

1 **DUNTEACHIN ESTATES HOMEOWNERS \* BEFORE THE**  
 2 **ASSOCIATION, INC. PETITIONER \* PLANNING BOARD OF**  
 3 **ZRA-198 \* HOWARD COUNTY, MARYLAND**

4  
 5 \* \* \* \* \*

6 **MOTION: Recommend approval of ZRA-198.**

7 **ACTION: *Recommend Approval; Vote 3-2.***

8 \* \* \* \* \*

9  
 10 **RECOMMENDATION**

11 On September 9, 2021, the Planning Board of Howard County, Maryland, considered the petition of  
 12 Dunteachin Estates Homeowners Association, Inc. (Petitioner) to amend the Age-restricted Adult Housing  
 13 (ARAH) conditional use requirements (Sections 131.0.N.1.a) as follows:

- 14 o Reduce the maximum number of dwelling units allowed per net acre in R-ED and R-20 districts  
 15 by 1.
- 16 o Require that at least 25% of the dwelling units in an ARAH development be limited to a  
 17 maximum 1,600 sq. ft. of above grade living space; and
- 18 o Increase the size of community buildings to 30 sq. ft. of net floor area per dwelling unit for the  
 19 first 99 units.

20 The Planning Board considered the petition and the Department of Planning and Zoning (DPZ)  
 21 Technical Staff Report.

22 **Testimony**

23 Mr. James Raggio represented the Petitioner and was joined by three additional speakers. Mr. Raggio  
 24 testified that the Dunteachin Estates Homeowners Association filed the amendments because of their experience  
 25 with a proposal for an ARAH proposal on Kerger Road. Mr. Raggio provided a presentation that included  
 26 information about the Kerger Road ARAH proposal, an overview of three proposed zoning amendments and  
 27 additional testimony supporting the proposed changes to the allowed ARAH density. Mr. Raggio further  
 28 testified about prior ARAH projects and their permitted density versus approved density. Mr. Jeffery Smith  
 29 spoke next and explained the rationale for the second amendment, which would set a maximum size of 1600  
 30 sq. ft. of living space for 25% of the dwelling units in ARAH developments. Mr. Smith cited PlanHoward 2030  
 31 policies that are supportive of this proposed amendment. He further shared examples of model homes that would  
 32 meet this size restriction. Finally, he spoke about two “friendly” amendments to the original ZRA that the  
 33 petitioner proposes in response to the DPZ Technical Staff report (TSR). The first friendly amendment would

1 define living space above grade and the second friendly amendment would address how the proposed size  
2 restrictions would relate to the Moderate-Income Housing Units (MIHU) requirements for ARAH  
3 developments. Ms. Margaret Sheehan spoke about the third amendment to modify the size requirements for the  
4 community building to be consistent with the current National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) Life Safety  
5 Code. She also offered a “friendly amendment” to the original ZRA language to extend these proposed  
6 community building size requirements to the POR, CCT, TNC, R-SL, MXD, and PSC districts, which  
7 also allow ARAH developments.

8 Five members of the public testified on the proposed Petition. One testified in favor of the ZRA and  
9 spoke about the housing needs of seniors with disabilities. Other speakers referred to the desires of seniors  
10 wishing to age in place and the demand for smaller, single level homes. Additional members of the public  
11 spoke in opposition. One speaker testified that the amendments would make many of the remaining eligible  
12 properties economically prohibitive for ARAH developments, including their own property, and that market  
13 rate housing allowed under base zoning would be more economically feasible than ARAH. A final speaker  
14 stated that this ZRA would decrease the supply of senior housing and drive prices higher.

15 Mr. Raggio, Mr. Smith, and Ms. Sheehan responded to Board member’s questions regarding the  
16 demand for senior housing, the proposed changes to the community center standards, and the requirements for  
17 open space and other amenities.

#### 18 Board Discussion and Recommendation

19 In work session, Board members spoke of the need for additional senior housing, the challenges of  
20 balancing density incentives with infill compatibility, and the necessity for a variety of senior housing products.  
21 Some Board members expressed concern about the lack of data and analysis to support making changes  
22 proposed by this ZRA, specifically the density and unit size amendments. The Board also discussed whether  
23 there was actual demand for smaller housing for seniors and a need for larger ARAH clubhouses. The Board  
24 determined that there is demand for smaller senior housing units, but did not reach a consensus that the proposed  
25 ZRA, as drafted, is the correct approach to yield a smaller housing product. There was no Board discussion  
26 specific to the “friendly” amendments referenced by the Petitioner.

27 Ms. Adler motioned to recommend approval of ZRA-198 as submitted in the Petition. Mr. Engelke  
28 seconded each motion. The motion passed 3-2.

29  
30 For the foregoing reasons, the Planning Board of Howard County, Maryland, on this 29 day of  
31 September 2021, recommends that ZRA-198, as described above, be **APPROVED**.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16

HOWARD COUNTY PLANNING BOARD

Dissent

Ed Coleman, Chair

DocuSigned by:

*Kevin Melliley*

Kevin McAuley, Vice-chair

Dissent

Erica Roberts

DocuSigned by:

*Phil Engelke*

Phillips Engelke

DocuSigned by:

*Tandy Adler*

Delphine Adler

ATTEST:

DocuSigned by:

*Amy Gowan*

Amy Gowan, Executive Secretary