Howard County Land Development Regulations Assessment
Comments Received as of December 2017

This table lists the public comments received related to the Howard County Land Development Regulations Assessment Project. The purpose of this table is to consolidate the comments that have been received and identify general topics to be addressed through the development regulations assessment project. The table will be used to inform the Consultant's understanding of discrete issues related to the Land Development Regulations, but will not be used to count the number of comments related to particular topics or to prioritize needed changes on that basis. General topic areas from this list are summarized in a separate document entitled Current Synopsis. Both documents will be updated monthly throughout the project.

#	Date	Source	Comment
1	Mar-17	Kick-off meeting	Would like you to focus in on the disparity of zoning regulations where the manuals overlap the zoning and the building requirements for 55+ communities. Private rooms don't have to be built to the zoning regulations. When I read through regulations and I can list it all out under this circumstance, I truly expect those regulations whether it is a privately-held community or whether it is public. What is in writing should be applied fairly across the board. They are being arbitrarily applied to benefit the developer and to the property owner's detriment. We are asking for the disparity to be stopped and there to be uniform enforcement of all regulations and if you are going to put a manual on your website then it should apply to everyone. Established neighborhoods are the backbone of every community and need same focus as Columbia. When you build as many age 55 communities as Howard County has built, you get people with life experience and time on their hands. I can't find a disclaimer that says under what circumstance this should be applied.
2	Mar-17	Kick-off meeting	Should be considering 55+ communities to make them subject to schools test. About 60% of new students come from sales of existing homes. Who knows if 20 or 30 years from now these may not be 55+ anymore.
3	Mar-17	Kick-off meeting	Would like to have a county-wide look at 55+ communities, there is a concentration because of when the land became available. The issue is because these locations are being picked without regard to the access – not walkable or near public transportation, nothing there for residents to access. Idea for senior living - would like quality of life to be increased. Would like the county to see as a whole where these should be.
4	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Also we allow land uses that are going to want transit and allow them to put them places where it is not feasible. There is a random concentration of 55+ housing. Worse, they will put them down a ¾ mile road where you wouldn't get transit service transit.
5	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Who is the age police? Who enforces this? It is a maneuver by developer to get out of the schools tax.
6	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	I got a question about someone in a 55+ community, it is a zoning trick to get you out of rules and are being manipulated. Probably should be more like retirement community.
7	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	There is some suspicion of administrative processes. There should be some things the Director should be able to do that needs to be approved administratively, but the staff is boxed in to doing a lot of review. We need better guidelines and criteria about what they can sign off on or not. Some things should be administrative.
8	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Sounds like a good idea to let professionals make professional decisions: as long as the predictable criteria are met.
9	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	How will you address the entitlement process? Administrative process could be simplified.
10	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Interest in affordable housing.
11	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	As a farmer, I see continuing and increasing conflicts between residents and active agricultural operations. I don't know what to do and see tensions going up and the very small farming population getting overridden. Somehow, we need to tone it down and work it out.
12	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	We brought up issues that ended up exploding on us – specifically, the mulch processing issue. We wanted it to be legal, but community groups opposed it and it's still unresolved.
13	Mar-17	Stakeholder	Next generation needs to find a way to make the land viable – this means expanding the way

		meeting	the land can be used.
14	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	We are a wealthy county, but land is expensive. You can't make a living on conventional farming with land this expensive.
15	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	So much farmland is preserved by easement. This is unusual and needs to be looked at as part of the assessment.
16	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Make the zoning clear, in terms of what we can and can't do.
17	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Community groups want assurance and exact specifications – they want to know what to expect from farm operations.
18	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Agriculture should also be viable in the east of the county. It might be great to have broad categories, but we need more standards to allay neighbors. Be general, but recognize that it's already hard to farm in the east. The community wants to be protected and know the scale of operations allowed.
19	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	People complain over small changes to farms and DPZ sides with the complainers - rather than seeing the economic benefit of the cause/change.
20	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	The Hudson case affected farming community concerns – lawsuits take a farmer's money.
21	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Why, when subdividing small lots, do we have the same process as large subdivisions?
22	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	When a development goes in, the farm's property setback increases. If the farm was there first, why is the farmer penalized with increased setbacks?
23	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Megachurches shouldn't be in rural areas, just because the land is available.
24	Mar-17	Kick-off meeting	Large industrial operations are zoned agriculture and they have expanded beyond what is applicable for a rural setting. We need better checks/control over gradual expansion.
25	Mar-17	Kick-off meeting	Define agriculture. We need streamlining.
26	Mar-17	Kick-off meeting	Big problem in defining what is industrial vs. what is agriculture.
27	Mar-17	Kick-off meeting	Use of conditional use permits and waivers, now called "alternative compliance", should be eliminated.
28	Mar-17	Kick-off meeting	End the use of alternative compliance.
29	Mar-17	Kick-off meeting	A specific regulation that applies to development - there is a proposed 250 unit residential development and as part of APFO it has to estimate the traffic impacts. The part that made no sense to me was they only had to assess the impact of the traffic within a radius of 1 mile, but the impact will be on thoroughfares. Our neighborhood is slightly more than 1 mile away and people will go right through our neighborhood. I would like to see that test changed – that the assessment should be to the nearest interstate.
30	Mar-17	Kick-off meeting	APFO – we have been making sure we have enough infrastructure – right now it is lacking. That is in the zoning code - is that something that would be worked on?
31	Mar-17	Kick-off meeting	Quality of life is high – but there are concerns related to development - maintaining a quality school system and traffic. Risk of flooding puts the county at risk. New development brings revenues, but I am concerned that will not be enough to keep up the school system and mitigate flood risk. Report expressed higher service demands - laws on the books should be followed.
32	Mar-17	Kick-off meeting	The ongoing APFO - the way forward is uncertain. Should be revised to include flood mitigation and flood modeling requirements.
33	Mar-17	Kick-off meeting	Found that the APFO process is not effective. That effort has already taken place, but recommendations were sadly lacking. There were no meaningful changes and we are completely dissatisfied. Would like to see a better look taken at it.
34	Mar-17	Kick-off meeting	One thing that would be really good - plan for public facilities holistically in the course of overall planning. There is no big picture look at public facilities needed to support resulting density from zoning changes. APFO law is reactionary and punitive for projects that one could

			anticipate. Wind up playing catch-up. Try to integrate facilities planning into the totality of planning process (applause).
35	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Can we talk about scope – how much of the outcome of this are you bound by, what we currently cover in zoning? What I spoke of last night was holistically planning for public facilities. One could have on the table, publicly available, a plan that describes the need for public facilities. Zoning and development regulations could keep that in mind.
36	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	One thing out of task force for APFO – would it be included in the review process as part of this?
37	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Don't take the APFO as the given, it exists in a context, could get some value out of the context.
38	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Making sure that residential development doesn't outpace public facilities.
39	Mar-17	Kick-off meeting	When we address traffic, it's only in terms of the individual development, but it should take a broader look.
40	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	The Planning Board sits in 3 different capacities, meeting, decision, advisory.
41	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Right to cross-examine is there - rare that it happens in government.
42	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	It just seems to me that for the whole process, so much could be distilled down, but it goes so out of bounds. The rules are the rules and the criteria, but it doesn't stay in check. The public is allowed to just run amuck, because there is a fear that the Planning Board is cutting the public off. Fear that you have to allow anything that they want to say. I've seen other jurisdictions ask - how does this impact you?
43	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Repeated appeal and de novo appeals. Procedures.
44	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	To add to the Hearing Examiner and Board of Appeals issues, I know we will be here 7 nights, but then we only get one date scheduled. The first night we are there until 10:00, but then the next hearing date can be 2 ½ months down the road. Cases like Bethany Glen should have known hearing dates – and not 2 ½ months in between.
45	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Last thing I want to add is that DPZ are the professionals, my frustration is we are dealing with laypeople on these boards. It is very frustrating to hear the opposition working angles that are clearly out of bounds, but it makes sense to people on the board but it is not vetted.
46	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Board of Appeals – DPZ can't help them or train them, they are appointed by Council. Executive nominates or Council approves - don't know how that training happens.
47	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	If you start with a general plan a layperson board is okay, but they have so much discretion.
48	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	A good thing out of Montgomery County's process – they had special exceptions, but created a limited use, basically a special exception. That took the discretion out of some things that would ordinarily go to Board of Appeals.
49	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	All the time, public wants us [the Planning Board] to deny something and we can't.
50	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Rules of procedure have been preempted because they aren't codified.
51	Mar-17	Kick-off meeting	Is it normal for zoning board to be Council?
52	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	We're talking buildings, structures. There are also historic sites – like a cemetery. The Board is advisory only – partially some cemetery people don't know it is there. A developer might come in and find a cemetery – falling into a unique trap where developers can just take them out, despite legal issues.
53	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	It depends, the recent case is fresh. The developer should have known – most will look at title of property (due diligence). In this case, one deed mentioned a family cemetery and the developer should have known. On a site visit they saw the headstones, but they are pretending that they had no idea and stumbled across it later in process. That would then be different situation – have to refer to Cemetery Advisory Board (CAB) to make a recommendation. Another situation - it is a surprise when bulldozers start. There is no process in place for DPZ to stop and refer over

			to the CAB, if advised then what? What's our threshold? One burial behind a strip mall? 3? 5? 10? What is the trigger? Our comments are just advisory, no teeth at all.
54	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	State's Attorney's office is involved with approving a disinterment because it could be a criminal matter. They don't really want to be involved - but they must legally authorize all disinterments – it is in code. The state's attorney doesn't necessarily check that a disinterment meets the criteria.
55	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Yes - the follow up is by statute rather than Code. Once there has been a disinterment, there is nothing to require a developer to disclose it. Do you think a home purchaser would be more wigged out if there is a cemetery in a development or if one has been removed?
56	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Why aren't developers required to develop around cemeteries?
57	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	That's why you need a designer to figure out how to capitalize on design. Why do I have to guarantee the maximum development potential? The developer speculated on a piece of ground. The larger issue – why do we respect these aspects - I don't want to live in a community that would blow off a cemetery because it hindered someone's bottom line.
58	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	There's an issue of how the government does business. In Ellicott City, government is one of biggest property owners – and what do they do to maintain their properties? Relative to historic structures - thinking about the old jail it needed a new roof, yet they didn't have to follow guidelines. County owned properties do have to come before us for Certificate of Appropriateness. This year I think it is really important to look at how the County will guide that process – properties that are really important and county-owned and how they will be protected - and regardless of ownership. Regulations will be the teeth that make sure that it happens.
59	Mar-17	Kick-off meeting	You work with cities, but not so much counties. One of the issues here is this is a big amorphous triangular thing. There are a few historic areas with character, but mostly not. All new development doesn't have character - how to deal with that? Here, there isn't really a strong look. In Columbia do we keep it looking like it did when we moved here?
60	Mar-17	Kick-off meeting	Trying to better understand existing character versus intended character and how the zoning code would incorporate both of those. Two neighborhoods – how does the zoning code incorporate neighborhoods that want change and ones that don't? Does the whole code apply to the whole county? If a community in a certain area wants a particular zoning designation - what would happen? Sounds like you are saying - your rule book does not allow certain communities to gain historic status even if they want to? Do any of those zoning codes enable the community themselves to have the power to make change happen - rather than the map?
61	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Another issue is that amendments are made by Council not by DPZ.
62	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	I live and work in Columbia and we are surrounded by out-parcels that are not part of the New Town zoning. Interesting that no one spoke last night about anything related to Columbia. Personally, I think that the development process in Columbia is onerous and has so many steps, but across the street they can easily get through the process. There is an imbalance that isn't fair. We should be balancing the requirements across the County - find a way to incorporate changes to non-New Town properties that are adjacent to New Town.
63	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Rouse was a mall developer and used those techniques to develop a City.
64	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	I have always viewed Columbia as a planned community and want to keep it that way – and yet plan for redevelopment. While Columbia is pretty much done, it really isn't - it will always change. I want to keep it as a planned community, but from my perspective, New Town zoning has some positive features and some things that need to change. The preliminary development plan set up the structure, then the sketch plans, then final development plans. One of the problems, because it was new, every FDP is different - individual. It would be nice to make a template so that we can move toward similar FDPs. The other thing is that comprehensive sketch plans present a unique opportunity for redevelopment. How can you make it enforceable - New Town does that because of the comprehensive sketch plans. You should think of them as an overall plan, since the FDP must comply with the CSP. I see the CSP as the planning view and then you have the FDP. If you focus on just a handful of CSPs to cover all Columbia, that's where you put all your community input - then redevelopment should move along on a fast track. We've already had arguments/discussions - it would be better to focus efforts on CSPs, because

			when you get to the FDPs you are getting really technical.
65	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Had a role when Rouse was developing, sketches of different areas, that was ok because he had open land. I would look at CSPs more as a redevelopment plan. We had the downtown plan, we put that all in the regulations in the New Town zoning. What if they had developed a CSP for all of downtown? It still could control everything downtown, but then you don't have to change the regulations. Another thing I like is that in Downtown development, put rules in place and then put property owners in position to change the FDP. Could use the same process, I see a heavy role for the County in all this.
66	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	See a role for CA in developing plans – we are a large property owner and a huge part of New Town.
67	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	In my view, I wish the Rouse company had produced a synopsis of the overall plan, right now it is embedded in the FDP, where hotels go, here's where other uses go, he must have had an overall plan and implemented it through the FDPs. Unfortunate that Rouse didn't keep an overall structure - what the intent was. In the FDPs, they were careful about land that bordered residences - restrictions were specific.
68	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Make sure that you know that the County took all FDPs and digitized them, it is basically the zoning. So that is really wonderful and something we had asked for. As you are looking ahead, if you wanted to generalize districts in future, that will help you to understand what would be allowed. The New Town proportions of uses, and counting of land uses hinders redevelopment. There is a need to have more residential eventually. Some in the community use the term a "gatekeeper rule" and they mean the master developer, but there isn't one. People confuse that term with covenants. They think there should be someone who intervenes in this - Howard Hughes was doing that. Make sure you ask people what they mean by "the petitioner". Another issue will be affordable housing, Columbia was built with affordable housing, but is exempt from MIHU (Moderate Income Housing Unit program) requirements. Some people want affordable housing, some people think we already have too much. We have a lot more than rural areas of course. It does need to be looked at. The process we've talked about is terrible, if you want redevelopment. The processes are predictable, but they take forever - it is not balanced.
69	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	36% open space, is required in NT - that is a planned value, anything to reduce or change that would be a no-go. The way it is accounted for (credited) - if I take 2/10 of an acre of open space, I must find it elsewhere in the open space bank. This is mostly non-buildable land that developer gave, that is one of the planned Columbia values. When you need a bit more parking, a developer needs to get it from somebody else (HRD).
70	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Whether it is a planned community or just nomenclature – there has to be something that separates Columbia from the rest of the County. With that said, we are in the middle of two major metro areas and you don't want so few options where people don't want to deal with it or redevelop it. I was bothered when I moved here by the limited housing stock and how old it is. I don't know if that is related to zoning, or just that our housing stock is aging. I don't think it will be attractive going forward for next 50 years. Just as those social concepts that make Columbia different; being a planned community also keeps it different. But, we want to modernize and remain competitive.
71	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Only thing to add – my concerns are about the areas where there aren't FDPs, but that are still in Columbia. Over time they might change and at some point – Dobbin Road, retail mixes, etc. – overall, how do they fit in? In Hickory Ridge we have lots of outparcels and it creates a challenge because when you're in Columbia, it's hard to define an exact boundary - there's a certain feel to the planned parts of Columbia. Resubdividing R-20 zoned lots - how does that fit into rest of Columbia? Dorsey's search is outside the NT zone.
72	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	For a mature community like Columbia - how does it fit in? What are the buffering requirements for uses? There should be guidance on that. New Town is the only zone without a purpose statement. I want to understand what NT is for? There are concerns from everyone – some people like it some people don't. I would like to see contextual models from other cities.
73	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	I still get the question about Reston and Columbia – what's the difference? Except for downtown, Columbia is not as fresh as it should be – it looks like a 50 year old community.
74	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Just like Mr. Rouse, they were cutting edge and avant garde. I would like to see this rewrite be avant garde and make Columbia cutting edge. Anticipate and think for the future.
75	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	When we get to writing the rules it will be tough. When we changed downtown we changed industrial parks, but we have never changed residential. It hasn't even come up - wait until we

			have to change that.
76	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	You lose people if the process doesn't keep momentum.
77	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	One of the differences is that people know we have New Town zoning and they are comfortable with it - people don't think it can be changed.
78	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	In defense, there was a big change to the Village Centers – enough flexibility to redo Village Centers with more residential.
79	Mar-17	Kick-off meeting	I have had discussions with the County a number of times and you are probably aware that Columbia has a unique system of planning. My question is that the County has said they will not get involved with covenants that run with the land, yet without the covenants, Columbia doesn't work. How far are you going with Columbia?
80	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	So those are key geographical areas and you hit on the covenants. The covenants in New Town and Downtown Columbia; the reality is we have a great master plan, but don't really control land use or density - Howard Hughes does. The same thing will affect every, or almost every, village center - same for the office parks. How does private entity have zoning power?
81	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	The County should be mindful of the DRRA.
82	Mar-17	Kick-off meeting	Conditional use applications for communication towers – diligent attempts to locate them on governmental structures - existing buildings, but in the RRDEO they can put it anywhere if they can't find a structure over 50 feet – and there are no structures over 50 feet in that zone. No longer can we put antennas on our poles or water towers. What's not in the code, but is clear, is that schools cannot have towers – this is an unwritten rule. Where can communications companies collocate outside of Columbia? The loophole that is being taken advantage of is - residents have no legal say. I'd like to see the code change that communication towers must build on governmental buildings, not in residential communities.
83	Mar-17	Kick-off meeting	Under fed law, it is illegal to argue placement of towers emitting radiation. Address placement of cell towers in zoning so that they aren't placed on school sites
84	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	When we come back for retrofit projects, if we acquired an easement – in the process of review there is no institutional review, which has caused a lot of friction. The other issue we are dancing around is complete streets. It is an ugly debate - maybe we could talk about it during this process? There are a lot of issues with complete streets and we are not set up to do that. A resolution was passed, but it hasn't been implemented.
85	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	With complete streets, there are competing interests – green infrastructure versus fire truck access - there are differences of opinion.
86	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	That's where complete streets come in for me - it is a vision of how things should look. Development patterns completely affect what we can do on the transportation system. We have a very circuitous public transit system because of street layout. People also want to develop way out, but there is no way to connect them with transportation system, except for single-occupant vehicles. I think this is because people fail to even consider transportation in the development regulations, such as bicycles. Should there be a bus stop at the end of ¼ mile road? We build uses that need transportation far from where transportation can go. I don't see transportation considered much at all and the built environment has a significant impact on people's health.
87	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	I see developments go in with a slip lane with no consideration for what that does to pedestrian or bike. Design manuals get down into the weeds - regulations talk about extending sidewalks, but nothing about bike lanes.
88	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	We are still building developments without sidewalks.
89	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	When you get pushback - we are not accounting for the entire cost. If the only way to get to a development is by car - then parking is needed everywhere.
90	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Take a look at the new Bicycle Master Plan also adopted recently and a Pedestrian master plan that is about 10 years old.
91	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	The other thing I wonder about - and I have not read the current zoning code, is Transit Oriented Development. I'm a firm believer that transit is critical for economic development. There is talk of BRT up US 29, all things to incorporate transit to Columbia. There are a couple opportunities for TOD, some zoning codes have incorporated TOD overlay districts, with

			reduced parking requirements and increased density.
92	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Have you ever seen somebody use any type of mixed use parking rather than so many parking lots? Bike parking, transit, etc.
93	Mar-17	Kick-off meeting	I have been through 2 comp zonings: we were promised access and our voices heard, but that never happened. In 2013 I realized all our work was cherry picked to fix the easy stuff and ignore all the nuisance things. I want commitment for access to the process and that we are listened to through the whole thing.
94	Mar-17	Kick-off meeting	Way too many conditional uses – probably people don't realize this – you can divide the single-family lot into two and that kind of flexibility isn't desirable. You move into a neighborhood because it has character, you should be able to keep it.
95	Mar-17	Kick-off meeting	I'd like to talk about need to tweak the conditional use application. Not a minor tweak. A petition for a conditional use… information regarding noise, dust, fumes, vibration, waste, or other physical conditions resulting from the use, which may have adverse impacts. I raised privacy, I was told that does not fall in that category. Well what does "other" mean? Went deeper into the code – special conditions for utilities – ask that it will not detrimental to privacy. When I mentioned that to DPZ staff, they said that was an oversight and needs to be changed. That needs to be changed.
96	Mar-17	Kick-off meeting	Conditional use issues – fairly new thing, not in place when I was younger. It has allowed a lot of development that people are not happy about – recommend eliminating conditional uses, especially ones that increase zoning (applause).
97	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Conditional use permits is a concern. They are relatively new tool for Howard County and (at least we believe it is) we don't know that there is a clear direction. How are they working - I think the citizenry doesn't feel that they have been heard?
98	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Third, I think conditional uses are overused, I think we need more zones or overlays. Need to have greater predictability of what can be done in what zones and what shouldn't be allowed. Conditional uses undermine predictability.
99	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	First, making sense of the zoning regulations. In my position on the Board, I see that there are so many matters for conditional uses where we look at something and don't know which way it is going, simple is good.
100	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Private schools are often very contentious, but you need private schools, so define what they can be. Why force schools to go through these hearings - give a chance to not have a hearing. Limited use recommendation – and use objective standards, really a hearing?
101	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Conditional use for a research facility. Percent of open space seems a little high, especially considering our forest conservation easement requirements.
102	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	130-3c appendix – laundry list of conditional use criteria that lends itself to either side of a debate - depending on how you spin it.
103	Mar-17	Kick-off meeting	The County needs to stop counting votes when it comes to passing conditional use.
104	Mar-17	Kick-off meeting	Conditional uses should go away. Higher densities are allowed by conditional use policies and they are used as a backdoor by developers.
105	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	The process for developing a piece of land - you bring in the engineers and they will lay something out, but it is done without any understanding of architecture and building typologies. It is strictly an exercise of how much can you pack in. A recent example came in with a layout and lot lines that did not understand/recognize what kind of buildings will be built. There was no appreciation of topography. I then see the architect who must come in later and build to a layout created by an engineer. This is especially a problem in this area - with a lot of topography. This is more about raw land, but there isn't that much left. The dilemma I still see is that people are developing land based on speculation. That process doesn't work.
106	Mar-17	Kick-off meeting	There has been an effort to increase transparency and opportunities for comment – like the DAP. We greatly appreciated that, however, the DAP only submits comments that don't have any weight, no teeth in this. Very happy to see the astute commentary of this panel of experts but would like their comments to be turned into their own approval process, or would like them to issue an opinion – and DPZ is bound to that decision.
107	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	On the DAP, we are only advisory, but have no power.
108	Mar-17	Stakeholder	Route 1 schools must go before the DAP - it feels less advisory.

