

May 16, 2012
REVISED: July 3, 2012

Frederick County Community Development Division

2011 Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Review Approved Requests Analysis

INTRODUCTION

In January 2011 the Board of County Commissioners (BOCC) announced its desire to review the 2010 County Comprehensive Plan and specifically to address the downzonings that occurred as part of the 2010 Plan's comprehensive zoning process. On May 19, 2011 at a public work session the BOCC voted to initiate a Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Review, with an application period in the summer 2011 to allow property owners to request changes in their land use plan designation and/or zoning.

This analysis report has been revised and updated to reflect further direction from the BOCC made at their work session held on May 31st.

Update Process Summary

1. 60-Day Referral and Comment Period – The requests were summarized by planning region and were referred to county and state agencies, municipalities, and adjoining counties. The referral was completed in early September 2011.
2. County Planning Commission Review – Following the 60-day comment period the Planning Commission was scheduled to conduct four (4) public hearings organized by planning region on November 16th, 17th, 30th, and December 1st. At the hearing on November 17th the Planning Commission voted to suspend their review and recommended to the BOCC that no changes be made to the 2010 County Plan.
3. BOCC Review – The BOCC held four public hearings on January 10th, 18th, 24th, and 31st 2012. The Board held three work sessions (February 14th, 21st, and 23rd 2012) to review the individual requests and took preliminary votes on each.
BOCC held a work session on May 31, 2012
4. Analysis – Has been revised and updated to reflect further direction from the BOCC on May 31st.
5. Joint Public Hearing and Planning Commission Referral - A joint FcPc/BOCC public hearing will be held July 31, 2012 on the Draft comprehensive plan and zoning changes as currently proposed by the BOCC
6. Adoption of the Plan/Zoning – Following the FcPc review the BOCC may make further revisions and give final direction for the adoption of land use plan, zoning map and water/sewer plan map changes.

Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Amendment Components

This review process will include three individual components that will primarily address mapping though revisions to the 2010 County Plan text document will also be made following adoption of the maps.

Comprehensive Zoning Map – appropriate mapping will be provided that reflects the approved requests.

Land Use Plan Map - Revisions to the Plan map will generally follow the zoning changes to maintain consistency between the zoning classification and the appropriate land use plan designation.

Water and Sewerage Plan - Revisions to the Water/Sewer Plan classifications will be proposed relative to changes in the zoning and/or land use plan designations. The following general revisions would be made:

- **No Planned Service (NPS) to Planned Service (PS)** – properties that are proposed to be included within a community growth area with a land use plan designation other than Ag/Rural or Natural Resource. The zoning would still be Agricultural.
- **No Planned Service (NPS) to 5** – properties proposed for zoning other than Agricultural or Resource Conservation AND are currently within a community growth area or proposed to be within a community growth area.
- **Planned Service (PS) to 5** – properties currently within a community growth area, having a development land use plan designation and proposed to be rezoned to other than Agricultural or Resource Conservation.

COUNTYWIDE SUMMARY

Currently, there are 206 requests under consideration. This number includes several new requests submitted after the application period in the summer 2011 and also reflects several requests that have been withdrawn. Of the 206 requests, the BOCC have given preliminary approval for 166. The tables below provide a summary of the approved requests including the countywide totals and for each planning region.

Approved Land Use Plan Designation Changes

Table 1 shows the acres approved for general land use plan designation categories. The specific land use plan designations included within the general categories are noted as follows:

- **Commercial** – General Commercial, Village Center, Mixed Use
- **Industrial** – Limited Industrial, General Industrial, Office/Research/Industrial
- **Residential** – Rural Residential, Rural Community, and Low/Medium/High Density Residential
- **Ag/Rural (CGA)** – Indicates a plan designation of Agricultural/Rural within a community growth area (CGA)

Table 1
Approved Land Use Plan Designation Changes
(acres)

Approved Land Use Plan Designation Changes 5/31/2012						
Planning Region	Commercial	Industrial	Residential	Ag/R (CGA)	Ag/Rural,NR	Total Acres
Adamstown	7	1,110	0	0	0	1,117
Brunswick	9	0	338	51	0	398
Frederick	0	158	622	0	109	889
Middletown	0	5	438	0	63	506
New Market	36	12	2,334	134	0	2,516
Thurmont	11	45	110	0	0	166
Urbana	98	112	1,160	1,269	24	2,663
Walkersville	6	34	168	883	0	1,091
Total Acres	167	1,476	5,170	2,337	196	9,346

Approved Zoning District Changes

Table 2 shows the acreage approved for general zoning categories. A second table provides the detailed breakdown for the specific zoning districts.

