

Oppose TIF legislation

Jean Link <myjeanlink@hotmail.com>

Mon 9/12/2016 7:54 PM

To: CouncilMail <CouncilMail@howardcountymd.gov>;

Dear Columbia Council,

I am a 45 year resident of Columbia and I currently live in Lakeside Condominiums in Town Center. While I'm in agreement with creating a more vibrant Town Center, I am opposed to the proposed TIF legislation. I believe it is counter to Jim Rouse's vision for Columbia. Please don't let Howard Hughes Corporation dismantle all Columbia has stood for all these years. Vote Against the proposed TIF legislation.

Thank you.

Jean Link

[10205 Wincopin Circle, Unit 301](#)
[Columbia, MD 21044](#)

Sent from my iPad

Tif

stanley wenocur <swenocur@icloud.com>

Mon 9/12/2016 7:10 PM

To:CouncilMail <CouncilMail@howardcountymd.gov>;

I want to express my strong concern about bills favoring TIF funding for downtown development. This is an issue and had been an issue, not just for Columbia, but across the country. It seems grossly unfair that the corporations who benefit and profit most from necessary infrastructure do not bear the cost of that structure. I would also like to see appropriate set asides for moderate and low income housing so that the people who work here can also live here. Columbia should not be like Aspen, Colorado where the people who work the ski areas cannot afford to live in the community.

Thanks,

Dr. Stan Wenocur,
Professor Emeritus, UMB
Sent from my iPhone

Town Center Development

Patricia South <psouthetal@icloud.com>

Mon 9/12/2016 6:08 PM

To: CouncilMail <CouncilMail@howardcountymd.gov>;

Just want to register my support for Jen Terrasa's bill and my nonsupport of the other six bills. I would hate to see Columbia become any more "exclusive" than it has already become.

I am amazed at how much housing costs have increased since I moved here in 2000.

Pat South

Sent from my iPhone

Downtown Columbia

John Rhead <jrheadphd@gmail.com>

Mon 9/12/2016 6:03 PM

To: CouncilMail <CouncilMail@howardcountymd.gov>;

I support Councilmember Jen Terrasa's bill which would require Howard Hughes to provide that 15% of all new housing in Town Center be moderately priced.

I oppose the other six bills currently before the County Council, particularly the one granting a TIF (Tax Increment Financing) to the developer, Howard Hughes, which is strongly promoting this legislation.

John Rhead

[5602 Lightspun lane](#)

[Columbia, MD 21045](#)

Untitled

wpbarbour@aol.com

Mon 9/12/2016 5:55 PM

To: CouncilMail <CouncilMail@howardcountymd.gov>;

To whom it may concern.

The Rouse vision was and hopefully will remain " A CITY THAT WORKS FOR EVERYONE' !!

This is what Columbia means to the state, to the nation and to the world.

Please do not let CORPORATE profit destroy this reality that has existed for 50 years.

I am one of the original's moving here in 1969 raising my children and helping this city reach it's maximum potential and remain a shining star for the world !!!

Wilde Lake is my home and retirement. Rents in these new condo's/apartments are out of reach for the very people Jim Rouse wanted to live and work in Columbia.

AGAIN, do not destroy the vision for profit !!!

William P. Barbour
Wilde Lake
Columbia, Md.

Support of Jen Terresa's bill

Theresa Gale <tgale@transforminc.com>

Mon 9/12/2016 5:54 PM

To: CouncilMail <CouncilMail@howardcountymd.gov>;

I ask that you support Councilmember Jen Terrasa's bill which would require Howard Hughes (the successor to The Rouse Company and General Growth Properties) to provide that 15% of all new housing in Town Center be moderately priced. Howard County's founders were very clear that affordable housing in Howard County was not just optional but a core and essential element of the vision for Columbia and the County. To stray from this vision is a gross disrespect for the founders and their vision which has built a community that attracts and sustains the lives of many.

I also oppose the other six bills currently before the County Council, particularly the one granting a TIF (Tax Increment Financing) to the developer, Howard Hughes.

I implore you to vote to continue our founder's vision and legacy ... it is what makes Columbia and Howard County great.

Theresa

[Theresa Gale](#)

Principal

301.419.2835 c 301.509.7479

Follow [Transform on LinkedIn](#)

Like [Transform on Facebook](#)

TIF Funding for the development of downtown Columbia

Michael Glasgow <msglasgow9@icloud.com>

Mon 9/12/2016 5:17 PM

To: CouncilMail <CouncilMail@howardcountymd.gov>;

Dear Members of the Howard County Council,

Columbia is not a blighted area and, therefore, is not an appropriate development for TIF funding. Please do not pass the legislation proposing to do so. The long term results of such a measure would drastically, and negatively, affect the well being of Howard County as tax benefits resulting from the development will go to the builder and not be available to fund the infrastructure needed to support the growing community.

Sincerely,

[Dr. Michael S. Glasgow](#)
[5400 Vantage Point Road](#)
[Columbia, MD 21044](#)
msglasgow@jhu.edu
410-992-1364 (h)
410-908-3035 (c)

downtown Columbia

Doug Miller <beacon7712@comcast.net>

Mon 9/12/2016 5:42 PM

To: CouncilMail <CouncilMail@howardcountymd.gov>;

Council members,

In your deliberations on the downtown Columbia redevelopment, I urge you make every effort to ensure that housing is kept reasonably affordable for ordinary working citizens. I would consider as the minimum standard Councilwoman Terrasa's proposal to impose upon Howard Hughes the same requirement for moderately priced housing (15%) that development elsewhere in the county must meet.

This issue affects us all, not just those of modest means. After all, if downtown housing can only be had by highly paid commuters who rush off to Washington and nearby suburbs to work, and the clerks and waitstaff in downtown shops have to drive in from elsewhere, traffic headaches and pollution will increase, and quality of life diminishes for all.

Doug Miller
[5437 Antrim Court](#)
[Columbia, MD 21045](#)

TIF bills for Columbia development

Marina Adler <adler@umbc.edu>

Tue 9/13/2016 9:22 AM

To: CouncilMail <CouncilMail@howardcountymd.gov>;

Cc: lizbobo@bmail39.shg21.bmsend.com <lizbobo@bmail39.shg21.bmsend.com>;

Dear members of the Howard County Council,

I am writing to you as a Columbia resident who is deeply concerned about the development plans for downtown Columbia. I moved to Columbia in 1990 because I was drawn to Jim Rouse's vision of community. He conceived Columbia to be "a place where the CEO and the janitor could live in the same community," and that is the place where I and my neighbors want to live.

As a Professor of Sociology, I teach about inequality and social policy. I know that access to affordable housing is one of the most important social justice issues of our times. Research shows that one way to ameliorate economic inequalities is by reducing housing segregation by race and class via affordable rents. Therefore, I support Jen Teresa's bill, which would require that 15% of all new housing in Town Center be moderately priced. This is currently required of developers in all other areas of Howard County. We would like to see this bill be made even stronger in the mix of "affordable" housing it would require.

I strongly oppose the other six bills currently before the County Council, particularly the one granting a TIF (Tax Increment Financing) to the developer, Howard Hughes, which is strongly promoting this legislation. Passage of this legislation would bequeath to that developer a huge (roughly \$90 million) gift at the expense of the taxpayers.

