

HOWARD COUNTY COUNCIL
RECEIVED

February 2, 2019

2019 FEB -6 PM 1:24
EW OJ CR DY
TW MS

The Honorable Christiana Rigby, Chair
Howard County Council
3430 Courthouse Drive
Ellicott City, MD 21043

RE: Council Bill 3-2019

Dear Chairperson Rigby:

We, the undersigned business leaders and professionals of Howard County, respectfully request that the County Council table Council Bill 3-2019 pending the conclusion of an ongoing ethics investigation regarding Historic Preservation Commission ("HPC" or "Commission") Board Member Drew Roth. While this legislation may have been filed with good intentions, information made available subsequent to its introduction has raised significant questions about the propriety of giving the Commission more power over the approval of development projects.

On December 6, 2018, HPC-18-63 regarding a 17-home subdivision to be located at 5819 Lawyers Hill Road was presented to the Commission. At that time, the Petitioner notified the Board that Board Member Drew Roth owned property adjoining the proposed subdivision and asked that he recuse himself. Mr. Roth refused and the Office of Law declined to intervene. Over the course of the hearing, Mr. Roth expressed clear opposition to the subdivision and sought modifications outside of the scope of the HPC. Notably, in the absence of Council Bill 3, the HPC is limited to advisory comments to be considered by the Planning Board in any approval or denial of the subdivision. Council Bill 3 would authorize the Commission to defeat the subdivision entirely.

Under Maryland law, an adjoining or abutting property owner is "presumptively aggrieved" by the development of a neighboring parcel. Such property owners have equal standing before administrative bodies as the petitioner. Undoubtedly, if the situation were reversed and Mr. Roth were the petitioner as opposed to a presumptive protestant, this Council would be reticent to give him more authority over the approval of projects on his land. The analysis is no different here.

We are sympathetic to the pressures put on the Council to support legislation that impedes residential growth. Existing constituencies routinely oppose any and all measures that will add new homes and, presumptively, lower property values.

Nevertheless, the exclusionary policies that were adopted last year and the popular will that directs it has set Howard County on a dangerous path. Council Bill 3 represents a bridge too far. Regardless of intention, its effect on the processing of the Lawyer's Hill subdivision would be nothing short of blatant corruption.

That leads to the motivation behind this letter. None of the undersigned have an interest in this project. This is a matter of good government. This bill, and anyone who votes for it, is telling the business community that corruption is acceptable so long as it is targeted at the right party. We believe this legislation should be defeated entirely, but in the absence of that we would strongly urge the Council to table the bill pending the resolution of an ethics complaint that has been filed against Mr. Roth regarding his refusal to recuse himself from voting on this project.

Sincerely,
Natalie Ziegler



HOWARD COUNTY COUNCIL
RECEIVED

February 2, 2019

2019 FEB 11 AM 10:43
CMBS TW MS

The Honorable Deb Jung
Howard County Council
3430 Courthouse Drive
Ellicott City, MD 21043

RE: Council Bill 3-2019

Dear Councilwoman Jung:

We, the undersigned business leaders and professionals of Howard County, respectfully request that the County Council table Council Bill 3-2019 pending the conclusion of an ongoing ethics investigation regarding Historic Preservation Commission ("HPC" or "Commission") Board Member Drew Roth. While this legislation may have been filed with good intentions, information made available subsequent to its introduction has raised significant questions about the propriety of giving the Commission more power over the approval of development projects.

On December 6, 2018, HPC-18-63 regarding a 17-home subdivision to be located at 5819 Lawyers Hill Road was presented to the Commission. At that time, the Petitioner notified the Board that Board Member Drew Roth owned property adjoining the proposed subdivision and asked that he recuse himself. Mr. Roth refused and the Office of Law declined to intervene. Over the course of the hearing, Mr. Roth expressed clear opposition to the subdivision and sought modifications outside of the scope of the HPC. Notably, in the absence of Council Bill 3, the HPC is limited to advisory comments to be considered by the Planning Board in any approval or denial of the subdivision. Council Bill 3 would authorize the Commission to defeat the subdivision entirely.

Under Maryland law, an adjoining or abutting property owner is "presumptively aggrieved" by the development of a neighboring parcel. Such property owners have equal standing before administrative bodies as the petitioner. Undoubtedly, if the situation were reversed and Mr. Roth were the petitioner as opposed to a presumptive protestant, this Council would be reticent to give him more authority over the approval of projects on his land. The analysis is no different here.

We are sympathetic to the pressures put on the Council to support legislation that impedes residential growth. Existing constituencies routinely oppose any and all measures that will add new homes and, presumptively, lower property values.

Nevertheless, the exclusionary policies that were adopted last year and the popular will that directs it has set Howard County on a dangerous path. Council Bill 3 represents a bridge too far. Regardless of intention, its effect on the processing of the Lawyer's Hill subdivision would be nothing short of blatant corruption.

That leads to the motivation behind this letter. None of the undersigned have an interest in this project. This is a matter of good government. This bill, and anyone who votes for it, is telling the business community that corruption is acceptable so long as it is targeted at the right party. We believe this legislation should be defeated entirely, but in the absence of that we would strongly urge the Council to table the bill pending the resolution of an ethics complaint that has been filed against Mr. Roth regarding his refusal to recuse himself from voting on this project.

Sincerely,
Natalie Ziegler
Carroll Mill Farm

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Natalie Ziegler" followed by a stylized flourish.

Sayers, Margery

From: Michael Kreft <mikekreft92@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 4, 2019 3:23 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: Support for CB3-2019

[Note: This email originated from outside of the organization. Please only click on links or attachments if you know the sender.]

Howard County Council Members,

I'm writing to support CB3-2019, which will provide an additional level of control over site planning and design in Howard County's two historic districts, Lawyers Hill and Ellicott City Main Street. The protection of our historic districts is important to me, and requiring site plans to meet established guidelines for new development should be respected.

I've been a home owner in Howard County for over 25 years. I feel CB3-2019 will further protect our historic districts from unchecked development. The unique character of the Lawyers Hill and Ellicott City Main Street are worth protecting. I frequently travel through both areas, and would hate to see them permanently altered by development not in keeping with the historic charm of these two districts.

Michael Kreft
Ellicott City, District 1

Fisher, Karina

From: Alan Schneider <ajs333@aol.com>
Sent: Monday, February 4, 2019 4:43 PM
To: crigby@howardcountymd.com; Jung, Deb; Jones, Opel; Walsh, Elizabeth;
djungmann@aol.com
Subject: Vote for **CB3** and CB4

[Note: This email originated from outside of the organization. Please only click on links or attachments if you know the sender.]

Historic areas need more protection. Proposed developments do not meet standards for protecting historic areas and adjacent wetlands and environmentally protected areas.

Wetlands need more protection. Wetlands were not protected when the mortuary on Route 108 was approved as a conditional use. Wetlands existed. Testimony by the environmental expert said "there are no wetlands". The approval of the site development plan was inconsistent with the approved conditional use. My appeal was within the 30 day period set by the DPZ. The hearing examiner accepted Sang Oh's argument that the appeal period began earlier, and dismissed my appeal. Opponent's experts were denied access to the site by "no trespassing signs" and i was threatened with a criminal trespass action against me.

Alan Schneider
12598 Clarksville Pike
Clarksville, Md.21029