		meeting	
109	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	While it doesn't always come through – every group that weighs in on a project gives you more clarity or insight. The big thing is that except for the Route 1 and Route 40 manuals – you get the feeling that even though we have these massive regulations - what are we going to end up with? I don't feel that there is some ideal we're working toward.
110	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	It seems like, given the comp plan, and in a greater sense with the growth Tiers - you can tell when you are going through a Tier area. But, Route 1, it looks like canyon of apartments and we can't figure out what it is going to be. That's why the manuals are important, they tell you what we'd like to end up with - more so than the regulations. I come from the field of architecture – what is the big picture?
111	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	At least once a month I want to set the manuals on fire. They are getting dated, there are inconsistencies, the zoning is updated, but the manuals aren't. The studies and findings that were the basis for the manual - are those still valid 10 years later? Maybe they need to be looked at more often. Some of the language in them, 3 people can come up with different conclusions, it uses language that is flowery. Those are a few of the issues. There is a lot of gray area. There are conflicts between landscaping diagrams versus what is in the landscape manual. On Route 1 where the manual requires a complete hedge - what business wants that? I know we keep a running list of things to change – as new projects come in you see a new issue.
112	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Coming from outside a planning world and reading a manual, based on some of the reading the intent is inferred, but a person from the outside looking in, the wording is off and not complete – it's jargon-y and outdated.
113	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	I understand the words in the first half and not the last half of a paragraph.
114	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	The use of acronyms is also the same issue.
115	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	If you do articles for certain magazines, they have voice editors - there should be something like that for manuals.
116	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Interaction between manuals and guides and policy – latest thinking that we have struggled with that to articulate a vision for code.
117	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	The Forest Conservation Manual is very outdated as to what can be credited - offsite/onsite open space areas.
118	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Landscape Manual – pushback on different aspects of the manual (design on Rt. 1 and 40, and Columbia)
119	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Landscape manual is too weak - if landscape architects were involved it would be better. Flexibility should be offered to those who know what they're doing.
120	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Recognizing that the comp plan sets the tone and the framework for development, zoning is the implementation tool - it's a much finer grained thing with the details. Great plans can get subverted by zoning regulations that are full of holes and loopholes. There may not be enough teeth in the zoning regulation to make the plan work. The goal should be - the quality of the development that we are getting. My group came up with cluster regulations and the first project done was superb, but it seems to be going downhill. There doesn't seem to be a mechanism to guarantee quality future development. We will always get development – but how do we build quality development and how do we make it better? The underlying basis of zoning is residential use and all other competing uses have to work within that residential framework. Protecting residential environments should be the number one option as we try to accommodate competing interests.
121	Mar-17	Kick-off meeting	Many property owners don't even know they have easements - this information should be easier to find.
122	Mar-17	Kick-off meeting	In terms of the work scope, Columbia and villages have been mentioned, but there are a lot of people from Ellicott City. It is an historic city and a very important part of this project. - don't forget us in Ellicott City.
123	Mar-17	Kick-off meeting	HowardCounty2030 shows historic Ellicott City as the highest tier of growth and revitalization. The watershed should be removed from that highest tier and should be reconsidered based on a risk of flooding.
124	Mar-17	Kick-off meeting	Ask them to end development in the historic district to preserve historic nature of the existing city.

125	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Isn't it in the county's best interest to consider this at the same time as the EC master plan?
126	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	I think the word master plan is an old word that used to identify uses and square feet of development. The goal of the master plan – identify a policy statement that would embrace the highest and best use for a site.
127	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	For Ellicott City, when we talked to retail experts they told us that we need to increase residential units within walking and biking distance. But when you get more than 50 feet out of the city there are no sidewalks or trails and we don't connect to anybody. When we talk about creating density, people are scared to death about the next flood. We will be fighting these issues - how to get people into Ellicott City, more people in town, and how to create more housing. Also, how to deal with people who come in and say – "stop all development." We really need to make Ellicott City what it needs to be.
128	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	We need to think about fragmented property ownership. Many owners are stymied by the process to the point where they don't reinvest in their own properties, they just sit on them. Many are family-owned.
129	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	They may have inherited property and they're not vacant. The problem is the quality of reinvestment in existing buildings. Owners aren't particularly sophisticated or motivated to reinvest in their properties. After the flood, many didn't reinvest with the best flood resistant materials possible. There are people who want to invest in their existing or historic buildings, but they find the change of use process too onerous. They want to make retail space a restaurant – but, it is too onerous, so they don't even try.
130	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	There is also an outside liquor issue with sidewalk cafes.
131	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	The nuclear issue on Main Street – allow on-street parking or not.
132	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	The problem is you have a town with a suburban mentality - how do you encourage a more urban mindset with people who have a very suburban one?
133	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	This touches on Ellicott City, I am assuming the analysis will address preservation.
134	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	We are investigating whether a Business Improvement District would be a good idea. We are really trying – we're functioning as a mini chamber of commerce to encourage highest and best use, but property owners find the process too onerous.
135	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Regarding tourism – Airbnb and the sharing world - they are doing it illegally. Addressing that question one way or another would be healthy. How much does the County want to address beautification? How do you create a cohesive district to make it a more salable retail experience? Someone higher up should make that decision – that's something that we could use.
136	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Make it easier to use tools that incentivize higher-end, nicer restaurants.
137	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	How can we get an upscale B&B? We had a conversation about a fantastic home, if it could become a B&B it would encourage high-end businesses on Main Street. If you make something beautiful like that, they will come.
138	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Those businesses are so hard to make money off of, so they need to make it a little more affordable.
139	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	We have our eye on the Courthouse – what cool adaptive reuse opportunities are there for buildings that are coming on the market?
140	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	From our vantage point, we are very excited about this process.
141	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	There are hundreds of things that need to be addressed, but I want to talk big picture. The big one is the process - we go through all these technical reviews and then it gets time to build. Who is in charge of enforcing what gets built? There is no real hammer for that – an SDP violation might not get found - there is no field enforcement.
142	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Required handicapped spaces are shown on plans, but no one is making sure they actually got built.
143	Mar-17	Stakeholder	We have a certification process for grading, but all other stuff goes through. Developers often sell after plans are approved – so there is a hole in the process and the big picture is lost.

		meeting	
144	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Maryland's HOA law is decrepit - HOAs can go out of business and leave issues like private facilities or stormwater management unresolved. The HOA didn't take them over so they just walk away - no one is responsible. What is the current standard - when things go well it is not an issue, but 8/10 times it is.
145	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	The Hearing Examiner has discretionary authority to approve or disapprove - my general rule, approve with conditions. What happens to the conditions of approval - are they applied later in the process?
146	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Most of the easily developed land has been developed – we are now looking at marginal lands with environmental features and that are fragile. They have issues like site access, steep slopes, or something else. I see where regulations need to get tighter - is there some land that shouldn't be developed? As a farmer I see regenerative agriculture as one of the things coming into the farming community. I watched a nearby farmer remove topsoil, put on grass/sod, and then say they are done. We have problems with impervious surfaces – so we need to increase organic matter during development. Mandate 3% organic matter or provide incentives.
147	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	You could also touch on mass grading in general – once you do that you've lost your ability.
148	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	The steep slopes definition is not helpful - only 25% and higher slopes that are a contiguous area of 20,000 sf or larger are protected.
149	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	We have put a lot of money into WIPs (Watershed Improvement Plans), but new development doesn't look at them. We are losing opportunities - make sure that WIPs are part of development review.
150	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	The water resources element was done beautifully and there were good suggestions on next steps. Rather than enumerate them I would reference that there are good next steps.
151	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Forest conservation- too many trees are being lost.
152	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	We have forest conservation requirements and then they replant an area with tiny trees.
153	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	From a science point of view - look at regulations and stream buffer widths. The science indicates buffers should be wider to preserve streams and water quality. While this deals with stream buffers, it relates to headwaters - retaining those is critical to stream hydrology. It is important that they are also buffered. If you mass grade a site and turn it into an impervious surface, you will not get the topsoil back. Maintain natural areas and clear only what you must. If you've cleared the whole site you are in a hard spot. The County has mapped certain sensitive areas and created a green infrastructure network map. Since the County has already created the map (*Greenprint – state of Maryland) it should be highlighted in the regulations. These areas will require special protection in the code.
154	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Once we can convince people that stormwater is an issue, we can convince them that green infrastructure is important.
155	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	The area on Route 40 in front of the shopping, is being clear cut. The buffer has been there 20 years and has large 75-100-year-old trees. Rather than follow the master plan guidelines the trees have been removed and the land is being graded. The shopping center wants more visibility, but the land is on the edge of a protected wetland. Removing the trees has had a big impact on the area. The regulations should prohibit such clearing, since the point of the Route 40 manual is to make it look natural. The things intended to protect the corridor have failed and while the Route 40 manual is binding - DPZ can deviate from it. Not sure how they do that - it is really hard to understand. I've seen plans get developed - it takes a lot of time to look at the regulations – streamlining would help the public better understand them and it would help the process.
156	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Many trees are coming down in commercial corridors and Ellicott City. For the area being cleared on Route 40, I can see the logic (the public can't see the shops), but that is bull. They just don't want to maintain the landscape. I've seen landscapes being put in new projects - I've also seen them taken out and replaced with lawn. If it worked in beginning, why didn't you put it back - blight affects me. Development with open space is important.
157	Mar-17	Stakeholder	I have seen projects with very tall retaining walls – 20-30 feet – at the new shopping center on

		meeting	Marriottsville Road and townhouses. Those walls are there because the developer couldn't have been able to develop the land - it is an environmental hazard – but allowed maximum development. Lost a lot of beautiful rolling topography, which is essential to protecting wetlands.
158	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	We have so few properties that are candidates for conservation easements, based on talking to property owners. It seems like we could have a better program for those properties. One property didn't have conservation value - we created buffers. There are a lot of complex properties and there are different ways the County could work - be better organized when anyone hears about available land. Not sure how much this is involved with regulations.
159	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	There are no tools for nonprofits, no incentive for them to put in easement, no tax credits. There are some significant properties owned by nonprofits.
160	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Tree planting is great, but we are losing a variety of habitats, meadows, and habitats for monarchs. It would be nice to see if there is a way to do tree planting or establish a meadow - encourage a variety of methods.
161	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	In our office we have 2 meadows and we see the potential for us to manage them. The problem is the lack of incentives - we don't get any money for it. We are required to do 16 acres of forest conservation and we can get money to manage them, but not for meadows – no forest conservation credits for doing that.
162	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	A bit on the cutting edge, good for pollinators, 400 species of native bees in Maryland. Even small areas can bring back a lot of pollinators.
163	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Biggest groundcover is turf and when land is developed there is mass grading. Is there anything that allows developers to not mass grade?
164	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	That is one of the biggest things we can do is limit mass grading. Another option is to add organic matter, etc., or just leave natural land. That is the way to can achieve hydrology goals - fingerprint development.
165	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	I moved in right after the moratorium was lifted in Ellicott City, lots of environmental protections. I understand the purpose of density is to leave other parts open. We are getting really dense communities to accommodate the environment, but density creates own issues. Through waivers, retaining walls, other tools, they are way over-maximizing what they can do on a lot. Parking spaces are so small; development is getting denser and less environmentally sensitive.
166	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	The Patuxent watershed is 85,000 acres and 53% is in Howard County. Drinking water from that source serves 650,000 people. According to MDE both waters are impaired by sediment. Sodium chloride has tripled in the reservoirs since 1990 – presumably from road salt. Do regulations recognize that development is impacting this with runoff from impervious surfaces? I keep hearing that there aren't many parcels left, but there is some wisdom at looking at local/regional water supplies, instead of only bay-wide. For instance there is a 9 acre piece up for development adjacent to one of the reservoirs. What are the existing regulations and is there any recognition that this is important?
167	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Primary Management Area as a possible example with enhanced buffers on stream mainstems and tributaries and enhanced buffers in the watershed. Stream buffers – a study found that a minimum of 100 feet was sufficiently wide to trap sediment. Not sure what they are here, whether they flex according to steep slope or to respond to wetlands. To me that would be an easy thing to look at - to see if that could be enhanced.
168	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Include uplands in stream buffers.
169	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	We straddle the Metropolitan District in our neighborhood and there are only 5 houses on Rockburn Branch. 8 years ago the County said because they are now in the Metro District sewer must be provided. Ultimately we got that pushed back into year 10. None of us want sewer and the Rockburn Branch is important. Look at the Metro District boundary and where sewer lines are located - don't require automatic boundary changes to put in sewer if none is needed.
170	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	I assume that we are incorporating Department of Public Works - saddened they don't have a representative here. This is where the rubber meets the road. DPW says something different than DPZ. Does DPW have a sustainability person?
171	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	You can streamline the regulations all you want but DPW does whatever it wants.
172	Mar-17	Stakeholder	Environmental Sustainability Board – request meeting for update on process.

		meeting	
173	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Interest in environmental preservation.
174	Mar-17	Kick-off meeting	A balance with the environment - I know individual departments have to make their own decisions and sometimes the left hand doesn't know what the right hand is doing. Another fundamental principle is that Howard County wants a self-sustainable water supply but there are limits on drinkable watershed. What are we going to do about it? Seems like nobody is paying attention to that.
175	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	We need to consider microgrids and the electrical easements, as well as water treatment facilities. Need to provide space for more facilities.
176	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Utilities code does not take into account changing technology.
177	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	You shouldn't be able to build a house with 4 houses surrounding it on all sides. Then there is no side, front, or back. That goal just maximizes density.
178	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Don't surround a house with houses on all sides.
179	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Flag lots – I hate them.
180	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Common driveways are allowed off a cul-de-sac or a major road stem. The length of the driveway is an issue. In Columbia, they are not allowed, because there are restrictions on flag lots. In other areas they are allowed resulting in weird situations where the front of a house looks at the back of another. Townhouse communities have a similar issue - we can service 75% of development projects, but not the 25% that don't provide a turnaround for service vehicles.
181	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	We get a lot development projects that have 8 (8 is the maximum) houses with what is really a long driveway. At some point this is a street disguised as a driveway; but you can't ask for public amenities if it is a "driveway" not a street.
182	Mar-17	Kick-off meeting	Looking at the overall goals, I have some reservations about flexible provisions. If anything, the existing code is too flexible. We are an established place; we have a lot of established communities. Don't let people ruin aesthetics or streets. It is way too easy to get variances.
183	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Concerns about what appears to be non-uniform enforcement of existing regulations. A clear way is to have contradictory regulations firmed up. There are areas of the code where the goal is for flexibility and other parts where you want more stringent regulations and protections. In other areas, clearing up subjective terms would be a goal.
184	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Don't have a particular issue, but I think generally people are for simplicity and flexibility, but it is hard to reconcile that for legislative issues.
185	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Need predictable regulations.
186	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	I am from the southeastern part of county, maybe in Columbia things are too rigid, but in the southeast the process is not rigid enough. Those comments have all come up already.
187	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Disappointing - I recognize this is political process, but the big fights should be at the master plan level, to the extent that the regulations can constrain the amount of discretion after being adopted by legislative body. There shouldn't be unfettered discretion by implementing agencies. One thing to keep in the code is the decisions the staff gets to make here (versus Montgomery County's process).
188	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	That would be my concern – the flexibility. Howard County has been pretty good over the years with flexibility. Not one size fits all. You want flexibility to create the best project. My concern is that we would lose that flexibility.
189	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	One comment that I share with you – I used to tell people that I was proud it was a pleasure doing business in Howard County. I am not hearing that anymore, to my disappointment - I now hear the exact opposite. We hear that it is a real bear to do business in Howard County – that is the sentiment that is going around. That it is not pro-business. There are too many hearings. It is because of citizen engagement and the people that show up to meetings. They are particularly energized and vocal. They've made it really hard to do business in Howard County, so businesses are taking business elsewhere.
190	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	We hear it from engineers and consultants that Howard County is easy to work in, but not from the citizens.

191	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Consistency is important so if you end up in an appeal, there is internal consistency in the code. Particularly with New Town and the rest of County. The relationship between subdivision and site plan and terminology - is it the same plan or is it not, to clarify that is important. Another thing, like in Montgomery County, I would question the conclusion that the code has to be readable by everyone – that effort is not worth it.
192	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	I agree. One thing to think in that direction, the flexibility is important.
193	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Ability to have DPZ make as many decisions as possible.
194	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	In your ideal code, we have all kinds of criteria for harmonious, reasonable, compatible. My client can reinter grave sites if it necessary for reasonable use of land.
195	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	There was a case that defines conformance – and there are criteria for that. Doesn't go to things people might ordinarily go to. I would be cautious about going to solve a problem that might not exist.
196	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	How do you keep the plan fluid enough so that any changes doesn't have to go through waivers? Some restaurants want sidewalk cafes – they are great activator, but zoning doesn't allow a sidewalk café. Everything from signage to parking next to cafes, how to blend all of that.
197	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	We lack consistency in terms of setbacks, density etc. We have zones with no open space and some with 50%. It's a mismatched system of zones that contributes to public confusion. The public thinks developers are trying to cheat the system
198	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Rules have to be clear so that people can't take advantage of loop holes (3 story limit but there are buildings 75' tall claiming they only have 3 stories so they get away with it)
199	Mar-17	Kick-off meeting	Eliminate flood risk and place a development moratorium in Tiber Hudson watershed while flood studies are being completed. Any new development should run through a model before impacts are made.
200	Mar-17	Kick-off meeting	Development regulations should incentivize storm water management and low density development.
201	Mar-17	Kick-off meeting	Laws and regulations and how we use the land should support our quality of life - public safety has to be considered. Concerns about waivers used on steep slope - never want to see another community go through what Ellicott City did. We have learned how much you can lose and how quickly. If we don't stop and even revoke some projects that have been approved.
202	Mar-17	Kick-off meeting	Need additional stormwater management tests and 2D model studies.
203	Mar-17	Kick-off meeting	Would like to see including mitigation of stormwater management. This is a county wide issue as we have seen floods in surrounding areas. In keeping with the sustainability initiative, any development that increases density needs an adequate stormwater facility that can handle a 500 year flood.
204	Mar-17	Kick-off meeting	I'd like some action on stormwater. I'd like some specific requirements for stormwater and what should run off property. I don't think there shouldn't be development – but everyone should be responsible for what runs off their property. I have read the code and it says a 100 year storm, but it should be a specific number, cubic feet/minute. There should be a specific standard.
205	Mar-17	Kick-off meeting	There should be language addressing storm water runoff. I have talked to residents whose properties have been damaged by silt from development and they have been told they have no recourse.
206	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	One of the issues is the way stormwater management has been managed in Maryland. With rigid MS4 permits the way we handle redevelopment is not handled the same as new development, both are not held to the same standards. Could pick up a lot more stormwater management under redevelopment – but know this is part state and county regulations. We've reached point where stormwater management is an issue, but we're not doing anything about it.
207	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Also need to look at climate change, expect more storms like the flood in Ellicott. Regulations for 100 year floods may be insufficient going forward. We have to relook at regulations when comes to stormwater.
208	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	I understand that regulations are applied differently in different areas, but I haven't seen practical examples of that. I want to make sure that regulations are treating different areas differently. May need to take more measures in the Ellicott City watershed.