I am sure that you are aware that TIF's were initiated for use in economically distressed communities. The intention was to help with economic development of areas that otherwise would not get funding. Downtown Columbia, which is one of the "richest" areas in one of the "richest" counties in the US clearly was not the intended target of TIFs.

Best regards,
Marina Adler

Marina Adler, PhD
Professor and Graduate Director
Department of Sociology, Anthropology, and Health Administration and Policy
University of Maryland Baltimore County

[1000 Hilltop Circle](#)
[Baltimore, MD 21250](#)
Office: 232 Public Policy Bldg
Voice: 410.455.3155

>> The most violent element in society is ignorance.<<
Emma Goldman

Opposition to TIF

Marilyn Dorfman <dorfwax@aol.com>

Tue 9/13/2016 1:29 AM

To: CouncilMail <CouncilMail@howardcountymd.gov>;

We wish to express our opposition to TIF.

Sincerely yours,

Robert and Marilyn Dorfman

Downtown Columbia Housing and TIF

Tracy Yamamoto <1yamamoto@verizon.net>

Copy email address

Tue 9/13/2016 8:55 PM

View details

To: CouncilMail <CouncilMail@howardcountymd.gov>;

Importance: High

Tracy Yamamoto
[10333 Whitewasher Way](#)
[Columbia, MD 21044](#)

September 13, 2016

Dear Howard County Council Members,

You face some very challenging decisions ahead in regard to the proposed downtown Columbia housing and TIF legislation. I have lived in Hickory Ridge for 23 years and raised my family here. My children both attended Wilde Lake Middle School and I work just off of Little Patuxent Parkway. The area planned for development will be overwhelmed if it passes as proposed. I fully support Councilwoman Jen Terresa's legislation for multiple reasons including:

- Requires builder Howard Hughes Corp to make 15% of the new housing affordable and built with market rate housing instead of unfairly isolating it.
- The builder should not be given "bonus density" of even more apartments
- Disallowing the builder to build on county-owned land
- No diversion of taxes to pay for infrastructure that the builder should be paying for like new streets, water, sewer and parking
- Future County Councils should be allowed the flexibility if needed to change the legislation instead of locking in for 40 years
- No reduction in parking requirements

After attending the July 18th County Council Hearing to gather more information, I could not believe that implementing a TIF is even being considered. I am adamantly opposed to tax dollars being used in this fashion. Howard Hughes Corporation (for profit) should be responsible for the infrastructure, just like other builders are held accountable in Howard County.

My further concerns are multiple including potential overcrowding at Wilde Lake Middle School, enough elementary school space, traffic, adequate infrastructure, the potential for Howard County General Hospital to adequately support such a higher density of people and the overall change coming to downtown Columbia.

Please vote FOR Jen Terresa's legislation.

Sincerely,

Tracy Yamamoto

1yamamoto@verizon.net

Written testimony R9.15.16

JB

Joel Broida <jbroida1@gmail.com>

Thu 9/15

CouncilMail; Broida Joel <jbroida1@gmail.com>; +2 more

Reply all |

Downtown Columbia Legislation

Written testimony submitted to the Howard County Council in regard to the Columbia Town Center Development and TIF financing

Presented by...Joel H. Broida residing at [5400 Vantage Point Road, Apt. 413, Columbia, MD 21044](#)
(Submitted as an individual, representing myself)

Columbia Town Center....Parking, affordable housing, a library, and schools, YES; TIF, NO ..5 votes

From the beginning (1967) there was an effective working relationship between the Howard County Government and the developer (the Rouse Company) of Columbia, Maryland"The Next America." It is important to note that from the outset the Rouse Company built and paid for basic infrastructure including roads, libraries, schools, affordable housing, and even parking lots for all of these facilities....and later passed on all of these facilities to the County. Rouse looked at and believed that this practice was a "customary and appropriate approach" for developers. Columbia has grown and matured over a period of almost 50 years. Now it is time to complete the last segment of this "New Town", Downtown Columbia.

Fast forward to 2016, both the Howard County Government and the current major developer, now Howard Hughes Corporation (HHC), want to initiate some significant changes in Downtown Columbia based on the 2010 amendments to the Howard County General Plan. As it turns out, some of these proposed changes include the construction of a large parking garage to accommodate patrons who attend concerts at Merriweather Post Pavilion, affordable housing, a new library, a new fire station, and schools for Downtown Columbia.

Recently, the County Executive and HHC jointly created a plan to use the property currently used as a parking lot over the last forty years by Merriweather Post Pavilion concert goers for other purposes. They want to build office and mixed use buildings on all of that same piece of ground. Further, HHC wants someone else to obtain financing called Tax Incentive Financing (TIF) and transfer the ownership of the parking garage to the Howard County Government. Even worse, they want to pass along the financial obligation to pay for this garage, you guessed it, on to the citizens of Howard County.

Wait a minute, there seems to be something unfair and unreasonable about this plan. HHC currently owns and makes a handsome profit from the Merriweather concert venue and now wants someone else to pay for the parking garage while the developer, HHC makes a profit from the other buildings they will construct on the old parking lot. It would seem to this observer that it is reasonable, and more to the point, for HHC to build and also assume the financial obligation for the Merriweather parking long before they turn it over to the County.

In plain words, given this information I strongly urge the Howard County Council to vote NO (5 NO's) to the TIF financing proposed by the County Executive on behalf of the Howard Hughes Corporation, the developer. There is no reasonable or logical justification I can find for the Council to support and vote for what is clearly the developer's obligation.

Worse, it is not correct for the developer to profit inappropriately at the expense of the each and every Howard County citizen, that would be wrong, wrong, wrong. It is high time that the Council stand up and insist that this developer build and pay for its own parking garage.

Respectfully submitted,

Joel H. Broida, a Columbia resident and concerned citizen since 1970

Sent with Writer

Sent from my iPad

Reply all | Delete Junk |

CB 43,44,45

PV Paul Verchinski <verchinski@yahoo.com>
Sat 9/17
CouncilMail

Reply all |

Unfortunately I am out of town. so I will not be able to testify in person. I support these bills for a number of reasons. Legislation should always follow the KISS principle and these bills do that. The competing bills are overly complicated and commit the county for a 40 year hold harmless period. Development is rapidly changing and the county should have control over future development. HHC is not Rouse.

[Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android](#)

Sayers, Margery

From: R. Alexander, Jr <ramseyalexjr@aol.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 17, 2016 10:27 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: Columbia, MD Town Center Affordable Housings...
Attachments: Agreement_between_CDHC_and_HRD(clean_5-6-14).doc; scan0010.pdf

Greetings Council Members:

The attached MOU/Agreement for Town Center is eerily similar to the attached article (scan) on "Housing plan lacks teeth discussion" in Baltimore, MD about Fort Covington. Affordable Housing will not come to fruition in Town Center until HHC and developers' contracts have provisions and conditions that are enforced by the County and applicable contractors. The four projects mentioned in the MOU will be just like the Metropolitan in that there is nothing with teeth to ensure that the 15% requirement will be archived. There was enough profit made on the \$100,000,000.00 Metropolitan construction project to provide 54 affordable units. Profit and Overhead costs need to be verified by an outside accounting entity. I am looking forward to the September 2016 sessions concerning Affordable Housing in Town Center.

