

Comments on Planning Advisory Board Draft and Office of Planning and Zoning responses

Summary of Testimony	Office of Planning and Zoning Response
<p>Role of GDP</p> <p>Note in the Plan that the Plan should be followed as closely as possible with rare deviations Adherence to the General Development Plan should be emphasized in the paragraph about the role of the GDP. The GDP is a time to but 'teeth' into practicing responsible planning and development. Do not allow for development to favor profit or bypass responsibility. Do not continue to allow exemptions if a developer says, or promises, to develop for a future population-all must be held to same standards- and they should be high standards.</p>	<p>The Plan2040 Preliminary Draft was edited for the PAB Draft to include the following language: "Plan2040 is intended for use as a guide for County policies and decisions. Subsequent policies, plans, programs and other implementation mechanisms should be consistent with Plan2040." The language is recommended to be edited as follows: Plan2040 is intended for use as a guide for County policies and decisions. <u>"In accordance with the State's Land Use Article, policies and implementation actions are required to be consistent with or have consistency with Plan2040. These actions will further implementation of Plan2040 and not be inconsistent with it.</u> Subsequent policies, plans, programs and other implementation mechanisms should be consistent with Plan2040."</p>
<p>Growth Limits, Overdevelopment</p> <p>Growth Limits, Need for Fiscal Impact Analysis (cost of growth on infrastructure and services); strategy to redirect growth to Baltimore City; attract jobs and housing for current County residents Objects to County's analyzation of past trends and future projections to justify that there is no need for growth caps at present. Believes Plan2040 should clearly include policies for reducing housing and population growth rates to acceptable levels. One means of doing this would be to place annual or quarterly caps on the number of building permits issued by the County. A new Built Environment Goal should be added to Plan2040 that targets provision of a means for each Region of the County to limit its rate of development to levels established by a Committee representative of its residents. Corresponding Policies and Strategies should direct formation of an appropriate Workgroup to identify an optimum administrative process for achieving this Goal. Requesting growth limits, use metrics to prevent over-population and thus a decrease in quality of life. Growth limits - A stronger emphasis in the plan on the need for community involvement in growth rate decision would lay the foundation for a meaningful regional planning process A "Built Environment Goal" should be added to Plan2040 that targets provision of a means for each Planning Region of the County (as identified in the Plan) to limit its rate of development to levels established by a Committee of its residents. Corresponding policies and strategies should direct formation of an appropriate process to identify the process for achieving this Goal.</p>	<p>Discussion of the County growth rate and consideration of a cap on development permits has been added to the PAB Review draft of Plan2040 (See pages 34-35 in Volume I). Also see pages 18-19 and new Policy 3.1 in Volume I for discussion of the existing Growth Management Program and reform of adequate public facilities regulations. Strategy BE13.a recommends conducting a fiscal impact analysis.</p>

Comments on Planning Advisory Board Draft and Office of Planning and Zoning responses

Plan does not satisfactorily address: overdevelopment, approval of projects with exceptions; Route 3 corridor needs relief from development; smart growth hasn't occurred

Hello, this email is in regard to the county's request for feedback regarding development in Crofton. I strongly feel more needs to be done to maintain rt 3 before considering additional growth. The county approves these plans yet if you approach the county about excessive litter on rt 3 they say it's a state hwy/problem. Additional approval for development with no real plans to address excessive litter/road maintenance on rt 3 is irresponsible. Money also needs to be put into more police and speed cameras to address the high-speed, congested, and dangerous traffic that goes racing down rt 3. These issues now extend down Davidsonville Road. If anyone thinks one light by the new school will be enough they are wrong. And all the new retaining walls going up on Davidsonville... they seem like a good idea for the new sidewalk but how long till those walls are COVERED in graffiti?!?!? The county needs to consider the bigger picture when they look to approve plans and quit pretending the state will take responsibility for maintenance. I've included a few random photos of rt 3 near the proposed development. The medians have litter and are rarely mowed. On the rare occasion they do mow it looks terrible with choppy dead grass and mulched litter left strewn about... Again, you may say that is a state hwy problem but I think it's up to the county to look at the impact of approving plans/developments the state can not maintain. I've lived in Crofton for over 25 years and have seen the negative impact of "over building" in the route 3 corridor. It's already beyond capacity and want to express my concerns about any further development. Traffic and traffic safety. Roads not keeping up with development. Frustrating. The latter re safety includes no lighting at the left onto Waugh Chapel when heading N on Rt 3. Extremely dark n dangerous. I am very unhappy with the traffic and over development on MD rt 3. I am asking the county to halt all further development until they have a real plan for handling the current and future traffic on rt 3. MD rt 3 is fast becoming another Ritchie HWY and the Crofton/Gambrills area will soon become a Glen Burnie South.

I am a newer resident of Anne Arundel County and live on Charles Hall Drive (very small neighborhood off MD 3 South between MD 32 and Annapolis Rd). Since we moved here there have been several new businesses added (most notably Royal Farms) to the area that have disrupted traffic flow immensely and I recently learned of the 2040 plan and the potential for MD 3 to become a limited access freeway. Is there any way to get more information on how these changes will impact our small neighborhood? It is currently difficult to exit the neighborhood, our school bus stop on MD 3 is very dangerous, and I am concerned about continued development. Thank you.

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: A reasonable speed limit, Adequate traffic lights to insure movability, Heavy-truck restrictions that are enforceable, A sidewalk that is actually usable is essential. Development must be at a density no higher than what is allowable under current zoning regulations. Thanks for taking community concerns into consideration as you move forward with the Draft Plan 2040 GDP.

I have lived in Crofton for 21 years and am dismayed at the development along the route 3 corridor. Traffic is a mess. Accidents abound. I fear for my 16 year old daughter who is learning to drive on that road. I have lost track of the number of fatal accidents that have occurred on route 3 in the past year, let alone the 21 years I have lived here. We have more than enough of every imaginable store or service along route 3. The growth in this area has been unchecked and not well planned. Please, no more development along route 3 in Crofton. Please, fix route 3 to make it a safe road. The multiple entrances and exits onto that road from each side and the median is insane. Motorists drive at highway speeds and above. How many more lives must be lost before the road is redesigned to be safer? I pray that it is not my daughter or anyone else's in the next accident.