- Commercial – General Commercial (GC), Village Center (VC), Mixed Use (MX)
- Industrial – Limited Industrial (LI), General Industrial (GI), Office/Research/Industrial (ORI)
- Residential – R-1 Low Density, R-3 Low Density, R-5 Medium Density

Table 2
Approved Zoning Changes
(acres)

Approved Zoning District Changes 5/31/2012												
Planning Region	Commercial			Industrial			Residential			Agricultural		Total
	GC	VC	MX	GI	LI	ORI	R-1	R-3	R-5	A	RC	
Adamstown	3	0	0	758	180	0	0	0	0	0	0	941
Brunswick	9	0	0	0	0	0	263	119	0	0	0	391
Frederick	0	0	0	0	0	0	579	0	0	109	0	688
Middletown	0	12	0	5	0	0	128	29	0	0	63	238
New Market	34	2	0	12	30	0	131	16	122	23	0	370
Thurmont	10	1	0	14	16	0	253	66	0	0	0	360
Urbana	74	0	48	0	0	112	663	0	0	24	0	921
Walkersville	5	4	1	15	19	0	29	17	0	0	0	90
Countywide Total Acres	135	19	49	804	245	112	2,046	247	122	156	63	3,999
Countywide Total Acres	203			1,161			2,415			219		3,999

Residential Development Potential

The total residential development potential for the approved requests is summarized in Table 3 below. The development potential separates requests for zoning (which may also include a land use plan designation request) from requests only for land use plan designations to avoid double counting. Analysis is also provided in Table 4 for the potential development that would occur on well/septic.

Table 3
Approved Residential Development Potential

2011 Comprehensive Plan / Zoning Review						
Residential Development Potential Analysis						
5/30/2012 Planning Region	Residential Zoning DU Potential			Land Use DU Potential		Total DU Potential
	R-1	R-3	R-5	LDR	in CGA	
Adamstown	0	0	0	0	0	0
Brunswick	105	251	0	0	107	463
Frederick	1,036	0	0	124	0	1,160
Middletown	51	62	0	409	0	522
New Market	52	34	430	4,309	281	5,106
Thurmont	365	139	0	0	0	504
Urbana	265	0	0	1,980	1,749	3,994
Walkersville	11	36	0	256	1,854	2,157
Countywide Total	1,885 du's	522 du's	430 du's	7,078 du's	3,991 du's	13,906 du's
	2,837 du's			10,691 du's		

The total residential development noted in Table 3 is expected to occur over a 20+ year timeframe. Regardless of the amount of development potential, the most significant factor that will affect the timing of development is the economy. The relative timeframe for the residential development to occur can be described as follows:

Zoning Potential – Those properties receiving residential zoning could be considered for development in a near-term timeframe over the next 10 years or so. Properties within a municipal growth area will also be subject to an annexation process with ultimate approval by the respective municipality.

Low Density Residential Plan Designation – This potential represents properties that are receiving a land use plan designation of Low Density Residential (LDR) and in many cases are being added to a community growth area. The zoning for properties, however, will remain Agricultural (A) so the timeframe for development may be in a mid-term period of 10 or more years. These properties would need to go through a subsequent rezoning process in the County or would be subject to an annexation process for those within a municipal growth area.

Community Growth Area Designation – This designation includes properties that would be added to a community growth area (CGA) but would remain with an Agricultural/Rural land use plan designation. This category is referred to as Future Growth Area in the 2010 County Plan and has a long-term development timing of perhaps 20+ years.

Well and Septic Development

The development potential expected to be served on well/septic only includes those requests for zoning or plan designations if they are outside of a community growth area (CGA).

NOTE: The requests for R-1 or R-3 zoning on properties within a CGA are expected to be annexed into the respective municipality and are not counted under the well/septic development potential.

The potential development assumes an average lot size of 2.5 acres/lot on the entire gross acres.

Table 4
Well and Septic Development Potential

Planning Region	No. of Properties	Acres	Potential Lots/Dwellings
Adamstown	0	0	0
Brunswick	2	280	112
Frederick	5	106	48
Middletown	10	128	51
New Market	5	103	41
Thurmont	4	97	38
Urbana	9	663	265
Walkersville	2	29	11
Total	37 properties	1406 acres	566 lots/dwellings

REGIONAL SUMMARY

At their work sessions in February to review the individual requests the Board noted the need for additional analysis or staff comment for individual requests.

The BOCC reviewed these comments and issues at their work session on May 31st. The BOCC's decisions are described following the staff response. These decisions are also described in the regional request summaries.

Adamstown Region

Case # AD-3 (Windridge) – Current Board action would restore the GI plan designation to about 70 % (155 acres) of the property.