R. Alexander, Jr.
Retired Architectural Engineer
Planner/Urban Studies Consultant
443.277.1117

**MEMORANDUM AGREEMENT REGARDING
AFFORDABLE HOUSING
BETWEEN
COLUMBIA DOWNTOWN HOUSING CORPORATION (CDHC)
AND
HOWARD RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION (HRD)
MAY __, 2014**

STATEMENT OF BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE

The Downtown Columbia Plan (the "Plan") was adopted by Howard County (the "County") on February 1, 2010 as Council Bill 58-2009. The Plan governs the development of certain portions of downtown Columbia, Maryland (the "Downtown Area") which are shown on the site plan attached hereto as **Exhibit 1** (the "Site Plan").

Subsequent to the adoption of the Plan the County provided for the creation of a Downtown Columbia Housing Foundation whose purpose is to make affordable housing more available in the Downtown Area. CDHC has been designated as the Downtown Columbia Housing Foundation.

HRD is the master developer of Columbia and owns a majority of the land located within the Downtown Area (the land owned by HRD is shown on the Site Plan and is referred to as the "HRD Land").

CDHC has adopted as one of its goals (the "Goals") that fifteen percent (15%) of all multifamily residential rental units ("Units") slated for development in the Downtown Area be affordable, targeting households with incomes averaging 50 percent of the Howard County median with an emphasis on persons below 50% of area median up to below market rents ("Affordable Units").

HRD is committed to providing a full spectrum of housing in the Downtown Area. The parties believe that, in lieu of the legislation which has been introduced to modify the County General Plan to impose specific requirements for affordable housing, affordable housing can be more effectively developed in the Downtown Area through the cooperative efforts of HRD and CDHC.

Accordingly, in consideration the mutual covenants hereinafter set forth, HRD and CDHC agree as follows:

1. **The Metropolitan.** A joint venture including HRD is currently developing on the parcel identified as "Metropolitan Parcel" on the Site Plan a multifamily residential rental project (a "Rental Project") containing ___ Units and known as the "Metropolitan". HRD intends to develop a second phase of the Metropolitan which shall contain approximately ___ Units. Plans for the Metropolitan were finalized before CDHC and HRD began discussions concerning affordable housing in the Downtown Area and such plans do not provide for the construction of Affordable Units. CDHC agrees that HRD shall have no obligation to include any Affordable Units as part of Phase I or II of the Metropolitan. CDHC and HRD also agree that the Metropolitan units are multifamily residential rental units and shall be included in the total Units in the Downtown Area for the purpose of calculating the CDHC goal of 15% affordable units.

2. Lakefront Project. HRD has advised CDHC that HRD expects its next Rental Project in the Downtown Area to be developed within the area identified as "Lakefront Parcel" on the Site Plan (the Lakefront Project"). HRD agrees that forty percent (40%) of the Units constructed on the Lakefront Parcel, but not less than 120 Units, will be Affordable Units (the "Lakefront Project"). HRD agrees to solicit, as further described in 7 below, experienced affordable housing developers to develop or assist with the development of the Lakefront Project. CDHC agrees to support HRD and its affordable housing development team in its efforts to secure financing for the Project, including LIHTC and other financing which may be available to finance affordable housing on the Lakefront Parcel. HRD agrees to proceed with its plan for a Rental Project on the Lakefront Parcel, including submitting an application for 2015 low income housing tax credits and proceeding to obtain the necessary approvals and financing to develop the Lakefront Parcel with the objective of commencing construction within twenty-four months from the date of this Agreement. HRD agrees to meeting with representatives of CDHC on a quarterly basis to keep them informed on HRD's progress.
3. Third Project. HRD anticipates that the first Rental Project to be developed after the Lakefront Parcel (the "Third Project") will be a high rise 750 Unit project located within the area designated as "Crescent Parcel" on the Site Plan (the "Crescent Project"). CDHC acknowledges that because of the need to build structured parking for the Crescent Project it may not be economically feasible to develop Affordable Units as part of the Crescent Project. Therefore, CDHC agrees that HRD shall not be required to include Affordable Housing within the Crescent Project; provided that, before commencing construction of the Crescent Parcel HRD shall have (i) designated one or more sites within either the Crescent or the Warfield neighborhoods on which it shall develop one or more Rental Projects (the "Fourth Project(s)") and (ii) agreed to include in the Fourth Project(s) such number of Affordable Units so that, after completion of the Fourth Project(s), the number of Affordable Units contained within the Metropolitan Project,, the Lakeside Project, the Crescent Project and the Fourth Project, shall equal not less than twelve percent (12%) of all Units built within said Parcels.. . If the Third Project is not built on the Crescent Parcel, then in order to disperse Affordable Housing throughout the Downtown Area, HRD agrees that the Third Project will not be built in the lakefront area. If the Third Project is not the Crescent Parcel, then the Third Project shall be a Future Project and its development shall be subject to the provisions of Paragraph 4, below. If the Crescent Project is not the Third Project, then the Crescent Project shall not be required to contain Affordable Housing provided that, before commencing construction of the Crescent Parcel HRD shall have (i) designated one or more sites on which it shall develop one or more Rental Projects (the "Additional Project(s)") and (ii) agreed to include in the Additional Project(s) such number of Affordable Units so that, after completion of the Additional Project(s), the number of Affordable Units contained within the Metropolitan Project, the Lakeside Project, the Crescent Project and all Future Projects for which building permits have been issued, shall equal not less than fifteen percent (15%) of all Units built within said Parcels.
4. Future Projects. HRD agrees that it shall cause any Rental Project developed on HRD Land, and not mentioned in Paragraphs 1- 3, above (a "Future Project"), to contain such number of Affordable Housing Units which equals (a) either fifteen percent (15%) or more of the total Units in the Future Project or (b) when combined with any Affordable Units previously developed as part of a Future Project results in all of the Affordable

Units developed within all existing Future Projects being equal to or greater than fifteen percent (15%) of all Units developed within all Future Projects, including the Future Project which is then being developed.

5. Fire House Parcel.

a. HRD Acquisition. HRD agrees that, in the event HRD acquires ownership or control of the land identified on the Site Plan as the "Fire House Parcel", it shall develop, or cause to be developed, the Parcel as a mixed income Affordable Rental Housing Project (the "Fire House Project"). CDHC shall determine the number of affordable units to be included in the Project taking into account available affordable housing resources and financing, including LIHTCs.

b. CDHC Acquisition. If CDHC acquires ownership or control of the Fire House Parcel it shall develop, or cause to be developed, on said the Parcel an affordable Rental Housing Project which shall contain the maximum number of Units which may be constructed on the site, and shall include all or a portion of the Units as Affordable, taking into account available affordable housing resources and financing, including LIHTCs.

c. Credit for Affordable Units. The Fire House Project shall not be considered a Future Project but the number of Units and the number of Affordable Units within the Fire House Project may be counted by HRD with regard to determining whether HRD has met the 15% requirement as to Future Parcels. Notwithstanding the foregoing the Fire House Project will not qualify as the Fourth Project or any Additional Project.

