

Plan2040
Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC)

Meeting Notes

September 23, 2020 - 5:00 PM

Virtual Meeting

CAC members present: Elizabeth Rosborg (Chair), Cate Bower, Anthony Brent, Bill Dodd, Melanie Hartwig-Davis, Patricia Huecker, Caren Karabani, Matthew Korbelak, Amy Leahy, Patricia Lynch, Charles Mannion, Gary Mauler, Kristin Pauly, William Shorter, Elizabeth Ysla Leight

County staff present: Steuart Pittman, County Executive; Steve Kaii-Ziegler, Planning and Zoning Officer; Christina Pompa, Deputy Planning and Zoning Officer; Cindy Carrier, Long Range Planning Administrator; Patrick Hughes, Long Range Planner; Michael Stringer, Long Range Planner; Mark Wildonger, Long Range Planner, Lynn Miller, Assistant Planning and Zoning Officer

Attendees: Earl Bradley, Wanda Eldridge, Ana Henry, Marvin Matthews, Steve Miller, Don and Debbie Weller

Introduction:

Ms. Rosborg, Chair

The meeting was called to order at 5:04 p.m.

Review Input from Online Open House:

Mr. Stringer, Office of Planning and Zoning

Mr. Stringer explained that Plan2040 will include the Vision and Themes; the Development Policy Areas Map and Planned Land Use Map which were available for public review during the Online Open House; goals, policies, and strategies that are organized under four topics - Natural Environment, Built Environment, Healthy Communities, and the Healthy Economy; the implementation plan, and performance measures. These elements will be included in the full draft document.

The Online Open House was available from August 5 to September 10. There were over 4,000 people who visited the site and over 950 people who submitted comments. A summary has been prepared and posted online. Most of those participating in the Online Open House were from the

eastern portion of the County. Mr. Stringer clarified that this represents comments about the goals and not from the other portions of the Online Open House. He added that participants were asked to provide their zip code, but not all who left a comment did. In regards to demographics, approximately 27% were 65 and older, 25% were between the ages of 55 and 64, 39% between 35 and 54, and 9% between 20 and 34. Mr. Stringer indicated that compared to the County population data, there was greater representation from the older population than the age distribution in the County. Approximately 75% identified as White, Non-Hispanic; 20% preferred not to say; and 2% were Latinx, Hispanic; 2% were Multi-racial; and 1% were Black, Indigenous. Compared to Countywide demographics, there was an over-representation of the White population than people of color. The County will need to reach out to those under-represented populations to ensure their opinions are heard.

Mr. Stringer explained that the Online Open House survey requested feedback on just the goals, rather than providing over 400 goals, policies, and strategies which may be overwhelming to a new user. There was strong support for the Natural Environment, Built Environment, and Healthy Communities goals. The first ten Built Environment goals addressed land use. Goals BE 11 and 12, which addressed affordable housing, had slightly more opposition. Lastly, there were generally strong levels of support for the Healthy Economy, though there was concern about growth in the Fort Meade and BWI area. There was some opposition to the mineral resources goal, though Mr. Stringer clarified that the County is required by the State to address mineral resources and that this goal does not deal with fracking, but it addresses sand and gravel resources.

Mr. Stringer noted that there were three key themes of feedback on the goals. Users of the Online Open House wanted more specificity to the goals. Mr. Stringer explained that the users may not have understood that the policies and strategies were available to download and review, but the Office of Planning and Zoning (OPZ) only requested feedback on the goals. He said other commenters said the goals were laudable, but wanted to make sure they are being met. Mr. Stringer clarified that the Implementation Plan portion of Plan2040 will explain how the goals, policies, and strategies will be implemented. Lastly, there were several comments noting that public water access was not explicitly noted in the goals. Mr. Stringer explained that public water access has always been a County priority and it is highlighted in the Land Preservation, Parks, and Recreation Plan (LPPRP) and there is a line item in the Capital Budget. It is not a specific goal because specific recreational amenities, such as ballfields, were not also noted. Public water access will continue to be a priority and is already in the goals, policies, and strategies of Plan2040 and the LPPRP.

