

Sayers, Margery

From: Barbara Sollner-Webb <bsw@jhmi.edu>
Sent: Wednesday, June 23, 2021 11:15 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: Patuxent River Commission votes to disfavor Erickson extension

[Note: This email originated from outside of the organization. Please only click on links or attachments if you know the sender.]

Dear Council members,

At tonight's hearing, you asked I send this to you via <councilmail@howardcountymd.gov> -- thank you for considering!

I am a long-time member of the State's Patuxent River Commission, a Governor-appointed commission concerned with the Patuxent Rive -- the longest/largest river contained within Maryland. Because a river's most critical part, environmentally, is that its headwaters retain >90% pervious surface, the Patuxent River Commission has taken considerable interest in the Erickson proposal, at the headwaters of the Middle Patuxent branch of the river. In a vote at the last meeting of the Patuxent River Commission, the commissioners votedoverwhelmingly against supporting that the Erickson developers be granted an extension beyond the original October deadline. Here is hoping you will consider the PRC's suggestion.
yours, Barbara Sollner-Webb, PRC member

--

to send to: Zoning Board members
Re ZB 1118M Erickson at Limestone Valley

Liz Walsh
Phone: 410-313-2001
E: ewalsh@howardcountymd.gov

Deb Jung
Phone: 410-313-2001
E: djung@howardcountymd.gov

Opel Jones
Phone: 410-313-2001
E: ojones@howardcountymd.gov

Christiana Rigby
Phone: 410-313-2001
E: crigby@howardcountymd.gov

David Yungmann
Phone: 410-313-2001
E: dyungmann@howardcountymd.gov

Sayers, Margery

From: Lora Wilder <ljwilder@att.net>
Sent: Tuesday, June 22, 2021 2:00 PM
To: Rigby, Christiana; CouncilMail
Subject: Please support the Erickson Community at Limestone Valley

[Note: This email originated from outside of the organization. Please only click on links or attachments if you know the sender.]

Dear Ms. Rigby and colleagues,

We are writing to urge you to support the development of the Erickson Senior Living community at Limestone Valley. As residents of Columbia for almost 30 years, we would love to be able to stay in Howard County during our later years and to avail ourselves of the opportunities and security that an Erickson community has to offer. We have visited friends in Erickson communities in other states and have been very impressed by the social and physical amenities they have to offer. Our friends have been extremely happy there and have felt supported at every level. They have been able to continue with activities they enjoyed prior to their move and even to expand their choice of activities. Most recently, our friends who reside at Ann's Choice in Warminster, PA, conveyed this message to us regarding their experience during the Covid pandemic: "The administration here has done a remarkable job in handling the situation, we are very fortunate to be living in such a safe environment" From our understanding, such care is consistent with the reputation that Erickson has earned.

We have attended, virtually, some of the Howard County Zoning Board's hearings on Erickson at Limestone Valley and have been dismayed by some of the testimony of opponents to the project. Specifically, we believe the testimony of residents and board members from Vantage Point to be a conflict of interest since the Erickson community would be a competitor to Vantage Point. One issue raised by these residents is competition for healthcare workers. As with other worker shortages that the economy is experiencing, low pay is a huge issue in terms of attracting employees. Providing a living wage would go a long way in assuring appropriate staffing in communities such as Vantage Point.

Another point raised by these opponents is that the vast majority of older people want to "age-in-place." While many indeed do, there are certainly a large number who realize that staying in their current homes can be restrictive to their social and physical well-being and who want the security, health, and social benefits of a large senior living community. Additionally, many people who express the desire to age-in-place in mid-life, become differently inclined as they age.

Additionally, a Vantage Point board member has stated the Erickson community would place a strain on Howard County General Hospital. In fact, the president of Howard County General Hospital stated in his letter of support for the project sent to the Zoning Board that "These retirement communities reduce the potential for unnecessary utilization or over-utilization of hospital services, and represent an important component in the care continuum." He also stated that "It is not our opinion that new facilities will overburden the hospital." (<https://www.ericksonatlimestone.com/wp-content/uploads/HCGHLetterSigned.pdf>) Clearly, the president of the hospital is in a better position to judge this issue.