209	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	2 overarching controlling things: stormwater and open space. The controls should be regional. HCC has to do it parcel by parcel.
210	Mar-17	Kick-off meeting	We need to integrate state and local requirements. SWM requirements for both are confusing – what takes precedence?
211	Mar-17	Kick-off meeting	To that end, I think the current regulations are a pay to play system – if you own a large parcel you can get away with a lot. I can't open a turtle rescue, but if I owned a big enough property I could get around all of that. We bought our homes and made our lives here for a certain expectation and we'd hate to see that ruined by these regulations.
212	Mar-17	Kick-off meeting	Way back when, I was on a task force that showed that if there is a zoning action there should be a sign that posted the notice. Absolutely infuriating that when a notice was posted it was where no one could see the sign. Notices have to be easier to find on the website. I kinda know what I'm not doing, I know that I know a lot more than other people and if I can't find it, then that's not good. I should be able to go and find it like that. It shouldn't need a tutorial, it should be simple.
213	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	I think as part of process, we need to come together and say, why are we doing this? Otherwise everything is being justified on a business sense. I am concerned about community. If you legislate something, there should be preamble that says the reason, it is about community and sustainability - quality of life and economic impact.
214	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Part of looking at this includes the voices that you're hearing. How do you make sure that the regulations are for the voices that aren't here today, but would be here in the next decade.
215	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	There are always things that can be improved, but working in both Howard and Montgomery Counties, it is much better in Howard County. Part of what would be helpful to think about is how this effort gets branded when it goes public. That will impact the people who want to do business here and it should put Howard County at competitive advantage.
216	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	I agree that everyone wants to be treated fairly and predictably. I would like to see how you would go about writing a code and can never anticipate all the permutations. We need a relief valve, a human being making a decision - not just in a straight-jacket. I understand the need for a tug of war, but people don't care about economic development. Our elected officials have to decide the public policy. The same people at a meeting who want to lower the APFO allocations and decrease density are the same ones who want to increase affordable housing.
217	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Concerns about people having to relearn a document they've been working with for 27 years to make it easier for someone else to read.
218	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	There are a lot of good things so don't muck it up.
219	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Howard County does just fine.
220	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	It seems like most of the code that we are dealing with is for conditions that were current 10 years ago. What's going to happen in the McMansion communities? Who is the next generation of buyers for that?
221	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	For everybody's education, are there any case studies that you could point us to that helps us think about things we don't even know what to think about. I went to Baltimore City and they just did that. It took 15 years. With all the historic properties and waterfront, but the thing I think was interesting, these things are set and then they are quickly out of date.
222	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	How much of the zoning stuff is micromanaging?
223	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Problem with nonconforming uses.
224	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Lot mergers – internal lot line merger ability - everything goes through variance process. No regulatory authority to treat multiple lots as 1 lot.
225	Mar-17	Kick-off meeting	A better filing system is needed and easier access to that information. The website is not easy to use.
226	Mar-17	Kick-off meeting	We need a change in culture to ensure that the regulations are actually followed on the part of the County.
227	Mar-17	Kick-off meeting	Howard County is complicated. Look at other nearby counties to see how they handled issues (Montgomery and Frederick)

228	Mar-17	Kick-off meeting	Put phone numbers on the website.
229	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Another section of the County Code - the Hearing Authority. We have a system with de novo review, an administrative law judge, and when that case is over, any party or participant can appeal to a board of appeals. It is held on the record and it is a de novo review and can take 21 hearings.
230	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	The purpose of that process was to provide a petitioner the option of going to the Hearing Examiner. However, if you are coming in with age-restricted housing, why should you not have the option to bypass the Hearing Examiner and going straight to the Board? What is the purpose of Hearing Examiner? It should be based on whether we know if there is going to be controversy. Was this done to take pressure off board of appeals? Why not have two panels? We could do it like an appellate court. Delay gets really backed up. The Hearing Examiner hears everything and they end up getting appealed anyway.
231	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Key issue is administrative procedure - want a horizontally integrated administration system, but concerned with the capacity to do this. Want completeness determination of everything that comes before the hearing examiner.
232	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	The hearing examiner rules of procedure are not codified, they are adopted by resolution. They are enormously outdated. When anything is amended, there is no audit that tells what else should be amended in tandem (internal consistency)
233	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Oral argument or on the record appeal - other jurisdictions have chosen the term oral argument.
234	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Procedures from other jurisdictions that you wish were in Howard County - it is almost always a de novo appeal from the hearing examiner in the majority of charter counties.
235	Mar-17	Kick-off meeting	The historic district commission is largely advisory. Because of the shrinking nature of historic resources, and the changes and waivers, which have allowed infill development, it would be good to give the commission some teeth. A model to start with is the California Coastal Commission, for that reason people visit that coast.
236	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Redevelopment for historic areas with Font Hill Manor, as an example, which is a large piece of property. Regulations for development specify maintaining trees and the amount saved - then development is maximized for the rest of the land. Protected areas were crammed right up against the back of homes and the view-shed of the property wasn't considered. Mount Joy – was preserved all around, the site was then graded and developed with townhomes all around it. That hurt the developer and didn't help the historic preservation. Finding a balance is important. Bulk regulations for new buildings don't ensure that what is going to be built conforms to what is there – need to look at that as well. For infill development, need to look at how historic is defined. Church Road clear-cutting argument - the landscape was historic but regulations are more about structures. What is the definition of historic?
237	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	In the Historic District Commission section of the code, it refers to historic districts and gives advisory comments. There are no guidelines for other areas; just the Secretary of Interior's Standards [is this working?]. Depending whether a property is on historic sites inventory, there is a section in the subdivision regulations that applies to historic sites on the inventory, but it has no teeth and is only advisory.
238	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Often preservation comes up very late in the process – there is no explanation why this is important. Aesthetic reasons only, but there are community reasons too.
239	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	HPC advisory comments aren't just for new development or infill – they also apply if tax credits are involved. The HPC is just part of the review process (if the property is on the inventory) but, comments are always advisory. However, there are a few zone districts where they do make decisions. HPC has to make a determination of architectural compatibility for projects in an historic district and for some conditional use. The (RHED zone) in Savage is an example. It is piecemeal in specific zoning districts. Section 16.118 of the subdivision regulations applies, if a site is on the inventory. These are things to consider, but it relies on leaving the structure there. A site as has to be on the inventory before it can be considered and comments are advisory.
240	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Sometimes it is just easier for an owner to tear down or get rid of a structure by demolition by neglect - no teeth.
241	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Most people know what is on the historic inventory; there are more than 1,000 properties. It is extensive and there is an interactive map on the DPZ website. Often the inventory is triggered by application for development.

242	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	The 116 code, that was the code when the county started looking at things like highest and best use and different zones allowing different uses. Anything related to historic properties started spreading through the code, to benefit owners of historic properties. Things used to be more cohesive, but now the tools are dispersed.
243	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	How the zoning districts came to be, it seems like Lawyers Hill was created differently from Ellicott City. Within Ellicott City there are a lot of zoning districts, so zoning regulations have a lot of different issues.
244	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	16.600 HPC establishment and procedures 21.12 and 21.13 are tax credits, these are used most often.
245	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	From the public's perspective, the process works pretty well with the HPC. There are regular meetings, the members give their opinion, but it doesn't mean anything. If someone goes with a historic house to DPZ they get all their information. The historic sites survey is online and the map - all of that is good. The problem that we see is that the regulations are bad or weak, they are moving in right direction, but if a large part of the process is advisory, then it all lands on Val to make the decision. You have protections and incentives for historic properties -- those should also be looked at to encourage people to take advantage of them.
246	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	And we need more carrots too. I pass 3 structures that are National Register eligible, they are both large pieces of land that if subdivided would ruin the character. But, people get tax credits only for the structure.
247	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Would love to use density sending to send it elsewhere in the County.
248	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	There is the Ellicott City historic district and the National Road leading in. These are gateways that need to have some similar respect. There is no review process for historic roads – we need to draw a circle around the historic district.
249	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	We have at least 5 potential historic districts, but the community has no interest. Lisbon is mostly zoned for business and residents ask why historic properties are being demolished. We lost 3 historic structures to demolition. We review all of those, but there are no teeth to protect the properties.
250	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	The area is populated with people who are interested and engaged, but HPC is just advisory. The system needs to be revisited.
251	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Lisbon has very strong links to the civil war and beautiful businesses. We tried to create an historic district and we were almost run out of the room, they were not receptive. We lost the historic crossroads - when do we say to residents that there should be an historic district, but there is no will of the people?
252	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Interest in streamlining and having concise historic preservation regulations that have teeth.
253	Mar-17	Kick-off meeting	I live up the street, my family built here throughout the generations. This may upset a few, but we all know each other. There was a conflict of interest - a manipulated market during Columbia's development and a conflict of interest that has carried on for several generations. There is a culture here, but an opportunity to correct some of these issues. A National Historic Site in Savage that is potentially going to be a subdivision, but that we assumed would be parkland (and a swimming pool) and other amenities. A TOD zoning occurred up here all along Whiskey Bottom, but with no transit. Some of the worst infill developments occur with backwards, sideways, houses. We have a hearing for building on graveyards. There is very little land that is truly historic, but the very little land that we should respect is not being respected. Perhaps zoning is the way to do that.
254	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Historic properties that are owned by Rec and Parks that have zoning that doesn't allow certain uses (e.g. B and B's)
255	Mar-17	Kick-off meeting	I see you are working in Prince George's County, which is historic, but not the same as Howard County – lots of density swapping, spot zoning, creative infill, putting an excessive amount of pressure on transitional areas, making areas that are not affordable, families are being priced out. I've worked on committees for safety. We have historic resources in jeopardy right now – 3% of residences are historic, and most are in jeopardy. Because of this opportunistic zoning, we are risking environmental and historic resources.
256	Mar-17	Kick-off meeting	You mentioned implementing downtown and village regulations, but never mentioned the industrial parks, which are a huge part of Columbia and the future of those is now unguided by Rouse's vision. They represent the biggest opportunity for change for Columbia, so the future of

			those industrial parks needs to be part of your study. You can study the existing code, but it doesn't get to the nub that the uses are changing in the industrial parks. What should the future be – should be concentrating on employment in the industrial parks. Hope you will address the bigger picture there and the bigger question is for the vision for the industrial parks.
257	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Same thing with all the light industrial stuff, off Snowden River, a lot of light industrial is going to retail and commercial uses – I don't know if that is allowed in the Code.
258	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	In a place like Columbia, retail space is very expensive per square foot. In industrial parks, space is cheap, all the brewpubs and all the cool stuff is going in these ugly buildings.
259	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	One of the things we focus on is the erosion of industrial land to residential. Everything occurs between 29 and the County border for industrial, based on the higher yield for residential in lots of these places. Things like churches occupying industrial parks - that is a big thing in Baltimore County. But is it the correct use, not so much, but we are certainly not making any more industrial land. While we are the economic development authority, we should be the redevelopment authority.
260	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	We do have, especially in Columbia, some of these older industrial areas where the buildings are functionally obsolete, such as Red Branch Road and Gerwig Lane on the east side. We want to put in a gym, but it is a specialized gym for gymnastics training – the issue is the parking requirements. In Gateway we are looking at re-envisioning a 1,000 acre single-use business park with flex space and class A office space to create an innovation district with mixed-use, compact development, some residential, and more retail. There's a very limited amount of retail because there are no rooftops - need to shift those uses. There is a war on talent. There's a tremendous opportunity there, given our location, our proximity to Fort Meade and existing companies that represent opportunities for us. But we have to relook at that approach.
261	Mar-17	Kick-off meeting	I would like to see this assessment focus on protecting important natural resources – the green infrastructure network has been mapped, but it has no regulatory teeth. It should be considered as part of the new development regulations, with higher standards for protecting that resource. The Tiber Hudson Watershed in Ellicott City should be considered as a protection area for new development, redevelopment and standards need to be increased – the focus needs to be on protection and limited development.
262	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Being one of those people from outside Columbia, I recognize why Columbia gets the awards. It was the planning that went into it, not the least that Rouse bought 14,000 acres and preserved 36% as open space. By contrast, I have heard that today that 50% of land mass is developed in Howard County - that's not leaving much. The amount of infill going into established neighborhoods is a serious concern. There seems to be no emphasis on preserving green areas, particularly in sensitive areas. We have zones where the intent of the zone doesn't match with what is there, leaving citizens high and dry.
263	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Connectivity of green space - Rec and Parks should be part of the process.
264	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	There needs to be more language on best management practices for trail systems. Some developers are building trails themselves, but there still should be standards that apply. There is a document addressing best management practices.
265	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Developers are able to claim credit for open space and homeowners feel that they have been cheated when they try to use their land.
266	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Open space for commercial properties doesn't have to be deeded to Rec and Parks, while residential development provides them open space, which is adjacent to commercial (creates a noncontiguous greenway).
267	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Look at a middle ground between wanting to take over more land and not having the capacity to maintain it.
268	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Columbia open space is CA property, with the exception of a few pockets.
269	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Open space goes on any zone – it can be swapped, but cannot be sold without Council approval.
270	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Land preservation & park plan - more interest in connectivity from the state so that planned trails are finally coming together.
271	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Connectivity issues are mainly on the part of homeowners.

272	Mar-17	Kick-off meeting	We would also like a county-wide look at the use of park land. Lots of swaps for open space for density and northern part of the county got a little robbed – there are not adequate park facilities. Would like to see equal distribution of parkland.
273	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Other major issue that doesn't work is parking – people have more cars than what the regulations envision.
274	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Given the mix of uses - we have shared use with public services and housing., however, the method of calculating parking is difficult in this scenario - especially in New Town
275	Mar-17	Kick-off meeting	Ample parking is sexy, insufficient parking is not. Roads are too narrow in many communities and that can lead to poor parking situations.
276	Mar-17	Kick-off meeting	The small area plan for North Laurel and Savage, we have been kicking that around for over a decade, things get scribbled in for whatever development is in the queue. Laurel Park is an example added to master plans.
277	Mar-17	Kick-off meeting	General Plan was changed illegally (PSA), affecting 200 prime acres of land.
278	Mar-17	Kick-off meeting	Howard County is the only County without property maintenance codes – only for rental properties. Hoping that this could be considered as part of this process.
279	Mar-17	Kick-off meeting	Wanted to pick up on the comment that new codes include property maintenance. I think that is what Rouse was doing with covenants – property maintenance. However, this is a small County and I have seen issues with property maintenance. It is a complaint-driven process here. We have a very small number of people that work for the County. Codes are great if they are enforced, but I see places in Howard County, nobody has complained about so they are not fixed. It sounds good but it goes against the American psyche, we were taught to not rat on people and that's what people are being asked to do in their neighborhoods, it goes against everything you are taught.
280	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	We have an issue with timing of public amenities going in – supposedly they will put sidewalks in, but they are not there, things are opening, there's a bus stop at the bottom of the hill.
281	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Compliance with the Site Plans, there is no way to close the regulatory loop on improvements that were done. In the long run, the County could face this issue. You approved this, the developer didn't build it, what was the County's obligation to follow through? Also really pushing for connectivity between communities – bike, pedestrian, road, is there a way that we could put some sort of connectivity index process into the code?
282	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	It seems like the County takes the approach of - Thanks for developing here, do what you want - instead of requiring certain things, so it doesn't give us any teeth.
283	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	There is entirely too much public input in our system. I say that knowing we can't get rid of public input. There are opportunities for public input, but public can attend but not do anything. In Tier 3, you have to go before Planning Board, and community gets really excited to talk. But there's only one issue they can talk about – only natural resources, but they come to talk about schools, etc. Do we really need that hearing then? I don't think the public provides valuable input.
284	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Public outreach and engagement – our zoning regulations incorporate 16.128 of the subdivision regulations, the requirements for pre-submission community meetings. It has been amended 3 or 4 times – we need to hold a meeting, send out written letters to adjoining neighbors, and even PTA members. You need to schedule this and post the property and when people come you have to send out minutes and a file plan within a year or else hold the meeting again, and then within the submittal you have to send a notice 7 days before. I think we should do away with paper. No paper anymore, all notices should be by email. The burden that this puts on the small guy when you have to notice all these people. You have to know to go to the general transportation map to see if there is an adjoining property on a type of street.
285	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	If you have to have both meetings, if the failure to get a written notice, can they not convene a meeting?
286	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	I am curious about the pre-submittal meetings in Montgomery County. When the design manual came out, they didn't require the meeting, but still did them because it can help with approvals.
287	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Interesting thing – how do you think about this stuff? Also, things we don't even know. Biggest thing I fear about this process, is we are blessed, 60% of adults have advanced degrees. There are a lot of people who think they are smarter than the Planning Director, so having case studies would be very helpful for us to focus on the big issues and not get down in the weeds.

288	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Developers are always pitted against an uninformed vote (citizens).
289	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Consider uncomplicating the presubmission meeting process, especially the notification process.
290	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Community meetings with or without County staff in attendance.
291	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	The community input process keeps being expanded (every 2 years approx.).
292	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	We have to come before the community and planning board after we have already invested a bunch of money. We have to have super complicated and finished plans and the community provides advice to completely restructure the plan.
293	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Waiting until the pre-submission process is too late in the design process. The citizen doesn't get to provide meaningful input when the developer has already spent money and can't change anything. Minimize the influence of politically connected people in the process.
294	Mar-17	Kick-off meeting	I shouldn't need a public hearing to exercise my legal property rights.
295	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	We build a lot of capital projects and have to go through this process, I still think we have to go through zoning checks, but it seems to be redundant. Is there some way to simplify, but duplicate the engineering review (particularly stormwater) - would like to get rid of that.
296	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Also, on comment for county projects not going through review – the Elkridge library came through the review, and it didn't comply with the Route 1 plan.
297	Mar-17	Kick-off meeting	You mentioned the comment button. What kind of feedback will people get on their comment? How will the public know - I think it is important that we get feedback on every single question.
298	Mar-17	Kick-off meeting	You say you are very open to community feedback, who exactly does that go to?
299	Mar-17	Kick-off meeting	I was curious as to the survey, you mentioned surveys, how will you determine who these surveys get sent to? Additional suggestions – a lot of citizenry doesn't access email (elderly) we would request a mailer or postcard or something through snail mail would be greatly appreciated.
300	Mar-17	Kick-off meeting	We would like to encourage you to put together periodic summaries of what your progress has been and what you're working on. One of our issues, we don't know where we stand or what is happening – periodic updates.
301	Mar-17	Kick-off meeting	You made a comment is it valuable for input to be repetitive – on the website is there value in being on the website? Are you looking for comments or quantity of agreement?
302	Mar-17	Kick-off meeting	This is an assessment of the regulations – can you enumerate specifically which ones you are looking at. In your previous assignments, did you undertake audits of the application and administration of the regulations so that you could get some sort of assessment about how they have been performing on a historical basis. But then you would summarize your findings? Would you do a statistical sampling of all the SDP requests? Are you also going to review the Hearing Examiner and Board of Appeals approvals? A lot of jurisdictions have annual reports that summarize, but I don't think we have the staff here do that.
303	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	After the new code is drafted, I assume it would be like a zoning amendment, legislation, and County Council would approve it.
304	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	You talked about the end product of this being legislation, if there was a phase 2, would this be in lieu of the next round of comprehensive rezoning if a total rewrite was in order?
305	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Will you look at primarily zoning but also subdivisions – and landscaping and forest conservation manuals?
306	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Depending upon your recommendations, then a decision would be made about whether to go beyond step 1? I would suggest that the decision to go forward shouldn't be made prematurely. I work in Montgomery County too and what started as an effort to clarify and straighten became a much larger project. It didn't find favor with citizens and developers. It will also show how great the need is to tweak, fine-tune, or do something more substantial.
307	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	I've worked in HC for a long time, mostly in Columbia. Even if I step into a different area, I get confused about the codes and regulations. Is it normal for county to have so many different rules? Is there going to be an effort to make things simpler throughout the county?

