
Plan2040
Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC)
Meeting Notes
August 7, 2019 - 5:00 PM
Chesapeake Conference Room, 2nd Floor
2664 Riva Road, Annapolis, MD

CAC members present: Elizabeth Rosborg (Chair), Cate Bower, Anthony Brent, John Clark, Bill Dodd, Joel Greenwell, Patricia Huecker, Amy Leahy, Patricia Lynch, Charles Mannion, Gary Mauler, William Moulden, Ellen Moyer, Kristin Pauly, Will Shorter, Allan Straughan

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

Attendees: Jon, Korin, Jim Lyons, Steve Miller

Finalize Vision:
Ms. Rosborg, Chair

The CAC was presented a proposed draft of the Vision Statement (Vision). Mr. Dodd supported the idea of a short and concise Vision and explained that the goals, objectives, and recommendations that followed in the Plan would elaborate upon the Vision. Mr. Mauler agreed with Mr. Dodd that the Vision needs to be short and concise.

Ms. Carrier stated that this is the first decision that the CAC would be making. In a planning process such as this, the best decision making is through collaboration to build consensus rather than have it decided by a vote. If the CAC finds that they need to come to a vote, then it should be decided what is considered a majority. Typically, a supermajority such as 75%-90% is best. She noted County staff shared a short version of the Vision, but it quickly grew in length based on comments from the CAC. She encouraged the CAC to think about the Vision as something that would be representative of the County values and whether it was something that the member could live with it. Ms. Rosborg noted that only a few members have been providing feedback and questioned whether other members were supportive or were not sharing their opinions.

Mr. Clark stated that he favored a version that Ms. Bower had sent to the CAC via email. He added that technology needs to be referenced in the Vision to facilitate quality of life. The CAC discussed

revisions to Ms. Bower's version. Ms. Huecker noted that an equitable distribution of infrastructure does not necessarily mean the infrastructure is adequate, just that there is an equal distribution of the infrastructure. Ms. Lynch added that infrastructure is provided as required and that some areas of the County may not need certain infrastructure.

Mr. Brent asked how the Vision reflects what is unique about Anne Arundel County. Ms. Bower offered that the Vision Themes (Themes) and how they are implemented make it unique. Mr. Brent suggested the Vision include language about the Chesapeake Bay as an example.

Mr. Moulden asked for clarification regarding "a livable built environment." He felt it was vague and is up to interpretation. He does not care whether it is short or long, but felt that the shorter it gets means topics are removed. He noted the current version does not identify a vision for schools, traffic problems, development growth into historic communities, or adequacy of facilities. He felt that this version sacrifices the visions of everything that is meaningful to the citizens of the County.

Mr. Clark said the Vision is a teaser for what is in the Themes. Ms. Carrier clarified that the Themes are meant to clarify the Vision and will be used to build goals, policies and strategies.

Mr. Mauler felt the Vision needs to be simple because it is the document will need to be defended in court. He added that the intent needs to be specific and obvious to leaders and decision makers. Ms. Rosborg said that level of detail could be explained in the Themes.

Ms. Lynch shared that she did not attempt to edit proposed versions because there was too much material, but she did develop her own Vision that focused more on land use.

Mr. Mauler suggested that what makes the County unique is the citizen involvement. Ms. Leahy questioned how that would be defended in court.

Mr. Brent wanted more pro-active language about protecting the environment.

Ms. Pauly suggested that topics within the Vision should match the Themes or vice versa.

Ms. Rosborg asked for an informal vote of the three proposed Visions. There was no consensus as many of the CAC members did not vote and want to change and reconsider the proposed versions. There was discussion about revising the Themes to better reflect the Vision.

Ms. Moyer suggested that if the Vision is linked to the Themes, then the CAC should identify where they are linked. Ms. Carrier clarified that the Themes in the draft did at one point relate to the Vision, but the Vision changed after several iterations.

Ms. Carrier confirmed Ms. Bower's question as to whether the Themes are an accurate synthesis of key issues from the Visioning meetings and data. Ms. Bower said the discussion should then focus around those concepts. Ms. Pauly said she wanted to put the Themes in a different order. Ms. Rosborg clarified that the Themes were presented in no particular order.

Mr. Shorter sought to clarify the wording so it would resonate with millennials. The CAC removed the verbs from the Themes titles. Mr. Brent emphasized that the text be pro-active. Mr. Shorter expressed an interest in more data such as economic outlooks, more transportation data, or school

enrollment projections. Ms. Carrier said that information on housing and population projections will be provided soon.

Ms. Rosborg asked the CAC whether the Themes are representative of what they want to see in the Vision. Ms. Moyer would like to see education included.

Mr. Kaii-Ziegler offered a Vision from another locality. The majority of the CAC members liked it but wanted to revise it to make it more unique to Anne Arundel County. A vote was taken. Twelve members were for the proposed Vision and four were against.