Review Planned Land Use Map:

Mr. Hughes and Mr. Stringer, Office of Planning and Zoning

Mr. Hughes shared that there were three main areas of the Development Policy Areas map that received comments and that these areas will be changed. On the Mayo Peninsula, there was opposition to the Village Center and Corridor Management Area, both of which will be removed and changed. The Staples Corner Village Center will have the Village Center overlay removed. Third, there was general concern about the implications of the Corridor Management Area, specifically along MD 3. Corridor Management Areas are existing and developed corridors and the intent is to improve safety and mobility and encourage infill, redevelopment, and mixed-use areas to preserve

existing neighborhoods and reduce auto dependency. Mr. Hughes noted that the name will be changed to avoid confusion and clarify the intent.

Ms. Rosborg asked what the new designation would be in Mayo where the Corridor Management Area will be replaced. Mr. Hughes said OPZ is discussing the issue. Ms. Pauly asked if there would be any visualizations to illustrate what the potential is for these areas. Mr. Stringer said this exercise may occur during the Region Plan process. Ms. Leahy asked for clarification on the definition of the Corridor Management Areas. Mr. Stringer explained that these are areas where there is significant traffic congestion and existing underutilized commercial development that deserve a more focused and planning effort to manage growth and address traffic safety and congestion. Ms. Leahy said the area near Benfield Boulevard and Veterans Highway is not a high traffic area. She was concerned that mixed-use would then allow workforce housing and the potential for more traffic. Ms. Carrier reminded the CAC that they helped develop the definitions and locations. Ms. Leahy expressed her concern about the legislation being passed that changes the permitted uses and zoning. Ms. Carrier said that the mixed-use zoning districts will be re-evaluated during the Plan2040 implementation process. Ms. Pompa clarified that the Corridor Management Area policy recommends a mix of uses and not specifically that a mixed-use zoning district be adopted in these areas. Ms. Huecker was concerned that because the individual mixed-use designations were merged into one mixed-use designation from the 2009 GDP to Plan2040, that that will allow developers to build without any specific requirements or mixed-use ratios. Ms. Carrier clarified that Region Plans will define those areas, that the mixed-use zoning districts will be re-evaluated, and that areas designated as mixed-use will be rezoned to the new mixed-use zoning categories during the comprehensive zoning process. Ms. Pompa explained that OPZ can consider the option to create new zoning districts based on recommendations from Plan2040 and the Region Plan process.

Ms. Rosborg asked what the difference is between planned land use and zoning. Ms. Carrier explained that 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 broad development types (residential, commercial, industrial, mixed-use, etc.). The Land Use Map designations are implemented through corresponding zoning districts and through policies set forth in Plan2040. Zoning, which includes density, setbacks, etc. is the regulatory tool to implement the planned land use. During the Region Plan process, the Planned Land Use designations will be refined. Comprehensive zoning will occur with each Region Plan process. Ms. Carrier explained that there may be changes to the zoning code.

Ms. Lynch asked why Plan2040 does not include a transportation or workforce housing plan. Ms. Pompa said the County has a transportation functional master plan and parts have been incorporated into Plan2040. Plan2040 also has a robust section on housing and affordable housing. Mr. Stringer said the Built Environment goals 11 and 12 speak to housing and affordable housing. Ms. Lynch would like to know where the affordable housing would be located. Ms. Lynch and Ms. Leahy expressed concern about not knowing where affordable housing would be located and how much of an impact it would have on the community. Ms. Pompa said affordable housing would be implemented through zoning and not a property by property analysis. Ms. Leahy said that some areas in Severna Park that are currently designated as Commercial are now shown on the Planned

Land Use Map as Mixed-Use and they are concerned that now that workforce housing will now be permitted in these areas.

