

IN THE MATTER OF

* BEFORE THE BOARD OF APPEALS

DONNA GORJÓN,

* OF

Appellant

* HOWARD COUNTY, MARYLAND

* CASE NO. BA-829-D / CE-26-17

* * * * *

APPELLANT'S NOTICE OF CITATION CORRECTIONS
TO MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

Appellant Donna Gorjón, pro se, submits this Notice to correct citations in her Memorandum of Points and Authorities filed July 30, 2026. The corrections conform the Memorandum to the provisions of the Howard County Zoning Regulations (“HCZR”) identified in the Administrative Agency’s Reply Memorandum served August 26, 2026. This Notice presents no new facts or requests for relief.

1. The provision under which DPZ made its “connected” determination.

Where the Memorandum identifies HCZR Section 120.0.B.2.a.2 as the provision under which DPZ made its “connected” determination, including where the Hearing Examiner’s Decision and Order of June 15, 2026 (page 4) restates Appellant’s argument, the correct citation is HCZR Section 128.0.B.2.a, which provides:

“An addition to a single-family detached dwelling may encroach into a setback without a variance, provided that the addition encroaches no further into the setback than the existing dwelling.”

DPZ’s Reply Memorandum confirms that Section 128.0.B.2.a is “the provision the Chief of Zoning Administration actually applied.” References in the Memorandum to the zoning reviewer’s notation on the permit survey, which cites “Section 120.0.B.2.a” (Exhibit 30), describe DPZ’s own record and are unchanged.

Appellant's Exhibit 33, which reproduced HCZR Section 120.0 (SC Shopping Center District), is replaced with the text of HCZR Section 128.0, Subsections A.1 and B, which contain the provisions cited in this Notice.

2. Section 129.0.

Section [III.I] of the Memorandum cites HCZR Section 129.0. Under Section 129.0.A, that section governs nonconforming uses, and a structure that does not conform only to setback or other bulk requirements "shall not be considered to be nonconforming within the meaning of these Regulations." Appellant therefore withdraws her reliance on Section 129.0.

The principle stated in Section [III.I] is governed instead by HCZR Section 128.0.B, the section on which DPZ relied. Section 128.0.B.5 provides:

"These provisions shall not be deemed to permit the intentional demolition and replacement of a structure which does not comply with current bulk requirements."

3. The basis of the appeal.

Section [III.A] of the Memorandum states that the Hearing Examiner misidentified the appeal as a code enforcement complaint under HCZR Section 130.0.B.4. Appellant clarifies that HCZR Sections 130.0.A.3 and 130.0.B.4 provide her right of appeal. Section 130.0.A.3 provides that appeals may be taken "by any person aggrieved" by "any decisions of the Department of Planning and Zoning," filed "not later than 30 calendar days from the date of the action." Section 130.0.B.4 authorizes the Hearing Authority "to hear and decide appeals where it is alleged the Department of Planning and Zoning has erred in the interpretation or application of any provisions of the Zoning Regulations."

The subject of the appeal is DPZ's March 10, 2026 decision in Case CE-26-17 and the "connected" determination under Section 128.0.B.2.a that the decision applied.

These corrections do not alter the facts or relief requested in the Memorandum.

Respectfully submitted,

Donna Gorjón
Appellant, Pro Se
gorjondo@att.net

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this 19th day of October, 2026, a copy of the foregoing Appellant's Notice of Citation Corrections was served by electronic mail to:

Kel Berg, Board Administrator – kberg@howardcountymd.gov
Aaron Weiss, Board Counsel – aweiss@howardcountymd.gov
David R. Moore, Senior Assistant County Solicitor, Counsel for DPZ –
dmoore@howardcountymd.gov
Kristen Perry, Deputy County Solicitor – kperry@howardcountymd.gov
Gary Kuc – gkuc@howardcountymd.gov
Lawrence Schoen, Property Owner – larryschoen@gmail.com
Marcie Karen Weil, Property Owner – hikingboots6@aol.com

Donna Gorjón