
From: Jung, Debra
Sent: Thursday, November 13, 2025 5:02 PM
To: Anderson, Isaiah
Subject: FW: ZRA217 which you will be voting on - My submitted testimony to the planning board regarding ZRA217

Flag Status: Flagged

From: Suzanne Hoffman <sihoffm@hotmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, October 11, 2025 12:18 PM
To: CouncilDistrict1@howardcountymd.gov; CouncilDistrict2@howardcountymd.gov; CouncilDistrict4@howardcountymd.gov; Dyungman <dyungman@howardcountymd.gov>; Skalny, Cindy <cskalny@howardcountymd.gov>; Knight, Karen <kknight@howardcountymd.gov>; Rigby, Christiana <crigby@howardcountymd.gov>
Cc: Suzanne <sihoffm@hotmail.com>
Subject: ZRA217 which you will be voting on - My submitted testimony to the planning board regarding ZRA217

WARNING!!!

This email originated from someone outside of Howard County
DO NOT CLICK LINKS OR OPEN ATTACHMENTS
unless you recognize the sender and know for sure that the content is safe

Dear Howard County Council Members,

I live in District 5 but I am sending this (see below) to all of you as you will be asked to vote on the ZRA217 in the future. I am strongly opposed to parts of it, as it lacks balance between the needs and wants of businesses, and the safety of the surrounding communities . DPZ (by its own admission) does not consider safety when reviewing zoning violation complaints. They apparently don't consider it when crafting or amending zoning regulations either. This wrong and it is dangerous for the county!

I ask that you vote against ZRA217, and require that a thorough review of safety be done before it is even seriously considered.

In fact I ask that you require this of ALL new and amended Zoning regulations, and for all current zoning regulations for which safety has been raised as an issue by the surrounding community (either via a complaint of a zoning violation case).

I am a life-long Howard County resident, and I know that the county has grown and changed over the years . With that growth comes increased traffic, and increased traffic generally raises concerns over safety. It is not unreasonable to want the county to take steps to ensure that the residents of (and the visitors to) the county remain safe. Reviewing all zoning regulations for safety is one step that the County Council can take towards this goal.

I know no one likes getting attachments so I am just including just the text of my submission to the planning board. The footnotes did not come through but in various places I reference the following:

Zoning violation case CE-22-126 files 8/2022 and 3 appeals (BA-806D, BA-794D, and BA-812D which is in progress.)

BA-806 Decision and Order, pages 27-28, 30-31, 44-45, 47-58

Suzanne Hoffman

4815 Manor Lane

Ellicott City, MD 21042

410-730-2543 (h) / 410-736-1433 (c)

My concern is with the petitioner's proposed amendments affecting Farm Breweries and Agritourism venues. Several of these changes would greatly affect the level of

traffic in the surrounding neighborhood, and there is no indication that the safety of the community has been taken into consideration in these proposals. While substantial increases in traffic make any road less safe, it is especially true in rural areas with no sidewalks. It is critical to evaluate whether any new or amended regulation could create dangerous conditions before approving it, rather than relying on DPZ to address such problems after new zoning is in place. My personal experience with DPZ has shown that they don't look for, or even acknowledge safety issues, even when confronted with undeniable proof that safety of the community has been compromised.

I live on Manor Lane in Ellicott City, so I have first-hand knowledge of how traffic associated with a Farm Brewery / Agritourism venue can negatively affect the surrounding neighborhood – even with the regulations as they stand today. Manor Hill Brewing (which has both brewery and agritourism permits) sits at the end of my narrow, historic dead-end road. Since it opened, we have gone from a peaceful, quiet lane, to one that is dangerous to walk on and tricky to enter or exit when the brewery is operating. If the changes discussed below pass, I respectfully request that DPZ review *all* affected locations and exempt those for which the changes would cause undue harm to the community.

Concern regarding the reasons for, and justification of, the proposed changes

*Under the reasons for the proposed amendment, Ms. Eisenburg states that the requested changes will “Address issues and reduce **conflicts** in the current code to improve clarity, accessibility, and ease of technical administration”. In her justification, she states that “the proposed ZRA is in harmony with preserving and promoting the health, **safety, and welfare** of the County.....”*

Before any expansion of allowed activities was seriously considered, DPZ should have looked at relevant past and current complaints to better assess the potential impact of these proposals. Safety of nearby residents should be the foremost consideration, and several of the proposals in ZRA217 will surely reduce the safety of the surrounding communities due to increased traffic, especially when associated with the alcoholic consumption by a brewery's customers.

