

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
COMMENTS ON SPECIFIC PROPERTIES (LUCA, SR, OOHR SITES)	
<p>(LUCA 122) To whom it may concern:</p> <p>For the reasons stated in our Land Use Change Application (LUCA), we stand by our arguments that 161 Ferguson Road should be zoned commercial not residential. A Commercial designation is consistent with the neighboring properties, its location adjacent to a busy state highway, and proximity to an active shooting club. The preliminary land use map does not take into consideration that the Critical Area Commission ("CAC") is in the process of updating its maps. The draft maps show a significant remapping in this area. Specifically, almost the entirety of the Property will be removed from the Critical Area on account of a significant mapping error in prior maps." Once finalized the revised map will leave only a very small portion of the parcel in the Critical Area. As stated in our Land Use Change Application, the portion of the parcel that can be developed is very limited on account of extensive steep slopes and forest conservation easements. The part of the parcel that can be developed is not raw land, it has already been developed.</p> <p>With respect to the comments submitted from community engagement, OPZ stated that 7 comments were submitted in support and 11 in opposition to the LUCA; however, that misstates the split in the submitted comments. Nine were submitted each in opposition to and in favor of the LUCA. See Plan2040 Community Engagement @Home Summary. The comments in objection to the land use state, without explanation or proof, that the concerns raised in our LUCA were exaggerated and all problems with the site were known to us when we purchased the property. These claims are simply wrong. When we purchased the property we could not have known that there was a persistent problems with illegal dumping on the property, which is one reason why we erected a secured gate at the property entrance. We could not have foreseen the Anne Arundel Fish and Game Club's (AAFGC) construction of an archery range, without permits, directly on our property boundary, and the years-long fight with AAFGC for its removal. The claim that the stretch of road is dangerous is unfounded; we have not been aware of any traffic accidents in this stretch of Ferguson Road, and a query to the local AA police department did not indicate any traffic accident occurring in the recent past. The Infiniti dealership had not been constructed when we purchased our property, and the problems with dealership related work activity in front of our driveway started only after the dealership was built. We did not foresee people attempting to drive either from Ferguson Road through our property to AAFGC or to find a shortcut to the Bay Bridge (another prompt to install the gate). And we certainly did not foresee, and unfortunately have no way to stop, armed and incoherent individuals from driving from AAFGC onto our property. And despite the gate we still have problems with trespassing, including a recent event caught on a dash-cam of an individual who decided to walk down our driveway to relieve himself (because of the close proximity to the highway).</p> <p>Finally, we are surprised and concerned about the comment from the Broadneck Council of Communities, which stated that their decision was made after "making on-site visits." Whomever submitted this comment from the Broadneck Council of Communities never requested our permission for a visit to the site, hence there are only two explanations: (a) whomever submitted the comment did not perform a site visit and therefore we wish the record to be corrected , or (b) they did, and therefore just admitted to trespassing, in which case we request to know the identity of the individuals who admitted in writing to trespassing in our property.</p> <p>Best regards, Julie and Giovanni Santoboni</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>(LUCA 122) To whom it may concern:</p> <p>For the reasons stated in our Land Use Change Application (LUCA), we stand by our arguments that 161 Ferguson Road should be zoned commercial not residential. A Commercial designation is consistent with the neighboring properties, its location adjacent to a busy state highway, and proximity to an</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>Regarding LUCA-128, we own the property at 2895 Jessup Road, Parcel Number 4000-0396-3500-00. It is difficult to tell from the proposed Land Use map where the actual property boundaries are, but I am suggesting and requesting that the Commercial zoning should cover the entire parcel # 4000-0396-3500-00 because the entire back portion of the parcel is already currently zoned W-1. As property owners we went to a lot of trouble and expense to get the back portion of this parcel rezoned to W-1 a few years ago. Please do not make the mistake of changing any of this parcel back to residential.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>Residential land use is no longer appropriate for the Properties described in LUCA187 and LUCA128 (fronting along Rt. 175). The Plan2040 draft supports all of these parcels being designated commercial. There is land on the south side of Rt. 175 in the rear that calls for low density residential. This would create a portion of property surrounded by commercial and industrial land use. That is not good planning and would not lead to a sustainable community. Elimination of low density from the land use map on the southern side of Rt. 175 is contextually the appropriate designation.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. The justification of the recommended Plan2040 land use for these properties states the request to change the Low Density Residential area to Industrial land use could be an intensification of uses in this Neighborhood Preservation - Village Center Policy Area. It is recommended that any change of use within this Village Center be discussed during the Region Planning process when a more comprehensive land use plan is developed with input from the community stakeholders.</p>
<p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the Draft General Development Plan. On behalf of The Maryland Jockey Club at Laurel Park I would like to submit the following points for consideration:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. As originally requested (LUCA 129), we would like to change our Land Use Designation for our entire property to Mixed Use. OPZ staff has it designated it Industrial and a portion as Mixed Use, but the entire property should be Mixed Use. Per legislation passed in 2020, the Maryland Stadium Authority (MSA) will be redeveloping the entire site. This will generate tremendous economic and community benefits for the County. The planning process is just beginning but it will feature a range of uses in addition to horse racing that will anchor additional redevelopment along the Rt. 198 Corridor. In order to be successful it will be developed in a Mixed Use framework for the entire site in order to provide the necessary flexibility for a project of this scale.</li> <li>2. We recommend that the following be added to “A New Model for Transit Services” on page 44:             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Support the improvement of the MARC Station at Laurel Racetrack and explore the opportunity to create a transit hub as part of the redevelopment of the Maryland Jockey Club at Laurel Park.</li> </ol> </li> <li>3. We recommend that the following be added to “Upgrading County Corridors and Community Cores-Central and West County Priority Investments” on page 45:             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Roadway and transit improvements along the Rt. 198 Corridor including the redevelopment of the Maryland Jockey Club at Laurel Park to maximize economic development opportunities.</li> </ol> </li> <li>4. We recommend that Policy HE5 on page 57 include:             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. HE5.3—Create a Sustainable Community Plan and Designation for the Route 198 Corridor including the Maryland Jockey Club at Laurel Park</li> </ol> </li> </ol> <p>Thank you for your consideration. Mark Thompson-SVP 1/ST Properties on behalf of The Maryland Jockey Club at Laurel Park</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>Concerns about expansion of marina. Oppose applicant request to change from Low Density Residential to Maritime for LUCA-136 (so supports Proposed Plan2040 designation of LDR). Concerns about ongoing violations, use of Parcel 359 for marina operations in violation of zoning. Concern about trees clear cut (between 2015-2016 based on aerial photos) and filling of wetland on site. Also concern that triangle shaped small parcel east of parcel 182 is not legally to be used by the marina, but is deed restricted for public water access</p>	<p>A response was provided via telephone.</p>
<p>LUCA 14. Changing the marina land use would be detrimental to the well being of our community, ie increased road traffic, adding other enterprises like possibly a restaurant, etc.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>I am a Lower Magothy Beach resident &amp; am concerned about expanding the Maritime planning area (&amp; thereby zoning) at the Hamilton Marina (LUCA-14). This expansion will certainly increase community traffic as well as change the existing buffer afforded by the current arrangement for neighboring community residents.</p>	<p>Thank you for taking the time to review the Plan and provide feedback. Your comment has been recorded and will be considered as part of the preliminary draft Plan2040 review. Please note that the preliminary draft Plan2040 will be presented to the Planning Advisory Board where there will be a briefing and public hearing. That process is anticipated to occur in December and January (dates to be determined). The draft Plan2040 is anticipated to be introduced to the County Council in February 2021 with public hearings to begin in March 2021 (dates to be determined).</p>

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>Still working thru it but have this question regarding LUCA 14. Staff recommended change would require rezoning a property from med density/maritime to all maritime, which the staff comments did not seem to support. Does this plan support a rezoning of this area?</p>	<p>The intent is to reconcile the planned land use map to the property boundaries. The 2009 GDP Land Use Map has one of the four lots that are included in this property as Low-Medium (as indicated on the pop-up and data sheet) and the Office of Planning and Zoning is recommending that this portion of the property be changed to "Maritime". If the Maritime land use is adopted by the County Council, then during the comprehensive zoning process that will take place for this area with the Region Plan process, it is likely that staff will recommend a Maritime zone for this portion of the property, consistent with the adopted land use.</p>
<p>Impressive document. However, I am disappointed to see that County planners apparently have not taken into consideration the comments from the community regarding LUCA-14. Instead of assessing what best meets the needs of the residents of the community, which would retain a mixed land use designation (Low-Med Residential/Maritime) for the property in question, planners have chosen to apply a rule-of-thumb about mixed land uses and defined it as Maritime only. This is despite the fact the mixed land use designation was instantiated by County many years ago to limit commercial activity in the community, and that decision has withstood the test of time for over 30 years. Why increase the commercial activity in a residential area?</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>I am not in favor of the LUCA-15 up-zoning change in Mayo since the up-zoning would add to peninsula traffic counts, impact the water quality in sensitive Ramsey Bay, impact the environment and viewshed, etc. It will also greatly impact the safety of Mayo ES by having more traffic pass by the small school on this narrow street. Please do not allow the developer to build condos or additional residential units on this small parcel.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>(LUCA 151) I'm in support of the zoning change for the Parks Land at 454 bay front rd. This is a great deal for the fire department as they are in need of this land for a new fire station</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>I'm writing in support of LUCA-151 by granting the Parks Family's request to change the commercial zoning at 454 bay front rd. Thanks parks family is willing to give the Deale Volunteer Fire Department 5 acres of land for a new modern fire station this will save the fire company and Anne Arundel County hundreds of thousands dollars for the land</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>I, Pamela S. Parks, am the property owner of 454 E. Bayfront Rd. Deale, Md. 20751. It is my intension to DONATE 5 acres of land to the Deale Volunteer Fire Department for a new and modern Fire Station which will better serve The Deale and surrounding community by having a fire station located on a road with immediate access to the surrounding area. This will also allow the DVFD to hold community events throughout the year. I am requesting that a portion of the property be upgraded (4 acres) with commercial zoning as requested. Thank you, Pamela Parks</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>I express my complete support for Earleigh Heights Vol Fire Co to change their zoning to allow commercial property.</p>	<p>Thank you for taking the time to review the Plan and provide feedback. Your comment has been recorded and will be considered as part of the preliminary draft Plan2040 review. Please note that the preliminary draft Plan2040 will be presented to the Planning Advisory Board where there will be a briefing and public hearing. That process is anticipated to occur in December and January (dates to be determined). The draft Plan2040 is anticipated to be introduced to the County Council in February 2021 with public hearings to begin in March 2021 (dates to be determined).</p>

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>I'm trying to follow-up on the 2040 Development Plan regarding LUCA153. I received an email outlining the 2020 Development Plan, but could find any information on the request to change the zoning for this parcel of land along Ritchie Highway just north of the Cypress Landing Community. Our HOA and I both agreed with the county and submitted our comments against approving this zoning request because of environmental protection and stormwater runoff and flooding. Our HOA also indicated the land use should be conservation due to this area is in front of our stormwater management area and it is forested which protects our community from traffic noise and general exposure to Route 2.</p>	<p>Thank you for taking the time to review the Plan and provide feedback. Your comment has been recorded and will be considered as part of the preliminary draft Plan2040 review. Please note that the preliminary draft Plan2040 will be presented to the Planning Advisory Board where there will be a briefing and public hearing. That process is anticipated to occur in December and January (dates to be determined). The draft Plan2040 is anticipated to be introduced to the County Council in February 2021 with public hearings to begin in March 2021 (dates to be determined).</p>
<p>The draft Plan2040 recommended land use for LUCA – 157 is “Commercial” and is consistent with existing zoning and compatible with the surrounding land use, existing and planned. The Draft Plan2040 Development Policy Areas Definitions &amp; Map are inconsistent; under the definitions (pg. 30), “Critical Corridor” is excluded from the “Targeted Development, Redevelopment and Revitalization Policy Areas,” but, on the Development Policy Areas Map (pg. 31) it is included and grouped with the other “Targeted Development, Redevelopment and Revitalization Policy Areas” (Critical Economic, Town Centers, Village Center Overlays, and Transit-Oriented Overlays).</p> <p>Based on the definition provided and the locations and properties identified as “Critical Corridor” on the map, the definition of “Critical Corridor” (on pg. 30) should be grouped with the other “Targeted Development, Redevelopment and Revitalization Policy Areas” for consistency. The definitions provided for “Critical Corridor” and “Critical Economic” are nearly the same. Certain areas identified as “Critical Corridor” also meet the definition and purpose of “Critical Economic” and those properties also happen to be located on major roads. The same development type and flexibility in land use policies should apply equally to “Critical Corridor” policy areas to encourage business growth and job creation in areas with existing transit access and infrastructure. Doing so would be consistent with smart growth policies, prevent sprawl, and increase the likelihood of improving existing infrastructure rather than creating new infrastructure; all the while minimizing the impact on the Natural Environment by concentrating development and redevelopment in existing commercially viable economic corridors where new stormwater practices can be installed and grouped together to mitigate the environmental impact of outdated stormwater facilities (and, in some cases, none at all).</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>The draft Plan2040 recommended land use for LUCA – 158 is “Mixed Use” and is consistent with existing zoning and compatible with the surrounding land use, existing and planned. The Draft Plan2040 Development Policy Areas Definitions &amp; Map are inconsistent; under the definitions (pg. 30), “Critical Corridor” is excluded from the “Targeted Development, Redevelopment and Revitalization Policy Areas,” but, on the Development Policy Areas Map (pg. 31) it is included and grouped with the other “Targeted Development, Redevelopment and Revitalization Policy Areas” (Critical Economic, Town Centers, Village Center Overlays, and Transit-Oriented Overlays). Based on the definition provided and the locations and properties identified as “Critical Corridor” on the map, the definition of “Critical Corridor” (on pg. 30) should be grouped with the other “Targeted Development, Redevelopment and Revitalization Policy Areas” for consistency.</p> <p>The definitions provided for “Critical Corridor” and “Critical Economic” are nearly the same. Certain areas identified as “Critical Corridor” also meet the definition and purpose of “Critical Economic” and those properties also happen to be located on major roads. The same development type and flexibility in land use policies should apply equally to “Critical Corridor” policy areas to encourage business growth and job creation in areas with existing transit access and infrastructure. Doing so would be consistent with smart growth policies, prevent sprawl, and increase the likelihood of improving existing infrastructure rather than creating new infrastructure; all the while minimizing the impact on the Natural Environment by concentrating development and redevelopment in existing commercially viable economic corridors where new stormwater practices can be installed and grouped together to mitigate the environmental impact of outdated stormwater facilities (and, in some cases, none at all).</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>The draft Plan2040 recommended land use for LUCA – 160 is “Mixed Use” and is consistent with existing zoning and compatible with the surrounding land use, existing and planned. The Draft Plan2040 Development Policy Areas Definitions &amp; Map are inconsistent; under the definitions (pg. 30), “Critical Corridor” is excluded from the “Targeted Development, Redevelopment and Revitalization Policy Areas,” but, on the Development Policy Areas Map (pg. 31) it is included and grouped with the other “Targeted Development, Redevelopment and Revitalization Policy Areas” (Critical Economic, Town Centers, Village Center Overlays, and Transit-Oriented Overlays). Based on the definition provided and the locations and properties identified as “Critical Corridor” on the map, the definition of “Critical Corridor” (on pg. 30) should be grouped with the other “Targeted Development, Redevelopment and Revitalization Policy Areas” for consistency.</p> <p>The definitions provided for “Critical Corridor” and “Critical Economic” are nearly the same. Certain areas identified as “Critical Corridor” also meet the definition and purpose of “Critical Economic” and those properties also happen to be located on major roads. The same development type and flexibility in land use policies should apply equally to “Critical Corridor” policy areas to encourage business growth and job creation in areas with existing transit access and infrastructure. Doing so would be consistent with smart growth policies, prevent sprawl, and increase the likelihood of improving existing infrastructure rather than creating new infrastructure; all the while minimizing the impact on the Natural Environment by concentrating development and redevelopment in existing commercially viable economic corridors where new stormwater practices can be installed and grouped together to mitigate the environmental impact of outdated stormwater facilities (and, in some cases, none at all).</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>The draft Plan2040 recommended land use for LUCA – 161 is “Mixed Use” and is consistent with existing zoning and compatible with the surrounding land use, existing and planned. The Draft Plan2040 Development Policy Areas Definitions &amp; Map are inconsistent; under the definitions (pg. 30), “Critical Corridor” is excluded from the “Targeted Development, Redevelopment and Revitalization Policy Areas,” but, on the Development Policy Areas Map (pg. 31) it is included and grouped with the other “Targeted Development, Redevelopment and Revitalization Policy Areas” (Critical Economic, Town Centers, Village Center Overlays, and Transit-Oriented Overlays). Based on the definition provided and the locations and properties identified as “Critical Corridor” on the map, the definition of “Critical Corridor” (on pg. 30) should be grouped with the other “Targeted Development, Redevelopment and Revitalization Policy Areas” for consistency.</p> <p>The definitions provided for “Critical Corridor” and “Critical Economic” are nearly the same. Certain areas identified as “Critical Corridor” also meet the definition and purpose of “Critical Economic” and those properties also happen to be located on major roads. The same development type and flexibility in land use policies should apply equally to “Critical Corridor” policy areas to encourage business growth and job creation in areas with existing transit access and infrastructure. Doing so would be consistent with smart growth policies, prevent sprawl, and increase the likelihood of improving existing infrastructure rather than creating new infrastructure; all the while minimizing the impact on the Natural Environment by concentrating development and redevelopment in existing commercially viable economic corridors where new stormwater practices can be installed and grouped together to mitigate the environmental impact of outdated stormwater facilities (and, in some cases, none at all).</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>The draft Plan2040 recommended land use for LUCA – 171 is “Commercial” and is consistent with existing zoning and compatible with the surrounding land use, existing and planned. The existing commercial uses, mostly neighborhood medical offices, are consistent with maintaining the goals of the recommended Development Policy Area – “Neighborhood Preservation.”</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>(LUCA-172) It is my hope that the powers that be utilize the comments and feedback given previously in September 2020 regarding LUCA 172 parcel 357 currently zoned as RLD. There were 68 opposed to re-zoning this parcel and 3 in favor. Who do you work for? I once again will voice my opposition to a change in zoning of this parcel to commercial. This parcel is at the corner of Rt 3 northbound and Millersville Road. It is an already congested intersection and poses traffic safety issues. I use this intersection every single time I leave my home and it is not unusual to see vehicles run red lights both northbound on Rt 3 and the left turn from the median road onto NB Rt 3. There is also an acceleration combined with a turn lane from NB Rt 3 on Millersville Road. The last thing the community that will be most affected by your decision is another strip mall placed in a corner of this intersection. This is a RURAL designation and when I moved to Overlea Estates 19 years ago, there was no WaWa, no Royal Farms, no car garage or 2 car washes. The median on Rt 3 was filled with trees; not another Royal Farms or car lot. Aside from the safety issue, the traffic abominable. It takes me 20 minutes to drive less than 4 miles to my children's school. On a Saturday late afternoon/early evening, when the Jehovah's Witness congregation lets out the cars are backed up on Millersville Road from the Rt 3 light pass Millersville Elementary and it could take up to 20 minutes to get to intersection. The community along Millersville Road is rural and since we live here, our voices should carry more weight than a developer that will build and leave and then the residents have to deal with sprawl &amp; crawl. I also want to include my opposition to a tennis facility at Millersville Park. The Tennis Alliance from Virginia showed up with an idea WITHOUT community interest or support and promised financial support then left the county holding the bag. A commercial tennis facility with lights is not a prudent use of our tax dollars nor does the infrastructure support additional traffic. It is my preference to have a passive nature park with walking paths, bike paths, community use for picnics and small gatherings.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>Comments from David Demers of 70 Linda Lane, Millersville, MD 21108 for AACo 2040Plan LUCA 172 I would like to see these parcels remain RLD or even Agricultural. Or make this a green space with a historic house that is at the current end of the South Shore bike path. Both of these parcels were designated RLD in the 2009 General Development Plan and now each has been designated commercial land use in the 2040 Plan. This is not consistent with the current zoning and both parcels should be restored to RLD in order to be consistent with the adjacent Rural land uses or zoning on both sides of Route 3. This includes the Millersville/Crownsville area and the Gambrills area which are both adjacent to this intersection at Route 3. The RLD designation would support the County's efforts to protect the Jabez Branch and the Severn River by maintain impervious cover and storm water runoff. MD route 3 The increase of traffic on route 3 has become a real problem for the surrounding communities. The intersection is considered failing according to what I have heard from the last traffic study and anyone who has to drive this route already knows who crowded this route is especially at rush hour. The backup at traffic lights has encouraged many drivers to make their way thru the surrounding neighborhoods in an attempt to miss the jam ups at these traffic lights. North bound drivers now regularly take St Stephens Church road to Cecil Ave to Millersville Road, etc. If the problem were just this additional traffic thru our neighborhoods during rush hours that would be bearable but these drivers are also trying to speed along at 50 MPH on Cecil Ave which did have a speed limit of 35 MPH and now has a speed limit of 30 MPH. The reduced speed limits are regularly being ignored. Adding lanes to Route 3 may provide some short term solution to the problem but is not a long term solution. There are too many cars on the road. Some form of public transportation, even if just local, needs to be addressed. I realize that this effort would require cooperation from the State as well. Also, the county must stop any more development along the Route 3 corridor until the traffic issue is addressed. Millersville Park What make sense for this property is to keep this land as green space. It was previously farm land. The construction of 2-4 tennis courts, perhaps a ball field and a walking path with no "after daylight hours" allowed would be more in keeping with this neighborhood and its rural setting. The large tennis facility proposed by the Department of Parks and Recreation does not make sense for this location. As it was explained to residents by the Department of Parks and Recreation, the intent was to hold large tournaments at this facility with lights to allow night time play. This would increase traffic in an area that cannot support that increase. Players would be driving in from all over the county and the state. The property in Crownsville where the state hospital used to be located would make more sense but a property in Annapolis would make the most sense for a facility such as this. The "evening light" and noise pollution in this rural neighborhood would be upsetting to any comparable neighborhood. Mixed Use Zoning The county needs to make it very clear what can and cannot be built on properties that have been designated for Mixed Use. No other land should be zoned for Mixed Use until the county defines what that means.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>Although I have some concerns about the 2040 Plan and the ability of the 2040 goals and objectives to be implemented, I appreciate all the effort that has gone into this plan and support many aspects of the Plan. The following reflect my concerns and frustration with ongoing issues related to traffic and unchecked development.</p> <p>PLAN2040 GOAL BE10 The solution to MD 3 traffic issues - creating a limited access freeway - presented in the 2040Plan raises many concerns that need to be addressed and shared with residents before implementation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How will a freeway fit in an already highly developed corridor?</li> <li>• What properties and buildings would be consumed?</li> <li>• What impacts on adjacent communities – traffic flow, noise, light and air pollution?</li> <li>• How will local traffic move among communities and reach local businesses?</li> <li>• How will a freeway impact future development?</li> <li>• What is the potential for drawing more traffic, especially trucks, from I-97?</li> <li>• How will the County direct truck traffic to I97?</li> </ul> <p>I am also concerned that the ongoing SHA fixes to the current highway, such as widening, new signals, and intersection improvements will not significantly improve traffic flow. Such fixes do not address the safety concerns inherent in multiple lanes, highway speeds, and numerous exits/entrances (<a href="https://ops.fhwa.dot.gov/publications/amprimer/access_mgmt_primer.htm">https://ops.fhwa.dot.gov/publications/amprimer/access_mgmt_primer.htm</a>). In fact, multiple lanes with numerous exits/entrances has been shown to increase accidents. How will these shorter-term solutions relate to the Plan2040 freeway concept? Are the structures and timeframes for the two concepts (freeway and SHA fixes) being integrated to minimize disruption and avoid wasting highway funding? Has the impact of proposed future growth been considered in the development and implementation of these options? Future growth can easily negate the solution. The county must provide more information and opportunities for public input on the different traffic solutions from stakeholders in the communities adjacent to the MD 3 CCPA.</p> <p>LUCA 172 - LUCA 172 consists of two parcels, one zoned C2 (parcel number 353) and one zoned RLD (parcel 357). Both parcels were designated rural in the 2009 GDP. Both parcels have been designated commercial land use in Plan 2040. The 2009 GDP rural land use designation for the RLD portion of LUCA 172 must be restored. Changing the 2040 land use to commercial is not consistent with current zoning for the RLD parcel or with the criteria that the County used to evaluate LUCA172 (received in an Oct 16 email from Plan2040):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It maintains consistency with current RLD zoning.</li> <li>• It would maintain consistency with existing Rural land use on the parcel and adjacent parcels.</li> <li>• It maintains consistency with the existing land cover.</li> <li>• It acknowledges the strong public opposition to changing LUCA 172 from rural to commercial land use (66 of 71 public responses were opposed).</li> <li>• It supports the County’s commitments to protect the special environmental values of the Jabez Branch watershed (Goal NE1)</li> <li>• As well as the other criteria you outlined for evaluating land use designations</li> </ul> <p>In addition, the submittal of Preliminary Development Plan or size of the parcel should not have been used to justify changing the RLD parcel to commercial land. I learned from OPZ staff (Oct 28 call) that the rationale for changing the RLD parcel to commercial land use was partly tied to the owner submitting a Preliminary Development Plan to commercially develop both parcels. Both Preliminary Plan submittals have not been approved in part because they proposed development in the RLD portion of the LUCA. Then during the Nov 5 Town Hall, I learned that due to it being less than an acre and owned by the same person as the C2 parcel, it made sense to approve it. If proximity to a land use or zoning is a basis for evaluating a LUCA, then RLD parcel should stay RLD because on the south side it is adjacent to a parcel larger than the C2 parcel, that are part of the rural/agricultural area. Such automatic deferral tdeveloper wishes is exactly what the County Executive has said would not occur under his administration. The C2 parcel is an example of leapfrog development permitted under the last administration. Changing the RLD parcel to commercial land use based in part on proximity to this C2 zoned parcel is an example rural sprawl. Rural sprawl which occurs when commercial development creeps or leap frogs up highways and along arterial roads into areas designated rural area. This must be stopped. In addition, restoring the rural designation of the RLD parcel would meet your commitment not to change land use designations for undeveloped parcels within the MD 3 CCPA until such increases can be discussed in the Regional Planning Process.</p> <p>MD 3 CCPA AND REGIONAL PLANNING I appreciate the county commitment not to change designated land uses (except for parcels that have already been rezoned) until those changes can be discussed during the Region Plans (Exception LUCA172 See Above). The planning for the CCPAs must be integrated with region planning process. The MD 3 CCPA is in two regions (5 and 6), which are scheduled for region planning in different years. To achieve a truly integrated plan for the CCPA the plans for regions 5 and 6 need to be done at the same time to ensure that the approach to MD 3 integrates public input and solutions from all communities along the CCPA. In addition, the county should work with the community groups in region 5 and 6 to ensure that residents are notified of the region planning process. In addition, a through description of the Regional Planning process, plan</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. See Summary of Public Comments document for response to some of your concerns. The Region Plan process will further refine development patterns within the corridor. Implementation of transportation improvements, including a limited access freeway will occur with stakeholder input.</p>

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>LUCA 172 The development of LUCA 172 should be limited if not entirely denied due to the failing intersection of 175/Route 3. Adding another strip mall here will only increase traffic problems at this unsafe and extremely dangerous intersection. Millersville Road would also suffer from the increase traffic generated by this development. I strongly urge that parcel 357 remain RLD. Add these properties onto the South Shore trail and the Board of Education Property there at Millersville road and use it for a park. Millersville Park - The 33 acres designated Millersville Park should be designated as a multiuser day park that serves the surrounding communities. It is central to the Millersville Community and should include athletic fields ( the original intent) walking trails, picnic area and nature area. It also has great potential to add to the recreational, social, and educational opportunities for Millersville Elementary which has seen a decrease in total open space due to the recent additions and portable classrooms. The large commercial style tennis center is not in keeping the rural atmosphere of the community at large or the RLD zoning. The current pandemic has shown us how our much we need the outdoors. A community park such as this would be a great addition to already popular South Shore Trail Phase #1.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>(LUCA 172) The following is a list of concerns of the negative impact the proposed plan 2040 will have on our beautiful and peaceful neighborhood. The intersection of Routes 3 and 175 are already very busy, congested and dangerous. Adding more unnecessary stores of any kind just intensifies the congestion and danger. Everything that anyone could possibly need or want can be found less than a mile south at Waugh Chapel or a little further south at any of the endless comercial and business centers that line both sides and the median of Route 3. As it stands now many people trying to avoid the traffic on Route 3 bypass the road by coming down Cecil Ave. The speed limit on Cecil Ave. is 30 mph and a huge percentage of these drivers excessively speed on the road. This was a quiet unnoticed neighborhood, but with more development that's been quickly changing. All of our neighborhood is on well water and septic adding any more stores or comercial development of any kind would put an unnecessary strain on our water supply. The possibility of contaminating our water supply is undeniable. We need the grass and trees as a natural filtration system. Asphalt and comercial buildings do not meet this challenge. Finally, the environmental impact and disruption to the wildlife in this area is heartbreaking. I believe that the wildlife deserve to have a place to live too. I know that all development can't be stopped but enough is enough. Do we really need another strip mall? We're paving over our natural environment. We're paving over paradise for a parking lot. Next issue in reference to the multipurpose day use community park. All of our previous concerns regarding the strip mall also apply to this proposal plus a few more. Even though you're hoping that this would be used and benefit primarily our community we all know that is not a reality. Without trying to sound too cynical we know that similar projects in other areas have been disastrous. Bringing crime, drugs, alcohol and other undesirable conditions to their neighborhood. Building one here in our quiet and peaceful neighborhood I'm afraid would just do the same thing here. You're saying that there would be no lights but once it's been built and it becomes more and more popular and in demand what or who could possibly stop it from being lit. Once again without trying to sound too cynical, please be honest would you really want or like this to be built in your neighborhood? We love our neighborhood and community and one of the special things about it is that unless you live here there's really no reason to drive down here. It doesn't really take you anywhere which is one of the things that make it so special, quiet and wonderful. We'd love to keep it that way. Thank you Phil &amp; Sue Shives</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>

Comments	County Response
<p>(LUCA-172) The following is a list of concerns of the negative impact the proposed plan 2040 will have on our beautiful and peaceful neighborhood. The intersection of Routes 3 and 175 are already very busy, congested and dangerous. Adding more unnecessary stores of any kind just intensifies the congestion and danger. Everything that anyone could possibly need or want can be found less than a mile south at Waugh Chapel or a little further south at any of the endless commercial and business centers that line both sides and the median of Route 3. As it stands now many people trying to avoid the traffic on Route 3 bypass the road by coming down Cecil Ave. The speed limit on Cecil Ave. is 30 mph and a huge percentage of these drivers excessively speed on the road. This was a quiet unnoticed neighborhood, but with more development that's been quickly changing. All of our neighborhood is on well water and septic adding any more stores or commercial development of any kind would put an unnecessary strain on our water supply. The possibility of contaminating our water supply is undeniable. We need the grass and trees as a natural filtration system. Asphalt and commercial buildings do not meet this challenge. Finally, the environmental impact and disruption to the wildlife in this area is heartbreaking. I believe that the wildlife deserve to have a place to live too. I know that all development can't be stopped but enough is enough. Do we really need another strip mall? We're paving over our natural environment. We're paving over paradise for a parking lot. Next issue in reference to the multipurpose day use community park. All of our previous concerns regarding the strip mall also apply to this proposal plus a few more. Even though you're hoping that this would be used and benefit primarily our community we all know that is not a reality. Without trying to sound too cynical we know that similar projects in other areas have been disastrous. Bringing crime, drugs, alcohol and other undesirable conditions to their neighborhood. Building one here in our quiet and peaceful neighborhood I'm afraid would just do the same thing here. You're saying that there would be no lights but once it's been built and it becomes more and more popular and in demand what or who could possibly stop it from being lit. Once again without trying to sound too cynical, please be honest would you really want or like this to be built in your neighborhood? We love our neighborhood and community and one of the special things about it is that unless you live here there's really no reason to drive down here. It doesn't really take you anywhere which is one of the things that make it so special, quiet and wonderful. We'd love to keep it that way. Thank you Phil &amp; Sue Shives</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>The draft Plan2040 recommended land use for LUCA – 172 is “Commercial” and is consistent with existing zoning and compatible with the surrounding land use, existing and planned. This property is located at a four-way signalized intersection and is ideal for commercial development as it has existing, safe, infrastructure, roadways and utilities, and can incorporate pedestrian access along Millersville Road.</p> <p>The Draft Plan2040 Development Policy Areas Definitions &amp; Map are inconsistent; under the definitions (pg. 30), “Critical Corridor” is excluded from the “Targeted Development, Redevelopment and Revitalization Policy Areas,” but, on the Development Policy Areas Map (pg. 31) it is included and grouped with the other “Targeted Development, Redevelopment and Revitalization Policy Areas” (Critical Economic, Town Centers, Village Center Overlays, and Transit-Oriented Overlays). Based on the definition provided and the locations and properties identified as “Critical Corridor” on the map, the definition of “Critical Corridor” (on pg. 30) should be grouped with the other “Targeted Development, Redevelopment and Revitalization Policy Areas” for consistency.</p> <p>The definitions provided for “Critical Corridor” and “Critical Economic” are nearly the same. Certain areas identified as “Critical Corridor” also meet the definition and purpose of “Critical Economic” and those properties also happen to be located on major roads. The same development type and flexibility in land use policies should apply equally to “Critical Corridor” policy areas to encourage business growth and job creation in areas with existing transit access and infrastructure. Doing so would be consistent with smart growth policies, prevent sprawl, and increase the likelihood of improving existing infrastructure rather than creating new infrastructure; all the while minimizing the impact on the Natural Environment by concentrating development and redevelopment in existing commercially viable economic corridors where new stormwater practices can be installed and grouped together to mitigate the environmental impact of outdated stormwater facilities (and, in some cases, none at all).</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>We are not happy that the residential low density parcel of LUCA172 was converted to commercial land use. The RLD portion of LUCA172 must be restored. It is not consistent with the County's efforts to protect the Jabez Branch and the Severn River by minimizing impervious cover and stormwater runoff. Changing the zoning from RLD to commercial to appease a developer is against the promises made by the County Executive. Please change the portion of LUCA172 back to RLD zoning. Furthermore the plans for the Route 3 corridor will impact our community so we need to understand exactly what is being planned. How will it impact our community with respect to noise, light and air quality? How will local traffic be accommodated? Regarding the plans for Millersville Park, please ensure no lights are allowed and it is for day use only.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>(LUCA-172) Please follow all the rules and policies consistently. The 2 acre parcel on Rt. 3 North and Millersville Road needs to be treated as any other parcel. Also, please look back at the comments from the last comment period. Those of us living in the Rt. 3 Millersville Road area want Route 3 traffic properly managed so we do not have failing and deadly intersections. We also do not need more retail development. Look at existing real estate in Waugh Chapel and up and down Route 3 before destroying more natural environment. Repurpose and reuse was has already been approved and developed. Once destroyed, we cannot get nature back. Thank you.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>(LUCA-172) I have been a resident of Indian Landing Estates in Millersville since 1978 and am disheartened by findings in the Plan 2040 report. The Plan changed the 2040 land use of LUCA172, known to locals as the Greer property, to commercial. This was done in opposition to local communities desires. The environmentally threatened Jabez Creek branch drains on this property. The commercial designation also reneges on a commitment that the county made to not make changes to land use designations on undeveloped parcels within the Rt. 3 corridor. The construction of not one but two gas stations at the Millersville Road and Rt 3 intersection is shocking. Changes to traffic flow there have led to gridlock, confusion, accidents and one death that I am aware of. In addition it cannot handle more stormwater runoff. There is absolutely no need or residential demand for another strip mall. This is a rural and historic area and this suggested rezoning invites more commercialization on Millersville Road that is not wanted. Our pleas and concerns made at the hearing on the Millersville Tennis Park were completely ignored. Even though we were promised answers to questions placed with public officials at that meeting, the minutes that we received months and months after the meeting showed that our concerns were completely and totally ignored. I request that you take the pleas of local residents seriously this time for the health of our community. Thank you</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>Thank you for offering Anne Arundel County citizens the opportunity to comment on the latest draft of the GDP. As a Crofton resident, I very much appreciate the redesignation of Route 3 as a Critical Corridor as opposed to a Targeted Development Area, however, I still have some concerns. The largest is that existing growth should be properly managed before new growth is added to the area. While some county schools are currently under capacity, our area's schools are at or over capacity as school construction has not kept pace with new residential development. While high density development seems to be a goal to help preserve land and encourage smart growth, let's not forget that our schools must have capacity for the kids who reside in those future developments. Our roads are also overburdened and while SHA and Anne Arundel County have plans for improvements along the roads, new large-scale, high density developments will negate any improvements made. The intersection of Staples Corner remains a concern as well. While no longer designated as a village center, it is already a traffic nightmare that will be exacerbated by the new high school. Adding even more development without improving the existing infrastructure is ill advised.</p> <p>The current administration has done a good job of soliciting feedback from county citizens and I hope that will continue. As I understand it, several of the LUCAs along Route 3 will be set aside for community feedback during the regional planning process before a change is made. During the November 7th meeting with County Executive Pittman, the Department of Planning and Zoning, the Crofton Civic Association and other community groups, it was stated that the Department of Planning and Zoning would give some of the LUCAs along Route 3, including LUCA 172, another look. I hope that happens and further hope that the Regional Planning Committees will not only be composed of developers and those representing commercial interests but that equal weight will be given to community groups and associations as well. They are the guardians of our communities and are made up of people who will live, work, and raise families in or area for the next 20 years. Finally, rather than bulldozing our remaining trees I hope that there will be more of a focus on revitalizing brownfield areas. Thank you for taking the time to read this and have a nice evening.</p>	<p>Thank you for taking the time to review the Plan and provide feedback. Your comment has been recorded and will be considered as part of the preliminary draft Plan2040 review. Please note that the preliminary draft Plan2040 will be presented to the Planning Advisory Board where there will be a briefing and public hearing. That process is anticipated to occur in December and January (dates to be determined). The draft Plan2040 is anticipated to be introduced to the County Council in February 2021 with public hearings to begin in March 2021 (dates to be determined).</p>

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>LUCA-172) As I stated in the September 2020 comments, I am opposed to re-zoning LUCA 172 (parcel 357) from its current zoning of Rural Low Density to commercial or any other zoning. Rt 3 is a mess, why would you add MORE development with the traffic congestion and safety issues at many intersections especially Rt 3 northbound &amp; Millersville Road and Rt 3 southbound &amp; Rt 175. There are still accidents happening at Rt 3 southbound and Rt 175 even with the changes since Royal Farms was built (which I was opposed to also since there is already a Royal Farms less than 3 miles farther south). I voted for you, Stuart Pittman because you were opposed to continued 'stupid/smart' growth.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>we strongly disagree on changing the zoning on this property on corner of route 3 to commercial it is already very crowded area lots of accidents and truck noises and huge traffic it is our residential area where we grew up and raised our kids enough with the commercial structures that ruins our life and clean air</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>(LUCA 172) Issues I have with the 2020GDP: Traffic on route 3 The current route 3 configuration between route 50 and route 32 is inadequate to support the existing traffic flow much less an increase if willy nilly development is allowable. Route 3 development If your objective is to create a west county route 2 you are well on the way. I cannot think of any additional services that could be built/developed that would improve my life. I am particularly concerned about the proposed development of the Greer property on the SE corner of route 3 and Millersville rd. Light and noise pollution, questionable ingress and egress, rezoning for the developer without consideration of the neighborhood and another sucker of water from a marginal water table (a few years ago my well went dry) and more sewage. I suggest you listen to Joni Mitchell's 'Big Yellow Taxi' Millersville Park The county was duped by the tennis alliance. A private/public partnership that had no chance of success with the alliance raising funds to cover their share. It will create more impervious surfaces to increase run off, erosion, storm water management issues and will be harmful to the surrounding waterways including Jabez Creek and the Chesapeake Bay. Traffic for a tennis club will be routed around and between several established neighborhood homes. Outdoor lighting will pollute these homes. Michael Doyle 1652 Isabella Ct Millersville, MD</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>Thank you for taking comments on this very important issue to us, the residents, who live right near a possible strip mall site and will be most impacted. I can tell you from experience, almost having been hit several times at the intersection of Rt. 3 and Millersville Rd., that adding to the congestion there is not a good idea and I am strongly opposed to any business development at that site. The addition of Royal Farms already increased traffic and congestion to the area. How many car accidents need to happen before the development right there stops?! We cannot safely live here if more happens. As a mother of three, I beg we stop adding to this already over crowded area. Thank you!</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>I am extremely concerned about several items of Plan2040, specifically around Millersville Road. Why has the RLD designation for LUCA172 been changed to C2? The intersection of Route 3 and Route 175/Millersville road has already been subjected to significant changes that impede traffic flow and do not work - why on earth would we wish to make it worse by putting even more commercial development on that intersection? The property is on well and septic, the intersection is failing, traffic is already bad there, and there is significant commercial space available less than two miles away. We do NOT need another strip mall, and especially not there. At what point were the affected residents going to be informed that a parcel designated as RURAL was going to be changed to commercial so a strip mall could go in, and where is the opportunity for input on changing the land use designation? If Route 3 is a 'Critical Corridor' what about the part that says "...existing, developed areas along major roads..."? This parcel is not, and never has been, a commercial, developed property, and should not be rezoned. This proposed change violates stated goals and policies throughout the GDP and should be denied (Goal BE2.1a ring a bell?). On a related note, Millersville Park needs to NOT be a regional anything - least of all a tennis park - Millersville Road is not large enough for any more traffic than it already supports, the last thing we need is anything that draws even more traffic. How about planning something that would actually be used by people that live in the area? I have yet to meet any of my neighbors that either play tennis or know anyone that plays tennis. A day-use park, picnic tables, exercise area, fine, but not a solely tennis facility - the bulk of people who would use do not live on or near Millersville Road.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>

Comments	County Response
<p>I am extremely concerned about several items of Plan2040, specifically around Millersville Road. Why has the RLD designation for LUCA172 been changed to C2? The intersection of Route 3 and Route 175/Millersville road has already been subjected to significant changes that impede traffic flow and do not work - why on earth would we wish to make it worse by putting even more commercial development on that intersection? The property is on well and septic, the intersection is failing, traffic is already bad there, and there is significant commercial space available less than two miles away. We do NOT need another strip mall, and especially not there. At what point were the affected residents going to be informed that a parcel designated as RURAL was going to be changed to commercial so a strip mall could go in, and where is the opportunity for input on changing the land use designation? If Route 3 is a 'Critical Corridor' what about the part that says "...existing, developed areas along major roads..."? This parcel is not, and never has been, a commercial, developed property, and should not be rezoned. This proposed change violates stated goals and policies throughout the GDP and should be denied (Goal BE2.1a ring a bell?).</p> <p>On a related note, Millersville Park needs to NOT be a regional anything - least of all a tennis park - Millersville Road is not large enough for any more traffic than it already supports, the last thing we need is anything that draws even more traffic. How about planning something that would actually be used by people that live in the area? I have yet to meet any of my neighbors that either play tennis or know anyone that plays tennis. A day-use park, picnic tables, exercise area, fine, but not a solely tennis facility - the bulk of people who would use it do not live on or near Millersville Road.</p> <p>Also of concern is the intent to make Route 3 a limited-access freeway. What, exactly, does that mean, and what is the plan for that? Plan2040 appears to be very light on any details of that proposal.</p>	<p>Please note the changes you reference are regarding the Planned Land Use Map, not zoning. The Planned Land Use Map is used to guide development patterns within the County based on the Vision and Goals set forth in Plan2040. This is achieved by designating areas with land use categories that represent development types (residential, commercial, industrial, mixed-use, etc.). The Planned Land Use for LUCA-172 was changed from Rural to Commercial because it is consistent with the existing zoning one the larger of the two parcels and is within the Planned Sewer Service category within the Patuxent Sewer Service Area. However, based on feedback through this public comment period, this recommendation is being re-evaluated.</p> <p>The Department of Recreation and Parks is managing the Millersville Site and your comments have been forwarded to them for review. Additional information can be found at <a href="https://www.aacounty.org/departments/recreation-parks/parks/millersville-park-tennis/index.html">https://www.aacounty.org/departments/recreation-parks/parks/millersville-park-tennis/index.html</a></p> <p>Frequent curb cuts and side streets for business and residential access are a significant contribution to the congestion experienced in the MD 3 corridor. Move Anne Arundel!, the County's Transportation Functional Master Plan recommends that the corridor be converted to a limited access managed roadway (a highway with limited or no access to adjacent properties with some degree of separation of opposing traffic flow and few or no intersecting cross streets) in an effort to increase mobility and decrease congestion. The roadway would provide limited linkages to ensure accessibility to the shopping centers and residential areas that have developed over the past 20 years. It is recommended that phasing occur from in at least three segments north to south: MD 32 to Waugh Chapel Road (2.4 miles), Waugh Chapel Road to MD 450 (3.7 miles), MD 450 to US 50 (2.8 miles). It will require continuing coordination between MDOT SHA, the County, and property owners.</p>
<p>I am vehemently opposed to LUCA 172 (parcel number 353 and parcel 357). This area DOES NOT NEED more stores, restaurants, or further development. The developments at Waugh Chapel were more than we needed! I am also in opposition to the change of the land use of LUCA 172 from rural to commercial. I also believe that the development of Millersville Park should be for DAY USE ONLY to serve the surrounding communities without drawing large amounts of traffic from outside the area, and not require night lighting. NO LIGHTS and DAY USE ONLY. Many of our residents moved to this area and continue to live here to enjoy limited noise and light pollution and appreciate the rural feel. Most of us pay very high taxes to enjoy this benefit. It is unjust to take this from the taxpayers in this county.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>I am vehemently opposed to LUCA 172 (parcel number 353 and parcel 357). This area DOES NOT NEED more stores, restaurants, or further development. The developments at Waugh Chapel were more than we needed! I am also in opposition to the change of the land use of LUCA 172 from rural to commercial. I also believe that the development of Millersville Park should be for DAY USE ONLY to serve the surrounding communities without drawing large amounts of traffic from outside the area, and not require night lighting. NO LIGHTS and DAY USE ONLY.</p> <p>Many of our residents moved to this area and continue to live here to enjoy limited noise and light pollution and appreciate the rural feel. Most of us pay very high taxes to enjoy this benefit. It is unjust to take this from the taxpayers in this county.</p>	<p>Thank you for taking the time to review the Plan and provide feedback. Your comment has been recorded and will be considered as part of the preliminary draft Plan2040 review. Please note that the preliminary draft Plan2040 will be presented to the Planning Advisory Board where there will be a briefing and public hearing. That process is anticipated to occur in December and January (dates to be determined). The draft Plan2040 is anticipated to be introduced to the County Council in February 2021 with public hearings to begin in March 2021 (dates to be determined).</p>

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>(LUCA-172) the RLD portion of LUCA 172 should not have been changed to Commercial. Their decision is NOT consistent with the adjacent Rural land uses or zoning. This parcel has never hosted commercial activity. The site is on well and septic. The Route 3/Millersville Rd/175 intersection is failing. The conversion of the RLD parcel to commercial is not consistent with the County’s efforts to protect Jabez Branch and the Severn River by minimizing impervious cover and stormwater runoff. In addition, restoring the rural designation of the RLD parcel would meet the county’s commitment not to change land use designations for undeveloped parcels within the Route 3 corridor until such increases can be discussed in the Regional Planning Process.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>Plan2040 upzoned LUCA172, which includes a parcel (P.0357 tax account 400002370327) designated rural in the 2009 GDP, from RLD to C2. This parcel is currently zoned RLD in an historical rural community, and drains into Jabez Branch 4, which is the only known habitat to native brook trout. The false ‘consistency’ excuse clearly does not apply. The property is ‘consistent’ with the historic RLD neighborhood. This unwarranted action appears to cater only to the Developer of the SE corner of Millersville Rd. whose plan has TWICE been Rejected by P/Z for failure to meet the basic site requirements, especially environmental.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>I am commenting on LUCA 172. I have already commented on this once. What happened to those comments? Did that matter? i am against that this parcel was converted to commercial, we cannot support more commercial in this area. The residents do not want this, the only people that do want it are the people who make the money off of it. Please listen to the residents. Or I should say listen this time because my past comments seemed to have been ignored.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. Please note that all comments are taken into consideration.</p>
<p>LUCA172 In the MD 3 CCPA, the county committed to not change designated land uses (except for parcels that have already been rezoned) until those changes can be discussed during the Region Plans. This policy was not properly applied to LUCA172, which includes a parcel that was designated rural in the 2009 GDP, has no commercial development and is currently zoned RLD. The Jabez3 endangered Branch drains onto this parcel that is adjacent to historic RLD properties and located on historic, rural Millersville Rd. The Plan2040 land use of that parcel was changed from RLD to C2 in violation of the County commitment. The RLD designation must be restored in the final Plan.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>

## Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>To Michael Stringer, Sr Planner and Architect of the 2040 General Development Plan Below are my comments on Anne Arundel County's 2040 Regional Plan. I have also given alternative recommendations.</p> <p>The comments are restricted to the Rt.3 Critical Corridor Policy Area and, in particular, the proposed zoning of land within area maps 6 (my residence and where I live) and 5 (the rest of my community and where I live).</p> <p>Comments are on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• LUCA 172 • LUCA 79 • Millersville Park • Brief comments on Mixed Use Zoning, Rt 3 as a limited access corridor, regional planning dates for regions 5 and 6.</li></ul> <p>In the Webinar this past week, you committed to read all inputs. There will be a lot to read. Please help us to keep this area – our home- a place we can continue to live in, to rear children, and to love and enjoy. Please help us keep it green.</p> <p>LUCA 172 - I am in strong opposition to development of 172 for the following reasons :</p> <p>a. LUCA 172 is composed of parcels 0353 and 0357. The smaller of the two, 0357, has just been rezoned from RLD to Commercial C2 to agree with the larger parcel zoning. However, it is immediately adjacent to RLD properties and single home residences. It should not be upzoned but, rather, stay consistent with those adjacent properties to the east. Please restore the 2009 GDP rural land use designation for the RLD portion of LUCA 172.</p> <p>b.The larger parcel, 0353, has a mixed history of Rural/RA prior to 1971 followed by (as I understand it) commercial zoning C1 to be consistent with a local business – Greer Well Drilling. At some point just prior to/during/as a condition of (?) the sale of the property in 2013/2014 , the property was again upzoned to C2 for commercial/office space. This zoning application – regardless of timing- should never have been approved. Why? Because:</p> <p>i.The nature of Greer's local well drilling business entailed a few well drilling trucks leaving the site to do the required well drilling and repair work at other locations. Those few trucks would return at the end of the day. It was family owned with few employees It did not increase local traffic in the least (I have lived here for 36 years and can testify to this.) The current developer's idea of a C2 commercial permit which will allow a 42,244 sft under roof strip mall plus parking for up to 248 cars (52% impermeable site coverage) is not comparable, by any sane measure, to a low traffic entity like Greers. A look at the existing site will explain the difference...a few outbuildings for materials storage and repair equipment and a farm house. No pavement, really. Rural, farmlike, really.</p> <p>ii. A review of the developer's application shows a less than honest reason for the upzoning change due to consistency change. I am puzzled by the county council's approval. To the east there is that 0357 parcel and the back of a few RLD parcel homesites. To the north (across Millersville Road) there is a small muffler repair shop which services, on any given day, maybe 10 cars? Parking at that site, including the small Mustang shop is, I think, 20 cars? To the South is RLD/RA (farmland). Westward there is the juggernaut of Route 3 with 2 supersized convenience stores (WaWa and Royal Farms) in the median for all trucks and motorists. Across the juggernaut we have R/A up 175 until it meets the designated Neighborhood Preservation Dairy farm and Gambrills road. To summarize here – this is NOT a "consistency change" by any stretch. Comparing parcels to higher density neighboring property for consistency only supports sprawl, but LUCA 172 cannot even claim this. It is an example, rather, of leapfrogging development. To be consistent it should actually be "downzoned" to RA or RLD. The zoning decision is NOT consistent with the adjacent Rural land uses or zoning. No, this is not a "consistency change"; it is a change for convenience of the developer that does not take into account the different nature of what he proposes as commercial (added traffic, added lighting at night, added congestion, unneeded retail space).</p> <p>iii. . The applicant states that this proposed commercial development is "logically more in line with the Odenton Small Area Plan." Huh? This is not Odenton. In fact, to get to Odenton from here, one would have to leap across overdeveloped Rt3 north and south lanes, go through Gambrills (farm), Sunrise farm, past a farm and feed store and a small country post office, and then a few miles West, arrive at the hive of activity that is turning into an overdeveloped mass of homes near a train station.</p> <p>iv. The site is on well and septic. Along MD 3, a significant amount of other development in the planned water and sewer envelope has been constructed MD 3 on well and septic systems. This development site should never have been approved without adequate infrastructure in place. Did I miss it in the AA</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. Staff will consider these points as the Planned Land Use Map is updating, including reievew of LUCA-172 and LUCA-79.</p>

Comments	County Response
<p>The draft Plan2040 recommended land use for LUCA – 173 is “Commercial” and “Rural.” The requested land use designation is “Mixed Use.” The property is located within the “Critical Corridor” on the Development Policy Area Map, and the justification for not designating the property as “Mixed Use” is inconsistent with the Critical Corridor policy area as well as the GDP and Comprehensive Zoning process because the underlying land use must be changed prior to the more granular and detailed Region Planning process. Mixed Use land use is also consistent with smart growth policies and practices because there is a large concentration of commercial and economic activity, adjacent to major roads and existing infrastructure, which will prevent sprawl and preserve the Natural Environment throughout the County. Therefore, the underlying land use should be changed to “Mixed Use” and any details about the specific future development or uses here can be implemented through zoning code changes and/or overlays after consideration and input received during the Region Planning process.</p> <p>The Draft Plan2040 Development Policy Areas Definitions &amp; Map are inconsistent; under the definitions (pg. 30), “Critical Corridor” is excluded from the “Targeted Development, Redevelopment and Revitalization Policy Areas,” but, on the Development Policy Areas Map (pg. 31) it is included and grouped with the other “Targeted Development, Redevelopment and Revitalization Policy Areas” (Critical Economic, Town Centers, Village Center Overlays, and Transit-Oriented Overlays). Based on the definition provided and the locations and properties identified as “Critical Corridor” on the map, the definition of “Critical Corridor” (on pg. 30) should be grouped with the other “Targeted Development, Redevelopment and Revitalization Policy Areas” for consistency.</p> <p>The definitions provided for “Critical Corridor” and “Critical Economic” are nearly the same. Certain areas identified as “Critical Corridor” also meet the definition and purpose of “Critical Economic” and those properties also happen to be located on major roads. The same development type and flexibility in land use policies should apply equally to “Critical Corridor” policy areas to encourage business growth and job creation in areas with existing transit access and infrastructure. Doing so would be consistent with smart growth policies, prevent sprawl, and increase the likelihood of improving existing infrastructure rather than creating new infrastructure; all the while minimizing the impact on the Natural Environment by concentrating development and redevelopment in existing commercially viable economic corridors where new stormwater practices can be installed and grouped together to mitigate the environmental impact of outdated stormwater facilities (and, in some cases, none at all).</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>

Comments	County Response
<p>The draft Plan2040 recommended land use for LUCA – 174 is “Commercial” and “Low-Medium Density Residential.” The requested land use designation is “Mixed Use.” The property is located within the “Critical Corridor” on the Development Policy Area Map, and the justification for not designating the property as “Mixed Use” is inconsistent with the Critical Corridor policy area as well as the GDP and Comprehensive Zoning process because the underlying land use must be changed prior to the more granular and detailed Region Planning process. A Mixed Use land use designation will better accomplish the desired outcomes of the Critical Corridor policy area, whereas the recommended land use designations, Commercial and Low-Medium Density Residential, lack flexibility and are not consistent with the Critical Corridor Management Development Policy Area. Mixed Use land use is also consistent with smart growth policies and practices because there is a large concentration of commercial and economic activity, adjacent to major roads and existing infrastructure, which will prevent sprawl and preserve the Natural Environment throughout the County. Therefore, the underlying land use should be changed to “Mixed Use” and any details about the specific future development or uses here can be implemented through zoning code changes and/or overlays after consideration and input received during the Region Planning process.</p> <p>The Draft Plan2040 Development Policy Areas Definitions &amp; Map are inconsistent; under the definitions (pg. 30), “Critical Corridor” is excluded from the “Targeted Development, Redevelopment and Revitalization Policy Areas,” but, on the Development Policy Areas Map (pg. 31) it is included and grouped with the other “Targeted Development, Redevelopment and Revitalization Policy Areas” (Critical Economic, Town Centers, Village Center Overlays, and Transit-Oriented Overlays). Based on the definition provided and the locations and properties identified as “Critical Corridor” on the map, the definition of “Critical Corridor” (on pg. 30) should be grouped with the other “Targeted Development, Redevelopment and Revitalization Policy Areas” for consistency.</p> <p>The definitions provided for “Critical Corridor” and “Critical Economic” are nearly the same. Certain areas identified as “Critical Corridor” also meet the definition and purpose of “Critical Economic” and those properties also happen to be located on major roads. The same development type and flexibility in land use policies should apply equally to “Critical Corridor” policy areas to encourage business growth and job creation in areas with existing transit access and infrastructure. Doing so would be consistent with smart growth policies, prevent sprawl, and increase the likelihood of improving existing infrastructure rather than creating new infrastructure; all the while minimizing the impact on the Natural Environment by concentrating development and redevelopment in existing commercially viable economic corridors where new stormwater practices can be installed and grouped together to mitigate the environmental impact of outdated stormwater facilities (and, in some cases, none at all).</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>LUCA 176 We respectfully submit that a change in the classification of this particular property to Commercial from Rural/Agricultural would NOT be an appropriate land-use designation. The application accurately states that the “existing development patterns along Central Avenue and Riva Road in the vicinity of the Property are dominated by low-density residential uses”. Existing commercial properties along this stretch are typically low-volume businesses without excess traffic other than the local community that frequents the business. As the application continues, it claims that the stretch of Central Avenue is trending commercial, which is factually false as there is currently no more than one commercial entity per mile along this stretch. The volume of commercial traffic along this area of Central Avenue is generally low. The church used as an example in the application has a true traffic signal as well as ingress/egress off of the lower volume road. Churches typically have their highest traffic volume on Sunday mornings, which does not conflict with typical weekday traffic norms. The application’s frequent reference to its location at “an intersection with a traffic signal” is extremely misleading. The “signalized intersection” cited in the application is a flashing red/yellow light and not conducive to increased commercial traffic at this intersection. Traffic from Riva Road has a flashing red and no left turn sign, while traffic on Central Avenue has a flashing yellow. Heavy traffic from Riva Road (and those ignoring the no left turn sign) and vehicles attempting to turn left out of the existing gas station cause hazardous situations for all travelers. Any proposed change to this property’s classification should only follow a rigorous traffic study and public notification of any proposed change to the traffic light or ingress/egress at this intersection. Land use and forest conservation is also of particular concern in this area. At the intersection cited in the application, flooding and run-off occur after every rain storm. Properties to the west and south of this intersection recently invested significant resources to mitigate erosion, flooding and runoff. Re-development of this property and the presumed increased hard services in and around this intersection would only exacerbate these environmental problems.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>LUCA-176 is supported in the preliminary draft of Plan2040 which encourages hubs of limited commercial and community services in rural or suburban areas. The current land use map provides for this use on both sides of Central Avenue. There are no environmental features of any significance on this site, which is currently improved by an antiquated residence which will not be further upgraded. Neighborhood commercial uses, at this site, will support the community.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>The stated goals of the GDP2040 are consistent with the request of LUCA-177. Specifically the goals listed below.</p> <p>GOAL BE6: Promote and facilitate economic growth and job creation within Critical Economic Development Policy Areas.</p> <p>GOAL BE11: Provide for a variety of housing types and designs to allow all residents housing choices at different stages of life and at all income levels.</p> <p>GOAL HE3: Promote high-quality, coordinated development that supports the Fort George G. Meade area.</p> <p>GOAL BE10: Relieve traffic congestion and improve mobility options and safety in the Critical Corridor Policy Areas.</p> <p>With the change in the zoning of the neighboring adjacent properties and the proposed re-routing of Race Rd., this property cannot sustain a low-density residential status. It is drastically affected by changes in the area and a new road that will split the property. Smart growth and fair and equal development opportunities will allow this property to add to the tax base, allow affordable new development of housing, support Ft. Meade, and relieve the congestion of Race road and Rt.175 intersection.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>The attraction and expansion of a diversity of businesses and industries that will provide jobs, income and a tax base that is sustainable and meeting the needs of residents is a stated goal of the draft of Plan2040. It applies to the site described in LUCA-177, which is surrounded by commercial uses and will be split by the re-routing of Race Road into Chestnut Road. This site is no longer suited for residential use, and low density residential designation on the land use map is not appropriate. The site abuts the Village Center and low density is incompatible with current abutting uses and those planned.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. The justification of the Plan2040 land use designation for this property (LUCA-177) states that the current Low Density Residential land use designation should be retained until a more comprehensive land use plan is developed for the Jessup Village Center during the Region Plan process with input from the community stakeholders.</p>
<p>The draft Plan2040 recommended land use for LUCA – 178 is “Commercial” and is consistent with existing zoning and compatible with the surrounding land use, existing and planned. The existing commercial uses, mostly medical offices, are consistent with maintaining the goals of the recommended Development Policy Area – “Neighborhood Preservation.”</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>The draft Plan2040 recommended land use for LUCA – 179 is “Commercial” and is consistent with existing zoning and compatible with the surrounding land use, existing and planned. The existing commercial uses, mostly medical offices, are consistent with maintaining the goals of the recommended Development Policy Area – “Neighborhood Preservation.”</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>

Comments	County Response
<p>The draft Plan2040 recommended land use for LUCA – 180 is “Commercial.” The requested land use designation is “Mixed Use.” The property is located within the “Critical Corridor” on the Development Policy Area Map, and the justification for not designating the property as “Mixed Use” is inconsistent with the Critical Corridor policy area as well as the GDP and Comprehensive Zoning process because the underlying land use must be changed prior to the more granular and detailed Region Planning process. A Mixed Use land use designation will better accomplish the desired outcomes of the Critical Corridor policy area, whereas the recommended land use designation, Commercial, lacks flexibility and is inconsistent with the Critical Corridor Management Development Policy Area. Mixed Use land use is also consistent with smart growth policies and practices because there is a large concentration of commercial and economic activity, adjacent to major roads and existing infrastructure, which will prevent sprawl and preserve the Natural Environment throughout the County. Therefore, the underlying land use should be changed to “Mixed Use” and any details about the specific future development or uses here can be implemented through zoning code changes and/or overlays after consideration and input received during the Region Planning process.</p> <p>The Draft Plan2040 Development Policy Areas Definitions &amp; Map are inconsistent; under the definitions (pg. 30), “Critical Corridor” is excluded from the “Targeted Development, Redevelopment and Revitalization Policy Areas,” but, on the Development Policy Areas Map (pg. 31) it is included and grouped with the other “Targeted Development, Redevelopment and Revitalization Policy Areas” (Critical Economic, Town Centers, Village Center Overlays, and Transit-Oriented Overlays). Based on the definition provided and the locations and properties identified as “Critical Corridor” on the map, the definition of “Critical Corridor” (on pg. 30) should be grouped with the other “Targeted Development, Redevelopment and Revitalization Policy Areas” for consistency.</p> <p>The definitions provided for “Critical Corridor” and “Critical Economic” are nearly the same. Certain areas identified as “Critical Corridor” also meet the definition and purpose of “Critical Economic” and those properties also happen to be located on major roads. The same development type and flexibility in land use policies should apply equally to “Critical Corridor” policy areas to encourage business growth and job creation in areas with existing transit access and infrastructure. Doing so would be consistent with smart growth policies, prevent sprawl, and increase the likelihood of improving existing infrastructure rather than creating new infrastructure; all the while minimizing the impact on the Natural Environment by concentrating development and redevelopment in existing commercially viable economic corridors where new stormwater practices can be installed and grouped together to mitigate the environmental impact of outdated stormwater facilities (and, in some cases, none at all).</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>The draft Plan2040 recommended land use for LUCA – 181 is “Commercial.” The requested land use designation is “Mixed Use.” The property is located within the “Critical Corridor” on the Development Policy Area Map, and the justification for not designating the property as “Mixed Use” is inconsistent with the Critical Corridor policy area as well as the GDP and Comprehensive Zoning process because the underlying land use must be changed prior to the more granular and detailed Region Planning process. A Mixed Use land use designation will better accomplish the desired outcomes of the Critical Corridor policy area, whereas the recommended land use designation, Commercial, lacks flexibility and is inconsistent with the Critical Corridor Management Development Policy Area. Mixed Use land use is also consistent with smart growth policies and practices because there is a large concentration of commercial and economic activity, adjacent to major roads and existing infrastructure, which will prevent sprawl and preserve the Natural Environment throughout the County. Therefore, the underlying land use should be changed to “Mixed Use” and any details about the specific future development or uses here can be implemented through zoning code changes and/or overlays after consideration and input received during the Region Planning process.</p> <p>The Draft Plan2040 Development Policy Areas Definitions &amp; Map are inconsistent; under the definitions (pg. 30), “Critical Corridor” is excluded from the “Targeted Development, Redevelopment and Revitalization Policy Areas,” but, on the Development Policy Areas Map (pg. 31) it is included and grouped with the other “Targeted Development, Redevelopment and Revitalization Policy Areas” (Critical Economic, Town Centers, Village Center Overlays, and Transit-Oriented Overlays). Based on the definition provided and the locations and properties identified as “Critical Corridor” on the map, the definition of “Critical Corridor” (on pg. 30) should be grouped with the other “Targeted Development, Redevelopment and Revitalization Policy Areas” for consistency.</p> <p>The definitions provided for “Critical Corridor” and “Critical Economic” are nearly the same. Certain areas identified as “Critical Corridor” also meet the definition and purpose of “Critical Economic” and those properties also happen to be located on major roads. The same development type and flexibility in land use policies should apply equally to “Critical Corridor” policy areas to encourage business growth and job creation in areas with existing transit access and infrastructure. Doing so would be consistent with smart growth policies, prevent sprawl, and increase the likelihood of improving existing infrastructure rather than creating new infrastructure; all the while minimizing the impact on the Natural Environment by concentrating development and redevelopment in existing commercially viable economic corridors where new stormwater practices can be installed and grouped together to mitigate the environmental impact of outdated stormwater facilities (and, in some cases, none at all).</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>The draft Plan2040 recommended land use for LUCA – 182 is “Commercial” and is consistent with existing zoning and compatible with the surrounding land use, existing and planned. Commercial land use is also consistent with the “Critical Economic” Development Policy Area as the commercial use on the property will serve as an economic driver and job creator while supporting the most intense commercial use in Anne Arundel County, BWI Airport.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>While acknowledging the adjacency of the site described in LUCA-183 to the light rail facility, mixed use is not likely to succeed at this location given the noise generated by the light rail and its proximity to BWI Marshall Airport which also is a generator of significant noise that will be a deterrent to residential development. The site should be designated as industrial, which is in keeping with the neighborhood and supporting the goal of preserving industrial uses to maintain economic sustainability of those uses. Proximity to the light rail will assist those working in the vicinity in their transportation needs. Adequate public transportation to work locations could be realized with an industrial land use classification.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>The draft Plan2040 recommended land use for LUCA – 184 is “Commercial” and is consistent with existing zoning and compatible with the surrounding land use, existing and planned. The existing commercial uses, mostly medical offices, are consistent with maintaining the goals of the recommended Development Policy Area – “Neighborhood Preservation.”</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>(LUCA 22) I am unhappy with the plan as currently written... I would like to see the zoning change for property located at 424 Broadneck Road to allow Chesapeake Charter Inc. to continue to provide excellent school bus services</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>(LUCA 22) I am not satisfied with the current plan... I believe the zoning for the property located at 424 Broadneck Road should be changed to industrial to allow Chesapeake Charter Inc. to continue to provide excellent school bus services</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>LUCA 22 – 424 Broadneck Road - The Preliminary Draft proposes to maintain the land use classification of this property as Low Density Residential, which is inappropriate given the property has been legally operating as a school bus facility since 1982. The requested land use change to Industrial is consistent with the current use and is also compatible with the Neighborhood Preservation Policy. The Neighborhood Preservation Policy contemplates the existence of local commercial and industrial uses as part of the Neighborhood Preservation areas. The school bus facility provides an important community service on the Broadneck Peninsula. Changing the land use classification to Industrial will do nothing more than to authorize an industrial zoning so that this facility can operate under a zoning district that will expressly permit its use. The neighborhood will remain unchanged.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>LUCA 48 – 1460 Dorsey Road - The Preliminary Draft proposes to maintain the land use classification for this property as Industrial. The requested land use of High Density Residential is more appropriate for this undeveloped six-acre property. High Density Residential classification will permit multi-family residences, which will service a community need more than the Industrial classification and will protect the residential character of the area. There is a church and a small residence immediately to the east of the property. Additionally, the Anne Arundel County bulk regulations for the W1 zone require a minimum lot size of 20 acres for an industrial park. As such, there is little to be done with this property with an Industrial land use classification.</p>	
<p>LUCA 53 – 845 Ritchie Highway - The Preliminary Draft proposes to maintain the land use classification for this property as Low Density Residential. The requested land use of Commercial is more appropriate for this property given that it directly fronts Ritchie Highway. The draft Neighborhood Preservation Policy contemplates the existence of commercial uses among communities and natural areas. A Commercial use is also consistent with the surrounding planned land use. The County’s Planned Land Use Map proposes to expand the commercial uses surrounding this property and eliminate the Natural Features. The planned land use for the properties to the west and across the street from the Property are proposed to change from Low-Medium Density Residential to Commercial. There are no homes near this property, and as such a Commercial land use will not impact any nearby communities. The nearest neighborhood is to the east of Cypress Creek and buffered by forest, with access via Manhattan Beach Road.</p>	
<p>(LUCA-25) Hello, my name is Ronald Poole. I have property on 292 Charles Hall Drive and according to recommendations to guide land use this property is zoned incorrectly. The area is zoned RLD which by definition requires 5 acres per home. There is no home on Charles hall dr. that meet this designation. All but one home on this road have approx. 1 acre. The lone home has just under 4 acres. This is the reason why the area should changed to a R1 zoned area since there is no home within that criteria. The reason why this is a concern is I would like to subdivide the property in order to allow my children to build a home when ready. I would appreciate feedback and help in correcting this matter. Thank you</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>I am looking to obtain more information on what is next in the GDP process. I was denied by this office and filled out the form online of why I disagree. Is there a point where I speak in front of a committee? I would like to speak to someone to help understand why the denial, as well as options to help resolve my property concerns.</p>	<p>The preliminary draft of Plan2040 is currently available for public comment at this website. The public comment period ends November 15. Staff will then make edits based on the public feedback. There will then be a Planning Advisory Board briefing and public hearing which will occur in December and January (dates to be determined). Additional edits will be made, as necessary. The County Council introduction of Plan 2040 is anticipated in February 2021 with public hearings to begin in March 2021 (dates to be determined).</p>
<p>The goals set forth in the preliminary draft of Plan2040 support commercial land use designations under LUCA-26 and LUCA-27. Specifically, promoting economic development that supports growth and provides opportunities for County residents applies here, as does the goal of attracting and expanding businesses that will provide jobs and a tax base that is sustainable. Maintaining housing at a less than desirable location is not sustainable. Parcels along Willow Road and Ridgely Avenue are wedged between commercial activity and Rt. 50. This is not a sustainable residential neighborhood. The vast majority of the residences are not owner occupied and the properties are not likely to be rehabilitated over time. They are served by antiquated septic systems. Commercial designation will support neighborhood serving commercial services and will reduce trips from beyond the neighborhood. The properties adjacent to Rt. 50 experience a high level of noise which is not conducive to residential use.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. The justification of the Plan2040 land use recommends that any expansion of Commercial land use within this corridor be discussed during the Region Planning process when a more comprehensive land use plan is developed with input from the community stakeholders.</p>