6. Future Acquisitions or Sales of Land.

a. HRD Acquisition. If HRD acquires any additional land in the Downtown Area (in addition to the Fire Station Parcel) then such land shall be considered HRD Land for purposes of this Agreement. No sale or other disposition or relinquishment of control by HRD of any HRD Land shall relieve HRD of its obligations under this Agreement with respect to any HRD Land.

b. CDHC Acquisition. If CDHC acquires ownership or control of any land in the Downtown Area it shall have the same obligations with respect to such land as would apply to CDHC's acquisition of the Fire Housing Parcel.

c. Acquisition by the County. Any Affordable Units developed by the County or CDHC on any land within the Downtown Area shall be counted as if such Affordable Units had been developed on HRD Land.

7. Developers, Advisors, Consultants. Within the next three of the date of this Agreement,, HRD will reach out to experienced affordable housing developers in Maryland through an RFI or RFQ, which will summarize the affordable housing goals for Downtown Columbia as outlined by CDHC and reflected in this Agreement, and ask for expressions of interest in developing, advising or consulting with HRD to meet these goals. Successful respondents should have demonstrated experience and capacity with LIHTC

(both four and nine percent) development in Maryland within the past 3 to 5 years, as well as other relevant affordable housing expertise.

8. Recordation of Documents. In order for a Unit to qualify as an Affordable Unit under this Agreement there must be recorded in the Land Records of Howard County before such Unit is occupied, a declaration running with the land requiring that the owner of the land on which such Unit is constructed maintain, for 30 years the number of Affordable Units required to be constructed under the provisions of this Agreement.
9. Verification. The owner of any Rental Project containing Affordable Units which are required under this Agreement shall permit representatives of CDHC access to review such documents as may be necessary to determine compliance with this Agreement.
10. Cooperation. The parties shall work together cooperatively to achieve the requirements set forth in this Agreement and the Plan. CDHC agrees to use funds that it receives under the Plan to provide financing to HRD for the development of Affordable Housing. CDHC agrees to work with HRD in good faith to support legislation which could reduce the cost of, or provide financing for Affordable Housing, including "density bonuses" which are used for Affordable Housing. Notwithstanding the foregoing, HRD's obligations hereunder shall not be affected if such legislation is not passed.
11. Enforcement. In the event that HRD or its successors or assigns fails to comply with any of the provisions contained in this Agreement, such failure shall give rise to a cause of action for declaratory and/or injunctive relief on behalf of CDHC as the designated housing foundation under the Plan, or its duly constituted and recognized successor. The fact that CDHC shall not enforce any particular provision hereunder in any particular instance shall not prevent CDHC from enforcing such provision notwithstanding that a similar violation of the restrictions was not previously enforced, and such failure to enforce any provision shall not be deemed to be a waiver of such restriction. Any party to a proceeding who succeeds in enforcing a provision or enjoining the violation of a provision hereunder may be awarded reasonable attorneys' fees against such losing party.
12. Successors and Assigns. This Agreement shall be binding upon the parties hereto and their successors and assigns, including any person or entity which may acquire ownership of any of the HRD Land.
13. Entire Agreement. This Agreement contains the entire agreement of the parties concerning the subject matter hereof, and may not be amended or modified except by a written instrument executed by both parties hereto.
14. Governing Law. The provisions of this Agreement shall be governed by Maryland law. Any action brought to enforce the provisions of this Agreement shall be brought only in the Circuit Court for Howard County, Maryland.

15. Third Party Beneficiary. The County shall be a third party beneficiary of this Agreement and may enforce the provisions hereof to the same extent either party may enforce such provisions.

Witness the execution hereof as of the day and year above written.

**HOWARD RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT
CORPORATION**

By: _____

Name:

Title:

**DOWNTOWN COLUMBIA HOUSING
CORPORATION**

By: _____

Name: Paul Casey

Title: President

Reply all | Delete Junk |

Parking Concerns Take a Back Seat in Pursuit of Affordable Housing - The New York Times

LW LINDA Wengel <lwengel@msn.com>
Sun 7:01 PM
CouncilMail

Reply all |

To help protect your privacy, some content in this message has been blocked. To re-enable the blocked features, [click here](#).

To always show content from this sender, [click here](#).

Not really our issue, but interesting. Linda Wengel

<http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/18/nyregion/parking-concerns-take-a-back-seat-in-pursuit-of-affordable-housing.html?rref=collection%2Fsectioncollection%2Fnyregion&action=click&contentCollection=nyregion@ion=rank&module=package&version=highlights&contentPlacement=9&pgtype=sectionfront>

Sent from my iPad

Reply all | Delete Junk |

Affordable Housing at Banneker

gforgash@verizon.net

Reply all |

○ Sun 5:08 PM

CouncilMail; Kittleman, Allan; Sigaty, Mary Kay; Terrasa, Jen

Testimony September 1...

24 KB

Download

Dear Mr. Kittleman, Ms. Sigaty and Howard County Council Members,
I will be out of the country for the meeting on September 22, 2016 but would like to submit my testimony. Please find attached my particular concerns regarding the Affordable Housing development project for Banneker. As stated, I am not in opposition to the development of Affordable Housing and support Jen Terrasa's plan.

Thank you for your consideration of my concerns and support.

Gloria Forgash
5837 Wyndham Cir
Columbia, MD
gforgash@verizon.net

September 19, 2016

Dear Mr. Kittleman, Ms. Sigaty, and Howard County Council Members

I am writing as a resident of the Wyndham Condominium Community which is behind the Banneker Fire Station and a part of the Banneker Road Community. I would like to first acknowledge the positive move towards affordable housing and the building of a new fire station (which is certainly long overdue for expansion and updating).

I am concerned, however, with the addition of 200 units proposed to be built above this new station. As you know, Banneker Road is a dead end road with it ending in a cul de sac of townhomes. The Wyndham Community of condominiums is directly across from a major business establishment, preceded by a gas station with a full shop and garage and take out eatery attached.

The road serves as overflow parking for the town home residents and is particularly difficult to maneuver in winter. This past winter with significant snow fall it was especially treacherous. Along with this overflow, major large trucks, vans and tow trucks park along this road as well.

The additional traffic associated with an additional 200 apartments (or any number for that matter) would be dangerous and impossible to maneuver. The resultant congestion would burden those who have been established in this community (including myself for 17 years!). As the school buses wait to pick up children and then to drop them off when the school days end will feel the impact (and danger) even more so.

Please reconsider the expansion on Banneker and keep our residents safe.

Thank you

Gloria Forgash

Wyndham Condominium Resident

Reply all | Delete Junk |

Downtown affordable housing

Larry Carson <karasov1@hotmail.com>

Reply all |

 Sun 1:51 PM
CouncilMail

Downtown Columbia Legislation

Since I can't attend the hearing Monday the 22nd, I just thought I'd let you know how I feel about this.

I know some council members believe that the developer/Kittleman proposal offers the best opportunity for affordable housing and has several advantages over Jen's plan: added land from the developer to several sites; perhaps quicker construction and several others.

For me, though Jen's plan offers the simplest and most certain option: 15% of anything built has to be for moderate income. If that had been adopted in 2010, numerous units would already be on line.

