




Howard County Maryland
Department of Planning and Zoning (410) 313-2350
3430 Courthouse Drive, Ellicott City, MD 21043 www.howardcountymd.gov



DPZ Office Use only:
Case No: 28-1134PDP
Date Filed: 2/18/2026

Amended Preliminary Development Plan Petition

Petition Type

Petition Type: Preliminary Development Plan (PDP) for a Mixed Use Development

Application Type: Amendment of Existing Plan

Description of Proposed Amendment:

To amend the approved First Amended PDP for Maple Lawn. Additional information is provided in the attached Supplemental Statement.

Petitioner's Representative Information

Petitioner's Representative Name: Mandee Heint

Address: 1001 Fleet Street, Baltimore, MD, 21202

Phone: (443) 797-3076

Email: mandee.heint@saul.com

Profession: Attorney

Petitioner Information

Petitioner Name: Michael Greenebaum

Petitioners Business Name/Trading As: G & R Maple Lawn, Inc.

Address: 1829 Reisterstown Road, Baltimore, MD, 21208

Phone: (410) 484-8400

Email: mgreenebaum@greenebaumenterprises.com

Petitioner's Interest in Subject Property: Joint Owner

If the petitioner is not the property owner, please explain:

Property Information

Are there multiple properties involved with this petition? Multiple Properties

Property Description: Mixed Use

Existing Use: Mixed Use

Property Owner: Maple Lawn Old Farm LLC

Property Address: 11788 Scaggsville Road, Fulton, MD, 20759

Tax Map: 41

Grid: 14

Parcel/Lot Number: 330

Zoning District: RR-MXD-3

County Council District: Council District 4 - Deb Jung

Total Site Area: 604.6

Subdivision Name (If applicable): Maple Lawn

Site Development Plan (If applicable):

Plat Number and recordation date (If applicable):

PDP Amendment Petition

Did Petitioner Complete Presubmission Community Meeting? Yes

Date if Yes: 01/09/2026

Original Zoning Board Case Number(s): ZB-995M, ZB-1039M

Signatures

The undersigned hereby affirms that all of the statements and information contained in, or filed with this petition, are true and correct.

Petitioner's Signature

 Date 2/1/26

If the Property Owner is not the Petitioner, you must submit a signed [Property Owners Authorization](#).

Process information and submittal requirements can be found on the [ProjectDox website](#).

Digitally Signed by: Mandee Heint

Signature Date: 2026-2-10 14:31:50

CONTACT US

Department of Planning and Zoning

Public Service and Zoning Division

3430 Court House Drive, Ellicott City, MD 21043

TEL: 410.313.2350

Supplemental Statement to Petition for Approval of the Second Amended Preliminary Development Plan – Maple Lawn

I. Introduction

This Supplemental Statement is submitted in support of the Petition for Approval of a Second Amended Preliminary Development Plan (“Second Amended PDP”) for Maple Lawn, an established Mixed-Use Development in Howard County, Maryland.

Maple Lawn consists of approximately 604.6 acres in the RR-MXD-3 Zoning District. It is located on the west side of Route 29 in the area generally bordered by Route 29, Route 216 and Johns Hopkins Road (Tax Maps 41 & 46 as shown on the accompanying Second Amended PDP).

The Second Amended PDP represents a coordinated, policy-driven approach to completing Maple Lawn in a manner consistent with the Howard County Zoning Regulations, the County’s adopted General Plan, *HoCo By Design*, the existing design principles, and extensive community engagement undertaken by the Petitioner.

Maple Lawn is currently approved for 1,340 dwelling units at a residential density of 2.2 dwelling units per gross acre and consists of the following six districts: (1) Garden District; (2) Midtown West District; (3) Midtown District; (4) Hillside District; (5) Westside District; and (6) Business District as shown on the accompanying Second Amended PDP.

The Petition seeks approval of revisions to the previously approved PDP, including: (i) a modest increase in overall residential density to a level permitted within the MXD-3 zoning district; (ii) inclusion of immediately adjacent parcels within the PDP boundary; and (iii) development of multifamily residential units within the Business District.

A. Project Background and Zoning History

On December 29, 2000, the Howard County Zoning Board (the “Zoning Board”) approved the original Preliminary Development Plan for Maple Lawn (the “Original PDP”) in ZB Case

995M. The Original PDP included approximately 507.9 acres and was approved for 1,116 dwelling units (485 single family detached (“SFD”), 395 single family attached (“SFA”), and 236 apartments) at a residential density of 2.2 dwelling units per gross acre. The corresponding Comprehensive Sketch Plan was approved on August 8, 2001 by the Howard County Planning Board (the “Planning Board”), as S-01-17. The Decision and Order for ZB Case 995M, the Original PDP and Criteria, and the record plats are included herein by reference.

On March 20, 2006, the Zoning Board approved the Amended Preliminary Development Plan for Maple Lawn (the “First Amended PDP”) in ZB Case 1039M. The First Amended PDP incorporated an additional approximate 97.5 acres into Maple Lawn and increased the permitted number of dwelling units to 1,340 (485 SFD and 855 Other Residential of which 619 were approved as SFA). The residential density remained at 2.2 units per gross acre. The corresponding Comprehensive Sketch Plan was approved on January 25, 2007 by the Planning Board, as S-06-16. The Decision and Order for ZB Case 1039M, the First Amended PDP and Criteria, and the record plats are included herein by reference.

In 2021, a petition to amend the PDP was filed and voluntarily withdrawn prior to adjudication. No findings were made regarding that petition. Since that time, both County policy and the proposed development plan have evolved in material ways, as described below.

B. Second Amended Petition – Maple Lawn West District and Business District Apartment

The Petitioner, G & R Maple Lawn, Inc., is the developer of Maple Lawn and seeks this second amendment to complete the planned Maple Lawn West District. The Maple Lawn West District is approximately 109.6 acres and is situated at 11788 Scaggsville Road, Fulton, MD 20759, Tax Map 41, Grid 14, Parcel 330 (the “West District Property”) as shown on the accompanying Second Amended PDP.

The Petitioner is also seeking this second amendment to allow for the construction of an apartment building within the southeast portion of the Business District and immediately adjacent parcels, with a voluntary commitment that fifteen percent (15%) of the units will be designated as Moderate Income Housing Units (“MIHUs”). The apartment development is proposed primarily on land that is already paved and currently utilized as surface parking. The Apartment Property is the area of the Business District designated as Other Residential.

The Apartment Property is approximately 6.2 acres and is situated adjacent to 8181 Maple Lawn Boulevard, Tax Map 46, Grid 3, Parcels 124, 200, and 226 (the “Apartment Property,” and together with the West District Property, the “Subject Property”).

The West District Property was included in the Original and First Amended PDP as the Old Farm District. Pursuant to the Original and First Amended PDP, the West District Property is designated only for SFD land use and approved for 32 SFD dwelling units. This Petition seeks to amend the permitted residential density to a maximum of 3.0 dwelling units per gross acre consistent with the MXD-3 zoning framework to allow for up to 221 additional SFD dwelling units on the West District Property. Residential density is allocated in a manner that reflects infrastructure capacity, community input, and stakeholder feedback received during earlier discussions, including feedback provided in 2021. Additional density is intentionally shifted away from the Old Farm and instead directed toward the Business District, where it can be more appropriately integrated with existing mixed-use activity.

The Apartment Property, with the exception of approximately three acres adjacent to the Business District, was also included in the Original and First Amended PDP as part of the Business District. Pursuant to the Original and First Amended PDP, the Business District portion of the Apartment Property is designated for Employment. This Petition also seeks to amend the land use

designation for the Apartment Property to Other Residential, as permitted within the MXD-3 district, allowing the addition of up to 260 dwelling units in the form of a multifamily apartment building on the Apartment Property. The proposed apartment use strengthens the mix of uses within the Business District, supports vibrancy and activity throughout the day, and advances placemaking objectives by integrating residential activity with existing commercial and employment uses.

The scale and intensity of the proposed apartment development were evaluated as part of the Traffic Impact Analysis and Fiscal Impact Analysis and were determined to be supportable by existing and planned transportation infrastructure and public services. The proposed apartment building is located primarily on land that is already paved and currently utilized as surface parking. This infill approach avoids impacts to open space and environmental resources and reflects an integrative design strategy that reinforces Maple Lawn as a true mixed-use community. The Petition for the Subject Property includes the following exhibits attached hereto:

- Exhibit 1 – The Second Amended PDP
 - Sheet 1 – Second Amended Preliminary Development Plan
 - Sheet 2 – Excerpts of Decision and Order (Intentionally Blank)
 - Sheet 3 – Boundary Map
 - Sheet 4 – Physical Inventory Map
 - Sheet 5 – Generalized Plan of Development for Entire MXD District
 - Sheet 6 – Changes from PDP (ZB 1039M) Approval
- Exhibit 2 – Preliminary Development Plan Criteria
- Exhibit 3 – Generalized Traffic Analysis
- Exhibit 4 – Annual Phasing Plan
- Exhibit 5 – Fiscal Impact Analysis
- Exhibit 6 – Report on Pre-Submission Community Meeting (including Notice of Meeting, List of Parties to whom notice was sent and List of Attendees)
- Exhibit 7 – Community Engagement Report

II. Subject Property and Surrounding Area

The West District Property is located along the north side of MD Rt. 216 near the intersection of MD Rt. 216 and Lime Kiln Road. As indicated above, the West District Property

was designated as the Old Farm District on the Original PDP. It is situated directly south of the existing Maple Lawn Garden District and directly west of the approximately 99 acre school campus property owned by the Howard County Board of Education. The school campus houses Fulton Elementary, Lime Kiln Middle, and Reservoir High. Access to these schools is from MD Rt. 216.

The West District Property is mostly open and presently under agricultural use. The West District Property includes the Maple Lawn Farmstead area, which has long been a recognizable feature of the site. The Second Amended PDP is structured to respect the character of this portion of the property through land use transitions, open space placement, and site planning that directs additional density away from the Farmstead area. The existing pond and surrounding open space will be retained as an amenity and visual focal point as development proceeds through subsequent plan stages.

The West District Property has frontage on MD Rt. 216. Primary access to the West District Property is proposed at the intersection of MD Rt. 216 and Lime Kiln Road, with that intersection and the MD Rt. 216 and Murphy Road intersection being redesigned as a roundabout, subject to SHA approval. Additional access is proposed north of the West District Property via a connection to an existing road within the Maple Lawn Garden District. These access improvements were evaluated as part of the Traffic Impact Analysis and are intended to support safe and efficient circulation consistent with anticipated development. The Petitioner recognizes that circulation and connectivity are key community considerations and will continue to consider stakeholder feedback as the access design advances through future approvals.

The Boundary Map provided on Sheet 3 of the accompanying Second Amended PDP shows the outlines of the West District Property, the existing road network, and the surrounding

neighborhoods and land uses. The Physical Inventory Map provided on Sheet 4 of the accompanying Second Amended PDP shows the environmental features and other physical characteristics of the West District Property.

The Apartment Property is located on the north side of MD Rt. 216 off of Buch Way near the intersection of MD Rt. 216 and Maple Lawn Boulevard. A portion of the Apartment Property was designated for Employment as part of the Maple Lawn Business District in the Original PDP, and the remaining portion is proposed to be incorporated into the existing MXD District. It is situated at the southernmost point of the existing Maple Lawn Business District. The Apartment Property is currently being used as a portion of the parking lot serving the Maple Lawn Business District and associated commercial uses.

Both portions of the Apartment Property are already disturbed and can be readily developed as infill within the existing Business District. The Apartment Property has frontage on Buch Way. Primary access to the Apartment Property is proposed at Buch Way, and additional access is proposed at Maple Lawn Boulevard by way of East Market Place. There will also be supplemental access from another road off of Maple Lawn Boulevard near the intersection of Maple Lawn Boulevard and Market Street. This access configuration integrates the Apartment Property into the existing street network and supports walkability, connectivity, and activity within the Business District.

The Boundary Map provided on Sheet 3 of the accompanying Second Amended PDP shows the outlines of the West District Property and Apartment Property, the existing road network, and the surrounding neighborhoods and land uses. The Physical Inventory Map provided on Sheet 4 of the accompanying Second Amended PDP shows the environmental features and other physical characteristics of the West District Property and Apartment Property.

III. Community Participation

As required by Section 127.0.D.2 of the Howard County Zoning Regulations, the Petitioner made a good faith effort to identify community associations and homeowners' associations representing the neighborhoods adjoining the Maple Lawn development. The Petitioner obtained a list of such associations from the Howard County Department of Planning and Zoning ("DPZ") and provided notice to the presidents of those associations by certified mail and regular mail using the most recent available addresses. Notice was also provided to adjacent property owners, as well as to other community associations, homeowners' associations, and interested persons identified by the DPZ. A copy of the notice is attached hereto.

The required Pre-Submission Community Meeting was held on January 9, 2026, in accordance with the applicable Pre-Submission Community Meeting Guidelines issued by the DPZ. The minutes from the Pre-Submission Community Meeting are attached hereto.

The Petitioner views the required community input meeting as a foundational element of the public engagement process, but not as a cap on meaningful community participation. Recognizing the importance of capturing a broad range of community perspectives and the value of early and ongoing dialogue, the Petitioner undertook additional outreach efforts beyond the minimum requirements established by the Zoning Regulations.

These additional engagement efforts included meetings with leadership of local homeowners' associations, direct discussions with residents and stakeholders who reached out with questions or concerns, and meetings with local school principals to discuss enrollment trends, operational considerations, and the relationship between the proposed development and nearby school facilities. The Petitioner also engaged with stakeholders regarding traffic circulation,

placement of residential density, preservation of community features, and the integration of residential and business uses within Maple Lawn.

Feedback received through this broader engagement process directly informed refinements to the Second Amended PDP. In response to concerns raised during earlier discussions, including those expressed in 2021, the plan was refined to better align residential density with infrastructure capacity and established activity centers. Additional refinements included integrating the proposed apartment development to support Business District vibrancy and placemaking, as well as the express retention of longstanding community features such as the existing pond.

Through this approach, the Petitioner sought not only to satisfy procedural requirements, but to engage in a substantive and iterative dialogue with the community. Further, the Petitioner recognizes that additional community engagement will be both required and warranted as the development process continues beyond this Petition, including during subsequent plan review and approval stages. The Petitioner intends to continue engaging with community members and stakeholders as the details of future development phases are refined, consistent with County requirements and best practices for collaborative planning.

IV. Response to Community Input

During earlier discussions regarding potential amendments to the Maple Lawn Preliminary Development Plan, including those that occurred in 2021, community members and stakeholders raised a range of concerns related to the location and distribution of residential density, the relationship between residential and business uses, traffic circulation, preservation of established community features, and overall integration within the Maple Lawn framework.

The Second Amended PDP reflects careful consideration of these concerns and incorporates substantive refinements that respond directly to the feedback received. In particular,

residential density was reevaluated and strategically redistributed. Additional density was directed away from areas of greatest concern, including the Old Farm area, and concentrated within the Business District, where existing infrastructure, services, and activity centers are already established.

The inclusion of a multifamily apartment building within the Business District responds to stakeholder feedback emphasizing the importance of concentrating higher-intensity residential uses in locations that support walkability, reduce impacts on established neighborhoods, and contribute to the vitality of mixed-use areas. By integrating residential uses with existing commercial and employment activity, the Second Amended PDP advances placemaking objectives and reinforces Maple Lawn as a cohesive and vibrant mixed-use community.

Concerns regarding environmental features and community character were also considered. The Second Amended PDP expressly retains longstanding community features, including the existing pond on the West District Property, which will remain as an amenity and visual focal point. The proposed apartment development is located primarily on land that is already paved and currently used as surface parking, reflecting an infill development approach that minimizes environmental impacts and avoids disturbance to open space.

Traffic and infrastructure considerations raised during earlier discussions were evaluated through a Traffic Impact Analysis and coordinated with the overall development plan. Access locations, circulation patterns, and roadway improvements were refined to support safe and efficient movement while aligning with anticipated development and existing conditions.

Through these refinements, the Second Amended PDP represents an evolution of the Maple Lawn plan that reflects community input, advances adopted County policy, and balances local concerns with the County's broader housing and land use objectives. The Petitioner believes the

current proposal responds thoughtfully to prior feedback and provides a more integrated, context-sensitive framework for completing Maple Lawn.

V. Submission Requirements

Pursuant to the Howard County Zoning Regulations, a petition for amendment of a Preliminary Development Plan must be accompanied by the materials set forth below.

8. Petition for Amendment of a Preliminary Development Plan

A petition for amendment of a Preliminary Development Plan must be accompanied by the following:

a. Approved Preliminary Development Plan and Preliminary Development Criteria

The approved Preliminary Development Plan and Preliminary Development Criteria for the Mixed Use Development, with any proposed changes clearly indicated

The approved Preliminary Development Plan, with the proposed changes clearly indicated, is shown on Sheet 6 of the attached Second Amended PDP. The approved Preliminary Development Plan Criteria, with the proposed changes clearly indicated in redline format, is shown on Exhibit 2 attached hereto.

A summary of the proposed changes is provided below:

1. Addition of single-family detached dwelling units

The addition of up to 221 SFD dwelling units to be constructed on the West District Property. The West District Property was previously designated as the Old Farm District under the Original PDP and approved for 32 SFD dwelling units.

2. Addition of multifamily apartment dwelling units

The addition of up to 260 multifamily apartment dwelling units to be constructed on the Apartment Property, which consists of the southeast portion of the Business District Property and two adjacent parcels totaling approximately 6.2 acres. A portion of the Apartment Property was

previously designated for Employment under the Original PDP, with the remainder of the Apartment Property being comprised of the adjacent parcels.

3. Change in land use designation for the Apartment Property

A change in the land use designation for the Apartment Property from Employment to Other Residential, as reflected on the Second Amended PDP.

4. Increase the permitted residential density

An increase in the permitted overall residential density from 2.2 dwelling units per gross acre to 3.0 dwelling units per gross acre, consistent with the MXD-3 zoning framework.

Land Uses & Permitted Density

| Second Amended PDP | | | | |
|--|-------|---------|-------|-------------|
| Land Use | Acres | % total | Units | Square Feet |
| Single Family Detached | 194.7 | 32.0 | 759 | |
| Other Residential | 77.7 | 12.8 | 1,062 | |
| Employment | 122.0 | 20.1 | | 1,860,012 |
| Open Space | 213.1 | 35.1 | | |
| Totals | 607.5 | 100% | 1,821 | 1,860,012 |
| Permitted Density – 3.0 dwelling units per gross acre | | | | |

| Approved PDP (ZB 1039M) | | | | |
|--|-------|---------|-------|-------------|
| Land Use | Acres | % total | Units | Square Feet |
| Single Family Detached | 207.2 | 34.2 | 507 | |
| Other Residential | 64.2 | 10.6 | 833 | |
| Employment | 122.0 | 20.2 | | 1,860,012 |
| Open Space | 211.9 | 35.0 | | |
| Totals | 605.3 | 100% | 1,340 | |
| Permitted Density – 2.2 dwelling units per gross acre | | | | |

b. Statement Setting Forth the Reasons for the Proposed Amendments

As described above, the Petitioner seeks approval of this Second Amended Preliminary Development Plan to allow for (1) the completion of the final planned phase of Maple Lawn,

known as the Maple Lawn West District, and (2) the construction of a multifamily apartment building, including designated MIHUs, within the Business District and an immediately adjacent two-acre property.

Maple Lawn is a mixed-use development located within the MXD-3 Zoning District. The Mixed Use Development zoning districts were established to permit flexible and efficient use of large parcels at key locations by combining housing, employment, local commercial, and open space uses in accordance with a unified design. Howard County Zoning Regulations Section 127.0.A. With respect to residential development, the MXD districts are intended to include a diversity of housing types at medium to high densities. *Id.* To achieve this purpose, the MXD-3 Zoning District permits a maximum residential density of 3.0 dwelling units per gross acre. Howard County Zoning Regulations Section 127.0.C.

Maple Lawn is also located within Howard County's Planned Service Area for public water and sewer. Under *HoCo By Design*, the Planned Service Area serves as the County's designated growth boundary and Priority Funding Area pursuant to the State's Smart Growth Act. *HoCo By Design* at 22. Development within Priority Funding Areas is subject to a State-mandated minimum residential density of 2.0 dwelling units per gross acre. Md. Code Ann., State Fin. & Proc. § 5-7B-03(d)(1)(i)(1).

Since approval of the First Amended PDP, Howard County adopted *HoCo By Design*, which identifies Maple Lawn as a Tier 1 area for growth and as an area to be strengthened and enhanced. *HoCo By Design* at 22–24, 29. *HoCo By Design* recognizes that only a limited amount of land in Howard County remains undeveloped or unpreserved, and that opportunities for growth in new locations are constrained. *Id.* at 162. As a result, *HoCo By Design* envisions that a significant share of future housing growth will occur within compact, walkable mixed-use activity

centers that include employment opportunities, commercial uses, community services, amenities, open space, and multimodal transportation connections. *Id.* at 140.

Howard County, like much of the region, is experiencing an ongoing shortage of housing across a range of price points and housing types. *HoCo By Design* emphasizes addressing this need by directing additional housing to locations already served by public infrastructure, schools, transportation networks, and community amenities. In this context, the proposed amendments represent an appropriate and efficient use of land within an established mixed-use community.

Despite its location within the MXD-3 Zoning District, the Planned Service Area, and a designated growth and revitalization area, Maple Lawn is currently approved for a residential density of only 2.2 dwelling units per gross acre. While this density exceeds the State-mandated minimum, it does not fully realize the development potential contemplated for mixed-use activity centers under the County's zoning framework and adopted in *HoCo By Design*.

This limited residential density constrains Maple Lawn's ability to achieve its full potential as a complete, inclusive, and vibrant mixed-use community. In particular, under the currently approved plan, the approximately 109-acre West District Property is limited to only 32 SFD dwelling units. Applying such a low-intensity use to a large parcel located within the Planned Service Area, adjacent to public schools, and proximate to commercial uses and major transportation corridors does not reflect an efficient or policy-aligned use of land or public infrastructure, and is contrary to Howard County's own policy goals.

The Second Amended PDP allows for a more efficient and policy-aligned use of both the West District Property and the Apartment Property. The proposed residential program introduces a broader range of housing types and income opportunities that further the original vision for Maple Lawn, align with the intent of the MXD-3 Zoning District, and advance *HoCo By Design*

and State Smart Growth objectives. The proposed residential density of up to 3.0 dwelling units per gross acre allows for the addition of up to 221 SFD dwelling units on the West District Property and up to 260 multifamily apartment dwelling units on the Apartment Property, including a voluntary commitment that 15 percent of the apartment units will be designated as MIHUs.

The Apartment Property is currently used primarily as surface parking serving the Business District and is significantly underutilized. Redevelopment of this previously disturbed site for residential use supports an infill development pattern and strengthens the Business District as a walkable, active center.

The proposed infill residential use reflects evolving land use and economic conditions since approval of the First Amended PDP. Across the region, office and commercial development patterns have shifted toward greater flexibility and reduced demand for standalone commercial square footage, while demand for housing, particularly rental and workforce housing, has continued to grow. Introducing residential units within the Business District supports existing businesses, increases activity throughout the day, and reinforces Maple Lawn as a more complete and resilient mixed-use center consistent with *HoCo By Design's* emphasis on compact, walkable activity centers.

The Business District component of Maple Lawn was planned to accommodate a range of employment and commercial uses within a mixed-use framework. Since approval of the First Amended PDP, workplace patterns and office utilization have shifted toward greater flexibility and hybrid work environments, increasing the importance of complementary residential uses that support activity throughout the day. Incorporating residential development within the Business District responds to these conditions and reinforces the intent of the MXD-3 zoning district by

promoting a more resilient, active, and integrated mixed-use center while maintaining the Business District's role as an employment and commercial hub.

The variety of housing options proposed in this amendment responds to identified needs within Maple Lawn and the surrounding area. Maple Lawn currently does not include rental apartment units or MIHUs. The introduction of rental apartments within the Business District, including designated MIHUs, creates new points of entry into the community and advances income inclusivity in a manner consistent with County housing objectives. Rental housing is a critical component of the County's "all-of-the-above" housing strategy, helping address documented shortages across multiple income levels and life stages.

Finally, the Second Amended PDP allows the West District Property to be developed consistent with the overall design framework established for Maple Lawn. The proposed development will extend the existing neighborhood pattern, including pedestrian-scaled blocks, interconnected streets, varied housing types, and a unified design approach. Connections to the existing Maple Lawn Garden District, including via Federal Street, will further reinforce Maple Lawn as a cohesive and integrated mixed-use community.

c. Material Required by Item 7 Above for a New Preliminary Development Plan, if the Information is Altered by the Proposed Amendments

Pursuant to Item 7 above and Section 127.0.D.3 of the Howard County Zoning Regulations, the following materials are provided to the extent the information has been altered by the proposed amendments.

7. Materials Required for a New Preliminary Development Plan

a. Vicinity Map

A vicinity map showing the context of the Mixed Use Development, including off-site land uses, roads, parks, streams, and open space corridors

The vicinity map showing the context of the Mixed Use Development, including the Subject Property, is provided on the attached Second Amended PDP.

b. Existing Built and Environmental Features

The major existing built and environmental features of the site and its immediate environs, extending out at least 500 feet from the site boundaries

The major existing built and environmental features of the Subject Property and the surrounding area extending at least 500 feet from the site boundaries are shown on the Physical Inventory Map contained on Sheet 4 of the attached Second Amended PDP.

c. Major Planning Assumptions and Objectives

The major planning assumptions and objectives, including the projected number of households and jobs

The major planning assumptions and objectives established under the Original and First Amended PDP remain generally unchanged. The primary planning objective has been to create a unified mixed-use community, continuing with the Maple Lawn design principles, that allows for the efficient use of land within the Planned Service Area by combining a variety of housing types at medium to high densities with local employment opportunities, commercial uses, and open space, while remaining compatible with surrounding land uses and protective of natural features.

As discussed above, the proposed Second Amended PDP reinforces and builds upon these planning assumptions and objectives by permitting a more efficient use of the Subject Property and expanding the range of housing options within Maple Lawn. Under the proposed Second Amended PDP, the projected number of households will increase to 1,821 dwelling units.

