

Legislative Testimony (online submissions) 12-18-2023

Timestamp	First name	Last name	City	State	Zip code	Are you representing yourself?	If no, what organization or whom do you represent?	Legislation	Position	Remarks	Attachment
2023-12-16 6:30:08	Linda	Hanifin Bonner	Annapolis	MD	21401	No	Anne Arundel Connecting Together, Inc.	Bill No. 78-23aaa: Essential Worker Housing Access Act of 2023 (MPDU bill) (amended)	Support		YES
2023-12-17 8:45:47	Tom	Decker	Annapolis	Maryland	21409	Yes		Bill No. 78-23aaa: Essential Worker Housing Access Act of 2023 (MPDU bill) (amended)	Oppose	Forcing developers to create high-density housing in all new developments creates more of a strain on the local infrastructure (roads, schools, utilities) that can't support the current population. Additionally, "affordable housing" means subsidized housing. Who's paying for these subsidies? "High-density" means apartments, condos, and townhouses. Not everyone wants to live in an urban environment. Some of us like suburban setting that comes with living outside cities.	
2023-12-17 9:44:22	Denise	MacDonald	Millersville	MD	21108	Yes		Bill No. 78-23aaa: Essential Worker Housing Access Act of 2023 (MPDU bill) (amended)	Oppose		
2023-12-17 21:17:24	Deborah	Gundry	Annapolis	MD	21401-1109	Yes		Bill No. 78-23aaa: Essential Worker Housing Access Act of 2023 (MPDU bill) (amended)	Support	Dear Councilperson Rodvien, As a constituent of your district, I am writing to urge you to restore key portions of the proposed Essential Worker Housing Bill (#78-23). The County's proposed Essential Worker Housing Bill is a critical tool in a full toolkit of strategies to increase access to housing that is attainable for all in our County. This issue is important to me because the thought of our firefighters, our police force, our teachers, our social workers and so on not being able to afford to live here may cause us to loose our essential worker force when they have to move elsewhere. The Council has made recent changes to the bill that undermine the intentions of inclusionary zoning. I want to see the bill strengthened in three key ways: Require that single family detached home developments in R5 zoning districts are required to build MPDUs, Restore the fee charged to developers to "buy-out" in lieu of building MPDUs to 3%, and Have the bill go into effect in January, 2024. I urge you to honor your commitment to affordable housing and restore the original spirit of this bill and restore these three key elements on December 18, 2023 Sincerely, Deborah Albert Gundry Annapolis, 21401	
2023-12-17 21:47:19	Deborah	Saylor	ODENTON	MD	21113	Yes		Bill No. 78-23aaa: Essential Worker Housing Access Act of 2023 (MPDU bill) (amended)	Oppose	Dear County Council, There is not enough affordable housing in Anne Arundel County and this new bill is not good enough. We need to be holding the developers accountable for driving the housing market up and unattainable for people who's incomes don't match the increasing market. I believe all housing developers new and old should have affordable housing options in the new/old communities going forward, with no option to buy out.	YES
2023-12-18 7:01:23	Kurt	Svendsen	ARNOLD	MD	21012	Yes		Bill No. 78-23aaa: Essential Worker Housing Access Act of 2023 (MPDU bill) (amended)	No position	See attached one-page written testimony	YES
2023-12-18 9:44:35	Lynda	Davis	Linthicum	MD	21090	Yes		Bill No. 78-23aaa: Essential Worker Housing Access Act of 2023 (MPDU bill) (amended)	Support	[Support with amendments] It is one week before Christmas. I would like to know if you, the members of this County Council, are going to be like Santa Claus and pass this bill with the amendments listed below that will strengthen and improve the bill or if you are going to be like the Grinch and deny the MPDUs to the people who have testified in the past few weeks and others like them who cannot afford to live in this county. I am urging you to lean into empathy and compassion and think about how it would feel if you could not afford to live in this county. How would that feel? I am urging you to put people over politics. I am urging you to put people who cannot afford to live here over the developers. I am urging you to be like Santa Claus and pass the bill with the following amendments: 1. Increase the percentage of MPDUs required for sale properties and rentals to 25%. 2. Eliminate the fee in lieu/buy out option for 10-19 units. 3. Raise the cap on the Area Median Income because of inflation which is impacting all income levels. 4. Ensure that the MPDUs will be distributed equitably throughout the county including in Pasadena, Arnold, Broadneck, Severna Park, Crofton, South County, Glen Burnie, Linthicum, and Severn. 5. Ensure that the MPDUs are not being built in food deserts or places without access to transportation, jobs, health care and if they are, a community development plan is put in place. 6. Ensure that the MPDU units are exactly the same as the market-rate units. At the end of the night, I hope we hear that you have chosen to be like Santa Claus. Thank you.	
2023-12-18 10:23:33	Erin	Curran	Annapolis	MD	21403	Yes		Bill No. 78-23aaa: Essential Worker Housing Access Act of 2023 (MPDU bill) (amended)	Support	I am a resident of Anne Arundel County and an 11-year renter in Annapolis. The affordable housing crisis has impacted our family greatly, especially this past year when our landlord at Bayshore Landing Apartments raised our rent 23%... TWENTY THREE PERCENT! We feel trapped and are scrambling to make ends meet. My husband took a second job, we've cut back on Christmas, children's activities, and charitable donations. We worry about the next annual rent increase. We are thinking we may need to move out of the county to find cheaper housing prices. That, however, creates a new obstacle as we currently live near my 70-something parents who provide loving care and support to our developmentally disabled teenager, and who I will be providing care for in the coming years. This bill could potentially help my family continue living in the community within which we've built truly life-supporting relationships.	

