

Sayers, Margery

From: Matthew Antonicelli <antonicelli@verizon.net>
Sent: Wednesday, July 24, 2019 1:38 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: Fwd: A Petition to the Howard County Council to OPPOSE CR89-2019

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

Matthew Antonicelli
antonicelli@verizon.net

-----Original Message-----

From: Google Forms <forms-receipts-noreply@google.com>
To: antonicelli <antonicelli@verizon.net>
Sent: Wed, Jul 24, 2019 1:37 pm
Subject: A Petition to the Howard County Council to OPPOSE CR89-2019



Thanks for filling out [A Petition to the Howard County Council to OPPOSE CR89-2019](#)

Here's what we got from you:

[EDIT RESPONSE](#)

A Petition to the Howard County Council to OPPOSE CR89-2019

The undersigned members of the community residing within the area affected by the 108 West to Columbia Road North right turn lane urge members of the County Council to oppose CR89-2019.

Further, the undersigned believe the property at the northeast corner of MD108 and Columbia Road should remain in the County's possession for use in a public works project increasing the number of turn lanes from MD108 westbound to Columbia Road northbound.

Email address *

antonicelli@verizon.net

Name *

Matthew Antonicelli

Address *

4136 Arjay Circle, Ellicott City, Md. 21042

Comments

At a ,minimum, at least get full price on property for county. Otherwise, this looks like corruption!

[Create your own Google Form](#)

Sayers, Margery

From: Michele Wright <WrightM_29067@msn.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 24, 2019 1:38 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: No to development of land adjacent to old rt. 108

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

Michele A. Wright

Sayers, Margery

From: Melissa Kistler <melissa.kistler@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 24, 2019 12:38 PM
To: Yungmann, David
Cc: Knight, Karen; Kittleman, Mary; CouncilMail
Subject: Re: CR89-2019

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

Thank you again for the response. I don't think the issue is necessarily people being misinformed, but people trying to navigate complexities (while having full time jobs and families) and not having their frustrations heard regarding development outpacing infrastructure changes. Thus, latching on to anything that can slow the decline of our county is what is happening.

With this- perhaps the issue isn't this portion of land then, but zoning.

Who controls the zoning of where the developer has purchased land? I believe the county council approves these changes? Was the zoning changed to suit the developer needs vs. the small houses that are there now- looks like maybe several years back this happened? Can the zoning be changed so that there isn't this loophole of them being about to build higher if they do not acquire the road?

In regards to traffic, will the results of testing be publicly available anywhere?

Best,
Melissa

On Tuesday, July 23, 2019, 6:19:15 PM EDT, Yungmann, David <dyungmann@howardcountymd.gov> wrote:

Ms. Kistler,

Your original email didn't mention waiving of the bidding process as being a concern. County government waives bidding requirements routinely which may or may not be a good policy, but it's done when there's only one likely buyer and no open marketplace for the property.

That doesn't appear to be the real issue for anyone who has been emailing us though. The issue that continues to come up is a sense that this conveyance is being done to facilitate the project as a benefit to the developer. That is the misinformation I believe is circulating around the community.

You are correct that part of the current roadway will be used for parking. However, the proposed buildings are 4-5 stories smaller than would be allowed and the number of units is well below the zoned density. If the road is not conveyed, the developer could increase the height of the buildings to make space for more parking on the property

they already have. Ironically, in addition to being able to build taller buildings, this property is zoned for more units than are being proposed.

Traffic is always a concern, which is perfectly legitimate given how jammed that intersection feels at rush hour. However, unless Old Columbia and/or Old Annapolis are widened, I doubt we would want SHA doubling the pace of cars coming off Rt. 108. Regarding traffic overall, if the new project doesn't pass the traffic testing required in APFO, which was strengthened last year, the project would need to downsize or not move forward at all. All of that testing is done during the subdivision process.

So it does come down to whether we should continue committing taxpayer dollars to maintaining a road that may never have a use other than serving a single property. I'm sure people will have various opinions on that. Thanks again for your email.