The Second Amended PDP proposes only limited changes to the previously approved Employment land uses by repurposing a portion of an existing parking lot within the Business District for development of the Apartment Property, as well as changes to the adjacent two-acre parcel. The projected number of jobs provided under the First Amended PDP will not change.

d. Generalized Traffic Analysis

A generalized traffic analysis for the Mixed Use Development in relation to major road improvements proposed in HoCo By Design

The Traffic Impact Analysis prepared for the Second Amended PDP is attached hereto as Exhibit 3. In summary, the Traffic Impact Analysis concludes that the proposed development can be accommodated by the adjacent roadway network with the planned improvements.

e. Phasing Plan

A phasing plan for the Mixed Use Development

The Annual Phasing Plan for the Subject Property is attached hereto as Exhibit 4 and is summarized in the allocation chart below.

| Allocation Chart (Business District & Maple Lawn West) | | | | | |
|--|-------------|-----------|-----------|----------|--------------------------|
| Year | 2029 | 2030 | 2031 | 2032 | Total |
| Residential | 260 (Apts.) | 32 (SFD)* | 175 (SFD) | 46 (SFD) | 513 (253 SFD, 260 Apts.) |

*Previously approved SFD dwelling units per ZB-995M

f. Approximate Boundaries and Acreage of Land Use Areas

Approximate boundaries and acreage of proposed residential, employment, focal point and major open space land use areas and, if applicable, of existing land uses that will continue after PDP approval

The approximate boundaries and approximate acreage of the proposed and currently approved residential uses, and currently approved employment, focal point, and major open space land use areas, and of existing interim land uses which will continue after approval, are shown on the Boundary Map on Sheet 3 of the attached Second Amended PDP

g. General Location of Proposed Retail Centers

General location of proposed retail centers

This project does not propose any new retail centers. The currently approved and constructed retail centers will remain unchanged with the exception of the use of a portion of a parking lot in the Business District for the development of the Apartment Property, and are shown on the attached Second Amended PDP.

h. Transportation System and Access

General Location of proposed major roads, points of access to existing roads, and, if applicable, public transit facilities

The proposed circulation system, including the general location of major roads and existing and proposed points of access to the existing roads, and any existing or proposed public transit facilities are shown on the attached Second Amended PDP. The West District Property has two proposed access points. The main entrance into the community will be located in the form of a traffic circle on MD Rt. 216 near the intersection of Lime Kiln Road and MD Rt. 216. Internally, the West District Property is planned to connect to Federal Street, an existing road within the Maple Lawn Garden District. Federal street will extend across the Pepco r/w and connect to the West District Property. There will be a series of interconnected roads within the community that lead to the proposed central traffic circle as well as the main open space.

The Apartment Property has two primary proposed access points. The main access point will be at the end of Buch Way, which is accessed from the traffic circle on MD Rt. 216 on the west side of U.S. Route 29. Internally, the Apartment Property is planned to connect to Maple Lawn Boulevard by way of East Market Place. There will also be supplemental access from another road off of Maple Lawn Boulevard near the intersection of Maple Lawn Boulevard and Market Street.

A condition of the approval of the Original PDP was Petitioner's commitment to create a special transportation charge/assessment among Maple Lawn Farms properties in order to help fund a Transportation Demand Management Plan ("TDMP") for Maple Lawn. The proposed Second Amendment to the PDP for Maple Lawn reinforces the importance of the special transportation charge/assessment in Maple Lawn, which is currently 30 cents per commercial square foot and \$30 per household. The funds in the TDMP have accumulated and will continue

to accumulate. With the approval of the changes to the PDP for Maple Lawn as proposed, the TDMP will continue to be funded. The Petitioner has and will continue to work with the County in order to plan for the best use of these funds for executing the goals of the TDMP.

i. Public Facilities

Description of the Public Facilities that will serve the Mixed Use Development

The Mixed Use Development will continue to be served by the public facilities that existed at the time of approval of the First Amended PDP. The proposed development on the Subject Property will be required to pass all applicable Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance (APFO) tests at the revised Comprehensive Sketch Plan stage.

j. Major Public Facilities

General location of any proposed major public facilities for which land may be provided within the Mixed Use Development

The Petitioner does not propose any major public facilities on the Subject Property.

k. Preliminary Development Plan Criteria

Preliminary Development Plan Criteria that establish residential densities, maximum allowed Floor Area Ratio for employment areas, permitted uses within each land use area, and other proposed requirements

The Preliminary Development Plan Criteria is attached hereto as Exhibit 2. Changes from the First Amended PDP criteria are indicated in red.

l. Ownership and Maintenance of Open Space

Proposed ownership and responsibility for maintenance of open space areas

Ownership and responsibility for maintenance of open space areas on the West District Property will be governed by land covenants and enforced by the Maple Lawn West Homeowners Association, which will be recorded in connection with the development of the West District Property. Open Space areas that have not been dedicated to the public will be deeded to the homeowner's association, which will be responsible for their permanent maintenance.

m. Management Plan

If all parcels in the PDP are not owned by the same person, a management plan that identifies the parties responsible for implementing each phase of the PDP and a description of the legal agreements that will enforce the management plan

The Petitioner is the developer of the Subject Property and will be responsible for implementing each phase of the proposed development.

n. Community Notice

A copy of the notice sent to community associations and homeowners associations representing neighborhoods adjoining the PDP and a listing of the associations contacted

A copy of the notice of the virtual pre-submission community meeting that was sent to community associations and homeowners associations representing neighborhoods adjoining the Subject Property and sent to adjacent property owners is attached hereto as Exhibit 6.

o. Community Meeting Report

A report on meetings held by the petitioner with community associations or homeowners associations for the surrounding neighborhoods

The report on meetings held by the Petitioner with the current Maple Lawn Homeowners Association is attached hereto as Exhibit 7.

**VI. Compliance with the Requirements for Mixed-Use Development
(Section 127.0.C of the Howard County Zoning Regulations)**

1. Planned Service Area

The Subject Property is located within the Planned Service Area and will be served by public water and sewer.

2. Minimum Acreage and Unified Control

a. The proposed Second Amended PDP encompasses 607.5 acres and more than 75 percent of the areas of all contiguous MXD-zoned parcels.

b. The Second Amended PDP includes the Petitioner's entire contiguous acreage.

3. Land Use Requirements

a. The land use areas on the Second Amended PDP meet or exceed the minimum requirements of Section 127.0.C, as summarized below:

| Land Use | Required Minimum % of Gross Area of Mixed Use Development | % of Gross Area Provided |
|-----------------|--|---------------------------------|
| Open Space | 35% | 35.1% |
| Residential | 20% | 44.8% |
| Employment | 15% | 20.1% |

b. Not applicable.

c. The primary focal point for Maple Lawn has been approved and constructed in the Midtown District, as shown on the attached Second Amended PDP. No changes to the existing focal point, and no additional focal points, are proposed.

d. The Phasing Plan establishing the timing and sequence of development of the Subject Property is attached hereto as Exhibit 4.

e. Recorded open space parcels will continue to constitute at least 35 percent of the total recorded land area within the Mixed Use Development. At least 10 percent of the gross open space acreage will be usable for active recreation facilities.

4. Permitted Uses

a. Uses of land will be limited to those permitted by the Second Amended PDP and Preliminary Development Plan Criteria, and any amendments thereto, and will comply with applicable zoning restrictions.

b. The proposed uses are drawn from the permitted list of uses stated in the attached Criteria. Conditional Uses allowed in any referenced zoning districts will also be included as accepted uses.

c. Not applicable.

d. Uses permitted only in the R-MH or M-2 District will not be permitted.

e. The Preliminary Development Criteria submitted for Conditional Uses will be in accordance with the procedures established in Section 127.0.G. The amended Comprehensive Sketch Plan will be in accordance with 127.0.E. (*See Criteria*).

5. Accessory Uses

- a. The accessory use provisions of Section 109 (the R-12 District) shall be applicable to all residential uses. (*See Criteria*).
- b. The accessory use provision of Section 115 (the POR District) and Section 122 (the M-1 District) shall be applicable to all employment uses. (*See Criteria*).

6. Residential Density and Affordable Housing

- a. The Second Amended PDP proposes a maximum residential density of 3.0 dwelling units per gross acre, consistent with the MXD-3 Zoning District.
- b. The Petitioner has previously satisfied applicable MIHU requirements for Maple Lawn. In addition, the Petitioner voluntarily commits that 15 percent of the multifamily apartment dwelling units proposed on the Apartment Property will be designated as MIHUs and constructed on site.
- c. The number of multifamily apartment dwelling units proposed in the Second Amended PDP does not exceed 30 percent of the total number of dwelling units within the Mixed Use Development.

7. Employment and Retail Floor Area

- a. The total square footage devoted to employment uses under the First Amended PDP will remain the same.
- b. Not applicable.
- c. No changes are proposed to the existing retail centers approved under the First Amended PDP.
- d. No changes are proposed to the existing retail centers approved under the First Amended PDP.
- e. No changes are proposed to the existing retail centers approved under the First Amended PDP.

8. Public Open Space Lots

Open space lots designated for public uses that require a building to accommodate the principal use will not constitute more than 30 percent of the gross acreage of open space within the MXD district.

9. Bulk Regulations

Requirements regarding setbacks, lot coverage, lot sizes, building heights, and other bulk regulations will be established by the Planning Board through approval of an amended Comprehensive Sketch Plan and Preliminary Development Plan Criteria, together with any requirements imposed by the Zoning Board.

10. Supplementary Regulations and Parking

The provisions of Section 128 (Supplementary Zoning District Regulations) and Section 133 (Off-Street Parking and Loading Facilities) shall apply unless modified through approval of the Comprehensive Sketch Plan and Preliminary Development Plan Criteria.

VII. Criteria for Approval of Second Amended Preliminary Development Plan (Section 127.0.D.7 of the Howard County Zoning Regulations)

The Second Amended Preliminary Development Plan and associated Criteria satisfy the approval criteria set forth in Section 127.0.D.7 of the Howard County Zoning Regulations. The plan is characterized by a unified and integrated design and advances the purposes of the MXD District as well as the County's adopted land use and housing policies. The Subject Property has previously been included within the Maple Lawn MXD District, and the compatibility determinations supporting approval of the Original and First Amended PDP remain applicable. The Second Amended PDP builds upon that established framework while responding to current policy direction articulated in *HoCo By Design*.

Landscaping, open space, buffering, roadway networks, perimeter lot sizes, building heights, land use transitions, and traditional neighborhood design elements are consistent with, and further refine, the previously approved plans.

A. Orderly Growth and Integration of Uses

The Second Amended PDP will foster orderly growth and the integration of residential, employment, and open space uses consistent with the purposes of the MXD District. The proposed

development advances the intent of the MXD-3 zoning classification by accommodating a broader mix of housing types at an appropriate density within an established mixed-use community.

Consistent with *HoCo By Design*, growth is directed to a Tier 1 area that is already served by public infrastructure, schools, employment centers, and major transportation corridors. The plan reinforces Maple Lawn's role as a compact, walkable, mixed-use activity center and supports the County's objective of directing new housing to locations that can efficiently absorb growth. The Phasing Plan attached as Exhibit 4 provides for orderly and coordinated development of the Subject Property.

B. Phasing and Transportation Improvements

The Mixed Use Development will be phased to align with transportation capacity and roadway improvements needed to serve the proposed development. As documented in the Traffic Impact Analysis attached as Exhibit 3, the proposed development can be accommodated by the adjacent roadway network with planned improvements. Internal streets will be constructed in coordination with development phases, ensuring appropriate access and circulation.

In accordance with County requirements, the development will also be subject to Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance review at the amended Comprehensive Sketch Plan stage, ensuring that transportation impacts remain acceptable as development proceeds.

C. Focal Point and Staging Plan

The Maple Lawn focal point has already been approved and constructed in the Midtown District, as shown on the attached Second Amended PDP. No changes to the existing focal point are proposed. Accordingly, this criterion continues to be satisfied.

D. Environmental Policies and Requirements

The Second Amended PDP is consistent with applicable environmental policies and requirements. Environmentally sensitive features on the West District Property are preserved within designated open space, with appropriate buffers provided, as shown on Sheet 4 of the attached Second Amended PDP. There are no environmentally sensitive features located on the Apartment Property. This approach aligns with County policy emphasizing environmental stewardship while directing growth to appropriate locations.

E. Consistency with Section 127.0.C of the Howard County Zoning Regulations

The minimum area, proportions of uses, and the proposed density and intensity of development are consistent with the requirements of Section 127.0.C of the Zoning Regulations. The Second Amended PDP maintains required open space and employment thresholds while accommodating residential density consistent with the MXD-3 District and adopted County policy.

F. Appropriate Proportions of Uses

The relative proportions of residential, employment, and open space uses are appropriate to the area surrounding the MXD District. Open space along the southern portion of the West District Property adjacent to MD Route 216 provides buffering from the roadway and neighboring land uses. Larger SFD dwellings are located along the perimeter adjacent to RR-DEO zoned land, with smaller dwellings located internally, creating a graduated transition in intensity.

The proposed multifamily apartment building is located within the southeastern portion of the Business District adjacent to MD Route 216, where higher-intensity residential development is appropriate and consistent with the mixed-use character of the area. This distribution of uses reflects *HoCo By Design's* emphasis on concentrating higher-density housing in established activity centers.

G. Focal Point Requirement

A focal point is required only for the first Preliminary Development Plan within an MXD District. As the Maple Lawn focal point has already been approved and constructed, no additional focal points are required or proposed.

H. Retail Centers

The location of land designated for retail centers remains appropriate for retail and personal service uses serving the local community. No new retail centers are proposed, and existing approved retail uses will remain unchanged.

I. Mix of Housing Types

The Second Amended PDP provides a broader mix of housing types, including additional SFD dwellings and multifamily rental apartments. The proposal includes up to 221 additional SFD dwelling units and a 260-unit apartment building. Fifteen percent of the apartment units will be designated as MIHUs and constructed on site, advancing the County's housing affordability and inclusivity objectives as articulated in *HoCo By Design*.

J. Public Transit Integration

Existing public transit facilities within Maple Lawn will remain undisturbed. Where feasible, public transit routes and facilities will continue to be integrated into the development of the Subject Property, consistent with County policy encouraging multimodal transportation options within mixed-use communities.

K. Appropriate Intensity and Scale

The intensity and scale of development are appropriate in relation to environmental constraints and the character of existing and planned development in the vicinity. Open space

preservation, buffering, and graduated transitions in residential intensity ensure compatibility with adjacent land uses while allowing efficient use of land within the Planned Service Area.

L. Compatibility with Surrounding Uses

The proposed development will be compatible with existing and planned surrounding land uses. Lower-density residential development is located along the perimeter adjacent to existing lower-density zoning, while higher-density residential development is concentrated within the Business District. Open space buffers further reinforce compatibility.

M. Open Space Network

The proposed open space network connects, where feasible, to existing and planned open space systems and protects environmentally sensitive features. Open space areas within the West District Property will also support community parks and recreational opportunities, contributing to quality of life and placemaking objectives.

N. Proximity of Housing and Jobs

The proposed development provides housing within pedestrian access of employment opportunities. The additional residential units will be located within walking distance of approximately 1.86 million square feet of approved employment uses within Maple Lawn, reinforcing the integrated live-work environment envisioned by the MXD District and *HoCo By Design*.

VIII. Conclusion

The Second Amended Preliminary Development Plan represents a coordinated and measured evolution of Maple Lawn that is consistent with the Howard County Zoning Regulations, advances the purposes of the MXD-3 Zoning District, and aligns with *HoCo By Design*. The proposed amendments allow for a more efficient and policy-aligned use of land within the Planned Service Area while maintaining the unified design framework that has guided Maple Lawn since its inception.

The Second Amended PDP addresses identified housing needs by expanding the range of housing types and income opportunities within an established mixed-use community, including the voluntary provision of MIHUs. Residential density is directed to appropriate locations that are already served by public infrastructure, employment, schools, and transportation, reinforcing Maple Lawn's role as a compact, walkable activity center envisioned by *HoCo By Design*.



Throughout the amendment process, the Petitioner engaged in meaningful dialogue with community members, stakeholders, and County agencies and incorporated feedback into the refinement of the plan. The resulting proposal reflects a collaborative approach to growth, responds to concerns raised during earlier discussions, and strengthens the integration of residential, employment, open space, and commercial uses through a cohesive design approach.

For the reasons set forth in this Petition, the Second Amended Preliminary Development Plan satisfies the applicable approval criteria and represents a balanced and forward-looking framework for completing Maple Lawn. Accordingly, the Petitioner respectfully requests approval of the Second Amended Preliminary Development Plan and associated Criteria.

* The Petitioner reserves the right to provide additional evidence at the hearing on this matter addressing the approval criteria. The Petitioner also reserves the right to withdraw and/or dismiss this Second Petition to Amend the PDP and Criteria at any time, and to proceed with the approved First Amended PDP and Criteria, if the Decision of the Zoning Board changes or imposes conditions upon any portion of the Second Amended PDP and Criteria requested herein.


Exhibit 1

EXCERPTS OF DECISION & ORDER



MAPLE LAWN FARMS
BYWARD COMPANY, LLC
12000 HUNTER ROAD
ZONING MAPS 17 & 18
SHEET 18 OF 18

- 1. ALL INFORMATION HAS BEEN OBTAINED FROM SOURCE AND IS BELIEVED TO BE TRUE AND CORRECT.
- 2. THE INFORMATION HAS BEEN OBTAINED FROM SOURCE AND IS BELIEVED TO BE TRUE AND CORRECT.
- 3. THE LOCATION OF ALL UTILITIES IS BASED ON RECORDS AND FIELD SURVEY.
- 4. ALL DISTRICTS ARE BASED ON RECORDS AND FIELD SURVEY.
- 5. ALL DISTRICTS ARE BASED ON RECORDS AND FIELD SURVEY.
- 6. ALL DISTRICTS ARE BASED ON RECORDS AND FIELD SURVEY.
- 7. ALL DISTRICTS ARE BASED ON RECORDS AND FIELD SURVEY.
- 8. ALL DISTRICTS ARE BASED ON RECORDS AND FIELD SURVEY.
- 9. ALL DISTRICTS ARE BASED ON RECORDS AND FIELD SURVEY.
- 10. ALL DISTRICTS ARE BASED ON RECORDS AND FIELD SURVEY.



| LAND USE | ACRES | % TOTAL | SQ. FT. |
|---------------------|-------------|--------------|-------------------|
| OPEN SPACE | 18.1 | 28.0 | 791,000 |
| ENTIRELY OPEN SPACE | 6.5 | 10.1 | 1,760,000 |
| OTHER RECREATIONAL | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| EMPLOYMENT | 20.0 | 31.0 | 5,600,000 |
| RETAIL CENTER | 20.0 | 31.0 | 5,600,000 |
| FOCAL POINT | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 64.1 | 100.0 | 12,751,000 |

SCALE: 1" = 100'


SCALE: 1" = 100'

SCALE: 1" = 100'


GLW

GENERALIZED PLAN OF DEVELOPMENT
(FOR ENTIRE MXD DISTRICT)

DATE: 10/15/10
BY: [Name]
CHECKED BY: [Name]
DATE: 10/15/10



VICINITY MAP
SCALE 1" = 1/4" MILE



MAPLE LAWN FARMS
 BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENTS
 1100 WEST 10TH STREET
 SUITE 100
 DENVER, CO 80202
 BOARD CASE NO. 19-0001

MAPLE LAWN FARMS
 BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENTS
 1100 WEST 10TH STREET
 SUITE 100
 DENVER, CO 80202
 BOARD CASE NO. 19-0001

CHANGES FROM FDP (ZB 1039M) APPROVAL


1. GENERAL NOTES: THE INFORMATION CONTAINED HEREIN IS FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES ONLY AND DOES NOT CONSTITUTE A CONTRACT.
2. ALL DISTRICTS ARE SUBJECT TO THE ZONING ORDINANCES OF THE CITY OF DENVER.
3. THE ZONING DISTRICTS SHOWN ON THIS MAP ARE SUBJECT TO THE ZONING ORDINANCES OF THE CITY OF DENVER.
4. ALL DISTRICTS ARE SUBJECT TO THE ZONING ORDINANCES OF THE CITY OF DENVER.
5. ALL DISTRICTS ARE SUBJECT TO THE ZONING ORDINANCES OF THE CITY OF DENVER.
6. ALL DISTRICTS ARE SUBJECT TO THE ZONING ORDINANCES OF THE CITY OF DENVER.
7. ALL DISTRICTS ARE SUBJECT TO THE ZONING ORDINANCES OF THE CITY OF DENVER.
8. ALL DISTRICTS ARE SUBJECT TO THE ZONING ORDINANCES OF THE CITY OF DENVER.
9. ALL DISTRICTS ARE SUBJECT TO THE ZONING ORDINANCES OF THE CITY OF DENVER.
10. ALL DISTRICTS ARE SUBJECT TO THE ZONING ORDINANCES OF THE CITY OF DENVER.

LEGEND

- CONCRETE PAVEMENT
- ASPHALT PAVEMENT
- PROPERTY BOUNDARY
- PROPERTY CORNER
- UTILITY POLE
- UTILITY TOWER
- OPEN SPACE
- ONLY PARTLY DEVELOPED
- OTHER RESIDENTIAL
- EMPLOYMENT
- RETAIL CENTER
- LOCAL PARK
- SCHOOL
- CHANGING ZONING DISTRICT

| LAND USE | APPROX. ACRES | APPROX. TOTAL SQ. FT. |
|-------------|---------------|-----------------------|
| RESIDENTIAL | 14.1 | 750,000 |
| COMMERCIAL | 1.7 | 120,000 |
| EMPLOYMENT | 2.0 | 1,400,000 |
| OPEN SPACE | 1.0 | 70,000 |
| OTHER | 1.2 | 84,000 |
| TOTAL | 20.0 | 1,400,000 |

THE INFORMATION CONTAINED HEREIN IS FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES ONLY AND DOES NOT CONSTITUTE A CONTRACT. THE ZONING DISTRICTS SHOWN ON THIS MAP ARE SUBJECT TO THE ZONING ORDINANCES OF THE CITY OF DENVER.



1100 WEST 10TH STREET, SUITE 100, DENVER, CO 80202
 (303) 733-1000
 WWW.GLEAFWORKS.COM

Exhibit 2

Second Amended Preliminary Development Plan Criteria

INTRODUCTION & CONDITIONS OF PDP APPROVAL

Introduction to Development Criteria

As established through the original approvals of Maple Lawn by the Howard County Zoning Board, Maple Lawn was approved as a mixed-use community incorporating principles of Traditional Neighborhood Development (TND). Those approvals created the framework for a unified development that integrates residential neighborhoods, employment uses, commercial activity centers, and open space within a coordinated plan.

Maple Lawn is an established Mixed Use Development located within the RR-MXD-3 Zoning District and is governed by the Mixed Use Development provisions of Section 127.0 of the Howard County Zoning Regulations. The development is organized into distinct districts, including Hillside, Midtown West, Garden, Maple Lawn West, Midtown, Westside, and the Business District, each contributing to the overall mixed-use character of the community.

The design of Maple Lawn emphasizes walkability, connectivity, a range of housing types, and the integration of residential and employment activity in a manner consistent with the purposes of the MXD District and the County's adopted General Plan, *HoCo By Design*. The community has been planned to support cohesive placemaking, pedestrian-oriented streetscapes, and a coordinated public realm, while allowing flexibility over time as development proceeds through subsequent plan approvals.

Because mixed-use development requires coordinated implementation over multiple phases, these Development Criteria establish a planning framework that will guide the continued completion of Maple Lawn in accordance with the approved Preliminary Development Plan, applicable zoning requirements, and County policy objectives. The Howard County Department of Planning and Zoning (DPZ) will review all future plans for the project for conformance with county regulations & standards, and with these criteria. In addition, the Maple Lawn Farms Design Review Committee (DRC) will review all future plans for conformance with these criteria, the covenants for the project, and any further standards required by the DRC for the successful implementation of the TND concept.

This Committee shall consist of design professionals and staff appointed by the Developer or other entity as set forth in other recorded documents until such time as responsibility for review and approval is turned over to a Master or Homeowners Association.

The conditions placed on the approval of Maple Lawn Farms by the Zoning Board are listed in two sections, the first being the original PDP (ZB995M), and the second the amended PDP (ZB1039M). In some cases, the conditions of the amended plan supersede those of the original plan.