I can't see the logic in rejecting a simple, sure-fire solution again. Considering that the county has not required lower priced housing at all in Columbia, it seems the least you could do now. Kimco has plans to redevelop Hickory ridge Village Center with apartments and none will have to be affordable at current standards.

I suspect that proposals involving the fire house, the former Flier building, etc, will be mired in controversy for years. Put the burden where it belongs, on the developer, and keep the county's promises on overall density made six years ago.

If a decade or more down the road more units are needed, the density can be adjusted then. Now is too soon.

As for the TIF, I can see that both ways, and Jen again has a good point. Perhaps it can sharply reduced as a compromise. Good luck with your decision.

Larry Carson

Reply all | Delete Junk |

Downtown Columbia Planning

Diane & Ted Swanson <tdatswanson@hotmail.com>

Reply all |

○ Tue 5:48 PM

CouncilMail; Diane & Ted Swanson <tdatswanson@hotmail.com>

Council Members,

Thank you for continuing to place Rouse's original goals + principles as your highest priority for Columbia's development. My Husband + I feel very privileged to be living in Columbia since 1975. We hope our children + grandchildren will someday be able to afford living here as well. We strongly support Jen Terrasa's bill requiring atleast 15% moderate priced new housing in the development of Town Center. We STRONGLY oppose any TIF legislation.

Please continue to make the best choices for our community + citizens, NOT for those who stand to make the most money. Thank you for all your hard work to keep Columbia a wonderful place to call home.

Ted + Diane Swanson
10085-1 Windstream Dr.
Columbia, Md. 21044
tdatswanson@hotmail.com

Reply all | Delete Junk |

Downtown Columbia Town Center

R. Alexander, Jr <ramseyalexjr@aol.com>

Reply all |

 Tue 5:11 PM
CouncilMail

Greetings Council Members:

It appears to me that the appropriate message is not being provided or conveyed to the Town Center developer(s); i.e., Town Center does not qualify for TIF consideration as planned. The County Council must be very transparent about this since Town Center is not an economic depressed area. HHC has failed on the Metropolitan project (360 units) and made over \$20 million in overhead and profit and did not provide one affordable unit. The same outcome is scheduled for the adjacent \$125 million complex that will have 437 units, none of which will be Affordable Units. For every 10 units being constructed the developer can build two (2) Affordable Units at no cost to the developer. Also, it appears that no one is interested in sound enforceable contract provisions and clauses to obtain Affordable Housing in Town Center.

R. Alexander, Jr.
ramseyalexjr@aol.com
443.,277.1117

Reply all | Delete Junk |

economic justice

SA

SALLY ANN <sacooper1@comcast.net>

Tue 1:01 PM

CouncilMail; Liz Bobo <lizbobo@comcast.net>

Reply all |

Dear Councilmembers,

I urge you to represent the concerns of the great majority of voters in Howard County and support legislation promoting economic justice.

In particular, please support Councilwoman Jem Terrasa's bill calling for the developer, Howard Hughes, to provide 15% of new housing in the New Town be moderately priced.

I also urge you to oppose granting a TIF to Howard Hughes. In no way can Columbia qualify for such a "gift".

Thank you for your consideration.

Sally Ann Cooper

[5365 Chase Lions Way](#)

Columbia, MD 21044

Reply all | Delete Junk |

Downtown Columbia

LP

LEE PRESTON <leeprestonjr@comcast.net>

Tue 11:39 AM

CouncilMail

Reply all |

As a Columbia pioneer I strongly support Councilmember Jen Terrasa's bill requiring Howard Hughes Company to provide that 15% of all new housing in Town Center be moderately priced. I have always supported the James Rouse concept of people from all socio-economic levels living together in one community. I also believe that the Howard Hughes Company pay for all of the infrastructure costs, as the Rouse company did.

M. Lee Preston Jr.

[13680 Bold Venture Drive](#)

[Glenelg, Maryland 21737](#)

9032 [Prosperity Way](#)

[Fort Myers Florida, 33913](#)

443-745-1202

Reply all | Delete Junk |

Town Center in Columbia

CP

courtney petersen <oldcourt2012@gmail.com>

Tue 11:27 AM

CouncilMail

Reply all |

I am a Columbia resident who moved here because of the diversity in the community and particularly in the schools. I believe in Rouse's vision of an economically diverse community and I live in one.

I am very **STRONGLY OPPOSED to giving a TIF to the Howard Hughes Company**. I know the successful Rouse Company paid for infrastructure and Hughes should as well.

I **STRONGLY SUPPORT Jen TERRASA's bill** to assure that **15% fo the housing build in Town Center be affordably priced**.

Thank you for your consideration.

Courtney Petersen

[7391 Hickory Log Circle](#)
Columbia, Md.

Reply all | Delete Junk |

Columbia Town Center Development

Colin MacLachlan <brayhill@verizon.net>

Reply all |

 Tue 10:57 AM
CouncilMail

Dear Councilmen,

As a Columbia homeowner and Howard County taxpayer, I strongly object to the Tax Increment Financing (TIF) being proposed to support the cost of infrastructure related to Howard Hughes' (HH) proposed residential development at Town Center. This is not a project that is going to improve the quality of life for Howard County residents, provide benefits for a depressed area, or offer housing opportunities to a substantial number of lower income families. Instead, HH's plan for Town Center departs from Jim Rouse's plans for Columbia, will worsen congestion in the immediate area and put pressure on existing public resources (roads, schools, public libraries, parks). To now ask that Howard County Taxpayers foot the bill for the infrastructure needed to maximize HH's profit is a slap in the face. Howard County is going to need every penny of that money for the many resource and infrastructure problems that result from this over-development, both now and in the coming years.

For all of these reasons, I urge you to vote against the TIF for Town Center. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Colin A. MacLachlan
10357 Whitewasher Way
Columbia, MD 21044

Reply all | Delete Junk |

RE: TIF legislation

Eileen Tennor <etennor@comcast.net>

Reply all |

 Tue 10:42 AM
CouncilMail

I am writing to urge the County Council to support more and better integrated affordable housing into Downtown Columbia and to require developers to assume more responsibility for infrastructure—roads, schools, utilities—to support the greater density the new development will bring.

The currently proposed minimal and isolated affordable units do not live up to the vision of Columbia's founding principles. If Jim Rouse could persuade the original investors and developers to support his vision of an inclusive and livable city, then his successors can and should do the same. Please do not exchange Rouse's proud legacy of inclusion for agreements with developers that will maximize returns for stockholders while sacrificing our community's values.

Eileen Tennor
5536 Suffield Court
Columbia MD 21044

410-997-1764
etennor@comcast.net

Reply all | Delete Junk |

Affordable Housing in downtown Columbia

Jean Jerardi <j.jerardi8@verizon.net>

Reply all |

Tue 9:45 AM
CouncilMail

This is to urge you to support affordable housing in downtown Columbia, where the CEO and the janitor can live in the same community.


Jean Jerardi

Reply all | Delete Junk |

Affordable housing in town center

Ann Neale <annneale@comcast.net>

Reply all |

 Tue 9:33 AM
CouncilMail

Council members, my husband, Phil Gallagher is a Columbia pioneer and I have lived here for 16 years. We are glad to see development in Columbia but very much believe there should be ample housing for those of low and moderate income.