As no specific conflicts are described, it appears that the only ‘**conflict**’ avoided is between business owners who want to (and/or already do) operate outside of the current zoning regulations and the neighbors who file zoning complaints against them. It very much disturbs me that (in my experience) the county seems to deny that even the most blatant violations exist and then attempts to change the rules to

appease the business owners, even if those changes will further adversely affect, and even **endanger**, the surrounding residential community.

The Manor Lane community has raised many concerns about zoning violations relevant to this ZRA at Manor Hill, and DPZ has failed to even investigate those complaints. This should be reason enough to pause in even considering approval of any increase in allowed activities.

Opposition to an increase in the allowed number of visitors / customers at any given time

Within ZRA-217 there is a request to **TRIPLE** the maximum number of customers from 50 to 150! Not only that, but for special events, the Hearing Examiner would be able to increase the number allowed by 10/acre (as opposed to the previous 5/acre) for every acre over 25. While a large increase in traffic is always a safety concern, the effect on a small country road is amplified even more, and no attempt has been made to assess such concerns.

*For example, Manor Hill spans approximately 50 acres, so this change could result in 400 (=150 + 10*25) people being allowed to visit for a special event. (It is not clear to me if the maximum of 300 refers to the entire number of attendees, or the additional number.)*

In the numerous complaints filed by neighbors against Manor Hill, we have effectively shown that the number of customers, which is well over the currently allowed limit, has already wreaked havoc on our previously quiet 1.1-mile-long dead-end lane. The road is too narrow for the existing level of traffic; it is just wide enough for two cars to pass, and there are no sidewalks to serve as a safe haven for pedestrians. Additionally, the intersection of Manor Lane and Rt 108 (where the speed is 45mph) is at a 90-degree angle, so most cars (and virtually all trucks) pulling into the lane cross the (invisible) center “line” thus requiring a great deal of extra attention to avoid an accident when entering or exiting the lane. The historic house at the corner is only 2 ft. from the roadway edge. Due to the challenge of making the sharp turn from Rt 108 onto Manor Lane when another vehicle is waiting to exit, their lawn has been driven over many times, despite the large rocks they have installed to protect their house and their lawn. Manor Lane cannot absorb any more traffic, without a significant reduction in safety – for the both the residents and the visitors to the brewery.

Many local residents (from the lane as well as many from nearby developments) used to love to walk or bike in our community, but to do so now is downright scary when the brewery is open. It would be truly terrifying for someone in a wheelchair or with a stroller! During a

recent appeal of a zoning complaint against Manor Hill Brewery, a traffic engineer discussed the unsafe conditions, and how any zoning regulations resulting in increased traffic needed to allow for the safe use of the road by pedestrians. Does a tragedy have to occur before the county will show concern for pedestrian safety?

Manor Hill's traffic on the weekend has already been formally tallied at 1100 vehicles/day, which is more than two times the maximum recommended for an "access street", which is how DPZ has classified Manor Lane. In fact, the same traffic engineer believes the proper classification of Manor Lane (based on the road width) is as an "access place" which has a recommended traffic flow of only 200 vehicles/day. This is more like the expected number of vehicle trips made by those who live on the road. In this same hearing DPZ admitted that they do not consider safety in their evaluations. This is outrageous! They only consider whether the structure of the roadway can handle a specified amount of traffic. Even under this incredibly weak criterion, the traffic volume is way too much. It is apparent that the Manor Lane roadway cannot handle the number of vehicles coming to and from Manor Hill. The lane was repaved only a few years ago and it is already crumbling in many places along the edge, making it more likely for vehicles to run off this narrow road when there is heavy traffic passing in both directions. This is yet another safety hazard.

