

CR17-2019

Sayers, Margery

From: DIANE BUTLER <politicodiane@msn.com>
Sent: Monday, July 15, 2019 10:35 AM
To: Walsh, Elizabeth; CouncilMail
Subject: Re: CB 17 and Dorsey acreage giveaway

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

Thanks for the detailed response, Liz.

As you know, I sat on the APFO committee and many of these "fixes" were voted down by the development community. I would be happy to back you on the longer wait, as four years is the normal planning time. The last two decades of overbuilding, and state mandated changes to our planning, besides the woeful developer fees are going to be very hard to make-up. If we have to have a building moratorium to get there, I am all in. I know that won't happen but we could surely cut the allocations in half, as a start.

I will look at the CR89 verbiage and get back to you. That project still has some major concerns.

Diane

From: Walsh, Elizabeth <ewalsh@howardcountymd.gov>
Sent: Monday, July 15, 2019 5:48 AM
To: DIANE BUTLER <politicodiane@msn.com>; CouncilMail <CouncilMail@howardcountymd.gov>
Subject: Re: CB 17 and Dorsey acreage giveaway

Good morning, Diane:

Yes. CB17 would amend County APFO law by extending the "waiting period" after which Developers can build in, regardless of whether or how crowded receiving elementary, middle or high schools are. As is, the stated term is four years—which in reality is no more than one, as prevailing Code and policy both are premised on the assumption that it takes proposed development about three years to get through the DPZ process. CB17 adds those three years back in to be a true four-year "waiting period"—although the nominal hold would be seven—and still applies only if the receiving schools remains "closed" for that entire extended term. Theoretically, the school system is supposed to be catching up to new student yields in this time allotted, but we all know this hasn't happened in the past. And now with all levels of County schools at and projecting to exceed capacity County-wide, we know we can't redistrict or build or renovate our way out of the over-crowding anymore. We just can't.

APFO law is Subtitle 11 of Title 16 (Planning, Zoning and Subdivisions and Land Development Regulations) of the County Code, which you can find here: https://library.municode.com/md/howard_county/codes/code_of_ordinances

The bill itself is here: <https://apps.howardcountymd.gov/olis/GetFile.aspx?id=24545>

We should be voting on CB17 at the end of this month, and as its sponsor I'd love to get your support for it.

The Dorsey Overlook land sale is the subject of CR89, and I am strongly opposed to that proposed measure. As is, the County proposes to sell about an acre of property fronting Old Columbia and Route 108 for \$50,000. As I understand it,

the Developer's latest plan for the site—to be presented at a presubmission meeting this Tuesday night, tomorrow—uses the County land pretty much as it is now, site access to the property with negligible buffering from Route 108.

That legislative summary is here: <https://apps.howardcountymd.gov/olis/PrintSummary.aspx?LegislationID=12289>

Information on the presubmission meeting is here:

https://data.howardcountymd.gov/Search_Plans/GetReport.aspx?mdate=Jul%2016%202019&planType=Pre-submission%20Community%20Meeting&planID=1887&lng=-76.8432443980359&lat=39.2404283328958

Please let us know if you have any further questions or comments. Thank you for being engaged!

Liz Walsh, Council Member
Howard County Council
Serving District 1

3430 Court House Drive
Ellicott City, MD 21043
410.313.2001

From: DIANE BUTLER <politicodiane@msn.com>

Sent: Saturday, July 13, 2019 7:23 PM

To: CouncilMail

Subject: CB 17 and Dorsey acreage giveaway

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

To the members of the council,

I have a few questions. Are you trying to amend the APFO with CB 17? Where can I get all of the language for this?

As for the Dorsey giveaway, I have a question. How many extra units does this afford the developer with the extra acreage? And my biggest question is why aren't we selling the land to the developer? You certainly wouldn't "give" it to me if I asked. Land in Howard County is precious, we have a budget shortfall. Charge the developer what the land is worth, and only sell it to them, if it does not allow for any increase in density with the added acreage.