Staff Response – *staff recommends applying the GI plan designation to the entire 222 acre property. The remaining 67 acres would be difficult to maintain with agriculture given how much industrial development would adjoin the property. This parcel would also be removed from the Carrollton Manor Priority Preservation Area. SEE MAP 2*

BOCC Decision – ***BOCC voted to support staff recommendation to expand GI plan designation.***

Case # AD-13B (Mackintosh) – Current Board action would restore the prior split of Agricultural (A) and Resource Conservation (RC) zoning. Requested the rezoning of the 111 acre parcel from Resource Conservation (RC) to either Limited Industrial (LI) or General Industrial (GI). This parcel has significant environmental constraints including 100-year floodplain, wetlands, mature forest, and existing Forest Resource Ordinance (FRO) easements.

Staff Response – *only support approximately 7 acres of LI or GI zoning along the MD 28 frontage for the portion of the parcel outside of the 100-year floodplain and FRO easements. This area would also be bounded by a small stream. SEE MAP 1*

BOCC Decision – ***Voted to rezone approximately 7 acres to LI or GI along MD 28.***

Case # AD-13-A (Mackintosh) – Current Board action would restore the GC plan designation only (would remain zoned A).

Staff Response – *Staff would recognize the historic significance of St. Paul's and would stress the need for appropriate buffering with any commercial development. An alternative to consider would be Village Center designation, which may provide a more appropriate intensity of development adjoining the church.*

BOCC decision – ***maintained prior action to only restore GC plan.***

Eastalco Community Growth Area

The current Board action restores the LI and GI zoning on the Eastalco property and the GI plan designation for the Windridge property (155 acres). All of the properties restored to the growth area as industrial would be removed from the Carrollton Manor Priority Preservation Area. Even though the Windridge property is within a community growth area it is not proposed for community water/sewer service and would remain classified as No Planned Service (NPS) on the Water and Sewer Plan.

Staff Response

The most significant issue with the restoration of the zoning for this employment growth area is the need to address road access to US 15 at a planned interchange with Mountville Rd. **(SEE MAP 2)** Beyond access to US 15 is the issue of east/west connections through this employment between US 15 and MD 85 in the vicinity of Buckeystown. The prior 2001 Adamstown Region Plan identified an east/west arterial road using Manor Woods Rd. and Hawker Rd. to connect US 15 and MD 85. As part of the 2010 County Plan staff recommended that the existing alignment of Mountville Rd. from US 15 to Ballenger Creek Pike be upgraded from a Collector classification to a Minor Arterial. Also recommended was a new Minor Arterial road alignment from the intersection of Mountville Rd. and Ballenger Creek Pike through the southern portion of the Eastalco property to New Design Rd. Staff recommends adding this Minor Arterial to the highway plan. **SEE MAP 2**

Staff also recommends two revisions to the land use plan designations and zoning proposed to be restored.

1. The southwest portion of the Eastalco property would be restored with a split between Limited Industrial (LI) and General Industrial (GI). Staff recommends this entire area be Limited Industrial to provide a better balance between the amount of LI and GI lands especially with the addition of the Windridge property (222 acres) as GI.
2. There is a small area (23 acres) of LI zoning on the west side of New Design Rd. that was a remnant of a larger GI area almost extending down to Adamstown Rd. These 23 acres were rezoned to LI in 1991. Staff would not recommend restoring this 23 acre area of LI as it adjoins property that has been given to the Carroll Manor Recreation Council for a park and would be too small by itself to be easily developed based on its configuration and the fact it does not follow any property lines.

BOCC Decision – maintained prior action to fully restore LI and GI on the plan/zoning. Requested to consider alternative alignments of an east-west arterial roadway. Map 2 has been revised to show alternative alignments for an east-west arterial.

Brunswick Region

Case #BR-2 (Ingram) – For the Ingram property request the remaining issue is the appropriateness of either R-1 or R-3 zoning. The prior zoning on the parcel (53 acres) was R-1. The development potential differences are described below:

- R-1 – 1 dwelling/acre on individual well/septic systems. Based on an average of 2.5 acres/lot applied to the entire acreage could yield approximately 22 lots/dwellings. For R-1 the matching plan designation is Rural Residential (outside of Jefferson CGA)
- R-3 – 3 dwellings/acre on public water/sewer provided through the Jefferson community systems. Based on net acreage of 70% (37 acres) maximum yield could be approximately 111 dwellings. The matching plan designation would be Low Density Residential (within the Jefferson CGA).

Staff Response – Staff would support the R-3, which would give the option of developing on public water/sewer and would not preclude development on individual well/septic systems (at R-1 density).