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>Luca 39, the site is currently zoned half residential medium density and half residential low-medium density (R15 and R5). The site currently is located in a neighborhood that has adjacent apartments and condominiums and increasing density would allow for more work force housing in the neighborhood and a housing type not currently offered in the area. The change to work force housing would allow the site to be developed for the benefit of homebuyers and probably have a similar amount of impervious coverage given that the site currently contains a church and an asphalt parking lot for about 110 cars and loading areas and drop off. The site is also within the Priority Funding Area and is served by public utilities.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>(LUCA 4) My name is Nick Stanco I live right around the corner and have been a resident of Crownsville for over 20 years. I own the property 1341 Sunrise Beach Rd Crownsville Md. 21032 . I am seeking a Commercial use for this Property. I have requested it and have gotten approval / recommendation from Anne Arundel County during the prior Zoning On January 2011. I have applied as well this time around. With the Wawa on the corner of sunrise beach and Crownsville rd closing for +/- 3 years now I believe I have the support of many within the community to allow this property to be developed and to give back to the community something similar. MY understanding there will be a new fire station built on the corner behind the closed Wawa. The closed Wawa I understand has covenants on it basically nullifying the property to ever serve the Community as such. No type of convince store can ever be built on that piece of property. I have participated in conversations / meetings with many in the Arden and Herald Harbor Association and neighbors that would like to see some type of Convenience store to serve the Community well. This I believe will restore equilibrium in the area- by having a convince store for essential products ( groceries, household products, etc) close by and easily accessible. please keep me abreast of the meetings so that we can make our Community better. I thank you in advance for your consideration. Nick J. Stanco Jr. &amp; Nani Stanco.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>I am a Crownsville resident, and I also have interests in the Gambrills/Crofton area where I go for shopping and recreation. These are my comments dated November 14, 2020.</p> <p>Regarding Volume 1 of the 2040 Plan, page 45: I don't understand how converting parts of Rt 3 to a "limited access freeway" would be helpful to people who live and work in the county, or to the existing businesses that would become isolated from motorists not having access to them. I looked for more information in Volume 2, but page 151 doesn't provide any additional information on this topic, it only repeats the information. The concept also seems counter to what's printed a few pages earlier at the top of page 148 in Volume 2. With all the businesses fronting Rt 3, where would one find space for making a limited access freeway--surely the plan isn't to destroy the unique businesses in the middle between the northbound and southbound lanes?? The real solution to alleviate traffic flow problems is for the county to halt the rapid new development along the Rt 3 corridor. I do like the plans for Rts 32, 100, 295, 50, and 97.</p> <p>Regarding Volume 2 of the 2040 Plan, page 163: Has the county considered the following idea related to solar panels? In Baltimore County at the community college in Dundalk, there are elevated solar panels in the parking lots, on posts/poles that elevate the panels perhaps 10 feet above the existing parking spaces. Seems like a clever use of space since the solar panels won't cause any new problems with heat, and they are popular places to park on both hot and rainy days due to the shelter the panels provide. For areas where we have existing large parking lots, around Marley Station Mall for example, perhaps the county could consider leasing such space to solar companies? It would be an excellent use of space in parking lots for light rail and trains, and provide shelter for commuters waiting for public transportation. Regarding Volume 2 of the 2040 Plan, page 251 and onward: I used the interactive map link on page 251 and read several of the applications, and have specific comments for some of them:</p> <p>I oppose LUCA-4. The application's claim that the change would benefit the community by providing opportunities for local commercial business is bogus. That premise is not credible, considering there's a vacant commercial property directly across the street from that address (formerly a Wawa, which closed perhaps 4 years ago and has been boarded up since). I am skeptical that there's any need for further commercial development at that corner. Of even greater concern, the property is on the corner of Old General's Highway, an historic, scenic road. This road needs to remain as pristine as possible to facilitate heritage tourism to and around the Annapolis area.</p> <p>I oppose LUCA-79. It is too drastic a change proposing going from rural to high-density residential and commercial. Isn't the county aware of the water retention/spread (it's almost like a shallow pond, the way it looks) at this site from Towser's Branch? Rural is the best designation for this property. I've been dismayed to see recent commercial development is already started at this area, even though the 2009 GDP land use category is rural.</p> <p>I oppose LUCA-172. I am surprised at the staff recommendation to change from rural to commercial, considering the large number of public comments opposing LUCA-172. With many small businesses going out of business from the pandemic, there is no need for commercial development at that corner, there will unfortunately be plenty of open properties to lease coming available soon. It would better to continue to allow the property to serve as a green buffer to traffic at that corner, because the rush hour traffic at that corner needs to keep moving toward the highway instead of being slowed from commercial development at that corner. The real solution to the traffic on Rt 3 is to cease rapidly building densely-populated new residences and businesses along it. I suggest the county reject the developer's self-serving request to change the designation. The 2060 Plan will be a better time to consider changing the designation IF it turns out there is a true need for another business.</p> <p>What I like about the 2040 Plan, in general: I've lived in Anne Arundel County since 1997, and it is charming to live in an area with large tracts of preserved woods and chunks of rural land, particularly considering how close we are to both Baltimore and D.C. It is wonderful that we have such appealing areas intact, and I very appreciate and approve of the numerous areas the county continues to have designated for Conservation, Open Space, and Rural--THANK YOU.</p> <p>Further, the county has made many of those areas accessible with trails for hiking or biking, and I have recently been exploring many of those trails. This is such a beautiful county to live in.</p> <p>My general concerns about the plan: In the past 10 years, I've witnessed an alarming increase in the number and size of construction projects, encroaching on or eliminating the woods and open spaces that I prize, and turning them into dense residential or commercial properties. In particular, I am dismayed at the rapid development I've seen along the Route 3 corridor. If I wanted to live in a densely-developed area, I wouldn't live where I am now. Please preserve the unique character of our county by</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. The County will take the comments into consideration in review of the Land Use Change applications.</p> <p>With the designation of the Route 3 corridor and the upcoming Region Plans, there is prioritization on addressing land use and transportation concerns and more opportunity for community engagement to shape the future of this area.</p>

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
Where can i find the comments on each individual LUCA Looking for 47 and 84	Information on individual LUCA properties can be found in an appendix to Volume II and in an appendix to the summary of public input on the Plan2040 Community Engagement @ Home website.
<p>Re: LUCA-48 [1460 Dorsey Road in Hanover] To whom this may concern: The subject property is 6 (+/-)-acre parcel located on Dorsey Road that lies adjacent to existing (built-out) industrial building to the west, St. Mark United Methodist Church to the east, and the recently built high-density Dorsey Ridge residential community. COPT acquired this property approximately 15-years ago with the desire to construct an industrial building. Over the years, COPT has found that the property's limited acreage and the steep slopes significantly limit the developable potential of this parcel for industrial development, rendering the property undevelopable under W-1 zoning. Over the past 3-4 years, the neighborhood has changed significantly with the addition of the Dorsey Ridge residential community, which was built on C-2 land. Other residential developments in the Harman's community have also reshaped the neighborhood. Given the constraints of the property (LUCA-48), the property owner (COPT) respectfully requests reconsideration of the subject parcel's current GDP designation of Industrial Zoning be changed to High Density Residential (R-22) due to the limiting factors of the parcel and the change in the character of the neighborhood over the several few years. Thank you very much for your consideration. Sincerely, Thomas Fahs—Corporate Office Properties Trust</p>	Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.
(LUCA 53) No additional houses are needed along Ritchie Highway. Additional houses would put more strain on schools and other county infrastructure. Commercial zoning would have the least impact on the infrastructure and environment. (Same IP Address as 208)	Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.
(LUCA 53) This is a comment to support land use change for 845 Richie Hwy, from residential to Commercial for the Land use Map. We Don't need more houses on Ritchie Hwy. This adds to the schools and traffic over crowding. The Commercial use will be less of an impact on our county infrastructure and the environment. (Sme IP Address as 209)	Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.
LUCA-53, Plan 2040 Land use map. This property should be commercial not Residential. This property located at 845 Ritchie Highway is not in a existing Residential Community. It is surrounded by commercial properties to the north and south and across the Highway on the South bound lane. I support support a land from Residential to Commercial for the Land use Map. The best use of this property is a commercial, a residential use would lead to the more traffic, more schools being over crowded and more environmental concerns. This is property being residential is not compatible with the neighborhood Preservation Policy Area. It is not a residential community, This property is surrounded by commercial properties and it has no access to the residential property behind it, It will not impact the neighborhood character. I strongly support the change of this property from Residential to Commercial.	Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.
LUCA-53, Plan 2040 Land use map. This property should be commercial not Residential. This property located at 845 Ritchie Highway is not in a existing Residential Community. It is surrounded by commercial properties to the north and south and across the Highway on the South bound lane. I support support a land from Residential to Commercial for the Land use Map. The best use of this property is a commercial, a residential use would lead to the more traffic, more schools being over crowded and more environmental concerns. This is property being residential is not compatible with the neighborhood Preservation Policy Area. It is not a residential community, This property is surrounded by commercial properties and it has no access to the residential property behind it, It will not impact the neighborhood character. I strongly support the change of this property from Residential to Commercial.	Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.
LUCA-53 Plan2040 This is to comment to support a land use change for 845 Richie Hwy, from residential to Commercial for the Land Use Map. This property is completely inappropriate for a residential use. It is surrounded by commercial properties on both north and south bound sides of Ritchie Hwy. Schools are already over crowded, residential development will add to the problem. - Residential development would add more Traffic , Commercial will have less impact on the Traffic. - Less impact on Environment.	Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.
LUCA-53 Plan2040 This is to comment to support a land use change for 845 Richie Hwy, from residential to Commercial for the Land use Map. Residential does not belong on a busy road like Ritchie Highway Schools are already over crowded, we don't need more Traffic , Commercial will have less impact on the Traffic. Less impact on Environment.	Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.
LUCA-53 Plan2040 This is to comment to support a land use change for 845 Richie Hwy, from residential to Commercial for the Land use Map. Commercial zoning would help impact traffic by school busses not having to make stops to pick up children.	Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>LUCA-53 Plan2040 This is to comment to support a land use change for 845 Ritchie Hwy, from residential to Commercial for the Land use Map. Schools are already over crowded in this area and commercial zoning would lessen foot traffic on this busy section of Ritchie Hwy.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>LUCA-53 Plan2040 This is to comment to support a land use change for 845 Ritchie Hwy, from residential to Commercial for the Land use Map. This section of Ritchie Hwy is mostly commercial and heavily travelled. The amount of traffic would be less impacted by commercial property.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>I am opposed to the residential zoning for 845 Ritchie Hwy. - LUCA - 53. The property is surrounded by business properties and should be zoned commercial. Adding residential units would increase traffic on already congested Ritchie Hwy in addition to increasing burdens on existing schools and infrastructure.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>I am opposed to the residential zoning for 845 Ritchie Hwy. - LUCA - 53. The property is surrounded by business properties and should be zoned commercial. Adding residential units would increase traffic on already congested Ritchie Hwy in addition to increasing burdens on existing schools and infrastructure.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>LUCA-53 Plan2040 This is to comment to support a land use change for 845 Ritchie Hwy, from residential to Commercial for the Land Use Map. Ritchie Hwy is not appropriate for residential development. The additional traffic from residential use would add to the already over crowded Severna Park corridor. Schools in the area do not need anymore students.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>LUCA-53 Plan2040: This is to comment to support a land use change for 845 Ritchie Hwy, from residential to Commercial for the Land use Map. Residential does not belong on a busy road like Ritchie Highway and commercial would benefit commuters and community with services. Residential would create even more traffic for Ritchie Highway.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>(LUCA 53?) Commercial would cut down on traffic!</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>LUCA-53 Plan 2040. I am in support of a change of zoning from Residential to Commercial for the property located at 845 Ritchie Hwy. This property fronts Ritchie Highway a four land divided highway. This is a very busy road and is best suited for commercial zoning. As a small bussiness owner in Anne Arundel County we have found it difficult to find commercial property available in Severna Park on Ritchie Highway. This would help fill a demand for commercial property and allow us to serve our community. This property being commercial will have less of an impact than a residential development would have. It will not add to the schools being over crowded or more traffic. I support the land change from residential to commercial. Thank you.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>LUCA-53 Plan2040 This is to comment to support a land use change for 845 Ritchie Hwy, from residential to Commercial for the Land use Map. Residential does not belong on a busy road like Ritchie Highway. Commercial will have less impact on traffic and we don't need more traffic on Ritchie highway.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>LUCA-53 Plan 2040: in favor of commercial property. Residential on Ritchie Hwy will cause more traffic and increase in school overcrowding. Busy highway such as RT2 should not be residential</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>LUCA-53 Plan 2040. I am in support of a change of zoning from Residential to Commercial for the property located at 845 Ritchie Hwy. This property fronts Ritchie Highway a four land divided highway. This is a very busy road and is best suited for commercial zoning. As a small bussiness owner in Anne Arundel County we have found it difficult to find commercial property available in Severna Park on Ritchie Highway. This would help fill a demand for commercial property and allow us to serve our community. This property being commercial will have less of an impact than a residential development would have. It will not add to the schools being over crowded or more traffic. I support the land change from residential to commercial. Thank you.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>LUCA-53 Plan2040 I support a land change for this property from residential to commercial. This property is situated between two commercial location and across the Highway from commercial properties. The character of this neighborhood not is not residential. There is no access to the residential community behind the property. The development on the property as a commercial will not result in any substantial growth or increase traffic volume. Residential use would increase the congestion and traffic more than commercial use would. The land use change from residential to commercial is consistent with the neighborhood preservation policy of the area as defined in the Plan2040, The commercial change should be granted. Thank you.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>The purpose of these comments is to support a land use change to Commercial for property located at 845 Ritchie Highway and shown as LUCA-53 on the PLAN204 Land Use Map. Property that fronts on northbound Ritchie Highway with 62,250 Average Trips per Day is not suitable for the recommended Low Density Residential Land Use. The property adjoins and faces properties with planned commercial land use. Those properties are zoned C3 and SB. The entire area, including the commercial uses are in a Neighborhood Preservation Development Policy Area. A Neighborhood Preservation Policy Area is defined by existing residential communities and natural areas (may include local commercial and industrial uses) that are not intended for substantial growth or land use change, but may have specific areas targeted for revitalization. Development is limited to infill and redevelopment that must be compatible with the existing neighborhood character. Public infrastructure exists but may need capacity improvements. The property at 845 Ritchie Highway as a commercial use will not result in substantial growth due to its size and is a specific area that should be targeted for revitalization. There is no connection to the existing residential community to the east, thus it will not impact the neighborhood character. In conclusion, the requested change of land use from Low- Medium Density to Commercial is consistent with the Neighborhood Preservation Policy Area as defined in the final draft PLAN2040 and should be granted.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>LUCA-53 Plan2040 This is to comment to support a land use change for 845 Richie Hwy, from residential to Commercial for the Land use Map.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>LUCA-53 Plan2040 This is to comment to support a land use change for 845 Richie Hwy, from residential to Commercial for the Land use Map.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>LUCA-53 Plan2040 This is to comment to support a land use change for 845 Richie Hwy, from residential to Commercial for the Land use Map.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>LUCA-53 Plan2040 This is to comment to support a land use change for 845 Richie Hwy, from residential to Commercial for the Land Use Map.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>LUCA-53, Plan 2040 Land use map. This property should be Commercial not Residential. The property is located at 845 Ritchie Highway is not in a existing Residential Community. It is surrounded by commercial properties to the north and south and across the Highway on the South bound lane. I support a land use change from Residential to Commercial for this property.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>Residential does not belong on a busy road</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>Residential does not belong on a busy road like Ritchie Highway</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>LUCA-53 plan 2040 Land Use Application. I support a change in the zoning map from Residential to Commercial for 845 Ritchie Hwy. It would be less impact on the area, everything else around the property is already zoned commercial. Residential houses on a four lane divided highway does not make sense to me. The Residential zoning would negatively impact the area more so than commercial zoning.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>(LUCA 53?) Ritchie Highway should not be zoned residential. It is a commercial road</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>LUCA-53 Plan2040 This is to comment to support a land use change for 845 Richie Hwy, from residential to Commercial for the Land use Map. Residential does not belong on a busy road like Ritchie Highway</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>In regards to LUCA-53 plan 2040 (land use application), I support the property being rezoned for commercial use. It seems fitting since commercially zoned properties adjoin and surround the property in question. I cannot see it as residential use and it should be zoned commercial.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>In Regards to LUCA-53 plan 2040, I support the property of 845 Ritchie Hwy being rezoned for commercial use. The property adjoins commercial properties and is not part of a residential community. I feel it should be zoned Commercial and not Residential.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>In regards to LUCA-53 plan 2040: The property is not connected or doesn't seem part of a residential community, it is surrounded by commercial properties. In my opinion, It is not suitable for residential homes, I feel it should be zoned commercial.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>LUCA-53 plan 2040 Land Use Application. I believe 845 Ritchie Hwy should be zoned commercial. I can't imagine it being residential amongst the commercial properties that surround it.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>These comments are for LUCA-65. Me and my family are OPPOSED to LUCA-65. This is my second time I am responding to this proposal. We are opposing due to Health Medical Reason, Noise Concerns, Enviironmental Concerns - breathing bad toxic air from truck fumes. I have Children &amp; Grandchildren living in community with large truck will cause harm to them. Increase Traffic of large and Loud Trucks was not part of my reason for me and my family moving into a residential community. We are very OPPOSED to this or any other proposal by this company. This will decrease my Home Value and cause this community to become industrialized and not a community to live and raise a family. James and Margaret Mickens - 202 Cedar Hill Lane, Brooklyn Park, Md 21225</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>I am opposed to LUCA-65 - It will bring our property vales and neighborhood ratings down - this is a new community with great potential, we don't need a trucking company bringing its value down and messing up the good name we are trying to build for the city of Brooklyn Park - the highly objectionable noises and smells would negatively impact existing and future residents of the Cedar Hill Community - this would also impact pet lovers and people with young children who would be using the trails that would run along that side of the community - this property is already zoned for residential use and should remain that way for the betterment of the Cedar Hill Community and the City of Brooklyn Park</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>This letter is in reference to LUCA-65. To whom it may concern, My wife and I just moved into a new home in the Ceder Hill community. I have a few concerns regarding the expansion of Black Jack Trucking LLC commercial land use permit. My concerns are as followed. Environmental pollution from idling trucks. Noise pollution due to the proximity to the community. I just made a large investment in my home and would like to protect the resale value. This letter is in reference to LUCA-65</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>I am opposed to LUCA-65 because I just purchased a brand new home in which I plan to raise my children. I did not and would not have bought this home had I known the environment would change, especially with noise and pollution. We enjoy this peaceful neighborhood and would appreciate retaining it and the value of our home. This plan will ultimately decrease the value of our neighborhood and likely cause home owners to face under water homes just as people faced in the prior housing crisis. Please do not do that to people trying to improve the nature of Brooklyn Park as a whole. That does not include more industry and frankly unattractive areas to this town.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>I am opposed to LUCA-65. It is inappropriate as well as a detriment for the entire Cedar Hill community current and future. Commercial business that bring additional noise, pollution, offense odors will be a adverse impact on the community as a whole. Those type of commercial business have no place in a community.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>(LUCA-65) The concept of promoting economic development that supports the diversity of businesses and industries providing jobs, income, and a tax base that is sustainable, as goals in Plan2040, plays out under the properties described in LUCA-65. The uses on this site have long been commercial, notwithstanding, current high density residential zoning. This is a case, where the land use map and ultimately zoning, should match the uses on the site. These properties, with frontage, ingress and egress on Route 2, and within close proximity to Rt. 695, should clearly be commercial.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>The draft of Plan2040 promotes the Town Center concepts. The property in question under LUCA-66 should either be commercially designated on the Land Use Map or, alternatively, if Town Center designated, there should be clarity that the site should be within the boundaries of the Parole Town Center Growth Management Area.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>The site described in LUCA-67 has been a defacto commercial use for many years. It is situated at a signalized intersection along a highly trafficked road. It should serve as either a hub containing limited commercial services that supports the neighborhood, or provide an alternative housing type to large lot single family dwellings. Both of the aforementioned alternatives are goals of Plan2040. Either of the land use designations (commercial or medium density residential) will be less impactful regarding vehicular traffic than the current use on the site.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>(LUCA 68) Maintain Open Space (OS) zoning for land located at the corner of Benfield Boulevard and Veterans Highway in Millersville (on parcels 8561 and 8601) as this land directly borders the Bear Branch of the Severn . If it is rezoned for Mixed Use, developers will remove trees and natural ground cover, thus causing additional run-off and destruction of natural habitat. This will also increase congestion on already Benfield Blvd. and increase traffic problems in this area.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>(LUCA 68) I am writing to ask your assistance in your capacities as environmental representatives on the Citizen Advisory Committee for the Land Use Plan . I just had the opportunity to review the Plan 2040 proposal and note a danger to the Severn River via the Bear Creek Branch Stream. Please work with the commission to keep the land at the corner of Benfield Boulevard and Veterans Highway in Millersville (on parcels 8561 and 8601) zoned for open space. If this space is rezoned as mixed use as shown in the proposal, the run off from impervious surfaces and additional motor vehicle traffic into the Creek and thereby the Severn River will continue to degrade the health of the the waters of the head of the Severn.</p>	<p>Thank you for taking the time to review the Plan and provide feedback. Your comment has been recorded and will be considered as part of the preliminary draft Plan2040 review. Please note that the preliminary draft Plan2040 will be presented to the Planning Advisory Board where there will be a briefing and public hearing. That process is anticipated to occur in December and January (dates to be determined). The draft Plan2040 is anticipated to be introduced to the County Council in February 2021 with public hearings to begin in March 2021 (dates to be determined).</p>
<p>(LUCA - 68) I am writing to ask your assistance in your capacities as environmental representatives on the Citizen Advisory Committee for the Land Use Plan . I just had the opportunity to review the Plan 2040 proposal and note a danger to the Severn River via the Bear Creek Branch Stream. Please work with the commission to keep the land at the corner of Benfield Boulevard and Veterans Highway in Millersville (on parcels 8561 and 8601) zoned for open space. If this space is rezoned as mixed use as shown in the proposal, the run off from impervious surfaces and additional motor vehicle traffic into the Creek and thereby the Severn River will continue to degrade the health of the the waters of the head of the Severn.</p>	<p>Thank you for taking the time to review the Plan and provide feedback. Your comment has been recorded and will be considered as part of the preliminary draft Plan2040 review. Please note that the preliminary draft Plan2040 will be presented to the Planning Advisory Board where there will be a briefing and public hearing. That process is anticipated to occur in December and January (dates to be determined). The draft Plan2040 is anticipated to be introduced to the County Council in February 2021 with public hearings to begin in March 2021 (dates to be determined).</p>
<p>(LUCA 68) Dear Sir/Madam, The county's draft General Development Plan (Plan 2040) looks like it is set to rezone the open space (OS) land located at the corner of Benfield Boulevard and Veterans Highway in Millersville (on parcels 8561 and 8601 owned by Mr. Badro). I am very concerned that about this, as the currently zoned open space directly borders the Bear Branch of the Severn. Furthermore, the landowner, Mr. Badro, has already stated in his previous legal actions that he plans to remove trees and natural ground cover, thus causing additional run-off and destruction of natural habitat. This is especially concerning in light of recent silt run-off from the Bear Branch that has caused Severn dead zones (see most recent examples at the Severn River Association facebook page). The Shipley's Choice HOA, the Severn River Association, the Growth Action Network Severn Riverkeeper organizations are ready to fight for maintaining the open space zoning of this land. These organizations already successfully fought Mr. Badro's efforts to rezone this open space in in County Board of Appeals Case No. BA 1-18R via hearing dates on May 1, 2018 - May 10, 2018. Please reply back to confirm the county's intent to maintain this land as designated open space. Regards, Matt Jones matthew.jones@jhuapl.edu 520 Bramblewood Rd Millersville MD 21108 (240) 461-7571</p>	<p>Thank you. Your comment has been recorded and will be considered during staff review of the public comments received throughout the Plan2040 preliminary draft process. Please note there will also be opportunities to comment at the Planning Advisory Board and County Council public hearings.</p>

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>(LUCA 68) Maintain Open Space zoning for land located at the corner of Benfield Boulevard and Veterans Highway in Millersville (on parcels 8561 and 8601) as this land directly borders the Bear Branch of the Severn. If it is rezoned for Mixed Use, developers will remove trees and natural ground cover, thus causing additional run-off and destruction of natural habitat.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>(LUCA 68) "Maintain Open Space (OS) zoning for land located at the corner of Benfield Boulevard and Veterans Highway in Millersville (on parcels 8561 and 8601) as this land directly borders the Bear Branch of the Severn. If it is rezoned for Mixed Use, developers will remove trees and natural ground cover, thus causing additional run-off and destruction of natural habitat."</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>(LUCA 68) Please, no more new building adjacent to waterways. Keep open land adjacent to Bear Branch - specifically the intersection of Benfield Rd and Veteran's Hwy parcels 8561 and 8601 - as undeveloped green space. Protect our rivers from run off from commercial and dense residential housing. Maintain open space zoning. We're watching our beautiful county get paved over. Stop the building.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>(LUCA 68) Maintain Open Space (OS) zoning for land located at the corner of Benfield Boulevard and Veterans Highway in Millersville (on parcels 8561 and 8601) as this land directly borders the Bear Branch of the Severn. If it is rezoned for Mixed Use, developers will remove trees and natural ground cover, thus causing additional run-off and destruction of natural habitat</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>(LUCA 68) Maintain Open Space (OS) zoning for land located at the corner of Benfield Boulevard and Veterans Highway in Millersville (on parcels 8561 and 8601) as this land directly borders the Bear Branch of the Severn. If it is rezoned for Mixed Use, developers will remove trees and natural ground cover, thus causing additional run-off and destruction of natural habitat</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>(LUCA 68) Maintain Open Space (OS) zoning for land located at the corner of Benfield Boulevard and Veterans Highway in Millersville (on parcels 8561 and 8601) as this land directly borders the Bear Branch of the Severn. If it is rezoned for Mixed Use, developers will remove trees and natural ground cover, thus causing additional run-off and destruction of natural habitat.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>(LUCA 68) Please, please maintain Open Space (OS) zoning for land located at the corner of Benfield Boulevard and Veterans Highway in Millersville (on parcels 8561 and 8601) as this land directly borders the Bear Branch of the Severn. The map on for Land Usage looks like it is being reclassified to Mixed Use. If it is rezoned for Mixed Use, developers will remove trees and natural ground cover, thus causing additional run-off and destruction of natural habitat. This area is already a major source for silt run off and dead zone creation!!!</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>(LUCA 68) Maintain Open Space (OS) zoning for land located at the corner of Benfield Boulevard and Veterans Highway in Millersville (on parcels 8561 and 8601) as this land directly borders the Bear Branch of the Severn. If it is rezoned for Mixed Use, developers will remove trees and natural ground</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
(LUCA 68) Maintain Open Space (OS) zoning for land located at the corner of Benfield Boulevard and Veterans Highway in Millersville (on parcels 8561 and 8601) as this land directly borders the Bear Branch of the Severn. If it is rezoned for Mixed Use, developers will remove trees and natural ground cover, thus causing additional run-off and destruction of natural habitat.	Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.
(LUCA 68) Maintain Open Space (OS) zoning for land located at the corner of Benfield Boulevard and Veterans Highway in Millersville (on parcels 8561 and 8601) as this land directly borders the Bear Branch of the Severn. If it is rezoned for Mixed Use, developers will remove trees and natural ground cover, thus causing additional run-off and destruction of natural habitat. Thank you!	Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.
(LUCA 68) "Maintain Open Space (OS) zoning for land located at the corner of Benfield Boulevard and Veterans Highway in Millersville (on parcels 8561 and 8601) as this land directly borders the Bear Branch of the Severn. If it is rezoned for Mixed Use, developers will remove trees and natural ground cover, thus causing additional run-off and destruction of natural habitat."	Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.
(LUCA 68) Maintain Open Space (OS) zoning for land located at the corner of Benfield Boulevard and Veterans Highway in Millersville (on parcels 8561 and 8601) as this land directly borders the Bear Branch of the Severn. If it is rezoned for Mixed Use, developers will remove trees and natural ground cover, thus causing additional run-off and destruction of natural habitat.	Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.
(LUCA 68) Maintain Open Space (OS) zoning for land located at the corner of Benfield Boulevard and Veterans Highway in Millersville (on parcels 8561 and 8601) as this land directly borders the Bear Branch of the Severn. If it is rezoned for Mixed Use, developers will remove trees and natural ground cover, thus causing additional run-off and destruction of natural habitat."	Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.
(LUCA 68) Maintain Open Space (OS) zoning for land located at the corner of Benfield Boulevard and Veterans Highway in Millersville (on parcels 8561 and 8601) as this land directly borders the Bear Branch of the Severn. If it is rezoned for Mixed Use, developers will remove trees and natural ground cover, thus causing additional run-off and destruction of natural habitat.	Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.
(LUCA 68) Maintain Open Space (OS) zoning for land located at the corner of Benfield Boulevard and Veterans Highway in Millersville (on parcels 8561 and 8601) as this land directly borders the Bear Branch of the Severn. If it is rezoned for Mixed Use, developers will remove trees and natural ground cover, thus causing additional run-off and destruction of natural habitat.	Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.
(LUCA 68) Maintain Open Space (OS) zoning for land located at the corner of Benfield Boulevard and Veterans Highway in Millersville (on parcels 8561 and 8601) as this land directly borders the Bear Branch of the Severn. If it is rezoned for Mixed Use, developers will remove trees and natural ground cover, thus causing additional run-off and destruction of natural habitat.	Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>(LUCA 68) Maintain Open Space (OS) zoning for land located at the corner of Benfield Boulevard and Veterans Highway in Millersville (on parcels 8561 and 8601) as this land directly borders the Bear Branch of the Severn. If it is rezoned for Mixed Use, developers will remove trees and natural ground cover, thus causing additional run-off and destruction of natural habitat.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>(LUCA 68) Maintain Open Space (OS) zoning for land located at the corner of Benfield Boulevard and Veterans Highway in Millersville (on parcels 8561 and 8601) as this land directly borders the Bear Branch of the Severn. If it is rezoned for Mixed Use, developers will remove trees and natural ground cover, thus causing additional run-off and destruction of natural habitat.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>(LUCA 68) "Maintain Open Space (OS) zoning for land located at the corner of Benfield Boulevard and Veterans Highway in Millersville (on parcels 8561 and 8601) as this land directly borders the Bear Branch of the Severn. If it is rezoned for Mixed Use, developers will remove trees and natural ground cover, thus causing additional run-off and destruction of natural habitat."</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>(LUCA 68) Please Maintain Open Space (OS) zoning for land located at the corner of Benfield Boulevard and Veterans Highway in Millersville (on parcels 8561 and 8601) as this land directly borders the Bear Branch of the Severn. If it is rezoned for Mixed Use, developers will remove trees and natural ground cover, thus causing additional run-off and destruction of natural habitat.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>(LUCA 68) The Bear Branch which runs through the woods near our house is a concern for me. Please maintain Open Space (OS) zoning for land located at the corner of Benfield Boulevard and Veterans Highway in Millersville (on parcels 8561 and 8601) as this land directly borders the Bear Branch of the Severn. If it is rezoned for Mixed Use, developers will remove trees and natural ground cover, thus causing additional run-off and destruction of natural habitat. Thank you for your consideration!</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>(LUCA 68) Maintain open space (OS) zoning for land located at the corner of Benfield Blvd and Veterans Hwy in Millersville (on parcels 8561 and 8601) as this land directly boards the Bear Branch of the Severn. If it is rezoned for mixed use, developers will remove trees and natural ground cover, thus causing additional run-off and destruction of natural habitat. Thank you.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>(LUCA 68) Maintain Open Space (OS) zoning for land located at the corner of Benfield Boulevard and Veterans Highway in Millersville (on parcels 8561 and 8601) as this land directly borders the Bear Branch of the Severn. If it is rezoned for Mixed Use, developers will remove trees and natural ground cover, thus causing additional run-off and destruction of natural habitat.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>(LUCA 68) Maintain Open Space (OS) zoning for land located at the corner of Benfield Boulevard and Veterans Highway in Millersville (on parcels 8561 and 8601) as this land directly borders the Bear Branch of the Severn. If it is rezoned for MixedUse, developers will remove trees and natural ground cover, thus causing additional run-off and destruction of natural habitat.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>(LUCA 68) Maintain Open Space (OS) zoning for land located at the corner of Benfield Boulevard and Veterans Highway in Millersville (on parcels 8561 and 8601) as this land directly borders the Bear Branch of the Severn. If it is rezoned for MixedUse, developers will remove trees and natural ground cover, thus causing additional run-off and destruction of natural habitat.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>(LUCA 68) Please maintain open space zoning for the land (parcels 8561 and 8601) at Benfield and Veterans Highway. The Bear Branch stream that feeds into the Severn River is next to these parcels of land. The health of the Severn River has been negatively impacted by development along this branch. The run off and destruction of natural habitat is contaminating the headwaters of the Severn River. This has adversely affected the health of the river.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>(LUCA 68) I am a home owner in Millersville. The parcels of land 8561 and 8601 that are at the intersection of benfield road and veterans highway in Millersville is on the plan is changing from open space to mixed use land. This land should remain as open space. It borders the bare branched of the Severn river and development will mean more destruction of natural habitat and run off water. There are already deer and foxes that cross benfield boulevard while I am headed to my house because they have been driven out of their natural habitat by existing development and this problem would only be exacerbated by more development.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>(LUCA 68) Maintain Open Space (OS) zoning for land located at the corner of Benfield Boulevard and Veterans Highway in Millersville (on parcels 8561 and 8601) as this land directly borders the Bear Branch of the Severn. If it is rezoned for Mixed Use, developers will remove trees and natural ground cover, thus causing additional run-off and destruction of natural habitat.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>(LUCA 68) Crain West community Association, comprised of 89 homes adjacent to these changes, strongly opposes changing the land use designation along the southern border of the Properties from Open Space to Mixed Use. The land fits the definition of Conservation Land Use, "land that is [...]"</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>The concept of having limited commercial services at the suburban area depicted in LUCA-68 is appropriate and supported by the goals of the preliminary draft of Plan2040. The natural features on the eastern part of the site will not be disturbed (and will buffer residential uses) as a result of any development. Commercial land use designation is consistent with providing commercial services to the</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>(LUCA-68) I just noticed that the county’s draft General Development Plan (Plan 2040) is set to rezone the open space (OS) land located at the corner of Benfield Boulevard and Veterans Highway in Millersville (on parcels 8561 and 8601 owned by Mr. Badro). It seems that the proposed General Development (Plan 2040) shows this open space being rezoned for mixed use. I have attached a map from page 34 of Plan 2040 Volume 1 which shows that the draft plan has removed the open space from those parcels.</p> <p>I am very concerned that about this, as the currently zoned open space directly borders the Bear Branch of the Severn. Furthermore, the landowner, Mr. Badro, has already stated in his previous legal actions (see attached ruling from 2018 on rezoning attempt) that he plans to remove trees and natural ground cover, thus causing additional run-off and destruction of natural habitat. This is especially concerning in light of recent silt run-off environmental impact that the Bear Branch has had on the Severn (see most recent example).</p> <p>We have until November 15, 2020 to comment on the draft plan. The website suggests filling out a survey, which seems insufficient. Please advise as soon as possible as to what our organizations can do to maintain the open space zoning of this environmentally sensitive land. I have copied Amy Leahy and Melanie Hartwig-Davis who are the Severna Park and the Environmental representatives on the Citizen Advisory Committee for Plan 2040.</p>	<p>Thank you for taking the time to review the Plan and provide feedback. Your comment has been recorded and will be considered as part of the preliminary draft Plan2040 review. Please note that the preliminary draft Plan2040 will be presented to the Planning Advisory Board where there will be a briefing and public hearing. That process is anticipated to occur in December and January (dates to be determined). The draft Plan2040 is anticipated to be introduced to the County Council in February 2021 with public hearings to begin in March 2021 (dates to be determined).</p>
<p>(LUCA-68) My name is Austin Holley, and I represent 854 homes comprising the Shipley’s Choice Homeowners Association (“SCHOA”). Thank you for the opportunity to comment once again on the Plan2040 Planned Land Use Map and, specifically, proposed land use changes to properties near our homes.</p> <p>As stated in our September comments, SCHOA enthusiastically supports the proposed expansion of the Conservation land use designation along the eastern edge of properties located at the northeast corner of Benfield Boulevard and Veterans Highway (the “Properties”). This undisturbed, tree-covered area comprises the steep flood plain of Bear Branch, part of the Severn River headwaters, and must be permanently protected.</p> <p>Furthermore, along with the Greater Severna Park Council, the Severn River Association, and other nearby communities, SCHOA remains strongly opposed to changing the land use designation along the southern border of the Properties from Open Space to Mixed Use. As stated in the Plan2040 Planned Land Use Map Briefing Document, “a new Conservation Land Use category will represent land that is [...] passive open space adjacent to platted floodplains.” This land, designated as Open Space by the 2009 General Development Plan, is precisely that!</p> <p>Similarly, SCHOA continues to oppose Land Use Change Application 68, which requested a designation change to Parcel 546 and a portion of Parcel 308 from Open Space to Commercial. Specifically regarding the LUCA-68 Information Datasheet, we would like to correct an error in the Justification section of the Staff Recommendation, which states, “The requested change to Commercial land use is consistent with the existing zoning.” In fact, the requested change is consistent with the existing zoning of only a portion of one of the two parcels (308). All of Parcel 546 is currently zoned Open Space. This is a crucial distinction when analyzing these issues.</p> <p>As the Plan2040 process continues, SCHOA looks forward to providing our input as an important community stakeholder.</p>	<p>Thank you for taking the time to review the Plan and provide feedback. Your comment has been recorded and will be considered as part of the preliminary draft Plan2040 review. Please note that the preliminary draft Plan2040 will be presented to the Planning Advisory Board where there will be a briefing and public hearing. That process is anticipated to occur in December and January (dates to be determined). The draft Plan2040 is anticipated to be introduced to the County Council in February 2021 with public hearings to begin in March 2021 (dates to be determined).</p>
<p>(LUCA 68) Crain West community Association, comprised of 89 homes adjacent to these changes, strongly opposes changing the land use designation along the southern border of the Properties from Open Space to Mixed Use. The land fits the definition of Conservation Land Use, “land that is [...] passive open space adjacent to platted floodplains”, and should be designated as such.</p> <p>Crain West continues to oppose Land Use Change Application 68, which requested a designation change to Parcel 546 and a portion of Parcel 308 from Open Space to Commercial. Please correct the error in the Justification section of the Staff Recommendation on LUCA-68 which states, “The requested change to Commercial land use is consistent with the existing zoning.” In fact, the requested change is consistent with the existing zoning of one portion of the two parcels (308). All of Parcel 546 is currently zoned Open Space. This is a crucial distinction for this area. If not required already at this stage of the process, staff should visit the area in question for Land Use Changes to better understand the environment and implications.</p>	<p>Thank you for taking the time to review the Plan and provide feedback. Your comment has been recorded and will be considered as part of the preliminary draft Plan2040 review. Please note that the preliminary draft Plan2040 will be presented to the Planning Advisory Board where there will be a briefing and public hearing. That process is anticipated to occur in December and January (dates to be determined). The draft Plan2040 is anticipated to be introduced to the County Council in February 2021 with public hearings to begin in March 2021 (dates to be determined).</p>

Comments	County Response
<p>(LUCA 68) I do not want to see the corner of Benfield Blvd and Veterans Hyway rezoned from OS to commercial. This is the entrance to Severna Park and must be kept OS</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>(LUCA 68) I live near Bear Branch off Benfield Blvd in Millersville. I do not want the runoff from the proposed building on Veteran’s Hwy and Benfield to adversely effect Bear Branch diwn to the Severn. I want to keep as much open space as possible in this area. I am against any change in zoning at Veteran’ s Hwy and Benfield Blvd.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>(LUCA 68) maintain open space zoning for land located at the corner of benfield boulevard and veterans highway in Millersville (on parcels 8561 and 8601)</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>(LUCA 68) "Maintain Open Space (OS) zoning for land located at the corner of Benfield Boulevard and Veterans Highway in Millersville (on parcels 8561 and 8601) as this land directly borders the Bear Branch of the Severn. If it is rezoned for Mixed Use, developers will remove trees and natural ground cover, thus causing additional run-off and destruction of natural habitat."</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>(LUCA 68) Maintain Open Space zoning for land located at the corner of Benfield Blvd. and Veterans Highway in Millersville. (parcels 8561 and 8601)</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>(LUCA 68) On behalf of the Shipley's Choice Homeowners Association, I have submitted an email (plan2040@aacounty.org) with detailed comments regarding our continued opposition to proposed land use changes to properties near our homes.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>(LUCA 68) The plan to rezone land on the corner of Benfield and Veterans will cause additional runoff and destruction of habitat as well as exacerbate the congestion along the Benfield corridor. Thank you for voicing concern over this plan to change zoning in AA Co.</p>	<p>Thank you for taking the time to review the Plan and provide feedback. Your comment has been recorded and will be considered as part of the preliminary draft Plan2040 review. Please note that the preliminary draft Plan2040 will be presented to the Planning Advisory Board where there will be a briefing and public hearing. That process is anticipated to occur in December and January (dates to be determined). The draft Plan2040 is anticipated to be introduced to the County Council in February 2021 with public hearings to begin in March 2021 (dates to be determined).</p>
<p>Plan2040 seeks to provide hubs of limited commercial and community services in rural or suburban areas. The intersection of Rt. 2 and Rt. 214 is hardly rural anymore. It is clearly suburban and the "rural" designation on the land use map is not consistent with the draft Plan2040. If neighborhood serving commercial is not desired, as an alternative, the site should be considered for "higher density residential", in order to allow for work force housing which would fulfill the goal of providing an adequate supply of housing in a neighborhood that has limited affordability to those of moderate income.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. The justification for the Draft Plan2040 Recommended Land Use for the property in question (LUCA-69) states that the planned land use changes to the site and surrounding area should be discussed further during the Region Planning process.</p>
<p>The draft of Plan2040 states that a goal is to provide for an adequate supply of housing in a variety of neighborhoods that is affordable for a range of income levels. Leaving the land described in LUCA-70 in the low density residential land use category does not support this goal nor is it appropriate for this site. At a minimum this site should be designated as medium density residential, since adjacent residential uses are within this category, and the site abuts a high speed railroad (to the west), a nature preserve (to the east), and industrial (to the north). Medium density residential will provide for affordable housing opportunities.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>Luca 70 - The site location in Laurel Area and within the PFA and adjacent to other town house communities seems to support the requested zoning change to a higher density residential use.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>

Comments	County Response
<p>The purpose of these comments is to support the requested land use change for the PYY Property (formerly Pasadena Yacht Yard) from Low-Medium Density Residential to Maritime. This change is supported by the Office of Planning and Zoning and is consistent with the goals, policies and recommendation of the GDP. An application for a change of land use for this legal, nonconforming use was filed within the required timeline and was assigned LUCA-71. The property located at 1130-1132 Pasadena Yacht Yard Road in Pasadena and has been an operating marina since 1949. As a nonconforming use, the Administrative Hearing Officer recognized the operation as MC- Heavy Commercial Marina District in a 1989 decision. PLAN2040 has a stated goal (Policy BE4.2) to analyze small scale non-conforming marinas in residential areas for the compatibility with the surrounding community. With 60 online comments received opposing OPZ staff's initial recommendation to remain Low-Medium Density Residential, the position in this revised draft of PLAN2040 was changed by OPZ staff to a Maritime Land Use. The stated justification is, "The requested change to Maritime land use is consistent with the site's existing land use." Another factor that is consistent with a land use change in PLAN 2040 is the Growth Tier Map. The property is in Tier I and is currently served by both public water and sewer. Also stated in the draft of PLAN2040 relating to marinas, "Water and water access are fundamental characteristics of life in Anne Arundel County." And, "... , the County has comparatively few public water access points to serve the general population." In a 2020 study commissioned by Anne Arundel Economic Development Corporation, the Maritime Advisory Board is working to, "grow the County's recreational and commercial maritime industries." In the section Planning for a Health Economy, Policy HE2.6 is titled, "Promote and sustain commercial fishing and maritime trades." Included under that title are recommendations to implement recommendations of the previously mentioned 2020 Maritime Economic Impact Study, Continue to work with maritime businesses to increase awareness and utilization of existing business development resources and supply resources to existing and potential maritime industry entities. The property owner has requested a land use change to Maritime, the Office of Planning and Zoning has recommended a land use change to Maritime and the Citizens Advisory Committee that has drafted the PLAN2040 document has recommended a land use change to Maritime. For the reasons presented, please support the requested land use change for LUCA-71 to Maritime.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>The draft Plan2040 recommended land use for LUCA – 79 is "Commercial" and "Rural." The requested land use designation is "Commercial" and "High Density Residential." The property is located within the "Critical Corridor" on the Development Policy Area Map, and the justification for not designating the property as "High Density Residential" is inconsistent with the GDP and Comprehensive Zoning process because the underlying land use must be changed prior to the more granular and detailed Region Planning process. An increase in residential density here is also consistent with smart growth policies and practices because there is a large concentration of commercial and economic activity, adjacent to major roads and existing infrastructure, which will prevent sprawl and preserve the Natural Environment throughout the County. Therefore, the underlying land use should be changed to "High Density Residential" and any details or potential restrictions to an increase in density can be implemented through zoning code changes and/or overlays after consideration and input received during the Region Planning process.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>The Draft Plan2040 Development Policy Areas Definitions &amp; Map are inconsistent; under the definitions (pg. 30), "Critical Corridor" is excluded from the "Targeted Development, Redevelopment and Revitalization Policy Areas," but, on the Development Policy Areas Map (pg. 31) it is included and grouped with the other "Targeted Development, Redevelopment and Revitalization Policy Areas" (Critical Economic, Town Centers, Village Center Overlays, and Transit-Oriented Overlays). Based on the definition provided and the locations and properties identified as "Critical Corridor" on the map, the definition of "Critical Corridor" (on pg. 30) should be grouped with the other "Targeted Development, Redevelopment and Revitalization Policy Areas" for consistency.</p>	
<p>The definitions provided for "Critical Corridor" and "Critical Economic" are nearly the same. Certain areas identified as "Critical Corridor" also meet the definition and purpose of "Critical Economic" and those properties also happen to be located on major roads. The same development type and flexibility in land use policies should apply equally to "Critical Corridor" policy areas to encourage business growth and job creation in areas with existing transit access and infrastructure. Doing so would be consistent with smart growth policies, prevent sprawl, and increase the likelihood of improving existing infrastructure rather than creating new infrastructure; all the while minimizing the impact on the Natural Environment by concentrating development and redevelopment in existing commercially viable economic corridors where new stormwater practices can be installed and grouped together to mitigate the environmental impact of outdated stormwater facilities (and, in some cases, none at all).</p>	

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>(LUCA-94) Thank you for work on this project. I have looked and some of the interactive map and agree that many of the requests for rezoning should be denied that relate to changing a community from low density to medium or high. It changes the community in a negative way and I object to slow creep toward eliminating our suburbs. I do however, agree to allowing the Earleigh Hts. Fire Hall to rezone to low impact commercial. I have objected in the past but if there was a group that would manage this with the community in mind, it's a volunteer firehouse. They need the new accommodations and upgrade in health and environmental standards.</p>	<p>Thank you for taking the time to review the Plan and provide feedback. Your comment has been recorded and will be considered as part of the preliminary draft Plan2040 review. Please note that the preliminary draft Plan2040 will be presented to the Planning Advisory Board where there will be a briefing and public hearing. That process is anticipated to occur in December and January (dates to be determined). The draft Plan2040 is anticipated to be introduced to the County Council in February 2021 with public hearings to begin in March 2021 (dates to be determined).</p>
<p>LUCA-94 Application for 161 Ritchie Highway, Earleigh Heights VFC. As a resident of Severna Park I would like to see this commercial zoning get approved. It would benefit the community not only with jobs but with increased fire protection.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>LUCA-94 Application for 161 Ritchie Highway, Earleigh Heights VFC. As a resident of AACO I would like to see this commercial zoning get approved. It would benefit the community not only with jobs but with increased fire protection.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>LUCA-94 Application for 161 Ritchie Highway, Earleigh Heights VFC. As a resident of Severna Park I would like to see this commercial zoning get approved. It would benefit the community not only with jobs but with increased fire protection.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>LUCA-94 Application for 161 Ritchie Highway, Earleigh Heights VFC. As a resident of Severna Park I would like to see this commercial zoning get approved. It would benefit the community not only with jobs but with increased fire protection.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>LUCA 94 Earleigh Heights Fire Department should be granted their Zoning request change. Senator Ed Reilly supports, Si Saab supports it and it makes good sense for the community. This zoning change request will allow them to continue to servce the are for many years to come.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>Under LUCA 94, I strongly recommend changing the zoning of 161 Ritchie Highway from Residential (R1) to commercial. This change will allow the volunteer fire company to lease a portion of their land for commercial development. The annual proceeds from any lease agreement would allow the volunteers to build a modern fire station and to purchase state of the art fire and medical apparatus at no cost to the citizens of the county. Lacking the change, the volunteers will be unable to raise sufficient revenue to build a new station, but will also face the challenges of maintaining the 60+ year old building now used by the volunteers and career firefighters assigned there. The county cannot afford to build a new station, so change the zoning and let the volunteers do it.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>LUCA-94. The property at 161 Ritchie Highway should be rezoned from residential to commercial as requested by the Earleigh heights Volunteer Fire Co. The other three corners are commercially developed. No person in their right mind is going to build low density housing on that corner. By changing the zoning, the fire company can lease out the section along Ritchie Highway for commercial development. The revenue earned from that venture will allow the volunteers to build a modern fire station at no cost to the county or the taxpayers. The County wants to place larger fire equipment at Earleigh Heights due to its central location and because of the number of 3 to 5 story senior living facilities in the immediate area. The current volunteer owned station is 60 years old and cannot accomodate the newer and larger equipment. The county cannot afford to build a new station, nor can it afford the Tower or Ladder Truck the volunteers will purchase and maintain with the funds received from leasing. Rezoning the property to help the volunteers help the county is not only the right thing to do, but it is a fiscally sound investment.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>LUCA 94 The corner where the Earleigh Heights firehouse sits should be zoned commercial. Development there has little impact on established homes. The Earleigh Heights Fire Company serves and protects our community with little support. They deserve the opportunity to build a new facility to be able to acquire modern equipment to continue to protect the people in their area.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>LUCA 94 I believe that the communities of Pasadena, Severna Park and Millersville would greatly benefit with the Earleigh Heights Volunteer Fire Company building a new firehouse. Currently the county used the hall for expanded training for recruit classes and with newer fatalities they would be more equipped to hold more events in the area bringing communities together.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>(LUCA-94) I wish to comment on the Plan 2040 Land Use Change Application submitted by the Earleigh Heights Volunteer Fire Company. The property in question is addressed as 161 Ritchie Highway and is at the intersection of Magothy Bridge Road. The request is to change said property from R-1 to Commercial. In view of the fact that three of the four corners of the intersection are currently zoned Commercial this change would not greatly change the appearance of the intersection but rather it would make the use of the area more uniform. This change is a step in the long range plan to replace the aging and insufficient fire station with a new facility to be located on the rear portion of the property along Magothy Bridge Road, thus allowing for a much safer response route for the emergency vehicles. Mush has been said regarding future use of the property. It has been and is still the intention of the Fire Company to retain as much open space as is possible so that the very popular events such as the annual carnival, Christmas tree sales and the weekly food trucks may continue to operate as in past years. In conclusion, many needed improvements and the addition of new and improved apparatus and equipment hinge heavily on the results of the zoning change requested. The Fire Company responded to slightly over 5,000 calls for service during 2019. The continued success of the Fire Company will in part be due to the great support received from the citizens we serve. The proposed zoning change will help us greatly in our ability to serve the citizens of Anne Arundel County. Therefor I am highly in favor of the proposed zoning change.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>(LUCA-94) Rezoning request from the Earleigh Heights Volunteer Fire Company to have their property rezoned from Residential to Commercial should be approved. Approving this request would be a win-win for the citizens of AACo as it would provide the means for providing fire apparatus and a new fire station and the commercial businesses would provide a source of both jobs and tax revenue.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>LUCA 95 - Creeping commercialization from Veteran’s Highway down Generals Highway employs the ‘consistency’ argument, yet ignores the adjacent historically rural parcels and the protected DNR natural environmental area, Severn Run and Sewell Spring Branch. With respect to 741 General’s Highway, it is on the border between Jabez Branch 3 in the northwest and Sewell Spring Branch in the southeast portion. Sewell Spring Branch is rated ‘high’ in preservation priority. Jabez Branch 3 is in the permitting process for restoration. Rezoning this property (parcel 403) for ‘compatibility’ with adjacent PLANNED land use north and west is the very definition of unsanctioned ‘commercial creep.’ WPRP and the County environmental officer must be consulted on this issue.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>OPPOSE: LUCA 172 and LUCA 95 Must keep these rural. Please use County open space money to preserve land in the County, especially in Crownsville. Please provide a Redevelopment Plan. Baltimore should be the regional town center for the area. Please work with Baltimore and surrounding counties to make a plan. I would not mind a portion of my tax dollar going to preserving land in the County and incentivizing growth in Baltimore city. Smart Growth does not apply to rural areas. The smart thing would be to grow in Baltimore where there is adequate infrastructure and affordable housing and promote green tourism and agritourism in the County. As we have seen, tax dollars from growth do not outpace cost of services (trash, sewer, schools, stormwater, roads).</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>November 12, 2020            To: County Planning Commission, Anne Arundel County, Maryland            Subject: Draft 2040 General Development Plan Comments</p> <p>The GHCCA writes to express two objections to the Planned Land Use Map and to outline general concerns regarding the implementation of the General Development Plan (GDP). Specifically, we object to the planned encroachment of the Annapolis Town Center Overlay into rural Crownsville and the Route 178 corridor and to the continued growth of commercial sprawl along Routes 3 and Veterans Highway where it meets 178.</p> <p>The Town Center boundary must stay between Route 2, Route 178/Riva Road, Route 665 and Bestgate Road. The 2040 GDP-adopted Regional Area Map (RAP 6) should govern and illustrate the clear public intent for Crownsville. As previously endorsed by the 2040 GDP Citizen Advisory Committee as well as over thirty years' worth of County Executives and Councils the effective boundary between rural Crownsville and the Annapolis Town Center should continue to be respected. While we support the expansion of the Annapolis Town Center to include the already heavily developed Annapolis Mall, we are concerned about the sprawl growth pressure on Generals Highway should the overlay extend across the Crownsville boundary line.</p> <p>We request that the County generate more detailed maps of the overlay, host a virtual comment meeting specifically for this overlay and provide staff representatives to walk the boundaries with GHCCA representatives. Additional impervious surfaces north of Bestgate Road will prove detrimental to Saltworks Creek, the Severn River and the \$1m Cabin Branch restoration site. The currently-proposed development map will allow the creeping destruction of the rural character of Route 178 by allowing for spot zoning applications based upon a "change of character." An example of this "change of character" domino effect is illustrated in LUCA 95 where 178 meets Veterans Highway. The recommendation to change this parcel to commercial use seemingly ignores adjacent historically-rural parcels as well as the protected Department of Natural Resources environmental area, Severn Run and Jabez Branch. Opening up this area to more commercial development will almost-certainly jeopardize the ongoing and complicated Jabez Branch restoration efforts. Consistent with the concerns of neighboring community associations, we also request that the 2009 GDP rural land use designation for the RLD portion of LUCA 172 be restored.</p> <p>Once gone, natural ecosystems and virgin forests do not come back. While the County acknowledges the attractiveness of smart growth and walkable communities, it must also reckon with the reality of expanded remote work opportunities and the pressures facing suburban communities. We are concerned that piecemeal town center overlay efforts may not be enough to halt unchecked development outside of overlay areas. GHCCA invites County leadership to preserve forested land with open space funding or other acquisition programs. Specifically, we commend to you the 130 acres of forest that the Scenic Rivers Land Trust is currently attempting to preserve in Crownsville. Environmental policies continue to lack adequate ecological considerations and metrics thus making conservation the only true gold standard in establishing long-term protection of our precious natural resources. We understand the County has many tough issues to tackle in this process. For all its multilayered complexity, the County's 2040 GDP will be merely a superficial rebranding of the 2009 GDP without the complete overhaul of current zoning nomenclature and development policies in order to realize the environmental vision of the plan. We acknowledge that difficult and perhaps unpopular land use zoning decisions will need to be made in order to protect our profound natural resources. While challenging in the short term, this will lead to a higher-valued and healthier community for all County citizens in the longer term. The GHCCA strongly encourages the County Planning Commission to equally value environmental resources by shifting emphasis onto the redevelopment of existing infrastructure; indeed, we encourage county leadership to collaborate on initiatives that incentivize growth and redevelopment in the Baltimore area where attention has been sorely lacking. We will be tracking and advocating for these efforts either through government funding or approval processes and will expect publication of a Redevelopment Plan in the near term.</p> <p>We remain hopeful that Anne Arundel County will continue to develop into a model of smart development and pledge to continue our advocacy for the preservation of the historic and environmental integrity of the Generals Highway Corridor.</p> <p>GHCCA Board of Directors Stephen Bradford, John Gregory, Janet Holbrook, Steven Kratzer, Billy Moulden, Joyce Rosencranz, Maureen Turman, Jasmine Wilding, Mark Zablotny cc: Steuart Pittman Steven Kaii-Ziegler Matthew Johnston Chris Trumbauer Cindy Carrier Andrew Pruski</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p> <p>The Development Policy Area Map will be updated to address concerns related to the Parole Town Center boundary.</p> <p>Web maps of the Development Policy Area Map will be made available on <a href="http://www.aacounty.org/plan2040">www.aacounty.org/plan2040</a></p> <p>Public meetings on draft Plan2040 will be held with the Planning Advisory Board and County Council.</p>

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p><a href="#">Please find attached comments from the Generals Highway Council of Civic Associations. We will also submit these via USPS.</a></p>	<p>Thank you for taking the time to review the Plan and provide feedback. Your comment has been recorded and will be considered as part of the preliminary draft Plan2040 review. Please note that the preliminary draft Plan2040 will be presented to the Planning Advisory Board where there will be a briefing and public hearing. That process is anticipated to occur in December and January (dates to be determined). The draft Plan2040 is anticipated to be introduced to the County Council in February 2021 with public hearings to begin in March 2021 (dates to be determined).</p>
<p>(LUCA-95, LUCA 172)The Severn River Association (SRA) supports the Generals Highway Council of Civic Associations and Millersville Community Association letters that address potential sprawl justified by ‘consistency’ with adjacent parcels, such as LUCA 95 and LUCA 172 as well as enlarged Annapolis Town Center ‘overlay’ map. The 2009 boundaries must be respected. These proposed changes conspire to be a real threat to the entire Severn River and Generals Highway corridor. They may justify creep from Rt3 and both up and down GH as individual parcels fall like dominoes. Jabez 3 and Jabez 4 are already impaired and Sewel Spring Branch is high priority for preservation.</p> <p>(LUCA-68) On the other side of the river, we support the Shipley’s Choice Homeowners Association letter that addresses retaining the open space along Benfield Boulevard. This area is the headwaters of Bear Branch which has suffered for years, starting with the development of Shipley’s Choice itself in the 1970s and suffering most recently from a release of environmentally hazardous fire prevention foam. The open space along Benfield Boulevard, may not look like much to some people, but it is critical to Bear Branch habitat. The communities along Bear Branch are very concerned and are often reporting or trying to correct environmental issues. We need to restrain development in these areas to keep impervious surfaces (buildings and parking lots) to a minimum. MDE is already telling us we have crossed the line with impervious surfaces and loss of forested land to recover the quality of our precious scenic river. We have got to stop erasing forests, especially contiguous greenways, and start removing impervious surfaces. Please find a way to make revitalization cheaper and more attractive to developers than destroying forests without skimping on upgrading stormwater management. Respectfully, Severn River Association</p> <p>Millersville Park The Millersville Park property should be used to create a multipurpose day-use community park, similar to the recent Recs/Parks Deale project. It should create minimal impervious surface, preserve the native Jabez and Indian Branch Creek streams, and not drain into Sewell Branch or the DNR NEA. It should not overload the historic rural Community with excessive traffic and not require night lighting.</p> <p>Redevelopment Plan The County must incentivize revitalization of abandoned commercial real estate. More importantly, how can it make revitalization cheaper and more attractive to developers than destroying forests? Redevelopment prevents more commercial sprawl and the need to install more infrastructure and impervious surfaces that negatively impact our roads and watersheds</p> <p>(OOHR-12) Severn School Rezoning Request SRA opposes the request to rezone Severn School open space property to commercial in this already over developed corridor.</p> <p>LUCA 172 LUCA172, which includes a parcel designated rural in the 2009 GDP, has no commercial development and is zoned RLD, was changed to commercial in violation of the county commitment to delay changing land use designations until the regional area plan process. Jabez 4 drains into this parcel. Restore it to RLD in Plan2040.</p> <p>Luca 95 Upzoning LUCA95 from RLD threatens the adjacent sensitive Severn streams and the DNR NEA. It IS currently consistent with the adjacent RLD zoning. Misapplying ‘consistency’ invites more commercial sprawl down General’s Hwy and degrades the streams.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>I was pleased to see that OOHR-10 and OOHR-15 are recommended to stay at low density residential. These properties are located very close to both the Saltworks Creek and Cabin Branch waterways in an area that needs protection, not additional development. I am also concerned about commercial development creep to the north of Bestgate Road in Annapolis. This area was designated to be outside of the Town Center area in prior developmental plans to act as a buffer between the Town Center area and the low-density residential/critical resource areas north of Bestgate Road. Additionally, Generals Highway is an historic byway and should remain a single lane in each direction. Generals Highway is not meant to be a "miracle mile" of shopping or an alternative transportation route when Route 97 is congested. Although it falls outside the scope of this develop plan, consideration must be given to the expansion of Route 97 to three lanes in each direction south of where it intersects with Routes 3/32.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>I want to commend the planners for not bowing to development interests when it came to a rezoning request for the forested plots known as OOHR-10 and OOHR-15. Please know that any upzoning to these two properties would face significant backlash from several established Annapolis communities including Woodlore, Epping Forest, Saltworks on the Severn and Monticello. We must preserve as much forested land, especially forest near creeks, streams and rivers such as these two properties. We can not let developers continue to clear cut properties such as this one with development proposals not consistent with environmental value. Thank you for rejecting their behind-the-scenes attempt to upzone these properties. If for any reason the property owners try to make another change to this area, expect significant, extended community opposition. Ideally, I believe the county should examine ways to preserve the forest on this property in perpetuity for the benefit of all Anne Arundel County residents. Thank you - AJ Metcalf, Woodlore resident.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>I am in support of the following statement with regard to OOHR-12 and the property known as 1185 Baltimore-Annapolis Blvd, Arnold, Maryland 21012. "The Parcel consists of 6.26 acres and is currently zoned R1. The LUCA requested a zoning designation of Industrial given its close proximity to existing industrial adjacent to the parcel, the long established nature of the business there, and the current site conditions. The requested Industrial Land Use classification will be compatible with the adjacent and surrounding industrial uses in the immediate vicinity. Those uses include heavy industrial uses such as auto repair, a trucking and freight shipping company, a HVAC business, a boat sales business and a large outdoor boat storage facility. The property at issue, The Severn Lower School Chesapeake campus, is located directly off on B&amp;A Blvd. near its intersection with Old County Road. B&amp;A is a minor arterial road with more than 7,000 trips per day. It is adjacent to a large W2, Light Industrial zone that extends to Ritchie Highway. Approximately 70% of the school's boundary is contiguous with the W2 zone. The school's shared boundary with the W2 zone on its northern property line extends approximately 280 feet. On the east the shared property line extends for 800 feet. The adjacent W2 uses include auto repair, a trucking and freight shipping company, a HVAC business, a boat sales business and a large outdoor boat storage facility. The character of the area is predominately industrial. The Severn Lower School property is currently zoned R1, Residential. It is located in the Managed Growth Area of the 2009 General Development Plan (GDP). The property is served by public water and is in the Future Service Area for public sewer on the Master Plan. Furthermore, the County Council's adoption of the Broadneck Small Area Plan included a specific recommendation to rezone the R1 portion of this industrial node to W2. This recommendation was then adopted by Council in the 2002 Comprehensive Rezoning. Placing an Industrial land use classification on the subject property would be consistent with this Broadneck Small Area Plan policy of recognizing the value of the community serving industrial uses. Unfortunately, the applicant missed the opportunity during the last comprehensive rezoning cycle to update the property in accordance with small area plan. An Industrial land use designation would allow the school's institutional improvements totaling 32,000 sq. ft. to be added to the existing industrial node and create economic opportunities to expand and upgrade the Industrial zone. A redevelopment of the site into low density residential is impossible given the site conditions and existing improvements. The property is clearly not conducive to residential development as it is adjacent to industrial uses that generate typical industrial impacts of noise, fumes and light that would be incompatible with residential dwelling units. It also abuts a heavily trafficked road making low density residential impractical. Furthermore, the County Council's adoption of the Broadneck Small Area Plan included a specific recommendation to rezone the R1 portion of this industrial node to W2. This recommendation was then adopted by Council in the 2002 Comprehensive Rezoning. Placing an Industrial land use classification on the subject property would be consistent with this Broadneck Small Area Plan policy of recognizing the value of the community serving industrial uses. There is no other Industrial zoning in the Ritchie Highway corridor from Rt. 50 in Arnold to East West Blvd. in northern Severna Park. Lastly, the County recommended a classification change in LUCA-42. A property in a similar area with a commercial use. Although not directly comparable, the issues resulting in the recommendation for LUCA-42 can be similarly applied here."</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>I write on behalf of myself and my neighbors to strongly oppose the application, OOHR-12, to change the land use designation of this property, 1185 Baltimore &amp; Annapolis Blvd, Arnold, to Industrial. This property is currently owned and operated by the Severn Lower School. I own a home and property directly adjacent to this property. My home and the four that adjoin this school sit on 1-2 acre parcels; we have retained a low-density, residential character in the area. The school property is approximately half open space/play fields, which fits the community character. Most concerning, we share a private road with the school and its ever-increasing commercial use of that road, through heavy trash removal trucks and other equipment, has severely damaged that road, making it virtually impassible for us. That road was built and paved by the residents before the school was built. Since the school was built, its ever increasing heavy use of the road has destroyed the pavement. The school has, so far, stalled with its promised repairs. We are concerned that changing the property designation to industrial will only caused increased heavy use of our road and further destruction of it. We have endeavored to be good (and patient) neighbors of the school, but we note that it has applied for this industrial designation without so much as notifying its neighbors with whom it shares this private road.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>Please see attached letter requesting that the draft PLUM be revised for 814 Bestgate Road, Lasting Tributes Funeral Care. If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact our office. Also see item #502</p>	<p>Email was provided a receipt.</p>
<p>(2895 Jessup Rd) Concerning Tax Map 13 parcel 153: the rear section of this parcel is indicated on the Land Use Plan as Residential Low Density. However, this part of the parcel is zoned W-1, which would require an Industrial designation on the Plan. A contiguous parcel- Parcel 158- is also zoned W-1 and it is shown as Industrial on the Plan (again, in the rear section). The rear part of Parcel 153 should be changed to Industrial on the Land Use Plan so that it coordinates with Zoning.</p>	<p>Certain areas of the County, such as the identified Village Center in Jessup, are recommended to retain the 2009 GDP Land Use until more community stakeholder input on land use can be received during the Region Plan process. The Planned Land Use Map that will be adopted with the Region Plan will supercede the Plan2040 Land Use Map and will set the foundation for future comprehensive rezoning. Note that comprehensive rezoning will occur with each of the Region Plans.</p>
<p>Please see the attached letter we received in the mail regarding some property we own at 6045-6049 Belle Grove Rd, Brooklyn. Can someone please contact me by phone regarding this letter? My contact info is below.</p>	<p>A response was provided via telephone.</p>
<p>Left voicemail expressing concern about his property being rezoned from C4 and not being able to participate due to a lack of technology.</p>	<p>A response was provided via telephone.</p>

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>I am one of the condo owners at Chatham Executive Park. You recently responded to our property manager, Bruce Dickie, regarding a letter that we received that our zoning would change to residential. You responded that it was in error and that the existing C3 zoning would continue. (See your response below).</p> <p>My question now is: Will the neighboring property at ) Future Phases/Tax Account 05-115-90042093 also continue at C3 zoning? They received the same letter that we received.</p> <p>If not, can you advise me as to how to proceed to resolve this? (The owner, Ventura Development Corp, is one of my clients).</p>	<p>Confirming that tax account #5-115-90042093 is proposed to have a Planned Land Use designation of Commercial. The most recent version of the Planned Land Use Map can be found here and clicking on the hyperlink for Planned Land Use Map. Please note that Planned Land Use is different from Zoning. The Planned Land Use Map is used to guide development patterns within the County based on the Development Policy Areas Map and the Vision and Goals set forth in Plan2040. This is achieved by designating areas with land use categories that represent development types (low density residential, rural, high-density residential, commercial, industrial, mixed-use, etc.). These land use designations are implemented through corresponding zoning districts. For example, the Commercial Planned Land Use designation corresponds to C1-C4, SB, and TC zoning categories. The Zoning Maps and Zoning Code are regulatory tools to manage development.</p>
<p>(LUCA-151) Comments Re: 454 Bay Front Road. We, members of the Deale Volunteer Fire Department, are presented with a unique opportunity. We will be permitted to change our location and open a new and modern fire house at 454 Bay Front Road. The owner is willing to do this, provided a portion of the property is upgraded with commercial zoning as requested. We fully support this. In support of this, we want to make clear the benefits to the community. We will be able to better serve the Deale and surrounding community by having a fire station located on a road with immediate access to the surrounding area. Our current location does not give us immediate access in as much as we must go through the traffic congested area of Deale prior to proceeding on our destination. Further, this added area would permit us to better serve the community through various social events we plan throughout the year, including:</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>Via phone call with Patrick: Caller owns 6054 Belle Grove Road (Parcel 586 of the SR2 recommendation). Recently bought the property as C4 and wants to keep the zoning for future resale value. Is depending on this property being his income and future retirement. Wants to be able to express opinion to PAB and Council, but doesn't have way to email or write letters easily.</p>	<p>A response was provided via telephone.</p>
<p>SR-22 I am the owner and operator of JB Machine Parts and supply. I originally purchased this property 20 years ago as commercial property and have been operating my business at this location, slowly watching all the properties around me change their unused commercial property to residential zoning. I would hope this was an oversight and ask that you please revisit SR-22 once again and determine to leave my property at C-4. I need this zoning to operate my shop at its current location. Non-conforming is not an option. Borrowing money and the property value will ultimately be crippling to my family and my employees families. Thanks, Mike Jacobs</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>(SR 22) My comments are in regards to 7966 Solley Rd Glen Burnie Md. 21060, tax # 300008969800, GDP map SR-22. I appose the recommendations that are currently being sought. I would truly ask that you keep my zoning unchanged.</p> <p>I purchased this property approximately 20 years ago as commercial and have been operating my My property 8151 Brock Bridge Rd. 41440138440 is proposed to change from Industrial to Mixed use. I need Communication from PZ , as I would like to move forward with plans for this property. If Steve Ziegler could return a call to 410-977-0479 would be most appreciated.</p>	<p>Thank you for taking the time to review the Plan and provide feedback. Your comment has been recorded and will be considered as part of the preliminary draft Plan2040 review. Please note that the preliminary A response was provided via telephone.</p>

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>Good Morning Mr. Hughes,                      I am not writing today on behalf of Woodwardville. But I hoped by using this email you would remember me and that our paths have crossed several times in the past few years.                      I am writing today with interest and concern about a property my husband and I own in the Centralia Area of AACo. 8216 Washington Street.                      We received notice from your office about changes proposed in the Plan2040 for that area of AACo. Could you better explain or point me in the right direction to get information on the exact impact of changing from Industrial to Mixed Use would bring ?</p>	<p>The recommended change you reference is in the draft planned land use map for Plan2040, the update to the County's General Development Plan. The Planned Land Use map guides how land is developed over the coming 20 years. In working with the Citizen Advisory Committee, the plan is drafted with a long-term goal to "Provide a high-quality mix of employment, residential, commercial and service uses near existing or funded transit stations," with a subsequent policy to "Encourage mixed-use development and redevelopment around transit stations, with links between transit-oriented areas and employment centers, community attractions and residential areas." To help implement this goal, properties in close proximity to the Savage rail station are proposed for a Planned Land Use designation of Mixed-Use. If ultimately adopted, this potential change in land use designation would not prevent your business from continuing to operate. Let me know if you have other questions. The Preliminary Draft of Plan2040 is available online for review and public comment at aacounty.</p>
<p>some things I agree with, but others I don't. SR 32 will create more problems with Lake Waterford goes to Magothy River. Agree with most Lucas presentations esp. Lucas 1, 7, 21, 80, 99, 118, 121.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>Phone call: Property at 5082 Mountain Road. Asking what the change is and what it means.</p>	<p>A response was provided via telephone.</p>