David Yungmann

Howard County Council – District 5

(410) 313-2001

<https://cc.howardcountymd.gov/Districts/District-5>

From: Melissa Kistler <melissa.kistler@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 23, 2019 1:36 PM
To: Yungmann, David <dyungmann@howardcountymd.gov>
Cc: Knight, Karen <kknight@howardcountymd.gov>; Kittleman, Mary <mkittleman@howardcountymd.gov>; CouncilMail <CouncilMail@howardcountymd.gov>
Subject: Re: CR89-2019

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

Thank you for your response. However, I don't think there is too much misunderstanding. I'm not an expert, and I'm not supposed to be. However, I want to trust the county government to do what is right. That is pretty simple- choose citizens first. Time and time again developers are chosen first and waivers and exceptions are considered for them to keep building in every little spot they can. The resolution is "an ACT declaring that a portion of Old Maryland Route 108, containing approximately 1.087 acres, is no longer needed for a public purpose and authorizing the County Executive **to waive the advertising and bidding requirements of Section 4.201 of the Howard County Code** in order to convey the County's property interest to the developer of the adjacent property, Dorsey Overlook, LLLP."

Why is there a need to waive these requirements for a developer? They are planning on using the road as more parking spaces for more cars that Old Annapolis Rd. and Columbia Rd. already can't handle. Just because it is a road why is it so much cheaper than the adjacent million dollar lots they purchased? Shouldn't the county keep this land just in case it can be used in the future for the betterment of infrastructure vs. just handing it off? Based on the plans, I also believe the developer needs this parcel to have enough parking potentially since it looks like it will be additional parking spaces. Do they have a viable plan that would retain this road? If not- then, yes this waiver does indeed facilitate the development. Is there a direct benefit to citizens of this waiver and development?

It's also bigger than just this item- Howard County has a problem and the last thing that should be approved is a waiver to make it easier for a developer to build where there is a small parcel to build on (and again- do they have plan what would not include this parcel as more parking for the units?)

How about focus on creating better regulations that don't allow for more pavement, more run off, more flooding, more traffic, more overcrowded schools, and in general a lower quality of life for Howard County citizens and a higher risk of people getting hurt or dying due to poor infrastructure planning. That is the job of the council- and every little waiver and exception given to developers to make their ability to build where there is no room to build easier is a derelict of duty.

On Monday, July 22, 2019, 10:49:54 PM EDT, Yungmann, David <dyungmann@howardcountymd.gov> wrote:

Thank you for your email. There seems to be some misunderstanding about this issue, with many residents thinking the road transfer facilitates the development. The property is already zoned for the proposed building, yet it does need to pass things like traffic studies, none of which is dependent on the developer owning this road. The purpose of disposing of the road is to free the county of long term maintenance costs for a road that would serve only one property. Until 3 years ago, the county disposed of unwanted roadways for zero dollars, it's interest being to unload the maintenance obligation. Kittleman administration created appraisal requirement. This appraised at \$50,000 because it's of no use to anyone once the private homes are purchased, making it basically a private driveway. If the project doesn't gain final approval, the county will retain the road to continue serving those private homes. If the project does get built, there's no reason for the county to retain the maintenance obligations to serve what would then be a single property. Route 108 is a State roadway. SHA has stated it has no plans to expand the road and has no interest in the property.

David Yungmann

Howard County Council – District 5

(410) 313-2001

<https://cc.howardcountymd.gov/Districts/District-5>

From: Melissa Kistler <melissa.kistler@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, July 22, 2019 3:48 PM
To: CouncilMail <CouncilMail@howardcountymd.gov>
Subject: CR89-2019

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

Hello-

I am writing in strong opposition to CR89-2019. The section of Old Rt. 108 should NOT be sold to the developer of Dorsey Overlook for a mere \$50,000. We need traffic relief. We need better infrastructure to support this proposed development. I'm tired of developers coming first. Do not allow this section of road to go to the developer. They need to come up with a better plan/smaller number of units- or better yet none at all.

Best,

Melissa Kistler

9417 Aston Villa Ellicott City, MD 21042

Sayers, Margery

From: Tara Scully <taramscully@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 24, 2019 11:59 AM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: Cr89-2019

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

Please preserve this county asset for future traffic relief, or storm water management or some other public benefit, then we should insist that the County Council get full value for the land. In a time when the budget is tight, taxes are up and the schools are overflowing we really need to make sure that we get full value for our county assets.

