



Support for Council Bill 18-2025 - Transit-Oriented Development March 17, 2025

Bridges to Housing Stability supports CB 18-2025 for two reasons.

First, any new housing in Howard County would be welcome. Nearly 18 months ago, the Council approved housing allocations in the General Plan that included targets for 340 units of affordable housing each year – both rentals and homes for sale. Unfortunately, the required subsequent steps have not yet been completed, including the review of our Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance and, most critically, comprehensive rezoning. With a Council election coming upon us in 2026, rezoning looks to be stalled until at least 2027.

In the meantime, our community is desperate for more housing. We know that Council members hear regularly from constituents who struggle with rising rents and home prices. The County's housing shortage is responsible for a large part of their pain. So, we support the provision in CB18 to streamline approvals for residential projects in the small number of TOD-zoned districts. TOD zoning requires a minimum of 20 units per acre, and the only feasible way to meet that requirement is through multifamily structures – in other words, condos and apartments, which have a minimal impact on our schools. The school system's planning tools show that in a new multifamily development with 100 apartments, our schools would have to absorb only about 10 additional students.

The second reason for our support of CB 18 is that our County needs more housing for people with disabilities. It's estimated that nearly 8% of County households have at least one member with a disability. That percentage will almost certainly rise as more residents age into the "Older Adult" category. CB 18 seeks to address the shortage of disability housing by including a tax incentive for projects that include DIHU – or disability income housing units. For those who aren't aware, DIHU units are reserved for households that have a disability and earn below 20% of area median income. For a single-person household, that means about \$18,000 in annual income. For a two-person household, it's about \$20,000. The rents for DIHU units currently range from about \$500 to \$750 per month, depending on the unit's size. Note that these rents are affordable for households that are trying to survive on Social Security Disability income. However, with rents so low, landowners and developers won't include DIHU homes in their projects unless they receive incentives to do so. As proof of that statement, we note that there is only 1 DIHU in Howard County today. Therefore, we strongly support the bill's provision to create incentives for including DIHU homes in transit-oriented projects.

We encourage the Council to pass CB 18-2025 so that more TOD development efforts can move forward quickly, to chip away at our housing shortage and provide more housing for our neighbors with disabilities who earn low income. Thank you.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Dana M. Sohr", is written over a light blue horizontal line.

Dana M. Sohr
Deputy Director

Bridges to Housing Stability, Inc.
9520 Berger Rd., Suite 311, Columbia, MD 21046
Phone (410) 312-5760 Fax (410) 312-5765
www.Bridges2HS.org

Fran LoPresti
6985 Deep Cup
Columbia, MD 21045
fflopresti@gmail.com

Hello Council members,

My name is Fran LoPresti. I live in Columbia, MD. I am here to support CB18-2025 concerning Transit Oriented Development or TOD zones. I have been a longtime advocate for Age Friendly policies and affordable housing in this county. I am testifying as a resident tonight.

This bill seeks to include Disability housing units (DIHU) within the definition of MIHU and to incentivize the inclusion of DIHU units in TOD zones. The bill is consistent with the 2024 state bill HB538 which encourages multi-family housing near public transit. It is also consistent with both the HoCoByDesign or the county General Plan as well as the Route 1 Corridor Plan. It is also consistent with the Age Friendly Howard Plan since many of our disabled citizens are also senior citizens.

Everyone in this room knows we are very short on housing in this county for workforce, moderate income, low income, senior, and disabled housing units. I will not go into those statistics. But I will say that we have created DIHU units in the single digits over the last 5 to 10 years and we need to catch up.

I would like to add an amendment to this legislation to add 15% of senior housing to these TOD projects and eligible for the PILOT. Seniors also like to be near public transit and amenities and multi-family housing for this growing population is desperately needed. If we are going to provide incentives to developers, let us try to make a dent in several types of needed multi-family housing units. It should also be noted that DIHU units produce very few school-aged children and senior housing units produce zero children into our schools.

I would like to make one more plea. I have talked to at least two of you and the administration about the need to adopt the updated Universal Design Guidelines from 2006 developed by the Age Friendly Housing workgroup and we need an update of the accessibility building code. I would like to see these TOD projects use the updated codes.

Thank you.