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>Thanks for reaching out to me. I have owned my home since 1989 in Whitehall Beach and love my community. As you are aware the issue is the proposed "R-2" to "Rural" zoning change. Can you give me an update on the status of my community and address my concerns below please?</p> <p>Timeline: I received a letter from the county Office of Planning and Zoning on September 9th indicating that the "Open House" will run through September 10th. By the end of that day my community was communicating heavily trying to understand why this was occurring to a long existing community and what the implications were for us as homeowners and as a community. I reached out to several personal friends since I am not an expert on how these decisions are made or regarding zoning practices. Some of the comments included: It seems very odd to do this to a long existing community, they are trying to stop growth in the area and preserve the environment, and it is yet to be determined what impact a decision like that could have on your community. By the 14th of September I received another email indicating that the communities affected by this kind of decision responded swiftly and decisively by 93% against a change to a "rural" designation. What I agree with: It is good for AACO to reduce or even stop subdivision growth in the area and we need to preserve the environment and protect the bay. Some of my questions and concerns include: How this was done. The speed and lack of inclusive dialogue and even communication and explanation as to the why and what of this zoning change was very unsettling, and troubling. Status changes. Apparently because we were platted before 1987, it may have less effect right now. However, in years to come, this could be used as a rationale to take away basic services particularly in times of tight budgets and/ or political challenges. How can we be assured we will be treated fairly? Service reduction. Would this change and/or discourage appropriate county investment in our neighborhood (e.g. water, septic, road maintenance, plowing, and other public services)? Compliance issues. If at some point the zoning change would be approved, in what ways would homeowners in our community be out of compliance due to a changed "rural" status and/or what restrictions would we experience which would be different than what we now have? How will that affect our ability to sell our homes? Loss of property value. As an example, some of our neighbors have assumed certain property values of their currently undeveloped lots when they did their retirement planning. What I wonder: Effective fact finding: Did the people who made this proposal do a site visit or did they simply do GPS mapping? Do they understand this community, its history, and its unique community feel? Community advocates: Who is responsible for assuring we are treated respectfully and appropriately? Most of us are busy with our work, families and lives and have limited time to pay attention to actions being taken on our properties. How can we assure we have advocates watching for decisions that will impact our community. Farms: Why were we targeted and while other communities on the peninsula were not? I wondered if it was because we have farms between us and Route 50. My understanding is that the half of the turf farm closest to us which changed owners in the last few years has an easement and is zoned as a perpetual Preservation Easement that limits the use to agricultural use with a residential dwelling, 3 tenant houses, 2 guest houses and farm related structures. I would hope that and believe that no future subdivision is permitted on that property. The other half of the turf farm and the Davidson farm are long established and have been environmentally sensitive landowners from my observation for the years I have lived here. Other properties: I have heard that there are a couple homes close to the turf farm on the back side of our neighborhood that are zoned rural. If that is correct is that what began this process? Traffic: I am sure you have heard from residents on the peninsula that there is tremendous traffic congestion at times. I do not believe this proposal is the resolution to that issue. I have lived here since 1989 and have changed my work patterns for years based on this congestion. I have negotiated with employers and clients to allow me to work from home on Fridays due to the Bay Bridge traffic and avoid going out on Rt. 50 from 3-7pm particularly on Fridays in the summer. this zoning proposal would not solve that problem. After attending what I thought would be a discussion on the Bay Bridge transit study at AACO, I realized that it was not a discussion but a public relations effort to convince people of what appeared to be a "conclusion". After some simple questions like "do you plan to expand the Severn River Bridge if you expand the Bay Bridge" and "what is the logic to enlarge the volume of traffic across the bay at the present location as opposed to spacing it out at another place on the bay", it seemed very clear to me that sound thinking was not being done. They gave the environmental issue as the criteria, but it did not take much research to determine that was not the full case. Mark, could you please give me an update on the status of the proposal, its potential effects on my community and respond to my questions. I look forward to your input.</p>	<p>Please note that the preliminary draft of Plan2040 retains Low Density Planned Land Use for the Burley and Whitehall Beach communities based on the property owners' feedback. See the Preliminary Draft Planned Land Use Map currently available for public review at <a href="http://aacounty.org/Plan2040">aacounty.org/Plan2040</a>. Please note that the Online Open House was the first opportunity for the public to review and comment on the draft Planned Land Use Map; however, that map was informed by numerous public forums the County has hosted during the past three years. The public comment period for the preliminary draft of Plan2040 is open until November 15th. The Office of Planning and Zoning will consider the public comments before it is presented to the Planning Advisory Board where there will be a briefing and public hearing. That process is anticipated to occur in December and January (dates to be determined). The draft Plan2040 is anticipated to be introduced to the County Council in February 2021 with public hearings to begin in March 2021 (dates to be determined).</p>

Comments	County Response
<p><a href="#">Letter sent</a></p>	<p>The proposed land use change from Low-Medium Density Residential to Low Density Residential will not have an affect on your ability to build a new home or replace an existing structure. If a future change in zoning to a Low Density Residential zoning category (ex. R1 or R2) were to occur, it would have little effect on existing lot because the neighborhood was platted prior to 1987, so they would be considered 'grandfathered.' (see County Code 18-4-401(2) &lt;<a href="https://codelibrary.amlegal.com/codes/annearundel/latest/annearundelco_md/0-0-0-20100">https://codelibrary.amlegal.com/codes/annearundel/latest/annearundelco_md/0-0-0-20100</a>&gt;).</p> <p>The proposed change is related to a Countywide process to update the General Development Plan (called Plan2040). A key element of the General Development Plan (GDP) is the Planned Land Use Map. Planned Land use is how the County and its residents envision the future use of the land to be in the next twenty years. The Office of Planning and Zoning is currently in the process of making draft recommendations and receiving public input on Planned Land Use as part of the update to the General Development Plan.</p>
<p>(SR-60) I represent the sellers of 4105 Cadle Creek Rd. Edgewater, MD 21037 and they have the home for sale and received a letter from this office letting them know that the county is rezoning their land. They do not wish to have this happen and are located between two businesses. They are selling this home with the option for someone to open a marina here if the buyer wishes to. What do they have to do to keep their commercial zoning? Thank you for your time.</p>	<p>Thank you. Your comment has been recorded and will be considered as part of the preliminary draft Plan2040 review. The letter you received was to inform you of a proposed land use change and to solicit your input. This is not a zoning change. It is not the final decision which will be made by the County Council. The proposed land use change applies to the portion of the property that had a Planned Land Use designation of "Industrial". The change is to be consistent with the remaining portion of the property and the primary character of this neighborhood which is "Low Density Residential". It also reflects the existing primary residential use of the property. Please note that the Planned Land Use Map illustrates general land use categories (e.g. commercial, low density residential, etc.) to describe the different types of land uses and to identify, on a broad scale, where those uses are most appropriate. The Planned Land Use map guides how land is developed over the coming 20 years, and though it is different from zoning, it does serve as a precursor to future rezoning through the comprehensive rezoning process. The proposed change in Planned Land Use is to better align the existing use of the property to its future anticipated use as well as the property's compatibility with the surrounding land use.</p>

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>My wife and I are in receipt of a letter from Anne Arundel County Office of Planning and Zoning dated 8/26/2020 (Ref. 1511). This letter indicates that our land is potentially going to be rezoned from it's current Maritime (MA2) to Low Density Residential as part of your Plan2040. We oppose this rezoning plan of our property. As one of the owners of MA2 zoned property identified in SR-63, we should have been directly consulted about our desires and possible future plans as your Plan2040 was being developed. This property has a long history of maritime usage and could possibly be utilized in that capacity again in the future. The MA2 zoning adds both real and potential value to our property. It was a factor in our purchase of the property. While current usage is residential, our options in the future should not be restricted. The rezoning of our MA2 property has the potential to cause us financial harm and we oppose this unilateral decision by Anne Arundel County. Please advise what our options are to stop this action.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. The letter you received was to inform you of a proposed land use change and to solicit your input. It is not the final decision which will be made by the County Council. The proposed land use change from "Maritime" to "Low Density Residential" is to reflect the primary residential use of the property. Please note that the Planned Land Use Map illustrates general land use categories (e.g. commercial, low density residential, etc.) to describe the different types of land uses and to identify, on a broad scale, where those uses are most appropriate. The Planned Land Use map guides how land is developed over the coming 20 years, and though it is different from zoning, it does serve as a precursor to future rezoning through the comprehensive rezoning process. The proposed change in Planned Land Use is to better align the existing use of the property to its future anticipated use as well as the property's compatibility with the surrounding land use.</p>
<p>GENERAL COMMENTS ON PLAN2040</p>	

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>Growth Area. The Mayo Peninsula has been identified as a Growth Area and OPZ considers Mayo a Tier 1 Growth area. Under MD State criteria, Growth areas have the water resources and infrastructure to accommodate population and business expansion in an orderly, efficient, and environmentally sustainable manner. The Mayo Peninsula meets none of these criteria, so OPZ should redesignate Mayo as Growth Tier 3 or to a Growth Tier more inline with the resources, infrastructure, and character of the Mayo Peninsula. Consistency between goals and policies and the land map used for future planning is critical.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. See Summary of Public Comments document for response to these issues.</p>
<p>Conservation. All Mayo Peninsula Parks including the Mayo Beach Park, Carrs Wharf Pier, the Mayo Wastewater Reclamation Facility Park at River Club, and Glebe Heights Community System Park should be designated for Conservation. The St. Mark's UM Church and Cemetery, Hope Chapel Cemetery, the Rosenwald School site, the Gresham property, and the Oyster middens at Beverly Triton Nature Park should be designated as historic resources. These changes are consistent with the county's 2017 Land Preservation Parks and Recreation Plan, which commits the county to adhere to the National Recreation &amp; Parks Association goal of Conservation.</p>	
<p>Growth capacity. Plan2040 projects growth of 50,000 citizens or 29,000 housing units by 2040, but OPZ has stated that holding capacity with current zoning is only 13,488 units. It appears that dramatic rezoning in targeted growth areas will need to occur, but no effort has been made to assess practical holding capacity in these areas. Targeting of town centers for future growth should not be done without coordination with town center planning. Should not future growth be targeted to areas with adequate facilities and infrastructure to accommodate that growth? Lack of growth limits. Plan2040 relies on the Smart Growth concept to specify that new development should occur at town centers, transportation centers and designated redevelopment areas, but it is totally mute on how much or what kind of development should occur. Citizens in many areas feel that there has been too much development that has happened too quickly. However, there is nothing in the plan about determining growth limits, description of avenues for community involvement in growth rate decisions or identification of tools for community control of rate of growth for various types of development.</p>	
<p>Development of Peninsulas. The language of Plan2040 mentions the challenges of development on peninsulas and the opportunities to limit development on peninsulas, protect shorelines, streams and forested areas, and manage the challenges of limited road access on peninsulas. We strongly support limiting development on the Mayo Peninsula. Development limited to infill and redevelopment compatible with the existing character of the neighborhoods with no net increase in density is supported by the land use map. The language of Plan2040 should be specific that these are goals and polices for development on peninsulas.</p>	
<p>Regional growth management. The County Executive has recently suggested that excess market demand for growth be redirected toward Baltimore, since the city would like more growth and Anne Arundel County is expected to have an excess. If this is a viable alternative, it should be covered with appropriate policies in Plan2040.</p>	
<p>Regional Planning. Since the Plan2040 document is presented as guidance rather than regulation, the Regional Planning process will have to consider and propose regulation of local zoning, type and rate of development, environmental preservation, school capacity, and traffic. A thorough description of the Regional Planning process, plan content, and implementation mechanisms, however, is not provided. Consequently, it remains difficult to evaluate the utility of Plan2040.</p>	
<p>Interim rezoning. The proposed Regional Planning schedule suggests that plans for nine regions will not all be completed before 2025, and the stage seems to be set for a parade of piecemeal rezoning bills to be presented to the County Council over the next several years. Since the land use map will have been approved much earlier and zoning must be consistent with it, the land use map will effectively become the new zoning map in the interim.</p>	
<p>Regional Planning Committee composition. Composition of the Regional Planning Committees will be particularly important in determining the content of the Regional Plans. The proposed committee structure is over weighted with developers, brokers, and others representing commercial interests. The county population is made of 10 times more employees than businesses, suggesting the business community is a small fraction of total residents. Commercial interests should be restricted to no more than 2 representatives on a Regional Planning Committees.</p>	
<p>It is vitally important the residents of Mayo, Edgewater, Galesville, Shadyside and Deale be adequately represented in the planning processes that will impact their future communities and quality of life.</p>	

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>Growth Area. The Mayo Peninsula has been identified as a Growth Area and OPZ considers Mayo a Tier 1 Growth area. Under MD State criteria, Growth areas have the water resources and infrastructure to accommodate population and business expansion in an orderly, efficient, and environmentally sustainable manner. The Mayo Peninsula meets none of these criteria, so OPZ should redesignate Mayo as Growth Tier 3 or to a Growth Tier more in line with the resources, infrastructure, and character of the Mayo Peninsula. Consistency between goals and policies and the land map used for future planning is critical.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. See Summary of Public Comments document for response to these issues.</p>
<p>Conservation. All Mayo Peninsula Parks including the Mayo Beach Park, Carrs Wharf Pier, the Mayo Wastewater Reclamation Facility Park at River Club, and Glebe Heights Community System Park should be designated for Conservation. The St. Mark's UM Church and Cemetery, Hope Chapel Cemetery, the Rosenwald School site, the Gresham property, and the Oyster middens at Beverly Triton Nature Park should be designated as historic resources. These changes are consistent with the county's 2017 Land Preservation Parks and Recreation Plan, which commits the county to adhere to the National Recreation &amp; Parks Association goal of Conservation.</p>	
<p>Growth capacity. Plan2040 projects growth of 50,000 citizens or 29,000 housing units by 2040, but OPZ has stated that holding capacity with current zoning is only 13,488 units. It appears that dramatic rezoning in targeted growth areas will need to occur, but no effort has been made to assess practical holding capacity in these areas. Targeting of town centers for future growth should not be done without coordination with town center planning. Should not future growth be targeted to areas with adequate facilities and infrastructure to accommodate that growth?</p>	
<p>Lack of growth limits. Plan2040 relies on the Smart Growth concept to specify that new development should occur at town centers, transportation centers and designated redevelopment areas, but it is totally mute on how much or what kind of development should occur. Citizens in many areas feel that there has been too much development that has happened too quickly. However, there is nothing in the plan about determining growth limits, description of avenues for community involvement in growth rate decisions or identification of tools for community control of rate of growth for various types of development.</p>	
<p>Development of Peninsulas. The language of Plan2040 mentions the challenges of development on peninsulas and the opportunities to limit development on peninsulas, protect shorelines, streams and forested areas, and manage the challenges of limited road access on peninsulas. We strongly support limiting development on the Mayo Peninsula. Development limited to infill and redevelopment compatible with the existing character of the neighborhoods with no net increase in density is supported by the land use map. The language of Plan2040 should be specific that these are goals and policies for development on peninsulas.</p>	
<p>Regional growth management. The County Executive has recently suggested that excess market demand for growth be redirected toward Baltimore, since the city would like more growth and Anne Arundel County is expected to have an excess. If this is a viable alternative, it should be covered with appropriate policies in Plan2040.</p>	
<p>Regional Planning. Since the Plan2040 document is presented as guidance rather than regulation, the Regional Planning process will have to consider and propose regulation of local zoning, type and rate of development, environmental preservation, school capacity, and traffic. A thorough description of the Regional Planning process, plan content, and implementation mechanisms, however, is not provided. Consequently, it remains difficult to evaluate the utility of Plan2040.</p>	
<p>Interim rezoning. The proposed Regional Planning schedule suggests that plans for nine regions will not all be completed before 2025, and the stage seems to be set for a parade of piecemeal rezoning bills to be presented to the County Council over the next several years. Since the land use map will have been approved much earlier and zoning must be consistent with it, the land use map will effectively become the new zoning map in the interim.</p>	
<p>Regional Planning Committee composition. Composition of the Regional Planning Committees will be particularly important in determining the content of the Regional Plans. The proposed committee structure is over weighted with developers, brokers, and others representing commercial interests. The county population is made of 10 times more employees than businesses, suggesting the business community is a small fraction of total residents. Commercial interests should be restricted to no more than 2 representatives on a Regional Planning Committees. It is vitally important the residents of Mayo, Edgewater, Galesville, Shadyside and Deale be adequately represented in the planning processes that will impact their future communities and quality of life.</p>	

Comments	County Response
<p>Growth Area. The Mayo Peninsula has been identified as a Growth Area and OPZ considers Mayo a Tier 1 Growth area. Under MD State criteria, Growth areas have the water resources and infrastructure to accommodate population and business expansion in an orderly, efficient, and environmentally sustainable manner. The Mayo Peninsula meets none of these criteria, so OPZ should redesignate Mayo as Growth Tier 3 or to a Growth Tier more in line with the resources, infrastructure, and character of the Mayo Peninsula. Consistency between goals and policies and the land map used for future planning is critical. Conservation. All Mayo Peninsula Parks including the Mayo Beach Park, Carrs Wharf Pier, the Mayo Wastewater Reclamation Facility Park at River Club, and Glebe Heights Community System Park should be designated for Conservation. The St. Mark’s UM Church and Cemetery, Hope Chapel Cemetery, the Rosenwald School site, the Gresham property, and the Oyster middens at Beverly Triton Nature Park should be designated as historic resources. These changes are consistent with the county’s 2017 Land Preservation Parks and Recreation Plan, which commits the county to adhere to the National Recreation &amp; Parks Association goal of Conservation. Growth capacity. Plan2040 projects growth of 50,000 citizens or 29,000 housing units by 2040, but OPZ has stated that holding capacity with current zoning is only 13,488 units. It appears that dramatic rezoning in targeted growth areas will need to occur, but no effort has been made to assess practical holding capacity in these areas. Targeting of town centers for future growth should not be done without coordination with town center planning. Should not future growth be targeted to areas with adequate facilities and infrastructure to accommodate that growth? Lack of growth limits. Plan2040 relies on the Smart Growth concept to specify that new development should occur at town centers, transportation centers and designated redevelopment areas, but it is totally mute on how much or what kind of development should occur. Citizens in many areas feel that there has been too much development that has happened too quickly. However, there is nothing in the plan about determining growth limits, description of avenues for community involvement in growth rate decisions or identification of tools for community control of rate of growth for various types of development. Development of Peninsulas. The language of Plan2040 mentions the challenges of development on peninsulas and the opportunities to limit development on peninsulas, protect shorelines, streams and forested areas, and manage the challenges of limited road access on peninsulas. We strongly support limiting development on the Mayo Peninsula. Development limited to infill and redevelopment compatible with the existing character of the neighborhoods with no net increase in density is supported by the land use map. The language of Plan2040 should be specific that these are goals and polices for development on peninsulas. Regional growth management. The County Executive has recently suggested that excess market demand for growth be redirected toward Baltimore, since the city would like more growth and Anne Arundel County is expected to have an excess. If this is a viable alternative, it should be covered with appropriate policies in Plan2040.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. See Summary of Public Comments document for response to these issues.</p>

Comments	County Response
<p>The Mayo peninsula is already struggling with increased housing growth and added attention to the county parks at the end of the peninsula. As we are a one way in and one way out community, Mayo is already at risk when there are medical emergencies on the peninsula. It is often difficult for the medical and fire personnel to get onto the peninsula and where they need to be ... and then get off the peninsula- in an expeditious manner. We cannot manage safely with another 50,000 people on the peninsula. You are endangering the lives of the residents who already live here - as well as the medical and fire crews that commit to caring for us. Please do not over stress out peninsula and it's people solely for greed. Protect the historical, wildlife, and natural areas for our families and future generations. More broadly, we would like for you to consider the following: Growth Area. The Mayo Peninsula has been identified as a Growth Area and OPZ considers Mayo a Tier 1 Growth area. Under MD State criteria, Growth areas have the water resources and infrastructure to accommodate population and business expansion in an orderly, efficient, and environmentally sustainable manner. The Mayo Peninsula meets none of these criteria, so OPZ should redesignate Mayo as Growth Tier 3 or to a Growth Tier more in line with the resources, infrastructure, and character of the Mayo Peninsula. Consistency between goals and policies and the land map used for future planning is critical. Conservation. All Mayo Peninsula Parks including the Mayo Beach Park, Carrs Wharf Pier, the Mayo Wastewater Reclamation Facility Park at River Club, and Glebe Heights Community System Park should be designated for Conservation. The St. Mark's UM Church and Cemetery, Hope Chapel Cemetery, the Rosenwald School site, the Gresham property, and the Oyster middens at Beverly Triton Nature Park should be designated as historic resources. These changes are consistent with the county's 2017 Land Preservation Parks and Recreation Plan, which commits the county to adhere to the National Recreation &amp; Parks Association goal of Conservation. Growth capacity. Plan2040 projects growth of 50,000 citizens or 29,000 housing units by 2040, but OPZ has stated that holding capacity with current zoning is only 13,488 units. It appears that dramatic rezoning in targeted growth areas will need to occur, but no effort has been made to assess practical holding capacity in these areas. Targeting of town centers for future growth should not be done without coordination with town center planning. Should not future growth be targeted to areas with adequate facilities and infrastructure to accommodate that growth? Lack of growth limits. Plan2040 relies on the Smart Growth concept to specify that new development should occur at town centers, transportation centers and designated redevelopment areas, but it is totally mute on how much or what kind of development should occur. Citizens in many areas feel that there has been too much development that has happened too quickly. However, there is nothing in the plan about determining growth limits, description of avenues for community involvement in growth rate decisions or identification of tools for community control of rate of growth for various types of development. Development of Peninsulas. The language of Plan2040 mentions the challenges of development on peninsulas and the opportunities to limit development on peninsulas, protect shorelines, streams and forested areas, and manage the challenges of limited road access on peninsulas. We strongly support limiting development on the Mayo Peninsula. Development limited to infill and redevelopment compatible with the existing character of the neighborhoods with no net increase in density is supported by the land use map. The language of Plan2040 should be specific that these are goals and polices for development on peninsulas. Regional growth management. The County Executive has recently suggested that excess market demand for growth be redirected toward Baltimore, since the city would like more growth and Anne Arundel County is expected to have an excess. If this is a viable alternative, it should be covered with appropriate policies in Plan2040. Regional Planning. Since the Plan2040 document is presented as guidance rather than regulation, the Regional Planning process will have to consider and propose regulation of local zoning, type and rate of development, environmental preservation, school capacity, and traffic. A thorough description of the Regional Planning process, plan content, and implementation mechanisms, however, is not provided. Consequently, it remains difficult to evaluate the utility of Plan2040. Interim rezoning. The proposed Regional Planning schedule suggests that plans for nine regions will not all be completed before 2025, and the stage seems to be set for a parade of piecemeal rezoning bills to be presented to the County Council over the next several years. Since the land use map will have been approved much earlier and zoning must be consistent with it, the land use map will effectively become the new zoning map in the interim. Regional Planning Committee composition. Composition of the Regional Planning Committees will be particularly important in determining the content of the Regional Plans. The proposed committee structure is over weighted with developers, brokers, and others representing commercial interests. The county population is made of 10 times more employees than businesses, suggesting the business community is a small fraction of total residents. Commercial interests should be restricted to no more than 2 representatives on a Regional Planning Committees. It is vitally important the residents of Mayo, Edgewater, Galesville, Shadyside and Deale be adequately represented in the planning processes that will impact their future communities and quality of life.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. See Summary of Public Comments document for response to these issues.</p>

Comments	County Response
<p>Growth Area. The Mayo Peninsula has been identified as a Growth Area and OPZ considers Mayo a Tier 1 Growth area. Under MD State criteria, Growth areas have the water resources and infrastructure to accommodate population and business expansion in an orderly, efficient, and environmentally sustainable manner. The Mayo Peninsula meets none of these criteria, so OPZ should redesignate Mayo as Growth Tier 3 or to a Growth Tier more in line with the resources, infrastructure, and character of the Mayo Peninsula. Consistency between goals and policies and the land map used for future planning is critical. Conservation. All Mayo Peninsula Parks including the Mayo Beach Park, Carrs Wharf Pier, the Mayo Wastewater Reclamation Facility Park at River Club, and Glebe Heights Community System Park should be designated for Conservation. The St. Mark’s UM Church and Cemetery, Hope Chapel Cemetery, the Rosenwald School site, the Gresham property, and the Oyster middens at Beverly Triton Nature Park should be designated as historic resources. These changes are consistent with the county’s 2017 Land Preservation Parks and Recreation Plan, which commits the county to adhere to the National Recreation &amp; Parks Association goal of Conservation. Growth capacity. Plan2040 projects growth of 50,000 citizens or 29,000 housing units by 2040, but OPZ has stated that holding capacity with current zoning is only 13,488 units. It appears that dramatic rezoning in targeted growth areas will need to occur, but no effort has been made to assess practical holding capacity in these areas. Targeting of town centers for future growth should not be done without coordination with town center planning. Should not future growth be targeted to areas with adequate facilities and infrastructure to accommodate that growth? Lack of growth limits. Plan2040 relies on the Smart Growth concept to specify that new development should occur at town centers, transportation centers and designated redevelopment areas, but it is totally mute on how much or what kind of development should occur. Citizens in many areas feel that there has been too much development that has happened too quickly. However, there is nothing in the plan about determining growth limits, description of avenues for community involvement in growth rate decisions or identification of tools for community control of rate of growth for various types of development. Development of Peninsulas. The language of Plan2040 mentions the challenges of development on peninsulas and the opportunities to limit development on peninsulas, protect shorelines, streams and forested areas, and manage the challenges of limited road access on peninsulas. We strongly support limiting development on the Mayo Peninsula. Development limited to infill and redevelopment compatible with the existing character of the neighborhoods with no net increase in density is supported by the land use map. The language of Plan2040 should be specific that these are goals and polices for development on peninsulas. Regional growth management. The County Executive has recently suggested that excess market demand for growth be redirected toward Baltimore, since the city would like more growth and Anne Arundel County is expected to have an excess. If this is a viable alternative, it should be covered with appropriate policies in Plan2040. Regional Planning. Since the Plan2040 document is presented as guidance rather than regulation, the Regional Planning process will have to consider and propose regulation of local zoning, type and rate of development, environmental preservation, school capacity, and traffic. A thorough description of the Regional Planning process, plan content, and implementation mechanisms, however, is not provided. Consequently, it remains difficult to evaluate the utility of Plan2040. Interim rezoning. The proposed Regional Planning schedule suggests that plans for nine regions will not all be completed before 2025, and the stage seems to be set for a parade of piecemeal rezoning bills to be presented to the County Council over the next several years. Since the land use map will have been approved much earlier and zoning must be consistent with it, the land use map will effectively become the new zoning map in the interim. Regional Planning Committee composition. Composition of the Regional Planning Committees will be particularly important in determining the content of the Regional Plans. The proposed committee structure is over weighted with developers, brokers, and others representing commercial interests. The county population is made of 10 times more employees than businesses, suggesting the business community is a small fraction of total residents. Commercial interests should be restricted to no more than 2 representatives on a Regional Planning Committees. It is vitally important the residents of Mayo, Edgewater, Galesville, Shadyside and Deale be adequately represented in the planning processes that will impact their future communities and quality of life.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. See Summary of Public Comments document for response to these issues.</p>

Comments	County Response
<p>Growth Area. The Mayo Peninsula has been identified as a Growth Area and OPZ considers Mayo a Tier 1 Growth area. Under MD State criteria, Growth areas have the water resources and infrastructure to accommodate population and business expansion in an orderly, efficient, and environmentally sustainable manner. The Mayo Peninsula meets none of these criteria, so OPZ should redesignate Mayo as Growth Tier 3 or to a Growth Tier more in line with the resources, infrastructure, and character of the Mayo Peninsula. Consistency between goals and policies and the land map used for future planning is critical. Conservation. All Mayo Peninsula Parks including the Mayo Beach Park, Carrs Wharf Pier, the Mayo Wastewater Reclamation Facility Park at River Club, and Glebe Heights Community System Park should be designated for Conservation. The St. Mark's UM Church and Cemetery, Hope Chapel Cemetery, the Rosenwald School site, the Gresham property, and the Oyster middens at Beverly Triton Nature Park should be designated as historic resources. These changes are consistent with the county's 2017 Land Preservation Parks and Recreation Plan, which commits the county to adhere to the National Recreation &amp; Parks Association goal of Conservation. Growth capacity. Plan2040 projects growth of 50,000 citizens or 29,000 housing units by 2040, but OPZ has stated that holding capacity with current zoning is only 13,488 units. It appears that dramatic rezoning in targeted growth areas will need to occur, but no effort has been made to assess practical holding capacity in these areas. Targeting of town centers for future growth should not be done without coordination with town center planning. Should not future growth be targeted to areas with adequate facilities and infrastructure to accommodate that growth? Lack of growth limits. Plan2040 relies on the Smart Growth concept to specify that new development should occur at town centers, transportation centers and designated redevelopment areas, but it is totally mute on how much or what kind of development should occur. Citizens in many areas feel that there has been too much development that has happened too quickly. However, there is nothing in the plan about determining growth limits, description of avenues for community involvement in growth rate decisions or identification of tools for community control of rate of growth for various types of development. Development of Peninsulas. The language of Plan2040 mentions the challenges of development on peninsulas and the opportunities to limit development on peninsulas, protect shorelines, streams and forested areas, and manage the challenges of limited road access on peninsulas. We strongly support limiting development on the Mayo Peninsula. Development limited to infill and redevelopment compatible with the existing character of the neighborhoods with no net increase in density is supported by the land use map. The language of Plan2040 should be specific that these are goals and polices for development on peninsulas. Regional growth management. The County Executive has recently suggested that excess market demand for growth be redirected toward Baltimore, since the city would like more growth and Anne Arundel County is expected to have an excess. If this is a viable alternative, it should be covered with appropriate policies in Plan2040. Regional Planning. Since the Plan2040 document is presented as guidance rather than regulation, the Regional Planning process will have to consider and propose regulation of local zoning, type and rate of development, environmental preservation, school capacity, and traffic. A thorough description of the Regional Planning process, plan content, and implementation mechanisms, however, is not provided. Consequently, it remains difficult to evaluate the utility of Plan2040. Interim rezoning. The proposed Regional Planning schedule suggests that plans for nine regions will not all be completed before 2025, and the stage seems to be set for a parade of piecemeal rezoning bills to be presented to the County Council over the next several years. Since the land use map will have been approved much earlier and zoning must be consistent with it, the land use map will effectively become the new zoning map in the interim. Regional Planning Committee composition. Composition of the Regional Planning Committees will be particularly important in determining the content of the Regional Plans. The proposed committee structure is over weighted with developers, brokers, and others representing commercial interests. The county population is made of 10 times more employees than businesses, suggesting the business community is a small fraction of total residents. Commercial interests should be restricted to no more than 2 representatives on a Regional Planning Committees. It is vitally important the residents of Mayo, Edgewater, Galesville, Shadyside and Deale be adequately represented in the planning processes that will impact their future communities and quality of life.</p>	<p>The comment references Growth Tiers that are based on the Sustainable Growth and Agriculture Preservation Act of 2012. The law restricts residential subdivisions through the use of a system of growth tiers. The law limits the number of lots that can be developed on individual septic systems in certain areas. Tiers must be mapped based on criteria outlined in the law and will determine the type of sewage disposal system allowed in a given area. Tier I is defined in the law as areas currently served by sewer systems. Since the Mayo Peninsula is served by the Mayo-Glebe Heights sewer service area, it is classified as Tier I. Please see the Summary of Public Comments document for more detailed response.</p>

Comments	County Response
<p>Growth Area. The Mayo Peninsula has been identified as a Growth Area and OPZ considers Mayo a Tier 1 Growth area. Under MD State criteria, Growth areas have the water resources and infrastructure to accommodate population and business expansion in an orderly, efficient, and environmentally sustainable manner. The Mayo Peninsula meets none of these criteria, so OPZ should redesignate Mayo as Growth Tier 3 or to a Growth Tier more inline with the resources, infrastructure, and character of the Mayo Peninsula. Consistency between goals and policies and the land map used for future planning is critical. Conservation. All Mayo Peninsula Parks including the Mayo Beach Park, Carrs Wharf Pier, the Mayo Wastewater Reclamation Facility Park at River Club, and Glebe Heights Community System Park should be designated for Conservation. The St. Mark’s UM Church and Cemetery, Hope Chapel Cemetery, the Rosenwald School site, the Gresham property, and the Oyster middens at Beverly Triton Nature Park should be designated as historic resources. These changes are consistent with the county’s 2017 Land Preservation Parks and Recreation Plan, which commits the county to adhere to the National Recreation &amp; Parks Association goal of Conservation. Growth capacity. Plan2040 projects growth of 50,000 citizens or 29,000 housing units by 2040, but OPZ has stated that holding capacity with current zoning is only 13,488 units. It appears that dramatic rezoning in targeted growth areas will need to occur, but no effort has been made to assess practical holding capacity in these areas. Targeting of town centers for future growth should not be done without coordination with town center planning. Should not future growth be targeted to areas with adequate facilities and infrastructure to accommodate that growth? Lack of growth limits. Plan2040 relies on the Smart Growth concept to specify that new development should occur at town centers, transportation centers and designated redevelopment areas, but it is totally mute on how much or what kind of development should occur. Citizens in many areas feel that there has been too much development that has happened too quickly. However, there is nothing in the plan about determining growth limits, description of avenues for community involvement in growth rate decisions or identification of tools for community control of rate of growth for various types of development. Development of Peninsulas. The language of Plan2040 mentions the challenges of development on peninsulas and the opportunities to limit development on peninsulas, protect shorelines, streams and forested areas, and manage the challenges of limited road access on peninsulas. We strongly support limiting development on the Mayo Peninsula. Development limited to infill and redevelopment compatible with the existing character of the neighborhoods with no net increase in density is supported by the land use map. The language of Plan2040 should be specific that these are goals and polices for development on peninsulas. Regional growth management. The County Executive has recently suggested that excess market demand for growth be redirected toward Baltimore, since the city would like more growth and Anne Arundel County is expected to have an excess. If this is a viable alternative, it should be covered with appropriate policies in Plan2040. Regional Planning. Since the Plan2040 document is presented as guidance rather than regulation, the Regional Planning process will have to consider and propose regulation of local zoning, type and rate of development, environmental preservation, school capacity, and traffic. A thorough description of the Regional Planning process, plan content, and implementation mechanisms, however, is not provided. Consequently, it remains difficult to evaluate the utility of Plan2040. Interim rezoning. The proposed Regional Planning schedule suggests that plans for nine regions will not all be completed before 2025, and the stage seems to be set for a parade of piecemeal rezoning bills to be presented to the County Council over the next several years. Since the land use map will have been approved much earlier and zoning must be consistent with it, the land use map will effectively become the new zoning map in the interim. Regional Planning Committee composition. Composition of the Regional Planning Committees will be particularly important in determining the content of the Regional Plans. The proposed committee structure is over weighted with developers, brokers, and others representing commercial interests. The county population is made of 10 times more employees than businesses, suggesting the business community is a small fraction of total residents. Commercial interests should be restricted to no more than 2 representatives on a Regional Planning Committees. It is vitally important the residents of Mayo, Edgewater, Galesville, Shadyside and Deale be adequately represented in the planning processes that will impact their future communities and quality of life.</p>	<p>The comment references Growth Tiers that are based on the Sustainable Growth and Agriculture Preservation Act of 2012. The law restricts residential subdivisions through the use of a system of growth tiers. The law limits the number of lots that can be developed on individual septic systems in certain areas. Tiers must be mapped based on criteria outlined in the law and will determine the type of sewage disposal system allowed in a given area. Tier I is defined in the law as areas currently served by sewer systems. Since the Mayo Peninsula is served by the Mayo-Glebe Heights sewer service area, it is classified as Tier I. Please see the Summary of Public Comments document for more detailed response.</p>

Comments	County Response
<p>Growth Area. The Mayo Peninsula has been identified as a Growth Area and OPZ considers Mayo a Tier 1 Growth area. Under MD State criteria, Growth areas have the water resources and infrastructure to accommodate population and business expansion in an orderly, efficient, and environmentally sustainable manner. The Mayo Peninsula meets none of these criteria, so OPZ should redesignate Mayo as Growth Tier 3 or to a Growth Tier more inline with the resources, infrastructure, and character of the Mayo Peninsula. Consistency between goals and policies and the land map used for future planning is critical. Conservation. All Mayo Peninsula Parks including the Mayo Beach Park, Carrs Wharf Pier, the Mayo Wastewater Reclamation Facility Park at River Club, and Glebe Heights Community System Park should be designated for Conservation. The St. Mark’s UM Church and Cemetery, Hope Chapel Cemetery, the Rosenwald School site, the Gresham property, and the Oyster middens at Beverly Triton Nature Park should be designated as historic resources. These changes are consistent with the county’s 2017 Land Preservation Parks and Recreation Plan, which commits the county to adhere to the National Recreation &amp; Parks Association goal of Conservation. Growth capacity. Plan2040 projects growth of 50,000 citizens or 29,000 housing units by 2040, but OPZ has stated that holding capacity with current zoning is only 13,488 units. It appears that dramatic rezoning in targeted growth areas will need to occur, but no effort has been made to assess practical holding capacity in these areas. Targeting of town centers for future growth should not be done without coordination with town center planning. Should not future growth be targeted to areas with adequate facilities and infrastructure to accommodate that growth? Lack of growth limits. Plan2040 relies on the Smart Growth concept to specify that new development should occur at town centers, transportation centers and designated redevelopment areas, but it is totally mute on how much or what kind of development should occur. Citizens in many areas feel that there has been too much development that has happened too quickly. However, there is nothing in the plan about determining growth limits, description of avenues for community involvement in growth rate decisions or identification of tools for community control of rate of growth for various types of development. Development of Peninsulas. The language of Plan2040 mentions the challenges of development on peninsulas and the opportunities to limit development on peninsulas, protect shorelines, streams and forested areas, and manage the challenges of limited road access on peninsulas. We strongly support limiting development on the Mayo Peninsula. Development limited to infill and redevelopment compatible with the existing character of the neighborhoods with no net increase in density is supported by the land use map. The language of Plan2040 should be specific that these are goals and polices for development on peninsulas. Regional growth management. The County Executive has recently suggested that excess market demand for growth be redirected toward Baltimore, since the city would like more growth and Anne Arundel County is expected to have an excess. If this is a viable alternative, it should be covered with appropriate policies in Plan2040. Regional Planning. Since the Plan2040 document is presented as guidance rather than regulation, the Regional Planning process will have to consider and propose regulation of local zoning, type and rate of development, environmental preservation, school capacity, and traffic. A thorough description of the Regional Planning process, plan content, and implementation mechanisms, however, is not provided. Consequently, it remains difficult to evaluate the utility of Plan2040. Interim rezoning. The proposed Regional Planning schedule suggests that plans for nine regions will not all be completed before 2025, and the stage seems to be set for a parade of piecemeal rezoning bills to be presented to the County Council over the next several years. Since the land use map will have been approved much earlier and zoning must be consistent with it, the land use map will effectively become the new zoning map in the interim. Regional Planning Committee composition. Composition of the Regional Planning Committees will be particularly important in determining the content of the Regional Plans. The proposed committee structure is over weighted with developers, brokers, and others representing commercial interests. The county population is made of 10 times more employees than businesses, suggesting the business community is a small fraction of total residents. Commercial interests should be restricted to no more than 2 representatives on a Regional Planning Committees. It is vitally important the residents of Mayo, Edgewater, Galesville, Shadyside and Deale be adequately represented in the planning processes that will impact their future communities and quality of life.</p>	<p>The comment references Growth Tiers that are based on the Sustainable Growth and Agriculture Preservation Act of 2012. The law restricts residential subdivisions through the use of a system of growth tiers. The law limits the number of lots that can be developed on individual septic systems in certain areas. Tiers must be mapped based on criteria outlined in the law and will determine the type of sewage disposal system allowed in a given area. Tier I is defined in the law as areas currently served by sewer systems. Since the Mayo Peninsula is served by the Mayo-Glebe Heights sewer service area, it is classified as Tier I. Please see the Summary of Public Comments document for more detailed response.</p>

Comments	County Response
<p>Growth Area. The Mayo Peninsula has been identified as a Growth Area and OPZ considers Mayo a Tier 1 Growth area. Under MD State criteria, Growth areas have the water resources and infrastructure to accommodate population and business expansion in an orderly, efficient, and environmentally sustainable manner. The Mayo Peninsula meets none of these criteria, so OPZ should redesignate Mayo as Growth Tier 3 or to a Growth Tier more inline with the resources, infrastructure, and character of the Mayo Peninsula. Consistency between goals and policies and the land map used for future planning is critical. Conservation. All Mayo Peninsula Parks including the Mayo Beach Park, Carrs Wharf Pier, the Mayo Wastewater Reclamation Facility Park at River Club, and Glebe Heights Community System Park should be designated for Conservation. The St. Mark’s UM Church and Cemetery, Hope Chapel Cemetery, the Rosenwald School site, the Gresham property, and the Oyster middens at Beverly Triton Nature Park should be designated as historic resources. These changes are consistent with the county’s 2017 Land Preservation Parks and Recreation Plan, which commits the county to adhere to the National Recreation &amp; Parks Association goal of Conservation. Growth capacity. Plan2040 projects growth of 50,000 citizens or 29,000 housing units by 2040, but OPZ has stated that holding capacity with current zoning is only 13,488 units. It appears that dramatic rezoning in targeted growth areas will need to occur, but no effort has been made to assess practical holding capacity in these areas. Targeting of town centers for future growth should not be done without coordination with town center planning. Should not future growth be targeted to areas with adequate facilities and infrastructure to accommodate that growth? Lack of growth limits. Plan2040 relies on the Smart Growth concept to specify that new development should occur at town centers, transportation centers and designated redevelopment areas, but it is totally mute on how much or what kind of development should occur. Citizens in many areas feel that there has been too much development that has happened too quickly. However, there is nothing in the plan about determining growth limits, description of avenues for community involvement in growth rate decisions or identification of tools for community control of rate of growth for various types of development. Development of Peninsulas. The language of Plan2040 mentions the challenges of development on peninsulas and the opportunities to limit development on peninsulas, protect shorelines, streams and forested areas, and manage the challenges of limited road access on peninsulas. We strongly support limiting development on the Mayo Peninsula. Development limited to infill and redevelopment compatible with the existing character of the neighborhoods with no net increase in density is supported by the land use map. The language of Plan2040 should be specific that these are goals and polices for development on peninsulas. Regional growth management. The County Executive has recently suggested that excess market demand for growth be redirected toward Baltimore, since the city would like more growth and Anne Arundel County is expected to have an excess. If this is a viable alternative, it should be covered with appropriate policies in Plan2040. Regional Planning. Since the Plan2040 document is presented as guidance rather than regulation, the Regional Planning process will have to consider and propose regulation of local zoning, type and rate of development, environmental preservation, school capacity, and traffic. A thorough description of the Regional Planning process, plan content, and implementation mechanisms, however, is not provided. Consequently, it remains difficult to evaluate the utility of Plan2040. Interim rezoning. The proposed Regional Planning schedule suggests that plans for nine regions will not all be completed before 2025, and the stage seems to be set for a parade of piecemeal rezoning bills to be presented to the County Council over the next several years. Since the land use map will have been approved much earlier and zoning must be consistent with it, the land use map will effectively become the new zoning map in the interim. Regional Planning Committee composition. Composition of the Regional Planning Committees will be particularly important in determining the content of the Regional Plans. The proposed committee structure is over weighted with developers, brokers, and others representing commercial interests. The county population is made of 10 times more employees than businesses, suggesting the business community is a small fraction of total residents. Commercial interests should be restricted to no more than 2 representatives on a Regional Planning Committees. It is vitally important the residents of Mayo, Edgewater, Galesville, Shadyside and Deale be adequately represented in the planning processes that will impact their future communities and quality of life.</p>	<p>The comment references Growth Tiers that are based on the Sustainable Growth and Agriculture Preservation Act of 2012. The law restricts residential subdivisions through the use of a system of growth tiers. The law limits the number of lots that can be developed on individual septic systems in certain areas. Tiers must be mapped based on criteria outlined in the law and will determine the type of sewage disposal system allowed in a given area. Tier I is defined in the law as areas currently served by sewer systems. Since the Mayo Peninsula is served by the Mayo-Glebe Heights sewer service area, it is classified as Tier I. Please see the Summary of Public Comments document for more detailed response.</p>

Comments	County Response
<p>Growth Area. The Mayo Peninsula has been identified as a Growth Area and OPZ considers Mayo a Tier 1 Growth area. Under MD State criteria, Growth areas have the water resources and infrastructure to accommodate population and business expansion in an orderly, efficient, and environmentally sustainable manner. The Mayo Peninsula meets none of these criteria, so OPZ should redesignate Mayo as Growth Tier 3 or to a Growth Tier more inline with the resources, infrastructure, and character of the Mayo Peninsula. Consistency between goals and policies and the land map used for future planning is critical. Conservation. All Mayo Peninsula Parks including the Mayo Beach Park, Carrs Wharf Pier, the Mayo Wastewater Reclamation Facility Park at River Club, and Glebe Heights Community System Park should be designated for Conservation. The St. Mark’s UM Church and Cemetery, Hope Chapel Cemetery, the Rosenwald School site, the Gresham property, and the Oyster middens at Beverly Triton Nature Park should be designated as historic resources. These changes are consistent with the county’s 2017 Land Preservation Parks and Recreation Plan, which commits the county to adhere to the National Recreation &amp; Parks Association goal of Conservation. Growth capacity. Plan2040 projects growth of 50,000 citizens or 29,000 housing units by 2040, but OPZ has stated that holding capacity with current zoning is only 13,488 units. It appears that dramatic rezoning in targeted growth areas will need to occur, but no effort has been made to assess practical holding capacity in these areas. Targeting of town centers for future growth should not be done without coordination with town center planning. Should not future growth be targeted to areas with adequate facilities and infrastructure to accommodate that growth? Lack of growth limits. Plan2040 relies on the Smart Growth concept to specify that new development should occur at town centers, transportation centers and designated redevelopment areas, but it is totally mute on how much or what kind of development should occur. Citizens in many areas feel that there has been too much development that has happened too quickly. However, there is nothing in the plan about determining growth limits, description of avenues for community involvement in growth rate decisions or identification of tools for community control of rate of growth for various types of development. Development of Peninsulas. The language of Plan2040 mentions the challenges of development on peninsulas and the opportunities to limit development on peninsulas, protect shorelines, streams and forested areas, and manage the challenges of limited road access on peninsulas. We strongly support limiting development on the Mayo Peninsula. Development limited to infill and redevelopment compatible with the existing character of the neighborhoods with no net increase in density is supported by the land use map. The language of Plan2040 should be specific that these are goals and polices for development on peninsulas. Regional growth management. The County Executive has recently suggested that excess market demand for growth be redirected toward Baltimore, since the city would like more growth and Anne Arundel County is expected to have an excess. If this is a viable alternative, it should be covered with appropriate policies in Plan2040. Regional Planning. Since the Plan2040 document is presented as guidance rather than regulation, the Regional Planning process will have to consider and propose regulation of local zoning, type and rate of development, environmental preservation, school capacity, and traffic. A thorough description of the Regional Planning process, plan content, and implementation mechanisms, however, is not provided. Consequently, it remains difficult to evaluate the utility of Plan2040. Interim rezoning. The proposed Regional Planning schedule suggests that plans for nine regions will not all be completed before 2025, and the stage seems to be set for a parade of piecemeal rezoning bills to be presented to the County Council over the next several years. Since the land use map will have been approved much earlier and zoning must be consistent with it, the land use map will effectively become the new zoning map in the interim. Regional Planning Committee composition. Composition of the Regional Planning Committees will be particularly important in determining the content of the Regional Plans. The proposed committee structure is over weighted with developers, brokers, and others representing commercial interests. The county population is made of 10 times more employees than businesses, suggesting the business community is a small fraction of total residents. Commercial interests should be restricted to no more than 2 representatives on a Regional Planning Committees. It is vitally important the residents of Mayo, Edgewater, Galesville, Shadyside and Deale be adequately represented in the planning processes that will impact their future communities and quality of life.</p>	<p>The comment references Growth Tiers that are based on the Sustainable Growth and Agriculture Preservation Act of 2012. The law restricts residential subdivisions through the use of a system of growth tiers. The law limits the number of lots that can be developed on individual septic systems in certain areas. Tiers must be mapped based on criteria outlined in the law and will determine the type of sewage disposal system allowed in a given area. Tier I is defined in the law as areas currently served by sewer systems. Since the Mayo Peninsula is served by the Mayo-Glebe Heights sewer service area, it is classified as Tier I. Please see the Summary of Public Comments document for more detailed response.</p>

Comments	County Response
<p>Growth Area. The Mayo Peninsula has been identified as a Growth Area and OPZ considers Mayo a Tier 1 Growth area. Under MD State criteria, Growth areas have the water resources and infrastructure to accommodate population and business expansion in an orderly, efficient, and environmentally sustainable manner. The Mayo Peninsula meets none of these criteria, so OPZ should redesignate Mayo as Growth Tier 3 or to a Growth Tier more inline with the resources, infrastructure, and character of the Mayo Peninsula. Consistency between goals and policies and the land map used for future planning is critical. Conservation. All Mayo Peninsula Parks including the Mayo Beach Park, Carrs Wharf Pier, the Mayo Wastewater Reclamation Facility Park at River Club, and Glebe Heights Community System Park should be designated for Conservation. The St. Mark’s UM Church and Cemetery, Hope Chapel Cemetery, the Rosenwald School site, the Gresham property, and the Oyster middens at Beverly Triton Nature Park should be designated as historic resources. These changes are consistent with the county’s 2017 Land Preservation Parks and Recreation Plan, which commits the county to adhere to the National Recreation &amp; Parks Association goal of Conservation. Growth capacity. Plan2040 projects growth of 50,000 citizens or 29,000 housing units by 2040, but OPZ has stated that holding capacity with current zoning is only 13,488 units. It appears that dramatic rezoning in targeted growth areas will need to occur, but no effort has been made to assess practical holding capacity in these areas. Targeting of town centers for future growth should not be done without coordination with town center planning. Should not future growth be targeted to areas with adequate facilities and infrastructure to accommodate that growth? Lack of growth limits. Plan2040 relies on the Smart Growth concept to specify that new development should occur at town centers, transportation centers and designated redevelopment areas, but it is totally mute on how much or what kind of development should occur. Citizens in many areas feel that there has been too much development that has happened too quickly. However, there is nothing in the plan about determining growth limits, description of avenues for community involvement in growth rate decisions or identification of tools for community control of rate of growth for various types of development. Development of Peninsulas. The language of Plan2040 mentions the challenges of development on peninsulas and the opportunities to limit development on peninsulas, protect shorelines, streams and forested areas, and manage the challenges of limited road access on peninsulas. We strongly support limiting development on the Mayo Peninsula. Development limited to infill and redevelopment compatible with the existing character of the neighborhoods with no net increase in density is supported by the land use map. The language of Plan2040 should be specific that these are goals and polices for development on peninsulas. Regional growth management. The County Executive has recently suggested that excess market demand for growth be redirected toward Baltimore, since the city would like more growth and Anne Arundel County is expected to have an excess. If this is a viable alternative, it should be covered with appropriate policies in Plan2040. Regional Planning. Since the Plan2040 document is presented as guidance rather than regulation, the Regional Planning process will have to consider and propose regulation of local zoning, type and rate of development, environmental preservation, school capacity, and traffic. A thorough description of the Regional Planning process, plan content, and implementation mechanisms, however, is not provided. Consequently, it remains difficult to evaluate the utility of Plan2040. Interim rezoning. The proposed Regional Planning schedule suggests that plans for nine regions will not all be completed before 2025, and the stage seems to be set for a parade of piecemeal rezoning bills to be presented to the County Council over the next several years. Since the land use map will have been approved much earlier and zoning must be consistent with it, the land use map will effectively become the new zoning map in the interim. Regional Planning Committee composition. Composition of the Regional Planning Committees will be particularly important in determining the content of the Regional Plans. The proposed committee structure is over weighted with developers, brokers, and others representing commercial interests. The county population is made of 10 times more employees than businesses, suggesting the business community is a small fraction of total residents. Commercial interests should be restricted to no more than 2 representatives on a Regional Planning Committees. It is vitally important the residents of Mayo, Edgewater, Galesville, Shadyside and Deale be adequately represented in the planning processes that will impact their future communities and quality of life.</p>	<p>The comment references Growth Tiers that are based on the Sustainable Growth and Agriculture Preservation Act of 2012. The law restricts residential subdivisions through the use of a system of growth tiers. The law limits the number of lots that can be developed on individual septic systems in certain areas. Tiers must be mapped based on criteria outlined in the law and will determine the type of sewage disposal system allowed in a given area. Tier I is defined in the law as areas currently served by sewer systems. Since the Mayo Peninsula is served by the Mayo-Glebe Heights sewer service area, it is classified as Tier I. Please see the Summary of Public Comments document for more detailed response.</p>

Comments	County Response
<p>Growth Area. The Mayo Peninsula has been identified as a Growth Area and OPZ considers Mayo a Tier 1 Growth area. Under MD State criteria, Growth areas have the water resources and infrastructure to accommodate population and business expansion in an orderly, efficient, and environmentally sustainable manner. The Mayo Peninsula meets none of these criteria, so OPZ should redesignate Mayo as Growth Tier 3 or to a Growth Tier more inline with the resources, infrastructure, and character of the Mayo Peninsula. Consistency between goals and policies and the land map used for future planning is critical. Conservation. All Mayo Peninsula Parks including the Mayo Beach Park, Carrs Wharf Pier, the Mayo Wastewater Reclamation Facility Park at River Club, and Glebe Heights Community System Park should be designated for Conservation. The St. Mark’s UM Church and Cemetery, Hope Chapel Cemetery, the Rosenwald School site, the Gresham property, and the Oyster middens at Beverly Triton Nature Park should be designated as historic resources. These changes are consistent with the county’s 2017 Land Preservation Parks and Recreation Plan, which commits the county to adhere to the National Recreation &amp; Parks Association goal of Conservation. Growth capacity. Plan2040 projects growth of 50,000 citizens or 29,000 housing units by 2040, but OPZ has stated that holding capacity with current zoning is only 13,488 units. It appears that dramatic rezoning in targeted growth areas will need to occur, but no effort has been made to assess practical holding capacity in these areas. Targeting of town centers for future growth should not be done without coordination with town center planning. Should not future growth be targeted to areas with adequate facilities and infrastructure to accommodate that growth? Lack of growth limits. Plan2040 relies on the Smart Growth concept to specify that new development should occur at town centers, transportation centers and designated redevelopment areas, but it is totally mute on how much or what kind of development should occur. Citizens in many areas feel that there has been too much development that has happened too quickly. However, there is nothing in the plan about determining growth limits, description of avenues for community involvement in growth rate decisions or identification of tools for community control of rate of growth for various types of development. Development of Peninsulas. The language of Plan2040 mentions the challenges of development on peninsulas and the opportunities to limit development on peninsulas, protect shorelines, streams and forested areas, and manage the challenges of limited road access on peninsulas. We strongly support limiting development on the Mayo Peninsula. Development limited to infill and redevelopment compatible with the existing character of the neighborhoods with no net increase in density is supported by the land use map. The language of Plan2040 should be specific that these are goals and polices for development on peninsulas. Regional growth management. The County Executive has recently suggested that excess market demand for growth be redirected toward Baltimore, since the city would like more growth and Anne Arundel County is expected to have an excess. If this is a viable alternative, it should be covered with appropriate policies in Plan2040. Regional Planning. Since the Plan2040 document is presented as guidance rather than regulation, the Regional Planning process will have to consider and propose regulation of local zoning, type and rate of development, environmental preservation, school capacity, and traffic. A thorough description of the Regional Planning process, plan content, and implementation mechanisms, however, is not provided. Consequently, it remains difficult to evaluate the utility of Plan2040. Interim rezoning. The proposed Regional Planning schedule suggests that plans for nine regions will not all be completed before 2025, and the stage seems to be set for a parade of piecemeal rezoning bills to be presented to the County Council over the next several years. Since the land use map will have been approved much earlier and zoning must be consistent with it, the land use map will effectively become the new zoning map in the interim. Regional Planning Committee composition. Composition of the Regional Planning Committees will be particularly important in determining the content of the Regional Plans. The proposed committee structure is over weighted with developers, brokers, and others representing commercial interests. The county population is made of 10 times more employees than businesses, suggesting the business community is a small fraction of total residents. Commercial interests should be restricted to no more than 2 representatives on a Regional Planning Committees. It is vitally important the residents of Mayo, Edgewater, Galesville, Shadyside and Deale be adequately represented in the planning processes that will impact their future communities and quality of life.</p>	<p>The comment references Growth Tiers that are based on the Sustainable Growth and Agriculture Preservation Act of 2012. The law restricts residential subdivisions through the use of a system of growth tiers. The law limits the number of lots that can be developed on individual septic systems in certain areas. Tiers must be mapped based on criteria outlined in the law and will determine the type of sewage disposal system allowed in a given area. Tier I is defined in the law as areas currently served by sewer systems. Since the Mayo Peninsula is served by the Mayo-Glebe Heights sewer service area, it is classified as Tier I. Please see the Summary of Public Comments document for more detailed response.</p>

Comments	County Response
<p>Growth Area. The Mayo Peninsula has been identified as a Growth Area and OPZ considers Mayo a Tier 1 Growth area. Under MD State criteria, Growth areas have the water resources and infrastructure to accommodate population and business expansion in an orderly, efficient, and environmentally sustainable manner. The Mayo Peninsula meets none of these criteria, so OPZ should redesignate Mayo as Growth Tier 3 or to a Growth Tier more in line with the resources, infrastructure, and character of the Mayo Peninsula. Consistency between goals and policies and the land map used for future planning is critical. Conservation. All Mayo Peninsula Parks including the Mayo Beach Park, Carrs Wharf Pier, the Mayo Wastewater Reclamation Facility Park at River Club, and Glebe Heights Community System Park should be designated for Conservation. The St. Mark's UM Church and Cemetery, Hope Chapel Cemetery, the Rosenwald School site, the Gresham property, and the Oyster middens at Beverly Triton Nature Park should be designated as historic resources. These changes are consistent with the county's 2017 Land Preservation Parks and Recreation Plan, which commits the county to adhere to the National Recreation &amp; Parks Association goal of Conservation. Growth capacity. Plan2040 projects growth of 50,000 citizens or 29,000 housing units by 2040, but OPZ has stated that holding capacity with current zoning is only 13,488 units. It appears that dramatic rezoning in targeted growth areas will need to occur, but no effort has been made to assess practical holding capacity in these areas. Targeting of town centers for future growth should not be done without coordination with town center planning. Should not future growth be targeted to areas with adequate facilities and infrastructure to accommodate that growth? Lack of growth limits. Plan2040 relies on the Smart Growth concept to specify that new development should occur at town centers, transportation centers and designated redevelopment areas, but it is totally mute on how much or what kind of development should occur. Citizens in many areas feel that there has been too much development that has happened too quickly. However, there is nothing in the plan about determining growth limits, description of avenues for community involvement in growth rate decisions or identification of tools for community control of rate of growth for various types of development. Development of Peninsulas. The language of Plan2040 mentions the challenges of development on peninsulas and the opportunities to limit development on peninsulas, protect shorelines, streams and forested areas, and manage the challenges of limited road access on peninsulas. We strongly support limiting development on the Mayo Peninsula. Development limited to infill and redevelopment compatible with the existing character of the neighborhoods with no net increase in density is supported by the land use map. The language of Plan2040 should be specific that these are goals and polices for development on peninsulas. Regional growth management. The County Executive has recently suggested that excess market demand for growth be redirected toward Baltimore, since the city would like more growth and Anne Arundel County is expected to have an excess. If this is a viable alternative, it should be covered with appropriate policies in Plan2040. Regional Planning. Since the Plan2040 document is presented as guidance rather than regulation, the Regional Planning process will have to consider and propose regulation of local zoning, type and rate of development, environmental preservation, school capacity, and traffic. A thorough description of the Regional Planning process, plan content, and implementation mechanisms, however, is not provided. Consequently, it remains difficult to evaluate the utility of Plan2040. Interim rezoning. The proposed Regional Planning schedule suggests that plans for nine regions will not all be completed before 2025, and the stage seems to be set for a parade of piecemeal rezoning bills to be presented to the County Council over the next several years. Since the land use map will have been approved much earlier and zoning must be consistent with it, the land use map will effectively become the new zoning map in the interim. Regional Planning Committee composition. Composition of the Regional Planning Committees will be particularly important in determining the content of the Regional Plans. The proposed committee structure is over weighted with developers, brokers, and others representing commercial interests. The county population is made of 10 times more employees than businesses, suggesting the business community is a small fraction of total residents. Commercial interests should be restricted to no more than 2 representatives on a Regional Planning Committees. It is vitally important the residents of Mayo, Edgewater, Galesville, Shadyside and Deale be adequately represented in the planning processes that will impact their future communities and quality of life.</p>	<p>The comment references Growth Tiers that are based on the Sustainable Growth and Agriculture Preservation Act of 2012. The law restricts residential subdivisions through the use of a system of growth tiers. The law limits the number of lots that can be developed on individual septic systems in certain areas. Tiers must be mapped based on criteria outlined in the law and will determine the type of sewage disposal system allowed in a given area. Tier I is defined in the law as areas currently served by sewer systems. Since the Mayo Peninsula is served by the Mayo-Glebe Heights sewer service area, it is classified as Tier I. Please see the Summary of Public Comments document for more detailed response.</p>

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>NOMP Positions on GDP Final</p> <p>Topic #1: Designate Most Parks on the Mayo Peninsula as “Conservation” -- The Planned Land Use classification of Mayo Beach Park and Carr’s Wharf Pier county properties should be changed from Open Space to Conservation, and that the Glebe Heights (across from Pure Water Way) and the Water Reclamation Facility county-owned properties be reclassified from Public Space to Conservation. Mayo Beach Park (swimming) and Carr’s Wharf Pier (fishing, crabbing) conform to the draft GDP definition of Conservation Land Use: “Land that is publicly and privately-owned and is used for conservation purposes in perpetuity. This designation includes properties preserved through land trusts, platted floodplains, passive open space adjacent to platted floodplains, and passive parks and other conservation lands.” We believe this change in characterization reflects the intent of the 2017 LPPRP, where, for example, both Beverly Triton Nature Park and Mayo Beach Park are listed under the header of “Passive recreation development, such as trails, water access, living shorelines, fishing, parking for access” (page III-46).The 2017 LPPRP also cites an important objective stated in the Department of Recreation and Parks (DRP) Guidelines and Reference Manual under its Recreation &amp; Parks section: “[to] improve quality of life by conserving and enhancing the natural and developed environment for current and future generations.” We see an outsized emphasis in the DRP on Recreation; we believe it is time for greater emphasis on Parks and the conservation of parklands for the benefit of all. Additionally, the Water Reclamation Facility and the Glebe Heights properties are ideal locations to serve the public as reforestation spaces/tree banks for development taking place both on and off the peninsula, expanding forested acreage and improving air quality. We have an obligation, as a peninsular community surrounded by rivers and the Bay, to preserve as much of the natural environment as possible, refrain from introducing additional impervious surfaces on our hardworking Critical Areas, and work against adverse effects on water quality. Characterizing these properties as Conservation for the long-term both serves the public and helps to fulfill our commitment to the environment.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. See Summary of Public Comments document for response to these issues.</p>
<p>Topic #2: Support for the Housing Density Ranges -- Zoning ranges for housing density (as opposed to Single Family Detached current classes of R1 R2 and R5) will promote multi-family housing. We recognize the equity of a proposed future zoning change from quantity of SFDs per acre to housing density ranges per acre. However, additional model building code language is needed here that would recognize preserving the usage density and architectural integrity/streetscape of mature neighborhoods. This potential reclassification also has the capability of increasing the housing density in existing areas, dependent on the development reviewer’s interpretation of the land use map. We advocate for net zero density increase on the Mayo Peninsula, as the land use map currently supports. We would also like to request that county zoning overlays that are less stringent than the Maryland State Critical Areas Law and similar be removed from county maps to eliminate potential future confusion on the part of land owners and development reviewers. Examples of such redundancies abound on the Mayo Peninsula. A case in point is identified as R5 zoning on the zoning map and RCA on the land use map in the GDP; the latter restricting density to one house per twenty acres.</p>	
<p>Topic #3: Strengthen the Effectiveness of the County Critical Area Program -- The GDP should include a specific plan to review, with public input, the classification of county shorelines as “buffer” or “modified buffer” in light of GDP overall commitment to the theme of Resilient, Environmentally-Sound, and Sustainable Communities and the goals within its stated priority of Planning for the Natural Environment. In addition to reclassifying much of the shoreline to Buffer, the county should lead the way toward securing a vegetated 100’ buffer even if it means rewarding property owners for contributing to its formation/enhancement. The draft GDP defines and refers to the Critical Area multiple times but shows no indication of strengthening its commitment to the intent of the state Critical Area laws, specifically the 100’ buffer serving to minimize adverse impacts on water quality. At some point in the past, possibly around 1986 when local implementation of the state Critical Area law began, the County classified a significant portion of its shoreline as “modified buffer” areas where development can take place under less demanding rules than those governing disturbance/development in the 100’ buffer (County Code Article 17, section 8). The Plan 2040 Planned Use Map shows that approximately half of the Mayo Peninsula shoreline is considered a “modified buffer” area. This widespread use of modified buffer classification means more disturbance/development within the state-mandated 100’ buffer and ultimately more degradation of the waterways. We believe that decisions made 34 years ago need to be reviewed and updated in light of the amount of new impervious surfaces installed near shorelines, and because of changing environmental conditions, most especially the increasing number of severe storms, king tides and sea level rise. In support of state Critical Area law, county zoning overlays that are less stringent than the state law must be removed from the county land use maps to eliminate potential future confusion on the part of land owners and development reviewers. The overlays shown on the Resource Sensitive Policy Areas Map must also be shown on the County’s Planned Land Use Map and Zoning Map. Examples of such redundancies abound on the Mayo Peninsula. A case in point (Map 00600, Parcel 0090) is identified as R2 zoning on the proposed GDP’s Land Use Plan and the county’s current zoning</p>	

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>NOMP Positions on GDP Final</p> <p>Topic #1: Designate Most Parks on the Mayo Peninsula as “Conservation” -- The Planned Land Use classification of Mayo Beach Park and Carr’s Wharf Pier county properties should be changed from Open Space to Conservation, and that the Glebe Heights (across from Pure Water Way) and the Water Reclamation Facility county-owned properties be reclassified from Public Space to Conservation. Mayo Beach Park (swimming) and Carr’s Wharf Pier (fishing, crabbing) conform to the draft GDP definition of Conservation Land Use: “Land that is publicly and privately-owned and is used for conservation purposes in perpetuity. This designation includes properties preserved through land trusts, platted floodplains, passive open space adjacent to platted floodplains, and passive parks and other conservation lands.” We believe this change in characterization reflects the intent of the 2017 LPPRP, where, for example, both Beverly Triton Nature Park and Mayo Beach Park are listed under the header of “Passive recreation development, such as trails, water access, living shorelines, fishing, parking for access” (page III-46).The 2017 LPPRP also cites an important objective stated in the Department of Recreation and Parks (DRP) Guidelines and Reference Manual under its Recreation &amp; Parks section: “[to] improve quality of life by conserving and enhancing the natural and developed environment for current and future generations.” We see an outsized emphasis in the DRP on Recreation; we believe it is time for greater emphasis on Parks and the conservation of parklands for the benefit of all. Additionally, the Water Reclamation Facility and the Glebe Heights properties are ideal locations to serve the public as reforestation spaces/tree banks for development taking place both on and off the peninsula, expanding forested acreage and improving air quality. We have an obligation, as a peninsular community surrounded by rivers and the Bay, to preserve as much of the natural environment as possible, refrain from introducing additional impervious surfaces on our hardworking Critical Areas, and work against adverse effects on water quality. Characterizing these properties as Conservation for the long-term both serves the public and helps to fulfill our commitment to the environment.</p> <p>Topic #2: Support for the Housing Density Ranges -- Zoning ranges for housing density (as opposed to Single Family Detached current classes of R1 R2 and R5) will promote multi-family housing. We recognize the equity of a proposed future zoning change from quantity of SFDs per acre to housing density ranges per acre. However, additional model building code language is needed here that would recognize preserving the usage density and architectural integrity/streetscape of mature neighborhoods. This potential reclassification also has the capability of increasing the housing density in existing areas, dependent on the development reviewer’s interpretation of the land use map. We advocate for net zero density increase on the Mayo Peninsula, as the land use map currently supports. We would also like to request that county zoning overlays that are less stringent than the Maryland State Critical Areas Law and similar be removed from county maps to eliminate potential future confusion on the part of land owners and development reviewers. Examples of such redundancies abound on the Mayo Peninsula. A case in point is identified as R5 zoning on the zoning map and RCA on the land use map in the GDP; the latter restricting density to one house per twenty acres.</p> <p>Topic #3: Strengthen the Effectiveness of the County Critical Area Program -- The GDP should include a specific plan to review, with public input, the classification of county shorelines as “buffer” or “modified buffer” in light of GDP overall commitment to the theme of Resilient, Environmentally-Sound, and Sustainable Communities and the goals within its stated priority of Planning for the Natural Environment. In addition to reclassifying much of the shoreline to Buffer, the county should lead the way toward securing a vegetated 100’ buffer even if it means rewarding property owners for contributing to its formation/enhancement. The draft GDP defines and refers to the Critical Area multiple times but shows no indication of strengthening its commitment to the intent of the state Critical Area laws, specifically the 100’ buffer serving to minimize adverse impacts on water quality. At some point in the past, possibly around 1986 when local implementation of the state Critical Area law began, the County classified a significant portion of its shoreline as “modified buffer” areas where development can take place under less demanding rules than those governing disturbance/development in the 100’ buffer (County Code Article 17, section 8). The Plan 2040 Planned Use Map shows that approximately half of the Mayo Peninsula shoreline is considered a “modified buffer” area. This widespread use of modified buffer classification means more disturbance/development within the state-mandated 100’ buffer and ultimately more degradation of the waterways. We believe that decisions made 34 years ago need to be reviewed and updated in light of the amount of new impervious surfaces installed near shorelines, and because of changing environmental conditions, most especially the increasing number of severe storms, king tides and sea level rise. In support of state Critical Area law, county zoning overlays that are less stringent than the state law must be removed from the county land use maps to eliminate potential future confusion on the part of land owners and development reviewers. The overlays shown on the Resource Sensitive Policy Areas Map must also be shown on the County’s Planned Land Use Map and Zoning Map. Examples of such redundancies abound on the Mayo Peninsula. A case in point (Map 00600, Parcel 0090) is identified as R2 zoning on the proposed GDP’s Land Use Plan and the county’s current zoning map, yet it is designated as RCA on the Resource Sensitive Policy Areas Map at the GDP site; the latter restricting density to one house per twenty acres. We cannot embed a Land Use Plan map in this GDP that omits these vital overlays.</p> <p>Topic #4: More Fully Address Impacts of Climate Change and</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. See Summary of Public Comments document for response to these issues.</p>