I do not know if the following is indicative of how DPZ treats all breweries/agritourism venues, but approval of Manor Hill's initial brewery permit was based on a very different commitment to the number, frequency, and type of trucks that would visit the brewery - parameters which posed less of a safety risk. This business has expanded immensely in each of these areas, and DPZ has never even reviewed whether it is still in compliance with that original permit. Renewal appears to be automatic with no concern about whether the current site is even still suitable for what this business has become, much less how any expanded permissions will negatively affect the neighborhood.

Given that Manor Hill has already been allowed to ignore numerous regulations *without consequence*, there is good reason to believe that this trend would continue under even more permissive regulations.

Opposition to omit the limit on 'festivals', especially given DPZ's definition of a festival

Currently breweries are limited to no more than four festivals a year. The proposed change puts ***no limit*** on the number. There could be one *every weekend* as long as it lasts no more than two consecutive days and falls between 8AM-8PM.

The definition of a festival on page 4 of the petition states that it

is intended to, or likely to, attract substantial crowds,

is unlike the customary or usual activities generally associated with the property, and is

is sufficiently differentiated in its offerings from day-to-day agritourism events and operations in scale and intensity

How in the world does allowing an unlimited number of weekends filled with “substantial crowds” that come to events that have nothing to do with farming or brewing make sense?!

What has changed to make DPZ want to eliminate the limit on the number of allowed festivals?

Manor Hill Brewery is already blatantly exceeding the number of festivals allowed , and DPZ did not even bother to look at the business’s public calendar when it was brought to their attention. Each festival draws a ‘substantial crowd’ resulting in *even more* traffic than their normal weekend activities, thus making the road *even more* unsafe for the residents. I cannot even imagine the consequences of having no restrictions!

On one particular weekend, when it rained in the early afternoon, traffic leaving Manor Hill was backed up over 1/2 mile onto Manor Lane. As I was coming home, I had to drive onto a neighbor’s lawn in order to avoid a police car driving on the wrong side of the road so he could respond to another call. He had been investigating a possible DUI at or near Manor Hill and he had no other way out as Manor Lane is a dead-end road.

I see that one new restriction has been proposed - the owner must now keep a noise log to show compliance if there is amplified noise. While this would be a good thing for the surrounding community, it does absolutely nothing to ensure a safe amount of traffic for the location.

Opposition to the removal of the requirement to grow a *primary* ingredient of their product

Another of the proposed changes would remove the requirement for a brewery to plant at least two acres of a primary ingredient used in the brewing process. This much weaker proposal allows for two acres of *any* ingredient to be planted – so growing feed corn and

adding a *single kernel* would suffice in meeting the requirement. This sets a very low bar for a Howard County farmers/brewers and thus does not promote agritourism in a positive way. The original requirement to grow a primary ingredient is not unreasonable, and it should not be a difficult to meet on a property where the principal function is *supposed to be* farming, and which holds an agritourism permit. By the way, Manor Hill does not meet this requirement.

While this issue does not endanger the surrounding community, it does appear to support those who are not really farmers, and to serve as a back door in allowing businesses to sidestep the spirit of the original requirement.

Opposition to the request to increase the space allowed for accessory structures

Lastly, the petitioner wants to more than double the number of square feet (from 2200 to 5000) allowed for accessory structures on any lot larger than five acres. While this may seem reasonable on the surface, I argue that for a *supposed farm* in the Howard County Land Preservation Program that has been granted agritourism and brewery permits, this is excessive.

The accessory structures at Manor Hill already exceed the current limit, and the large events that take place make the road even more unsafe for the residents. The proposed increase would just enable larger crowds (even in inclement weather) and facilitate the ability to hold *more and bigger* private events that are not linked to agritourism (including the political fundraisers that are periodically held there).

In summary

Safety should be a paramount consideration of the County and any proposed changes in zoning should be evaluated for safety. Increased automobile traffic generally means more dangerous roadways, especially in rural areas where there are no sidewalks. It should not take a tragedy to require a safety review for new and amended regulations.

Before formally proposing any changes to zoning regulations, DPZ should seriously consider the potential effects on the surrounding

neighborhood (*for each affected location*) – not just the desires of the businesses that would be helped by the change.

If any affected businesses are located in areas where safety would be compromised by a change in zoning, those businesses should be excluded from that change. This could be done via a by-name exclusion, or simply by tightening the requirements, so that such businesses would no longer be included.

