From:

Cynthia Meyler <cmey35@gmail.com>

Sent:

Wednesday, February 3, 2021 8:45 PM

To:

CouncilMail

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

Please vote NO on cb7 and cb8.

Cyndi Meyler (Howard County resident since 1993)

From:

Carolan <cbstansky@comcast.net>

Sent:

Wednesday, February 3, 2021 3:47 PM

To:

CouncilMail

Subject:

No to CB7 and CB8

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

Dear Council members:

Please just say no to ZRA amendments without thorough public comment and especially while regulations are being updated.

Yes, time is money for developers (and anyone running any business), but they knew (or should have known) the existing zoning rules.

"Betting" that they could get an exception or zoning change is a risk they take, not one you must mitigate.

Folks have recently taken to calling vaccine distribution "The Hunger Games."

Last year, after a school board member publically stated "we need more development so our budget can increase", it dawned on me development in Howard County is often like a "Ponzi Scheme".

New income is used to address old problems, and so on and so on. Who will be the last one standing with no "new dollars" left to find?

Yes, I accept that some (many?) zoning rules will be rewritten in the name of revitalization and "progress". Let's wait and do it in a thoughtful manner and stop piecemeal "solutions" that help one and hurt many. Carolan Stansky
D1-Ellicott City

From:

Caroline Bodziak <cbodziak@gmail.com>

Sent:

Wednesday, February 3, 2021 10:16 AM

To:

CouncilMail

Subject:

NO to CB7 and CB8

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

Hello Howard County Council,

I would like you to vote NO on CB7 and CB8.

The developer is asking in the middle of Howard County's reworking of its growth plan. I also question why the developer would ask to increase the size of allowable buildings by 80% and insist it would not create additional density. Please vote No. Developers should be paying HoCo for the privilege of making so much money off their construction in our amazing county, not the other way around.

Thank you,

Caroline Bodziak 3133 Hearthstone Rd. Ellicott City, MD 21042 443-812-5896

From:

Robert Judge <robert.judge@verizon.net>

Sent:

Wednesday, February 3, 2021 7:42 AM

To:

CouncilMail

Subject:

Vote NO on CB7-2021 and CB8-2021

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

I am writing to urge you to vote NO on both CB7 and CB8. This county does not have the infrastructure to support these bills. I have been a county resident my entire life and have lived in Elkridge since 1992. My three children attended Elkridge Elementary, Elkridge Landing Middle and Long Reach High School. My youngest is in 10th grade at Long Reach. All of my children have always attended overcrowded schools. It is irresponsible to approve more residential units when we do not have the infrastructure to support them.

I would like to propose an alternative, give the developers higher density, but no water or sewer service for the next 15 years. Let's see if they will accept that.

Robert Judge 6609 Grouse Road Elkridge MD 21075 410-660-7013 robert.judge@verizon.net

From:

Jason Crouch <ericjasoncrouch@gmail.com>

Sent:

Wednesday, February 3, 2021 7:38 AM

To:

CouncilMail

Subject:

CB7 and CB8 - Vote NO

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

County Council,

Today, please vote NO on CB7 and CB8.

Jason Crouch

From:

Amy Bracciale <amy.bracciale@gmail.com>

Sent:

Wednesday, February 3, 2021 7:37 AM

To:

CouncilMail

Subject:

Vote NO on CB7 and CB8

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

Council Members,

Please vote NO on CB7 and CB8.

Thank you. Amy Crouch

CB8 - Financial Contributions

ZRA	DATE	NAME	C. Rigby	O. Jones	Deb Jung	Ca	alvin Ball
193, Blue Stream	9/25/2018	Arnold Sager		\$ 1,000.00			
193, Blue Stream	9/25/2018	Arnold Sager			\$ 200.00		
193, Blue Stream	12/5/2019	Hermann Drive, LLC		\$ 500.00			
193, Blue Stream	11/13/2019	Water Assoc., Inc.	\$ 500.00				
193, Blue Stream	6/15/2017	Chris Murn				\$	1,000.00
193, Blue Stream	4/25/2018	Chris Murn				\$	2,000.00
193, Blue Stream	8/3/2018	Chris Murn				\$	4,000.00
193, Blue Stream	10/19/2018	Chris Murn				\$	2,000.00
193, Blue Stream	12/12/2019	Chris Murn				\$	500.00
193, Blue Stream	1/13/2021	Chris Murn				\$	6,000.00
193, Blue Stream	1/13/2021	Melissa Murn		a a		\$	6,000.00

