

FW: CR89 and CR90

Feldmark, Jessica

Sent: Wednesday, June 22, 2016 12:06 PM**To:** Ball, Calvin B; Fox, Greg; Greg Fox (Greg.Fox@Constellation.com); Weinstein, Jon; Sigaty, Mary Kay; Terrasa, Jen**Cc:** Wimberly, Theo; Sayers, Margery; Clay, Mary; Knight, Karen; McLeod, Kate; Pruum, Kimberly; Smith, Gary**Attachments:** APF Task Force Review Com~1.xlsx (17 KB)

Council Members,

Carl contacted me yesterday to **follow up on the discussion of APFO at your hearing Monday evening**. I suggested that an analysis of **how the task force's recommendation would impact the charts** might be helpful. Please see attached.

Thanks,
Jess

Jessica Feldmark
Administrator
Howard County Council
410-313-3111
jfeldmark@howardcountymd.gov

From: Delorenzo, Carl
Sent: Wednesday, June 22, 2016 11:31 AM
To: Feldmark, Jessica
Cc: Bronow, Jeff; Sager, Jennifer
Subject: CR89 and CR90

Jessica,

As the County Council considers how it would like to proceed with CR89 and CR90, Jeff Bronow and I prepared a table that includes all of the recommendations passed by the APF Review Task Force and their effect on either the Housing Unit Allocation Chart or the Open/Closed Chart. Please let us know if you'd like further detail. This document is print-ready.

Thank you,
CD.

Carl DeLorenzo
Director of Policy & Programs
Howard County, Maryland
410-313-2172

APFO Recommendations Passed by the Task Force	Impact on Housing Unit Allocation and Open/Closed Chart if Recommendation is Considered
Convene an APFO review committee at a minimum at the conclusion of every General Plan cycle	None
Change the definition of 'minor' using the definition included in the subdivision regulations	None
Exempt MIHU units from allocations test; schools and roads test still applies; exemption does not apply in Downtown Columbia; cap exemption at amount of required MIHUs	None
Apply APFO tests at Environmental Concept Plan (ECP) stage rather than sketch plan stage of subdivision regulations process	None
Remove the allowance of shared allocations across Established Communities and Growth & Revitalization categories	Yes. This recommendation would only impact the Housing Unit Allocation Chart. The 'Shared G & R and Est.Comm (1)' column would be removed.
Allow additional new allocations for properties rezoned to a higher density in Established Communities to be taken from Growth and Revitalization planning area closest to rezoned project as determined by DPZ, except from Downtown Columbia	None. The recommendation only changes from which pot the specific rezoned property would take its allocations.
(1) Change program capacity at which a school is deemed open to 110%; (2) If projected enrollment lies between 110% and 115% of program capacity then developer can move forward if it pays a public school facilities surcharge double the amount in current law; if projected enrollment is over 115% and up to 120% of program capacity then developer can move forward if it pays a public school facilities surcharge triple the amount in current law; (3) The developer's wait time for the allocations and schools test combined shall not exceed 5 years contingent on the receipt of allocations within the 5 year time period; the last development plan shall be allowed to be processed at the developer's risk; (4) All existing Howard County dwelling units excluding MIHU and age-restricted dwelling units shall pay an annual fee (\$25 for apartment/condominium; \$50 for townhouse; \$75 for single family detached) that is dedicated to public school capital budget; (5) In an effort to identify efficiencies and better utilize existing space, HCPSS shall reduce its capital budget request by 2% per year for the next 5 fiscal years excluding revenue from the surcharge and the household fee in this motion	Yes. Though the numbers in the Open/Closed Chart would not change, how schools are coded would change. For example, in CR90, Talbot Springs ES has a utilization percentage of 113.3% and is deemed open because the chart is based on a program capacity of 115%. If program capacity changed to 110%, the Talbot Springs ES utilization percentage would not change, but its open/closed status would now be based on the various provisions in this recommendation.
Refer to 'Open/Closed Chart' as 'School Capacity Chart', use the term 'constrained' for those schools above the threshold percentage, and 'adequate' for those schools below the threshold	No changes on numbers, only on chart title
Amend the following provision: "A facility owned by Howard County or any agency thereof where essential County Government services are provided, including LIMITED TO police services, fire prevention and suppression services, emergency medical services, highway maintenance, detention facilities, water treatment and supply, sewage disposal and treatment and solid waste disposal."	None
Exempt age-restricted projects that incorporate continuing care and/or intermediate care services from the allocations test as these projects help our elderly population and reduce the need for other medical facilities	None
Exempt Downtown Columbia from the 300 unit annual allocation limit for a single elementary school district if the school region within which the school district resides is over 100% capacity	None
Include ECP in subdivision regulations	None
Increase Established Communities annual allocation from 400 to 600, decrease Growth and Revitalization annual allocation from 1,200 to 1,000 - contingent on elimination of shared allocation pool	Yes. This recommendation would only impact the Housing Unit Allocation Chart. Refer to Recommendation on Row 7.
Require the County to develop a plan of action to address DFRS' public water supply/cistern needs in the western portion of the county	None

APFO Recommendations Passed by the Task Force	Impact on Housing Unit Allocation and Open/Closed Chart if Recommendation is Considered
Raise CLV from 1500 to 1600 for Downtown Columbia in the Design Manual to be consistent with APFO	None
Request the County to review the feasibility of an energy test that contains a mitigation requirement based on optimal cost-to-efficiency ratios	None
Support DPZ's process of reviewing infill regulations to include such things as stormwater management and the density exchange program; urge that process is complete in 2016; fast track this motion if the County Council considers legislation on the subject prior to submission of the APF Task Force report	None