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>NOMP Positions on GDP Final.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. See Summary of Public Comments document for response to these issues.</p>
<p>Topic #1: Designate Most Parks on the Mayo Peninsula as “Conservation” -- The Planned Land Use classification of Mayo Beach Park and Carr’s Wharf Pier county properties should be changed from Open Space to Conservation, and that the Glebe Heights (across from Pure Water Way) and the Water Reclamation Facility county-owned properties be reclassified from Public Space to Conservation. Mayo Beach Park (swimming) and Carr’s Wharf Pier (fishing, crabbing) conform to the draft GDP definition of Conservation Land Use: “Land that is publicly and privately-owned and is used for conservation purposes in perpetuity. This designation includes properties preserved through land trusts, platted floodplains, passive open space adjacent to platted floodplains, and passive parks and other conservation lands.” We believe this change in characterization reflects the intent of the 2017 LPPRP, where, for example, both Beverly Triton Nature Park and Mayo Beach Park are listed under the header of “Passive recreation development, such as trails, water access, living shorelines, fishing, parking for access” (page III-46).The 2017 LPPRP also cites an important objective stated in the Department of Recreation and Parks (DRP) Guidelines and Reference Manual under its Recreation &amp; Parks section: “[to] improve quality of life by conserving and enhancing the natural and developed environment for current and future generations.” We see an outsized emphasis in the DRP on Recreation; we believe it is time for greater emphasis on Parks and the conservation of parklands for the benefit of all. Additionally, the Water Reclamation Facility and the Glebe Heights properties are ideal locations to serve the public as reforestation spaces/tree banks for development taking place both on and off the peninsula, expanding forested acreage and improving air quality. We have an obligation, as a peninsular community surrounded by rivers and the Bay, to preserve as much of the natural environment as possible, refrain from introducing additional impervious surfaces on our hardworking Critical Areas, and work against adverse effects on water quality. Characterizing these properties as Conservation for the long-term both serves the public and helps to fulfill our commitment to the environment.</p>	
<p>Topic #2: Support for the Housing Density Ranges -- Zoning ranges for housing density (as opposed to Single Family Detached current classes of R1 R2 and R5) will promote multi-family housing. We recognize the equity of a proposed future zoning change from quantity of SFDs per acre to housing density ranges per acre. However, additional model building code language is needed here that would recognize preserving the usage density and architectural integrity/streetscape of mature neighborhoods. This potential reclassification also has the capability of increasing the housing density in existing areas, dependent on the development reviewer’s interpretation of the land use map. We advocate for net zero density increase on the Mayo Peninsula, as the land use map currently supports. We would also like to request that county zoning overlays that are less stringent than the Maryland State Critical Areas Law and similar be removed from county maps to eliminate potential future confusion on the part of land owners and development reviewers. Examples of such redundancies abound on the Mayo Peninsula. A case in point is identified as R5 zoning on the zoning map and RCA on the land use map in the GDP; the latter restricting density to one house per twenty acres.</p>	
<p>Topic #3: Strengthen the Effectiveness of the County Critical Area Program -- The GDP should include a specific plan to review, with public input, the classification of county shorelines as “buffer” or “modified buffer” in light of GDP overall commitment to the theme of Resilient, Environmentally-Sound, and Sustainable Communities and the goals within its stated priority of Planning for the Natural Environment. In addition to reclassifying much of the shoreline to Buffer, the county should lead the way toward securing a vegetated 100’ buffer even if it means rewarding property owners for contributing to its formation/enhancement. The draft GDP defines and refers to the Critical Area multiple times but shows no indication of strengthening its commitment to the intent of the state Critical Area laws, specifically the 100’ buffer serving to minimize adverse impacts on water quality. At some point in the past, possibly around 1986 when local implementation of the state Critical Area law began, the County classified a significant portion of its shoreline as “modified buffer” areas where development can take place under less demanding rules than those governing disturbance/development in the 100’ buffer (County Code Article 17, section 8). The Plan 2040 Planned Use Map shows that approximately half of the Mayo Peninsula shoreline is considered a “modified buffer” area. This widespread use of modified buffer classification means more disturbance/development within the state-mandated 100’ buffer and ultimately more degradation of the waterways. We believe that decisions made 34 years ago need to be reviewed and updated in light of the amount of new impervious surfaces installed near shorelines, and because of changing environmental conditions, most especially the increasing number of severe storms, king tides and sea level rise. In support of state Critical Area law, county zoning overlays that are less stringent than the state law must be removed from the county land use maps to eliminate potential future confusion on the part of land owners and development reviewers. The overlays shown on the Resource Sensitive Policy Areas Map must also be shown on the County’s Planned Land Use Map and Zoning Map. Examples of such redundancies abound on the Mayo Peninsula. A case in point (Map 00600, Parcel</p>	

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p><b>DESIGNATE PARKS AS “CONSERVATION” PLANNED LAND USE</b> The Planned Land Use classification of Mayo Beach Park and Carr’s Wharf Pier county properties should be changed from “Open Space” to “Conservation,” and the county-owned Glebe Heights acreage (across from Pure Water Way) and the Water Reclamation Facility should be reclassified from “Public Space” to “Conservation.” Mayo Beach Park (swimming) and Carr’s Wharf Pier (fishing, crabbing) conform to the draft GDP definition of Conservation Land Use: “Land that is publicly and privately-owned and is used for conservation purposes in perpetuity. This designation includes properties preserved through land trusts, platted floodplains, passive open space adjacent to platted floodplains, and passive parks and other conservation lands.” We believe this change in characterization reflects the intent of the 2017 LPPRP, where, for example, both Beverly Triton Nature Park and Mayo Beach Park are listed under the header of “Passive recreation development, such as trails, water access, living shorelines, fishing, parking for access” (page III-46).The 2017 LPPRP also cites an important objective stated in the Department of Recreation and Parks (DRP) Guidelines and Reference Manual under its Recreation &amp; Parks section: “[to] improve quality of life by conserving and enhancing the natural and developed environment for current and future generations.” We see an outsized emphasis in the DRP on Recreation; we believe it is time for greater emphasis on Parks and the value on conserving natural areas in parklands for the benefit of all. Additionally, the Water Reclamation Facility and the Glebe Heights properties are ideal locations to serve the public as reforestation spaces/tree banks for development taking place both on and off the peninsula, expanding forested acreage and improving air quality. We have an obligation, as a peninsular community surrounded by rivers and the Bay, to preserve as much of the natural environment as possible, refrain from introducing unnecessary impervious surfaces on our hardworking Critical Areas, and work against adverse effects on water quality. Characterizing these properties as Conservation for the long-term both serves the public and helps to fulfill our commitment to the environment.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. See Summary of Public Comments document for response to these issues.</p>
<p><b>COUNTY CRITICAL AREA LAW</b> The GDP should include a specific plan to review, with public input, the classification of county shorelines as “buffer” or “modified buffer” in light of GDP overall commitment to the theme of Resilient, Environmentally-Sound, and Sustainable Communities and the goals within its stated priority of Planning for the Natural Environment. The county should lead the way toward securing a vegetated 100’ buffer on all shoreline even if it means rewarding property owners for contributing to its formation/enhancement. The draft GDP defines and refers to the Critical Area multiple times but shows no indication of strengthening its commitment to the intent of the state Critical Area laws, specifically the 100’ buffer serving to minimize adverse impacts on water quality. At some point in the past, possibly around 1986 when local implementation of the state Critical Area law began, the County classified a significant portion of its shoreline as “modified buffer” areas where development can take place under less demanding rules than those governing disturbance/development in the 100’ buffer (County Code Article 17, section 8). The Plan 2040 Planned Use Map shows that approximately half of the Mayo Peninsula shoreline is considered a “modified buffer” area. This widespread use of modified buffer classification means more disturbance/development within the state-mandated 100’ buffer and ultimately more degradation of the waterways. We believe that decisions made 34 years ago need to be reviewed and updated in light of the amount of new impervious surfaces installed near shorelines, and because of changing environmental conditions, most especially the increasing number of severe storms, king tides and sea level rise. <b>ZONING INFORMATION</b> Plan2040 provides three informative maps along with the draft GDP. However, no one map shows both the Critical Area classifications and current zoning designations. When checking multiple maps, one can find several parcels on the Mayo Peninsula show both R2 zoning and Critical Area RCA. A case in point (Map 00600, Parcel 0090) is identified as R2 zoning on the proposed GDP’s Land Use Plan and the county’s current zoning map, yet it is designated as RCA on the Resource Sensitive Policy Areas Map at the GDP site, the latter restricting density to one house per twenty acres. We cannot embed a comprehensive Land Use Plan map in this GDP that omits clear delineation of Critical Area classifications. In line with this topic, and in support of state Critical Area law, county zoning areas that are less stringent than the state Critical Area classifications should be removed from the current County Zoning Viewer to eliminate potential future confusion on the part of land owners and development reviewers.</p>	
<p><b>CLIMATE CHANGE</b> A serious look into the next 20 years, especially in coastal and peninsular areas like Mayo, must include the known and anticipated effects of sea level rise and climate change. This variable will have the most significant impact on the environmental and economic life in the county in 20 years. While the topic is referenced, it is not central to the GDP, despite the fact that the county has over 533 miles of coastline, all of which will be substantially impacted by climate change and rising sea levels over the life of the GDP. The Mayo peninsula is largely a residential area that includes communities that are nearly surrounded by water and includes areas of sensitive natural resources, several parks and recreation sites and extensive forest cover. Future development will be primarily focused on existing lots most of which are in the state-designated critical area. Development on the Mayo peninsula has an adverse impact on the water quality of the surrounding waterways – the South,</p>	

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>THIS IS THE ORGANIZATIONAL POSITION SUBMITTED ON BEHALF OF THE NEIGHBORS OF THE MAYO PENINSULA:</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. See Summary of Public Comments document for response to these issues.</p>
<p>Topic #1: Designate Most Parks on the Mayo Peninsula as “Conservation” -- The Planned Land Use classification of Mayo Beach Park and Carr’s Wharf Pier county properties should be changed from Open Space to Conservation, and that the Glebe Heights (across from Pure Water Way) and the Water Reclamation Facility county-owned properties be reclassified from Public Space to Conservation. Mayo Beach Park (swimming) and Carr’s Wharf Pier (fishing, crabbing) conform to the draft GDP definition of Conservation Land Use: “Land that is publicly and privately-owned and is used for conservation purposes in perpetuity. This designation includes properties preserved through land trusts, platted floodplains, passive open space adjacent to platted floodplains, and passive parks and other conservation lands.” We believe this change in characterization reflects the intent of the 2017 LPPRP, where, for example, both Beverly Triton Nature Park and Mayo Beach Park are listed under the header of “Passive recreation development, such as trails, water access, living shorelines, fishing, parking for access” (page III-46).The 2017 LPPRP also cites an important objective stated in the Department of Recreation and Parks (DRP) Guidelines and Reference Manual under its Recreation &amp; Parks section: “[to] improve quality of life by conserving and enhancing the natural and developed environment for current and future generations.” We see an outsized emphasis in the DRP on Recreation; we believe it is time for greater emphasis on Parks and the conservation of parklands for the benefit of all. Additionally, the Water Reclamation Facility and the Glebe Heights properties are ideal locations to serve the public as reforestation spaces/tree banks for development taking place both on and off the peninsula, expanding forested acreage and improving air quality. We have an obligation, as a peninsular community surrounded by rivers and the Bay, to preserve as much of the natural environment as possible, refrain from introducing additional impervious surfaces on our hardworking Critical Areas, and work against adverse effects on water quality. Characterizing these properties as Conservation for the long-term both serves the public and helps to fulfill our commitment to the environment.</p>	
<p>Topic #2: Support for the Housing Density Ranges -- Zoning ranges for housing density (as opposed to Single Family Detached current classes of R1 R2 and R5) will promote multi-family housing. We support the county’s intention to remove the inequity in housing inherent with single family development zoning. We recognize the equity of a proposed future zoning change from quantity of SFDs per acre to housing density ranges per acre. However, additional model building code language is needed here that would recognize preserving the usage density and architectural integrity/streetscape of mature neighborhoods. This potential reclassification also has the capability of increasing the housing density in existing areas, dependent on the development reviewer’s interpretation of the land use map. We advocate for net zero density increase on the Mayo Peninsula, as the land use map currently supports. We would also like to request that county zoning overlays that are less stringent than the Maryland State Critical Areas Law and similar be removed from county maps to eliminate potential future confusion on the part of land owners and development reviewers. Examples of such redundancies abound on the Mayo Peninsula. A case in point is identified as R5 zoning on the zoning map and RCA on the land use map in the GDP; the latter restricting density to one house per twenty acres.</p>	
<p>Topic #3: Strengthen the Effectiveness of the County Critical Area Program -- The GDP should include a specific plan to review, with public input, the classification of county shorelines as “buffer” or “modified buffer” in light of GDP overall commitment to the theme of Resilient, Environmentally-Sound, and Sustainable Communities and the goals within its stated priority of Planning for the Natural Environment. In addition to reclassifying much of the shoreline to Buffer, the county should lead the way toward securing a vegetated 100’ buffer even if it means rewarding property owners for contributing to its formation/enhancement. The draft GDP defines and refers to the Critical Area multiple times but shows no indication of strengthening its commitment to the intent of the state Critical Area laws, specifically the 100’ buffer serving to minimize adverse impacts on water quality. At some point in the past, possibly around 1986 when local implementation of the state Critical Area law began, the County classified a significant portion of its shoreline as “modified buffer” areas where development can take place under less demanding rules than those governing disturbance/development in the 100’ buffer (County Code Article 17, section 8). The Plan 2040 Planned Use Map shows that approximately half of the Mayo Peninsula shoreline is considered a “modified buffer” area. This widespread use of modified buffer classification means more disturbance/development within the state-mandated 100’ buffer and ultimately more degradation of the waterways. We believe that decisions made 34 years ago need to be reviewed and updated in light of the amount of new impervious surfaces installed near shorelines, and because of changing environmental conditions, most especially the increasing number of severe storms, king tides and sea level rise. In support of state Critical Area law, county zoning overlays that are less stringent than the state law must be removed from the county land use maps to eliminate potential future confusion on the part of land owners and development reviewers. The overlays shown on the Resource Sensitive</p>	

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p><b>Topic #1: Designate Most Parks on the Mayo Peninsula as “Conservation”</b> -- The Planned Land Use classification of Mayo Beach Park and Carr’s Wharf Pier county properties should be changed from Open Space to Conservation, and that the Glebe Heights (across from Pure Water Way) and the Water Reclamation Facility county-owned properties be reclassified from Public Space to Conservation. Mayo Beach Park (swimming) and Carr’s Wharf Pier (fishing, crabbing) conform to the draft GDP definition of Conservation Land Use: “Land that is publicly and privately-owned and is used for conservation purposes in perpetuity. This designation includes properties preserved through land trusts, platted floodplains, passive open space adjacent to platted floodplains, and passive parks and other conservation lands.” We believe this change in characterization reflects the intent of the 2017 LPPRP, where, for example, both Beverly Triton Nature Park and Mayo Beach Park are listed under the header of “Passive recreation development, such as trails, water access, living shorelines, fishing, parking for access” (page III-46).The 2017 LPPRP also cites an important objective stated in the Department of Recreation and Parks (DRP) Guidelines and Reference Manual under its Recreation &amp; Parks section: “[to] improve quality of life by conserving and enhancing the natural and developed environment for current and future generations.” We see an outsized emphasis in the DRP on Recreation; we believe it is time for greater emphasis on Parks and the conservation of parklands for the benefit of all. Additionally, the Water Reclamation Facility and the Glebe Heights properties are ideal locations to serve the public as reforestation spaces/tree banks for development taking place both on and off the peninsula, expanding forested acreage and improving air quality. We have an obligation, as a peninsular community surrounded by rivers and the Bay, to preserve as much of the natural environment as possible, refrain from introducing additional impervious surfaces on our hardworking Critical Areas, and work against adverse effects on water quality. Characterizing these properties as Conservation for the long-term both serves the public and helps to fulfill our commitment to the environment.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. See Summary of Public Comments document for response to these issues.</p>
<p><b>Topic #2: Support for the Housing Density Ranges</b> -- Zoning ranges for housing density (as opposed to Single Family Detached current classes of R1 R2 and R5) will promote multi-family housing. We support the county’s intention to remove the inequity in housing inherent with single family development zoning. We recognize the equity of a proposed future zoning change from quantity of SFDs per acre to housing density ranges per acre. However, additional model building code language is needed here that would recognize preserving the usage density and architectural integrity/streetscape of mature neighborhoods. This potential reclassification also has the capability of increasing the housing density in existing areas, dependent on the development reviewer’s interpretation of the land use map. We advocate for net zero density increase on the Mayo Peninsula, as the land use map currently supports. We would also like to request that county zoning overlays that are less stringent than the Maryland State Critical Areas Law and similar be removed from county maps to eliminate potential future confusion on the part of land owners and development reviewers. Examples of such redundancies abound on the Mayo Peninsula. A case in point is identified as R5 zoning on the zoning map and RCA on the land use map in the GDP; the latter restricting density to one house per twenty acres.</p>	
<p><b>Topic #3: Strengthen the Effectiveness of the County Critical Area Program</b> -- The GDP should include a specific plan to review, with public input, the classification of county shorelines as “buffer” or “modified buffer” in light of GDP overall commitment to the theme of Resilient, Environmentally-Sound, and Sustainable Communities and the goals within its stated priority of Planning for the Natural Environment. In addition to reclassifying much of the shoreline to Buffer, the county should lead the way toward securing a vegetated 100’ buffer even if it means rewarding property owners for contributing to its formation/enhancement. The draft GDP defines and refers to the Critical Area multiple times but shows no indication of strengthening its commitment to the intent of the state Critical Area laws, specifically the 100’ buffer serving to minimize adverse impacts on water quality. At some point in the past, possibly around 1986 when local implementation of the state Critical Area law began, the County classified a significant portion of its shoreline as “modified buffer” areas where development can take place under less demanding rules than those governing disturbance/development in the 100’ buffer (County Code Article 17, section 8). The Plan 2040 Planned Use Map shows that approximately half of the Mayo Peninsula shoreline is considered a “modified buffer” area. This widespread use of modified buffer classification means more disturbance/development within the state-mandated 100’ buffer and ultimately more degradation of the waterways. We believe that decisions made 34 years ago need to be reviewed and updated in light of the amount of new impervious surfaces installed near shorelines, and because of changing environmental conditions, most especially the increasing number of severe storms, king tides and sea level rise. In support of state Critical Area law, county zoning overlays that are less stringent than the state law must be removed from the county land use maps to eliminate potential future confusion on the part of land owners and development reviewers. The overlays shown on the Resource Sensitive Policy Areas Map must also be shown on the County’s Planned Land Use Map and Zoning Map. Examples of such redundancies abound on the Mayo Peninsula. A case in point (Map 00600, Parcel 0090) is identified as R2 zoning on the proposed GDP’s Land Use Plan and the county’s current zoning</p>	

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>Topic #2: Emphasize Natural Resource Management of Parks – The GDP needs to put a greater emphasis on the conservation of parklands for the benefit of all. We have an obligation, as a peninsular community, surrounded by rivers and the Bay, to preserve as much of the natural environment as possible, refrain from introducing additional impervious surfaces on our hardworking Critical Areas, and work against adverse effects on water quality.'</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. See Summary of Public Comments document for response to these issues.</p>
<p>Topic #3: Support for the Housing Density Ranges -- Zoning ranges for housing density (as opposed to Single Family Detached current classes of R1 R2 and R5) will promote multi-family housing. We support the county's intention to remove the inequity in housing inherent with single family development zoning. We recognize the equity of a proposed future zoning change from quantity of SFDs per acre to housing density ranges per acre. However, additional model building code language is needed here that would recognize preserving the usage density and architectural integrity/streetscape of mature neighborhoods. We advocate for net zero density increase on the Mayo Peninsula, as the land use map currently supports.</p>	
<p>Topic 4: Strengthen AACo Critical Area Zoning – Anne Arundel County zoning overlays are less stringent than the Maryland State Critical Areas Law and should be changed to at least mirror Maryland's. Examples of such redundancies abound on the Mayo Peninsula. A case in point would allow 2 homes per acre on the zoning map, but the land use map shows an RCA designation, restricting density to one house per twenty acres.</p>	
<p>Topic #5: Strengthen the Effectiveness of the County Critical Area Program -- The GDP should include a specific plan to review, with public input, the classification of county shorelines as "buffer" or "modified buffer" in light of GDP overall commitment to the theme of Resilient, Environmentally-Sound, and Sustainable Communities in Planning for the Natural Environment. In addition to reclassifying much of the shoreline to Buffer, the county should lead the way toward securing a vegetated 100' buffer even if it means incentivizing property owners for contributing to its formation/enhancement. The draft GDP defines and refers to the Critical Area multiple times but shows no indication of strengthening its commitment to the intent of the state Critical Area laws, specifically the 100' buffer serving to minimize adverse impacts on water quality. In the mid 80s the County classified a significant portion of its shoreline as "modified buffer" areas where development can take place under less demanding rules than those governing disturbance/development in the 100' buffer. The Plan 2040 Planned Use Map shows that approximately half of the Mayo Peninsula shoreline is considered a "modified buffer" area. This widespread use of modified buffer classification means more disturbance/development within the state-mandated 100' buffer and ultimately more degradation of the waterways. We believe that grandfathering created 34 years ago needs to be reviewed and updated in light of the amount of new impervious surfaces installed near shorelines, and because of changing environmental conditions, most especially the increasing number of severe storms, king tides and sea level rise.</p>	
<p>Topic #6: More Fully Address Impacts of Climate Change and Conservation – The GDP needs to more seriously address the anticipated effect of climate change, including increased threats of flooding and salt water intrusion, increased runoff from additional impervious surface, and the inevitable loss of tree canopy from development in sensitive areas. Between 2002 and 2017, property on the Mayo peninsula lost \$8 million, with almost \$28 million lost in AACo and more than \$555 million in Maryland, according to First Street Foundation research. A serious look into the next 20 years, especially in coastal and peninsular areas like Mayo and the four other peninsulas, must include the known and anticipated effects of sea level rise and climate change. This variable will have the most significant impact on the environmental and economic life in the county in 20 years. Development on the Mayo peninsula has an adverse impact on the water quality of the surrounding waterways – the South, West, and Rhode Rivers and Cadle Creek. Stormwater rules have largely failed in the past as evidenced by the declining water quality of these rivers and associated creeks and streams, and it is not clear that the current stormwater legislation will improve these conditions. Climate change is likely to increase flooding of low-lying coastal areas, while the risk to public health and safety from future storm events is exacerbated by constrained access and egress to residential areas on the peninsula. The GDP should identify programs to limit future waterfront development by compensating coastal land owners for abandonment of development rights, creation of conservation easements, even more stringent controls on storm water runoff, investments in watershed restoration and shoreline protection, even stronger protections for trees, wildlife, and other native species that prevent runoff, and other creative approaches to increasing the resilience and natural buffers of shorelines and surrounding critical areas.</p>	
<p>Topic 7: Strengthen Regional Planning – We applaud the county's intention to engage citizens in the regional planning process for implementation of the GDP, however the regions are large and diverse. Membership on the planning committees needs to assure that local areas such as Edgewater, Londontowne, Mayo, Davidsonville, Galesville, Shadyside, and Deale are fully represented and that the interests of conservation and preservation are balanced against the interests of development. Mayo</p>	

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>I agree with all of the Neighbors of the Mayo Peninsula's comment's on the 2020 GDP. Topic #1: Designate Most Parks on the Mayo Peninsula as "Conservation" -- The Planned Land Use classification of Mayo Beach Park and Carr's Wharf Pier county properties should be changed from Open Space to Conservation, and the Glebe Heights (across from Pure Water Way) and the Water Reclamation Facility county-owned properties should be reclassified from Public Space to Conservation. These changes are consistent with the county's 2017 Land Preservation Parks and Recreation Plan, which commits the county to adhere to the National Recreation &amp; Parks Association goal of Conservation: "Protecting open space, connecting children to nature, and engaging communities in conservation practices. Anne Arundel County is committed to developing its parks and recreation system in a manner that provides opportunity for people of all ages to enjoy natural resources, and that supports the protection of natural resources." Characterizing these properties as Conservation for the long-term both serves the public and helps to fulfill our commitment to the environment. Additionally, the Water Reclamation Facility and the Glebe Heights properties are ideal locations to serve the public as reforestation spaces/tree banks for development taking place both on and off the peninsula, expanding forested acreage and improving air quality. Topic #2: Emphasize Natural Resource Management of Parks – The GDP needs to put a greater emphasis on the conservation of parklands for the benefit of all. We have an obligation, as a peninsular community, surrounded by rivers and the Bay, to preserve as much of the natural environment as possible, refrain from introducing additional impervious surfaces on our hardworking Critical Areas, and work against adverse effects on water quality. Topic #3: Support for the Housing Density Ranges -- Zoning ranges for housing density (as opposed to Single Family Detached current classes of R1 R2 and R5) will promote multi-family housing. We support the county's intention to remove the inequity in housing inherent with single family development zoning. We recognize the equity of a proposed future zoning change from quantity of SFDs per acre to housing density ranges per acre. However, additional model building code language is needed here that would recognize preserving the usage density and architectural integrity/streetscape of mature neighborhoods. We advocate for net zero density increase on the Mayo Peninsula, as the land use map currently supports. Topic 4: Strengthen AACo Critical Area Zoning – Anne Arundel County zoning overlays are less stringent than the Maryland State Critical Areas Law and should be changed to at least mirror Maryland's. Examples of such redundancies abound on the Mayo Peninsula. A case in point would allow 2 homes per acre on the zoning map, but the land use map shows an RCA designation, restricting density to one house per twenty acres. Topic #5: Strengthen the Effectiveness of the County Critical Area Program -- The GDP should include a specific plan to review, with public input, the classification of county shorelines as "buffer" or "modified buffer" in light of GDP overall commitment to the theme of Resilient, Environmentally-Sound, and Sustainable Communities in Planning for the Natural Environment. In addition to reclassifying much of the shoreline to Buffer, the county should lead the way toward securing a vegetated 100' buffer even if it means incentivizing property owners for contributing to its formation/enhancement. The draft GDP defines and refers to the Critical Area multiple times but shows no indication of strengthening its commitment to the intent of the state Critical Area laws, specifically the 100' buffer serving to minimize adverse impacts on water quality. In the mid 80s the County classified a significant portion of its shoreline as "modified buffer" areas where development can take place under less demanding rules than those governing disturbance/development in the 100' buffer. The Plan 2040 Planned Use Map shows that approximately half of the Mayo Peninsula shoreline is considered a "modified buffer" area. This widespread use of modified buffer classification means more disturbance/development within the state-mandated 100' buffer and ultimately more degradation of the waterways. We believe that grandfathering created 34 years ago needs to be reviewed and updated in light of the amount of new impervious surfaces installed near shorelines, and because of changing environmental conditions, most especially the increasing number of severe storms, king tides and sea level rise. Topic #6: More Fully Address Impacts of Climate Change and Conservation – The GDP needs to more seriously address the anticipated effect of climate change, including increased threats of flooding and salt water intrusion, increased runoff from additional impervious surface, and the inevitable loss of tree canopy from development in sensitive areas. Between 2002 and 2017, property on the Mayo peninsula lost \$8 million, with almost \$28 million lost in AACo and more than \$555 million in Maryland, according to First Street Foundation research. A serious look into the next 20 years, especially in coastal and peninsular areas like Mayo and the four other peninsulas, must include the known and anticipated effects of sea level rise and climate change. This variable will have the most significant impact on the environmental and economic life in the county in 20 years. Development on the Mayo peninsula has an adverse impact on the water quality of the surrounding waterways – the South, West, and Rhode Rivers and Cadle Creek. Stormwater rules have largely failed in the past as evidenced by the declining water quality of these rivers and associated creeks and streams, and it is not clear that the current stormwater legislation will improve these conditions. Climate change is likely to increase flooding of low-lying coastal areas, while the risk to public health and safety from future storm events is exacerbated by constrained access and egress to residential areas on the peninsula. The GDP should identify programs to limit future waterfront development by compensating coastal land owners for abandonment of development rights, creation of conservation easements, even more stringent controls on storm water runoff,</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. See Summary of Public Comments document for response to these issues.</p>

Comments	County Response
<p>#1: Designate Most Parks on the Mayo Peninsula as “Conservation” -- The classification of Mayo Beach Park and Carr’s Wharf Pier should be changed from Open Space to Conservation, and the Glebe Heights parcel (across from Pure Water Way) and Water Reclamation Facility should be changed from Public Space to Conservation. This would not change their use or potential use as parks/public access areas but it would help to fulfill our simultaneous commitment to being good stewards of the environment.</p> <p>#2: Emphasize Natural Resource Management of Parks – The GDP needs to put a greater emphasis on the environmental management of park lands for the benefit of all. We have an obligation, as a peninsular community, surrounded by rivers and the Bay, to preserve as much of the natural environment as possible, refrain from introducing additional impervious surfaces on our hardworking Critical Areas, and work against adverse effects on water quality.</p> <p>#3: Support for the Housing Density Ranges -- Zoning ranges for housing density will promote multi-family housing. We support the county’s intention to remove the inequity in housing inherent with single family development zoning. But we need more building code language that would help maintain the usage density and architectural integrity/streetscape of mature neighborhoods. We advocate for net zero density increase on the Mayo Peninsula, as the land use map currently supports.</p> <p>#4: Strengthen Critical Area Zoning – The county's zoning overlays are less stringent than Maryland's Critical Areas Law and should be changed to a strength that at least equals the state law. Examples of such inconsistencies abound on the Mayo Peninsula.</p> <p>#5: Strengthen the Effectiveness of the Critical Area Program -- A significant portion of county shorelines are classified as “modified buffer” areas where development can take place under less demanding rules than would otherwise be allowed in the 100’ buffer. That’s the case for approximately half of the Mayo Peninsula shoreline. This widespread use of modified buffer classification means more disturbance/development within the state-mandated 100’ buffer and ultimately more degradation of the waterways. We believe that grandfathering created 34 years ago needs to be reviewed and updated. The GDP should include a specific plan to review, with public input, the classification of county shorelines as “buffer” or “modified buffer.”</p> <p>#6: More Fully Address Impacts of Climate Change and Conservation – The GDP needs to more seriously address the anticipated effects of increases in flooding, salt water intrusion, and polluted stormwater runoff. The GDP should identify programs to limit waterfront development, compensate coastal land owners for development rights, create conservation easements, further reduce stormwater runoff, invest in watershed restoration and shoreline protection, secure even stronger protection for trees and pursue other creative approaches to increasing the resilience and natural shoreline buffers and critical areas.</p> <p>#7: Strengthen Regional Planning – Membership on the regional planning committees needs to assure that Edgewater, Londontowne, Mayo, Davidsonville, Galesville, Shadyside, and Deale are fully represented and that the interests of conservation and preservation are balanced against the interests of development. Mayo peninsula residents’ greatest concern is the lack of a proactive, balanced land use plan for our community. Past experience with the Small Area Planning process make residents</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. See Summary of Public Comments document for response to these issues.</p>

Comments	County Response
<p>#1: Designate Most Parks on the Mayo Peninsula as “Conservation” -- The classification of Mayo Beach Park and Carr’s Wharf Pier should be changed from Open Space to Conservation, and the Glebe Heights parcel (across from Pure Water Way) and Water Reclamation Facility should be changed from Public Space to Conservation. This would not change their use or potential use as parks/public access areas but it would help to fulfill our simultaneous commitment to being good stewards of the environment.</p> <p>#2: Emphasize Natural Resource Management of Parks – The GDP needs to put a greater emphasis on the environmental management of park lands for the benefit of all. We have an obligation, as a peninsular community, surrounded by rivers and the Bay, to preserve as much of the natural environment as possible, refrain from introducing additional impervious surfaces on our hardworking Critical Areas, and work against adverse effects on water quality.</p> <p>#3: Support for the Housing Density Ranges -- Zoning ranges for housing density will promote multi-family housing. We support the county’s intention to remove the inequity in housing inherent with single family development zoning. But we need more building code language that would help maintain the usage density and architectural integrity/streetscape of mature neighborhoods. We advocate for net zero density increase on the Mayo Peninsula, as the land use map currently supports.</p> <p>#4: Strengthen Critical Area Zoning – The county’s zoning overlays are less stringent than Maryland’s Critical Areas Law and should be changed to a strength that at least equals the state law. Examples of such inconsistencies abound on the Mayo Peninsula.</p> <p>#5: Strengthen the Effectiveness of the Critical Area Program -- A significant portion of county shorelines are classified as “modified buffer” areas where development can take place under less demanding rules than would otherwise be allowed in the 100’ buffer. That’s the case for approximately half of the Mayo Peninsula shoreline. This widespread use of modified buffer classification means more disturbance/development within the state-mandated 100’ buffer and ultimately more degradation of the waterways. We believe that grandfathering created 34 years ago needs to be reviewed and updated. The GDP should include a specific plan to review, with public input, the classification of county shorelines as “buffer” or “modified buffer.”</p> <p>#6: More Fully Address Impacts of Climate Change and Conservation – The GDP needs to more seriously address the anticipated effects of increases in flooding, salt water intrusion, and polluted stormwater runoff. The GDP should identify programs to limit waterfront development, compensate coastal land owners for development rights, create conservation easements, further reduce stormwater runoff, invest in watershed restoration and shoreline protection, secure even stronger protection for trees and pursue other creative approaches to increasing the resilience and natural shoreline buffers and critical areas.</p> <p>#7: Strengthen Regional Planning – Membership on the regional planning committees needs to assure that Edgewater, Londontowne, Mayo, Davidsonville, Galesville, Shadyside, and Deale are fully represented and that the interests of conservation and preservation are balanced against the interests of development. Mayo peninsula residents’ greatest concern is the lack of a proactive, balanced land use plan for our community. Past experience with the Small Area Planning process make residents skeptical that regional plans will be successful. The fact that the Mayo peninsula is in one of the planning zones to be dealt with later in the local planning process increases that skepticism.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. Please see the Summary of Public Comments document for response to these topics.</p>

Comments	County Response
<p>The Neighbors of the Mayo Peninsula have developed position statements on 7 topics that we believe are critical to quality of life on the Mayo Peninsula (see below). I support these position statements.</p> <p>#1: Designate Most Parks on the Mayo Peninsula as “Conservation” -- The classification of Mayo Beach Park and Carr’s Wharf Pier should be changed from Open Space to Conservation, and the Glebe Heights parcel (across from Pure Water Way) and Water Reclamation Facility should be changed from Public Space to Conservation. This would not change their use or potential use as parks/public access areas but it would help to fulfill our simultaneous commitment to being good stewards of the environment.</p> <p>#2: Emphasize Natural Resource Management of Parks – The GDP needs to put a greater emphasis on the environmental management of park lands for the benefit of all. We have an obligation, as a peninsular community, surrounded by rivers and the Bay, to preserve as much of the natural environment as possible, refrain from introducing additional impervious surfaces on our hardworking Critical Areas, and work against adverse effects on water quality.</p> <p>#3: Support for the Housing Density Ranges -- Zoning ranges for housing density will promote multi-family housing. We support the county’s intention to remove the inequity in housing inherent with single family development zoning. But we need more building code language that would help maintain the usage density and architectural integrity/streetscape of mature neighborhoods. We advocate for net zero density increase on the Mayo Peninsula, as the land use map currently supports.</p> <p>#4: Strengthen Critical Area Zoning – The county's zoning overlays are less stringent than Maryland's Critical Areas Law and should be changed to a strength that at least equals the state law. Examples of such inconsistencies abound on the Mayo Peninsula.</p> <p>#5: Strengthen the Effectiveness of the Critical Area Program -- A significant portion of county shorelines are classified as “modified buffer” areas where development can take place under less demanding rules than would otherwise be allowed in the 100’ buffer. That's the case for approximately half of the Mayo Peninsula shoreline. This widespread use of modified buffer classification means more disturbance/development within the state-mandated 100’ buffer and ultimately more degradation of the waterways. We believe that grandfathering created 34 years ago needs to be reviewed and updated. The GDP should include a specific plan to review, with public input, the classification of county shorelines as “buffer” or “modified buffer.” My add: Much of the stormwater runoff problem in critical areas appears to be allowed by state code. Anne Arundel should establish more stringent code requirements where the state code is dated and inadequate. For example, "The water quality volume (WQv) is required to be controlled only for the specific project. WQv for offsite areas is not required (see page 2.4 “Offsite Drainage Areas”)". By design and by code an onsite project can produce an offsite erosion problem during discharge. (See development, water collection and holding pond discharge at Sweet Leaf Ln, Mayo. as an example)</p> <p>#6: More Fully Address Impacts of Climate Change and Conservation – The GDP needs to more seriously address the anticipated effects of increases in flooding, salt water intrusion, and polluted stormwater runoff. The GDP should identify programs to limit waterfront development, compensate coastal land owners for development rights, create conservation easements, further reduce stormwater runoff, invest in watershed restoration and shoreline protection, secure even stronger protection for trees and pursue other creative approaches to increasing the resilience and natural shoreline buffers and critical areas.</p> <p>#7: Strengthen Regional Planning – Membership on the regional planning committees needs to assure that Edgewater, Londontowne, Mayo, Davidsonville, Galesville, Shadyside, and Deale are fully represented and that the interests of conservation and preservation are balanced against the interests of development. Mayo peninsula residents’ greatest concern is the lack of a proactive, balanced land use plan for our community. Past experience with the Small Area Planning process make residents skeptical that regional plans will be successful. The fact that the Mayo peninsula is in one of the planning zones to be dealt with later in the local planning process increases that skepticism.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. See Summary of Public Comments document for response to these issues.</p>

Comments	County Response
<p>#1: Designate Most Parks on the Mayo Peninsula as “Conservation” -- The classification of Mayo Beach Park and Carr’s Wharf Pier should be changed from Open Space to Conservation, and the Glebe Heights parcel (across from Pure Water Way) and Water Reclamation Facility should be changed from Public Space to Conservation. This would not change their use or potential use as parks/public access areas but it would help to fulfill our simultaneous commitment to being good stewards of the environment.</p> <p>#2: Emphasize Natural Resource Management of Parks – The GDP needs to put a greater emphasis on the environmental management of park lands for the benefit of all. We have an obligation, as a peninsular community, surrounded by rivers and the Bay, to preserve as much of the natural environment as possible, refrain from introducing additional impervious surfaces on our hardworking Critical Areas, and work against adverse effects on water quality.</p> <p>#3: Support for the Housing Density Ranges -- Zoning ranges for housing density will promote multi-family housing. We support the county’s intention to remove the inequity in housing inherent with single family development zoning. But we need more building code language that would help maintain the usage density and architectural integrity/streetscape of mature neighborhoods. We advocate for net zero density increase on the Mayo Peninsula, as the land use map currently supports.</p> <p>#4: Strengthen Critical Area Zoning – The county's zoning overlays are less stringent than Maryland's Critical Areas Law and should be changed to a strength that at least equals the state law. Examples of such inconsistencies abound on the Mayo Peninsula.</p> <p>#5: Strengthen the Effectiveness of the Critical Area Program -- A significant portion of county shorelines are classified as “modified buffer” areas where development can take place under less demanding rules than would otherwise be allowed in the 100’ buffer. That’s the case for approximately half of the Mayo Peninsula shoreline. This widespread use of modified buffer classification means more disturbance/development within the state-mandated 100’ buffer and ultimately more degradation of the waterways. We believe that grandfathering created 34 years ago needs to be reviewed and updated. The GDP should include a specific plan to review, with public input, the classification of county shorelines as “buffer” or “modified buffer.”</p> <p>#6: More Fully Address Impacts of Climate Change and Conservation – The GDP needs to more seriously address the anticipated effects of increases in flooding, salt water intrusion, and polluted stormwater runoff. The GDP should identify programs to limit waterfront development, compensate coastal land owners for development rights, create conservation easements, further reduce stormwater runoff, invest in watershed restoration and shoreline protection, secure even stronger protection for trees and pursue other creative approaches to increasing the resilience and natural shoreline buffers and critical areas.</p> <p>#7: Strengthen Regional Planning – Membership on the regional planning committees needs to assure that Edgewater, Londontowne, Mayo, Davidsonville, Galesville, Shadyside, and Deale are fully represented and that the interests of conservation and preservation are balanced against the interests of development. Mayo peninsula residents’ greatest concern is the lack of a proactive, balanced land use plan for our community. Past experience with the Small Area Planning process make residents skeptical that regional plans will be successful. The fact that the Mayo peninsula is in one of the planning zones to be dealt with later in the local planning process increases that skepticism.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. See Summary of Public Comments document for response to these issues.</p>

Comments	County Response
<p>#1: Designate Most Parks on the Mayo Peninsula as “Conservation” -- The classification of Mayo Beach Park and Carr’s Wharf Pier should be changed from Open Space to Conservation, and the Glebe Heights parcel (across from Pure Water Way) and Water Reclamation Facility should be changed from Public Space to Conservation. This would not change their use or potential use as parks/public access areas but it would help to fulfill our simultaneous commitment to being good stewards of the environment.</p> <p>#2: Emphasize Natural Resource Management of Parks – The GDP needs to put a greater emphasis on the environmental management of park lands for the benefit of all. We have an obligation, as a peninsular community, surrounded by rivers and the Bay, to preserve as much of the natural environment as possible, refrain from introducing additional impervious surfaces on our hardworking Critical Areas, and work against adverse effects on water quality.</p> <p>#3: Support for the Housing Density Ranges -- Zoning ranges for housing density will promote multi-family housing. We support the county’s intention to remove the inequity in housing inherent with single family development zoning. But we need more building code language that would help maintain the usage density and architectural integrity/streetscape of mature neighborhoods. We advocate for net zero density increase on the Mayo Peninsula, as the land use map currently supports.</p> <p>#4: Strengthen Critical Area Zoning – The county's zoning overlays are less stringent than Maryland's Critical Areas Law and should be changed to a strength that at least equals the state law. Examples of such inconsistencies abound on the Mayo Peninsula.</p> <p>#5: Strengthen the Effectiveness of the Critical Area Program -- A significant portion of county shorelines are classified as “modified buffer” areas where development can take place under less demanding rules than would otherwise be allowed in the 100’ buffer. That’s the case for approximately half of the Mayo Peninsula shoreline. This widespread use of modified buffer classification means more disturbance/development within the state-mandated 100’ buffer and ultimately more degradation of the waterways. We believe that grandfathering created 34 years ago needs to be reviewed and updated. The GDP should include a specific plan to review, with public input, the classification of county shorelines as “buffer” or “modified buffer.”</p> <p>#6: More Fully Address Impacts of Climate Change and Conservation – The GDP needs to more seriously address the anticipated effects of increases in flooding, salt water intrusion, and polluted stormwater runoff. The GDP should identify programs to limit waterfront development, compensate coastal land owners for development rights, create conservation easements, further reduce stormwater runoff, invest in watershed restoration and shoreline protection, secure even stronger protection for trees and pursue other creative approaches to increasing the resilience and natural shoreline buffers and critical areas.</p> <p>#7: Strengthen Regional Planning – Membership on the regional planning committees needs to assure that Edgewater, Londontowne, Mayo, Davidsonville, Galesville, Shadyside, and Deale are fully represented and that the interests of conservation and preservation are balanced against the interests of development. Mayo peninsula residents’ greatest concern is the lack of a proactive, balanced land use plan for our community. Past experience with the Small Area Planning process make residents skeptical that regional plans will be successful. The fact that the Mayo peninsula is in one of the planning zones to be dealt with later in the local planning process increases that skepticism.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. See Summary of Public Comments document for response to these issues.</p>
<p>#1: Designate Most Parks on the Mayo Peninsula as “Conservation” -- The Planned Land Use classification of Mayo Beach Park and Carr’s Wharf Pier county properties should be changed from Open Space to Conservation, and the Glebe Heights (across from Pure Water Way) and the Water Reclamation Facility county-owned properties should be reclassified from Public Space to Conservation. These changes are consistent with the county’s 2017 Land Preservation Parks and Recreation Plan, which commits the county to adhere to the National Recreation &amp; Parks Association goal of Conservation: "Protecting open space, connecting children to nature, and engaging communities in conservation practices. Anne Arundel County is committed to developing its parks and recreation system in a manner that provides opportunity for people of all ages to enjoy natural resources, and that supports the protection of natural resources." Characterizing these properties as Conservation for the long-term both serves the public and helps to fulfill our commitment to the environment. Additionally, the Water Reclamation Facility and the Glebe Heights properties are ideal locations to serve the public as reforestation spaces/tree banks for development taking place both on and off the peninsula, expanding forested acreage and improving air quality.</p>	<p>We appreciate your concern for the protection of natural resources on these public lands. The decision to classify parks as Conservation or Open Space was based on their primary use. The Conservation designation is given to parks where the primary use is for conservation and does not preclude open space, or active recreation or public use. In addition Open Space is reserved for properties where the primary use is active recreation but does not preclude conservation or public use. Public Use is reserved where the primary use of the property is a public facility, but does not preclude Conservation nor Open Space activities.</p>

Comments	County Response
<p>All Mayo Peninsula Parks including the Mayo Beach Park, Carrs Wharf Pier, the Mayo Wastewater Reclamation Facility Park at River Club, and Glebe Heights Community System Park should be designated for Conservation. The St. Mark's UM Church and Cemetery, Hope Chapel Cemetery, the Rosenwald School site, the Gresham property, and the Oyster middens at Beverly Triton Nature Park should be designated as historic resources.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>Good evening - I hope someone can help be understand something I noticed in the Resource Sensitive Policy Area mapping. In looking at this map on your Plan 2040 webpage, and then filtering for "Critical Area - Buffer/Modified Buffer," I see what appears to be a majority of shoreline on the Mayo peninsula is "modified buffer." Please explain what the Modified Buffer means and why so much of our shoreline here is in that category.</p>	<p>Thank you for taking the time to review the Plan2040 materials.</p> <p>The Critical Area Buffer is the area of at least one hundred feet located directly adjacent to the State's tidal waters, tidal wetlands, and tributary streams. Ideally, this Buffer is composed of trees, shrubs, and other plants that catch sediments and other pollutants coming from buildings, lawns and paved areas.</p> <p>Modified Buffer Areas are areas are places, communities, subdivisions, or neighborhoods within a town or county where the Buffer does not function properly. This is because the pattern of development involves roads, buildings, and utilities within the Buffer. Usually these areas include multiple lots and were developed and built out long before the Critical Area Law was adopted. In order to allow for reasonable development and redevelopment in these areas, COMAR 27.01.09.01-8 gives local governments the authority to designate them as Modified Buffer Areas. Within these areas, property owners have some flexibility with regard to disturbance to the Buffer. Local programs vary, but generally the Buffer in these areas is regulated by local zoning laws. Development activities are permitted and mitigated as specified by the local zoning code as implemented by the planning department.</p> <p>Anne Arundel County has a buffer modification program for areas where there is no existing functioning minimum 100 foot buffer. These areas are also denoted on maps and other buffer regulations apply. For more information on the Buffer and Buffer Modification Area requirements, please visit Article 17, Section 8 of the County Code.</p>

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>The Mayo Peninsula has been identified as a Growth Area and OPZ considers Mayo a Tier 1 Growth area. Under MD State criteria, Growth areas have the water resources and infrastructure to accommodate population and business expansion in an orderly, efficient, and environmentally sustainable manner. The Mayo Peninsula meets none of these criteria, so OPZ should redesignate Mayo as Growth Tier 3 or to a Growth Tier more inline with the resources, infrastructure, and character of the Mayo Peninsula. Consistency between goals and policies and the land map used for future planning is critical. Plan2040 projects growth of 50,000 citizens or 29,000 housing units by 2040, but OPZ has stated that holding capacity with current zoning is only 13,488 units. It appears that dramatic rezoning in targeted growth areas will need to occur, but no effort has been made to assess practical holding capacity in these areas. Targeting of town centers for future growth should not be done without coordination with town center planning. The language of Plan2040 mentions the challenges of development on peninsulas and the opportunities to limit development on peninsulas, protect shorelines, streams and forested areas, and manage the challenges of limited road access on peninsulas. We strongly support limiting development on the Mayo Peninsula. Development limited to infill and redevelopment compatible with the existing character of the neighborhoods with no net increase in density is supported by the land use map. The language of Plan2040 should be specific that these are goals and polices for development on peninsulas. Composition of the Regional Planning Committees will be particularly important in determining the content of the Regional Plans. The proposed committee structure is over weighted with developers, brokers, and others representing commercial interests. The county population is made of 10 times more employees than businesses, suggesting the business community is a small fraction of total residents. Commercial interests should be restricted to no more than 2 representatives on a Regional Planning Committees. It is vitally important the residents of Mayo, Edgewater, Galesville, Shadyside and Deale be adequately represented in the planning processes that will impact their future communities and quality of life.</p>	<p>The comment references Growth Tiers that are based on the Sustainable Growth and Agriculture Preservation Act of 2012. The law restricts residential subdivisions through the use of a system of growth tiers. The law limits the number of lots that can be developed on individual septic systems in certain areas. Tiers must be mapped based on criteria outlined in the law and will determine the type of sewage disposal system allowed in a given area. Tier I is defined in the law as areas currently served by sewer systems. Since the Mayo Peninsula is served by the Mayo-Glebe Heights sewer service area, it is classified as Tier I. While representative of where public sewer service is available and where the County has developed in the past, Growth Tier I is not indicative of the County's "Growth Areas." The County's Growth Areas are shown on the Development Policy Areas Map. Please see the Summary of Public Comments document for more detailed response.</p>
<p>Plan2040 relies on the Smart Growth concept to specify that new development should occur at town centers, transportation centers and designated redevelopment areas, but does not provide how much or what kind of development should occur. Citizens in many areas feel that there has been too much development that has happened too quickly. However, there is nothing in the plan about determining growth limits, description of avenues for community involvement in growth rate decisions or identification of tools for community control of rate of growth for various types of development. The language of Plan2040 mentions the challenges of development on peninsulas and the opportunities to limit development on peninsulas, protect shorelines, streams and forested areas, and manage the challenges of limited road access on peninsulas. Development should be limited on the Mayo Peninsula. Development limited to infill and redevelopment compatible with the existing character of the neighborhoods with no net increase in density is supported by the land use map. The language of Plan2040 should be specific that these are goals and polices for development on peninsulas.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>1.We need public water to replace wells. before any more development of the Mayo peninsula -- with fire hydrants throughout the peninsula. 2. Rt. 214 from Muddy Creek Rd to the elementary school should be a 4 lane boulevard with walking/biking in between. 3. NO ADDITIONAL COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT SHOULD BE ALLOWED. 4. Green areas, parks, access should be improved, and where possible, linked together. 5. South River Farm Park should have direct access from Rt.214 -- not through Loch Haven!</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>After studying the proposal it is apparent no one is looking at the traffic to the Mayo Peninsula right now. The growth rate proposed for Mayo is definitely too dense. The area communities need to have representatives at all planning meetings.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>

Comments	County Response
<p>The Mayo peninsula needs more infrastructure improvements before growth. 214 between Mayo and Muddy Creek road floods consistently. The best the county can do is put up High Water signs. Traffic is a big issue. Mayo is a small town, it looks like the DC beltway with a consistent line of vehicles coming and going. How much money is needed or gained by overdeveloping an already crowded area. I would rather pay higher taxes than see more growth. The growth is comical and indicative of any easy buck. As soon as the sewer system gets upgraded, here come the builders. You see houses being built that are less than 15 feet apart, shameful and greedy. Why do you want to make a suburb look like a downtown area. Take a look at the Kmart shopping center, many vacant stores, how about concentrating on building an economy rather than building houses and putting more and more people on top of one another. It's a peninsula, there is only so much space. Stop making it less and less desirable.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. Plan2040 includes a set of policies designed to address the flooding, transportation, and environmental issues of Mayo and other peninsulas in the County. Please see Built Environment Goal 4 and its supporting policies and strategies.</p>
<p>Mayo Peninsula should absolutely not be considered Tier 1 growth. The infrastructure is not in place and putting the infrastructure in will significantly impact the critical environment that makes up the peninsula.</p>	<p>The comment references Growth Tiers that are based on the Sustainable Growth and Agriculture Preservation Act of 2012. The law restricts residential subdivisions through the use of a system of growth tiers. The law limits the number of lots that can be developed on individual septic systems in certain areas. Tiers must be mapped based on criteria outlined in the law and will determine the type of sewage disposal system allowed in a given area. Tier I is defined in the law as areas currently served by sewer systems. Since the Mayo Peninsula is served by the Mayo-Glebe Heights sewer service area, it is classified as Tier I. While representative of where public sewer service is available and where the County has developed in the past, Growth Tier I is not indicative of the County's "Growth Areas." The County's Growth Areas are shown on the Development Policy Areas Map.</p>
<p>Mayo peninsula should not be considered a tier 1 growth area! There is NO safe justification for the injection of additional residents. The county has already failed to provide safe roadways! After the building moratorium was lifted and the local parks are free to residents of MD and ALL other states your office has intentionally put the lives and safety of the Mayo area at risk! There are delays in fire and EMT responses already and you support adding 50k more residents and up to 29k more homes would be catastrophic! Stuart Pitman was elected because he stated that he was AGAINST this rezoning and changing the make up of these communities! Now we see he is only against changing his community! He and his family own large farms south of here and he wants to preserve that area and stop development there! Your administration is full of hypocrites! You have done nothing positive for the people of the county! STOP development of an area that has shallow wells, unsafe drinking water, dangerous roads during inclement weather! This plan will reduce our property values and degrade our blue ribbon schools to be just another Annapolis city school where those who graduate can't even read or get accepted to a reputable University! NO condos, NO multi-unit housing! You are intentionally changing the face of our community for personal financial gain! Please release your personal tax returns and those of your entire extended family ASAP! NO NEW residents and NO new developments can be safely added to our community! Your studies are flawed and paid for by developers who have an interest in making our community larger and changing our demographics!</p>	<p>The comment references Growth Tiers that are based on the Sustainable Growth and Agriculture Preservation Act of 2012. The law restricts residential subdivisions through the use of a system of growth tiers. The law limits the number of lots that can be developed on individual septic systems in certain areas. Tiers must be mapped based on criteria outlined in the law and will determine the type of sewage disposal system allowed in a given area. Tier I is defined in the law as areas currently served by sewer systems. Since the Mayo Peninsula is served by the Mayo-Glebe Heights sewer service area, it is classified as Tier I. While representative of where public sewer service is available and where the County has developed in the past, Growth Tier I is not indicative of the County's "Growth Areas." The County's Growth Areas are shown on the Development Policy Areas Map.</p>

Comments	County Response
<p>The Mayo Peninsula meets none of the criteria of a Tier 1. So it needs to be redesignated as Tier 3. Because Mayo Peninsula is a peninsula, growth and development should follow the guidelines for such with strong community input. Regional planning process needs to be transparent to the community members with active input. The different parks on the Mayo Peninsula need to be designated for conservation not extensive development.</p>	<p>The comment references Growth Tiers that are based on the Sustainable Growth and Agriculture Preservation Act of 2012. The law restricts residential subdivisions through the use of a system of growth tiers. The law limits the number of lots that can be developed on individual septic systems in certain areas. Tiers must be mapped based on criteria outlined in the law and will determine the type of sewage disposal system allowed in a given area. Tier I is defined in the law as areas currently served by sewer systems. Since the Mayo Peninsula is served by the Mayo-Glebe Heights sewer service area, it is classified as Tier I. While representative of where public sewer service is available and where the County has developed in the past, Growth Tier I is not indicative of the County's "Growth Areas." The County's Growth Areas are shown on the Development Policy Areas Map.</p>
<p>The referenced pages read as though there may be a zoning designation [proposed in the future] of low to medium density for some parcels previously zoned R2 and medium density for R5. Historically residential R1 and R2 zoned properties were considered low density. The Table on page 110 indicates that current R2 zoning could go two ways in the future, either to low density status, or low to medium density status. If [current] R2 goes to the "low to medium" density category it is assumed that residential development density of these lots could fill the gap between R1 and R5. And, [current] R5 could accommodate up to 10 dwelling units per 7,000 sf.</p> <p>Page 110 of the GDP2040 proceeds to the graphic, numbered 18 and titled, Land Use Plan. In this graphic, the communities, on the Mayo Peninsula, of Loch Haven, Selby, Shoreham Beach, Beverly Beach and surrounding communities are depicted as medium to low density; predominantly [current] R5. The currently designated R2 communities and parcels on the Peninsula are shown in the graphic as low density areas.</p> <p>Is it realistic to believe that the Graphic numbered 18, will override the Table numbered 18 when visited for clarification in the future?</p> <p>Removing current residential density designations and replacing these with ranges could more than triple the potential for development on the Mayo Peninsula which is now taxed to sustainably support the existing population.</p> <p>Can you provide some information behind this duality of R2 and R5 reclassifications so that I can think about it further?</p> <p>Thanks for your answer and I applaud your and your teams' really great work in this GDP effort.</p>	<p>In the 2009 GDP, residential R1 and R2 zoned properties were considered low density. In some cases, historically, properties with R2 zoning were classified as Low-Medium Density, which in some circumstances, could have allowed rezoning to R5. Table 18 on Page 110 limits this. Note that it draws a distinction between the defined density of residential land use categories of the 2009 GDP and those of Plan2040, with the intent of avoiding ambiguity in future rezoning. The 2nd and 3rd columns reflect 2009 GDP density and zoning definitions, while the last two columns reflect the proposed density and zoning definitions for Plan2040. In the latter, R2 and R5 zoning correspond to different Planned Land Use categories. Our land use analysis was conducted to bring consistency between the established development pattern and density of existing neighborhoods and the Planned Land Use category. The Low Density and Low-Medium Density categories for Plan2040 correspond to different zoning categories in Table 18 to help avoid the kind of upzoning you describe in your email. All of the communities you mention are classified in the draft Plan2040 Land Use map as Low-Medium Density Residential, which is consistent with their R5 zoning. For some portions of those neighborhoods where the existing built density is more consistent with Low Density than Low-Medium Density, the Planned Land Use was changed to Low Density Residential in the draft Plan2040 land use. OPZ hopes that the staff analysis will have limited examples of inconsistency between built, established densities and planned land use designation. We hope you and other members of the public who know your communities best will really study the proposed Land Use Map to ensure that it accurately reflects established communities. Thank you for taking the time to look at this.</p>
<p>In the Online Open House, there was an image of what a Critical Corridor for 214 on the Mayo Peninsula might entail. In responding to the Online Open House, we asked that it be removed, and you have done that in the print version of the GDP. We are getting more information about what that might mean, and would like to see the proposed corridor boundaries again. Is there any way we can see that map from the Online Open House?</p>	<p>Please use this link to access the Online Open House. [Map link required an Enterprise login, so a pdf from August was sent]</p>

Comments	County Response
<p>I have recently reviewed the 2040 GDP - thank you for your efforts in putting together this document. In reviewing its pages, particularly the section on "Planning for Healthy Communities," it is clear that one priority is "Expanding on the 12,000 acres of parks and natural resources areas managed by Anne Arundel County." This is great. However, I would like to express a concern that is shared by me and many of my neighbors. Significant interconnected bicycle or pedestrian pathways networks exist or are planned in areas north (Severna Park, Glen Burnie, etc.). On the other hand, there seems to be limited planning to have similar public improvements considered for our part of the county (Edgewater, Mayo, Davidsonville, and points south). Either this is a big oversight, or it is a significant lost opportunity on the part of the planners. Adding and connecting walkable and bikeable networks in the southern part of the county would allow the families (including mine) that live in the communities cut off by the major roads cutting through the area - e.g., routes 2 and 214 - to take advantage of the existing green spaces in new ways. Many of our neighborhoods have no sidewalks or parks and have limited walkability and bikeability. We must climb our cars to get to places safe enough for our children to bike and play. We cannot walk to schools, even though they are just nearby. Prioritizing the development of an interconnected recreational bicycle and pedestrian network in District 7 would be a huge positive step forward for the county and the health of its families and environment. Thus, I request that the planners seriously consider doing so. Thank you for your time.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. Plan2040 includes multiple policies and strategies that support improvements to the bicycle network, including Built Environmental Policy BE15.2 and supporting strategies. Plan2040 identifies bicycle network improvements in District 7 including along Route 2 and Route 4 (see Figure 25 in Volume ii - Background Information). Please see Move Anne Arundel (the Transportation Functional Master Plan) and the Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan for more details on planned bike and pedestrian improvements in District 7.</p>
<p>I am a resident of Edgewater, MD. I only recently became aware of the 2040 GDP - it would be great to have a way to ensure that all ACo residents be aware of this plan! There is a lot of terrific information included within it's pages. In reviewing the plan, one item that is blatantly missing is any consideration for the long-term implementation of interconnected bicycle or pedestrian pathways in our portion of the county. While there is indeed a lot of rural areas in the southern part of the county, not including networks to make both the more aAND the less populated areas walkable and bikeable is a huge lost opportunity. Significant networks exist or are planned in areas north (Severna Park, Glen Burnie, etc.), and after recently speaking with our county council representative (Jessica Haire, District 7), it is clear that there is limited discussion to have similar public improvements considered for our part of the county (Edgewater, Mayo, Davidsonville, and points south). Rest assured, there are no shortage of residents in this area that would greatly benefit from more walkable and bikeable land! Our schools are overcrowded with children (including mine), and most cannot walk to school due to major roads cutting through the area - routes 2 and 214. Many of our neighborhoods have no sidewalks, are isolated by these highways and other busy roads with no sidewalks, and are bordered by rivers, essentially cutting us off from park and bike areas. We need to get into our cars in order to get to places safe enough for our children to get outside and play. I would like to request that the 2040 GDP prioritize the development of an interconnected recreational bicycle and pedestrian network in District 7. In reviewing maps of the area and considering the possibility of attractive pedestrian/bike bridges to safely connect the region's green spaces, it seems that this effort could be a huge win for the county. I have spent years having to get into my car to find nearby parks for my family to bike or walk, and it would be wonderful if we, and all of our nearby friends and neighbors - young and old - could just walk out the door and/or hop on our bikes and enjoy time nearby - no fossil fuels needed. Thank you for your time as you consider this feedback.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. Plan2040 includes multiple policies and strategies that support improvements to the bicycle network, including Built Environmental Policy BE15.2 and supporting strategies. Plan2040 identifies bicycle network improvements in District 7 including along Route 2 and Route 4 (see Figure 25 in Volume ii - Background Information). Please see Move Anne Arundel (the Transportation Functional Master Plan) and the Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan for more details on planned bike and pedestrian improvements in District 7.</p>

Comments	County Response
<p>I am a resident of Edgewater, MD. I only recently became aware of the 2040 GDP - it would be great to have a way to ensure that all AACo residents be aware of this plan! There is a lot of terrific information included within its pages.</p> <p>In reviewing the plan, one item that is blatantly missing is any consideration for the long-term implementation of interconnected bicycle or pedestrian pathways in our portion of the county. While there is indeed a lot of rural areas in the southern part of the county, not including networks to make both the more aAND the less populated areas walkable and bikeable is a huge lost opportunity. Significant networks exist or are planned in areas north (Severna Park, Glen Burnie, etc.), and after recently speaking with our county council representative (Jessica Haire, District 7), it is clear that there is limited discussion to have similar public improvements considered for our part of the county (Edgewater, Mayo, Davidsonville, and points south). Rest assured, there are no shortage of residents in this area that would greatly benefit from more walkable and bikeable land! Our schools are overcrowded with children (including mine), and most cannot walk to school due to major roads cutting through the area - routes 2 and 214. Many of our neighborhoods have no sidewalks, are isolated by these highways and other busy roads with no sidewalks, and are bordered by rivers, essentially cutting us off from park and bike areas. We need to get into our cars in order to get to places safe enough for our children to get outside and play.</p> <p>I would like to request that the 2040 GDP prioritize the development of an interconnected recreational bicycle and pedestrian network in District 7. In reviewing maps of the area and considering the possibility of attractive pedestrian/bike bridges to safely connect the region's green spaces, it seems that this effort could be a huge win for the county. I have spent years having to get into my car to find nearby parks for my family to bike or walk, and it would be wonderful if we, and all of our nearby friends and neighbors - young and old - could just walk out the door and/or hop on our bikes and enjoy time nearby - no fossil fuels needed.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. Plan2040 includes multiple policies and strategies that support improvements to the bicycle network, including Built Environmental Policy BE15.2 and supporting strategies. More specific details on bicycle network improvements are identified in the Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan.</p>
<p>As a citizen of Edgewater, MD living off of Mayo Road, there is a definite need in our area of District 7 (Davidsonville, Edgewater, Mayo and points South) for the inclusion of bike lanes to be added to the future development plans. The multitude of bikers in our area need to have safer roads to travel on, as their safety (as well as the drivers that try to avoid getting close to them) is often at risk given the current road structures that do not include bike lanes. There are barely any shoulders that allow for both bikes and traffic to travel the same routes together without compromising safety. The current plans for future development, adding more cars and traffic to our area, make it even more imperative there are a specified areas designated for these lanes. Thank you.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. Plan2040 includes multiple policies and strategies that support improvements to the bicycle network, including Built Environmental Policy BE15.2 and supporting strategies. Plan2040 identifies bicycle network improvements in District 7 including along Route 2 and Route 4 (see Figure 25 in Volume ii - Background Information). Please see Move Anne Arundel (the Transportation Functional Master Plan) and the Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan for more details on planned bike and pedestrian improvements in District 7.</p>
<p>Re: Anne Arundel County update of the 2040 General Development Plan (GDP) Please prioritize, fund and implement public projects for the long-term implementation of interconnected bicycle or pedestrian pathways in our portion of the county. Significant networks are planned in areas north (Severna Park, Glen Burnie, etc.) and also should include District 7 (Edgewater, Mayo, Davidsonville, and points south). Please have the GDP prioritize the development of an interconnected recreational bicycle and pedestrian network in District 7. Thank you for your dedication, Christine Green 200 Grays Road Harwood MD 20776</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. Plan2040 includes multiple policies and strategies that support improvements to the bicycle network, including Built Environmental Policy BE15.2 and supporting strategies. Plan2040 identifies bicycle network improvements in District 7 including along Route 2 and Route 4 (see Figure 25 in Volume ii - Background Information). Please see Move Anne Arundel (the Transportation Functional Master Plan) and the Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan for more details on planned bike and pedestrian improvements in District 7.</p>

Comments	County Response
<p>One item that is blatantly missing from the plan is any consideration for the long-term implementation of interconnected bicycle or pedestrian pathways in our portion of the county (Edgewater, Mayo, Davidsonville).</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. Plan2040 includes multiple policies and strategies that support improvements to the bicycle network, including Built Environmental Policy BE15.2 and supporting strategies. Plan2040 identifies bicycle network improvements in District 7 including along Route 2 and Route 4 (see Figure 25 in Volume ii - Background Information). Please see Move Anne Arundel (the Transportation Functional Master Plan) and the Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan for more details on planned bike and pedestrian improvements in District 7.</p>

Comments	County Response
<p>November 15, 2020 The Honorable Steuart Pittman County Executive Anne Arundel County, Maryland Dear Sir: Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Plan2040 General Development Plan (GDP). The Public Water Access Committee is a broad-based group of volunteer “wet feet” activists who work to improve public water access in Anne Arundel County and the Chesapeake Bay. Eighty percent of the people in Anne Arundel County do not live in water-privileged communities or waterfront homes. Although the draft Plan2040 includes the equity goal of the inclusion of all residents and the removal of barriers that limit opportunities based on who they are or where they live (Vol. 1, page 10), other features of draft Plan2040 undermine that goal and promote inequity.</p> <p>1) The final GDP must include improving public water access as a robust goal. Setting the “(d) development of additional water access facilities and boat ramps” (Vol 2, page 187) as a priority in the background materials is a strong first step. The final GDP must specify public water access improvement as a primary goal in the GDP itself. Additionally and unfortunately, some other sections of draft Plan2040 undermine the water access facility priority in the current draft background materials. The Committee also recommends the following changes to draft Plan2040 in order to advance and achieve public water access for all.</p> <p>2) The final GDP must classify public waterfront parks as “Public Use” rather than “Conservation”. This draft Plan2040 GDP map shows that our public waterfront parks are systematically misclassified in the new category of “Conservation”. (Vol 1, page 34). That misclassification will lead to struggles over public access and public use. “Conservation” sounds innocuous. However, the primary function of our waterfront parks is public use, not conservation. Our waterfront parks were bought with state Program Open Space (POS) and federal Land and Wildlife Conservation Fund (LWCF) grants. Those grants of public money have public strings. The county must use the land bought with POS and LWCF for public access. Additionally, POS and LWCF themselves stringently protect our public parks from development. Unlike private church or scout camps, which could go bankrupt and be sold to developers, the county cannot, because of POS and LWCF funding protections, sell our waterfront public parks to developers. Even though this new draft amends the initial definition of “Conservation” to include facilities such as public water access, the label itself, “Conservation”, will be deployed as a weapon against public use of and basic improvements to our waterfront public parks. Our public parks should be clearly labeled and accurately defined as “Public Use”.</p> <p>3 ) The final GDP must eliminate the proposed “Peninsula Privilege”. The draft GDP contains a “Peninsula Privilege”(Vol 1, pages 19, 26, 30, 39, 83, 84, Vol 2, pages 95, 96) that will block basic improvements to and public use of our waterfront public parks. Peninsula Privilege gives special traffic protection and special development protection to the most affluent areas of the county. This special privilege is presented without any analysis, without any basis in fact, and at the bidding of the well-off and well-connected county residents. The county must apply traffic and development protections evenly and fairly across the entire county, instead of giving special privileges to the already privileged.</p> <p>4) The final GDP must plan to fund public water access. Despite the shocking lack of public water access in our county, the haves now get more water private access and the have-nots pay for that private water access. That status quo must change. The county must fund and build public boat ramps, public swimming beaches and other public water access amenities for all. For example, the county contributed \$129,000 towards the repair of the private community beach in Loch Haven, a subdivision next to South River Farm Park. Next door, South River Farm Park gets nothing for public water access improvements. Cape St. Claire is getting \$250,000 from the state Waterway Improvement Fund (WIF) for "beach nourishment" of one of its two private community beaches. Meanwhile, mature hardwood trees are falling into Rock Creek at Weinberg Park. WIF money comes from big boat excise taxes and is meant for public boat ramps. The county must use public funds for public water access instead of private water access improvements for the well-off and well-connected. Thank you considering these comments on the draft Plan2040. The Committee looks forward to participating in the next phases of the GDP process. Regards, Lisa Arrasmith, Chair The Public Water Access Committee <a href="https://www.facebook.com/aapwac">https://www.facebook.com/aapwac</a></p>	<p>Goal HC8, supporting policies, and implementing strategies support increasing park and recreation opportunities. Public water access is specifically addressed in Volume II of the draft Plan2040 document (page 184) and referenced as a priority for implementation (page 187). Additional water access will continue to be implemented through CIP project P567400 Water Access Facilities.</p> <p>An update to the Land Preservation, Park and Recreation Plan (LPPRP) is underway. The update will implement the importance of continuing to increase public water access in the County. Specific comments addressing public water access will be forwarded to the Department of Recreation and Parks for inclusion in the update to the LPPRP.</p> <p>Through consultation with the Department of Recreation and Parks, the Conservation Land Use was placed on County Park properties where the primary (not exclusive) use is natural resource protection. The definition of Conservation Land Use has been amended to clearly state that appropriate public water access is allowed. The Conservation designation does not preclude these lands being used for active recreation.</p>

Comments	County Response
<p>The haves get more and the have-nots pay for that more. Our county can and must do better. We waded through the morass of the first draft of the 2040 General Development Plan (GDP) so you don't have to. All sorts of things buried WAY down in the fine print . . . Read on! Summary: The Public Water Access Committee commented on the draft Plan2040 General Development Plan (GDP). The GDP will set land use policy in the county for the next 40 years. This flawed draft: 1) Lacks any mention of public water access 2) Lacks funding for public water access and does not stop the current practice of using taxpayer dollars to fix private community beaches instead of building public boat ramps and public swimming beaches 3) Misclassifies our public parks as used for "Conservation" instead of "Public Use" 4) Creates a Peninsula Privilege that will block improvements to public parks by giving special traffic and development privileges to the most affluent parts of the county. Full comments below. September 10, 2020 The Honorable Steuart Pittman County Executive Anne Arundel County, Maryland Dear Sir: These comments are in response to the draft Anne Arundel County General Development Plan (GDP) for 2040. The Public Water Access Committee is a broad-based group of volunteer "wet feet" activists who work to improve public water access in Anne Arundel County and the Chesapeake Bay. The 2040 GDP will set county land use policy for the next 20 years. As is discussed below, the draft GDP lacks any mention of public water access, lacks any funding commitment for public water access, misclassifies our public waterfront parks as Conservation areas to be "(u)sed for conservation purposes in perpetuity" and wrongfully sets up a "Peninsula Privilege" that will effectively block basic park improvements for the next 20 years. The county can and must do better. 1) The final GDP must acknowledge the lack of public water access and plan for solutions for that deficiency. The draft GDP does not mention public water access. The draft GDP has no goals nor plan for achieving more public water access. Lack of public water access is a critical deficiency in Anne Arundel County. Eighty percent of the people in Anne Arundel County do not live in water-privileged neighborhoods or in waterfront homes. Public facilities are scarce and inadequate for the county population. For example, Anne Arundel County has more trailered boats and fewer public boat ramps than any other county on the Bay in Maryland. (See attached analysis.) In 2015 there were 9,506 trailered boats registered in Anne Arundel County. There has been a 2020 pandemic boom in boat sales. There are still only four public boat ramps in Anne Arundel County for more than 9,000 trailered boats. In contrast, in 2015 Dorchester County had 1,267 trailered boats and 23 public boat ramps. There are only three public swimming beaches in our county. Unless we can squeeze into those three crowded public swimming beaches, our vaunted shoreline is beyond the reach of the eighty percent of us without access to a private community beach or waterfront home. 2) The final GDP must plan to fund public water access. Now, the haves get more and the have-nots pay for that more. That status quo must change. The county must build public boat ramps, public swimming beaches and other public water access improvements instead of diverting public dollars for private benefit. Loch Haven, a subdivision next to South River Farm Park, is getting \$129,000 to fix its private community beach. Next door, South River Farm Park gets nothing for public water access improvements. Cape St. Claire is getting \$250,000 from the state Waterway Improvement Fund (WIF) for "beach nourishment" of its private community beach. Meanwhile, mature hardwood trees are falling into Rock Creek at Weinberg Park. WIF money comes from big boat excise taxes and is meant for public boat ramps. The county must use public funds for public water access instead for private water access improvements for the well off and well connected. 3) The final GDP must classify public waterfront parks as "Public Use" rather than "Conservation". The draft GDP map shows that our public waterfront parks are systematically misclassified as "Conservation". That misclassification will lead to struggles over public access and public use. "Conservation" sounds innocuous – until you dig deep into the elusive definitions. "Conservation" is defined as "Publicly and privately-owned lands where primary function is conservation in perpetuity". That is wrong. The primary function of our waterfront parks is public use, not conservation. Our waterfront parks were bought with state Program Open Space (POS) and federal Land and Wildlife Conservation Fund (LWCF) grants. Those grants of public money have public strings. The county must use the land bought with POS and LWCF for public access. Our waterfront parks must be properly classified as "Public Use" in the final GDP. 4) The final GDP must eliminate the "Peninsula Privilege". The draft GDP contains a "Peninsula Privilege" that will block basic improvements to our waterfront parks. Peninsula Privilege gives special traffic protection and special development protection to the most affluent areas of the county. Traffic and development protections must be applied evenly and fairly across the county, instead of giving special privileges to the already privileged. Thank you for this opportunity to comment on the draft 2040 Boost Post Carousel Boosted on October 1 By Mike Lofton Rejected People Reached 0 Post Engagements 0 View Details 2 Comments 2 Shares Comments Comment as The Public Water Access Committee</p>	<p>Goal HC8, supporting policies, and implementing strategies support increasing park and recreation opportunities. Public water access is specifically addressed in Volume II of the draft Plan2040 document (page 184) and referenced as a priority for implementation (page 187). Additional water access will continue to be implemented through CIP project P567400 Water Access Facilities.</p> <p>An update to the Land Preservation, Park and Recreation Plan (LPPRP) is underway. The update will implement the importance of continuing to increase public water access in the County. Specific comments addressing public water access will be forwarded to the Department of Recreation and Parks for inclusion in the update to the LPPRP.</p> <p>Through consultation with the Department of Recreation and Parks, the Conservation Land Use was placed on County Park properties where the primary (not exclusive) use is natural resource protection. The definition of Conservation Land Use has been amended to clearly state that appropriate public water access is allowed. The Conservation designation does not preclude these lands being used for active recreation.</p>

