

Name	Email Address	Phone #	Comments/Recommendations
Greg Cantori	greg@littledeeds.com	410-450-4466	<p>1.) Include renters under list of stakeholders - the omission shows bias towards homeowners as primary stakeholders; therefore renters, lower-income people and younger and future residents should be included in all future planning.</p> <p>2.) Referencing #1 (Executive Summary), section C (Best Practices, Policy and Legal), Can the County add specific actions/steps needed to become more proactive in being an affordable housing leader? And what are the specific actions in 'focusing on equity' that need to occur?</p> <p>3.) ADU's need to be promoted - not just permitted - to have any serious impact on our County's housing affordability. Currently only blood relatives are allowed to live in ADU's, without the ability to pay rent to their family members.</p> <p>4.) Studies show that counties that only permit ADU's see no real increase in their creation. The housing agency should create an aggressive ADU facilitation staff position and process to ensure barriers are removed - as well as create a loan fund/grant program for those willing to create affordable units.</p> <p>5.) The recommendation to allow multi-family housing should apply to ALL single family zones w/o exception. Property owners should have the right to create the highest/best use of their properties w/o interference from neighbors or arbitrary zoning</p> <p>6.) None of the recommendations have numerical goals. Without specific, numerical and action-based goals - by a specific date and steps to get there - these recommendations have no teeth and will sit on the shelf.</p> <p>7.) How will you deal with the Baltimore County Council? The Council has never created an affordable housing process, plan, agency or program - they had to be sued for them to take any action. Knowing the Council is beholden to wealthy homeowners, what can the work group do individually and collectively to make them take action?</p>
Diane Elliott	dianeelliott5@msn.com		<p>1.) Please be fair/equitable in determining where the housing will go - they should be distributed evenly throughout the county. 32-year resident of Owings Mills, and this area has taken a turn for the worse as a result of Section 8 and subway.</p>
Ann Dalrymple	hickmurpmile@gmail.com		<p>1.) Businesses could purchase affordable housing for their employees to rent @ rate of 30% of their income. DHCD could field complaints from residents re: safety & compliance.</p> <p>2.) Residential building permits should be managed as RFP's are, to provide affordable housing in proportion to the #'s of households in each level of income in BC. Issue RFP's for building permits that meet specs in an Affordable Housing Developers Guide. To prevent poverty concentration, construction of each new community should provide housing for at least 2 levels of income - in proportion to the # of households at each level in the county.</p> <p>3.) A link to the VCA and it's purpose should be provided in the final report.</p> <p>4.) Re: Recommendations #1-4: Generally these do not change the urgent situation re: affordable housing as there are several affordable housing movements in the county already, and the pre-development phase already includes a community feedback process.</p> <p>5.) Re: Recommendation #7, Sentence 4: This should read: Multifamily developments that include affordable housing units in commercial/industrial zoning districts should only be permitted in Opportunity Area census tracts [so as not to conflict with recommendation 8].</p> <p>6.) Re: Recommendations #9-12, 14: Yes (agrees).</p> <p>7.) Re: Recommendation #13: Could be modified as per my building permit strategy proposal above if passing the recommendation proves too difficult.</p> <p>8.) Re: Recommendation #15: Yes (agrees).</p> <p>9.) Re: Recommendation #17: Housing Needs Assessment is already available upon request through the Nat'l Low Income</p>

Housing Coalition.

10.) Re: Recommendation #19: Yes - as it is now, unnecessary conservancies have increased the cost of land, making housing less affordable.

11.) Re: Recommendation #20: Stakeholders should include long-term renting residents of Baltimore County - or at least Affordable Housing Advocates (ACLU).

12.) Re: Recommendation #21: "Incentives" wouldn't be needed w/a building permit RFP strategy.

13.) Re: Recommendations #22-24, 26, 30: Not needed under a building permit RFP strategy.

14.) Re: Recommendation #28: Recommendation 15 will take care of this.

15.) Re: Recommendation #29: Great idea!

16.) Re: Recommendation #31-32: No.

Dillon Dotson

dillond18@gmail.com

1.) Re: Upzoning - I agree with allowing residential in commercial & industrial zoning; however, I saw no mention of upzoning residential areas to allow for medium or high density housing. SFZ is disaster for environment, traffic & finances - it isn't a sustainable land use due to costs and is subsidized by higher density zones.

2.) Re: Parking minimums - I saw no recommendations for addressing the excess of parking in many areas. Using land to store cars for free/subsidized rates will lead to financial ruin. I recommend converting land that is used for parking/garages to housing. Additionally reducing/eliminating parking minimums will also help.

GTCC (Eric Rockel - President)

erockel@earthlink.net

1.) The GTCC rejects proposal to add high-density, multi-use properties to the County's land use inventory in the greater Timonium area for several reasons - a.) impact to schools, b.) traffic congestion, c.) other infrastructure concerns i.e., water, sewer and recreational needs.

2.) Rejects proposal to end DR-1 and DR-2 zoning classifications. Believes these zoning classes were intended to minimize housing impacts to the Loch Raven reservoir caused by runoff of pollutants, which many of these properties abut and believe these zoning classifications should remain due to environmental benefits.

3.) Believes the recommendation to eliminate a hearing officer's hearing for affordable housing developments is misplaced and may be discriminatory - if you apply differing laws for distinct types of development you are in effect discriminating.

4.) Believes a more practical solution to the County's affordable housing needs would be to utilize the many apartment and townhome rental complexes already in existence (i.e., "The Lakes"). Some of these already offer affordable rents, and if the county could come to an agreement with these rental complexes, they could add between 5 and 10 affordable units per complex.

5.) States that the greater Timonium area already exhibits many of the characteristics embodied in the vision statement, and they do not want to see the suburban character of the area degraded with additional higher density housing and the abandonment of traditional zoning regulations.

Sonya Dease (Dundalk USA)

sonya@dundalkusa.org

410-282-0261

1.) I would propose in addition to credit counseling to coach the behaviors needed to manage finances effectively, assistance we should offer assistance to pay prior rental delinquencies as an added measure of supportive services to the beneficiaries of the affordable housing. Prior rental delinquencies are a common imposition for financial stability and often pose a limitation to options when credit checks are involved.