

**Sayers, Margery**

---

**From:** Susan Garber <buzysusan23@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, June 17, 2019 6:20 PM  
**To:** CouncilMail  
**Subject:** 32,33, 99,100

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

Dear County Council Members,

Although I am presently out of town, I wanted to briefly weigh in on some of the important legislation you are hearing tonight.

**CB32-2019 Supporting DPZ representatives to be subject to examination under oath**

While the Planning Board was established as the means for the public to express opinions on important development and zoning matters, it no longer seems to perform that function. Nor does it reliably provide good guidance to the Council since it frequently ignores much of the public's testimony and simply accepts the Technical Staff Report from the DPZ representative. This is particularly the case on quasi-judicial hearings. Far too often it appears that technical staff reports have been copy and pasted whole cloth from a developer's application and protestants have no opportunity to question the DPZ representative.

There is a desperate need for citizens to be able to question the department of Planning and Zoning representative for clarification on the facts of the case and on DPZ's position. These responses should be provided under oath, just as citizens are required to provide their testimony under oath. I strongly recommend passage of CB 32 for that reason.

One amendment I would suggest is to also have the petitioner's attorney testify under oath. While in theory the attorney is to ask questions only during a quasi-judicial hearing, the reality is that much testimony is provided under the guise of loaded and leading questions.

Since DPZ representatives testify under oath now in Zoning Board cases, there is no reason not to extend this to Planning Board hearings as well

**CB33-2019 Supporting** broadening of 'standing' status.

The denial of standing in Planning Board Appeals is an all too frequent occurrence. It appears that the practice has weaponized the prevention of citizen participation.

Anyone who provides testimony or interrogates the petitioner and his witnesses in a Planning Board hearing should be considered a party to the case. The provision to prove that one is aggrieved more than anyone else is aggrieved is as impossible as any case of attempting to prove a negative. This practice must be corrected. I urge all Council Members to support CB 33.

**CR 100 - 2019 Against further restrictions on citizen testimony.**

I strongly urge you to vote against CR 100 - 2019 as written. I am concerned that the change may make it impossible for a person to speak under several scenarios:

- a.) there was a problem with the sign up process and the individual has no way of knowing it until they have been 'skipped'
- b.) persons who have multiple obligations may elect not to, or be unable to, arrive at the start of a meeting in which their issue is anticipated to occur in the latter portion of a session. If they sign up on line prior to a session and miss when they are called, they would forfeit the ability to speak despite having made quite an effort to be there
- c.) Cutting off registration at the *scheduled* start of a meeting eliminates the opportunity for a person not intending to speak on a particular topic to hear inaccurate information provided in testimony they feel compelled to rebut or correct.

While I understand it is helpful to have a fairly accurate count before the start of a meeting, there are circumstances where having to sign up prior to the *scheduled* start of a meeting would severely suppress citizen input. Just as the Council has circumstances where meetings don't start as scheduled, so too is the life of citizens not always predictable. Vote NO on CR-100 please.

**CR 99-2019**

I hate to see you in a position where you are told you have no alternative to accepting the chart as written, without delay or modification, as has happened year after year.

There is a significant difference this year, The new enrollment chart appears to indicate for the first time that the total number of students forecasted has now reached the point where we no longer have 'under capacity school capacity' to deal with additional students. In other words while we have heard

for years that redistricting would produce a seat for every child since we have vacancies in the West and in other isolated schools, **this is no longer the case.**

**Please dare to challenge “how we’ve always done it” and produce better outcomes for students, families, and tax payers.**

Thank you for your consideration of this input. I hope to be able to address additional bills and resolutions before you vote.

Respectfully submitted,

Susan Garber

North Laurel/Savage