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Plan2040 General Development Plan (GDP). I represent the WatersEdge Kayak Club, 1700 kayakers strong, many of whom live in Anne Arundel County. We use many of the existing water access areas for touring daytrips. We work closely with the Public Water Access Committee, a broad-based group of volunteer “wet feet” activists who work to improve public water access in Anne Arundel County and the Chesapeake Bay. Eighty percent of the people in Anne Arundel County do not live in waterprivileged communities or waterfront homes. Although the draft Plan2040 includes the equity goal of the inclusion of all residents and the removal of barriers that limit opportunities based on who they are or where they live (Vol. 1, page 10), other features of draft Plan2040 undermine that goal and promote inequity.</p> <p>1) The final GDP must include improving public water access as a robust goal. Setting the “(d)development of additional water access facilities and boat ramps” (Vol 2, page 187) as a priority in the background materials is a strong first step. The final GDP must specify public water access improvement as a primary goal in the GDP itself. Additionally and unfortunately, some other sections of draft Plan2040 undermine the water access facility priority in the current draft background materials. The Committee also recommends the</p>	<p>Goal HC8, supporting policies, and implementing strategies support increasing park and recreation opportunities. Public water access is specifically addressed in Volume II of the draft Plan2040 document (page 184) and referenced as a priority for implementation (page 187). Additional water access will continue to be implemented through CIP project P567400 Water Access Facilities.</p> <p>An update to the Land Preservation, Park and Recreation Plan (LPPRP) is underway. The update will implement the importance of continuing to increase public water access in the County. Specific comments addressing public water access will be forwarded to the Department of Recreation and Parks for inclusion in the update to the LPPRP.</p>
<p>November 16, 2020 Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Plan2040 General Development Plan (GDP). I represent the WatersEdge Kayak Club, 1700 kayakers strong, many of whom live in Anne Arundel County. We use many of the existing water access areas for touring daytrips. We work closely with the Public Water Access Committee, a broad-based group of volunteer “wet feet” activists who work to improve public water access in Anne Arundel County and the Chesapeake Bay. Eighty percent of the people in Anne Arundel County do not live in waterprivileged communities or waterfront homes. Although the draft Plan2040 includes the equity goal of the inclusion of all residents and the removal of barriers that limit opportunities based on who they are or where they live (Vol. 1, page 10), other features of draft Plan2040 undermine that goal and promote inequity.</p> <p>1) The final GDP must include improving public water access as a robust goal. Setting the “(d)development of additional water access facilities and boat ramps” (Vol 2, page 187) as a priority in the background materials is a strong first step. The final GDP must specify public water access improvement as a primary goal in the GDP itself. Additionally and unfortunately, some other sections of draft Plan2040 undermine the water access facility priority in the current draft background materials. The Committee also recommends the</p> <p>2) The final GDP must classify public waterfront parks as “Public Use” rather than “Conservation”. This draft Plan2040 classifies public waterfront parks as “Conservation” which is not appropriate for public waterfront parks. Public waterfront parks should be classified as “Public Use” to ensure that they are accessible to all residents and to support the county’s goal of increasing public water access.</p> <p>3 ) The final GDP must eliminate the proposed “Peninsula Privilege”. The draft GDP contains a “Peninsula Privilege” which is not appropriate for public waterfront parks. Public waterfront parks should be accessible to all residents and should not be restricted to Peninsula residents.</p> <p>4) The final GDP must plan to fund public water access. Despite the shocking lack of public water access in Anne Arundel County, the draft Plan2040 does not plan to fund public water access. This is a major failure of the draft Plan2040 and should be corrected.</p> <p>5) The County should not repeat the mismanagement of public lands that was epitomized by the 35 year old Peninsula Privilege. The draft Plan2040 should ensure that public waterfront parks are accessible to all residents and are not restricted to Peninsula residents.</p> <p>Regards, Jon Valentine Anne Arundel County resident</p>	<p>Goal HC8, supporting policies, and implementing strategies support increasing park and recreation opportunities. Public water access is specifically addressed in Volume II of the draft Plan2040 document (page 184) and referenced as a priority for implementation (page 187). Additional water access will continue to be implemented through CIP project P567400 Water Access Facilities.</p> <p>An update to the Land Preservation, Park and Recreation Plan (LPPRP) is underway. The update will implement the importance of continuing to increase public water access in the County. Specific comments addressing public water access will be forwarded to the Department of Recreation and Parks for inclusion in the update to the LPPRP.</p> <p>Through consultation with the Department of</p>

Comments	County Response
<p>I am an avid outdoorsman and have lived in Anne Arundel County for many years. While water access has improved slightly over the decades, there is still much work that needs to be done. We have another opportunity for public water access input in the Anne Arundel County Plan2040 General Development Plan (GDP) process. I make the points listed below in regards to public water access in Anne Arundel County:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Public water access must be a strong goal set out in the main GDP instead of hiding in the end of the background material.</li> <li>2) Our waterfront public parks must be placed in the "Public Use" Land Use classification.</li> <li>3) The Peninsula Privilege must be eliminated and protections against traffic and development deployed fairly and equitable across the entire county.</li> <li>4) Public money must be used for public water access rather than improving private community beaches.</li> </ol>	<p>Goal HC8, supporting policies, and implementing strategies support increasing park and recreation opportunities. Public water access is specifically addressed in Volume II of the draft Plan2040 document (page 184) and referenced as a priority for implementation (page 187). Additional water access will continue to be implemented through CIP project P567400 Water Access Facilities.</p> <p>An update to the Land Preservation, Park and Recreation Plan (LPPRP) is underway. The update will implement the importance of continuing to increase public water access in the County. Specific comments addressing public water access will be forwarded to the Department of Recreation and Parks for inclusion in the update to the LPPRP.</p> <p>Through consultation with the Department of Recreation and Parks, the Conservation Land Use was placed on County Park properties where the primary (not exclusive) use is natural resource protection. The definition of Conservation Land Use has been amended to clearly state that appropriate public water access is allowed. The Conservation designation does not preclude these lands being used for active recreation.</p>

Comments	County Response
<p>Thank you and your colleagues for the extensive work putting this plan together and for working with us to include our comments and concerns.</p> <p>Our Comments include those of the Bay Ridge Community Association, with 374 members on the Annapolis Neck Peninsula, and those we agree with that are provided by the Growth Action Network, (30 members organizations with a total membership of 20,000 Anne Arundel County Citizens).</p> <p>We work closely with Kristin Pauly in reviewing and commenting on the plan and look forward to your revisions as it moves through the next levels of approval. Please let me know if we can provide more information or clarify anything.</p> <p>Best regards,                      Ryan Stangle, President, Bay Ridge Community Association                      Lily Openshaw, Vice President, Bay Ridge Community Association                      John Van de Kamp, Board of Directors, Bay Ridge Community Association</p> <p>Here are our concerns by topic--</p> <p><b>Forest Drive</b>--The Plan is incomplete because it does not prioritize making Forest Drive safe. It does not include Annapolis's development along Forest Drive that makes Forest Drive more hazardous.</p> <p><b>Climate Change</b>--There is a strong emphasis on using climate change to drive policy and operations without specifying metrics or the cost to the taxpayer.</p> <p>This includes proposing a new division in Planning and Zoning to monitor and integrate climate change measures throughout County operations. This will raise taxes and drive greater oversight and regulation that will inconvenience homeowners and communities.</p> <p><b>Growth Limits</b>--the Plan does not specify growth limits.</p> <p><b>Residential Holding Capacity</b>--No effort has been made to assess practical residential "holding capacity." Current zoning is 13,488 housing units. The plan projects growth of 50,000 citizens and 29,000 housing units.</p> <p><b>Affordable Housing</b>--the plan lacks guidance on where affordable housing should be located. Target development rates and locations must be included. Forest Drive's safety is a concern if affordable housing is considered for location there.</p> <p><b>Regional Planning Details</b>--The regional planning process must consider and propose regulation of local zoning, type and rate of development, environmental preservation, school capacity, and traffic. A thorough description must be provided. Without it, it is difficult to evaluate Plan 2040's utility.</p> <p><b>Regional Planning Committees(RPC)</b>--the committee's composition will determine the content of the regional plans.</p> <p>The proposed committee structure appears overweighted with developers, brokers and others representing commercial interests. The County has more than 10 times more employees than businesses; the business community is a small percentage of total residents. Commercial interests should be restricted to no more than 2 representatives on a Regional Planning Committee.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. See Summary of Public Comments document for response to these issues.</p>

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>Anne Arundel County Chamber of Commerce Comments General Development Plan November 15, 2020 Overview The Anne Arundel County Chamber of Commerce represents over 400 businesses located throughout Anne Arundel County and we are pleased to present these comments concerning the draft of the General Development Plan. The comments presented in this document were prepared by the Chamber’s Legislative Committee with input from the Board of Directors, Chamber members and through an virtual Town Hall meeting. This document will present broad comments about the General Development Plan and specific recommendations for the goals, policies and strategies of the Planning for a Healthy Economy section. The draft GDP document seeks to guide the blending of land development regulations, environmental protection, certain social policies and promote economic growth. From the Chamber’s perspective, the draft GDP has not placed enough focus for the economic aspects of the various goals, policies and strategies and their impact to support small and large businesses that will provide jobs for hundreds of thousands of Anne Arundel County residents. The GDP creates long lasting guidelines and will ultimately result in a comprehensive re-zoning that can make the County a less attractive place for businesses to operate if economic impacts are not fully considered. We believe that there should be an increased focus about the economic consequences from any goal, policy and strategy in the GDP since it will impact employment opportunities for the residents of Anne Arundel County and tax revenue for local, county and state governments. General Comments The draft GDP Plan is out of balance weighing heavily against market-driven growth in favor of preserving agricultural lands and environmental conditions. There is no question that the environment must remain a priority, and it can remain so while also allowing the market to dictate where economic and population growth should occur. The Plan proposes that development and growth should occur only in specific policy areas such as Town Centers, Critical Economic, and Transit-Oriented. These designated Development Policy Areas only make up a small fraction of the overall County, and fail to incorporate the existing framework of infrastructure and economic demand throughout the remainder of the County. The overwhelming majority of the County is designated as either Rural and Agricultural, Peninsula, or Neighborhood Preservation policy areas. The impact of limiting areas of Targeted Growth spaced apart throughout the County will result in increased strain on the County’s aging transportation infrastructure, which is contradictory to the goal of minimizing existing and new traffic congestion. Too much separation of commercial and employment centers from residential areas will force residents into their car and on to the roadways. It appears that the Plan treats the County as urban in certain respects and suburban in others. The urban concept relies heavily on “multimodal” transit that does not currently exist within the suburban County. The overwhelming majority of transit is, and will remain, auto-centric. In addition, the movement towards electric vehicles (EV) is accelerating and many auto manufactures are offering EVs and their will be an increased demand for the required infrastructure to support these vehicles which is not addressed in the Plan. In an effort to shift away from the existing transit uses, the Plan calls for new alternative transit options that would likely take several decades of planning and hundreds of millions, if not billions, to construct. It is uncertain where the funds for these transit options would come from and it should be noted that improving and expanding existing roadways and traffic corridors receive funding through fees from new development. If the Plan limits where that development and growth can occur, then certain congested areas are likely to remain unimproved for the foreseeable future. By promoting pockets of mixed-use growth into Town Centers, the County will end up with mini-urban areas sprawled throughout the County that rely heavily on automobile traffic. There are several suggestions in the Planning for the Built Environment section of the Plan calling for “flexibility” and a “form-based code” to allow for a variety of development types, but they are limited to only those Development Policy Areas that the County has selected for growth. The idea of flexibility is extremely important and needs to be implemented County-wide. Environmental protective and restorative measures, along with preservation, can and should be incorporated into growth, development, and redevelopment areas, but the market should dictate where that occurs. By limiting where growth can occur, the Plan is inherently isolating and overburdening those areas throughout the County that lack infrastructure. Regulations can be implemented to ensure environmental protection and adequate infrastructure in all parts of the county. The County plays a dual roll as regulator and administrator of the land development process. All too often, the regulatory function overshadows the administrative function and “by-right” or compliant job creating projects (many of which are for small businesses) are significantly delayed by too much regulatory oversight. Strategies should be incorporated into the Built Environment section of the Plan that call for the establishment and on going monitoring or metrics to measure the time from plan submission to shovel in the ground. Planning for a Healthy Economy Comments A primary goal of the Chamber is to ensure that our member companies have a strong and growing local economy in which to do business. To accomplish this, the Chamber believes that local and state government policies should support and encourage business and not create an excessive tax burden, implement cumbersome and costly regulations and when possible, help create sustainable private sector jobs. The Planning for a Health Economy section supports the primary goal of the Chamber and we would like to offer a series of specific comments about he goals, policies and strategies contained in this section. It is important to have reasonable development regulations along with adequate infrastructure in the County to ensure that businesses have the tools to provide sustainable jobs for the residents and</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. To clarify, the Development Policy Areas Map broadly identifies areas in the County where development and redevelopment are encouraged. In other words, development is not strictly limited to the Targeted Development, Redevelopment and Revitalization Policy Areas. The Planned Land Use Map identifies non-residential designations in areas outside of the Targeted Policy Areas where development and redevelopment may occur. Staff will update policies and strategies to emphasize the economic, community, and environmental benefits of brownfield sites and identify the need for coordination of business support services. Please note that Plan2040 primarily focuses on land use and economic program plans to support businesses may be prepared separately by various organizations.</p>

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>Great job! As someone who has lived on a peninsula for over 40 years, I particularly appreciate the attention paid to limiting development on these fragile areas. I would even support/encourage building moratoriums as most are already overcrowded and traffic choked. The focus on tree canopy replenishment is admirable. Emphasis definitely needs to be on forest retention at development sites.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>Great job! As someone who has lived on a peninsula for over 40 years, I particularly appreciate the attention paid to limiting development on these fragile areas. I would even support/encourage building moratoriums as most are already overcrowded and traffic choked.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>Plan 2040 “lays out a policy framework that informs many of the County’s future decisions on land use and environmental protection”, and it states that this framework “will be implemented through Regional Plans, functional plans, design manuals, regulations, the capital budget, and the work programs of County departments”. Plan 2040 recognizes the environmental decline occurring throughout our County and acknowledges citizen concerns about degraded water quality and the loss of forests and wildlife habitat: “After decades of focused restoration efforts, the health of the Chesapeake Bay continues to struggle. The 2018 State of the Bay report gives us an overall grade of D+. The County lost 2,775 acres of trees between 2010 and 2017.” The Plan suggests that the County “limit development in existing residential neighborhoods, limit development on peninsulas and expand protection of farmland, forests, and shorelines”. The Magothy River Association (MRA) would very much like to see the County follow the guidance laid out in Plan 2040. As a first step, the MRA asks the County to vigorously enforce the regulations that currently exist and immediately cease granting modifications to development projects that do not adhere to the Code. Additionally, the MRA asks the County to revise the Anne Arundel County Codes to strengthen environmental protections by holding development projects to standards for stormwater management that actually protect our waterways rather than to the minimum standards that are employed today. As it stands, the Code does not offer protections that maintain the water quality of our creeks and rivers. Dead zones in the creeks and rivers grow with every new development as sediment-laden runoff contaminates the water with every rainfall. Allowing development on steep slopes, within stream buffers, with outfall flows into sensitive wetlands and other damaging practices have brought the oxygen levels to near zero in many feeder streams and creeks along the Magothy River. Plan 2040 calls for “environmentally sound communities that protect the natural environment”. It calls for “collective efforts to reduce stormwater runoff, and restore forests, rivers, and shorelines”. This will not happen with the weak protections offered in the current code, as evidenced by the degraded conditions of the Magothy, Severn and South Rivers. The goals of Plan 2040 must be matched by commitment from the County to strengthen the Code so that measurable improvements will be evident in our creeks and rivers. The Magothy River Association asks the County to use Plan 2040 to rigorously guide its policies and decisions going forward. A first step to realizing the environmental goals of Plan 2040 includes adherence by Planning and Zoning to the existing regulations as well as identification and elimination of the weaknesses in the Code as soon as possible.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>I would like written confirmation that the Beechwood on the Burley and Whitehall Beach communities on the Broadneck Peninsula will continue to be designated as R2. Members of both communities were told this would be the case by Reece Peak on September 29, 2020.</p>	<p>The preliminary draft of Plan2040 retains Low Density Planned Land Use for the Burley and Whitehall Beach communities. See the Preliminary Draft Planned Land Use Map currently available for public review at <a href="http://aacounty.org/Plan2040">aacounty.org/Plan2040</a>.</p>
<p>Subject: Would like to serve on the region plan citizen advisory committee for Annapolis Neck Peninsula [No body]</p>	<p>Thank you for your interest. Please note that the Region Plan process will be adopted as part of Plan2040 and at this point it is premature to say which Regions will be the first to begin. Nonetheless, the Office of Planning and Zoning will note your interest and let you know when we are accepting applications from residents to serve on the Region Plan Citizen Advisory Committee.</p>

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>Thank you. I've been reading the comments in the document and can't find the comments filed on behalf of The Public Water Access Committee as well as other comments I know were submitted by email.</p> <p>Please direct me to the location of those comments in the document.</p>	<p>A summary of comments received through the Plan2040@aacounty.org email account is presented in section 5 of the summary report (including reference to public water access) and a response to general comments (including reference to public water access) is provided in section 6.</p> <p>Copies of emails and letters received at Plan2040@aacounty.org have been added as an attachment to an updated version of the public input summary document. You can download the updated version at <a href="http://www.aacounty.org/plan2040">www.aacounty.org/plan2040</a></p>
<p>Citizens said at 'Visioning Sessions' that there has been too much development, but there is nothing in the plan about setting growth limits or that provides ways for communities to be involved in growth rate decisions. Communities also need ways to control the rate of growth for various types of development. There is a need for workforce housing in the County, but a Affordable Housing plan that says where where these developments should be located is not included. Redevelopment areas, town centers and transportation depots would be good options. CE Pittman has recently suggested that unwanted AAC growth be redirected to Baltimore, since the city needs redevelopment and new growth. This alternative should be covered with appropriate Land Use recommendations and policies In Plan2040. The Regional Planning process will have to recommend specific legislation for the nine Regions on local zoning, type and rate of development, environmental preservation, school capacity, and traffic. A full description of the Regional Planning process is not provided and it is difficult to see how Plan2040 will be implemented.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>Plan2040 - Our Community, Our Voice Under the leadership of County Executive Pittman the OPZ attempted to capture the concerns of citizens with respect to past development practices and their recommendations for the future of Land Management in the County. With over 17 Visioning Forums, 8 Listening Sessions, 30 Community meetings, day-long workshop, and numerous online survey's and with the help of the Citizens Advisory Committee the OPZ published the Plan2040 General Development Plan Draft. There is a rather long documented list of citizens concerns which is summarize here:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amount and Pace of Development: Population growth and development. Negative change to the physical character of the County, Reduced the quality of life for citizens.</li> <li>• Traffic Congestion: Concerns that growth has led to increased traffic congestion, Impact of traffic on the quality of life.</li> <li>• Infrastructure Capacity: Concerns that Infrastructure improvements have not kept up with demands created by developers and the cost burden to citizens to subsidize the developer industry.</li> <li>• School Capacity: Concerns that some schools have become overcrowded resulting in a declining quality of education delivered especially effecting low income families.</li> <li>• Environmental Decline: Concerns about declining water quality, loss of forests that impact the physical and mental wellbeing of people and wildlife.</li> <li>• Public Parks and Waterfront Access: Demand for more public parks and multiple forms of recordation type including the arts, providing public waterfront access. It is impressive how much effort and cost OPZ expended to capture the concerns and wishes of its citizens. The staff of OPZ should be commended for a great effort to meet with and capture the concerns of over 1,000 citizens. Unfortunately it is very disappointing to see that after reading the final draft that it appears that OPZ is going full steam ahead and plans to welcome in 50,000 new homes into the county anyway. This is an insult to those citizens who took the time to meet with OPZ. Both Citizens and members of the CAC expressed the desire to limit the number of homes, limit growth rate, and limit general development. The CAC discussed on more than one occasion the need to limit growth to well under 26,000 homes! The original number that OPZ presented to the CAC was 26,000 based on data contained in a study, they commissioned, by RKG Associate Inc out of VA. In fact we were given a task to place LEGO blocks on a county map to allocate the 26,000 new homes to different parts of the county. Naturally, OPZ did not want those LEGO block placed in South County. No, they wanted the North and West County areas to absorb even more homes thereby increasing the density in already over developed areas with failing roads and lacking services. We were not told how many housing projects were already in the pipeline so there was no way to determine the actual number of homes OPZ was planning. In the end, even after the concerns of citizens and CAC members were noted, OPZ is now going full steam ahead with around 50,000 homes projected. Again not know what report to believe it can't be determined if that is from 2020 to 2035 OR 2020 to 2040. A timeline for Plan2040 was NEVER discussed which makes one wonder why it is called Plan2040. The one issue that is a major concern that some people have worried about for years is: When will the County run out of developable land? The RKG study and report estimated that with current zoning and building codes, the County will run out of land in 2035. This major issues was NOT allowed to be discussed at any CAC meeting. You can see in the Plan2040 draft that this issue is discussed but the conclusions and numbers are different and not consistent with the RKG study so then question that needs to be asked is:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Which projection is the correct one?</li> <li>• Why was this not discussed since 2035 falls in the Plan 2040 timeline?</li> <li>• What will housing look like in the County as we approach 2035 or 2040?</li> <li>• What will take place in South County as farming uses go down even more. They only comment that was made about 2035 during a CAC meeting was that if more housing is needed then the County will build UP! The fact is that this a very BIG issue and was not discussed and a vision was NOT developed for dealing with the very high density housing that would be required. Another question is how will the county deal with a housing shortage in 2035? The important question is why did the OPZ NOT allow the CAC to brainstorm on what the housing would look like, what new forms of transportation would be needed, what type of services and amenities would be required? It is very disappointing that these important question were not addressed. In general, it was disturbing to some CAC members that they were not allowed to collaborate and brainstorm during the whole Plan2040 process. A lot of very smart people volunteered for over a year but the potential these people had to discover new and innovative approaches for land use was lost. CAC members felt that it was just business as usual and just a token effort to be able to say that the public had an opportunity for inputs. Based on feedback from Citizens, it is fair to say that they felt that the land use policies and procedures that were followed over the last 30 years did not produce outcomes that reflected what Citizens wanted from the County and the OPZ. Given that failure, the logical solution was to assume that a NEW DIRECTION should have been discussed and recommendations made on how to get there. It was very disappointing that there was little to no "out of the box" thinking that went into the PLAN2040 document. In fact, the 2009 GDP and the 2004 Small Area Planning documents are mention in the Plan2040 as being used as a guild for going forward. Given the negative feedback from the citizens and CAC members, one must ask the question; why NEW ideas were NOT allowed to be brainstormed. The Land Use Maps and the Development Policy maps do not appear to reflect the wishes of the people who provided feedback during the many listening sessions and they appear to support a "business as usual" approach going forward. The answer by OPZ is that Citizens will be able to determine the way development is done in the Reginal Planning Committees. The problem with that is that those MAPS</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>General Comments • On the whole, this is an excellent document for which the planning staff is to be commended. To the extent the County succeeds in implementing its strategies and achieving its goals, the quality of life of the residents of the County and the environment that surrounds us should be improved significantly. I do, however, have suggestions with respect to a few items in Volume 1. • As the Plan recognizes, unchecked growth in the County over the last several years has caused a general decline in the quality of life. If that growth continues unabated, no amount of planning will reverse that trend. The Plan indicates that the County’s population is expected to increase by 50,000 (or 29,000 households) by 2040. While it addresses directing that growth in intelligent ways, the Plan apparently takes that rate of growth as inevitable. It does not articulate clearly any goals respecting overall growth or discuss the desirability or feasibility of measures that would limit growth. • The passage about the effect of the Plan on zoning correctly states that, “In accordance with the State’s Land Use Article, the Zoning Map must be consistent with the Planned Land Use Map.” A passage on p. 12, however, observes that, “The goals and policies contained within Plan2040 are intended to be guides. They provide the framework for the County’s zoning ordinance and development regulations and guide County programs and budgets.” That statement harks back to the Court of Appeals’ decision in the Terrapin Run case to the effect that comprehensive plans “represent only a basic scheme generally outlining planning and zoning objectives in an extensive area, and are in no sense a final plan; they are continually subject to modification in the light of actual land use development and serve as a guide.” In order to avoid confusion, it would be desirable to modify the statement on p. 12 to make clear that the Plan is more than a general guide., As the General Assembly said in overruling Terrapin Run and that it, “should be followed as closely as possible while not being elevated to the status of an ordinance, and that deviations from the plan should be rare”. Sensitive Areas and Habitat Protection • I was extremely pleased to read Goal NE 1.1 “Preserve, enhance, and restore sensitive areas, including habitats of rare, threatened, and endangered species, streams, floodplains, tidal and non-tidal wetlands, bogs, shorelines, steep slopes, and all applicable buffers.” I was even more gratified to find this implementation step: “a. Create a County Habitat Protection Program in accordance with guidance provided in COMAR Sec. 27.01.09.” It is obvious that the goal cannot be accomplished unless the County has a clearer picture of the location of the environmentally sensitive areas within its borders. That there exists no documented inventory of those areas is demonstrated by the Resource Sensitive Areas map, which shows only a small fraction of its hundreds of sensitive areas and fails to mention habitat protection areas at all. I recommend that the Plan include an implementation step directed at identifying and mapping or inventorying those areas. In addition, to assure that adequate attention is paid to these goals in land-use decisions, it would be useful to add an implementation step that requires the relevant agencies, including OPZ, Inspections and Permits, and Administrative Hearings, to make specific findings regarding the effect of their decisions on the achievement of these goals. Decisions such as the approval of major subdivisions, variances, and special exceptions, and the grant of significant permits would be accompanied by an articulation of these findings. This requirement could be included in the Implementation and Accountability section of the Plan. The Plan includes at p. 65 a proposal to “Update the Habitat Assessment Manual guidance document for use in review of development applications in the Critical Area.” That would be a very useful undertaking. The impact of development on habitat protection areas is not limited to development within the Critical Area. This provision should be expanded to include developments outside the critical area that could affect habitat protection areas in the critical area in accordance with COMAR § 27.01.09.05(C)(1)(d). Consistency of Policies with Proposed Changes in the Land Use Map • Some aspects of the proposed land use map do not accord with policies articulated elsewhere in the Plan. For example, Policy NE 4.2 is to “Limit the addition of impervious surfaces and encourage the reduction of impervious surfaces.” The staff’s recommendation with respect to LUCA-94, appears to ignore that policy. This is a proposal by the Earleigh Heights Volunteer Fire Department to change the use of its property from residential to commercial. The applicant’s reason for that change is to enable it to develop a small commercial center on Ritchie Highway that would be used to finance the construction of a new firehouse. While a new firehouse might well be desirable, there are other ways to finance it, and the proposed land use change would add a significant amount of impervious surface at the headwaters of the Magothy River, contrary to the Plan’s policy. Had OPZ considered that policy when formulating its recommendation, it should have recommended against this proposal rather than kicking the decision down the road to the regional planning process. • In some instances, the staff has approved a request for a change in use on the grounds that the requested change conformed with an existing non-conforming use. This rationale is inconsistent with the nature of non-conforming uses. It is elementary that, in establishing the existing zoning for the property, the County Council determined that zoning classification to be consistent with “the public safety, health, morals and welfare” (Maryland Code, Art. 25A § 5), and that more intensive uses would be inconsistent with those goals. The only reason the existing use was permitted to continue was out of concern for harming the vested interests of the property owner. For this reason, all states limit the extension of non-conforming uses, and generally encourage their eventual elimination so that the property can be devoted to a use more in harmony with the public interest. The property owner’s request would move in precisely the opposite direction, contrary to long-established public policy. Moreover, once there is a change in the uses permitted on</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. The statement on the use of Plan2040 as 'a guide' will be reviewed and revised. The other comments will also be considered in revisions and in implementation of Plan2040.</p>

<b>Comments</b>	<b>County Response</b>
I'm glad to see that preservation of the natural environment is a priority. Please address the need to limit future population growth and coordinate with the City of Baltimore, who wants more people living there.	Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>November 9, 2020 Anne Arundel County Office of Planning and Zoning RE: Anne Arundel County’s Draft General Development Plan Update, Plan2040</p> <p>Dear Plan2040 team and members of the Citizens Advisory Committee,</p> <p>The Greater Washington Partnership (the Partnership) applauds Anne Arundel County, the Office of Planning and Zoning, and the Citizens Advisory Committee for the work they have done to create the draft Plan2040, the County’s new General Development Plan. The vision set forth in the draft Plan2040, if implemented, will create more resilient, inclusive, and equitable communities that will be an asset to Anne Arundel and the wider region. The Partnership is a civic alliance of the leading employers in the Capital Region of Baltimore, Washington, and Richmond, who employ more than 250,000 residents. Our board is committed to making the Capital Region the best place to live, work, and build a business. Creating a seamless and world-class regional transportation network is one of the primary goals of the Partnership.</p> <p>We strongly support Plan2040’s draft themes of resilient, environmentally sound, and sustainable communities, new and improved infrastructure, strategic economic growth and redevelopment, and an inclusive, equitable, and responsive government. As outlined in the Partnership’s Blueprint for Regional Mobility, we believe that encouraging development and revitalization around transit stations makes the best use of existing infrastructure and assets, and can create more opportunities for people to live and work in Anne Arundel County. The Partnership is wrapping up our Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) study in Anne Arundel County which focuses on three transit stations, Odenton, Cromwell-Glen Burnie, and Laurel Park. We are pleased to see these station areas included in the plan’s targeted development areas and transit-oriented overlay areas. Through interviews and data analysis conducted during our TOD study, the research team identified the following opportunities the county should consider:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Odenton needs new parking infrastructure at the MARC station to allow for TOD around the station, which is supported by policy BE9.1 d.</li><li>2. The County should explore better Anne Arundel to Anne Arundel transit connectivity, especially to and from existing MARC and light rail stations to nearby activity centers. Improving transit service between Fort Meade and the Odenton MARC station and BWI and the Cromwell-Glen Burnie light rail station will be key to achieving the draft Plan2040 goal HE3, “to promote high-quality, coordinated development that supports the Fort George G. Meade Area” and goal HE4, “to protect the future growth potential of Baltimore-Washington International Thurgood Marshall Airport (BWI Airport).”</li><li>3. The county should work with Prince George’s and Howard Counties at Laurel Park to plan and integrate infrastructure and transit improvements between Laurel and Laurel Park stations.</li><li>4. Set a county-wide vision for TOD and create a TOD working group to support and target development to specific areas that are best suited for growth. Creating more walkable communities, a low-stress bicycle network, and expanding transit services were included in the draft plan, taken from Move Anne Arundel, and we encourage the county to prioritize their implementation around light rail and MARC stations to maximize the near and long term TOD potential in the county. Better transportation networks around transit stations will help accomplish goal BE9, to “provide a high-quality mix of employment, residential, commercial and services uses near existing or funded transit stations.” In addition to the four sub-policies of BE9.1, we encourage the county to target resources and incentives for development to areas around transit-stations as a means to achieve many of the draft plan’s goals related to preserving the natural environment and create an excellent built environment, healthy communities, and a healthy economy.</li></ol> <p>Finally, we encourage a stronger emphasis on the importance of regional connectivity for Anne Arundel County. Situated between Baltimore and the District of Columbia, and the emerging economic hub at New Carrollton, Anne Arundel County can be the ideal home for residents who work throughout these neighboring jurisdictions or for businesses who want to attract a workforce from around the Capital Region. However, that potential will not be fully unlocked without a new B&amp;P Tunnel along the Amtrak/MARC line in Baltimore, a run-through commuter rail service that continues past Union Station into northern Virginia, and a seamless commuter rail vision for the entire region. While these projects are out of the scope of Anne Arundel’s General Development Plan, they are important projects to actively support and keep on your radar. Thank you for your work and commitment to making Anne Arundel one of the best places to live, work, and grow a business in the Capital Region.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>The way I see it, the county's biggest challenges to land use are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Affordable housing. NIMBYism has prevented development of enough affordable housing for our county's workforce. Every part of the county needs to include some affordable housing so that all property owners are minimally-effected by the effort to house all of our workers and allow them to live near where they work and live in safe, clean neighborhoods. It is ridiculous that people who work at BWI cannot afford to live in our county - nor can many police officers, teachers, and other public servants. Wealthy residents' voices should not be the only voices heard as development plans are considered.</li> <li>2. Overdevelopment by aggressive property owners and developers. Currently, zoning policies and procedures allow developers to push through encroachments on wetland buffers, cut down wooded areas to put in 25-foot sewer easements without regard to the quality of life of people already living in those neighborhoods, conduct meetings regarding zoning changes without a County representative available, and convince County officials that more development is always better. This has led to overcrowding in schools, which must be addressed, as well as flooding in previously-existing neighborhoods caused by runoff from new developments, traffic problems, and threats to pedestrian safety, to name just a few concerns.</li> <li>3. School overcrowding is a real issue here, and all the new housing being jammed in on tiny plots of land (thus circumventing the rules about development in overcrowded school feeder zones - this should stop) continues to put pressure on schools in some of our more affordable housing areas. In addition, there is a perception that the wealthier areas are getting new schools/upgrades, while Glen Burnie High School (just one example) looks like a factory from 1940. The optical are bad, and the overcrowding does our students no favors. A few years ago I spoke with a young teacher from Meade High School (I'm sure he is no longer there, because of the overcrowding) and not only did he have to provide paper, pens, and other supplies to his students so they could do homework assignments, he was completely unable to do any kinetic activities (gallery walks, acting out Shakespeare scenes, etc.) in his classroom because of severe overcrowding. How will we attract top talent to Ft. Meade and the rest of our county if students are crammed into overcrowded classrooms?</li> <li>4. Unrealistic plans for development in rural areas, such as turning the Crownsville Hospital site into a lacrosse stadium and shopping/restaurant district, with extensive road/infrastructure improvements paid for by County investments with no real guarantee of return/reimbursement of taxpayer dollars. I appreciate that Mr. Pittman did not support that development plan, but unworkable plans should even make it to the feasibility study phase. If developers are not willing to chip in for roads, sewer lines, etc., runoff abatement, reforestation, etc., they should not be allowed to proceed with studies.</li> <li>5. Protecting critical areas. Most of the county is united in support of this goal, with the exception of some developers and a few residents who think that the laws and zoning regulations do not apply to them. I support the enforcement of all laws and regulations that protect the critical area.</li> <li>6. Traffic safety is a real concern that has been amplified by COVID-19. Every time I drive on an interstate highway I feel as if I am risking my life. Certainly there have been more accidents since COVID-19 arrived here. I would like to see county officials take a second look at our traffic issues before implementing Plan2040.</li> </ol>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Affordable housing is addressed in Plan2040 under Built Environment Goals BE11 and BE12.</li> <li>2. Development review procedures have been reformed and are now clarified through Green Notices posted on the Office of Planning and Zoning website. These reforms have led to a reduction in Modifications and more stringent application of existing regulations.</li> <li>3. School capacity is addressed in Plan2040 under Goal HC2 and through the Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. A workgroup is currently meeting to develop recommendations to reform and improve the Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. A new Policy BE1.3 and supporting strategies have been added to Plan 2040 focused on Adequate Public Facilities regulations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>oConduct fiscal impact analysis and impact fee study</li> <li>oUpdate impact fees</li> <li>oUpdate growth management program</li> <li>oUpdate APF for schools</li> </ul> </li> <li>4. Polices to continue Anne Arundel County's committment to protection of rural areas are included in Plan2040 under Built Enviroment Goal BE2.</li> <li>5. Policies to update and improve the County's Critical Area program are included in Plan2040 under Natural Environment Goal NE1.</li> <li>6. Polices and implementing strategies to improve traffic safety are included in Plan2040 under Built Environment Goal BE15.</li> </ol>

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>Plan2040 contains many good Goals, Policies, and Strategies. However a few key items are missing: - Current residents have made it clear that growth is too rapid in many areas in the county. Planning for 29,000 new housing units by 2040 suggests a growth rate comparable to that recently experienced and found unacceptable by many residents. However, nothing in the plan suggests that communities will have any new control over local rates of development and growth. Statements are made that growth will be directed to town centers, transit corridors, and targeted redevelopment areas, but there is no mention of coordination with town center planning or effort to evaluate desires of current residents of those areas. - Proposed composition of Regional Planning Committees has 3 of 9 members representing commercial or development interests and this heavily overweights these interests. Economic data shows that only 10% of the workforce is business owners. The Regional Planning Committees should be more representative of the local citizen population. - The authority and responsibility of the Regional Planning Committees is not well defined. It is not clear that they will have much latitude in land use decisions or that any the County will be obligated to implement any RPC recommendations. For example authorized RPC recommendations on local growth rates should be paired with a process for implementation by the County departments. - References are made to attracting commercial and residential growth to the area near Ft. Meade, but workforce growth and development in that area is already expected to be large. County economic development resources would be much better used to attract development to areas like Glen Burnie and Brooklyn Park. - Much of West County lies in a key watershed for the Patuxent River. "Smart growth" concepts that direct growth to that area is likely to produce significant pollution of the Patuxent. This should be acknowledged and addressed in the plan.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. Please see the Summary of Public Comments document for response to these topics.</p>
<p>I just read through the plan. Obviously, this represents a lot of work, with input from many people with divergent priorities and mindsets. It would seem on the surface that everyone got what they wanted. But what happens when the wishlists conflict? The element that appears to be missing is a way to quantify these conflicting needs and to assign priorities, by area. An example: Affordable housing, maintaining community character, vibrant commercial areas, decreasing traffic congestion, and protecting the environment seem to be in conflict when applied to a specific area. What would a community like Severna Park look like if everything in the plan really happened? This push-pull is nothing new. The only realistic solution has been in balancing conflicting needs. Communities, like Severna Park, have fought many battles to maintain the quality of life that attracted people to the area. Opposing forces have always been there and there have been compromises. In the end, however, Severna Park has managed to keep its character. While some from outside of Severna Park see the area as elitist, we all know that isn't the reality. I am not sure how a plan like this could address quantifying the extent of the potential conflicts for any given area. Perhaps there is a statistical approach that could do that. I guess it really does come to down not being able to "having our cake and eating it too." Everything looks great when considered in the aggregate, but the problem comes in the specific application.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>Though I am happy to keep South county so green and pristine why is there such overdevelopment everywhere else? No matter how you present it, no one is curbing the urban sprawl ! That sprawl is the driving push for destroying schools, neighborhoods and roads. Everything everywhere is over crowded.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>

Comments	County Response
<p>In the plan, I saw the box "Equity in the Built Environment" and the note to: "Increase Equity: Make strategic investments to provide equal access to all County residents to good schools, parks, libraries, and affordable housing." As hopeful as that sounds, it is tantamount to whitewashing. Why? Because it was the only pitiful Equity remedy I could find in the plan.</p> <p>With no real stated remedies with clear goals, objectives nor any accountability, this 2040GDP will not, and cannot, make a dent in our county's segregated legacy if we do not address it clearly and forcefully. You need to layout specificities in actions to break the cycle of white supremacy.</p> <p>For example: Along the lines of affordable equitable land use; Why is there no mention whatsoever of actively encouraging rezoning from single-family to neighborhood residential? Perhaps because as the facilitators acknowledged, the plan is yet again the product of mostly older white homeowners' input. How will the county actively desegregate?</p> <p>How will the county catch and punish those breaking fair housing laws and, just as importantly, change the more subtle use of Single-Family Zoning that actively perpetuates segregation? Will we consider duplexes, tri's, and quads as viable homes in single-family areas? We know People of Color have much lower rates of homeownership, net worth, and opportunities in general. We must change our land use so they can begin to build the 'equity' that's so much needed.</p> <p>Why is there is no encouragement of, nor even the mention of, building Accessory Dwelling Units anywhere in the plan? What about movable tiny homes as bonafide ADUs' as many municipalities in California now allow? (Los Angeles, San Diego for example...)</p> <p>What about encouraging Junior Accessory Dwelling Units to further create more attainable and affordable housing without the need for public subsidies?</p> <p>Or perhaps there could be subsidies for lower-income homeowners that provide ADU's for those individuals and families most at risk of homelessness. If we do not break the lock of the exclusiveness of single-family zoning, we will be left with the typical plan that segregates affordable housing to only a few areas and that continue to require huge subsidies to build. That is not a viable solution to our housing crises. It isn't working now, and won't in the future. Be proactive, be bold.</p>	<p>We would like to point out several of the goals, policies and strategies in Plan2040 that address equity. Rather than making it a stand-alone chapter or goal, Plan2040 addresses equity across the goals, policies, and strategies in the Plan2040 document . This "equity in all policies" approach is recommended by the American Planning Association (APA) Planning for Equity Policy Guide. Equity is highlighted in the draft of Plan2040 in a number of places including: Planning for the Natural Environment - Promoting increased tree canopy in underserved areas to address water quality and urban heat island issues (Policy NE2.1).</p> <p>Planning for the Built Environment - Committing to more extensive engagement with communities that have been under-represented in planning processes in the past (Goal BE3 and supporting policies and strategies). Reforming zoning and development regulations to promote a variety of housing types including cottage houses, tiny houses, duplexes, triplexes, and in-law units (Goal BE 11 and supporting policies and strategies. Creating more affordable housing and evaluating alternative forms of inclusionary housing programs such as a moderately-priced dwelling unit program that would require new development projects to provide a certain number of affordable housing units (Goal BE12 and supporting policies and strategies).</p> <p>Healthy Communities - Prioritizing investments in public facilities and services in underserved communities including schools (Goal HC2), food systems (Goal HC7), and recreation and parks (Goal HC8).</p> <p>Healthy Economy - Supporting women and minority-owned businesses and supporting workforce training (Goal HE2 and supporting policies and strategies). Implementation of policies to address inequity will be a long-term effort that will require public support, so we encourage you to continue to follow and engage in the planning process.</p>
<p>It is allowing more and more developemnt in the Jessup area. We are already over-crowded here and crime has increased, pollution has increased, wildlife has no where to go, Road rage has increased, overcrowding in our area school is out of control. The proposed low income housing is not fair to those families because they have to live right next to industrial development in poor housing where they are stacked on top of each other instead of individual houses that won't fall apart in ten years! There is no relief on property taxes for the owners who are giving up the very reason they settled in Jessup. Big Corporate Developers are the only ones making our with this plan. They are the ones making a profit and they should pay the balk of the property tax revenue and individual's property taxes should go down not up!!!! IT NEEDS TOO STOP - You can dress it up and make it look pretty in your plans but the actual results are horrible!!!! PLEASE STOP!</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>Residential property zoned single family shall have approval options for auxiliary dwelling units, such as an apartment or addition for extended family members over 55 or who are disabled. These units should have the option for extended septic system compliance over a 5 year period without additional county permit fees. These may be rental units to recover the costs of construction and mortgage, if the property owner pays the upfront costs. The county is in need of more affordable housing options, especially for seniors and the disabled who are out of housing options and need to be near family measures. The plan should be amended to promote this option.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. Requirements for pedestrian infrastructure improvements are required in subdivision and site development plan review per County Code Article 17-6-113.</p>

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>My name is Anthony Johnson I own property at 1461 Middletown Rd. I spoke with Mr. Pittman about redevelopment a property it's a low income housing I am on a general development plan but I'm clueless on what's going on can you give me a call at 410-533-5035 I'm trying to find out what I can and what I cannot do. If my property is able to be rezoned and am I able to subdivide the property. I'm looking forward to hearing from you God bless thank you.</p>	<p>A response was provided via telephone.</p>
<p>Extend bicycle/ walking paths in South County. Especially Edgewater and Davidsonville. Lots of cyclists in danger on thin windy roads.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. Plan2040 includes multiple policies and strategies that support improvements to the bicycle network, including Built Environmental Policy BE15.2 and supporting strategies. Plan2040 identifies bicycle network improvements in South County including along Route 2 and Route 4 (see Figure 25 in Volume ii - Background Information).</p>
<p>Please include the development of an interconnected recreational bicycle and pedestrian network in District 7. There are so many hazardous areas where children can't walk to school or are forced to walk along very busy roads.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. Plan2040 includes multiple policies and strategies that support improvements to the bicycle network, including Built Environmental Policy BE15.2 and supporting strategies. Plan2040 identifies bicycle network improvements in District 7 including along Route 2 and Route 4 (see Figure 25 in Volume ii - Background Information). Please see Move Anne Arundel (the Transportation Functional Master Plan) and the Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan for more details on planned bike and pedestrian improvements in District 7.</p>
<p>Please connect bicycle and pedestrian greenways in south county to provide alternate transit modes in our community. South county needs safer bike paths! Edgewater especially.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. Plan2040 includes multiple policies and strategies that support improvements to the bicycle network, including Built Environmental Policy BE15.2 and supporting strategies. Plan2040 identifies bicycle network improvements in District 7 including along Route 2 and Route 4 (see Figure 25 in Volume ii - Background Information). Please see Move Anne Arundel (the Transportation Functional Master Plan) and the Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan for more details on planned bike and pedestrian improvements in District 7.</p>
<p>District 7 also needs an interconnected pedestrian and bicycle network. Vehicle traffic is a major problem especially in the edgewater area.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. Plan2040 includes multiple policies and strategies that support improvements to the bicycle network, including Built Environmental Policy BE15.2 and supporting strategies. Plan2040 identifies bicycle network improvements in District 7 including along Route 2 and Route 4 (see Figure 25 in Volume ii - Background Information). Please see Move Anne Arundel (the Transportation Functional Master Plan) and the Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan for more details on planned bike and pedestrian improvements in District 7.</p>

Comments	County Response
<p>2040 GDP prioritize the development of an interconnected recreational bicycle and pedestrian network in District 7.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. Plan2040 includes multiple policies and strategies that support improvements to the bicycle network, including Built Environmental Policy BE15.2 and supporting strategies. Plan2040 identifies bicycle network improvements in District 7 including along Route 2 and Route 4 (see Figure 25 in Volume ii - Background Information). Please see Move Anne Arundel (the Transportation Functional Master Plan) and the Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan for more details on planned bike and pedestrian improvements in District 7.</p>
<p>Requesting that the 2040 GDP prioritize the development of an interconnected recreational bicycle and pedestrian network in District 7.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. Plan2040 includes multiple policies and strategies that support improvements to the bicycle network, including Built Environmental Policy BE15.2 and supporting strategies. Plan2040 identifies bicycle network improvements in District 7 including along Route 2 and Route 4 (see Figure 25 in Volume ii - Background Information). Please see Move Anne Arundel (the Transportation Functional Master Plan) and the Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan for more details on planned bike and pedestrian improvements in District 7.</p>
<p>I have lived in south county for over 55 years. It seems we are always forgotten. I would to request that the 2040 GDP prioritize the development of an interconnected recreational bicycle and pedestrian network in District 7. Thank you.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. Plan2040 includes multiple policies and strategies that support improvements to the bicycle network, including Built Environmental Policy BE15.2 and supporting strategies. Plan2040 identifies bicycle network improvements in District 7 including along Route 2 and Route 4 (see Figure 25 in Volume ii - Background Information). Please see Move Anne Arundel (the Transportation Functional Master Plan) and the Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan for more details on planned bike and pedestrian improvements in District 7.</p>
<p>Requesting that the 2040 GDP prioritize the development of an interconnected recreational bicycle and pedestrian network in District 7.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. Plan2040 includes multiple policies and strategies that support improvements to the bicycle network, including Built Environmental Policy BE15.2 and supporting strategies. Plan2040 identifies bicycle network improvements in District 7 including along Route 2 and Route 4 (see Figure 25 in Volume ii - Background Information). Please see Move Anne Arundel (the Transportation Functional Master Plan) and the Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan for more details on planned bike and pedestrian improvements in District 7.</p>
<p>Requesting that the 2040 GDP prioritize the development of an interconnected recreational bicycle and pedestrian network in District 7.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. Plan2040 includes multiple policies and strategies that support improvements to the bicycle network, including Built Environmental Policy BE15.2 and supporting strategies. Plan2040 identifies bicycle network improvements in District 7 including along Route 2 and Route 4 (see Figure 25 in Volume ii - Background Information). Please see Move Anne Arundel (the Transportation Functional Master Plan) and the Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan for more details on planned bike and pedestrian improvements in District 7.</p>

Comments	County Response
<p>Requesting that the 2040 GDP prioritize the development of an interconnected recreational bicycle and pedestrian network in District 7.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. Plan2040 includes multiple policies and strategies that support improvements to the bicycle network, including Built Environmental Policy BE15.2 and supporting strategies. Plan2040 identifies bicycle network improvements in District 7 including along Route 2 and Route 4 (see Figure 25 in Volume ii - Background Information). Please see Move Anne Arundel (the Transportation Functional Master Plan) and the Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan for more details on planned bike and pedestrian improvements in District 7.</p>
<p>The 2040 GDP should prioritize the development of an interconnected recreational bicycle and pedestrian network in District 7.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. Plan2040 includes multiple policies and strategies that support improvements to the bicycle network, including Built Environmental Policy BE15.2 and supporting strategies. Plan2040 identifies bicycle network improvements in District 7 including along Route 2 and Route 4 (see Figure 25 in Volume ii - Background Information). Please see Move Anne Arundel (the Transportation Functional Master Plan) and the Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan for more details on planned bike and pedestrian improvements in District 7.</p>
<p>I'm requesting that the 2040 GDP prioritize the development of an interconnected recreational bicycle and pedestrian network in District 7</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. Plan2040 includes multiple policies and strategies that support improvements to the bicycle network, including Built</p>
<p>Please prioritize the development of an interconnected recreational bicycle and pedestrian network in District 7.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. Plan2040 includes multiple policies and strategies that support improvements to the bicycle network, including Built Environmental Policy BE15.2 and supporting strategies. Plan2040 identifies bicycle network improvements in District 7 including along Route 2 and Route 4 (see Figure 25 in Volume ii - Background Information). Please see Move Anne Arundel (the Transportation Functional Master Plan) and the Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan for more details on planned bike and pedestrian improvements in District 7.</p>
<p>Requesting that the 2040 GDP prioritize the development of an interconnected recreational bicycle and pedestrian network in District 7.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. Plan2040 includes multiple policies and strategies that support improvements to the bicycle network, including Built Environmental Policy BE15.2 and supporting strategies. Plan2040 identifies bicycle network improvements in District 7 including along Route 2 and Route 4 (see Figure 25 in Volume ii - Background Information). Please see Move Anne Arundel (the Transportation Functional Master Plan) and the Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan for more details on planned bike and pedestrian improvements in District 7.</p>
<p>For the 2040 GDP Please prioritize the development of an interconnected recreational bicycle and pedestrian network in District 7. Thanks, Myriam Ramsey</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. Plan2040 includes multiple policies and strategies that support improvements to the bicycle network, including Built Environmental Policy BE15.2 and supporting</p>

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>Please ensure that the 2040 GDP prioritize the development of an interconnected recreational bicycle and pedestrian network in District 7!</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. Plan2040 includes multiple policies and strategies that support improvements to the bicycle network, including Built Environmental Policy BE15.2 and supporting strategies. Plan2040 identifies bicycle network improvements in District 7 including along Route 2 and Route 4 (see Figure 25 in Volume ii - Background Information). Please see Move Anne Arundel (the Transportation Functional Master Plan) and the Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan for more details on planned bike and pedestrian improvements in District 7.</p>
<p>1. The draft plan looks great. Thanks for focusing growth in appropriate areas. More transit and more bike trails and sidewalks are needed and are very much welcome. Thank you for including them in the plan! 2. The 20-year plan for bike trails (walking &amp; biking trails) needs to include a whole lot more trails. They're not just for recreation. A 10-mile daily bike commute is perfectly reasonable if safe infrastructure is in place (even farther if you have an e-bike). Trips on trails replace trips in cars, which reduces traffic congestion, reduces carbon emissions, and improves quality of life for all of us. And only about 20% of trips are for the daily commute, so replacing shorter trips to shopping, parks, etc., is also really important. Providing trails along arterial roads (which is what seems to be in the 20-year plan) is important, but that's just the beginning. Connecting those trails to communities (along secondary roads) is also needed. We can't afford to wait another 20 years to make those connections. 3. We're seeing malls struggling across the country. We need a plan to repurpose them in a way that makes our urban areas better. The Annapolis Mall seems like an ideal location for mixed use development. With a transit hub, library, shops, restaurants, and a hospital right there, it seems like the only thing missing is (high density) residential space. The acres and acres of mostly empty parking should be replaced with equal parts green space and apartment buildings (or better yet build apartments over top of retail like at Annapolis Town Center). The parking lot is way too big, and it's insane that they are required to provide enough year-round parking for a peak holiday demand that only lasts a couple of weeks. 4. I-97 and MD-3 are often congested because they serve as alternate routes used by DC/Baltimore commuters when I-95 and MD-295 are congested or blocked by car crashes. Even though routes through our county are a little longer, they are often quicker than the more direct 95/295 routes. Trying to make traffic flow more quickly through I-97 and MD-3 will only draw more traffic from the 95/295 corridor. We know that making roads bigger never fixes congestion, it only makes things worse. "Just one more lane" is a recipe for disaster. Getting people out of cars (through improving transit, for example) is the only real solution. This is a regional problem (not just within our county) that needs a regional solution. 5. Transit services need to be better advertised. A lot of people still don't know about the newer transit services in the county. 6. Please keep Crownsville Hospital out of the hands of developers. And please don't try to put 20+ additional sports fields there either. It should be kept (mostly) in a natural state. 7. End parking minimums. Big parking lots are a waste of land and sit mostly empty most of the time.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. Plan2040 includes multiple policies and strategies that support improvements to the bicycle network, including Built Environmental Policy BE15.2 and supporting strategies. Plan2040 identifies bicycle network improvements in District 7 including along Route 2 and Route 4 (see Figure 25 in Volume ii - Background Information). Please see Move Anne Arundel (the Transportation Functional Master Plan) and the Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan for more details on planned bike and pedestrian improvements in District 7.</p>
<p>My name is Jeff Phillips. I live approximately 1/2 mile from Staple's Corner and appreciate the opportunity to provide input regarding the necessity to upgrade this area of Crofton. Several years ago I read with interest the plan for Staple's Corner to be designated as a Crofton Community "Main Street" and was thankful that such forethought had gone into the plan. It involved changing traffic pattern flows, introducing usable pedestrian walkways and incorporating "main street" business space along the intersection going each direction along 434 and 450. Unfortunately, recent Plan2040 looks like it will move Anne Arundel County in the right direction. One area I would put a lot of emphasis on is bike trails and sidewalks. More bike trails like the Baltimore and Annapolis Trail and Bacon Ridge/Waterworks Trails. These trails greatly enhance and create a healthy lifestyle community where people want to work and live. I would also work on expanding sidewalks and flattening the current sidewalks. I live in the Bay Hills community in Arnold and our sidewalks are so uneven it's better to push your stroller on the road. Building and maintaining sidewalks help create walkable communities that are desirable to live in. I think this is vital to taking Anne Arundel County to the next level.</p>	<p>Thank you for taking the time to review the Plan and provide feedback. Your comment has been recorded and will be considered as part of the preliminary draft Plan2040 review. Please note that the preliminary draft Plan2040 will be presented to the Planning Advisory Board where there will be a briefing and Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>Bicycle infrastructure must be emphasized more strongly. A well connected network will reduce the need for so many highway improvements, it will help the County reduce its impact on climate change, and it will help Anne Arundel County compete with well connected Counties like Montgomery County. Everyone should be able to access community amenities like the grocery store and doctor's offices by walking or biking. Bike lanes on the side of high speed limit roads are not sufficient, a safe network of shared use paths is essential in creating a network that feels comfortable for more people to use.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. Plan2040 includes multiple policies and strategies that support improvements to the bicycle network, including Built Environmental Policy BE15.2 and supporting strategies. Please see Move Anne Arundel (the Transportation Functional Master Plan) and the Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan for more details on planned bicycle network improvements.</p>
<p>Here is some feedback from what I saw in Volume I: Comment #1 One of the most significant land use changes since the 2007 Maryland Stormwater Management Act was passed, has been the requirement for new development and redevelopment to use environmental site design (ESD) to the maximum extent practical (MEP) to assist with groundwater recharge and to improve the quality of stormwater runoff. The County should be reporting, year-by-year, the number and types of private and public best management practices (non-structural and structural) that have been built and accepted. Most importantly, the County should be reporting the amount of cumulative rainfall captured and treated for a 1 year, 24-hour storm event so the intended impact of these BMPs can be properly understood. It would be even better if the report broke out the number BMPs associated with single family dwelling construction compared to residential developments of six dwellings or more and the cumulative impact. It should be understood how this significant change to land use is measurably contributing to meeting TMDL objectives. Comment #2 The goals, policies and strategies were allowed to be developed in an unconstrained resource and personnel environment. In no way is the 2040 Plan related to the County's current or future budgets or the funded personnel authorizations. There are 46 strategies that involve a change to Code. Another 46 strategies are about reviewing, evaluating, updating or creating a plan, program or strategy. Twenty-seven strategies require support from federal, state, or regional organizations. There are also six strategies that would possibly create a new department, committees, citizen councils or even a Development Authority. Many others are simply about following through on recommendations already made in studies, plans or in the last GDP. Only a few of the strategies request additional funding and/or staff to effect their strategy(s). One might ask if all of the draft goals, policies and strategies were assessed for their relevance/feasibility/practicability against any particular criterion? Comment #3 Achieving solutions to more than 90% of the strategies in five years or less (short term) is unrealistic. OPZ, for example, has lead or co-lead for at least 178 strategies, not to mention the dozens of others they support. Strategies should be prioritized according to some measure of importance. Moreover, strategies carried over from the previous GDP should be given special attention. Solution timelines, in the absence of key assumptions missing in the draft Plan, should be more pragmatic. Comment #4 The fact that 55.8% of the strategies are "ongoing" suggests that perhaps more than half the strategies may have simply been pulled from current functional plans. Some strategies are supposed to actually guide functional plans. One can't tell what strategies in the draft Plan are supposed to influence what functional plans. Comment #5 Very few of the strategies mention the commissions or boards that have ties to them and how they might factor into working or commenting on proposed solutions. For example, I can't imagine either the Transportation Committee or the Bicycle Advisory Commission not playing some role as transportation-related strategies are addressed. Perhaps the Implementation Action Committee should be made up of reps from</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. Please see the Summary of Public Comments document for response to these topics.</p>
<p>The 2040 GDP needs to include language that enables the planning and implementation of an interconnected bicycle and pedestrian path network in District 07 (region 09 specifically). The 2040 GDP and the 2019 transportation plan disproportionately prioritize bicycle network improvements in the northern portion of the county while completely ignoring our area. Please update the plan accordingly to better support the county-wide goal of improving multimodal transportation. The prioritization should initially focus on areas immediately south of the South River along the Route 2 and 214 corridors and should aim to connect multiple neighborhoods with existing public assets (schools, libraries, and parks).</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. Plan2040 includes multiple policies and strategies that support improvements to the bicycle network, including Built Environmental Policy BE15.2 and supporting strategies. Plan2040 identifies bicycle network improvements in District 7 including along Route 2 and Route 4 (see Figure 25 in Volume ii - Background Information). Please see Move Anne Arundel (the Transportation Functional Master Plan) and the Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan for more details on planned bike and pedestrian improvements in District 7.</p>

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>I'm concerned with the implementation of this plan, specifically the transportation portion. The County's Bike Commission worked with the County to develop a list of roads that are being repaved in the next 2-3 years that are wide enough to be striped to include bike lanes. There were over a dozen roads on the list. The Traffic Engineering Department said they would only add bike lanes to one of the roads because they 'don't have the staffing/resources'. That doesn't make any sense. The roads are being repaved and will have no striping, so they all need new lines with or without bike lanes. It's going to be at least 20 years before these roads get repaved again, which means no bike infrastructure for another 20 years. (They keep saying they will only restripe the roads when they get scheduled for repaving and then when the roads get repaved they still won't do it.) The Bike Commission is too polite to push back because they're afraid if they do they'll get no help at all from the county. I know the County Executive and County Council are trying to do the right thing, but some County staff don't seem to be interested in following these guidelines. Please require your agencies to implement these goals as soon as possible, so county residents don't have to spend another 20 years risking their lives every time they ride a bike.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. Plan2040 includes multiple policies and strategies that supporting improvements to the bicycle network, including Built Environmental Policy BE15.2 and supporting strategies.</p>
<p>Planned paths for bikers. zit is difficult fir vehicles to see around the bikers on the roads such as Saint George Barber rd. and connecting roads . Slowing traffic down and many close calls ; potentially causingg accidents.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>As cycling has climbed in popularity, and as an avid cyclist, I have a suggestion for an improvement: Currently, there is easy cycling from the BWI Loop, to the B&amp;A Trail, and even with just a small amount of navigation, one can get onto the newly added College Parkway trail. But unfortunately, one of the greatest parks in our state, Sandy State Park, is not safely accessible. Currently, one can ride via mostly paths to the 7-11 at 730 E. College Parkway, Annapolis, MD. But getting the last 2.5 miles to Sandy State park requires riding on a very dangerous 2 lane road that has no shoulder. Additionally, this road is one of the bumpiest in Anne Arundel County and is likely due for repaving soon (your hands are numb from the vibration after riding this road and there are many cracks from the crumbling tarmac). It would be terrible if re-paving occurred without adding a shoulder or bike path. Just this past March, 1 cyclist was killed and 2 others seriously injured. Likely this would have been avoided with a shoulder on this road. During the warmest months, there is over 100 cyclists a week that ride down this road to Sandy Point. It should also be noted that this road is heavily traveled in the summer as groups of cars go to Sand Point, or detour the Rt 50 traffic on their way to the Bay Bridge. I apologize if this is not the correct forum to ask for this request, so please respond back with to whom I should address my suggestion/concern, or forward accordingly.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. Plan2040 includes multiple policies and strategies that support improvements to the bicycle network, including Built Environmental Policy BE15.2 and supporting strategies. More specific details on bicycle network improvements are identified in the Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan.</p>
<p>In general, I believe this plan is good. I certainly hope that the county can follow through on the promotion of redevelopment, preservation of forest cover, and the addition of pedestrian and bicycle access. My biggest concern is with the land use proposal and I certainly hope that the regional planning process respects the wishes of the community with respect to the potential changes in use and zoning. Many people have spent countless hours trying to evaluate LUCAs, SRs, and OOHs. It would dishearten many to see that effort ignored. Most of the objections are to changing rural, open space, or low density to something different, but some of these are acceptable where "surrounded by", not simply "adjacent to" something else. This is extremely important to those who are long term residents trying to preserve their neighborhood. Even newer residents who chose their neighborhood based on the nearby open space or forest care immensely about land use.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>It is time to see and enjoy more interconnected bicycle and pedestrian pathways in AAco. I see much more of this in other counties and states but a paucity of such amenities here in AAco. In particular, it would be pleasant to travel by foot or wheel on protected pathways. Painting white lines on Rte 2 is not much different than painting a target on my back. Be a little forward thinking. I do not expect overnight results but I would cherish the thought that progress is being made for the upcoming and future generations.</p>	<p>Thank you for taking the time to review the Plan and provide feedback. Your comment has been recorded and will be considered as part of the preliminary draft Plan2040 review. Please note that the preliminary draft Plan2040 will be presented to the Planning Advisory Board where there will be a briefing and public hearing. That process is anticipated to occur in December and January (dates to be determined). The draft Plan2040 is anticipated to be introduced to the County Council in February 2021 with public hearings to begin in March 2021 (dates to be determined).</p>
<p>General comments: AACPS says that walk zones around schools are currently 2 miles for high schools, 1.5 miles for middle and elementary, and 0.5 miles for K and pre-K. The county should ensure safe routes around all public schools to support this. (and libraries and parks would also be wonderful!) Specific issues: Pasadena is a public transportation desert. I hope any revitalization here improves that. I think the no-fixed-route bus to UM medical center is a start.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. Plan2040 includes policies and strategies that support safe routes to schools, including the Built Environment strategy BE15.1.b and BE15.2.d.</p>

