



Department of Planning and Zoning

To: Dave Grabowski, Chair, Planning Board
Gary Rosenbaum, Vice Chair
Tammy Citaramanis
Linda Dombrowski
Paul Yelder

From: Marsha McLaughlin, Director, Department of Planning and Zoning (DPZ)

Date: April 9, 2009

Subject: Proposed General Plan Amendment and Zoning Regulation Amendment 113 – Public Comment

The following materials are to assist you in reviewing the broad range of public comment on the proposed General Plan Amendment (GPA) and Zoning Regulation Amendment (ZRA 113) related to Downtown. In the table below, DPZ staff tallied the general positions expressed by local community organizations and individuals in response to the proposal during the public testimony. The table provides an overview of the general range of support and opposition related to the proposal.

In the attached matrix, DPZ staff compiled the many comments raised in the public testimony and sorted these comments in relation to DPZ's Key Recommendations from the Technical Staff Report. The matrix is intended to represent the range of public comments raised, but it does not correlate the comments to levels of support. It is designed to allow comparison of ideas with the proposal by the applicant and Key Recommendations by DPZ.

Table of General Positions

DPZ created the table below that reflects the relative levels of support and opposition related to the proposal. DPZ staff characterized these positions as supporting, requesting amendments, requesting resubmission or opposing. When group spokespeople or individuals explicitly stated a position in their testimony, the positions were so noted. If a person did not explicitly state a position, then the testimony was categorized using the following parameters:

- **Support.** – If a person made only comments that were supportive of the proposal or of the concepts in the proposal, the testimony was categorized as supporting.
- **Amend** – If a person made comments affirming some portions of the proposal but criticizing other portions or recommended specific changes, the testimony was categorized as requesting amendments.
- **Resubmit** – If a person specifically requested that the proposal be withdrawn and resubmitted or requested that the additional information provided by GGP be considered an amended submission and a revised staff report be issued, the testimony was categorized as requesting resubmission.
- **Oppose** – If a person made comments that were consistently critical of the proposal, the testimony was categorized as opposing.

As shown in the table below, 25 community organizations and 103 individuals provided testimony.

Community Organizations

- 32% of the community organizations submitted testimony in support of GGP's proposal.
- 52% of the community organizations submitted testimony requesting that the proposal be amended.
- 16% of the community organizations submitted testimony requesting that the proposal be resubmitted by GGP and/or a new technical staff report be produced.

Individuals

- 50% of the participating individuals submitted testimony in support of GGP's proposal.
- 24% provided testimony requesting amendments to the GGP proposal.
- 11% provided testimony requesting that the proposal be resubmitted by GGP and/or a new technical staff report be produced.
- 15% provided testimony in opposition to the proposal.

Table of General Positions Taken on Proposal				
Organizations				
Public Commentary	Support	Amend	Resubmit	Oppose
African American Coalition of Howard County		1		
Alliance for a Better Columbia			1	
Bicycling Advocates of Howard County	1			
Bring Back the Vision	1			
Chamber of Commerce	1			
Coalition for Columbia's Downtown			1	
Columbia 2.0	1			
Columbia Association Board of Directors		1		
Columbia Center for Theatrical Arts	1			
Columbia Orchestra	1			
Columbia Tomorrow	1			
Environmental Sustainability Board		1		
Full Spectrum Housing Coalition		1		
Harper's Choice Village Board		1		
Hickory Ridge Village Board		1		
Howard County Citizens Association			1	
Interfaith Coalition for Affordable Housing		1		
King's Contrivance Village Board		1		
League of Women Voters			1	
Oakland Mills Village Board		1		
Owen Brown Village Board		1		
The Business Alliance	1			
Town Center Village Board		1		
Transportation Advocates of Howard County		1		
Wilde Lake Village Board		1		
Total Community Organizations – 25	8	13	4	0
Individuals				
Public Commentary	Support	Amend	Resubmit	Oppose
Total Individuals – 103*	51	25	11	15

*One individual submitted comments that addressed Columbia incorporation but did not address the proposal.

Staff Report Matrix with GGP Response and Public Comment

The attached matrix provides a compilation of comments raised during the public testimony provided at the four nights of Planning Board proceedings, in writing, and on video. This matrix is intended to assist you with organizing the public testimony for your work sessions. The matrix was originally submitted to you at the April 2, 2009 Planning Board meeting; it has since been reformatted in two ways.

First, the heading of the third column has been changed from *Summary of Public Testimony/CA Board Response* to *Comments Raised in Public Testimony*. This change reflects that the information as presented is not actually a summary, but simply a list of comments raised in the public testimony. The matrix should not be used as a summary or a substitute for reviewing the full record. It is not a stand-alone document, but rather is intended to be used in conjunction with the testimony that you received throughout the process and with your own personal notes. This point is of particular importance for community members who did not attend the public proceedings, review the written testimony or view the video testimony. Written and video testimony is posted and available on the web, and recorded testimony from Planning Board meetings is available from DPZ.

Please note that this matrix provides a compilation of comments raised rather than a summary. It is important to note that individual comments are listed once, whether they were mentioned by one individual or many people and community organizations. The ideas presented in the matrix are not ordered, weighted, or prioritized.

Second, the use of color has been eliminated to make it easier for the public to print the document from the County's website. In the earlier format, those comments raised by the Columbia Association (CA) were in red. In this reformatted version, the text color is uniform throughout the document and the comments raised by CA are labeled "CA:", so CA's comments may be easily identified throughout the matrix.

In summary, the comments raised in public testimony are numerous and varied. Managing the testimony as submitted will undoubtedly be a challenging task as you work towards developing recommendations. Hopefully, these tools will be useful to you in organizing the testimony as you begin your work sessions.

Attachment

Proposed GPA

Theme 1 – Making a Special Place

	DPZ Key Recommendation	GGP Presentation on January 8, 2009
1.	The plan should address a strategy to preserve the former Rouse Company Headquarters	GGP will prepare specific design guidelines for the Lakefront core and any redevelopment of the GGP HQ building parcel which may or may not include the former Rouse Company Headquarters building. The design guidelines will address building height, massing, scale building orientation, pedestrian and vehicular access and open space appropriate for its lakefront location.
2.	The Plan should coordinate the proposed development program including heights, densities and number of hotel rooms in the General Plan amendment, Zoning Regulation amendment and Supplemental Documents.	Agree. GGP will amend all documents to be consistent.
3.	The Illustrative Plans provided as exhibits should include all of the area covered by the Final Development Plans listed in the Zoning Regulation Amendment.	Agree - GGP will amend the exhibit and documents to be consistent.
4.	The Plan should provide for design guidelines for the Columbia Mall as part of one or more neighborhoods.	Agree - GGP will further study to determine which neighborhoods and how to differentiate the Columbia Mall to incorporate into the final Design Guidelines
5.	The Plan should delineate boundaries for the Lakefront core.	Agree
6.	The Plan should provide for design guidelines to address how the Warfield neighborhood would provide pedestrian and multi-modal connections and design relationships with the existing residential communities.	Agree - GGP will prepare revised guidelines during the preparation of the final Design Guidelines
7.	The Plan should identify strategies to attract and support local merchants within the Downtown and to complement neighborhood retail uses in the nearby, neighboring village centers.	Agree - Language should be added to the plan discussing the need for the preparation of a merchandising plan for Downtown and the Village Centers.

