

Constituent Input:

Should the City Levy Development Impact Fees To Cover the Cost of Expanding Public Infrastructure?

YES:	73/77	=	95.0 %
NEUTRAL:	2/77	=	2.5 %
NO:	2/77	=	2.5 %

+++++

Hi Ian,

Thanks for your information and explanations. As to your question: **Yes, I do think the City should levy impact fees on new development to cover the cost of expanding public infrastructure,** especially when generated by developers that do not follow smart growth principles.

+++++

The city should levy impact fees! If developers don't want to foot the bills for expansion, they can choose not to develop. Existing property owners should not incur the additional financial burdens.

+++++

Thanks, Ian, your newsletters are so informative, and help to form educated decisions.

In regard to your question about raising residential taxes to help fund a new fire station, I don't mind paying a higher tax to help my city, but **I do feel a much higher "development impact fee" should take care of added growth,** making the developers rich. Relocation of residents to a 'nicer part of town' may not bring in enough additional city funds. Developers need to be held responsible!

+++++

I vote yes on the development impact fees!

+++++

Dear Mr. Thomas,

A few years ago, I met with you personally and told you that **developers should pay and subsidize infrastructure --- including water, power, sewer and fire & police protection --- in their new developments** and that the City of Columbia has to stop putting this burden on homeowners and property owners through property taxes.

Hi Ian,

Just read your constituent email and just had to reply with a resounding, "YES!"

"As I discussed above, I do not support making current customers pay the costs of expanding the capacity of public infrastructure systems for growth."

Thank you for this. This is spot on and echoes what I have been hearing in the last months from Columbians on all sides of the political spectrum:

+++++

Hi, Ian,

I favor an impact fee to finance public infrastructure.

+++++

I am in favor of impact fees being levied on new development, not increasing taxes.

+++++

Yes, developers should bear more of the burden of their developments. Obviously, the property tax and utility fee revenues for development are not high enough to cover those costs themselves, or we wouldn't be facing this bond issue

+++++

YES: the logical and fair way to pay for growth would be to charge a "New Development Impact Fee" to cover the cost of expanding the capacity of our public infrastructure systems! I have live in Columbia 42 years and hope others will see the wisdom of this proposal. Keep up the good work.

+++++

My first reaction in regard to levying a tax on developers to cover the costs of providing the additional infrastructure support is positive.

+++++

Ian: Yes I think the city should levy impact fees on new developments, absolutely. This might help discourage overgrowth and satisfy many of your respondents who think as I do, that we should not grow forever and not spread out forever.!

+++++

I do not agree to add a special impact fee. Just part of growth. Glad to see the new station in south Columbia is that best use of the dollar.

+++++

Because the impact fee approach is “pay as you go” for developers (rather than “you go, we pay”), impact fees seem to me to serve the whole community better than for the city to pay development costs of infrastructure.

+++++

Hi Ian,
Yes to the new development impact fee.

+++++

I agree that developers should consider the impact that development has on city services and infrastructure and be accountable, to some degree, in financially mitigating that impact. While that financial responsibility may subsequently be reflected back in the form of an increase to rent or purchase prices, they will still have to deal with the local market and be competitive with their pricing.

+++++

Ian:
1) Yes, the city should levy impact fees on new development.

+++++

Funding, like when we built our new home in The Village at Cherry Hill, should come from the developers funding and passed along to whom ever purchases the home, not from the general population of property owners. General funds are a better idea, fund something for all of the property owners and citizens of Columbia.

+++++

I like your idea of the new development impact fee. Makes sense. It's something the developers would need to pay, is that right?

+++++

Fees for growth is another issue the council should consider in the future, that requires a lot of study and discussion. I see it as a future issue and not part of the current vote. The city should have this discussion and I know all the realtors and developers will oppose it. I put this to the city’s lack of planning for growth that has been going on for many, many years. Zoning for smaller lots will lower the cost of extending services. A development fee with a surcharge for large lots is an option.

+++++

Yes, the City should levy a NEW DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEE on new construction (new subdivisions) to cover the costs of city expansion. This should include the cost for expanding the infrastructure (roads and the water, gas and electric utilities) as well as the additional cost of building NEW Fire Stations, Police Stations, and Public Schools.

+++++

Ian,

The answer to your question is yes--the City should levy impact fees on new development to cover the cost of expanding infrastructure.

+++++

I agree with you that we really need impact fees on new development.

+++++

I share your view that it is fair and reasonable to charge "New Development Impact Fees" that will (approximately) offset the capital outlay by the city for infrastructure, including things such as this firehouse.