BOCC decision – supported staff recommendation for R-3 zoning and LDR plan to provide option of developing on water/sewer or well/septic.

Case # BR-6 (Jefferson Valley) – request in the Woodbourne Manor development would add 8 acres of R-3 zoning in a strip that is currently designated on the plan as Low Density Residential. The 8 acres, currently zoned Agricultural, includes portions of three (3) residential lots and some proposed HOA open space. None of the 8 acres is within the existing water recharge easement established to support the community water system serving the development. The development is currently limited by MDE to a maximum of 198 dwellings even if the additional 8 acres is rezoned to R-3.

Staff Response – would recommend extending the R-3 zoning and LDR plan designation to incorporate remaining land beyond the subject 8 acres up to the boundary of the water recharge easement. **(SEE MAP 3)** This area totals approximately 15 acres and includes additional HOA open space land (8.3 acres total) and portions of three (3) residential lots subdivided under the current Agricultural zoning. The total area proposed to be designated LDR with R-3 zoning would be approximately 23 acres of which 8.3 acres would be HOA open space.

BOCC Decision – supported recommendation to expand R-3 zoning and LDR plan

Case # BR-8 (Johnson) – Current Board action to restore would only include portion (29.9 acres) of the parcel within the community growth area with an Agricultural/Rural plan designation.

Staff Response – Staff would support including the entire parcel (50.9 acres) within the community growth area with an Agricultural/Rural land use plan designation. The Ag/Rural designation is appropriate given the issues with the water and sewer system capacities.

BOCC Decision – supported recommendation to include entire parcel within the Jefferson growth area.

Frederick Region

Case #FR-3 (Barbieto) – The action to only restore the R-1 would leave the parcel with split zoning of R-1 (4.75 acres) and A in a very odd configuration.

Staff Response - recommend zoning the entire parcel (10.3 acres) R-1 with a matching Rural Residential plan designation.

BOCC Decision – supported recommendation to rezone entire parcel to R-1 to avoid split zoning.

Case # FR-20 (Lidie) – Current Board action would approve the new request for Agricultural zoning to allow for more flexibility in constructing accessory structures.

Staff Response – Staff had identified an option to address the issue through a Zoning text amendment. However, rezoning to Agricultural would in the end be a better option.

BOCC Decision – no change in prior action to rezone to Agricultural.

Priority Preservation Area Issue (SEE MAP 4)

The Board's action for cases FR-30 (Crum) and 31 (Thatcher) would remove the Priority Preservation Area (PPA) from these properties. There would still be PPA designations on several adjoining properties, most of them within the City's growth area, on the west side of the Monocacy River.

Staff Response - staff would recommend removing all of the PPA on the west side of the Monocacy River for the Walkersville PPA. The staff draft of the Walkersville PPA prepared for the 2010 County Plan did not include any properties on the west side of the Monocacy River.

BOCC Decision – supported recommendation to remove PPA designation on the west side of the Monocacy River.

Community Growth Area Revision (SEE MAP 4)

An existing farm parcel (TM 57, Parcel 28, 138 ac.) known as the Richfield Farm was removed from the Frederick growth area in the 2010 Plan. This parcel (See Map 3) is surrounded by the City on three sides and is within the City's 20-year growth area with a Mixed Use land use plan designation.

Staff Response – *Staff recommends to include this parcel within the Frederick growth area with a Mixed Use land use plan designation to match the City's designation. The zoning would remain Agricultural and RC.*

BOCC Decision – ***supported recommendation to include Richfield property in Frederick growth area with a Mixed Use plan designation.***

Middletown Region

Case # MD-2 (Gaver) – The current Board action would restore the RC zoning. The Gavers have submitted a letter withdrawing their request to restore the RC zoning.

Staff Response - *Staff met with the Gavers and explained that the Agricultural zoning will provide more subdivision rights and flexibility for the 14 acre parcel. The Gaver's have submitted a letter indicating a desire to keep the current Agricultural zoning, which reflects the characteristics of the property.*

Case # MD-4 (Walz) – The request is only to restore approximately 1.5 acres of R-1 zoning. There is an existing garden center/nursery use on the parcel, which was approved under the Agricultural zoning.

Staff Response - *would support the restoration of only the 1.5 acres to avoid making the garden center use non-conforming.*

BOCC Decision – ***no change in prior action to restore 1.5 acres of R-1 with remainder of parcel remaining Ag.***

Case # MD-6 (Shafer) – Current Board action would restore the prior zoning, which would split the parcel (4.7 ac.) with RC and A zoning.