We were glad to learn, through the Zoning Board meetings, of the extent to which the Erickson company has worked with community organizations to address concerns, make adjustments, and add amenities to their initial plans. Such goodwill has resulted in community groups such as the River Hill Community Association and nearby churches expressing their support for the project.

In closing, we would appreciate your support for the development of the Erickson community at Limestone Valley. Thank you for your time and service.

Sincerely,
Lora and Jay Wilder
9521 Sweet Grass Ridge
Columbia MD 21046

James M. (Jack) Guarneri
10224 Little Brick House Court
Ellicott City, MD 21042
Resident Council District 1
E-Mail: jackguarneri@gmail.com/Phone: (301) 844-8930
For Testimony to County Council on June 21, 2021 in opposition of
Council Bill 50-2021 (Proposed Extension of Time Limits in Council Bill 59-2018)

Bottom Line Up Front: The 2 year extension proposed is excessive. When CB59-2018 was passed Council on July 30, 2018 and signed by the CE Kittleman on August 6, 2018 the petitioners and their attorney were well aware of the 3 year time limit to gain Zoning Board CEF-M approval in order to maintain extension of the PSA. The majority of delays that have occurred are not the fault of the County or the COVID pandemic but rather due to strategic, tactical, and scheduling decisions made by the petitioner. If any extension is approved it should be limited to the 2 months that the County took to shift ZB meetings from in person to virtual.

Background: When CB59-2018 was passed unanimously by the Council in July 2018 it contained in Section 2 time thresholds that the petitioner was required to meet in order for the property not to revert from PSA: 1. 3 years from the effective date of the PSA extension for Zoning Board to amend the zoning map to CEF-M for the purpose of a CCRC and 2. 10 years from the effective date for connection to public water and sewer for the CCRC. This was signed by the then County Executive Kittleman on August 6, 2018. The petitioners and their attorneys were well aware of these time thresholds.

Timeline: The petitioner went to the Planning Board on March 21, 2019 (8 months after CB59) with their plan for the CCRC; PB approved the plan. The petitioner went to the Zoning Board on March 4, 2020 (12 months after PB) with essentially the same plan. Due to an oversight on a petitioner campaign donation disclosure the hearing was postponed approximately 1 month. At that time COVID restrictions were implemented and prevented live meetings, and the development and approval of a virtual meeting process caused the initial ZB hearing to be delayed until June 17, 2020 (2 month of delay due to COVID). Since then the ZB has held a total of 13 virtual hearings on the CEF-M rezoning petition. The length of time of the petition consideration has been due to significant opposition to the plan not the format of the hearings.

Why might have time thresholds been included in CB59?

- Uncertainty in the potential impact of proposed rezoning/extending PSA. The focus of the Bill and majority of testimony was on offering housing options to growing senior population and concerns with extending PSA not on other development impacts.
- To establish a reasonable time limit for the petitioner to identify CEF required community amenities and develop details of CCRC.
- New information that might be available on community opposition/impacts including other developments in progress at that time.
- Provide a means of reverting the property to outside the PSA IAW PlanHoward 2030.
- To provide no fault escape clause or exit strategy to the next County Council/ZB.

Sayers, Margery

From: Lisa Berlin <lisaberlin@takingcareofbusiness.onmicrosoft.com>
Sent: Monday, June 21, 2021 11:26 PM
To: Jones, Opel; CouncilMail
Subject: Erickson Limestone project

[Note: This email originated from outside of the organization. Please only click on links or attachments if you know the sender.]