308	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Are we going to try to fold in our policies and interpretations?
309	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	I'm new to the Planning Board; I have concerns when in a quasi-judicial meeting – the rules or procedures, and changing of the presentation order. Do those have to wait until 2019 to change?
310	Mar-17	Kick-off meeting	What are the criteria that you will have to incorporate community input, because it is very important? The criteria adopted in general plan and criteria for addressing community needs are often bypassed, such as recommendations made by the community. 30 years ago, the population and commercial development was so different, no one thought about what it would be now. How can we have a plan that looks forward 30 years in the future? We have been promised environmental protections that are not being included or adopted. How to include this into legally defensible standards.
311	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Consider R-20 as a density zone instead of an open space controlled zone
312	Mar-17	Kick-off meeting	In R-20, there are 26 conditional uses permissible – some have lots of requirements, but some have very few.
313	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Is it possible to write a code that nonprofessionals can comprehend, as well as someone who has made it their profession?
314	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Residential Environmental Development (RED) was supposed to be environmentally friendly, some things are good about it -- but we are allowing too much intensity for that space. We are allowing density bonuses that are too intense.
315	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	It was in the general plan and it was a zoning district created in the 80s. I would fight to make sure that RED stays in because it allows more agricultural uses than others. RED is mainly along Patapsco River and the state park is there. In the R-20, you are also allowed to employ the RED.
316	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	The name and the location are correct, but the name is misleading. To me, open space should be preserved space, but it is often where stormwater management goes.
317	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	RED is all over the county, but only minimally.
318	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Infill – want to be proactive to what that looks like. This will be ongoing issue – design.
319	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	I see it too, similar to that, I'm a resident in an older neighborhood. I see it working with infill development, clear a lot and new house goes in that doesn't relate to anything on the street and dwarfs the older homes. It is a design issue that I see in mature neighborhoods.
320	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	My big issues would be redevelopment, as the county has aged. Route 1 corridor, older industrial parks, trying to fit the regulations around redevelopment. Redevelopment could be greenest thing you could do, beats tearing down forest.
321	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Redevelopment too - I believe the regulations are for a County in the 60s, 70s - a greenfield. Throughout the community, there are areas where fitting in and compatibility and redevelopment is necessary to keep the community good, but the process also discourages improving properties because it is too hard.
322	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	I sat through the EDA question of how to repurpose older commercial developments. We don't have a good process to deal with redevelopment, especially on commercial side. It is a nightmare to deal with change of use - lots of issues with parking, retail taking over warehousing. There is not a clear solution. Stuff happens that you would not expect – a grocery store in an industrial building.
323	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	We have an issue with a fee-in-lieu payment for public infrastructure – the infrastructure becomes Public Works problem. We have difficult time to get right of way because we don't have quick take. "Quick-take" – needs to go on Maryland ballot though. Particularly in older infill subdivisions. Moving utility poles, especially out west – country roads with subdivisions, widening road, but then Public Works has to figure it out if they can use the fee-in-lieu to do it.
324	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	It is redevelopment and our greenfield options are limited. We are finding we have to do lots of infill. With the public's input, infill is discouraged. NIMBYs and regulations discourage infill.
325	Mar-17	Kick-off meeting	You mentioned Philadelphia and decay. If new development comes in without there being a need for it, it also vacates older areas. Is there anything in the zoning code that would address the financial implications of older buildings?
326	Mar-17	Stakeholder	From our vantage point, it is pretty clear despite Howard County being a "suburban"

		meeting	jurisdiction, we are largely built out, it is really focusing on the future and focusing on redevelopment – how to come up with a code that fosters redevelopment. We have a couple key areas within Columbia, the Village Centers (the County cares a lot because we own one and have a big vested interest) and we have a process that is very complicated and how does that fundamentally jive with the effort by the jurisdiction to foster redevelopment? We are basically discouraging redevelopment. If we look at the land use plan and targeted area of reinvestment, our friends in Ellicott City, we were part of a team for the Master Plan, how to foster, guide, encourage, guide, rather than discourage a wonderful asset to community. Also the Columbia Gateway, that is a 1,000 acre redevelopment opportunity of a typical suburban office park that doesn't work and won't work going forward with Euclidean zoning.
327	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Suggest that there is control, compress the timeline, should be able to have a shorter timeline - and try to simplify things, especially for smaller projects.
328	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	One thing in referencing the suburbs, we need to recognize that a portion of the county is changing, becoming more urban. For instance, turning radii on streets, I worked through a process in Columbia through waivers. We need to recognize that suburban model in terms of technical things just doesn't work. There are too many steps in process.
329	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	The other structural/institutional issues is that everything is backloaded into development review. For example, historic preservation commission review doesn't happen before site plan review. Community concerns could possibly be resolved if public input happens earlier in the process.
330	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	An advantage to Howard County is an objective approval process. If you meet the regulations, you are guaranteed to get your proposal passed.
331	Mar-17	Kick-off meeting	We need more stuff about infill, I live in the east on Route 1 and voted to increased density, that just sucks because there is nothing good about increased density. That part really makes people crazy - schools can't handle it.
332	Mar-17	Kick-off meeting	One thing we are dealing with is in the aftermath of the Route 1 density and development; public facilities have not kept up. The high school is vastly overcrowded; there is no place to build a high school in your community.
333	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Last big issue for Public Works, there is a very poor process to deal with stuff on Route 1 - preexisting lots, dealing more with lots as big as this room and no streets or utilities. Developers plop a house on the middle of 3 of them, but we've never really succeeded in what to do with them. These are legal lots, but there is no infrastructure - how to deal with that?
334	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	There are instances where the Route 1 manual doesn't jive with PlanHoward. There are people who spend night and day poring over manuals and codes, they lob grenades at us in meetings – especially when there is an overlay on something and it isn't entirely clear which way you're supposed to go. We don't plan, people don't understand what is going on in the room. There is inconsistent guidance. We have a clearer understanding of what ends with our panel – but people in our room don't understand. Attorneys like the ambiguity and people are frustrated by the amount of congestion.
335	Mar-17	Kick-off meeting	I live here in the SE corner of county, half is in Route 1 corridor. My main question is about revitalization, it is basically stuck forever. Is it a matter of applying the zoning regulations differently or are there new tools needed? Are things that regulations can do to revitalize this area? There's a complication in how the State controls Route 1, and things that are more important to us. How to make sure the right investments are made.
336	Mar-17	Kick-off meeting	Personally, I would like it if this area isn't where all the unwanted pieces go.
337	Mar-17	Kick-off meeting	Route 1 planning, we will give higher density for walkable amenities and good communities, and the greater community will come to visit. Only thing we've gotten is the greater density. The amenity part has been taken away in bits. Look at the deaths on Route 1. Question is, what do we do with CAC? It needs to be totally rewritten and redone, come up with alternatives, I am up in Elkridge, and we desperately need community meeting rooms, schools. Just because developers can't put in commercial doesn't mean we can't get other amenities. We need to get back to what will make us all want to go to Route 1 and then we will put our dollars there.
338	Mar-17	Kick-off meeting	Is the planning of Route 1 included in zoning?
339	Mar-17	Kick-off meeting	For Route 1 planning, when we will get back to it?

340	Mar-17	Kick-off meeting	To reinvest in Route 1, I understand density issue for Route 1 revitalization, my family had businesses up and down Route 1 100 years ago. We have a lot of people expecting high impact development or upzoning that is above and beyond their current zoning, so they are allowing decay to occur.
341	Mar-17	Kick-off meeting	I think we have studied Route 1 long enough. How many more studies will we have to do on Route 1? Another thing that bothers me is the rules about parking, the realities of how people live and here we decided we love townhouses. Why is it that certain pockets of the County get to live by certain rules? There are totally different rules if you lived in different parts of the county.
342	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Finally, Route 1 is the bane of our existence, we look at it and it should be a phenomenal economic development opportunity and the gateway in to the County and we really struggle about it. Unfortunately we do it because of us and nothing else.
343	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	You mentioned the incentives end of it. How do you push and craft a direction for some of these areas, particularly when I think about Route 1, the struggle that we have is that it is old, real old, but the progress is there. There is some progress, but it is glacial and where there is not progress, it because we have these small parcels and really struggle with developers to piece them together to make them reasonable. How to make it easier for people to be successful?
344	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	I am curious how Route 1 goes through so many jurisdictions in the state, how do you deal with creating a sustainable economic development blueprint, how to deal with fringes that go into another jurisdiction?
345	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	I think if you're not willing to set the standard, we struggle with that all the time, we have to do what we think is appropriate.
346	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	I think our biggest challenge is the 13 miles of Rout 1 in Howard County, a lot of little parcels. I am really intrigued with idea of incentive densities. During the previous administration, we were hunting to buy land to assemble. The guy with the hub cap business wouldn't sell – it's worth a million bucks an acre. I think when I say the 13 miles it is also kind of when we think about how to create energy for redevelopment, it is generally focused on something like this. We have some sections that if you went away and came back, lots of projects have happened, there are 2,000 new units. Retailers are taking notice.
347	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	A lot of people are waiting in line to get onto that corridor. Assemblage is a big issue. We are running out of dirt for reasonable development.
348	Mar-17	Kick-off meeting	It would be nice to talk about the 216 corridor. Long explosion of density - it is dense and we are experiencing problems with that. I do want to thank Allan Kittleman for opening up discussions and for Val recognizing the need to open up regulations. For starters, we have a concern at our condos that there is a lack of noise walls along Route 29 to protect our community. Second, we need to address insufficient parking for condos. Need better insulation or window criteria for soundproofing and how to deal with noise. I also have concerns about the roads used to model decibel levels to configure the noise walls. Increasing traffic volumes in our area and roundabouts, which are a nightmare to enter. There is so much traffic and accidents there; we know that the traffic is only going to get worse. Something needs to happen. Our 55+ community is very concerned about traffic issues.
349	Mar-17	Kick-off meeting	I live in the Ice Crystal community, my question is any development ever turned down? Ride down 216 - I don't see anybody saying that there are going to be any more schools, but there is lots of new development. We go through 5 circles, we are living in a death trap because every person that drives west of 29 that wants to go to 95. It can take 5 to 10 minutes to get to 29. Does anybody ever look at those things?
350	Mar-17	Kick-off meeting	We have been addressing this from an APFO point of view, but from a zoning point of view, as we grow, we need to make sure it is a predictable process and predictable land use outcome.
351	Mar-17	Kick-off meeting	There are overcrowded schools, I have asked this question to DPZ on several occasions. How are you giving approval to developers who are developing in communities with overcrowded schools? Their answer is that we look at HPSS feasibility studies. How is it we are having overcrowded schools. They are building too much in these areas, and the schools can't accommodate it. Sort of a circular answer. There is a disconnect. I have been asking this question since 2013. I am trying to figure out what DPZ is doing differently or planning to do differently with HPSS feasibility study. There needs to be a bridge in this gap.
352	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Schools: consistency in the code. Conflicts within the code as to how schools were even defined in New Town. Also, credited versus noncredited open space is unclear.

353	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Form will complicate things: we need to accommodate children and civic uses.
354	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Parking requirements for schools is an issue because there are a lot of shared uses.
355	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	The code should be considerate of the other permitted uses in our schools.
356	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	JHUAPL – would like properties to be rezoned to PEC, which is not an easy process. That zone captures just about everything we do on our site. Concerned about shipping container restrictions.
357	Mar-17	Kick-off meeting	Land uses are affecting schools (auto painting, embalming facility). Account for public health and social capital when you look at allowed uses.
358	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	You go through the SDP process and in theory the project gets approved - we either have a say or sign off on it. The plan gets approved, signed, and then people design the buildings. But in the real world, people want the building permit done at the same time. We work with that informally.
359	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	How the code is written – DILP can't issue the building permit until the SDP is approved, but we let people submit the permit application.
360	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	That practice is good, but it is a matter of codifying what we have been doing.
361	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	I find it very confusing at what level of review different things get approved. Sometimes we will review curb ramps and we are told that they come back during SDP. Or sometimes we review an accessible route, but it is too late to do anything because it has been decided during the ECP. There should be a major clarification on when transportation should be involved.
362	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	When we are talking about more complicated development, there is not a great process for looking at how the whole thing works. They can come out and lay things out but, unless it is in a particular area, we don't have much of a say.
363	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	There is a chasm between what [hearing examiner] approves and what is approved at site development plan stage. This is part of the lack of institutional capacity. This goes directly to a lot of the community frustration with the process. It has been to the developer's advantage to backload into development review.
364	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Developer agreement revisions should be communicated and posted.
365	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Sign code - Reed v. Gilbert is part of it. It needs to be rewritten in its entirety, as it has serious constitutional problems. It is also geared to zoning and community interaction type things, rather than engineering and how the sign industry does business.
366	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Sign code: The HCC wish the department had much more flexibility, rather than going back to the Board to rewrite it when it could be a simple administrative function. The size of a sign or setback should not require a legislative change.
367	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	I want to focus on how well we can provide services to a community after it is built. One example is trash and recycling. There are situations where residents may live on a private road, which doesn't meet county specifications. For example, there are 13 homes on private drive, all new. Plans come to DPW and we review them and state that the road is too narrow with no turnaround at the end. Consequently, trash/recycling can't be provided so the solution is a concrete pad in front of street - in front of someone's house. There's nothing we can do about it, there's no way to buy the land to make a turnaround. Since it was a paper street and was already subdivided, there's nothing we can do.
368	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Also, alleys are an issue – they are not accessible to trash vehicles. Townhouse development with garages in the back. It would be nice if we could pick it up in the alley, but because of how we allowed the development to be constructed, with minimal widths, we can't pick it up. They have to bring it out to main street, but in this case, some lots don't even face a public street. This plan went through and we commented on it. The regulations don't call out that there is a requirement to have those alleys at a certain width for trash pick-up.
369	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Public Works doesn't want to maintain things that can't be maintained such as roads that are too small, or to load up the rights of way with things that cause DPW a lot of angst. If built to county standards we would maintain them, but with the shrinking right-of-ways, we won't.
370	Mar-17	Stakeholder	I am wondering if developers know that up front, certainly the people who buy these units

		meeting	don't. If a developer knew, would they choose to do it differently. In this case, a turnaround wasn't required - it is just a very narrow alley.
371	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Sequencing of plans is also an issue. Road improvements usually come before the site plan. Then there are issues that come up that could impact the road development plan, but the plan is already approved. There is a disconnect.
372	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Most of my economic development life has been spent in urban centers. What makes an urban center? Some of the things I've observed over the last year is that if we believe that walkable urban centers are here to stay, then we still have decisions that are being made, site planning decisions that are being made that don't help walkability. I talked to some business members, we'd like to walk over there, but sidewalks don't go where we want to go, why are the blocks so long – the lengths of blocks and where people want to walk, which is important for street level retail. As things move forward hopefully there will be more street level retail in Ellicott City.
373	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	HCC sits in 2 zones and a planned building may sit in 2 zones. The zoning code will then become very complicated for us and we will hit the max height. If we could accommodate height more, we would be willing to increase setbacks. Forest conservation could be possible in NT zones, but that's not the zone we can draw from.
374	Mar-17	Kick-off meeting	Encourage sustainability in other ways – solar power, solar farms in rural properties, but solar farms are an eyesore. Propose that County encourage solar farms in areas that are already developed – lots of flat roofs, would love to see incentive program to include solar power in plans.
375	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	Transition Neighborhood zone (TNC) is supposed to be a buffer. I'm thinking of 144 near Centennial Lane. Its purpose was to have a neighborhood slowly transition to commercial, larger buildings and parking lots. But it's not any different than what is in the commercial district. Is that zone going away?
376	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	What are you doing with zones that haven't been tested yet? TNC on Route 40 has never been used, who is guiding you on zones that haven't been tested. We are struggling with all these waivers.
377	Mar-17	Kick-off meeting	Transparency of the approval process is severely lacking. We have often been surprised by developments that were offered waivers or conditional uses, used for a different purpose. Certain understandings have been turned on their heads – to the surprise of residents. I found out that the process is very opaque and in the favor of the developer. I Would like to see increased simplicity and increased communication.
378	Mar-17	Kick-off meeting	When you meet with some stakeholder groups, I am really tired of the developer-lawyer overreach. I think that the unbelievable the CRAs, redlines, oh whatever you want, is beyond unacceptable. I know we have made some course corrections, but it doesn't feel like it is quite enough.
379	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	There are always extra regulations that are not contained in the 700+ pages
380	Mar-17	Stakeholder meeting	A set of regulations will never deal with every single anomaly and take care of every time a developer needs to meet with staff to work through a situation unique to a property. How do you make this not appear to be a backroom dealing in the eyes of the public?
381	Mar-17	Kick-off meeting	I'm a homeowner and there is a large entity in my neighborhood that has done inappropriate modifications. The planning process is weighted towards developers. The best that you can hope for from the County is that they take a side-seat. The developer runs the show. The citizens don't know the process and there is nowhere to get a single voice from DPZ. No single employee can explain how the planning/zoning process works. The county should be representing my interests and protecting me from illegal community action.
382	Mar-17	Kick-off meeting	Are you doing the Urban Renewal Code as part of your scope? I have a lot of concerns with Title 13. Urban Renewal occupies an important part of Maryland's Constitution. Codifiers took all executive functions and gave them to County – the Constitution says that charter provisions were for local government. When the County Council enacted it and edited it, the first thing they did was divide up all the functions. The Planning Commission became the office of planning for functions. It basically has a process issue - it doesn't go to Planning Board. When interest rates were sky high, Howard County also removed the cap on bonds from the Urban Renewal Code. It makes no sense with the power functions divvied up and it makes no sense with overlapping provisions in the County Code. The General Assembly needs to fix this – the Constitution has a flaw. Prince Georges County is a comparison.
383	Mar-17	Stakeholder	I have two questions. The first question goes to the fundamental vision of zoning plan, in other

		meeting	words how would you like to see Howard County in 10 years? Is the vision to be like Montgomery County? The code is pretty much a special exception, once you open a door there is no closing it anymore.
384	Mar-17	Kick-off meeting	I want to like your idea of simplification of zones – looking for positives of that, but for people living here who don't plan on turning over. This is a very strong property rights county – what happens when a new simplified zone gets plopped on my street – is the simplification actually going to result in net upzoning across the board, or will there be downzoning.
385	Mar-17	Kick-off meeting	The process is weighted in favor of developer and not citizen – the developer has knowledge and resources citizen doesn't have.
386	Mar-17	Kick-off meeting	DPZ roles and responsibilities are fragmented so unless you are in the system all the time, like a developer, the citizen doesn't understand that the person they are dealing within DPZ doesn't represent all aspects and functions of DPZ e.g. conditional use, site engineering, land development.
387	Mar-17	Kick-off meeting	Not even employees seem to be able to describe all the DPZ functions put together.
388	Mar-17	Kick-off meeting	Not easy to obtain information about how conditional procedure works, especially the hearing process.
389	Mar-17	Kick-off meeting	Citizens must spend thousands of dollars on local and expert testimony when confronted with deep pocket developers. County representatives are too hands-off in process and should be more proactive in protecting the community and citizens.
390	Mar-17	Kick-off meeting	Waiting until the presubmission meeting to get community input is too late in process because developer has already expended a lot of resources on plans and pre-development efforts. They dig in their heel on any change at this point because of the costs associated with change and the issues raised by community.
391	Mar-17	Kick-off meeting	Need to minimize interference by politically influential interests and allow the process to work. There must be clear criteria when the director of DPZ gets involved.
392	Mar-17	Kick-off meeting	Zoning regulations and requirements must be clearly defined and criteria established. For example: What is a minor modification? How high is a 3 story building?
393	Mar-17	Kick-off meeting	Clearly integrate state and local requirements and define when each apply. Make sure that state and local organizations interface appropriately – e.g. well and septic issues and State Health Dept.
394	Mar-17	Kick-off meeting	Make sure the websites are clear and easy to use - improve search tools. Example – information on DPZ hearing is found under County Council page rather than DPZ. It took 2 employees and me to find the right information. Provide easy to locate contact numbers and be more responsive to information requests.
395	Mar-17	Kick-off meeting	Make sure DPZ documentation is kept and properly filed - lots of documentation is missing. What to do to prevent an entity from expanding beyond current zoning?
396	Mar-17	Kick-off meeting	When does rural-agricultural become something else?
397	Mar-17	Kick-off meeting	Check for easements affecting me.
398	Apr-17	Online	Planning and Zoning needs to stop providing waivers and "alternative compliance" of environmental rules, especially in flood zones.
399	Apr-17	Online	As a non-stakeholder, or is it ""second class stakeholder"", I have ""used"" regulations to protect the value of my property, and to preserve and sustain Historic and natural places. The extreme use of waivers by DPZ - no matter the administration - makes a Swiss cheese of any protections for anyone but those with a single-minded vision to add density.
400	Apr-17	Online	Finally (thanks for hanging in there with me!), let's talk about density. There is a school of thought that Main Street Ellicott City can only be made vital by dramatically increasing density. Main Street is not a CBD, and is unlikely to become that. Creating apartment blocks does not return us to the pre-Internet era of a hinterland supporting an urban center. The way to revitalize a little town Main Street is to make it a destination. That comes from public and political will, creative retailing and marketing, and an investment in infrastructure. Infill will kill the golden goose.
401	Apr-17	Online	A strip of grass with a twig stuck in the ground does not pass for a "Forest Conservation Area" despite a sign saying that's what it is.

402	Apr-17	Online	Developers cut down important wooded areas and are allowed to put in a couple of saplings to comply with environmental recommendations.
403	Apr-17	Online	People in Ellicott City are understandably concerned about flooding. Our new regulations need to limit waivers and alternative compliance, and be created in conjunction with a master flood plan. Otherwise, we will continue with a crazy quilt of developments and infill subdivisions all of which contribute only some level of ""minimum requirement"". We could drown in our own sloppiness.
404	Apr-17	Online	The possibility of this kind of flash flooding occurring again is a real possibility. From Howard County's own web page for the Office of Emergency Management (https://www.howardcountymd.gov/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=CIBLzx7NOx0%3d&portalid=0) I quote: "There is an expected 30%+ Annual Likelihood of a Flood hazard in Howard County. In the most likely Flood hazard scenario, the Total Impact is considered Limited-Significant. In the worst-case scenario, the Total Impact is considered Significant-Critical."
405	Apr-17	Online	I'm glad this subject is finally being addressed but was upset to see, in the opening slide of the presentation I saw on March 28, that Howard County's Historic Districts were not included among Columbia, other communities, and western HC. It seems a deliberate oversight.
406	Apr-17	Online	I believe that the Historic District Commission should be given "teeth". As it is, I think the advice they render is easily ignored, particularly by developers.
407	Apr-17	Online	The toothless Historic District Commission is staffed with informed, dedicated volunteers who are handcuffed by the advisory nature of their role. I wasn't living here when the commission was formed, but it smacks of a clever way to coopt citizen activists. My example of a useful example was the California Coastal Commission. You replied that they have teeth. They do for sure, and those teeth have kept the California coast alive ecologically and as its own economic engine.
408	Apr-17	Online	Development in the historic district, as vulnerable as it has been shown to be, needs to be very closely scrutinized, much more than is done under the current regs
409	Apr-17	Online	I appreciate that your process is not a straw poll, and that you're not collecting ""votes"". A plan that is built around the squeakiest wheel would not necessarily be the best plan, but I am concerned that the data that you do collect could be weighted by access. Your process describes ""stakeholders"" as people who use regulations . And then there is everybody else.
410	Apr-17	Online	I think that caring for Old Town and the immediate area is extremely important and that the waivers that are given to developers are done so too hastily. Invest in Old Town by managing the flood waters, reducing development, and improving the current infrastructure and it will pay long term dividends. If we continue to build ugly town homes and buildings around this area it will just be another dumpy town that has nothing special to offer. Not to mention, if we continue to build on the hills around it, there might not be a town left due to the runoff it will create. Please consider this in your policies.
411	Apr-17	Online	We have seen just what the "worst-case" "significan-critical" looks like, and I don't think we want to add to the risk of that happening again.
412	Apr-17	Online	I am frustrated with the way waivers (now called "alternative compliance") are so easily granted to developers who want to build in the Historic District. For one development, The Town at Court Hill, we were told that one explanation for granting a waiver was that development of this parcel was planned 40 years ago; however naive and ill-advised that decision was, for some reason it still needed to be honored. The logic of this decision did, and does, escape me -- we now live in a better informed time when we know the damage that over-development can cause. It was indeed that type of decision that most likely contributed to the horrific flood that occurred July, 2016. We now better understand the environmental risk that unchecked construction of impermeable surfaces can create. The whole of the Ellicott City community, including businesses, residents, and those who come to enjoy Ellicott City were victims of decisions made long before many of us were here. But we are better informed now and can make better decisions for the future. Why would we choose to do differently?
	Apr-17	Online	I would like to see the Downtown Columbia Zoning District process used throughout Howard County. It needs some tweaks and I don't think the Planning Board should have decision making authority, but it's a good model. And the PROCESS should replace covenants and gatekeeper role.
	Apr-17	Online	1. DPZ might benefit from an ombudsman to help projects go more smoothly, such as Tom Butler has done in the past. That person could help resolve differences of opinions between departments and generally keep things running more efficiently.