Any prior zoning complaints associated with the proposed changes to a zoning regulation should be reviewed to see how the new regulation relates to the previously expressed concerns.

As stated earlier, I realize that all of my examples relate to how the changes would affect Manor Hill and the surrounding community. This is because I am very familiar with the zoning issues covering that property, the negative effects its activities have on the surrounding community, the owner's blatant disregard for zoning regulations, and DPZ's unwillingness to even investigate current violations. These issues concern me greatly as they would be exacerbated by the aforementioned proposed changes.

I don't know how this set of proposed zoning changes would affect other similar businesses in Howard County, and I understand not wanting to limit all the others if only a few are located in places where the adoption of these changes will adversely affect the safety of the neighborhood **but** there has to be a way around that. Further endangering any community, especially ones that were never appropriate for such businesses, is not the answer.

I sincerely hope that in the future DPZ will strive to take a more even-minded approach in holding all business owners accountable, and in effectively considering the needs of the community when proposing and applying zoning regulations.

Decisions made regarding zoning regulations reflect how the county treats its private citizens as well as its business owners, **and private citizens should not be second class citizens.**

From: Jung, Debra
Sent: Thursday, November 13, 2025 4:17 PM
To: Anderson, Isaiah
Subject: FW: CB74. Please consider this amendment (Road access, water conservation)
Attachments: ProposedAmendmentCB74_Nov12.pdf

Flag Status: Flagged

From: Joan P <joanpontius@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 12, 2025 9:27 AM
To: Williams, China <ccwilliams@howardcountymd.gov>; CouncilDistrict1@howardcountymd.gov;
CouncilDistrict4@howardcountymd.gov
Subject: CB74. Please consider this amendment (Road access, water conservation)

WARNING!!!

This email originated from someone outside of Howard County
DO NOT CLICK LINKS OR OPEN ATTACHMENTS
unless you recognize the sender and know for sure that the content is safe

Hi China, Deb, and Liz

There are so many problems with the proposed Ag ZRA.

Please consider as high priority these two items (attached) aimed to:

- 1) conserve water by holding Farm Alcohol Producer to the same restrictions in place for the bottling of well water
- 2) avoid conflict with residential uses of the road by adopting objective criteria instead of relying on unmeasurable criteria such as "safe" road conditions that don't "unduly conflict" with other uses

Thanks in advance
Joan Pontius
EC
443-963-4403

November 12, 2025

Proposed amendment - RESTRICT FARM ALCHOL PRODUCER TO CONDITIONAL USE ON AN ARTERIAL ROAD

CONCERNS:

- 1) USE OF WELL WATER For well water conservation—which is critical for farming and residential use—the use of well water for beverage production should be consistent with the restrictions in place for the bottling well water. The county’s only provision for bottling of well water is conditional use on easements. Since malt-based and grain-based beverages are mostly water, consistency would require that the use of well water for production of these beverages also be restricted to conditional use on easements. CB74-2025 already includes a related inconsistency, in that *Farm Alcohol Producer* is included as both accessory and conditional use¹. The conditional use, requiring 25 acres and on an arterial road is more restrictive than the requirements of accessory use on 5 acres. Maryland’s statutes for Land Use² indicate that when regulations conflict, the more restrictive shall govern. This means that the ZRA’s provision for Alcohol Producer under accessory use is extraneous. These issues suggest the need to amend the proposal by removing Farm Alcohol Producer as Accessory use.
 - a) Amend Page 11. Remove lines 12,13
 - b) Amend Page 13. Remove lines 21,22
 - c) Amend Page 17. Remove lines 13,14
- 2) SAFETY AND CONFLICT Objective criteria requiring access to a parcel be “safe” and “not unduly conflict with other uses” include the existing standards (page 44. Lines 6-8) of the parcel being 400 feet of an arterial road (assuring easy access by Fire and Rescue), and requiring no intervening driveways between the arterial road and the property (minimizing the potential to unduly conflict with other uses that access the local road). However, including these standards only for residential cluster subdivisions (Page 44. Line 4) is arbitrary and capricious.

¹ CB74-2025 has *Farm Alcohol Producer* as both accessory and conditional use.

