

1 **ERICKSON LIVING PROPERTIES, II, LLC, * BEFORE THE**
2 **PETITIONER * PLANNING BOARD OF**
3 **CASE NO.: ZB-1118M * HOWARD COUNTY, MARYLAND**

4 * * * * *

5 **MOTION:** *To recommend approval of the petition to rezone 62.116 acres from B-2 and RC-*
6 *DEO to CEF-M for a 1,440-unit continuing care retirement community with public*
7 *and private amenities, service station, and enhancements, with the conditions*
8 *recommended by the Department of Planning and Zoning.*

9 **ACTION:** *Recommended approval; Vote 5-0.*

10 * * * * *

11 On March 215, 2019, the Planning Board of Howard County, Maryland, considered the petition of
12 Erickson Living Properties, II, LLC for a Zoning Map Amendment to rezone 62.116 acres from B-2 and RC-
13 DEO to CEF-M for a 1,440-unit continuing care retirement community with public and private amenities, a
14 service station, and community enhancements.

15 The Planning Board considered the petition, the Department of Planning and Zoning Technical Staff
16 Report and Recommendation, and the comments of reviewing agencies. DPZ recommended approval, citing
17 that the petition complies with the approval criteria for CEF Districts, and with the applicable General Plan
18 policies.

19 Bill Erskine and Scott Templin represented the Petitioner. Mr. Templin gave an overview of the
20 Erickson Living community model, the proposed site layout generally, and the proposed enhancements.

21
22 **Testimony**

23
24 Public Testimony consisted of ten speakers in favor of the Petition, four opposed, and two did not
25 express a preference. Speakers in favor, cited the need for additional housing in Howard County for residents
26 as they age, and three shared their own personal desires to find housing locally so that they could remain in
27 the area. Some speakers in favor noted concerns with road alignment and traffic volumes.

28 Mr. Richard Thomas, representing the Board of Directors of the River Hill Community Association,
29 spoke in favor of the Petition, noting that the left-hand turn into the project from MD 108 should be further
30 studied.

31 Ms. Gayle Annis-Forder, Senior Pastor of Linden-Linthicum United Methodist Church, spoke in
32 favor of the Proposal. Ms. Annis-Forder thanked the Petitioner for working with the community over the past
33 two years, and for providing public amenities that her congregation will be able to use. Ms. Annis-Forder also
34 expressed some concerns over traffic safety.

1 Ms. Nina Basu provided comments on behalf of the Inner Arbor Trust in Columbia, Maryland. Ms.
2 Basu spoke favorably on the Petition and the prospect of partnering with the Petitioner to support seniors in
3 accessing the arts.

4 Those opposing the project generally expressed concerns that the project was too large for the area,
5 unaffordable, that there was insufficient demand for CCRC units, and that an increase in traffic could result.

6 Mr. Jack Guarneri, representing the Bicycling Advocates of Howard County, opposed the Petition,
7 indicating that the traffic generated would be detrimental to the county and the enhancements would not
8 benefit the community.

9 Ms. Ann Jones discussed compatibility with surrounding preservation properties and the implications
10 associated with locating residential next to farming operations. She recommended that future residents be
11 made aware of these implications.

12 Board Discussion and Recommendation

13
14
15 In work session the Planning Board acknowledged the work that the developer had done with the
16 community to date and supported the campus-style design that respects the natural environment.

17 Mr. Phil Engelke commented that this project was a well thought-out, attractive campus that
18 embraces the stream valley. He also noted the concerns raised during public testimony related to traffic and
19 connections along Route 108 and commented that the project would be the first in the area to look to improve
20 traffic and accessibility along MD 108.

21 Ms. Erica Roberts echoed these comments and commended the applicant for their communication and
22 coordination with community groups and institutions.

23 Mr. Coleman inquired about the impact on existing housing stock and whether the new units will
24 accelerate a transition out of existing housing stock that would otherwise occur more gradually. He asked if
25 there have been any studies on the impact of an accelerated transition. The Petitioner responded that while
26 there hasn't been a study, the transition is more likely to be phased over time and depend on the individual
27 needs of the household.

28 Mr. Coleman also asked if there are certain improvements that require State Highway Association
29 approval and if, absent those approvals, the project could not go forward. DPZ advised the Board that any
30 needed approvals will occur as the plan advances through the review process.

31 Mr. McAlily acknowledged the applicant's efforts to engage the public and the involvement of the
32 Village Board.

33 Ms. Tudy Adler commented that the projects meets the requirements for the change in zoning and
34 made the motion to recommend approval to change the proposed zoning from RC-DEO to CEF with the four

1 recommendations from the Department of Planning and Zoning. Mr. McAliley seconded the motion. The
2 motion passed by a vote of 5 to 0.

3 For the foregoing reasons, the Planning Board of Howard County, Maryland, on this 8th day
4 of April 2019, recommends that Zoning Board Case No. ZB-1118M, as described above, be

5 APPROVED, with the following conditions:

- 6 1. The Site Development Plan shall comply with the Design Advisory Panel's recommendations, as
7 determined by the Director of Planning and Zoning.
- 8 2. Many of the proposed enhancements require approvals from the MD SHA and other regulatory
9 agencies. In the event that an enhancement required per the Decision and Order has not received a
10 full approval prior to the issuance of building permits or construction of the first CCRC residential
11 dwelling, the Petitioner will pay into an escrow account the full cost of constructing that
12 enhancement.
- 13 3. The Petitioner shall provide details concerning the maintenance over time of the multi-use pathway(s)
14 to ensure safe access and use by the broader community.
- 15 4. The Petitioner should work closely with the County to ensure that the needed utility system
16 components can be accommodated on the property.

17
18 HOWARD COUNTY PLANNING BOARD

19 Phillips Engelke /sk
20 Phillips Engelke, Chair

21 Erica Roberts /sk
22 Erica Roberts, Vice-chair

23 Delphine Adler /sk
24 Delphine Adler

25 Ed Coleman /sk
26 Ed Coleman

27 Kevin McAliley /sk
28 Kevin McAliley

29 ATTEST:

30 Valdis Lazdins
31 Valdis Lazdins, Executive Secretary