Conditions of Original PDP Approval (ZB995M)

- a. That the number of residential dwelling units approved with this PDP approval shall be 1,116 dwelling units, 485 of which shall be Single Family Detached Units, 395 of which shall be Single Family Attached Units, and 236 of which shall be Apartment Units;
- b. That the Petitioners shall comply with the phasing and staging requirements of this decision and the Revised Phasing and Staging Plan submitted to the Board on September 25, 2000, including Notes 1 and 2 on such Plan;
- c. That the residential lots to be located along the western edge of the project where it borders the Flamewood development shall each be at least 20,000 square feet in area as shown on Petitioner's Exhibit 4, and lots abutting existing residential communities shall have a minimum lot size of 20,000 square feet and shall have minimum lot widths of 120 feet, except for corner lots or pie-shaped lots whose rear widths shall exceed 120 feet adjacent to all existing residential neighborhood lots;
- d. That the project shall be developed according to the Traditional Neighborhood Design as

- proffered by Petitioners;
- e. That the Petitioners shall implement the Traffic Demand Management Plan as outlined in Petitioners' Exhibit 55;
 - f. That the Petitioners shall be required to plant over 20,000 trees as part of its compliance with its overall landscaping and forest conservation requirements as proffered in its petition and testimony before the Board, and will provide the 50 feet open space buffer with the landscaping, planting of trees and berming as proffered in the petition, testimony before the Board and/or in Petitioners; Exhibit 114C;
 - g. That the Petitioners shall provide sheltered bus stops in the Focal Point and the Business District that can be utilized by public transit providers;
 - h. That the Petitioners shall comply with the State's new storm water management techniques;
 - i. That the Petitioners shall provide 50 regular Moderate Income Housing Units and 50 Moderate Income Housing Units for Senior Citizens, and all 100 of these MIHUs shall be exempt from annual phasing/allocation requirements per Note 1 of the Revised Phasing and Staging Plan;
 - j. That the unused allocations as provided in the Revised Phasing and Staging Plan may be used in later years;
 - k. That the Petitioners will cooperate with the County and affected property owners in the location of Maple Lawn Boulevard through the project;
 - l. That the Petitioners shall establish the Landscape Design Standards, Architectural Standards, and Community Standards as proffered in the petition and testimony before the Board, implemented by covenants and the code book to be enforced by the Master Association;
 - m. That Employment uses permitted only in the M-1 Zoning District shall not be permitted in the project, but POR and B-1 uses shall be permitted in the project per Petitioners' Exhibit 78;
 - n. That Petitioners would not propose development of the Price and Wessel properties at a residential density greater than 2.3 dwelling units per acre if they ever filed a petition for approval of an MXD PDP for those properties;
 - o. That there will be no strip shopping center permitted in the project;
 - p. That there will be a maximum of one gasoline service station/car wash permitted in the project;
 - q. That there will be no stand-alone commercial communication towers permitted in the project;
 - r. That the homeowners in the Flamewood, Mooresfield, Hopkins Meade, and greater Beaufort Park developments shall be allowed to join the project's homeowners' association recreational facilities under precisely the same terms as the project's residents, except that the developer or the homeowners' association could require that a membership be sold back upon the sale of an off-site home to a new owner if there was not enough capacity to satisfy project residents;
 - s. That the Petitioners shall make no road connection, including access points at Johns Hopkins Road or MD 216 unless mandated by the County or State;
 - t. That the Petitioners shall design the Focal Point in a format similar to the town square concept in Kentlands, which would include retail, employment uses and amenities, as proffered in the petition and testimony before the Board, and in connection with which the Petitioners shall provide space for a storefront library, swimming facilities, tennis courts, multi-purpose courts, picnic facilities, tot lots, and/or other civic structures;
 - u. That the Petitioners shall develop the houses and commercial buildings in the various areas of the project, in terms of houses or buildings facing the street, setbacks of houses from roads, height requirements, as proffered in the petition and testimony before the Board, as summarized in finding 2; and
 - v. That the Petitioners shall front end the proffered intersection improvements at US 29 and Johns Hopkins Road, if necessary, should the interchange not be constructed when needed pursuant to the CSP process.

CONDITIONS OF AMENDED PDP APPROVAL (ZB1039M)

FINDINGS OF FACT

3. Petitioners have withdrawn almost all the parts of the petition relating to the proposed land use changes and density changes to the Original PDP Map including 242 additional age-restricted dwelling units to the Old Farm District and the additional 26 dwelling units in the Hillside District

and 26 units in the Midtown District. The only part of this petition requesting approval of the amended PDP Map that relates to the approval in the Original PDP Map is for about an acre of land of existing Employment area in the Business District that is proposed to for re- designation to Other Residential to connect to a proposed Other Residential development on the Wessel property. It will also be necessary for portions of the Hillside District to be re-designated from Other Residential to SFD if Petitioners convert any of the Apartment/Condo units to SFD units in the Hillside District.

4. Petitioners' petition, in addition to the minor changes referred to in Finding of Fact 3 above, as it existed at the close of the record in this case:
 - a. Proposed PDP Map approval to add a new parcel to the existing Maple Lawn MXD PDP with land use designations for the 94.2 acre New Area I or the Wessel property (Parcel 116); and
 - b. Proposed PDP Map approval to add a new parcel to the existing Maple Lawn MXD PDP with land use designations for the 3.2 acre New Area II or the Oliver property (Parcel 122); and
 - c. Proposed changes to the existing text of the Criteria as shown on the attachment to the Department of Planning and Zoning's May 4,2005 Addendum to the Technical Staff Report (with existing PDP text Criteria in non-bold type and proposed changes to the PDP text Criteria in bold typeface); and
 - d. Proposed requirement that the Petitioners pay for and convey to the Howard County Housing Commission a site to accommodate 100 MIHUs in lieu of the proffered requirement from ZB Case 995M to provide 100 MIHU dwelling units on-site (50 of which would be for seniors). Approval of this substituted requirement as to provision of land to accommodate off-site MIHUs would render unnecessary Petitioners' request that the Board clarify that the proffered requirement in ZB 995M relating to on-site senior units would be age-targeted units only rather than for mandated age-restricted units;
 - e. Proposed to revise the unit mix for the Hillside District to change the land use designation as necessary to accommodate either single-family attached or detached units¹; and
 - f. Proposed that the Petitioners' residential phasing chart be adjusted to reflect the combination of the withdrawal of the above-mentioned portions of Petitioners' amended PDP petition and an approval of the new proffer as to the MIHUs, which would return the 100 MIHUs to market rate units. In ZB Case 995M, the 100 MIHUs were exempted from the phasing chart. As market rate units, these units will have to be accounted for on the amended phasing chart. The details of the amendments to the phasing will be addressed later in this decision; and
 - g. Proposed that no new petition for the withdrawn portions of the petition shall be filed for two years from the date of this decision.
5. The proposal for the two new sites to be added to the Maple Lawn MXD PDP is summarized as follows:

New Area I (Wessel property). This property is located on the north side of MD 216 and is located west of the Business District on the Original Maple Lawn PDP.

 - a. Residential - 224 residential dwelling units are proposed on 94.2 acres at a 2.3 du/acre density. The residential land use area is located in the central/eastern part of the property and connects with the new small area of residential townhouse land use area in the Business District. All of the 224 residential units proposed are single-family attached (townhouse) units, 24 of which are Live/Work units, a type of townhouse unit. The

¹ The current land use designation for the residential portion of the Hillside District is Other Residential which would permit any residential use other than single-family detached, including townhouses. In order to allow the mix of units in the Hillside District to be changed from condominium/apartment uses to single-family detached units, the land use designation for part of the Hillside District would have to be changed to Single-Family Detached for any area developed as single-family detached; if the previously planned condo units are developed as townhouses, the current land use designation of Other Residential would permit development of that type of unit.

approximate acreage of the residential areas is 19 acres or a little less than a quarter of the 94.2 acre Wessel property; and

- b. Employment/Commercial - 29,220 SF of retail use and 655,332 SF of office use is proposed for a total of 684,552 sq. ft. of Employment. This new Employment land use area is a significant extension of the Business District to the east. It is located in the southern portion of the Wessel property and extends well to the northern part of the parcel in the western portion of the property. In addition, there is a smaller Employment land use area in the northeast corner of the Wessel property that connects with the existing Employment land use area of the Business District. The approximate acreage of the Employment use areas is 42 acres or a little less than half of the 94.2 acre Wessel property; and
- c. Open Space - The remaining acreage on the Wessel property, approximately 33 acres of the 94.2 acres, will be Open Space land use. This area is mainly in the northern portion of the Wessel property with a long finger that extends into the central portion of the parcel, and another narrower finger on the western edge of the parcel that connects with athletic fields on the school properties to the west of the Wessel Property.

New Area II (Oliver property). This 3.2 acre parcel is located in the northern area of the MXD zone, to the south of the existing Sanner Road intersection with Johns Hopkins Road.

- a. Employment/Commercial - Two-thirds of the Oliver property is proposed to be designated as Employment land use in the eastern portion of the parcel as an extension of the Employment area in the Midtown District on the Original PDP to the southeast. A portion of this area would be used for an extension of Maple Lawn Boulevard, so it can intersect with Johns Hopkins Road in alignment with the existing Sanner Road intersection.
 - b. Open Space - The remaining approximately one acre portion of the Oliver property to the west of Maple Lawn Boulevard is proposed for Open Space land use as an extension of the existing Open Space area on the Original PDP.
7. The residential phasing plan originally submitted with this petition proposed the phasing of an additional 518 dwelling units in years 2011-2016 in addition to the 1116 dwelling units already approved in the phasing plan through 2015 approved as part of the Original PDP². Because the Petitioner withdrew proposed approval of 294 of these additional 518 units, only 224 dwelling units need to be added to the existing phasing chart for 1,116 units. The Petitioners did not specify how its withdrawal of requested units should be accounted for in the residential phasing plan. The Board will therefore simply consider the phasing plan to be amended to propose an additional 189 units for years 2011-2013 (60 in 2011, 53 in 2012 and 76 in 2013 as proposed in the amended phasing plan) with the remaining 35 units proposed for addition in 2014. The remaining 61 additional units in 2014, 113 additional units for 2015 and 120 additional units for 2016 are removed from the residential phasing chart. Therefore, the Board is making a decision on Petitioners' proposed Residential Phasing Chart as shown on Exhibit C to the petition with the subtracted 294 units as noted above. The Petitioners' employment phasing plan is considered by the Board as shown on Exhibit C to the petition.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

3. The Board, based on the above-described satisfaction of the several criteria for approval, concludes that the proposed petition with its PDP and Criteria, as amended by Petitioners before the closing of the record in this case, as specified in Findings of Fact 3, 4 and 5 shall be approved subject to the conditions provided below:

² The Zoning Board exempted the 100 MIHUs from the Phasing Plan it approved in ZB 995M, 50 in 2007 and 50 in 2010. Petitioners showed those exempted MIHUs in its proposed Phasing Chart with the petition in this case. Because the Petitioners have proposed elimination of the MIHUs in their amended petition, it is appropriate that all the 1340 proposed residential units be included in the Board's approved Phasing Plan.

- a. That the number of residential dwelling units approved with this unified 605.3 acre PDP shall be 1340 dwelling units at a density of 2.2 dwelling units/acre, 485 of which units shall be Single-Family Detached and 855 of which shall be Other Residential Units. Of the 855 Other Residential Units, 619 units are approved as Townhouse/Single-Family Attached Units. The Board approves the conversion of the remaining Condominium/Apartment units in the Hillside District to either Single-Family Attached or Detached Units, including any necessary change to the land use designations on the PDP to effectuate such conversion, except that it requires that at least 10% of the dwelling units in the unified PDP be developed as Apartment/Condominium Units; and
- b. That the Petitioners' Residential and Employment Phasing Plans as provided in Finding of Fact 7 are approved; and
- c. That the withdrawn parts of the petition, including the additional 242 age-restricted unit proposal for the Old Farm District and the 52 condo units in the Hillside and Midtown Districts may not be re-petitioned for approval for two years from the date of this decision; and
- d. That the Petitioners are required to pay for and convey to the Howard County Housing Commission a site to accommodate 100 MIHUs off-site in lieu of providing the 100MIHUs at Maple Lawn in accordance with the January 18, 2006 letter from Leonard Vaughan to Charlie O'Donovan.

DEVELOPMENT TABULATION (through 2nd Amended PDP)

Land Use Acreage and Percentages

| | | |
|------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Single Family Detached | 192.6 194.7 acres | 31.8 32.0% |
| Other Residential | 73.6 77.7 acres | 12.2 12.8% |
| Employment | 122.0 acres | 20.1% |
| Open Space | 217.1 213.1 acres | 35.8 35.1% |
| Total Acres | 605.3 607.5 acres | 100.0% |

Residential Units

| | | |
|------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Single Family Detached | 507 759 Units | 37.8 31.8% |
| Single Family Attached | 623 618 Units | 46.5 33.9% |
| Apartments | 210 444 Units | 15.7 24.4% |
| Total Units | 1,340 1,821 Units | 100.0% |

Moderate Income Housing Units

The MIHU requirement was met offsite, in accordance with the D&O for ZB1039M. **The Petitioner is proposing a voluntary commitment that fifteen percent (15%) of the units in the Business District apartment building will be designated as Moderate Income Housing Units ("MIHUs")**

Residential Density

Overall Density ~~2.2~~ 3.0 units/gross acre

Maximum Employment/Floor Area Ratios (FAR)

Overall FAR 0.35

(Calculated on total acreage for all Employment areas on the CSP. Individual employment parcels may exceed 0.35, subject to the requirement that the overall gross employment does not exceed 0.35 FAR)

Employment /Maximum Floor Area

Employment 1,860,012 sq ft. The maximum square footage allowed for retail centers is ~~181,590~~ 182,250 square feet and is included in the employment total above.

DEVELOPMENT CRITERIA

Required Project Boundary Setbacks:

- 50-foot minimum open space buffer adjacent to existing residential communities.
- 100-foot minimum setback for residential units from Johns Hopkins Road.
- 50-foot minimum setback for commercial buildings from Johns Hopkins Road and a 20-foot minimum setback for parking from Johns Hopkins Road.
- 300-foot minimum setback for residential buildings from Md. Route 216, and a 30-foot setback for multi-story residential apartment buildings from Md. Route 216
- 50-foot minimum setback for all commercial structures from Md. Route 216, and 300-foot minimum setback for all multi-story structures from Md. Route 216, and 500-foot minimum setback for all commercial structures greater than four stories from Md. Route 216.
- Sign and entry features may be located at any location in a setback, if approved by the Planning Board, and does not interfere with sight distance along public roads.

The following criteria are organized according to the land use categories below and shall apply to all development within the Fulton MXD Zoning District shown within the boundaries of this Amended Comprehensive Sketch Plan, except as modified by the Planning Board pursuant to Site Development Plan review.

- Single Family Detached (SFD)
- Other Residential (OR)
- Employment
- Open Space (OS)

Single Family Detached (SFD)

Permitted Uses

All lots within Single Family Detached land use areas shall be used only for one Single Family Detached Dwelling, or one Zero Lot Line Dwelling Unit per lot. Private recreational facilities, such as swimming pools, tennis courts and basketball courts reserved for the on-site residents and their guests are also permitted. Accessory Structures and Accessory Uses are also permitted.

Any of the permitted uses may include home occupations within the principal structure.

The following additional uses not referred to or included in the above uses, which are allowed by Special Exception in the RR district, will be permitted as a matter of right in the Single Family Detached Land Use Areas, and are specifically approved by the Planning Board on this Amended Comprehensive Sketch Plan.

- Antique shops, art galleries and craft shops
- Bed and breakfast inns
- Concert or recital establishments
- Home occupations (also see Section 128.C.1 for accessory use provisions)
- Charitable and philanthropic institutions
- Homes-nursing homes, group care facilities, children's homes
- Athletic facilities-athletic fields, commercial or community swimming pools, tennis clubs and similar uses
- Country clubs and golf courses

- Public utility uses, limited to: (a) Utility substation, (b) Above ground pipelines, (c) Pumping stations, (d) Telephone exchanges, (e) other utility devices such as transformers, switch gear, telephone cabinets, etc.
- Entrance features for subdivisions
- Accessory dwelling units (such units shall not count towards the maximum number of dwelling units; such units shall be owned and maintained by the owner of the principal dwelling unit; also see Section 109).

For all lots and parcels which are technically in the SFD land use, but later recorded as additional open space (e.g., NCOS & walkway parcels) the provisions of the Open Space criteria shall be used in lieu of the SFD criteria.

Density

Average density shall not exceed 2.8-4.0 dwelling units per gross acre based on the entire area of the Single Family Detached land use.

Lot Size and Width

| LOT TYPE | MINIMUM LOT SIZE | MIN. LOT WIDTH AT FRONT BRL |
|----------|--------------------|-----------------------------|
| Cottage | 2,500 Square Feet | 32' |
| Manor | 4,000 Square Feet | 48' |
| Villa | 5,400 Square Feet | 54' |
| Estate | 20,000 Square Feet | 120'* |

*except for lots identified on Amended CSP, which shall not be less than 100' at front BRL

Lot type shall be designated on Final Plats for all Single Family Detached areas. Estate Lots shall be located as shown on ~~this plan~~ S-06-16.

Structure Setbacks

The minimum required setbacks for Single Family Detached structures shall be as follows:

| LOT TYPE | MIN. FRONT SETBACK | MIN. SIDE SETBACK | MINIMUM REAR SETBACK | |
|----------|--------------------|--|------------------------|---|
| | | | TO PRINCIPAL STRUCTURE | TO REAR GARAGE (ATTACHED OR DETACHED) OR TO ACCESSORY STRUCTURE |
| Cottage | 10' | 4' EXCEPT FOR GARAGE WHICH MAY BE 0' | 20' | 3' |
| Manor | 12' | 6' EXCEPT FOR GARAGE WHICH MAY BE 0' | 20' | 3' |
| Villa | 12' | 6' EXCEPT FOR GARAGE WHICH MAY BE 0' | 20' | 3' |
| Estate | 20' | 20' EXCEPT FOR GARAGE WHICH MAY BE 10' | 20' | 20' |

A zero lot line dwelling unit may be located on any property line which is not a street right-of-way provided that (i) no part of the dwelling shall encroach onto the adjoining lot; (ii) an access easement for the purpose of maintenance to the side of the structure shall be included in the deed where appropriate. Spacing between dwelling units shall be a minimum of 8'. Garages however, may adjoin along the property line, provided they comply with all building and fire code regulations.

Habitable space and/or open/enclosed decks may be built over attached garages. In those cases, the garage setbacks shall govern.

Other decks must be a minimum of 10' from rear property line, and are subject to side yard setbacks.

Facing accessory structures and detached garages (across an alley/lane R.O.W.) shall be a minimum of 30' apart.

Structures may be located anywhere within such setback areas in accordance with a Site Development Plan approved by the Howard County Planning Board.

Exceptions to Setback Requirements

Except for the following, Section 128.A.1 applies:

- Porches may encroach into the front yard to within 2' from the front property line or right-of-way for Cottages, Manors, and Villas; to within 12' for Estates. Porches may encroach into the side yard of corner lots to within 2' from the right-of-way for Cottages, Manors, and Villas; to within 12' for Estates. Where a side yard abuts an open space or passage, porches may encroach to within 1' from the side property line for Cottages, Manors, and Villas; to within 12' for Estates.
- Stoops and steps may encroach into the front and side yards to within 1' from the front property line.
- Garden walls, fences, piers, gates and similar ornaments may be built in the front and side yards not closer than 1' from the front property line; not greater than 48" in height along the front property line and not greater than 72" along the side and rear property lines. An archway or piers defining a lead walk may be up to 9'.
- Masonry veneers may encroach a maximum of six inches into any required setback.

Access

Permanent access to lots may be provided by means of alleys, using perpetual reciprocal easements or other acceptable legal provisions.

Building Height

Maximum building height on all lots shall be 38' to the midpoint of the roof height measured from the highest adjoining ground elevation adjacent to the building, except as otherwise approved on a Site Development Plan by the Howard County Planning Board.

Coverage

Lot coverage for estate lots shall not exceed 50 percent, including principal and accessory structures but not including sidewalks, paved parking areas, driveways, porches, stoops, steps, decks, patios, in-ground pools, landscaping and similar structures.

Parking

No less than two parking spaces shall be provided for each Single Family Detached dwelling unit. No less than one parking space shall be provided for each accessory dwelling unit. Such spaces may consist of garage, driveway and/or similar off-street parking spaces. Visitor parking and overflow parking may be accommodated as on-street parking within the public right-of-way.

Reductions in parking requirements are permitted pursuant to the Howard County Zoning Regulations Section 133.E.1 (Shared Parking).

Other Residential (OR)

Permitted Uses

Apartment dwellings (including stacked townhouses and other architectural layouts with both horizontal and vertical party walls), Single-Family Attached dwellings, Live-Work units, Semi-Detached dwellings and Two-Family dwellings shall be permitted within Other Residential land use areas. Midtown Parcel A-1 and the OR area of the Westside District may contain Live-Work Units.

Stacked townhouses have the appearance of conventional townhouses, but are actually separated both horizontally and vertically. The units may or may not have integral at-grade garages.

Live-work units are vertically integrated building types, where the first floor (and basement, if provided) shall be utilized as commercial space and the upper level(s) shall be residential uses only.

Upper floors of all Other Residential structures shall be residential use only.

Apartment building types may also include accessory uses, support services, and amenities including but not limited to exercise facility, administrative offices, mail room, meeting rooms, etc. with no limitations in size. Commercial/retail space on the first floor of an apartment building may not exceed 1200 square feet or 15% of the gross first floor area, whichever is greater. This criterion is not meant to prohibit vertically integrated uses where the first floor is commercial/retail and the upper floors residential.

Other permitted uses include private recreational facilities such as tot lots, swimming pools, basketball courts and tennis courts, reserved for the use of a specific project's residents and their guests. Such facilities may be located within condominium developments as well as within communities where all properties are included within recorded covenants and liens, which govern and provide financial support for operations of the facilities.

Any of the permitted uses may include home occupations within the principal structure.

Accessory structures and uses are also permitted for all Other Residential Land Use Areas.

The following additional uses not referred to or included in the above uses, which are allowed by Special Exception in the RR district, will be permitted as a matter of right in the Other Residential Land Use Areas, and are specifically approved by the Planning Board on this Amended Comprehensive Sketch Plan.

- Antique shops, art galleries and craft shops
- Bed and breakfast inns
- Concert or recital establishments
- Home occupations (also see Section 128.C.1 for accessory use provisions)
- Charitable and philanthropic institutions
- Homes-nursing homes, group care facilities, children's homes
- Athletic facilities-athletic fields, commercial or community swimming pools, tennis clubs and similar uses.
- Country clubs and golf courses
- Public utility uses, limited to: (a) Utility substation, (b) Above ground pipelines, (c) Pumping stations, (d) Telephone exchanges, (e) other utility devices such as transformers, switch gear, telephone cabinets, etc.
- Entrance features for subdivisions

- Accessory dwelling units (such units shall not count towards the maximum number of dwelling units; such units shall be owned and maintained by the owner of the principal dwelling unit; also see Section 109).

For all lots and parcels which are technically in the OR land use, but later recorded as additional open space (e.g., NCOS & walkway parcels) the provisions of the Open Space criteria shall be used in lieu of the OR criteria.

Density

Average density shall not exceed 14.0 units per gross acre based on the entire area of Other Residential land use.

Lot Size

No minimum or maximum lot size is established for the Other Residential land use areas.

Structure Setbacks

The minimum required setbacks for Other Residential structures shall be as follows:

| LOT TYPE | MIN. FRONT SETBACK | MIN. SIDE SETBACK | MINIMUM REAR SETBACK | | MINIMUM FRONT, SIDE AND REAR SETBACK FROM MAPLE LAWN BLVD |
|------------------------|--------------------|--|------------------------|---|---|
| | | | TO PRINCIPAL STRUCTURE | TO REAR GARAGE (ATTACHED OR DETACHED) OR TO ACCESSORY STRUCTURE | |
| Single Family Attached | 0' | 0' | 20' | 3' | 20' |
| Manor | | 4' EXCEPT FOR GARAGE WHICH MAY BE 0' | 20' | 3' | 20' |
| Villa | | 4' EXCEPT FOR GARAGE WHICH MAY BE 0' | 20' | 3' | 20' |
| Estate | | 10' EXCEPT FOR GARAGE WHICH MAY BE 10' | 20' | 3' | 20' |

Habitable space and/or open/enclosed decks may be built over attached garages. In those cases, the garage setbacks shall govern. Where the rear lot line is contiguous to green open space, the rear principal structure setback may be reduced to 10' and the rear setback for decks may be reduced to 3'.

Other decks must be a minimum of 10' from rear property line, and are subject to side yard setbacks.

Facing accessory structures and detached garages (across an alley/lane R.O.W.) shall be a minimum of 30' apart.

Between Apartment buildings, the minimum setback distances shall be 30' front to front, 50' back to back, 50' front to back and 15' for all other conditions. Between Single-Family Attached buildings, the minimum setback distances shall be 30' front to front, 50' back to back (except across an alley), 50' back to front and 6' (or as required by the Building Code) for all other conditions.

In the Hillside District, the front and side setbacks from Maple Lawn Blvd. may be reduced to 5'. On Parcel A-1 in Midtown, the front setback for apartments, along Maple Lawn Blvd. may be reduced to 10'.

Structures may be located anywhere within such setback areas in accordance with a Site Development Plan approved by the Howard County Planning Board.

Exceptions to Setback Requirements

Except for the following, Section 128.A.1 applies:

- Porches may encroach into the front yard to within 2' from the front property line or right-of-way for all Other Residential lot types.
- Stoops and steps may encroach into the front yard to within 1' from the front property line for all Other Residential types.
- Garden walls, fences, piers, gates and similar ornaments may be built in the front and side yards not closer than 1' from the property line; not greater than 48" in height along the front property line and not greater than 72" along the side and rear property lines. An archway or piers defining a lead walk may be up to 9'.
- Masonry veneers may encroach a maximum of 6" into any required setback area.

Access

Permanent access to lots may be provided by means of alleys, using perpetual reciprocal easements or other acceptable legal provisions.

Building Height

Maximum building height in the Other Residential land use areas shall be 50' for Attached, Semi-Detached, or Two-Family Dwelling Units, and 70' for Live-Work units and Apartments, in each case to the midpoint of the roof height measured from the highest adjoining ground elevation adjacent to the building, except as otherwise approved on a Site Development Plan by the Howard County Planning Board.

Coverage

No coverage requirements are imposed in Other Residential land use areas.

Parking

No less than two parking spaces shall be provided for each Single Family Attached, Live-Work, Semi-Detached, and Two-Family dwelling unit. No less than one and one-half parking spaces shall be provided for each apartment unit. Such spaces may consist of garage, driveway and/or similar off-street parking spaces. No less than one parking space shall be provided for each accessory dwelling unit. Such parking shall be provided in proximity to such dwelling unit and may be included as part of a common parking area provided for residents, tenants, and guests. Principal structures shall be no closer than 15' to the curb of common parking areas with head-in or angled parking, and no closer than 10' to the curb for parallel parking, unless sufficient landscaping is provided to justify a reduction in the setback, per the Howard County Landscape Manual. Live-work units are exempt from this setback requirement. Visitor parking and overflow parking may also be accommodated as on street and parallel parking within the public right-of-way.

Such parking areas may be parallel spaces located on paved areas in and/or adjacent to publicly maintained roadways, adjacent to public or private service drives or oriented diagonally or at right angles to such roadways or service drives.

Reductions in parking requirements are permitted pursuant to the Howard County Zoning Regulations Section 133.E.1 (Shared Parking).

Housing for Elderly and/or Handicapped Persons

In the event a facility qualifies under federal, state or county programs intended to promote housing for the elderly or handicapped, the parking requirements may be modified to provide for four parking spaces for every ten dwelling units participating in such program. In the event the units are withdrawn from such a housing program, the owner of the facility shall immediately notify the Department of Planning and zoning and shall construct, prior to further occupancy of the withdrawn units, such additional parking spaces as are necessary to provide one and one-half parking space for each dwelling unit withdrawn.

Employment

Parcel Size

No minimum or maximum parcel sizes apply in the Employment land use areas.