Route 3 Corridor has been over-developed. Many projects are still in the pipeline. Community hoping for relief from development, but we don't find it in Plan2040. Several properties will recieve higher intensity land use under Plan2040. Move Anne Arundel recommendations for Route 3. If development meets standards, it is permitted and built. The County says that Route 3 is a State road. Asks PAB to scrutinize the Planned Land Use Map designations. We have experienced too much growth and dangerous roads. We lack adequate facilities to support existing property, let alone for more people. We are not responsible for "AA County wannabes" We have enought housing, not adequate facilities to support them. We don't support any more growth until we protect the environment, provide schools, and protect air quality. Concerns of development on Route 3 corridor: traffic and environmental impacts to Jabez Branch. Oppose Millersville Park - Tennis Facility proposal

The County recognizes the transportation and land use challenges along the Route 3 corridor in the Crofton-Gambrills area and identified it as a Critical Corridor Policy Area in Plan2040. Plan2040 includes policies and strategies under Goal BE10 that focus on addressing traffic issues and developing coordinated land use/transportation solutions in Critical Corridors. Plan2040 is a Countywide policy plan. More detailed planning for this area will come in Region Plans. Many of the Planned Land Use Map zoning changes in this area reflect development that has already been constructed or permitting and makes the PLUM consistent with zoning changes adopted by Council since 2009. The Maryland Department of Transportation State Highway Administration (MDOT SHA) has recently prepared a study to identify solutions to reduce congestion on Route 3. The County has dedicated funds from the Permanent Improvement Fund to leverage state investments on Route 3. The first priority is widening Route 3 between St. Stephens Church Road and Rt 32. Additional investments will include intersection improvements and management of traffic signals to improve traffic flow.

Comments on Planning Advisory Board Draft and Office of Planning and Zoning responses

<p>Hold the line on anymore commercial or industrial development along MD 175 from National Business Parkway to the county line; Recommend that OPZ pause any further development in West County until the county can address the traffic on our major roads and also our side roads; Recommend that the Plan2040 preserve any "remaining" green space, farms, and open space just like what is being recommended for South County</p>	<p>More detailed plans and comprehensive rezoning for Jessup area will be addressed in Region Plans. Plan2040 includes policy language to support transportation improvements, including reform of the Adequate Public Facilities regulations.</p>
<p>Environment, Resource Conservation, Water Resources</p>	
<p>Greenways should be mandatory protection and Strategy 3.2(d) of Plan2040 should specify that no net loss of trees will be acceptable in Greenways, with a fee-in-lieu of replanting comparable to that of Annapolis City.</p>	<p>Strategy NE3.2.d and BE1.1.a.13 both state policy language to strengthen regulatory protections for designated Greenways. The details of those regulations will be developed with reforms to Articles 17 and 18 that will follow adoption of Plan2040.</p>
<p>Outline path to finding better ways to preserve ag industry, acknowledge the role forests and ag land plays in prevention and mitigation of stormwater pollution and groundwater recharge</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) and to increase preservation of agricultural land (NE3.3 and supporting policies and strategies). 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>Although forest conservation is spoken of frequently in the GDP, there is not enough specificity of areas that should be preserved and the language is weak. A goal of the GDP could be to strengthen the Forest Conservation Ordinance to be a no net loss ordinance as in other Maryland counties</p>	<p>Goal NE2 and supporting policies and strategies focus on forest conservation, including recommendations to strengthen mitigation requirements under the Forest Conservation Ordinance. A 'no net loss' of forest standard was considered, but with advice from Citizen Environmental Commission, it was not included because it was not considered feasible.</p>
<p>The proposal to regulate ephemeral streams and an associated 25' buffer is burdensome and of questionable benefit; 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, 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, 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 should be given (as it currently is) to achieve the greatest environmental benefit The Anne Arundel County proposed Plan 2040 GDP includes new protections for an imaginary classification of waterway – "Ephemeral Streams". "Ephemeral streams" are not recognized by the State of Maryland ; nor the U.S. Federal Government. This absence of "ephemeral streams" as a Clean Water Act jurisdictional entity occurs because QUALIFIED EXPERTS agree that it is impossible to clearly define what an "Ephemeral Stream" is. All language addressing "ephemeral" waters should be stricken from the Anne Arundel County Plan 2040 GDP. "Ephemeral streams", like "Unicorns", can only be described purely theoretically. In reality "ephemeral stream" have no scientific basis of definition and do not exist at this time. Please provide Anne Arundel County's proposed standard for delineation of "Ephemeral Streams". I also request that AA County provide documentation how AA County will define the differences between an "Ephemeral Stream" versus a linear topographic depression. Proposal to regulate ephemeral streams - is burdensome and has potential for unintended negative consequences, too difficult to define to actually implement. Increasing stormwater requirements - would overly restrict development areas and actually promote sprawl The proposal to regulate ephemeral streams and an associated 25' buffer is burdensome and of questionable benefit</p>	<p>Ephemeral streams play important functions for watershed hydrology. They are protected under ordinances in other Maryland Counties, including neighboring Howard and Prince George's County. The County will use best practices and definitions from the State and Maryland Counties to craft a definition of ephemeral streams. Planting buffers is also important to providing ecological and water quality functions. Greater detail on this topic can be addressed in the update of the Landscape Manual.</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, 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, 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 should be given (as it currently is) to achieve the greatest environmental benefit, increasing SWM requirements and basing storm events on projected data due to climate change is not consistent with State regulations. Such a regulatory change would shrink the development envelope on both new development (including infill) and redevelopment projects, further promoting sprawl and restricting housing opportunities, the expansion of greenways beyond those areas that are outlined in State law and regulation will have several unintended consequences for development in targeted areas meant to accommodate population growth, such as Priority Funding Areas, Town Centers and Transit Oriented Development Areas,</p>	<p>These comments are based on the Preliminary Draft version, not the PAB Draft version of the document. However, many of the concerns were reviewed from the comment letter that was sent in on the Preliminary draft, including: NE2.1.d Increase mitigation requirements for projects that retain forest above the forest conservation ordinance's conservation thresholds, and prioritize mitigation onsite or within the same watershed" [changed to prioritize rather than require on-site mitigation] NE4.5.b Update the Anne Arundel County Stormwater Management Practices and Procedures Manual with the latest science, rainfall data, water quality, and peak-flow requirements in recognition of precipitation changes related to climate change" [changed focused to use of latest data of actual precipitation, rather than future forecasts]</p>