Staff Response – *Staff has not been able to contact the Shafer's though we would not object to having the entire parcel zoned Agricultural (A) as requested by the applicant as it is on the edge of the RC area.*

BOCC Decision – ***supported recommendation to zone entire parcel Agricultural to avoid split zoning.***

Case # MD-17 (AC Jets) – Current Board action would restore 37.9 acres of R-3 zoning along US 40A and LDR plan designation on 102.8 acres of the parcel.

Staff Response – *Staff would note the inconsistency with applying the R-3 zoning on the portion of the parcel, which is designated on both the County Plan and the Town's Plan as General Commercial.*

BOCC Decision – ***no change in prior action to restore R-3 zoning.***

Case # MD-18 (C & D) (Yinger) – Current Board action would restore R-1 zoning on parcels 781 and 782. Staff has met with Mr. Yinger to explain the advantages of keeping the Village Center (VC) zoning as was adopted in the 2010 Plan and Mr. Yinger has agreed to withdraw the request for R-1 zoning and to expand the VC on Parcel 781 by approximately 6 acres for a total of 12.1 acres. **SEE MAP 5**

Staff Response – *Staff supports maintaining the VC zoning and would not object to an expansion of the VC on Parcel 781. The balance (33.9 ac.) of Parcel 781 would then remain zoned Resource Conservation (RC).*

BOCC Decision – ***supported recommendation to expand VC zoning for an additional 6 acres.***

New Market Region

Case # NM-1 (Tate) – The Board’s action would approve GC zoning for this parcel even though the existing zoning has always been Agricultural (A).

Staff Response - support the GC zoning given the existing and planned commercial and industrial uses surrounding the property.

BOCC Decision – no change in prior action to approve GC zoning.

Case # NM-6 (RJD) – The current Board action would restore the ORI, LI, and R-5 zoning and corresponding plan designations. Mr. Demitt has since requested that the plan designation be ORI for the entire area per his application.

Staff Response – Staff would not object to the ORI plan designation, even though it would be inconsistent with the LI and R-5 zoning, since the ultimate goal is to facilitate MXD zoning. The MXD floating zone could not be applied to land designated residential. It should be noted that maintaining County zoning on this parcel would likely preclude it from being considered for annexation into New Market.

BOCC Decision – supported application of ORI plan designation on entire parcel with the LI and R-5 zoning.

Case # NM-23 (Cawood) – The Board’s current action would deny the new request for VC zoning. This property was not downzoned and has always been zoned Agricultural. Until recently the property had been used as an auto repair shop. The immediate area has a mix of residential and commercial uses along Old National Pike.

Staff Response - staff believes that the VC would be an appropriate zoning given the past commercial use of the property and would be compatible with surrounding uses.

BOCC Decision – Approved request for VC zoning, which reversed prior action to deny.

Case # NM-26 and 30 (Howard Payne) – The Board’s current action would deny the new requests for GI zoning (from RC) on both cases. These parcels have been recently sold (September 2011) to an individual wanting to locate a landscaping contractor business on it. Neither parcel has ever been zoned industrial.

Staff Response – Mr. Payne sold these two parcels to Mr. Hurd in September 2011 possibly under the premise that they were already zoned industrial. Although, it is not very clear as Mr. Payne submitted requests to rezone them from RC to GI. Staff would not object to the GI zoning for parcel 123 (NM-26). Staff would not recommend GI zoning for parcel 122 (NM-30) which has 100-year floodplain and moderate slopes. Staff would also note that rezoning to GI will likely significantly increase the tax assessment of the parcel.

BOCC Decision – Approved request for GI on Parcel 123 (Case # NM-26), which reversed prior action to deny. No change in prior action to deny GI on Parcel 122 (Case # NM-30).

Case # NM-32 (Rayburn) – The Board’s current action would deny the new request for R-3 zoning. The applicant has contested that the parcel is too small and inappropriate for PUD zoning.

Staff Response – The 80 acre parcel would not be too small and in fact PUD zoning would provide much greater design flexibility for smaller parcels. An infill property in Adamstown is only 10 acres and has been approved for PUD zoning for 50 dwelling units. The PUD zoning would also provide the option of having a commercial component in the development possibly along the MD 144 frontage.

BOCC Decision – no change in prior action to deny request for R-3.

Linganore Community Growth Area

The analysis for the Linganore community includes the proposed additions to the community growth area (CGA) as well the development potential for several properties currently within the CGA. **SEE MAP 6**) The table that follows projects the pupil yield and other comments are provided addressing road alignments that will need to be added to the land use plan.