We strongly support Jen Terrasa's bill requiring the HH Company to build at least 15% moderate income housing in Town Center. We strongly oppose the TIF which would award tens of millions of tax payer dollars to a profitable company.

We oppose the other six bills presently before the council.

Columbia can move into the 21st Century with development without doing so on the backs of low and moderate income people and without tax payers bearing the cost of doing business for a successful developer.


Thanks

Reply all | Delete Junk |

Tax Break for Howard Hughes

Eric Naumburg <enaumburg@hotmail.com>

Reply all |

 Tue 9:31 AM
CouncilMail

Council Woman Sigaty:

I oppose the TIF (tax increment financing) that would be a give away of \$90 million to the Howard Hughes Corp. The Rouse Company paid for the needed public infrastructure required by its development projects, I see no reason to change the policy. Taxes should be for the public good and not to enrich private corporations.

Sincerely, Eric

Eric Naumburg, M.D.

enaumburg@hotmail.com

443-562-6562

testimony on downtown Columbia legislation

RG

Ryan Gardner <rwgardner@gmail.com>

Thu 10:04 AM

CouncilMail

Reply all |

| Action Items

From:

Ryan Gardner

[10338 Sixpence Cir
Columbia, MD 21044](mailto:rwgardner@gmail.com)

Greetings Howard County Council:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to most of the proposed legislation related to downtown Columbia.

First, the idea of the TIF is appalling. It amounts to forcing taxpayers to donate their hard earned money to a large corporation that is going to own most of the downtown region of the 2016 #1 "small" city in America. You can't tell me Howard Hughes needs it. That money should be going to our schools. If this passes, it seems downright corrupt.

Additionally I am strongly opposed to anything that further increases the density of the downtown area (including the proposed bill). The schools are already overcrowded as funding continues to be reduced. I moved here for what it is. I moved from the city because I didn't want to be in a city! I enjoy the peaceful, low-crime, low-stress pace and feel of the neighborhood that I worked very hard to buy a home in.

Making things much worse... How are we considering removing adequate public facilities ordinance (APFO) protections from Downtown? Again, this just seems corrupt! Why do we even have the protections if they can be removed (at the nearby citizens' expense)? ...this only amplifies my concerns about the schools, traffic, density, etc.

I would be *much* happier if you were to include construction another, much needed, middle school to help alleviate the continually growing pressure on Wilde Lake MS, where my 1 and 3 year old are slated to attend.

Please, please think about what you would do if you lived very near downtown and your kids were to use those schools in a few years. (Perhaps you would like it, but I suspect most of you enjoy suburban homes and like it that way. I live right by downtown, my family uses some of the same schools, and I worked very hard to get to live in this place that I love the way it is/was.)

Thank you.

Ryan Gardner

Reply all | Delete Junk |

Please support Terrasa plan

DH

Dr. Lisa Hawkins-Eidson <drhawkinseidson@verizon.net>

Reply all |

Thu 10:21 AM

CouncilMail

Greetings,

I am writing to support the Terrasa plan for downtown development. Here are several reasons why:

- Our schools are already full. The brand new Wilde Lake Middle School will already be full when it opens this school year, and the proposed development will overcrowd schools further.
- Adding additional units over the 5,500 will only increase congestion in the downtown area. I am already worried that our family will decrease our visits to the Mall area due to congested roads.
- Isolating low income housing does not work. Failed housing projects have been based on this model. Columbia is about integration, not separating out pockets of low-income residents.
- Not requiring the developer to support infrastructure isn't fair to our community. We already pay high taxes to live here, and our schools and roads deserve support.

Please support the Terrasa plan.

Sincerely,

Lisa Hawkins-Eidson, Psy.D.

10358 Sixpence Circle

Columbia, MD 21044

Reply all | Delete Junk |

TIF

Lynn Lewis <lynnlewislcswc@comcast.net>

Reply all |

Thu 12:48 PM
CouncilMail

Pls know that I and many others appreciate your looking carefully into the TIF. It will certainly benefit contractors. However, the rest of us will be paying for it for years into the future. Thank you for your consideration. Please count me as a Howard County resident who is against the TIF.

Lynn Lewis
5222 Harper's Farm Rd
Columbia
21044
Sent from my iPhone

Reply all | Delete Junk |

Testimony to Howard County Council, 9/22/16

Chelle or Bob <chellerg@verizon.net>

Reply all |

○ Thu 2:04 PM
CouncilMail

My name is Rochelle Ginsburg. I live in the Thunder Hill section of Oakland Mills. I'm testifying in support of county Councilmember Jen Terrassa's proposal for development of Downtown Columbia. I support keeping the number of housing units to the original 5500 because I am concerned about the stress of the added density to the area. I support Councilmember Terassa's plan because it does not call for a \$90 million TIF up front to be repaid with public funds. I support the development of 15 per cent of the 5500 units to be affordable housing to serve county citizens such as teachers and police officers. And I strongly support the integration of the affordable housing units throughout every property in a scattered site approach consistent with best practice for housing policy. I support Councilmember Terassa's proposal because it is consistent with the recognition recently cited in Money Magazine for Columbia's "socioeconomic diversity" and "inclusiveness".

Sent from my iPad

Affordable Housing Testimony 9/22/16

SZ Shari Zaret <sharizaret4kc@gmail.com>
Thu 4:16 PM
CouncilMail

Reply all |

Affordable Housing –Testimony 9/22/16

I would like to thank Councilman Ball, and the members of the Howard County Council, for extending the opportunity to give feedback on the two proposals that have been introduced regarding Affordable Housing in Columbia. After careful analysis of both sets of proposals, I am asking that **you vote in favor of Councilmember Jen Terrasa's bills, CB 43, CB 44 and CB 45.**

Establishing a requirement for a percentage of all new housing in Columbia's redeveloped center to include a **full spectrum** of housing opportunities is in keeping with our historic development and our community values of inclusion, diversity, and stewardship. As Chair of the Columbia Association Board of Directors in 2013, I worked with former President Phil Nelson and his staff in examining Columbia's residential sales price trends. It was heartening to note that even during the downturn of the Great Recession, Columbia homes fared well in retained value, compared to other suburban areas. In large part, that was due to the added quality of life that so many people desire: good schools, miles of open space walking paths, and amenities like neighborhood pools and after school programs that link people in a shared sense of community. CA programs mirror this open and welcoming attitude; people of limited income can get reduced price memberships, and students and seniors get a break on fees as well. The philosophy is that everyone should be included in the best of what Columbia has to offer.

Now, redevelopment of Columbia's center offers a new opportunity to expand this vision to the next generation of Columbia residents. Our success in establishing practices that make our values real in the world has been recognized with national honors, like this week's declaration by Money Magazine that Columbia Maryland "... is the Number One small city in America". The article lauds our population diversity, our top library system, and our commitment to good schools and to being good neighbors. But after almost fifty years of mainly successes, we are now faced with a dilemma about how the next decades will unfold. I am disturbed by the County Executive's alternative proposals on Downtown affordable housing, because these bills

do not represent the best practices of full spectrum, inclusionary housing, that is part of our community's heritage and strength.