Comments on Planning Advisory Board Draft and Office of Planning and Zoning responses

<p>In relation to updating the Critical Area program: current Articles 17 and 18 need to update the expectations for using best practices, provide more specific administration guidelines, and monitor consistent application; identify sensitive environmental features to preserve them 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</p>	<p>These details will be addressed as the County conducts the update of the Critical Area Program.</p>
<p>Should have calculations to account for ecological instability, and future expenses to the State to keep the area stabilized and not part of commercial developments criteria.</p>	<p>These concerns are embedded in the policy rationale behind the Forest Conservation Ordinance and stormwater regulations that require Environmental Site Design to the Maximum Extent Practicable.</p>
<p>Recommend that the Plan2040 preserve any "remaining" green space, farms, and open space just like what is being recommended for South County</p>	<p>More detailed planning for Jessup area will occur in Region Plans.</p>
<p>Neither Volume 1 nor Volume 2 of Plan2040 address or reference the relevancy or implications of a designation as "Draft Priority Forest Retention Area(s)". GIC is particularly concerned that the conflicting guidance could result in undesired or confusing outcomes. While the text box designation specifically states that it is "not intended to be regulatory" it remains highlighted and separately identified from the Critical Area, and (by implication) designated for some regulatory purpose. Yet, the draft Plan2040 provides no specific or explicit purpose for this designation. In fact, the overall description within the draft Plan2040 appears to validate that there are (at least) some implications for the designation. 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>The RSPA map includes the draft Priority Forest Retention Area layer as developed by OPZ-GIS based on the criteria established in the updated Forest Conservation Ordinance adopted in 2019. The map does not supplant the requirement of a Forest Stand Delineation. Any subdivision or development permit application will need to comply with the Forest Conservation Ordinance, regardless of accuracy of the map.</p>
<p>Please address specific concerns before moving forward with this plan, for example: storm water and septic needs. Protect the important Jabez branch stream, or other community concerns.</p>	<p>Goal NE4 and its supporting policies and strategies are designed to improve and protect water quality by reducing pollution from stormwater and septic systems. Goal NE1, Policy 1.4 includes strategies to increase protections for the Jabez Branch, including proposing to establish an overlay zone with more stringent environmental standards.</p>
<p>Values of conservation, protection and the land and Patuxent River. We don't do enough to protect the Pa Would like to protect the environment. Runoff and sedimentation of creeks.</p>	<p>Plan2040 includes a number of goals, policies and strategies designed to protect natural resources and water quality. In particular, Goals NE1 to NE5 and their supporting strategies establish a framework to increase protections for stream buffers and reduce water pollution.</p>
<p>Climate Change</p>	
<p>More Fully Address Impacts of Climate Change and Conservation (not central to the GDP), 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. 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. Greater focus on climate change and its impact in Anne Arundel County, develop more particularized modelling of the impact of global warming and sea change on Anne Arundel County allowing these estimates to be factored into ongoing discussions regarding growth. Climate change and its effects on all of the planning areas, while extensive in the data presented, and commendable targets in the planning goals, fail to satisfactorily recognize all of the effects and problems that climate change is already causing and which will continue to grow - effects of stormwater runoff on creeks and streams and ultimately the bay, are well recognized, a problem farther upstream is less well known.</p>	<p>Plan2040 establishes a policy framework for further work on climate change, including the preparing a Climate Action Plan for the County (BE16.1.a). Flooding and salt intrusion is referenced multiple times throughout Plan2040 in the context of sea level rise. The Natural Environment chapter includes strategies to design for sea-level rise as part of shoreline restoration projects (NE1.3.d), land preservation (NE3.1.e), management of septic systems (NE4.3.c), and public water and sewer infrastructure (NE5.3.b). The Built Environment chapter includes strategies to address sea-level rise with respect to development on peninsulas (BE4.1.b), marinas (BE4.2.c), roadways and bridges (BE15.3.a and b.) and across County functional master plans (BE16.1). The Healthy Communities chapter includes strategies focused on development community capacity for resilience to flooding and sea-level rise (HC10.4.c). Volume II of Plan2040 includes an assessment of sea-level rise vulnerability, including multiple projections for rise scenarios and a map of vulnerable areas (See pages 165-167). In 2011, Anne Arundel County prepared a Sea Level Rise Strategic Plan, which included many specific recommendations. Funding and implementation of plans and actions will be critical to the County's efforts to adapt to sea-level rise.</p>
<p>Transportation</p>	

Comments on Planning Advisory Board Draft and Office of Planning and Zoning responses

