CAC members present: Elizabeth Rosborg (Chair), Cate Bower, John Clark, Bill Dodd, Thomas Fahs, Joel Greenwell, Melanie Hartwig-Davis, Patricia Huecker, Elizabeth Ysla Leight, Patricia Lynch, Charles Mannion, Gary Mauler, Ellen Moyer, Kristin Pauly, Will Shorter, Allan Straughan

Office of Planning and Zoning (OPZ) present: Cindy Carrier, Acting Deputy Planning and Zoning Officer; Patrick Hughes, Long Range Planner; Mark Wildonger, Long Range Planner; Don Zeigler, Long Range Planner

Attendees: Fred Galloway, Steve Miller, John Van de Kamp

Administrative and Approval of Meeting Notes – August 21, 2019
Ms. Rosborg, Chair

Introduction:
Mr. Kaii-Ziegler shared that the Office of Planning and Zoning (OPZ) will be adding new positions to support the new planning initiatives. Christina Pompa, currently the Deputy Director of Planning and Growth Management at Charles County, has been appointed to be the new Deputy Planning and Zoning Officer for the Planning Division. She will oversee the Long Range Planning Section and will begin on September 30th. Ms. Carrier, the current Acting Deputy Planning and Zoning Officer, will continue as the Long Range Planning Administrator and continue to coordinate the General Development Plan (GDP). He emphasized that the changes will be seamless, that OPZ will be stronger, and the County is in good hands with Ms. Carrier’s team.

County Tour
Mr. Mauler asked if other CAC members would be interested in participating in a guided tour of the County to learn about the opportunities and challenges other communities face. Ms. Rosborg clarified that this would be on CAC members’ own time and would not be a County-sponsored event. Ms. Moyer thought there is value in sharing ideas and suggested members present these ideas at a future meeting. Mr. Shorter asked if the County was looking at best practices of other municipalities. Ms. Rosborg said the County is researching best practices around the country.
Carrier noted that there has been a robust public outreach component of the GDP process in order to gather feedback and ideas from residents and stakeholders. Based on this feedback, the County has a good understanding of the issues and that the next step is synthesizing the ideas and developing goals, objectives, and strategies. She noted that ten-minute presentations by 20+ members would push the schedule out further. Mr. Kai-Ziegler shared that Charles County took seven years to adopt their County-wide master plan due to a variety of issues, of which included the desire to cover every subject. He encouraged the CAC to balance the desire for information with the importance of finishing the GDP in a reasonable timeframe. The GDP will provide general policy guidance; whereas the Region Plans will get into additional detail.

Ms. Pauly was in support of Ms. Moyer’s idea of ten-minute presentations at a future meeting. Ms. Rosborg encouraged Ms. Pauly and Ms. Moyer to develop a template for other interested CAC members to complete that describes what information members would like to share with the CAC. Mr. Clark suggested members could team up with others in their newly created Region Areas to streamline the presentation. Mr. Straughan reminded the CAC that they are currently tasked with developing a high-level vision, and not get into the details.

Region map
Ms. Rosborg said there has been one change to the Region Area map. The Severna Park Community and Region Area boundary will be extended north to Brightview Drive and Obrecht Road. There are no new changes to the Crownsville or Region 6 Planning Area.

Goal, Objective, and Strategy Board
Ms. Rosborg indicated that a flip chart is located in the rear of the room in the event CAC members have an idea about a goal, objective, or strategy that they would like to see included in the GDP. Members may write on it at a convenient time or they may email Ms. Carrier with their suggestion.

Meeting Notes
Mr. Shorter motioned to accept the meeting notes as circulated. Ms. Bower seconded, and the meeting notes were approved unanimously.

Review Process, Content, Etc. Region Plans
Mr. Hughes, OPZ

Mr. Hughes reviewed the framework of the proposed Region Plan process. The process has a 36-month timeframe, identifies the need for a lead planner and additional staff to develop plans, and the content for the plans. One common theme from the 17 Visioning Sessions was the need for each Region Plan to have consistent content. While this attempts to standardize the plans, there is an understanding that some Regions may have their own unique issues. One important addition to the content is the inclusion of an implementation plan and techniques to measure the implementation.

Ms. Bower asked whether recommendations that are ongoing or not implemented from the previous Small Area Plans and 2009 GDP will be carried over to the new Region Plans. Ms. Carrier said that they would be and reminded the CAC that this was one of the exercises OPZ received feedback on during the 17 Visioning Sessions. Ms. Bower requested that these carryover recommendations be flagged.
Ms. Hartwig-Davis asked who provided the status updates for the Small Area Plan and 2009 GDP recommendations since there seemed to be some disagreement between what was presented and what the community felt was accomplished. Ms. Carrier said the updates were provided by various County departments and suggested that stakeholders who disagree with the status to record their concerns in a letter and request a meeting with OPZ to discuss in more detail.

