

**Elizabeth Rosborg**  
**Chair, Citizen Advisory Committee**

---

**Plan2040**

**Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC)**

Meeting Notes

December 18, 2019 - 5:00 PM

Chesapeake Conference Room, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor

2664 Riva Road, Annapolis, MD

**CAC members present:** Elizabeth Rosborg (Chair), Cate Bower, John Clark, Bill Dodd, Joel Greenwell, Melanie Hartwig-Davis, Patricia Huecker, Amy Leahy, Elizabeth Ysla Leight, Patricia Lynch, Charles Mannion, Gary Mauler, Ellen Moyer, Allan Straughan

**County staff present:** Christina Pompa, Deputy Planning and Zoning Officer; Patrick Hughes, Long Range Planner; Mark Wildonger, Long Range Planner; Jane Cox, Cultural Resources Division Chief; Erin Karpewicz, Arundel Community Development Services Policy and Development Coordinator; Lynn Miller, Assistant Planning and Zoning Officer

**Attendees:** Susan Cochran, Jerry Pesterfield

**Introduction:**

*Ms. Elizabeth Rosborg, Chair*

The meeting was called to order at 5:05 p.m.

**Finalize draft textual context, goals, policies, and strategies for the Affordable Housing, Community Revitalization, Historic Preservation and Cultural Resources sections of the “Planning for the Built Environment” chapter:**

*Ms. Elizabeth Rosborg, Chair*

*Mr. Patrick Hughes, Planner*

Ms. Bower recommended a transition between the normal font text and italicized text. Ms. Lynch agreed and noted that she was angry with some repetition and lack of formatting. Ms. Pompa clarified that the text in italics are the vision themes and may be formatted to be a sidebar. Mr. Hughes stated that the document will still be re-formatted at a later stage in the process.

Ms. Bower asked for clarification regarding the statement about stabilizing housing for the homeless. Ms. Karpewicz stated that transitioning homeless individuals to homes usually require supportive services so they can learn to stay in the homes. Mr. Mauler was confused by the names and roles of

each government or non-profit agencies, wondered if there was any overlap, and if the agencies were a waste of taxpayer dollars. Mr. Hughes said staff would spell out acronyms of agencies and programs.

Ms. Rosborg asked why the Maryland Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD) highlighted Severna Park as an Opportunity Area within the Priority Funding Area. Ms. Pompa said the map will be refined based on newer information. She also clarified that Opportunity Areas and federal Opportunity Zones are similar, but are different. Ms. Karpewicz clarified that DHCD is involved in the process because of they are a funding source. She noted that from a fair housing perspective, it is important to provide affordable housing opportunities in areas of opportunity. These are areas that have been mapped by the state and federal government in order to spread affordable housing around the County. Ms. Rosborg said that some of these areas are already built out. Ms. Pompa emphasized that this program is to obtain housing funds. The State has already mapped these areas and the County has no involvement in the mapping. Ms. Bower asked that the designations in the legend of the map be defined. Ms. Pompa agreed that these would be defined in the document. Mr. Clark asked if this map is similar to Policy Area map exercise the CAC conducted at the last meeting. Ms. Pompa said it is a subset, but the exercise was more general. Ms. Karpewicz said this map helps illustrate where the state identifies a need to focus funding.

Ms. Pompa noted that the low-income tax credit program is significantly oversubscribed. There is a point system to prioritize projects. These mapping pieces or designations feed into the point system and the projects that receive the highest points will receive awards. Ms. Karpewicz summarized by saying that this directs the County where to allocate funding. Mr. Dodd asked how the department created their criteria. Ms. Karpewicz said there are indicator areas such as education, poverty levels, property values, public safety, employment, and access to transportation. Ms. Leahy asked whether the senior housing bill that was recently introduced to the County Council looks at the same criteria as to where projects will go. Ms. Pompa said family projects score higher than senior housing. Ms. Leahy said the bill takes it out of the special exception and puts it in the conditional use. Ms. Karpewicz agreed with Ms. Pompa that family housing is a priority.