From: Harry Burrell <hburrell007@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, March 17, 2025 3:51 PM
To: Anderson, Isaiah; Hicks, John
Subject: Fwd: FW: 3 min Testify -Statement

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

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

Please disregard my previous email and use this speech statement. Thank you
Harry

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Harry Burrell <hburrell@cphcorp.com>
Date: Mon, Mar 17, 2025, 3:48 PM
Subject: FW: 3 min Testify -Statement
To: Harry Burrell <Hburrell007@gmail.com>

Harry Burrell, AIA, NCARB, RA

DESIGN STUDIO PRINCIPAL

hburrell@cphcorp.com

o 301.918.2662 x 6807

c 410-591-7506



BUILDING STRONGER COMMUNITIES TOGETHER

From: Harry Burrell
Sent: Monday, March 17, 2025 3:43 PM
To: Harry Burrell <Hburrell007@gmail.com>
Subject: 3 min Testify -Statement

Good evening, Council Members, and staff. My name is Harry Burrell. I live at [4365 Centennial Lane Ellicott City](#). First and foremost, I would like to thank you for your time and for accepting my appointment to the Howard County Commission Board. As an architect with a wealth of experience, and strong passion for architecture and design who has worked in major cities such as Baltimore City and Washington DC, it is a pleasure to bring back my wealth of knowledge and I am ready to support the leaders of this organization in their commitment to their continue development and beautification initiatives that Howard County 's historic charm has to offer. Once again, I thank you for time and consideration, and I'm looking forward to meeting everyone.

Harry Burrell, NCARB, AIA, RA

Design Studio Principal

hburrell@cphcorp.com

O: 407.322.6841 – X 6807

C: 410-591-7506





BUILDING STRONGER COMMUNITIES TOGETHER

HOWARD COUNTY HOUSING AFFORDABILITY COALITION

Howard County Council Public Legislative Hearing
March 17, 2025

Council Bill 18 Testimony

Good evening Chair Walsh, Vice Chair Jones and Council Members.

On behalf of the Howard County Housing Affordability Coalition, it is my privilege to testify in support of Council Bill 18 (CB 18). The Coalition strongly supports the bill's intent to increase the supply of Disability Income Housing Units (DIHUs) at TODs, enabling people with disabilities to afford to live near and access public transportation. We anticipate that clarifying the definition of MIHUs to specifically name DIHUs will better inform developers early in the development process that they can choose DIHUs to meet their affordable housing obligation under County law.

The Coalition also supports CB 18's streamlining of County local approval processes to align with recently enacted State legislation, SB 538-2024. For TOD residential new construction, the bill establishes and retains the School Surcharge rate at the time of submittal of the sketch plan and exempts TOD residential units from the Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance School Capacity Test.

The Coalition offers two suggestions to enhance CB 18. First, we recommend that the bill embrace a recommendation of the Housing Opportunities Master Plan and adopted in the HoCo By Design General Plan that 10% of new affordable units be accessible. This would be particularly useful for DIHUs at TODs. Second, we suggest that a PILOT be available for developers providing DIHUs at a percentage less than the 15% currently in the bill. Given that the rent received from a DIHU is significantly less than that received for a MIHU, requiring 15% DIHUs may make a project financially infeasible. If the percentage is maintained, the PILOT should be calculated to ensure the development remains financially feasible by offsetting the difference in revenue between an MIHU and a DIHU.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. We ask your support of CB 18 and thoughtful consideration of our recommendations for the bill. Please let me know if you have any questions about the Coalition's position.

Respectfully Submitted,

Jackie Eng

Jackie Eng
Coalition Coordinator

The Coalition is composed of 40 organizations and over 900 individual members and allies. Our goal is to achieve community understanding, policy making and regulatory decisions that will lead to an increase in—and equitable access to—Howard County affordable housing. We seek to contribute to a community-wide recognition that Howard County's economic vitality is dependent upon access to jobs, housing that individuals and families can afford, a quality educational system, and resident mobility.

The People's Voice, LLC

Ethics Ballot TM

3600 Saint Johns Lane, Suite D, Ellicott City, MD21042

Testimony on CB18-2025 – Mixed. Suggest amendments.

TOD, being located near the MARC Station is allowed pretty high density, because at least regarding impacts on traffic, it is assumed that being near mass transit will have less impact. Thus, TOD, by definition, is geographically allowed in a localized area. That means, the area schools need to have APFO to help pace timing of new students. Removing the entire school test seems to be an awfully large incentive for TOD's, maybe more than is needed, even if one has a goal of incentivizing them. It would be best to consider not offering a full elimination of the school wait, without getting more for that benefit.

We understand that the MIHU requirement adding disability units, and even Pilot programs which can lengthen the time a unit stays affordable, are commendable parts of the Bill, that increase the accessibility to the currently required units, but maybe a portion of reduced APFO waits could be give in return for requiring more of them. The freezing of fees and any reducing of the wait will offset any funding difficulties that providing more of the affordable units might create.

As for freezing of fees, it is hard to try to accommodate balancing growth needs with adequate County public services, when what that takes most, is money. To freeze these fees indefinitely, on large projects with many units, is losing too much money the County needs. Please consider a cap on the length of time the rate can be frozen, maybe going backwards from permit time for a maximum number of years.