Proposed GPA**Theme 1 – Making a Special Place**

	Comments Raised in Public Testimony	PB Recommendation
1.	Require preservation of former Rouse Company Headquarters; Convey former Rouse Company Headquarter building to public ownership and convert to community uses; Support preservation; Do not demolish; Incorporate into the lakefront district as an art space; Preserve Rouse building in the first phase; Upgrade to show how existing buildings can be made green; Allow building to become commercial at lake level and that dense development, including a parking structure hidden from view, be constructed west of present building; Protect all Gehry buildings Downtown; CA: “Agree to DPZ Recommendation with additional language: ‘Include the Visitor Center for preservation’”	
2.	Eliminate Zone 1-4 stories in PL (Park Land) in Symphony Woods and change to “not permit buildings in PL Merriweather”; Agree with maximum four stories in Lakefront Core area but recognize exception for American City Corporation building at 8 stories; CA: “Agree to DPZ Recommendation”	
3.	CA: “Agree to DPZ Recommendation”	
4.	Identify what is planned for the Mall long term; Notes that Mall blocks system of connectivity that is major goal of the plan; Notes that all roads and sidewalks are blocked or interrupted by the Mall; Mall connection should run from Lord & Taylor’s to Clyde’s; Mall needs to be added as a district or combined with the Warfield neighborhood; CA: “Agree to DPZ Recommendation”	
5.	Support centralized area to focus on the arts at existing lakefront area where the lake itself could be part of the ambience of an arts district; Relocate the “Spanish Steps to Nowhere” to connect the Mall to the Teachers Building; Lakefront should be divided into two districts, with one on the Lake being entertainment, cultural and nature hub; CA: “Agree to DPZ Recommendation with additional language: ‘Preserve the current cultural and other mixed use nature of the Lakefront core. “Downtown Arts and Entertainment Park” should be renamed in the ZRA to “Downtown Arts and Entertainment District(s)” to allow for such a use in an area that may not be considered a park, such as in the Lakefront neighborhood.’”	
6.	Include the NW part of Warfield in the Downtown; CA: “Agree to DPZ Recommendation with additional language: ‘The County should ensure that a Public Infrastructure and Amenity Plan is in the ZRA.’”	
7.	Require retail leasing plan for Town Center, Wilde Lake Village Center and Oakland Mills Village Center; Support for a grocery store in either Downtown or Wilde Lake Village Center; Want to see the now isolated Lakefront more active, alive day and night with residents, shoppers and visitors; As a business person and resident, I welcome substantial changes to make our Downtown more attractive and exciting; Include village centers, hospital and HCC connections in the plan to integrate local merchants; CA: “Agree to DPZ Recommendation”	

	DPZ Key Recommendation	GGP Presentation on January 8, 2009
8.	The Plan should include a 15-percent MIHU requirement consistent with other comparable zoning districts as well as the proposed 10-percent middle income housing requirement. These requirements should also be included within the Zoning Regulation Amendment and address concerns about external appearance.	GGP continues to believe that an innovative and flexible strategy for a full spectrum housing program would provide the most flexible, appropriate and diverse mix of housing in downtown Columbia. However, we will continue to work with the County and affordable housing task force to finalize a program which will meet the needs of the final Plan and downtown.
9.	The Plan should identify a suitable location for a new fire station so that construction may begin as soon as possible.	Agree - GGP will meet with the County public safety office on location and program needs to incorporate into the plan.
10.	The Plan should include a revised phasing plan that ensures Merriweather Post Pavilion is renovated in the first phase of development in accordance with the General Plan Amendment.	Agree - GGP believes that the phasing plan and Amenities program outlined in section 4.2 of the Plan provides for this commitment to renovate Merriweather Post Pavilion in Phase I.
11.	The Plan should include a “percent for art” program for private development based on construction costs or an alternative commitment to support public art.	Agree – However alternate commitments to cultural arts that are already included in the plan should be credited towards any public art requirement. IN addition, we believe that other forms of offset should be allowed such as inclusion of public art and programs into private facilities work and improvements. GGP will work with staff to develop a comprehensive program which incorporates these concepts.
12.	The Plan should include a strategy for County Council’s adoption of Downtown-wide design guidelines and review by the County’s Design Advisory Panel (DAP). DAP review and a strategy for the inclusion of more detailed neighborhood design guidelines at the Final Development Plan stage should be described in the Zoning Regulation Amendment.	Agree

	Comments Raised in Public Testimony	PB Recommendation
8.	Support affordable housing for people who work in Columbia ... lower middle income families, police officers, teachers, nurses, etc.; Support requiring in the ZRA that affordable housing be within the Downtown area; Agrees with the developer that there be no requirements for middle-income families; Strongly recommend that the “key” mechanism of the GGP established “housing fund” be included in any final proposal; Suggest approval of \$400 for any approved permit; Support full spectrum housing that the additional of commercial and retail space requires; Support mixed use and moderate income commitments for a far more proximate, much less concentrated and therefore more reliable consumer and labor force population; Support more housing options and to include the next generation; Affordable housing should total 25%-35% and be allocated in specific percentages including 25% below 80% median income and none above 100%; Identify rationale for removing \$5,000,000 contribution for affordable housing support; Support developer’s proposal of including moderate income units financed by a premium charged for market rate housing; Concern expressed that Jan 22 option reduces developer and lessee contributions by 68%; CA: “Agree to DPZ Recommendation with additional language: ‘CA supports a full spectrum of housing in MIHU and middle income housing, and it will be interspersed throughout all of the proposed neighborhoods.’” [See also comments under Item 1. in Proposed ZRA]	
9.	Require that a police sub-station and a new or expanded fire station and expanded Howard County General Hospital be in the plans and provision for possibility that new schools will be needed; Land must be identified in the ZRA for new schools, fire station, police station, transportation center, civic center, satellite parking (near MPP) and developer should identify some of its own land for purpose of community enhancements; Access for FRS; CA: Support the need to identify suitable location for a new fire station; Developer should provide land for the fire station; “Agree to DPZ Recommendations with additional language: ‘CA supports the need to identify a suitable location for a new fire station. In keeping with current practice, we believe the developer should provide land for the fire station.’”	
10.	Support the cultural center proposed to cluster the arts and other cultural and civic institutions nearby and the plan to renovate Merriweather Post, while restoring and reforesting the deteriorating Woodlands; Merriweather Post Pavilion should be refurbished in the first phase and then be turned over to a non-profit or the County, as GGP indicated; Refurbishing of Pavilion should be completed in the first phase and donated; Increase performing arts space in addition to Merriweather Post Pavilion, as it currently functions as a summer pops concert venue and not for community arts use; Support the arts by creating new opportunities for established and recognized programs and facilities; CA: “Agree to DPZ Recommendation”	
11.	GGP funding and contributions of land need to be greatly increased; Concern expressed that GGP amended ZRA does not equal the one-percent of cost of construction for art as originally envisioned; CA: “Agree to DPZ Recommendation”	
12.	Require review of architectural and site plans by the County’s Design Advisory Panel (DAP); Designate specific sites for signature buildings on plan; Require more exacting design standards for signature buildings; Support design manual and review by County’s Design Advisory Panel; Do the plans reflect realistic density and building heights that consider “human scale” and provide inviting environments?; CA: “Agree to DPZ Recommendation with following language: ‘Downtown-wide design guidelines and review by a sub-committee of the County’s Design Advisory Panel (DAP). The subcommittee will be comprised of individuals with CA assessed architectural review experience.’”	

