

1 **OLDE SCAGGSVILLE ROAD, LLC;** * **BEFORE THE**
 2 **G & R MAPLE LAWN, INC.** * **PLANNING BOARD OF**
 3 **PETITIONER** * **HOWARD COUNTY, MARYLAND**
 4 **ZB-1134M (REZONING)** *

5
 6 * * * * *

7 **MOTION: To recommend that the Zoning Board rezone the Property from B-1 to RR-MXD-**
 8 **3.**

9 **ACTION: *Vote 3-0***

10 * * * * *

11 **RECOMMENDATION**

12 On April 23, 2026, the Planning Board of Howard County, Maryland, considered the petition of Olde
 13 Scaggsville Road, LLC; G&R Maple Lawn, Inc., (the “Petitioner”), to amend the Zoning Map to rezone 11292
 14 & 11296 Buch Way; approximately 2 acres in size (the “Property”) from the Business: Local (B-1) zoning
 15 district to the Rural Residential Mixed Use (RR-MXD-3) zoning district. The Property is located along the
 16 north side of Buch Way. Mr. Mike Buch is the owner of the Property. The petition is not a Site Plan rezoning;
 17 thus, no documented site plan was submitted; however, the Petitioner has indicated that the Property would be
 18 incorporated into the Maple Lawn neighborhood (the “Development”) and developed with a 260-unit apartment
 19 building, if approved.

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

22 **TESTIMONY**

23 Ms. Lynda Eisenberg, AICP, DPZ Director, presented the proposed Zoning Map Amendment (ZMA).
 24 Ms. Eisenberg explained the zoning history of the Property and how the zoning maps have changed over time.
 25 Ms. Eisenberg explained the Petitioner’s “change” argument stating that there was a change in the character of
 26 the neighborhood due to the adoption of the 2013 Comprehensive Zoning Plan (CZP) and a 2016 Zoning Board
 27 case, (ZB-1107) to rezone the Property from RR-MXD-3 to B-1. She then discussed the appropriateness of the
 28 B-1 and RR-MXD-3 districts and the reasoning behind the creation of both districts.

29 Following DPZ’s presentation of the proposed amendment, Ms. Mande Heinl, Petitioner’s
 30 Representative, presented testimony on behalf of the Petitioner. Ms. Heinl testified that the map amendment is
 31 part of a larger goal of integrating these parcels into the overall Maple Lawn Development plan to construct
 32 260 multi-family apartments. She discussed that Maple Lawn is a pre-existing, well established community that
 33 has been planned out, designed and built over the last several years. Mr. Michael Greenebaum, the Master

1 Developer and additional Representative for the Petitioner, gave a brief overview and history of the
 2 Development. Mr. Mike Buch, the Property Owner, testified about the proposed apartment building within the
 3 rezoned parcels. He gave a brief overview of the history of the parcels and the history of the surrounding areas.
 4 Mr. Dan Sweeney, the Civil Engineer for the project, gave an overview of the subject Property and outlined the
 5 proposal. He explained that the rest of the Development is RR-MXD-3 and that the Property was an outlier
 6 parcels, designated as B-1 and was underutilized. Ms. Heidl asserted that the rezoning request is based on
 7 change of the existing neighborhood. She explained that the parcels were zoned RR-MXD-3 prior to the
 8 rezoning that took place in 2016. She further asserted that these parcels were not part of the Maple Lawn
 9 Development Preliminary Development Plan (PDP), were not being developed under a mixed use plan and
 10 were functioning as independent sites; thus, leading to the Zoning Boards agreement on the “Mistake” argument
 11 when rezoning the parcels from RR-MXD-3 to B-1. Ms. Heidl stated that there have been substantial,
 12 unanticipated changes in the character of the neighborhood since 2016. She indicated that the County has
 13 recognized the need to address housing shortages and the need to expand housing opportunities throughout the
 14 County. Ms. Heidl further explained that since the adoption of HoCo By Design, the County’s General Plan, it
 15 has been emphasized that growth should be directed to activity centers, integrated into mixed use communities
 16 and where infrastructure already exists. She asserted that this Property is adjacent to the existing Business
 17 District of Maple Lawn, an established mixed-use activity center. Ms. Heidl further argued that there has been
 18 an unanticipated economic change in the neighborhood driven by the COVID-19 pandemic. It has reduced the
 19 demand for traditional office space, increased commercial vacancies in retail and other uses. The Maple Lawn
 20 Business District would benefit from and should be supported by integrated residential uses such as the
 21 proposed apartment use, if the Property is rezoned. She concluded that there has been a change to the
 22 surrounding neighborhood, and that the proposal includes incorporating these parcels into the overall PDP with
 23 a similar MXD overlay. She further stated that these parcels are adjacent to and are essentially part of the
 24 Business District and have frontage on a road to the Development that is also within the MXD overlay and
 25 governed by the same PDP.