Mr. Mauler did not understand why Arundel Mills is not an Opportunity Area based on the amount of employment. Ms. Karpewicz said this is based on indicator data. Mr. Mauler disagreed and felt there is opportunity in that area. Ms. Karpewicz clarified that this map just guides investment into multi-family rental developments. However; ACDS does identify other sites for acquisition. Mr. Clark asked how individuals become aware of programs and possible locations. Ms. Karpewicz said ACDS has a portfolio of “scatter site” rental units on their website. They do not do home ownership because the cost to acquire and rehabilitate the property is higher than the market value. Ms. Karpewicz also noted that there is outreach at churches and festivals to advertise programs and they invite individuals to learn more about their counseling and financial coaching programs. Mr. Mauler suggested outreach to the local businesses as well.

Mr. Mauler felt that commercial revitalization does not improve communities, reduce blighted areas, increase property values, or reduce sprawl based on his own research. He characterized these benefits as assumptions and myths and would like to see case studies that support these facts. Ms. Miller said she would provide case studies and reports identifying the benefits of revitalization.

Mr. Clark suggested that some Anne Arundel Economic Development Corporation (AAEDC) thresholds for facade improvements incentives are too high for small businesses to meet. He asked

if AAEDC is reconsidering these investment thresholds. Ms. Miller clarified there are two programs – a tax credit and a loan program. If a business is located in a Commercial Revitalization district, it could be eligible for a tax credit. The program provides a property tax credit for up to five years equal to the incremental increase in real property tax assessment for improvements of at least \$100,000 of assessed value. There is also the Arundel Community Reinvestment (ACR) Fund which offers loans up to \$100,000 to be repaid over three to seven years at zero percent interest. Ms. Miller acknowledged that given the high threshold of investment, some property owners will often take advantage of several available tools. AAEDC does conduct outreach to property owners in revitalization areas. Ms. Pompa provided an example from Upper Marlboro and suggested the CAC could add a strategy in the GDP to look at grant resources for façade improvements in certain areas.

Mr. Mauler had several comments about overlay areas having an expanded list of uses. Mr. Hughes clarified that these are set and explained in the County Code. Ms. Miller explained that the term “expanded use” does not mean more development, just simply more permitted uses than would otherwise be permitted in the base zoning. The intent is to create incentives for the redevelopment of properties. Redevelopment does not always mean greater development or density, but it might result in an improved use on a property. Mr. Mauler said he made his comment because the Land Use Market Analysis said the northwest part of the County would be built out by 2035. He said it would be logical to revitalize and increase densities on properties in 2036. He asked what the saturation rate is of people in an area. Ms. Miller said the policies in the GDP will address these issues and the land use plan will facilitate redevelopment projects that result in more density and or intensity as well as improving deteriorated sites. Ms. Rosborg asked whether property owners know if they are in this overlay and that there is an expanded list of permitted uses. Ms. Miller explained that when there are any changes to an overlay area, all the property owners are notified. Because this is legislated by the County Council as it becomes part of the County Code, there are also County Council hearings.

Ms. Karabani asked how much funding from the Baltimore Regional Neighborhood Initiative (BRNI) has gone to the County. Ms. Karpewicz did not have that information on-hand, but will follow up. Ms. Miller explained that some programs funded through BRNI can be applied to both the city and the County.

In the “Redevelopment Opportunities” section, Ms. Karabani suggested the revitalization strategies address aesthetics. The County will look into this.

Mr. Mauler noted that airport noise zones can change. Ms. Pompa said the Federal Aviation Administration announced they will re-examine the noise contours.

Mr. Mauler read an excerpt of the document that identified a study, the author, and the funding source and suggested this is an example of how he felt the document is too wordy. County staff will provide footnotes when applicable to address his concern.

Mr. Mauler noted that there are several Native American and historical artifacts and sites in west County. Ms. Cox clarified that the County started reviewing historic preservation concerns, archeology, and historic buildings in 1989, but the County did not have a strong code until 2005. Many of the approvals for Arundel Mills were prior to the County have tools to protect those resources.

Ms. Bower asked what the relationship of the archeological digs is at the Smithsonian Environmental Research Center (SERC). SERC is through the federal program with the Smithsonian. The County local program coordinates with SERC on an academic level, but they are independent and federally funded.

