



Howard County Citizens Association

Since 1961... The Voice of the People of Howard County

Date: 15 July 2026

Subject: Maple Lawn West Proposal

I am Stu Kohn from Scaggsville representing the Howard County Citizens Association as its President.

We would ask the Petitioner to please tell the opposition what your justification is to increase the density from 2.2 dwelling units to 3. Can our existing infrastructure accommodate such an increase? Why is the Petitioner having the audacity to propose 513 additional units or another approximately 1500 more residents, especially when in September 2021 the Planning Board denied the proposal 4 to 1 when the proposal had 8 fewer dwelling units? The Planning Board Members in 2021 stated the petition does not comply with Sections 127.0.D.7.k and 127.0.D.7.l.7 of the zoning code. The major reasoning of the Planning Board's Denial is most compelling and says it all. How with this new proposal are there any significant changes? The Petitioner can cite HoCo by Design all he wants, but the reality is the zoning criteria has not been met. This petition should be unequivocally DENIED! The zoning code whereby the Planning Board articulated their concerns states as follows in the sections of the zoning regulations.

k.

The intensity and scale of land use, as determined by proposed densities, F.A.R. limits and other requirements, will be appropriate in relation to the environmental constraints of the site and the character of existing and planned development in the vicinity of the site.

l. The development will be compatible with existing and planned vicinal land uses. One or more of the following methods may be used to ensure an appropriate relationship between the Mixed-Use Development and surrounding land:

(7)

Provision of a transition in land uses such that uses on the edge of the Mixed-Use Development are similar to adjacent land uses outside the development.

The major question is what makes this proposal any different than it did five years ago? What is the advantage of this plan compared to the one of five years ago? The only possible advantage is the Petitioner states there will be a traffic circle intersection at Route 216 and Lime Kiln Road. The addition of such a traffic circle would be increased to 5 circles within the vicinity. With such a configuration the Maple Lawn area could be declared a potential site to hold the 2036 Summer Olympics. Yes - 5 circles! Let the games begin! Perhaps we should reserve our seats today. Using this analogy, we are only being a little facetious to get the point across that enough is enough! This designated site originally called for 32 single family

homes and that's how it should remain. Constructing 260 apartment units to obtain only 39 Moderate Income Housing Units (MIHU) is not that meaningful. However, if the Petition is approved, we ask the Hearing Examiner to ensure the Decision and Order clearly states the Petitioner shall fully commit in writing as stated in their testimony to the 15 percent mandatory allotted MIHUs not the 10 percent as described in the Technical Staff Report. The setback from Route 216 undoubtedly needs to be much greater than the stated 30 feet in the Technical Staff Report (TSR) on page 12, saying "The Petitioner is proposing to add a 30-foot setback for multi-story residential apartment buildings from Route 216. We have a major discrepancy. We ask the Hearing Examiner that if this Petition were for some reason Approved that a condition be stated in the Decision and Order whereby the setback shall be 300-feet especially when referring to the TSR on page 12 Item 3 where it states, "The PDP Development Criteria requires a 300-foot minimum setback for residential buildings from 216."

We urge the Hearing Examiner to promote common sense to realistically do what would be best. Supreme Court Justice, William Douglas stated, "Common Sense often makes good law." We strongly suggest in this case you lay the law down telling the Petitioner, "NO."

In 2021 when the Planning Board denied the proposal, they overwhelmingly stated this development was not ready for prime time. Five years later the plans haven't changed that much for approval. So how could the Petitioner think this proposal has merit? It doesn't!

We are puzzled as to why the last time a traffic study was conducted was 7 years ago when referring to the TSR on page 4 under c. Roads. This is totally unacceptable. Before a decision is made the Hearing Examiner should simply tell the Petitioner to conduct a current traffic study.

We further recommend the Hearing Examiner before a decision is made that the Department of Planning and Zoning be required to involve various agencies to obtain any concerns with this proposal such as Public Works, Transportation, Police and Fire, etc.

In conclusion, this proposal should be DENIED! Our County is not by any means ready because the infrastructure to support such a proposal is not ready for prime time and most importantly the criteria as stipulated in the zoning code have not been met!

Thank you for listening and we only hope this proposal will be DENIED as did the Planning Board in 2021 who had enough common sense as was stipulated in the past. The future is not ready for such a proposal.

Thank you,

Stu Kohn
HCCA President