I am opposed to the proposed plan that would place low income and "moderate" income families in separate clusters of housing, removed from the new "luxury" buildings at the center of town. Having lived in older cities in different parts of the country, I have witnessed the negative psychological and sociological consequences of this kind of economic segregation. Columbia's founder, James Rouse, was quite clear in the documents that were published during the original development of our ten villages, that the goal of New Town was to be a place where there would be a mix of housing types, appropriate to different needs and stages of life, and would include multi-racial, multi-ethnic and multi-income residential communities. This was, and maybe still is, a radical vision of unity in the United States. And in some ways, as Columbia has evolved, we have suffered from our success.

Our current housing stock is priced far above what students attending Howard Community College could pay. Middle income families struggle to come up with a down payment on a town home, given the current tight mortgage market. Seniors, many of whom were part of the original "Pioneer" group of residents during Columbia's earliest years, are trying to age gracefully in place, but have to contend with costly home repairs. But if we don't make new housing available, and affordable, for those who represent Columbia's larger vision, we lose our distinct characteristic as a place where we all prosper because, as the original poster says, we "Grow People".

The County Council and engaged citizens worked hard over the course of many years of public hearings to come up with a workable General Plan for Downtown Columbia. We all want to see that long-term plan succeed; but we need to adhere to the basic foundation values of this most valuable community. I oppose any attempt to extract a forty-year "carte blanche" agreement for both current and future developers, where the political process that has guided our county so successfully in the past is subordinated to corporate profit reports and stock fluctuations. We must also reject claims that in order to create a small percentage of affordable housing, we should now agree to increased density levels in Downtown, by the adding of over 500 additional residential units. This does NOT represent the consensus that was achieved with so much hard work by so many dedicated people.

Thank you.

Shari B. Zaret,


Kings Contrivance Village Board member

10087 Hatbrim Terrace

Columbia, MD 21046

Reply all | Delete Junk |

Downtown Development

K  kports2000 <kports2000@gmail.com>
Thu 4:43 PM
CouncilMail

Reply all |

Dear Sirs,

I am a resident of Columbia, and I wanted to express my dismay at the lack of affordable housing that is being incorporated into the developer's plans. Columbia was created as a place that INTENTIONALLY included a mixture of different housing types that appealed to folks from ALL income levels. Over time, this idea has been watered down and completely disregarded. This plan continues this trend, and it is extremely disappointing.

I am also concerned about the 40 year freeze on legislation and the removal of APFO protections as well as the TIF. I understand the desire for the development to move forward, but it seems like we are giving away too much to achieve that end.

Thank you.

Reply all | Delete Junk |

Support Councilwoman Terrasa's Affordable Housing

MM
○

Melissa Mulreany <mjmhtc@yahoo.com>

Thu 4:55 PM


CouncilMail

Reply all |

Please support Councilwoman Terrasa's Affordable Housing plan. Respecting the environment, promises, AND the Columbia tradition of affordable housing is a win, win, win proposition. Do the right thing. Vote for Jen's plan

Melissa J. Mulreany, DDS
MJM-Health Training Concepts
(301) 421-1997

Testimony regarding the downtown Columbia legislation

KA  Kristine Amari <kristine.amari@gmail.com>
Thu 5:31 PM
CouncilMail

Reply all |

Howard County Council,

I wanted to write in with testimony about the legislation for the development of downtown Columbia. I wanted to come in person, but recently had surgery and am unable to make it due to that.

Overall I am deeply concerned by and in strong opposition to the vast majority of the proposed legislation:

- It's shameful that there is even consideration of diverting property taxes to pay for things that developers normally pay for themselves. This is literally one of the best places for developers to build in the country right now by many measures; the idea that we need to incentivize this with taxpayer money is patently ridiculous and I find it irresponsible. Quite frankly it's difficult for me to imagine it could pass through any means other than corruption.
- The public schools are already overcrowded, and therefore I am opposed to anything that increases the burden on them when there are currently no plans to alleviate this in the immediate future. The growing neglect of the public schools in Howard County is deeply troubling. I don't want my kids to be taught in trailers. Columbia desperately needs more public school infrastructure and has been neglecting that need. Complacency will not maintain our currently very good school system; we need to be proactive!
- I do not think increasing the number of apartments from 5,500 (already a huge number) to 6,400 is good for our community. I am already convinced that there will not be adequate facilities (parking and traffic specifically concern me). I strongly believe Columbia is considered by Money magazine to be the best place to live in the country right now in large part because it provides convenience combined with a stress-free atmosphere (i.e. reasonable traffic and no concerns about parking). Making Columbia into a city may be profitable, but I strongly disagree that it will be enjoyable for residents compared to the current environment. Consider if this is how you would like to live, whether this is how the people who came to Columbia for what it has been for so many years, and please make your decisions accordingly!
- Removing the adequate public facilities ordinance (APFO) protections seems unbelievably short-sighted and again, corrupt to me. How is this even on the table? Why on earth would anyone ever in good conscience put the profit of huge corporations above providing adequate public facilities? I am in disbelief that this can even be legal. The fact that this is being discussed only makes me more convinced that making

appropriate provisions for traffic, parking, and the schools is not going to happen under the proposed legislation. Again, this is shameful and we can do better!

In general it seems to me that this legislation was clearly not drawn up with the interests of the citizens of Columbia and Howard County in mind. As our representatives I urge you to do right by us and ensure the beautiful, amazing, low-crime and low-stress environment which is hugely popular right now is not destroyed in the name of profiting corporations whose employees and executives don't live here. Columbia is a unique place; PLEASE protect it!

Thank you for your time and consideration.
Kristine Amari

Reply all | Delete Junk |

TOWN CENTER

Ann von Lossberg <1089nights@gmail.com>

Reply all |

○ Thu 9:09 PM
CouncilMail


I am a Columbia resident who moved here because of the diversity in the community and particularly in the schools. I believe in Rouse's vision of an economically diverse community and I live in one.

I am very **STRONGLY OPPOSED to giving a TIF to the Howard Hughes Company**. I know the successful Rouse Company paid for infrastructure and Hughes should as well.

Thank you for your consideration.

Ann von Lossberg
www.annvl.zenfolio.com
www.1089nights.com

Downtown Columbia Legislation

TS  Tim Sosinski <timski@ariumae.com>
Thu 10:27 PM
CouncilMail

Reply all |

County Council Chair and Members:

It has been a while since I addressed the County Council on the issue of how to achieve full spectrum housing in Downtown Columbia. Passing the torch to a new generation in my various local business efforts and seeking opportunities outside of Howard County has drawn me away from active participation in the current debate on this transcendent issue. It is an issue that strikes at the moral center of our Columbia Identity. How we deal with housing those having limited resources is a litmus test of our viability as a just society. With such wealth, we should be leading our divided Country on this issue.

A quick review of the current status of this debate has brought back memories of how good people can settle for subpar solutions that have too many moving parts and require too much cooperation to succeed. During the initial version of the Downtown Legislation, my own acceptance of a "trust fund" instead of a faulty "requirement" proved to be a mistake. After many years and many units already planned or built, we still have no prospect of affordable housing Downtown. On the last day of the previous legislative debate, I agreed with that last minute solution based upon GGP's verbal assurance of a "place at the table" that would lead to "affordable housing getting built." That assurance proved to be foolish when GGP sold out to Howard Hughes. I should have understood that anything that had the ability to fail in this effort would fail. There is simply too much profit to be made from this bonus density. Howard Hughes would be irresponsible to do anything that cut into the maximum income.