To Mr. Opel Jones and members of the Howard County Council:

I am writing to urge you to vote FOR the Erickson Limestone project in Clarksville. It is much needed in this community and will be very different from the existing continuing care retirement facilities in Howard County. As a Certified Daily Money Manager, I worked mostly with seniors and had occasion to see clients in several Erickson communities in Maryland. They consistently provided attractive apartments, quality care, competent staff and a wide range of interesting, stimulating activities for all residents including those in assisted living and skilled nursing care. They are large enough in scale to sometimes be more affordable and provide amenities that attract a diverse group of residents. I always thought an Erickson community would be a great place to retire, if I could stay in or near Howard County where I live.

Now that I am 70, this still seems a good idea. Many seniors want to age in place. This always sounds ideal, but there are too often complicated logistical issues that can lead to loneliness, isolation, unsafe conditions and health declines. This is especially true once seniors stop driving. This can create great need and place a burden on families, neighbors and faith communities who try to offer support. There is often a lack of stimulation and personal/medical care when needed. A good continuing care retirement community resolves these issues by providing transportation and services that keep residents engaged and as healthy as possible. We need both aging in place and different types of retirement facilities in this community, so all residents have a choice.

I believe that Ginny Thomas' opposition to the Erickson project may be due to the fact that she is on the Board of the Residences at Vantage Point. It is a conflict of interest which protects Residences at Vantage Point at the expense of those who want a different type of retirement community. I am aware that she strongly supports aging in place, as I do for those that want it, but it is not the only way.

I have been told that this project may cause traffic flow and population density changes for Clarksville. There has been huge growth along the Rt. 108 corridor in that area. I would hope that the Clarksville community working with Erickson could resolve this. To the best of my knowledge, Erickson has been a good neighbor and addressed community concerns in other places they have built. Many of my clients in Erickson facilities were from the surrounding communities, which speaks to the care Erickson took to resolve community concerns. From conversations with friends, neighbors and colleagues, I can assure you that there are many people in Howard County who feel as I do. Please vote FOR the Erickson Limestone project. Thank you for your consideration. Sincerely, Lisa Berlin

Sayers, Margery

From: Ginny Thomas <ginny.thomas@ca-board.org>
Sent: Monday, June 21, 2021 9:34 PM
To: Sayers, Margery; Walsh, Elizabeth; Jones, Opel; Rigby, Christiana; Jung, Deb; DYungman@howardcountymd.gov
Cc: ginny.thomas@ca-board.org; cgthomas65@verizon.net
Subject: Fwd: Testimony on CB 50--Virginia Thomas

[Note: This email originated from outside of the organization. Please only click on links or attachments if you know the sender.]

Hi Margery,
Here is my testimony for CB 50
Thanks for your help.

Ginny

ginny.thomas@ca-board.org
410-992-7984

June 21, County Council hearing on CB 50

Virginia M Thomas
410-992-7984
cgthomas65@verizon.net.

I ask that you withdraw or defeat this bill for the following reasons:

You, sitting as the zoning board, are still hearing the land use change case for Erickson at Limestone, so how can you legally listen to any testimony regarding this case?

In order for you to approve Erickson's request for a two-year extension, you would need to disregard the intent of former Councilman Gregg Fox, who made it clear that to get his vote the project must

start two years after the Council voted to allow the project into the water and sewer district. In fact, the entire Council supported this amendment.

In order to disregard that amendment, wouldn't this County Council have to schedule a hearing on the benefit to the County and the taxpayers to change the land use category from Rural? If Erickson cannot establish the need, then why would you extend the time to build it? Is this an example of how much you can trust the word of Erickson's staff? Or should you be hearing from the investors in this project as to their intentions.

When the project was admitted into the water and sewer district 2 years ago, the Council was not in possession of all the facts about the true need for a project of this magnitude. At the very least, the you should require that the petitioner submit the case so this Council can decide if the area should be changed to the Metro District. You should not assume that the previous Council acted in the best interests of the residents of Howard County, especially seniors or individuals with a

disability and their
caregivers.

