

Sayers, Margery

From: fine <darcyfine@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 19, 2018 2:35 PM
To: Sigaty, Mary Kay; Fox, Greg; Ball, Calvin B; Weinstein, Jon; Terrasa, Jen; CouncilMail
Subject: CB59-2018

July 19, 2018

Dear County Council Members:

I urge you to vote YES to CB59-2018.

It is my feeling that the use of that proposed acreage for an Ericson Living Community would be ideal, actually a “win-win-win” situation for so many of the seniors currently living in our county, the Clarksville area as a whole, and the county coffers.

I am very happy that so many of the comments Monday night were positive. I’d like to address one that I thought was a little misleading. Yes, Vantage House is another CCRC facility, but there are many differences. For one thing, unless things have recently changed there, most people do not know how very expensive the monthly fees are at Vantage House from the moment you move in. However, when you move into an Erickson community, you pay a much lower monthly fee until you need the extra care and then your monthly fees go up.

More positive thoughts:

1. Erickson, as many have testified, is a very reputable company with over 30 years of experience. This is not their first project. In fact, they have 20 successful Communities in over 11 states. I can’t believe they would be interested in coming to Howard County and this location if they did not feel that it would be another success.
2. Erickson, not Howard County, would be paying for the cost of bringing the sewer and water to this property.
3. Erickson, not Howard County, would be paying to fix the current traffic problems that exist on route 108 near the proposed project. In any event, trying to make a left turn out of the shopping center where Roots is located is very dangerous and definitely needs to be fixed.
4. Erickson has also agreed to establish open spaces including a park, an amphitheater, pickleball courts, etc. on five acres of the property which would be open to all Clarksville residents. That’s big.
5. Erickson conducted a “balloon” test this past winter. Because the property in question is very hilly and the tallest buildings are located towards the rear of the property, the complex would hardly be seen from either Route 108 or the adjacent residential communities.

6. 6. It is estimated that this Erickson community would bring in an extra \$4,000,000 or more per year in taxes to Howard County. If this parcel is instead eventually sold to a developer, even if 61 new homes were built, property taxes would never even come close to that amount.
7. 7. If you vote "yes" to this bill, you will be allowing the creation of many new jobs.
8. 8. If you vote "yes" to this bill, it does not affect the local school system in any way.
9. 9. The proposed underground parking also addresses any run-off issues.
10. 10. Lastly, this is an excerpt from Scott's Fiscal Impact Summary which I think is very important: "Erickson Living will provide a full range of services for the residents of the proposed development, including first response/medical aid, security, road maintenance, street lighting and social services, all of which are services which are typically provided by local or regional government units for the benefit of their respective constituents. The self-contained nature of the development coupled with the broad range of services provided within the community will minimize the reliance by the residents of the proposed development upon the resources of Howard County."

Other than having our names on the priority list at Charlestown (in Baltimore County) since 2015 (thankfully transferable to any other Erickson Community), we have no connection with anyone at Erickson other than Molly Fricker (our designated sales rep) and, now, Scott Templin, who I did not know before.

We have lived in Howard County for many, many years. We love it here, and would really like to move to this new Erickson Living Community at Limestone, as would many of our Woodmark neighbors who are also on Erickson's priority list.

Thanks so much for your consideration and all your hard work!

Respectively submitted,

Doris Fine

Mark Rothstein

12302 Benson Branch Road

Ellicott City, Maryland 21042

Sayers, Margery

From: Atal Eralp <atal.eralp@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 18, 2018 2:49 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: I Support the Erickson Living at Limestone Valley Project

Dear Howard County Members,

Howard County Council Members

I Support the Erickson Living at Limestone Valley Project

My Name is Atal Eralp. I live at 10704 Symphony Way Columbia 21044. I am a retired engineer looking for a CCRC community. Five years ago, I visited many CCRC communities and found Erickson communities to be the best communities for me and my wife, and we signed up for the waiting list. However, all current Erickson communities are outside of Howard County. I am delighted that currently Erickson is considering building a CCRC in Clarkson. I strongly support Erickson proposals for Limestone Valley Community. The benefits of Limestone Valley Community for Clarkson and Howard County are explained at presentations and documents provided to you by the Erickson Living. Erickson Living is a leader in the senior housing industry.

I love Howard County. I would like to spend my remaining years in Howard County. But if Limestone Valley CCRC is not approved, Howard County will lose us. More importantly Howard county will lose all the taxes we pay and all the contributions we make to many businesses who pay taxes. My hope is that you will do everything possible to make Limestone Valley Community an option for the growing senior population in Howard County.