Planning Board Recommendation Work Sheet for GPA/ZRA 113

Theme 2 – Moving and Connecting People

A

	DPZ Key Recommendation	GGP Presentation on January 8, 2009
1.	The Plan should provide for more fully developed bicycle accommodations for a <i>complete streets</i> approach.	Agree - GGP will further this discussion and revise documents accordingly. Prior to the first FDP submission, pedestrian environmental quality design guidelines will be created.
2.	The Plan should cross-reference street types described in the General Plan amendment, design guidelines and roadway classifications in County's Roads Design Manual on Exhibit H: Street Framework Diagram.	Agree - GGP will prepare a matrix.
3.	The Plan should include a timetable for feasibility studies of transit and major transportation improvements.	Agree – As part of the APF submission with each Final Development Plan, GGP will evaluate the feasibility of the recommended local transportation and pedestrian environmental quality improvements required by the APF ordinance and the final Design Guidelines. Within 60 days following the submission of the first FDP under the Plan, GGP will initiate feasibility studies for the new downtown Route 29 interchange, the Broken Land Parkway / Route 29 north/south collector road connection as well as the new downtown transit hub. Additionally, an updated and amended Transportation Policy Map to show the new Route 29 interchange will be included in the Plan.

A

	Comments Raised in Public Testimony	PB Recommendation
1.	Support multi-modal transportation; Encourage connections to afford residents opportunities to easily access Downtown area without getting into their cars; Support connecting Howard Community College and Howard County General Hospital to the downtown area through pathways and shuttle buses; Support a transit-friendly, walkable Downtown; Support GGP Bicycle Circulation Plan and request embedding requirements for completing Columbia's streets into all aspects of zoning, design and oversight standards; Support explicitly mandating the treatment of pedestrian and bicycle circulation systems as part of transportation not as part of amenities; CA: "Agree to DPZ Recommendation with the following language: 'The ZRA should state that in Phase 1, the County will prepare a Public Infrastructure and Amenities Plan. It would identify the public infrastructure projects and amenities, such as transportation facilities, environmental projects, schools, playgrounds, expanded library, new fire station, satellite police station, and other enhancements, that should be included in the Phasing Program, a document that would be adopted by the Zoning Board. Proposed bicycling facilities would be part of this Plan.'"	
2.	Urge that it is critical that shuttle and bus routes be included in the planning for road systems; Request real intermodal, planned transportation system by adding specifics about all transportation including the Transit Center, bus routing, stops, shelters – now, not later. ... into the updated vision [i.e., GPA proposal]; Opposed adding Wincopin Street to network; Improve Little Patuxent Parkway, Ring Road and Broken Land Parkway to safely accommodate walking, scootering, pushing strollers and Segwaying; Provide feasibility studies for mitigation of traffic from the Little Patuxent Parkway northern intersection with Governor Warfield Parkway to Route 29, southern intersection of same, intersection of Broken Land Parkway and Hickory Ridge Road, and improved regional traffic on Route 29 and MD 175 via widening bridge; Oppose widening Little Patuxent Parkway to eight lanes; Oppose vehicular traffic on future Wincopin Street; Oppose Level-of-Service E; Route 29 would need to be six-lanes each way as well as Route 100 to support; Not concerned with traffic and noise because Downtown located in a safe area; CA: "Agree to DPZ Recommendation"	
3.	Support idea of adjusting tolerance for traffic; Support surrender some freedom of travel in exchange for developing a place people want to be; Allow for a street grid that more resembles a city; Concern over traffic levels on roadways accessing Downtown; Concern over traffic, gridlock and respiratory health of Wilde Lake residents; Conduct a feasibility study to test the transit system proposed by GGP including transit and pedestrian bridge over Rte 29; Identify how to lock in transit hub that GGP talked about as similar to Charleston, SC; Question need for a third interchange off Rte 29, citing environment and lake; Include the results of a new County-sponsored transportation study that utilizes an advanced regional travel demand model; Request feasibility of third interchange; Include a feasibility study of a shuttle to connect the hospital, HCC, Wilde Lake and Oakland village centers, Downtown and Blandair Park via Busway; Study congestion on Vantage Point Rd; CA: require analysis and confirmation as feasible by SHA for projects involving Rte 29 and MD-175; "Agree to DPZ Recommendation with the following language: 'The Public Infrastructure and Amenities Plan should confirm that new transit and road projects are feasible and can support the amount of development proposed for each phase. This Plan should include the results of a County-sponsored transportation study that utilizes, an advanced regional travel demand model, such as the one already developed by the Baltimore Metropolitan Council of Governments. Any projects involving US 29, MD 175, or their interchanges must also be analyzed and confirmed as feasible by the State Highway Administration.'"	

	DPZ Key Recommendation	GGP Presentation on January 8, 2009
4.	The Plan should address requiring provisions in the <i>Adequate Public Facilities Act</i> for regular, five-year reassessments of transportation strategies, their successes or failures, and requiring further mitigation and adjustment of future projections as needed.	Agree
5.	The Plan should recommend review (at the FDP stage) of proposals for design and funding of pedestrian, bicycle and transit improvements across the existing grade-separated pedestrian overpass at Route 29 and connecting to Oakland Mills Village Center.	Agree
6.	The Plan should identify a strategy for locating the transit hub and potential transit corridors.	Agree - GGP will locate it with possible optional locations.
7.	The Plan should include alternative [funding] strategies to address parking systems in Downtown.	Agree – Language will be added to the Plan which encourages analysis of various parking systems and strategies to be implemented with each parking structure and program.
8.	The Plan should include specific Design Guidelines for the treatment of garages to include retail in the ground floor levels in order to support a successful park-once approach and improve the pedestrian experience.	Agree -This was the intent of the Design Guidelines. GGP will review and make revisions and clarifications to strengthen these concepts.

	Comments Raised in Public Testimony	PB Recommendation
4.	Request another traffic study to address concerns over congestion, parking problems and interchanges; Support an urban traffic pattern with an urban level of service to encourage walk ability and the development of alternative transportation; Benchmark transit against similar places; Structure a staging process that monitors whether projections are met and potentially revises future development accordingly, which requires five-year increments or less; Ensure that the financial resources required for essential transportation improvements are fully and irrevocably committed; Concern over traffic impact to scenic road Governor Warfield Parkway with changes to LPP; CA: Maintain LOS D; Allow constrained intersections concept to expire; Monitor traffic for acceptability in each phase before proceeding to the next phase; “Agree to DPZ Recommendation with the following language: ‘The ZRA should state that the current Adequate Public Facilities standard for roads in Downtown Columbia will not deteriorate to a worse standard. Level of Service D (1450 Critical Lane Volume) should be maintained and the current concept of “constrained intersections” should expire. Traffic will need to be monitored and found acceptable in each phase before proceeding to the next phase.’”	
5.	Provide horizontal park” to connect Blandair Park to Oakland Mills Village Center to existing pedestrian bridge to Downtown; Support Columbia Busway Bridge to connect Oakland Mills to the Downtown; Replace existing pedestrian bridge with new, iconic Columbia Busway Bridge for bus transit, cyclists and pedestrian users only [per the proposal by Fred Gottmoeller and John Slater]; Support Busway bridge built parallel to existing ped bridge; Support Busway bridge with funding commitments to be specified in the Plan; Support Busway and shuttle service from hospital and HCC to Blandair Park; CA; “Agree to DPZ Recommendation with the following language: ‘The proposed pedestrian/cyclist/bus shuttle bridge over US 29 connecting Downtown with Oakland Mills should be studied as part of the Public Infrastructure and Amenities Plan.’”	
6.	Include a specific location for transit center in any final plan [GPA proposal] accepted by the County; Coordinate transit center with specific, designated land uses and road/parking systems/services along with coordinated shuttle routes; Include recommended headway/frequencies and all supporting amenities such as bus shelters, bike racks, bike lockers, bike stations and connected sidewalks; Include in the transit center building site additional stories or “air rights” for offices, shops and residential; Transportation Center site should be established in first phase; CA: “Agree to DPZ Recommendation with the following language: ‘The site of the Transit Center and new transit system should be identified as part of the Public Infrastructure and amenities Plan.’”	
7.	Oppose tax increment funding if it would encumber tax increments that would normally go to other uses and require that the TIF bonds be paid off first; CA: The transit center, new transit system and parking systems should be identified as part of a Public Infrastructure and Amenities Plan; “Agree to DPZ Recommendation with the following language: ‘Parking needs and proposed facilities should be identified as part of the Public Infrastructure and Amenities Plan. Parking studies in Downtown should consider parallel parking on LPP and other streets, as well as satellite parking in areas outside of the main downtown district.’” [see also Item A. of ZRA]	
8.	Provide all parking for Merriweather on The Crescent as close to Route 29 as possible; For new development provide a minimum of three parking spaces per dwelling unit (hopefully underground) plus extra parking for visitors; CA: “Agree to DPZ Recommendation with the following language: ‘Parking needs and proposed facilities should be identified as part of the Public Infrastructure and Amenities Plan.’”	

