

CB 54 – Support with amendments

We agree with testimony on this Bill that a building that has NOT paid a tax that is proposed to be credited, should be exempted from that credit. Also, we believe that it is not necessary to incentivize redevelopment to the extent of reducing fees charged, when going from commercial to residential. That will be enough of a profitable project to consider, and does not need said enticement to occur.

To the extent that residential is added, that those new units that did not previously exist, should pay all the appropriate current taxes and fees to help balance infrastructure that is needed. Applying new taxes to only the increase in the units makes sense. It is good that issue is noted.

Incentivizing redevelopment and assisting with creating more beneficial buildings to exist can be done while still safeguarding unnecessary amounts of lost revenues.

CB55/56 – Amended testimony –

Please do not exclude the CEF zone from the proposed new requirements. CEF zoning needs no extra incentive to be used. It has unlimited density and lots of customized treatment. These projects, in particular, are likely to be among the most profitable that can exist at this time.

The notion that having to provide some units for affordable housing would keep projects from being profitable enough sounds preposterous. This concern being raised in CB56 (not providing elsewhere) versus CB55 (requiring them at all), is interesting. Seems like providing elsewhere or paying fees is not the concern, but lowering the price on some units is the concern. Please be sure to provide any evidence of these claims to the public. The goal of spreading out this provision, and helping older residents herein needs to be carefully prioritized. When folks talk about extreme demand and then say prices will rise with higher costs, are contradicting themselves.

I assume that making units affordable to MIHU/LIHU or DIHU already includes adjusting the residential expenses like condo fees, that exist.

Lastly, please pay attention to all you can do to keep affordable units for the longest time period into the future in this legislation and in future analysis of programs unit price change allowances.

Thank you.

Lisa Markovitz

President, The People's Voice

---

**From:** Larry Carson <karasov1@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, July 18, 2025 10:53 AM  
**To:** CouncilMail  
**Subject:** CB 54

**Flag Status:** Flagged

**WARNING!!!**

This email originated from someone outside of Howard County  
\*\*\*DO NOT CLICK LINKS OR OPEN ATTACHMENTS\*\*\*  
unless you recognize the sender and know for sure that the content is safe

Hi, I'm Larry Carson, of 7168 Winter Rose Path, Owen Brown Columbia. I'm writing to support CB54 because it will add some incentive for redevelopment of older, perhaps neglected homes. There is such a huge need for more housing in the county, I think anything the county can do to incentivise that is worthwhile, so I hope this bill passes unanimously. I have lived in Elkhorn Landing, 152 townhouses since May, 1978. In just the last few years, prices of homes swelling here have soared by over \$100,000. Houses now are selling for nearly \$500,000. This development was built by Howard homes as entry level housing starting in the \$43,000 - \$50,000 range.

We need to make some serious changes! Thank you.