	Apr-17	Online	In PDOX, the fire/rescue take too long to review plans; PZ should ask engineers about the reason they design things in a certain way, before automatically denying the plan and forcing a re-submission, particularly for non-sensical comments. Direct submissions should be used more often. Due to PDOX, DPZ wants everything perfect prior to approval, as they are the judge. This routinely adds 30-45 days to plan approvals that could have been addressed directly to the responsible agency. PDOX is not being used properly in these situations.; SHA can't review PDOX drawings. They should be added to the system. They also only only review finals, but yet are still asked to review preliminary plans by the county. This does not make sense.
	Apr-17	Online	In talking with neighbors and observing what is happening in our new neighborhood in Waverly Woods West in Marriottsville I would like to submit comments. The process which determines the placement of trees appears to be quite flawed. Why put a maple tree which will heave sidewalks and have roots growing to the surface of yards in a postage stamp sized lot? Yet big, open areas within the community have no trees whatsoever. The huge common areas should be planted with varieties of trees that can grow tall since their root system would have a lot more room and a nice variety of specimens would add to the natural habitat of birds. The second comment has to do with communication from the developer. There appears to be a major disconnect with the developer and the people who have moved into this development. Does the developer have no duty to address concerns raised by members of the community? I sense that is the case. Thank you for the opportunity to address these issues.
	Apr-17	Online	The Ellicott City Historic District was created to protect and preserve the Church Road neighborhood. Recently, a home builder sought approval of 13 lots that change the character of that neighborhood. The plan was challenged before the Historic Preservation Commission on the grounds that it ruined the historic nature of the existing neighborhood. The Office of Law advised the Commission that the objection of surrounding neighbors was actually a challenge to proposed density of the plan, and therefore, beyond the power of the Commission to consider. The case proceeded to the Planning Board, where again, a challenge was mounted to the proposed subdivision plan based upon the adverse impact it would have on the historic nature of the area. Again, it was rejected, because the impact on the Ellicott City Historic District was not one of the criteria in the R-ED zoning District. In order to protect the ambience of the Historic District, the R-ED Zoning District needs to clarify the requirements for approval of a subdivision plan in an Historic District and unequivocally state that any plan must conform with the existing lot size, setback and density of the existing homes. As of now, a plan in the Historic District need only comply with the general R-ED criteria, and the Department of Planning and Zoning is free to ignore the impact of the Historic District overlay zone. Why have a Historic District if no one cares to protect it from the adverse impacts of standard Euclidean development or treats it like any other parcel in Howard County not located in an historic area? I am available to assist in the drafting of such legislation.
	Apr-17	Online	Given our interest in encouraging folks to walk or bike for short trips to the store, I think in many cases this is not practical because of the perceived distance. The solution, I believe, is to adopt the European practice of allowing some limited kinds of stores to set up shop within traditionally residential areas. For example, stores could be easily incorporated into a townhouse complex or on the ground floor of an apartment building. A store may be appropriate at the perimeter of single-family housing, where the neighborhood meets the main street. Many neighborhoods have a parcel that includes public-purpose entities such as a day-care center or swimming pool that could easily accommodate stores with little disruption of the neighborhood. While this idea may encounter significant resistance, more enlightened neighborhoods may embrace the idea. I suggest that the new zoning structure include a category that might allow this kind of limited usage.
	Apr-17	Online	I believe the process is backwards, Howard County Zoning Assessment should start with the most successful part first! Columbia! Fix that (see attached). Howard County should be taking the successful parts of what made Columbia special and emulating that. But before that can begin the DPZ has to declare that they are a regulating agency not a facilitating agency.
	Apr-17	Online	We need to add an additional test to the AFPO rules that reduces storm water run off.
	Apr-17	Online	Additionally, we need to stop development in historic districts in the county.

	Apr-17	Online	The area along MD99 (from the Waverly development(s) at Marriottsville Rd. in the west to senior-living and assisted living arrangements approaching Rogers Ave in the east) has been allowed to become the "age-restricted corridor" of Howard County. This is plain and simply wrong, wrong, wrong for a lot of reasons. No one particular part of the county should be made to bear the burden of a generalized need. What services are there **really** in this part of the county to serve the needs of the elderly, disabled and infirm? What about the impact to the homeowners (who, I might add, have paid hefty prices to purchase their properties) who have expectations about the the values of their properties? Builders should not be able to develop the properties just because it's the 'design du jour'... as in everything, I mean everything these days is denser than the original zoning called for. Everything is becoming "conditional use," i.e. age-restricted because the developers can 'slip it by' the county, build more densely (than single-family units) and reap huge, HUGE profits from the density of the developed area. Existing communities need to be heard and their input needs to be given good weight in development debates. So often we citizens are simply ignored... because the proposed development is somehow wedged in to meet the county guidelines. More weight needs to be given to citizen input. New idea: How about allowing for renewal naturally? How about not developing all of an area? How about leaving some percentage for development 15-20 years out?--And another percentage for development 35-40 years out as a means of getting refreshed development, "fresh blood" in to rejuvenate areas and ensure they rise up instead of decline--and for keeping the tax base high?
	Apr-17	Online	Very specifically concerning this Assessment: I feel the term "stakeholders" is used more frequently for builders, developers and land use attorneys. There have been meetings tailored to their concerns that continues the Howard County tradition of giving more credence to their needs rather than average residents and homeowners. Homeowners already feel discounted in Howard County. I'm skeptical that there is a real desire on P&Z's part for change; maybe they'll find some new language (as in alternative use rather than waiver), but it's still the same old song and dance.
	Apr-17	Online	water related issues are notorious in Ellicott City neighborhoods, particularly Valleymeade and Dunloggin. Requests to have infrastructure updates/management in Dunloggin are routinely not addressed so how can building multi family dwellings on plot of land in Dunloggin help remedy the problem? It not only contributes to the devaluing of homes and property in the neighborhood, but also to school overcrowding and stress on the current infrastructure. Why is it that a piece of untapped land can't just remain that, untapped and undeveloped?????
	Apr-17	Online	Thank you for working to collect broad input from the community in the process of updating the regulations on land development. This is very important, and very much appreciated. Motivation for the comments 1. Quality of life: The quality of life in our county is high – we were attracted here by the quality of schools, green space, public infrastructure, and community. The process of updating the development regulations can help ensure that this quality of life is maintained over time. 2. Concerns and costs: We are concerned about maintaining the quality of our school system, and dealing with traffic on our roads. Schools in the north and east of our county are already overcrowded. Traffic on Route 99 is an issue. The risk of flooding puts our properties and a treasures of our county (including Ellicott City's historic district) at risk. New development brings in revenue for our county, in terms of fees paid by developers and property taxes. However, we are concerned that such revenues may not offset the substantial costs of building new schools, building transportation infrastructure, and building infrastructure to mitigate flood risk. 3. Pressures on County budget: This is especially important in light of the Spending Affordability Advisory Committee report that found that moderate revenue growth will require fiscal discipline to keep up with the county's increasing financial demands. From the County's press release on the report: "The report expressed concerns on potentially higher service demands and slower tax revenues associated with the changing demographics and housing development patterns in the County. Moreover, uncertainties at the Federal level, including potential reductions in federal spending, will likely impact income, spending and job growth in the region, the report said." (See: https://www.howardcountymd.gov/News/ArticleID/818/News030317b and https://www.howardcountymd.gov/Departments/County-Administration/Budget/Spending-Affordability-FY-2018)
	Apr-17	Online	Comments on development regulations 1. The laws on the books – zoning regulations, etc. – should be followed.

			a. The use of conditional use permits should be eliminated. b. The use of waivers – recently termed “alternative compliance” – should be eliminated. Waivers or alternative compliance lead to public safety and other risks.
	Apr-17	Online	I sat on two different infill committees over the years and recently as member of the APFO committee for Howard County. While we could not find the correct place in the APFO for infill regulations, the need for them was noted and voted positively for. Very few items were passed during this committee due to the high ranking for passage, but the need for updated infill legislation was one of these. In our already existing environment in our older neighborhoods we struggle with storm water management, additional traffic on roads not large enough to accommodate this traffic, and we really struggle with the maintenance of property particularly when the property has been bought, and the owner is waiting on the APFO to build or when the owner is renting the property and is not maintaining the property in accordance with the rest of the neighborhoods standards. A huge problem on infill lots is felled trees. The new owners of the properties immediately go out and cut down the great big old trees that are so common and beautiful in older neighborhoods. They do this before they submit plans for subdivision so that they do not have to follow the forest conservation rules that are in place once the plans have been submitted (to replace trees that are removed). They also do not remove the trees from the lots, nor do thy remove the stumps. This becomes a breeding ground for termites and eventually causes problems for the neighboring lot's sheds and play structures. But the biggest problem is how trashy the lots look for a number of years before new construction begins. So not only do the immediate neighbors suffer from looking at all of this mess for years before construction, they are then provided with the continued indignity of construction debris for another two years. That is unacceptable in an already built environment. ALL FELLED TREES, whether from the wind or the saw, SHOULD BE REQUIRED TO BE REMOVED FROM THE PROPERTY WITHIN A 4 WEEK TIME PERIOD. All DEAD trees should also be required to be REMOVED from infill properties that are rentals and/or waiting for APFO to build. I will wander up to the lot right next door to me later today and take some pictures to include with my next missive. A dead limb from this lot just came down on my property and destroyed my three year old tree that I had planted as a screen to keep from looking at this mess. This yard used to be one of the showplaces of the neighborhood and is now blight. The pond that was so meticulously maintained is now full of trash that no one cleans up and blows into the neighboring yards. Absentee owners MUST BE REQUIRED to maintain their properties. I know this is tricky to legislate, but there has to be a way. Trimming shrubs and mowing grass also becomes an issue. You can call the fire department once the grass reaches the foot tall length but this should be addressed in our legislation on "infill" lots. Infill legislation is tricky, but it must be implemented. We also need to apply some standards to rental properties. These properties require a rental license and it could be addressed there. I will continue my thoughts later. I will also go back and see what other suggestions were made during our two infill committees that were held in Howard county in the past.
	Apr-17	Online	Storm water management in older neighborhoods is also a hot button topic. When a builder builds in the back yard of properties (that were purposefully left yard as drainage fields) these new developments impact the lots below them with storm water. In the past these lots were required to "perc" and were normally left unbuilt upon. But due to public sewer and water this requirement no longer exists and the developer buys up this extra lot and plops a house on it. This then floods out the existing neighbors that were there first. Rain gardens do not solve this problem and many developers just pay a fee in lieu of doing proper storm water management, anyway. This should never be allowed to happen. If they want to buy these wet lots then they should be required to deal with all of the current water from the adjacent properties that this lot was left empty for, as well as any new water that the lot will generate by covering it with cement. Our older "percolate" laws were there for good solid reasons. Plus, any time in the past that the county has required a drain field on a property, the new owner should not be allowed to tear up this drainage system just to put up new houses with out having to come up with a full replacement for all of the other houses involved. The houses at 4052 and 4040 Saint Johns Lane in Ellicott City had previous county ordered drain fields that were subsequently torn up when 4054 and 4056 were built. Due to the underground springs and the fact that this whole area in the past had been left for water drainage this has now impacted all of the lots and they are never dry and have caused flooding damage to most all of the basements. It also causes damage to the yards as they are always "rivers" during the rain, and too wet to support plantings. On top

			of that, the other two new "backyard infill" houses that have yet to go in are going to really exacerbate the already existing water problem, as they are "uphill" from the lower lots.
	Apr-17	Online	2. To mitigate flood risk in the watersheds and neighborhoods affected by the July 2016 flood, there should be: a. A moratorium on development in the Plumtree and Tiber-Hudson watersheds until the flood studies are complete. b. Then, once the studies and model have been delivered, a citizen workgroup or panel should be established. c. No new development should be authorized in the watershed until recommendations from the flood studies that are agreed upon between the County and this workgroup/panel are implemented d. For any new proposed developments, the workgroup/panel should run the model to examine the potential impacts on flooding before a decision is made to allow the development to move forward.
	Apr-17	Online	3. The Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance should be revised to: a. Include a test for stormwater quantity (flood mitigation). Developers should be required to mitigate to 120% the impact of a 500-year storm, as proven by a 2D model. (2D models are the standard for the industry, and what is being produced in the hydrologic studies currently being conducted. The 2016 flood was caused by a 1,000-year storm; however, in some areas the quantity of water in the rivers/streams was at the level of a 165-500 year event as calculated by the U.S. Geological Survey.) b. Remove the ability for developers to move forward with their projects if certain existing tests (schools, roads) are not met for 4-5 years from the date of submission. This undermines the entire spirit of APFO. c. Revise the special APFO rules for 50-55+ communities. These communities are not currently subject to the APFO schools test. However, current residents who move into these communities and sell their homes contribute to increased students in the school system. Approximately 60% of new students in the school system come from sales of existing homes. Further, as demographics change, there is a possibility that the market could be oversaturated with 55+ communities which could therefore lead to revisions in the rules governing 55+ communities that may allow them to be sold to younger residents
	Apr-17	Online	4. The development allocations should be revised to: a. Incentivize stormwater quantity control (flood mitigation) and low density development by giving developments that go beyond what is required in the regulations, first priority for allocations. b. Remove the Tiber-Hudson watershed from the highest tier (Growth and Revitalization) of development allocations. Examine the allocations for the Plumtree watershed and remove the areas from the highest tier depending on flood risk.
432	Apr-17	Online	Evaluation of the 42 zoning types with Department of Planning and Zoning (DPZ) – streamline/update. Emphasis on defining certain terms such as “substantive”, “compatible”, “surrounding”, and other subjective words to provide clear criteria.
433	Apr-17	Online	Support legislation that affects Agricultural Preservation property to remain as intended and disallow industrial or large commercial uses. Request the amendment of legislation regarding the preservation process to include recovering County funds on farms which convert to commercial revenue uses.
434	Apr-17	Online	Work to hold developers to the same standards, regulations, and laws as everyone else, by disallowing re-submissions at the same process level where errors, misinformation, or unmet criteria are found.
435	Apr-17	Online	Work on improving Zoning Board, Hearing Examiner and Board of Appeals schedules by implementing a finish date for proceedings to diminish continuances and delays. No case should take over two years for a decision. (I realize this is not in your domain but is a very valid request).
436	Apr-17	Online	Protect the environment with stronger storm water management regulations with emphasis on retaining forested areas.
437	Apr-17	Online	Promote County enforcement of Dept. of Natural Resources State recommendations for development with emphasis on tree cover requirements in addition to specimen tree issues.
438	Apr-17	Online	Create a goal for DPZ to prioritize criteria being met in zoning over and above the maximum allowable density, in that a property is not entitled to the maximum density allowed on parcels if other criteria are not met. Eliminate waivers, redlines, variances, acceleration of process, without rare and dire causes that don’t harm others. Disallow these when the only goal is to get

			to maximum density for the parcel. To update the DPZ (PDox), Project Development database to show waivers and redlines – not currently functioning.
439	Apr-17	Online	Revisit Route 1 and Route 40 revitalization plans, updating items required for completion with community input.
440	Apr-17	Online	Conduct a Comprehensive Review of NT Zoning. Revise the NT Zoning Regulations to provide clear criteria for redevelopment of older residential, commercial, or industrial areas outside of Downtown Columbia and the Village Centers. It is part of the Policies and Implementing Actions (Policy 10.2) in Plan 2030 as adopted on February 4, 2013.
441	Apr-17	Online	Request a discussion on the implementation of changes to the Rules regarding "Standing" to appeal zoning decisions. Clearly define both the rights of citizens to formally object and the appropriate limitations.
442	Apr-17	Online	Update the Planning Board (PB) Rules of Procedure last updated in 2007 in particular the "Key PB Functions" table found on page 6. A complete review as to what constitutes a quasi-judicial hearing for the various zoning types needs to be established. Why haven't the Planning Board, Zoning Board and all Hearing Examiners taken the required training classes in zoning per MD law?
443	Apr-17	Online	Have a representative from DPZ attend all pre-submission meetings to answer any questions from the audience pertaining to the process.
444	Apr-17	Online	a) Where the Traffic Report, accompanying a submission for Final Development Plan approval, considers a development's ingress and egress impact on the Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance then the site plan showing the building footprint that was used should be added to the list of exhibits required in the Technical Staff Report.b) The Technical Staff Report should not simply approve a Traffic Study because a development meets the APFO standards. It should comment on the site ingress and egress location impacts on the adjoining streets and identify the limitations that must be solved in preparing the Site Development Plan submission .c) Downtown densities exceed as-built densities. To mitigate the adverse impact of typical inner city densities and attain Columbia objectives of building a better living environment, minimum Setbacks must be adopted for each street type such as Parkways, Boulevards, Avenues and Streets.
445	Apr-17	Online	The development project would be taxed and paid for first by the developer for the expense of increased needs of future infrastructure after development. This is so that the increased demands for appropriate infrastructures after development has been paid for first by developers instead of having to be paid for by the existing taxpayers after the needs for increased infrastructure occurs. This includes such items as Schools, Fire Protection Facilities, Police Facilities and Jails and Larger Court Houses, Utility Distribution Systems, Roads, additional Transportation Facilities (buses, rail, and tractor trailers), Sanitary Sewer Systems, Water Treatment Facilities, Libraries and Internet Communication Facilities, Recreation Facilities, and Solid Waste Disposal Systems.
446	Apr-17	Online	Make the recommendations of the Historic Preservation Commission and the Design Advisory Panel Regulatory bodies have to be given "great weight" by the deciding bodies that are given them.
447	Apr-17	Online	Update Planning Board Rules of Procedure, require a certain level of attendance, provide education in zoning matters for Members, and provide legal training in conducting quasi-judicial hearings.
448	Apr-17	Online	Support stronger Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance measurements with emphasis on EMS/Fire/Police/Health, less crowded schools, eliminated trailers, and stronger traffic tests to update the Level of Service of roads declared "E" means Failure and that no development shall be allowed until such time roads are improved or funding for improvements is designated.
449	Apr-17	Online	Work with the County, Howard Hughes and Columbia Association to enforce Industrial area Covenants. Emphasis on Symphony Woods plans and Gatekeeper needs to include Columbia land covenants and overseer of the Village enforcement of the design covenants, its interests should be aligned with sound planning decisions.
450	Apr-17	Online	Ensure the protection to existing wetlands in an attempt to protect the Chesapeake Bay.
451	Apr-17	Online	Increase the number of sidewalks along county roads and streets.
452	Apr-17	Online	Need better Rt. 1 Policing to keep pace with the development and increased traffic along the corridor.
453	Apr-17	Online	Revisit and update the 2002 requirements for Universal Design to be incorporated by builders in 55+ communities.

