

Sayers, Margery

From: abhijit honrao <abhijit.honrao@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 4, 2020 4:31 PM
To: CouncilMail; planning
Subject: CB1 Impact written testimony

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

I am a resident of Maryland since 2005. I have a minor subdivision (one additional lot), in which I am planning to build a house for my family for three. This July I was getting the permission to built, I have signed a contract with the builder to start construction of the house.

I have already committed to the legal binding contract and have given deposit money. This bill will cause us great financial hardship.

Please consider my request and consider my subdivision as a grandfathering rule and allow me to start the construction.

I am aware of the over crowding of the Howard County Schools. But we cannot introduce a Bill without giving some kind of consideration of the financial hardship this bill will cause to me and my family.

Abhijit Honrao

Sayers, Margery

From: Susan Garber <buzysusan23@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, March 2, 2020 5:19 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: CB1 Amendments

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

I am feeling very uncomfortable about tonight's vote on CB-1. The obvious purpose of CB 1 is to stop the foolish process of 'testing' for school capacity four times (in as little as 3 yrs 1 month) and then allowing development to proceed anyway, regardless if there are seats available. The cumulative result of this practice is the mess we are in regarding overcrowded schools.

The BOE has stated that it takes an average 7 years to identify and purchase suitable land, and to design and construct a new school. So it makes sense that CB 1 seeks to extend the testing to 7 years maximum. Even then, development can proceed with or without seats available, continuing our dangerous practice.

As I have watched the progression of amendments and amendments to amendments on CB 1 I am gravely dismayed. Going into this evening's vote it looks like the number of years of testing could ultimately be reduced from the proposed 'honest' seven to 6 and then 5. But it looks far worse if I'm reading correctly. Are these amendments actually saying that where the rate of over capacity exceeds 5% beyond the (105, 110, and 115%) APFO standards as the result of the proposed development, the development can proceed anyway after the fifth test. Doesn't this seem to completely dismantle some of the provisions of the hard fought new APFO regulations????AND fly in the face of common sense??? Am I misinterpreting this??

IMHO, the original, un-amended CB1 deserves passage.

Susan Garber
North Laurel/Savage