Could I please get a response from the members of the council, or their assistants this time?

Thank you, Diane Butler

Sayers, Margery

From: Walsh, Elizabeth
Sent: Monday, July 15, 2019 5:49 AM
To: DIANE BUTLER; CouncilMail
Subject: Re: CB 17 and Dorsey acreage giveaway

Good morning, Diane:

Yes. CB17 would amend County APFO law by extending the “waiting period” after which Developers can build in, regardless of whether or how crowded receiving elementary, middle or high schools are. As is, the stated term is four years—which in reality is no more than one, as prevailing Code and policy both are premised on the assumption that it takes proposed development about three years to get through the DPZ process. CB17 adds those three years back in to be a true four-year “waiting period”—although the nominal hold would be seven—and still applies only if the receiving schools remains “closed” for that entire extended term. Theoretically, the school system is supposed to be catching up to new student yields in this time allotted, but we all know this hasn’t happened in the past. And now with all levels of County schools at and projecting to exceed capacity County-wide, we know we can’t redistrict or build or renovate our way out of the over-crowding anymore. We just can’t.

APFO law is Subtitle 11 of Title 16 (Planning, Zoning and Subdivisions and Land Development Regulations) of the County Code, which you can find here: https://library.municode.com/md/howard_county/codes/code_of_ordinances

The bill itself is here: <https://apps.howardcountymd.gov/olis/GetFile.aspx?id=24545>

We should be voting on CB17 at the end of this month, and as its sponsor I’d love to get your support for it.

The Dorsey Overlook land sale is the subject of CR89, and I am strongly opposed to that proposed measure. As is, the County proposes to sell about an acre of property fronting Old Columbia and Route 108 for \$50,000. As I understand it, the Developer’s latest plan for the site—to be presented at a presubmission meeting this Tuesday night, tomorrow—uses the County land pretty much as it is now, site access to the property with negligible buffering from Route 108.

That legislative summary is here: <https://apps.howardcountymd.gov/olis/PrintSummary.aspx?LegislationID=12289>

Information on the presubmission meeting is here:

https://data.howardcountymd.gov/Search_Plans/GetReport.aspx?mdate=Jul%2016%202019&planType=Pre-submission%20Community%20Meeting&planID=1887&lng=-76.8432443980359&lat=39.2404283328958

Please let us know if you have any further questions or comments. Thank you for being engaged!

Liz Walsh, Council Member
Howard County Council
Serving District 1

3430 Court House Drive
Ellicott City, MD 21043
410.313.2001

From: DIANE BUTLER <politicodiane@msn.com>

Sent: Saturday, July 13, 2019 7:23 PM

To: CouncilMail

Subject: CB 17 and Dorsey acreage giveaway

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

To the members of the council,

I have a few questions. Are you trying to amend the APFO with CB 17? Where can I get all of the language for this?

As for the Dorsey giveaway, I have a question. How many extra units does this afford the developer with the extra acreage? And my biggest question is why aren't we selling the land to the developer? You certainly wouldn't "give" it to me if I asked. Land in Howard County is precious, we have a budget shortfall. Charge the developer what the land is worth, and only sell it to them, if it does not allow for any increase in density with the added acreage.

Could I please get a response from the members of the council, or their assistants this time?

Thank you, Diane Butler

Sayers, Margery

From: DIANE BUTLER <politicodiane@msn.com>
Sent: Saturday, July 13, 2019 7:24 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: CB 17 and Dorsey acreage giveaway

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

To the members of the council,

I have a few questions. Are you trying to amend the APFO with CB 17? Where can I get all of the language for this?

As for the Dorsey giveaway, I have a question. How many extra units does this afford the developer with the extra acreage? And my biggest question is why aren't we selling the land to the developer? You certainly wouldn't "give" it to me if I asked. Land in Howard County is precious, we have a budget shortfall. Charge the developer what the land is worth, and only sell it to them, if it does not allow for any increase in density with the added acreage.

Could I please get a response from the members of the council, or their assistants this time?

Thank you, Diane Butler