Height

Maximum building height shall be limited to 120' unless approved to be greater on a Site Development Plan by the Howard County Planning Board. Additionally, the following shall apply:

- Commercial buildings at the corner of Johns Hopkins Road and Maple Lawn Boulevard shall not exceed three stories.
- Commercial buildings east of Maple Lawn Boulevard at the Focal Point shall not exceed four stories.
- Commercial buildings in the Business District within 300 feet of MD Route 216 shall not exceed one story.
- Commercial buildings in the Business District located between 300 feet and 500 feet from MD Route 216 shall not exceed four stories.
- Commercial buildings in the Business District beyond 500 feet from MD Route 216 shall not exceed eight stories above the highest adjoining grade.
- Commercial buildings in the Westside District within 300 feet of MD Route 216 shall not exceed two stories.
- Commercial buildings in the Westside District beyond 300 feet from MD Route 216 shall not exceed four stories above the highest adjoining grade.

Permitted Uses

The following uses are permitted in Employment land use areas:

Employment uses permitted only within M-1 Zoning District shall not be permitted. All uses permitted as a matter of right in the POR, B-1 and M-1 Districts, as per Petitioner's PDP Exhibit 78, without regard to any limitations or restrictions on retail or personal service uses otherwise permitted in such districts; fast food, convenience stores, country clubs and golf courses, movie theaters, legitimate theaters and dinner theaters, public utility uses (excluding stand-alone communication towers), group care facilities, housing for the elderly and/or handicapped persons, nursing homes and sheltered housing. Parcel A-2 may contain Live-Work Units as defined in the Other Residential (OR) section. Accessory Structures and Accessory Uses are also permitted.

The following additional uses not referred to or included in the above uses, which are allowed by Special Exception in the POR, B-1 and M-1 districts, will be permitted as a matter of right in the Employment Land Use Areas, and are specifically approved by the Planning Board on this Amended Comprehensive

Sketch Plan, provided, however, that quarries, temporary wrecked vehicle storage and yard waste shall not be allowed:

- Public school buildings-temporary conversion to other uses
- Theaters, legitimate and dinner
- Theaters, movie
- Public utility uses, limited to the following: utility substations, above ground pipelines, pumping stations, telephone stations, and telephone exchanges, but no stand-alone commercial communications towers.

The following use restrictions also apply:

- No more than 15% of the total Employment land use area may be devoted to warehouse and light manufacturing uses.
- Cemeteries, mausoleums & crematoriums are not permitted
- A maximum of one gasoline service station is permitted. The gasoline service station may include a car wash, car repair facilities, and/or convenience store food.
- No single Retail Center shall contain more than 150,000 square feet of gross floor area designated for use by retail and personal service businesses. Designated Retail Centers may include retail stores, personal service establishments, and similar uses, as well as fast food restaurants and a gasoline service station; however for all Retail Centers the total square foot area which may be used for retail and personal service business shall not exceed 181,590 (300 square feet per gross acre). No individual retail establishment within the MXD-3 District shall have a gross floor area greater than 65,000 square feet. Retail and personal services and other allowed uses, such as restaurants and a gasoline service station may also be located within other designated Employment Areas outside of a Retail Center.

Section 128.F shall apply to Employment land use areas.

Coverage

No coverage requirement is imposed in Employment land use areas.

Floor Area Ratio (FAR)

Overall limit is 0.35 calculated on the total acreage for all Employment land use areas.

Setbacks (Also see "Project Boundary Setbacks")

The minimum setback for employment/commercial structures shall be as follows:

- 50' from the boundary line along Johns Hopkins Road or Route 216
- 10' from the right-of-way of Maple Lawn Boulevard
- No setback is required from the right-of-way of any internal public or private roads other than for Maple Lawn Boulevard as noted above.
- 10' from any other property line

Parking Setbacks

- 15' to public right-of-way of Maple Lawn Boulevard (except for parallel parking adjacent to roadway)
- 10' to any other property or boundary line (except for parallel parking adjacent to roadway, or where a parcel line lies within a use-in-common parking area serving multiple parcels.)
- 20' to project boundary line along Johns Hopkins or Route 216

Exceptions to Setback Requirements

Structures may be located anywhere within setback areas in accordance with a Site Development Plan approved by the Howard County Planning Board.

Except for the following, Section 128.A.1 applies:

- A. Bay windows, eaves, French Balconies, porticos, cornices, awnings, signs, and similar architectural elements may encroach fully into any setback.
- B. Arcades may encroach into any setback to within 1' of the property line. Where such arcades are proposed, the front façade may align, vertically, with the front of the arcade, thereby reducing the required front setback accordingly. An arcade is an arched building, or portion of a building, or gallery often covered with a roof structure or building supported by a series of arches and/or columns on piers.

Parking

- a. A minimum of five parking spaces shall be provided for each 1,000 square feet of net leasable area devoted to commercial retail sales uses.
- b. A minimum of 3.3 parking spaces shall be provided for each 1,000 square feet of net leasable area that is devoted to office or research and development uses.
- c. No parking requirement is imposed upon any restaurant, coffee shop or similar facility constructed within buildings which primarily serves tenants and employees of such buildings, or neighboring buildings accessible by pedestrians.
- d. One parking space shall be provided for each bedroom contained within any hotel, inn or similar facility and one parking space shall be provided for each five employees of such facility.
- e. One parking space shall be provided for each three seats within any restaurant, coffee shop or similar facility constructed within a hotel, inn or similar facility or as a freestanding structure and one parking space shall be provided for each five employees of any such facility.
- f. One parking space shall be provided for each two beds in any hospital or clinic; one parking space shall be provided for each employee on a major shift; and eight parking spaces shall be provided for each doctor treating outpatients on a major shift.
- g. Industrial Uses:
 - Warehouse 0.5 spaces per 1,000 square feet of net leasable area
 - 'Flex' Space (Industrial/Office) 2.5 spaces per 1,000 square feet of net leasable area
 - Other Industrial 2.0 spaces per 1,000 square feet of net leasable area.

Recreational Uses:

- Health Club 10.0 spaces per 1,000 square feet of net leasable area
- Swimming Pool, Community 1.0 space per seven persons permitted in the pool at one time by the Dept. of Health
- Tennis Court 2.0 spaces per court

"Net leasable area" is defined as 90% of the gross floor area (after deducting any floors devoted to storage and common uses), unless a more precise value is determined by reducing the gross floor area by areas devoted to parking, vehicular circulation, office building storage areas, equipment and mechanical rooms/areas, locker and shower facilities, entrance foyers/atria, and similar areas.

Required minimum parking for all such commercial and employment uses shall be met off-street. Additional parking may be accommodated on-street, in parallel parking within public road rights-of-way, parallel spaces located on paved areas adjacent to publicly maintained roadways or oriented diagonally or at right angles to such roadways, in and/or out of the public R/W.

Reductions in parking requirements are permitted pursuant to the Howard County Zoning Regulations Sections 133.D.8 (Parking Studies), 133.E.1 (Shared Parking) and 133.E.2 (Trip Reduction Plans).

Open Space (OS)

Permitted Uses

Any uses which do not involve any extensive coverage of land with structures, including, but not limited to, parks, playing fields, playgrounds, tennis, basketball and all purpose courts, golf courses, pools, pathways, any other outdoor recreational uses, and environmental facilities such as storm water management facilities or water quality facilities. In addition, buildings and parking lots shall be permitted if they are for the public or for residents and people working within the Subject Property and are owned by a homeowners' or business owners' association, or are for non-profit uses, such as a school, library, fire and rescue station, post office, museum, art gallery, nature center, or community building. Parking lots are permitted only as an accessory use to an approved use on the same lot. Open land within designated residential land use areas shall be considered Open Space if it is held for the common use of persons residing in the vicinity of such land.

Other Permitted uses:

- a. Public or private child care center.
- b. Community Center for customary community activities including but not limited to:
 1. The presentation and performance of outdoor community activities, public or private, such as musical and theatrical performances, outdoor picnics, art shows, and carnivals.
 2. Rummage sales, white elephant sales, cake sales, dances, and similar activities.
 3. Operation of a community hall including leasing of same for public or private use.
 4. Operation of incidental commercial activities such as a snack bar.
- c. Public or private tennis courts, together with such incidental commercial activities as are consistent with primary use of the lot as a tennis facility.
- d. Buildings and parking lots which are owned and used by any governmental entity or homeowners' association or are used for non-profit purposes including but not limited to:
 1. Community library facility
 2. Teen center building including incidental sales on the premises of food and beverages
 3. Buildings used primarily for religious activities
 4. Mail room, post office, pool house, meeting hall, exercise facility, leasing offices, administrative offices, including incidental sales on the premises of food and beverages.
- e. Park structures including but not limited to gazebos, pavilions, amphitheater seating, decks, fountains, walks, hardscape plazas, trails, patios, etc.
- f. Utility facilities
- g. Environmental facilities such as drainage, stormwater management facilities, wetland mitigation, afforestation or reforestation.
- h. Activity areas such as tot lots, volleyball and multi-purpose courts, picnic areas, etc.
- i. Sign and entry features may be located at any location in a setback, if approved by the Planning Board and does not interfere with sight distance along public roads.

Lot Area

No minimum/maximum lot sizes apply within Open Space land use areas except that 35% of the gross acreage of all recorded land must be open space and 10% of the Open Space must be available for active recreation.

Setbacks

Buildings or structures within Open Space land use areas shall be a minimum of 10' from any right-of-way or property line, except that park like structures such as gazebos, pavilions, benches fountains and similar structures may be located anywhere within an open space lot; except, however, that buildings and structures may be permitted anywhere within Open Space land use areas in accordance with a Site Development Plan approved by the Howard County Planning Board.

Height

There shall be no height limitations for buildings or structures in Open Space land use areas, provided improvements are constructed in accordance with a Site Development Plan approved by the Howard County Planning Board.

Coverage

No coverage requirement is imposed upon lots within Open Space land use areas.

Parking

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Health Club | 10.0 spaces per 1,000 square feet of net leasable area |
| Swimming Pool, Community | 1.0 space per seven persons permitted in the pool at one time by the Dept. of Health |
| Tennis Court | 2.0 spaces per court |

Such parking areas may be in parking lots, parallel spaces located on paved areas in and/or adjacent to publicly maintained roadways, adjacent to public or private service drives or oriented diagonally or at right angles to such roadways or service drives.

Reductions in parking requirements are permitted pursuant to the Howard County Zoning Regulations Sections 133.D.8 (Parking Studies), and 133.E.1 (Shared Parking).

Accessory Uses

Any use normally and customarily incidental to any use permitted in any Land Use Area shall be permitted.

Exhibit 3

Maple Lawn Farms

Howard County, Maryland

January 26, 2026

Traffic Impact Analysis for the Second Amended Preliminary Development Plan (PDP)

Prepared for:

Maple Lawn Old Farm, LLC

Mr. Mark Bennett, Sr.

1829 Reisterstown Road, Suite 300

Baltimore, Maryland 21208

(410) 484-8400

mbennett@greenebaumenterprises.com



TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | | |
|---|--|-----------|
| ➤ | INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY OF FINDINGS | 1 |
| ➤ | EXISTING TRAFFIC CONDITIONS | 3 |
| | Figure 1 Location Map for Site and Study Intersections | 5 |
| | Figure 2 Existing Lane Use and Traffic Control | 6 |
| | Figure 3 Existing Peak Hour Traffic Volumes | 7 |
| | Table 1 LOS Standard | 8 |
| | Table 2 Results of Intersection Capacity Analysis (Existing) | 8 |
| ➤ | BACKGROUND TRAFFIC CONDITIONS..... | 9 |
| | Figure 4 2030 Base Peak Hour Traffic Volumes | 10 |
| | Figure 5 Location Map for Background Developments | 11 |
| | Table 3 Trip Generation for Background Developments..... | 12 |
| | Figure 6A Trip Assignment for Developments #1 and #2..... | 13 |
| | Figure 6B Trip Assignment for Development #3 | 14 |
| | Figure 6C Traffic Adjustment Due to MD 216 and Lime Kiln Road Re-Alignment..... | 15 |
| | Figure 7 2030 Background Peak Hour Traffic Volumes..... | 16 |
| | Table 4 Results of Intersection Capacity Analysis (Existing and Background)..... | 17 |
| ➤ | TOTAL TRAFFIC CONDITIONS | 18 |
| | Figure 8 Site Plan..... | 20 |
| | Table 5 Trip Generation Rates for Site | 21 |
| | Table 6 Trip Generation for Site | 21 |
| | Figure 9 Trip Assignment for Site | 22 |
| | Figure 10 2030 Total Peak Hour Traffic Volumes | 23 |
| | Table 7 Results of Intersection Capacity Analysis..... | 24 |
| ➤ | RESULTS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND CONCLUSIONS..... | 25 |

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A – Intersection Turning Movement Counts and Aerial Photographs

APPENDIX B –Capacity Analysis Worksheets

Professional Certification: I hereby certify that these documents were prepared or approved by me, and that I am a duly licensed professional engineer under the laws of the State of Maryland, License No. 17243, Expiration Date: 2/7/2027.



Prepared by: Mickey A. Cornelius, P.E., PTOE, RSP1
Richard Huang, P.E., PTOE

MAC:amr
(F:\2025\2025-1031_Maple Lawn West 2025\DOCS\REPORTS\INITIAL\Maple
Lawn Farms TIA.docx)

The Traffic Group, Inc. ®
Traffic Engineers & Transportation Planners

Merging Innovation and Excellence®

CORPORATE OFFICE
9900 Franklin Square Drive, Suite H
Baltimore, Maryland 21236
410-931-6600 Fax: 410-931-6601
1-800-583-8411
www.trafficgroup.com

INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Study Purpose

This Traffic Impact Analysis was conducted in accordance with Howard County and Maryland Department of Transportation State Highway Administration (MDOT SHA) Traffic Study requirements in conjunction with the proposed Second Amended Preliminary Development Plan (PDP) for Maple Lawn Farms. The subject property is located along the north side of MD 216, west US 29. The Seconded Amended PDP Plan adds the area to the west known as the Maple Lawn West District and revises the Business District. The Maple Lawn West District is proposed to be developed with 253 (32 of which were previously approved) single-family dwelling units, while the Business District is proposed to include 260 apartment units.

Study Criteria/Methodology

This Traffic Impact Analysis was prepared to comply with Howard County requirements for a PDP Traffic Study. At this stage in the development process, the county MXD zoning regulations require a generalized Traffic Study for the Mixed-Use Development in relation to major road improvements proposed in the General Plan. It should be noted that this is not an Adequate Public Facilities Traffic Impact Study or Chapter 5 Traffic Impact Study which will be required at the next plan submittal stage. Plan Howard 2030, in association with Howard County by Design, identifies the major road improvements in the General Plan. A review of those plans shows that the major improvements for this area have been completed. Therefore, this generalized Traffic Study has been prepared to show how the development can be accommodated by existing and/or proposed access points along the surrounding roads.

Although the Adequate Public Facilities Traffic Study will be submitted at the next stage of the process, the general methodology of the PDP Traffic Study is the same. However, the scope of the PDP Traffic Study is smaller than the future Adequate Public Facilities Traffic Study.

In accordance with typical Howard County and MDOT SHA requirements, intersection capacity analyses were conducted for the study intersections using the Critical Lane Volume (CLV) capacity methodology. Roundabouts are analyzed using the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) procedures. Level of Service "E" or better conditions are considered acceptable along a state road while Level of Service "D" or better conditions are considered acceptable at the intersection of county roads. MDOT SHA desires Level of Service "D" or better conditions at all locations.

Scope of Services

The principal scope of services undertaken as part of this study are as follows:

- Conduct a field investigation to collect physical information concerning the nearby road system.
 - Conduct new traffic counts at the study intersections.
 - Provide an allowance for regional traffic growth on the surrounding roadways.
 - Obtain information from Howard County concerning approved development in the surrounding vicinity.
 - Conduct trip generation and trip distribution analyses for the approved developments.
 - Conduct trip generation and trip distribution analyses for the proposed development of the site.
 - Develop total future traffic volume forecasts for a 2030 design year.
-
- Conduct intersection capacity analyses and level of service evaluations for the study intersections using the CLV methodology or HCM methodology, as appropriate.
 - Provide an overall evaluation of the impact of the proposed development of the site on the surrounding area road system.

Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Based upon the data and analyses presented in this study, the proposed development of the Second Amended PDP for Maple Lawn Farms can be accommodated by the adjacent roadways. The results of the intersection/roundabout capacity analyses conducted as part of this study for existing, background, and total future traffic volumes show that acceptable levels of service can be maintained at all intersections included in this study.

More detailed operational analyses of the study intersections and other intersections in accordance with County and MDOT SHA regulations will be required at the next plan submission stage.

EXISTING TRAFFIC CONDITIONS

Site Information

Maple Lawn Farms is located along the north side of MD 216, west of the US 29 as shown in Figure 1. Much of the approved PDP has been completed with the remaining development considered as background traffic in this study. The Second Amended PDP adds the Maple Lawn West District with 253 (32 of which were previously approved) proposed single family dwelling units and adds 260 apartment units to the Business District. Primary access to the Maple Lawn West District is proposed at the intersection of MD 216 with Lime Kiln Road, with that intersection and the MD 216/Murphy Road intersection being redesigned as a roundabout. A connection is also proposed to the north via a connection to Federal Street within the Garden District of Maple Lawn Farms.

The proposed 260 apartment units will be served by the existing road connections to Maple Lawn Boulevard and a connection to Buch Way which provides access to MD 216 via Scaggsville Road at an existing roundabout.

Study Area

As part of the PDP submission, a generalized Traffic Study is required to illustrate the surrounding roads can accommodate traffic from the proposed development specifically related to planned major road improvements in the General Plan. It is important to note that future traffic studies will be prepared as the development process proceeds to address Adequate Public Facilities and Chapter 5 Traffic Study requirements in accordance with county regulations.

Plan Howard 2030 identifies that the planned major road improvements near Maple Lawn have been completed. These include the expansion of MD 216 and completion of Maple Lawn Boulevard. Therefore, this Traffic Study focuses on access points and roads along the property frontage.

In accordance with Howard County criteria, the nearby road system was evaluated and key intersections identified based upon the site location and access. MD 216 is a Minor Arterial roadway which will serve as the primary access for this project. Secondary access is proposed through the existing Maple Lawn Farms community to the north of the site, which in turn provides access to Johns Hopkins Road. Based upon the location of the subject property and surrounding road system, this Traffic Study addresses the following key intersections:

- MD 216 and Lime Kiln Road
- MD 216 and Murphy Road
- MD 216 and South Maple Lawn Boulevard/School Access
- Johns Hopkins Road and Maple Lawn Boulevard
- MD 216 and Westside Boulevard/Old Columbia Road
- MD 216 and Maple Lawn Boulevard
- Maple Lawn Boulevard and Lager Boulevard
- MD 216 and Scaggsville Road/US 29 Southbound Ramp

Figure 1 also identifies these study locations.

Figure 2 has been prepared to provide a schematic of the surrounding area road system showing the existing lane use and traffic control at the study intersections.

Traffic Volumes

Intersection turning movement counts were conducted from 7–9 AM and 4–6 PM at all study intersections. The counts were conducted on November 19, 2025, while Howard County schools were in session. The existing peak hour traffic volumes are shown in Figure 3.

Copies of all traffic count summary sheets are included in Appendix A. Aerial photographs of the study locations are also included in that Appendix.

Analysis of Existing Traffic Conditions

Intersection capacity analyses were conducted for the existing 2025 traffic volumes using the CLV and HCM methodologies. Table 1 identifies Level of Service criteria for both the HCM and CLV methodologies. The results are shown in Table 2. Copies of the capacity worksheets are included in Appendix B.

A review of the capacity analysis results shows that all study intersections are currently operating with good Level of Service “C” or better conditions under the 2025 existing traffic volumes.

Figure 1. Location Map for Site and Study Intersections




Figure 2. Existing Lane Use and Traffic Control




Figure 3. Existing Peak Hour Traffic Volumes




Table 1. LOS Standard

| Unsignalized Intersection | | LOS | CLV |
|---------------------------|------------------------------------|-----|-----------------|
| LOS | Control Delay (Seconds/Vehicle) | | |
| A | ≤10 | A | ≤1000 |
| B | >10 and ≤15 | B | >1000 and ≤1150 |
| C | >15 and ≤25 | C | >1150 and ≤1300 |
| D | >25 and ≤35 | D | >1300 and ≤1450 |
| E | >35 and ≤50 | E | >1450 and ≤1600 |
| F | >50 | F | >1600 |

Table 2. Results of Intersection Capacity Analysis (Existing)

| Intersection | AM Peak Hour | PM Peak Hour |
|---|-----------------------------|--------------|
| | LOS/CLV | |
| 1. Johns Hopkins Rd at Sanner Rd/Maple Lawn Blvd | A/473 | A/802 |
| 3. MD 216 at Lime Kiln Rd | A/795 | B/1032 |
| 4. MD 216 at Murphy Rd | A/701 | A/689 |
| 5. MD 216 at S. Maple Lawn Blvd/School Ent | A/817 | A/783 |
| Roundabout | LOS/Delay (seconds/Vehicle) | |
| 2. Maple Lawn Blvd at Lager Blvd, (v/c) | A/4.4 | A/4.2 |
| (v/c), Worst Lane | 0.24 | 0.18 |
| EB - Lager Blvd | A/5.6 | A/4.4 |
| NB - Maple Lawn Blvd | A/3.7 | A/4.3 |
| SB - Maple Lawn Blvd | A/4.1 | A/4.0 |
| 6. MD 216 at Westside Blvd/Old Columbia Rd, (v/c) | A/9.3 | A/8.3 |
| (v/c), Worst Lane | 0.51 | 0.50 |
| EB - MD 216 | A/9.3 | A/8.0 |
| WB - MD 216 | A/8.9 | A/7.2 |
| NB - Old Columbia Rd | B/12.5 | A/8.6 |
| SB - Westside Blvd | B/10.1 | B/10.5 |
| 7. MD 216 at Maple Lawn Blvd, (v/c) | B/11.2 | B/10.9 |
| (v/c), Worst Lane | 0.59 | 0.68 |
| EB - MD 216 | B/10.9 | B/11.1 |
| WB - MD 216 | B/10.4 | A/7.8 |
| SB - Westside Blvd | B/14.0 | C/17.4 |
| 8. MD 216 at US 29 SB Ramp/Scaggsville Rd, (v/c) | A/6.5 | A/6.1 |
| (v/c), Worst Lane | 0.69 | 0.55 |
| EB - MD 216 | A/7.3 | A/6.1 |
| WB - MD 216 | B/12.2 | B/10.2 |
| NB - Old Columbia Rd | A/0.4 | A/0.1 |
| SB - Westside Blvd | C/15.1 | B/10.9 |

BACKGROUND TRAFFIC CONDITIONS

Design Year

This study addresses a 2030 design year. In order to assess the impact of the proposed development on future traffic conditions, consideration was given to other traffic growth which may impact traffic conditions for the future design year.

Future traffic studies required as the development proceeds through the process will update existing volumes and phase design years.

Background Traffic

Regional traffic growth was considered for the study area roadways using a 2% annual growth rate. Figure 4 shows the resulting 2030 base peak hour traffic volumes.

Additional trips were also considered on the surrounding area roadways due to approved development in the surrounding vicinity. Figure 5 provides a map showing the location of nearby approved developments. Table 3 identifies each of these developments and shows the trip generation rates and projected peak hour trips for each of these sites.

The trips projected to be generated by the approved developments were assigned to the surrounding area road system as shown on the assignment sheets contained in Figure 6A and Figure 6B.

Based upon the proposed Maple Lawn West District access to MD 216 and recommended changes to the Lime Kiln Road and Murphy Road alignments to intersect at a single roundabout location, Figure 6C shows the adjustments to existing traffic volumes.

The trips projected to be generated by the approved developments and traffic adjustments to the MD 216/Lime Kiln Road/Murphy Road intersections were combined with the 2030 base traffic volumes resulting in the 2030 background traffic volumes shown in Figure 7.

Analysis of Background Traffic Conditions

Intersection capacity analyses were conducted for the study intersections using the background traffic volumes, and the results are shown in Table 4. Copies of the capacity worksheets are contained in Appendix B.

A review of Table 4 indicates that the study intersections are projected to maintain acceptable Level of Service "D" or better conditions during both the weekday morning and evening peak hours.

Figure 4. 2030 Base Peak Hour Traffic Volumes




Figure 5. Location Map for Background Developments




Table 3. Trip Generation for Background Developments

| Land Use | AM Peak Hour | | | PM Peak Hour | | |
|--|--------------|-----------|------------|--------------|------------|------------|
| | In | Out | Total | In | Out | Total |
| 1. Retail Building | | | | | | |
| Trips/1000 sq.ft. | 0.86 | 0.55 | 1.41 | 2.74 | 2.96 | 5.70 |
| Trips/16,575 sq.ft. | 14 | 9 | 23 | 45 | 49 | 94 |
| Less 10% Internal Trips | -1 | -1 | -2 | -5 | -5 | -10 |
| Passby (AM-26%, PM 36%) | <u>-3</u> | <u>-2</u> | <u>-5</u> | <u>-10</u> | <u>-11</u> | <u>-21</u> |
| Net New Trips | 10 | 6 | 16 | 30 | 33 | 63 |
| 2. Office Buildings #3 & #4 | | | | | | |
| Trips/1000 sq.ft. | 1.47 | 0.20 | 1.67 | 0.27 | 1.30 | 1.57 |
| Trips/54,096 sq.ft. | 80 | 11 | 91 | 15 | 70 | 85 |
| Less 10% Internal Trips | <u>-8</u> | <u>-1</u> | <u>-9</u> | <u>-2</u> | <u>-7</u> | <u>-9</u> |
| Net New Trips | 72 | 10 | 82 | 13 | 63 | 76 |
| 3. Office Buildings #5 | | | | | | |
| Trips/1000 sq.ft. | 1.47 | 0.20 | 1.67 | 0.27 | 1.30 | 1.57 |
| Trips/86,143 sq.ft. | 127 | 17 | 144 | 23 | 112 | 135 |
| Less 10% Internal Trips | <u>-13</u> | <u>-2</u> | <u>-15</u> | <u>-2</u> | <u>-11</u> | <u>-13</u> |
| Net New Trips | 114 | 15 | 129 | 21 | 101 | 122 |

Note: Trip rates obtained from approved study for Maple Lawn Farms.