The co-mingle opportunity to the public to testify at the zoning meeting wasn't shared with the public before this hearing. That isn't fair to people who may have wanted to testify if they had know they could be heard by the zoning board. Since some of them weren't signed up before the deadline the zoning board set or they thought they were only to be rejected they might have welcomed this opportunity to testify tonight and then again at the June 23 hearing.

Thanks for your consideration

Virginia M Thomas

"The information transmitted is intended only for the person to which it is addressed and may contain proprietary or privileged material. Any review, re-transmission, dissemination or other use of or action taken in reliance on this information by a person other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you received this information in error, please contact the sender and delete the information. Thank you for your cooperation."

Sayers, Margery

From: Judith Iliff <judee1010@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 21, 2021 5:27 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: Erickson Community on Route 108

[Note: This email originated from outside of the organization. Please only click on links or attachments if you know the sender.]

To the Council,

I support the building of the Erickson Community on Route 108.

I currently live in an over 55 community in Elkridge and I am planning on the next phase of my life. And...that plan is to move into the proposed Erickson Community on Route 108.

Please vote for the building of the Erickson Community.

Thanks,

Judee Iliff
7305 Maplecrest Road
Unit 207
Elkridge, Maryland 21075

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

Sayers, Margery

From: Stuart Berlin <stuberlin@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 21, 2021 4:57 PM
To: Jones, Opel; CouncilMail
Subject: Erickson Project in Clarksville

[Note: This email originated from outside of the organization. Please only click on links or attachments if you know the sender.]

Mr. Jones
Members of the Howard County Council

I have been a resident in Oakland Mills since June, 1986. It has been a wonderful place to raise our daughters. But I am no longer in my 30's like when I moved to Columbia.

My wife and I are seriously looking into 'the next step.' We will need a community that will provide not only the social part of our lives, but will provide some level of care. We are thinking about the Erickson Limestone project that will be voted on I believe this Wednesday night. I urge that you vote FOR this project.

Ms. Virginia Thomas is opposing this project. I believe that there is a conflict of interest in her testimony as she is on the board of Vantage Place in Columbia. Your denial of a permit to Erickson ensures more of a market share for that concern. I believe that she has stated that seniors in Howard County want to age in place. While it may be true for some seniors, I know many who desire to age in a community where services will be provided, my wife and I among them.

I believe that the positive economic impact will be beneficial in the long run for Howard County.

I certainly imagine that there are issues concerning traffic flow in the area. I believe with thoughtful and respectful conversation, these issues can be solved. I would think that other issues could be solved similarly.

Again, I urge you to vote FOR the zoning permits for this new community. Howard County is a graying county. There are many of us who look forward to being in a safe community that will cater to our needs.

With best regards,

Stuart D. Berlin
9561 Fallen Stone
Columbia MD 21045
410-733-3512

Sayers, Margery

From: Ruby Nwaebube <RNwaebube@presmd.org>
Sent: Monday, June 21, 2021 12:05 PM
To: Ball, Calvin; Sidh, Sameer; Walsh, Elizabeth; Jones, Opel; Jung, Deb; Rigby, Christiana; Yungmann, David
Cc: CouncilMail
Subject: Re: SGAHC Oppose CB50-PSA Extension & CB42 Result Response Letter
Attachments: Updated SGAHC CB50- PSA Extension Written Testimony.pdf

[Note: This email originated from outside of the organization. Please only click on links or attachments if you know the sender.]

Hello Honorable Howard County Council,

I hope this email finds you well. My name is Ruby Nwaebube, and I am the Advocacy Associate for Preservation Maryland. On behalf of the Smarter Growth Alliance Howard County (SGAHC), I would like to re-submit an updated version of written testimony opposing CB50. Below this email, I have attached the document for your review. Please let me know if you have any questions.