The proposed Vision is:

By honoring its rich Chesapeake heritage as well as embracing the robust opportunities of a new day, Anne Arundel County enhances its quality of life, shapes a future that represents the best of both worlds, and creates a place where its residents are proud to live, work, learn, and play.

The CAC agreed to the proposed Themes:

- New and Improved Infrastructure
- Strategic Economic Growth and Redevelopment
- Community Character
- Connected and Responsive Government
- Resilient, Environmental-Sound, and Sustainable Communities

Mr. Shorter sought to clarify a section of the Themes to include diversity and inclusion. He will follow up with Ms. Carrier.

Ms. Rosborg reminded the CAC that materials they receive are not to be shared outside of the meetings until they are released to the County's website. Items will be marked as "draft" in the future to avoid any confusion. Ms. Bower noted there are many planning terms being used and that it would be helpful for a list of the terms and their definition so everyone has the same understanding.

Continue defining planning area boundaries:

Ms. Rosborg, Chair

Ms. Rosborg asked for comments on the proposed Regional Planning Area boundaries.

Regional Planning Area 1:

- No comments

Regional Planning Area 2:

- Clarification that the northern boundary is MD 100.

Regional Planning Areas 3 and 4:

- Ms. Leahy said there is a section of the Millersville community that is part of Severna Park. Severna Park's boundary should be the Severn River to the south, I-97 to the west, Brightview Drive to the north, and should include the Shipley's Choice subdivision. Ms. Leahy will work with County staff to verify these boundaries.

- The western and northern part of Pasadena has higher density housing that Severna Park does not have. Ms. Carrier clarified that this is fine because the Development Policy Areas will help provide more specific guidelines for development. Many of Regional Planning Areas will have multiple types of development. Mr. Kaii-Ziegler noted that nine Regional Planning Areas is a good number because it is in-line with OPZ resources.

Regional Planning Area 5:

- Given Ms. Carrier's comment about the Development Policy Areas, Mr. Dodd acknowledged that the commercial uses south of MD 450 in Davidsonville will be analyzed differently.

Regional Planning Area 6:

- Mr. Moulden noted that Crownsville is bound by Bestgate Road to the south, I-97 to the west, MD 3 to the north, and the Severn River to the east. The boundary should also include the Bacon Ridge Natural Area.

Regional Planning Area 7:

- Clarification that the Riva community is in Regional Planning Areas 7.
- Ms. Moyer noted that the Annapolis community symbolized as green is not the City of Annapolis. She would like to see the City of Annapolis outlined and labeled on the map.
- The Mayo community will be changed to the Mayo Peninsula.

Regional Planning Area 8:

- Ms. Huecker noted that the area south of MD 450 is represented by the Davidsonville Area Civic Association, and that is why it was included in the Davidsonville community.

Regional Planning Area 9:

- Ms. Bower likes the map, but is not sure if the Owensville community will want to be included in the agricultural side, represented by Regional Planning Area 9. She also noted that nine Regional Planning Areas is preferred to seven to avoid confusion with Councilmanic districts. Ms. Carrier noted that the map will be posted to the website for public comment.
- There was a comment to have the southern part of Edgewater be in Regional Planning Area 9. The reason to split Edgewater was to include South River Colony in Regional Planning Area 7, the more developed Area; rather than the more rural Areas of 8 and 9.

Approval of July 31, 2019 Meeting Notes and Next Steps:

Ms. Elizabeth Rosborg, Chair

The meeting minutes were approved with two amendments.

Mr. Kaii-Ziegler noted that the key to the GDP is the implementation plan and schedule which identifies the recommendation, who will be the lead, an estimated timeframe, and whether it is a capital or operating budget item and to track the progress aggressively. Recommendations that cannot be measured may need to be identified as aspirational. Ms. Carrier added that the other part of Bill 21-18 is to address the Regional Area Planning process is to identify the content of the plan and the committee composition. Ms. Rosborg charged the CAC to review the draft Regional Planning Process plan and provide comments prior to the next meeting.

Ms. Rosborg emphasized that County staff have a large workload and their time is valuable. Communication to staff should be done in a timely manner prior to meetings. She said attendance is imperative and several members have missed a majority of meetings. If a CAC member cannot attend, please let County staff know as soon as possible. CAC members are encouraged to reach out to others and remind them to attend meetings since consensus will be needed.

Ms. Carrier said the online survey had ended and County staff is preparing a summary of the results. This will be shared with the CAC shortly. Development Policy Areas will be discussed at an upcoming meeting, so it is important to begin thinking about ideas on how these areas. Definitions of types of policy areas and a map will be drafted soon to aid in the discussion.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:06 p.m.