

Sayers, Margery

From: Angie Boyter <angie.boyter@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, September 8, 2019 2:28 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: CB38-2019 Testimony
Attachments: CB-38 Testimony Revised.docx

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

Attached is my testimony in support of CB38-2019, because I will not be able to attend the September 16 hearing.

Angela M Boyter

3914 MacAlpine Road

Ellicott City MD 21042

410 465-1444

TESTIMONY ON CB38-2019

I support CB 38 in its entirety. The provisions are effective measures that should help protect the Patapsco Lower North Branch Watershed in future major storms by means of well-conceived measures such as requiring better stormwater runoff control and prohibition against building within 100' of the floodplain, waterways, and wetlands and 50' from steep slopes. The provisions to require better information on environmental impact in site development plans will also help protect and preserve our environment. It further supports good land use by no longer allowing developers to pay fees in lieu of providing open space and forest conservation. These "fees in lieu" have the effect of eliminating open space in exactly places that need it the most.

Each of these provisions is worth discussing, and many citizens could cite striking local examples of why they are needed, but I will concentrate on one that is particularly relevant to my community of Dunloggin, where I have lived since 1967. That is the prohibition against residential infill in any existing communities lacking the infrastructure necessary to manage stormwater under current standards. The community of Dunloggin began in the mid-50s on the site of a former dairy farm. This previous use was significant; one reason it was a dairy farm was that the heavy, rocky soil made it less than desirable for raising crops. It also meant that it did not perc well, so many of the lots were somewhat larger than the minimum half-acre required in the R-20 zone. This is true in a number of areas of the county. It was built out in the early 70s with a bit over 900 homes. It was considered a stable neighborhood and a lovely place to live. Then came public utilities, "infill", and "Smart Growth" (known locally as Dumb Growth).

As a result, the county has allowed a number of over-sized lots to be subdivided, often with waivers or variances, and houses were literally built in an existing front or back yard. In some cases, developers bought several adjacent oversized parcels and combined them to build multiple new homes. The placement of these homes was often less than ideal, and many shared driveways and pipestems resulted. Often, in order to accommodate a new home, beautiful mature plantings were destroyed. One section of Saint John's Lane that originally had eight homes on large lots now has 20 homes either built or planned. Most important for CB 38, adequate stormwater management for the infill is nonexistent.

The largest lots in Dunloggin, which were the most obvious targets for "infill", were often the properties with the worst drainage. There was a good reason they were large. Residents have had significant increase in stormwater management problems like flooded basements and large standing puddles and slippery or icy roads since the "infill". The median in MacAlpine Road where I live routinely becomes a fast-moving stream when there is heavy rain. This would happen once every year or two when I moved into the neighborhood 50 years ago; now it probably happens monthly or more often during the wetter seasons. Worse, my next-door neighbors had over \$14,000 in damage to their family room and an additional \$20,000 in damage to their foundation during the 2016 storm that flooded old Ellicott City. In 2018 they lost their hot water heater and den furniture during THAT flood. We can't simply blame global warming. I was in Dunloggin in 1972 during Hurricane Agnes, and Dunloggin did not experience the widespread and significant problems we have today during heavy rains. The developer of Dunloggin in the 1950s knew enough to take our drainage conditions into account. It is inexcusable that the county has ignored this and created the problems we have today. Let's not continue the past bad practices.

There seems to be pretty universal recognition of the stormwater management problem in this area, and I have heard no criticism of the proposed solution as ineffective. It is actually a very minimal solution, because most of it includes only one watershed. Over half of my community is not in the Patapsco Lower North Branch and would not have the same protections, although we definitely have the same stormwater management inadequacies. We would prefer inclusion of the Plumtree watershed as well. The only objection to this bill that I have heard is that it will essentially stop development in the relevant watershed. Insofar as that is accurate, this argument shows just how serious the problem is. The county has neglected its responsibility to protect existing residents by allowing irresponsible growth that has caused damage to many people and communities. We need a new slogan for our land use. Everyone has heard the slogan "Drink responsibly"; let's adopt a parallel slogan for our land use in Howard County, "Develop responsibly."

I urge you to support this bill to protest the Patapsco Lower North Branch and further to help protect neighborhoods throughout the county by eliminating alternative compliance provisions and fees in lieu of open space and forest conservation requirements county-wide.

Sayers, Margery

From: JTK <jtk409a@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, September 7, 2019 8:38 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: Pass CB38

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

Dear Council Members:

I strongly support CB-38.

The county has for far too long allowed developers to get waivers of regulations intended to protect forests, streams, and steep slopes in our watersheds.

I've seen this occur during my entire life here in the county. I've been shocked at what the county has allowed developers to do – the clearcutting and topographical modification of the hills above Main Street, on the once-scenic College Avenue, is one of the most egregious examples.

The last remaining undeveloped portions of eastern Howard County are environmentally sensitive areas in the Patapsco Valley watershed: Bonnie Branch Road, Beechwood, and Ilchester. We cannot allow waivers of these protections any longer.

It's time for this Council to be bold. We want to see action. We want to see you pass CB-38 as it is written – without amendments proffered by developers' attorneys in private meetings.

We need you to do this. Protect our watersheds. Pass CB-38.

Julia T. Kovacs
Ellicott City, MD 21043

Sayers, Margery

From: Melissa Kistler <melissa.kistler@me.com>
Sent: Friday, September 6, 2019 3:50 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: CB38 and CB42

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

I just wanted to write to voice my support for both of these bills. The issues addressed by these bills are vital and long overdue!

Thank you!

Best,
Melissa

Ellicott City, MD

Melissa Kistler
Sent from my iPhone

Sayers, Margery

From: Steve Cooperstein <scooperstein@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, September 6, 2019 1:58 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: CB 42 and CB 38

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

Good afternoon.

I am a resident in the Glenmar subdivision off Elko Drive, and I am in favor of both CB 42 and CB 38.

The county needs to get those developer impact fees so that when my kids reach middle school and high school, they are able to get their education in brick buildings with enough classrooms, desks, and resources.

Right now, due to the actions taken over the last many years, there is neither sufficient money nor land available for more school facilities because the county council previously allowed development without concessions or impact fees. How many more students will be in the system, living in the new housing at 103/100 (apartment/condo complex), Montgomery and Brightfield (townhouses), etc? But no land was set aside to build HS14, and that will now require eminent domain actions.

Please make sure these trends have come to an end. Better late than never.

Thank you.

-Steven Cooperstein

Sayers, Margery

From: Karen Lynch <karen.e.lynch1@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, September 6, 2019 1:32 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: CB 42 and CB 38

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

To Whom It May Concern,
I am in favor of CB 42 and CB 38.

Please continue your work in trying to convince the developers to slow down the building and preserve our wetlands. Our environment as well as adequate school capacity for all the children in the county today are both more important than developer profits!

Thank you!
Karen Lynch
Elkridge resident