Planning Board Recommendation Work Sheet for GPA/ZRA 113

Theme 3 – Sustaining the Environment

A

	DPZ Key Recommendation	GGP Presentation on January 8, 2009
1.	The Plan should include strategies for exceeding the County's required standards related to green construction and operations.	Agree – GGP will work with Biohabitats to develop strategies for inclusion of standards and requirements from the Howard County Green Neighborhood Guidance document and USGBC Green Buildings Guidelines. Guidance will be included in final Sustainability Guidelines. However it should be noted that the environmental enhancements and many of the land planning components identified in the plan substantially exceed existing environmental regulatory requirements.
2.	The Plan should provide a timetable for implementing environmental restoration and storm water management projects described in the Supplemental Documents. Environmental restoration and storm water management projects should be specifically described in the phasing plan and should include formal agreements for ongoing maintenance prior to completion of the phase.	Agree - The phasing guidelines in the submission include restoration milestones for the Environmental Enhancements plan. GGP will clarify.
3.	The Plan should provide for an acre-to-acre replacement plan of parkland for each acre of Symphony Woods where new buildings are planned; or, the plan should suggest other locations for proposed arts, cultural and community facilities if the Columbia Association does not authorize such facilities on their land.	Agree - The Plan does not require that such development occur. Rather the Plan provides the opportunity for cultural enhancement within Symphony Woods. Any development within Symphony Woods should be environmentally responsible and would have to be approved by the Planning Board. Environmental enhancements as detailed in the Plan Supplemental Documents should be available for replacement credit.

A

	Comments Raised in Public Testimony	PB Recommendation
1.	Support green facilities because these would improve access to commercial and entertainment and allow many of Columbia's workers to live, work, and play here; Support language of sustainable development; Require LEED Gold standard in the Zoning Regulation amendment; Support minimum requirement for LEED Platinum for all new buildings in Downtown; CA: "Agree to DPZ Recommendation with the following language: 'Recommend the highest environmental building standards at the time of construction be used for Downtown development with the goal of a carbon neutral footprint for all downtown by 2039.'"	
2.	Require that all sustainable development provisions for the GPA must be explicitly included and legally required in the Zoning Regulations or Design Manual; Reduce storm water runoff by 50%; Require no net increase in per capita vehicle miles traveled in the Downtown; Certify all new and redeveloped buildings as LEED gold, Green Communities, or equivalent; The watershed plan should have a timetable that clearly states when the projects in the plan are going to be done; CA: "Agree to DPZ Recommendation"	
3.	Preserve woodland along the 1,100 feet of Little Patuxent Parkway adjacent to Symphony Woods as permanent open space with no buildings fronting along Little Patuxent Parkway; Propose cultural, arts and other community facilities in the Lakefront Neighborhood to maintain historic cultural core; Prohibit any exchange of parkland that would allow for construction in Symphony Woods; Improve the health of the Woods and encourage people to use and enjoy; Agree with Columbia Association's vision but do not prohibit any building or roads; Replace any trees removed with like; Do not sacrifice Symphony Woods; Proposal is inconsistent with Vision Statements 3.2, 3.3, 3.4 of DCCV; Symphony Woods should not be "off limits" during concerts; Support placing a cultural or community building in Symphony Woods; Delete drawings and text [by GGP] and replace with ideas by Cy Paumier; Support Symphony Woods as the Cultural Arts District; Preserve trees along Little Patuxent Parkway as vigilant guardians of our unique environment and our way of life; Symphony Woods should be upgraded and returned to how it was in the 70's; Note that trees do not live forever and many trees in this park are dying; Seek future in which Symphony Woods will be restored, both to greater natural beauty and to public purpose; Oppose CA's plan for Symphony Woods; Retain 90% of the large, healthy trees and good-quality forest to constitute a true "Central park" that provides ecological benefits and quality-of-life benefits for residents, employees and visitors; Include useable open space for basketball, tennis, soccer and other active recreational activities in Downtown; Support creation of paths, roads, gathering spaces and buildings in Symphony Woods if such additions make the Woods and wetland sustainable and vibrant; CA: "Agree to DPZ Recommendation with following language: 'Acre-for-acre replacement of parkland would only be acceptable if it is consistent with CA's vision and plan for Symphony Woods. Of primary importance to CA is the future of Symphony Woods. CA wants to protect the woodlands and create a park setting that is more user-friendly. CA is concerned that the two large buildings, underground parking, and several roads proposed for Symphony Woods are in direct contradiction to CA's vision. Because CA is very concerned about the removal of many trees in Symphony Woods and wants to preserve the integrity of the parkland, CA does not agree with exchanging existing land in the heart of Symphony Woods for other land. CA agrees with the proposal for an attractive connection between The Mall and Merriweather Post Pavilion. However, a proposed cultural arts center should be included in the Lakefront neighborhood.'" [See also Item 3. of ZRA]	

	DPZ Key Recommendation	GGP Presentation on January 8, 2009
4.	The Plan should discuss distinct (mutually exclusive) definitions and separate requirements for accounting of existing designated open space, new amenity areas and new arts, cultural and community uses and facilities.	Agree
5.	The Plan should indicate a minimum required amount of total new amenity areas in acres per neighborhood.	Agree – GGP has included in its submission document a plan showing 16 new Amenity spaces and the requirement for at least one 25,000 sf minimum area per neighborhood.
6.	The Plan should coordinate proposed Design Guidelines and proposed Sustainability Framework to provide for general Green Design Guidelines for all of Downtown Columbia for adoption by the County Council. These Green Design Guidelines could then be used as the basis for devising unique Green Design Guidelines for each neighborhood that could be included in each neighborhood-specific FDP amendment.	Agree – This is will be part of the Sustainability Guidelines to be developed in year 1 after approval. Also adoption of County's Green Neighborhood Guidance Document
7.	As the proposed master plan is refined, alternate designs should be pursued to minimize impacts on high quality forest areas identified in Supplemental Documents.	Agree – GGP's Environmental Enhancements plan has cataloged and quantified all forest areas as delineated in the Supplemental Documents. All future or refined master plans will be developed using the same measurements and guidance as the current plan.