It is recommended that the Casey and Blentlinger properties be included within the Linganore community growth area. The Smith/Cline properties should be included within the New Market community growth area since they are also targeted for annexation by the Town of New Market.

BOCC Decision – no change in prior action to restore LDR plan designation for Oakdale (Case # NM-12), Casey (Case # NM-42), Blentlinger (Case # NM-36), and Smith/Cline (Case# NM-13 and NM-14). Supported recommendation for planned road alignments and school sites as shown on Map 6.

Request	Acres	Potential Dwellings ¹	Pupil Yield Range ²
Oakdale NM-12	1,265	3,235 ⁴	ES 645—640 MS 324—381 HS 450—492
Casey NM-42	638	1,340	ES 266—343 MS 135—145 HS 187—203
Blentlinger NM-36	282	592	ES 118—151 MS 60—70 HS 82—90
Smith/Cline NM-13, 14	264	554	ES 77—142 MS 55—65 HS 76—84
Gladhill NM-16	146	307	ES 61—61 MS 31—37 HS 43—47
Beshers NM-08	16	34	ES 8—7 MS 5—5 HS 6—6
Traylor NM-39	34	72	ES 14—16 MS 8—8 HS 11—12
Subtotal	2,645 ac.	6,134 du's	ES 1189—1360 MS 618—711 HS 855—934
Other properties currently within Liganore CGA			
Cromwell/Dorsey	154	323	ES 65—66 MS 35—38 HS 36—49
Resco	75	159	ES 32—32 MS 16—19 HS 22—25
Carey/Hutzel NM-20, 21	41	146	ES 30—29 MS 15—17 HS 21—22
Subtotal	270 ac.	628 du's	ES 127 – 127 MS 66 – 74 HS 79 – 96
TOTAL	2,915 ac.	6,762 du's	ES 1,316 –1,487 MS 684 – 785 HS 934 – 1,030

Notes:

¹ 70% of gross acreage @ 3 dwellings/acre if LDR. MDR @ 5 dwellings/acre.

² 2007 FCPS pupil generation rates . Range utilizes countywide school average pupil yield rates and property's current school district pupil yield rate. Assumed 60% single-family, 20% townhouse, 20% multi-family

³ Assumes the following maximum school capacities: ES: 700; MS: 900; HS: 1600

⁴ Based on 2008 DRRRA proposal. Includes existing undeveloped PUD properties under ownership of Oakdale Investments.

Oakdale (NM-12)

- Transportation:
 - Eaglehead Drive reconstruction from Linganore Creek to Oakdale High School
 - Woodridge Road extension to Gas House Pike
 - Yeagertown Road connection to Pinehurst Drive
 - Gas House Pike, Central Church Road improvements
- Water and sewer capacity from New Design Road Water Treatment Plan and Ballenger WWTP generally sufficient to serve this development. Bens Branch and Boyers Mill Road Sewer Pump Stations expanded and now in operation. New infrastructure lines and other details to serve future development determined by the DUSWM.
- Identification of school sites, public parkland.

Casey and Blentlinger (NM-42 & NM-36)

- Identification of an arterial road connection: Boyers Mill Road to MD 75
- Identification of school sites
- Linear stream valley parkland dedication. Community Park symbol retained along Hazlenut Run/Bens Branch
- Water and sewer capacity from New Design Road Water Treatment Plan and Ballenger WWTP generally sufficient to serve this development. Bens Branch and Boyers Mill Road Sewer Pump Stations expanded and now in operation. New infrastructure lines and other details to serve future development determined by the DUSWM.
- There are two properties not part of the Casey/Blentlinger ownership that are surrounded by the subject properties and should also be considered for the Low Density Residential land use plan designation.

Smith/Cline (NM-13 & NM-14)

- Properties within Town of New Market's growth/annexation area and designated residential. These properties would be included within the New Market community growth area.
- Potential Collector road connection from Boyers Mill Rd. to Old New Market Road. This may be considered in addition to or in place of the arterial road connection through Casey/Blentlinger
- Water and sewer capacity from New Design Road Water Treatment Plan and Ballenger WWTP generally sufficient to serve this development. New infrastructure lines and other details to serve future development determined by the DUSWM.
- Regional Park symbol shown on 2010 Plan.