As the APFO Review Committee takes on a lot of these issues, it is becoming apparent that fiscal sources are going to be important to prioritize to ever get multiple competing needs addressed. We went way too long with woefully low fees, to start any reduction of them now will just go back to the endless hole we dug ourselves regarding the extremely long time it takes to increase school capacity and improve any other County services.

The references to HB 538 do not seem entirely relevant because that State Bill suggests APFO easements for low income projects. TOD doesn't have those types of units. That's why we felt that the largesse of the benefits in CB18 warrant more in return for the County. This year's State APFO possible changes still exempt overcapacity school areas from suggested easing of regulations.

Yesterday, I decided to look up more TOD zoning details when considering the related document of the pupil data sources from different types of units. The comparisons of students from apartments being less than other types of units, is only partially relevant, because TOD allows townhomes. I only just realized that. So, if the goal is to apply benefits in CB18 to apartments only then that should be another amendment. Although, remember, the number of units will determine the math of whether low numbers of students come, as with high density projects, the total pupils could still be high, but why apply the removal of waits to townhomes if it is noted they produce way more students?

Lastly, regarding the goal to incentivize, please do not apply the benefits in CB18 to existing projects. Thank you for considering these concerns.

Lisa Markovitz

President, The People's Voice

The People's Voice, LLC

Ethics Ballot TM

3600 Saint Johns Lane, Suite D, Ellicott City, MD21042

SUMMARY of suggested amendments –

Only give some reduced wait and have more for providing 20% instead of 15% of combined MIHU and disability income units.

Make the frozen fees going backwards from permit time a maximum number of years.

Do not apply CB18 benefits to existing TOD's, nor to townhouses. If a project has a hybrid system of apartments plus other units, then cut the benefits accordingly by percentages.

County Council Public March 17, 2025

Good evening and Happy St. Patrick's Day Members of the Howard County Council. I'm here to testify **in favor of CB18-2025**.

My name is Pamela Beck, and I have been a resident in Howard County for 47 years. I have 2 children that attended Howard County Public Schools in Columbia. My older daughter was always a member of the "gifted and talented" program throughout her education. However, my son who lives with Autism and Insulin Dependent diabetes had a much more challenging time getting through the HCPS system - especially at that time when resources were limited. I'm please to say that he did graduate with a diploma and ended up working for 20 years at the Howard County Public Library in the Circulation Department. He loved being a part of that community and was passionate about his job.

I spent many years on the Board of Directors of the Howard County Autism Society which has been re-named Autism Society of Maryland. As my son grew older, it became evident to me that there was a need for affordable housing for people with disabilities. I wanted my son to be able to live as independently as possible no

matter what challenges he faced, and speaking to many other parents, they faced the same issues. Luckily and through a lot of hard work, my son moved to an apartment (with assistance) 11 years ago, which was not very common at the time for many individuals with disabilities. In fact, many parents and their kids visited my son to see how it was being accomplished.

This prompted me to create the Housing Committee at the Howard County Autism Society and continue on the Task Force for the Patuxent Commons Development.

Speaking for many, we will always be very thankful for the efforts made by all the members of the Howard County Council for making the project happen and watching it rise on Cedar Lane and Freetown Road.

But now it's time to look beyond Patuxent Commons. For those with disabilities income opportunities are challenging; many are not capable of driving a car; and social interactions are often difficult.

The concept of mixed usage of moderate and disability income housing units continues to be needed. What made Patuxent Commons so well placed is having it near shopping, medical facilities, as well as having the

convenience of public transportation right outside the property. For those that cannot afford or are unable to access places this bill CB18-2025 that has been proposed, will ensure a more inclusive and accessible community.

By focusing on Transit-Oriented Developments that support ALL people looking to reside in Howard County an opportunity to have an amazing place to call home.

Thank you again for your visionary thought process.
Pamela Beck



HCCA

Howard County Citizens Association

Since 1961...

The Voice Of The People of Howard County

Date: 17 March 2025

Subject: HCCA Testimony for CB18-2025

Good evening, Council Members:

My name is Ryan Powers and I am testifying tonight as the HCCA's newest Board Member.

We believe CB18 is serving us a turducken. This bill seems like an odd amalgamation of combining expanding access to existing affordability with extreme APFO exemption. We note that Councilwoman Rigby's social media ad doesn't make it clear this Bill includes an APFO exemption. It is surprising these two unrelated issues should be in the same Bill.