Mr. Kaii-Ziegler asked the CAC to keep in mind that there will always be public dissatisfaction with the degree of implementation. He emphasized that the key for the GDP and Region Plans to succeed is a strong citizen’s advisory committee that develops the plan and then oversee the implementation of the plan. This committee will be aided by the County and other stakeholders.

Mr. Mauler asked if there was a legal requirement to status the plans. Mr. Kaii-Ziegler said there is not, but the best way to implement the plan is to organize a committee. Ms. Rosborg said there is strong support for implementing the plans. Mr. Kaii-Ziegler referenced the City of Alexandria that used a blank report card to allow the community to evaluate and report on the plan implementation every year. The report would also provide an explanation as to why or why not a recommendation could or could not be implemented. This allows the group and community to own and present the status report. Ms. Moyer noted there is a natural tension between public participation and staff. She suggested the concept of a collaborative process be written into the plan. Ms. Bower suggested the Region Plan citizen’s advisory committee be comprised of a “minimum” of 11 members rather than a firm number.

**Draft Policy Areas**

*Mr. Zeigler, OPZ*

Mr. Zeigler reviewed the Policy Areas from the 2009 GDP. The Targeted Growth Policy Area included town centers, mixed-use areas, and commercial revitalization areas. The Managed Growth Policy Area included the remaining Priority Funding Areas (PFA) outside of Targeted Growth Areas. The Rural Policy Area included areas outside the PFA, areas with rural characteristics, and areas that are on private septic and well. The three Policy Areas helped establish future land uses and investment in public facilities and were based in natural resources, existing and planned water/sewer facilities, the PFA, and revitalization goals. Policy Areas provide a framework for implementing the goals, policies, and strategies of the GDP and a means for making cost-effective investments in public facilities and services. Since there were only three policy areas, the policies were broad and multiple policies could be applied for each policy area.

Based on feedback from a recent survey, the proposed Policy Areas are Resource Sensitive, Targeted Growth and Revitalization, Neighborhood Preservation, Peninsula Policy, and Rural and Agricultural. The Targeted Growth and Revitalization Policy Area have five sub-areas which are Critical Economic, Town Center, Village Center, Transit-Oriented, and Corridor Management. The Policy Areas have expanded from three in the 2009 GDP to five in the proposed GDP in an effort to help better guide environmental protection, infrastructure, and protecting the character of existing communities. The Commercial Revitalization sub-area, presented at the previous meeting, has been removed because it overlapped with other sub-areas. Another change from the previous meeting is the addition of the Critical Economic sub-area which focuses more on existing regional economic and employment centers.
The Resource Sensitive Policy Area includes a variety of environmental, cultural, and historic features, such as wetland and stream buffers. The intent of the policy is to minimize the impact of development or infrastructure improvements in sensitive areas.

The Targeted Growth and Revitalization Policy Area is intended to focus development to certain areas of the County where there are redevelopment and revitalization opportunities. The five subareas and their description are listed below:

- The Critical Economic sub-area will include existing or planned regional-scale destinations, employment centers, or areas supporting the economic growth of major economic drivers. This area is primarily industrial, commercial, and mixed land uses, with flexible land use policies to facilitate business growth and job creation. An example would be the Arundel Mills area.
- The Town Center sub-area will include existing or planned compact, walkable, pedestrian-oriented, higher-density residential and nonresidential mixed-use areas and implementation is guided by a town center master plan. An example would be the Odenton Town Center.
- The Transit-Oriented subarea will be a compact, walkable, pedestrian-oriented, mixed-use around transit stations; and implementation is guided by a Transit District Plan. The distance from a transit stop is a radius of 0.5-mile. An example would be the Cromwell Light Rail Station area.
- The Village Center sub-area would be smaller scale centers with development oriented for the community and guided by a village master plan. An example would be Deale Village.
- The Corridor Management sub-area would be existing developed corridors; focusing opportunities for infill development, redevelopment, revitalization and mixed-use to serve/preserve adjacent neighborhoods; and implementation would be guided by a Corridor Growth Management Plan. An example is MD 2 in Edgewater.

The Neighborhood Preservation Policy Area is not intended for substantial growth or revitalization and is characterized by stable residential communities; development would match existing character; it may include local commercial and industrial uses, is within PFAs; located where public sewer exists or is planned; and where other infrastructure exists, but may need improvements. An example would be Riva.

The Peninsula Policy Area is characterized by communities served by a one-road corridor; has limited development; and transportation investments would be prioritized. These areas are primarily residential, surrounded by water and Critical Area, and may be inside or outside of the PFA or public sewer service area. An example is the Mayo Peninsula.