Mr. Stringer shared that there was strong support that the proposed Planned Land Use Map protects the environment, rural and agricultural areas, neighborhood character, and focuses growth in targeted areas. In general, there was support for the Planned Land Use Map. Many open ended comments were about the removal of the Natural Features designation and how areas would then be protected or stay undeveloped. Mr. Stringer explained that with advances in technology the County could no longer support the Natural Features designation. However, the County did translate what the intent was and applied it to certain parcels based on criteria that could be defined. He reminded the CAC that environmental regulations, such as wetland protections, still apply to the development review process and are recommended to be enhanced. In addition, park designations were done in consultation with the Department of Recreation and Parks and that parks designated as Conservation would not limit public access. Park designations were based on their primary use. These items will be refined during the Region Plan process.

Mr. Stringer shared that public comment was received on 156 of the 182 Land Use Change Applications (LUCA). A majority of the comments supported the proposed Plan2040 Land Use designation on 79 of the 155 LUCA properties. Mr. Stringer explained that some responses were false negatives, meaning that respondents were opposed to the applicant's request and not necessarily opposed to the actual proposed Planned Land Use. For 10 of the LUCA sites, there were more than 20 comments and the majority opposed the proposed Plan2040 Land use designation.

Mr. Hughes reviewed a couple properties where the Planned Land Use will be changed. LUCA-71, located on Fort Smallwood Road, will revert back to the Maritime Planned Land Use from the proposed Low Density Residential Planned Land Use after OPZ received additional information through public comments. LUCA-76, located west of MD 3, will be changed to Public Use because the County has since purchased the property to build a school and park.

Mr. Stringer reviewed the Staff Recommended (SR) Planned Land Use changes. OPZ received public input on 50 of the 67 SR properties. The majority of public comments supported the proposed Plan2040 Land Use designations on 24 of the 50 SR properties. For two SR sites, there were more than 20 comments and the majority opposed the proposed Plan2040 Land Use designations.

Mr. Hughes said OPZ made a few changes to the SR based on public feedback. SR-10 is located at the intersection of Ritchie Highway and Crain Highway. This property was proposed to be High Density Residential, but will change back to Commercial due to its existing use. SR-11, located at the intersection of Ritchie Highway and I-895, will have the portion that is County-owned changed from Low Density Residential to Conservation. SR-50, located on the Broadneck peninsula, will stay as Rural. Despite hearing opposition from the public, the intent is to control density and reduce infill potential due to expressed concerns about traffic. This area is not currently in the sewer service area. If sewer were to be expanded to this area with a Low Density Residential designation, development could increase. OPZ staff will reach out to these communities and discuss the change and implications and receive further input for consideration. SR-54, located on Mayo Road in

Edgewater, will be cleaned up to better delineate the existing residential and commercial uses. SR-65, located along Rockhold Creek, will be changed from Low Density Residential to Maritime to be consistent with the existing use and current zoning. During the Online Open House, there were other requests to change the Planned Land Use. There is a property on Long Hill Road in Pasadena that will change from Commercial to High Density Residential to be consistent with adjacent properties and the Development Policy Area. An area north of the airport will change from Industrial to Mixed Use and Low Density Residential to Transit based on input from the Maryland Aviation Administration.

Ms. Rosborg asked if there were other changes to the Planned Land Use Map. Mr. Hughes explained the examples he provided are a sample of several others that will change prior to the full preliminary draft of Plan2040 which will be available to the public on Friday. There will be at least 30 days to comment on the preliminary draft Plan2040. The Planned Land Use Map in the preliminary draft of Plan2040 will include all the changes as a result of the Online Open House. Ms. Carrier said the public can still comment on the preliminary draft Planned Land Use Map. OPZ will consider the comments and make necessary updates prior to a draft being presented to the Planning Advisory Board (PAB). The PAB will review and identify recommended changes. Plan2040 will then be reviewed by the County Council and ultimately approved.