<p>Finds that transportation goals and strategies are only partially embraced and tend to be confined to portions of the Built Environment section; find that while Move Anne Arundel! has quantified performance metrics to measure achievement, the Plan 2040 goals tend to be soft and incremental: Directly embrace and include the Move Anne Arundel transportation goals, quantified performance metrics and strategies; Quantify all of the goals for Plan2040 such as growth, density, congestion, transportation mode share, air/water quality, affordability, etc.; Include transportation in all of the plan sections where it matters rather than confining it to a few parts of the Built Environment: Add a goal in the Natural Environment section that specifies the role of transportation in protecting and improving our air and water quality, 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, education and recreation, must provide more transportation options, especially to attract employers who will be hiring millennials; Anne Arundel Trail network</p>	<p>Transportation issues are addressed in multiple sections of Plan2040. Additional references were added based on comments received from Bike AAA and the Anne Arundel Transportation Commission on the Preliminary Drafter version of Plan2040.</p> <p>Air and noise pollution are intentionally placed in the Built Environment section (BE15.3 and BE17).</p> <p>Transportation policy language is incorporated into the land use goals, policies and strategies related to Targeted Development, Redevelopment and Revitalization Areas (under Goal BE5), Critical Economic Areas (under Goal BE6), Town Centers (under Goal BE7) , Transit Oriented Area (Inder Goal BE9), and Peninsula Policy Areas (Under Goal BE 4). Safe Routes to Schools and Community Walkability are specifically discussed under BE15.2. Transportation references related to access to food, employment, and health care (HC7.1.e), and seniors/disabled (HC5.1.d) are within the Healthy Communities section. There are also transportation references related to Targeted Development, Redevelopment, and Revitalization Areas (HE1.2.c, HE2.2, HE2.3.a, HE3.1, HE3.1.b) within the Healthy Communities section. Additional transportation references will increase redundancy and complexity of plan rather than providing greater clarity and direction. Move Anne Arundel goals are incorporated into Plan2040 (see pages 51-53 in Volume I and pages 155-163 in Volume II). Quantified metrics from Move Anne Arundel are incorporated into Plan2040 and will be reported on a regular basis. The breadth of topics of Plan2040 required a mix of quantitative and qualitative performance measures.</p>
--	---

Comments on Planning Advisory Board Draft and Office of Planning and Zoning responses

<p>1. (V.1), is too briefly presented in Draft Plan2040. It must be strengthened in content, background and recommendations to include a major focus on the linkage between land use and transportation. 2. (V.1) subject- 'Transportation', is limited to only 2 pages (44 & 45). To comprehend this 'Transportation Update' in its entirety, the reader, to include government officials, must review 3 volumes: Vol 1 and 2 of the Plan2040/GDP plus a separate Transportation Functional Master Plan- 'Move Anne Arundel'. This work effort, especially for targeted elected officials, is challenging and time consuming. This is in contrast to the 'Transportation' element covered in the 2009 GDP- that provided in one chapter (#9), a direct and comprehensive review of the County's transportation issues, with a focus on the essential relationships between land use and transportation. One of the major deficiencies in the Plan2040/GDP is that neither V.1 nor V.2 contain overlays of land use and transportation interrelationships, goals, policies, strategies and recommendations. This is not only the case for transportation, but also for other physical attributes i. e. Public Facilities, Sewer and Water, etc. For example, the recommendations on the Town Centers do not overlay transportation issues, policies, etc. dealing with access and egress, capacity, mitigating on-site and nearby community congestion. 3. (V.2 Pgs 95, 98). The transportation element of the Plan2040/GDP, should include the impacts of creating a new Bay Bridge crossing (3rd Span) targeted for development within the same 2030-2040 time frame as the GDP; 4. Goals BE 7 (town centers) and BE 8 (commercial and community services) conflict with BE 10.1 (reduce traffic congestion); Consider organizing and prioritizing these subjects to present a clearly defined plan that can be reviewed and understood. Plan2040/GDP, should construct plans, within the means available, to solve the short, mid- and long term projects within reasonable timeframes. Transportation congestion, for example, was one of the most frequently mentioned transportation concerns in the county's outreach sessions, but it is difficult to determine from the draft Plan2040/GDP, exactly what priority the County is giving to solving what issue, how and by when; 5. V.2, (page 138), Regional Transit Authority, the RTA should be an expanded county-wide Regional Transportation Authority (to include transit). The RTA should integrate, coordinate, and enable the use of public/private partnerships to operate, all modes of public transportation. It should be county-wide in jurisdiction (not just limited to North-County) and provide for line haul, fixed route, commuter, park and ride services. It should also include on-call and/or time coordinated demand responsive services. To be effective it needs to provide and/or coordinate "first" and "last" mile service for transit availability; 6. V.2, (page 141, Figure 24), Transit Network, the Plan2040/GDP should set a goal to implement, over time, via an RTA, universal no-charge transfer privileges, among the five transit providers in the County; 7. V.2, (page 145), Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities, it must be clear that the planning and completion of a bicycle and pedestrian trail network must be an integral part of the Plan2040/GDP and Master Transportation Plan and must include arterial connectors to transportation facilities, parks, schools, shopping, etc. 8. V.2 (page 146) provide more detail on the following statement ...'Land Use –Transportation Connection'...."It is possible that land use and transportation policies along with transportation facilities and services could evolve over the next two decades that would achieve a more balanced transportation network in some areas;" Specific Policies or Strategies in the GDP should address actions to mitigate the effects of the statement made in V.2, page 147 - how can these increases in trips be accommodated? Are there recommendations to, over time, reduce vehicular trips? Will traffic demand management and extensive use of Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) be part of this solution? 