Ms. Bower asked about sequencing of the goals, policies and strategies. Mr. Hughes said there is no particular order. Ms. Bower said there tendency for people to make that judgment. She said the affordable housing goal only affects a portion of the property, yet is ahead of other goals. Her point is to position other goals in some order of importance.

Mr. Mauler recommended that citizens have role in development review process. Ms. Rosborg noted that citizens can be involved in the process. Ms. Pompa said this suggestion would be more appropriate in another section.

Mr. Mauler suggested affordable housing is a permanent lien, rather than a long-term lien. Ms. Karpewicz explained her organization is looking into something more permanent.

Mr. Mauler suggested that inspectors provide constructive feedback to violators. Ms. Leahy added that there is process to bring the property to compliance. Ms. Lynch said it seems like enforcement is needed, but a better code is imperative.

Ms. Bower requested that County staff think about whether the goals, policies, and strategies are necessary, feasible, appropriate, and sufficient as a set.

#### **Administrative items: Adopt December 4, 2019 meeting notes; Next steps**

Ms. Rosborg introduced Mr. Pesterfield as the chair of the Planning Advisory Board (PAB). She reminded the CAC that the PAB will review the draft GDP before it goes to the County Council.

Ms. Moyer shared an observation that unless the processes change, the results will be the same. She asked there be an understanding of what are the barriers to a sustainable community and how to change the processes to change. Mr. Mauler and Ms. Lynch agreed.

Ms. Lynch suggested that the “elephant in the room” is the 28,000 new home units projected to be needed by 2035 based on the Land Use Market Analysis. Ms. Rosborg clarified that this figure is based on the average growth trend. Ms. Lynch said the County needs to slow development down. Ms. Miller added that projections are a planning tool so there is some idea of scenarios of what could happen. The GDP is intended to identify policies and mechanisms that will determine capacity for development. There may not be capacity for 28,000 units.

Ms. Hartwig-Davis announced a seminar titled “Demystifying Density” happening on February 20<sup>th</sup> sponsored by the National Trust for Historic Preservation in Washington, D.C. The DC Metro area is projecting approximately 300,000 new units by 2030. Mr. Mauler was skeptical that the presenters have a conflict of interest. Ms. Hartwig-Davis said these are professionals and there is no conflict of interest. Ms. Pompa said these projections are based on job demand and that the methodology was different than the County’s Land Use Market Analysis. She reminded the CAC that if the County does not grow, then the County may lose out on jobs.

Mr. Pesterfield said that he has seen the Land Use Market Analysis. He also shared that the County produces a measurements report that comes to the PAB which is then sent to the State. The report identifies the number of housing units if there are no changes to the zoning. The 2017 report showed that approximately 15,000 units could be built under the current regulations. The current rate at which units are built is 2,500 a year. The model is complex and takes into account environmental sensitive areas. He said the CAC can help shape the direction of growth; however, the CAC should keep in mind that units can still be built under existing zoning.

Mr. Straughan said Howard County has a policy to allow people to build in the County in order to increase the tax base. If you do not build, then the tax base does not increase. Ms. Pompa said that properties may also decline in value due to a lack of growth. Mr. Straughan said that one benefit of a lack of building is that properties become more desirable due to a lack of supply. If the CAC wants investment in the County, then the policy should be to build in a smart way or increase taxes.

Ms. Moyer said that the CAC should consider the shared economy.

Ms. Huecker said she is interested in higher densities if there is adequate infrastructure. She would like to have more discussion on infrastructure. Mr. Pesterfield said the statement about the only way to pay for things is to build is not true. He pointed to a 2005 study that said development does not pay for infrastructure. A no-growth strategy can pay for improvements by working through the budget.

Ms. Leahy asked if the role of the CAC is to change the Code. Ms. Rosborg said their role is to recommend changes through recommendations in the GDP. Ms. Leahy asked why the administration is changing the Code that is impacting the CAC and GDP.

Ms. Rosborg reminded the CAC that the County Executive has announced a series of budget town hall hearings and encouraged the CAC to attend. She also reminded the CAC that there is one CAC meeting in January and two in February.

Ms. Lynch motioned to accept the December 4<sup>th</sup> meeting notes. Ms. Bower seconded and the motion passed 14-0. Mr. Clark made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Straughan seconded and the motion passed 14-0. The meeting was adjourned at 6:47 p.m.