Ms. Bower asked how the preliminary draft would be advertised for public comment. Ms. Pompa said there would be a press conference, press release, advertisements on County social media, assistance from the Office of Community Engagement and Consistent Services, and an e-blast to the Plan2040 email distribution list.

Ms. Hartwig-Davis asked for an update on the status of the Mayo Water Reclamation Facility. Ms. Carrier said the Planned Land Use Map shows it as Public Use as of now, but because it is transitioning, the designation could change during the Region Plan process.

Preview draft Plan2040 document:

Ms. Carrier, Office of Planning and Zoning

Ms. Carrier said the public generally supports the Planned Land Use Map based on survey results. The Planned Land Use Map balances protection of the environment and provides areas for future development and redevelopment where there is existing infrastructure. She asked whether a majority of the CAC concurs with the draft Planned Land Use Map. Ms. Bower, Mr. Brent, Mr. Dodd, Ms. Hartwig-Davis, Ms. Karabani, Mr. Korbela, Ms. Ysla Leight, Mr. Mannion, Ms. Pauly, and Ms. Rosborg voted to support the draft Planned Land Use Map. Ms. Huecker, Ms. Leahy, Ms. Lynch, and Mr. Mauler voted in opposition. Mr. Shorter was not present during the vote.

Review and Adoption Process:

Ms. Carrier, Office of Planning and Zoning

Ms. Carrier indicated that this is the last CAC meeting. The preliminary draft Plan2040 will be available for public review shortly. Staff will consider comments from that public review. The PAB will be briefed on Plan2040 and a public hearing will be held. Oral and written testimony will be

received. The PAB's role is to provide recommendations to the County Executive. The County Executive will then provide feedback prior to a draft being presented to the County Council.

Ms. Carrier thanked the CAC for their time and effort. Ms. Pompa thanked the CAC and encouraged them to stay engaged. Mr. Kaii-Ziegler thanked the CAC as well and noted that implementation is the key part of this process.

Ms. Huecker asked for clarification on text amendments. Mr. Kaii-Ziegler explained that text amendments to the County Code, based on recommendations from Plan2040, will be introduced to the County Council by the County Executive or a County Councilmember in the form of a bill and will go through the legislative process. OPZ's role is to only draft text amendments. OPZ will draft an explanation of the process.

Ms. Bower suggested that the members of the CAC would make great candidates for the Region Plan CACs. She requested OPZ to consult with the CAC members to help identify potential candidates to serve on the Region Plan CACs.

Mr. Pittman thanked the CAC for their service. He was thrilled with the Online Open House platform. He acknowledged the Planned Land Use Map identifies areas for the preservation of environmental resources and areas for development and redevelopment, albeit, not all at the same scale. He recognized there is a strong interest in fixing land use during the GDP process, but noted that the Region Plan process is the appropriate time to address more specific issues. He said that there may be an opportunity to do performance zoning and utilize Plan2040 during the development review process to ensure consistency. He will suggest that the comment period will be extended to 45 days. He said Plan2040 helps address Smart Growth, and specifically protects open space, preserves the Chesapeake Bay, reduces traffic, preserves the character of the neighborhoods, promotes and encourages agriculture to maintain open space, and promotes multi-modal transportation options which should result in a higher quality of life.

Administrative items:

Ms. Rosborg, Chair

Ms. Huecker motioned to adopt the meeting notes. Ms. Lynch seconded the motion and the motion was approved 14-0. Ms. Rosborg clarified that CAC members will need to apply to volunteer to serve on the Region Plan CACs. Ms. Pauly, Mr. Dodd, and Ms. Lynch thanked Ms. Rosborg and the staff for their work. Ms. Huecker made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Pauly seconded the motion and the motion was approved 14-0. The meeting was adjourned at 7:03 p.m.