I frequent this intersection often to my kids pediatrician, camps, and other personal matters.

- Tara Scully
3102 Ramblewood, 21042, Valleymede
Howard County Resident for my entire lifetime

Sayers, Margery

From: Joe P <joepavlovsky@msn.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 23, 2019 5:58 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: Council Resolution CR89-2019 - Please keep this section of old Rt 108 as county property

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

Our family uses these intersections multiple times a day. The traffic has become unbearable at times due to the backups on all feeder roads. The small section of Rt 108 that is being considered to be sold to a developer is land that can be used to help reduce this congestion. I urge the council to keep this land for future projects. Our community deserves better traffic patterns.

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

Sayers, Margery

From: Martin Shimer <martin.shimer@verizon.net>
Sent: Tuesday, July 23, 2019 4:47 PM
To: CouncilMail
Cc: Ball, Calvin B
Subject: CR 89 2019

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

County Council Members

I've just learned that Howard County intends to sell an acre of land at the corner of Route 108 and Columbia Road for far less than market value and without any public notice or other advertising of the county's intent. I sincerely hope that this proposal is rejected and invite all council members to visit this intersection during rush hour in the evening. For the full impact, this visit should be conducted while school is in session and not during summary break when traffic volume is reduced. This land and the rest of the existing roadway should be retained by the county to support better and safer traffic flow through that intersection. This intersection has been beset with issues ever since the development on Old Annapolis Road in the past 5 or 6 years. The county should not be offering handouts, or dare I say favors, to developers where that very development will only further degrade county residents ability to safely navigate that intersection.

I will take note of how members vote on this resolution.

Sincerely,

Martin Shimer.....a resident that must navigate that intersection every work day.

Sayers, Margery

From: Melissa Kistler <melissa.kistler@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 23, 2019 1:36 PM
To: Yungmann, David
Cc: Knight, Karen; Kittleman, Mary; CouncilMail
Subject: Re: CR89-2019

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

Thank you for your response. However, I don't think there is too much misunderstanding. I'm not an expert, and I'm not supposed to be. However, I want to trust the county government to do what is right. That is pretty simple- choose citizens first. Time and time again developers are chosen first and waivers and exceptions are considered for them to keep building in every little spot they can. The resolution is "an ACT declaring that a portion of Old Maryland Route 108, containing approximately 1.087 acres, is no longer needed for a public purpose and authorizing the County Executive *to waive the advertising and bidding requirements of Section 4.201 of the Howard County Code* in order to convey the County's property interest to the developer of the adjacent property, Dorsey Overlook, LLLP."

Why is there a need to waive these requirements for a developer? They are planning on using the road as more parking spaces for more cars that Old Annapolis Rd. and Columbia Rd. already can't handle. Just because it is a road why it so much cheaper than the adjacent million dollar lots they purchased? Shouldn't the county keep this land just in case it can be used in the future for the betterment of infrastructure vs. just handing it off? Based on the plans, I also believe the developer needs this parcel to have enough parking potentially since it looks like it will be additional parking spaces. Do they have a viable plan that would retain this road? If not- then, yes this waiver does indeed facilitate the development. Is there a direct benefit to citizens of this waiver and development?

It's also bigger than just this item- Howard County has a problem and the last thing that should be approved is a waiver to make it easier for a developer to build where there is a small parcel to build on (and again- do they have plan what would not include this parcel as more parking for the units?)

How about focus on creating better regulations that don't allow for more pavement, more run off, more flooding, more traffic, more overcrowded schools, and in general a lower quality of life for Howard County citizens and a higher risk of people getting hurt or dying due to poor infrastructure planning. That is the job of the council- and every little waiver and exception given to developers to make their ability to build where there is no room to build easier is a derelict of duty.