	Comments Raised in Public Testimony	PB Recommendation
4.	Thin trees and vegetation in woodland along Route 29 to permit views of Downtown from Route 29; CA: "Agree to DPZ Recommendation"	
5.	Support for direct connection from the mall to the center of the lakefront as a great idea, [while] the zigzag park [Lakefront Terrace] is ok as long as the lake flyover is not built right next to it as in the plans; Identify how much open space GGP is planning to donate back to Town Center besides sidewalks; Identify how much parkland is being allocated to each new neighborhood; Particularly like how the urban development will be set among restored natural areas and useable open space that will promote gathering, culture and events; CA: "Agree to DPZ Recommendation with the following language: 'Each neighborhood's total new amenity areas in acres should be determined by the County as part of the Public Infrastructure and Amenities Plan.'"	
6.	Link design criteria with impacts on existing buildings; Require storm water management standards to mitigate runoff from future and existing impervious surfaces into Lake Kittamaqundi; CA: "Agree to DPZ Recommendation"	
7.	Oppose the removal of 95% of the trees visible from Little Patuxent Parkway ... thus, the proposed buildings, especially on CA property, should be moved to the Lakefront, Symphony Overlook or non-forested areas of the Crescent; GGP should be asked to donate adjacent undeveloped land on the northeast side of the Woods [i.e., high quality forest]; CA: "Agree to DPZ Recommendation with the following language: 'These designs should be limited to noninvasive, native Maryland plantings in their landscape designs and open space.'"	

Planning Board Recommendation Work Sheet for GPA/ZRA 113

Theme 4 – Balancing and Phasing Growth

A

	DPZ Key Recommendation	GGP Presentation on January 8, 2009
1.	The phasing plan shall consist of six increments that set maximum levels of new development for each land use category: residential, retail, office and hotel. The phasing plan shall also require minimum levels of development that shall be completed for each land use category before the next phase commences.	GGP has developed the phasing based on extensive modeling and economic analysis and continues to believe three phases are appropriate. GGP will strengthen the Phasing table on pg 58 of the Plan, and the CEPPA matrix, to more clearly establish minimum and maximum development levels for each phase and to confirm commitments to public improvements by phase as intended The ZRA will establish a requirement that before approving a site development plan the Planning Board must determine that Downtown Community Commons, Downtown Parkland and Environmental Restoration are being provided in accordance with the Downtown General Plan Amendment.
2.	Each phase shall include a list of infrastructure, restoration and amenity projects to be completed before the next phase can commence. Each project shall be funded, in part or in its entirety, by a financial contribution from the original petitioner. Each phase shall include at least one project from each the following categories: - Transit and major transportation improvements not currently required by APF (such as additional lanes or interchange improvements, etc.) • First phase shall include completion of feasibility studies for all needed major transportation improvements - Environmental restoration projects for those watersheds that include the Downtown area - Downtown Neighborhood Community Gathering Space (to be included within the first five phases) - Arts, Cultural and Community or public/civic facility (Schools, Fire Station, Police sub-station, Library) • First Phase shall include renovations to Merriweather Post Pavilion as described in the GPA and identification of a location for a new Downtown Fire Station.	Agree - Each phase in our current phasing plan does this (see pages 59-63) except that some projects such as environmental restoration are completed before the final phases. Additional clarification will be provided about Amenity phasing and responsibility.

A

	Comments Raised in Public Testimony	PB Recommendation
1.	<p>Recommend six phases over three; Dwelling units to be linked to phases and the benchmarks; Encourage first phase of this project to focus on central core area near the mall; Encourage Crescent parcel to be a later phase; Support including infrastructure as part of planning to avoid retrofitting later; Support density in housing, office and commercial to support cultural amenities and multi-modal transportation; Oppose density that exceeds what is currently permitted in Downtown; Support additional density if housing is incorporated as part of overall master plan and all adequate public facilities are addressed; Support phasing in which the density is passed by the Council in increments; Do not support five-year increments as they are too short; Recommend deleting phasing from GPA and suggest that phasing should be controlled by available adequate infrastructure under APFA [Adequate Public Facilities Act adopted by County]; Want stronger phasing language to include 6 five-year phases with incremental density, office, retail and hotel space determined for the subsequent phases only after 75% of the current phase is executed and effectiveness of the current infrastructure and traffic evaluated (strongly object to authorizing all density); CA: “Agree to DPZ Recommendation with the following language: ‘The ZRA should state that development rights will be allotted incrementally, on a phase-by-phase basis rather than up front rights to the full amount of development that GGP proposes. A Phasing Program, which specifies the projects and services that are necessary to support the proposed land development in each of 6 phases, should be adopted in Phase 1 by the Zoning Board after the County completes the Public Infrastructure and Amenities Plan.’”</p>	
2.	<p>Hold GGP largely accountable for the financial cost of improving infrastructure; Share responsibility of costs for relocating the recently renovated library; Future developer should pay for roads, sidewalks, water, sewer, etc.; Set aside a parcel for a school in Downtown; Support increased residential density; Include transit early in the planning phase; ZRA must require phasing according to DPZ’s recommendation of six, five-year phases; First phase should have 750 housing units, then we should judge the developers performance before granting any more units; Support six increments of phasing ... however, 1,600 residential units should be the maximum residential density approved at this time. ... additional density can be addressed in subsequent phases following successful completion of the first five-year phase; Support that the phases are in ten-year increments not any shorter peripatetic, hedge your bet phases of five years – which would certainly make longer term lending commitments more difficult; Agree with maximum of five-year intervals and know what features in which sites in somewhat chronological order; Be specific with plans and timelines; Youth entertainment and activities need more attention and should be specified; Conduct resident surveys and require Council to adopt density grants; Propose that in addition to the ten-year milestone, a second criterion could be implemented to trigger a process assessment when a minimum phase level is accomplished, for example, when any district exceeds 50% build out; Mitigate to protect existing residents from noise, dust, odors, dangerous construction vehicles, construction traffic, safety concerns and obstructed rights-of-way and pathways; Avoid delayed and incomplete construction by requiring restoration bonds in case of construction abandonment; Request street, sidewalk and safety infrastructure completion early in each phase along with traffic mitigation, sustainability projects, amenities, etc; Recommend four phases of 7-8 years each or some other compromise that takes into consideration all development process; CA: “Agree to DPZ Recommendation with the following language: ‘CA agrees with DPZ’s Key Recommendation, and that this recommendation be stated in the ZRA.’”</p>	

	DPZ Key Recommendation	GGP Presentation on January 8, 2009
3.	The Plan shall require each FDP amendment to include tracking of all previous and current phases, to ensure completion of required projects, to provide a comparison of currently completed projects with phasing plan, and provide strategies on how a proposed FDP amendment will implement and comply with current phase.	Agree
4.	The Plan should include project monitoring in five-year increments with developer reporting, association reporting, and GGP cumulative reporting including the regular five-year re-assessment of traffic analyses.	Agree

Theme 5 – Involving Everyone

	DPZ Key Recommendation	GGP Presentation on January 8, 2009
1.	The Plan should clarify that Final Development Plans will address an entire neighborhood at a minimum.	Agree - GGP will work with staff to develop revised FDP requirements to include a neighborhood concept plan and Masterplan coordination with each FDP submission.
2.	The Plan should discuss possible, alternative management strategies for Downtown including an alternative for fewer entities to manage Downtown. Alternative strategies should include an explanation of managing entities composition, public participation procedures, decision-making processes, and enforcement mechanisms.	Agree – GGP will provide additional study, information and rationale and look to consolidate the organizations if appropriate.