Legislative Testimony (online submissions) 12-18-2023

Timestamp	First name	Last name	City	State	Zip code	Are you representing yourself?	If no, what organization or whom do you represent?	Legislation	Position	Remarks	Attachment
2023-12-18 10:34:24	Abraham	Sadat	Washington	DC	20002	No	Teachers Association of Anne Arundel County	Bill No. 78-23aaa: Essential Worker Housing Access Act of 2023 (MPDU bill) (amended)	Support	<p>Honorable Members of the Anne Arundel County Council,</p> <p>I am writing to express my strong support for the Essential Worker Housing Act and to emphasize the urgent need for affordable housing in Anne Arundel County. As an Anne Arundel County native and current AACPS teacher, I believe that addressing the affordable housing crisis is crucial for the well-being and prosperity of Anne Arundel's citizens.</p> <p>It has come to my attention that there are multi-million dollar waterfront homes in Severna Park and Annapolis that have been sitting on the market for years, even decades, due to the lack of market demand for such properties in our area. Meanwhile, achieving affordable housing in these high-demand areas remains a significant challenge. This stark contrast underscores the pressing need for action to bridge the gap between the housing market and the needs of our community.</p> <p>The Essential Worker Housing Act represents a vital step forward in addressing the affordable housing crisis in Anne Arundel County. By creating more opportunities to alleviate the housing shortage, this act acknowledges the importance of providing safe, decent, and affordable housing options for essential workers who contribute significantly to our local economy and community.</p> <p>Affordable housing is crucial for the well-being of our essential workers, including teachers, healthcare providers, firefighters, police officers, and many others who play vital roles in our daily lives. These professionals deserve the opportunity to live in the communities they serve, and affordable housing options would enable them to do so. By ensuring that essential workers have access to affordable housing, we can enhance their quality of life, reduce commute times, and increase their overall job satisfaction.</p> <p>Moreover, affordable housing benefits the entire community by fostering economic stability and diversity. It helps attract and retain a skilled workforce, which is essential for the sustained growth and development of our county. Affordable housing enables individuals and families to establish roots, contribute to the local economy, and engage in community activities, thereby creating a more vibrant and cohesive society. This is especially crucial as Maryland as a whole continues to struggle to compete with Virginia economically.</p> <p>By supporting the Essential Worker Housing Act, you have the power to make a significant positive impact on the lives of our essential workers and the overall well-being of Anne Arundel County. I urge you to take this important step towards addressing the affordable housing crisis and ensuring that our community remains a place where everyone can thrive.</p> <p>Thank you for your attention to this critical issue and for your dedication to serving the residents of Anne Arundel County. I trust that you will carefully consider the benefits of the Essential Worker Housing Act and take decisive action to support the creation of more affordable housing opportunities.</p> <p>Sincerely, Abraham Sadat</p>	
									9		
2023-12-15 13:28:33	Stuart	Title	Odenton	MD	21113	Yes		Bill No. 84-23a: Odenton Town Center Master Plan – Approval (amended)	Oppose	Do to Covid I may not be able to attend in person which is very unfortunate! The CMC of Commerce will be submitting additional from our work group of developers and trades that I fully support!	YES
2023-12-15 13:47:14	Kristi	Simon	Odenton	MD	21113	No	Odenton Action Coalition / Central Maryland Chamber of Commerce	Bill No. 84-23a: Odenton Town Center Master Plan – Approval (amended)	Support	*SUPPORT WITH AMENDMENTS* Please see attached written testimony. Thank you, Odenton Action Coalition (a committee of the Central Maryland Chamber of Commerce)	YES
									2		
2023-12-16 6:31:16	Linda	Hanifin Bonner	Annapolis	MD	21401	No	Anne Arundel Connecting Together, Inc.	Bill No. 86-23a: Zoning & Development – Redevelopment (amended)	Support		YES
2023-12-17 9:44:58	Denise	MacDonald	Millersville	MD	21108	Yes		Bill No. 86-23a: Zoning & Development – Redevelopment (amended)	Oppose		
									2		