Thank you,
Ruby

Ruby Nwaebube
Advocacy Associate
PRESERVATION MARYLAND
3600 Clipper Mill Road, Suite 248
Baltimore, Maryland 21211
rnwaebube@presmd.org
presmd.org

From: Ruby Nwaebube <RNwaebube@presmd.org>
Date: Friday, June 18, 2021 at 6:06 PM
To: cball@howardcountymd.gov <cball@howardcountymd.gov>, ssidh@howardcountymd.gov <ssidh@howardcountymd.gov>
Subject: FW: SGAHC Oppose CB50-PSA Extension & CB42 Result Response Letter

From: Ruby Nwaebube <RNwaebube@presmd.org>
Date: Friday, June 18, 2021 at 6:03 PM
To: EWalsh@howardcountymd.gov <EWalsh@howardcountymd.gov>, OJones@howardcountymd.gov <OJones@howardcountymd.gov>, DJung@howardcountymd.gov <DJung@howardcountymd.gov>, CRigby@howardcountymd.gov <CRigby@howardcountymd.gov>, DYungmann@howardcountymd.gov <DYungmann@howardcountymd.gov>

Cc: councilmail@howardcountymd.gov <councilmail@howardcountymd.gov>

Subject: SGAHC Oppose CB50-PSA Extension & CB42 Result Response Letter

Hello Honorable Howard County Council,

I hope this email finds you well. My name is Ruby Nwaebube, and I am the Advocacy Associate for Preservation Maryland. On behalf of the Smarter Growth Alliance Howard County (SGAHC), we would like to submit written testimony opposing CB50 and a response letter to the final results of CB42. Below this email, I have attached the two letters for your review.

Thank you,
Ruby

Ruby Nwaebube

Advocacy Associate

PRESERVATION MARYLAND

3600 Clipper Mill Road, Suite 248

Baltimore, Maryland 21211

rnwaebube@presmd.org

presmd.org

Smarter Growth Alliance For Howard County

June 21, 2021

The Honorable Howard County Council
George Howard Building
3430 Court House Drive
Ellicott City, MD 21043

**RE: CB50-2021 – Community Enhancement Floating District - General Plan Amendment -
Timeline Extension**

Dear Council Members:

The Smarter Growth Alliance for Howard County (SGAHC) is an alliance of local and state organizations working together to foster healthy, equitable, and sustainable communities through smarter development and transportation decisions and improved protections for the county's natural, historic and cultural resources.

The SGAHC opposes CB50 as there is a procedural disallowance to serve in both capacities of discussing and voting on this proposed bill.

How is it feasible for you as County Council Members to even think about discussing and voting on this proposed Bill when you are acting as Zoning Board Members? This is a conflict of interest. Any and All discussions during this Legislative Hearing you hear regarding the contents of the Erickson Zoning Board case that the extension of the Planned Service Area might be beneficial for Affordable Housing is irrelevant. This was stated by those who testified at the Planning Board Hearing. The Planning Board was allowed to hear this, but you as County Council Members acting as the Zoning Board are not permitted to hear such testimony.

You need to instruct those testifying to not mention Erickson's zoning board case. It is not possible to serve as Council Members on this legislation at a public hearing and on the Zoning Board without ex parte communications because those testifying are not able to adequately oppose or support the legislation without being able to opine on the matter of how the PSA expansion would be beneficial.

*Chesapeake Bay Foundation • Clean Water Action • Coalition for Smarter Growth • Community Ecology Institute
Earth Forum of Howard County • HARP • Horizon Foundation • Howard County Citizens Association
Howard County Conservancy • Howard County Sierra Club • Maryland Conservation Council
Maryland League of Conservation Voters • Maryland Ornithological Society • Patapsco Heritage Greenway
Preservation Maryland • Safe Skies Maryland • Savage Community Association • The People's Voice • Transition Howard County*

The Zoning Board's Rules of Procedure state:

“Board members shall not engage in ex parte communications of any kind with anyone other than Board counsel or staff regarding the case from the time the Board is notified by the Director of the Department of Planning and Zoning of filing of the petition to 30 days after the time the Decision and Order is issued.”