	Comments Raised in Public Testimony	PB Recommendation
3.	Provide review of the entire project at specific intervals; Require a checklist of specific benchmarks as part of this process; Support re-opening of Faulkner Ridge Elementary if school is needed; Development proposals should include at least one full neighborhood, to ensure each has a distinctive character, and amenities; CA: “Agree to DPZ Recommendation with the following language: ‘The ZRA should indicate that each phase should be approved through the County’s existing 4-step process: PDP, CSP, FDP and SDP. The proposal to skip parts of the normal process by having only an FDP and SDP for Downtown development would significantly reduce the public’s opportunity to review and comment on these high profile neighborhood plans as they evolve. Before a subsequent phase can begin, the County will determine that all of the public infrastructures and amenities are in place, traffic levels are shown to meet the existing level of service standard of D, and at least 3/4 of the development has been built for the current phase.’”	
4.	Support six-stage development process to better allow for ongoing monitoring and evaluation to ensure that Village goals can ultimately be met; Process should be carefully monitored to ensure that General Growth will implement only what has been approved by the County; CA: “Agree to DPZ Recommendation”	

Theme 5 – Involving Everyone

	Comments Raised in Public Testimony	PB Recommendation
1.	Recommend County’s Design Advisory Panel to look at consistency for all Neighborhoods; Establish some minimum acreage for FDP but not an entire neighborhood; Lakefront Neighborhood is too large of an area – create two neighborhoods and reallocate Town Center Apartments to be included in the Crescent Neighborhood; CA: “Agree to DPZ Recommendation with the following language: ‘Agrees the Final Development Plan should be consistent with the Phasing Program.’”	
2.	Combine the individual organizations into an Institute for Sustainable Cities; Provide initial funding sources; Incorporate or support existing non-profits; A youth task force should be convened to generate more ideas; Housing, cultural matters and transportation should be handled by existing organizations; Downtown Partnership be established as a new entity with representation from GGP, CA, the County, a representative from Town Center Community Association and other relevant organizations; Town Center Community Association should facilitate all pre-submission and follow-up meetings as part of the approval process; An independent , designated position should be established to monitor Downtown development to report to community and assure development is proceeding in accord with rules, principles and strategies promulgated by County; CA: “Agree to DPZ Recommendation”	

GPA – Other Comments

Note: Unlike numerical designations in the preceding matrix, this matrix and its alphabetical designations do not relate to a submitted document. The alphabetical designations are provided strictly for ease of reference during PB discussion.

	Topic	Reference
A.	Overall, general comments	GGP's Proposal
		DPZ's Technical Staff Report
B.	Adoption Process	Timeline
		Legal

GPA – Other Comments

Note: Unlike numerical designations in the preceding matrix, this matrix and its alphabetical designations do not relate to a submitted document. The alphabetical designations are provided strictly for ease of reference during PB discussion.

	Comments Raised in Public Testimony	PB Recommendation
A.	Support proposed package in its entirety; Support with amendments; Request to withdraw proposal and resubmit later; Reject proposal in its entirety; Support idea in principle; Commend GGP for amount of information and web access; Support predictable and comprehensive master plan; Support the vision to link the lakefront to the Mall and Symphony Woods; Support change in Downtown as outlined in General Plan Amendment and ZRA 113; Support Smart Growth; Move forward collaboratively to build something better together; Plans for Downtown are discontinuous with Columbia's ideology – there should be lower population, building and vehicle density; Note world renown experts; Oppose the proposed plan because it lacks specifics – needs tangible benefits; Support idea that Downtown Columbia remain a, rather than the, destination of choice in Howard County; Scale back to focus on needs of existing residents; Desire to preserve culture of Columbia by moving forward; Support vibrancy; Support economic growth; Need activities for families; Place to meet, great and eat; Want a world-class destination; Support more activities for kids; Support to keep up with rest of region; Want more excitement than a Mall; County's future is at stake; Will increase all Columbia property values; Support 5,500 units in order to support and provide for a full spectrum of housing; Significant investment is needed to attract businesses and the workforce for them	
	Support recommendations with amendments; Support recommendations with request for additional recommendations; Support with request for additional information; Support with changes to Zoning Regulation amendment; Do not support; Commend DPZ for review of all information and comprehensive TSR; Need independent consultants to confirm various studies; Support most of DPZ's TSR; Request DPZ submit a revised TSR in response to Jan 8 and Jan 22 options; CA: Some important requirements are not clearly defined in the DPZ Key Recommendations or are omitted in the ZRA; Recommend several amendments	
B.	Proceed towards adoption of a plan for Downtown to avoid piecemeal approach if in future land is sold to many owners; Do not proceed towards adoption of a plan for Downtown but wait and see outcome of a possible GGP reorganization; Proceed in timely manner to prepare for any eventuality	
	Recommend Villages should have legal standing to force changes to plan; Support connections from Downtown to Oakland Mills as "front door"; Concern over effects of Downtown development on Wilde Lake Village; Concern interplay of ZRA 102 and ZRA 113 not adequately examined; Provide language in the Zoning Regulations to give each of Columbia Villages more input into the redevelopment process; All residents should have standing to appeal land use decisions, including Downtown; "Generally consistent with" vs. "in compliance with" vs. "in conformance with" should be studied; Request review of scheduling requirements in §16.801(4)ii, (5) and (6); Request to void all unused density rights and revoke gatekeeper status; Amend State legislation to end all exemptions to environmental laws; Require compliance without exemption to all regulations as per new zoning; Concern that specific language related to requirements for Village Centers in GGP proposed GPA (p. 14, §1.4) would affect viability of residential in Village Centers; Also, similar concern related to staff report addressing the ZRA that removal of the Downtown land area from the overall density calculation for Columbia (2.5 units per acre) might also affect the viability of additional residential in Village Centers	

	Topic	Reference
C.	Viability	Financial
D.	Other	Enforcement
		Public Participation
		Population Control
		GGP Mailed Survey
		Annexation
		Deed Restrictions
		Incorporation

	Comments Raised in Public Testimony	PB Recommendation
C.	Concerns over possible bankruptcy should preclude adoption of the proposal; Concerns over bankruptcy should not preclude adoption, since County should adopt a Downtown plan to guide any future owner(s); Request financial plan; Grow and build together, urbanize and prosper; Support a vibrant live where you work community where businesses could benefit from multiple income levels interacting on a daily basis; Economic vitality is the bedrock of our high quality education system....that economic vitality is contingent upon dramatic change in downtown Columbia; Eliminate Agricultural tax rate on GGP land; Request for economic analysis of costs; Analyze the value of GGP contributions and levies; Analyze whether projected road excise tax will be adequate for road improvements necessitated by plan including impacts outside Downtown; Developers must be required to commit resources to the infrastructure and guarantees to make this happen need to be written in the ZRA; Additional walkways needed to spur project; It might be nice to have an open book approach to building the first 400 units	
D.	Link GPA to ZRA to make enforceable; Support including specific criteria in GPA for approval of the Zoning Regulation Amendment; Additional specific comment that there is still need for a gatekeeper; Question as to whether this plan measures up to a legally binding commitment according to State law; Include "shall" language in ZRA and "in accordance with the ZRA" in GPA; Recommend County control all planning and zoning, ending HRD monopoly; Request for legal opinion on enforceability and the effect of a GGP bankruptcy; Concern that substitution of "will" for "shall" in Jan 22 Phasing Plan option would affect enforceability; also, concern that use of term "New Town" in GGP documents rather than "Downtown" as used and established in ZRA definitions and text might hinder enforceability	
	Issue to be decided by all citizens of Howard County through the County process and should not be dominated by the desires of Columbia Association; Trust our County officials; Use technology to make County government more inclusive; Honor community input; Only 12 of 36 recommendations by DPZ addressed by GGP; Professionals assembled by GGP positively compared to original work group	
	Support educational efforts for voluntary reduction in births to reduce growth	
	Concern about the survey being deceptive and how GGP would use the results	
	Ensure residents have voting rights; Residential and mixed use residential/retail, commercial buildings should be immediately annexed into the Town Center Community Association and into the existing Town Center neighborhoods; CA: Require developer to enter into a declaration of annexation with Columbia Association and the appropriate Village	
	Oppose deed restrictions related to certain properties outside of the Downtown, specifically Grandfather's Garden Center and the Atholton Shopping Center	
	Suggest taking the next step in accountability to become a true city with elected officials	