Affordable housing bill testimony

My name is Deborah Saylor, I am a single mother of 2 and currently live in Odenton, MD. I am an ACT core team member for Ark and Dove Presbyterian Church.

My housing story: I lived in the Scots Manor Apartments (now the Highland Apartments) for 9 years. They were riddled with mold, cockroaches and spider crickets. I got flooded out of my 1st apartment and was displaced until they could get me into another unit. The unit they moved me into had worse mold and the front door was scary because it had a huge gap, my mom was scared when we first moved in and they put a plate on the door to fill the gap. These apartments were the only affordable housing option in west county at the time, rent was \$600 a month for a 2-bedroom apartment. These same apartments now go for \$1775 a month for a 2-bedroom apartment.

My daughter now had severe allergies to mold and cockroaches, to the point she has an inhaler and epi-pen.

I was lucky to be approved for a house right next to Ark and Dove Presbyterian Church but this was during the unfair lending time and they approved me for a house that was more than 1/2 my income, per month. I have struggled financially because of my decision to buy a house that was out of my price range. However, where in Anne Arundel County can you find a home where your mortgage is \$960 a month (30% recommend portion of your income for housing). My housing costs are \$1442 a month, that is \$482 over the recommend amount of \$960.

My son will never be able to find a home for himself unless there are more affordable housing options, because his job (that he works 48hrs a week) doesn't pay enough to cover rental costs in our area.

Dec 18, 2023 County Council – Essential Worker Housing Access Act (Bill 78-23)

Given that a final vote on this legislation will be taken at tonight's meeting, or this is the last night in which amendments can be introduced and approved in preparation for the January 2nd meeting; the last opportunity to approve this Bill before it otherwise expires on January 5th, I think now is an appropriate time to offer two specific comments that are still germane to the "third amended" bill set for tonight's Public Hearing and which were also included in my initial testimony on this Bill.

Generally, I wholeheartedly support the County spending taxpayer funds on strategic efforts to make housing more affordable to both own and rent, especially for those with low and moderate incomes. I believe this is a "public good" worthy of the use of General Fund dollars.

Comment # 1: My initial testimony supporting this type of legislation highlighted the proposed bill's **lack of "truth in budgeting" with respect to exemptions**; 50% of the Capital Facility Connection Charges (CFCC) and 100% of impact fees. As the former Assistant Budget Officer, with over 20 years of experience in Anne Arundel County Government, I suggested a "truthful" way of implementing this program through the explicit approval of a General Fund appropriation to transfer \$5.5 million to the Housing Trust Fund to cover the estimated cost of these exemptions, on an annual recurring basis.