While we support the provisions for affordable disability income housing units, we would like a clean bill. By granting APFO exemptions and stalling school impact fees, you will pile on to the burdens of already overcrowded schools. This is not an APFO exemption for one development like the County Council has voted for in the past: it is 6 different areas concentrated along the eastern edge of the County with who knows how many future developments? And this area gets a 30% density bonus on top of that. This can only lead to frequent redistricting farther away from local communities while also keeping kids in packed schools for years before the redistricting process is complete. This is such a wide-reaching exception that 14 schools will be affected. There is some overlap in boundaries, but Councilmember Rigby ten schools are in your district. Councilmember Jones has five, four for Councilmember Walsh. Councilmember Jung has a tiny piece of Reservoir. So, only Councilmember Yungmann is unscathed except-- how many years do you think it will be before parents in D5 are complaining about larger class sizes and less resources due to this legislation? Along the APFO exemption route, Bollman Bridge ES is predicted to be at 112.5% capacity, Hanover Hills ES 114%, Thomas Viaduct 118.1%, Patuxent Valley 118.4%. Councilwoman Rigby these schools with significant overcrowding are all in your district. High schools are better off in terms of space for now, but the Guilford High School boundary area is in four out of six of these TOD areas, in Districts 1, 2 and 3. Hammond High School gets hit twice in District 3. These schools are some of the most vulnerable: free and reduced meals percentages: 66.1, 48.4, 63.5, 46.9, 56.4 -- the numbers go on like that. The County needs time to balance growth with school needs--it shouldn't grant APFO exemptions here.

This bill is not a fulfillment of State Bill 538; that Bill didn't seek to just thwart APFO but required actual large numbers of affordable housing for easing it. Do you, our county leaders, want to make APFO into Swiss cheese by spot zoning TOD project favors? This was considered unacceptable for implementing safety issues. The County will soon hear recommendations from the APFO Review committee. Why preempt their hard work; choose instead to let that process play out. Instead of a bill coming before the Council now, which we believe hurts the school system and doesn't guarantee

greater amounts of affordable housing get built, let more of our community enter the APFO conversation.

If the only possible thing the Council can do to provide more affordable housing is to attack the school system, you are an autoimmune disease attacking its own body. Give us real solutions instead of this: get rid of the fee-in-lieu so that people live in the very nice housing units that are being developed. Help finance housing projects from nonprofits that provide a path toward affordable home ownership. Don't continue to cater to developers while getting so little affordable housing in return; the County's value is worth more. We also believe the home buying tax exemptions for public service employees working for Howard County should be expanded.

Howard County needs great schools and affordable housing. Dropping school fees and taking local high-density projects out of APFO isn't it. Please vote "No" on this bill.

Thank you for your time,

Ryan Powers
HCCA Board Member

Current TOD development projects will rapidly bring hundreds of students in a few schools

Name	Filename	APT	APT-MIHU	SFA	TOD Station	School Waiting Bin	Comments
Paddock Point	S-25-001	146	286		542 Laurel		
Corridor Rd	SDP-24-019	155	27		Savage MARC		
Paddock Point C-5, k-2, & OS Lot D	F-25-004*						unclear to me
Paddock Pointe Phase 3B	SDP-24-037				58 Laurel		
O'Donnell Properties	SDP-23-013	242	43		Dorsey MARC	1st year	
Dorsey Business Center	S-22-005	212	38		Dorsey MARC	4th year	Was not in Fiscal Report. I mapped it.
10010 Junction Dr.	S-23-004	552	98		Dorsey MARC	2nd year	
	Totals:	1307	492		600		
	Students @ 0.16 Low est APT	209.12	78.72				CB18 whereas....
	Students @ 0.38 High est APT	496.66	186.96				CB18 whereas....
	Students @ 0.514 (SFA)			308.4			Pupil Yield Analysis Report
Total estimated new students generated without any APFO delay		595 low	983 high				

CB18 will have severe impacts on HCPSS. Listed are schools within TOD areas

	Official Enrollment (SY24-25)	Capacity	PreK	Projected Util SY27-28 (%)	FARMS % (2023)
Elkridge	798		713	54 103.5	45.3
Ducketts Lane	573		650	51 85.7	66.1
Hanover Hills	875		810	70 114.9	46.9
Bollman Bridge	775		609	83 112.5	56.4
Forest Ridge	659		647	46 107.3	38.9
Laurel Woods	625		609	45 105.3	63.5
Elkridge Landing	686		779	99.1	31.9
Thomas Viaduct	758		740	118.1	53
Patuxent Valley	840		760	118.4	48.4
Murray Hill	616		662	101.5	43.1
Guilford Park*	1218		1658	97	Not available
Oakland Mills	1413		1400	105.3	49.2
Hammond	1159		1445	92.2	46.5
Reservoir	1597		1573	96.8	31

*New school, no 12th grade

Red= APFO-defined above capacity