On Monday, July 22, 2019, 10:49:54 PM EDT, Yungmann, David <dyungmann@howardcountymd.gov> wrote:

Thank you for your email. There seems to be some misunderstanding about this issue, with many residents thinking the road transfer facilitates the development. The property is already zoned for the proposed building, yet it does need to pass things like traffic studies, none of which is dependent on the developer owning this road. The purpose of disposing of the road is to free the county of long term maintenance costs for a road that would serve only one

property. Until 3 years ago, the county disposed of unwanted roadways for zero dollars, it's interest being to unload the maintenance obligation. Kittleman administration created appraisal requirement. This appraised at \$50,000 because it's of no use to anyone once the private homes are purchased, making it basically a private driveway. If the project doesn't gain final approval, the county will retain the road to continue serving those private homes. If the project does get built, there's no reason for the county to retain the maintenance obligations to serve what would then be a single property. Route 108 is a State roadway. SHA has stated it has no plans to expand the road and has no interest in the property.

David Yungmann

Howard County Council – District 5

(410) 313-2001

<https://cc.howardcountymd.gov/Districts/District-5>

From: Melissa Kistler <melissa.kistler@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, July 22, 2019 3:48 PM
To: CouncilMail <CouncilMail@howardcountymd.gov>
Subject: CR89-2019

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

Hello-

I am writing in strong opposition to CR89-2019. The section of Old Rt. 108 should NOT be sold to the developer of Dorsey Overlook for a mere \$50,000. We need traffic relief. We need better infrastructure to support this proposed development. I'm tired of developers coming first. Do not allow this section of road to go to the developer. They need to come up with a better plan/smaller number of units- or better yet none at all.

Best,

Melissa Kistler

9417 Aston Villa Ellicott City, MD 21042

Sayers, Margery

From: Melissa Kistler <melissa.kistler@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, July 22, 2019 3:48 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: CR89-2019

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

Hello-

I am writing in strong opposition to CR89-2019. The section of Old Rt. 108 should NOT be sold to the developer of Dorsey Overlook for a mere \$50,000. We need traffic relief. We need better infrastructure to support this proposed development. I'm tired of developers coming first. Do not allow this section of road to go to the developer. They need to come up with a better plan/smaller number of units- or better yet none at all.

Best,
Melissa Kistler

9417 Aston Villa Ellicott City, MD 21042

Sayers, Margery

From: Eric Miller <em8643a@alumni.american.edu>
Sent: Monday, July 22, 2019 10:04 AM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: Council Resolution 89-2019

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

Dear County Council:

I have major concerns about how the Dorsey Overlook development would impact the already severe traffic problems in the Columbia Rd./108 area. I find it nearly impossible to leave my complex between 4:30 and 7:30 most weekdays. I would ask that you please hold off on any final vote on this resolution until all traffic studies are complete and, if necessary, be willing to kill off this development if such studies show a major detrimental impact on traffic in the surrounding areas.

Thank you.

Eric Miller
4906-1 Columbia Rd.

Sayers, Margery

From: Carolina Q Dignan <caro5522@yahoo.com>
Sent: Saturday, July 20, 2019 12:41 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: Land on 108 sale

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

Please do not allow the sale of the land on 108. Traffic on that intersection is bad enough as it is!!
Thank you.

Carolina Dignan
Gray Rock Farm

Sent from my iPhone

Sayers, Margery

From: Eric Mize <eamize@verizon.net>
Sent: Friday, July 19, 2019 9:04 AM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: Opposition to CR89-2019 (July 22 Agenda)

[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,

Regarding: July 22, 2019 Agenda Item, CR89-2019

I am stating my opposition to CR89-2019, the sale of a portion along Route 108 for \$50,000, while waiving the advertising and bidding requirements of Section 4.201 of the Howard County Code.

As a matter of comparison, my property is assessed for tax purposes at a rate of \$780,000 per acre. The bill proposes the sale of this land at about \$46,000 per acre. By this measure, the land is offered at a 94% discount, which does not seem fair to County property taxpayers.

In light of the county budget deficit, I oppose CR89-2019. There is no harm in ensuring that the advertising and bidding requirements of Section 4.201 of the Howard County Code are followed in the sale of this property.

This will help ensure the County and its citizens receive true marketplace value for the land.

Thank You,
Eric Mize
10061 Whitworth Way