Happily, the one group that was true to their word on this difficult issue has been the County Council. Although my belief is that you too were disappointed in the lack of affordable housing created by the first Downtown Legislation, you did not let the issue slide. You wisely demanded a second bite at the apple.

You recognized that something needed to happen to fix the problem. The legislation presently before you presents two approaches to the required "fix."

The first approach put forward by Howard Hughes, the Administration and their agents, offers a complex solution that involves concentrating units on government controlled sites. I look at the proposals and see a number of fundamental problems .

- I wonder if we are not creating a discrimination law suit by placing low income families over a fire stations or a transit stop? Are fire sirens and sleeping children compatible? Are buses spewing fumes on a midnight run below your bedroom a heathy situation? Even a library seems unlikely to avoid having a 5am dumpster pickup or late meetings below some family window? Would the County officials and taxpayers enjoy defending themselves in court and in the media with such obviously faulty planning?

- As an architect, I know that housing combined with institutional uses is likely to cost significantly more than average housing. In a competition for subsidies, will such a project ever win the tax credit that seems necessary to make the project viable?
- As a developer, I know that one approach to achieving a non-result is to create a scenario that dies of complexity. If you want to prevent an action, find a solution that has so many moving parts that failure of one critical elements is almost certain. The goal of preventing any significant affordable housing is achieved by making somebody else responsible in a messy and uncertain process.
- Although I have not followed the details of each proposal, my understanding is that the Administration proposal locks us in for decades. Hopefully this is not the last chance to get this right. If Howard Hughes can prevent affordable housing by any means possible it seems likely that they will enhance their position by keeping Downtown as an exclusive Ivory Tower. With no threat of consequences to their pocketbook and further legislation to correct problems, I predict a difficult path toward any affordable housing Downtown.

The second approach is a tweaked version of the straight forward MIHU approach that spreads the affordable housing throughout Downtown. Although that approach is not perfect, it is far more certain and far less complex. It is almost certain to succeed.

If we are looking for a long term solution, the second approach seems far superior. Unless you can start over with a better solution, I suggest rejecting the "fix" put forward by the administration. Then accept the alternative put forward by council member Terrasa that is an easily understood main stream solution that will succeed.

In your heart of hearts, I am pretty sure that you can see past the smoke, mirrors, and fancy logic and vote the real fix proposed council person Terrasa. Thank you for your efforts.

TIM SOSINSKI

11795 BRAGDON WOOD

CLARKSVILLE, MARYLAND 21029

Home 410 531 5617

Cell 410 627 5000

TimSki@ARIUMae.com

Reply all | Delete Junk |

Attached please find a copy of testimony for C. Piatko at 9/22 hearing

CP Christine Piatko <christine.piatko@gmail.com>
Thu 11:39 PM
Feldmark, Jessica; CouncilMail

Reply all |

Piatko County Council T...
81 KB

Download

Thank you for the opportunity to testify before the council. Attached please find a copy of testimony for C. Piatko at 9/22 hearing.

Christine Piatko
christine.piatko@gmail.com

County Council Special Public Hearing on September 22, 2016, regarding Downtown Housing and TIF Legislative Packages

Members of the County Council, Chairman Ball

Christine Piatko, 11804 Blue February Way, Columbia MD 21044

Testifying FOR Councilwoman Jen Terrasa's proposed legislation

for three reasons: the density, the TIF and our schools:

On the wall behind you is the Howard County seal, depicting our county as a very agricultural area. And here we sit discussing high-rise buildings up to 20 stories tall. Our county is already the fastest-growing county in the state, and we keep allowing more and more development, both in Columbia and in other parts of our county. 5,500 apartments is already a vast number to add to our downtown, filling up not just the new Crescent and the Metropolitan neighborhoods, but later the Lakefront, Symphony Overlook, and various Mall parking lots. Surely this is more than enough. Surely we can find room for our affordable housing within that vast number of 5,500, without having to add "bonus density" of a thousand more apartments, and without putting apartments in undesirable locations like the Banneker Firehouse.

Please consider that no one has moved to Howard County looking for an urban environment. We have two major cities nearby. There are various smaller semi-urban locations nearby too, for those looking for that lifestyle – locations that are adjacent to Metro. We chose Columbia. Many of Columbia's residents choose to live here and raise their families here because of the *suburban* lifestyle. Columbia is a "Goldilocks" kind of place – we have everything we need (from shops to medical care to cultural events to children's activities), but it's not too hard to get there or to park there. Over-development could ruin that balance.

On top of the “bonus density” and the 40-year freeze in the proposed legislative package, we are asked to agree to a TIF— a diversion of new property taxes back to the developer. A friend asked Mr. Fitchett at the Hickory Ridge Village Board Meeting on Aug. 1 why the Howard Hughes Corporation needs public financing for roads, water and sewer in the Crescent Development, when developers normally cover such costs themselves. His answer was that high rises 14-20 stories tall are very expensive to build. But at the Sept. 12 Pre-Submission Meeting of the Area 3 SDP, he presented plans for two very nice 7-story residential buildings which certainly looked quite urban. The new One Merriweather building is 8 stories tall, and it gives the area a very urban feel as well. If 14- to 20-story buildings are too expensive, then perhaps we should stick with 7- or 8-story buildings, avoid this controversial TIF, and we’d still get an urban environment in our downtown for those who find that desirable.

And stating that this TIF is not a tax burden is incorrect. It may not take away current dollars – but it is taking away tax dollar decisions from our future generations.

And speaking of our future generations... My daughter attended, and my son attends, Wilde Lake High School. In all of this development, schools seem to have become an afterthought. Development brings in more new students. Yet the proposed legislation includes an effort to remove APFO protections for schools in Columbia’s downtown area, as if students in those schools were somehow less worthy of adequate educational space than students in other parts of the county. This is particularly reprehensible.

The TIF legislation makes no mention of new schools at all. Mr. Mileski has made a new elementary school a priority for any extra revenue that may come in beyond the amount required for financing costs, but these projected revenues seem optimistic. Dr. Ball evidently called them

“nebulous” in last week’s Work Session. Yet we have no assurance in the legislation that any revenue will go towards schools, or – as Ms. Sigaty pointed out in the same Work Session - that such schools would even be in the Columbia neighborhoods bearing the brunt of all the new density, rather than in other parts of the county. Furthermore, one new elementary school will not be all we need – a new middle school will be needed as well, and Columbia high schools will be overcrowded too. Yet there is no space in the west side of Columbia big enough for a new middle or high school.

Our schools are a major reason why people choose to move to our county. We need to keep making our schools a top priority. We need to stop bringing in so much new development and overwhelming our schools, leaving our children in crowded trailers. And we certainly should not divert taxes away from our schools through this proposed TIF.

Please vote for Councilwoman Terrasa’s proposed legislation, and against the administration’s legislative package, which is a bad deal for our county and for Columbia. This current deal is tipped too far in favor of these particular developers vs. your constituents of Columbia and Howard County.

Thank you.