From:

kathleencf < kathleencf@yahoo.com>

Sent:

Wednesday, February 3, 2021 7:09 AM

To:

CouncilMail

Subject:

Council Vote

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

Please vote NO on CB7 and CB8.

Thank you,

Kathleen Farrow

From:

Christine & Earl Dietrich < dietrichs4@verizon.net>

Sent:

Tuesday, February 2, 2021 8:23 PM

To:

CouncilMail; Rigby, Christiana

Subject:

Vote NO on CB8

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

Dear Councilmembers,

I urge you to vote NO on CB8.

As a 23 year resident of HoCo, I have disagreed with the intense and rapid urbanization of the county. Amid the pandemic, decisions are being pushed through without proper community input. So much growth has led to pressure on our infrastructure, roads, and schools and countywide resources have not kept pace with the residential growth. This continues to happen over and over, despite complaints from residents. I understand the need for progress but it must be done as part of a comprehensive plan that considers the consequences of such dense urbanization. I moved here for the suburban/rural life, as did many of the people who currently live here, and that is being stripped away for the greed of developers who do not live in the areas they develop. We are left to live with the outcome of irresponsible growth. I urge you to vote NO until a general plan can be properly evaluated by the community and planning for additional resources to the population growth is in place.

Sincerely, Christine Dietrich

From:

Pat Hemler <pathemler@gmail.com>

Sent:

Tuesday, February 2, 2021 7:56 PM

To: Cc: CouncilMail Pat Hemler

Subject:

CB 8-2021 - Please Vote No

[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 want to express my concern and opposition to Council Bill 8-2021 which would allow developers to buy-down their obligations to provide required commercial space in Corridor Activity Center zoned areas.

I would encourage the council to adhere to the county master plan. Any future changes to the master plan should be done with deliberate study and decision. The suggested developer-funded study cannot be assumed to be impartial.

As a 32-year Howard County resident and property owner, thank you for your efforts to ensure the continued high-quality of life for our residents and for improvements along the Route 1 corridor. I urge you to please vote no to CB 8-2021.

Thank you,

Patrick Hemler 8910 Lincoln Street Savage, MD 20763

From:

Sara Vermillion <speedy.vee@gmail.com>

Sent:

Tuesday, February 2, 2021 7:48 PM

To:

CouncilMail

Subject:

Comments on CB-7-2021 and CB-8-2021

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

Dear Howard County Council Members,

Thank you for this opportunity to express an opinion on CB-7-2021 and CB-8-2021. I have worked on transportation policy issues for 25 years and ridden the MARC train from/to the Savage Station for 20 years. I am in favor of Transit-Oriented Development (TOD), if it follows the intended framework that makes it truly transit-oriented and an important component of a county-wide transportation plan. However, I'm concerned that these bills—particularly CB-8-2021—erode the benefits of TOD and allow the developer to increase profits at the expense of the surrounding infrastructure.

Specifically, the TOD framework includes not just locating the development close to transit, but also:

- a) Sufficient retail space for grocers and other essential businesses so the commuters don't have to get off the major transit mode—in this case the MARC train—and immediately hop in their cars to go run errands, thereby adding congestion to the roads that the TOD was supposed to relieve. By reducing the required commercial square footage below 20 square feet per dwelling unit, CB-8-2021 severely undermines this key component of TOD development, not just for this project, but for all future TOD projects in the county. Further, the wording of the bill summary that notes this reduction in commercial square footage can be done "if the Department of Planning and Zoning finds based on a market study submitted by the developer that the reduction is necessary for the financial viability of the project" raises questions as to who defines "financial viability." It essentially allows the developer to make this reduction in commercial space a requirement, not an option.
- b) Integration into a comprehensive transportation and development plan for the surrounding area. The increased density that CB-7-2021 allows (and that future TOD projects would allow) by increasing the height of the residential buildings should be factored into impacts to local roads, schools, and other infrastructure. Has this been considered? I have to doubt it, as the answer to how much the increased height would increase density was "it won't."