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>1) Land Use: Population density calculations for residential and commercial development need to be more clearly linked to capacity planning (e.g., school attendance growth or traffic metrics) as a key objective in the GDP draft. This is vaguely mentioned in the Education sections on pgs 105-06 but should be more clearly portrayed throughout. 2) Transparency and Public information dissemination: In 2015, Hogan Properties was granted several "modifications" by zoning which excused them from holding public information meetings regarding the Riverwalk and 'The Enclave' communities. This resulted in virtually no public knowledge of the residential/commercial development that has now taken hold in Crofton/Gambrills and Odenton. As such, there needs to be mention of improved governance and transparency when it comes to development applications or requests for zoning modifications having to do with any residential-commercial development in Anne Arundel County. This is a loophole exploited by several developers. Dr. D. Earhart (orion_329@yahoo.com)</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. Analysis of population and infrastructure capacity is provided in Plan2040: Background Information. Land capacity is addressed in the Land Use and Development section, traffic is addressed in the Transportation and Mobility section, and school capacity is addressed in the Public Education Facilities and Services Section. Additionally, these topics are addressed in the Concurrency Management Plan chapter. A modification to skip community meetings is no longer permitted (Article 17-2-108 of the County Code). Strategy 19 under Policy BE1.1 further expands limitations of modifications to Article 17.</p>
<p>I remember when I first moved to Crofton 15 years ago (from Boston) I thought ... wow how "rural" the Crofton area is. I see farms and parks and so much green space, and worried I would feel isolated. And quickly began to embrace the sense of community and belonging, access to parks, walking paths, great schools, breathing space, minimal traffic, local small businesses, and access to the cities when needed. Over the years the amount of growth has been painful to witness without good planning. The area has been developed too fast and we are overwhelmed with crazy traffic patterns, traffic, car and pedestrian accidents, wildlife displacement, tree and green space loss. And where are the farms???</p> <p>Please do not allow any more growth until there is proper public infrastructure such as roads, sidewalks, parks, sports fields, schools, support of small businesses.</p> <p>Also ensure there is proper community input and limits placed on development.</p>	<p>Thank you for taking the time to review the Plan and provide feedback. Your comment has been recorded and will be considered as part of the preliminary draft Plan2040 review. Please note that the preliminary draft Plan2040 will be presented to the Planning Advisory Board where there will be a briefing and public hearing. That process is anticipated to occur in December and January (dates to be determined). The draft Plan2040 is anticipated to be introduced to the County Council in February 2021 with public hearings to begin in March 2021 (dates to be determined).</p>
<p>I would like to our communities to include SAFE walking and biking options to reduce traffic, protect the environment, improve health and provide equitable transportation options.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>Glad to see plans for more public access to water. Seriously concerned that there is no recognition of the need for a change in suburban planning. We are at the dawn of the age of telecommuting and need forward-looking planning that allows some support infrastructure within walking distance in each development. Imagine being able to walk to small commercial area like a cross-roads or plaza with a small grocery, a coffee shop, a library, a post office, and a cleaners. Imagine there is a community building that includes telework space so people don't have to be completely isolated while working or studying. Imagine the daycare you send your child to is right there. Imagine all the small businesses in</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>The Crofton Small Area Plan is so flawed as to be ludicrous.</p> <p>1. Reconstructing MD Rte. 424 will never happen. On paper, this may seem to be a wonderful idea. Those of us who have lived in Crofton for many years have seen additional lanes, sidewalks planned and some actually constructed, extensive and expensive altering and re-landscaping the shoulders of the road and numerous entries/exits for churches, housing developments, schools, a strip shopping center, a farm-to-table business, a gas and convenience store, a restaurant and a park. All this permanence taking place with no actual plan to deal with the impact on the original road.</p> <p>2. Safety improvements are needed and possible. Lowered speed limits with police enforcements or speed cameras (possible for two school entrances), traffic signals that are timed to help traffic flow and restrictions on trucks hauling concrete and construction materials are needed and require no construction or modifications requested by developers and builders. MD Rte. 424 is a neighborhood road, the first true road in the Crofton area. For many people, it allows passage from MD Rte. 50 to MD Rte. 3, schools, the library, neighbors and neighborhoods and small commercial establishments. Once students return in person to school, more than two thousand young children, teenagers and the adult staff will be using MD Rte. 424. They deserve higher safety standards than are currently in place there.</p> <p>3. Additional development along MD Rte. 424 and MD Rte. 450 should not be allowed until improvements to the current roads and adequate facilities requirements are complete. The time to work on these roads was when former planning, zoning and building officials were approving new construction. As we all know now, this didn't happen. There are currently three parcels of land near Staples Corner that will soon have applications for possible re-zoning requests for future development. I am pleased that the designated Village Center in a Targeted Development, Redevelopment and Revitalization. Crofton citizens are counting on no zoning changes that will impact MD Rte. 424 and MD Rte. 450. The proposed roundabout at the intersection of these two roads was originally on the plan but common sense prevailed, and the plan was rejected.</p> <p>Thank you in advance for reading my letter and considering my opinion. Engineers and planners make grandiose plans, but we are counting on common sense to prevail.</p>	<p>Thank you for taking the time to review the Plan and provide feedback. Your comment has been recorded and will be considered as part of the preliminary draft Plan2040 review. Please note that the preliminary draft Plan2040 will be presented to the Planning Advisory Board where there will be a briefing and public hearing. That process is anticipated to occur in December and January (dates to be determined). The draft Plan2040 is anticipated to be introduced to the County Council in February 2021 with public hearings to begin in March 2021 (dates to be determined).</p>
<p>As a concerned Crofton citizen, I believe no additional development along MD Rte.424 and MD Rte. 450 should be allowed until mobility and safety standards that benefit the community and control vehicular traffic are in place, not just planned. A road that is safe would be a top priority which includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A reasonable speed limit</li> <li>Adequate traffic lights to insure movability</li> <li>Heavy-truck restrictions that are enforceable</li> <li>A sidewalk that is actually usable is essential.</li> <li>Development must be at a density no higher than what is allowable under current zoning regulations.</li> </ul> <p>Thanks for taking community concerns into consideration as you move forward with the Draft Plan 2040 GDP</p>	<p>Thank you for taking the time to review the Plan and provide feedback. Your comment has been recorded and will be considered as part of the preliminary draft Plan2040 review. Please note that the preliminary draft Plan2040 will be presented to the Planning Advisory Board where there will be a briefing and public hearing. That process is anticipated to occur in December and January (dates to be determined). The draft Plan2040 is anticipated to be introduced to the County Council in February 2021 with public hearings to begin in March 2021 (dates to be determined).</p>
<p>Traffic will increase with additional hiring of employees and tractor trailers at Atlas container Need traffic light at corner of Grimm Rd. and Telegraph Rd. too many tractor trailers coming from Atlas and traffic from community at back of GrimmRd. There are parking signs posted at circle at dead end of Grimm Rd. Tractor trailers are parking along residential side of Grimm Rd. Something must be doneNeed no parking signs posted on residential side of Grimm Rd. Also need sidewalk on residential side of GrimmRd so people can walk safely. Atlas container Parking lot lights are shining on residential homes on GrimmRd</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>Please improve Jumpers Hole Rd in the area between MD-2 and MD-177. This is an important connector road that sees high vehicular traffic, as well as pedestrian and cyclists who live/work in the surrounding neighborhoods and shopping centers. Please also consider looking further west on Jumpers to connect to the B&amp;A trail. The residents who live to the east of MD-2 have no safe, non-automotive way of accessing the B&amp;A trail, even though thousands live within walking and cycling distance to this great asset to our community. Improvement of the sidewalks along Jumpers and a safer crossing at the state roads would solve this.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. Portions of Jumpers Hole Road between Route 2 and Route 177 have been identified as a Critical Corridor in the Plan2040 Development Policy Areas map. This designation supports improvements to transportation in this area (see Built Environment Goal BE 10 and its supporting policies and strategies).</p>
<p>When will the sidewalks and curbs be completed in Brooklyn Park? They stopped at W Arundel Rd. Also the alleys need attention.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>Plan 2040 looks like a good start! I would like to see more sidewalks in the county and I would like the current sidewalks to be improved. The sidewalks in my neighborhood in Bay Hills Community, Arnold are not level enough for those that are handicapped and stroller users. The sidewalks are not widespread throughout the neighborhood they are only in portions which limits access to desired areas. I would also like to see more outdoor eating at restaurants. Thank you for making Anne Arundel County a better place to live.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>I wanted to see a map that would layout road changes, widening, sidewalks that would have the possibility of negativity impacting residents quality of life.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>As a condition of rezoning from residential to commercial, sidewalks shall be included in the approved plot plan that can be connected to the nearest intersections.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>Minimum parking requirements are counterproductive to many of the goals and strategies in the plan: they increase the cost of housing and contribute to uglier, less walkable communities. The plan recognizes (on p. 28 of vol. 1) the inequity inherent in restrictive single-family zoning, but low densities and segregated uses remain prevalent on the proposed land use map. The word "focused" is misspelled on p. 30 of vol. 1 ("Town Centers" section).</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>I would like to see pedestrian pathways in Edgewater area. There are a lot of businesses in the route 214/2 area and not always convenient to walk to. I would like a budget put in plan for this area as well.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>Good morning, this is the stated objective in Plan 2040. "Redevelopment and Revitalization: Redevelop vacant and underutilized properties, like struggling malls, shopping centers, and offices rather than expanding development into undeveloped properties and rural areas." HOWEVER, we continue to move ahead with clearing unused forested lands to build new developments, when numerous opportunities exist to REUSE existing under used property. Examples abound. One is the Forest Avenue proposed development off Crystal Springs road. WHO would want to live on that crowded rather unattractive roadway with no walking access safely anywhere.? Why not redesign the giant box store at the Annapolis Mall, former Nordstrom, and redesign ten acres of its parking lot into gardens and recreation. There are a plethora of stores, restaurants, entertainment sites, a library, and services RIGHT THERE. And, across the street is the giant Anne Arundel Medical Center. And a mile north is the Eisenhower Golf Course. Why NOT repurpose that into the planned Senior Living complex. There is a HUGE unused office complex off Riva Road at Holiday Court. There are huge portions of Marley Station Mall that are underused. WHY NOT redesign, reengineer, and rebuild those places into attractive housing condominiums that could be for work force housing. It remains foolish to leave all of those similar places unused and abandoned, THEN go denude forested lands and build new from scratch with no infrastructure available.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>COMMENTS ON PLAN2040 SUBMITTED BY JETTE FINDSEN, TRACYS LANDING, MEMBER OF ANNE ARUNDEL COUNTYS CITIZENS ENVIRONMENTAL COMMISSION</p> <p>Overview: I would like to applaud Anne Arundel County for its commitment to reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and building resilience to future climate change. This includes a promise to strive towards achieving net zero greenhouse gas emissions, as expressed on page 6 “A Vision for the Future.” Other notable Plan 2040 commitments related to climate change include:</p> <p>GOAL BE16: Increase the County’s resilience to future changes in climate and reduce emissions of greenhouse gases.</p> <p>Policy BE16.1: Establish systems in the County government to integrate climate change considerations across County functions.</p> <p>Policy BE 16.2: Reduce greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) to support achievement of State of Maryland goal of reducing emissions by 40% by 2030.</p> <p>Policy BE16.3: Support transition to renewable energy sources. Several goals to protect and restore forests and other natural habitats (i.e., Goals NE1, NE2, NE3), promote smart growth (i.e., Goals BE1, BE7, BE9, BE10, BE13, BE15), encourage sustainable buildings and infrastructure (i.e., Goal HC1), and increase recycling (i.e., Goal HC9). • These measures are likely to contribute to carbon sequestration. They may also avoid further increases in GHG emissions from transportation, depending on whether they can slow or reduce vehicle miles driven by fossil fuel-powered vehicles. Meanwhile, recycling of organic materials such as paper-based products will avoid emissions from landfills and incineration.</p> <p>Recommendations: I commend the County for pledging to strive towards net zero GHG emissions in the Vision Statement of Plan 2040. Achieving net zero emissions means dramatically cutting emissions while neutralizing, removing, or offsetting any remaining emissions. This is a great pledge and would put Anne Arundel County among the US’s most ambitious urban communities in terms of addressing GHG emissions. However, a net zero target is difficult to achieve and involves careful analysis, community engagement, and planning. Plan 2040 does not appear to include a discussion of how this net zero goal can be achieved and although many of the policies and measures already identified in Plan 2040 will help Anne Arundel County get part of the way to such a goal, the document is missing a section that pulls together all GHG-related measures to show that they contribute to the County’s overall efforts to address climate change. Such as section could also communicate that the County is 1) looking to achieve ambitious GHG reductions, 2) will be working to assess mitigation options and develop a GHG reduction target that is meaningful while grounded in what’s feasible, and that 3) such an analysis may lead to further long-term changes to the County’s planning efforts.</p> <p>Achieving net zero emissions would have significant impact on how Anne Arundel County develops over the next 20 year – this is in large part due to the large impact the transportation sector has on overall GHG emissions (i.e., transportation represents 40% of Maryland’s GHG emissions and these emissions continue to grow). I’m concerned that the current measures listed in Plan 2040 are insufficient to achieve net zero emissions in the long term and that more measures are needed that would require additional changes compared to what’s mentioned in Plan 2040, including plans for smart growth. The County may therefore want to change the vision statement to ‘achieve ambitious greenhouse gas reductions’ instead of ‘net zero greenhouse gas emissions’ – this would provide more flexibility for the County when it starts working on the Climate Action Plan under Policy BE16.1.a. In addition to these high-level comments, I have the following specific suggestions (new language is in bracketed text): Based on the information provided in Volume II of Plan 2040, Anne Arundel County has not yet developed a GHG inventory for county operations, or for the community as a whole, which is usually the first step in developing a Climate Action Plan. If we use Maryland’s GHG inventory as an indicator for what GHG emissions may look like in Anne Arundel County, electricity consumption would likely represent 30% of total emissions, fossil fuel use in buildings 18%, transportation 40%, industrial processes 6%, agriculture 2%, and waste management 3% (see <a href="https://mde.maryland.gov/programs/Air/ClimateChange/Pages/GreenhouseGasInventory.aspx">https://mde.maryland.gov/programs/Air/ClimateChange/Pages/GreenhouseGasInventory.aspx</a>). Maryland’s emissions from transportation are growing while emissions from electricity consumption are declining due to the growing uptake of renewables.</p> <p>The Maryland GHG emissions profile indicates that in order to come into alignment with the Maryland State goal of reducing emissions by 40% by 2030, Anne Arundel County should pay particular attention to the transportation sector, e.g., by promoting electric vehicles, vehicle fuel switching, and use of public transportation. One big uncertainty is what the expected expansion of the Bay Bridge would mean for transportation patterns in the County. Nonetheless, it will be difficult for the County to develop a business-as-usual scenario for GHG emissions and identify specific mitigation measures until</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. Plan2040 will be revised to indicate that the County will strive to reduce Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions, rather than achieving net zero. Additional strategies regarding GHG inventory, provisions for electric vehicles, and procurement policies will be added to Plan2040. It should be noted that other greenhouse gas reduction strategies are woven throughout recommendations in Plan2040. Additional recommendations, metrics, and implementation will be explored in the Climate Action Plan (Strategy a of Policy BE16.1).</p>

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>As a young person living in Anne Arundel County, I GREATLY appreciate the focus on transitioning to renewable energy. My future depends on YOUR choice to invest in sustainability - and seeing so much preservation of the environment in this plan is inspiring. I would love to see an even greater focus on the environment, but I do appreciate how much is already included.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>My deepest concern is for high density sprawl along the route 3 corridor. This is NOT "smart growth". It is HIGH DENSITY SPRAWL. RESIDENTS went to the Vision meetings wanting CHANGE which this is NOT! Growth along route 3 has not paid for itself. Infrastructure has been ignored and delayed. Further growth is not sustainable without the infrastructure to accommodate it and IT is NOT environmentally sustainable. Builders should pay the cost of road improvements. NO more money in the honey pot of the SHA which they use as a discretionary fund!!!!!! THE MOTTO SHOULD BE "INFRASTRUCTURE FIRST", THEN IF, fitting and desirable, DEVELOPMENT". We in West County have an extreme paucity of ADEQUATE FACILITIES". THUS, NO PERMITS FOR CONSTRUCTION UNTIL AF. HISTORIC PROPERTIES AHAVE BEEN IGNORED IN ODENTON TOWN CENTER DEVELOPMENT. HIGH DENSITY ENCROACHMENT HAS, BY FRAGMENTED SPOT ZONING with INFILL DWARFED THE INTENT OF PRESERVATION IN SMART GROWTH. AN EXISTING COMMUNITY SHOULD NOT SUFFER IMMEASURABLY IN THE NAME OF "TRANSIT ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT".</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>General comment: No mods should be granted by Planning and Zoning for any new development, especially commercial. Mods may be considered for renovation or redevelopment that do not affect wetlands, setbacks, safety zones, specimen trees and conservation easements. Each community shall have limitations on the number of permits issued for residential and commercial new development. This should not be dependent on school capacity alone and consider a reasonable rate of growth. Traffic and access to transit should be determining factors. The intent is to limit uncontrolled growth, deforestation and wetlands loss. This should include permits for renovation and redevelopment that go beyond existing footprints and parking capacity.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. Plan2040 includes strategies focused on reforming use of modifications under Built Environment Policies BE 1.1 and BE 1.2.</p> <p>The County currently uses an Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance (County Code Article 17-5) to review and mitigate impacts of development projects on schools and traffic. A workiTwo working group focused on schools and traffic is currently evlauting the Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance and will be making recommendations to reform and improve the ordinance. In the draft Plan2040, Built Environment Policy 1.3, and strategy BE5.2.b addresses implementing reforms to the Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance.</p> <p>A new Policy BE1.3 and supporting strategies have been added to Plan 2040 focused on Adequate Public Facilities regulations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Conduct fiscal impact analysis and impact fee study</li> <li>o Update impact fees</li> <li>o Update growth management program</li> <li>o Update APF for schools</li> </ul>
<p>I would like a lot more use of vacant land as "green space." We do not need cluster dwelling in our non-urban residential communities. The peace and quiet we currently enjoy would be gone. We do not need over-crowded schools, so school availability should always be one of the first criteria to consider any kind of development. Driving throughout the county I see different types of housing is readily available to satisfy each resident's desires and needs. We need to consider runoff situations when over developing. We also need to consider wildlife and their need for a home. Perhaps bus transportation could be better to move people between jobs and recreation and their homes. I flat out oppose development of drainage pond areas and our counties beautiful farmlands. They are as much a symbol of our community as ego alley in Annapolis and the Naval Academy are. We don't want increased crime so we also need to be very careful the kind of housing we have and programs which attract undesirable elements into our family oriented communities.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>I feel that there should be an expansion of reliable, public transportation between Annapolis and Glen Burnie. I have been living in Anne Arundel county for the past four years, and I have been commuting to Annapolis for the past two years. Traffic congestion while driving on 97 has been horrible, and it took a pandemic to alleviate that congestion. On top of that, the amount of potholes is horrendous, especially on the southbound side of the highway. It is starting to get as bad as 295 was, and it has been like this for the past four years. Now, I do not believe expanding the highway would be the right answer, because it would have a negative impact in the environment. Anne Arundel county must invest in a green, mass transit public transportation that would link Annapolis and Glen Burnie. Maybe some type of light rail project of some sort? The county should invest in green and reliable public transportation to address these issues.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>There are no provisions or proposals to incorporate and utilize improvements to technology that could help with traffic. Self driving mass transit, improved traffic light technology, dedicated self driving routes, improved electric vehicle charging availability.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>Please see these two links which express my concerns and hopes for AACo: <a href="https://www.capitalgazette.com/environment/ac-cn-column-gerald-winegrad-20200926-klfzsfmavgbtkfsvyf2or6y54-story.html">https://www.capitalgazette.com/environment/ac-cn-column-gerald-winegrad-20200926-klfzsfmavgbtkfsvyf2or6y54-story.html</a> <a href="https://www.capitalgazette.com/lifestyles/ac-cn-column-gerald-winegrad-20201003-fcrp5cdfgrdejhkpc2qcpibly-story.html">https://www.capitalgazette.com/lifestyles/ac-cn-column-gerald-winegrad-20201003-fcrp5cdfgrdejhkpc2qcpibly-story.html</a> Another valuable document is the recent letter/ comments sent by the Arnold Preservation Council (APC). I agree with all of these documents which state my concerns more knowledgeably and concisely than I ever could. I would like to say that I am 100% against all so-called clear-cutting and believe we should preserve every healthy tree. "If it grows, pave it" should never have been this county's apparent slogan. Every decision that is made should be with the environment, climate change and the safety of our water sources and Bay in mind. Moreover, growth in Arnold has got to stop. Building a Chick-Fil-A (sic) is crazy and should NOT happen, especially when your plan talks about addressing traffic congestion on College Parkway. Finally, your plan is very comprehensive though repetitive and I found it overwhelming to go through. I would imagine many others find it at least as daunting. I never did figure out your interactive maps. I'm thankful for leaders like Elizabeth Rosberg of the APC who looked at it all in greater detail for the rest of us, and for former State Senator Winegrad's fervor and expertise.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>Thank you for your reconsideration of the Rte 3 Corridor from the Targeted Development and Revitalization Policy Area. Many groups, as well as individual citizens, worked long and hard to help make county officials more aware of the problems associated with Rte 3. The Rte 3 Corridor needed relief from continued growth, its facilities are overutilized and continued development is to no one's advantage in terms of taxes, traffic, public safety and the environment. In addition, designating Staples Corner as a Village Center would have had negative impacts on the community considering the newly built Crofton High School which will generate so much more traffic on very narrow area roads. Those of us who attended many meetings and hearing are grateful for these decisions and hope they will lead to improvements in our quality of life.</p>	<p>Thank you for taking the time to review the Plan and provide feedback. Your comment has been recorded and will be considered as part of the preliminary draft Plan2040 review. Please note that the preliminary draft Plan2040 will be presented to the Planning Advisory Board where there will be a briefing and public hearing. That process is anticipated to occur in December and January (dates to be determined). The draft Plan2040 is anticipated to be introduced to the County Council in February 2021 with public hearings to begin in March 2021 (dates to be determined).</p>

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>The most important issue facing Crownsville, Md. is future land use on and within an area that extends along General's Highway from Bestgate Rd. to Rt. 3. In fact, it is the only issue. This is the great watershed of the South River, including Crownsville Hospital, low density housing and small businesses. The county roads that connect this historical area, consisting of open spaces, old forests, small estuaries or streams which exists along the General's highway corridor should not ever be open to further commercial development that is not necessary for the safety, or improvement for residents who already reside there. There are specifically two locations which can begin to open the G.H. corridor to upheaval over time by causing the need for more traffic lights which delay travel time. One is Generals Hwy and Herald Harbor road and the other is on Sunrise Beach Road and Generals Hwy. Any new establishments will also lead to new road frontage, which attracts more home builders, followed by a demand for commercial retail establishments. Crownsville and the area along Generals Highway would like to premanently preserve the historical, scenic, and ecological treasure that has existed for thousands of years, from the early natives through the colonial period. Many communities throughout Anne Arundel County are fighting the results of unnecessary development but General's hwy has the advantage of low growth that separates us from other communities, total urbanization and the devastation of our watershed and preservation of land used by our rich and diverse native wildlife.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>Overall I think it makes a lot of sense, I am concerned about the traffic on rt 3 from rt 32 heading south all the way to 450. It feels already as if it is a limited access freeway, so I dont clearly understand what we would do to address the congestion? Also, as you look at the zoning and planning, there are a growing number of homes that are just south of Crofton (south of 450) that are really part of the crofton community, but because we are designated as rural there are no plans for services for us (sewer, public water, natural gas lines) It may be something to consider that while that was originally a rural area, the make up of it has changed a bit. If not for services purposes, but at least as you continue to look at school zoning, and any social inclusion with the community of Crofton.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>Maybe concentrate on extending the light rail service as you promised. That is after you make it safe and accountable. You also stated more green less building. Seems that was all a bunch of lip sync service. Fix what we have before adding more.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>Bull . You need to fix what is broken first. Extend the light rail that you raved about. After you staff it with safety and Accountability first. Concentrate on the green as you promised and less on building. Stand up for your constituents the LEGAL ones I should say. You work for us REMEMBER????? You are slowly destroying Anne Arundel County with your own agendas. Shame on you</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>It is too late for where I live in AACo, but I would hope that you would recognize the CBF advise in keeping what little bit of forest we have left here. I watched as the owners of property behind me strip away truckloads of mature trees BEFORE applying for permit to build townhomes and what can you do? AACO all for business and I guess none of us are actually supposed to live here no trees, no wildlife UNLESS you live in a critical area. Traffic is an issue that needs to be addressed and has not been in the past. I have been told that whoever has the most money wins and this is true, those of us who don't have a contact in the county get overlooked and set aside until you want to take the property. This is probably the first time a plan of such nature actually asked the citizens what they thought of it. When you had the 20 year plan for Severn and rezoned people's houses to fit your future plans you didn't ask any of us then.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>I am opposed to the rezoning of land in Anne Arundel county for development purposes. The irresponsible rezoning in Severna Park and Millersville has led to overcrowded schools, traffic issues and distractions of protected natural resources. Rezoning and development for financial gain is detrimental to our community.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>This is an amazingly well together and comprehensive plan. Kudos to the contributors! One request - on p45, I'd like to suggest considering Benfield BLVD as an opportunity for improvement. I know that the corridor is very tight and E/W BLVD does provide some relief, but traffic flow in that whole area can add 20 minutes to a commute on a bad day. The re-opening of W. Benfield Road has helped (as has COVID, unfortunately), but I do think that once schools are open again and more people are commuting, that area has been a huge headache to get through and nearly every day there are fender benders due to the stop and go nature of the traffic.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>The preliminary draft of the General Development Plan 2040 is well written and comprehensive. It provides a vision for the future of Anne Arundel County. While the goals and the recommendations of the Plan 2040 GDP are laudable, the concerns of those of us who live in the Pasadena/Severna Park/Arnold corridor about the pace and volume of development remain. In spite of the fact that the County has had the tools to enact many of the goals of environmental protection and adequate facilities since the mid 1980's, it has consistently failed to act on behalf of the citizens to preserve the quality of both our environment and our daily living by allowing overdevelopment. The County has failed to follow its own regulations, supporting the business interests of developers at the expense of the quality of life of the citizens who live here. Developments were approved by Planning and Zoning with many variances or modifications to the County Code. The County's push for development has been a disaster for our creeks and rivers – the water quality has degraded to the point that the water is not safe for swimming for 48 hours after a rainfall. Our quality of life is compromised by snarled traffic on the main corridors as well as every secondary road and feeder road, often turning a simple two-mile trip into a half hour endeavor. Plan2040 states that "Anne Arundel County residents voiced concerns about the development pattern that has occurred and the resulting impacts. 'Too much growth,' 'infrastructure capacity needs to be in place before development,' 'the cluster development provisions are not working to conserve land' were concerns often heard during the public outreach efforts." Plan 2040 also notes that the County Code has fallen short of implementing its land use plan by "approving cluster developments that have not promoted integrated site design in order to preserve natural features; and approving modifications to the Code that are inconsistent with the Vision and Goals of the GDP." The Plan 2040 provides a framework wherein "land-use goals, policies and strategies are intended to guide the location, amount and type of development within the County with the purpose of forming a land use pattern that improves the County's natural environment and the character of its communities which will in turn, result in a better quality of life for its residents." The previous General Development Plan (2009) and the Small Area Plans (2005) also had excellent recommendations for increased environmental protections for forests and waterways and plans to preserve the character of the neighborhoods of our communities, but we watched as parcel after parcel of land was clear-cut, outfall pipes were directed into sensitive wetlands, and traffic increased exponentially with the relentless approval of development projects in our midst. Development has occurred in sensitive wetlands, and traffic volume has increased on Ritchie Highway, Benfield Road, Baltimore-Annapolis Boulevard and College Parkway, bringing traffic to a standstill at many times of the day. As the new Plan 2040 document clearly points out, the County has had the resources to put the brakes on this type of destructive development in its arsenal of regulations for many years. Some of the regulatory tools that currently exist are called out in Volume 2 of the 2040 Plan. At the Federal level there is the Clean Water Act; at the State level there is the Chesapeake Bay Critical Area Act and Habitat Protection laws, the Stormwater Management Act and the Maryland Forest Conservation Act. At the County level there are Articles 16 (Floodplain Management, Sediment and Erosion Control, and Stormwater Management), 17 (Subdivision and Development Codes) and 18 (Zoning Codes) in the County Codes. These existing laws would, IF FOLLOWED, control the onslaught of development that has degraded our creeks and rivers and our overall quality of life here in the County. When will Planning and Zoning actually require developers to follow these laws? The citizens of our county have made it very clear that jamming more paved areas into already overcrowded communities is not what we want. People choose to live here because of the beauty of our natural landscape and the quality of our waterways. We look forward to the day when the County Codes are strengthened to require rigorous environmental standards that actually afford protection to our environment. In the meantime, if the County follows the laws and codes already on the books, it has a much better chance of achieving the very desirable goals that the General Development Plan 2040 lays out.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>Having lived my entire life in south Anne Arundel County, with my ancestors having lived on Parker Island that is now gone, I do not take for granted the value of a rural South Anne Arundel County and would like to halt any further rezoning effort to provide more development or more commercialization. The value of having a rural setting to live in, or having it nearby to visit is now heightened more than ever. The maritime and agricultural heritage is part of what gives Anne Arundel much of its charm, character and liveability as well as the wooded land and creeks and streams that all enable an ecosystem to thrive and provide recreational activities not seen in too many nearby areas, including in other counties. South Anne Arundel County is known for its excellent bicycling opportunities and further development would mean more traffic and more danger to cyclists as well as causing disruption to getting around the area. There is a true community feel and spirit to South County where many people know and appreciate each other and further efforts to develop the land will only upset the residents, create tension in daily life and disrupt the natural balance that has existed for many generations. Thank you.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>As a Board Member of the Indian Landing Community Association, I agree with the letter submitted by our Board and local community groups. I have lived in Indian Landing Estates in Millersville since 1977. The quality of life along this area of the county has changed dramatically and not for the best over the past few years. It is out of control and haphazard in the manner that pieces of land are devoured, gas stations appear, traffic levels explode yet nothing is done to preserve the nature of the environment or demonstrate good land planning. The voices of individual residents who live here and pay taxes are ignored. My personal experience with the Millersville Tennis Park is a prime example. Little thought or concern was given to additional traffic and congestion. I was shocked at the public hearing at Millersville Elementary that no one addressed the aquifers and water demands. Due to poor planning on the county's part in the 70's we had no choice but to drill wells and install septic systems since we have no public water or sewages. All of the new growth affects the home owners water and quality of life. The concerns expressed at that meeting will never answered.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>In reviewing the proposed Plan 2040, we believe the framework for planning and zoning is well written and inclusive. However, from someone who lives in the Pasadena/Severna Park/Arnold corridor, we are concerned that these zoning and development plans will actually be followed. The framework is in place, but it needs to be strictly followed. There have been too many approvals for "cluster developments" that do not adhere to the code by allowing for modifications and variances. When these projects are considered collectively, they have allowed for overdevelopment at the expense of our waterways and increased traffic volume. Traffic on Ritchie Highway, Benfield Road and other area roads has increased exponentially in the last decade, and the water quality in our streams, creeks and rivers are deteriorating as a result of that overdevelopment. These factors all contribute to the quality of life for the residents who live here. The county needs to follow the laws already enacted if they want to achieve the ambitious goals outlined in Plan 2040.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>I urge the county to stick to the plans laid out in the Draft 2040 and to stop awarding variances. I've seen so much habitat destroyed in the 12 years since becoming an Arnold resident, and this has been a disaster for our creeks and rivers. The water quality has degraded to the point that the water is not safe for swimming for 48 hours after a rainfall. Our quality of life is compromised by more crowded schools, heavier traffic, and loss of open space. Please keep Anne Arundel County a beautiful place to live, and slow the development!</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>Stop building along route 3. Traffic is not safe</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>I oppose any further development of medium to high-density housing in the entire county. My immediate community is being overrun by such developments and the increased traffic, congestion, and decreasing quality of life make moving out of the state an ever appealing option. If allowed, I will attach a screenshot from one of your development maps of my immediate community showing the disproportionate amount of medium to high-density housing in my area (area encompassed by the 97/100 intersection to 100/10 to 97 and East West Blvd). I venture to guess that this isn't taking place in the backyards of any government officials on the board of approvals. Continued building in our county will decimate our resources, stress the current infrastructure, and bring a pittance of revenue compared with the costs to maintain and rebuild said infrastructure. Once it's gone, we can't get it back.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>This GDP draft proposes aggressive recruiting of commercial enterprises in the redevelopment and new growth around the Ft. Meade/Odenton and other areas. As a business owner and resident, I can tell you that congestion along Rt. 175 and other roadways surrounding the base are nearing maximum capacity given the immense growth of new housing as it is already. I am against continued development without having population growth of both businesses and residential areas pinned to metrics such as school capacities, traffic congestion metrics, and other critical data points. I do not think this plan addresses any of that.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. The County currently uses an Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance (County Code Article 17-5) to review and mitigate impacts of development projects on schools, traffic, and sewer service. Two working groups focused on schools and traffic are currently evaluating the Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance and will be making recommendations to reform and improve the ordinance. In the draft Plan2040, Built Environment Goal 5 strategy BE5.2.b addresses Implementing reforms to the Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance to make it more effective. A new Policy BE1.3 and supporting strategies have been added to Plan 2040 focused on Adequate Public Facilities regulations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>oConduct fiscal impact analysis and impact fee study</li> <li>oUpdate impact fees</li> <li>oUpdate growth management program</li> <li>oUpdate APF for schools</li> </ul>
<p>The Plan2040 doesn't cover limiting or possibly reducing traffic on Generals Highway. RT 178 has again become a major commuter route as I-97 is becoming more crowded during rush hour.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>I believe we need stronger regulations for tree removal. I think we also need to stop residential development. The neighborhoods we have will increase in value since less is available and we want that. We don't want progression of AACO into a city. It will come with too many problems. We've already seen increased traffic beyond the capacity to manage it. Growth needs to cease and preservation needs to be maintained.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>I'm NOT in favor of any consideration given to 'up-zoning' of designated land use along MD Rte 3 to higher intensity use. This is totally inappropriate until all problems are successfully addressed. Existing MD Rte 3 problems have complicated our neighborhood life with noise pollution and traffic problems. DO NOT compound these problems with more of your progress!</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>I looked at the Planned Land Use map and I think you've got the wrong information on Valentine Creek Drive, which is slated to be used in some way. The street ends way before the map shows it does. I live at 1113 Valentine Creek Dr and where you show Creeks End Lane ( I'm guessing that's the trail to the water) is at my driveway; the street doesn't continue on after that. It looks like, perhaps, the street was supposed to be built further, but they never did it. I'm guessing no one from the county ever came out and actually saw the area since none of that exists in real life. It's just forest.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. Please note that Valentine Road has not been constructed but the road and adjacent parcels were approved in a subdivision plat. Anne Arundel County has acquired the land for natural area protection, but the map shows that the road exists as a legal right of way.</p>
<p>The first thing that should be done to ease traffic congestion in a downtown area like Annapolis is to make the main streets for pedestrians only, and bar them to traffic. It is done in East Lansing, Mi and is fantastic. That's an easy fix and not expensive, compared to other plans. The second thing to consider in your long range plans is to stop overcharging your citizens for services here. It's outrageous what we pay here for real estate taxes, water, and electricity. When I compare it to my relatives in my home state of Massachusetts, or others in Maine, NH, Vermont and Penn., they are shocked at what we pay. It is like larceny. Your plan is like larceny for what benefits to us?</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. Please note that there will also be opportunities to comment at the Planning Advisory Board and County Council public hearings. Please also be aware that the City of Annapolis is also conducting an update to their comprehensive plan. More information about their process can be found on their website.</p>

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>We agree with your proposal; "roads with reasonable speed limits, adequate traffic light, to provide ..... etc. Everything planned for it should be completed before you envision new plans. All plans should keep in mind the population density that already exists and the infrastructure needed. Thank you for allowing us to comment.</p>	<p>Thank you for taking the time to review the Plan and provide feedback. Your comment has been recorded and will be considered as part of the preliminary draft Plan2040 review. Please note that the preliminary draft Plan2040 will be presented to the Planning Advisory Board where there will be a briefing and public hearing. That process is anticipated to occur in December and January (dates to be determined). The draft Plan2040 is anticipated to be introduced to the County Council in February 2021 with public hearings to begin in March 2021 (dates to be determined).</p>

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>To Whom It May Concern: The following comments on the draft General Development Plan (“GDP” or “the Plan”) promulgated by Anne Arundel County (“the County”) are offered by the Arundel Rivers Federation (“the Federation”) in the spirit of collaboration and constructive dialogue. The Federation is grateful for the opportunity to comment on this important policy document, and we are grateful for the hard work of County personnel in crafting the draft. We look forward to continued engagement as we work collectively to develop an environmentally conscientious path for the County over the next 20 years. The following comments are offered with reference to the volumes of the draft plan available for review at <a href="https://www.aacounty.org/departments/planning-and-zoning/long-range-planning/general-development-plan/">https://www.aacounty.org/departments/planning-and-zoning/long-range-planning/general-development-plan/</a> The comments are divided by volume, and each is preceded by a reference to the page number within that volume. Some of the comments are substantive and address the content of the referenced passages. Other comments are phrased as questions, and still others simply point out typographical errors in the draft text.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. Revisions to Plan2040 will be made to address the grammar and word choice comments. The Equity in the Natural Environment section will be amended to make the connection between environmental conditions and low income and minority communities more clear. Many of these comments ask for additional level of detail that can be found in the table in the Implementation and Accountability section of Plan2040 or will be addressed through implementation of the plan.</p>
<p>Volume I P 16- “Equity in Natural Environment”—There does not appear to be any discussion of equity in this paragraph. There is discussion of current conditions in certain areas of the County, but no linkage of these areas to demographic conditions, nor explanation of how the environmental conditions combined with demographic conditions cause or contribute to equity or inequity in the natural environment. Consider providing these links to indicate what the nature of the problem is to the lay reader.</p>	
<p>P 17- “Challenges”—“Pressure to develop in rural areas of the County continues to threaten the character of the area and viability of the agricultural economy.” How is this pressure being quantified? How does it compare to non-rural areas of the county? If there is less pressure on already developed areas, why is that, and how can that trend be reversed to encourage more infill and redevelopment instead of the utilization of open space and agricultural land to meet the growth needs in the County?</p>	
<p>P 17- “Opportunities”— “Design and construct infrastructure to be resilient to impacts of climate change.” Who will be doing this design and construction? How will this opportunity be realized, e.g., through existing environmental site design (“ESD”) principles, or something different?</p>	
<p>P17- Bureau of Watershed Restoration and Protection Project Goals “Number of projects completed/anticipated” –When is the timeline for completion of the projects reflected in the pie graphs?</p>	
<p>P22- “The goals and policies include aspirational statements for the environment we strive to attain, as well as compliance with Federal and State regulatory requirements.” (emphasis added). This sentence is ambiguous. Regulatory requirements are not optional. If the statements herein are merely "aspirational" then they are not sufficiently robust to ensure compliance with law, and should be revised to reflect the County’s commitment to meeting its regulatory imperatives.</p>	
<p>P22- Policy NE1.1: Refers to protecting environmental features “by increasing and tracking the protections afforded during the development process.” What specific increases in protections during development are being considered? Any additional detail here would be valuable.</p>	
<p>P22 Policy NE2.2- “Develop, establish and implement a Forestry Management Program” What department will administer the Forest Management Program?</p>	
<p>P22 Policy NE3.2- “Continue expanding the network of protected corridors of woodlands and open space as set forth in the Greenways Master Plan” Is the reference to the Greenways Master Plan appropriate in light of the fact that the Green Infrastructure plan is currently being drafted and will supersede the Greenways Master Plan? Shouldn't the newer plan be the baseline for corridor protection?</p>	
<p>P23 Policy NE4.1- “Achieve or exceed Federal and State mandated water quality standards.” This is a huge task, and this conclusory statement does not indicate any specific means by which the county expects to accomplish it. It would be encouraging to see some detail here to flesh out any sort of roadmap for how the County intends to accomplish this feat. In light of the County’s current reliance on nutrient trading to meet the requirements of its Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (“MS4”) Permit, and the impending technological limits of the wastewater treatment plant nutrient reductions that form the credits of that trading plan, meeting federal permit requirements going forward will require aggressive measures to reduce stormwater pollution. Any additional detail articulating the County’s strategy on this front would be encouraging.</p>	
<p>P23 Policy NE4.4- “Reduce sediment pollution from active construction sites.” The Federation would be very interested in learning what specific actions are being contemplated to realize this policy. Is County</p>	

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>First, I'd like to congratulate the Office of Planning and Zoning for the hard work they have done to create a well-thought comprehensive plan. I particularly liked the equity emphasis mentioned, but would like to see more equity-based goals and policies. At the beginning of the plan, "desire for more public parks and opportunities for public waterfront access" was listed as one of six challenges identified by the community. While I've seen goals and policies about expanding parkland and providing more recreational opportunities for all communities, I couldn't see anything about public waterfront access. This is a county with miles and miles of shoreline. Water is everywhere, but the public cannot have access to it. It is a shame and definitely an inequitable situation that county residents cannot enjoy the waterfront within stone's throw from where they live. The issue of public waterfront access should be included as a goal and well-thought policies should be developed to realize this goal. I am thrilled to see a access to healthy food as a plan goal and several policy recommendations realties to it. I am especially happy about the recommendation of establishment of a food policy council. I am puzzled about the plan's approach to solid waste management. The only goal is about residential solid waste. I'd like to see at least an explanation about why commercial, industrial, and institutional waste was left out. Another important element of solid waste that was left out is food waste. In order to protect the environment and extend the life of the Millersville Landfill, the most important item that should be diverted from the landfill is food waste. According to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, more food reaches landfills than any other material, constituting 22 percent of municipal solid waste. As food decomposes, it emits methane, a more potent greenhouse gas than carbon dioxide. Food scrap recycling should be included in the comprehensive plan as a policy under the goal of solid waste reduction and recycling, which should include both residential and non residential solid waste. As part of this policy, curbside food scrap collection should be included as a strategy. Mention of expanding the food scrap collection program to all three residential drop-off facilities under Policy HC9.2.f is puzzling, since there is no mention of food waste management in the plan. When I visited the county's web site, I saw information about introduction of organics recycling, even though it is only a drop-off service for residents at the Central Recycling Center. If such a service is in existence, how come it is not mentioned in the plan other than the expansion of the collection program to all three drop-off sites. What happens to the collected food waste, whether it is being processed in the county to turn it into compost should be discussed, and a recommendation should be made to create a composting facility. My final comment is about the community engagement process. How come I've never heard about the Plan 2040 until now? How does the Office of Planning and Zoning reach out to public to announce the planning process and seek participation? I hope there will be a better outreach efforts in the future.</p>	<p>The "Community Services" background report to Plan2040, found on <a href="http://aacounty.org/plan2040">aacounty.org/plan2040</a>, explains that most commercial and industrial solid waste goes to privately owned and operated facilities. The intent of Policy HC9.1: Optimize recycling programs, systems and outreach with a clear priority toward promoting reducing, reusing and recycling residential discards over land disposal includes addressing organic waste diversion. Please see page 8 regarding the various public engagement opportunities.</p>
<p>I urge you to please stop the reckless pace of development. A review of the State's construction stormwater NOI data shows that Anne Arundel (my county) has more development proposals than any other. And a large number are on forested tracts that are critical to protecting water quality and habitat. Everyone knows that developers have an outsized influence on the political process. I urge you to resist this influence and remain focused on doing what is in the public interest. In the planning process focus development where it makes sense (existing infrastructure) and protects the environment (infill development and away from forests and wetlands). And please, please keep development far from low lying areas that will increasingly flood in the long term due to climate change.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>do not change our residential to a commercial you are ruining the green space the trees the quiet neighborhood we learned to love and raised our children in it you used to be peaceful and quite and it is becoming commercial getting all kind of commercial zoning on route 3 it is very crowded</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>STOP over building and tearing down. It is time to protect the waterways that this community needs, uses and in so important to the environment. Stop the overdevelopment, overcrowding and the blatant disregard for the the health of the environment.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>No more zoning should be changed to allow anymore building . We need the preserve our forest and rivers in the area. Stop building and don't change zoning in our area.. roads are crowded and land is sparse.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>

Comments	County Response
<p>(Greenways) Overall Plan2040 is a great example of collaboration and listening. I'm concerned that it is already being overcome by current events - Is there going to be a Greenways Plan update, as mentioned in this plan, or are we going to have a Green infrastructure plan, as I have seen mentioned as currently being in progress? Is MD 3 just getting widened to 3 lanes each way (as a plan I saw recently) or turning into a limited access highway (as in the Move Arundel section)? Ref: page 64 policy NE1.1 For those of us who do not trust developers any more, where is a document/database of environmentally sensitive areas that were confirmed as of some date? That data should be used to validate a developer's "existing conditions" document. Ref: page 66, policy NE1.5 item a begins "Prohibit the use of glyphosate" and infers that glyphosate is a pesticide. It is not a pesticide, but is an herbicide. Glyphosate is already controlled, but not prohibited. It should be a "last resort" herbicide, but not prohibited. I'm not sure it should be called out here at all.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. Greenways Plan Update - draft is in progress and scheduled to be completed in 2021. Title may change to Green Infrastructure to align with similar plans by State of Maryland and other Counties. Route 3 - Planned improvements include both lane widening and limiting access. Environmentally Sensitive Areas - the County relies largely on data compiled by State agencies in addition to site specific studies by consultants. State data on environmentally sensitive areas can be viewed at the <a href="#">Merlin website</a>. The County is developing additional spatial data tools and making them available to the public. Glyphosate - The term 'pesticide' is used by scientists and regulators as a broad term that includes all substances used to control pests including herbicides and insecticides.</p>
<p>In as much as Plan2040 includes these goals that are the goals of the Edgewater Citizen Association, we agree with the plan. Keep Edgewater a desirable residential area. Keep the existing commercial environment in its current footprint and prevent the intrusion of commercial building into the residential communities of Edgewater or into land zoned as rural. Address the stormwater runoff to prevent polluting the South River as well as the creeks and streams leading to it. Keep forested areas intact and protect sensitive environmental areas. Improve highways and streets to reduce congestion. Make Edgewater a desirable place for bicyclists and pedestrians. Facilitate sewer and water connections for established communities north of Route 214. Keep the area south of Route 214 rural as it is commonly recognized as the start of South County, and was so recognized in the GDP of 2009. Preserve open space and seek to expand it.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>"Planned Land use is how the County and its residents envision the future use of the land to be in order to promote a more desirable outcome and is depicted in an adopted comprehensive plan as the Land Use Map." [page 100] And, "The primary purpose of Plan2040 and previous GDPs in Anne Arundel County since 1978 is to establish a framework for where and how growth occurs." [page 104] These indicate that this Plan should be focused on getting this right. If, "Development in these [Environmentally Sensitive] areas is guided by policies and regulations to limit or prohibit impacts of land uses to sensitive areas." [page 96], then the Critical Area overlays contained on this map must also be overlaid on the Planned Land Use Map, to present the real vision of a desirable outcome. Also, the wording of "guided" used here, as opposed to "governed" or "constrained by" is problematic. The explanation of types of land features that are included on the Environmentally Sensitive Features Map does not promote transparency as regards Critical Areas, rather it dilutes the importance of critical areas due to the multitude of land feature categories which may be contained on or added to the Environmental map. [pages 107 to 109] The fact that COMAR regulates county land use practice (to the degree that it speaks to an area like forest conservation or critical areas) and the county has errantly come up against misinterpretation very recently, indicates that CAs deserve a prominent place on the Land Use Map. "Note that environmental constraints were not factored into the non-residential zoning district analysis." [page 104] Does this statement include disregard for the non-residential districts in CAs on the map? Overall, the good work of many shines in this document, however, I find the real "meat" of the development plan(s) to be poorly defined. Please correct at least the CA overlay addition to the Land Use Map before presentation to the PAB and County Council. Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment.</p>	<p>The Planned Land Use Map takes many factors into consideration including the Critical Area designation. Including the Critical Area designations would reduce the legibility of the Planned Land Use Map. The Critical Area designations are illustrated on the previous page spread. The Planned Land Use Map is implemented through zoning and through policies set forth in Plan2040. The Zoning Map and its corresponding regulations found in Article 18 of the County Code, is a tool that follows and implements the Planned Land Use Map by regulating the development that is allowed today. Other tools, such as development regulations, stormwater and environmental regulations, and historic preservation requirements, will implement the Plan2040 Vision and help shape how development occurs. Proposed development on site shall be subject to all applicable regulations, including those regulations governing environmentally sensitive areas, at time of development.</p>

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>The Advocates for Herring Bay (AHB) commend the County Executive and staff for developing a clear vision for the county and delineating a strong set of goals, policies, and strategies to manage land use in the coming decades. In particular, AHB strongly supports the proposed strategies in Plan 2040 for preserving, enhancing, and restoring the county’s ecological assets, especially measures that would expand protections for wetlands, forests and environmentally sensitive habitats. We also applaud the inclusion of performance metrics for each strategy, which will allow county officials and citizens to monitor progress toward achieving those goals. While Plan2040 increases accountability for actions by the executive branch, we are concerned that it lacks a parallel track for the legislative branch. In our view, achieving the vision of Plan2040 requires not only backward-looking metrics on program accomplishments but forward-looking information on whether future actions would support or undermine the goals outlined in the legislatively approved general development plan. This was a weakness of the previous GDP (2009), and has meant that citizen groups like AHB have had to do the heavy lifting to ensure the principles of the GDP are represented in legislative changes to the county code. To that end, we recommend that the County Executive work with the County Council to translate the key elements of Plan2040 into an objective “scorecard” that would inform lawmakers about a bill’s consistency with the plan before they vote. As a practical matter, the “scoring” probably would be done by staff in the executive branch, but having a transparent analytical framework – even a simple checklist—would give lawmakers a better understanding of the effects of their actions and protect against unintended consequences of new legislation. As is the case with any plan, the County Council would still be free to use its own judgement on the appropriate regulatory policies for the county. However, having such information publicly available in advance of legislative action would increase the odds that the promised vision for the county becomes reality.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>The rural nature of South Anne Arundel County should be preserved above all else when it comes to planning for the southern half of AA County. It's what makes the entire county attractive, otherwise the county would be one big suburb and an unattractive place to live or visit, except for Annapolis. It is nice to be able to drive a short stretch and be in a rural setting. South County is a part of Anne Arundel's character and should not be lost to further development or commercialization.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>The Planned Land Use Map should respect the boundaries of the Regional Area Map adopted by the Citizens Advisory Committee. In particular, the Annapolis Town Center boundary should be respected. The Planned Land Use Map will encroach upon the Crownsville/Route 178 corridor by allowing piecemeal development that will gradually change the character of the area through a death by a thousand cuts and permitting sprawl to proceed unchecked which is at odds with the environmental and historical value of this area. Redevelopment should be emphasized over allowing new development based on a change of character in adjacent areas.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>Please retain Crownsville as semi-rural and do not develop it. The environment needs the buffer area. Crownsville Hospital should be a historic site with good environmental use.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>It is very important to keep South County RURAL. The community has steadfastly commented in every GDP and all planning processes for the past 60 years to keep South County Rural. The scenic and historic roads, agricultural and maritime culture are some of the essence of what makes this area appealing to those who live here and visit here. It is important to retain those unique qualities that</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>I have lived here in this part of AA County for about 17 years, and have witnessed the slow - and sometimes not so slow - development of what used to be a pretty quiet and sylvan area. I understand the attraction in this area is primarily due to the Ft Meade expansion. And one expansion inevitably tends to lead to other expansions. I would suggest though that enough is enough. Leave the Route 2</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>Growing up on a farm in Southern Anne Arundel County instilled the understanding I now have of our vanishing heritage in the area. The protection of this asset is vital to the people that make up the community. The rural agricultural communities effort to protect this treasure has been fought for many year. The preservation of natural areas and there intended use is key to the character of Southern Anne Arundel County.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>I ask that the County stop approving development requests that degrade our waterways and our environment. I Request that the County act on behalf of its citizens who have to travel already</p>	<p>Thank you, you're comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>To respond effectively to plan2040, the Communities need the Greenways Plan, which was due from Recs/Parks for a few years now. The Website is outdated. The Plan was never updated by Mr Anthony. When can we expect this critical component to effectively participate in the Plan2040 and provide informed feedback?</p>	<p>Protection, enhancement and expansion of the County's greenway system is a goal of Plan2040. Please see Goal NE3, Policies NE3.1, NE3.2 and the corresponding strategies in Volume I of Plan2040. The Green Infrastructure Plan is a functional master plan that will be updated after the adoption of the General Development Plan to implement these strategies.</p>

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>It is important to protect the rural and natural areas of Southern Anne Arundel County. The agricultural and maritime heritages are integral to the community and what makes it special. The rural agricultural and maritime aspects are what the community has prioritized to protect over the last 60 years. It is important to continue to preserve that nature. The maritime industry is very important to the local economy. It provides many local jobs for local people saving commute time and adding to the quality of life so many enjoy. We need to continue to support and promote the maritime industry. Thank you for the good work you all are doing to plan for our future.</p>	<p>Thank you for taking the time to review the Plan and provide feedback. Your comment has been recorded and will be considered as part of the preliminary draft Plan2040 review. Please note that the preliminary draft Plan2040 will be presented to the Planning Advisory Board where there will be a briefing and public hearing. That process is anticipated to occur in December and January (dates to be determined). The draft Plan2040 is anticipated to be introduced to the County Council in February 2021 with public hearings to begin in March 2021 (dates to be determined).</p>
<p>I am following up on our conversation regarding comments from our Galesville community on Plan2040 that are due by Sunday November 15, 2020. Galesville's three community associations (West River Improvement Association (WRIA); Galesville Community Center Organization (GCCO); Galesville Heritage Society (GHS)) have worked together as a community to provide our collective comments on Plan2040. As mentioned, the Plan2040 website appears to be designed to receive specific comments from individuals, not comprehensive comments from organizations. Therefore, our comments (four pages), signed by our three association Presidents, are attached. I will also mail a copy of our signed, consolidated comments to your office at 44 Calvert Street Annapolis, MD 21401. If you need any further information, please contact me at: [Redacted] We look forward to Galesville's active participation in the Plan2040 process going forward. I would appreciate receiving an acknowledgment that our comments have been received.</p>	<p>Thank you for taking the time to review the Plan and provide feedback. Your comment has been recorded and will be considered as part of the preliminary draft Plan2040 review. The Plan2040 Citizen Advisory Committee, which was composed of representatives from each of the 16 Small Areas, has completed their work. However; the Region Plan process will include a Stakeholder Advisory Committee for each Region with diverse geographic representation. The order of Region Plans has not yet been determined. It will be determined by the County.</p>
<p>Please note our comments regarding the preliminary draft of Plan2040, the Anne Arundel County General Development Plan. We are members of the Anne Arundel County Commission on Disability Issues and while we do not represent the full Commission, we have reviewed the preliminary draft of Plan2040 with regard to disability issues as individuals. We believe the preliminary draft plan has done a good job identifying goals, policies, and strategies for disability issues in the Planning for the Built Environment and Planning for Healthy Communities Sections, but we are concerned that these issues may be lost during the region planning process. We would like to see language added to the draft Plan2040 that stresses the importance of addressing disability issues at the region plan level.</p>	<p>Thank you for taking the time to review the Plan and provide feedback. Your comment has been recorded and will be considered as part of the preliminary draft Plan2040 review. Please note that the preliminary draft Plan2040 will be presented to the Planning Advisory Board where there will be a briefing and public hearing. That process is anticipated to occur in December and January (dates to be determined). The draft Plan2040 is anticipated to be introduced to the County Council in February 2021 with public hearings to begin in March 2021 (dates to be determined).</p>
<p>In your Background, Volume II document, page 99, there is a reference to Staples Corner and envisioning that as a neighborhood village center. I strongly oppose this. Staples Corner is a failed intersection and you want to put in a mixed use village center. Please reconsider this aspect of the GDP. You guys did a great job notwithstanding my one comment.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>Unacceptable levels of development along the Rt. 3 corridor approaching Millersville Rd./Rt. 175, particularly at the SE corner of Rt. 3 &amp; Millersville Rd.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>Hello, I would like to comment on the county goal to "Ensure public services and infrastructure adequately meet needs." In particular, to address the needs of the students. To add more seats to allow for continued uncontrolled and rapid development in AA county, and in particular the Crofton feeder school system, will only continue to weaken our schools. Overcrowding is a huge issue here, and temporary classrooms and additional wings only ruin our schools to bow to developers is not okay. Class lunches have to start in the 10 am hour to accommodate for the ridiculous overcrowding because the core of the school was not built for the increased number of students. This is just one example of how adding more seats is not the answer for quality education for our citizens. It's time to curb unchecked housing growth in western AA county.</p>	<p>Thank you for taking the time to review the Plan and provide feedback. Your comment has been recorded and will be considered as part of the preliminary draft Plan2040 review. Please note that the preliminary draft Plan2040 will be presented to the Planning Advisory Board where there will be a briefing and public hearing. That process is anticipated to occur in December and January (dates to be determined). The draft Plan2040 is anticipated to be introduced to the County Council in February 2021 with public hearings to begin in March 2021 (dates to be determined).</p>
<p>45 days is not enough time for non-experts to go through the land use plan, understand it, and give relevant and comprehensive feedback. This is an unreasonably short period for the amount of information just brought to the public's attention. I ask that the comment period be extended. Thank you.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
That in every public places we have recycling containers and make this county a cleaner city in all aspects.	Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.
I think the most significant concern I have is that the plan's goal is to protect 80% of land within the PPA when in fact the County should seek to expand the PPA. There are countless properties that have been developed and are now vacant throughout the county and we should not only seek to redevelop those but also promote the reclamation of some of those properties that make sense back to forested and agricultural use. Additionally, I see no specifics of how the County will go about promoting the agricultural economy. The simple fact of the matter is that farmer's most expensive resource is land and the price for it continues to soar while the margin for agricultural goods remains slim. CANCEL IT.	Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. Plan2040 includes strategies to increase protections for agricultural land under Policy NE3.3 and to support the agricultural economy under Policy HE2.5.
	Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.
Our waterfront on Stoney Creek has been classified as conservation. What does that mean?	Replied to email with same question.
This plan does not show any vision of design professionals or any efforts by the county professional career staff. There no developing change or up gradation of life of county residents shown in this report. This is just a very low grade exercise with a lot of expenses of public money. This exercise is just an academic type of exercise but not showing any improvement in quality of ordinary residents of AA County.	Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.
This is restricting the county way too much in terms of available locations to develop which will only exacerbate housing supply and reduce the County's tax revenue.	Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.
It will take the next 20 years to figure out what's in this plan and decide if it's worth doing much less trying to implement it	Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.
No mixed use.	Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.
Request the zoning for Whitehall and Beechwood on the Burley be r-2 and not changed to R or RA. This is consistent with the communities on the land that have existed for 70 years or more. Mr Pittman has agreed with this request.	The preliminary draft of Plan2040 retains Low Density Planned Land Use for the Burley and Whitehall Beach communities. See the Preliminary Draft Planned Land Use Map currently available for public review at <a href="http://aacounty.org/Plan2040">aacounty.org/Plan2040</a> .
Maintain open space!!!	Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
Maintain open space zoning!	Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.
I would like to see the subject of accessory dwelling units (ADU) discussed. ADU's are a great way for a family to assist an elderly parent or child with special needs that cannot live completely independently . Right now AA County makes it impossible or extremely difficult to build an ADU on on one's own property. I think ADU's have the ability to help with housing difficulties faced by many. I would like to see the restrictions of ADU's greatly reduced.	Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. Goal BE 11 and its supporting goals and policies address providing a variety of housing types. While ADU's are not explicitly mentioned, they will be considered in implementation of these goals, policies, and
The area to the south of Mountain Rd. at Edwin Raynor is shown in the Development Policy Area Map as "Village Center" but is shown in the Planned Land Use Map as "Low" or "Low-Medium Residential." I don't have a problem with either designation, but I worry that the Village Center designation on the residential portion could allow for an argument to rezone from residential to commercial.	Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. Further refinement of Land Use and comprehensive rezoning for this area will be discussed with the community in the Region Plan.
Are there any new county parks planned and if so where?	The Land Preservation Parks and Recreation Plan (LPPRP) provides information on potential future County Parks. The LPPRP is referenced in Plan2040. You can download and review the LPPRP at <a href="https://www.aacountv.org/denartments/recreation-">https://www.aacountv.org/denartments/recreation-</a>
Prohibitively expensive and scary if implemented.	Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.
Proposed amendment for property status change from any residential to any commercial zoning as follows: The parking area for any commercial development shall be limited to the footprint of the proposed building. For additional parking to meet county zoning codes, one tree must be planted for each additional space. Trees shall be 1.5 inch caliper size and have a minimum 16 square foot exposed soil area. Additional trees shall be on the same site or in a planting zone adjacent to the parking areas. The plantings shall be subject to the bonding and inspection requirements of the Forestation Act.	Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. Landscaping requirements are detailed in the Anne Arundel County Landscape Manual. Landscape requirements are based on total parking lot area rather than number of parking stalls. The Forest Conservation Ordinance includes regulations for tree retention and reforestation (Article 17-6-3). The comments may be considered when the Landscape Manual is updated.
For new Commercial development over 4000 s.f. a LEED designation of Bronze should be required. Over 6000 s.f. silver should be required. Over 8000 s.f. gold, and over 10,000 s.f. platinum. For renovation or new commercial construction in an existing building, LEED for renovation is suggested to encourage redevelopment in existing buildings. In all cases the county should contribute funding only to LEED re-certification not for achieving the LEED certification in the first place.	Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. Building performance requirements are addressed in Plan2040 in the Built Environment chapter. Strategy BE 16.2.c directs the County to "Adopt latest versions of State and international building and energy codes with goals of achieving Net Zero Energy, Waste, and Water by 2040 for new construction and by 2050 for alterations of existing buildings." These building code updates achieve many of the outcomes of LEED certifications while working with the existing building review and permitting process.
I truly appreciate all of the time and thought from both CEC and staff that went into this. I have been engaged with community meetings that have been hosted throughout the past year but I guess my first concern is in trading the 97 pg GDP Wheee do you start and what input/engagement do you really need from ordinary citizens like me, cause I'm not sure	Duplicate message. Appears to have been submitted prematurely.

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>I truly appreciate all of the time and thought from both CEC and staff that went into this. I have been engaged with community meetings that have been hosted throughout the past year but I guess my first concern is in trading the 97 pg GDP Wheee do you start and what input/engagement do you really need from ordinary citizens like me, cause I'm not sure. 3 areas of input. 1.I very much agree with Op Ed picas in capital by Paul Christensen that growth rate caps and true local control must be included in our plan for the future. (10/27/20). I'm all about learning from other BP and Paul mentioned one where "Several jurisdictions in other states have used rate limits on approval of building permits to tune growth to local needs. They simply limit the number and types of building permits issued each year in areas of interest. This approach is a proven technique. Unfortunately, nothing in Plan 2040 suggests that anything so radical might even be considered." 2. I live on annapolis Neck and for development along forest drive there needs to a more rigorous framework for development in the city/county sectors that bump against one another. I've heard a lot of talk of how city/county are working better together. But this can't b personality driven 3. What are some of the lessons from COVID that need to be informing the GDP? Our county WiFi infrastructure is totally inadequate and is impacting quality of life/equity in education School capacity during COVID has shown that capacity is much more than # of classrooms. Finally I'm looking for 2rd to the regionals meetings but I don't understand how they are going to be structured and what the results realistically can be.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>I urge you to keep south county rural.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>I urge you to keep south county rural.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>Too busy a road for residential properties.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>Keep South County rural and maintain its farming heritage. We have lost most farmland in Anne Arundel County to development and need to preserve what we have left.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>Ritchie Highway is no longer a residential street. It is basically one long commercial thoroughfare and should be zoned accordingly</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>Make all new roadways safe for cyclists and pedestrians</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. Plan2040 includes multiple policies and strategies that support improvements to the bicycle network, including Built Environmental Policy BE15.2 and supporting strategies.</p>
<p>I wasn't able to get the draft enlarged so I could read it. I am very concerned about over building in our county. When there are office buildings empty why do we give permission to build more?</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>All the property on Ember Drive in Pasadena that is zoned R-1 should be rezoned to W-2 just like the rest of the industrially zoned property on Baltimore Annapolis Blvd. from Waterford Road to the end of Ember Drive. After Route 10 and Route 100 were built, access to Ember Road from the contiguous residential properties (now on the other side of the highways), was cut off. This left only one means of access to the R-1 properties on Ember Drive. That access along Baltimore Annapolis Blvd. (from Waterford Road) is composed of dozens of down and dirty industrial properties. Therefore, it no longer makes sense for the properties at the end of Ember Drive to be Zoned R-1 (or any residential zone for that matter). Thank you.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>The land use section of the plan for Edgewater rightly turned down LUCAs that asked for commercial in residential districts and RA districts. BUT I think they should have emphasized that those pieces of land should stay as they are zoned, instead of just saying the designations would be decided in regional planning. A more definite affirmative stand should have been taken.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>I am not happy with</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>In reviewing the planned GDP, I noticed that my neighborhood on Jumpers Hole between MD 177 and MD-2 is considered a Critical Corridor. This doesn't surprise me, yet the usability and access to Jumpers Hole is not up to par with what is expected of it. The residential area is rapidly expanding and it is becoming increasingly difficult to even use Jumpers Hole during the day, let alone during rush hour. Improvement of this road would be massively beneficial to the residents of the area as well as the people who use the road regularly.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. Portions of Jumpers Hole Road between Route 2 and Route 177 have been identified as a Critical Corridor in the Plan2040 Development Policy Areas map. This designation supports improvements to transportation in this area (see Built Environment Goal BE 10 and its supporting policies and strategies).</p>
<p>All parcels on Ember Rd in Pasadena should be zoned W-2 because they gain access from a commercial/industrial area and are along MD Route 100 within the residential noise zone buffer area</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>My name is Christopher J. Howard Address: 231 Rock Ridge Road, Millersville, MD 21108 Tax Account #: 345490017840 Tax Map: 0023 Block/Grid: 0015 Parcel: P.0732 Per the County's Land Use &amp; Zoning Map of our property, the current zoning line bisects our property just beyond the back of our house to the rear property line into Open Space (OS), while the front portion of our property is zoned ER2 Residential. We would like to request that this be updated in the Comprehensive Plan so that our entire property is zoned ER2 Residential.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. We appreciate your concern about the split zoning of the property. Some properties in the County intentionally have two zoning districts applied and sometimes it is the result of a mapping error. Please note that Plan2040 addresses Planned Land Use, which is different from Zoning. The Planned Land Use Map provides policy guidance. The Zoning Map and its corresponding regulations found in Article 18 of the County Code, is a tool that follows and implements the Planned Land Use Map by</p>
<p>We live on Stoney Creek in Pasadena, MD, and I see our waterfront is zoned as conservation area. What does that mean to home owners?</p>	<p>When the analysis for land use was conducted, this strip of land was shown as "Community Open Space" but has since been corrected on the County's parcel.</p>
<p>Thank you for the opportunity to read and comment on development plans for Anne Arundel County. I understand that population growth offers many challenges and tough decisions. One area of concern that I have is the potential of rezoning single dwellings to multiple dwelling units. It is my hope that such changes are done with extreme thought and limits. Consequences of liberal allowance of such changes can have devastating impact on the neighborhoods involved due to issues such as overcrowded roadways (which already exist in many areas), increased demand on water and sewage abilities, and schools just to name a few.</p> <p>The idea of reuse of vacated structures such as closed shopping malls for residential use can be a good I am emailing on behalf of Faith Baptist Church regarding the land/building we currently own located at 7379 East Furnace Branch Road, Glen Burnie, 21060 with a real property account number of 90039776 and Anne Arundel County Tax Account number of 500090039776. The property currently shows in Anne Arundel County records as being zoned "R5", but in MD State records it is listed as "Exempt Commercial." After speaking with the Anne Arundel County zoning office, it was suggested that I reach out to you as there are currently long-range plans in the process. As the property operated as a gas station prior to our acquisition, we were hoping to have the zoning reverted back to commercial use. This would allow us more options for use on the property and also a better possibility of selling in the future. It is a corner lot. Also, there are several commercial businesses up and down East Furnace Branch Road that are operational. Any help as to how to proceed would be much appreciated.</p>	<p>Thank you for taking the time to review the Plan and provide feedback. Your comment has been recorded and will be considered as part of the preliminary draft Plan2040 review. Please note that the preliminary draft Plan2040 will be presented to the Planning Advisory Board where there will be a briefing and public hearing. That process is anticipated to occur in December and January (dates to be determined). The Your best bet would be to contact the State Department of Assessment and Taxation at (410) 974-5709 or sdat.aa@maryland.gov. While the County is working on a long-range land use plan and the planned land use for the property is proposed to change from Medium Density Residential to Low-Medium Density Residential, the zoning is not anticipated to change.</p>
<p>What is the schedule for the GDP town halls? It's not readily apparent on the website/ I'm not looking in the right place.</p>	<p>The schedule is included below. [graphic indicating town hall meeting dates and times was given]</p>
<p>[Subject Properties 363-365 Ritchie Hwy 21146 &amp; 202 East Maple Rd 21090] I am working on these 2 questions in the midst of comprehensive rezoning. Could you please inform me of the future plans for both of these properties and if upgrading zoning is an integral part of AAC's future plans as I am working on both of these addresses aggressively.</p>	<p>According to the proposed Planned Land Use Map as part of Plan2040, 363 and 365 Ritchie Highway are proposed to have their Planned Land Use designation changed from Low Density Residential to Commercial. The zoning is currently C1. Please note that Plan2040 addresses Planned Land Use and comprehensive zoning would occur after the Region</p>
<p>the Plan 2040 format is not very "user friendly" ... I will appreciate timely updates</p>	<p>Thank you for taking the time to review the Plan and provide feedback. Your comment has been recorded and will be considered as part of the preliminary draft Plan2040 review. Please note that the preliminary draft Plan2040 will be presented to the Planning Advisory Board where there will be a briefing and public hearing. That process is anticipated to occur in December and January (dates to be determined). The draft Plan2040 is anticipated to be introduced to the</p>
<p>I apologize for the confusion, but please disregard my previous two emails. Please see attached letter requesting a land use designation change for the Harmony Marina. If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact our office. Again, I apologize for the confusion. Have a nice day!</p>	<p>Email receipt was provided.</p>
<p>[Call] Concern about 954 Main Street in Galesville not being designated as it's highest and best use.</p>	<p>A response was provided via telephone.</p>

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>954 Main Street, Galesville, MD 20765. The address on the building reads "956". It is the Galesville Volunteer Fire Department Building, which has been vacated and replaced by the new Anne Arundel Fire Department #1 building on Muddy Creek Road.                      Parcels: 100000318905                      PIN 690080431000000000000000                      Tax Account Number 100000318905</p> <p>There is one document that I found that lists the property as "Commercial Exempt". The original building was built in 1929, and an additional two bays were added to the eastern part of the building to accommodate larger vehicles later. (I am guessing sometime between the late 1950" and the early 1970's). The area where the additional two bays were added had fishing net sheds on it as its previous use. Directly to the west of the building is the Galesville Memorial Hall. The land for the Hall was donated to the community by the Woodfield family. I think the Memorial Hall and the Volunteer Fire Dept. land are linked, but no one involved seems to have a direct and concise answer or a document to prove anything.</p> <p>In reviewing the draft of Anne Arundel County's Plan 2040, I believe the land and improvements at 954 Galesville Rd., Galesville, MD 20765 should be zoned for a higher and better use than R2. Given the history of the property, I believe that the property has been inappropriately zoned R2 for quite a while. Perhaps the original zoning is incorrect.</p> <p>Quoting the current Plan 2040, "...the County's demographics are shifting, getting older and more racially and ethnically diverse." Among the challenges is an aging population. The number of adults over 65 years old will increase by approximately 40% from 91,000 in 2020 to 129,000 in 2040. The 2040 Plan is the opportunity to: tailor public services to meet the needs of an increasingly diverse population; expand and improve programs to meet growing needs of seniors and people with disabilities; and develop programs, facilities, and infrastructure to support aging in place.</p> <p>Galesville has a very old population with a 103 year-old resident, a 93-year old resident, and several widows and widowers in their 80's. These people are from here or have been here for decades and have extended family in the community. Their desire is clearly to age in place. They are doing that by remaining in their family homes and often residing on the ground floor of the home and leaving the second story vacant. Sometimes friendly arrangements are made for others to live with them, keep an eye on them or care for them.</p> <p>I understand that there is a new "Assisted Living" zoning designation that has been approved or not yet on the books for the county. If the property in question were zoned to accommodate multifamily or assisted living, and redeveloped to accommodate either use, we could alleviate some of the housing issues in Galesville and South County. We could provide reasonably priced and appropriately sized housing for these seniors, provide suitable amenities and preserve community relations and friendships while giving the elderly the opportunity to transfer their properties to younger families interested in moving to Galesville.</p> <p>Before the commentary period for the final Plan 2040 is drafted, can those involved review this property for rezoning?</p>	<p>Thank you for taking the time to review the Plan and provide feedback. Your comment has been recorded and will be considered as part of the preliminary draft Plan2040 review. Please note that the Planned Land Use Map in Plan2040 is not a zoning map. Planned Land Use designations tend to be more generalized. Zoning will be confirmed during the comprehensive rezoning process which will happen with or soon after each Region Plan. Depending on the type of the Assisted Living Facility, that use is either Permitted, a Conditional Use, or a Special Exception in the existing R2 zoning district.</p> <p>Please note that the preliminary draft Plan2040 will be presented to the Planning Advisory Board where there will be a briefing and public hearing. That process is anticipated to occur in December and January (dates to be determined). The draft Plan2040 is anticipated to be introduced to the County Council in February 2021 with public hearings to begin in March 2021 (dates to be determined). Your contact information has been added to our list and you will be notified of future updates.</p> <p>Also note that Galesville is identified on the Plan2040 Development Policy Areas Map as a "Village Center" where during the upcoming Region Plan process it is intended that a concept plan for the area be developed and planned land use further refined to implement the concept plan. Comprehensive rezoning of this area will occur with the Region Plan.</p>
<p>I was working on a map that had both the current zoning map, and the map it may change too on the same application. You could essentially toggle to move and see what the area would look like.</p>	<p>Please note that the Planned Land Use Map in Plan2040 is not a zoning map. Planned Land Use designations tend to be more generalized. The "slider map" available during the Online Open House is not available during this public comment period. However; an interactive map is provided on the <a href="http://aacounty.org/plan2040">aacounty.org/plan2040</a> website. An interactive map for zoning and the 2009 Planned Land Use can be found here.</p>
<p>I appreciate the update but noticed there was no Hanover area representative, Is this an oversight or are they included somewhere else. I searched the document for Hanover and did not see anything.</p>	<p>The Citizen Advisory Committee was composed of representatives from the 16 Small Area Planning areas. The Hanover area is included in the BWI/Linthicum Small Planning area.</p>

Comments	County Response
<p>My name is Christopher J. Howard                      Address: 231 Rock Ridge Road, Millersville, MD 21108, Tax Account #: 345490017840, Tax Map: 0023, Block/Grid: 0015, Parcel: P.0732                      Please advise how I may submit a comment on the upcoming Comprehensive Plan pertaining to my primary residential property as identified above. Per the attached screen shot of the County's Land Use &amp; Zoning Map of our property, the current zoning line bisects our property just beyond the back of our house to the rear property line into Open Space (OS), while the front portion of our property is zoned ER2 Residential.                      We would like to request that this be updated in the Comprehensive Plan so that our entire property is zoned ER2 Residential.                      I attempted to call the (410) 222-7432 phone number provided to me to understand how to most effectively submit a formal comment, but was advised in a recorded message to submit questions via this email along with details of my comments.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment, it is acknowledged and part of the public record for Plan2040.                      We appreciate your concern about the split zoning of the property. Some properties in the County intentionally have two zoning districts applied and sometimes it is the result of a mapping error.                      Please note that Plan2040 addresses Planned Land Use, which is different from Zoning. The Planned Land Use Map provides policy guidance. The Zoning Map and its corresponding regulations found in Article 18 of the County Code, is a tool that follows and implements the Planned Land Use Map by regulating the development that is allowed.                      Based on review of the Planned Land Use Map for Plan2040 (see this link on the Office of Planning and Zoning website), the Planned Land Use designation for the entire parcel is Low Density Residential. That would support a future change in Zoning to make the entire property to R2. The County plans to undertake a comprehensive review of zoning as part of Region Plans that will follow after Plan2040 is adopted.                      For more information please see the Plan2040 website, <a href="http://www.aacounty.org/plan2040">www.aacounty.org/plan2040</a></p>
<p>I am a concerned citizen of the Severna park area and I am very worried about the possible rezoning of properties in the Severna Park area. The Severna Park Elks is a Private Club and has a Permitted land use in an R2 Zoned Area. We have been led to believe that there is a possibility of being rezoned after the plan has been approved by the County Council. If this rezoning is allowed to happen, this would reduce the value of our property in the future. We have NO plans to sell the property, but we do not know the need of this Lodge in 20 , 30 or 40 years. We want what we have and nothing more. Please make sure that our property 160 Truckhouse Road Severna Park 21146 remains R2!!!</p>	<p>The County Office of Planning and Zoning is concerned that you were given false information regarding an impending rezoning. There is not a proposed zoning change for this property. Plan2040, the County's General Development Plan which is a policy plan for guiding growth within the County, addresses Planned Land Use, not Zoning. The proposed Planned Land Use map would change the Planned Land Use designation for 160 Truck House Road from Low - Medium Density Residential to Low</p>
<p>I am a concerned citizen of the Severna Park area and I am very worried about the possible rezoning of properties in the Severna Park area. The Severna Park Elks is a Private Club and has a Permitted land use in an R2 Zoned Area. We have been led to believe that there is a possibility of being rezoned to an R1 Zoned Area after your plan has been approved by the County Council. If this rezoning is allowed to happen, this would reduce the value of our property in the future. We have NO plan to sell the property, but we do not know the need for this lodge in 20, 30, or 40 years. We want what we already have and nothing more! Please make sure that our property remains R2 !!!</p>	<p>The County Office of Planning and Zoning is concerned that you were given false information regarding an impending rezoning. There is not a proposed zoning change for this property. Plan2040, the County's General Development Plan which is a policy plan for guiding growth within the County, addresses Planned Land Use, not Zoning. The proposed Planned Land Use map would change the Planned Land Use designation for 160 Truck House Road from Low - Medium Density Residential to Low Density Residential. This change is consistent with the current R2 zoning as identified in Table 17 of Volume II of Plan2040. A future zoning change is not anticipated for this property.                      A website for Plan2040 was created approximately three years ago to keep the public informed of the process and to share information. For accurate and up to date information, please be sure to visit the Plan2040 website.</p>