Proposed ZRA 113

	DPZ Comments <i>(as summarized by GGP)</i>	GGP Presentation on January 22, 2009
1.	Section 125. A. 9. i. (1) and (2) - Require 15 percent moderate income housing units and 10 percent middle income housing units.	To address comments about the need for additional moderate income housing versus middle income housing, and the desire for greater certainty in its provision, we suggest that 15 percent of all new downtown housing be <i>required</i> to be moderate income housing. In order to accommodate 15 percent moderate income housing units, we further suggest there be no requirement for middle income housing units. We also suggest that a 400 unit limitation be placed on the number of market rate Downtown Net New Dwelling Units that can be constructed before the required amount of moderate income housing units are provided. Lastly, we suggest that authority be given to provide moderate income housing in excess of this requirement and/or in advance of the construction of market rate dwelling units to meet future moderate income housing requirements.
2.	Section 125. A. 9. i. (3) - Require Public Art funded by developer based on 1 percent of construction costs.	Agree public art is important. Suggest establishing a public art expenditure requirement of \$325/new dwelling unit and \$.25/square foot of new commercial development. Exceptions should be established for affordable housing, places of worship, cultural facilities, parking structures, community space. Also incorporate an annual expenditure adjustment.
3.	Section 125. A. 9. j. (3) (a) - Require 1:1 replacement of existing parkland devoted to other use, but do not permit previously credited open space or environmentally sensitive areas to be exchanged for existing parkland.	<p>a. Generally, Symphony Woods will only be developed, if at all, if proposed by C.A. and if approved by the Planning Board. Presumably, C.A. would propose and approval would only be given if the area was being <i>enhanced</i>. If that is the case, replacement space should not be required. Nevertheless, GGP accepts the no net loss and 1:1 replacement concept. However, existing areas that are being enhanced environmentally in accordance with the Plan should be available to replace existing parkland at a 2:1 ratio.</p> <p>b. Create a definition for Environmental Restoration and Enhancement Area. Such area would be available for the 2:1 replacement referred to above.</p>

Proposed ZRA 113

	Comments Raised in Public Testimony	PB Recommendation
1.	Provide for fifty percent of new housing to be affordable to people who fall below the median; Strongly support 5,500 full-spectrum housing units for Downtown, meaning that 10% of housing be available in each cohort of those making 40,60,and 80 percent of Howard County's median income; Concur with my village that any new affordable or subsidized housing be contained within defined boundaries of the proposed "Downtown," and the ZRA must make it explicit that such housing will be integrated into the neighborhoods being proposed by the GPA; Do not include category for 100% - 120% of median; Include following ranges: below 50% provide 5%, for 50-65% provide 10%, for 65-80% provide 10%; For 80-100% provide 10%, for a total of 35% affordable housing; Recommend provide 10% for below 40% of median, provide 10% for 40-60%, 10% for 60-80%, for a total of 10-10-10 or 30% affordable housing, including much more funding going into GGP's proposed non-profit as a fair starting point for a total of \$29,000,000 over 30 years; Require \$8,000 per unit charge only for the 2,750 units above 120% and \$0.50 per square foot of new commercial to be dedicated to housing alone; Integrate affordable housing throughout the project so that 30% of the spectrum occurs in each building with 60% in each block and 90% in each neighborhood (with at least 1,000 units), and include requirements to assess success of above strategies for each phase; Include new MD commercial transfer taxes, County general fund contributions, assessments for density bonuses, state and federal sources, along with increases in allocations and fast tracking for affordable housing, focused on Downtown; Recommend alternate for Affordable Living Prototype of rental only units for 40% to 120% of median income – requirement in zoning for GGP to pay fee to subsidize creation of roughly four of these projects in Downtown is requested; Include 10% for 80-100% of median and 10% for 100-120% of median beyond the 10-10-10 proposed earlier;	
2.		
3.	Prohibit construction of multi-story, cultural and community buildings within Symphony Woods to preserve the open space as woodlands and to honor the historic commitments made by the Rouse Company; Permit one-story buildings not to exceed 500 gross square feet within Symphony Woods; Prohibit any building that requires parking on grade, in a structure or below grade; Prevent or deny any exchange of land between GGP and CA that would destroy parkland; Clarify "transfer to community" and whether this means a gift or a sale; Provide cost to taxpayers to operate facility; Oppose replacement of parkland by use of environmentally sensitive open space; Require replacement of parkland at a 2:1 ratio [i.e., inverse of 1:2 ratio proposed by GGP for replacement on environmentally sensitive and/or other parkland]; Prohibit tree removal for roads; CA: Agree with the replacement only if it supports CA plans for Symphony Woods; Does not agree with exchanging existing land in the heart of Symphony Woods for other land; Advise that CA is working with consultants on creating proposals for a revitalized park in Symphony Woods	

	DPZ Comments <i>(as summarized by GGP)</i>	GGP Presentation on January 22, 2009
4.	Section 125. A. 9. j. - Except as provided in the ZRA 1:1 replacement provisions, all parkland, environmentally sensitive areas, Downtown Community Commons and Downtown Arts and Entertainment Park land types designated in Section 103.D must retain their <i>existing</i> character	<p>a. Generally agree. Delete “existing” and instead require retaining character as one of the designated land types to avoid subjective and multiple interpretation(s) of what an area’s “existing” character is and to what moment in time “existing” refers. Instead, simply require the area to retain its character as defined in Section 103.A and as designated in Section 103.D.</p> <p>b. Add clarifying language that improvements permitted by the definition of each land type are consistent with and do not change the character of the area.</p>
5.	Section 125. E. 1. - Include entire neighborhood in FDP petition.	<p>a. Because of increased detail required at FDP stage, meeting this requirement would be extraordinarily costly and speculative if end-users for all parcels within the neighborhood have not been identified. Instead, recommend including a Neighborhood Concept Plan (NCP) with the initial FDP submission for Planning Board review and approval as measured against the Plan’s Street Framework Diagram; Street and Block Plan; Building Height Zones Plan; and Amenity Space Framework Diagram and Design Guidelines. Each detailed FDP would then be measured against the approved Neighborhood Concept Plan, Design Guidelines and other FDP criteria.</p> <p>b. Because the NCP would be a general plan that will only be approved by the Planning Board if it is in compliance with the Downtown General Plan Amendment exhibits or if a rationale for deviation is provided and accepted by the Board as not detrimental to the public welfare, a small property owner could prepare the NCP and have its FDP be measured against the Plan in the same way as a larger landholder. A smaller landowner may however choose to wait until an NCP has been approved to simplify the regulatory review process associated with its FDP petition</p>
6.	Section 125. E. 2. (B) - Submit more detailed neighborhood design guidelines to the Design Advisory Panel.	Agree - However, it is critical that the Design Advisory Plan be required to base its review on the overall Downtown Design Guidelines approved as a part of the Plan.
7.	Section 133 - Specify shared parking requirements and standards.	Agree - They have been included in the revised ZRA.