Figure 6A. Trip Assignment for Developments #1 and #2




Figure 6B. Trip Assignment for Development #3




Figure 6C. Traffic Adjustment Due To MD 216 And Lime Kiln Rd Re-Alignment





Figure 7. 2030 Background Peak Hour Traffic Volumes



Rh, 251031\INITIAL\Figrev.dwg-BACK, F12/29/25

Table 4. Results of Intersection Capacity Analysis (Existing and Background)

| Intersection | Existing | | 2030 Background | |
|--|-----------------------------|--------|-----------------|--------|
| | AM | PM | AM | PM |
| | LOS/CLV | | | |
| 1. Johns Hopkins Rd at Sanner Rd/Maple Lawn Blvd | A/473 | A/802 | A/529 | A/897 |
| 3. MD 216 at Lime Kiln Rd | A/795 | B/1032 | | |
| 4. MD 216 at Murphy Rd | A/701 | A/689 | | |
| 5. MD 216 at S. Maple Lawn Blvd/School Ent | A/817 | A/783 | A/884 | A/862 |
| 9. MD 216 at Site Access 2 | | | | |
| Roundabout | LOS/Delay (seconds/Vehicle) | | | |
| 2. Maple Lawn Blvd at Lager Blvd | A/4.4 | A/4.2 | A/5.0 | A/4.6 |
| (v/c), Worst Lane | 0.24 | 0.18 | 0.29 | 0.23 |
| EB - Lager Blvd | A/5.6 | A/4.4 | A/6.7 | A/4.7 |
| NB - Maple Lawn Blvd | A/3.7 | A/4.3 | A/3.9 | A/4.8 |
| SB - Maple Lawn Blvd | A/4.1 | A/4.0 | A/4.5 | A/4.2 |
| 3. MD 216 at Lime Kiln Rd/Site Access | | | A/7.8 | A/7.8 |
| (v/c), Worst Lane | | | 0.51 | 0.62 |
| EB - MD 216 | | | A/8.4 | A/7.1 |
| WB - MD 216 | | | A/5.3 | A/8.7 |
| NB - Lime Kiln Rd | | | A/9.9 | A/5.9 |
| SB - Site Access | | | A/4.3 | A/7.0 |
| 6. MD 216 at Westside Blvd/Old Columbia Rd | A/9.3 | A/8.3 | B/10.6 | A/9.4 |
| (v/c), Worst Lane | 0.51 | 0.50 | 0.56 | 0.58 |
| EB - MD 216 | A/9.3 | A/8.0 | B/10.7 | A/8.9 |
| WB - MD 216 | A/8.9 | A/7.2 | A/10.0 | A/8.0 |
| NB - Old Columbia Rd | B/12.5 | A/8.6 | B/14.7 | A/9.6 |
| SB - Westside Blvd | B/10.1 | B/10.5 | B/11.7 | B/12.7 |
| 7. MD 216 at Maple Lawn Blvd | B/11.2 | B/10.9 | B/13.7 | B/14.3 |
| (v/c), Worst Lane | 0.59 | 0.68 | 0.68 | 0.83 |
| EB - MD 216 | B/10.9 | B/11.1 | B/13.0 | B/13.7 |
| WB - MD 216 | B/10.4 | A/7.8 | B/12.9 | A/8.6 |
| SB - Westside Blvd | B/14.0 | C/17.4 | C/17.5 | D/26.9 |
| 8. MD 216 at US 29 SB Ramp/Scaggsville Rd | A/6.5 | A/6.1 | A/7.9 | A/6.9 |
| (v/c), Worst Lane | 0.69 | 0.55 | 0.74 | 0.61 |
| EB - MD 216 | A/7.3 | A/6.1 | A/8.1 | A/6.6 |
| WB - MD 216 | B/12.2 | B/10.2 | C/15.4 | B/11.8 |
| NB - Old Columbia Rd | A/0.4 | A/0.1 | A/0.5 | A/0.1 |
| SB - Westside Blvd | C/15.1 | B/10.9 | C/18.7 | B/12.6 |

TOTAL TRAFFIC CONDITIONS

Site Information

The Maple Lawn West District is located along the north side of MD 216 near the intersection of that roadway with Lime Kiln Road. That portion of the site is proposed to be developed with 253 single-family dwelling units. While 32 units were previously approved, this study assumes all 253 units as new site trips. Primary access to that portion of the site is proposed via the development of a new roundabout incorporating the site access, Murphy Road, Lime Kiln Road, and MD 216. Secondary access is also proposed through the existing Maple Lawn community to the north via a connection to Federal Street.

The proposed 260 apartment units within the Business District are located in the southeast corner of the site. Access is available through the site to/from Maple Lawn Boulevard. A connection will also be provided to Buch Way which will provide a connection to MD 216 at the roundabout intersection with Scaggsville Road and the US 29 southbound ramps.

Figure 8 provides a concept showing the Maple Lawn Farms Districts.

Trip Generation/Distribution

Trip generation rates were obtained from the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual (12th Edition) for the proposed development of the site. Table 5 provides the trip generation rates, and Table 6 shows the projected peak hour trips to be generated.

The peak hour trips projected to be generated by Maple Lawn West were assigned to the surrounding area road system as shown in Figure 9. These trips were combined with the background traffic volumes resulting in the 2030 total peak hour traffic volumes shown in Figure 10.

Analysis of Total Traffic Conditions

Intersection capacity analyses were conducted for the study intersections using the appropriate methodology, and the results are shown in Table 7. Copies of the capacity worksheets are contained in Appendix B to this report.

A review of capacity analysis results shown in Table 7 indicates that all of the study area intersections are projected to operate at acceptable levels of service during both the weekday morning and evening peak hours. It should be noted that the proposed roundabout at the future Maple Lawn West District access along MD 216 is projected to operate with good Level of Service "B" conditions during both of the weekday morning and evening peak hours. This roundabout will improve the current condition which includes multiple access points along MD 216 with Lime Kiln Road and Murphy Road.

The results of the traffic evaluations for the Seconded Amended PDP for Maple Lawn Farms show that the surrounding road system and proposed access locations are projected to operate with acceptable traffic conditions. More detailed traffic studies will be prepared in accordance with Howard County and MDOT requirements for future plan stage submissions.

Figure 8. Site Plan




Table 5. Trip Generation Rates for Site


| Formula/Rate | Directional Distribution | | | |
|---|--------------------------|-----|--------------|-----|
| | AM Peak Hour | | PM Peak Hour | |
| | IN | OUT | IN | OUT |
| Single-Family Detached (ITE-210, Units) | | | | |
| AM Peak Hour Trips = $0.67 \times \text{Units} + 5.59$ | 27% | 73% | 62% | 38% |
| Ln(PM Peak Hour Trips) = $0.92 \text{ LN}(\text{Units}) + 0.33$ | | | | |
| Multifamily Housing, Mid-Rise (ITE-221, Units) | | | | |
| AM Peak Hour Trips = $0.42 \times \text{Units} - 7.77$ | 23% | 77% | 64% | 36% |
| PM Peak Hour Trips = $0.36 \times \text{Units} + 3.07$ | | | | |

** Trip rates obtained from ITE Trip Generation Manual 12th Edition, 2025.

Table 6. Trip Generation for Site

| Land Use | Size | AM Peak Hour | | | PM Peak Hour | | |
|-------------------------------------|-----------|--------------|------------|------------|--------------|------------|------------|
| | | In | Out | Total | In | Out | Total |
| Maple Lawn West | | | | | | | |
| Single Family Detached Houses | 253 units | 47 | 128 | 175 | 140 | 86 | 226 |
| Business District Apartments | | | | | | | |
| Multifamily Housing (Mid Rise) | 260 units | 23 | 78 | 101 | 62 | 35 | 97 |
| Total Trips | | 70 | 206 | 276 | 202 | 121 | 323 |

Figure 9. Trip Assignment for Site



Rh, 251031\INITIAL\Figrev.dwg-STN, F12/29/25

Figure 10. 2030 Total Peak Hour Traffic Volumes




Table 7. Results of Intersection Capacity Analysis

| Intersection | Existing | | 2030 Background | | 2030 Total | |
|--|-----------------------------|--------|-----------------|--------|------------|--------|
| | AM | PM | AM | PM | AM | PM |
| | LOS/CLV | | | | | |
| 1. Johns Hopkins Rd at Sanner Rd/Maple Lawn Blvd | A/473 | A/802 | A/529 | A/897 | A/536 | A/909 |
| 3. MD 216 at Lime Kiln Rd | A/795 | B/1032 | | | | |
| 4. MD 216 at Murphy Rd | A/701 | A/689 | | | | |
| 5. MD 216 at S. Maple Lawn Blvd/School Ent | A/817 | A/783 | A/884 | A/862 | A/884 | A/941 |
| Roundabout | LOS/Delay (seconds/Vehicle) | | | | | |
| 2. Maple Lawn Blvd at Lager Blvd | A/4.4 | A/4.2 | A/5.0 | A/4.6 | A/5.2 | A/4.7 |
| (v/c), Worst Lane | 0.24 | 0.18 | 0.29 | 0.23 | 0.33 | 0.23 |
| EB - Lager Blvd | A/5.6 | A/4.4 | A/6.7 | A/4.7 | A/7.2 | A/5.0 |
| NB - Maple Lawn Blvd | A/3.7 | A/4.3 | A/3.9 | A/4.8 | A/4.1 | A/4.9 |
| SB - Maple Lawn Blvd | A/4.1 | A/4.0 | A/4.5 | A/4.2 | A/4.6 | A/4.4 |
| 3. MD 216 at Lime Kiln Rd/Site Access | | | A/7.8 | A/7.8 | A/9.0 | B/10.4 |
| (v/c), Worst Lane | | | 0.51 | 0.62 | 0.58 | 0.72 |
| EB - MD 216 | | | A/8.4 | A/7.1 | B/10.6 | A/8.3 |
| WB - MD 216 | | | A/5.3 | A/8.7 | A/5.9 | B/12.4 |
| NB - Lime Kiln Rd | | | A/9.9 | A/5.9 | B/11.7 | A/7.0 |
| SB - Site Access | | | A/4.3 | A/7.0 | A/5.7 | A/8.9 |
| 6. MD 216 at Westside Blvd/Old Columbia Rd | A/9.3 | A/8.3 | B/10.6 | A/9.4 | B/11.3 | B/10.3 |
| (v/c), Worst Lane | 0.51 | 0.50 | 0.56 | 0.58 | 0.60 | 0.62 |
| EB - MD 216 | A/9.3 | A/8.0 | B/10.7 | A/8.9 | B/11.6 | A/9.5 |
| WB - MD 216 | A/8.9 | A/7.2 | A/10.0 | A/8.0 | B/10.5 | A/8.5 |
| NB - Old Columbia Rd | B/12.5 | A/8.6 | B/14.7 | A/9.6 | C/16.3 | B/10.3 |
| SB - Westside Blvd | B/10.1 | B/10.5 | B/11.7 | B/12.7 | B/12.6 | B/14.5 |
| 7. MD 216 at Maple Lawn Blvd | B/11.2 | B/10.9 | B/13.7 | B/14.3 | B/14.8 | C/16.3 |
| (v/c), Worst Lane | 0.59 | 0.68 | 0.68 | 0.83 | 0.70 | 0.88 |
| EB - MD 216 | B/10.9 | B/11.1 | B/13.0 | B/13.7 | B/14.3 | B/14.9 |
| WB - MD 216 | B/10.4 | A/7.8 | B/12.9 | A/8.6 | B/13.5 | A/9.5 |
| SB - Westside Blvd | B/14.0 | C/17.4 | C/17.5 | D/26.9 | C/19.4 | D/33.2 |
| 8. MD 216 at US 29 SB Ramp/Scaggsville Rd | A/6.5 | A/6.1 | A/7.9 | A/6.9 | A/8.7 | A/7.8 |
| (v/c), Worst Lane | 0.69 | 0.55 | 0.74 | 0.61 | 0.74 | 0.67 |
| EB - MD 216 | A/7.3 | A/6.1 | A/8.1 | A/6.6 | A/8.9 | A/6.9 |
| WB - MD 216 | B/12.2 | B/10.2 | C/15.4 | B/11.8 | C/16.6 | B/14.0 |
| NB - Old Columbia Rd | A/0.4 | A/0.1 | A/0.5 | A/0.1 | A/0.5 | A/0.1 |
| SB - Westside Blvd | C/15.1 | B/10.9 | C/18.7 | B/12.6 | C/20.5 | B/14.1 |

RESULTS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND CONCLUSIONS

Study Purpose

This Traffic Impact Analysis was conducted in accordance with Howard County and MDOT SHA Traffic Study requirements in conjunction with the proposed Second Amended PDP for Maple Lawn Farms. The subject property is located along the north side of MD 216, west US 29. The Seconded Amended PDP Plan adds the area to the west known as the Maple Lawn West District and revises the Business District. The Maple Lawn West District is proposed to be developed with 253 single-family dwelling units, while the Business District is proposed to include 260 apartment units.

Study Criteria/Methodology

This Traffic Impact Analysis was prepared to comply with Howard County requirements for a PDP Traffic Study. At this stage in the development process, the county MXD zoning regulations require a generalized Traffic Study for the Mixed-Use Development in relation to major road improvements proposed in the General Plan. It should be noted that this is not an Adequate Public Facilities Traffic Impact Study or Chapter 5 Traffic Impact Study which will be required at the next plan submittal stage. Plan Howard 2030, in association with Howard County by Design, identifies the major road improvements in the General Plan. A review of those plans shows that the major improvements for this area have been completed. Therefore, this generalized Traffic Study has been prepared to show how the development can be accommodated by existing and/or proposed access points along the surrounding roads.

Although the Adequate Public Facilities Traffic Study will be submitted at the next stage of the process, the general methodology of the PDP Traffic Study is the same. However, the scope of the PDP Traffic Study is smaller than the future Adequate Public Facilities Traffic

In accordance with typical Howard County and MDOT SHA requirements, interanalyses were conducted for the study intersections using the CLV capacity. Roundabouts are analyzed using the HCM procedures. Level of Service "E" or better are considered acceptable along a state road while Level of Service "D" or better are considered acceptable at the intersection of county roads. MDOT SHA desires "D" or better conditions at all locations.



Economic Impact and Cost of Services Analysis of the Proposed Maple Lawn West Residential Development

Prepared for
G & R Maple Lawn, Inc.
and
Greenbaum Enterprises

Daraius Irani, Ph.D., Chief Economist
Shelby Francis, Research Manager

February 10th, 2026



Towson, Maryland 21252 | 410-704-3326 | www.towson.edu/resi

Executive Summary

Maple Lawn is an approximately 600 acre commercial and residential, mixed-use development in Howard County, Maryland, currently consisting of 1,308 homes including single-family homes, townhouses, and condominiums as well as 1,770,869 sq. ft. of retail and other commercial space. Greenebaum Enterprises is proposing to revise the final phase of Maple Lawn to add 221 homes including single-family homes (“Maple Lawn West”) to an already-approved 32 single-family homes. Also, 260 apartments will be added in the business district. Additional commercial development expansion in Maple Lawn will consist of over 89,143 sq. ft. of new commercial space.

G&R Maple Lawn, Inc. and Greenebaum Enterprises, the developer of Maple Lawn, contracted with Towson University’s Regional Economic Studies Institute (RESI) to conduct a cost of services analysis for the proposed developments as well as an economic contribution and impact analysis of the proposed development. The study area for both analyses is Howard County.

The cost of services analysis details estimates of the costs of public services provided by Howard County and tax revenues incurred and gained from proposed developments in Maple Lawn West. RESI’s analysis found that proposed developments will support more tax revenue than the services provided to them will cost:

- The proposed residential (Maple Lawn West and the business district) development is expected to net an annual surplus of just over \$818,000.
 - For the proposed single-family homes, the net annual tax surplus is \$2.24M
 - For the proposed apartment (including the MIHU units), the net annual tax surplus is -\$1.42M

The cost of services analysis also provides estimates of the present value of tax revenue and cost of services over 30 years from the proposed residential (Maple Lawn West and the business district) development. The results were mixed.

- For the proposed single-family homes, the 30-year present value of the net annual tax surplus is nearly \$50 million
- For the proposed Apartment, the 30-year present value of the net annual tax surplus is nearly -\$160 million

This section provides the one-time school surcharge fee applied to new residential construction in Howard County.

- The proposed Maple Lawn West and business district residential development will generate over \$10.2 million in school surcharge fees paid to Howard County for the construction and maintenance of the county’s public schools.

The economic contribution and impact analysis section provides estimated economic impacts of the proposed Maple Lawn West development and residential development in the business district. sources and data provided by Greenbaum Enterprises and additional available public data

sources and inputs were developed for an IMPLAN analysis. IMPLAN is an industry-recognized economic modeling tool. Based on the results of the IMPLAN analysis:

- The economic impact of the proposed Maple Lawn West Developments and the residential development in the business district is approximately 680 jobs, \$137 million in output, and \$56 million in employee compensation.

Introduction

RESI was tasked with estimating the economic and fiscal contribution of the existing Maple Lawn Development in Howard County as well as the future economic and fiscal impacts of the proposed developments in Maple Lawn. Maple Lawn is a 604-acre mixed-use development in Fulton, MD. The current development consists of 1,308 housing units ranging from single-family homes to townhouses and apartments, and 1,770,869 sq. ft. of retail and commercial space.

The development is well connected in terms of walking paths and sidewalks. There are numerous open spaces that are functional and well connected to the residential community. There is also a community center with a large community pool.

The proposed development plan in Maple Lawn West is for 253 single family homes single-family homes as well as 260 apartments to be located in the business district of which 39 of the apartments will be for rent to households making 60 percent of Howard County's median household income. Given the scarcity of undeveloped land in the County, Maple Lawn's proposed density of residential use along with planned opens spaces achieves two goals: it maximizes the assessable value of the land and provides a wider spectrum of housing affordability. Moreover, the proposed development, as currently planned, is designed similar to the existing development, tying the two areas together.

In the study, RESI estimated the economic impact of the proposed residential (Maple Lawn West and the business district) development in Maple Lawn West

Cost of Services Analysis

To understand the fiscal effects that this residential development will have on the county, RESI prepared a cost of services analysis (COSA). The purpose of a COSA is to estimate the costs and revenues that are incurred and gained with the establishment and/or expansion of a development. For this analysis, county tax revenues and public expenditures were estimated and contrasted for the planned development broken down by single-family homes and apartments.

To undertake the COSA for the proposed residential development, RESI estimated both the real property tax revenues for the single-family home and the apartment as well as the income tax for the new residents of the residential development. Additionally, RESI estimated county costs associated with the residential development. To facilitate the analysis, RESI made several assumptions that will be identified in the relevant portions of the analysis.

For the proposed residential development, RESI based the property tax revenue on the home prices, which are on average approximately 30 percent higher than average home price in Howard County.

Typical lending criteria require that no more than 30 percent of gross monthly income goes towards home mortgage (including insurance and taxes). Based on this lending requirement and the average home prices in Maple Lawn West, RESI was able to estimate the average projected household income in Maple Lawn West.

RESI was provided with the proposed rent for the apartments in the business district and using the same assumptions about monthly rent and income as well an assumption of the value of the apartments, RESI was able to calculate the average projected household income the proposed apartment development.

After calculating the average household income in the proposed residential development and working on the assumption that taxable income is 83 percent of household income, RESI calculated the personal income tax revenue per household in the development.

The proposed residential development support property and income tax revenues for the Howard County Government. Figure 1 below shows that while the planned development is estimated to support \$10.0 million.

Figure 1: Estimated Annual Property and Income Tax Revenues Paid to Howard County

| | Single Family Homes | Apartments |
|---------------|---------------------|--------------------|
| Real Property | \$5,252,280 | \$2,159,040 |
| Income | \$1,883,685 | \$745,526 |
| Total | \$7,135,965 | \$2,904,566 |

Sources: Howard County Department of Finance, Howard County Public School System, IMPLAN, RESI, Greenebaum Enterprises, U.S. Census Bureau, Energy Information Administration (EIA)

In addition to supporting tax revenues in Howard County, the residential development utilizes services provided by the County government. RESI estimated the cost of these services for the existing development and the planned development. RESI used general funds allocations from Howard County’s FY 2025 approved budget to estimate the cost of services such as public schools, public safety, parks, and libraries.

RESI estimated the number of students who will reside in the planned development. These data were multiplied by the cost-per-pupil expenditures in Howard County. The cost of services excluding school (K-12) per capita was used to capture the balance of the costs associated with residents living in Howard County. This cost was multiplied by the average household size in Howard County to determine the cost per household and then multiplied by the number of new households in the residential development.

The estimated cost of services is presented in Figure 2 below.

Figure 2: Estimated Annual Costs of Services Provided by Howard County

| | Single Family Homes | Apartments |
|-----------------------|---------------------|--------------------|
| Public School | \$1,731,265 | 1,080,045 |
| Exclude Public School | \$3,161,594 | \$3,249,593 |
| Total | \$4,892,859 | \$4,329,068 |

Sources: Howard County Department of Finance, Howard County Public School System, IMPLAN, RESI, Greenebaum Enterprises, U.S. Census Bureau, EIA

A comparison of the total income and property tax revenues shown in Figure and the total cost of services in Figure shows that local tax revenues exceed the cost of services incurred by the County. This surplus of tax revenue over costs for both the existing and planned developments at Maple Lawn is shown in Figure 3 below.

Figure 3: Estimated Annual Surplus of Tax Revenue over Cost of Services to Howard County

| | Single Family Homes | Apartments |
|-------------------|---------------------|----------------------|
| Tax Revenue | \$7,135,965 | \$2,904,566 |
| Cost of Services | \$4,892,859 | \$4,329,068 |
| Difference | \$2,243,106 | (\$1,424,548) |

Sources: Howard County Department of Finance, Howard County Public School System, IMPLAN, RESI, Greenebaum Enterprises, U.S. Census Bureau, EIA

The future development is estimated to support over \$0.8 million in surplus revenues over County costs.

Once Maple Lawn’s proposed residential developments are completed, they will support tax revenues and require services on an annual basis. To better interpret these annual totals, RESI calculated their present value over 30 years. Present value is the current value of a future sum of money, accounting for interest.¹ RESI assumed a 3 percent discount rate and the assumed growth rates for each of the revenue and cost sources are in the parentheses. Figure 4 below shows estimates of the 30-year present value of tax revenue from Maple Lawn’s proposed residential development.

Figure 4: 30-Year Present Value of Maple Lawn’s Proposed Residential Development’s Tax Revenue

| | Single Family Homes | Apartments |
|----------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| Real Property Taxes (6.6%) | \$280,389,314 | \$88,478,775 |
| Income Taxes (3.8%) | \$57,353,281 | \$22,365,787 |
| Total | \$337,742,595 | \$110,844,562 |

Sources: Howard County Department of Finance, Howard County Public School System, IMPLAN, RESI, Greenebaum Enterprises, U.S. Census Bureau, EIA

¹ David R. Henderson, “Present Value,” The Library of Economics and Liberty, accessed February 23, 2021, <https://www.econlib.org/library/Enc/PresentValue.html>.

Figure 5 below shows the estimated 30-year present value of the cost of services for Maple Lawn’s proposed developments.

Figure 5: 30-Year Present Value of Maple Lawn’s Proposed Residential Development’s Cost of Services

| | Single Family Homes | Apartments |
|-------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| Public Schools (4.7%) | \$67,588,782 | \$42,165,087 |
| Exclude Public School (8.15%) | \$220,744,092 | \$226,851,636 |
| Total | \$288,332,874 | \$269,016,722 |

Sources: Howard County Department of Finance, Howard County Public School System, IMPLAN, RESI, Greenebaum Enterprises, U.S. Census Bureau, EIA

Figure 6 below shows the surplus of the 30-year present value tax revenue over the 30-year present value cost of services for Maple Lawn’s proposed developments.

Figure 6: Difference Between 30-Year Present Value of Maple Lawn’s Residential Proposed Development’s Tax Revenue and Cost of Services

| | Single Family Homes | Apartments |
|------------------------|---------------------|------------------------|
| Total Tax Revenue | \$337,742,595 | \$110,844,562 |
| Total Cost of Services | \$288,332,874 | \$269,016,722 |
| Total | \$49,409,721 | \$(158,172,161) |

Sources: Howard County Department of Finance, Howard County Public School System, IMPLAN, RESI, Greenebaum Enterprises, U.S. Census Bureau, EIA

In addition to annual taxes, Howard County charges a one-time school surcharge fee for newly built residences based on the home’s gross square footage. Revenue from this surcharge is used in the construction, renovation, and maintenance of Howard County’s public schools. Figure 7 below estimates the total school surcharge fee for Maple Lawn’s planned residential development.

Figure 7: Estimated School Surcharge Fees to Howard County from the Proposed Maple Lawn Residential Development

| | Units | Total School Surcharge Fee |
|------------------------|------------|----------------------------|
| Apartments | 221 | \$1,675,577 |
| Single Family Attached | 253 | \$8,450,200 |
| MIHU Apartment | 39 | \$98,445 |
| Total | 505 | \$10,224,223 |

Sources: Howard County Department of Finance, RESI

This estimate uses a charge of \$8.35 per square foot applicable for any construction after December 31, 2025.

Economic Contribution and Impact Analysis

The current and planned developments at Maple Lawn do not only provide tax revenues and fees to the County government. Maple Lawn residents and resident businesses also support activity in the local economy. To estimate these effects, RESI conducted economic and fiscal contribution and impact analyses for the Maple Lawn proposed residential development. The analysis was conducted using the 2024 IMPLAN model for Howard County, MD.

IMPLAN is an industry standard input-output modeling tool. IMPLAN is based on economic multipliers, or the additional economic activity that occurs after an initial transaction. Consider the following example: if a resident of Maple Lawn hires a company to repaint a room in the home, the fee that household pays the painting company can be used to buy supplies (such as paint and paintbrushes) and/or to pay employees. In turn, these suppliers can purchase the supplies that they need and/or pay their employees. The employees can then make purchases to support their households, for example on rent or a mortgage, at the grocery store, for recreation, etc.

