

1 COUNTY COUNCIL MEMBER LIZ WALSH * BEFORE THE
2 PETITIONER * PLANNING BOARD OF
3 ZRA-199 * HOWARD COUNTY, MARYLAND

4 * * * * *

5 MOTION: Amend Section 126.0.E to require that at least 15 percent of all dwelling units
6 in residential developments in the Planned Golf Course Community (PGCC)
7 zone be Moderate Income Housing Units (MIHUs).

8 ACTION: *Recommended Approval with Modifications; Vote 5-0.*

9 * * * * *

10 RECOMMENDATION

11 On November 4, 2021, the Planning Board of Howard County, Maryland, considered the petition of
12 County Council Member Liz Walsh (Petitioner) to require that 15% of all residential units be Moderate
13 Income Housing Units (MIHUs) in the PGCC (Planned Golf Course Community) zoning district.

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

16 TESTIMONY

17 Councilmember Walsh explained that residential developments within the PGCC zoning district are
18 currently exempt from providing MIHUs. She stated that the Turf Valley Golf Course community is the only
19 development that is zoned PGCC, and no MIHUs have been constructed. She indicated that there are an
20 estimated 803 units remaining to be built in Turf Valley, as of September 2020, and this amendment will
21 require 15% of those units to be MIHUs. She asserted that the PGCC district is a mixed-use zone and is
22 similar to the TOD (Transit Oriented Development) and CAC (Corridor Activity Center) zoning districts as
23 they provide for a mix of uses where people can work and live. She explained that these zoning districts have
24 a 15% MIHU requirement and were the basis for her proposed amendment.

25 Councilmember Walsh also testified that this amendment is in line with the Housing Opportunities
26 Master Plan, Policy 9.2 of *PlanHoward 2030*, and the Racial Equity Task Force recommendation to apply
27 MIHU requirements universally through all zoning districts in the County. Mr. McAliley asked if this
28 amendment would impact any current development projects or if this would only apply to future development
29 projects. DPZ staff stated that the ZRA, as drafted, is unclear in its application to future development projects.
30 Councilmember Walsh clarified that her intent was for the 15% requirement to apply to new residential
31 developments only and would not impact existing, constructed dwelling units. Mr. Engelke asked how many
32 other zoning districts did not have any MIHU requirements. DPZ staff stated that the four (4) zoning districts
33 that do not have MIHU requirements are PGCC, R-VH (Residential: Village Housing), HO (Historic: Office),
34 and HC (Historic: Commercial).

1 Five (5) members of the public testified on the proposed Petition. One testified in favor of the ZRA
2 and spoke about the PGCC district, its similarity to other mixed-use areas, and that it should also be made
3 affordable for all. Other speakers spoke about how the adoption of this zoning amendment will bring the
4 PGCC zoning district in-line with other residential zoning districts that require an MIHU percentage and will
5 ensure diversity and inclusion. Additional members of the public spoke in opposition. One speaker testified
6 that it is unfair to apply the proposed amendments to Turf Valley, which has been contemplated and
7 developed over the course of four decades. The same speaker indicated the ZRA would stop or slow the
8 continued development of Turf Valley. Another speaker stated that if this ZRA is approved, developers would
9 lose the revenue generated from 15% of the market rate units and undermine the financial viability of future
10 development at Turf Valley. The same individual also testified that PGCC is a low-density zone, which makes
11 the 15% MIHU requirement inconsistent with other similar zones, where a 10% MIHU requirement applies.
12 Another speaker suggested that application of the ZRA would be made clearer by adding an effective date to
13 the language.

14 Ms. Walsh responded to Board members' questions regarding the affordability of housing within the
15 PGCC district, zoning districts with similar MIHU requirements, and the future growth of the Turf Valley
16 area.

17 Board Discussion and Recommendation

18 In work session, Board members discussed affordable housing options within the PGCC district,
19 future development of the Turf Valley area, and the wording of the proposed amendment. Some Board
20 members expressed concern that it was unclear how the change would be applied to units not yet developed.
21 Others questioned the number of units it would impact, and whether the ZRA would allow for any fee-in-lieu
22 options. Board members stated that this would be an opportunity to proactively build different levels of
23 housing options into the community. The Board discussed that they agreed with the ZRA in principle, but that
24 the language needed to be clarified.

25 Ms. Roberts made the motion to recommend approval of ZRA-199, with recommendations to specify:
26 (1) when the proposed amendment takes effect; (2) the total number of units the amendment is expected to
27 impact; and (3) whether the amendment excludes fee-in-lieu options. Mr. McAliley seconded the motion. The
28 motion passed 5 to 0.

29 For the foregoing reasons, the Planning Board of Howard County, Maryland, on this 30th day of
30 November 2021 recommends that. ZRA-199, as described above, be **APPROVED**.

31
32 HOWARD COUNTY PLANNING BOARD

DocuSigned by:

Edward T. Coleman

F0F5EF9202BC401...

Ed Coleman, Chair

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

DocuSigned by:

Kevin McAliley

17D7DFE9D4214A8...

Kevin McAliley, Vice-chair (Virtual Attendance)

DocuSigned by:

James Cecil

7DA112381D2D404...

James Cecil

DocuSigned by:

Phil Engelke

B744G4F46EE8477...

Phillips Engelke

DocuSigned by:

Erica Roberts

B3C6AEB1EEFA493...

Erica Roberts

ATTEST:

DocuSigned by:

Amy Gowan

5D4D5DD9470C4D4...

Amy Gowan, Executive Secretary