9. There must be a reference in the 2040 Plan/GDP, to document the connectivity to the 2009 GDP Transportation element (Chapter 9)....that reaffirms the background and recommendations in the 2009 GDP that are not in conflict with the 2040 Plan; include an updated Figure 9-7 from the 2009 GDP to be included in the 2040 Plan/GDP, that shows 'Priority Highway Investment Corridors;' Plan2040 is missing a major element dealing with Anne Arundel County's transportation network in a regional context.</p>	<p>1 & 2. Plan2040 was separated into two volumes to provide a concise presentation of Goals, Policies and Strategies with a companion background report for more supporting information. The commenter disagrees with this format, but it has been appreciated by many others, including the Maryland Department of Planning considering it a model that should be followed by other counties. Regarding map overlays, the Plan2040 static document presents maps designed to be clear and legible. Interactive web-based maps have been made available through the planning process that provide the ability to show more layered information. 3. The Chesapeake Bay Crossing study is referenced in Volume II of Plan2040 (page 148). The National Environmental Policy Act review of proposed alternatives is underway. The impacts of the alternatives is evaluated in that study. Additional information on the Chesapeake Bay Crossing study, including a graphic illustrating the three top alignment alternatives will be added to the Transportation Element section of Volume II Plan2040. 4. The comment combines policies for different geographic Development Policy Areas. The underlying comment appears to be that promoting development conflicts with efforts to relieve transportation congestion. Plan2040's approach is to support development and redevelopment in targeted areas including Town Centers and near transit facilities to provide more opportunities for people to live near where they work to reduce commute distances and support viability of mass transit. The comment seems to state that traffic is a problem that will one day be solved. In reality, it is an ongoing issue that is managed. With every capital budget and with application of County development regulations, investments are made in transportation improvements in coordination with development. Regarding prioritization of transportation infrastructure, the Capital Budget projects list utilizes the scoring system developed in Move Anne Arundel! 5 & 6. A coordinated set of policies and strategies were developed in Move Anne Arundel and incorporated in Plan2040, primarily in Policy BE15.2 (see strategies BE15.2.f.1-8) and land use policies that support improving transit in Targeted Development, Redevelopment and Revitalization Areas (under Goal BE5), Critical Economic Areas (under Goal BE6), Town Centers (under Goal BE7), and Transit Oriented Area (under Goal BE9). Anne Arundel County does provide county-wide services that include on-call and coordinated demand responsive services in addition to the current RTA services. In 2018, Anne Arundel County moved to provide better coverage to improve transit coverage by combining RTA and City of Annapolis transit services within Anne Arundel County to establish Anne Arundel County Transit. This 1st step combined with improvements identified in Move Anne Arundel and supported by Plan2040 establishes the framework for traditional and non-traditional transit services within the County. The Office of Transportation will forward and review these suggestions with the County Transportation Committee. As more review is warranted, staff recommends no change to this section of Plan2040 at this time. 7. Plan2040 includes policies and strategies to support expansion of the pedestrian and bicycle network (BE15.1, BE15.2 and supporting strategies), especially in Targeted Development, Redevelopment and Revitalization areas (BE5.2.e), Town Centers (BE7.1.d), and schools (BE15.2.d). 8. Plan2040 incorporates the range of transportation solutions adopted in Move Anne Arundel! to improve the transportation system for future population growth and development (see Goal BE 15 and Policy BE15.2), including implementation of Transportation Systems Management and Operations (TSMO) strategies, investments in transit, and expansion of bike and pedestrian facilities. 9. The Plan2040 Transportation Element which includes the detailed analysis performed in the development of Move Anne Arundel updates the 2009 GDP Transportation Element and once adopted, will supercede its guidance.</p>
<p>Transportation - Route 50/301 Corridor Plan2040 is limited in its coverage of transportation. In listening sessions: environment, overdevelopment, and traffic were biggest topics. Bay Bridge spans are aging and must be replaced within next 20-30 years All 3 potential locations for third crossing are all in Anne Arundel County. County must work to re-direct the third span out of the County 3rd lane usage of bridge must also be changed; Forest Drive Corridor must be considered.</p>	<p>The Chesapeake Bay Crossing study is referenced in Volume II of Plan2040 (page 148). The National Environmental Policy Act review of proposed alternatives is underway. The NEPA process is the appropriate forum to advocating for the location of the proposed third crossing. Issues related to Forest Drive will be addressed in the upcoming Region Plan. Plan2040 is a Countywide policy plan. More detailed planning for specific areas such as Forest Drive will occur in Region Plans.</p>
<p>The County should incentivize needed traffic improvements by adding flexibility to traffic mitigation policies and other innovative approaches to addressing traffic issues.</p>	<p>Plan2040 policy 5.2 and supporting strategies focus on improving the Adequate Public Facilities regulations. A working group is currently developing recommendations specific to the transportation adequate public facilities requirements.</p>
<p>Extremely concerned about increased traffic, infrastructure, and noise abatement.</p>	<p>Plan2040 includes a coordinated set of policies to improve transportation and infrastructure systems and address noise pollution.</p>
<p>Region Plans, Comprehensive Rezoning</p>	