Comments	County Response
<p>I am a concerned citizen of the Severna park area and I am very worried about the possible rezoning of properties in the Severna Park area. The Severna Park Elks is a Private Club and has a Permitted land use in an R2 Zoned Area. We have been led to believe that there is a possibility of being rezoned after the plan has been approved by the County Council. If this rezoning is allowed to happen, this would reduce the value of our property in the future. We have NO plans to sell the property, but we do not know the need of this Lodge in 20 , 30 or 40 years. We want what we have and nothing more. Please make sure that our property 160 Truckhouse Road Severna Park 21146 remains R2!!!</p>	<p>The County Office of Planning and Zoning is concerned that you were given false information regarding an impending rezoning. There is not a proposed zoning change for this property. Plan2040, the County's General Development Plan which is a policy plan for guiding growth within the County, addresses Planned Land Use, not Zoning. The proposed Planned Land Use map would change the Planned Land Use designation for 160 Truck House Road from Low - Medium Density Residential to Low Density Residential. This change is consistent with the current R2 zoning as identified in Table 17 of Volume II of Plan2040. A future zoning change is not anticipated for this property.</p> <p>A website for Plan2040 was created approximately three years ago to keep the public informed of the process and to share information. For accurate and up to date information, please be sure to visit the Plan2040 website.</p>
<p>I have received your letter recommending my property, to possibly, being re-zoned. Whom shall I direct my emails to as to appose this recommendation?</p>	<p>Please use this email address (plan2040@aacounty.org) so it can be included in the record.</p>
<p>I am a concerned citizen of the Severna Park area and I am very worried about the possible rezoning of properties in the Severna Park area. The Severna Park Elks, located at 160 Truck House Road, is a Private Club and has a Permitted land use in an R2 Zoned Area. We have been led to believe that there is a possibility of being rezoned to a R1 Zoned Area after your plan has been approved by the County Council. If this rezoning is allowed to happen, this would reduce the value of our property in the future. We have NO plan to sell the property, but we do not know the need of this lodge in 20, 30 or 40 years. We want what we already have and nothing more! Please make sure that our property remains R2 !!!</p>	<p>The County Office of Planning and Zoning is concerned that you were given false information regarding an impending rezoning. There is not a proposed zoning change for this property. Plan2040, the County's General Development Plan which is a policy plan for guiding growth within the County, addresses Planned Land Use, not Zoning. The proposed Planned Land Use map would change the Planned Land Use designation for 160 Truck House Road from Low - Medium Density Residential to Low Density Residential. This change is consistent with the current R2 zoning as identified in Table 17 of Volume II of Plan2040. A future zoning change is not anticipated for this property.</p> <p>A website for Plan2040 was created approximately three years ago to keep the public informed of the process and to share information. For accurate and up to date information, please be sure to visit the Plan2040 website.</p>
<p>I am a concerned citizen of the Severna Park area and I am very worried about the possible rezoning of properties in the Severna Park area. I am a member of The Severna Park Elks, located at 160 Truck House Road. It is a private club and has a permitted land use in an R2 Zoned Area. We have been led to believe that there is a possibility of being rezoned to a R1 Zoned Area after your plan has been approved by the County Council. If this rezoning is allowed to happen, this would reduce the value of our property in the future. We have NO plan to sell the property, but we do not know the needs of this lodge in 20, 30 or 40 years. We want what we already have and nothing more! Please make sure that our property remains R2 !!!</p>	<p>The County Office of Planning and Zoning is concerned that you were given false information regarding an impending rezoning. There is not a proposed zoning change for this property. Plan2040, the County's General Development Plan which is a policy plan for guiding growth within the County, addresses Planned Land Use, not Zoning. The proposed Planned Land Use map would change the Planned Land Use designation for 160 Truck House Road from Low - Medium Density Residential to Low Density Residential. This change is consistent with the current R2 zoning as identified in Table 17 of Volume II of Plan2040. A future zoning change is not anticipated for this property.</p> <p>A website for Plan2040 was created approximately three years ago to keep the public informed of the process and to share information. For accurate and up to date information, please be sure to visit the Plan2040 website.</p>

Comments	County Response
<p>I am a concerned citizen of the Severna Park area and I am very worried about the possible rezoning of properties in the Severna Park area. The Severna Park Elks, located at 160 Truck House Road, is a Private Club and has a Permitted land use in an R2 Zoned Area. We have been led to believe that there is a possibility of being rezoned to a R1 Zoned Area after your plan has been approved by the County Council. If this rezoning is allowed to happen, this would reduce the value of our property in the future. We have NO plan to sell the property, but we do not know the need of this lodge in 20, 30 or 40 years. We want what we already have and nothing more! Please make sure that our property remains R2 !!!</p>	<p>The County Office of Planning and Zoning is concerned that you were given false information regarding an impending rezoning. There is not a proposed zoning change for this property. Plan2040, the County's General Development Plan which is a policy plan for guiding growth within the County, addresses Planned Land Use, not Zoning. The proposed Planned Land Use map would change the Planned Land Use designation for 160 Truck House Road from Low - Medium Density Residential to Low Density Residential. This change is consistent with the current R2 zoning as identified in Table 17 of Volume II of Plan2040. A future zoning change is not anticipated for this property. A website for Plan2040 was created approximately three years ago to keep the public informed of the process and to share information. For accurate and up to date information, please be sure to visit the Plan2040 website.</p>
<p>I am a concerned citizen of the Severna Park area and a Severna Park Elks Lodge #2482 member. I am very worried about the possible rezoning of properties in the Severna Park area and how it will affect the Severna Park Elks property. The Severna Park Elks, located at 160 Truck House Road, is a private club and has a permitted land use in an R2 Zoned Area. We have been led to believe that there is a possibility of being rezoned to a R1 Zoned Area after your plan has been approved by the County Council. If this rezoning is allowed to happen, this would reduce the value of our property in the future. We have NO plan to sell the property, but we do not know the needs of this lodge in 20, 30 or 40 years. We want what we already have and nothing more! Please make sure that our property remains R2 !!!</p>	<p>The County Office of Planning and Zoning is concerned that you were given false information regarding an impending rezoning. There is not a proposed zoning change for this property. Plan2040, the County's General Development Plan which is a policy plan for guiding growth within the County, addresses Planned Land Use, not Zoning. The proposed Planned Land Use map would change the Planned Land Use designation for 160 Truck House Road from Low - Medium Density Residential to Low Density Residential. This change is consistent with the current R2 zoning as identified in Table 17 of Volume II of Plan2040. A future zoning change is not anticipated for this property. A website for Plan2040 was created approximately three years ago to keep the public informed of the process and to share information. For accurate and up to date information, please be sure to visit the Plan2040 website.</p>
<p>I am a concerned citizen of the Severna Park area and a Severna Park Elks Lodge #2482 member. I am very worried about the possible rezoning of properties in the Severna Park area and how it will affect the Severna Park Elks property. The Severna Park Elks, located at 160 Truck House Road, is a private club and has a permitted land use in an R2 Zoned Area. We have been led to believe that there is a possibility of being rezoned to a R1 Zoned Area after your plan has been approved by the County Council. If this rezoning is allowed to happen, this would reduce the value of our property in the future. We have NO plan to sell the property, but we do not know the needs of this lodge in 20, 30 or 40 years. We want what we already have and nothing more! Please make sure that our property remains R2 !!!</p>	<p>The County Office of Planning and Zoning is concerned that you were given false information regarding an impending rezoning. There is not a proposed zoning change for this property. Plan2040, the County's General Development Plan which is a policy plan for guiding growth within the County, addresses Planned Land Use, not Zoning. The proposed Planned Land Use map would change the Planned Land Use designation for 160 Truck House Road from Low - Medium Density Residential to Low Density Residential. This change is consistent with the current R2 zoning as identified in Table 17 of Volume II of Plan2040. A future zoning change is not anticipated for this property. A website for Plan2040 was created approximately three years ago to keep the public informed of the process and to share information. For accurate and up to date information, please be sure to visit the Plan2040 website.</p>

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>I am a concerned citizen of the Severna Park area and I am very worried about the possible rezoning of properties in the Severna Park area. The Severna Park Elks, located at 160 Truck House Road, is a Private Club and has a Permitted land use in an R2 Zoned Area. We have been led to believe that there is a possibility of being rezoned to a R1 Zoned Area after your plan has been approved by the County Council. If this rezoning is allowed to happen, this would reduce the value of our property in the future. We have NO plan to sell the property, but we do not know the need of this lodge in 20, 30, or 40 years. We would like to keep what we already have and nothing more! Please make sure that our property remains R2 !!!</p>	<p>The County Office of Planning and Zoning is concerned that you were given false information regarding an impending rezoning. There is not a proposed zoning change for this property. Plan2040, the County's General Development Plan which is a policy plan for guiding growth within the County, addresses Planned Land Use, not Zoning. The proposed Planned Land Use map would change the Planned Land Use designation for 160 Truck House Road from Low - Medium Density Residential to Low Density Residential. This change is consistent with the current R2 zoning as identified in Table 17 of Volume II of Plan2040. A future zoning change is not anticipated for this property. A website for Plan2040 was created approximately three years ago to keep the public informed of the process and to share information. For accurate and up to date information, please be sure to visit the Plan2040 website.</p>
<p>I am a concerned citizen of the Severna Park area and I am very worried about the possible rezoning of properties in the Severna Park area. The Severna Park Elks, located at 160 Truck House Road, is a Private Club and has a Permitted land use in an R2 Zoned Area. We have been led to believe that there is a possibility of being rezoned to a R1 Zoned Area after your plan has been approved by the County Council. If this rezoning is allowed to happen, this would reduce the value of our property in the future. We have NO plan to sell the property, but we do not know the need of this lodge in 20, 30 or 40 years.</p>	<p>The County Office of Planning and Zoning is concerned that you were given false information regarding an impending rezoning. There is not a proposed zoning change for this property. Plan2040, the County's General Development Plan which is a policy plan for guiding growth within the County,</p>
<p>I am a concerned citizen of the Severna Park area and I am very worried about the possible rezoning of properties in the Severna Park area. The Severna Park Elks, located at 160 Truck House Road, is a Private Club and has a Permitted land use in an R2 Zoned Area. We have been led to believe that there is a possibility of being rezoned to a R1 Zoned Area after your plan has been approved by the County Council. If this rezoning is allowed to happen, this would reduce the value of our property in the future. We have NO plan to sell the property, but we do not know the need of this lodge in 20, 30 or 40 years. We want what we already have and nothing more! Please make sure that our property remains R2 !!!</p>	<p>The County Office of Planning and Zoning is concerned that you were given false information regarding an impending rezoning. There is not a proposed zoning change for this property. Plan2040, the County's General Development Plan which is a policy plan for guiding growth within the County, addresses Planned Land Use, not Zoning. The proposed Planned Land Use map would change the Planned Land Use designation for 160 Truck House Road from Low - Medium Density Residential to Low Density Residential. This change is consistent with the current R2 zoning as identified in Table 17 of Volume II of Plan2040. A future zoning change is not anticipated for this property. A website for Plan2040 was created approximately three years ago to keep the public informed of the process and to share information. For accurate and up to date information, please be sure to visit the Plan2040 website.</p>
<p>I have questions and need to speak with someone regarding two parcels (8000-9007-9811 and 8000-9007-9812) (1) Parcel 8000-9007-9811(Owner: Mary Sollers). For some reason this Parcel has an incorrect address (999 Mt Zion Marlboro Rd, Drury) assigned. This parcel has never been (999 Mt Zion Marlboro Rd). 999 Mt Zion Marlboro Rd has a burned out house &amp; the owner was Weldon Sollers (deceased). Parcel 8000-9007-9811 (Mary Sollers) is a vacant lot/Parcel. This issue needs to be corrected immediately (2) Parcel 8000-9007-9812 (Owner: Erica Sollers), now has an addresss (1001 Mt Zion Marlboro Rd Drury) assigned. Also, for some reason there has been zoning being performed on these lots/parcels. I need to know why zoning is being conducted without my mother (Mary Sollers) or my (Erica Sollers) approval. I need to speak with someone regarding these issues.</p>	<p>A response was provided via telephone.</p>

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>I am a concerned citizen of the Severna Park area and I am very worried about the possible rezoning of properties in the Severna Park area. The Severna Park Elks, located at 160 Truck House Road, is a Private Club and has a Permitted land use in an R2 Zoned Area. We have been led to believe that there is a possibility of being rezoned to a R1 Zoned Area after your plan has been approved by the County Council. If this rezoning is allowed to happen, this would reduce the value of our property in the future. We have NO plan to sell the property, but we do not know the need of this lodge in 20, 30 or 40 years. We want what we already have and nothing more! Please make sure that our property remains R2 !!!</p>	<p>The County Office of Planning and Zoning is concerned that you were given false information regarding an impending rezoning. There is not a proposed zoning change for this property. Plan2040, the County's General Development Plan which is a policy plan for guiding growth within the County, addresses Planned Land Use, not Zoning. The proposed Planned Land Use map would change the Planned Land Use designation for 160 Truck House Road from Low - Medium Density Residential to Low Density Residential. This change is consistent with the current R2 zoning as identified in Table 17 of Volume II of Plan2040. A future zoning change is not anticipated for this property.</p> <p>A website for Plan2040 was created approximately three years ago to keep the public informed of the process and to share information. For accurate and up to date information, please be sure to visit the Plan2040 website.</p>
<p>I am a concerned citizen of the Severna Park area and I am very worried about the possible rezoning of properties in the Severna Park area. The Severna Park Elks, located at 160 Truck House Road, is a Private Club and has a Permitted land use in an R2 Zoned Area. We have been led to believe that there is a possibility of being rezoned to a R1 Zoned Area after your plan has been approved by the County Council. If this rezoning is allowed to happen, this would reduce the value of our property in the future. We have NO plan to sell the property, but we do not know the need of this lodge in 20, 30 or 40 years. We want what we already have and nothing more! Please make sure that our property remains R2 !!!</p>	<p>The County Office of Planning and Zoning is concerned that you were given false information regarding an impending rezoning. There is not a proposed zoning change for this property. Plan2040, the County's General Development Plan which is a policy plan for guiding growth within the County, addresses Planned Land Use, not Zoning. The proposed Planned Land Use map would change the Planned Land Use designation for 160 Truck House Road from Low - Medium Density Residential to Low Density Residential. This change is consistent with the current R2 zoning as identified in Table 17 of Volume II of Plan2040. A future zoning change is not anticipated for this property.</p> <p>A website for Plan2040 was created approximately three years ago to keep the public informed of the process and to share information. For accurate and up to date information, please be sure to visit the Plan2040 website.</p>
<p>People are stalling out at the questionnaire on the surveymonkey link. Honestly, asking people personal questions discourages public participation. Is your email address the best email for submitting comments by email?</p>	<p>Please use the online questionnaire at <a href="http://www.aacounty.org/plan2040">www.aacounty.org/plan2040</a> as a first option. If that does not work, please use the <a href="mailto:plan2040@aacounty.org">plan2040@aacounty.org</a> email address.</p>
<p>My question is concerning Tax Map 13 parcel 153. The rear section of this parcel is indicated on the new General Development Plan as Residential Low Density. However, this part of the parcel is zoned W-1, which would require an Industrial designation on the Plan. A contiguous parcel- Parcel 158- is also zoned W-1 and it is shown as Industrial on the Plan (again, in the rear section). It seems that the designation for Parcel 153 on the General Development Plan is a mistake. Why is it shown this way? How can it be changed to Industrial?</p>	<p>Certain areas of the County, such as the identified Village Center in Jessup, are recommended to retain the 2009 GDP Land Use until more community stakeholder input on land use can be received during the Region Plan process. The Planned Land Use Map that will be adopted with the Region Plan will supercede the Plan2040 Land Use Map and will set the foundation for future comprehensive rezoning. Note that comprehensive rezoning will occur with each of the Region Plans.</p>

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>Hello - I am interested in volunteering for the citizen advisory committee for Plan 2040. Please let me know when the application process is open.</p>	<p>Thank you for your interest. Please note that the Region Plan process will be adopted as part of Plan2040 and at this point it is premature to say which Regions will be the first to begin. Nonetheless, the Office of Planning and Zoning will note your interest and let you know when we are accepting applications from residents to serve on the Region Plan Citizen Advisory Committee.</p>
<p>A week ago, our Exalted Ruler at the Severna Park Elks was given some information with regard to Plan 2040, which is a Land Use Plan for the next 20 years. Of course, we were never apprised of this plan, it just happened to slip from a country realtor who knew of the Plan 2040.</p> <p>This plan is coming before the County Council on November 15, 2020. The concern to our Lodge was that our property could be changed from an R2 Residential Area to an R1 Residential Area. This designation could reduce the value of our property reducing the number of building lots if we were to sell and have the property subdivided. There are NO plans to sell but we want to protect the value of the property for our younger members in case there is a need or desire to sell the property.</p> <p>I am requesting this Plan be halted so that we can survive for many years to come. This County Council needs to inform all organizations involved when something like this will affect them for a long time. So much for your transparency. Very frustrated.</p> <p>As a member of the Elks for the past 40+ years, I too am looking out for our future generations to come. Please understand, we are a fraternal organization, here for our community.</p>	<p>The County Office of Planning and Zoning is concerned that you were given false information regarding an impending rezoning. There is not a proposed zoning change for this property. Plan2040, the County's General Development Plan which is a policy plan for guiding growth within the County, addresses Planned Land Use, not Zoning. The proposed Planned Land Use map would change the Planned Land Use designation for 160 Truck House Road from Low - Medium Density Residential to Low Density Residential. This change is consistent with the current R2 zoning as identified in Table 17 of Volume II of Plan2040. A future zoning change is not anticipated for this property.</p> <p>A website for Plan2040 was created approximately three years ago to keep the public informed of the process and to share information. For accurate and up to date information, please be sure to visit the Plan2040 website.</p>
<p>After reviewing the plan under consideration for the Anne Arundel County Growth and Development Plan, it's clear to me that inadequate thought has been given to the needs of our communities as it relates to the school system. Developers spin numbers to make a case that the school infrastructure is adequate but having raised three children in the AA school system that constantly dealt with overcrowding, it's clear they don't have our community's best interests in mind.</p> <p>Children should be able to go to school in their own community without constant shuffling to temporaries or being bused. When a new school opens at full capacity, that tells a story about what the kids in the years prior had to deal with.</p> <p>Our property values and quality of life depends more on how we build community than it does on adding businesses and high density housing.</p> <p>Please consider the impacts the GDP has on our school system in a more comprehensive way.</p>	<p>Thank you for taking the time to review the Plan and provide feedback. Your comment has been recorded and will be considered as part of the preliminary draft Plan2040 review. Please note that the preliminary draft Plan2040 will be presented to the Planning Advisory Board where there will be a briefing and public hearing. That process is anticipated to occur in December and January (dates to be determined). The draft Plan2040 is anticipated to be introduced to the County Council in February 2021 with public hearings to begin in March 2021 (dates to be determined).</p>
<p>I am wondering if the 2040 plan addresses the scores of invasive species, especially plant species? Are you familiar with this issue?</p>	<p>Plan2040 addresses invasive species control in Policy NE2.2, Strategy a. " Maintain the viability of the County's forested lands through invasive species control."</p>

Comments	County Response
<p>My name is Patrick Bozel, and I am a resident and a 30 year member of the Severna Park Elks' Lodge located on 160 Truckhouse Road, Severna Park, MD. I am concerned there is consideration of rezoning properties in the Severna Park area. The Severna Park Elks, a Private Club dedicated to serving our communities, presently has a Permitted Land Use; R2 zoned since our inception over 50 years ago. I have read there is consideration of being rezoning from RZ to R1 after the proposal have been reviewed by the County Council.</p> <p>The purpose of my email is to state emphatically, I am against the rezoning plan; reducing the value of our property and handcuffing any future financial needs our lodge may consider. To be clear, we have no needs to sell our existing property, however, no one can predict the future, and the purpose of the building of our lodge with extra acreage was due to the foresight of our original members, a security blanket in time of need.</p> <p>I am simply requesting to maintain the status quo and ensure no changes in zoning occur, detrimental to our Severna Park Elks' Lodge.</p>	<p>The County Office of Planning and Zoning is concerned that you were given false information regarding an impending rezoning. There is not a proposed zoning change for this property. Plan2040, the County's General Development Plan which is a policy plan for guiding growth within the County, addresses Planned Land Use, not Zoning. The proposed Planned Land Use map would change the Planned Land Use designation for 160 Truck House Road from Low - Medium Density Residential to Low Density Residential. This change is consistent with the current R2 zoning as identified in Table 17 of Volume II of Plan2040. A future zoning change is not anticipated for this property.</p> <p>A website for Plan2040 was created approximately three years ago to keep the public informed of the process and to share information. For accurate and up to date information, please be sure to visit the Plan2040 website.</p>

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>The draft identifies serious deficiencies in the County’s public parks system and pledges to address them. It is weak on specifics. It ought to at least reference the background reports that enumerate specifics needs and remedies and call for their inclusion in Regional Plans. “Equity in Plan2040 Public policy, including policy related to land use, housing, public infrastructure, and public services, has contributed to inequality across the Country and in Anne Arundel County. For example, the following maps illustrate the overlapping patterns of people of color and poverty as well as access to recreation and parks in Anne Arundel County In an equitable society, a person’s access to basic resources such as education, employment, housing, clean air, clean water, and recreation and parks is not strongly linked to a person’s race, ethnicity, or economic class. A consistent theme in goals, policies, and strategies in Plan2040 is to be inclusive of all our residents, to prioritize investment in historically underserved and under-resourced communities, and to remove barriers that limit people’s opportunities based on who they are or where they live in the County. A more inclusive and responsive County government will employ new methods of citizen engagement. With continuous advancements in technology, there will be more opportunities than ever for the County government to reach all populations with accurate and up-to-date information. Engaging and empowering all segments of the County’s diverse population will ensure best practices are used when delivering resources and services, creating and enforcing zoning and development regulations, and implementing the values of sustainability, environmental stewardship, and community building throughout the County” Public Parks and Waterfront Access: Desire for more public parks and opportunities for public waterfront access. Increase Equity: Make strategic investments to provide equal access to all County residents to good schools, parks, libraries, and affordable housing. Policy NE1.3: Protect, enhance, and create living shorelines and nearshore habitat. Living shoreline projects on public property must preserve/create safe convenient public water access. Policy NE6.2: Improve communications and outreach with County Residents to engage and educate regarding sustainable and resilient policies. Assuring robust public access to public properties will significantly build public support for environmentally sound and sustainable communities. GOAL HC8: Provide a diverse range of accessible public recreational facilities to serve the needs of all County residents. Policy HC8.1: Recreation and parks should be accessible to all residents and provide a variety of recreational opportunities. Policy HC8.2: Improve and expand recreational opportunities for all communities to have facilities and programs nearby. These need to specifically focus on documented deficiencies in the County’s park system. See Attachment A Attachment A Water Access (from the Community Services background report for the GDP-Plan 2040) Anne Arundel County has 533 miles of shoreline along tidal waters, the sixth-most among Maryland counties, to serve an existing population of more than 564,000 — far more than other counties with longer shorelines. Water and access to the water are fundamental characteristics of life in Anne Arundel County. This includes water access for recreation — including boating, swimming, fishing, crabbing, and appreciation of water views. Many neighborhoods maintain community (i.e., restricted to neighborhood residents and their guests) beaches, piers, and boat ramps. In addition, there are 303 commercial and community marinas with nearly 12,035 boat slips in the County3. The County does not operate or manage these community and commercial facilities. (Thus, the vast majority of water access opportunities in AA County are not available to the public) 3. Source: Marina Inventory of Anne Arundel County (2018). <a href="https://www.aacounty.org/departments/planning-and-zoning/research-and-gis/map-services/index.html">https://www.aacounty.org/departments/planning-and-zoning/research-and-gis/map-services/index.html</a> Page   24 Plan2040 Background Report Community Services Despite the importance of water access, the County has comparatively few public water access points to serve the general population, and specifically those who do not live in water-privileged communities. Public water access points in the County, described in detail below, include boat ramps, “car-top” boat launches, beaches, and parks and publicly accessible resource lands with water frontage. DRP maintains a guide to canoe and kayak launch sites and fishing spots throughout the County – this guide is available on the County’s website. In addition to providing car top boat access, the County is working with the State of Maryland to identify and map potential “water trails” which connect numerous destinations along the Chesapeake Bay and its tributaries. (This has been underway for years without results)The County is also evaluating the potential for primitive, paddle-in campsites within County land along the Patuxent River. 1. Public Boat Ramps - a major initiative of the County Executive and the DRP is to provide public boat ramps on all major rivers in Anne Arundel County. Currently, there are five public boat ramps (paved ramps intended for use by trailer-mounted boats) in the County, including: A. Fort Smallwood Park B. Discovery Village Shadyside C. Sandy Point State Park (State of Maryland) D. Truxtun Park (City of Annapolis) E. Tucker Street Boat Ramp (City of Annapolis—restricted to City residents). (For comparison; Baltimore County operates 7 public ramps; Queen Anne’s 11 public ramps; Dorchester more than two dozen FREE public ramps) 2. In addition to the five ramps above, the Solley Cove Park ramp on Curtis Creek northeast of Glen Burnie is being designed for construction in 2019.(Its December 2019-no ramp) 3. Public Car-top Launches - the public boat ramps above also allow launching of smaller “car-top” vessels (i.e., canoes, kayaks, and other non-motorized watercraft that do not need a trailer). Public car-top boat launch sites are located at the following parks and resource lands: A. Beachwood Park; B. Jonas Green Park; C. Carr’s Wharf D. Mayo Beach Park; E. Davidsonville Park; F. Patuxent Wetlands Park G. Discovery Village; H. Quiet Waters Park; I. Downs Park; J. Rose Haven Memorial Park; K. Fort Smallwood; L. Shadyside Park ; M. Galesville Wharf N. Solley’s Cove Park; O.</p>	<p>Goal HC8, supporting policies, and implementing strategies support increasing park and recreation opportunities. Public water access is specifically addressed in Volume II of the draft Plan2040 document (page 184) and referenced as a priority for implementation (page 187). Additional water access will continue to be implemented through CIP project P567400 Water Access Facilities.</p> <p>An update to the Land Preservation, Park and Recreation Plan (LPPRP) is underway. The update will implement the importance of continuing to increase public water access in the County. Specific comments addressing public water access will be forwarded to the Department of Recreation and Parks for inclusion in the update to the LPPRP.</p> <p>Through consultation with the Department of Recreation and Parks, the Conservation Land Use was placed on County Park properties where the primary (not exclusive) use is natural resource protection. The definition of Conservation Land Use has been amended to clearly state that appropriate public water access is allowed. The Conservation designation does not preclude these lands being used for active recreation.</p>

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>Why does Galesville need saving? For the past 368 years, Galesville has been a special place for all who live here and all who visit. It is one of Anne Arundel County’s (AAC) jewels and a State treasure. With its one Main Street that runs to the water’s edge, * “Galesville is a tightly knit community that values and celebrates its rich heritage. Galesville’s heritage has long resonated along its street, creeks, and shorelines in its businesses, marinas, restaurants, and community spaces”. With several Main Street properties for sale or abandoned and other properties in a state of flux and/or in a dilapidated state, Galesville’s heritage and uniqueness as a vibrant residential and commercial town are threatened. Unless Galesville community leaders take action now, Galesville as we know it, will slowly disappear and become just another AAC bedroom community</p> <p>What properties are in play? The properties for sale, abandoned and/or in need of repair:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 930 Galesville Road: An auto repair business/garage with XX acres. (2008 Designated for Nonconforming Use; NC use designation expires soon; will revert to R2).</li> <li>• 1000 Main Street: An abandoned Historical Registry building, the West River Market, once the town hub (Zoned C1 and R2; LD1 in critical area)</li> <li>• 954 Main Street: The Galesville Fire Station no longer in use as the newly built fire station, Fire Company 1 on Muddy Creek Road, is now servicing the Galesville community (Zoned R2).</li> <li>• 1004 Main Street: The closed, iconic Topside restaurant is in need of repair to improve its appearance and make it safe (Zoned C1). This building is on the Historical Registry. <p>What is the community vision for Galesville? (Reference the Envision Galesville Quality of Life Survey Summary) In late 2019, the Galesville Heritage Society with support from the West River Improvement Association (WRIA) and the Galesville Community Center Organization (GCCO), sponsored a community survey. Over 130 respondents completed the survey. Overwhelmingly, the respondents expressed their desire to preserve Galesville’s peaceful village atmosphere while revitalizing the local businesses that support residents in Galesville and close-by communities and bring visitors to our unique community. When asked how Galesville should promote itself as a destination, the majority of respondents said it should be identified as a “restaurant and maritime destination”. Bottom line, respondents want to clean up the town, bring businesses “back-to-life” and/or attract new businesses. They want to do whatever it takes to ensure Galesville does not become just another Anne Arundel County “bedroom community”.</p> <p>What is the vision for Galesville’s Main Street? (Reference the attached Envision Main Street draft) One vision of Main Street is described in the attached draft document, Envision Main Street. This vision lays out how one might view Main Street as one travels from the west end to the east end of town. Why act on this vision now? Anne Arundel County is in the midst of updating its 2009 General Development Plan (GDP). The GDP will guide the land use in the County for the next two decades. Once it is adopted later this year, the County will begin working on Regional Plans. (At this time, there is no identified order for the Regional Plans. Galesville could be early in the process or 3-5 years away). The GDP also encompasses Comprehensive Rezoning as part of, or immediately following each Regional Plan. In addition, the properties in question may benefit from re-zoning, land use variances or other administrative and/or regulatory changes. This may require input to the AA County Land Use MAP process. The Land Use Map provides general guidance in the density, character and location of land uses in the County based on the Plan2040 Vision (Long Range Planning Division of the Office of Planning and Zoning). What actions can community leaders take? Community leaders could work together, inclusively, to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Communicate with the affected property owners on the potential of their properties and the benefits of rezoning to potential buyers and to the village of Galesville;</li> <li>• Communicate and work with State and County officials to identify programs and incentives that may be acceptable to affected property owners and entice commercial investors;</li> <li>• Make the results of the Envision Galesville Survey known, e.g., during the comment period for the General Development Plan and the Region Comprehensive Rezoning process;</li> <li>• Seek-out and encourage suitable investors to purchase the affected properties for commercial use.</li> </ul> <p>What County/State programs and/or incentives may help “save” Galesville? County/State</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Arundel Community Reinvestment (ACR) Fund (Anne Arundel Economic Development Corporation (AAEDC): Provides zero interest loans. Program would have to be modified or Galesville designated as a Commercial Revitalization Area)</li> <li>• Commercial Revitalization Area (Requires legislation. Would allow Tax Credits for improvements)</li> <li>• Historic Preservation Tax Credit (Are the properties Contributing Structures within the Historic District? If used, improvements need to be in accordance with historic preservation guidelines)</li> <li>• Sustainable Community designation (Department of Housing and Community (DHCD): Requires State approval; limited funding available)</li> </ul> <p>What can Galesville community leaders do now to help save Galesville?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Create a sense of urgency (increase transparent communications; hold town meetings; launch a community blog)</li> <li>• Meet with property owners to try and convince them to support rezoning the properties in question.</li> <li>• Discuss options/opportunities with community and/or outside investors. Continue working the Galesville Properties angle.</li> <li>• Meet with County Officials <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Lynn Miller</li> <li>o Kitchens/Pittman</li> <li>o County Council</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Seek out one or more outside investors</li> </ul> <p>Who are Galesville’s community leaders? Three (3) community organizations with over XXX active members provide support and sponsor activities that help Galesville maintain its hometown charm. These are: The West River Improvement Association (WRIA) The Galesville Heritage Society (GHS) The Galesville Community Center Organization (GCCO) Each of these organizations has an elected President. The Presidents work together both informally and formally to</p> </li></ul>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. This level of scale and detail will be addressed in Region Plans, rather than the General Development Plan.</p>

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>Reinforce Galesville's value to AA County and Maryland State as a historical, unique community, a special place and destination, and a way of life worth preserving for generations to come. Key to our collective vision is creating a Village Center and improved infrastructure for residents and visitors to share in activities that inspire community intercourse, i.e. , create open spaces that welcome Villagers and visitors to gather and enjoy the natural beauty of this waterfront community and its remarkable heritage.</p>	<p>The Office of Planning and Zoning agrees that Galesville should be recognized as a Village Center and has been included as such on the Development Policy Areas Map.</p>
<p>Demonstrate Galesville's foresight in conducting our Envision Galesville community-wide survey, using survey results to imagine and help shape Galesville's future quality of life and emphasizing how this collective vision is consistent with AA County's Plan 2040 vision, themes and goals.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>Ensure Galesville has representation on the Plan2040 Citizen Advisory Committee, as well as moving Galesville up in the Region Plan review process. Region 9 is now scheduled last with Regions 7 and 8 and to include appropriate Plan2040 maps to identify Galesville.</p>	<p>The Plan2040 CAC has concluded their meetings as of September 2020. The Office of Planning and Zoning acknowledges Region 9's desire to begin the Region Plan process as soon as possible and will consider this when determining the Region Plan schedule.</p>
<p>We request Galesville be specifically identified on the Plan2040 maps</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>(Lighthouse Baptist Church) We write to request that the draft PLUM be revised to show the Property as having a Commercial land use designation. A Commercial land use designation for the Property is compatible with, and provides a benefit to, the surrounding area and community. Additionally, a Commercial land use designation is appropriate for the Property in light of the character of the greater surrounding area and the changes which have occurred in that area, as described in this letter.</p>	<p>The requested change to Commercial land use is not compatible with the surrounding planned land use of Low Density Residential, nor is it consistent with the Plan2040 Neighborhood Preservation Policy Area. Expansion of Commercial in this area should be discussed during the Region Planning process.</p>
<p>(Lighthouse Baptist Church) Lighthouse does not seek redesignation with the intention to develop or sell the Property to development interests. Rather, Lighthouse wishes to continue to make capital improvements to the Property but is unable to obtain financing to do so, because of the residential land use designation and zoning. For that reason, Lighthouse seeks a designation, which is consistent and compatible with the mix of uses in the surrounding area, as well as the historic and current use of the Property itself.</p>	<p>The church does not need a Commercial Planned Land Use or zoning in order to operate. An expansion of the Commercial Planned Land Use in this area should be discussed during the Region Plan process.</p>
<p>I, Pamela S Parks, am the property owner of 454 E Bayfront Dr Deale MD 20751. It is my intention to donate 5 acres of land to the Deale Volunteer Fire Department for a new and modern Fire Station which will better serve the Deale and surrounding community by having a fire station located on a road with immediate access to the surrounding area. This will also allow the DVFD to hold community events throughout the year. I am requesting that a portion of the property be upgraded (4 acres) with commercial zoning as requested.</p>	<p>The requested change to Commercial land use is not consistent with the existing zoning, agricultural use, Rural Sewer Service Area, Rural and Agricultural Policy Area, and the Resource Sensitive Policy Area due to the Critical Area Resource Conservation Area designation; nor is it compatible with the surrounding planned land use. A fire station does not need commercial land use or zoning. The existing Rural Agricultural (RA) zoning permits Volunteer fire stations, per Article 18-4-106 of County Code.</p>
<p>This vision statement is certainly upbeat, but it does not really give me a feel for where we want to be twenty years from now, especially for a land use plan. I suggest that if we do not rewrite the vision statement, that at least the following concepts be added. "As Anne Arundel County moves toward the year 2040, we plan to maintain the rural nature of South County, the suburban nature of Central County, and the urban nature of North County. It is desirable that County population growth not exceed our recent history of about one percent per year. Job growth will be focused on attracting employment that improves personal income or our residents and does not encourage new major employers that cause congestion, sprawl and excessive strain on our resources. Urban development will be confined to the town centers of Odenton, Parole and Glen Burnie."</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>Afterall, growth is generally the number one issue for most citizens, and is only obliquely mentioned in the plan, but not as a guide or clear policy goal. Plan2040 is replete with numerous references to growth concepts such as town centers, transit-oriented development, mixed-use development, and affordable housing which allows up to 22 units per acre but never identifies a desired or planned rate of growth.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>I suggest the intended measurable items, “Goals and Policies” be placed immediately behind the “A Vision for the Future” on Page 6. Then Themes, Challenges and Opportunities can then follow since it appears that many are generally background rather than actionable items. This way, the elected officials and general public can more clearly see what actions are being proposed and planned for adoption without having to read many more pages.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>Anne Arundel County now has a number of zoning districts that constitute the basic map. Then there are a number of overlays such as Critical Areas and Commercial Revitalization. These categories are both legally binding. Plan2040 is proposing Development Policy Areas. Will these be legally binding or will they remain “policy”? If they remain policy, who will apply them and how? See pages 30 to 33 in Volume One.</p>	<p>The Development Policy Areas Map broadly identifies areas in the County where development and redevelopment are encouraged, as well as areas where preservation of rural or suburban character and natural features are prioritized. The Development Policy Areas will provide a logical and predictable framework for implementing the goals, policies, and implementing strategies in Plan2040. The Planned Land Use Map is implemented through zoning and through policies set forth in Plan2040. The Zoning Map and its corresponding regulations found in Article 18 of the County Code, is a tool that follows and implements the Planned Land Use Map by regulating the development that is allowed today. Zoning is more specific than Planned Land Use, with provisions to establish regulations such as permitted uses, maximum density, setbacks, structure height and coverage, minimum lot size and setbacks and required parking.</p>
<p>Maryland law requires that the general development plan be done every ten years. Our current General Development Plan has been in place since 2009. The current timeline for Plan2040 is to be approved by the County Council in early 2021. Then, nine regional plans are to be developed over the next three years. The expectation is that the land use plan/map will not be submitted to the County Council until at least 2024. This is at least a full fifteen years since our last land use plan, and five years longer than the State requirement.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>Plan2040 contains a 22-page listing of zoning changes to the 2009 General Development Plan. These changes have been proposed by various citizens and organizations. In many cases, the Planning staff recommends that the changes “...be discussed during the Region Planning process when a more comprehensive land use plan is developed with input from the community stakeholders.” The zoning data that I found in Plan2040 shows the latest zoning map to be as of 2017. If so, then does that mean that requested zoning changes have already been under review for three years. Awaiting approval of Plan2040 plus the subsequent planning process means another three or four years for a total of six plus years. Surely, we can be more responsive.</p>	<p>This comment appears to reference the last 22 pages of Volume II. This table represents changes to Planned Land Use, not zoning.</p>

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>We should have an executive summary that identifies our basic principles so that both citizens and the County Councilmembers know what they are voting for or against</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>clarity of the plan for our citizens could be vastly improved with a fairly simple crosswalk table. Most of the information already exists...or should exist. The table would compare land use by category in 2017, the last zoning map, to the Plan2040's proposed land use in 2040. Since the zoning categories proposed for 2040 are generally quite different from 2017, all data in acres should be presented based on the proposed 2040 categories. With a table, it is quite easy to see what changes we're making between the present and 2040.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>On page 34 of Volume One, Transit is defined as "Public Facilities used for rail, bus, water or air". Shouldn't this land use be called "Transportation"? Air just does not fit under a transit category.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>I am especially impressed that so many performance measures are included in Plan2040. This is how we can really measure the success of our actions. Hopefully, the large number of performance measures will not preclude the tracking of our progress. Of course, including performance measures means that tracking data will have to be developed on some sort of recurring basis. Will the data be presented annually or on some other timeline?</p>	<p>Annual monitoring will provide an accountability framework for reporting progress on implementation of the Plan2040 strategies. The performance measures report analyzes the County's progress toward meeting the Plan 2040 goals and policies in four-year intervals. This analysis will include evaluation of the effectiveness of the strategies in achieving the desired outcomes of the goals and policies.</p>
<p>I understand that we are very early into the planning process for 2040, but at some point we need to assign costs and revenues to the incredible volume of goals, policies, objectives, and strategies. That is when we will get serious about what is most important. At this point, the plan is really a listing of desires and needs. The cost of what is being proposed in this plan will likely be astronomical.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>The Implementation Element in the 2021 Plan is completely inadequate. Needs much more specifics and a clear path for comprehensive re-zoning.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>The last comp plan was adopted in 2009. It is now overdue. Without comprehensive re-zoning or at least the implementation of Land Use, the plan is incomplete and, therefore, fails to satisfy the state requirement for 10-year update. So, AA County's plan continues to be late.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>Implementation is, arguably, the most important component of the entire process. It is this phase where the plan gains "teeth" and the visions and recommendations of the plan become reality through comprehensive re-zoning, code amendments, funding of projects and programs, etc. Without a doubt, the most important and most impactful implementation initiative is comprehensive re-zoning. County planners are proposing to conduct comprehensive re-zoning AFTER adoption of the regional planning efforts – 4+ years from the adoption of Plan 2040! If this schedule holds (and there is no reason to believe it will – especially since no other recent planning effort has been ontime) then this means that the AA County comp plan will be 15 years out of date and at least 5 years overdue. During at least five of those 15 years, residents will not have been able to avail themselves of one of their fundamental property rights: the ability to pursue re-zoning of their property. This is unconscionable. This issue is just as impactful for those seeking change as those attempting to preserve stability. It is equally critical regardless of whether one identifies themselves as pro-development or smart growth advocate.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. Note that there is currently no moratorium in place for administrative rezonings.</p>
<p>The lack of a comprehensive re-zoning process to implement the Land Use of the 2021 GDP creates considerable confusion and may violate individual rights and potentially, state code. What is the official land use in the County, 2009 or 2021? To what source do we look when we need to ascertain the Land Use designation of a property? Will the regional plans include land use, if so, will they supercede the land use of the 2021 plan? Why did everyone waste time on land use discussions in the 2021 plan if we were not going to use them for re-zoning purposes and why did we do all this if the regional plans were going to undo the 2021 land use? If the Land Use in the 2021 plan is now seen as binding, does that mean that the 2009 zoning – which is based upon 2009 Land Use – is no longer applicable? When we adopt the 2021 Plan, we are essentially nullifying 2009 zoning. Since it was based upon 2009 land use, the 2009 zoning is no longer legitimate. Does adoption of the 2021 plan usher in a time of "free range" where no one has zoning protections?</p>	<p>To clarify, Planned Land Use is different from Zoning. This distinction is explained in Plan2040. The 2009 Planned Land Use Map should be used until Plan2040 is adopted, at which time the Plan2040 Planned Land Use Map shall be used. Region Plans will include Planned Land Use Maps and will supersede the Plan2040 Planned Land use Map for each respective region. Preparation of the Region Plans will need to be staggered over time in recognition of limited resources to facilitate community engagement, conduct needed analysis, write the Region Plans, and manage other long range planning projects. It is expected that each Region Plan will take 18 to 36 months to complete which will include comprehensive zoning. The current zoning will govern until comprehensive rezoning occurs with each respective region or an administrative rezoning is approved by the Hearing Officer.</p>

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>Council should adopt a moratorium on Article 17 and 18 Code amendments until new zoning is adopted. Land Use, rights, responsibilities and the assignment of zoning classifications is inappropriate if the binding code provisions are constantly changing.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>For the reasons stated above, Lasting Tributes respectfully requests a recommended commercial designation for the Property or the Property Frontage [814 Bestgate Road]. Its plans for a specific commercial use (funeral establishment) at the Property would benefit the area and would be in keeping with the character of the surrounding area. More importantly, a commercial land use designation is generally more appropriate to the part of Bestgate where the property is located. In fact, a low density residential land use designation is not in keeping with the development patterns and land uses, which have emerged in the area in the time since the 2009 GDP. While, Lasting Tributes has no intention of selling the Property or Property Frontage, but rather seeks to provide its specialty services there as a funeral establishment, the surrounding land uses, alone, support the view that the land use designation for the Property or at least the Property Frontage should be updated to commercial.</p>	<p>The Plan2040 Planned Land Use Map will be updated. The front portion of the property will be changed to Commercial.</p>
<p>The Town Center boundary must stay between Route 2, Route 178/Riva Road, Route 665 and Bestgate Road. The 2040 GDP-adopted Regional Area Map (RAP 6) should govern and illustrate the clear public intent for Crownsville. As previously endorsed by the 2040 GDP Citizen Advisory Committee as well as over thirty years' worth of County Executives and Councils the effective boundary between rural Crownsville and the Annapolis Town Center should continue to be respected. While we support the expansion of the Annapolis Town Center to include the already heavily developed Annapolis Mall, we are concerned about the sprawl growth pressure on Generals Highway should the overlay extend across the Crownsville boundary line.</p>	<p>The Conservation area north of Industrial Drive and Commerce Park Drive will be removed from the Town Center designation on the Development Policy Area Map.</p>
<p>We request that the County generate more detailed maps of the overlay, host a virtual comment meeting specifically for this overlay and provide staff representatives to walk the boundaries with GHCCA representatives. Additional impervious surfaces north of Bestgate Road will prove detrimental to Saltworks Creek, the Severn River and the \$1m Cabin Branch restoration site. The currently-proposed development map will allow the creeping destruction of the rural character of Route 178 by allowing for spot zoning applications based upon a "change of character."</p>	<p>The Planned Land Use Map, Development Policy Areas Map, and the Resource Sensitive Policy Area Overlay Map have been provided online for users to zoom in and pan to specific areas. An explanation of public meetings for Plan2040 is provided in Plan2040.</p>
<p>An example of this "change of character" domino effect is illustrated in LUCA 95 where 178 meets Veterans Highway. The recommendation to change this parcel to commercial use seemingly ignores adjacent historically-rural parcels as well as the protected Department of Natural Resources environmental area, Severn Run and Jabez Branch. Opening up this area to more commercial development will almost-certainly jeopardize the ongoing and complicated Jabez Branch restoration efforts. Consistent with the concerns of neighboring community associations, we also request that the 2009 GDP rural land use designation for the RLD portion of LUCA 172 be restored.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>GHCCA invites County leadership to preserve forested land with open space funding or other acquisition programs. Specifically, we commend to you the 130 acres of forest that the Scenic Rivers Land Trust is currently attempting to preserve in Crownsville. Environmental policies continue to lack adequate ecological considerations and metrics thus making conservation the only true gold standard in establishing long-term protection of our precious natural resources.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>For all its multilayered complexity, the County's 2040 GDP will be merely a superficial rebranding of the 2009 GDP without the complete overhaul of current zoning nomenclature and development policies in order to realize the environmental vision of the plan.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>The GHCCA strongly encourages the County Planning Commission to equally value environmental resources by shifting emphasis onto the redevelopment of existing infrastructure; indeed, we encourage county leadership to collaborate on initiatives that incentivize growth and redevelopment in the Baltimore area where attention has been sorely lacking. We will be tracking and advocating for these efforts either through government funding or approval processes and will expect publication of a Redevelopment Plan in the near term.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>GIC respectfully requests that the County reconsider its position with respect to LUCA-162. LUCA-162 is located in a relatively remote area along Holland Point Road, and is uniquely suited for the storage of watercraft during the winter months (the time when the yard surrounding the Service Department is particularly crowded). This site is located far away from conflicting residential uses, and is easily accessible, being only a short drive from the existing marina. While it is located in a Critical Area Resource Conservation Area, it is not located on the water, and is located in an area that currently has de minimis lot coverage. Indeed, even if the area covered by LUCA-162 (approximately 1.41 acres) were completely converted to impervious cover, the total lot coverage would be approximately far below the 15% allowed in the RCA Critical Area overlay.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>With respect to LUCA-163, the 2009 GDP classifies the subject parcel as “Low Density Residential.” GIC requested this designation be changed to “Industrial” use because, as a self-contained community, GIC requires a designated location to store equipment and facilities necessary to maintain the Island, which are not limited to marina-type uses. Furthermore, this would not be a significant increase in the intensity of the potential use given that the property appears to be immediately adjacent to property that currently is zoned MA-1.3. Indeed, from a planning perspective it makes sense to either (a) allow adjacent land to be developed in consort with the Maritime zoned property, or alternatively, (b) to subsume the maritime zoned property within a newly-designated industrial area. Furthermore, currently, all areas in on the Island in the draft Plan2040 are designated as either “Low Density Residential” or “Marina”. The needs of the Island community require the housing and storage of maintenance equipment and a facility sufficient to service the entire Island. Additionally, an expansion of the existing locations permitted be used by the GIC maintenance and service departments would facilitate the operational flexibility of the community. The staff recommendation appears to have denied GIC’s request because of the belief that the “requested change to Industrial land use is not consistent with the Plan2040 Peninsula Policy Area, and is not compatible with the surrounding Low Density Residential planned land use.”<sup>4</sup> GIC submits that the area designated as LUCA 163 actually is ideal for an industrial classification, particularly as it is immediately adjacent to property that currently is zoned MA1 (not a “Low Density Residential planned land use” as indicated by the County’s comments. The industrial designation would allow the eventual use of the property as Gibson Island’s centralized public works functions. It is simultaneously centrally located while also being remote from competing residential land uses. This area would allow for the relocation of the existing service facilities from Aberfoyle Road (where they are co-located with the community marina). GIC respectfully requests that the County reconsider its position with respect to LUCA-163 in order to allow GIC the ability to develop this area with a centralized public works facility.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>(SR 36) With respect to SR-36, 2009 GDP classifies the area on the Pasadena side of the Gibson Island Causeway Road (i.e. just on the other side of the Island) as “Low Density Residential”. The Plan2040 staff recommendation is to change this entire area to a “Rural” designation because “[t]he recommended change from Low Density Residential to Rural is consistent with the existing use, developed density, Rural Sewer Service Area and Peninsula Policy Area, and is compatible with the surrounding planned land use.” While GIC takes no position on the staff’s recommendation with respect to the majority of the area, it believes that the new area should not include two parcels of land owned by GIC, as shown on the attached Exhibit A.</p> <p>At the southernmost end of this area, and on the western side of Mountain Road, these two parcels currently owned by GIC have always been included within the Gibson Island community. Although the parcels are not physically located on the Island, the Gibson Island Club owned the property until 1956, at which time the parcels were conveyed to the Gibson Island Country School, Inc, subject to the obligation that the parcel be used for a school, and also subject to a right of first refusal retained by the grantors. The conveyance to the school was also subject to a number of restrictive covenants intended to benefit Gibson Island. In late 2018, the school use having terminated, GIC acquired fee simple title to these parcels.</p> <p>Functionally, these two parcels have always been part of Gibson Island, effectively serving as its “front gate.” Indeed, the strategic importance of these parcels is why the Deed from Gibson Island to the school contained a right of first refusal as well as extensive restrictive covenants to ensure that the future development of the parcels was consistent with the needs of Gibson Island.</p> <p>GIC respectfully requests that the County not recommend these two parcels for a “Rural” designation, and instead maintain the current “Low Density Residential” designation. First, the current designation is appropriate, as these two parcels and the surrounding parcels are all subdivided and developed with low-density residential uses. Indeed, the entirety of the Windmill Point area is already made up of lots between a half acre and 2.5 acres. In total, there are 33 lots contained in the approximately 37 acres closest to the Gibson Island Causeway – a density of approximately one home site per acre, in keeping with its R1 zoning district. This density simply does not suggest a “Rural” density, as commonly understood to include the RLD (1 home per 5 acre) and RA (1 home per 20 acre) density. The designation of these two parcels as “Low Density Residential” comes with almost no risk of overdevelopment, given that these properties have been under either the ownership or control of Gibson Island for almost 70 years, and that they will be continued to be managed in a fashion that protects not only the natural attributes of the property, but also in a fashion that avoid deleterious viewshed impacts from Mountain Road, the Magothy River, and from Gibson Island.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>(Other) As currently drafted, Plan2040 designates the area between Redhouse Cove and Aberfoyle Road as “Maritime”. GIC submits that, while this designation is a continuance of the existing designation, it is not in conformity with the on-going, established historical use of part of this property. GIC maintains its existing Service Department in this area and has done so for over 100 years. However, the land use designation has never been adjusted to reflect this use. GIC respectfully requests that the proposed General Development Plan be updated to bring the areas shown in Exhibit B in conformity with the existing and established industrial use.</p>	<p>The maintenance area identified in the graphic provided by the applicant on November 30, 2020 will be changed to an Industrial Planned Land Use.</p>
<p>GIC asks the County to reconsider designation of a large area of the Island as a “Priority Forest Retention Area,” or at a minimum that the County clarify that the designation has no regulatory impacts. GIC’s concern is that this designation appears to supplant the Forest Stand Delineation process (including the designation of Priority Retention Areas) required under the state Forest Conservation Act, and as implemented through the Anne Arundel County Code. GIC requests that the County remove all areas on Gibson Island from the “Priority Forest Retention Areas” layer. Alternatively, the County should explicitly state in the GDP that the designation is not intended to have regulatory impacts or to supplant the requirement of a Forest Stand Delineation to establish Priority Retention Areas.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>Institute an aggressive Vision Zero Goals similar to the achievements in Oslo:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A mix of regulations that lowered speeds,</li> <li>- Barring cars from certain areas,</li> <li>- Expanding its bike network,</li> <li>- Traffic calming measures around schools. (a new twist: Include horizontal murals painted by children, parents, and teachers at every intersection around the school....they fade every year so each graduating class can paint a new one!) I funded the first-ever street safety murals in - Baltimore (ask me for more info!)</li> <li>- Safety before Speed</li> <li>- Hierarchy of Vulnerability</li> </ul>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. Plan2040 incorporates in Built Environment Goal 15 the goals, policies, and strategies of Move Anne Arundel, the Transportation Functional Master Plan which adopts Vision Zero principles.</p>
<p>Change every yellow "Share the Road" sign to neon yellow "May Use Full Lane"</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>Reduce speed limits on county roads - Remove the traffic engineers' authority to designate speed based on roadway design. Instead use overall quality of life, effective speed and net average speed, and protection of vulnerable people as a priority in setting speed limits. Then enforce them rigorously (enforcement should pay for itself and perhaps pay into an alternative transportation fund)</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>Add extensive speed enforcement: add a Lights, Camera, Action! program to ID dangerous drivers in an effort to educate and/or prosecute them.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>Add "Bike the Beach" Park and Ride locations around the greater Annapolis area. Parking could be on existing large business lots and some smaller ones that wish to host the effort.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>Investigate the Twin Cities Electric Vehicle Mobility Network to promote quick trips via electric cars: <a href="https://hourcar.org/twin-cities-ev-mobility-network/">https://hourcar.org/twin-cities-ev-mobility-network/</a></p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>[page 98: Strategy d under Policy BE15.1: check typo "over of traffic speed"]</p>	<p>Thank you. The typo has been corrected.</p>
<p>there is much more need for local recreational trails and bike lanes. Less emphasis on using non-motorized vehicles to go from home to work, but maybe more need for both exercise and errands. So maybe the need for a major increase in trails/bike-lanes beyond the Jon Korin effort to build a bigger, connected trails system, which is the current focus of all funding efforts.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. Plan2040 includes multiple policies and strategies that support improvements to the bicycle network, including Built Environmental Policy BE15.2 and supporting strategies. More specific details on bicycle network improvements are identified in the Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan.</p>
<p>I ask the Council to work towards building safe routes to schools, all through Anne Arundel County. I'd ask you to work with the County Executive, particularly the Department of Public Works, to identify areas where sidewalks and multiuse paths would bring about the most benefit, and then work with the other branches of County government to deliver them.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>Combine the Plan elements into a single document (as are all previous GDP's) and place the Goals, Policies, Strategies, Land Use Changes list, and other details into an Appendix document.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>The 2040 Plan should open with: A) What Are the Anticipated “BIG ISSUES” the County Will Encounter Over the Next 20 Years. This should include Growth and Development, Repurposing land uses such as vacated shopping centers/strip commercial, the placement and construction of a new Bay Bridge and its impact on existing roads and bridges (and the impact on surrounding communities), climate change and sea water rise, maintaining South County’s Agriculture status and blending Land Use, Transportation, Public Facilities, etc. elements in the rest of the county, Redevelopment of the Crownsville facilities, etc....Further I believe it would be helpful if each element(Land Use, Transportation, Storm Water, etc.) of the Plan start out with a paragraph on Anticipated Big Issues over the next 20 years.</p> <p>And B), A reference to the 2009 GDP, what did it accomplish, and what it did not accomplish and what are the key carry-overs to the 2020 Plan.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>The Transportation element of Plan 2040 is presented on two pages (44&amp;45). It is extremely light in content, background and recommendations. Further this requires a review of a third document, the Transportation Master Plan, “Move Anne Arundel.” Rather the stand alone chapter of the 2009 GDP, Transportation, provides a cleaner, more comprehensive understanding of the County’s transportation issues, including the relationship between land use and transportation.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>The 2040 Plan’s “A New Model for Transit Services” element should include a recommendation to create a county-wide Regional Transportation Authority to develop, fund, coordinate and operate(or contract for) public, and public-private transit services. Until that happens the piece-meal recommendations will be weak and without the wherewithal for execution of these recommendations.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>The plan does not overlay the major elements (Land Use, Transportation, Public Facilities, Sewer and Water, etc.) to discover conflicts and/or what may result in better complements. That should be discussed. Likewise a map should be included of “Key 2040 Recommendations” with complementary text presenting social/economic recommendations that cannot be mapped.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>There are in excess of 500 (63 pages) Goals, Policies &amp; Strategies. This is too many to be meaningful. The top 10 or 20 should be culled. At a minimum they should be subdivided into short-range (first 10 years) and longer range.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>Volume 2 comments:</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>P 138, para 4, a map identifying these Key Roadway Improvements would be helpful.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>P 138-140 A map showing Roadway Ownership, i.e., County (DPW), State (SHA/MDTA), Federal (FHWA) would help this discussion.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>P 140, Chesapeake Bay Crossing Study---There is no mention that the three final Bay crossings alternatives in the MDTA 100 mile study area are in Anne Arundel County. And that MDTA staff is recommending the existing corridor (Routes 50/301) as the selected corridor. Previous studies have mentioned that construction of a new bridge be completed by 2040 which obviously is within the time frame of Plan 2040. There is no mention of the study/impacts of the approach roads and impact on the communities through which this traffic will be funneled. As this will be a multi-billion dollar project it needs to be a priority consideration in the GDP.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>A map is needed showing the relationship of transportation projects and land use recommendations. Reference Vol 1, Policy Areas and Planned Land Use maps. The presentation should focus on the anticipated growth in population, the addition of 87,000 vehicle trips and the addition of the thousands of vehicles that will be added to the inventory in the County.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>The information provided is extensive and many of our community members have refrained from studying the results due to the complex organization of the two binders and level of print detail. The Table of Contents is not compatible between Vol 1 with the detail in Vol #2. However they are co-dependent therefore the complex formatting presents a challenge to the average citizen.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>Re Goals, Policies and Strategies: The need for inclusion of a follow-on reporting, measuring and monitoring structure in parallel with the fulfillment of this plan is essential to any level of commitment and success.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. Plan2040 includes an Implementation and Accountability Chapter.</p>

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>In deference to the campaign promises of our CE, we supported and ‘advised’ on this Plan to slow down growth, especially in already congested areas. When the Built Environment Town Center section was written, the verbiage stated that “development would be driven towards the Town Centers.” Knowing the traffic limits of Rt #2 at the Parole Town Center, we (CAC) attempted to modify the word “driven” as the TC cannot sustain the density needed for large expansions of this property. We were rejected by the LRP team many times. The final verbiage on the TC expansion was that “development would be promoted towards the TC’-same strategy and result- similar verbiage. We were not heard despite our repeated efforts.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. The County is required to address the State’s Planning Vision for Growth: "Growth is concentrated in existing population and business centers, growth areas adjacent to these centers, or strategically selected new centers" Promoting growth in Town Centers and other targeted areas instead of the Neighborhood Preservation, Peninsula and Rural Areas is how we are recommended to address this Vision.</p>
<p>We are a Peninsula with serious traffic problems due to our location on the major Rte #50/301 corridor. We also have few transportation options other than our personal vehicles for transportation west into Annapolis, north into Baltimore and east to the E. Shore.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>our Peninsula has been named by the Governor as the primary site selected for the 3rd span of the Bay Bridge... on the same Rte #50/301 corridor that is the site of the two existing Bay Bridge spans. The MdTA NEPA 1 study recommended three choices for the location of a 3rd Bay Bridge span that are all located in AA County. With the 200 mile length of the Chesapeake Bay, a 3rd crossing site must be targeted for a location north and/or south of the current two spans. To locate a 3rd span next to the existing would crush the Broadneck. Two spans are already causing significant traffic delays on beach weekends as well as growing traffic congestion during the week due to heavy commuting volumes 12 months/year. An alternate solution for a 3rd span must be selected to provide a crossing located a distance away from the Annapolis area. This serious traffic situation has been barely touched in Plan2040 and demands involvement of our AA County Officials.</p>	<p>The Bay Bridge study is referenced on page 140 of Volume II.</p>
<p>Due to the Broadneck’s proximity to the waterfront, it is a prime site for development but redevelopment must be the priority for older buildings in this area, extending to Pasadena, Severna Park and Glen Burnie.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>“Holding Capacity” is a key measurement that has not yet been utilized by the AAC OPZ as a delimiter for future growth. AA County is over 95% “BUILT”--with currently stated projections for additional Workforce and Affordable Housing. Shortly after the CAC assembled, we were advised a Consultant’s report had determined that over 28K housing units (HU) were needed in AA County. We-(the CAC)-have questioned this data as we are aware that this number exceeds our stated ‘holding capacity’. The only way to satisfy the need for this number of additional HU’s is to redevelop older properties such is planned for Glen Burnie under Bill # 64-20. We have seen the County Council gain approval for land use ‘spot’ approvals for WFH (ie: Bill #12-20) by having individual bills requested by constituents, approved to satisfy one location. Despite the fact that we have requested that the County complete a Workforce Housing Plan...., it has not yet been drafted. There are only a few appropriate locations near transit depots and other APF locations in the County where this plan could satisfactorily be realized but action is needed now. There is no WFH Plan in this Plan2040 which should have been a top priority for the Administration.</p>	<p>A holding capacity analysis was conducted for Plan2040 that also included the residential development capacity within Town Center districts, Mixed Use zones, the BRAC mixed-use development areas, and Commercial zones that allow residential development (Background Information, Table 15 and Pages 103-106). These other districts provide capacity for 32,680 additional units under current zoning regulations, for a total of 46,168 units.</p>
<p>The Transportation Plan in Plan2040 is inadequate as laid out on pages 44-45 of Volume #1. These are mostly the same/similar plans/ideas that have been included in every small area plan, GDP, Long Range Plan for over 25 years with few accomplished upgrades nor any follow through on improvements.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>We are lacking growth limits in AAC where many options are available to slow down development actions in our communities. If the number of permits issued to developers were measured against the available properties in AAC, then a justified limit to building permits could be imposed.</p>	<p>Based on a thorough assessment of past development trends, combined with a data driven forecast for future development potential, The Office of Planning and Zoning does not support an effort to create and/or apply some form of Building Permit Cap at the present time. The best available data indicates AACO is growing at “slower” average annual growth rates, and we expect that trend to continue. Although highly unlikely, should the County return to growth pressures experienced in the 1960’s to 1970’ s, the issue of future growth controls can be reconsidered. The Office of Planning and Zoning has serious concerns about the legality, efficacy, lack of supporting data, and potential unintended consequences in establishing a cap on permits.</p>
<p>The Broadneck Peninsula includes farming land that must be protected. This Plan2040 suggests that RA zoning protects 10K acres of agricultural land in South County when development reflects a far less number. The 2009 GDP restated that 20K acres of farmland was to be protected with an ultimate goal of 40K acres. This Plan characterizes the Ag program as a success when the facts state otherwise. This Plan2040 must include an accurate and achievable strategic plan designed to ensure Ag sustainability that includes better approaches to agricultural preservation and addresses the fundamental reasons for the decline of the Ag industry.</p>	<p>Plan2040 includes current, accurate statistics on agricultural land preservation. The Plan acknowledges the changes in the agricultural economy (see Page 53 in Volume I and pages 203-205 in Volume II). Plan2040 includes policies and strategies to support the agricultural economy (Policy HE2.5 and supporting strategies). The County Agriculture, Farming and Agritourism Commission is active in its mission of the promotion, coordination, development, furtherance and establishment of agriculture, farming and agritourism in Anne Arundel County.</p>
<p>There should be more inclusion and tighter integration of transportation and land use strategies in all sections of Plan2040 rather than confining Transportation to the Built Environment section.</p>	<p>Additional references to transportation and land use connections will be included where they add value and do not overly repeat.</p>
<p>Directly embrace and include the Move Anne Arundel transportation goals and quantified performance metrics in an Executive Summary and Volume 1</p>	<p>Plan2040 includes all of the <i>Move Anne Arundel!</i> goals under BE15 and references the performance metrics in the Implementation section.</p>
<p>Quantify all of the goals for Plan2040 such as growth, density, congestion, air/water quality, affordability, etc.</p>	<p>Plan2040 includes performance measures for all goals, policies, and strategies. Considering the breadth of the plan, meaningful quantitative measures could not be developed for all performance measures, so many are qualitative.</p>
<p>Address transportation in all of the sections where it matters rather than mainly confined to a few parts of the Built Environment.</p>	<p>Additional references to transportation will be included in Plan2040 where they add the most value.</p>
<p>Plan2040 should create places where people can “Live, work, learn and play without daily car use”. We recommend being more specific about the intended locations for these places.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
Provide insight in how COVID might impact land use planning, with likely changed patterns in work from home and share mobility options. We recommend that one of the near term implications is the increased bike-walkable access to schools: school transportation can be relieved when a larger share of the students have safe access to school.	Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. Perspective on the Covid-19 pandemic will be added to the introduction of Plan2040. Plan2040 includes policies and strategies that support
P.16 Transportation is now the largest sector emitting greenhouse gases. This section now focuses mostly on water quality. We recommend to also mention air and noise quality as highlighted later in the goals BE 16 and 17 and how a shift away from gas-powered vehicles improve both air and water quality	Air and noise pollution are addressed in the Built Environment, rather than the Natural Environment section of Plan2040 to focus on the sources of pollution. Strategy BE16.2.b focuses on reducing VMT and transportation mode shift to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Goal BE17 focuses on reducing noise pollution.
P19 Add Trails to the Parks & Open Spaces map.	Existing and planned trails will be added to Parks and Open Space map.
P.24 Add a chart from Move Anne Arundel that has the specific goals for changing mode share.	The referenced section of Plan2040 provides information on historical trends in land use. A chart on future goals for transportation does not fit in this location, but can be referenced in another location of
P.40 Add to Goal BE7 “without daily car use”.	The phrase will be added to Goal BE7.
P.40 please add “that can be accessed without the use of privately-owned vehicle” to the end of GOAL BE9	The concept of transportation options is included in the existing goal statement and supporting policy and
Incorporate “promote walking and bicycling” into GOALS BE7, 8 and 9. These three goals are based on the concept of Livable Communities but do not mention walking and bicycling.	Enhancing walkability and creating a low-stress bicycle network are discussed in BE15.2. To avoid repetition, this language will remain the same.
BE10 Incorporate the mode-shift goals	Mode-shift goals will be added.
Insert a new goal in proximity to GOAL BE12 on page 42 of Volume One that reads “Ensure the County’s workforce, elderly and other vulnerable populations have access to adequate alternative transportation such as sidewalks, walkways, bikeways and transit.”	This concept is addressed in other parts of Plan2040. For example, HC 5.1.d and HC 7.1.e addresses transportation for the elderly and disabled. Goal BE15 includes many policies and strategies related to alternative transportation.
P. 44 Include the bigger quantified goals of Move Anne Arundel, especially for mode-share in BE10, instead of the project specific recommendations from MoveAnne Arundel.	The <i>Move Anne Arundel!</i> Summary was included to respond to citizen requests for specific information on transportation. For internal consistency of Plan2040, all performance measures are included in the table in Plan2040 incorporates the goals, objectives, and performance measures of <i>Move Anne Arundel!</i> . Text will be amended to emphasize this
We would appreciate the inclusion of a statement where Plan2040 endorses the Move Anne Arundel! 2040 goals, objectives and performance measures, as adopted by the County Council.	Text will be amended to emphasize this
P.46 Add a Goal and strategy related to safe walking and biking as a healthier and more equitable mode of transportation, especially with access to healthy food sources, healthcare, employment, school and recreation.	This concept is already included Plan2040. HC7.1.e addresses transportation to access health care, healthy food and services. Goal BE15 policies and strategies related to safe routes to school. HE3.2
A Healthy Economy must provide more transportation options, especially to attract employers who will be hiring millennials.	Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.
Sidewalks that are ADA compliant, within school walk zones, and in more areas than mixed-use areas—add to Healthy Communities	This concept is already included Plan2040. HC7.1.e addresses transportation to access health care, healthy food and services. Goal BE15 policies and
Safety – opportunities for reducing single-occupant vehicles is suppressed when pedestrians and bicyclists are in physical danger of being hit by powered vehicles—add to Healthy Communities	Policy BE15.1 addresses transportation safety.
Lower emission county vehicle fleet—add to Built Environment	Transition to a lower emission, electric County
County-owned roadways, walkways, bikeways and vehicles are maintained in good condition--add to Built Environment	BE15.4 already addresses transportation facility maintenance.