Page 11. Section 104.0.RURAL CONSERVATION C.16. Accessory use, subject to Section 128.0.O

Page 13. Section 105.0.RURAL RESIDENTIAL C.11 Accessory use, subject to Section 128.0.O

Page 17. Section 106.1.EASEMENTS.C.1.o Accessory use, subject to Section 128.0.O

Page 20. Section 106.1.EASEMENTS.D.1.b(2) Conditional use subject to Section 131.0.N.57

Page 42. Section 128.0.SUPPLEMENTARY REGULATIONS.O RC/RR/EASEMENTS—Accessory use on parcels greater than 5 acres.

Page 52 Section 131.0.N.Conditional Uses. 57. RC/RR/EASEMENTS—Conditional use on parcels greater than 25 acres on an arterial road.

² Maryland Land Use law §1–202. (a) A regulation adopted under this division that conflicts with any statute, local law, or other regulation shall govern if the regulation adopted under this Division: (1) requires a greater width or size of yards, courts, or other open spaces; (2) requires a lower height of buildings; (3) requires a reduced number of stories; (4) requires a greater percentage of lot left unoccupied; or (5) imposes a more restrictive standard.

- a) Amend Page 44. Line 4. Remove. *"If the local road is internal to a residential cluster subdivision,"*
- b) Amend Page 30, lines 22-24. Include objective criteria for safety and access under Special Farm Permits. *"the subject property adjoins an arterial or collector highway, the local road access point is within 400 feet of its intersection with the arterial or collector highway, and there are no intervening driveways between the arterial or collector highway and the access to the property along the local road;*

From: Kenneth Moreland <kmoreland78@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, November 16, 2025 2:01 PM
To: CouncilMail; Yungmann, David
Cc: Renee Moreland
Subject: Letter regarding CB74-2025 (ZRA 217)
Attachments: Moreland 11-15-25 Letter re- CB 74-2025 (ZRA217).docx

Flag Status: Flagged

WARNING!!!

This email originated from someone outside of Howard County

DO NOT CLICK LINKS OR OPEN ATTACHMENTS

unless you recognize the sender and know for sure that the content is safe

Dear Councilpersons:

Please find attached my letter in support of certain revisions to Section 128 of the County's Zoning Regulations, as well as my recommendations to make certain additional revisions to that Section 128 for consistency and clarity of restrictions on business and other activities on properties with shared-access driveways.

Thank you for considering my comments and for your service to our County.

Sincerely,

Kenneth V. Moreland

Kenneth V. Moreland
4898 Castlebridge Rd.
Ellicott City, MD 21042
410-812-2822

November 15, 2025

Re: CB-74-2025 (ZRA 217)

Dear Howard County Councilpersons:

My wife and I have been residents of Howard County for 37 years. I am writing this letter in support of many of the provisions of CB74-2025 (ZRA 217). I applaud the efforts to address issues and reduce conflicts potentially inherent in the existing Zoning Regulations.

I strongly support and applaud the additions in several sections of Section 128 and 131 those provisions that preclude business or other activities in circumstances where there are shared access driveways, specifically the provisions that state: **“THE DRIVEWAY PROVIDING ACCESS TO THE PROPOSED SITE SHALL NOT BE SHARED WITH OTHER PROPERTIES;**”

Finally, I would strongly request that you specifically add these same provisions regarding precluding access/egress via shared driveways to all other business and ancillary activities included in the Regulations and otherwise, including **Pick-Your-Own Enterprises, Value-Added Agricultural Processing with On-Site Sales, Farm Sales, Community Supported Agriculture, Food Hubs, Riding Academies & Stables, Incidental Outdoor Stays, Bed and Breakfast Inns, and also for vehicles related to the installation and maintenance of Commercial Solar Facilities.**