Comments on Planning Advisory Board Draft and Office of Planning and Zoning responses

<p>Empower the Region Plan AC's to have more control over pace of development in their local areas, a means to influence the type of residential development that occurs, the opportunity to modify the rates and types as needs change over time, regulation of building permits to reflect needs of each region with citizen input, expedite drafts for the regions that will not produce plans until February 2024.</p> <p>The GDP should make clear that as the regional planning process goes forward participants are empowered to make specific recommendations regarding limits on growth. Further, the final plan should make clear that the regional planning process is not to be dominated by business and developers but must include meaningful participation by the people who live and work in each region; Region 9, is slated for either phase 2 or phase 3. Because of the significant issues faced by our region due to climate change, we urge you to move Region 9 to phase 1.</p> <p>One area of feedback I have is the Composition of the Regional Planning Committees will be all-important in determining the content of the Regional Plans. It's not clear to me how this balance will be achieved and ensuring that committee structure is not 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>Recommend that only residents of an area be included on the Regional Planning Committees; Since the Regional Planning is coming after the GDP, the PAB could recommend a way for the RPC to suggest updates to the GDP to incorporate new ideas that were never allowed to be considered by the CAC. Provide a description of the Regional Planning process, plan content, and implementation mechanisms; Region plans are overweighted with developers, brokers and other commercial interests.</p>	<p>The proposed Region Plan process can't currently be expedited. The County only has resources to develop three Region Plans at a time. The Region Plan process will further refine the Land Use Map especially in the Targeted Development, Redevelopment and Revitalization policy areas, develop concept plans for each of the communities to characterize the desired type and scale of development patterns and define densities through recommendations for comprehensive rezoning.</p> <p>As stated in the Consideration of Cap on Permits section of Plan2040 (Volume 1, page 34), creation of a permit cap at this time is not supported based on an assessment of past development trends and forecast for future development potential. The average annual growth rate within the County has been declining over the last four decades and that trend is expected to continue. In 2019, the County grew by only 0.7 percent.</p> <p>The Planning Advisory Board may recommend a different order to the Region Plan process than what is recommended in Plan2040. Ultimately, the County Council will decide the order of the Region Plan schedule.</p>
<p>Plan2040: must explicitly state how zoning and development requests will be handled before Region Plans are complete (wants moratorium) Concern about Region Plan process and potential for piecemeal zoning</p>	<p>Development applications and administrative zoning requests will be processed in accordance with the County Code. Once Plan2040 is adopted, administrative rezoning requests will be required be consistent with its adopted Land Use Plan.</p>
<p>Regional area planning maps 5 and 6 should be planned and activated at the same time - properties on both sides of the Rt 3 corridor, particularly those adjacent to the 175 intersection, are more alike than unalike.</p>	<p>The Planning Advisory Board may recommend a different order to the Region Plan process than what is recommended in Plan2040. Ultimately, the County Council will decide the order of the Region Plan schedule.</p>
<p>Assumption that the GDP will be 5 years late because comprehensive rezoning will not be completed until 2026 and that until that is complete, property owners are being denied full use of their property; "spot rezoning", is going to become more of an issue if the Comprehensive Rezoning is not completed in a timely manner and concern because of the import rezoning has on the future development in the county, while the GDP is more of a process guide to future development.</p> <p>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. Second letter dated 1/5: Comprehensive rezoning should immediately follow GDP</p>	<p>The GDP will not be five years late. The State law requires that at least once every 10 years, the comprehensive plan be reviewed and, if necessary, revised or amended. This law was changed in 2013 where the requirement had previously been a six-year review. The Maryland Department of Planning (MDP) created a schedule to transition the comprehensive planning cycle of each local jurisdiction from a six-year cycle to a 10-year cycle by December 1, 2015, coinciding with the release of census data; MDP has Anne Arundel scheduled to complete the 10-Year Cycle Review between 2021-2024. Comprehensive rezoning is not a State mandate and is not included in this 10-Year Review Cycle. The County will complete Plan2040 in 2021 and will update demographic data based on the 2020 Census through the Region Plan process. Comprehensive Rezoning will occur with each Region Plan, after the refinements of the Land Use Plan have been updated through the Region Plan process.</p>
<p>Affordable and Workforce Housing</p>	
<p>Specify locations, densities, rate and height limits for affordable and workforce housing</p>	<p>The combination of Goals and strategies for BE11, which seeks housing types and designs for residents of all incomes, and BE12, which ensures that the County's workforce has adequate housing, addresses the intent of this statement. While specific locations are not yet started, workforce housing will be guided to where residential units are needed as stated in BE12.1.g. Inclusionary housing programs such as the incorporation of a moderately priced dwelling program into the County Code could also provide workforce housing in many locations throughout the County that may currently lack workforce housing now. Policy BE11.2.a seeks to study how new forms of housing could be provided to the existing housing pattern which affect the scale and potentially increase the density of current zones.</p> <p>Plan2040 supports development of affordable housing in Communities of Opportunity as defined and analyzed in the Consolidated Plan (see map on Page 129 of Volume II). These areas do provide for higher density housing.</p>

Comments on Planning Advisory Board Draft and Office of Planning and Zoning responses