I'm not surprised by the fact that no one on the County Council chose to publicly explore such methods for explicitly funding "tax expenditures" like these exemptions. In the end, the appearance of "getting something for nothing" is just too tempting. I am disappointed, but I will not use this as an excuse to not support this Bill.

Comment # 2: I also questioned the proposed bill's **preferential treatment given to local government employees**. Despite the passage of an amendment to "fix" this preferential treatment, and then another amendment to "fix" the unintended consequences of the initial amendment, preferential treatment for local government employees still remains in Bill 78-23.

Why does section 17-12-106 (D) allow the Administrator to "adjust the income requirements for eligibility under subsection (A)(2) for employees of the County, the County Board of Education, and the City of Annapolis"?

Given the **defined-benefit pension** and **health insurance benefits** provided to many of these local government employees, they are almost certainly much better off economically than other essential workers with the same "income" level. Therefore, **the preferential treatment given to local government employees in section 17-12-106 (D) should be removed**. (See page 12, lines 4-8, of Bill 78-23; third amended version.)

I am not asking for "perfection" in legislation. However, if this preferential treatment given to local government employees is not removed by amendment, I am asking that an explanation be offered to the public at tonight's County Council meeting.

Sincerely,

Kurt Svendsen, Arnold, MD



Central Maryland Chamber

The Center of Intelligent Business

Legislative Position: Favorable with Amendments

Anne Arundel County Council Bill 84-23

December 15, 2023

Dear Chairman Smith and Members of the Council,

The Central Maryland Chamber's Odenton Action Committee supports the Odenton Town Center Master Plan with amendments.

The Central Maryland Chamber of Commerce (CMC) was originally formed in 1962 as the Odenton Chamber of Commerce. The CMC is a regional organization representing almost 400 businesses in the Central Maryland corridor and exists to be the primary business resource and advocate as the area experiences exponential growth.

The committee has compiled a number of edits to both the bill and roads amendment.

1. We would like to confirm that the section below implies that the percentage of uses is irrelevant as has been an impediment on many projects in the OTC:
§ 18-9-106 requires a development with a gross area of five acres or more in the OTC-C shall contain a mix of any of the allowed residential, commercial, light industrial, and civic or institutional uses. Are the mix of uses required to comply with any other Code provisions governing specific mix of uses or percentages of mix?
2. Relative to core area, there is a major distinction between the west core and east core sites. All sites east of railroad tracks need flexibility language included for redevelopment which could address problematic areas. One possible way to deal with this is to add something like this at the end of 17-7-809 (Redevelopment sites): Such flexibility should also be provided to redevelopment sites in the East Core where these particular requirements are not well suited given the distinction/differences between the West Core and East Core areas.
3. There should be a specific definition of "floor area" in the master plan. The only specifically defined term in the master plan is "Floor-Area- Ratio (FAR)". If a permitted use is something like a park or recreational use or community parking, the "floor area" as that term is used in certain sections of the master plan (other than building FAR for density calculation) should be land area. This may not be as important going forward if the minimum use percentage is no longer applicable.
4. 17-7-807 Addresses the requirement that activity space needs to be 50% public. This is a high percentage, especially if it's residential. Activity space/ public space – shopping center should be counted towards it open to public. Shopping is an activity isn't it and is open to the public.
5. The Committee questions why Academy Yard been carved out of the TOD? It is in the required .05 miles and will be connected to the MARC by a trail system eventually and should be included, especially since the OTCAC strives for connectivity, especially for transit and reducing car trips.