454	Apr-17	Online	Have a few citizens evaluate the DPZ Website by working with Staff to make suggestions for improvements regarding navigation and contents. This should include a novice, medium experience and someone very knowledgeable in zoning, policy and both the Administration and County Council process.
455	Apr-17	Online	It is difficult but there needs to be a way to address unintended consequences of regulations. Example: I own a 285 acre farm. There is considerable damage from deer each year. We decided to build a deer fence surrounding the farm. So as a good citizen, I thought it best to find out the set back requirements before building the fence. I called the county and asked for the setback requirements. It depended on the height of the fence. Because the fence is to control deer, it needs to be 8' tall. And because the fence was to be over 6' tall, it would be considered a structure and would be subject to set back requirements for structures. This meant a 75' setback from the front, 30' from sidelines (if there is a neighbor) and 10' from the rear line. There is a state road that goes through the middle of the farm so I have 2 front set backs. By the time I added up all the ground lost to setbacks, it would have been over 8 acres. Fortunately, DPZ and I were able to develop a policy that would not require set backs for open wire fences on agricultural land. I was lucky that DPZ was open and willing to work with this situation but if not that would have been a severe and unnecessary consequence of a requirement designed for residential neighborhoods but applied to all land in the county. It did not take into consideration agriculture.
456	Apr-17	Online	The county needs to have the developers share the costs for new schools, new roads and the impact on traffic and everyday life. Right now it is cheaper for developers to build in Howard county than in surrounding counties for these reason, and the citizens of the county are left paying more or give up services. DPZ and the county executive should work for all citizens and not only for the property owners that want to develop and the developers. As of today, citizens have to pay for lawyers if they want to be heard, and I don't think that is right. The county is determined to develop every single swat of land, without taking in consideration to what this does to the existing community(s), traffic, and schools. Zoning rules are overlooked to the benefit of the developers, taking advantage of the fact that citizens don't have the time or the money to hire a lawyer and make sure that rules are enforced. That should be the function of DPZ, but the whole department bends over to please the developers.
457	May-17	Online	GHCA Initiatives Agenda for 2017: 1. The Crossroads itself: A. The Highland Design Standards: recommend Highland be included in the areas requiring POSITIVE review by Architectural Review Board. B. BRX and BR Zones: 1. BRX: remove it from Highland in its entirety. (prevent any applications) 2. BR: amend it, removing inappropriate uses and strengthen restrictions. 2. The Greater Highland Area: A. Amend the DEO & Cluster Provisions to promote well-designed, attractive development, including revision of the current DEO formula to produce an outcome of one unit for each 3 acres (rounded up) of the original property. B. Amend the Conditional Use Process itself and the most troublesome conditional uses such as funeral homes, landscape contractors, and nursing homes. Revert to the term "Special Exception" to lessen the presumption of suitability in a zone. C. Strongly object to and note the illegal PSA expansion in Fulton and Clarksville (200 Acres) in order to prevent any such last-minute subterfuge in the future. D. Support Inclusion of Highland in first phase of County Bike Plan. 3. Support Other Citizen Groups: A. Support the Kittleman revision of the current Tier plan. B. Support ban on commercial solar on preservation parcels. C. Support shut-down of illegal mulching operations. D. Support HCCA initiatives as presented to DPZ and the Kittleman Admin.
458	May-17	Online	I know it's been said over and over, but my feelings are that they need to fix the current problems with stormwater before more areas of runoff are added. I live in West End and suffered major losses in 2016. there was a study released 2 years prior outlining what was eventually going to happen. No action was taken, we weren't even told about the study. Yet they want to build 150+ new townhomes on the hill behind us. The runoff plan is weak at best. They also want to build more units off of Courthouse Drive if I remember correctly. This will add to runoff at the top of Main Street with no consideration of consequence. The current residents/businesses need to be protected from the "highest bidder" processes in place now. Maybe the new developer should have to place bond against flooding due to in creased runoff. Or maybe do an impartial study and fix the problem before it happens.
459	May-17	Online	I would like to see more attention to quality architecture. Most of the new developments we see in the county feature a tacky, eclectic, pseudo-colonial style that appears to be plucked out of builder source catalogs. We can do better. I would suggest studying some of the style

			guidelines of "new urbanism" planned communities such as Celebration in Florida, Baxter in South Carolina or the many others that define authentic historic revival domestic architectural detail.
460	May-17	Online	Another concern is the ways developers tend to go into a property and bulldoze everything before building begins. More sensitivity to the existing landscape would certainly be appreciated.
461	May-17	Online	Finally, what can be done to make retention ponds more attractive? The way they are currently constructed, they look embarrassingly like industrial facilities. Certainly steps could be taken to make them appear a more natural part of the environment.
462	May-17	Online	The Special Exception process (now Conditional Use) is what got me involved in Howard County land use. A local nursery/garden center in my residential neighborhood operated under a SE approval. The commercial nature of the operation was disruptive to the community. It was only through numerous visits to the Board of Appeals and the addition of conditions to the approval that the business could operate without constant neighborhood complaints. TAKEAWAY: Most homeowners do not realize that uses not normally occurring in a residential neighborhood can occur under Conditional Use approvals. Once an approval has been granted, the onus is on the neighbors to make sure all conditions are adhered to.
463	May-17	Online	A religious congregation purchased property in the back of my neighborhood of cul-de-sacs. Under the CU regulations and despite the concerns of the neighbors, it was granted approval for a worship space and a daycare/pre-school for up to 40 children with the "promise" that the uses would not grow. These two approvals, which each have minimal acreage requirements, were augmented to include a school for up to 6th graders. Several expansions were requested over time for additional worship space. Again, conditions were set that were regularly ignored without complaints to DPZ. The most recent request was for the addition of senior housing. Each of the approved uses have acreage requirements. The uses were layered allowing the same acreage to be counted multiple times. TAKEAWAY: Once an approval is granted, the door is open for expansions and additions. It must be clear how many times the same land can be counted for different CU approvals.
464	May-17	Online	There is a purpose and need for Conditional Uses. However, the current regulations are very uneven in how the proposed uses are reviewed. Some uses have minimal impact. Some of the regulations have very detailed requirements. Some have no additional requirements beyond the basic standards. Some require the developer to jump through numerous hoops to get approval while others give the developer carte blanche while limiting arguments for opponents. The use of the CU option has allowed developers to significantly increase density or avoid other regulations that would otherwise have limited the ability to develop the site. TAKEAWAY: The range of regulations for various CU uses are uneven and perhaps unfair to both proponents and opponents of a proposal.
465	May-17	Online	The Donaldson Funeral Home case in Clarksville brought up a lot of issues with Conditional Uses. Originally, the regulations for funeral homes had very limited requirements for parking. This was because the regulations had not been updated to consider how the funeral home business had changed. This was also the case with the regulations for nursery/garden centers where a newer business model is much different from the one when the regulations were written. TAKEAWAY: Regular review of regulations and consideration of current models for the use proposed should be included in new regulations.
466	May-17	Online	The funeral home case was also an example of the developer using the CU option to purchase residential land at a significant discount from the cost of nearby commercial land. The granting of the CU effectively extended the immediately adjacent commercial land uses along Clarksville Pike. The onerous, long-running fight at the Hearing Examiner, the Board of Appeals, and the courts would have been avoided if the developer had simply chosen to locate the business on a nearby commercial parcel rather than the residentially zoned parcel. TAKEAWAY: Discourage large, potentially disruptive uses from locating on residentially zoned land. Limit the ability to use CU to avoid requesting a zoning change.
467	May-17	Online	The pre-submission meeting has been an excellent addition to the zoning regulations. The opportunity at an early point for the community to learn about a proposed project and ask questions is valuable to everyone. Many times, the neighbors raise issues that the developer has not considered. The result can be a change to the plan or an alternative way to accomplish the project. The residents feel they are being heard and are more willing to accept the proposal. I have found that the presentations can be very uneven. Some developers do a full-

			on review of the proposal while others just sort of show up. I have attended meetings where I am the only person there. Other meetings have really needed to have more than just the project engineer who is trying to present and take notes at the same time. I am not sure that DPZ needs to staff these meetings, but perhaps, there could be some way to insure the person conducting the meeting really understands the purpose and is prepared to explain the process as well as the proposed project. TAKEAWAY: Further updating of the pre-sub meeting organizational requirements may be needed.
468	May-17	Online	Pre-submission meetings may be occurring at the wrong time. With the State requirements of an Environmental Concept Plan needed significant detail, in some cases by the time the pre-submission meeting is held, the plan may already be carved in stone. TAKEWAY: Make sure the pre-submission meeting is held where it can be most beneficial to all parties.
469	May-17	Online	As they relate to the NT zone, there are too many pre-submission meetings. In other zoning classifications in the county, only one community meeting is required. The process for development or re-development (Village Centers) require several pre-submission meetings to complete the multi-step process. As part of the on-going process to redevelop the Hickory Ridge Village Center, the developer was required to hold two pre-subs. The first meeting had over 150 people in the room literally screaming at the developer. Kimco pressed the pause button and held a series of 19 small group meetings where residents and developer talked one on one with each other. As a result, the plan evolved significantly. There were still angry people at the next pre-sub, but most people had a better understanding of the what and why of the proposal. Perhaps the small-group format could be encouraged for major projects. TAKEAWAY: Examine the requirements for when, how many, and what type of community meetings should be held based on interest in development proposals.
470	May-17	Online	It has been noted that NT zoning was designed for greenfield development. After 50 years, Columbia is essentially fully developed. New regulations for NT should recognize the need for redevelopment of already existing properties include residential uses as well as commercial uses. The onerous regulations that have been put in place for redeveloping village centers puts unnecessary hurdles in the path to redevelopment of the centers. The number of meetings required and the length of time required between meetings draws out the process even more. Similarly, the 16-step process for Downtown redevelopment confuses those with a casual interest in the projects. Most people just don't understand what is being shown to them as some of these meetings. People expect to see elevations and specifics on traffic and infrastructure when all that is required is concept. By the time the meeting is held that will give the specifics, the general public has gotten bored with the process. TAKEAWAY: Shorten and clarify steps and community input opportunities for the development process.
471	May-17	Online	There has been much conversation about the "Master Developer" for Columbia. In the beginning, Jim Rouse developed Columbia like a shopping center which was the formula he was most familiar with. HRD decided what should go where and how competition would be limited to protect the "tenants" he already had. With the city fully developed, the need for a Master Developer has diminished. It is an unfortunate fact for those owners who were required to follow Rouse's plan if they wanted to develop in NT that others want to do things differently. Restricting uses based on a 50 -year-old model cannot be sustained. The planned city has been developed. There is no need for a new entity to control what goes where for every single property. Let the market do that. For large scale redevelopment, the Planning Board and the Zoning Board should have that role. TAKEAWAY: Remove references to the Master Developer in the zoning regulations.
472	May-17	Online	Columbia is full of outparcels of land that Rouse didn't purchase in the 1960s and were not included in the NT zone. These outparcels have developed over time and often provide opportunities for uses that may or may not be in keeping with the Rouse plan for Columbia. Setbacks between residential zones and NT should be reviewed. Clarity regarding uses in NT commercial and other nearby parcels should be examined. Perhaps current non-NT parcels can be folded into the NT zone to make communities more cohesive. An attempt should be made to minimize the us vs. them mentality. TAKEAWAY: Examine outparcel uses within the NT zone to provide more seamless transitions.
473	May-17	Online	The alphabet soup of the NT development process should be revised. A zoning amendment to remove mention of the CSP has already been proposed. The Final Development Plan (FDP) is the specific zoning for the parcels in NT. There are over 200 FDPs. Many are similar but not exactly the same. FDPs should be standardized to limit the variations among them. Commercial

			sites should have similar standards. Various residential classifications should be considered that cover single family or attached housing. For example, there are parcels that were originally developed as low-rise garden apartments with lots of surface parking. It may make sense for the properties to be redeveloped as mid-rise units with structured parking. The specificity on some FDPs might preclude such an upgrade without going through a significant re-zoning process similar to the process for village center redevelopment. Some FDPs may limit a specific use on only that parcel when it makes no sense for that limitation to exist. TAKEAWAY: Revamp the FDP format to simplify and standardize zoning within NT.
474	May-17	Online	The original approval of the NT zoning classification set various limits for total number of residential units and minimum or maximum acreage for various housing, commercial and open space uses. A running total of these figures has been kept by DPZ over the years. Fifty years later, it seems unnecessary to keep such a specific count of housing units, density, etc. especially with the large amount of infill that has taken place on adjacent outparcels. While the number of units in NT Columbia has a cap, the total number of units in the Columbia zip codes does not. Is it time to say the regulations developing the planned city have been met? TAKEAWAY: Consider doing away with the various density and use charts that have been kept for NT.
475	May-17	Online	A popular way for developers to get the most possible lots on a parcel is to use flag lots or private cul-de-sacs. Flag lots cause problems for owners. Oddly shaped lots diminish privacy. Shared driveways cause problems with neighbors. Several homes on a single driveway makes parking, access, and maintenance an issue for everyone. Private cul-de-sacs are not maintained by the county. Often new owners find out that the county doesn't maintain their street when the snowplow never arrives. Older private streets require repaving for which the adjacent owners are responsible. Many private cul-de-sacs do not have active HOAs to collect dues and stockpile funds for repairs. All in all, asking people to share access is a real headache for all involved. TAKEAWAY: Limit the number of flag lots, shared driveways, private roads or cul-de-sacs.
476	May-17	Online	In the last twenty years, much of the agriculture land in the western part of the county has been developed with very large homes. Demographics are changing in the county with seniors remaining in their homes of many years long after their children have moved out. The zoning regulations limit the use of accessory apartments. It might be a good idea to look at ways to allow more apartments in existing homes so that multiple generations or an owner/caretaker arrangement or even rental apartments within a home to provide income for retired homeowners can occur. TAKEAWAY: Examine the use of accessory apartments to provide a wider range of housing options.
477	May-17	Online	Here are my big picture issues and made small picture issues .>Redevelopment and Infill> New Town Zoning Regulation changes>Downtown Columbia Approval process>Historic District zoning flexibility to deal with new realities >Housing options including affordability Integrity of established >communities including design Parking requirements all zones >Transportation requirements built into the process Relevancy of Planing >Board Corridor Zones and transition zones are they workingThink that is it.
478	May-17	Online	Too many zoning districts -Eliminate specialized zoning districts obviously devised to accommodate one project -Review and reduce or Eliminate floating zones-destroy concept of planning for land use; can be put anywhere, so residents cannot look at zoning map to see land use plans for their area -standards too subjective -Eliminate Community Enhanced Floating (CEF) zone. Too subjective, inadequate restrictions on developer -Eliminate PSC district -considerable risk that inadequate demand will lead to age restriction being lifted, leaving simply a denser community -Review and perhaps eliminate devices that allow developers to pay fees in lieu of providing certain amenities or that exchange density from one project to another.
479	May-17	Online	Establish a Settled Neighborhood category with: -no further subdivision of lots -setbacks and similar standards in effect when community was built. No clustering if not allowed in original community. -Consider more carefully effect on public facilities likes schools, roads and (especially in

			Dunloggin) stormwater management - Require better protection for mature landscaping when approving infill design
480	May-17	Online	Consider effect on entire area, not just adjacent properties, for both new construction and infill -More effectively address remedies to stormwater problems in existing neighborhoods caused by past inadequate attention to stormwater management by county and developers -Require adequate maintenance of rain gardens or eliminate them as tools for stormwater management
481	May-17	Online	Review and reduce number of allowed uses in residential zones -Eliminate all conditional uses that increase residential density -Eliminate two-family dwellings in single-family zones -Eliminate age-restricted housing conditional use -can be accommodated in traditional zone -considerable risk that inadequate demand will lead to age restriction being lifted, leaving simply a denser Community
482	May-17	Online	Too many waivers and variances. Tighten standards -Review approval processes and reduce number of steps -Review hearing procedures to reduce time for processes like conditional uses
483	May-17	Online	-RE-D zone poorly designed. Too many allowed uses, density too high
484	Apr-17	Online	Evaluation of the 42 zoning types with Department of Planning and Zoning (DPZ) - streamline/update. Emphasis on defining certain terms such as "substantive", "compatible"/ "surrounding"/ and other subjective words to provide ciear criteria.
485	Apr-17	Online	Support legislation that affects Agricultural Preservation property to remain as intended and disallow industrial or large commercial uses. Request the amendment of legislation regarding the preservation process to include recovering County funds on farms which convert to commercial revenue uses.
486	Apr-17	Online	Work to hold developers to the same standards/ regulations, and laws as everyone else, by disallowing resubmissions at the same process level where errors, misinformation, or unmet criteria are found.
487	Apr-17	Online	Work on improving Zoning Board, Hearing Examiner and Board of Appeals schedules by implementing a finish date for proceedings to diminish continuances and delays. No case should take over two years for a decision.
488	Apr-17	Online	Protect the environment with stronger stormwater management regulations with emphasis on retaining forested areas.
489	Apr-17	Online	Promote County enforcement of Dept of Natural Resources State recommendations for development with emphasis on tree cover requirements in addition to specimen tree issues.
490	Apr-17	Online	Create a goal for DPZ to prioritize criteria being met in zoning over and above the maximum allowable density, in that a property is not entitled to the maximum density allowed on parcels if other criteria are not met. Eliminate waivers/ redlines, variances/ acceleration of process, without rare and dire causes that don't harm others. Disallow these when the only goal is to get to maximum density for the parcel. To update the DPZ (PDox)/ Project Development database to show waivers and redlines - not currently functioning.
491	Apr-17	Online	Revisit Route 1 and Route 40 revitalization plans/ updating items required for completion with community input.
492	Apr-17	Online	Conduct a Comprehensive Review of NT Zoning. Revise the NT Zoning Regulations to provide ciear criteria for redevelopment of older residential/ commercial, or industrial areas outside of Downtown Columbia and the Village Centers, it is part of the Policies and Implementing Actions (Policy 10.2) in Plan 2030 as adopted on February 4, 2013.
493	Apr-17	Online	Request a discussion on the implementation of changes to the Rules regarding "Standing" to appeal zoning decisions. Clearly define both the rights of citizens to formally object and the appropriate iimitations.

494	Apr-17	Online	Update the Planning Board (PB) Rules of Procedure last updated in 2007 in particular the "Key PB Functions" table found on page 6. A complete review as to what constitutes a quasi-judidal hearing for the various zoning types needs to be established. Why haven't the Planning Board, Zoning Board and all Hearing Examiners taken the required training classes in zoning per MD law?
495	Apr-17	Online	Have a representative from DPZ attend all Pre-submission meetings to answer any questions from the audience pertaining to the process.
496	Apr-17	Online	a) Where the Traffic Report/ accompanying a submission for Final Deveiopment Plan approval, considers a development's ingress and egress impact on the Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance then the site plan showing the building footprint that was used should be added to the fist of exhibits required in the Technical Staff Report. b) The Technical Staff Report should not simply approve a Traffic Study because a development meets the APFO standards, it should comment on the site ingress and egress location impacts on the adjoining streets and identify the limitations that must be solved in preparing the Site Development Plan submission. c) Downtown densities exceed as-built densities. To mitigate the adverse impact of typical inner city densities and attain Columbia objectives of building a better living environment, minimum Setbacks must be adopted for each street type such as Parkways, Boulevards, Avenues and Streets.
497	Apr-17	Online	The development project would be taxed and paid for first by the developer for the expense of increased needs of future infrastructure after development. This is so that the increased demands for appropriate infrastructures after development has been paid for first by developers instead of having to be paid for by the existing taxpayers after the needs for increased infrastructure occurs. This includes such items as Schools, Fire Protection Facilities/ Police Facilities and Jails and Larger Court Houses, Utility Distribution Systems, Roads, additional Transportation Facilities (buses, rail, and tractor trailers), Sanitary Sewer Systems, Water Treatment Facilities, Libraries and internet Communication Facilities/Recreation Facilities/ and Solid Waste Disposal Systems.
498	Apr-17	Online	Make the recommendations of the Historic Preservation Commission and the Design Advisory Panel Regulatory bodies have to be given "great weight" by the deciding bodies that are given them.
499	Apr-17	Online	Update Planning Board Rules of Procedure, require a certain level of attendance, provide education in zoning matters for Members/ and provide legal training in conducting quasj-judicial hearings.
500	Apr-17	Online	17. Support stronger Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance measurements with emphasis on EMS/FEre/Police/Health, less crowded schools/ eliminated trailers, and stronger traffic tests to update the Level of Service of roads declared "E" means Failure and that no development shall be allowed until such time roads are improved or funding for improvements is designated.
501	Apr-17	Online	Work with the County/ Howard Hughes and Columbia Association to enforce Industrial area Covenants. Emphasis on Symphony Woods plans and Gatekeeper needs to include Columbia land covenants and overseer of the Village enforcement of the design covenants, its interests should be aligned with sound planning decisions.
502	Apr-17	Online	Ensure the protection to existing wetlands in an attempt to protect the Chesapeake Bay.
503	Apr-17	Online	increase the number of sidewalks along county roads and streets.
504	Apr-17	Online	Need better Rt. 1 Policing to keep pace with the development and increased traffic along the corridor.
505	Apr-17	Online	Revisit and update the 2002 requirements for Universal Design to be incorporated by builders in 55+communities.

506	Apr-17	Online	Have a few citizens evaluate the DPZ Website by working with Staff to make suggestions for improvements regarding navigation and contents. This should include a novice, medium experience and someone very knowledgeable in zoning, policy and both the Administration and County Council process.
507	Apr-17	Online	All 42 Boards and Commissions listed on County website needs to have their Minutes current and posted on County website.
508	Apr-17	Online	List on the County website of the Boards to include any public/private partnerships that exist.
509	Apr-17	Online	Work with elected officials and new owners of Merriweather Post Pavilion to put sound level requirements back to the levels prior to the 2013 increase, including the main stage and all auxiliary stages to include Symphony Woods regarding the Chrysalis.
510	Apr-17	Online	Work with our Legislators to effect positive change to BWI Noise levels connected with the FAA NextGen plan to manage air traffic.
511	Apr-17	Online	Work with the Board of Education and Administration to secure land in the Northeast Region of the County as designated by the HCPSS Feasibility study for a new High School. Support new feeder elementary and middle schools there also. Emphasis on using trailers only as a temporary solution.
512	Apr-17	Online	Support blended full spectrum housing in Downtown Columbia. Ensure Affordable Housing in Downtown Columbia finally gets started and is carefully monitored for compliance. Request Howard Hughes to plan for and reserve sites for the civic buildings required in the 2010 Downtown Columbia Plan. In addition, adopt a minimum setback of40-feet for buildings along Broken Land and Little Patuxent Parkways to retain their broad tree-lined characteristics.
513	Apr-17	Online	Work with transportation advocates to ensure the vision for the future of Downtown Columbia transit center becomes reality.
514	Apr-17	Online	Have the County Council Website be consistent in establishing a policy regarding posting "Related Documents to proposed Legislation. If a Bill is presented in its entirety and it is specifically written in "legal language" only, please list a link where someone who can get a more familiar "interpretation of the facts of the bill in simpler terminology. This is for the majority of citizens that are not lawyers. Example: Sanctuary County Bill CB9 2017. The "summary" of this bill was non-specific, that a citizen could not get all the details from that summary. It was too generic.
515	Apr-17	Online	Legislation should be advanced to provide that the Department of Public Works be more transparent by publishing progress studies and other information as it becomes available. Procurement rules should require that the contractor deliver preliminary reports as their work progresses' and publishes them on the website.
516	Apr-17	Online	Look into the feasibility and funding of eliminating overhead wires in downtown Ellicott City.
517	Apr-17	Online	Ensure Bicycle Safety especially in the West to provide separate (bicycle lanes and lay-byes).
518	Apr-17	Online	Consider an educational program for ALL joggers and walkers on rural roads to require the wearing of bright colored clothes or reflective material especially at dusk and during early morning hours. In addition, require running or walking pedestrians to face on-coming traffic. This will become even more meaningful with the advent of electric (silent) vehicles.

