35

Preservation Board Commercial Solar Facility Policy.

1	AMY GO	WAN				*	BEFORE THE						
2	PETITION	*	PLA	PLANNING BOARD OF									
3	ZRA-197 * HOWARD COUNTY, MARYLA												
4	* *	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
5	MO	TION:	To 1	recomm	end ap	proval o	of the po	etition d	and to re	equire d	accesso	ry groui	nd
6	mount solar collectors to be screened from adjacent residential properties												
7	and the right-of-way.												
8	ACTION: See Board Recommendation section for individual motions and votes.												
9	* *	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
10	On	February	4, 2021	, the Pla	anning 1	Board of	f Howard	d Count	y, Maryl	and, co	nsidered	the peti	tion of
11	Department of Planning and Zoning (DPZ) Director Amy Gowan to amend multiple sections of the Howard												
12	County Zoning Regulations (HCZR) to implement recommendations from the Solar Task Force based on												
13	DPZ's analysis and consistency with the HCZR. The ZRA proposes the following amendments:												
14	1.	Upda	te the ci	urrent so	lar defii	nitions ir	Section	103.0.					
15 16	 Allow rooftop commercial and accessory ground-mount solar collectors in all zoning districts. 												
17 18	3. Exempt accessory ground-mount solar collectors from the accessory structure lot coverage requirement in Sec. 128.0.A.12 provided they do not cover more than 3% of the lot.												
19 20	4. Allow ground-mount commercial solar facilities in B-1, B-2, CE, M-1, M-2, POR, and PEC as a conditional use.												
21	5. Eliminate the requirement for a glare study in Sec. 131.0.N.52.												
22 23	6. Limit the size of ground-mount commercial solar facilities on parcels that are in the Agricultural Land Preservation Program to 16 acres or 34% of the parcel, whichever is less.												
24 25	7. Add a preliminary and final review by the Agricultural Preservation Board in Sec. 131.0.N.52 for ground-mount commercial solar facilities.								0.N.52				
26	The Planning Board considered the petition, DPZ Technical Staff Report, and public testimony.								imony.				
27	Additionally, a representative from the Office of Community Sustainability provided expert testimony								timony				
28	regarding renewable energy as it relates to the Petition.												
29	<u>Testimony</u>												
30	Two members of the public testified on this matter and expressed concern about the allowed size of												
31	commercial solar facilities on properties in Agricultural Land Preservation Program (ALPP). They asserted												
32	that commen	rcial solar	facilitie	es that pr	oduce r	nore that	n 2 mega	watts ar	e not and	cillary to	o farmin	g and sho	ould be
33	prohibited of	on ALPP	propert	ties. Add	ditional	ly, they	suggeste	ed that	commer	cial sol	ar facili	ties shou	ıld not
34	occupy more than 20% of an ALPP easement, which they explained is consistent with the Agricultural										cultural		

1 2 3 Board Discussion and Recommendation 4 In work session, the Planning Board addressed the components of ZRA-197 individually and voted 5 on each amendment. 6 **Section 103.0 - Definitions** 7 The Board indicated that the proposed definitions were clear and concise. Mr. McAliley motioned to approve 8 and Ms. Adler seconded. The motion passed 5 - 0. 9 Multiple Sections - Allow rooftop commercial and accessory ground-mount solar collectors in all 10 zoning districts 11 The Board supported allowing rooftop solar collectors in all zoning districts. The Board also supported 12 allowing accessory ground-mount solar collectors in all zoning districts; however, the Board expressed 13 concern about the visual impact on adjacent properties and roadways. Mr. McAliley motioned to approve with 14 the added requirement that accessory ground mount solar collectors be buffered or screened from adjacent 15 properties and roadways. Ms. Roberts seconded. The motion passed 5 - 0. 16 Section 128.0.A.12 - Exempt accessory ground-mount solar collectors from the accessory structure lot 17 coverage requirement 18 The Board supported exempting accessory ground mount solar collectors from the accessory structure lot 19 coverage requirement, so that they are not inadvertently prohibited by Sec. 128.0.A.12. Mr. McAliley 20 motioned to approve and Ms. Roberts seconded. The motion passed 5 - 0. 21 Section 131.0.N.52 - Allow ground-mount commercial solar panels in B-1, B-2, CE, M-1, M-2, POR, 22 and PEC as a Conditional Use 23 The Board concurred with DPZ's analysis of the existing zoning district purpose statements and surrounding 24 jurisdictions. Mr. McAliley motioned to approve and Ms. Roberts seconded. The motion passed 5 - 0. 25 Section 131.0.N.52 - Eliminate the requirement for a glare study 26 Mr. Coleman expressed concern about eliminating the glare study entirely, since there isn't a requirement to 27 utilize glare mitigating technology, such as single axis tracking panels. However, the other Board members 28 expressed that technological advancements reduce or eliminate glare that otherwise resulted from older fixed 29 panel technology and therefore it is not necessary to regulate glare. Mr. McAliley motioned to approve and 30 Mr. Engelke seconded. The motion passed 5 - 0. 31 Section 131.0.N.52 - Limit the size of ground-mount commercial solar collector facilities on parcels that 32 are in the Agricultural Land Preservation Program to 16 acres or 34% of the parcel, whichever is less 33 The Board discussed the most appropriate approach to limit the scale of commercial solar facilities on ALPP 34 properties. Two Board members supported inclusion of the Agricultural Preservation Board Commercial 35 Solar Facility approach to limit the size to 20% of the easement and to prohibit facilities that produce over 2 36 megawatts. However, the other Board members were unclear of the basis for 20% as compared to the 37 proposed 34%, which was based on ALPP eligibility requirements. Mr. McAliley motioned to approve and 38 Ms. Roberts seconded. The motion passed 3 - 2.

1	Section 131.0.N.52 - Add a preliminary and final review by the Agricultural Preservation Board												
2	The Board concurred with the Solar Task Force's recommendation on the proposed Agricultural Preservation												
3	Board review process. Mr. McAliley motioned to approve and Mr. Engelke seconded. The motion passed 5 - 0.												
5													
6	For the foregoing reasons, the Planning Board of Howard County, Maryland, on this $\frac{18}{100}$ day of												
7	February, 2021 recommends that ZRA-197, as described above, be APPROVED .												
8													
9	HOWARD COUNTY PLANNING BOARD												
10	Docusigned by: Edward T. Coleman												
11	Ed C 75 TE 11 TE 1												
12	bewin Melliley												
13	KeVPMMAMey, Vice-chair												
14	DocuSigned by: Tudy Adler												
15	Dephine Ather												
16	DocuSigned by:												
17	Phitrips Engage												
18	DocuSigned by:												
19	Eri& Repetits												
20	Zareu riocorio												
21	ATTEST:												
22	DocuSigned by: Any Gonan												
23	Amy Gowan, Executive Secretary												
24													
25													