My support for the proposed zoning regulations changes, and the rationale for the additional changes I have proposed is based on personal experiences. In 2018, my wife and I bought a buildable lot that is accessed via a narrow, paved lane at the end of a mile-long stretch of homes on Castlebridge Road in the Riverwood Community of Ellicott City. Access to Castlebridge Road and then to this paved lane is also possible via the adjacent Gaither Farm/Gaither Hunt neighborhoods. We also bought an adjacent buildable lot in case one of our children would choose to build there in the future. We completed construction of our home and moved into it in 2021 (the second lot remains vacant but well maintained). Once the public part of Castlebridge Road ends, we are parties to a shared access and maintenance agreement for this narrow lane with several other parcel owners, some of which are buildable lots and some of which are agricultural parcels. This lane is not maintained by the County, but jointly by the parties to the shared access and maintenance agreement. My two lots are the first parcels along this lane. Presently, there

are two other houses built and occupied on this shared driveway. Since 2021, the unrelated owners of those properties each have sought to conduct “ancillary” business activities on their non-residential parcels. One has sought to have their property used as a social event venue, a venue for photography sessions, and has grown flowers for sale, both wholesale and retail. The other owner, who has a small vineyard, has invited the public to pick-your-own grapes and has expressed their desire to do wine tastings, etc. on his property in the future. This owner has also recently proposed a Commercial Solar Facility on part of their “agricultural” parcel, which was presented to the APAB earlier this year.

My family, and the HOA’s of my neighbors in the Riverwood and Gaither Hunt communities, have strongly opposed these ancillary activities in the past, and will continue to do so going forward. Our primary concerns are related to the increased traffic, noise, risk of property damage from increase public access past our homes, and the disturbance of our peaceful residential surroundings.

I request that you approve CB74-2025 (ZRA 217), but also seriously consider and make the revisions to the Regulations in the other areas I have proposed above. I would be available to expound on these points and concerns at your convenience. Please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Kenneth V. Moreland". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Kenneth V. Moreland

From: Kenneth Moreland <kmoreland78@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, November 16, 2025 2:13 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: Testimony on CB74-2025 (ZRA217)

Flag Status: Flagged

WARNING!!!

This email originated from someone outside of Howard County ***DO NOT CLICK LINKS OR OPEN ATTACHMENTS*** unless you recognize the sender and know for sure that the content is safe

I have signed up online to testify on CB74-2025, but based on my reading of the agendas I got in an email concerning Council meetings this coming week, will the discussion and testimonies for this Bill take place on Monday evening, Nov 17 or Wednesday evening Nov 19? Please advise, as I would like to hear and participate in the deliberations of this proposed changes to Zoning Regulations. FYI...I have registered online to testify.

Thank you,

Kenneth V Morland
410-812-2822

From: Jonathan Dickey <Jonathan.Dickey@raymondjames.com>
Sent: Monday, November 17, 2025 9:43 AM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: Comments on AG ZRA-CB74-2025 attached
Attachments: Amendment CB74-2025 11 19 25.docx

Flag Status: Flagged

WARNING!!!

This email originated from someone outside of Howard County
DO NOT CLICK LINKS OR OPEN ATTACHMENTS
unless you recognize the sender and know for sure that the content is safe

I am unable to attend the meeting on November 19. I attach my comments in support of amendment CB74-2025.

Best,

Jonathan Dickey

If you'd like to set up a call or review, please [click here](#) to schedule a date & time that works best for you!

Jonathan Dickey, CFP®, CPA

Senior Member, M3

Financial Advisor, RJFS

10500 Little Patuxent Parkway, Suite 305 | Columbia, MD 21044

Direct: (443) 546-2092 | Main: (443) 546-2556 | Fax: (443) 546-2557

jonathan.dickey@raymondjames.com

www.merriweathermoneymanagement.com



MERRIWEATHER
MONEY MANAGEMENT

Merriweather Money Management is not a registered broker/dealer and is independent of Raymond James Financial Services, Inc. Investment Advisory Services are offered through Raymond James Financial Services Advisors, Inc.

Financial Planner Board of Standards Inc. owns the certification marks CFP®, Certified Financial Planner™ and federally registered CFP (with flame design) in the U.S., which it awards to individuals who successfully complete CFP Board's initial and ongoing certification requirements.

Securities offered through Raymond James Financial Services, Inc. member FINRA/SIPC.

Please visit <https://www.raymondjames.com/legal-disclosures/social-media-disclaimer-icd> for Additional Risk and Disclosure Information. Raymond James does not accept private client orders or account instructions by email. This email: (a) is not an official transaction confirmation or account statement; (b) is not an offer, solicitation, or recommendation to transact in any security; (c) is intended only for the addressee; and (d) may not be retransmitted to, or used by, any other party. This email may contain confidential or privileged information; please delete immediately if you are not the intended recipient. Raymond James monitors emails and may be required by law or regulation to disclose emails to third parties.