These three types of spending are economic impacts. The **direct impact** is the initial transaction (the Maple Lawn resident paying the painting company); the **indirect impacts** occur when supplies are purchased; the **induced impacts** are spending that stems from employee wages. The sum of these impacts is the **total impact**. In this analysis, economic impacts are measured in terms of employment, output, and employee compensation. For this report, the 2024 IMPLAN model for Howard County was used.

The economic impact analysis examined the economic activity associated with the construction of the proposed residential development and the spending by future residents of Maple Lawn. For this analysis, data on the number and type of housing units in Maple Lawn's proposed residential development was provided by Greenebaum Enterprises. To develop inputs into the IMPLAN model, RESI estimated household income levels for new Maple Lawn west residents using data from the U.S. Census Bureau as well as other metrics such as property values and home prices. Estimated household income totals were entered into the 2024 IMPLAN model for Howard County along with the estimated construction cost, which then estimated the contribution and impact the construction impacts and future household spending.

Please note that there is difference between an economic contribution and an economic impact. In the former, the businesses are already operational in the county and the question being answered is what they are contributing to the county's economy. Additionally, the residential contribution is from existing households in the area. On the other hand, an economic impact is commonly used to describe the entry of a new business or new residents bringing "new dollars" into the county.

Once constructed, the economic impact of the proposed Maple Lawn residential development is 680 jobs, \$137.5million in output, and \$56.7 million in employee compensation.

Figure 9: Summary of Economic Impact of Proposed Maple Lawn Residential Development in Howard County, MD

| | Direct | Indirect | Induced | Total |
|-----------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|
| Employment | 292 | 47 | 341 | 680 |
| Output | \$54,600,000 | \$11,587,887 | \$71,357,082 | \$137,544,968 |
| Employee Compensation | \$30,388,025 | \$4,096,725 | \$22,262,709 | \$56,747,459 |

Sources: Howard County Department of Finance, IMPLAN, RESI, Greenebaum Enterprises, U.S. Census Bureau, EIA

The impacts seen in **Error! Reference source not found.**Figure 9 for the proposed developments at Maple Lawn would represent new economic activity in the Howard County economy and would support secondary economic impacts.

Methodology

RESI conducted economic and fiscal impact analyses for Maple Lawn, a smart-growth development in Fulton, Maryland. A standard input-output technique was applied using IMPLAN, an industry-standard economic impact analysis tool. RESI also prepared a cost of services analysis using Howard County household, income, education, and budget data gathered from various sources.

IMPLAN Model Overview

IMPLAN is an input-output modeling tool. IMPLAN is based on economic multipliers, or the additional economic activity that occurs after an initial transaction. Consider the following example: if a resident of Maple Lawn hires a company to repaint a room in the home, the fee that household pays the painting company can be used to buy supplies (such as paint and paintbrushes) and/or to pay employees. In turn, these suppliers can purchase the supplies that they need and/or pay their employees. The employees can then make purchases to support their households, for example on rent or a mortgage, at the grocery store, for recreation, etc.

These three types of spending are economic impacts. The **direct impact** is the initial transaction (the Maple Lawn resident paying the painting company); the **indirect impacts** occur when supplies are purchased; the **induced impacts** are spending that stems from employee wages. The sum of these impacts is the **total impact**. In this analysis, economic impacts are measured in terms of employment, output, and employee compensation.

Two different types of IMPLAN analyses were conducted for this project. One looked at the multiplier effects associated with retail/commercial activity in Maple Lawn. Inputs for this portion of the IMPLAN analysis were based on commercial building information (square footage, tenant type/industry, etc.) provided by Greenebaum Enterprises and St. John

Properties, as well as publicly available data from various sources, such as average square footage by employee published by the EIA.

The other examined the economic activity associated with spending by current or future residents of Maple Lawn. For this analysis, data on the current residential stock of Maple Lawn as well as the number and type of housing units in the proposed development was provided by Greenebaum Enterprises. To develop inputs into the IMPLAN model, RESI estimated household income levels for current Maple Lawn residents using data from the U.S. Census Bureau as well as other data such as property values and home prices. Estimated household income totals were entered into the 2018 IMPLAN model for Howard County, which then estimated the contribution and impact of this current or future household spending.

The 2018 IMPLAN model for Howard County was used for this analysis.

Cost of Services Analysis

To understand the fiscal effects that Maple Lawn's existing development and future developments have had and will have on the region, RESI prepared a cost of services analysis (COSA). The purpose of a COSA is to estimate the cost and revenue that is incurred and gained in the establishment and/or expansion of a development. In Maple Lawn's case, RESI was asked to estimate the existing development as well as a planned expansion of the development, which includes both commercial and residential properties.

To estimate the cost of services, RESI calculated the following:

- (1) Using American Community Survey, RESI identified the number of residents and households, and then estimated the number of school-age children residing in Maple Lawn using the number of residents/households
- (2) Using Howard County Public School System (HCPSS) enrollment and FY25 budget, RESI then calculated the cost per pupil using public school services
- (3) RESI then calculated the cost per capita for Howard County residents for all services other than public schools
- (4) RESI used the calculations from steps (2) and (3) to estimate the cost of services provided to residents/future residents of Maple Lawn
- (5) RESI used proportions of workforce totals and commuter flows based on county of workplace from the U.S. Census Bureau to calculate cost of services for workers who live outside Howard County but work in Maple Lawn

To estimate tax revenue, RESI estimated and assumed the following

- (1) New home buyers in Maple Lawn West, put down a 23% downpayment on the single family homes
- (2) Mortgage and rent were assumed to be no more than 30% of gross household income

RESI estimated the total income and property tax revenues based on current county taxation rates and the number of households currently in Maple Lawn or expected to be in Maple Lawn after the proposed development is complete. The cost of services was then compared to the tax revenues to determine if the development is a financial benefit or cost to Howard County.

END OF DOCUMENT

**Meeting Notes
Maple Lawn Farms
7600 Maple Lawn Boulevard
Fulton, Maryland
Pre-Submission Community Meeting**

Meeting Date: January 9, 2026, at 6:00 pm

Location: St Mark's Episcopal Church, 12700 Hall Shop Road, Highland, Maryland

Attendees:

Michael Greenebaum – Greenebaum Enterprises, Inc.

Mark Bennett – Greenebaum Enterprises, Inc.

Mike Buch – Buch Construction

Dan Sweeney – Gutschick, Little & Weber, P.A.

Mandee Heintz – Saul Ewing LLP

Sean Cooley – Saul Ewing LLP

See attached list



Meeting Minutes:

• **Introduction**

- We are here tonight to discuss a Preliminary Development Plan (or PDP) Amendment to Maple Lawn farms and the addition and rezoning of approximately 2.5 acres adjacent to the Business District. Many projects in the area have incorporated the name Maple Lawn due to the success of this project; however, for the purposes of the PDP, Maple Lawn is defined by the blue boundary.
- The original Maple Lawn PDP was approved in 2000. It was later amended in 2006. As some of you may know, there was an amendment submitted to Howard County in 2021, however that proposed amendment was withdrawn. The plan we are presenting tonight is a different plan, that reflects the feedback from the community to the 2021 proposal.
- This is the Proposed Preliminary Development Plan Amendment (shown on screen). The PDP is a land use plan. The plan lists the amount of each land use type, the maximum allowable density, and the maximum allowable commercial area. These limits are based on the MXD Zoning. The plan does not propose a specific subdivision layout. This will come later as part of a future sketch plan submission.
- **Changes proposed:**
 - a. Increase the density within Maple Lawn from the currently approved 2.2 units per acre to 3.0 units per acre. 3.0 is the maximum allowed by the RR-MXD-3 Zoning. This increase would allow an additional 418 new units to be built in Maple Lawn
 - b. Revise the land use in Maple Lawn West / Old Farm. With this proposal, all land use in Maple Lawn West will be either single-family detached or open

space. The amendment revises the layout but doesn't change the land-use categories in the area.

- c. Expand the maple lawn boundary to include two new parcels totaling 2.5 acres. This area will be added to the business district. The two parcels being incorporated into Maple Lawn are currently zoned B-1. As part of this process, they will be rezoned to RR-MDX-3.
 - d. Change the land use in the southeast corner of the Business District from Employment to Other Residential. Other Residential allows both single-family attached (townhomes) or multi-family buildings.
 - This plan shows the changes in red compared to the previously approved 2006 PDP plan. As you can see, the changes are limited to Maple Lawn West and Business. The reconfiguration of the single-family detached and open space is shown in the west, and the expansion and land-use change are shown in the business. The revisions to the chart show increases in density, total land area, and revised land-use totals.
 - This plan shows the changes in red compared to the previously submitted 2021 amendment, which was later withdrawn. The dark grey, which corresponds to other residential, has been completely removed from Maple Lawn West, leaving only single-family detached and open space.
 - Although the PDP does not propose a specific site layout, here is a conceptual rendering showing what could be done with the proposed land uses and densities. Single-family detached homes are shown in the west, and a new apartment building is shown in the business district.
 - Zooming into the business district, this shows how a potential 260-unit +/- building could fit with the area, rezoned to RR-MXD-3 and designated as Other Residential.
 - Finally, zooming in on Maple Lawn West, this layout shows 253 new single-family detached homes with roads and open space, and is also anticipated to include additional amenity features for Maple Lawn.
- **Existing Conditions**
 - The Maple Lawn West is located at 11788 Scaggsville Rd, and consists of 110 acres of mostly undeveloped land with a turkey farm. The expansion area in the Business District is located at 11296 Buch Way and consists of two parcels totaling 2.5 acres. The parcel has a small building.
 - The property is zoned RR-MXD-3 and B-1.
 - **Proposed Conditions**
 - The proposed Second Amended Preliminary Development Plan includes 481 residential units split between the Old Farm District (approx. 221 units) and the Business District and expansion area (approx. 260 units).
 - As presented, the proposed Second Amended Preliminary Development Plan revises the permitted density to correspond to the increase in residential units, altering the allowable land use and unit types, and providing alternative access to Route 216.
 - The total PDP project boundary will be expanded by 3 acres +/-.

- The expanded area will be rezoned from B-1 to RR-MXD-3.
- **Community Input with Responses**
 - A community member asked about new recreational amenities such as tot lots and a gym on the West District Property.
 - **A:** Places for kids to play and fitness areas will be included on the Old Farm District development.
 - A community member asked whether there be a new community center.
 - **A:** In theory, yes, there would be a new community center. However, this is early in the process, and plans are not finalized.
 - A community member asked what the estimate is for when the house is built if all goes well with the approval process.
 - **A:** It will be at least three years before shovels are in the ground.
 - A community member asked what Howard County thinks the impact from the new development will be on the schools.
 - **A:** In order to build a new school in Howard County, the schools must be “open”, meaning they have capacity. If the schools are over capacity and “closed”, the project will be delayed for up to five (5) years, or until the schools have capacity to accommodate new students. Right now, all of the schools are open. This development would require school seats for elementary, middle and high school students.
 - A community member asked how many seats are left in the Howard County schools.
 - **A:** We do not have an exact number.
 - A community member asked how many cars will be introduced with this new development, and whether there will be a new traffic plan.
 - **A:** It is currently unclear how many new cars will be introduced. Regardless, there will be a new traffic plan, as required by the development process.
 - A community member asked why the original plan for 32 homes was abandoned?
 - **A:** HoCo by Design, the General Plan, indicates that there is a housing shortage in Howard County. The highest and best use for the property is more than 32 units.
 - A community member asked how much impervious surface is being added by the change in the development plan.
 - **A:** With the currently approved plan, on average, the lots in Maple Lawn West would have been 10% impervious. With the amended plan, the lots in Maple Lawn West would be on average 35% impervious.
 - A community member asked if the development will be more than 5,000 square feet.
 - **A:** Yes. The development will comply with County regulations.
 - A community member asked what kind of stormwater management and buffering will be added to protect existing communities.
 - **A:** The buffers for the new development will be similar to those for the other parts of Maple Lawn. This is still early in the process, we are open to feedback, and suggestions to address community concerns or ideas.
 - A community member asked how big the Old Farm District is.
 - **A:** Just over 100 acres.

- A community member asked about the impact of the project on the schools and traffic.
- **A:** It is too early to have an answer on schools. We are working on a new traffic study and this will be public when it is complete and the petition is submitted.
- A community member asked whether an adjacent community to the Old Farm District that is having issues with power and septic could see improvements with power and septic issues as part of the new development.
- **A:** We cannot speak to adjacent, unrelated communities, but we will include in the meeting minutes to document the concern.
- A community member asked how many kids will be added to the community by this new proposed development as compared to the previous 2021 proposal.
- **A:** The expectation is that the apartments will not add the same number of kids as the single-family homes. There are less homes in the Old Farm District so presumably there will be less kids with this development, than the 2021 proposal.
- A community member stated that “Howard County public schools are shrinking. There are more than enough seats for students but there will be redistricting. However, this is not likely to affect Maple Lawn kids because they are local. Traffic is working well so far. This is a much better plan than the one from 2021. I appreciate the use of the vacant lots for an apartment building because the Business District is failing. I want the developer to consider getting rid of the seven lanes on Maple Lawn Boulevard.”
- **A:** The point of this plan is to put more vibrancy in the Business District.
- Several other community members agreed this proposal was more in line with community input from 2021 and appreciated the shift in density to the Business District.
- A community member asked how the land for the apartment building would be zoned.
- **A:** RR-MXD-3, with a land use designation of Other Residential.
- A community member asked how residents of the apartment building will access the building.
- **A:** While the plan is not final, the idea is that the primary access will be off of Route 216, directly or indirectly.
- A community member suggested that if access to the development on the Old Farm District is proposed off of Yaeger, there should be speed bumps added to Yaeger.
- **A:** Thank you. We will look into that.
- A community member stated that it is not good planning to have only one way to access the Garden District, and only one way to access the development on the Old Farm District off of Route 216.
- **A:** The Old Farm (Maple Lawn West) and Garden District will connect with the proposed plan, giving each two access points.
- A community member asked if there are any MIHUs as a part of this plan.
- **A:** Maple Lawn has already satisfied its affordable housing requirement. Nevertheless, the proposed apartments will have 15% MIHUs as a show of good faith and commitment to the goals of HoCo By Design.

- A community member stated that there should be a study on the Vine apartment building and the number of children who live in the building.
- **A:** We will look into that.
- A community member stated that there is an issue with a vacated road, and asked what is going to happen with this vacated road, and whether the new traffic circle will be sufficient for public safety?
- **A:** The new circle is conceptual and this will be reviewed. State Highway will deal with the landlocked paved surface.
- A community member asked/stated whether the original plan had an MIHU exemption.
- **A:** Maple Lawn was not exempt. The proposed 15% is above and beyond.
- A community member asked/stated if the apartment building would have MIHU units on-site.
- **A:** Yes, 15% in the apartment building. We would work with DHCD.
- A community member asked/stated about how many children would be in the apartment building. She is concerned about redistricting.
- **A:** We are not sure, but will note the concern.
- A community member asked/stated whether the new medical building that is being built has new tenants.
- **A:** We are 16 to 18 months away from finishing that build. There is retail that will be built there as well.
- A community member asked/stated the total number of units.
- **A:** About 250 single families on the farm and 260 apartment units.
- A community member asked/stated what the guarantee is for this area to have the school rating to continue.
- **A:** We do not control the school ratings.
- A community member asked/stated that the fact that redistricting happens so often is that the modelling is not working.
- **A:** The county's calculation has the schools designated as open or closed, which determines whether new development is permitted.
- A community member asked/stated if you could highlight where the apartment building will be located.
- **A:** It's next to the gas station in the southeastern part of the Business District. Mande showed the location on the screen.
- A community member asked/stated what the thought behind why there was a road connecting the West District to the Garden District.
- **A:** This is a fire department requirement.
- A community member asked if Maple Lawn East will be a part of the same HOA.
- **A:** Maple Lawn West would likely have its own HOA. There may be collaboration between the HOAs. To be determined as the project progresses. We will continue to meet with HOA leadership.
- A community member asked/stated if you could give existing Maple Lawn residents assurance that existing Maple Lawn residents will not be responsible for Maple Lawn West.
- **A:** Yes, this will be the responsibility of Maple Lawn West.
- A community member asked/stated how tall the apartment building will be.

- **A:** It will be the same height as the adjacent office buildings.
- A community member asked/stated what is currently where the apartment building is planned to be.
- **A:** It is a parking lot and a single building.
- A community member asked/stated what the impact will be to the fire department.
- **A:** The fire department will review site plans prior to approval.
- A community member asked/stated if the original maple lawn can be kept in the same school district.
- **A:** We do not control the schools but will make a note in the minutes.
- A community member asked/stated that I like the plan and the fact the apartment building is being built where it is being built. This is good for the housing shortage. Dense housing is good. It will hopefully make the community better.
- **A:** Thank you.
- A community member asked/stated is Gene Yaeger's house going to stay.
- **A:** As far as we know, but that is not up to the developer.
- A community member asked/stated whether approval for the site plan will be granted with this level of engineering.
- **A:** No. Detailed engineering will happen at the site planning process.
- A community member asked/stated if the impacts of what has been proposed has been adequately addressed.
- **A:** Not all of the impacts are tested at this phase. Some will be tested at the site plan stage.
- A community member asked/stated if stormwater management will be adequate.
- **A:** This is addressed during the site planning stage. Stormwater management will be addressed onsite, consistent with county requirements.
- A community member asked/stated what the phase process will be for this development. Will the plans for where construction be better this time in terms of access.
- **A:** The purpose of these meetings is to discuss these issues. We will discuss with the community to determine the least disruptive phasing.
- A community member asked/stated what the long-term goal is for a Maple Lawn West HOA.
- **A:** The Maple Lawn West HOA will likely be separate, but the idea would be for all of Maple Lawn to be cohesive.
- A community member asked/stated what the lot sizes will be.
- **A:** Similar density to Garden District and Midtown West District.
- A community member asked/stated if Maple Lawn West is part of public service area.
- **A:** Yes.
- A community member asked/stated to consider the intersection of Route 216 and Pendell. A traffic light please.
- **A:** Future traffic studies at the next phase will include more detailed operational evaluations of that intersection
- A community member asked/stated if there is a way to have multiple routes.
- **A:** There would be another community meeting for the site plan to address this level of detail. This is very early in the process.

- A community member asked/stated how the existing car break ins will be addressed.
- **A:** Cameras, gates, and lights could be a solution. We are open to discussing anything that would make Maple Lawn safer.
- A community member asked/stated at what point in the process will a builder be picked, and will the homes have a similar aesthetic to the existing Maple Lawn community.
- **A:** The goal in the builder selection is to make sure the Maple Lawn community is cohesive and looks the same as the existing homes. A builder has not been chosen.
- A community member asked/stated how long the farm is going to be in operation.
- **A:** It's not going away tomorrow. But we are not sure.
- A community member asked/stated whether there are any plans to develop the parcel next to Maple Lawn West.
- **A:** It has been discussed as potentially a 55 and older community. But it is not in the public service area which is a barrier. The developer does not currently own this parcel.
- A community member asked/stated whether this would be the end of the Maple Lawn development.
- **A:** Yes. This would be the final phase of Maple Lawn.
- A community member asked/stated what the major milestones will be for the community for when all of the approvals could come.
- **A:** This will go before the Planning Board, the Zoning Board, and possibly the Hearing Examiner. If approved, a subsequent community input process would occur with the site plan. Mandee noted "this meeting is the minimum requirement. We are not limited to this meeting and we are more than happy to meet with any and all community members – in Maple Lawn, in homes, coffee." Mandee shared her contact information and told anyone interested to reach out to continue the conversation. She also noted she's met with HOA members and the school principals, and is happy to meet with anyone.
- A community member asked/stated if the community can be kept informed during the process, and whether the presentation can be sent.
- **A:** Absolutely, and we will include the presentation in the minutes.

Pre-Submission Community Meeting Sign In Sheet
Maple Lawn Farms PDP -1/9/26

| Name | Address or Email address |
|-----------------------|---|
| PAUL S. JANE | 7730 WATER STREET, FULTON, MD 20759 |
| Carol Baker | 11733 Wayneridge St. Fulton, MD 20759 lollipopmom@comcast.net |
| BOB + DEB GREENBERGER | 11414 Inger BLVD FULTON MD 20759 |
| Pen Hunt | 11306 Terrace Ln Fulton MD 20759 |
| Rick Gordon | 11426 Choptank St Fulton MD 20759 |
| MARK FRUTH RICHMAN | 11422 CHOPTANK ST. FULTON, MD rmrichman@gmail.com |
| Christina Arnold | 7000 Maple Lawn Blvd manager@mapelawnhoa.com |
| Celia Strickler | 8810 Gunston St. Fulton MD 20759 |
| Jamie Strickler | " " |
| Lori Jurane | 7000 Maple Lawn Blvd. LIZIANNE911@hotmail.com |
| Michelle Bloor | mishook7@gmail.com |
| Richard Robbins | 8509 Callibrook Ln, Fulton, MD 20759 - rjrobbins@comcast.net |
| Adrienne Tankulis | ^{olghant} adrienne.tankulis@gmail.com |
| Robert Dehan | dehan.robert@gmail.com |
| Shareda Karunakaran | sssssharada@gmail.com |
| TOM SIMS | 8421 Flowering Street |
| Melissa Terinsky | 11472 Inger Blvd, melissa.terinsky@gmail.com |
| Chris Bard | 7768 Elmwood |
| Joel Land | 11542 Inger Blvd JLAND20GMAIL.COM |
| Josh Teik | 7665 Madtown |
| Ryan Hermann | 10608 Steamboat Ldg |
| Beth Viscarra | Bethviscarra@gmail.com |

Pre-Submission Community Meeting Sign In Sheet

Maple Lawn Farms PDP -1/9/26

| Name | Address or Email address |
|--------------------|---|
| Erika Gardiner | erikalgardiner@gmail.com → Maple Lawn South |
| Miti Patel | miti.patel1990@gmail.com |
| Ethen Consoli | Serenergy massage 28@gmail.com |
| David Boyd | dboyd17@gmail.com |
| JOEL HUREWITZ | joelhurewitz@gmail.com |
| Caral Whitehead | Caramiaul5@gmail.com #11538 Jagan Blvd. |
| PAUL SCHOLZ | pst.bucket@comcast.net |
| Prasad Kankaran | pppprpad@gmail.com |
| Hank Boyd | hboyd20vmd.edu |
| Sony Brathwaite | sbrathwaite@msn.com, Fulton, MD |
| JAN BEUMER | BEUMERJ@GMAIL.COM |
| Kim Cross | Kimjonescross.dvm@gmail.com |
| Clay Cross | claycross@gmail.com |
| Paul Mavromihalis | pmavromihalis@gmail.com |
| Shelly Brown | Shelly L. Brown 10@gmail.com |
| Abigail Kelman | ajkelman@yahoo.com |
| Scottie Johnson | scottie.johnson4@gmail.com |
| MICHAEL CONSOLI | elmd5013@aol.com. |
| Chionta | CAGionta@gmail.com |
| Eloise Kanowsky | eloise.kanowsky@gmail.com |
| M.J. Jones | mj.jones.inc@gmail.com |



Howard County Maryland
Department of Planning and Zoning
 3430 Courthouse Drive, Ellicott City, MD 21043



BY:
 dpzzoning@howardcountymd.gov (410) 313-2350

AFFIDAVIT AND DISCLOSURE OF CONTRIBUTION

**For Petitions to Amend the Zoning Regulations, Zoning Maps
 and Preliminary Develop Plans of Howard County**

Zoning Matter: G & R Maple Lawn, Inc.

**AFFIDAVIT AS TO CONTRIBUTIONS TO CANDIDATES AND BUSINESS
 ENGAGEMENTS WITH ELECTED OFFICIALS**

**As required by the Maryland Public Ethics Law Annotated Code of Maryland, General
 Provisions Article Sections 5-852 through 5-854**

ALL BOLDED TERMS ARE DEFINED BY SECTION 5-852 MARK EACH PARAGRAPH AS
 APPLICABLE

- I, G & R Maple Lawn, Inc., the **Applicant** filing an **Application** in the above zoning matter, to the best of my information, knowledge, and belief HAVE / HAVE NOT made a **Contribution** or contributions having a cumulative value of \$500 or more to the treasurer of a **Candidate** or the treasurer of a **Political Committee** during the 48-month period before the **Application** was filed; and I AM / AM NOT currently **Engaging in Business** with an **Elected Official**.
- I, the **Applicant** or a **Party of Record** in the above referenced zoning matter, acknowledge and affirm that, if I or my **Family Member** has made a **Contribution** or contributions having a cumulative total of \$500 or more during the 48-month period before the **Application** was filed or during the pendency of the **Application**, I will file a disclosure providing the name of the **Candidate** or **Elected Official** to whose treasurer or **Political Committee** the **Contribution** was made, the amount, and the date of the **Contribution**; and that a **Contribution** made between the filing and the disposition of the **Application** will be disclosed within 5 business days after the **Contribution**.

3. I, the **Applicant**, acknowledge and affirm that, if I begin **Engaging in Business** with an **Elected Official** between the filing and the disposition of the **Application**, I will file this Affidavit at the time of **Engaging in Business** with the **Elected Official**.

I SOLEMNLY AFFIRM UNDER THE PENALTIES OF PERJURY and upon personal knowledge that the contents of this Affidavit are true.

G & R Maple Lawn, Inc.

(Print Full Name)

John A. Buntin Vice President
(Sign full name & indicate legal capacity, if applicable)

2/10/26
Date

Zoning Matter: G & R Maple Lawn, Inc.

DISCLOSURE OF CONTRIBUTION

As required by the Maryland Public Ethics Law Annotated Code of Maryland, General Provisions Article Sections 5-852 through 5-854

ALL BOLDED TERMS ARE DEFINED BY SECTION 5-852

If the **Applicant** or a **Party of Record** or their **Family Member** has made a **Contribution** or contributions having a cumulative value of \$500 or more during the 48-month period before the **Application** is filed or during the pendency of the **Application**, the **Applicant** or the **Party of Record** must file this disclosure providing the name of the **Candidate** or **Elected Official** to whose treasurer or **Political Committee** the **Contribution** was made, the amount, and the date of the **Contribution**.

For a **Contribution** made during the 48-month period before the **Application** is filed, the **Applicant** must file this disclosure when they file their **Application**, and a **Party of Record** must file this disclosure within 2 weeks after entering the above zoning matter.