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
1. More inclusion and tighter integration of transportation and land use goals and strategies in all sections of Plan2040 rather than confining Transportation to the Built Environment section.	Additional references to transportation and land use connections will be included where they add value and do not overly repeat.
2. Highlighting the quantified goals for a shift in transportation modes toward walking, biking and transit for the county overall and more aggressively in the town centers	Goals for mode shift from <i>Move Anne Arundell!</i> will be added to Plan2040.
3. Plan2040 should create places where people can “Live, work, learn and play without daily car use”. We recommend being more specific about the intended locations for these places and the strategies for achieving this (eg. proximity to transit, safe network of bike/walk routes, changing parking requirements, connected neighborhoods instead of cul de sacs and hierarchical roads that force people into their cars even for short trips, etc.)	Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. More specific language will be added.
4. A commitment to improved coordination and progress on multimodal transportation policies, processes and laws including Complete Streets, APF-Multimodal Transportation, Design Manuals, Development standards, Vision Zero and others. Attached is a letter from the AACTC on this topic.	Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.
Page 17 – The stated forested loss number of 2,775 acres is based on projections, not actual verifiable data. This number should be based on the data that the County has submitted in accordance with the State Forest Conservation Act to the Maryland Department of Natural Resources which results in a loss nearer to 1,600 acres.	Statistic will be reviewed and updated.
Page. 22 (Policy NE2.1) – It should be noted that expanding forest at a large scale would require eliminating agricultural areas or previously developed areas. This would directly result in the reduction in the amount of developable area and/or reducing the useable agricultural land within the County, which would mean the County would not be able to meet its economic goals for housing, jobs and growth stated in the GDP.	Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.
Page. 22 (Policy NE 2.2) – A Forestry Management Program would be a great asset for the County and would help to facilitate how to best achieve Policy NE2.1. MBIA looks forward to assisting stakeholders in the formation of such a Program.	Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. The County will notify all stakeholders when this process begins.
Page. 22 (Policy NE4.1) – Development is currently required to meet State and Federal mandated water quality standards; exceeding such standards should be offset by bonuses in density and/or other zoning and other development regulation flexibility as long as the density bonus is achievable.	Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. This concept should be considered in any future updates to stormwater management regulations.
Page. 22 (Goal NE4 – General Comment) – It should be noted that the agricultural sector is not mentioned under this goal, yet according to the Chesapeake Bay Program, it is the #1 source of nitrogen, phosphorous, and sediment pollution within the Chesapeake Bay Watershed. To fully address pollution to the Bay the agricultural sector must be addressed in the Plan, otherwise the Plan will fail to attain its pollution abatement objectives.	Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. This concept should be considered in any future updates to stormwater management regulations.
Goals & Policies –Pages 22-23 & 64-76. The goals and policies stated within the Draft Plan2040 strive to reach important objectives (i.e. clean air, water, and soil); however, the path by which they get there conflicts with other sections of the Plan with unintended consequences. Several of the goals and policies would require a large reduction of the developable land area to accommodate both new development and redevelopment within the County.	Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.
Air pollution is the second highest contributor to nitrogen pollution to the Chesapeake Bay (behind agriculture) so it should be addressed in the Plan by promoting clustering, high density development, and a plan to limit sprawl.	Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.
In general, a larger emphasis should also be placed on restoring existing degraded natural resources and promoting the treatment of impervious areas that were developed prior to SWM regulations by way of ESD.	Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>The Greenways Master Plan provides an excellent process for the County to plan for the protection and expansion of high-quality natural corridors; however, promoting its expansion beyond such areas will again reduce developable area with little (if any) environmental benefit, and ultimately further promote sprawl. Also, all policy goals attached to the Greenways Master Plan should be held until the Greenways Master Plan has been updated. MBIA looks forward to working with the County and stakeholders in the development of a new Greenways Master Plan.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>the Plan should recommend removing exemptions for County and Board of Education projects within the Code so that environmental protections are equally applied among all development within the County.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>The need to regulate ephemeral streams and an associated 25' buffer is not supported by data. We also take note that this regulation would have significant unintended consequences as ephemeral streams only exist after a rain event and include a wide swath of drainage ditches, swales, and other landscape features that normally would not be considered streams.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>The requirement to plant buffer areas that were not previously planted would be extremely burdensome to redevelopment and infill projects. Other alternatives should be explored.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>Increased forest mitigation for projects that conserve above the currently stated conservation thresholds would further limit the developable area within the County and promote greater sprawl.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>Requiring on-site mitigation and/or within watershed mitigation to meet forest conservation requirements may result in a lower quality forest and sprawl. These should be priorities for locating mitigation, but flexibility must be given (as it currently is) to achieve the greatest environmental benefit.</p>	<p>Strategy will be revised to focus on prioritization rather than requirement.</p>
<p>Increasing SWM requirements and basing storm events on projected data due to climate change is not backed by data and is not in keeping with State regulations. As previously stated, this would shrink the development envelope on both new development (including infill) and redevelopment projects, further promoting sprawl within the County and into adjacent counties, with concomitant increased traffic congestion and environmental impacts.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>Overall, there are many specific recommended goals and policies for restricting development, while those few policies and goals that relate to fostering new growth in targeted areas are made in generalized terms and lack sufficient specificity to make improvements that will actually address growth challenges in targeted growth areas.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. More specific language will be added.</p>
<p>Recommended goals and policies to encourage growth in the Targeted Development, Town Center, Redevelopment and Revitalization Policy Areas and changes to the Code for targeted areas should provide density and development regulation-based incentives rather than rely primarily on unspecified economic, tax or fee incentives.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. More text on regulatory incentives will be added.</p>
<p>We cannot merely “retain” appropriate zoning in targeted areas, but we must add more appropriately zoned land to allow the denser use needed in those areas.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. Comprehensive assessment of zoning will be conducted during Region Plans.</p>
<p>Recommended goals and policies to encourage growth in the Targeted Development, Town Center, Redevelopment and Revitalization Policy Areas should recommend refining other development related restrictions and environmental regulations for these areas (e.g.: FCA, critical area requirements, setback, buffering, and parking regulations) to be appropriate for and facilitate infill and redevelopment in these areas.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. More specific language will be added.</p>
<p>Page 24 – To be consistent with the chart on page 25, correct the reference to land use distribution in second sentence of the Introduction to 2018 and the percentage of land developed for residential use should be 36.7%.</p>	<p>Statistic will be reviewed and updated.</p>
<p>Page 24 – based on the Residential building permits chart on page 26, it should be pointed out that the number of permits for single family detached housing are at the lowest levels since the chart starts in 1971 (excepting the 2010-2013 recession); yet the Plan desires to further limit permits. The last parenthetical in the first paragraph should refer to residential permit figures.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>Page 26 - The statement that modifications to allow development inconsistent with the GDP has “become too common” is not supported by data. The statement that permissive interpretation of low-density residential zones is inconsistent with the GDP is unclear and not supported. The statement PUD’s and cluster developments “too often” have been used to force higher density development where infrastructure and environmental resources cannot sustain it is not supported - in fact, we believe that the PUD tools do not provide enough density incentive to merit significant public benefit costs. We believe all these tools provide the needed flexibility to meet the Plan goals.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
Page 27 – With respect to the sixth bullet under Challenges, we note that very little development has taken place on peninsulas.	Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.
Page 28 – in the second to last paragraph, the 63% reference should be for single family detached dwellings only. The reference to apartments and condominiums comprising 8% of the land of the County is contradicted by the chart on page 25 showing 12%.	Statistic will be reviewed and updated.
Pages 30-31 - The definition of Peninsula states that development is limited to infill and redevelopment-was this intended to imply that subdivisions would not be permitted? The definition of Peninsula states that it must be served by a single primary road corridor. However, the Development Policy Areas map seems to include areas in the Broadneck and Annapolis areas which are served by multiple access roads, so should not meet the definition of peninsula. Does this map increase the areas beyond what is in the current code with respect to peninsulas? Does the map accurately reflect the new Glen Burnie zone set forth in Bill 64-20? The map shows a large swath of area around Crownsville and to the West and South of Odenton as rural and agricultural - is this correct?	Definition and map will be reviewed and updated if needed.
Page 32 - Scenic and historic road designations do not regulate development, but rather they determine improvements that are required.	Statement will be amended.
Page 34 - Under commercial land use designation, there is a reference to “auto-oriented uses”. Is this defined?	Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.
As a general comment, several maps must be aligned.	Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.
We do not believe that codifying a statement of intents and purposes is necessary, but if the council deems it advisable, these should not act as limitations on specific code provisions.	Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.
Limiting the PUD regulations will further restrict the ability to meet the goals of the GDP and will restrict the use of PUD regulations as a beneficial planning tool. PUD development compared to base zone development provides greater flexibility in preservation of larger quantities of open space and environmental areas.	Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.
We would oppose requiring town houses as a special exception.	Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.
We would strongly oppose requiring the Planning and Zoning officer to make a finding that any code changes are consistent with the GDP. Although text amendments must be consistent with the GDP, we believe that this proposal is not consistent with the County charter, in as much as it grants the Planning and Zoning officer a veto over council action.	Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.
We would oppose the goal in BE4 that nuisance flooding areas could be included in an expansion of the critical area.	Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.
In BE10.1, statements regarding “improve safety” cannot be quantified, and similarly in BE15.1, “safe transportation system” is not quantifiable.	Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.
In B15.2a7, the goal of implementing bicycle/pedestrian connections must be subject to neighboring property owner’s rights.	Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.
The county government and school board need to work together to solve the capacity issues, not just for future growth, but, for the current families in the county. Development has been falsely cited as the wholesale cause of over-capacity in the school systems. There are other issues that have caused over capacity that need to be addressed, such as multiple families sharing homes, which increases the number of people in the household and student generation.	Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. Strategy HC2.1.c addresses reform of the school capacity element of the Adequate Public Facility Ordinance .
Page 54 – update employment statistics from January 2020	Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.
Goals and Policies – pages 56-57, and pages 118-127. We fully support attempts to identify measures that can be taken to increase employment opportunities for all residents of the County, especially for lower income residents.	Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
We note that the recent Glen Burnie overlay legislation in Bill 64-20 should be used as a template for promoting desired development in targeted areas	Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.
Encouraging mass transit, one of the county's greatest challenges to assist lower income residents should be a goal for a healthy economy.	Plan2040 includes goals, policies, and strategies to support transit, including access to employment in multiple locations, HE2.2 focuses economic development efforts on areas with existing or funded transit facilities, multiple policies and strategies under Goal BE15 regarding transit, and HC7.1.e addresses transportation to access health care, healthy food and services.
Financing alternatives, such as the use of public private partnerships and TIFCA's, should be explored more aggressively by the County to leverage redevelopment or new development in targeted growth areas.	Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.
HE1.2 seems to state that redevelopment outside the targeted areas would be discouraged, which is contrary to other goals. Redevelopment, no matter its location, is more beneficial to the community. A number of redevelopment properties were developed prior to stormwater management requirements and forest conservation regulations. Redevelopment of these older properties will provide environmental benefits.	Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.
HE1.3 – it is unclear what “appropriate community-driven redevelopment” means.	Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.
HE 1.3.1a -clarify whose “planned growth” is referenced – the County or the Fort?	Text will be reviewed to clarify intent.
Note: page 126 repeats HE5.1 and HE5.2.	Repeated rows in table will be removed.
Page 60, Process and Schedule – Analysis was mentioned several times. It is our opinion that it is essential that analysis used to gather factual information regarding housing, schools, employment, commercial needs, etc. be completed before the commencement of each regional plan. This information should be made available at the first advisory committee and community meeting. The tone of the draft Plan2040 tends to resonate as no growth and stop development. Responsible growth is necessary in every government and business to sustain a vibrant economy. The advisory committee needs to work with facts that encompass the overall needs of the region and not personal agendas.	Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.
Page 61, Composition of Committees – States that advisory committee meetings will be open to the public. Unlike the CAC meetings for the GDP, these meetings should allow a public question and comment period at the end of the meeting so the advisory committee can hear first-hand what the overall region’s needs and concerns are. It is also noted that the age, gender, racial, and ethnic composition of the advisory committee should reflect the demographics of the region. We disagree. The committee should be diverse so that a plan is not developed for one demographic. For example, a region may currently have a large retirement population but this may not necessarily be the same demographic over the next 20 years. That is why it is essential that the committee include diverse representation.	Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.
Page 62, Overview of Concurrency Management Plan – “The purpose of the plan is to define levels of service standards for certain public facilities, identify the capacity improvements needed for each of these facilities to accommodate existing and future development at the desired level of service, describe how development impacts on the specific facilities are measured and tracked, and to demonstrate how concurrency management planning informs the CIP and the APFO.” It is our opinion that when this plan is developed that both beneficial and adverse development impacts on the specific facilities should be identified. There are facts showing that many road improvement projects are performed and paid for by the developer and often provide more capacity than the project needs. Impact fees need to be included in this assessment and utilized by the county to create capacity. Too often these fees are not utilized for capacity. The impact fee utilization program must be re-evaluated to determine how it can be overhauled so that the impacts fees are utilized appropriately.	Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.
Page 62/63, Annual Monitoring and Performance Measures – Annual monitoring will provide accountability framework for reporting progress on implementation of Plan2040. Annual compilation will be performed by each department with OPZ as the lead. In addition to annual monitoring, 4-year performance measures will be implemented to analyze the county’s progress. The performance measures report will inform minor plan amendments and modifications that may be needed to achieve Plan2040 goals. This process needs to be transparent and involve all parties who may be affected by a plan amendment or modification. Is County Council involved in this process?	Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>Page 63, Implementation Action Committee – County intends to establish a committee to monitor the progress of Plan2040. It is our opinion that this committee needs to be diverse and represent all demographics, unlike the GDP CAC.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>Agricultural preservation. The plan suggests that RA zoning “protects” 10,000 acres of agricultural land in South County when, in fact, it allows construction of 500 new residences and fragmentation of large parcels into units that are too small for viable farming of many of the current crops. Only 13,961 acres of the 1993 goal of 20,000 have actually been protected with easements. The 2001 South County Small Area Plan readopted with the 2009 GDP restated the 20,000 acres goal to be reached by 2007 with an ultimate goal of 40,000 acres. The failure to even come close to the preservation goal and the continued decline in agricultural economic performance should sound an alarm about the achievement of a sustainable agricultural economy. The Draft GDP characterizes the Ag program as a success, the facts say otherwise. The Plan must acknowledge the reality and create a well-researched strategic plan designed to achieve Ag sustainability that includes better approaches to agricultural preservation that address the fundamental reasons for decline of the agriculture industry.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>Ecosystem services. The role of forests and well-managed agricultural lands in prevention and mitigation of stormwater pollution and in groundwater recharge must be promoted. The value of these ecosystem services should be estimated and included in assessing the true costs of development in these areas. A means for compensation of forest and agricultural land owners whose properties provide ecosystem services should be devised to provide continued encouragement of land conservation.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>Lack of growth limits. Plan2040 relies on the Smart Growth concept to specify that new development should be ‘promoted’ at town centers, near transportation depots and designated redevelopment areas, but it is totally mute on how much or what kind of development should occur. Citizens stated during AAC ‘Visioning Sessions’ that there has been too much development approved by Planning and Zoning. However, there is nothing in the plan about determining growth limits, description of avenues for community involvement in growth rate decisions or identification of tools for community control of rate of growth for various types of development.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. See Summary of Public Comments for response on this topic.</p>
<p>Holding capacity. The plan projects growth of 50,000 citizens or 29,000 housing units by 2040, but OPZ has stated that holding capacity with current zoning is only 13,488 units. It appears that dramatic rezoning in targeted growth areas will need to occur, but no effort has been made to assess practical holding capacity in these areas. Targeting of town centers for future growth should not be done without coordination with town center planning and local citizens’ organizations. Transportation Impact studies must be completed to ensure that drastic road improvements are not required prior to new developments.</p>	<p>The holding capacity estimate of 13,488 units appears to reference the 2019 Measures and Indicators Report. That estimate only includes property within Residential (RA - R22) zoning districts. A holding capacity analysis was conducted for Plan2040 that also included the residential development capacity within Town Center districts, Mixed Use zones, the BRAC mixed-use development areas, and Commercial zones that allow residential development (Background Information, Table 15 and Pages 103-106). These other districts provide capacity for 32,680 additional units under current zoning regulations, for a total of 46,168 units.</p>
<p>Regional growth management. The CE has recently suggested that excess market demand for growth be redirected toward "North County" and Baltimore, since the city needs redevelopment and new . If this is a viable alternative, it should be covered with appropriate policies in Plan2040.</p>	<p>Regional coordination on land use, transportation, economic development, and environmental issues is critical to the growth management. Built Environment Policy 1.3 and its supporting strategies direct the County to continue to engage in regional collaboration directly with neighboring local jurisdictions and through regional organizations including the Baltimore Metropolitan Council. It is recognized that the population of the City of Baltimore has declined and that there are many efforts to promote revitalization. It would be outside the legal authority of Anne Arundel County as well as presumptuous to adopt policies in the General Development Plan that directs how Baltimore should develop.</p>

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>Affordable housing. The need for low-income and workforce housing in the County is acknowledged in the plan, but the County has not included nor performed a Workforce/Affordable Housing plan to determine where these developments should be located. Redevelopment areas, town centers and transportation depots are determined to be attractive options, but the plan should specify target development areas with locations, densities, and rates of development. The plan should also specify height restrictions that will assure compatibility with surrounding neighborhoods.</p>	<p>Plan2040 includes goals, policies and strategies related to affordable housing that follow the analyses and planning of the Anne Arundel County 2021-2025 Consolidated Plan and the 2020 Baltimore Regional Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice. Regarding location of affordable housing, Plan2040 Built Environment Policy 12.1 states "Increase the</p>
<p>Economic development resources. Goal HE1 states that we want to provide opportunities for all County residents, but the plan later states that we should promote development near Ft. Meade and Jessup in West County. This area will experience development pressure far in excess of the desires of local communities, and further promotion is not needed. Furthermore, new jobs at Ft. Meade are likely to be white-collar government contractors who frequently do not reside in the area for more than a few years. Ft Meade should not be allowed to become the tail that wags the AACo dog.</p>	<p>The Fort Meade-NSA complex is the largest employer in the State. It's prominence and its location near the western boundary of the County, does recruit employees outside of the County. If the County wants to reduce traffic congestion and control sprawl, it is sound land use and economic development policy to develop housing and the technology ecosystem around Fort Meade. The employees can travel far to work, with the resulting traffic, air pollution, and land use impacts, or the County can offer more opportunities to live near a major employment center and invest in the public facilities and amenities to make it an outstanding place.</p>
<p>County development resources would be best spent attracting jobs and housing for current County residents and in promoting redevelopment and revitalization of areas in need of it. It should be noted that more than 40% of current jobs are of the blue-collar type and more than 80% of employment in the county is provided by business with less than 9 employees.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. Mineral Resources is a required element of comprehensive plans under the Maryland Land Use Article.</p>
<p>Mineral extraction. It is not clear why a \$95M sand and gravel extraction industry, mostly located near the Patuxent River, is given special attention in a county with a \$45B economy. This is an example of an industry that should be discouraged as it has created many noise and safety issues for surrounding Regional Planning details. Since the Plan2040 document is presented as guidance rather than regulation, the Regional Planning process will have to consider and propose regulation of local zoning, type and rate of development, environmental preservation, school capacity, and traffic. A thorough description of the Regional Planning process, plan content, and implementation mechanisms, however, is not provided. Consequently, it remains difficult to evaluate the broader Plan2040.</p>	<p>The process and content of Region Plans addressed briefly in Volume 1 of Plan2040 and in more detail in Volume 2 (Pages 211 - 216).</p>
<p>Interim rezoning. The proposed Regional Planning schedule suggests that plans for nine regions will not all be completed before 2025, and the stage seems to be set for a parade of piecemeal rezoning bills to be presented to the County Council over the next several years. Since the Land Use map will have been approved much earlier and zoning must be consistent with it, the Land Use map will effectively become the new zoning map in the interim.</p>	<p>The County Code provides for rezoning through application to the Administrative Hearings Officer (see Article 18-16-303). Rezoning may not be granted except on the basis of an affirmative finding that: 1. There was a mistake on the zoning map or the</p>
<p>RP Committee composition. Composition of the Regional Planning Committees will be all-important in determining the content of the Regional Plans. The proposed committee structure appears to be over weighted with developers, brokers, and others representing commercial interests. The county has more than 10 times more employees than businesses, suggesting that commercial interests should be restricted to no more than 2 representatives on a RP Committee.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. Legislative Bill 21-18 requires that Region Plan committees include "no less than nine citizens who are members of the ...planning area" Plan2040 recommends that the committees "be broadly representative of the Region" and that "the</p>
<p>Reporting schedule. The 2009 GDP has demonstrated that tracking and performance measurements of both Plan2040 and the Regional Area Plans will be essential to achieving stated goals. A regular reporting schedule should be specified to ensure accountability by all participants responsible for the success of Plan2040. Without a specified schedule, accurate reporting will fail.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. The Implementation and Accountability section of Plan2040 lays out a schedule for annual reports and 4-year more in-depth review (pages 62 and 63).</p>
<p>This approach to land use planning while in the past has been useful, in today's world it seems to me that there should be a more holistic and integrated approach to planning for the County across more than physical planning. Some of these issues certainly are addressed regarding some introductory comments around what is called the five "Vision" themes of the report. However as I illustrate below I think that this product falls significantly short of being able to provide a useful strategic planning process to build on traditional land use planning and all the other strategies and issues that need to be integrated for a holistic County planning approach. Other than the brief mention of the Vision themes on page 7, the report fails to provide adequate linkages to these priority County goals/aspirations.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>Granted, there are many ways to address the issues and goals at hand for AA County, but the current report still falls short of establishing clear and easily digestible Policies, Plans and Projects. I do applaud the hard work required to create the extensive matrix at the end of Volume 1 across the Four Themes. Granted there are general Timeframes (short medium and long) for all the matrix entries. However, as these assorted entries stand, there is no prioritization and there is a lack of valid SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant and Time- bound) indicator attributes. I also argue that the use of Goals, Policies and Strategies need to be retooled and streamlined. I do not see how a useful Planning Document can present 432 Strategies (which I counter are actually various types of actions/activities) with 100 Polices (which in my mind are NOT Policies).</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>I also sense that Volume 2 is intended to establish what I refer to as an assessment of the “situation” at hand across the four themes. All this information requires fine tuning and assimilation into a more “friendly” compilation. This could take the form of graphics, charts, tables/matrices etc. Somehow, Volume 2 also fails to provide sufficient background across many excellent studies, reports and strategies undertaken for or by the County over the past 15 years addressing septic failures and contamination, climate change, sea level rise and adaptation and GHG emissions. Over the years, there has been numerous “good practice” assessment and programs contributing to this County Vision.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>I also note that there is not a “balance” of identification of issues and actions. The Built Environment matrix contains 17 “Goals” with several containing excessive “Strategies”. For example, BE 1 has 31 Strategies, BE12-27, and BE15-42. On the other hand, the Healthy Economy has several Goals with limited Policies and Strategies, e.g., HE3 1 Policy and 3 Strategies and HE4 also with 1 Policy and 2 Strategies.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>If I consider Policy BE15.3: Provide a transportation network that is environmentally sensitive and resilient I read 3 Strategies:...</p> <p>There is no delineation around old or new infrastructure, no indication of adaptation via retrofitting or design upgrades or proper alignment of the Performance Measures. Under Strategy 2, there is mention of the Status of identification of at-risk facilities and plans for maintenance and recovery. This entry fails to address resilience planning, vulnerability assessment and hazard identification with engineering and costing.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>There are several issues and considerations that are not addressed. For example, the Federal Government controls several large tracts of land within the County such as Ft Meade, NSA and Greenbury Point Naval facilities. These are not part of the County planning process yet have significant impacts across all the themes discussed. Other significant large land areas that need attention include Sod Farms and Golf Courses. They are important economic contributors, maintain open space and recreational services but are problematic when considering agro-chemical inputs and runoff and water pollution. I did not see comprehensive identification of these areas in the maps (I did see some but not all).</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>Lastly, it is difficult to capture the spirit and tone of more pressing concerns around the theme of Climate Change and Risk Reduction. Going back more than a decade the State rolled out a Climate Action Plan which is more recently called Greenhouse Gas Reduction Actions. I have seen reference to Goal BE 16: Increase the County’s resilience to future changes in climate and reduce emissions of greenhouse gases with mention to “Develop and implement a Climate Action Plan for Anne Arundel County that will provide detailed recommended actions to address adaptation and mitigation actions”. The County has been working on such matters for years and there should be more information that provides input around carbon footprints, County operations and GHG emissions etc. I would also think that this topic has both a private and public set of actions with options and possible “incentives”.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>15 years ago, I embarked on building an environmentally friendly house here on the water on Martin’s Cove off Mill Creek. This process for permit application had a duration of 2 1/2 years in which I was actively involved with all the processes to get my permit approved. I was committed to build a house that was environmentally friendly with a reduced carbon footprint and would be efficient across all aspects of building materials. This process illustrated for me the difficulty in creating a partnership and a welcoming attitude from the permit Department about accomplishing these goals. I attach a brochure describing my house project and I can assure you that at the time there was not a proactive vision in the County Permit Department to be accepting of some of the alternative construction aspects. I still feel that there is opportunity to create a better embracing environment with both individual and small construction enterprises to encourage building with a reduced carbon footprint to achieve climate action plan goals.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>This illustrates the need to further explore improving citizen County partnerships that address many of the vision 2040 goals for sustainable development and environmental stewardship .</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>In parallel to that process I also embarked on communication at several Department operations in the County to determine how consideration for reducing the County carbon footprint and energy efficiency was being undertaken. At the time that was difficult to navigate because some parties did not either understand the principles of such objectives or did not have any interest in exploring these further.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>Another consideration regarding planning in the County is illustrated by the Naval Academy building its new Naval Exchange (NEX) at Greenbury Point several years ago. The communities of Providence and Mulberry Hill had a difficult time to get the Navy management command structure to entertain our concerns about this expansion and impact to our communities. It became evident that these federal facilities can operate and basically undertake construction without having to address County building permit requirements. These facilities operate at a federal level and do not appear to embrace local communities to engage proactively in conversation and citizen involvement. The larger footprint across Greenbury Point includes both an important recreational area which is a nature reserve as well as potential future development activities both within the federal sector and consideration of private plans for parts of the old naval facilities on the North side of the Severn River. These considerations should also find their way into the County Vision 2040 and identify possible strategies and actions to ensure sustainable development and preservation of this unique and critical habitat. This also encompasses an important existing mixed hardwood forest which is the headquarters of Martins Cove which remains under the jurisdiction of the Navy and has part of it as a conservation area established by the Martin Farm subdivision.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>Volume 1: Delete pages 125-126, repeated</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>Volume 1: Inconsistent numbering/lettering of Strategies pages 98-101 mixes letters and numbers</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>Volume 2: Pages 252-274 no page numbers</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>Volume 2: There is also a need to better explain the purpose of this section and why it is included</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>It was unclear how much modification would be allowed on the Land Use maps in the Regional Plans from the land Use Map approved as part of Plan 2040.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>While reference to a revised Greenways map was made, no date was given for completion of the revised Greenway Plan or how it would be incorporated into Plan 2040 or the Regional Plans. (The County has been saying for years that an updated Greenway Plan would be completed shortly)</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>We still recommend the addition of two additional strategies in the Natural Environment chapter. Under NE1.3 Protect, enhance, and create living shorelines and nearshore habitat., I would add a new strategy f: protect shoreline areas used by horse shell crabs and shorebirds as breeding and migratory stopover areas. Under NE1.4, a new strategy c, protect and expand areas providing habitat for diminishing species such as milkweed for Monarch Butterflies.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>We also recommend that you add a new policy under NE2: Encourage the use of natural regeneration wherever conditions permit because under the right conditions reforestation will occur more quickly and with less effort.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>The role of local land trusts in protecting areas of significant natural resource value should be noted in the Natural Environment chapter.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>[Healthy Communities] The Anne Arundel Group commends the County for focusing on equity, accessibility and sustainability in its plans for healthy communities, particularly in regard to creating more opportunities for park and recreational opportunities in Glen Burnie, Parole, and Fort Meade, where there is a need. The Anne Arundel Group further supports the Plan 2040 inclusion of preparedness for human-created emerging environmental emergencies such as heat waves, flooding, and drought.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>[Healthy Communities] In accordance with the stated task of tailoring public services to an increasingly diverse population, the Anne Arundel Group recommends that Goal HC10, which addresses public safety, also include the intention to ensure that the increasingly diverse population receive fair and equitable access to EMS, fire and police services as well as fair and equitable treatment under the law. The failure to mention this issue in the public safety goal was not congruent with all other goals, which addressed equity, diversity and accessibility and should be addressed in this section as well.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>[Healthy Communities] The future of the Crownsville Hospital property, particularly its potential for meeting County health care needs. should be discussed.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>[Healthy Economy] It should be noted that a Healthy Economy will only be restored and maintained by prioritizing and focusing on recovery from COVID-19 impacts. In the long run, all employers, all businesses, all employees, and all consumers depend on the health and well-being of the County's citizens.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>The Magothy River Association (MRA) would very much like to see the County follow the guidance laid out in Plan 2040. As a first step, the MRA asks the County to vigorously enforce the regulations that currently exist and immediately cease granting modifications to development projects that do not adhere to the Code.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>Additionally, the MRA asks the County to revise the Anne Arundel County Codes to strengthen environmental protections by holding development projects to standards for stormwater management that actually protect our waterways rather than to the minimum standards that are employed today. As it stands, the Code does not offer protections that maintain the water quality of our creeks and rivers. Dead zones in the creeks and rivers grow with every new development as sediment-laden runoff contaminates the water with every rainfall. Allowing development on steep slopes, within stream buffers, with outfall flows into sensitive wetlands and other damaging practices have brought the oxygen levels to near zero in many feeder streams and creeks along the Magothy River.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>Plan 2040 calls for "environmentally sound communities that protect the natural environment". It calls for "collective efforts to reduce stormwater runoff, and restore forests, rivers, and shorelines". This will not happen with the weak protections offered in the current code, as evidenced by the degraded conditions of the Magothy, Severn and South Rivers. The goals of Plan 2040 must be matched by commitment from the County to strengthen the Code so that measurable improvements will be evident in our creeks and rivers.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>The Magothy River Association asks the County to use Plan 2040 to rigorously guide its policies and decisions going forward. A first step to realizing the environmental goals of Plan 2040 includes adherence by Planning and Zoning to the existing regulations as well as identification and elimination of the weaknesses in the Code as soon as possible.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>Adding provisions to identify and protect rare, threatened, and endangered species is not only important, but critical to the county's capacity to comply with the Endangered Species Act. This provision should be done in conjunction with Policy NE1.2a in order to create a County Habitat Protection Program and should be one of several components of a publicly available natural features map.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>In fact, various sources of publicly-available data and information currently exist to completely map remaining undeveloped tracts of land across the county as a basis for assessing remaining forest cover, waterways and wetlands, sensitive habitat areas, open space, and shorelines as a basis for planning and prioritizing future land protection and habitat restoration projects. Were the county to invest in the development of a natural features base map for remaining tracts of undeveloped land in the county – easily achievable with existing GIS data bases and analyses – then adverse impacts to sensitive lands and resources could be alleviated before potential developers invest resources in the planning and development process and the county is put into the position of denying applications for development on landscapes that clearly should not have been made available for development in the first place. In order to reduce the time and cost associated with such an undertaking, this analysis could be staged to first prioritize the inventory and analysis of highly sensitive lands – e.g., those in the critical area, in important watershed areas, on remaining large tracts of forestland, and in areas already identified to include sensitive habitats, such as lands containing sensitive and/or endangered species. Similar inventory and analyses could be applied to highly erodible shorelines, important fisheries habitat, designated greenways, and flood prone areas. Developing such analyses to provide a natural resources baseline for landscapes across the county could inform a wide range of decisions to be made by county officials affecting future land uses including which lands should be preserved; which should be available for development; which should be restored to improve water quality, wildlife habitat, and recreation opportunities; which might be flooded or otherwise impacted by climate change, and what potential contribution forestlands and open space may make to addressing climate change, improving access to nature for all county citizens, and maintaining the character of communities across the county.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. The County will work on improving GIS databases as part of implementation of Plan2040 as outlined in Policy NE6.1.</p>

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>Policy NE3.2 calls for expanding the network of protected corridors and woodlands across the county. As noted, local land trusts and philanthropic organizations can play an important role in preserving land. It might be useful if the county, based on the inventory suggested above and proactive decisions regarding the amount and location of lands to remain undeveloped in the county, partnered with these organizations and interested individuals to begin the process of prioritizing land acquisition and conservation efforts. Given the potential of undeveloped lands to provide a wide range of benefits from fish and wildlife habitat protection and recreation to watershed protection and climate benefits, the county should consider designating lands as resource conservation, climate mitigation, and recreation areas to demonstrate a commitment to land conservation and expand the public’s understand of the values of open space and conservation for achieving other goals identified in Plan 2040. Agricultural lands, properly managed, can also provide habitat conservation and carbon sequestration benefits consistent with the county’s climate change goals. The county should work with state and federal officials on developing a system of carbon credits for farmers who elect to practice climate-friendly management practices on their lands to benefit the environment, generate revenue, as well as protect the culture and character of the county’s remaining agricultural lands.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. This comment supports policies in Plan2040 to increase land conservation efforts, including Goal NE3 and BE16 and their supporting policies and strategies. These include collaboration with private land trusts and exploring innovative fundnig mechanisms including carbon credits.</p>
<p>Policy NE4.5 addresses stormwater management best management practices. As a result of climate change, the county is already experiencing more intense storms and rainfall events. The county does need to increase standards for water retention on construction sites in order to reduce stormwater runoff from large rain events. If such a standard is not possible across the county, then priority should be given to establishing such standards in sensitive landscapes, in watersheds where water quality is a concern such as in areas where the county projects that it is not likely to meet its TMDL commitments, and on peninsulas and similar landscapes where stormwater runoff is likely to have a significant, adverse effect on water quality in surrounding waterways.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>With regard to the goal of ensuring safe and adequate groundwater resources and wastewater treatment services, the county should ensure that growth and future development is not likely to adversely impact water resources and wastewater capacity prior to permitting additional development. This is particularly a concern on peninsulas such as the Mayo peninsula where saltwater intrusion is a growing concern as is the appearance of arsenic in some drinking water supplies. Where these conditions are found to exist, the county should suspend permitting and development until the county determines that further development will not exacerbate the situation or create a public health risk.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>Finally, in light of the environmentally-sensitive nature of many regions of the county, including the extensive mileage of shoreline along the Chesapeake Bay and its tributaries, it is clear that the county needs to improve its capacity to collect, interpret, and utilize information and data to monitor the health of our lands and waterways and the impact of development on the health of human and ecological communities in the county.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>This projected growth, climate change, and other environmental factors are likely to have a significant impact on the quality of life for county residents. For this reason, establishing a specific office to disseminate information to county residents, businesses, and government agencies regarding the impacts of development on our environment and to develop and coordinate strategies to deal with these factors would be extremely beneficial to all.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>Finally, draft Plan 2040 includes a staff proposed land use change on the Mayo peninsula (SR- 58) that would change the land use from “Low-Medium Density Residential” to “Low Density Residential”. While nearly all residents, including me, agree with the proposed land use change, the staff recommendation notes that any development in the area will likely result in the loss of trees and could impact water quality in the affected waterways. Given that the waterways likely to be affected by any development in this area are already polluted, further development that would add to pollutant loads in these waterways should not be approved unless and until the county can demonstrate its capacity to implement measures to meet Clean Water Act requirements for improvements in the health of these waterways. While I respect the staff recommendation, further development should not be permitted in this area, even at low density levels, in light of the potential effects of stormwater runoff on surrounding waterways, an already congested road system, school capacity concerns, and the potential for climate change to cause sea level rise and increase the potential for flooding on the peninsula.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>

Comments	County Response
<p>The final GDP must include improving public water access as a robust goal. Setting the “(d)development of additional water access facilities and boat ramps” (Vol 2, page 187) as a priority in the background materials is a strong first step. The final GDP must specify public water access improvement as a primary goal in the GDP itself. Additionally and unfortunately, some other sections of draft Plan2040 undermine the water access facility priority in the current draft background materials. The Committee also recommends the following changes to draft Plan2040 in order to advance and achieve public water access for all.</p>	<p>Goal HC8, supporting policies, and implementing strategies support increasing park and recreation opportunities. Public water access is specifically addressed in Volume II of the draft Plan2040 document (page 184) and referenced as a priority for implementation (page 187). Additional water access will continue to be implemented through CIP project P567400 Water Access Facilities.</p> <p>An update to the Land Preservation, Park and Recreation Plan (LPPRP) is underway. The update will implement the importance of continuing to increase public water access in the County. Specific comments addressing public water access will be forwarded to the Department of Recreation and Parks for inclusion in the update to the LPPRP.</p> <p>Through consultation with the Department of Recreation and Parks, the Conservation Land Use was placed on County Park properties where the primary (not exclusive) use is natural resource protection. The definition of Conservation Land Use has been amended to clearly state that appropriate public water access is allowed. The Conservation designation does not preclude these lands being used for active recreation.</p>
<p>The final GDP must classify public waterfront parks as “Public Use” rather than “Conservation”. This draft Plan2040 GDP map shows that our public waterfront parks are systematically is classified in the new category of “Conservation”. (Vol 1, page 34). That misclassification will lead to struggles over public access and public use. Even though this new draft amends the initial definition of “Conservation” to include facilities such as public water access, the label itself, “Conservation”, will be deployed as a weapon against public use of and basic improvements to our waterfront public parks. Our public parks should be clearly labeled and accurately defined as “Public Use”.</p>	<p>Goal HC8, supporting policies, and implementing strategies support increasing park and recreation opportunities. Public water access is specifically addressed in Volume II of the draft Plan2040 document (page 184) and referenced as a priority for implementation (page 187). Additional water access will continue to be implemented through CIP project P567400 Water Access Facilities.</p> <p>An update to the Land Preservation, Park and Recreation Plan (LPPRP) is underway. The update will implement the importance of continuing to increase public water access in the County. Specific comments addressing public water access will be forwarded to the Department of Recreation and Parks for inclusion in the update to the LPPRP.</p> <p>Through consultation with the Department of Recreation and Parks, the Conservation Land Use was placed on County Park properties where the primary (not exclusive) use is natural resource protection. The definition of Conservation Land Use has been amended to clearly state that appropriate public water access is allowed. The Conservation designation does not preclude these lands being used for active recreation.</p>
<p>The final GDP must eliminate the proposed “Peninsula Privilege”. The draft GDP contains a “Peninsula Privilege”(Vol 1, pages 19, 26, 30, 39, 83, 84, Vol 2, pages 95, 96) that will block basic improvements to and public use of our waterfront public parks. Peninsula Privilege gives special traffic protection and special development protection to the most affluent areas of the county. This special privilege is presented without any analysis, without any basis in fact, and at the bidding of the well off and well-connected county residents. The county must apply traffic and development protections evenly and fairly across the entire county, instead of giving special privileges to the already privileged.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>

Comments	County Response
<p>The final GDP must plan to fund public water access. Despite the shocking lack of public water access in our county, the haves now get more water private access and the have-nots pay for that private water access. That status quo must change. The county must fund and build public boat ramps, public swimming beaches and other public water access amenities for all.</p>	<p>Goal HC8, supporting policies, and implementing strategies support increasing park and recreation opportunities. Public water access is specifically addressed in Volume II of the draft Plan2040 document (page 184) and referenced as a priority for implementation (page 187). Additional water access will continue to be implemented through CIP project P567400 Water Access Facilities.</p> <p>An update to the Land Preservation, Park and Recreation Plan (LPPRP) is underway. The update will implement the importance of continuing to increase public water access in the County. Specific comments addressing public water access will be forwarded to the Department of Recreation and Parks for inclusion in the update to the LPPRP.</p> <p>Through consultation with the Department of Recreation and Parks, the Conservation Land Use was placed on County Park properties where the primary (not exclusive) use is natural resource protection. The definition of Conservation Land Use has been amended to clearly state that appropriate public water access is allowed. The Conservation designation does not preclude these lands being used for active recreation.</p>
<p>(SR-27) Hatfield supports the recommended land use designation change to mixed use. At this time, Hatfield plans to continue the Current Industrial Use of the Properties. Hatfield’s support for the mixed use land use designation change is based on the understanding that, should the Properties subsequently be rezoned to a mixed use zoning designation consistent with the proposed mixed use land use designation, the continued Current Industrial Use would be continue to be permitted in accordance with the Standard Development Method provided for in County Code §18.2.201.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>[SR-57] On behalf of Mr. Doherty and as his legal representative, I am concerned and wish to confirm that this lot can be improved with a single-family residential home under this new category.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>

Comments	County Response
<p>The final GDP must include improving public water access as a robust goal. Setting the “(d)evelopment of additional water access facilities and boat ramps” (Vol 2, page 187) as a priority in the background materials is a strong first step. The final GDP must specify public water access improvement as a primary goal in the GDP itself. Additionally and unfortunately, some other sections of draft Plan2040 undermine the water access facility priority in the current draft background materials. The Committee also recommends the following changes to draft Plan2040 in order to advance and achieve public water access for all.</p>	<p>Goal HC8, supporting policies, and implementing strategies support increasing park and recreation opportunities. Public water access is specifically addressed in Volume II of the draft Plan2040 document (page 184) and referenced as a priority for implementation (page 187). Additional water access will continue to be implemented through CIP project P567400 Water Access Facilities.</p> <p>An update to the Land Preservation, Park and Recreation Plan (LPPRP) is underway. The update will implement the importance of continuing to increase public water access in the County. Specific comments addressing public water access will be forwarded to the Department of Recreation and Parks for inclusion in the update to the LPPRP.</p> <p>Through consultation with the Department of Recreation and Parks, the Conservation Land Use was placed on County Park properties where the primary (not exclusive) use is natural resource protection. The definition of Conservation Land Use has been amended to clearly state that appropriate public water access is allowed. The Conservation designation does not preclude these lands being used for active recreation.</p>
<p>The final GDP must classify public waterfront parks as “Public Use” rather than “Conservation”. This draft Plan2040 GDP map shows that our public waterfront parks are systematically misclassified in the new category of “Conservation”. (Vol 1, page 34). That misclassification will lead to struggles over public access and public use. “Conservation” sounds innocuous. However, the primary function of our waterfront parks is public use, not conservation. Even though this new draft amends the initial definition of “Conservation” to include facilities such as public water access, the label itself, “Conservation”, will be deployed as a weapon against public use of and basic improvements to our waterfront public parks. Our public parks should be clearly labeled and accurately defined as “Public Use”.</p>	<p>Goal HC8, supporting policies, and implementing strategies support increasing park and recreation opportunities. Public water access is specifically addressed in Volume II of the draft Plan2040 document (page 184) and referenced as a priority for implementation (page 187). Additional water access will continue to be implemented through CIP project P567400 Water Access Facilities.</p> <p>An update to the Land Preservation, Park and Recreation Plan (LPPRP) is underway. The update will implement the importance of continuing to increase public water access in the County. Specific comments addressing public water access will be forwarded to the Department of Recreation and Parks for inclusion in the update to the LPPRP.</p> <p>Through consultation with the Department of Recreation and Parks, the Conservation Land Use was placed on County Park properties where the primary (not exclusive) use is natural resource protection. The definition of Conservation Land Use has been amended to clearly state that appropriate public water access is allowed. The Conservation designation does not preclude these lands being used for active recreation.</p>
<p>The final GDP must eliminate the proposed “Peninsula Privilege”. The draft GDP contains a “Peninsula Privilege”(Vol 1, pages 19, 26, 30, 39, 83, 84, Vol 2, pages 95, 96) that will block basic improvements to and public use of our waterfront public parks. Peninsula Privilege gives special traffic protection and special development protection to the most affluent areas of the county. This special privilege is presented without any analysis, without any basis in fact, and at the bidding of the well off and well connected county residents. The county must apply traffic and development protections evenly and fairly across the entire county, instead of giving special privileges to the already privileged.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>The final GDP must plan to fund public water access. Despite the shocking lack of public water access in our county, the haves now get more water private access and the have-nots pay for that private water access. That status quo must change. The county must fund and build public boat ramps, public swimming beaches and other public water access amenities for all.</p>	<p>Goal HC8, supporting policies, and implementing strategies support increasing park and recreation opportunities. Public water access is specifically addressed in Volume II of the draft Plan2040 document (page 184) and referenced as a priority for implementation (page 187). Additional water access will continue to be implemented through CIP project P567400 Water Access Facilities.</p> <p>An update to the Land Preservation, Park and Recreation Plan (LPPRP) is underway. The update will implement the importance of continuing to increase public water access in the County. Specific comments addressing public water access will be forwarded to the Department of Recreation and Parks for inclusion in the update to the LPPRP.</p> <p>Through consultation with the Department of Recreation and Parks, the Conservation Land Use was placed on County Park properties where the primary (not exclusive) use is natural resource protection. The definition of Conservation Land Use has been amended to clearly state that appropriate public water access is allowed. The Conservation designation does not preclude these lands being used for active recreation.</p>
<p>The County should not repeat the mismanagement of public lands that was epitomized by the 35 year Beverly-Triton Beach Park fiasco which coupled excluding the public from public lands due to a sweetheart deal with a private entity coupled with an anti-ADA/ill-considered access beach facility development plan</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>For Plan 2040 to succeed, the county must defer rezoning or variance decisions unl all the components of Plan 2040 are in effect. Such constraints must be included in the enabling legislaon.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>The county must restore the rural designaon for the RLD parcel within LUCA 172, at least unl a change can be debated in the region plan.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>Developments connue to be approved by Planning and Zoning with many variances or modifcaons to the County Code. The County’s push for development has been a disaster for our creeks and rivers – the water quality has degraded to the point that the water is not safe for swimming for 48 hours aer a rainfall. Our quality of life is compromised by snarled traffic on the main corridors as well as every secondary road and feeder road</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>These (Federal, State and previous County Codes &amp; GDP Policies) exisng laws would, IF FOLLOWED, control the onslaught of development that has degraded our creeks and rivers and our overall quality of life here in the County. When will Planning and Zoning actually require developers to follow these laws?</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. Plan2040 includes policies to improve development review, code enforcement, and transparency (see (Natural Environment Policy NE 1.1, Built Environment Policy BE1.1 and BE 1.2).</p>
<p>Widen the South side of Rt. 424 in front of old AT&amp;T Substation that is beside Cardinals Nest Road adjacent to Underwood Rd. (at Light) to accommodate a NEW lane to be used for turning RIGHT/Mergeo nto Rt. 450W. This would take an awful lot of the burden/congestion off from the traffic that backs up at the intersection light; cars can proceed to either enter shopping center to the LEFT (Staples Corner), turn left onto Rt. 450E or continue through the intersection to Davidsonville Rd. (Rt. 424).</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. This comment has been shared with the Office of Transportation. Detailed location planning like this can be addressed in the upcoming Region Plans.</p>
<p>Safety Issue: Remove current line of sight obstruction for drivers that currently exists at Highs Gas/Shopping Center, they cannot properly see oncoming traffic far enough down Davidsonville Rd. to enter roadway, or only allow exiting Shopping Center Traffic to exit towards Rt. 450. This will help avoid the current very long standing traffic coming from Rt. 50 for many miles every week day</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. This comment has been shared with the Office of Transportation. Detailed location planning like this can be addressed in the upcoming Region Plans.</p>

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>(LUCA 79) Can the 2040 plan still accommodate that community vision now that the development has commenced? Please be creative to keep the rural in the St Stephen’s Church road and traffic on Rt 3 where it is coming from and going to.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>The proposed Millersville Park property should not be used draw large amounts of traffic from outside our area onto already overloaded neighborhood roads, and not require night lighting. Rather, the county could create a multipurpose day-use community park that would serve the surrounding communities and would create minimal impervious surface.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>Mixed Use Zoning: The Mixed Use LUCAs should be put on hold until guidelines and regulations to prevent more sprawl. There are parcels already designated, may be designated, or are zoned as mixed use that may be developed before the mixed-use review is completed and enforcement of the new rules has begun.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>Regional Plans: Regional Planning Dates: CCPA regions 5 and 6 (us), scheduled for planning in different years, should be planned at the same time. There is no distinct line between East and West side land use.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>The 2040 Plan's vision (Goal BE10) for MD 3 is to convert it to a limited access freeway in three phases: MD 32 to Waugh Chapel Road (2.4 miles), Waugh Chapel Road to MD 450, and MD 450 to US 50. My understanding is that the 2.4 mile stretch on the north end from St Stephen’s Church to the I97 merge may become a 3 lane road (instead of the 3 lanes reduced to 2 lanes and back to 3 lanes). Also, as to walkability in the area and reducing road traffic in this region, thought to pedestrian and bike over or underpasses on Rt 3 ( it may take years, but) would be welcome.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>Planning recommends clarity on the titling of the two volumes. An idea for consideration might be to present the background piece first, so that Volume II becomes Volume I, with the implementation piece to follow. The actual names printed on the cover pages should be clear and concise. One should be the county’s comprehensive Plan 2040, the other is background or an appendix, and should be titled as such to avoid future confusion. Another directive which Planning finds missing is how the county sees these two documents interacting. A small addition to the Plan 2040 introduction could assist residents and other stakeholders in using and better understanding the large breadth of work presented in Plan 2040.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. The titles of the documents will be refined and introductory text added to clarify the relationship between the two volumes.</p>
<p>Planning understands the land use designations in the comprehensive plan may be updated or detailed further through the county’s Region Plans and would be happy to learn more about the county’s plans or timing for future growth tier map amendments. If the county is not ready to comprehensively update the tier map based on new designations, one option would be to host the tier map on the county webpage and link to it rather than including the tier map in the plan. This would allow the county to modify the tier map after Plan 2040 has been adopted. The plan text could say, "the county adopted a tier map in 2013. Once the comprehensive plan update is complete, the tier map will be updated to reflect the plan."</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. County will follow up with MDP on the best process for updating the Growth Tiers Map.</p>
<p>The MDOT recommends that Plan 2040 reference the alignment of its goals with the Maryland Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. The reference will be added to Plan2040.</p>
<p>Commuter Choice Maryland is MDOT’s Travel Demand Management (TDM) program, and it could be incorporated into Plan 2040 as a supporting strategy</p>	<p>The County appreciates the State's support in these efforts and will reach out for assistance.</p>
<p>It is recommended that any proposed transportation projects on State roads be considered for inclusion in future updates to Anne Arundel County’s annual Transportation Priority Letter, which is submitted annually to the Transportation Secretary.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>Planning recommends that the county evaluate Goals BE11 and BE12 (page 40, Volume I) for conformance to the requirements of HB-1045.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>HB 1045 defines workforce rental housing between 50% and 120% AMI, while page 42 of Plan 2040 defines it as 50% to 100% AMI</p>	<p>Researched and confirmed the definition in Plan2040 accurately reflects state law.</p>
<p>On Page 115 of Volume II, Plan 2040 discusses how Priority Funding Areas (PFA's) will be reviewed and updated after the comprehensive rezoning processes that follow the development of each Region Plan. Planning looks forward to working with the county on this process. It may generally be advisable for purposes of review, verification, and validation, to maintain a consistent set of sources and data vintage when presenting demographic and socio-economic statistics. In addition, the county should clearly cite the appropriate source and footnote any adjustments to data</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>The Targeted Growth Areas and Managed Growth Areas from the 2009 Comprehensive Plan have been replaced with various "Targeted Development, Redevelopment, and Revitalization Policy Areas", i.e., areas with existing or planned sewer service where development, redevelopment and revitalization (Page 96-97, Volume II). These areas are discussed in the Development Policy Area Definitions and shown in the Development Policy Areas map in Volume I, pages 30-31 and in the same map in Volume II, page 97. While the glossary in Volume II defines "Targeted Development, Redevelopment, and Revitalization Policy Areas" (page 246), it does not specifically state that these areas are designated or targeted growth areas. Other than giving a history of planning in the county, "Targeted Growth Areas" are mentioned in Volume II, pages 105 and 123, but they are not clearly defined. Please clarify if "Targeted Development, Redevelopment, and Revitalization Policy Areas" are considered Targeted Growth Areas from a policy or prioritization perspective</p>	<p>Yes, Targeted Development, Revitalization, and Revitalization Areas are being used as an updated, refined term for what was described as Targeted Growth Areas in the 2009 GDP and have been clarified as "Growth Areas."</p>
<p>Volume I and II show slightly different household projection numbers. Volume I, page 24: Baltimore Metropolitan Council (BMC) projects the population to grow by approximately 50,000 people (29,000 households) by 2040. Whereas Volume II, page 104 states BMC projects 27,000 new households. Please make consistent.</p>	<p>Statistic in Volume II, page 104 changed to 29,000 households</p>
<p>Page 30 Volume I - The Development Policy Area Definitions table shows Critical Corridor above the heading of "Targeted Development, Redevelopment, and Revitalization Policy Areas", whereas the Development Policy Areas map on page 31 shows it under the heading. Volume II, page 96 describes the Critical Corridor Policy Area and then the "Targeted Development, Redevelopment, and Revitalization Policy Areas", which include the critical economic area, town center, and overlays. Please make the text, table, and map consistent.</p>	<p>Development Policy Area Maps have been revised for consistency.</p>
<p>Page 87 Volume I Policy BE7.1 - Refers to a Town Center Plan for Glen Burnie but is not mapped on the Development Policy Areas Map (page 31). Should the map include a town center designation for Glen Burnie?</p>	<p>Glen Burnie Town Center is shown on map as a Town Center Policy Area, however it is relatively small.</p>
<p>Page 141 Volume II - The Transit Network Map should include the MARC - Camden Line and its stations near the boundaries between Anne Arundel and Howard counties.</p>	<p>Figure 24 will be updated to include MARC lines and stations</p>
<p>Page 80 Volume II - Map 15, Septic System Density shows the sewer service area as a thick black line, but the line is obscured by the hatching for the septic system density depictions. Planning recommends moving the hatching below the sewer service area line to clarify the map.</p>	<p>Figure 15 will be updated.</p>
<p>Page 82 Volume II - Planning recommends that the "Stormwater Management" heading be revised to "Stormwater Management and Overall Pollution Forecasts" or something similar, to convey that the section addresses both stormwater and Water Reclamation Facility pollutant loading.</p>	<p>Heading of section will be changed</p>
<p>Planning recommends that Plan 2040 include a couple of sentences about increasing the pace of easement acquisition and the role that funding, outreach, and other tools might play in the PPA section.</p>	<p>Topic is addressed under Policy NE 3.3. and implementing strategies.</p>
<p>Page 56 - Volume II says that the PPA will be expanded by 837 acres, to 40,267 acres. This is a notable effort; 432 acres of the expansion lie in five existing easement properties and 405 acres are currently unpreserved. The acreage listed in Plan 2040 for both the PPA (before expansion) and Rural Legacy Area match the figures that Planning has been using. The county has not applied for a Rural Legacy grant since FY 2018 but is securing easements using funds from previous years.</p>	<p>Area statistics for PPA and RLA will be updated.</p>
<p>Page 58 Volume II - The land preservation data table includes as "Protected Land" 2,330 acres in preservation districts and 10,000 in floodplains, open space, or covered by restrictive zoning. Planning considers land to be permanently protected only if it is publicly owned or under permanent easement. Therefore, Planning would consider the PPA to be only about 44% protected instead of 75%.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged and the statistics will be updated.</p>

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
Page 26 Volume I - Chart Residential Building Permits Since 2000: the title of the chart should be corrected as it shows bar graphs from 1971 forward.	Chart will be updated.
Page 24 Volume I column 2 - It appears that a reference point is missing in the sentence "...the population of the County is projected to grow by approximately 50,000 people (29,000 households) by 2040. Countywide employment is projected to grow by more than 68,000 jobs."	For clarity, "by 2040" will be added to end of sentence .
The Four Rivers Heritage Area Management Plan is not referenced until page 137 of Volume II. It should probably be included among the plans described starting on or about page 19. Planning recommends adding the following italicized language to meet the statutory requirement that jurisdictions must include, by reference, the approved Heritage Area Management Plan in comprehensive or master plans (Financial Institutions Article, Title 13, Subtitle 11, Annotated Code of Maryland, § 13-1111(e)). o The Four Rivers Heritage Area Management Plan was adopted and made a part of the comprehensive plan of Anne Arundel County in 2001. This update of the General Development Plan, when adopted by the county, incorporates by reference all portions of the Four Rivers Heritage Area Management Plan, as part of the comprehensive plan.	Reference will be added in Regulatory Planning Framework section of Volume II
When referring to matters related to state-owned streets, roads and highways, the phrase "Maryland Department of Transportation State Highway Administration (MDOT SHA)" should be incorporated into the Plan.	Plan will be reviewed for appropriate and consistent use of that name and acronym
The county may want to consider adopting a tree canopy ordinance that promotes tree canopy be added to areas where low levels of tree canopy exist, or high impervious areas exist.	Strategy to consider adopting a tree canopy ordinance will be added to Plan2040.
Planning asks the county to consider better affiliation between the Volume I and II documents on this subject [Water Resources Plan, Goals NE 4 and 5.	Text will be added to more clearly defined the relationship between Volumes I and II
Page 68, Volume II indicates that private wells are mostly from the Aquia aquifer, but page 69 indicates that the wells are primarily sourced from the Patuxent, Patapsco, Magothy and Aquia aquifers. Planning recommends clarifying this information where needed.	The text has been clarified.
Plan 2040 indicates there is sufficient groundwater in the Patapsco and Patuxent aquifers to meet projected Anne Arundel County demand through 2040, at 73 MGD, as well as supplying other county users and permitted levels in surrounding counties. However, potential increases in regional demand could result in water levels falling below the regulatory management levels in certain areas as well as other operational issues. In some southern portions of the county, water levels are nearing or have already exceeded the 80% management level. o Does meeting water demand in other surrounding counties "at permitted levels" include future projected demand for those areas or just currently permitted levels? o Did the county analyze any studies by the Maryland Geological Survey or seek their guidance on whether there is sufficient capacity in the Patapsco and Patuxent aquifers to meet all (Anne Arundel County and surrounding counties) future projected water demand? Planning recommends that the county include this information.	Question 1: Withdrawals from wells within the model area other than those operated by the Anne Arundel County Department of Public Works were increased to the permitted average-day appropriation amount.  Question 2: Yes, the Maryland Geological Survey studies directly addressed groundwater supply in the Patapsco and Patuxent aquifers associated with projected water demand, with the caveat that future demand from wells other than AACO DPW wells were estimated using permitted appropriations.  Page 69 Change opening of 2nd paragraph to: A study of major well fields in the County as well as individual wells and independent well fields found that there is currently sufficient available drawdown in the Upper Patapsco, Lower Patapsco, and Patuxent aquifer systems in Anne Arundel County to support withdrawals and does not adversely affect domestic-well operation (Andreasen, David C, 2017).
Page 76 should be updated to indicate that since the 2017 CWSP (note that other portions of the WRP indicate the CWSP is dated 2016), the number of service areas served by county-owned and -operated public sewage treatment facilities has increased from eight to nine since the Piney Orchard WRF was recently taken over by the county.	Nine of the eleven sewer service areas are now owned and operated by the County, due to the addition of Piney Orchard.
What would the impact to the TN and TP at the WRFs described in Tables 9 and 10 be if the septic systems were connected to the public sewer system, as proposed on pages 77 and 85. Planning recommends that this outcome be evaluated and summarized on page 85.	The septic systems within the sewer service areas are included in the build out nutrient loading calculations at the water reclamation facilities in Tables 9 and 10.

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>For each WRF where future design capacity falls short of buildout nutrient discharge levels (as shown in Tables 9 and 10), Planning recommends that the WRP should indicate how the deficit will be addressed. If the county is unable to identify a feasible method for addressing expected deficits at individual WRFs, then the county may need to revise its land use plan accordingly.</p>	<p>County is investigating new technology to further reduce nutrient loadings. County is also exploring potential revision to the land use plan if needed.</p>
<p>Planning recommends that the county analyze more than one land use plan option to evaluate whether the buildout conditions in one plan option might be less impactful to receiving waters than another plan option. The analysis should investigate impervious surface change and forest cover change</p>	<p>Given that the area outside of the Rural Sewer Service Area is primarily built out, there are few options for reducing density. The County has acknowledged different land use options through the comprehensive review of land use and is continuing to consider options prior to the adoption of the Plan.</p>
<p>Page 26 – Planning commends the county for acknowledging the challenges in development previously encountered by approving “Modifications”. Recognizing this awareness, Planning suggests enforcement take higher precedent in the county to ensure better development practices moving forward.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>Page 26 – Planning commends the commitment to up-zoning in residential areas. This is a best practice model in the housing element models and guidelines created to satisfy HB1045 (2019), effective June 2020.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>Page 79 - Policy BE1.1, Strategy 18: Add “transit supportive design guidelines” as one of the tools.</p>	<p>Text will be added to strategy as recommended.</p>
<p>Page 84 - Goal BE5: Add “transit supportive” before “high quality development...” to encourage transit supportive development in designated growth areas.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. Strategy BE5.1.a will be amended to "Adopt zoning and development tools tailored to the distinct Targeted Development, Redevelopment, and Revitalization Policy Areas that promote high quality design <u>that supports walking, biking, and transit.</u></p>
<p>Page 86 - Policy BE6.2 Strategy a.: The county should revise development regulations to support transit-friendly business/employment center development. Perhaps, add “transit friendly” before “high-quality development...”</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. Strategy BE6.2.a will be amended to emphasize transportation options.</p>
<p>Page 95 - Policy BE13.2 Strategy e.: Add “transit-friendly design” in the strategy statement.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. Strategy BE13.2.e will be amended to emphasize transportation options.</p>
<p>Page 84 - Policy BE4.3 Strategy a.: The county should carefully evaluate any highway capacity improvements in Peninsula Policy Areas to limit the potential of facilitating low-density development outside priority funding areas.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>Page 85 - Policy BE5.2 Strategy b: To support multimodal transportation, the county may want to explore a comprehensive transportation review approach for development and redevelopment to include transit, pedestrian, and bicycle facility requirements in the Adequate Public Facility Ordinance (APFO). There are some Maryland examples the county may want to review. The City of Rockville is one of early local jurisdictions that addresses the multimodal transportation measures in the APFO. Rockville established a “Comprehensive Transportation Review” as part of the APFO concurrence process. The Frederick County’s APFO also includes transit measures and adequate pedestrian and bicycle facility evaluation requirements. Planning offers its assistance in this area if further investigation is desired.</p>	<p>An APFO work group is actively looking at the transportation review, including best practices from other jurisdictions and multimodal measures.</p>
<p>Page 88 - Policy BE 10.1 should include an access management strategy to help achieve Goal BE10 for the Critical Corridor Policy Areas. The county may consider actions such as access consolidation, building a well-connected local road network and/or parallel local roadways, connected-commercial properties, etc.</p>	<p>Access management strategy will be added.</p>

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>Page 94 – Policy BE 13.1 recommends taking advantage of state funding and technical assistance programs that are available for revitalization projects in Sustainable Communities, such as the Community Legacy, Strategic Demolition Fund, Operating Assistance Grant, Community Safety and Enhancement, and Sidewalk Retrofit programs. Additional grant programs are available to assist with sustainable initiatives. While some are listed, include “and other grant programs as appropriate” to encourage utilization of additional resources.</p>	<p>Phrase "and other grant programs as appropriate" will be added to the statement.</p>
<p>Page 98 - Plan 2040 emphasizes pedestrian safety and multimodal access over traffic speed and vehicle access points during transportation-land use planning and development review. Performance measures should include access to low-stress walking and biking networks and buffering pedestrian facilities in relation to adjacent motor vehicle traffic lanes</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged and will be considered among the multiple performance measures in Move Anne Arundel, the Transportation Functional Master Plan.</p>
<p>Page 100 - Plan 2040 recommends developing a low-stress bicycle network. Performance measures to be considered include the percentage of network connected through low-stress network protected bicycle lanes, shared-use paths, and other conditions. Consider primary low-stress network expansion in short-trip opportunity areas to encourage more permanent mode shifts in these areas. The county should consider including Level of Traffic Stress (LTS) and Bicycle Network Analysis (BNA) to evaluate and plan for a low-stress bicycle network.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged and will be considered among the multiple performance measures in Move Anne Arundel, the Transportation Functional Master Plan.</p>
<p>Page 101 - Plan 2040 encourages transportation policies that support consistently well-maintained transportation facilities and networks, including developing and maintaining a sidewalk and shared use path condition database. Consider coordination with MDOT asset management practices and integration with established geodatabases</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>Page 102 - Policy BE 16.2: Local governments play a critical role in promoting the deployment of zero GHG emissions vehicles such as electric vehicles (EV). The county may consider a strategy to support the EV and EV infrastructure deployment. The county could develop an EV infrastructure implementation plan or consider a pilot program or development regulation to require EV charge-ready for development projects</p>	<p>A strategy will be added to support the transition of the County vehicle fleet to electric or low/no emission vehicles.</p>
<p>Page 108 - Plan 2040 envisions enhanced transit options for older adults and individuals with disabilities. Continue to coordinate with the MDOT Maryland Transit Administration (MDOT MTA) for the expansion of demand response, paratransit, medical, and senior center transportation options.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>Page 111 – The county may want to reduce possibility for documentation redundancy, or inconsistencies, by utilizing “Move Anne Arundel” rather than creating a new comprehensive countywide trails plan, especially with the pending Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan update.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>Page 120 - The county may add a strategy for encouraging transit-friendly commercial/business/employment developments rather than continuing to build auto-oriented campus-like business parks which is hard to be served by transit. The county should also consider transit supportive land use in the Fort George G. Meade area (page 123, Policy HE 3.1).</p>	<p>A strategy will be included to support transit friendly development design.</p>
<p>Page 125 - Plan 2040 recommends making specific community infrastructure commitments such as streetscape improvements or parking. MDOT recommends considering streetscape and community improvements that emphasize multimodal access to businesses</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>Page 25 - Chart Housing Type Anne Arundel County 2019: What is the source of the chart? Is it from the county's building permit records or data from a Census Bureau report? Might prove helpful to include a table showing actual number of permits by housing type—if not in this document, then on page 115 of Volume II.</p>	<p>Source: U.S. Census American Community Survey Estimates 2012-2016 and RKG Associates, Inc., 2018 Housing permits data shown on Page 26, based on County records.</p>
<p>Page 52 - Chart Household Income, Race and Ethnicity: The median household income values shown for race (White and Black) and ethnicity (Hispanic) do not align with what is reported in the ACS 2018 one-year estimates [Table S1903 or Tables B19013A-I] According to ACS estimates, White Alone Not Hispanic Households in Anne Arundel County reported a median \$103,360 while households White Alone (\$102,468), Black Alone (\$78,888), and Hispanic Alone (\$72,304).</p>	<p>The County chose to use ACS 2018 5-year estimates for median household income as a more representative statistic.</p>
<p>Page 52 - Equity in Economy: This document suggests that the county's 2018 median household income is "...19 percent higher than the State median and 62 percent higher than the National median." However, the American Community Survey (ACS) 2018 One-year Estimates show Anne Arundel County's median household income at \$97,814 about 58 percent higher than the nation's \$61,937 and 17.6 percent higher than the State's \$83,242.</p>	<p>The County chose to use ACS 2018 5-year estimates for median household income as a more representative statistic.</p>
<p>Page 53 - Summary Employment Statistics: Recommend revisiting the figures reported for labor force, employment, and unemployment rate. According to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics and the Maryland Department of Labor, in January 2020, Anne Arundel County had a labor force of 319,375 persons not 329,940; the county had an employed workforce of 309,895 not 268,342; and its January 2020 unemployment rate was 3.0 percent.</p>	<p>Statistics in the plan are based on synthesis of multiple data source. Similar enough to the statistics cited in the comment to not be significantly different, especially considering the dramatic changes in the economy in 2020.</p>
<p>Page 11, map Percent Non-White by Census Tract 2017: See note on the lower right-hand corner, should the definition refer to "specific ethnic groups" or just to specific groups?</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>Page 104 - The Land Use Market Analysis report makes a projection of growth by 94,000 persons and 28,000 households by 2035 with much of the growth happening in the north and Annapolis area. It may be helpful to reviewers to make a statement about the discrepancy in the projection of people.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>It would be useful to see a discussion about the proposed land use and the updated holding capacity and how it relates to the development policy areas. For example, consider a table like Table 15 on page 105 that shows the proposed land use and development policy areas. Relevant maps showing the holding capacity within each development policy area would be helpful as well.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>Page 103 - The county notes in Plan 2040 that environmental constraints were not factored into the non-residential zoning district analysis of the holding capacity (Volume II, page 104). However, it is stated that "Approximately 13,736 acres of developable land (land zoned for development without environmental constraints) remains in the county." Please clarify if this number includes non-residential zoning districts.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>Page 31 Volume I and page 111 of Volume II - A planned land use map is provided. However, there is no existing land use map. Although changes from the 2009 planned land use map are discussed on Table 14 of page 102, and again on page 107 of Volume II, it would be helpful to see an existing land use map.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>Page 92 - Chart Race and Ethnicity (2017): There is a disconnect between the chart and the discussion above in column 1, i.e., the text refers to 2018 data and the chart references 2017. The figures presented could not be verified using the cited source.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. Year 2017 will be removed from chart title to avoid confusion. Data is referenced in report completed in 2018 utlizing mutliple data sources including ACS 2017 data</p>
<p>Page 93 - Chart Household Income Distribution: Planning is curious as to the reasoning behind using work by the private sector vendor Woods &amp; Poole and not the Census Bureau’s American Community Survey. Similarly, for Table 13: Employment Trends on page 94, what is the reason behind using Woods &amp; Poole as opposed to the Baltimore Metropolitan Council Cooperative Forecasts— of which Anne Arundel County is a member.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>Page 14 - Indicates “Per State requirements, counties are required to include a Growth Tiers Map in their comprehensive plans”. It is recommended you clarify that counties can decide not to adopt a growth tier map by revising the sentence as follows or with something similar: “Per State requirements, counties that have adopted a growth tier map must incorporate it into the comprehensive plan for the Growth Tier Map to remain adopted for purposes of § 9–206 of the Environment Article.”</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. Sentence will be revised to "Per State requirements, counties that have adopted a growth tier map must incorporate it into the comprehensive plan for the Growth Tier Map to remain adopted for purposes of § 9–206 of the Environment Article."</p>
<p>Page 112 - The charts (also located on page 36 of Vol. I) describe the growth tier criteria. Consider using “and” or “or” between the governing criteria or otherwise clarifying how each of the bulleted criteria relate to the growth tiers. For example, are areas with existing sewer service outside growth areas part of Tier I? Additionally, please define “growth areas”, since the term is no longer used to describe the Development Policy Areas (Page 31, Volume I). It would also be helpful to understand how “areas planned or zoned for land, agricultural, or resource protection or preservation” relate to features in Resource Sensitive Policy Area Overlay, Planned Land Use, and/or Development Policy Areas Maps (pages 30-34, Vol. I).</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>Planning encourages the county to update its tier map to also reflect the latest growth areas; areas planned for land, agricultural, or resource protection or preservation; and other criteria that would be updated by the Plan. Additionally, the county may wish to annotate properties that are planned for sewer service and located outside growth areas as “Tier IIA, planned for sewer but not within a growth area.”.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>Page 117 - Utilize found goals and implantation strategies from the Natural Hazard Mitigation Plan recommendations including actions to address future risks of extended heat waves, flooding, and drought. The addition of a Nuisance Flood Plan could be an added benefit.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>Page 117 - Work with the local community network to assist vulnerable communities in developing action plans and improving emergency preparedness at the community level. In addition to planning for catastrophic events, promote awareness and preparedness for the longer term or more permanent impacts of sea-level rise.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>The elements of climate resilience as it relates to historic preservation, for example, is not addressed comprehensively until the Healthy Communities chapter of Volume II. The three policies that apply to preservation under Goal BE-14 in Volume I are only understood after referencing the Historic Preservation and Cultural Resources section in Volume II.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. There is an inherent challenge in preparing a concise, reader-friendly comprehensive plan. Not all issues or details fit. That is why the County decided to create a two volume plan.</p>

Comments on Preliminary Draft Plan2040

Comments	County Response
<p>The Climate Resiliency section of Volume II is an excellent discussion of the impacts of climate change, especially regarding flooding and sea level rise. However, the stated number of threatened archaeological and historic resources mentioned on page 155 may be considerably underrepresented considering the possibility that many eligible structures have not been surveyed.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged. The likely underestimate of archaeological and historic resources at risk will be added.</p>
<p>Once the Comprehensive Plan is adopted Planning will complete a detailed review of the amended tier map under Section 1-505 of the Land Use Article, considering updated sewer service areas, areas planned or zoned for conservation or preservation, county, and municipal growth areas, preserved lands, and other criteria detailed in the law and Planning’s Septics Law Implementation Guidance. If requested Planning can complete a detailed review of the proposed tier map amendment before Plan 2040 is adopted. If interested, please contact Deborah Sward at <a href="mailto:deborah.sward@maryland.gov">deborah.sward@maryland.gov</a> to discuss the GIS requirements for this effort.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>Page 31. Consistent with PlanHoward 2030, the preliminary draft of Plan2040 supports transit-oriented development around the shared MARC stations. It should be noted that the Maryland Department of Transportation is preparing an RFP to solicit transit-oriented development (TOD) proposals for the surface parking lots serving the Dorsey MARC station.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>Page 35. Most of the existing abutting land uses outlined in the Planned Land Use Map are similar to those found in Howard County and are dominated by light industrial, warehousing, flex warehouses, railroad/CSX right-of-way, and low density residential. In Howard County, industrial land uses predominate along the CSX right of way.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>Page 37. The Howard County Rt.1 Corridor bordering Anne Arundel County is identified as Growth Tier I and is served by public sewer and designated for growth and revitalization. The adjacent lands on the Anne Arundel County side are predominantly Tier I and share the same compatible designation for targeted growth. Small amounts of Tier II (areas planned to be served by public sewer) are located in the Laurel and Jessup areas of Anne Arundel County and an even smaller portion adjacent to the Patapsco Valley State Park is designated Tier IV.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>Page 38. Plan recommendation BE1 on page 38, confirms the plan’s commitment to “[A]lign development regulations and review practices with Plan2040, that recognizes the importance of the County’s environmental features; limitations on infrastructure; and the desire to focus development, redevelopment and revitalization in the Targeted Development, Redevelopment and Revitalization Policy Areas”. The preliminary draft emphasizes regional parkland and watershed protection around the Patapsco Valley State Park (north of 100, parallel to Race Road in Howard County) which is consistent with Policy 3.4 in PlanHoward 2030.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>Page 44. The plan summarizes the key recommendations from Move Anne Arundel (page 44). In the section related to a creating a low stress bicycle network-for routes on the shared county border and especially if they will provide access to MARC stations. Howard County is interested and available to assist you in planning this network. In the section related to improving regional corridors to make commutes more reliable, the plan calls for the establishment of a transit center on Fort Meade. This effort should be coordinated with the RTA. Additionally, Howard County looks forward to coordinating on planning and design of roads that cross county borders or will impact Howard County travel patterns.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>Page 57. Howard County supports GOAL HE5 that states “[E]nhance commercial hubs and corridors to create thriving and attractive centers that serve both local communities and regional needs”. PlanHoward 2030 (page 58) recognized the need for nodes in the Route 1 Corridor for “for additional retail, restaurant, and employment development”. We support the preliminary plan’s vision for enhancing commercial hubs and corridors such as MD-32, MD-175 and MD-100.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>Page 80. In policy BE1.3, a and b, the plan calls for continued “... collaborative efforts between County and State agencies, the City of Annapolis and neighboring jurisdictions to coordinate planning efforts in land use, development, transportation systems, and protection of environmental resources.” The Howard County Office of Transportation agrees with this goal and suggests both county offices enhance this coordination. The plan also calls for continued participation in the “the Baltimore Metropolitan Council and initiating a more formal relationship with the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments, in leadership and in working committees to coordinate effective regional approaches to land use, transportation, housing, and environmental protection.” Since Howard County’s regional travel patterns align with Anne Arundel’s, we are available to work together to initiate the relationship with the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>

Comments	County Response
<p>Page 86. Policy BE6.2.b, the plan calls for developing “strong multimodal links between employment centers, community attractions and transit-oriented areas. Since both Howard and Anne Arundel residents travel to and from jobs in both counties, the development of these links should consider these patterns and be coordinated on a regional level.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>General. The plan references transit oriented, compact, walkable, pedestrian oriented mixed-use areas, including three at MARC stations that share a border with Howard County. These areas both support, and are supported by, high frequency, quality and reliable commuter rail services. Maintaining and increasing MARC service is critical in ensuring continued private sector investment in these areas. Any support the Anne Arundel plan could give to articulate the importance of MARC service on the Camden Line would be appreciated. Howard County looks forward to coordinating our efforts in this area.</p>	<p>Thank you, your comment is acknowledged.</p>