<p>History of white supremacy in America and Anne Arundel County. Racist policy, including zoning and land use laws, have had impacts on generational wealth and where people can live. Plan2040 includes many of the recommendations of Anne Arundel NAACP. Recommend that we include housing policies to promote more range of housing (Affirmative Housing Study recommendations). See article by Abraham Finton - racism and Anne Arundel school districts and community divisions. Support State level changes that can increase the legally permissible density of housing only in areas with relatively high incomes, concentration of jobs, or access to public transit. The NAACP is concerned that the current housing plan may increase higher density housing in already high density areas and areas identified as "Communities of Opportunity" are not currently being targeted for higher density development; Implement Zoning Best Practices from the 2020 Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Study conducted by Root Policy Research: Zone for middle income households, revise zoning ordinances to better promote attainable housing, Implement dynamic development standards, Implement the Land Use Recommendations from the 2020 Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Study seen on page 315: Extend districts that allow multifamily development by right to areas that are well served by light rail, including those with existing commercial uses that are compatible with multifamily development, Consider adopting inclusionary zoning to make the best of use of remaining multifamily development that is allowed, Monitor the effectiveness of expanded districts that allow affordable housing developments, as well as fee reduction incentives. Remove conditional use designation if needed to make affordable housing more financially feasible. Exempt family affordable housing from APFO; Target neighborhoods that have less than 1% African American homeownership with "up-zoning" laws that increase the opportunity for publicly owned multifamily building in the neighborhoods</p>	<p>The combination of Strategies BE12.1.g, which proposes a Moderately Priced Dwelling Unit program, and strategy BE11.2.a, which will study how to provide new forms of housing, are intended to provide increased density in areas that do not have high densities and are also within Communities of Opportunities. Implementation of these strategies are expected to result in further refinement during the region planning process and changes to the Zoning Article of the County Code. The strategies for Goal BE9 seek transit-oriented development, revisions to the County Code and could potentially address providing apartments and high density housing near transit stations.</p>
<p>Lack of affordable housing is a key issue. Plan2040 acknowledges this, but many of our requests that would support more housing were rejected. Need for housing and affordable housing. Have to balance that need with environmental impact and need for infrastructure. There seems to be resistance to affordable housing in communities with affluent people. There is a housing crisis in AA County. Inconsistency between the goal to provide affordable housing and the amount of low density residentially zoned land. Plan2040 refers to equity and economic sustainability, but they need to be implemented. People need to be able to live and work in close proximity. In order to overcome biases, for the goals and policies to be satisfied, things need to change. Good planning principles - a mix of uses should be provided to create opportunities and broader mix of residences.</p>	<p>Plan2040 recognizes the need for more housing options that are affordable across income levels. Built Environment Goal 11 and its supporting policies and strategies focus on maintaining the existing housing stock and exploring options to increase the variety of housing types. Built Environment Goal 12 and its supporting policies and strategies identify multiple actions to support affordable housing.</p>
<p>Development Policy Areas</p>	
<p>DPA should not include Broadneck and portions of Annapolis as Peninsula areas - doesn't meet code definition for peninsulas; the County should incentivize needed traffic improvements by adding flexibility to traffic mitigation policies and other innovative approaches to addressing traffic issues. DPA maps should remove portions of Broadneck and Annapolis from peninsula area, incentivize needed traffic improvements by adding flexibility to traffic mitigation policies and other innovative approaches to addressing traffic issues. Broadneck Peninsula - should not be considered in same category as other codified peninsulas</p>	<p>The Development Policy Area designations have a different intent than Article 17-5-403 of the County Code. 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. In addition, they provide a mechanism for making cost-effective investments in public facilities and services. The Code reference only discusses the adequate road facilities impact area for proposed developments.</p>
<p>Support for the Peninsula Development Policy Areas designation</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>The Development Policy Areas Map should be confirmed to align with the Planned Land Use Map. For example, there are properties designated as Mixed Use in the Planned Land Use map but are shown as "Neighborhood Preservation" on the Development Policy Areas map</p>	<p>The Neighborhood Preservation Development Policy Area includes existing residential communities and local commercial uses that are not intended for substantial growth, but may be targeted for revitalization. Development is limited to infill and redevelopment that must be compatible with the existing neighborhood character. There are currently several mixed-use zoned areas within the County that are built or being currently built as mostly residential. In other areas, the intent is for small scale mixed-use to serve the local community. These residential and small-scale mixed-use areas align with the Neighborhood Preservation Development Policy Area definition.</p>
<p>Establish a separate planning process for critical corridor policy areas, especially MD 3, to provide the needed focus on critical corridor issues as well as to integrate across the entire critical corridor policy area; should provide a more formal process that constrains development to meet economic needs identified with community input and analyses of the changing retail landscape; should include better mechanisms, regulations, and incentives to identify redevelopment opportunities and then to support reuse and redevelopment in place of consuming additional undeveloped land</p>	<p>Implementation of the Critical Corridor Development Policy Areas will be guided by a concept plan to be developed in Region Plans. Developing a concept plan during the Region Plan process affords the community the opportunity to analyze transportation issues in tandem with land use recommendations.</p>
<p>Keep all of Jessup a Neighborhood Preservation area with an opportunity to allow limited Small Business uses along MD175. We do not want industrial or commercial to spread along MD-175</p>	<p>The Jessup Village Area is Neighborhood Preservation with a Village Center overlay. The Neighborhood Preservation area stretches from MD 175 north to nearly MD 100 and the northern part of Race Road. The southern extent of the Neighborhood Preservation area abuts National Business Park which is designated as Critical Economic.</p>
<p>Built Environment</p>	