Central Maryland Chamber

The Center of Intelligent Business

6. There is a possible mistake or typo in 18-2-101 should be corrected. Section referenced as 17-2-101(17) – should be (18) not 17 to refer to Odenton Town Center Plan (not the Parole plan). This is Important because it refers to an effective date. 17-2101-18 would be correct.
7. 18-9-107- Parking- in subsection (B) (Structured Parking Requirements), it is not reasonable to require structured parking in apartment projects over 200 units. The viability of structured parking really depends on the particular site, the cost structure and whether the rents will support the excessive cost of structured parking vs. utilization of available land area, especially outside the West Core. The plan cannot be 100% structured parking and the estimated costs are \$20,000 per parking garage space vs. \$3000 surface which will significantly impact the ability to build affordable housing.
8. Should a project that has been under development under a pre-2016 plan should have a choice to update their plan according to the 2024 revision. Why have them build in the past?
9. 18-16-305- Variances- the statement “a variance may not be granted to the provisions of the Odenton Town Center Master Plan” doesn’t limit the ability to use flexibility provisions otherwise provided, which should be clarified.
10. 17-7-801. Definitions- (5) “SITE” MEANS ANY LOT OR PARCEL OF LAND, OR COMBINATION OF LOTS OR PARCELS OF LAND THAT ARE CONTIGUOUS AND BEING DEVELOPED AS PART OF A COMMON SUBDIVISION OR SITE DEVELOPMENT PLAN.
This should include sites that are separated by a road but being developed as one master plan.
11. 17-7-804 (A) Clarification is necessary on when P & Z can “override” what Public Works thinks is best regarding roads.
12. New roads amendment- The committee is unsure if the Council is aware of the impact of this amendment and that what was voted on is incredibly vague. The amendment details are not clearly written and includes doing frontage improvement but also improving roads half based on current DPZ designs. This creates high requirements on just about “any road you abut” and at the developer’s expense. Please note that these increased costs will have to be passed along to the renter or buyer.
Developers paying for roads is double taxation, and impact fee credits or other reimbursable fees, taxes, and county development expenses should be allowed as credits. This was introduced over and beyond other requirements and sets a precedent in the County and for small project this will be a huge amount of money. There may be county right of way issues and developers would have to pay the county and it would be a lengthy time process. The Office of Law has made prior decisions based on proportionality. In reality, the developers have been building roads for the county- but forcing to build roads, plus costs and no credits by proffer is an issue. The reimbursements need to be “usable” as Seven Oaks got impact fee credits based on excess road amount above and beyond for Town Center Boulevard, however must of the credits may not be able to be used. This has to do with (2) and (c) in the Amendment:
 - a. There is no reference to a reasonable nexus. For instance, if a small traffic generator wants to develop, but the master plan roadway is a \$1 m endeavor, will the County require them to



Central Maryland Chamber

The Center of Intelligent Business

construct the roadway and pay for any ROW acquisition necessary? A development should only be required to construct/pay for the portion of the master plan roadway that they will impact. For instance, if a project generates 1000 daily trips, but the planned roadway will carry other volumes from existing development, say another 1000 daily trips, the project should only be required to pay for 1/2 of the cost of the planned roadway (not construct the entire roadway).

- b. There are countless items that could subjectively trigger a road rebuild of a perfectly functioning road such as slight grade changes, curb height, asphalt requirements and on and on. In addition, if improved to the center line, which is the only reasonable requirement, is the County prepared to match the other side that may already be developed or likely won't be redeveloped anytime in the near future?
- c. In addition, this requirement will eliminate the ability to obtain impact fee credits since credits are not available for improvements required by Code. This is ridiculous!!
- d. There is an issue here with cost and timing. Will the ROW be acquired at fair market value? Will this process take many years which will hold up the grading permit approval?
- e. This needs criteria based on proportionality or other factors. Depending on who reviews the project they may require a road. This is too vague and while it may intend flexibility, but this is subjective.

13. 17-5-401. Standards - The "five-year lookback" for a prior use is not reasonable.

Any site that generated more than 50 daily trips (250 daily trips in Odenton since the 2009 Master Plan) after the APF code changes in 2005 was required to provide a TIS and possibly to construct off-site improvements to address its impact. By providing a "five-year lookback", the County would be requiring a site to provide a new TIS and additional off-site improvements even though previous improvements mitigated the initial use on the site, thus requiring a site to double-mitigate. The County could get road improvements twice even if a developer wanted to occupy the property with the same use, they would have to go through the process again. This sets another precedent for the entire county. Any "use" should be assumed to have APF Roads approval in perpetuity, and the test should only apply for a change in use (with the test being for the delta). Also, it is important to keep in mind that a previous use, even if vacant for many years, could re-occupy with the same use without an APF test. APF approval is, therefore, not 'taken away' with vacancy at any point.