The Rural and Agricultural Policy Area is characterized by farms, rural residential, limited commercial; is outside of the PFA, and is served by private septic. Development would be minimized to protect the rural and agricultural heritage and economy, and there would be limited extension of public facilities and services. An example is Davidsonville.

Mr. Straughan asked who developed the definitions for the policy areas and what the difference is between the definitions of Neighborhood Preservation and Peninsula as well as what is meant by “no revitalization” in the Neighborhood Preservation Policy Area. Mr. Zeigler said the definitions were created by staff and refined by public input via a recent survey. He added that the two Policy Areas are similar, but noted that the Peninsula Policy Areas may or may not be in the PFA. Mr. Hughes noted that the Neighborhood Preservation definition has since been updated in the CAC’s
handout and now reads “Development is limited to infill and redevelopment that must be compatible with the existing neighborhood character and heritage.”

Ms. Pauly asked what the general purpose is of these Policy Areas. Mr. Zeigler reiterated that these policies help guide the planned land use map and future land use decisions.

Ms. Moyer noted that Commercial Revitalization Policy Area was removed and asked if the Corridor Management Policy Area replaced it. Mr. Zeigler clarified that the Critical Economic Policy Area also includes the same concepts from the Commercial Revitalization Policy Area. Ms. Moyer noted that the Corridor Management Policy Area needs to be more directed and create a sense of place that reflects the County’s unique character.

Ms. Bower asked if the Neighborhood Preservation Policy Area would include areas that do not have public sewer or water services. Ms. Carrier noted that the areas with no public water or sewer and primarily designated as the Rural and Agricultural Policy Area.

Mr. Mauler asked how pipeline projects impact the timeline and land use. Ms. Rosborg clarified that land use will be discussed at a later time and that tonight’s discussion is about Policy Areas.

Mr. Zeigler instructed CAC members to provide input on the draft Policy Area maps during the breakout exercise.

[The CAC broke into groups to discuss the draft Policy Areas]

West County – The group discussed support for the Transit-Oriented Policy Areas as a strategy to encourage public transportation, reduce vehicle emissions, and traffic along the Baltimore-Washington Parkway. Maryland City should stay as a Corridor Management Policy Area to encourage more redevelopment. In Jessup along MD 175, Mr. Mauler thought the area north of MD 175 should be Neighborhood Preservation due to increasing traffic along the roads. The Village Center Policy Area should remain on the south side. The homes in the neighborhood had roads built for horse and buggy and many of the residents have chickens, horses, and ponies. Mr. Fahs noted that there is some conflict of how the neighborhood is evolving given the location and a desire to keep it rural.

North County – The group agreed with the proposed Corridor Management Policy Areas, the Transit-Oriented Policy Areas, and the Neighborhood Preservation Policy Areas. A proposed Village Center Policy Area in the southern part of North County did not quite fit the description, so the group recommended removing it from the map. They did not have an opportunity to discuss the Rural and Agricultural Policy Areas. There was a discussion about keeping the half-mile radius for the Transit-Oriented Policy Area. There may; however, be community opposition for the Transit-Oriented Policy Area. The CAC asked if the parks and schools layer could be added to the maps.

East County – The group discussed eliminating pockets of Neighborhood Preservation Policy Areas and Rural and Agricultural Policy Areas on peninsulas and reclassify them wholly as Peninsula Policy Areas. Edits were made to several Corridor Management Policy Areas and one Village Center Policy Area.
South County – The group would like to see the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration sea level rise predictions as an overlay and classify those areas as a Resource Sensitive Policy Areas. They added a Corridor Management Policy Area north of the South River Bridge along MD 2 as well as on Mayo Road on the Mayo Peninsula. They also included a Village Center on the Mayo Peninsula so a new commercial area could serve residents on the peninsula. Ms. Hartwig-Davis shared that the Anne Arundel County Peninsula Coalition will present the concept of a peninsula overlay at the next CAC meeting.

Ms. Carrier clarified that these areas reflect current conditions and what the community wants them to be. These can be refined further during the Region Plan process. Mr. Mauler asked why there is not a Corridor Management Policy Area down MD 2 in South County anticipating the demand for low-income housing and affordable transportation.

Next Steps

Ms. Rosborg reminded the CAC that the next meeting is a joint meeting with the Citizens Environmental Commission and the Peninsula Coalition. Ms. Moyer requested that the Department of Recreation and Parks provide information about required square footage of parkland per resident. Ms. Rosborg said this information was shared during the background report phase and can also be found in the 2017 Land Preservation, Parks and Recreation Plan online.

Mr. Short motioned to adjourn. The motion was seconded by Mr. Clark and the meeting was adjourned at 7:05 p.m.