

1 behalf of the Petitioner. Mr. Vogel gave a history of the dams located upstream from the subject property
2 (Union Dam, Simpkin Dam, and Bloede Dam). Mr. Vogel indicated that these three dams were created to
3 power manufacturing facilities that helped with the development of Howard County. Mr. Vogel testified that
4 Union Dam and Simpkin Dam were removed in 2010 and that Bloede Dam was removed in 2018, and behind
5 each of these dams there was more than 100 years of sediment.

6 Mr. Oh asserted that the County Council would not have kept the Property in a residential zoning
7 district (R-ED) had they known this would happen. He indicated that he and his client would be open to
8 rezoning the Property to any commercial zoning designation that allows the proposed use as depicted on the
9 DSP.

10 Testimony

11
12 No members of the public testified on this matter. However, the Planning Board asked that an email
13 containing testimony from a Howard County resident be acknowledged in this Planning Board
14 Recommendation and treated as testimony as if the resident were present at the hearing. The email expressed
15 concern about industrial activity being permitted in an environmentally sensitive area and the safety of those
16 employed by or who patronize the proposed business.

17 Board Discussion and Recommendation

18
19
20 In work session, the Planning Board discussed whether the current zoning designation of R-ED was
21 appropriate and whether there was a mistake made during the last Comprehensive Zoning. It was
22 acknowledged that the R-ED zoning district can accommodate the Petitioner's proposed office use through
23 the Conditional Use process. The Property's proximity to Main Street in Elkridge, which contains many
24 historic structures, was also discussed and that there is no easement protecting the historic structure.

25
26 Additionally, the Planning Board recognized that the M-1 is a more appropriate zoning designation
27 for the Property than M-2 since it excludes very intensive industrial uses that would not be appropriate for this
28 site. The Board also considered a B-1 zoning designation since the uses associated with B-1 are less
29 intensive. The Board concluded that M-1 was more appropriate than B-1 given the location of the property
30 near the end of a road, near a state park and a river, and given the surrounding M-2 properties.

31
32 Ms. Adler made the motion to recommend approval of the petition, ZB-1124M, to rezone the 0.40-
33 acre property located at 5481 Levering Avenue from R-ED to M-1 subject to a Documented Site Plan
34 provided for an office. The motion passed by a vote of 5 to 0.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

For the foregoing reasons, the Planning Board of Howard County, Maryland, on this 21 day
February _____, 2021, recommends that Zoning Board Case No. ZB 1124M, as described above,
be **APPROVED**.

HOWARD COUNTY PLANNING BOARD

DocuSigned by:
Edward T. Coleman

F0F5EF3262DC481...
Ed Coleman, Chair

DocuSigned by:
Kevin McAlliley

17D7DFE9D4214A8...
Kevin McAlliley, Vice-chair

DocuSigned by:
Delphine Adler

39C39F6DB20E4A6...
Delphine Adler

DocuSigned by:
Erica Roberts

BDC508028617447...
Erica Roberts

DocuSigned by:
Phil Engelke

B741C4F48EF847...
Phillips Engelke

ATTEST: DocuSigned by:
Amy Gowan

5B4D5DD9470C4D4...
Amy Gowan, Executive Secretary