

Sayers, Margery

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)

Sayers, Margery

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

Sayers, Margery

From: Stephanie Mummert <skmummert@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 3, 2021 12:21 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: Please vote no on CB7

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

While I appreciate the effort towards encouraging transit oriented developments, I only foresee additional burden on the county infrastructure without the actual benefit of creating communities that are IN REALITY transit oriented, walkable and truly livable . Yes, I'm sure these properties at Savage or Laurel are convenient for commuters who use the MARC train, but these stations have the limitation of being served by the Camden line, instead of the far more versatile Penn line.

I'll explain, in case you have never had the pleasure of commuting via the MARC Camden line. It runs, as the line name would suggest, from Camden Yards down into Penn station in DC. It shares the rail line with freight/CSX trains. The trains do not run all day. Currently only 3 or 4 trains early in the morning and a similar limited afternoon schedule. I point this out because while I am amazed at the progress of these sites from where they were when I was a commuter, the rail line alone is not enough to support these locations as only transit focused. If the goal of this designation is ultimately to reduce automobile traffic and provide a walkable home base at these locations, please focus on encouraging building out the retail (supermarkets, restaurants, shopping) options instead of just building up.

Not to mention, while I am always focused on the ongoing problem of insufficient school capacity, while allowing this change may not automatically translate into increased enrollment into an already stressed and overcrowded region in the school system, the new residents that may be attracted by these new flashy condos and apartments will absolutely bring a burden to our existing infrastructure in a variety of ways that we may not be able to anticipate today.

Finally, I never want to be that "NIMBY" resident but adding this kind of height to buildings at rail stations that are all completely suburban will inappropriately change the character of our suburban transit stops. These kinds of tall structures will be entirely out of place in each of these locations. I spent years commuting to DC through Montgomery county (before we moved to HoCo). To be frank, if I wanted to live in that dense version of a suburb I would have chosen to live in Montgomery county. I chose to live in Howard County for a reason.

I fully support encouraging and supporting these transit oriented developments. I just do not think taller buildings provides any kind of solution to the people who live and work here. Your focus should be on your constituents and not on the needs of the developers.

Thank you for your attention to these issues.

Stephanie Mummert
District 3

Sayers, Margery

From: joel hurewitz <joelhurewitz@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 3, 2021 10:41 AM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: CB7--2021 ZRA MARC Stations

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

Dear Council,

I share the concerns expressed by Member Walsh on CB7.

I also do not understand the planning behind the desire for tall buildings without a relationship to the surrounding neighborhoods at the Dorsey and Savage Stations. It could be like Devils Tower--all alone.

On the other hand, it might make sense at the Laurel Station, but only when considered in context with the neighboring redevelopment in PG and AA Counties. Thus, the one-size-fits-all approach for all TODs seems to be a mistake.

Joel Hurewitz

Sayers, Margery

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

Sayers, Margery

From: Dan J <najnad@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 3, 2021 8:00 AM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: vote no on increased developments and population densities, please

[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 am writing to you to please vote no on any and all motions to increase developments and/or population densities in Howard county, to include CB7 and CB8.

I am a resident in Elkrige. I dont think any increases in developments or population densities should be improved until such time that the county is actually ready for it. The schools are overcrowded and there is no plan to get them below 100% capacity nor to reduce the student/teacher ratio, both of which speak to the overall quality of education being provided. If that situation alone does not improve, my family and I will either switch to private schools or move out of Howard county. In addition, the roads and infrastructure are overwhelmed with the current population of residents and those who come into the county for work/shopping/entertainment. To increase developments and population densities will only exacerbate that problem as well.

I know there is an upcoming land use plan, so at a minimum any bills seeking to increase developments and/or population densities should be voted no on, and then once that land use plan has been approved, stick to the plan, no exceptions.

thank you

Dan Janning

Sayers, Margery

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

Sayers, Margery

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

Sayers, Margery

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

CB7 - Financial Contributions

ZRA	DATE	NAME	A. Kittleman	J. Terrasa	C. Rigby
192, Annapolis Junction Town Center, LLC	11/29/2016	Annapolis Junction	\$ 1,000.00		
192, Annapolis Junction Town Center, LLC	4/9/2018	Annapolis Junction			\$ 500.00
192, Annapolis Junction Town Center, LLC	9/20/2018	Annapolis Junction			\$ 500.00
192, Annapolis Junction Town Center, LLC	6/20/2019	Annapolis Junction		\$ 250.00	

Sayers, Margery

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

Sayers, Margery

From: Christine & Earl Dietrich <dietrichs4@verizon.net>
Sent: Tuesday, February 2, 2021 9:09 PM
To: CouncilMail; Rigby, Christiana
Subject: Vote NO on CB 7