Thank You.

Atal Eralp

Sincerely,

Atal Eralp
10704 Symphony Way
Columbia, MD 21044
atal.eralp@gmail.com

Sayers, Margery

From: Dan O'Leary <danielol12832h@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, July 22, 2018 12:55 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: GHCA Testimony CB-59 -2018
Attachments: Written Test HCC 180716.doc

July 22, 2018, by email

Howard County Council
Ellicott City, MD

Dear Council Members:

Please accept the attached written version of my testimony before you on July 16, 2018.

I will be out of town for your works session, but rest assured I will watch the video and get reports from others who will be there.

As always, I thank you for lending me an ear and your attention.

Sincerely

Dan O'Leary, Chairman of the Board, (GHCA),
12832 Highland Rd. Highland MD 20777

PS: if for some reason the attached file cannot be downloaded, please contact me immediately



July 22, 2018, by email

Howard County Council
Ellicott City, MD

Dear Council Members:

Please accept this written version of my testimony before you on July 16, 2018

I am going to attempt to greatly simplify your deliberations by focusing your attention on the central issue before you:

1. Whether you can legally approve expansion of the PSA in accordance with the General Plan?
This is dependent upon positive resolution of BOTH the following questions:

A. Do you have the authority to do this at this time? HC Code Sec. 16.211. - SAYS NO.

"In any year in which members of the County Council are *elected*, the incumbent Councilmembers, shall not take final action on any zoning application after the date of the *primary election* as set by law and until the newly *elected* County. Since the GP itself requires that expansion of the PSA be denied unless...{it} includes a zoning proposal that is consistent with the General Plan and Smart Growth policies.

The zoning proposal in this Bill, by necessity is part and parcel of the Bill and therefore a "zoning application." and therefore off-limits to the Council, especially one that has not one member returning for the next session, Surely, if there ever was a matter worthy of withdrawal, this is it.

B. Can you approve it in its current form? No. Here is why:

It does not fulfill the requirements of the GP and is in conflict with the provisions, intent and spirit of the GP.

The GP on page 70 says: " Any requests for a General Plan Amendment for expansion of the PSA should be denied unless... The proposed expansion of the Planned Service Area includes a zoning proposal that is consistent with the General Plan and Smart Growth policies."

The GP on page 75 says under Implementing Actions: Place Types and Tiers. **{the County must }** Obtain State concurrence on PlanHoward 2030 place designations and tiers in accordance with PlanMaryland's final criteria and procedures and the Sustainable Growth and Agricultural Preservation Act on or before December 31, 2012."

The proposal itself admits it cannot meet these requirements. Hence the two amendments to the GP in the Bill itself designating Rural Conservation land to be Tier I and RC land to be "Designated Growth." This equates a rural part of Clarksville with the conditions existing at the intersection Route 1 and 175.

The proposal must fulfill these conditions under the current General Plan, NOT an amended GP. These requirements limit and proscribe the conditions under which the PSA may be expanded under the GP. In order to fulfill these requirements this Bill amends the very conditions binding the hands of the Council. Subverting the intent of the Plan, which was developed and debated over a 3-year period, amounts to changing the rules of the game and even altering the size and shape of the playing field to accommodate the talents of a specific team:

Team Erickson.

Even if Council wished to do so, it would have to be a sequential process, not a simultaneous one. A separate measure must be debated to provide the citizenry a transparent view of major surgery on the GP.

One of the principal, if not the most important, reasons to devise a general plan is to provide a firm degree of certainty to residents and business owners as to the future of the area in which they choose to live and invest. Amending the GP as proposed here turns the plan on its head and dashes the expectations of the vast majority of the many affected residents.

If the citizens cannot rely upon the clear and simple language of what is meant to be a long-term Plan providing the stability they reserve, what can they rely upon?

Therefore I think I have illustrated to you why:

1. You don't have the authority, and
2. You cannot approve it in its current form.

Allow me to direct your attention to the testimony of others, verbal and written, on two essential points:

1. The reversion clause will not stand legal scrutiny. any change in the PSA must be done by Council bill, subject to referendum.
2. Substantial acreage to the northwest -- hundreds of acres -- is in MD State Preservation subject to newly passed legislation which will allow release of these parcels, subjecting it to irresistible economic forces to develop it to the highest density.

We call upon you to do your duty and preserve the integrity of the GP and perhaps the Council itself

Sincerely,

Dan O'Leary, Chairman of the Board, (GHCA),
12832 Highland Rd. Highland MD 20777