Therefore, I'm wholeheartedly opposed to CB-8-2021, and would be in favor of CB-7-2021 only if this and other TOD projects are appropriately integrated into the Route 1 Corridor and county-wide plans. The Council has made progress in reining in developers in Howard County, and I sincerely thank you for that effort. However, these bills allow developers to use the TOD buzz word to get approval for projects, and then whittle away at the benefits of a true TOD to increase their profits.

My apologies for the late submission of my comments. Even though I've suspended my MARC train monthly pass during COVID, telework has allowed the busy schedule to continue!

Regards, Sara Vermillion 8321 Savage-Guilford Road Savage, MD 20763 240/475-2423

From:

Dena Evans < ltlblkdog@hotmail.com>

Sent:

Tuesday, February 2, 2021 6:25 PM

To:

CouncilMail; Rigby, Christiana

Subject:

vote NO on CB 8

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

Howard County Council Members,

I urge you to vote NO on CB 8

I know you have a lot of things to read so I'll keep it short.

The request does NOT benefit the community as it is too open ended and the result could have a devastating impact on our county! Public facilities roads, schools, hospitals, etc. in the Corridor are far from adequate now and this will make the situation worse. Our community is where your heart and vote should be focused and the community is telling you NO!

Please, Howard County Council Members, I beg you...stop allowing these waivers, revisions, last minute changes, modifications, sneaky loophole allowances and support the community's wishes, not the developer.

Thanks for your time, Dena Evans

From:

Hans and Marie Raven <hansandmarie.raven@verizon.net>

Sent:

Monday, February 1, 2021 8:03 PM

To:

CouncilMail

Subject:

CB 8-2021 feedback

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

Dear Honorable Council Members,

I am writing to ask you to reject CB 8-2021 because it fails to be patient and squeezes in a change BEFORE the next General Plan process and Comprehensive Plan for the RT. 1 Corridor is completed. In order to create 'amenity rich, walkable, mixed use developments' the CAC Zoning District requires residential developments to provide 70 square feet of commercial space for each dwelling unit (whittled down from 300 sq. ft. originally). This ZRA proposes a reduction to 20 square feet of commercial per residential unit for developments containing 800 or more dwelling units, if the developer has a market study done to show the amount of commercial space required would affect the project's financial viability. I would submit that current market survey analysis frequently fails to take into account the kind of retail space residents need and want. Rather than smaller, separate retail spaces, I have yet to see a large scale housing community take a page from Montgomery County and include universally needed larger spaces, such as grocery store chains, healthcare/pharmacy clinics, and packing and shipping facilities. These industries, as we have seen, are essential regardless of what else is going on in the world.

Under the proposed (ZRA) the owner can reduce or completely eliminate the commercial requirement for this mixed use zone. The consequence of the reduction in commercial space is the substitution of additional residential density and the production of more auto traffic to travel off site for retail products and services, on an already heavily travelled Route 1 corridor. Paying fees to reduce the square footage of commercial space to be paid into a fund administered by the Howard County Economic Development Authority does NOT meet the need of the original intent of having amenity rich, walkable, mixed use communities. It would be much more prudent to consider a green space land use on the first floor instead of retail, if the developer feels empty retail spaces could be a blight for the community. Given the characteristics of the Rt. 1 corridor, having some recreational green space which is easily accessible would serve a much better purpose, especially in these COVID times. It makes sense for our environmental future as well.

The best piece of legislation for the council to consider would be one allowing for recreational space in addition to commercial space. At a bare minimum the council should consider requiring that requests for ZRA's have to be posted on the affected properties, so that community members aren't in the dark until an unexpected change occurs in their neighborhood.

Sincerely, Marie Raven

Laurel, MD 301-317-8010 (home)