



# HOWARD COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND ZONING

3430 Court House Drive ■ Ellicott City, Maryland 21043 ■ 410-313-2350

Voice/Relay

Valdis Lazdins, Director

FAX 410-313-3467

February 14, 2019

Mr. Colin Chapin  
200006 Delaware Inc.  
445 Magna Drive  
Aurora Ontario L4G7A9

Dear Mr. Chapin:

RE: WP-19-067, Laurel Park Station

The Director of the Department of Planning and Zoning considered your request for an alternative compliance from the Howard County Subdivision and Land Development Regulations.

As of the date of this letter, the Planning Director **approved** your request for an alternative compliance of **Section 16.144(r) – Status of Plans which do not meet milestone deadlines, or which fail to provide information in a timely manner**; requires the submission of plans within a specified deadline date; **Section 16.145(b)(8)(i)(a) – Submission of Preliminary Plan**; which requires the submission of the preliminary plan/SDP within a specified milestone time period from the approval date of the Sketch Plan; **and Section 16.156(g)(2) – Additional Information**; which requires the resubmission of the revised plans within 45-days from the date of the revision request.

Approval is subject to the following conditions:

1. The revised Site Development Plan (SDP-15-063) for Phase 2 is extended for 6 months and must be submitted to the Department of Planning and Zoning **on or before September 3, 2019**.
2. The Site Development Plan and/or associated Final Plan for Phase 3 is extended for 9 months and must be submitted to the Department of Planning and Zoning **on or before November 12, 2019**.
3. The Site Development Plan and/or associated Final Plan for Phase 4 is extended for 9 months and must be submitted to the Department of Planning and Zoning **on or before January 1, 2020**.
4. Compliance with comments from the Development Engineering Division dated February 11, 2019.
5. On all future plan submissions, provide a brief description of alternative compliance petition, WP-19-067, as a general note to include request(s), section(s) of the regulations, action and date.

Our decision was made based on the following:

**Extraordinary hardship or practical difficulties which may result from strict compliance with the Regulations** - The extraordinary hardship or practical difficulty involved with this alternative compliance request would require the developer to lose their housing unit allocations if the APFO milestone date is not met. If the alternative compliance request was not approved, the issued housing unit allocations will be forfeited and a new Sketch Plan would be required thus placing a hardship on the applicant. Phase 1 of the development is under contract with a builder. The developer has recently undertaken extensive exercises in bidding the project as originally conceived and analyzing the feasibility of the future phases. It was determined that the original development scheme would not be economically feasible. The petitioner has been working with the County in modifying the project to achieve a more cost effective, functional and attractive design. Because of this redesign, engineering and architectural plans will require extensive revisions; thus, impacting the engineer and architect from meeting the established deadline dates. It is anticipated that the extension of time will provide an overall better design of the site.

**Not Detrimental to the Public Interest** - Approval of the alternative compliance request will not alter the essential character of the neighborhood and will not substantially impair the appropriate use or development of the surrounding properties. The granting of the alternative compliance request for an extension of the APFO milestone deadline date will not change the uses proposed on the site, but will provide an economically feasible project. The alternative compliance request does not request a relaxation in the design regulations; therefore, the approval of this alternative compliance request will not be detrimental to the public. The extension will allow the engineer and architect to perfect the design of the site and prepare the necessary plans for submission.

**Will Not Nullify the Intent or Purpose of the Regulations** - Approval of this alternative compliance request will not nullify the intent or purpose of the regulations since the site will be design under the TOD regulations. The new design will provide an economically feasible project with the same about of residential units and commercial space (office and retail) as approved under the original design.

**Extraordinary hardship or practical difficulties which may result from strict compliance with the Regulations** - The extraordinary hardship or practical difficulty involved with this alternative compliance request would require the developer to lose their housing unit allocations if the APFO milestone date is not met. If the alternative compliance request was not approved, the issued housing unit allocations will be forfeited and a new Sketch Plan would be required thus placing a hardship on the applicant. Phase 1 of the development is under contract with a builder. The developer has recently undertaken extensive exercises in bidding the project as originally conceived and analyzing the feasibility of the future phases. It was determined that the original development scheme would not be economically feasible. The petitioner has been working with the County in modifying the project to achieve a more cost effective, functional and attractive design. Because of this redesign, engineering and architectural plans will require extensive revisions; thus, impacting the engineer and architect from meeting the established deadline dates. It is anticipated that the extension of time will provide an overall better design of the site.

**Not Detrimental to the Public Interest** - Approval of the alternative compliance request will not alter the essential character of the neighborhood and will not substantially impair the appropriate use or development of the surrounding properties. The granting of the alternative compliance request for an extension of the APFO milestone deadline date will not change the uses proposed on the site, but will provide an economically feasible project. The alternative compliance request does not request a relaxation in the design regulations; therefore, the approval of this alternative compliance request will not be detrimental to the public. The extension will allow the engineer and architect to perfect the design of the site and prepare the necessary plans for submission.

**Will Not Nullify the Intent or Purpose of the Regulations** - Approval of this alternative compliance request will not nullify the intent or purpose of the regulations since the site will be design under the TOD regulations. The new design will provide an economically feasible project with the same about of residential units and commercial space (office and retail) as approved under the original design.

Indicate this alternative compliance petition file number, request, section of the regulations, action, conditions of approval, and date on all related plats, and site development plans, and building permits. This requested alternative compliance will remain valid for the time period specified in the conditions of approval.

If you have any questions, please contact Brenda Luber at (410) 313-2350 or email at [BLuber@howardcountymd.gov](mailto:BLuber@howardcountymd.gov).

Sincerely,



Kent Sheubrooks, Chief  
Division of Land Development

KS/BL

cc: Research  
DED  
Real Estate Services  
SDP-15-063  
Robert H. Vogel, Engineering