

## CRU TF SCHEDULE BY 2018 COMP PLAN CHAPTERS

Questionnaire Rank	Request Number	Description
--------------------	----------------	-------------

### MAY 26 - ECONOMY

- |   |       |  |
|---|-------|--|
| ✓ | P4.   | Request to create two, new floating zones to allow for (a) planned mixed-use development and (b) planned neighborhoods, including specific criteria for such designations, as well as (c) to combine the Commercial and Employment Center districts and (d) to allow residential uses in the newly combined district |
| ✓ | P5.   | Request to allow truck stops, truck parking lots, gas sales, convenience stores and restaurants with or without drive-through in the Industrial district   |
| ✓ | TF13. | Review streamlining the Cottage Industry process.  |
| ✓ | TF18. | Review timelines. Currently, projects scheduled before Planning Commission and Board of Appeals must be submitted 20 days before meetings. For projects that require concept, preliminary and final review, this allows only a week for applicants to address comments and resubmit for the following meeting.       |
| ✓ | S4.   | Consider standardizing 10-day, 15-day, and 20-day notices to one standard  |

### JUNE 9 - TOWNS & VILLAGE

- |   |      |   |
|---|------|---|
| ✓ | TF3. | Review landscaping to reduce the requirements for trees (for example, one business site was required to have 185 trees and bushes on a 1.3-acre site).  |
| ✓ | TF7. | Review setbacks and required rights-of-way for roads, so the County, State or utilities do not have to maintain vegetation planted along rights-of-way. |

### JUNE 23 – TOWNS & VILLAGE

*2017 Economic Development Plan* – Ms. Jamie Williams, Director, Economic and Tourism Development

- |   |     |  |
|---|-----|--|
| ✓ | S2. | Consider re-evaluating 25-foot setbacks for recreational uses such as pools in Village |
| ✓ | S3. | Consider clarifying how accessory structures can be located in front yards             |

### JULY 14 – HOUSING, TRANSPORTATION, AND HISTORIC & CULTURAL RESOURCES

Review the Results of the Task Force Member Questionnaire  
Review of a proposed Schedule for Task Force Conversations

- |   |                |  |
|---|----------------|--|
| 4 | <del>P9.</del> | <del>Request to review standards related to subdivisions accessing private roads</del> |
| 5 | S1.            | Consider adding accessory dwelling units to the Village zoning district                |
| 6 | S9.            | Consider reviewing demolition process as it relates to age of structure                |
| 7 | S13.           | Consider discussing an overall approach to short-term vacation rentals (STVR)          |

## CRU TF SCHEDULE BY 2018 COMP PLAN CHAPTERS

Questionnaire Rank	Request Number	Description
<b>JULY 28 - ENVIRONMENT</b>		
7	P7.	Request to review lot coverage standards and other Critical Area provisions, lot line adjustments on parcels under 5 acres, and wastewater treatment
6	P10.	Request for modified buffer in RCD for campgrounds, as defined in § 2.2 (18)
7	TF9.	Review elimination of the County’s maximum pier length of 150 feet.
<del>3</del>	<del>S10.</del>	<del>Consider reviewing the definition of waterway width versus State approach</del>
6	S14.	Consider discussing climate change, resilience, and the floodplain regulations by potentially requiring Base Flood Elevation plus three feet for new projects
<b>AUGUST 11 – COUNTRYSIDE</b>		
5	P1.	Request to change farm definition so a shed could be built without a dwelling
6	P2.	Request to allow utility-scale energy systems in the Agricultural Zoning District
<del>3/4</del>	<del>P3/TF8</del>	<del>Request to continue to exclude data centers from Agricultural Zoning District // TF8. Review allowing data centers on land in AZD at 0.5% of total land (about 630 acres) in order to let the land owners decide if they want to look at this option.</del>
7	TF1.	Review the concept of reducing setbacks for agricultural structures to 200 feet except near current housing developments, incorporated towns, and villages.
6	TF17.	Review setbacks for buildings containing animals. Currently, this is 600 feet. Review for more flexibility. Maybe 600 feet from residential zoning districts or provide for an administrative variance process to reduce the required setback.
<b>AUGUST 25 – COUNTRYSIDE CONTINUED</b>		
5	P17.	(NEW) Request to add Agritourism, as defined by the State of Maryland, as a permitted use in AZD
5	TF2.	Review elimination of the 10% rule (related to new agricultural subdivisions).
8	TF5.	Review concept of a reset to allow building sites up to 1 unit per 30 acres as of the approval of new zoning regardless of what has been subdivided previously.
<del>4</del>	<del>TF6.</del>	<del>Review allowing sustainable agricultural operations for production for farmers markets, personal use, or commercial sale on homesites in ag zoning districts where such homesites do not meet the current requirements for 20 acres.</del>
<b>SEPT 8 – ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS</b>		
6	S6.	Consider removing the renewal requirements for sand and gravel pits
7	S7.	Consider reviewing the definition of structures, especially considering fences
6	S8.	Consider reviewing the definition of accessory structure and accessory use
<del>4</del>	<del>S11.</del>	<del>Consider reviewing the conditions related to hunting trailers on farms</del>
6	S12.	Consider reviewing the side setbacks and rear setbacks of three feet and five feet, respectively, for accessory structures in rear yards, which occur throughout the LUO.

## CRU TF SCHEDULE BY 2018 COMP PLAN CHAPTERS

Questionnaire Rank	Request Number	Description
<b>SEPT 22 – ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS</b>		
6	P6.	Request to consider adjacent lots under same ownership in order to meet the minimum requirements related to rules for the keeping of backyard chickens
7	P18.	(NEW) Request to consider allowing backyard goats with provisions similar to backyard chickens
7	TF4.	Review allowing nonconforming structures that were conforming when built (to be granted a fully legal status as conforming vs. as legal, nonconforming).
<del>3</del>	<del>TF14.</del>	<del>Review waterfront regulations. Waterfront is now considered the Front Yard. This causes issues such as pools are not allowed in the front yard and since the road is now considered the rear yard, accessory sheds can be 5' from the road.</del>
<del>4</del>	<del>TF15.</del>	<del>Review size limitations on accessory structures currently limited to 1,200 ft<sup>2</sup> in most properties under five acres. This could be enlarged to at least 2,000 ft<sup>2</sup> as long as stormwater management and screening regulations are met.</del>
<del>3</del>	<del>TF16.</del>	<del>Review Front Yard definition on corner lots; currently, it's the side with the smallest dimension. Review of the side where the driveway entrance is located is a better option. If there are two driveways, one could then be removed.</del>
5	S5.	Consider removing renewal language for telecommunications

### OCTOBER 13 – ENVIRONMENT CONTINUED

5	TF10.	Review how to better define establishing a Modified Buffer, keeping in mind that not all waterfront properties are in a straight line.
5	TF11.	Review how to better define an Expanded Buffer.
5	TF12.	Review how to better define the term Structure (in the definitions section), as it applies to the establishment of the aforementioned Buffers.

### OCTOBER 27 – THIRD PUBLIC FORUM

#### REQUESTS RECOMMENDED FOR ELIMINATION

✓	P8.	Request to allow Class 8 Farm Breweries in the Agricultural Zoning District (already in progress)
5	P11.	Request to review lot sizes and required setbacks in property owner's district (related to map)
9	P12.	Request to review subdivision density standards related to zoning map request (rezoning to a different district is preferred option)