519	May-17	Online	I read A Better Way to Zone with great interest. In looking at the New Town Zoning, one of the areas that has the biggest potential to benefit from your review is Downtown Columbia as it continues to develop.My major concern is that the 2010 Downtown Columbia Plan eliminated the previous property line setbacks, raised the building height limitations and did not add floor area ratios to control site capacity. Consequently the four buildings so far constructed to the 2010 Plan are 5 feet or less from their property lines. Their appearance is incompatible with the many existing buildings that are set back 25 feet from streets and 40 to 80 feet from Parkways. Columbia's downtown was conceived as A City in a Park and so very different from typical city centers. To respect this renowned concept, any revision to the zoning should reintroduce the setbacks OR perhaps incorporate the Contextual Zoning or Form-based Zoning provisions described in A Better Way to Zone.
520	May-17	Online	In general there are too many zoning districts.
521	May-17	Online	Need understandable definitions of terms (plain English) and consistent use of those terms. This will make interpretation clearer.
522	May-17	Online	Issues with the R-APT zone: o 25 units to the acres is not “higher density” housing. o The parking requirements for multi-family housing should be based on bedroom count rather than dwelling units. The 2.5 parking spaces per unit requirement is too high by today’s standards. o This zone is best suited for surfaced-parked, 3-4 story, 36-48’ tall, garden style apartments.
523	May-17	Online	Need a zone to address other residential building types. For example: o Wrapped Garage Type: 50-60 du/ac, 4 stories, parked in structure at 1.5spaces/ac. o Podium Type: 60-70 du/ac, 4-6 stories, parked in structure at 1.5spaces/ac.
524	May-17	Online	Need a zone with more for higher density townhomes. R-SA-8 at 8 du/net acre yields a low density, suburban form. For example, more urban building types yield: o 20 ft. Wide Rear-loaded Garage Type: 15 du/ac with minimal alley apron o 18 ft. Wide Rear-loaded Garage Type: 16-18 du/ac with minimal alley apron
525	May-17	Online	Require MIHUs in every residential zone including NT zones. There may be a case for not providing MIHU if it can be proven that market-rate affordable is in proximity to a proposed development. Paying fee-in-lieu never results in the same number of units than if they are built directly by the developer.
526	May-17	Online	Provide density incentives in exchange for added amenities (public, private and semi-private).
527	May-17	Online	Issues with the TOD zone: o The term “developable acreage“ is undefined. The term is directly tied to the residential density calculation. o The term/phrase “net acre of residential development “ is challenging to interpret.
528	May-17	Online	The 2.3 parking spaces per unit for apartments is too high. Most apartments are overparked.

529	May-17	Online	Specific Comments on the Route 1 Manual • The Manual is outdated and no longer relevant. The Manual needs to be revised or discarded. • Outside of providing property owners with new uses (via zoning), there was little incentive for the predominantly industrial and commercial uses to redevelop. • The Manual does not adequately address TOD. It was clear that the TOD components were not the focus since most of the TOD zoned land is not along Route 1. • The land use recommendations in the Manual envisioned a pedestrian friendly Route 1. Route 1 has very few if any opportunities to make it pedestrian friendly. • Too much emphasis on vertically mixed-use development. The corridor is already overly saturated with commercial retail uses. A better goal would be to concentrate retail in designated centers rather than dispersing them into a relentless array of strip centers that eventually compete against each other.
530	May-17	Online	Specific comments on Route 1 manual continued:• Remove the required commercial space in the CAC zone. The code should not dictate since retail is a market-driven use. • Consider an urban renewal approach to address the blight and unmotivated property owners. • The strategy for Route 1 did not take into account the additional school capacity generated by the addition of medium density residential. • The strategy for Route 1 did not take into account the traffic generated by the addition of the redevelopment areas. The Route 1 and MD 175 intersection is too dangerous for pedestrians or bicycles to cross in addition to reaching a near failing LOS. • The corridor has significant grade changes making street-facing development impractical. Sight distance is an issue at the Bluestream development. • The design and posted speeds make for an uncomfortable pedestrian environment. SHA will never decrease capacity along Route 1. Traffic calming only occurs in a few spots (briefly at Main Street Laurel, at the University of Maryland, at the Hyattsville Arts District). Need centers like these in targeted key spots along the corridor with lots of traffic signals and enhanced methods to reduce vehicular speeds (speed cameras, narrow the road section, etc.). • Provide density incentives for adding enhanced streetscape and undergrounding of utilities. In the Montgomery County CBDs, this is the norm and the cost of developing in the CBDs.
531	May-17	Online	Specific Comments on the Green Neighborhoods Ordinance • Sustainability begins with land use. The focus for the Green Neighborhoods program should be on infill rather than greenfield development. • If the goal is environmental protection, then there are other ordinances (SWM and Forest Conservation) that achieve this goal. • Since the provisions are codified, making minor changes requires a legislative action. • Change the ordinance to give general provisions and reference a revised new manual for the specific provisions. Suggest creating a guideline manual that can be revised requiring Planning Board review and approval. Many issues could have been corrected if the provisions were not codified.

532	May-17	Online	Specific Comments on the Green Neighborhoods Ordinance • Make it extremely difficult to apply to sites without significant natural environmental features to comply. Need to have additional credits for urbanized areas or redeveloped areas without a floodplain or large areas of forest to protect. • The credits are skewed too heavily on protection of natural areas (greenfields) and may have the unintended consequence of promoting sprawl. • The reuse of recycled materials for use in building infrastructure often conflicts with the County Road Manual. This makes the recycled materials credit difficult to achieve. Thera may be more conflicts with other codes (i.e. SWM, DOT Design Manuals). • Large multi-phased projects are burdened with excessive process and paperwork. It should be easier for these projects to be sustainable since they have the potential of being very sustainable.
533	May-17	Online	Specific Comments on the Landscape Manual • The Manual is outdated and no longer relevant. The Manual needs to be revised or discarded. • The Manual is too formulaic and promotes conventional suburban development (separation of uses through planted buffers). • The standards are challenging to apply in a high density, compact, urbane development. This usually requires waivers or alternative compliance.
534	May-17	Online	The street design standards need to be modified.
535	May-17	Online	The provision of ESDs within the ROW needs to be addressed.
536	May-17	Online	County streets are generally too wide and designed to allow (legal or not) for greater speeds. The only advantage to an excessively wide street is that it can be modified to permit on-street parking and/or a bike lane.
537	Jun-17	Online	"It should not be permissible to change a farm to anything else (such as housing), any more than a homeowner in a neighborhood of houses can choose to convert his house to a store. Think of the end goal for our county: do we want all our farmland to be out in the midwest? Will we destroy our farmland in order to live in it? Do we want each and every farmhouse replaced by a housing development? Do we want farm culture to disappear: the County Fair, the ability of our children to experience where their food comes from and to learn to care how it is produced? Like it or not, ownership of farmland entails a responsibility to the community. Infill should be encouraged by law, and areas for new development should not be permitted beyond already-developed areas until these are completely, honestly, full. Eventually further development will thus be impossible: yes, our land area is not unlimited! "
538	Jul-17	Online	These comments relate to New Town. Petitioner. In Downtown and the village centers, New Town defines the petitioner as the fee-simple owner of the property but in most other areas zoned New Town (except for small changes to single family lots), it is the original petitioner only (HRD) who may request a change to NT zoned land. This should be reexamined as it was for Downtown and village centers. Land use minimums and maximums. The percentages established in the NT regulations were established to implement the mixture of uses that make-up Columbia. There is a need to evaluate whether those percentages are still appropriate more than 50 years later. Overall Residential Density. There is a maximum overall residential density specified in New Town. After more than 50 years, there may be a need to accommodate additional residential uses in Columbia to meet the needs of the community going forward. This should be examined and addressed. Moderate Income Housing Unit Provisions. These regulations do not apply in New Town outside of Downtown Columbia. This should be revisited. Redevelopment Process. To be more in alignment with the County's General Plan and the State's land use policies, which encourage and promote growth in centers, redevelopment areas, and those areas already served by public water and sewer, the

			development process for Columbia's village centers and Downtown should be re-examined and streamlined. The process, as currently required, makes it more difficult to redevelop than it does to build in green field areas. This seems counter to county and state land use policies. Infill. One of the most difficult things to address is how new development fits in with older areas. Outside Downtown Columbia there is no guidance or criteria to guide these decisions. Administrative Review. More clarity is desirable on how administrative decisions are made. Decision making criteria included in the regulations would be beneficial. FDPs. Since DPZ has digitized all the New Town FDPs, generalized their major land use, and created a digital map, one idea worth investigating would be to create sub-categories of NT to guide future (re)development of these generalized land use categories.
539	Jul-17	Online	Until our county has housing in direct proportion to all the income levels in the county we are living in a place we do not deserve. On the subject of mass transit, the county is woefully lacking. I wish every elected official could visit Europe to experience adequate mass transit. It is readily available yet doesn't intrude on the residential feel of neighborhoods. Even Boston, NYC and Philadelphia are way ahead of us. Imagine being able to hop a train in Columbia and read a good book while you are whisked to Baltimore or DC.
540	Jul-17	Online	Change development regulation to allow Forest Conservation Easements on residential lots of 3 acres or more, provided that the easement is no closer than 100 feet from a dwelling and does not encumber more than 2/3s of the lot area.
541	Jul-17	Online	My concern is to protect and preserve established residential neighborhoods that border on or are extremely close to land zoned for industrial use. Howard County is and must be responsible to its citizens for ever having permitted residential developments adjacent to industrial zones. The county should NEVER have permitted homes to be built next to industrial zones, but it did. Now the county's first duty is to the homeowners and taxpayers living next to industrial zones. I recommend that no additional residential building be permitted adjacent to industrial zones and that existing residential neighborhoods bordering or extremely close to industrial zones be protected from any and all new industrial development. Established neighborhoods must be protected from onerous industry that might seek to build on that land after homes have been built and neighborhoods long established. Thank you.
542	Jul-17	Online	I wish to comment that I have lived at 4010 Saint John's Lane in Ellicott for approximately 16 or 17 years. In that time I have seen increasing water flow through the back of my property when it rains heavily. I have pictures of water flowing like a river across my back yard....and the pictures are not of the worst instances. I cannot determine the source of the increased flow, but my guess would have to be that it is due to all the infill on my block (on my side of the block). My immediate neighbor also has a worsening water issue when it rains. Neither of us had such a pronounced issue 15 years ago.
543	Jul-17	Online	I wanted to bring up my wife and my concern about the water run-off issue here at 4018 Saint Johns Lane that has gotten quite bad since we moved into this house in 1993. The main issue, we believe, is that the road surface on Saint Johns Lane has had so many road surface built up and never had the older layers removed. As this has occurred, the water runs onto out property and not down the street to the drain in front of 4010. Our front yard has become a swimming pool when we get heavy rains and our driveway also looks like a swimming pool on the apron. I can provide photos to show the same to you, if you'd like!!! This same rain water runs between our house and the neighbors house at 4010 and eventually winds up in her back yard! It has formed a ditch there between our two houses that I often have tried to fill with dirt from other parts of our property. Several years ago, we had decided that we had had enough water issues with our basement flooding when we got the heavy rains, so we had a drain tile system installed with a new sump pump to help alleviate this flooding issue!

			This flooding issue is out of control and needs to be dealt with, not only on our property, but other locations throughout the Dunloggin neighborhood!!! Enough is enough! After 24 years here at 4018 we deserve better!!! Would love to chat with you guys and to show photos mentioned above!!! The home phone here is-. Regards and hope to talk soon!
544	Jul-17	Public Meeting	Conditional Uses for two-family dwellings has too few conditions especially for a use that will double density.
545	Jul-17	Public Meeting	Age Restricted Adult Housing is being overbuilt in the county. There is a fear that the 55+ market will deminish and these communities will no longer be 55+. Developers are building Age Restricted Adult Housing because they can achieve greater density through the Conditional Use process.
546	Jul-17	Public Meeting	The Instructional Use Conditional Use in the R-20 district will allow instruction of music, dance, martial arts, yoga, and meditation, but does not allow academic teachings.
547	Jul-17	Public Meeting	For Conditional Use petitions the burden of proof is on the protestant instead of the applicant. The process of the Hearing Authority review should be reviewed.
548	Jul-17	Public Meeting	Processes need to be simplified, but still accommodate public input and the development industry.
549	Jul-17	Public Meeting	Appeals to the Board of Appeals should not be heard as de novo trials.
550	Jul-17	Public Meeting	The regulations should focus on predictability.
551	Jul-17	Public Meeting	Houses built on pipestem lots should not be allowed to face the rear of existing houses fronting on a public road.
552	Jul-17	Public Meeting	Whiskey Bottom Road has been upzoned to allow existing parcels with existing houses to be subdivided into multiple lots.
553	Jul-17	Public Meeting	Village Center parking lots are being redeveloped into high density apartments causing parking inadequacies.
554	Jul-17	Public Meeting	The commercial redevelopment process is too time consuming. Market conditions drive redevelopment and what was once a vibrant marketplace may no longer be.
555	Jul-17	Public Meeting	The requirements for the Route 1 overlay are too prescriptive.
556	Jul-17	Public Meeting	The Design Advisory Panel should expand its role and not only focus on corridor redevelopment.
557	Jul-17	Public Meeting	The plan exhibits presented by the applicant in the pre-submission community meeting is not what is being submitted to the County for approval.
558	Jul-17	Public Meeting	Why is the Design Advisory Panel an advisory panel and not an approving authority? At the River Hill Garden Center meeting the Design Advisory Panel provided great input for site and building design that should be required.
559	Jul-17	Public Meeting	There needs to be a balance between maximizing profit and site design. The majority of surrounding properties concerns are based on things they can see, hear and smell.
560	Jul-17	Public Meeting	Developments are mass graded and not built with nature. Sites are stripped, filled, and all nature is removed before development.
561	Jul-17	Public Meeting	Current stormwater management regulations reduces area for site design. The regulations need to examine how redevelopment is impacted by regulations not in effect at the time initial construction occurred.
562	Jul-17	Public Meeting	The effects of new buildings on infrastructure (schools, traffic, transit) is a major concern.
563	Jul-17	Public Meeting	Development site design must provide connectivity. Developers should have an obligation to build sidewalks and connect to existing infrastructure.
564	Jul-17	Public Meeting	Alignment of infrastructure and development is a major concern.
565	Jul-17	Stakeholder	The public has an emotional concern of Conditional Uses because it allows unepected

		Meeting	change to occur.
566	Jul-17	Stakeholder Meeting	Many projects over the last 20 years keep falling into the Conditional Use category.
567	Jul-17	Stakeholder Meeting	Conditional Use language is arbitrary and usually driven based on one development plan that will impact the entire district.
568	Jul-17	Stakeholder Meeting	The NT process for Conditional Uses is through an FDP amendment to establish the use in the particular FDP project area.
569	Jul-17	Stakeholder Meeting	The guidelines for Conditional Use approval need to be evaluated.
570	Jul-17	Stakeholder Meeting	Conditional Use expansions are taking a small community use and making them an institutional use.
571	Jul-17	Stakeholder Meeting	FDP's were written by a developer and the language is meant to be flexible.
572	Jul-17	Stakeholder Meeting	Language in the FDP's cross reference to another zoning district, so changes to those other districts impact the FDP's and allowable uses.
573	Jul-17	Stakeholder Meeting	Assess what is actually built compared to the FDP. Consider form based zoning for NT.
574	Jul-17	Stakeholder Meeting	Infill and redevelopment are major concerns for Columbia Village Centers and Downtown.
575	Jul-17	Stakeholder Meeting	NT infill and redevelopment is pretty well governed by the process. The swiss cheese areas in the NT district should be made compatible with the NT district.
576	Jul-17	Stakeholder Meeting	Schools operate with Columbia and non-Columbia communities, so open space outside of Columbia is still a concern for Columbia communities.
577	Jul-17	Stakeholder Meeting	What will happen to vacant FDP parcels? Will they be rezoned to another use? People do not understand the potential uses of properties that are vacant or green space.
578	Jul-17	Stakeholder Meeting	Reevaluate parking standards for townhome communities. Many communities complain about lack of parking.
579	Jul-17	Stakeholder Meeting	The Lakefront does not have adequate parking.
580	Jul-17	Stakeholder Meeting	Building orientation should be evaluated during site design. The orientation of buildings on Snowden River Parkway were not thoughtout.
581	Jul-17	Stakeholder Meeting	There is a lack of connectivity and no community aspect between uses.
582	Jul-17	Stakeholder Meeting	Plan for the change in transportation mode. There is a disconnect between old time transportation methods and new transportation methods. Focus on new methods and shared transit rather than individual vehicle transportation.
583	Jul-17	Stakeholder Meeting	Site design impacts quality of development more than building design.
584	Jul-17	Stakeholder Meeting	The approved design guidelines for Downtown Columbia provides a better visualization and big picture for future uses. It should be mandatory to have a design manual before development.
585	Jul-17	Stakeholder Meeting	There is more desire for design guidelines because they encourage quality design. It allows corporate redevelopment to be compatable with well designed existing communities.
586	Jul-17	Stakeholder Meeting	Are solar panels used to light street lights considered commercial solar and not permitted by the NT regulations?
587	Jul-17	Stakeholder Meeting	Primary use is not defined in NT zoning.
588	Jul-17	Stakeholder Meeting	The Planning Board criteria for site development plan approvals (outside Downtown Columbia and NT) is limited.

589	Jul-17	Stakeholder Meeting	Be mindful of Conditional Use criteria and farm use permit criteria that restricts uses to properties located on arterial or collector roads. Farms cannot choose what roads they are located on.
590	Jul-17	Stakeholder Meeting	The major issues related to commercial mulching is health and traffic issues.
591	Jul-17	Stakeholder Meeting	Agricultural preservation parcels are treated differently than unencumbered farms. The preservation is only to sell development righs and not to give up the right to farm.
592	Jul-17	Stakeholder Meeting	Allow mulch and compost in agricultural preservation parcels.
593	Jul-17	Stakeholder Meeting	What is the line between commercial trucking and trucking in relation to an agricultural use. What is the definition of commercial?
594	Jul-17	Stakeholder Meeting	How will Conditional Use changes affect the review of the Agricultural Presrevation Board?
595	Jul-17	Stakeholder Meeting	The code should allow trending uses that will be economically beneficial for farm owners, including wedding venues, wineries and other related uses. New major residential subdivisions will have a greater impact in overall traffic, schools, etc.
596	Jul-17	Stakeholder Meeting	Consider allowance of AirBNB
597	Jul-17	Stakeholder Meeting	Allow detached accessory dwelling units to provide an affortable option for large parcels in western Howard county.
598	Jul-17	Stakeholder Meeting	Farms have setbacks from residential units. Consider requiring residential units to have setbacks from farms.
599	Jul-17	Stakeholder Meeting	Be careful with types of buffering along residential and agricultural properties. Planting oak trees along property boundaries can impact the usable area of the agricultural land due to potential shading issues and acid from leaves.
600	Jul-17	Stakeholder Meeting	There are better tools to implement the Final Development Plan process.
601	Jul-17	Stakeholder Meeting	Seriously consider the concept of incorporating Columbia.
602	Jul-17	Stakeholder Meeting	Provide a better classification on what "standing" is.
603	Jul-17	Stakeholder Meeting	Limit Conditional Uses and those that may be classified as back door spot zoning.
604	Jul-17	Stakeholder Meeting	Combine the zoning and subdivision and land development regulations.
605	Jul-17	Stakeholder Meeting	Board of Appeal cases from the Hearing's Examiner should be heard on the record. This will provide incentive for petitioner's to present their best product even if they assume the case will be appealed.
606	Jul-17	Stakeholder Meeting	Consider having a Master Examiner who hears the case and defers the decision to the Board of Appeals.
607	Jul-17	Stakeholder Meeting	Board of Appeals cannot hear decisions made by the Zoning Board or County Council.
608	Jul-17	Stakeholder Meeting	Some petitioners request text amendments instead of seeking variances because it is easier to get County Council approval instead of approval from the Hearing Authority.
609	Jul-17	Stakeholder Meeting	There are too many text amendments too often. Changes to the regulations are sporadic.
610	Jul-17	Stakeholder Meeting	Mixed use centers with ground floor retail need adequate pedestrian connectivity to residences.
611	Jul-17	Stakeholder Meeting	Lessen the Conditional Use criteria by making it clearer and less ambiguous.
612	Jul-17	Stakeholder Meeting	Holistically clean up the entire code.