Staff Recommendations

- School Sites
 - Elementary – 2 sites on northern portion of Woodridge development at Gas House Pike and on Casey property. A third site will remain in the Greenview PUD.
 - Middle – 1 site, move current symbol on Ganley property in the New Market community to the Blentlinger property.
 - High – 1 site recommended in the Urbana region as part of the Monrovia Town Center site on east side of MD 75 north of MD 80.
- Roads
 - Arterial connection between Boyers Mill Rd. and MD 75
 - Collector extension through Woodridge to Gas House Pike

- Collector extension of Mussetter Rd. east of Boyers Mill Rd. to the Delaplaine property.
- Allow for a connection between Eaglehead Dr. and Quinn Rd.
- Internal collector connections within the Casey/Blentlinger properties
- Other Land Use Plan Revisions
 - There are 14 lots zoned Agricultural and the Audobon property that should be included within the Linganore CGA. The Audobon property would retain its Natural Resource plan designation and Resource Conservation (RC) zoning. The 14 lots would be designated Low Density Residential but retain their Agricultural (A) zoning.

Thurmont Region

Case # TH-1 (Hinerman) – Current Board action to deny the new request for LI zoning.

Staff Response – would not object to the LI zoning to bring the current uses on the property in compliance with an appropriate zoning district. Staff would note that the property appears to be used for material and construction equipment storage not related to the landscape contractor business. Staff would also stress the need for the business to comply with all site plan and permitting requirements.

BOCC Decision – **Approved request for LI zoning, which reversed prior action to deny.**

Case # TH-4 (Imrie) – Current Board action would restore the prior zoning, which would be split with a small area of RC.

Staff Response – would recommend applying the R-1 zoning to the entirety of both lots with the corresponding Rural Community plan designation.

BOCC Decision – **supported recommendation to apply R-1 to entire parcel to avoid split zoning.**

Urbana Region

Case # UR-30 (Fingerboard Properties) – Current Board action would rezone from VC to GC.

Staff Response – Given the location of this parcel adjoining (was once part of the Landon House parcel) the Dolan property (Landon House) staff would prefer to have MX zoning versus GC zoning to provide greater flexibility in uses and to provide a better opportunity for joint development with the Dolan property.

BOCC Decision – **no change in prior action to rezone to GC.**

Case # UR-32 (Dolan) – Current Board action to deny new request for MX zoning.

Staff Response – Staff reiterates its position to maintain the VC zoning on this parcel given the historical significance of the site.

BOCC Decision – **no change in prior action to deny request for MX.**

Case # UR-35 (Urbana Fire Co.) – Current Board action is to approve request for MX zoning. The site will continue to include the fire station leaving only the carnival grounds available for future development.

Staff Response – Though staff believes the VC is still appropriate given the limited land available for development and adjoining uses which are not expected to be redeveloped at higher intensities, we would not object to the requested MX zoning.

BOCC Decision – **no change in prior action to approve request for MX.**

Case # UR-40 (Ramsburg) – Current Board action is to deny new request for R-1 zoning.

Staff Response – would continue to recommend retaining the existing A zoning. Staff and prior Board's have consistently supported the long-standing policy of not expanding Rural Subdivisions (now referenced as Rural Residential) and do not believe that this property has unique circumstances that would warrant rezoning to R-1. This rezoning would establish a precedent to rezone other agricultural properties that adjoin existing subdivisions and would be argued to be "infill". The A zoning on this property has been upheld in at least two prior reviews by other Boards.

BOCC Decision – no change in prior action to deny request for R-1.

Urbana Community Growth Area

The following analysis looks at those requests that would expand the Urbana CGA beyond the existing Villages of Urbana/Urbana Highlands PUD. The expanded growth area would mostly reflect what was previously adopted in the 2004 Urbana Region Plan. As in the 2004 Region Plan these properties would be included within the community growth area but designated Agricultural/Rural to reflect a long-term development timing. Before these properties would be considered for a residential plan designation a comprehensive water/sewer study will need to be conducted. Beyond the need to provide additional school and road infrastructure is the water and sewer capacity. The primary issue is the finite capacity of the transmission lines through the Monocacy National Battlefield property. These lines cannot be expanded in any way that would require encroachment into the Battlefield property. **SEE MAP 7**

Property	Acres	Potential Dwellings	Pupil Yield Range ²
Villages of Urbana & Urbana Highlands PUDs (Remaining Pipeline Only)	---	151	ES 31 - 38 MS 16 - 18 HS 21 - 26
Urbana Town Ctr MXD¹ (currently designated as Age-Restricted residences)	55	600	ES 120 - 140 MS 60 - 69 HS 84 - 101
Expanded CGA (New Requests Only)	1,269	2,561 ¹	ES 510 - 578 MS 257 - 284 HS 356 - 414
TOTALS	1,450 ac.	3,312 DUs	ES 661 - 756 MS 333 - 371 HS 461 - 541

Notes:

¹ 70% of gross acreage @ 3 dwellings/acre

² 2007 FCPS pupil generation rates . Used countywide average and local Urbana-area school pupil yield rates . Assumed residential housing type mix of 60% single-family, 20% townhouse, 20% multi-family. Pupil yield for 50 acres are subtracted to account for location of two public school sites (ES & MS).