But, from what I can tell, this seems unlikely to happen. I support development in and around Columbia but do consider it only sensible to include infrastructure capital costs as a reasonable part of fees collected by the city and would want absolute assurance all such fees were used for the applicable infrastructure expansion only. And would expect public accounting of such.

+++++

Your recommendations sound workable!

Thanks!

+++++

Hi Ian,

I share your views (as usual, if not always) on the idea that new development should pay for its own infrastructure.

+++++

Yes, the city should levy impact fees on developers. If this slows expansion of the city, so much the better.

+++++

I like your logic, we need a development fee.

+++++

Mr. Thomas,

I most definitely support impact fees for growth and believe the impact fees to connect to sewers, drinking water, roads, and utilities should be higher for developers.

+++++

I agree with you on your stances/opinions on the issues of development, taxes, infrastructure, and water. Thank you for the updates and explanations of the issues.

+++++

Hi Ian,

As you would expect, I support development fees.

+++++

Hi Ian,

Thanks for being in touch. Yes, the city should levy impact fees on new development to cover the cost of expanding public infrastructure.

+++++

Yes, definitely levy impact fees! Thank you for your wisdom and work!

+++++

Hi Ian.

I agree that developers should bear the cost of all infrastructure and increased service needs created by their developments.

+++++

Hello Ian. I always enjoy reading your updates. We support the levy on new growth developers and don't feel current taxpayers should carry the costs of a new fire station on the south part of town.

+++++

As you indicate in your newsletter, this need to build a fire station is just another example of how the city of Columbia continues to support uncontrolled development, expanding ever outward providing services to newer neighborhoods even as infrastructure within the older parts of the city continue to decay (I am STILL waiting for my PCCE project to begin, nearly 3 years after council approved it could go forward and more than 10 years since the project was first proposed).

+++++

In the long term, it makes sense to assess new construction to cover additional infrastructure rather than tax all of Columbia for this new construction (i.e., new development impact fee).

+++++

I certainly would support a development fee to pay for infrastructure needed in new subdivisions.

+++++

My two cents.

Cities are either growing or dying. We should be thankful that ours continues to grow.

+++++

Thanks for the opportunity to express my opinion. I agree that there should be new development impact fees assessed that would be adequate to fund the new/improved infrastructure needs of new housing development. I do not mind paying for things like education that impact all of us but I do object to paying for the costs of new development. Those benefitting from the new development - developers, property owners - should pay their own way on this especially since most of the new development is either commercial or higher end residential.

+++++

Yes I support a New development fee to get developers to pay more of their fair share.

+++++

I agree with you 100% - Yes, to impact fees on new development.

+++++

I do believe that we should have Levied Impact Fees on New Developments to help cover Infrastructure Costs., YES.

+++++

Thank you, Ian!

Yes, I very much agree that impact fees should be levied on new development! I don't at all mind Columbia's population growing, but I do think our built environment needs to have a much smarter and sustainable design than the way Columbia is currently expanding.

+++++

Yes! They should not tax existing customers for this grown in other areas.

+++++

Good Evening Ian,
Not this it will surprise you, but I favor instituting and impact fee for new/green-field development.

+++++

A lot of Columbia's problems come from rapid growth, trying to make infrastructure catch up.

+++++

Yes, I support new impact fees to be imposed on new development to cover the costs of new public infrastructure.

+++++

We also support new development impact fees in lieu of ratepayer subsidy of infrastructure needed due to growth.

+++++

We also support raising development fees to pay for the true price of expansion of city services.

+++++

Expanding infrastructure shouldn't be paid for by current customers as a general rule. And certainly expansion shouldn't cause detriment to existing customers in either utilities or services (i.e. sewer system overflows, slower fire response times, etc). And I mean this in both a detriment caused by stretching too thin current resources and also leaving problems unsolved because money is going towards expansion instead ((like the storm water issues on Worley/Again that went unsolved for so long and the back log of neighborhoods needing traffic calming). Thank you for representing us on these important matters!

+++++

In general, I like and support your idea to have a "New Development Impact Fee."

+++++

Yes to impact fees for new development both residential and industrial, the FULL COST of all additional services should be paid. It is time for residents to stop subsidizing new development.

+++++

I agree with you with using new development Impact fees as you describe it.

+++++

Yes to this important question:

Do you think the City should levy impact fees on new development, to cover the cost of expanding public infrastructure?

Thank you.