	Comments Raised in Public Testimony	PB Recommendation
4.		
5.	Support increased specificity for applications and more specific criteria for Planning Board review; Support neighborhood as minimum area for FDP; Require an order of construction for the overall project; Preserve green fields of Crescent as an opportunity for a distant vision of planning to flower in response to future needs	
6.	Require that all items listed under § E.3.m (Exhibit pages 24-25) be addressed by Neighborhood Design Guidelines in §E.2.B (Exhibit page 21); Propose deleting §2.B.(3) and rely on DPZ review using FDP compatibility criteria – as an alternative, suggest a preliminary process with a sketch plan prior to SDP	
7.		

ZRA – Other Comments

Note: Unlike numerical designations in the preceding matrix, this matrix and its alphabetical designations do not relate to a submitted document. The alphabetical designations are provided strictly for ease of reference during PB discussion.

	Topic	Section Reference
A.	Public Infrastructure and Amenity Plan	§ 103 in general
B.	Environmental Issues	§ 103 in general
C.	Definition – Downtown Revitalization – Exemptions	§ 103.A. on page 1, GGP's ZRA of Jan 22
D.	Intent: Exemptions for Other Property Owners (not GGP)	§ 125.A.9a., which starts on page 7, GGP's ZRA of Jan 22
E.	Maximum Floor Area	§ 125.A.9c.(2), (4) on Exhibit page 8, DPZ's TSR of Nov 13
F.	Demolition and Replacement Exempt from Compliance	§ 125.A.9.g. on page , GGP's ZRA of Jan 22
G.	Open Space Preservation: Net New Open Space Required Intent: Exemptions for Other Property Owners (Not GGP)	§ 125.A.9.j.2.a. on page , GGP's ZRA of Jan 22
H.	Additional text, submitted by GPP on March 19, 2009, as written, public testimony and relates to the Phasing Plan	§ 125 A.9.j.(6)

ZRA – Other Comments

Note: Unlike numerical designations in the preceding matrix, this matrix and its alphabetical designations do not relate to a submitted document. The alphabetical designations are provided strictly for ease of reference during PB discussion.

	Comments Raised in Public Testimony	PB Recommendation
A.	CA: State that development rights will be allotted incrementally on a phase-by-phase basis; Adopt concurrency phasing program in first phase of six phases for infrastructure projects, amenities, environmental projects and public facilities; Include list of infrastructure, restoration and amenity projects to be completed before next phase can be commenced; Confirm new transit and road projects are feasible and can support amount of development proposed for each phase; Study proposed pedestrian/cyclist/bus shuttle bridge over US 29; Approve each phase through the County's existing four-step process (PDP, CSP, FDP, SDP); Ensure ¾ of development in current phase is built before next phase can begin	
B.	Support requirement that new plantings in Downtown Columbia should be only with native and non-invasive species of trees, shrubs and plants – in ZRA	
C.	Request new sentence be added to the end of the definition as follows: "Downtown Revitalization does not include (i) any construction or land disturbing activity that does not increase the gross floor area of an existing building by more than ten percent (10%) of the gross floor area of that building or (ii) any interior renovation or change in the use of any existing building that is permitted by a Final Development Plan approved prior to [effective date]."	
D.	Request adding two new subsections to read as follows: "(a) For the purposes of this Section 125.A.9.a., new development or redevelopment does not include (i) any construction or land disturbing activity that does not increase the gross floor area of an existing building by more than ten percent (10%) of the gross floor area of that building or (ii) any interior renovation or change in the use of any existing building that is permitted by a Final Development Plan approved prior to [effective date]." and "(b) A Final Development Plan amendment for Downtown Revitalization may include less land than is shown on the underlying approved Final Development Plan, and approval of a Final Development Plan amendment does not invalidate those elements of an underlying approved Final Development Plan or Final Development Plan phase that are not the subject of the Final Development Plan amendment."	
E.	Support amendments in DPZ TSR requiring "gross floor area" to substitute for "net floor area" ;	
F.	Request to add the following: "Existing structures or improvements that are demolished may be replaced by structures or improvements with the same footprints or dimensions on the ground."	
G.	Request to add at beginning of sub-section a: "Subject to Section 125.A.9.g."	
H.	Add the following new sub-section: "No permit for land disturbance activity in Phase 2 or Phase 3 of the Downtown Implementation Phasing Plan shall be issued for Downtown Revitalization unless (i) the Community Enhancements, Programs, and Public Amenities (CEPPAs) identified for the preceding phase have been provided in accordance with the Downtown Implementation Phasing Plan, and (ii) Site Development Plans have been approved for at least the Minimum Levels of development identified in the Downtown Implementation Phasing Plan for the preceding phase for retail, office, residential and hotel land use types." – see also Attachment 3 in correspondence dated March 19, 2009, for Phasing Plan option.	

	Topic	Section Reference
I.	Neighborhood Concept Plan	§ 125.E.1.(B), (C), (D) on pages 21-22, GGP's ZRA of Jan 22
J.	FDP Submission Requirement	§ 125.E.3.l. (11) on Exhibit page 24, DPZ's TSR of Nov 13
K.	Withdrawal of Petition	§ 125.E. and G.
L.	SDP Submission Requirement	§ 125.G.2.A. on Exhibit page 28, DPZ's TSR of Nov 13
M.	Compliance	§ 125.G.2.B.1 on page 29, GGP's ZRA of Jan 22
N.	Building Height	§ 103 C. Downtown Maximum Building Height Plan on Exhibit page 35 (map on the second to last page of TSR)

	Comments Raised in Public Testimony	PB Recommendation
I.	Delete (B) and (D) and replace with “The Petition shall be consistent with the Downtown General Plan Amendment depicted in Exhibit E” or permit (B) and (C) to apply to any FDP amendment encompassing more than one currently subdivided lot [to eliminate Neighborhood Concept Plan; allow small FDPs]	
J.	Expand requirement to require that “most threatened” buildings identified by Preservation Howard County as “Lakefront Promenade/Gehry buildings...” which includes the Exhibit Building and the former Rouse Headquarters be indicated and identified as such on submittals for Lakefront Neighborhood; additionally, also include the Teachers Building and American City Building	
K.	Provide for withdrawal of petition [by applicant] after conditions are imposed	
L.	Support review by County’s Design Advisory Panel; Require designated Signature buildings to receive more exacting design evaluation by DAP	
M.	Enunciate what is meant by “compliance” here and elsewhere in the ZRA	
N.	Support amended heights in DPZ TSR with elimination of Zone 1-4 stories in PL (Park Land) in Symphony Woods and instead “not permit buildings in PL Merriweather”; Note exception for existing American City building at 8 stories within Lakefront core; Oppose any building over 150 feet in height; Prefer massing of tallest buildings near center of Downtown as opposed to periphery; Allow variety of heights to support architectural diversity; Discourage low buildings, such as Mall that wastes open space; How many buildings of 15-20 stories does the GGP plan envision?; Height should be 100 feet (8 stories) with exceptions up to 160 feet (14 stories); Delete Plaza residence FDP from Plan; Oppose buildings over 150 feet; Include some iconic buildings over 20 stories (per 1966 letter from J.W. Rouse regarding 300- to 500-foot restaurant tower); Require that the height and breadth of buildings located near existing homes should preserve the vested ambience for all current residents; Require that buildings should be spaced at the lakefront to assure maximum access to and visibility of the lake	