³ Includes only those acres associated with residential uses in the approved 181 acre MXD

Staff Recommendations

- School Sites
 - Elementary – 1 site within the expanded growth area. This would be in addition to the new school currently under consideration to relieve the Centerville and Urbana schools.
 - Middle – 1 site within the expanded growth area.
- Roads
 - Arterial connection between I-270 at Park Mills Rd. to Ball Rd/ Ijamsville Rd.
 - New interchange on I-270 at Park Mills Rd.
 - Collector connections between the Villages of Urbana and the expanded growth area.

BOCC Decision – no change to prior action to restore properties surrounding the Villages of Urbana PUD into the Urbana growth area. Supported recommendation to add planned road alignments and school sites as shown on Map 7.

Monrovia Community Growth Area

The proposed expansion of this growth area involves what was first approved as the Monrovia Town Center PUD in 2006. This original approval was for 1,608 dwellings on 402 acres and was to be an age-restricted community. The general commercial land at the MD 75/80 intersection would have been incorporated into the Monrovia Town Center project.

The current Board action would restore the Low Density Residential land use plan designation on the entire property holdings from the original Monrovia Town Center. Staff offers two options for the Monrovia CGA. **SEE MAP 8.** The pupil yield estimates for the two options on shown on tables on the following page. The staff recommendations would be the same for both options.

Option 1 – Would restore all of the Monrovia Town Center properties with the addition of the Burall property and two northern parcels.

Option 2 – Would focus the Monrovia Town Center to the west side of MD 75 still including the Burall property.

Staff Recommendations and Comments

- School Sites
 - High – 1 site within the Monrovia Town Center properties. Targeted on a 65-acre land bay on east side of MD 75. This school would address development from an expanded Urbana community and from development in the Liganore and New Market communities.
- Roads
 - New collector connection from MD 75 east to Weller Rd. that would provide additional access to the high school and would provide a continuous collector connection from the Landsdale development on Ed McClain Rd. to MD 75.
- Other Facilities
 - Fire station site for the relocation of the existing Green Valley substation
 - Community park site that may be targeted for the Burrall parcel.
 - Water and sewer capacity from New Design Road Water Treatment Plan and Ballenger WWTP generally sufficient to serve this development. Wastewater will be accessed by the Middle Phase of the Bush Creek Interceptor, which the Landsdale PUD project will be constructing. Water is provided through the East County water transmission line.

BOCC Decision – supported Option 1 and staff recommendations for planned road alignments and school site as shown on Map 8.

Monrovia CGA – Option 1

Property	Acres	Potential Dwellings	Pupil Yield Range ¹
Landsdale PUD (currently designated as Age-Restricted residences)	397	1,100 ²	ES 219-220 MS 110-143 HS 153-165
Monrovia Town Center (original PUD approved parcels)	402	1,350 ³	ES 269-270 MS 135-176 HS 188-203
Burrall Property	24	51 ⁴	ES 11 MS 6-7 HS 8
Northern Parcels	80	168 ⁴	ES 34 MS 17-22 HS 24-26
TOTALS	903 ac.	2,669 du's	ES 533-535 MS 268-348 HS 373-402

Monrovia CGA – Option 2

Property	Acres	Potential Dwellings	Pupil Yield Range ¹
Landsdale PUD (currently designated as Age-Restricted residences)	397	1,100 ²	ES 219-220 MS 110-143 HS 153-165
Monrovia Town Center (PUD approved parcels; w/s of transmission lines)	306	875 ³	ES 175 MS 88-114 HS 122-132
Burrall Property	24	51 ⁴	ES 11 MS 6-7 HS 8
TOTALS	727 ac.	2,026 du's	ES 405-406 MS 204-264 HS 283-305

¹Pupil yield is calculated as the range between the number of students generated using the County average rate and the local feeder system rate (Green Valley ES, Windsor Knolls MS, and Linganore HS). Calculations assume a residential housing type mix of 60% single family detached, 20% townhouse, and 20% multi-family.

²Dwelling units as approved for the Landsdale (Green Valley) PUD in 2004

³Assumes a dwelling unit yield of 4 DUs/acre; 65 acres are removed from this calculation to account for school site dedication

⁴Housing yield calculated using 70% of gross acreage @ 3 DUs/acre

Walkersville Region

Case # WA-08 (Frall) – Applicant requested rezoning from VC to MX for vacant Lot 3.
BOCC Decision – *approved request for MX on Lot 3.*