26 Planning Board member, Ms. Barbara Mosier, inquired about which parcels were impacted by this
 27 proposed map amendment. Ms. Heidl explained the current site plan and outlined the parcels that will be zoned
 28 from B-1 to RR-MXD-3. She also explained the road in front of the rezoned parcels is already zoned RR-MXD-
 29 3.

30 During the hearing, a member of the public testified in opposition to the proposed zoning map
 31 amendment. Mr. Steven Pudchik testified indicating a concern with the rezoning of the parcels.
 32
 33
 34

BOARD DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATION

1 Planning Board Vice-Chair, Mr. Godsey, asked the other Board members if they had any additional
2 thoughts or questions. Ms. Mosier discussed the viability of the rezoning and questioned the “change” argument.
3 She further stated that the change of the function of the neighborhood in 2016 could be a possibility for the
4 ‘change’ argument. Vice-Chair Mr. Godsey stated that the existing B-1 designation is a sufficient option but by
5 rezoning to MXD, it would fit into the Development as a better option. Mr. Tilburg asked County Attorney Mr.
6 David Moore if there were any previous examples for ‘change’ arguments for rezoning cases. Mr. Moore
7 provided examples from reported Maryland cases but did not have any examples from Howard County directly.
8 Ms. Heidl explained that the changes that had taken place and why they changed the neighborhood
9 characteristics. She stated that this is the first time these parcels were considered in being integrated into the
10 overall Maple Lawn Development Plan. This integration is a change in the character of the neighborhood as it
11 changes the dynamic of the parcels. She also asserted that the adoption of HoCo By Design has encouraged and
12 called for the planning of integrated developments to achieve high quality planning. She concluded that in order
13 for these parcels to be integrated into the Development Plan, these parcels must be zoned RR-MXD-3. Ms.
14 Mosier summarized the changes outlined by Ms. Heidl and stated that the underutilized office parking areas
15 offer a substantial change in the character of the neighborhood. Mr. Tilburg inquired about commercial viability
16 of the Property. Ms. Heidl clarified that the Property is disconnected from the overall Maple Lawn community
17 and is surrounded by RR-MXD-3 zoned parcels. She explained that it is more difficult to construct an isolated
18 office rather than incorporating the use into a highly desired office area within an established community.
19

20 Ms. Mosier motioned to recommend that the Zoning Board rezone the Property from B-1 to RR-MXD-
21 3. Mr. Tilburg seconded the motion. The motion passed 3-0.

22 For the foregoing reasons, the Planning Board of Howard County, Maryland, on this 4th day of May,
23 2026, recommends that ZB-1134M, as described above, recommend that the Zoning Board rezone the Property
24 from B-1 to RR-MXD-3.

25
26 HOWARD COUNTY PLANNING BOARD

27
28
29 _____
Mr. James Cecil, Chair (absent)

30
31 DocuSigned by:
Mason Godsey

32 _____
Mr. Mason Godsey, Vice-chair
33
34

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13

Signed by:
William C Tilburg
62427B6131E44C6...

Mr. William Tilburg

Signed by:
Barbara Mosier
B65ABB04E9F949F...

Ms. Barbara Mosier

Ms. Lynn Moore (absent)

ATTEST:

DocuSigned by:
Lynda Eisenberg
4220B635863942E...

Lynda Eisenberg, AICP, Executive Secretary