+++++

I do agree that the city should be charging more to the developers for all of the subdivisions in order to help pay for the infrastructure updates that are required because of their developments. Maybe this will also help curtail some of the unnecessary "urban sprawl". All cities need to be ensuring urban sprawl is necessary. Need to be doing a better job of utilizing existing land/properties/housing within existing city limits BEFORE allowing or supporting annexing and more sprawl.

+++++

Hello Ian - Denser new development (less raw land taken) seems better to me, so fees that tend to make that happen seem good. First time/installation costs for new infrastructure should be paid for by the new home buyers/developers

+++++

I support the idea of shifting some of the infrastructure expansion burden to developers.

+++++

I also like the idea of the impact fees. Maybe they don't cover all the costs, but half would be nice.

+++++

I definitely agree with you that the City should charge a "New Development Impact Fee" to cover the cost of expanding the capacity of our public infrastructure systems. Money is made from new infrastructure developments and funds to pay for them should not be the burden of the taxpayers. Whoever is building them should bear the cost. Besides, the City often also provides tax breaks for new development so taxpayers end up paying for that too.

+++++

Ian- I appreciate all of the work you are doing for 4th ward & Columbia in general. I support impact fees on new construction. I worry that they will pass the expense on to the buyer but I think developers have it pretty easy in Columbia.

+++++

Yes, it think there should be impact fees on distant, low-density developments.

+++++

The new developments should pay a fee to create fire stations in outlying areas. I also feel that "new development impact fee" should be instituted as an ongoing fee(not a one time fee) to support fire and other services like trash removal to the developments most of which have luxury or high cost real estate! Thanks for your concerns

+++++

I agree with you that the city should impose impact fees on new development to cover the cost of expanding infrastructure, especially when it is low-density and encroaches on farm or park lands.

+++++

I think those new homes and developers should pay for everything including infra structure and all the services they need.

I don't think it is "mine" responsibility to pay for those folks that do not want to have neighbors and leave away from everything and everybody.

The City is constantly let developers to do that, profit from those sales, and we the old residents get the bills after they move to the next project.

+++++

You thoughts on how strains on infrastructure should be paid are on point. I wholeheartedly that a New Development Impact Fee should be charged to take the burden off the tax payers.

+++++

I am completely in favor of a new impact development fee as you have described. I live on Glenwood Court and our street patches have been patched and are crumbling again.

+++++

BTW Ian, We are in favor of impact fees on new development. Forgot to let you know that. Thanks!

+++++

Thank you for your thoughtful recent email. I'm responding to indicate I believe the City should levy impact fees on new development, to cover the cost of expanding public infrastructure.

Everyone who uses or profits from the use of city resources should pay for that privilege. This includes developers. I'm aware of the developers' arguments against this approach, including statements that they will have to pass on costs to their customers, which would hurt their "competitiveness" in the market. From my perspective (and please correct me if I'm wrong) certain lobbyists and politicians are then "bought off", and the end result is that the existing users/taxpayers pay the lions share of public infrastructure costs related to expansion.

+++++

I'm all for impact fees for developers/ments.

+++++

Growth cost- I have always believed that the cost of development should be paid by the developers who pass those costs on to the new homeowners. Never have understood why existing residents should pay forever for the cost of new infrastructure while the new residents get a forever break. It starts with street, water, sewer, electric, & trash and continues to more police and firefighters and schools. We're seeing it today as the city is building new sidewalk on Sinclair Road to the new school. Developers should be required to pay for all the extension of city service plus the addition of services that will be required such as fire & police stations and schools.

+++++

"Do you think the City should levy impact fees on new development, to cover the cost of expanding public infrastructure?" Yes, I definitely consider the above is needed. There has been more than enough subsidized expanding of public infrastructure in the past.

+++++

Do you think the City should levy impact fees on new development, to cover the cost of expanding public infrastructure? Definitely, but better have your ear muffs handy, because the ones benefiting the most from this urban sprawl will be howling like a scalded dog,

+++++

Thanks for asking for input. I strongly support the idea that the City should levy impact fees on new development to cover the cost of expanding public infrastructure.

+++++

I heard your comments on TV last night and they were spot on regarding what has caused the need for more infrastructure and fire/police – Columbia's geographic area is larger due to sprawling residential development that has not payed it's way.

+++++

I do think there should be fees levied on new development to support the cost of adding infrastructure to accommodate it. It seems that's the only fair way.

+++++

Yes, the City should levy impact fees on new development, to cover the cost of expanding public infrastructure. Most definitely. Thank you for asking,

+++++