Enough said – your only choice is to withdraw the Bill or all Council Members acting as the Zoning Board must abstain. If you do decide to vote on this CB50-2021 your vote will be considered by the voters of Howard County to be your position in the Zoning Board Case. One would think you would want to divorce yourselves of this to ensure your constituents that you know your roles as Zoning Board Members from that as acting as a County Council Member.

Thank you for your consideration. Please do what is right!

Sincerely,

Howard County Citizen's Association
Stu Kohn
President

The People's Voice
Lisa M. Markovitz
President

cc: The Honorable Calvin Ball, County Executive

June 21, 2021

TO: Howard County Council

FROM: Joan Lancos
6110 Covington Road
Columbia, MD 21044

RE: Council Bill 50-2021

I support CB 50-2021 which will extend the time frame set up in CB59-2018 for consideration of the Erickson proposal. I attended the original Council hearing on CB59. I spoke in favor of the bill to extend the Planned Service Area to allow the Zoning Board to consider Erickson's proposal to establish a CEF on property along MD 108 adjacent to Clarksville. At the time, I was unsure of my position on the case, but felt that it should be considered.

Since approval of CB59-2018, due to elections and the COVID pandemic, the Zoning Board case has moved forward more slowly than anyone could have predicted. I have attended every night of the hearings over the last few years. The case has a lot of interest in the community. I believe you owe it to the community and to the petitioner to allow the case to come to completion.

Please approve CB50-2021 so that the Zoning Board hearings can be completed, a Decision and Order can be signed, and the community has closure on this issue. It is the right thing to do.

Thank you.



HCCA

Howard County Citizens Association

Since 1961...

The Voice Of The People of Howard County

Date: 21 June 2021

Subject: HCCA Is VEHEMENTLY AGAINST CB50-2021

My name is Stu Kohn and I am testifying on behalf of the Howard County Citizens Association, HCCA and we are vehemently **AGAINST** CB50-2021.

What is wrong with this picture, why are we here and why is anyone testifying on this Bill? You as Zoning Board Members should not hear this proposed legislation as Council Members.

You have a conflict of interest as stated under your Zoning Board Rules of Procedure on page 7 under "Communications Outside of a Hearing – There shall be no ex parte communications between a member of the Board and a party to the case or any person having a direct or indirect interest in the outcome of the case regarding any matter relevant to the merits of the case."

The fact that Erickson stated and unequivocally promised both the Planning and the Zoning Board in April and July 2018 to trust us as we will fold the tent in October 2021 if the Decision and Order is not approved is their problem.

The time period of 16 months which Erickson is complaining about has no credence. We can clearly account for 13 of the 16 months. Refer to the Page 2 of this testimony. One of the major lessons from this Bill is that the County Council should not be acting as the Zoning Board if you plan to rule on this Bill.

In hindsight, Erickson should have used a worst case scenario when determining their suggested time frame for the PSA extension which they promised and committed to both the Planning Board and County Council in 2018. They should have referred to previous CEF cases. For example, the Chapelgate CEF case took 23 months for the Zoning Board to hear and an additional 134 days for the Office of Law to complete the Decision and Order thus over two years. A commitment and someone's word needs to be adhered to and honored. If you were to approve this Bill one can only assume this will be your vote in the Zoning Board case. How would you prove we are wrong?

It is one thing for the Petitioner to renege on his promise, but it's another thing for this body to not be committed to the Zoning Board Rules of Procedure. You have an obligation to your constituents. Therefore, you as the County Council have no choice, but to zone in and say CB50-2021 is hereby withdrawn or recuse yourselves or vote — NO. We only hope you will take the necessary action to stop this nonsense. Thank You for listening.