613	Jul-17	Stakeholder Meeting	The code should be drafted by professional experts. Many of the amendments are written by the County Council and public who are amateur code writers.
614	Jul-17	Stakeholder Meeting	Include criteria for protecting floodplain in certain Conditional Use criteria. Without it there is no mechanism to take into account potential floodplain issues. Land in Howard County is dwindling and environmental impacts have become more prevalent.
615	Jul-17	Stakeholder Meeting	Too much responsibility for stormwater management has been placed on individual homeowners.
616	Jul-17	Stakeholder Meeting	To alleviate scheduling problems that prolong projects, allow certain cases to go directly to the Board of Appeals instead of going through the Hearing's Examiner.
617	Jul-17	Stakeholder Meeting	The Board of Appeals can limit the opening and closing statements, but cannot limit the time for testimony, therefore Hearings can be prolonged.
618	Jul-17	Stakeholder Meeting	Appeals should be on the motion and merits. If a case is appealed on one or two points the testimony should only be heard on those points and not on all criteria evaluated with the Conditional Use case.
619	Jul-17	Stakeholder Meeting	Separate the Zoning Board from the County Council.
620	Jul-17	Stakeholder Meeting	Planning Board Rules of Procedure are different depending on the case being heard.
621	Jul-17	Stakeholder Meeting	Emphasize the need for procedural changes in regards to interested citizen participation. The process is more complicated than needed and difficult to undertand for the average citizen.
622	Jul-17	Stakeholder Meeting	The development process in contorted and confusing. The role of the Planning Board is ineffective and they do not have a valuable contribution to the development process. The Planning Board should have better expertise and better qualifications.
623	Jul-17	Stakeholder Meeting	The Planning Board is not needed outside of the Columbia review process.
624	Jul-17	Stakeholder Meeting	Update the Rules of Procedure for the Planning Board. Why are the Rules different for the Planning Board and Zoning Board?
625	Jul-17	Stakeholder Meeting	Paternal Gift is the only successful cluster development. The Density Exchange Option is too dense, the requirements are too weak and the preserved area is poorly designed. Alter the formula for density exchange.
626	Jul-17	Stakeholder Meeting	Conditional Uses must conform with MD Law and MD Case Law. Write the law with anticipation of future legislation.The burden of proof should be on the applicant to to demonstrate his/her location is the best possible choice for the use.
627	Jul-17	Stakeholder Meeting	Area outside of the Planned Service Area controls the future of zoning and land use and can only be changed in the General Plan.
628	Jul-17	Stakeholder Meeting	Howard county regulations have withered away and the bar is too low. The County is facilitating instead of regulating law. The County defines steep slopes different than the State and HSCD. DNR standards should have influence on Howard County regulations, such as critical areas. Use Maryland Law for advice on preserving tree cover and mitigation for specimen tree removal. Two new trees do not replace an 100 year old tree. Developers are using home incentives to replace lack of natural beauty. If you make developers live in the area they propose to developer to experience the traffic and construction and overcrowded schools. Primarily need to have site design regulations to for a better design with the natural environment.
629	Jul-17	Stakeholder Meeting	Standards for new development in existing neighborhoods are poorly designed. Dunloggin has poorly drained soils and rolling topography that is not suitable for infill development. Stormwater management is not adequate in the Dunloggin area and ESD practices should be required by developer. Provide a settled neighborhood classification that does not allow further subdivision of lots. Require setbacks and bulk regulations that were in effect when the original subdivision was created. No cluster

			developments and no fee-in-lieu for developer activity. Think about the remedies of smaller SWM practices and the maintenance required by individual homeowners. Every house in Dunloggin could convert into a two-family dwelling. Protect older neighborhoods.
630	Jul-17	Stakeholder Meeting	Remove floating zones because uses are not predictable. The Zoning Board has too much influence in design. Leave that to the planners. Zoning should not be changed unless there is a mistake. Contract zoning is illegal, but it is occurring. Dorsey Hall is a good cluster development that is zoned R-20. They only pay Columbia Association dues, but are not part of the NT district or process.
631	Jul-17	Stakeholder Meeting	There are 14 counties that have APFO and only six have provisions for stormwater management. Why does Howard County not include stormwater management in the APFO?
632	Jul-17	Stakeholder Meeting	Clarion should review Decision and Orders to understand the process. The right to appeal is statutory in nature.
633	Jul-17	Stakeholder Meeting	Jusification for alternative compliance needs to be adequate.
634	Jul-17	Stakeholder Meeting	Change the use of properties through site development plan instead of rezonings.
635	Jul-17	Stakeholder Meeting	Howard County has a lot of plans but implementation of the plans is inadequate.
636	Jul-17	Stakeholder Meeting	Provide affordable housing throughout the County.
637	Jul-17	Stakeholder Meeting	Preservation and modification of existing dwellings is essential. A large portion of the population wants to age in place.
638	Jul-17	Stakeholder Meeting	Flexibility in the regulations is needed, but character should remain unchanged.
639	Jul-17	Stakeholder Meeting	Update the Route 1 Manual. Route 1 is a transportation and job corridor that has been transformed into residential zoning.
640	Jul-17	Stakeholder Meeting	The ZRA to further reduce commercial space in the CAC zone has impacted development along the entire corridor.
641	Jul-17	Stakeholder Meeting	The 2000 Downtown Columbia Plan needs adjustment. There is concern about the public realm, specifically the public streets. The guidelines describe how the streets should be, but there is no dimension between curb and building. Dimensions need to be added to the guidelines. To maximize density buildings are placed right along the road. Zoning should address street setbacks for complete streets. Refer to Tysons Corner new guidelines for setbacks and dimensions. Jim Rouse's vision is for a greener downtown community.
642	Jul-17	Stakeholder Meeting	Industrial parks have become business parks and are the best for redevelopment opportunities. Warehousing space is diminishing.
643	Jul-17	Stakeholder Meeting	There is a wall between the County and Columbia. How can the wall be loosened?
644	Jul-17	Stakeholder Meeting	Provide more objective standards.
645	Jul-17	Stakeholder Meeting	Streets are not designed for industrial uses.
646	Jul-17	Stakeholder Meeting	The covenants and ownership are important for Columbia to survive.
647	Jul-17	Stakeholder Meeting	There are concerns from the development community that property will become undevelopable through the code rewrite.
648	Jul-17	Stakeholder Meeting	Base zones need to be more predictable.
649	Jul-17	Stakeholder	The process is more cumbersome and time consuming that it was 10 years ago. It used

		Meeting	to be an advantage to develop in Howard County.
650	Jul-17	Stakeholder Meeting	The County needs to have more available public meeting dates. Waiting 3-months for continuation date is unacceptable. The Planning Board needs 12 members that are randomly partnered together for separate hearing nights so that more meetings can be heard. Consider two Hearings Examiners or an administrative law judge to hear rezoning petitions.
651	Jul-17	Stakeholder Meeting	It is a positive that not all development plans require Planning Board approval.
652	Jul-17	Stakeholder Meeting	Specifically speaking for Downtown Columbia, the final plan requirement for private road reivew is not efficient. The private road review should be included in the site development plan review.
653	Jul-17	Stakeholder Meeting	The Preliminary Development Plan and Final Development Plan processes are too complicated, especially amendments to those plans.
654	Jul-17	Stakeholder Meeting	There is a high degree of subjective criteria for Conditional Uses.
655	Jul-17	Stakeholder Meeting	Variances to specific Conditional Use criteria should be allowed.
656	Jul-17	Stakeholder Meeting	There should be ability to rezone property outside of the comprehensive zoning process to allow underutilized properties to be developed to full potential.
657	Jul-17	Stakeholder Meeting	There is an excessive amount of public involvement that gives a false hope of entitlement. It is not a popularity contest when it comes to public hearings and the law.
658	Jul-17	Stakeholder Meeting	A lot of time is spent on processing alternative compliance petitions for specimen tree removal, environmental features on lots less than 10 acres and time extension requests.
659	Jul-17	Stakeholder Meeting	There are missing definitions in the regulations.
660	Jul-17	Stakeholder Meeting	Higher density developments are over parked creating more impervious area and more stormwater management devices.
661	Jul-17	Stakeholder Meeting	Retail parking has been increased from 5 spaces per 1,000 square feet to 6 spaces to 1,000 square feet. This ratio is too hihg. Retail sets its own parking requirements and it is important not to provide a cap in parking.
662	Jul-17	Stakeholder Meeting	Regulations for self storage are limited to certain zoning districts.
663	Jul-17	Public Meeting	There is a lack of consistency in Conditional Use wording. What is the difference between adjoining and abutting and shall and should? The County does not follow the regulations as they are written.
664	Jul-17	Public Meeting	There should be consequences for repeat violators of Conditional Uses.
665	Jul-17	Public Meeting	Allow some uses, such as landscape contractors, blacksmiths, sawmills as Conditional Uses in the eastern county.
666	Jul-17	Public Meeting	The visual impact on surrounding communities need to be concrete and terms need to be defined.
667	Jul-17	Public Meeting	What is the process for review of an environmental impact study? Who is responsible for preparation and who is responsible for review and approval?
668	Jul-17	Public Meeting	Property posting needs to be revised. There needs to be earlier notification of proposed Conditional Uses before a public hearing.
669	Jul-17	Public Meeting	Roosters should not be allowed in Columbia.
670	Jul-17	Public Meeting	The character of neighborhoods should be assessed.
671	Jul-17	Public	The development process should include sustainability tools and renewable energy.

		Meeting	
672	Jul-17	Public Meeting	Starter homes are gone. There are more developer driven developments than individual developments, which results in maximum density products.
673	Jul-17	Public Meeting	There are no innovated development approaches. Howard County have not moved beyond typical residential development. It feels like we have taken a step back. We need more creative designs and creative building types.
674	Jul-17	Public Meeting	Conditional Use process lacks communication. The process does not facilitate communication between the parties. The process is run as though it is a criminal court and it hinders the communication between the developer and community. The process creates barriers in communication. Citizens are not familiar with the process and need Counsel to help defend the community, which results in money being spent in order to voice a substantial opposition.
675	Jul-17	Public Meeting	The developer has spent tons of money on a plan and by the time the pre-submission community meeting is held the developer has angst in change since so much money has already been spent.
676	Jul-17	Public Meeting	What is the definition of minor modification in the Conditional Use regulations?
677	Jul-17	Public Meeting	There is a lot of opposition to connecting public streets during new subdivision design even when the existing subdivision has planned for the future connection.
678	Jul-17	Public Meeting	If local roads do not connect, we push cars onto connectors which increases traffic on those roads.
679	Jul-17	Public Meeting	Outside of Downtown Columbia and Village Centers there is one preliminary development plan. There is no vision for future development. Can we change the NT zoning without a crisp vision of the future?
680	Jul-17	Public Meeting	Agricultural land should remain open and there are plenty of uses to sustain larger parcels. We do not need to condense all the farmland.
681	Jul-17	Public Meeting	With all of the public input how do you weigh options and draft a comprehensive plan with all the differentiating opinions and interests?
682	Jul-17	Public Meeting	APFO should include fire, police and stormwater management.
683	Jul-17	Public Meeting	Is the redline revision process going to be evaluated? Mylar originals for older site development plans require hand drafting and technology is getting away from hand drafting.
684	Aug-17	Online	I'm writing to you about changing the Howard County policy that requires the connection of neighborhood streets to new development projects. If this change makes sense to you then please consider asking any groups you support to sign on to a letter to County Executive Kittleman. This policy has a particularly damaging effect when applied to courts, dead-ends and other cul-de-sac streets. It turns quiet neighborhood streets into thru roads. There are hundreds, probably thousands, of these dead-end streets throughout Howard County. There's probably some in your neighborhood. We're helping several communities in Howard County who are faced with this very issue. One of these, Fulton Estates, is an excellent example of the damaging effect of an out-dated policy. Fulton Estates Court is presently a quiet, dead-end street with a dozen homes. A development company wants to create a connection with Lime Kiln Road – a major thoroughfare as shown in the illustration posted at: Fulton Court. If this connection is created then the alternate routes provided by GPS apps, could make Fulton Estates Court-Lime Kiln Road an attractive cut-thru option to avoid congestion on MD216. At times this could increase traffic volume on Fulton Estates Court from the present dozen peak-hour trips to hundreds. Current Howard County policy requires developers to convert dead-end streets into thru roads. This is done to provide emergency vehicles with a second means of access should the primary road become blocked. This benefit could be achieved without exposing a quiet

			neighborhood to cut-thru traffic. One option would be to require locked gates across the second access road. The gate could only be opened by emergency services personnel. This would provide a second means of access for emergency vehicles without exposing neighborhood residents to a large increase in cut-thru traffic. This is but one of several options for achieving this same goal. If this change in County policy makes sense to you then please consider urging groups you support to sign on to the letter posted at: Neighborhood Preservation Sign-On Letter. If they'd like to sign-on, just say so in a reply to this message. I'd be delighted to stop by and discuss this neighborhood preservation effort with you and others active in your group. To schedule a meeting or to discuss this request, contact me at
685	Aug-17	Online	New Town Zoning - there should be a Columbia Planning Board, operating under the auspices of the Department of Planning and Zoning. Five members would be appointed by the County Executive selected from a list of ten submitted by the Village Boards. County Council would approve. HRD's gatekeeper role should be abolished with property owners having the right to go directly to DPZ. Covenants should be relinquished by HRD.
686	Aug-17	Online	Thanks for providing a way for citizens to be aware of and participate in the Development Regulations Assessment in Howard County. For those citizens who are interested in the Howard County Development Regulations assessment process, but who are not so close to development regulations, it is critical to have all abbreviations defined. I suggest a separate document where all abbreviations used by Clarion, by DPZ, and in all comments be listed alphabetically and defined. This would be very easy to do and would greatly improve access and clarity!
687	Aug-17	Online	Thanks to all participants county and citizen alike for improving the the process and our lives . I believe all of this good work will be lost if we do not along with this process address the Former practice/habit/back room directive(s) of An administration or councils ability to influence P&Z outcomes. For the benefit of the few. Just read the comments to this process, you will come away with a good list of what are perceived as abuses of the trust. Please understand this is way outside the Planers ability to interpret written standards. Council action or adding to an existing form of oversight may be the way to mitigate this real problem that has led us to the reform we are seeing in this process here today. My comment goal is to spark the parallel conversation or result for the benefit of all
688	Aug-17	Online	I reviewed the public survey results provided online recently and was disappointed to see what appeared to be only 558 respondents roughly for a county of our size. I was however pleased to see that a lot of the concerns that I, and many neighbors that I speak to regularly, were highlighted regarding the residential zoning process not working. The continued growth of residential housing in the northern Ellicott City area, and proposed conditional use changes, continues to increase density in already overcrowded areas of the county. There doesn't appear to be a good checks and balance between the desires of land developers and the community residents that have to live with those desires and decisions of the planning board. It is the residents that are left to suffer with the overcrowding of schools and increased traffic congestion, and not the developers and planning board. While these survey numbers are small, I felt they were very representative of my general feelings as well as many people I know that live in Howard County in the North. I think when many people hear the words Planning and Zoning they just don't understand what that actually means to them and ignore notices or communications about it. I hope that future surveys are better publicized and that they are continued to be used throughout the process. Please take this survey feedback into consideration during discussions around proposed changes to the zoning regulations.

689	Sep-17	Online	There is a recent example that highlights many of the underlying issues related to regulations being enforced. A recent Decision and Order BA 735D ("D&O") issued by the Howard County Hearing Examiner takes a very straight forward application of a zoning regulation provision and instead rewrites the law, then makes it impossibly complex! This 30+ page D&O shows the author "twisting her self in knots", "muddying the waters" to arrive at a foreordained conclusion This decision as written appears to be calculated to deceive. In this case the Hearing Examiner literally rewrote the regulations. Now think how a Planning Board made up of laypeople are going to react to this! Undoubtedly, the arguments made in this Decision can easily be refuted by another zoning expert but then the Planning Board is confronted with two complex documents! Especially, if someone is intent to deceive. In this decision, the writer obfuscates the deception by sprinkling words like "preasonable de minimis, supportive, related and on balance" and then piles in irrelevant material. Now how can a Planning Board react to this? How do they pick between two experts? One of the issues discussed in the past with council has been "simple English" that is regulations that can be clearly understood but when you have someone intent on supporting one side this would not help. FDP interpretation is not complex, they have been interpreted perfectly well for 40 years! How can we develop a system of regulation that minimizes and discourages this type of abuse?
690	Sep-17	Online	Comments submitted on behalf of the Horizon Foundation: The Horizon Foundation welcomes the opportunity to provide comments on the County's update to its Land Development Code. Howard County is to be commended for using the update to strengthen the transportation and land use connection. This connection was an integral part of the original planning for Columbia and can be applied county-wide. We encourage the County to take full advantage of this opportunity and strongly recommends the County complete its work on writing and adopting a complete streets policy, and incorporate that policy and its companion processes into the updated development code. Changes to the County's land development vision must be paired with changes to the County's approach to building, operating and maintaining its transportation network. The connection between transportation and land development is well-documented. Thus, the revised land development code must include a process that leverages this connection to the greatest extend possible. Streets that accommodate the needs of all users are a highly-valued asset that helps communities retain employers and residents, and attract new businesses. When implemented well, Complete Streets policies have consistently resulted in stronger local economies and community connectedness, fewer crashes within the public right-of-way, and opportunities for public health gains. Once adopted, the Howard County Complete Streets policy would accomplish several key purposes for the county: 1. Articulate the county's vision for a multimodal transportation system 2. Establish a new process for ensuring all transportation project and the maintenance and operation of existing transportation facilities accommodate all users, regardless of

			travel mode 3. Over time, result in a multimodal transportation network that, when combined with the County's trails network, enhances safety, mobility and access for all travelers Suggested resources for transportation and land use: 1. From the American Planning Association, "The Transportation/Land Use Connection," Revised Edition, available at https://www.planning.org/publications/report/9026872/ 2. From the Victoria Transport Policy Institute, "Land Use Impacts on Transport: How Land Use Factors Affect Travel Behavior" available at http://www.vtpi.org/landtravel.pdf
691	Sep-17	Online	Safe transportation by the user's chosen mode, whether public transit, foot, bicycle or motor vehicle is a civic right, especially for our aging demographic, for those without the resources to have private vehicles and the young who prefer not to drive. The County's land development must be allowed only where the existing and concurrently improved network can properly serve the development with multi-modal transportation. Transportation by multiple modes is as essential a public facility as water and sewer. All new development must be evaluated from this point of view. A facility open to the public such as residential, offices that serve the community, retail, library and other community facilities, must be located where it will be served by public transit, bike and pedestrian access. New development must allow for safe crossings of major roadways both for direct pedestrian access and so that fixed public transit routes in both directions of travel can be accessed from either side of streets, even if they are large streets. Thus, before allowing a new development at a large pedestrian-unfriendly intersection, ped/bike/transit facilities must be improved. This may include pedestrian signals, overpasses and tunnels and could be done with a combination of public and developer funds. See specific comments on the attached marked up Subdivision and Land Development Regulations. New development must carry the full public cost of the additional burden it places on our transportation facilities. When new residential or other development is allowed, it will increase traffic on nearby roads, thus making it less safe to walk, bike or ride transit. Therefore, such development must include upgrades to facilities such as sidewalks, road shoulders, bike lanes/paths and bus shelters, including facilities that extend beyond the property being developed. The County must assist with procuring land from adjacent property owners by purchase or eminent domain. The cost may need to be born by both public and developer funds. Depending on the size of the development and expected traffic, new facilities should extend to the nearest existing facility, which will sometimes be a considerable distance away. Nobody has the right to make another's world less safe. Streets that accommodate the needs of all users are a highly-valued asset that helps communities retain employers, labor force, residents, and attract new businesses. When implemented with effective regulations, Complete Streets policies have consistently resulted in stronger local economies and community connectedness, fewer crashes within the public right-of-way, and opportunities for public health gains."

692	Dec-17	Online	Your focus seems to be entirely on "redevelopment", without regard for preserving the character of the county or the ecology of the land and the reasons homeowners bought property here in Howard County in the first place. I live in Columbia, and I didn't come here because I wanted to live in ugly concrete canyons. The people who bought here years ago invested in the beauty of Howard County and we don't want more congestion, utlra-high density, sprawl, and miles of concrete they have in Reston now. Don't make Howard County ugly in the name of $$$.
693	Dec-17	Online	I appreciate the extent of public outreach and the transparency of this effort. I am concerned, however, that by streamlining procedures that currently slow the land development process, new development could occur apace, which is not desirable or sustainable. I support streamlining re-development because it has the opportunity to improve on current environmental conditions, but new green land development should received stronger environmental review and protection before being streamlined. In particular, remaining natural areas such as lands in the Green Infrastructure Network should be excluded from development or include exceptional protections. Decisions on natural land development should not be made at the staff level without outside expert review.
694	Dec-17	Online	The process of growth in Howard County has become out of control. Growth does not equal success and prosperity. 29 and Route 40 are jammed from 3:00 pm - 7:00 pm. We have a tremendous amount of planned building coming in place over the next five years. We do not have adequate infrastructure to manage the building within the zoning regulations. The lax conditional use regulations MUST be changed to include off-site considerations, such as APFO . The "Roads test" must include safety and not just adequate ingress and egress as determined by the paid representatives for the builders and developers. The land development regulations must include consideration of the existing taxpayers and not be so heavily determined by the high paid professionals that developers can afford to pay to find loopholes and abuse the system.
695	Dec-17	Online	College Avenue that connects St Paul Street to Bonnie Branch Road does not have a walking path. Currently walking in College Avenue is completely unsafe. Can the Land Development regulation and zoning please consider it as a request to develop one? This will be a great advantage for residents in this area to walk to Historic Ellicott City.

Additional Documentation Submitted with Comments:

- Dunloggin: A Case Study Of Damage to Existing Neighborhoods
- Howard County Citizens Association & The People's Voice 2017 – Action Items
- Letter: Greater Highland Crossroads Association
- Letter: Cherry Tree Park Condominiums
- Letter: MBIA
- Letter: British American Building
- Letter: Kevin Garvey
- Letter: Hickory Ridge Community Association