

4. The building permit reservations are allowed to roll over annually until the sunset provision takes effect and the preliminary plan becomes void.

**Decision:**

In accordance with Chapter 103, the Commission, on motion of Mr. Barnes, seconded by Mr. Chadwick, and unanimously carried, approved the plan subject to the 12 conditions in the staff report.

In accordance with Chapter 71, the Commission, on motion of Mr. Barnes, seconded by Mr. Chadwick, and unanimously carried, approved the preliminary plan subject to the four conditions recommended by staff.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS**

There were no public comments.

Mr. Baile entered the meeting.

**WORK SESSION – 2012 CARROLL COUNTY MASTER PLAN UPDATE**

Update on Legal Questions

Ms. Gail Kessler, County Attorney's Office, explained that a master plan is a guide for an area's future development. There is no rezoning at this time. She noted that even if an area is identified to be suitable for a certain use, it does not mean that it will be rezoned in the future. Ms. Kessler indicated the Court of Appeals has stated that a master plan represents only a basic scheme, only an outline of planning and zoning objectives and is in no sense a final plan. She suggested that if the Commission goes to the individual landowners at this point, it would be considered spot zoning. Phase 1 is identifying areas for possible employment use. Phase 2, at the rezoning phase, would be talking to the individual landowners to receive approval.

Mr. Wertz suggested that qualifying language be added to the Plan to indicate that if there is a conflict between the land use map and the zoning map, the zoning map shall prevail.

Review of Carroll County Economic Development and Employment Needs Study (EDLENS) Target Industries and Criteria

Ms. Daly, Bureau of Planning, reviewed a handout which identified the target industries and criteria as identified in EDLENS.

Mr. Devilbiss asked Economic Development staff to assess whether the County is in the same situation, looking for the same types of target industries, etc.

Mr. Steve Powell, Chief of Staff, indicated that the County focuses on office industries and the traditional manufacturing sector. Businesses with high water usage are not something the County can consider.

Ms. Paige Sunderland, Department of Economic Development, indicated that 90 percent of the County's commercial/industrial land is five acres or less, with 70 percent of those properties two acres or less.

Mr. Powell stated that smaller parcels are not what the County needs, but parcels 25-50 acres in size. Another option would be adjacent parcels that can be joined and total 25-50 acres.

Mr. Devilbiss questioned whether clients prefer land with water and sewer for development of office space.

Ms. Sunderland explained that public water and sewer service makes the project easier. The County lacks finished land. She noted that, from a marketing perspective, public water and sewer service areas are more marketable given the ease in hooking up to a system without worrying about State regulations, etc. She confirmed that the target industries listed on the handout would be their targeted industries.

Mr. Powell noted that any food and beverage industries requiring large amounts of water, should be eliminated from the list.

Mr. Barnes questioned whether the County has considered expanding water/sewer into areas targeted for economic development.

Staff discussed the facilitation of water development and water recharge efforts that has occurred with the municipalities over the years.

Ms. Brenda Dinne, Project Coordinator, discussed watershed and wastewater treatment plant capacities in the County with the Commission.

Mr. Yeo entered the meeting.

Mr. Devilbiss reviewed the goals, policies, and strategies to protect the watershed that are included in the Reservoir Watershed Management Agreement.

Ms. Daly distributed a handout developed by staff detailing potential criteria for locating additional economic development opportunities.

Ms. Sandy Baber, Bureau of Planning, reviewed with the Commission various map layers available to be shown on the County map.

The Commission had considerable discussion regarding whether their recommendations should include mapped areas or just criteria, whether the areas should be identified as general blobs or more detailed, whether parcel layers should be shown if a map is utilized, etc.

Mr. Powell suggested that the Commission utilize the EDLENS maps as a starting point.

Ms. Sunderland explained that the criteria in EDLENS is still appropriate. She noted that location is the number one criteria. Ms. Sunderland suggested that the Commission may want to reduce the acreage requirement to 10 acres as that is the acreage included in the Business Park Amendment.

The Commission adjusted the proposed criteria as follows: the requirement that land be ½ mile to an interstate or major highway was removed; minimum acreage was set at 10 acres; the lack of conflict with residential areas was changed to lack of conflict with residentially developed land; the proximity to an existing commercial area was added; and, land under agricultural preservation easements and publicly owned land will be removed from consideration.

Mr. Chadwick questioned how the Commission should deal with land in the municipalities or within municipal growth areas.

Ms. Daly indicated that if the Commission found potential sites in these areas, the Commission would need to ask the towns to consider amending their plans.

Mr. Devilbiss indicated that staff will create the mapping product countywide based on the criteria discussed by the Commission.

Ms. Daly explained that the first round of maps would be working documents for the Commission to evaluate whether potential areas exist.

Mr. Devilbiss indicated the Commission would discuss Chapter 12: Housing at their next work session scheduled for Monday, January 9, 2012.

The meeting adjourned a approximately 3:40 p.m.

---

Secretary

---

Approved