In lines below of same Section It is important to note that the "offset" of trips is used to determine if a new TIS is required. For instance, if a change of use generates more than 250 daily vehicle trips over and above the trips generated by the previous use. If a new TIS is required based on this increase in the delta, the trips associated with a previous use of a vacant building MUST be added as a "background development", and then the future condition of the TIS tests for the delta of trips. In this manner, the vacant building trips are included in the analysis.

40 (II) IF THE INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS PROVIDED IN ACCORDANCE WITH
41 SUBSECTION (D)(2)(I) IS ACCEPTED BY THE OFFICE OF PLANNING AND ZONING, THE
42 NUMBER OF TRIPS ATTRIBUTED TO **THE PRIOR USES SHALL BE USED TO OFFSET THE**
TOTAL



43 NUMBER OF DAILY TRIPS GENERATED BY THE USES PROPOSED IN THE NEW DEVELOPMENT OF THE SITE.

14. 3-6 B 101 G-(G) Development application submittals; notice. This is not necessary and would involve hundreds of pages. What is presented at the OTCAC meeting should be all that is necessary.
 - (1) A DEVELOPER SHALL SUBMIT ALL SKETCH PLANS, PRELIMINARY PLANS, FINAL PLANS, SITE DEVELOPMENT PLANS, OR INCENTIVE PROGRAM APPLICATION COMMITTEE.
15. Request to combine concept plan and sketch plan modifications to the committee should be removed or so stated. It's still on the check list for OTC submittal, not under the purview of the committee. Being that it's a county code situation, the county shouldn't hold up modifications because of the committee.
16. 17-7-801. Definitions in 1 (i) (iii) are very subject which creates conflict so to speak when a developer is trying to provide under their definition and reviewer decides that they have another meaning. Then below:
 - 40 (5) "SITE" MEANS ANY LOT OR PARCEL OF LAND, OR COMBINATION OF LOTS OR
 - 41 PARCELS OF LAND THAT ARE CONTIGUOUS AND BEING DEVELOPED AS PART OF A
 - 42 COMMON SUBDIVISION OR SITE DEVELOPMENT PLAN. 43 Also #5 on the same page.Definition of site. If the properties don't touch, they can't be a part of a project. Doesn't make sense especially when contiguous ownership and project plan is divided by a road it now must be looked at separately- treating it as two separate projects. Like each section of Academy Yard. The word contiguous should be removed to make this work, as this doesn't work especially in a town center.
17. 17-7-803. The committee questions compliance with other laws and manuals. It conflicts and causes confusion when it says "or".
18. 17-7-807. Activity space- there should be an activity space list for residential and commercial. They are two opposite uses yet have the same requirements. This also goes back to percentages of public vs private activity space.

Due to its potential to prevent the growth and expansion of our area, we would request that these amendments be considered in the master plan. The members of the Central Maryland Chamber Odenton Action Coalition thank you for reviewing our testimony and would be happy to answer any additional questions the Council may have.



ANNE ARUNDEL
CONNECTING TOGETHER

P.O. Box 6053 – Annapolis, MD 21401
December 18, 2023

Statement on Bill #78-23 – Essential Worker Housing

Anne Arundel County Council Members

Again, ACT thanks you for the opportunity to provide its input to Bill #78-23, and also for the important work that you are doing to address Anne Arundel County's affordable housing needs. We are very much aware that this work requires introspection, compromise, and time to accomplish.

And as we have previously stated, ACT's support of the Essential Worker Housing Bill #78-23 acknowledged that it is not the "perfect" or final solution to the county's housing crisis – and that the eligibility of residents for this program only represents one segment of the work force. There still exists a serious gap between the costs of affordable housing in the County and its availability for those residents with AMI's below the \$70,000 level. Even with this limitation, it is important to adopt this bill so that we can then proceed to work on the gap and other relating needs.

In the beginning of this process, we all knew that taking bold actions was an important part of the landscape in addressing the housing crisis in the County. And we are reminded that you stated you would fight to get affordable housing implemented in the County.