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

Dear Councilmembers,

Vote NO on CB 7

I believe that an increase in the height of buildings or density of development should be postponed and evaluated as part of the General Plan. It seems like too many projects are approved independently without a larger, long term design for the impact of rapid residential growth. I have witnessed growth in the SE and Rte 1 corridor without the necessary infrastructure to accommodate it. For instance, decades ago when Maplelawn was established, the schools were built, larger roads were constructed, and large shopping centers to meet everyone's needs were in place either prior to, or coinciding with, the building of homes. However in the SE, I see haphazard dense apartments and townhomes without resources. Even when buildings like Ashbury Courts are constructed (on Rte 1 right in the middle of Rte 1 N and Rte 1 S), where commercial space is built into the ground level, the shops are not useful staples that people use and need every day like a grocery store or restaurant, and to this day, a number of those store fronts remain empty. HoCo wants to be "walkable" and yet the existing development at Annapolis Junction has little to no resources for residents, still requiring them to drive to get anywhere. Adding even *more*, *higher*, and *denser* residences is simply thoughtless. I've seen the "bait and switch" too much to trust that developers wont try to use loopholes to get what they want. I urge you to take more time on CB7 so that a proper plan can be put in place.

Sincerely,
Christine Dietrich

Sayers, Margery

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

Sayers, Margery

From: Dena Evans <ltlblkdog@hotmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 2, 2021 6:05 PM
To: CouncilMail; Rigby, Christiana
Subject: vote NO on CB 7

[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 CB7**

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

Adding greater density to multiple zones, I'm asking...no begging...you to vote NO!

The current residences at Annapolis Junction are NOT at max capacity, ridership via train into DC is way down, and there is no reason to cram more density in by allowing the additional building height.

This is clearly a sneak attack by the developer to lock down additional benefits that do NOT benefit the community. Our community is where your heart and vote should be focused and the community is telling you NO! This bill **only** benefits developer. 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

Sayers, Margery

From: Hans and Marie Raven <hansandmarie.raven@verizon.net>
Sent: Monday, February 1, 2021 2:52 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: CB 7-2021 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 you to express my dismay with aspects of CB 7-2021, specifically related to increasing the maximum height of buildings from 100 feet to 180 feet in the Transit Oriented Development (TOD) zone on the 'Savage Station at Annapolis Junction' site. I have a number of objections to this height increase. First of all, to think that allowing more units to be built upwards will not have an effect on density is worthy of derisive laughter. No developer is going to say that you cannot have children, or a vehicle if you wish to live on the upper floors of the building. Thinking that living near the MARC station is going to ensure that there is no reason to have a vehicle in the county is pure fantasy. Even if there is not an increase in total number of vehicles during peak commuting hours, anyone traveling the Route 1 corridor on a weekend will tell you that there is already significant congestion and back-ups occurring in all directions at Whiskey Bottom Road and Rt. 1., a location midway between the Laurel and Savage TOD zones. Finally, given the dramatic changes in elevation that occur across TOD zones, one cannot apply a uniform height requirement to all sections and expect a similar aesthetic outlook. There is not nearly enough room to hide the additional 80 feet of height proposed, an extra 40 feet of height beyond the height of the newest series of ugly high-rises being built in Columbia in all areas. I'm not sure why Howard County seems so bent on becoming the next Bethesda- it's getting scary down there with only small sections of sunlight being filtered through the tall buildings which are driving land values so high, small business owners can't afford their leases anymore.

Another objection I have to this bill relates to allowing the developer to have the option of buying out of the affordable housing requirements for this project. Let's not pretend that having a mix of residential and commercial units near high quality transportation such as the MARC stations will continue to be affordable to those who need more affordable housing in the county when the developer can simply buy out of the process and can pay to have the units placed elsewhere. Moderate income units placed in an area lacking desirable transportation and other resources do not serve the intended population. I ask you to consider when is the last time you walked down a busy road to enjoy the saplings planted for supposed forest conservation? We've already seen the ridiculousness of allowing developers to buy themselves out of preserving trees on their lots through forest conservation payments, which stick trees other places in the county where they do not contribute to nesting and sanctuaries for wildlife nor public enjoyment of the space. Unfortunately, I have to also oppose the current Amendment 1 to CB 7 because of a lack of equity in this amendment despite its good intentions. Shouldn't the Council change the existing regulations for ALL zones regarding the discontinuation of fee in lieu and not being able to 'transfer' the moderate income units elsewhere? It is not a compromise to give the applicant an exception for the additional height he asked for in return for what should already be the regulation/standard everywhere else in the county. While I appreciate this amendment idea from someone in Ellicott City who believes in a reasonable standard and closing loopholes, I would hope that views and ideas from someone in the affected community affected will be given more consideration when it comes to this piece of legislation.

I'm not sure why there is this rush for this legislation now. Why not wait for the HoCo by Design General Plan? It is supposed to lead to smarter, more equitable, and holistic growth for the county which looks at the long term- not just what can be skated under the public's radar during a pandemic. I would like to call your attention to how moving ahead of the HoCo by Design General Plan is unwise and unfair. If ZRAs are used to give all the TOD sites and the CAC sites greater density BEFORE a Master Plan for the Route 1 Corridor occurs as part of the General plan, we are shooting

ourselves in the foot and undermining the whole intent by having a master design plan. While obviously being unfair to residents, one could argue that all the other developers are being cut out of the opportunity to get allocations through this process as well. Please let common sense and equity prevail.

Sincerely,

Marie Raven
Laurel, MD
301-317-8010 (home)