

1 **CORRIDOR 70/32, LLC** * **BEFORE THE**
 2 **PETITIONER** * **PLANNING BOARD OF**
 3 **ZRA-205** * **HOWARD COUNTY, MARYLAND**

4
 5 * * * * *

6 **MOTION: Recommend Denial of ZRA-205.**

7 **ACTION: *Recommend Denial with a Modification; Vote 4-0.***

8 * * * * *

9 **RECOMMENDATION**

10 On June 15, 2023, the Planning Board of Howard County, Maryland, considered the petition of
 11 Corridor 70/32, LLC (Petitioner) to clarify the types of light manufacturing that can be conducted on a POR
 12 zoned parcel that is within 1,800 feet by road of an interstate highway ramp by specifying and, thereby,
 13 excluding other light manufacturing uses by amending Section 115.0.B.22 *“Flex space, provided the property*
 14 *is within 1800 feet by road of an interstate highway ramp, and provided that the light manufacturing uses are*
 15 *limited to those uses permitted in the PEC District”* as follows:

- 16 1. Add Contractor’s Office and Outdoor or Indoor Storage Facility, Self-Storage Facilities,
 17 Warehouses, and Moving and Storage Establishments after *“Flex space,”*.
- 18 2. Remove *“and provided that the light manufacturing uses are limited to those uses permitted in*
 19 *the PEC District.”*

20 The Planning Board considered the petition and the Department of Planning and Zoning (DPZ)
 21 Technical Staff Report.

22 **Testimony**

23 Mr. Jamie Fraser, representing Corridor 70/32, LLC (Petitioner), testified that the intent of the
 24 amendment is to allow Contractor’s Office and Outdoor or Indoor Storage Facility, Self-Storage Facilities,
 25 Warehouses, and Moving and Storage Establishments to Use 22 in the list of uses permitted by right
 26 (Section 115.0.B) in the POR zoning district. He contended that POR is intended to allow light
 27 manufacturing uses; however, the Flex Space use category references the light manufacturing uses permitted
 28 in PEC, but light manufacturing uses are not listed as permitted uses in PEC. He asserted that the
 29 development potential of flex space is diminished by listing “light industrial uses” broadly and not identifying
 30 specific light manufacturing uses. He explained that specifying uses that they considered as more appropriate
 31 in the POR zoning district is preferable to changing POR’s allowed Flex Space uses from PEC uses to M-1
 32 uses.

1 Mr. Coleman asked if the definition of "light industrial" is being expanded upon. DPZ staff indicated
2 that the petitioner is proposing to eliminate the reference to light manufacturing uses in PEC and replace it
3 with specific industrial uses that the petitioner asserts are more compatible with the POR zoning district. Mr.
4 Coleman asked the petitioner why they are eliminating light manufacturing uses, which could allow
5 additional development options. Mr. Sang W. Oh, Talkin & Oh LLP, stated that the intent is to clarify which
6 light manufacturing uses should be allowed in a Flex Space within 1,800 linear feet from an interstate
7 highway ramp and the proposed uses are less intense than those currently allowed. Board member, James
8 Cecil, asked Mr. Oh why they would not use the M-1 category instead of PEC. Mr. Oh stated all of the uses in
9 M-1 were not intended for the POR.

10 No member of the public testified in opposition of the proposed ZRA.

11 Board Discussion and Recommendation

12 In work session, Board members indicated support for the proposed uses, but expressed concern
13 about removing the reference to light manufacturing uses permitted in PEC as they wanted to provide
14 property owners additional flexibility for future economic opportunities. Board members also discussed if the
15 *Use 22 Flex Space* should reference uses permitted in the M-1 Light Manufacturing Zoning District or the
16 light industrial uses, as defined in the Zoning Regulations, due to the lack of clarity noted by the Petitioner.

17 Mr. Cecil motioned to recommend denial of ZRA-205 as proposed, because it limits the uses
18 currently allowed and should allow a greater flexibility for light industrial or light manufacturing uses.

19
20 Mr. McAliley seconded the motion. The motion passed 4-0.

21
22 For the foregoing reasons, the Planning Board of Howard County, Maryland, on this 13th day of
23 July 2023, recommends that ZRA-205 be **DENIED**, as described above.

24
25
26 HOWARD COUNTY PLANNING BOARD

27 DocuSigned by:
Edward T. Coleman
28 Ed Coleman, Chair F0E5EF3264DC407...

29 DocuSigned by:
Kevin McAliley
30 Kevin McAliley, Vice-chair 17D7DF59D4214A8...

31 DocuSigned by:
James Cecil
32 James Cecil 7DA11238TD2D404...

DocuSigned by:
Lisa Kenny

On behalf of
Barbara
Mosier

263CAE9E2FB947D...

Barbara Mosier

1

2

3 ATTEST:

DocuSigned by:
Mary Kendall

1448B42380DA4A6...

4

5 Mary Kendall, Acting Executive Secretary