The compromises made to the original bill are most disappointing – specifically in allowing a buyout in the SF homes. Whether or not it reduces numbers of available units – the result of this action is that it sends a message to our residents that there still exists in this county, neighborhoods where you are not welcome if you do not make a certain amount of money or come from a different culture. This is deeply disturbing because we have so much work to do in our County to overcome the legacy of discriminatory exclusionary housing practices.

ACT is a willing partner in pursuing the next steps needed to address the barriers to attaining affordable housing. We do not view the results of this bill, whatever it may be, to be a closed door – quite the opposite. We believe that whatever the outcome may be, that these results can be leveraged towards developing stronger actions that eliminate the existence of exclusionary housing – and make a real difference in this County. We are ready to be a partner to take the actions needed to create a more equitable community within AAC.

To further reinforce our position in pursuing these changes, ACT strongly supports,

- Initiating a major evaluation of the County’s zoning process for land use in the planning areas, and how decisions are made to accommodate creative housing – particularly for affordable units.
- Establishing legislative changes enabling missing middle housing to occur, through an important component of zoning reforming.
- Conducting an analysis of the County’s permitting process – and defining the impediments that exist to facilitating cost-effective developments, e.g., the costs of review, changes, and time.

We urge you to reach agreement on this vital legislation and to further your commitment to addressing the affordability of housing needs of county residents. We are committed to this work with you.

Linda Hanifin Bonner, Ph.D, Attainable Housing Co-chair

Bonnie Henderson, Attainable Housing Co-chair

Anne Arundel Connecting Together



ANNE ARUNDEL
CONNECTING TOGETHER

ACTP.O. Box 6053 – Annapolis, MD 21401

DECEMBER 18, 2023

**BILL #86-23 - SUBDIVISION AND DEVELOPMENT-ZONING-DEVELOPMENT
REQUIREMENTS FOR PARTICULAR TYPES OF DEVELOPMENT – REDEVELOPMENT.**

Anne Arundel County Council Members,

ACT thanks you for the opportunity to provide its input to Bill #86-23. We believe it will enable another needed component to achieve affordable housing by integrating multi-family dwellings through the substantial improvement or redevelopment of unimproved sites, existing dwellings, or the use of contiguous lots. At the same time, we believe that including allowable zoning categories applicable for affordable housing will further strengthen its effectiveness towards addressing the County’s housing issue. Specifically, there needs to be an integration of zoning categories within all housing legislation in the ongoing regional planning work in order to ensure that affordable housing is accomplished.

For example, we recommend that this proposed bill use the model of the Workforce Housing policy and incorporate the mixed-use zoning category in which the multi-family units can be produced. Knowing that there exists over 13,000 on ACDS’s housing list, if the Council really wants to make a difference it can require that Bill #86-23 go one step further and **BOLDLY STATE** that all housing units within a redevelopment site are designated as “affordable” and either through sale or rental, the tenant must be on the ACDS eligibility list. Additionally, these units should not be eligible or made available at market-rate, until this demand no longer exists.

The basis for this recommendation is that there exists a significant market for units with less than 2 bedrooms for not only essential workers – but older residents and those of limited income. While the Workforce Housing legislation defines rental and owner income levels, this bill lacks either similar wording or a requirement for affordable units. This language also needs to be included as an amendment.

The second recommendation focuses on the County’s current planning process for affordable housing. For Anne Arundel County to have an effective affordable housing program, it is essential that the zoning and bulk regulations requirements be reviewed and realigned for consistency throughout the County. The proposed redevelopment legislation must integrate and be consistent with those in the adopted workforce housing policy (#54-19) and the requirements of the Essential Worker Housing Legislation (MPDUs) (78-23).

Developing a process for a cohesive integration of all opportunities for affordable housing, using these three pieces of legislation, is a step to creating an overall affordable housing policy for the County.

We also call your attention to the process of community notification and involvement within this proposed legislation and that of others we have reviewed. Specifically, we recommend changing the procedure to where the developer (applicant) notifies community stakeholders and conducts a meeting at the concept plan stage, rather than after the application is approved.

Making this change addresses two impediments. First, it enables the surrounding community to have a legitimate and informative input about the proposed development; and second, it saves the developers (applicants) resources from not making additional revisions which are likely to be required from the input. More importantly, this change further validates that community input is meaningful and not a perfunctory obligation.