Investment products are: Not deposits. Not FDIC or NCUA insured. Not guaranteed by the financial institution. Subject to risk. May lose value.

This may constitute a commercial email message under the CAN-SPAM Act of 2003. If you do not wish to receive marketing related email messages from us, please select "unsubscribe." You will continue to receive emails from us related to servicing your account(s). If you wish to re-subscribe at any time, please reach out to your advisor.

If you wish to unsubscribe from marketing emails, please visit <https://www.raymondjames.com/email-unsubscribe/outlook/>.

ZRA Proposal Meeting November 19, 2025

My name is Jonathan Dickey and I speak in favor of the proposed revisions.

My wife and I own and reside on our farm on Daisy Road in the Lisbon Maryland area of western Howard County. Our farm is in the agricultural preservation program.

The proposed revisions will allow us to better use our farming facilities. The revised rules expand alternative revenue opportunities, such as using our main barn for various event possibilities, hosting group events using our large arena space, and offering other group related activities.

We intend to pursue these activities while continuing to operate our equine-related business, primarily boarding and training horses in the field of dressage. These additional opportunities should in turn boost other local businesses and allow those businesses to thrive.

We have been in Howard County since the late 1930s, when my father acquired our family farm on Forsythe Road. I grew up on that farm which my sister and brother-in-law continue to own and operate today. We have witnessed the constant growth, development and changes that have occurred in western County for many years.

Our family was early to join the agricultural preservation process, placing that farm into agricultural preservation in the early 80's. Those efforts to preserve and protect the agricultural heritage of Howard County have, in my opinion, been successful.

We remain strong believers in the actions to protect the agricultural and extended farming community. We placed another farm, perhaps one of the larger remaining agricultural parcels in western County in agricultural preservation in 2021. We will continue to be strong supporters of those goals.

As a farm owner, and one who speaks with other farmers in the community, the challenges of maintaining a successful agricultural operation increase each year. Under the current rules guiding preservation properties and the rural and rural conservation areas of the County, that tension is constant. In my opinion, restrictions in current rules limit the options of farmers to operate profitably and successfully.

I believe that the proposed changes provide very needed flexibility toward the ability of farmers to maintain those properties and profit from the hard work required. At the same time, the revisions serve to protect the County's agricultural heritage.

As early proponents and very long-time residents, I will always be suspicious of any changes that would further dilute the boundaries that have led to overdevelopment in Howard County and further eliminate what remains of the County's agricultural heritage.

However, I believe the revisions also contain the needed guardrails to prevent abuse of the rules. I believe the revisions allow farmers' that ability to consider complementary uses for their properties while retaining their agricultural identity. The expansion of this type of Agritourism should add economic benefits that support local neighborhoods and small businesses.

Thank you for the opportunity to present my comments. I strongly support the proposed revisions.

2425 Daisy Road LLC
Jonathan & Alison Dickey

From: Kenneth Moreland <kmoreland78@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 25, 2025 9:39 AM
To: CouncilMail
Cc: Eisenberg, Lynda; Zoller, James
Subject: Follow up on Testimony re: CB74-2025 (ZRA 217)
Attachments: Moreland 11-25-25 Letter re- CB 74-2025 (ZRA217).docx

Flag Status: Flagged

WARNING!!!

This email originated from someone outside of Howard County ***DO NOT CLICK LINKS OR OPEN ATTACHMENTS*** unless you recognize the sender and know for sure that the content is safe

Council Members and DPZ leadership:

I see that CB74-2025 is on the Council's agenda for December 1. These attached letter and related attachment follows up on my testimony and handout during my testimony on this bill on both November 19 and 20, 2025.

Thank you for your attention to my concerns and proposals to modify this proposed legislation.