Stu Kohn
HCCA President

Erickson's Rationale for Planned Service Area is Not Justified

Time Period: *Petitioner states time period of Nov 6, 2018 thru Mar 4, 2020 (**16 Months**) -- from the time Petition was filed till the first Zoning Board (ZB) Hearing.*

For Consideration: *There were no ZB hearings from May 17, 2018 to Apr 4, 2019 (**11 Months**) as the ZB did not meet because of a completely new Board due to the election.*

For Consideration: *From Mar 4, 2020 which was the initial Erickson ZB Hearing to the next hearing of June 17, 2020 (**2 Months**) Erickson **DID NOT FILE** Proper Campaign Finance Reports as cited by the ZB)*

Summation: **Therefore 13 of the 16 Months the Petitioner – Erickson is complaining about cannot be justified.**

Smarter Growth Alliance For Howard County

June 21, 2021

The Honorable Howard County Council
George Howard Building
3430 Court House Drive
Ellicott City, MD 21043

**RE: CB50-2021 – Community Enhancement Floating District - General Plan Amendment -
Timeline Extension**

Dear Council Members:

The Smarter Growth Alliance for Howard County (SGAHC) is an alliance of local and state organizations working together to foster healthy, equitable, and sustainable communities through smarter development and transportation decisions and improved protections for the county's natural, historic and cultural resources.

The SGAHC opposes CB50 as there is a procedural disallowance to serve in both capacities of discussing and voting on this proposed bill.

How is it feasible for you as County Council Members to even think about discussing and voting on this proposed Bill when you are acting as Zoning Board Members? This is a conflict of interest. Any and All discussions during this Legislative Hearing you hear regarding the contents of the Erickson Zoning Board case that the extension of the Planned Service Area might be beneficial for Affordable Housing is irrelevant. This was stated by those who testified at the Planning Board Hearing. The Planning Board was allowed to hear this, but you as County Council Members acting as the Zoning Board are not permitted to hear such testimony.

You need to instruct those testifying to not mention Erickson's zoning board case. It is not possible to serve as Council Members on this legislation at a public hearing and on the Zoning Board without ex parte communications because those testifying are not able to adequately oppose or support the legislation without being able to opine on the matter of how the PSA expansion would be beneficial.

*Chesapeake Bay Foundation • Clean Water Action • Coalition for Smarter Growth • Community Ecology Institute
Earth Forum of Howard County • HARP • Horizon Foundation • Howard County Citizens Association
Howard County Conservancy • Howard County Sierra Club • Maryland Conservation Council
Maryland League of Conservation Voters • Maryland Ornithological Society • Patapsco Heritage Greenway
Preservation Maryland • Safe Skies Maryland • Savage Community Association • The People's Voice • Transition Howard County*

The Zoning Board's Rules of Procedure state:

“Board members shall not engage in ex parte communications of any kind with anyone other than Board counsel or staff regarding the case from the time the Board is notified by the Director of the Department of Planning and Zoning of filing of the petition to 30 days after the time the Decision and Order is issued.”

Enough said – your only choice is to withdraw the Bill or all Council Members acting as the Zoning Board must abstain. If you do decide to vote on this CB50-2021 your vote will be considered by the voters of Howard County to be your position in the Zoning Board Case. One would think you would want to divorce yourselves of this to ensure your constituents that you know your roles as Zoning Board Members from that as acting as a County Council Member.

Thank you for your consideration. Please do what is right!

Sincerely,

Howard County Citizen's Association
Stu Kohn
President

The People's Voice
Lisa M. Markovitz
President

cc: The Honorable Calvin Ball, County Executive

NOTES:

CB50-2021 is AN ACT amending Council Bill No. 59-2018 to provide an additional two years before certain adjustments will be null and void unless certain conditions are met related to Zoning Board approval and the connection to public water and sewer related to the development of Property located west of Clarksville Pike (Md Route 108) and south of Sheppard Lane, in Clarksville, Howard County, Maryland; and generally relating to PlanHoward 2030.

HCCA's Testimony to the Council in July 2018 -- <http://howardcountyhcca.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/HCCA-Testimony-CB59-2018-Erickson-PSA-Expansion.pdf>.

HCCA's Testimony to the Planning Board in April 2018 -- <http://howardcountyhcca.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/04/HCCA-Testimony-PB-PSA-RT-108.pdf>.