Finally, we have also identified an important inconsistency occurring within the county's planning process. In one instance legislation requires that the applicant submits a "sketch plan" and in another, it is a "concept plan." There is a significant difference between a "sketch" and "concept." The proper planning term is a "concept plan" which provides details about the proposed site with drawings, has completed the County's check list, but is not finalized to the application process. We urge the County to address this inconsistent detail in its documents and procedures.

We are hopeful that while this piece of legislation offers another opportunity for affordable housing to be integrated into the County's planning process – there is additional work to be accomplished. ACT, thanks you for the opportunity to present its comments and recommendations to Bill #86-23 and look forward to continuing to collaborate with you to define additional opportunities for affordable housing in Anne Arundel County.

Linda Hanifin Bonner, Ph.D, Attainable Housing Co-chair
Bonnie Henderson, Attainable Housing Co-chair
Anne Arundel Connecting Together

Bill 84-23

December 18th, 2023 Testimony by

Stuart Title [REDACTED]

Odenton, Maryland 21113

on the Administrative Amendment

dated

December 4, 2023

It is unconscionable that this Amendment with little specifics and many subjective interpretations passed. It showed a true lack of understanding of the cost of development and the additional cost this will have especially to smaller projects.

The Office of Law many times has considered proportionality of a public improvement vs. size of a project, and this goes against what appears to be legal.

IF A PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT BORDERS A COUNTY ROAD THAT DOES NOT COMPLY WITH THE DPW DESIGN MANUAL, THE DEVELOPER SHALL IMPROVE TO THE CENTER OF THE COUNTY ROAD TO COMPLY WITH THE DPW DESIGN MANUAL AND DEDICATE

Do you all realize how many items could subjectively qualify at the whim of P&Z:

Grades, surface, curbs, conduit, medians, etc. And who is going to do the other half of the road if not being developed or already developed. Also one side may be required to do improvements that would make the road unsafe if the opposite side isn't done. And NO the answer isn't requiring the developer to do the County's job on both sides. The County should do both sides with developer fees and impact fees!

AND DEED IN FEE SIMPLE SUFFICIENT PROPERTY TO THE COUNTY TO INCLUDE ALL REQUIRED IMPROVEMENTS. IF A DEVELOPER IS REQUIRED BY THIS CODE TO IMPROVE A COUNTY ROAD AND THE DEVELOPER CANNOT ACQUIRE THE NECESSARY PROPERTY AFTER EXHAUSTING ALL

Do you all understand this process and the time it takes especially when you are trying to acquire("take") a private property especially a private developer none

the less. If possible, put yourself in those shoes where you live. And as a private developer I let you know I need your property and if you don't sell to me the County will take it!

REASONABLE EFFORTS TO THE SATISFACTION OF THE COUNTY, THE COUNTY MAY ACQUIRE THE PROPERTY AT THE DEVELOPER'S EXPENSE PRIOR TO APPROVAL OF THE GRADING PERMIT.

Once again, a lack of understanding of the cost and time of this process!

As I have spoken to staff and Council regarding many concerns, I have with Bill 84-23 in general and have testified as such, I am also in support of the oral and written testimony of the Central Maryland Chamber of Commerce.

With regards to the first paragraph of the Amendment:

AFTER THE PRE-SUBMITTAL MEETING, THE PLANNING AND ZONING OFFICER MAY REQUIRE THE DEVELOPER TO DESIGN, CONSTRUCT, AND DEDICATE ROADS IDENTIFIED AS PLANNED IN THE ODENTON TOWN CENTER MASTER PLAN AS A CONDITION OF APPROVAL OF A DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION.

Once again very subjective and at the whim of officer that change frequently. There are many parcels that front 3-4 roads. These parcels would be additional impacted!

Unfortunately I have Covid and may not be able to testify in person which is incredibly unfortunate for the development community...unless you decide to truly understand the impact of your actions.

Thank you for your time that I hope you take in understanding the issues with regards to this Amendment and others that may come about. Feel free to reach out. 