Sincerely,

Kenneth Moreland
410-812-2822

Kenneth V. Moreland
4898 Castlebridge Rd.
Ellicott City, MD 21042
410-812-2822

November 25, 2025

Re: CB-74-2025 (ZRA 217)

Dear Howard County Council Members:

I am writing this letter in follow-up to my testimony before the Council on both November 19 and 20, 2025 regarding CB74-2025 (ZRA 217). During those sessions, I strongly supported additions in several sections of Section 128 and 131 those provisions that preclude business or other activities in circumstances where there are shared access driveways, specifically the provisions that state: **“THE DRIVEWAY PROVIDING ACCESS TO THE PROPOSED SITE SHALL NOT BE SHARED WITH OTHER PROPERTIES;”**. However, I requested that you specifically add these same provisions regarding precluding access via shared driveways to all other business and ancillary activities included in the Regulations and otherwise, including **Pick-Your-Own Enterprises, Value-Added Agricultural Processing with On-Site Sales, Farm Sales, Community Supported Agriculture, Food Hubs, Riding Academies & Stables, Incidental Outdoor Stays, Bed and Breakfast Inns, and also the installation and maintenance of Commercial Solar Facilities.**

At the Council’s Legislative Work Session on November 20, 2025, I handed out to Council members and DPZ staff proposed amendments to Sections 128 and 131 that would address the changes I proposed (see attached handout).

I also support Councilman Youngman’s proposed changes to the regulations to add documentation to recorded “shared access and maintenance agreements” for all parties if such precluded activities have been historically agreed to by all parties to such agreements.

I request that you approve CB74-2025 (ZRA 217), but also seriously consider and make the revisions to the Regulations in the other areas I have proposed above. I would be available to expound on these points and concerns at your convenience. Please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Kenneth V. Moreland". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Kenneth V. Moreland

Proposal to Amend Section 128.0I and 131:

Permits for Special Farm Uses & Conditional Uses

By: Kenneth Moreland (November 20, 2025)

128.0I: Permits for Special Farm Uses

The Department of Planning and Zoning may approve permits for the following categories of uses, which are related to farming and agriculture. A permit shall only be approved if the Department of Planning and Zoning finds that the proposed use conforms with the criteria given below and that are listed for each category. **WHEN REVIEWING APPLICATIONS AND RENEWALS FOR SPECIAL FARM USE PERMITS, DPZ MAY CONSIDER THE CUMULATIVE IMPACT OF OPERATIONS WHERE MULTIPLE PERMITS ARE GRANTED, INCLUDING AN ASSESSMENT OF THE ADEQUACY OF SHARED FACILITIES UTILIZED BY OVERLAPPING PERMITS.**

Except for the value-added agricultural processing category, ~~the Pick Your Own Enterprises category, and the small farm stand category,~~ all other categories above shall comply with the requirement that the lot or parcel upon which the operation is located shall have frontage on and direct access to a road classification as an arterial or collector public road, or may front on and have direct access to a local road, if:

- (1) Access to an arterial or collector public road right-of-way is not feasible;
- (2) The access to the local road is safe based on road conditions and accident history;
- (3) That the use of the local road for access will not unduly conflict with other uses that access the local road.

(4) Sight distance and the design of driveway entrances MUST BE adequate to accommodate expected traffic. THE DRIVEWAY PROVIDING ACCESS TO THE PROPOSED SITE SHALL NOT BE SHARED WITH OTHER PROPERTIES; HOWEVER, THE DIRECTOR OF PLANNING AND ZONING MAY WAIVE THIS CRITERIA IF THE PETITIONER PROVIDES AFFIDAVITS FROM ALL PERSONS WHO ALSO SHARE THE DRIVEWAY THAT THEY DO NOT OBJECT TO THE USE OF THE DRIVEWAY FOR THE USE. IF THE USE OF A SHARED DRIVEWAY IS ALLOWED, THE PETITIONER SHALL DEMONSTRATE THAT THE USE WILL NOT RESULT IN DAMAGE TO OR DETERIORATION OF THE SHARED DRIVEWAY OR IN INCREASED HAZARDS TO OTHER USERS OF THE DRIVEWAY. THE DIRECTOR OF PLANNING AND ZONING SHALL PRESCRIBE APPROPRIATE CONDITIONS AND SAFEGUARDS TO ENSURE THE PETITIONER'S RESPONSIBILITY FOR REPAIR OF ANY DAMAGE OR DETERIORATION OF THE SHARED DRIVEWAY CAUSED BY THE USE.

Note: Add these same requirements to Section 131.0 regarding Conditional Uses