A **Contribution** made between the filing and the disposition of the **Application** must be disclosed within 5 business days after the **Contribution**.

Any person who knowingly and willfully violates Sections 5-852 through 5-854 of the General Provisions Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland is subject to a fine of not more than \$5,000. If the person is not an individual, each officer and partner who knowingly authorized or participated in the violation is subject to the same penalty.

Applicant or Party of Record: G & R Maple Lawn, Inc.
(Print Full Name)

RECIPIENTS OF CONTRIBUTIONS:

| NAME | DATE | AMOUNT |
|------|------|--------|
| N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

I acknowledge and affirm that any **Contribution** I make between the filing of this disclosure and the disposition of the **Application** must be disclosed within 5 business days of the **Contribution**.

G & R Maple Lawn, Inc.

(Print Full Name)

John D. Bennett Sr. Vice President
(Sign full name & indicate legal
capacity, if applicable)

2/10/26
Date

This Affidavit must be signed, scanned and uploaded through the ProjectDox Zoning Petition Application process at <https://howard-md-us.avolvecloud.com/ProjectDox/>

For more information or questions, contact DPZ at (410) 313-2350.



AFFIDAVIT AND DISCLOSURE OF CONTRIBUTION

**For Petitions to Amend the Zoning Regulations, Zoning Maps
and Preliminary Develop Plans of Howard County**

Zoning Matter: G & R Maple Lawn, Inc.

**AFFIDAVIT AS TO CONTRIBUTIONS TO CANDIDATES AND BUSINESS
ENGAGEMENTS WITH ELECTED OFFICIALS**

**As required by the Maryland Public Ethics Law Annotated Code of Maryland, General
Provisions Article Sections 5-852 through 5-854**

ALL BOLDDED TERMS ARE DEFINED BY SECTION 5-852 MARK EACH PARAGRAPH AS
APPLICABLE


- I, Michael Greenebaum, the **Applicant** filing an **Application** in the above zoning matter, to the best of my information, knowledge, and belief HAVE / HAVE NOT made a **Contribution** or contributions having a cumulative value of \$500 or more to the treasurer of a **Candidate** or the treasurer of a **Political Committee** during the 48-month period before the **Application** was filed; and I AM / AM NOT currently **Engaging in Business** with an **Elected Official**.
- I, the **Applicant** or a **Party of Record** in the above referenced zoning matter, acknowledge and affirm that, if I or my **Family Member** has made a **Contribution** or contributions having a cumulative total of \$500 or more during the 48-month period before the **Application** was filed or during the pendency of the **Application**, I will file a disclosure providing the name of the **Candidate** or **Elected Official** to whose treasurer or **Political Committee** the **Contribution** was made, the amount, and the date of the **Contribution**; and that a **Contribution** made between the filing and the disposition of the **Application** will be disclosed within 5 business days after the **Contribution**.

3. I, the **Applicant**, acknowledge and affirm that, if I begin **Engaging in Business** with an **Elected Official** between the filing and the disposition of the **Application**, I will file this Affidavit at the time of **Engaging in Business** with the **Elected Official**.

I SOLEMNLY AFFIRM UNDER THE PENALTIES OF PERJURY and upon personal knowledge that the contents of this Affidavit are true.

Michael Greenebaum

(Print Full Name)



(Sign full name & indicate legal capacity, if applicable)

2/13/2026
Date

Zoning Matter: G & R Maple Lawn, Inc.

DISCLOSURE OF CONTRIBUTION

As required by the Maryland Public Ethics Law Annotated Code of Maryland, General Provisions Article Sections 5-852 through 5-854

ALL BOLDED TERMS ARE DEFINED BY SECTION 5-852

If the **Applicant** or a **Party of Record** or their **Family Member** has made a **Contribution** or contributions having a cumulative value of \$500 or more during the 48-month period before the **Application** is filed or during the pendency of the **Application**, the **Applicant** or the **Party of Record** must file this disclosure providing the name of the **Candidate** or **Elected Official** to whose treasurer or **Political Committee** the **Contribution** was made, the amount, and the date of the **Contribution**.

For a **Contribution** made during the 48-month period before the **Application** is filed, the **Applicant** must file this disclosure when they file their **Application**, and a **Party of Record** must file this disclosure within 2 weeks after entering the above zoning matter.

A **Contribution** made between the filing and the disposition of the **Application** must be disclosed within 5 business days after the **Contribution**.

Any person who knowingly and willfully violates Sections 5-852 through 5-854 of the General Provisions Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland is subject to a fine of not more than \$5,000. If the person is not an individual, each officer and partner who knowingly authorized or participated in the violation is subject to the same penalty.

Applicant or Party of Record: Michael Greenebaum
(Print Full Name)




RECIPIENTS OF CONTRIBUTIONS:

| NAME | DATE | AMOUNT |
|------|------|--------|
| N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

I acknowledge and affirm that any **Contribution** I make between the filing of this disclosure and the disposition of the **Application** must be disclosed within 5 business days of the **Contribution**.

Michael Greenebaum

(Print Full Name)



(Sign full name & indicate legal capacity, if applicable)

2/13/2026
Date

This Affidavit must be signed, scanned and uploaded through the ProjectDox Zoning Petition Application process at <https://howard-md-us.avolvecloud.com/ProjectDox/>

For more information or questions, contact DPZ at (410) 313-2350.



AFFIDAVIT AND DISCLOSURE OF CONTRIBUTION

**For Petitions to Amend the Zoning Regulations, Zoning Maps
and Preliminary Develop Plans of Howard County**

Zoning Matter: G & R Maple Lawn, Inc.

**AFFIDAVIT AS TO CONTRIBUTIONS TO CANDIDATES AND BUSINESS
ENGAGEMENTS WITH ELECTED OFFICIALS**

**As required by the Maryland Public Ethics Law Annotated Code of Maryland, General
Provisions Article Sections 5-852 through 5-854**

ALL BOLDED TERMS ARE DEFINED BY SECTION 5-852 MARK EACH PARAGRAPH AS
APPLICABLE

- I, Mark Bennett, the **Applicant** filing an **Application** in the above zoning matter, to the best of my information, knowledge, and belief HAVE / HAVE NOT made a **Contribution** or contributions having a cumulative value of \$500 or more to the treasurer of a **Candidate** or the treasurer of a **Political Committee** during the 48-month period before the **Application** was filed; and I AM / AM NOT currently **Engaging in Business** with an **Elected Official**.
- I, the **Applicant** or a **Party of Record** in the above referenced zoning matter, acknowledge and affirm that, if I or my **Family Member** has made a **Contribution** or contributions having a cumulative total of \$500 or more during the 48-month period before the **Application** was filed or during the pendency of the **Application**, I will file a disclosure providing the name of the **Candidate** or **Elected Official** to whose treasurer or **Political Committee** the **Contribution** was made, the amount, and the date of the **Contribution**; and that a **Contribution** made between the filing and the disposition of the **Application** will be disclosed within 5 business days after the **Contribution**.

3. I, the **Applicant**, acknowledge and affirm that, if I begin **Engaging in Business** with an **Elected Official** between the filing and the disposition of the **Application**, I will file this Affidavit at the time of **Engaging in Business** with the **Elected Official**.

I SOLEMNLY AFFIRM UNDER THE PENALTIES OF PERJURY and upon personal knowledge that the contents of this Affidavit are true.

Mark Bennett

(Print Full Name)

Mark L. Bennett Vice President 2/10/26
(Sign full name & indicate legal capacity, if applicable) Date

Zoning Matter: G & R Maple Lawn, Inc.

DISCLOSURE OF CONTRIBUTION

As required by the Maryland Public Ethics Law Annotated Code of Maryland, General Provisions Article Sections 5-852 through 5-854

ALL BOLDED TERMS ARE DEFINED BY SECTION 5-852

If the **Applicant** or a **Party of Record** or their **Family Member** has made a **Contribution** or contributions having a cumulative value of \$500 or more during the 48-month period before the **Application** is filed or during the pendency of the **Application**, the **Applicant** or the **Party of Record** must file this disclosure providing the name of the **Candidate** or **Elected Official** to whose treasurer or **Political Committee** the **Contribution** was made, the amount, and the date of the **Contribution**.

For a **Contribution** made during the 48-month period before the **Application** is filed, the **Applicant** must file this disclosure when they file their **Application**, and a **Party of Record** must file this disclosure within 2 weeks after entering the above zoning matter.

A **Contribution** made between the filing and the disposition of the **Application** must be disclosed within 5 business days after the **Contribution**.

Any person who knowingly and willfully violates Sections 5-852 through 5-854 of the General Provisions Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland is subject to a fine of not more than \$5,000. If the person is not an individual, each officer and partner who knowingly authorized or participated in the violation is subject to the same penalty.

Applicant or Party of Record: Mark Bennett
(Print Full Name)



RECIPIENTS OF CONTRIBUTIONS:

| NAME | DATE | AMOUNT |
|------|------|--------|
| N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

I acknowledge and affirm that any **Contribution** I make between the filing of this disclosure and the disposition of the **Application** must be disclosed within 5 business days of the **Contribution**.

Mark Bennett

(Print Full Name)

Mark Bennett Vice President
(Sign full name & indicate legal
capacity, if applicable)

2/10/26
Date

This Affidavit must be signed, scanned and uploaded through the ProjectDox Zoning Petition Application process at <https://howard-md-us.avolvecloud.com/ProjectDox/>

For more information or questions, contact DPZ at (410) 313-2350.



AFFIDAVIT AND DISCLOSURE OF CONTRIBUTION

For Petitions to Amend the Zoning Regulations, Zoning Maps and Preliminary Develop Plans of Howard County

Zoning Matter: G & R Maple Lawn, Inc.

AFFIDAVIT AS TO CONTRIBUTIONS TO CANDIDATES AND BUSINESS ENGAGEMENTS WITH ELECTED OFFICIALS

As required by the Maryland Public Ethics Law Annotated Code of Maryland, General
Provisions Article Sections 5-852 through 5-854

ALL BOLDED TERMS ARE DEFINED BY SECTION 5-852 MARK EACH PARAGRAPH AS
APPLICABLE

1. I, Olde Scaggsville LLC, the **Applicant** filing an **Application** in the above zoning matter, to the best of my information, knowledge, and belief HAVE / HAVE NOT made a **Contribution** or contributions having a cumulative value of \$500 or more to the treasurer of a **Candidate** or the treasurer of a **Political Committee** during the 48-month period before the **Application** was filed; and I AM / AM NOT currently **Engaging in Business** with an **Elected Official**.
2. I, the **Applicant** or a **Party of Record** in the above referenced zoning matter, acknowledge and affirm that, if I or my **Family Member** has made a **Contribution** or contributions having a cumulative total of \$500 or more during the 48-month period before the **Application** was filed or during the pendency of the **Application**, I will file a disclosure providing the name of the **Candidate** or **Elected Official** to whose treasurer or **Political Committee** the **Contribution** was made, the amount, and the date of the **Contribution**; and that a **Contribution** made between the filing and the disposition of the **Application** will be disclosed within 5 business days after the **Contribution**.

3. I, the **Applicant**, acknowledge and affirm that, if I begin **Engaging in Business** with an **Elected Official** between the filing and the disposition of the **Application**, I will file this Affidavit at the time of **Engaging in Business** with the **Elected Official**.

I SOLEMNLY AFFIRM UNDER THE PENALTIES OF PERJURY and upon personal knowledge that the contents of this Affidavit are true.

Olde Scaggsville LLC

(Print Full Name)

Michael J. Buch Co-Manager

(Sign full name & indicate legal capacity, if applicable)

2/10/26

Date

Zoning Matter: G & R Maple Lawn, Inc.

DISCLOSURE OF CONTRIBUTION

As required by the Maryland Public Ethics Law Annotated Code of Maryland, General Provisions Article Sections 5-852 through 5-854

ALL BOLDED TERMS ARE DEFINED BY SECTION 5-852

If the **Applicant** or a **Party of Record** or their **Family Member** has made a **Contribution** or contributions having a cumulative value of \$500 or more during the 48-month period before the **Application** is filed or during the pendency of the **Application**, the **Applicant** or the **Party of Record** must file this disclosure providing the name of the **Candidate** or **Elected Official** to whose treasurer or **Political Committee** the **Contribution** was made, the amount, and the date of the **Contribution**.

For a **Contribution** made during the 48-month period before the **Application** is filed, the **Applicant** must file this disclosure when they file their **Application**, and a **Party of Record** must file this disclosure within 2 weeks after entering the above zoning matter.

A **Contribution** made between the filing and the disposition of the **Application** must be disclosed within 5 business days after the **Contribution**.

Any person who knowingly and willfully violates Sections 5-852 through 5-854 of the General Provisions Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland is subject to a fine of not more than \$5,000. If the person is not an individual, each officer and partner who knowingly authorized or participated in the violation is subject to the same penalty.

Applicant or Party of Record: Olde Scaggsville LLC
(Print Full Name)

RECIPIENTS OF CONTRIBUTIONS:

| NAME | DATE | AMOUNT |
|------|------|--------|
| N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

I acknowledge and affirm that any **Contribution** I make between the filing of this disclosure and the disposition of the **Application** must be disclosed within 5 business days of the **Contribution**.

Olde Scaggsville LLC

(Print Full Name)

Michael D. Bush Co-Manager

(Sign full name & indicate legal capacity, if applicable)

2/10/26

Date

This Affidavit must be signed, scanned and uploaded through the ProjectDox Zoning Petition Application process at <https://howard-md-us.avolvecloud.com/ProjectDox/>

For more information or questions, contact DPZ at (410) 313-2350.



AFFIDAVIT AND DISCLOSURE OF CONTRIBUTION

For Petitions to Amend the Zoning Regulations, Zoning Maps and Preliminary Develop Plans of Howard County

Zoning Matter: G & R Maple Lawn, Inc.

AFFIDAVIT AS TO CONTRIBUTIONS TO CANDIDATES AND BUSINESS ENGAGEMENTS WITH ELECTED OFFICIALS

As required by the Maryland Public Ethics Law Annotated Code of Maryland, General
Provisions Article Sections 5-852 through 5-854

ALL BOLDED TERMS ARE DEFINED BY SECTION 5-852 MARK EACH PARAGRAPH AS
APPLICABLE

1. I, Buch Construction, Inc., the **Applicant** filing an **Application** in the above zoning matter, to the best of my information, knowledge, and belief HAVE / HAVE NOT made a **Contribution** or contributions having a cumulative value of \$500 or more to the treasurer of a **Candidate** or the treasurer of a **Political Committee** during the 48-month period before the **Application** was filed; and I AM / AM NOT currently **Engaging in Business** with an **Elected Official**.
2. I, the **Applicant** or a **Party of Record** in the above referenced zoning matter, acknowledge and affirm that, if I or my **Family Member** has made a **Contribution** or contributions having a cumulative total of \$500 or more during the 48-month period before the **Application** was filed or during the pendency of the **Application**, I will file a disclosure providing the name of the **Candidate** or **Elected Official** to whose treasurer or **Political Committee** the **Contribution** was made, the amount, and the date of the **Contribution**; and that a **Contribution** made between the filing and the disposition of the **Application** will be disclosed within 5 business days after the **Contribution**.

3. I, the **Applicant**, acknowledge and affirm that, if I begin **Engaging in Business** with an **Elected Official** between the filing and the disposition of the **Application**, I will file this Affidavit at the time of **Engaging in Business** with the **Elected Official**.

I SOLEMNLY AFFIRM UNDER THE PENALTIES OF PERJURY and upon personal knowledge that the contents of this Affidavit are true.

Buch Construction, Inc.

(Print Full Name)

Michael J. Buch *SENIOR Vice President* *2/10/26*

(Sign full name & indicate legal capacity, if applicable)

Date

Zoning Matter: G & R Maple Lawn, Inc.

DISCLOSURE OF CONTRIBUTION

As required by the Maryland Public Ethics Law Annotated Code of Maryland, General Provisions Article Sections 5-852 through 5-854

ALL BOLDED TERMS ARE DEFINED BY SECTION 5-852

If the **Applicant** or a **Party of Record** or their **Family Member** has made a **Contribution** or contributions having a cumulative value of \$500 or more during the 48-month period before the **Application** is filed or during the pendency of the **Application**, the **Applicant** or the **Party of Record** must file this disclosure providing the name of the **Candidate** or **Elected Official** to whose treasurer or **Political Committee** the **Contribution** was made, the amount, and the date of the **Contribution**.

For a **Contribution** made during the 48-month period before the **Application** is filed, the **Applicant** must file this disclosure when they file their **Application**, and a **Party of Record** must file this disclosure within 2 weeks after entering the above zoning matter.

A **Contribution** made between the filing and the disposition of the **Application** must be disclosed within 5 business days after the **Contribution**.

Any person who knowingly and willfully violates Sections 5-852 through 5-854 of the General Provisions Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland is subject to a fine of not more than \$5,000. If the person is not an individual, each officer and partner who knowingly authorized or participated in the violation is subject to the same penalty.

Applicant or Party of Record: Buch Construction, Inc.

(Print Full Name)

RECIPIENTS OF CONTRIBUTIONS:

| NAME | DATE | AMOUNT |
|----------------------|-----------------|---------|
| The Calvin Ball Team | May 10, 2022 | \$2,000 |
| The Calvin Ball Team | May 10, 2022 | \$2,500 |
| The Calvin Ball Team | October 6, 2023 | \$1,500 |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

I acknowledge and affirm that any **Contribution** I make between the filing of this disclosure and the disposition of the **Application** must be disclosed within 5 business days of the **Contribution**.

Buch Construction, Inc.

(Print Full Name)

Michael J. Buch SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT *2/10/26*

(Sign full name & indicate legal capacity, if applicable) Date

This Affidavit must be signed, scanned and uploaded through the ProjectDox Zoning Petition Application process at <https://howard-md-us.avolvecloud.com/ProjectDox/>

For more information or questions, contact DPZ at (410) 313-2350.



AFFIDAVIT AND DISCLOSURE OF CONTRIBUTION

**For Petitions to Amend the Zoning Regulations, Zoning Maps
 and Preliminary Develop Plans of Howard County**

Zoning Matter: G & R Maple Lawn, Inc.

**AFFIDAVIT AS TO CONTRIBUTIONS TO CANDIDATES AND BUSINESS
 ENGAGEMENTS WITH ELECTED OFFICIALS**

**As required by the Maryland Public Ethics Law Annotated Code of Maryland, General
 Provisions Article Sections 5-852 through 5-854**

ALL BOLDDED TERMS ARE DEFINED BY SECTION 5-852 MARK EACH PARAGRAPH AS
 APPLICABLE

1. I, Mike Buch, the **Applicant** filing an **Application** in the above zoning matter, to the best of my information, knowledge, and belief **HAVE** / **HAVE NOT** made a **Contribution** or contributions having a cumulative value of \$500 or more to the treasurer of a **Candidate** or the treasurer of a **Political Committee** during the 48-month period before the **Application** was filed; and I **AM** / **AM NOT** currently **Engaging in Business** with an **Elected Official**.

2. I, the **Applicant** or a **Party of Record** in the above referenced zoning matter, acknowledge and affirm that, if I or my **Family Member** has made a **Contribution** or contributions having a cumulative total of \$500 or more during the 48-month period before the **Application** was filed or during the pendency of the **Application**, I will file a disclosure providing the name of the **Candidate** or **Elected Official** to whose treasurer or **Political Committee** the **Contribution** was made, the amount, and the date of the **Contribution**; and that a **Contribution** made between the filing and the disposition of the **Application** will be disclosed within 5 business days after the **Contribution**.

3. I, the **Applicant**, acknowledge and affirm that, if I begin **Engaging in Business** with an **Elected Official** between the filing and the disposition of the **Application**, I will file this Affidavit at the time of **Engaging in Business** with the **Elected Official**.

I SOLEMNLY AFFIRM UNDER THE PENALTIES OF PERJURY and upon personal knowledge that the contents of this Affidavit are true.

Mike Buch *MICHAEL L. BUCH*

(Print Full Name)

Michael L. Buch *Co-MANAGER* *2/10/26*

(Sign full name & indicate legal capacity, if applicable) Date

Zoning Matter: G & R Maple Lawn, Inc.

DISCLOSURE OF CONTRIBUTION

As required by the Maryland Public Ethics Law Annotated Code of Maryland, General Provisions Article Sections 5-852 through 5-854

ALL BOLDED TERMS ARE DEFINED BY SECTION 5-852

If the **Applicant** or a **Party of Record** or their **Family Member** has made a **Contribution** or contributions having a cumulative value of \$500 or more during the 48-month period before the **Application** is filed or during the pendency of the **Application**, the **Applicant** or the **Party of Record** must file this disclosure providing the name of the **Candidate** or **Elected Official** to whose treasurer or **Political Committee** the **Contribution** was made, the amount, and the date of the **Contribution**.

For a **Contribution** made during the 48-month period before the **Application** is filed, the **Applicant** must file this disclosure when they file their **Application**, and a **Party of Record** must file this disclosure within 2 weeks after entering the above zoning matter.

A **Contribution** made between the filing and the disposition of the **Application** must be disclosed within 5 business days after the **Contribution**.

Any person who knowingly and willfully violates Sections 5-852 through 5-854 of the General Provisions Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland is subject to a fine of not more than \$5,000. If the person is not an individual, each officer and partner who knowingly authorized or participated in the violation is subject to the same penalty.

Applicant or Party of Record: Mike Buch MICHAEL L. BUCH
(Print Full Name)

RECIPIENTS OF CONTRIBUTIONS:

| NAME | DATE | AMOUNT |
|----------------------|-----------------|---------|
| The Calvin Ball Team | October 6, 2023 | \$1,500 |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

I acknowledge and affirm that any **Contribution** I make between the filing of this disclosure and the disposition of the **Application** must be disclosed within 5 business days of the **Contribution**.

Mike Buch MICHAEL L. BUCH
(Print Full Name)

Michael L. Buch 2/10/26
(Sign full name & indicate legal capacity, if applicable) Date

This Affidavit must be signed, scanned and uploaded through the ProjectDox Zoning Petition Application process at <https://howard-md-us.avolvecloud.com/ProjectDox/>

For more information or questions, contact DPZ at (410) 313-2350.



AFFIDAVIT AND DISCLOSURE OF CONTRIBUTION

**For Petitions to Amend the Zoning Regulations, Zoning Maps
and Preliminary Develop Plans of Howard County**

Zoning Matter: G & R Maple Lawn, Inc.

**AFFIDAVIT AS TO CONTRIBUTIONS TO CANDIDATES AND BUSINESS
ENGAGEMENTS WITH ELECTED OFFICIALS**

**As required by the Maryland Public Ethics Law Annotated Code of Maryland, General
Provisions Article Sections 5-852 through 5-854**

**ALL BOLDED TERMS ARE DEFINED BY SECTION 5-852 MARK EACH PARAGRAPH AS
APPLICABLE**

- I, Carl Buch, the **Applicant** filing an **Application** in the above zoning matter, to the best of my information, knowledge, and belief **HAVE** / **HAVE NOT** made a **Contribution** or contributions having a cumulative value of \$500 or more to the treasurer of a **Candidate** or the treasurer of a **Political Committee** during the 48-month period before the **Application** was filed; and I **AM** / **AM NOT** currently **Engaging in Business** with an **Elected Official**.
- I, the **Applicant** or a **Party of Record** in the above referenced zoning matter, acknowledge and affirm that, if I or my **Family Member** has made a **Contribution** or contributions having a cumulative total of \$500 or more during the 48-month period before the **Application** was filed or during the pendency of the **Application**, I will file a disclosure providing the name of the **Candidate** or **Elected Official** to whose treasurer or **Political Committee** the **Contribution** was made, the amount, and the date of the **Contribution**; and that a **Contribution** made between the filing and the disposition of the **Application** will be disclosed within 5 business days after the **Contribution**.

3. I, the **Applicant**, acknowledge and affirm that, if I begin **Engaging in Business** with an **Elected Official** between the filing and the disposition of the **Application**, I will file this Affidavit at the time of **Engaging in Business** with the **Elected Official**.

I SOLEMNLY AFFIRM UNDER THE PENALTIES OF PERJURY and upon personal knowledge that the contents of this Affidavit are true.

Carl Buch

(Print Full Name)

Carl Buch PRESIDENT

(Sign full name & indicate legal capacity, if applicable)

2-10-2026

Date

Zoning Matter: G & R Maple Lawn, Inc.

DISCLOSURE OF CONTRIBUTION

As required by the Maryland Public Ethics Law Annotated Code of Maryland, General Provisions Article Sections 5-852 through 5-854

ALL BOLDED TERMS ARE DEFINED BY SECTION 5-852

If the **Applicant** or a **Party of Record** or their **Family Member** has made a **Contribution** or contributions having a cumulative value of \$500 or more during the 48-month period before the **Application** is filed or during the pendency of the **Application**, the **Applicant** or the **Party of Record** must file this disclosure providing the name of the **Candidate** or **Elected Official** to whose treasurer or **Political Committee** the **Contribution** was made, the amount, and the date of the **Contribution**.

For a **Contribution** made during the 48-month period before the **Application** is filed, the **Applicant** must file this disclosure when they file their **Application**, and a **Party of Record** must file this disclosure within 2 weeks after entering the above zoning matter.

A **Contribution** made between the filing and the disposition of the **Application** must be disclosed within 5 business days after the **Contribution**.

Any person who knowingly and willfully violates Sections 5-852 through 5-854 of the General Provisions Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland is subject to a fine of not more than \$5,000. If the person is not an individual, each officer and partner who knowingly authorized or participated in the violation is subject to the same penalty.

Applicant or Party of Record: Carl Buch
(Print Full Name)

RECIPIENTS OF CONTRIBUTIONS:

| NAME | DATE | AMOUNT |
|----------------------|-----------------|---------|
| The Calvin Ball Team | October 6, 2023 | \$2,000 |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

I acknowledge and affirm that any **Contribution** I make between the filing of this disclosure and the disposition of the **Application** must be disclosed within 5 business days of the **Contribution**.

Carl Buch

(Print Full Name)

Carl Buch PRESIDENT
(Sign full name & indicate legal
capacity, if applicable)

2-10-2026
Date

This Affidavit must be signed, scanned and uploaded through the ProjectDox Zoning Petition Application process at <https://howard-md-us.avolvecloud.com/ProjectDox/>

For more information or questions, contact DPZ at (410) 313-2350.



