CZ-R7-GRA-014**

To the north of Sunset Drive the adopted zoning is R1, C2, and MC and the adopted PLU is LDR, Commercial, and Maritime. The owner requested C2 zoning for the entire portion north of Sunset Drive. Staff and the SAC recommend C2 zoning for this portion of the site as it is consistent with the surrounding area. For consistency, staff and the SAC recommend updating the DPA from Neighborhood Preservation to Critical Corridor, and updating the PLU to Commercial for the area north of Sunset Drive.

To the south of Sunset Drive, the adopted zoning is MC and C4, and the adopted PLU is Maritime and Commercial. The owner requested to revise the MC/C4 split, and OPZ and the SAC are supportive of this request. For consistency, OPZ and the SAC recommend updating the PLU to be consistent with this request.

#### CZ-R7-GRA-016

The adopted zoning is MB, and the adopted PLU is Maritime. The owner requests MC; however, their desired use is permitted under the adopted MB zoning. Staff and the SAC recommend maintaining the adopted MB zoning.

#### CZ-R7-GRA-017 and CZ-R7-GRA-018

The adopted zoning of both sites is MB and R1, and the adopted PLU is Commercial. The owner requests C4 zoning to align with existing uses. Staff and the SAC recommend C4 zoning.

#### CZ-R7-GRA-101

The adopted zoning is MA2 and R1, and the adopted PLU is Maritime. Staff and the SAC recommend MA2 zoning for the entire site.

#### CZ-R7-GRA-019, CZ-R7-GRA-020, and CZ-R7-GRA-021

The adopted zoning on the south of CZ-R7-GRA-019 is split MC and MA2, and the adopted PLU is Maritime. The adopted zoning on the north side of CZ-R7-GRA-019 and the entirety of CZ-R7-GRA-020 and CZ-R7-GRA-021 is C2, and the adopted PLU is Commercial for these areas. The owner requested to change all of the C2 areas to C4. Staff and the SAC support this request.

Ms. Stoltzfus motioned to recommend approval of the DPA, DPAO, PLU, and zoning changes as recommended by OPZ for the Greater Annapolis community, with the exception of the previously noted recommendations. Ms. Mason seconded, the motion passed 6-0.

### **Annapolis Neck**

See the PAB draft of the [CZ Map](#) or the [Region 7 CZ Change Table](#) for more details.

#### PLU-R7-ANK-103

This is the Quiet Waters Retreat. The adopted zoning is R1, the adopted PLU is Parks and Open Space. Staff and the SAC recommend maintaining the adopted zoning to acknowledge an existing lease agreement. This will result in a change to the PLU for that lease area to LDR. Two additional properties on Quiet Waters Lane are part of Quiet Waters Retreat and need to be shown with Parks and Open Space PLU and OS zoning, CZ-R7-ANK-106.

#### PLU-R7-ANK-104

This is Hillsmere Elementary School. The adopted zoning is R2, the adopted PLU is Parks and Open Space. Staff and the SAC recommend the PLU be changed to Public Use.

#### CZ-R7-ANK-001

The adopted zoning is R2, and the adopted PLU is Conservation. The applicant requested to maintain the adopted R2 zoning. This property is under conservation easement and OPZ recommends OS zoning. The SAC recommends R2 zoning on this property. Ms. Stoltzfus believes that the property still has an outstanding loan and the property owners association, which is the owner, is concerned about changing the zoning and potentially decreasing the value of the property. She said the situation seems similar to the situation with the Bay Ridge Civic Association's "Big Woods" properties, where OPZ changed its recommendation to support retaining the adopted R2 zoning. Mr. Hughes said that the Annapolis Roads representatives did not mention the loan issue in communications on the property previously.

Mr. Hughes stated that providing OS zoning on parcels that are not intended to be developed is helpful for accurately modeling development capacity and water and sewer capacity.

Mr. Evans motioned to recommend R2 zoning on this property. Ms. Rosborg seconded, the motion passed 6-0.

#### CZ-R7-BAY-001

This is the Bay Ridge "Big Woods" site. The adopted zoning is R2, and the adopted PLU is Conservation. The Bay Ridge Civic Association has an outstanding loan on these properties and is concerned that a change in zoning could devalue the properties. Staff and the SAC recommend maintaining the adopted zoning. For consistency, staff and the SAC recommend updating the PLU to be consistent with this request.

#### CZ-R7-BAY-003

The adopted zoning is OS, and the adopted PLU is Conservation. The applicant requested R2 zoning. Staff support this request; however, the SAC did not come to a consensus on this site. For consistency, staff recommend updating the PLU to be consistent with this request.

#### CZ-R7-BAY-002

The adopted zoning is C2, and the adopted PLU is Parks and Open Space. The applicant requested to maintain their adopted zoning. Staff and the SAC support this request.

#### CZ-R7-ANK-101 and CZ-R7-ANK-102

This is the Fishing Creek Farms area. There are nine community open space properties in this area that have adopted PLU of Conservation. The owner requests R1 and R2 zoning on this site. These parcels were previously recommended for Open Space Zoning, but they are not under permanent conservation easement so OPZ supports those changes.

Mr. Edwards motioned to recommend approval of the DPA, DPAO, PLU, and zoning changes as recommended by OPZ for the Annapolis Neck and Bay Ridge communities, with the exception of the previously noted recommendations. Ms. Stoltzfus seconded, the motion passed 6-0.

#### **Region 7**

There were 803 Consistency changes. Ms. Rosborg motioned to recommend approval of the consistency changes. Ms. Stoltzfus seconded, the motion passed 6-0.

Mr. Blevins motioned to recommend approval of the Region 7 Plan with DPA, DPAO, and PLU changes as recommended by OPZ, with the exception of the previously noted recommendations. Mr. Evans seconded, the motion passed 6-0.

Ms. Mason motioned to recommend approval of the CZ changes for Region 7 recommended by OPZ, with the exception of the previously noted recommendations. Mr. Evans seconded, the motion passed 6-0.

### **Adjournment**

Mr. Kurtz requested that the County lay out the guidelines for a Village Sector Plan, including language about public engagement requirements. This would be added to Article 18 as a master plan that is reviewed by the Planning Advisory Board when making recommendations to the County Council.

Ms. Rosborg suggested including a recommendation to codify the DPAO. Ms. Carrier stated that the DPAO are adopted during the Master Plan processes as policy areas. DPAOs are not codified and they do not provide additional incentives or allowances beyond what is allowed in the underlying zoning.

The PAB discussed the need for examples to reference so the community can feel they better understand the process and that they are making educated decisions. They also discussed the need to engage more people in general and diverse groups of people in the planning process.

Mr. Kurtz discussed a handout from the PAB meeting on Region 4 held on October 24. This handout recommends property owners set aside land with environmental features that make it undevelopable to set it aside as a green space.

Ms. Rosborg requested the County lay out the guidelines for Village Center Overlays. The Village Center Overlay is just a policy area. While a Sector Plan could have regulatory language in Article 17 there are not the same as the Village Center Overlays.

Ms. Mason motioned to adjourn the meeting, and Mr. Blevins seconded the motion. The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,



Jessica Levy  
Secretary, Planning Advisory Board



Gus Kurtz  
Chair, Planning Advisory Board

These minutes should not be considered as verbatim, but do encapsulate comments made by the PAB, its staff, and persons who offered comments.