Property Owners Authorization for Zoning Petitions

Any Zoning Petition not submitted and otherwise signed by the Property Owner shall be submitted with written authorization from the Property Owner authorizing the Petitioner to act on behalf of the Property Owner.

I (we): Olde Scaggsville LLC
 (Print Property Owner(s) Name / Firm / Organization)

Hereby Authorize: G & R Maple Lawn, Inc.
 (Print Petitioner Name/Organization)

For Subject Property: 11292, 11296, Buch Way, Laurel, MD 20723
 (Print Subject Property Address)

To apply for the following Zoning Petition:

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Administrative Adjustment | <input type="checkbox"/> Non-Conforming Use (Hearing Examiner) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Nonconforming Use Confirmation (Division) | <input type="checkbox"/> Amend the Zoning Map of Howard County |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Temporary Use Permit | <input type="checkbox"/> Amend the Zoning Regulations of Howard County |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Non-Residential Variance | <input type="checkbox"/> Preliminary Development Plan in a MXD District |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Residential District Variance | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Amended Preliminary Development Plan |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Conditional Use | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Explain): |

The undersigned property owner does further authorize the Petitioner to make applications for any and all site plans and/or permits necessary to implement its plan in relation to the aforementioned conditional Zoning Petition.

MICHAEL L. BUCH
 Name
MBUCH@BUCH.US.COM
 Property Owners Email

Michael L. Buch
 Property Owners Signature
8155 WESTSIDE BLVD.
FULTON, MD 20759
 Property Owners Address

2/10/26
 Date
240-375-6294
 Property Owners Phone



Howard County Maryland
Department of Planning and Zoning
 3430 Courthouse Drive, Ellicott City, MD 21043

dpzzoning@howardcountymd.gov

(410) 313-2350

Property Owners Authorization for Zoning Petitions

Any Zoning Petition not submitted and otherwise signed by the Property Owner shall be submitted with written authorization from the Property Owner authorizing the Petitioner to act on behalf of the Property Owner.

I (we): Olde Scaggsville LLC
 (Print Property Owner(s) Name / Firm / Organization)

Hereby Authorize: G & R Maple Lawn, Inc.
 (Print Petitioner Name/Organization)

For Subject Property: 11292, 11296, Buch Way, Laurel, MD 20723
 (Print Subject Property Address)

To apply for the following Zoning Petition:

- Administrative Adjustment
- Nonconforming Use Confirmation (Division)
- Temporary Use Permit
- Non-Residential Variance
- Residential District Variance
- Conditional Use
- Non-Conforming Use (Hearing Examiner)
- Amend the Zoning Map of Howard County
- Amend the Zoning Regulations of Howard County
- Preliminary Development Plan in a MXD District
- Amended Preliminary Development Plan
- Other (Explain):

The undersigned property owner does further authorize the Petitioner to make applications for any and all site plans and/or permits necessary to implement its plan in relation to the aforementioned conditional Zoning Petition.

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| <u>Carl Buch</u> Name | <u>Carl Buch</u> Property Owners Signature | <u>2-10-2026</u> Date |
| <u>cbuch@buch.us.com</u> Property Owners Email | <u>18349 PIPES LANE</u> Property Owners Address | <u>240-375-6764</u> Property Owners Phone |
| | <u>SYKESVILLE, MARYLAND 21784</u> | |



ZONING PETITION AFFIDAVIT

Petitioner Name: Olde Scaggsville LLC
 Property Address: 11292 Buch Way, Laurel, MD 20723
 Zoning Petition Type: Zoning Map Amendment

Affidavit made pursuant to the pertinent provisions of Title 22 of the Howard County Code as amended.

The undersigned does hereby declare that no officer or employee of Howard County, whether elected or appointed, has received prior hereto or will receive subsequent hereto, any monetary or material consideration, any service or thing of value, directly or indirectly, upon more favorable terms than those granted to the public generally in connection with the submission, processing, issuance, grant or award of the attached application for a zoning petition as requested for the property referenced above.

I we, do solemnly declare and affirm under the penalties of perjury that the contents of the foregoing affidavit are true and correct to the best of my, our, knowledge, information and belief.

MICHAEL L. BUCH
 Petitioner Name

Michael L. Buch
 Signature

5/19/26
 Date

ELLEN BUCH
 Witness Name

Ellen Buch
 Signature

5/19/26
 Date

 Witness Name

 Signature

 Date

This Affidavit must be signed, scanned and uploaded through the ProjectDox Zoning Petition Application process at <https://howard-md-us.avolvecloud.com/ProjectDox/>

For more information or questions, contact DPZ at (410) 313-2350.



ZONING PETITION AFFIDAVIT

Petitioner Name: G & R Maple Lawn Inc.
 Property Address: 11788 Scaggsville Road, Fulton, MD 20759
 Zoning Petition Type: Preliminary Development Plan Amendment

Affidavit made pursuant to the pertinent provisions of Title 22 of the Howard County Code as amended.

The undersigned does hereby declare that no officer or employee of Howard County, whether elected or appointed, has received prior hereto or will receive subsequent hereto, any monetary or material consideration, any service or thing of value, directly or indirectly, upon more favorable terms than those granted to the public generally in connection with the submission, processing, issuance, grant or award of the attached application for a zoning petition as requested for the property referenced above.

I we, do solemnly declare and affirm under the penalties of perjury that the contents of the foregoing affidavit are true and correct to the best of my, our, knowledge, information and belief.

Michael Greenbaum
 Petitioner Name President G & R Maple Lawn, Inc. [Signature] 5-20-2026
 Signature Date

Cheryl Bailey
 Witness Name Cheryl Bailey 5-20-2026
 Signature Date

Susan Bollinger
 Witness Name Susan M Bollinger 5-20-2026
 Signature Date

This Affidavit must be signed, scanned and uploaded through the ProjectDox Zoning Petition Application process at <https://howard-md-us.avolvecloud.com/ProjectDox/>

For more information or questions, contact DPZ at (410) 313-2350.

From: [Heinl, Mandee](#)
To: [Sauer, Julia](#)
Cc: [Tyler, Justin](#)
Subject: RE: ZB-1134M Maple Lawn
Date: Thursday, May 21, 2026 3:36:52 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[57917925-v1-Affidavit Zoning Petition \(Olde Scaggsville\) - ZMA Petition \(executed\).pdf](#)
[57920294-v1-Affidavit Zoning Petition \(G&R\) - PDP & ZMA Petitions \(executed\).pdf](#)

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 Julia,

Sorry for my delay here – this has been an adventure. Here is the information – please let me know if I missed anything.

- G & R Maple Lawn, Inc.
 - Officers
 - Michael Greenebaum (President)
 - Business Address: 1829 Reisterstown Road, Suite 300, Baltimore MD 21208
 - Date Office Assumed: December 1, 2012
 - Mark Bennett (Vice President)
 - Business Address: 1829 Reisterstown Road, Suite 300, Baltimore MD 21208
 - Date Office Assumed: December 1, 2012
 - Susan Bollinger (Secretary and Treasurer)
 - Business Address: 1829 Reisterstown Road, Suite 300, Baltimore MD 21208
 - Date Office Assumed: December 1, 2012
 - Owners of Maple Lawn Old Farm LLC w/ at least at 5% ownership interest
 - 2012 Greenebaum Dynasty Trust I
 - Michael Greenebaum (Sole Beneficiary)
 - 1829 Reisterstown Road, Suite 300, Baltimore, MD 21208
 - 2012 Greenebaum Dynasty Trust II
 - Amy Greenebaum Burwen (Sole Beneficiary)
 - 1829 Reisterstown Road, Suite 300, Baltimore, MD 21208
 - Mark Bennett
 - 1829 Reisterstown Road, Suite 300, Baltimore, MD 21208

- Owners of Olde Scaggsville LLC w/ at least a 5% ownership interest
 - Mike Buch
 - 8155 Westside Boulevard, Fulton, MD, 20759
 - Carl Buch
 - 8155 Westside Boulevard, Fulton, MD, 20759

TY!

Mandee

Mandee Heinl

SAUL EWING LLP | Baltimore

Office: [\(410\) 332-8980](tel:4103328980)

From: Sauer, Julia <jsauer@howardcountymd.gov>

Sent: Monday, May 18, 2026 4:38 PM

To: Heinl, Mandee <mandee.heinl@saul.com>

Cc: Tyler, Justin <jtyler@howardcountymd.gov>

Subject: ZB-1134M Maple Lawn

****EXTERNAL EMAIL** - This message originates from outside our Firm. Please consider carefully before responding or clicking links/attachments.**

Good afternoon, Mandee.

I hope you enjoyed your weekend. I wanted to follow up on a conversation we had a couple weeks ago about providing a list of names, and business addresses, of all individuals having at least 5% financial interest in the properties (pursuant to Section 16.205(c)(iv)-(vi) of the County Code). I wanted to see if you had any questions or if you had an opportunity to gather the information?

Thank you!

Julia Sauer

Chief | Division of Public Service and Zoning Administration

410.313.4342 (o) | jsauer@howardcountymd.gov

3430 Court House Drive, Ellicott City, MD 21043 | [website](#)



**Meeting Notes
Maple Lawn Farms
7600 Maple Lawn Boulevard
Fulton, Maryland
Pre-Submission Community Meeting**

Meeting Date: January 9, 2026, at 6:00 pm

Location: St Mark's Episcopal Church, 12700 Hall Shop Road, Highland, Maryland

Attendees:

Michael Greenebaum – Greenebaum Enterprises, Inc.

Mark Bennett – Greenebaum Enterprises, Inc.

Mike Buch – Buch Construction

Dan Sweeney – Gutschick, Little & Weber, P.A.

Mandee Heintz – Saul Ewing LLP

Sean Cooley – Saul Ewing LLP

See attached list



Meeting Minutes:

• **Introduction**

- We are here tonight to discuss a Preliminary Development Plan (or PDP) Amendment to Maple Lawn farms and the addition and rezoning of approximately 2.5 acres adjacent to the Business District. Many projects in the area have incorporated the name Maple Lawn due to the success of this project; however, for the purposes of the PDP, Maple Lawn is defined by the blue boundary.
- The original Maple Lawn PDP was approved in 2000. It was later amended in 2006. As some of you may know, there was an amendment submitted to Howard County in 2021, however that proposed amendment was withdrawn. The plan we are presenting tonight is a different plan, that reflects the feedback from the community to the 2021 proposal.
- This is the Proposed Preliminary Development Plan Amendment (shown on screen). The PDP is a land use plan. The plan lists the amount of each land use type, the maximum allowable density, and the maximum allowable commercial area. These limits are based on the MXD Zoning. The plan does not propose a specific subdivision layout. This will come later as part of a future sketch plan submission.
- **Changes proposed:**
 - a. Increase the density within Maple Lawn from the currently approved 2.2 units per acre to 3.0 units per acre. 3.0 is the maximum allowed by the RR-MXD-3 Zoning. This increase would allow an additional 418 new units to be built in Maple Lawn
 - b. Revise the land use in Maple Lawn West / Old Farm. With this proposal, all land use in Maple Lawn West will be either single-family detached or open

space. The amendment revises the layout but doesn't change the land-use categories in the area.

- c. Expand the maple lawn boundary to include two new parcels totaling 2.5 acres. This area will be added to the business district. The two parcels being incorporated into Maple Lawn are currently zoned B-1. As part of this process, they will be rezoned to RR-MDX-3.
 - d. Change the land use in the southeast corner of the Business District from Employment to Other Residential. Other Residential allows both single-family attached (townhomes) or multi-family buildings.
 - This plan shows the changes in red compared to the previously approved 2006 PDP plan. As you can see, the changes are limited to Maple Lawn West and Business. The reconfiguration of the single-family detached and open space is shown in the west, and the expansion and land-use change are shown in the business. The revisions to the chart show increases in density, total land area, and revised land-use totals.
 - This plan shows the changes in red compared to the previously submitted 2021 amendment, which was later withdrawn. The dark grey, which corresponds to other residential, has been completely removed from Maple Lawn West, leaving only single-family detached and open space.
 - Although the PDP does not propose a specific site layout, here is a conceptual rendering showing what could be done with the proposed land uses and densities. Single-family detached homes are shown in the west, and a new apartment building is shown in the business district.
 - Zooming into the business district, this shows how a potential 260-unit +/- building could fit with the area, rezoned to RR-MXD-3 and designated as Other Residential.
 - Finally, zooming in on Maple Lawn West, this layout shows 253 new single-family detached homes with roads and open space, and is also anticipated to include additional amenity features for Maple Lawn.
- **Existing Conditions**
 - The Maple Lawn West is located at 11788 Scaggsville Rd, and consists of 110 acres of mostly undeveloped land with a turkey farm. The expansion area in the Business District is located at 11296 Buch Way and consists of two parcels totaling 2.5 acres. The parcel has a small building.
 - The property is zoned RR-MXD-3 and B-1.
- **Proposed Conditions**
 - The proposed Second Amended Preliminary Development Plan includes 481 residential units split between the Old Farm District (approx. 221 units) and the Business District and expansion area (approx. 260 units).
 - As presented, the proposed Second Amended Preliminary Development Plan revises the permitted density to correspond to the increase in residential units, altering the allowable land use and unit types, and providing alternative access to Route 216.
 - The total PDP project boundary will be expanded by 3 acres +/-.

- The expanded area will be rezoned from B-1 to RR-MXD-3.
- **Community Input with Responses**
 - A community member asked about new recreational amenities such as tot lots and a gym on the West District Property.
 - **A:** Places for kids to play and fitness areas will be included on the Old Farm District development.
 - A community member asked whether there be a new community center.
 - **A:** In theory, yes, there would be a new community center. However, this is early in the process, and plans are not finalized.
 - A community member asked what the estimate is for when the house is built if all goes well with the approval process.
 - **A:** It will be at least three years before shovels are in the ground.
 - A community member asked what Howard County thinks the impact from the new development will be on the schools.
 - **A:** In order to build a new school in Howard County, the schools must be “open”, meaning they have capacity. If the schools are over capacity and “closed”, the project will be delayed for up to five (5) years, or until the schools have capacity to accommodate new students. Right now, all of the schools are open. This development would require school seats for elementary, middle and high school students.
 - A community member asked how many seats are left in the Howard County schools.
 - **A:** We do not have an exact number.
 - A community member asked how many cars will be introduced with this new development, and whether there will be a new traffic plan.
 - **A:** It is currently unclear how many new cars will be introduced. Regardless, there will be a new traffic plan, as required by the development process.
 - A community member asked why the original plan for 32 homes was abandoned?
 - **A:** HoCo by Design, the General Plan, indicates that there is a housing shortage in Howard County. The highest and best use for the property is more than 32 units.
 - A community member asked how much impervious surface is being added by the change in the development plan.
 - **A:** With the currently approved plan, on average, the lots in Maple Lawn West would have been 10% impervious. With the amended plan, the lots in Maple Lawn West would be on average 35% impervious.
 - A community member asked if the development will be more than 5,000 square feet.
 - **A:** Yes. The development will comply with County regulations.
 - A community member asked what kind of stormwater management and buffering will be added to protect existing communities.
 - **A:** The buffers for the new development will be similar to those for the other parts of Maple Lawn. This is still early in the process, we are open to feedback, and suggestions to address community concerns or ideas.
 - A community member asked how big the Old Farm District is.
 - **A:** Just over 100 acres.

- A community member asked about the impact of the project on the schools and traffic.
- **A:** It is too early to have an answer on schools. We are working on a new traffic study and this will be public when it is complete and the petition is submitted.
- A community member asked whether an adjacent community to the Old Farm District that is having issues with power and septic could see improvements with power and septic issues as part of the new development.
- **A:** We cannot speak to adjacent, unrelated communities, but we will include in the meeting minutes to document the concern.
- A community member asked how many kids will be added to the community by this new proposed development as compared to the previous 2021 proposal.
- **A:** The expectation is that the apartments will not add the same number of kids as the single-family homes. There are less homes in the Old Farm District so presumably there will be less kids with this development, than the 2021 proposal.
- A community member stated that “Howard County public schools are shrinking. There are more than enough seats for students but there will be redistricting. However, this is not likely to affect Maple Lawn kids because they are local. Traffic is working well so far. This is a much better plan than the one from 2021. I appreciate the use of the vacant lots for an apartment building because the Business District is failing. I want the developer to consider getting rid of the seven lanes on Maple Lawn Boulevard.”
- **A:** The point of this plan is to put more vibrancy in the Business District.
- Several other community members agreed this proposal was more in line with community input from 2021 and appreciated the shift in density to the Business District.
- A community member asked how the land for the apartment building would be zoned.
- **A:** RR-MXD-3, with a land use designation of Other Residential.
- A community member asked how residents of the apartment building will access the building.
- **A:** While the plan is not final, the idea is that the primary access will be off of Route 216, directly or indirectly.
- A community member suggested that if access to the development on the Old Farm District is proposed off of Yaeger, there should be speed bumps added to Yaeger.
- **A:** Thank you. We will look into that.
- A community member stated that it is not good planning to have only one way to access the Garden District, and only one way to access the development on the Old Farm District off of Route 216.
- **A:** The Old Farm (Maple Lawn West) and Garden District will connect with the proposed plan, giving each two access points.
- A community member asked if there are any MIHUs as a part of this plan.
- **A:** Maple Lawn has already satisfied its affordable housing requirement. Nevertheless, the proposed apartments will have 15% MIHUs as a show of good faith and commitment to the goals of HoCo By Design.

- A community member stated that there should be a study on the Vine apartment building and the number of children who live in the building.
- **A:** We will look into that.
- A community member stated that there is an issue with a vacated road, and asked what is going to happen with this vacated road, and whether the new traffic circle will be sufficient for public safety?
- **A:** The new circle is conceptual and this will be reviewed. State Highway will deal with the landlocked paved surface.
- A community member asked/stated whether the original plan had an MIHU exemption.
- **A:** Maple Lawn was not exempt. The proposed 15% is above and beyond.
- A community member asked/stated if the apartment building would have MIHU units on-site.
- **A:** Yes, 15% in the apartment building. We would work with DHCD.
- A community member asked/stated about how many children would be in the apartment building. She is concerned about redistricting.
- **A:** We are not sure, but will note the concern.
- A community member asked/stated whether the new medical building that is being built has new tenants.
- **A:** We are 16 to 18 months away from finishing that build. There is retail that will be built there as well.
- A community member asked/stated the total number of units.
- **A:** About 250 single families on the farm and 260 apartment units.
- A community member asked/stated what the guarantee is for this area to have the school rating to continue.
- **A:** We do not control the school ratings.
- A community member asked/stated that the fact that redistricting happens so often is that the modelling is not working.
- **A:** The county's calculation has the schools designated as open or closed, which determines whether new development is permitted.
- A community member asked/stated if you could highlight where the apartment building will be located.
- **A:** It's next to the gas station in the southeastern part of the Business District. Mande showed the location on the screen.
- A community member asked/stated what the thought behind why there was a road connecting the West District to the Garden District.
- **A:** This is a fire department requirement.
- A community member asked if Maple Lawn East will be a part of the same HOA.
- **A:** Maple Lawn West would likely have its own HOA. There may be collaboration between the HOAs. To be determined as the project progresses. We will continue to meet with HOA leadership.
- A community member asked/stated if you could give existing Maple Lawn residents assurance that existing Maple Lawn residents will not be responsible for Maple Lawn West.
- **A:** Yes, this will be the responsibility of Maple Lawn West.
- A community member asked/stated how tall the apartment building will be.

- **A:** It will be the same height as the adjacent office buildings.
- A community member asked/stated what is currently where the apartment building is planned to be.
- **A:** It is a parking lot and a single building.
- A community member asked/stated what the impact will be to the fire department.
- **A:** The fire department will review site plans prior to approval.
- A community member asked/stated if the original maple lawn can be kept in the same school district.
- **A:** We do not control the schools but will make a note in the minutes.
- A community member asked/stated that I like the plan and the fact the apartment building is being built where it is being built. This is good for the housing shortage. Dense housing is good. It will hopefully make the community better.
- **A:** Thank you.
- A community member asked/stated is Gene Yaeger's house going to stay.
- **A:** As far as we know, but that is not up to the developer.
- A community member asked/stated whether approval for the site plan will be granted with this level of engineering.
- **A:** No. Detailed engineering will happen at the site planning process.
- A community member asked/stated if the impacts of what has been proposed has been adequately addressed.
- **A:** Not all of the impacts are tested at this phase. Some will be tested at the site plan stage.
- A community member asked/stated if stormwater management will be adequate.
- **A:** This is addressed during the site planning stage. Stormwater management will be addressed onsite, consistent with county requirements.
- A community member asked/stated what the phase process will be for this development. Will the plans for where construction be better this time in terms of access.
- **A:** The purpose of these meetings is to discuss these issues. We will discuss with the community to determine the least disruptive phasing.
- A community member asked/stated what the long-term goal is for a Maple Lawn West HOA.
- **A:** The Maple Lawn West HOA will likely be separate, but the idea would be for all of Maple Lawn to be cohesive.
- A community member asked/stated what the lot sizes will be.
- **A:** Similar density to Garden District and Midtown West District.
- A community member asked/stated if Maple Lawn West is part of public service area.
- **A:** Yes.
- A community member asked/stated to consider the intersection of Route 216 and Pendell. A traffic light please.
- **A:** Future traffic studies at the next phase will include more detailed operational evaluations of that intersection
- A community member asked/stated if there is a way to have multiple routes.
- **A:** There would be another community meeting for the site plan to address this level of detail. This is very early in the process.

- A community member asked/stated how the existing car break ins will be addressed.
- **A:** Cameras, gates, and lights could be a solution. We are open to discussing anything that would make Maple Lawn safer.
- A community member asked/stated at what point in the process will a builder be picked, and will the homes have a similar aesthetic to the existing Maple Lawn community.
- **A:** The goal in the builder selection is to make sure the Maple Lawn community is cohesive and looks the same as the existing homes. A builder has not been chosen.
- A community member asked/stated how long the farm is going to be in operation.
- **A:** It's not going away tomorrow. But we are not sure.
- A community member asked/stated whether there are any plans to develop the parcel next to Maple Lawn West.
- **A:** It has been discussed as potentially a 55 and older community. But it is not in the public service area which is a barrier. The developer does not currently own this parcel.
- A community member asked/stated whether this would be the end of the Maple Lawn development.
- **A:** Yes. This would be the final phase of Maple Lawn.
- A community member asked/stated what the major milestones will be for the community for when all of the approvals could come.
- **A:** This will go before the Planning Board, the Zoning Board, and possibly the Hearing Examiner. If approved, a subsequent community input process would occur with the site plan. Mandee noted "this meeting is the minimum requirement. We are not limited to this meeting and we are more than happy to meet with any and all community members – in Maple Lawn, in homes, coffee." Mandee shared her contact information and told anyone interested to reach out to continue the conversation. She also noted she's met with HOA members and the school principals, and is happy to meet with anyone.
- A community member asked/stated if the community can be kept informed during the process, and whether the presentation can be sent.
- **A:** Absolutely, and we will include the presentation in the minutes.

Pre-Submission Community Meeting Sign In Sheet
Maple Lawn Farms PDP -1/9/26

| Name | Address or Email address |
|-----------------------|---|
| PAUL S. JANE | 7730 WATER STREET, FULTON, MD 20759 |
| Carol Baker | 11733 Wayneridge St. Fulton, MD 20759 lollipopmom@comcast.net |
| BOB + DEB GREENBERGEL | 11414 Inger Blvd FULTON MD 20759 |
| Pen Hunt | 11306 Terrace Ln Fulton MD 20759 |
| Rick Gordon | 11426 Choptank St Fulton MD 20759 |
| MARK FRUTH RICHMAN | 11422 CHOPTANK ST. FULTON, MD rmrichman@gmail.com |
| Christina Arnold | 7000 Maple Lawn Blvd manager@mapelawnhoa.com |
| Celia Strickler | 8810 Gunston St. Fulton MD 20759 |
| Jamie Strickler | " " |
| Lori Jurane | 7000 Maple Lawn Blvd. LIZIANNE911@hotmail.com |
| Michelle Bloor | mishook7@gmail.com |
| Richard Robbins | 8509 Callibrook Ln, Fulton, MD 20759 - rjrobbins@comcast.net |
| Adrienne Tankulis | ^{olghant} adrienne.tankulis@gmail.com |
| Robert Dehan | dehan.robert@gmail.com |
| Shareda Karunakaran | sssssharada@gmail.com |
| TOM SIMS | 8421 Flowering Street |
| Melissa Terinsky | 11472 Inger Blvd, melissa.terinsky@gmail.com |
| Chris Bard | 7768 Elmwood |
| Joel Land | 11542 Inger Blvd JLAND20GMAIL.COM |
| Josh Teik | 7665 Madtown |
| Ryan Hermann | 10608 Steamboat Ldg |
| Beth Viscarra | BethViscarra@gmail.com |

Pre-Submission Community Meeting Sign In Sheet

Maple Lawn Farms PDP -1/9/26

| Name | Address or Email address |
|---------------------|---|
| Erika Gardiner | erikalgardiner@gmail.com → Maple Lawn South |
| Miti Patel | miti.patel1990@gmail.com |
| Ethen Consoli | Serenergy massage 28@gmail.com |
| David Boyd | dboyd17@gmail.com |
| JOEL HUREWITZ | joelhurewitz@gmail.com |
| Caral Whitehead | Caramiaul5@gmail.com #11538 Jagan Blvd. |
| PAUL SCHOLZ | pst.bucket@comcast.net |
| Prasad Karkhanavala | pppprpad@gmail.com |
| Hank Boyd | hboyd20vmd.edu |
| Sony Brathwaite | sbrathwaite@msn.com, Fulton, MD |
| JANE BEUMER | BEUMERJ@GMAIL.COM |
| Kim Cross | Kimjonescross.dvm@gmail.com |
| Clay Cross | claycross@gmail.com |
| Paul Mavromihalis | pmavromihalis@gmail.com |
| Shelly Brown | Shelly L. Brown 10@gmail.com |
| Abigail Kelman | ajkelman@yahoo.com |
| Scottie Johnson | scottie.johnson4@gmail.com |
| MICHAEL CONSOLI | elmd5013@aol.com. |
| Chionta | CAGionta@gmail.com |
| Eloise Kanowsky | eloise.kanowsky@gmail.com |
| M.J. Jones | mj.jones.inc@gmail.com |