Comments on Planning Advisory Board Draft and Office of Planning and Zoning responses

<p>Plan2040 does not provide sufficient vision for policies and strategies to accomplish the critical goals it identifies for the County's built environment, transportation, and economy. For the growth strategy to be successful, the plan will need to show the same kind of conviction and make bold recommendations in Target Areas like those displayed in the sections dedicated to Planning for the Natural Environment; A growth strategy that depends so heavily on redevelopment will require strong zoning incentives and procedural advantages that provide a catalyst for transformational redevelopment. The plan uses a 2040 household growth projection that is about 20% lower than the Baltimore Metropolitan Council Round 9A Cooperative Forecast for the County. Given the already constrained supply of residential and non-residential land, a gap of this magnitude on the demand side could be problematic. The policies in support of BE6.1 and BE6.2 should be restated to provide policies that will enable the Target areas to accommodate the growth the Plan restricts in other parts of the County. Policy BE6.1 should be restated to call for strategies that "Retain and incrementally expand appropriately zoned land in the CE Areas to meet the County's projected economic needs." Policy BE6.2 should be expanded into four separate policies that call for: (a) clearer and more streamlined process within the CE Areas, (b) greater flexibility in the development requirements for setbacks, bulk, stormwater, forestation, and parking in the CEs Areas, (c) added density based incentives, such as density or height bonuses, for the provision of public benefits in the CE Areas that a built environment that enhances community quality and sustainability, and (d) economic incentives to businesses and services to create and support employment centers and regional destinations. Likewise, Policy 7.1 should be expanded to clearly call for: (a) clearer and more streamlined process within the Town Centers, (b) greater flexibility in the regulatory standards for the Town Centers for bulk restrictions, stormwater requirements, forestation requirements, and parking, and (c) added mixed use incentives, such as density or height bonuses, for the provision of design and public benefits that provide people-centered amenities and a built environment that will enhance community quality and sustainability; lack of integration of transportation policies with land use goals and policies. Clear and specific policies and strategies for land use patterns of sufficient density to support these networks are needed to realistically plan for success. For example, flexibility to ease specific current restrictions and increased permitted densities or added incentive-based density programs in the Target Areas would support more viable land use – transportation networks in those areas, transportation goals of Plan2040 specifically state the need to provide density and height bonuses where new multimodal transportation infrastructure is desired.</p>	<p>The population forecast referenced in Plan2040 is based on the Baltimore Metropolitan Regional Council Round 9A Forecast. Most of the suggestions in this comment are already addressed in Plan2040. The Critical Economic and Town Center development policy areas are the Targeted Development, Redevelopment, and Revitalization Policy Areas as shown on page 39 of Volume I. Specific strategies that apply to all Targeted Development, Redevelopment and Revitalization Areas include: BE1.1.a.7 - Providing streamlined review of development applications within the County's Targeted Development, Redevelopment and Revitalization Policy Areas; BE1.1.a.18 - 18. Exploring and developing additional innovative tools such as overlay zones, form-based codes, and transit supportive design guidelines to implement the Development Policy Areas; and provide flexibility and incentives such as density bonuses in the County's Targeted Development, Redevelopment and Revitalization Development Policy Areas; BE5.1.b - b. Expand incentives to encourage business and employment growth in Targeted Development, Redevelopment and Revitalization Policy Areas, such as density bonuses, impact and connection fee reductions, increased design flexibility and other regulatory incentives; BE5.2.d - d. Utilize financial and regulatory incentives and development agreements to encourage growth in Targeted Development, Redevelopment, and Revitalization Policy Areas; BE6.2 - Provide clear regulatory standards and a flexible process that supports high-quality design and appropriately scaled development incentives to promote development of major economic drivers, regional destinations, employment centers, and support businesses and services within a built environment that enhances community quality and sustainability; BE7.1 - Provide clear regulatory standards with flexibility to support high quality design and incentives scaled to promote mixed-use development and redevelopment; and provide people-centered amenities and a built environment that will enhance community quality and sustainability. Restating these strategies under the policies that are specific to the Critical Economic and Town Center policy areas would be redundant. Regarding integration of land use and transportation policies, the policies and strategies under Targeted Development, Redevelopment, and Revitalization Areas (BE5), Critical Economic Areas (BE6), Town Centers (BE7), and transit areas (BE9) all support transit friendly development. Regarding the comment on Policy BE6.1 regarding expansion of appropriately zoned land in the Critical Economic Areas, this issue can be re-evaluated during Comprehensive Zoning and Region Plans.</p>
<p>Plan2040 significantly reduces development capacity outside select areas referred to as "Targeted Development, Redevelopment and Revitalization Policy Areas." Specific policies are named to restrict growth outside these areas, yet the Plan does not provide similarly specific strategies for enabling and incentivizing development within these Policy Areas - should provide clearer support for bonus density and height provisions, added flexibility to the forestation, stormwater, steep slopes, bulk regulations, setbacks, critical area restrictions, and other development regulations, streamlined development application process (similar to new GB sustainability overlay), provide clear support for additional exemptions to school capacity requirements, and flexible zoning and development regulations in Priority Funding Areas, Target Development and Redevelopment Areas; enact innovative zoning tools like the Glen Burnie Sustainability Community Overlay Area to incentivize redevelopment within the Targeted Development, Redevelopment and Revitalization Policy Areas; Importantly, there is no support for the claims (1) that modifications have allowed development inconsistent with the GDP or (2) that PUDs and cluster developments have too often been used to force higher density where infrastructure and environmental resources cannot sustain it. The opposite is true. Modifications and PUD/Cluster development planning tools provide beneficial ways of avoiding/minimizing environmental impacts, retaining more open space and forested areas, and through development savings allowing for enhanced recreational amenities. Density is restricted by zoning regulations and a PUD or cluster development cannot exceed the permitted zoning density; Transportation goals of Plan2040 should be directly tied to built environment goals and should specifically state the need to provide density and height bonuses where new multimodal transportation infrastructure is desired Overly restricts development in county. Need to provide stonger support for incentives like density bonuses in Targeted Areas, and processes like those adopted for Glen Burnie Overlay. Targeted Areas - use overlays like the one created for Glen Burnie in more areas of the County Residential Building Permits have declined in the County. School capacity - Montgomery County process provides a more effective method.</p>	<p>These comments are based on the Preliminary Draft version, not the PAB Draft version of the document. However, many of the concerns were reviewed from the comment letter that was sent in on the Preliminary draft, including: BE1.1a.18 Exploring and developing additional innovative tools such as overlay zones, form-based codes, and transit supportive design guidelines to implement the Development Policy Areas; and provide flexibility and incentives such as density bonuses in the County's Targeted Development, Redevelopment and Revitalization Development Policy Areas. BE5.1.b. "Expand incentives to encourage business and employment growth in Targeted Development, Redevelopment and Revitalization Policy Areas, <u>such as density bonuses, impact and connection fee reductions, increased design flexibility, and other regulatory incentives.</u>" BE5.2.b <u>Update the Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance to improve its effectiveness in ensuring public services and infrastructure are provided to support development and redevelopment. In particular, develop a new Growth and Infrastructure Policy based on Montgomery County's Growth and Infrastructure Policy which uses data-driven analysis to identify impacts to the school system based on housing growth and redevelopment trends, housing type, home ownership turnover, and student generation rates and cycles. In addition, consider a comprehensive transportation review to ensure multimodal capacity for development</u> BE5.2.d. "Utilize financial <u>and regulatory</u> incentives and development agreements to encourage growth in Targeted Development, Redevelopment, and Revitalization Policy Areas."</p>

Comments on Planning Advisory Board Draft and Office of Planning and Zoning responses

<p>Better management and supervision of staff are necessary to give citizens confidence in the (stormwater permit) process. Professional staff should be evaluated</p>	<p>A Stormwater Working Group has been formed that includes representatives from the Department of Inspections and Permits, Watershed Steward Academies, Homeowners Associations, property management companies and DPW to come up with an action plan that addresses all phases of stormwater management. Part of the action plan states that there will be more consistency among inspectors, better and more open communication between staff and applicants, improved inspection checklists that are available to the public and updates to the stormwater management manual.</p>
<p>Retain BRAC Mixed-Use Development in Article 18 of the County code. BRAC Mixed-Use Development is valuable portion of the code that was intended to provide flexibility for properties within close proximity to and supporting Fort Meade, including additional and much needed residential uses; Plan2040 makes several references to amending / revising Article 17 and Article 18 of the County Code. Language should be added to Plan2040 clarifying that existing projects or projects that have previously filed development applications can proceed under the existing code or be grandfathered.</p>	<p>Staff have identified the BRAC Mixed Use section of the County Code be revised due to Plan2040 Land Use Plan update to include these geographic areas as Mixed-Use. State laws regarding vesting apply. Nothing in Plan2040 suggests changing that, so no additional language on that issue seems necessary.</p>
<p>Designate most Parks on the Mayo Peninsula as "Conservation" - Mayo Beach Park and Carr's Wharf Pier county properties should be changed from Open Space to Conservation, and Glebe Heights (across from Pure Water Way) and the Water Reclamation Facility county-owned properties be reclassified from Public Space to Conservation; Support for the Housing Density Ranges to promote multi-family housing; Additional model building code language is needed that would recognize preserving the usage density and architectural integrity/streetscape of mature neighborhoods while achieving net zero density increase on the Mayo Peninsula; county zoning overlays that are less stringent than the State law must be removed from the County land use maps. 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 60, 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 (CA overlay will prevail; recommending Rural for these areas would be problematic as they are within the Annapolis SSA and have existing sewer service)</p>	<p>Land use designations for County Parks were established through consultation with the Department of Recreation and Parks and considered existing and planned uses. Changes to accommodate a change in land use for a portion of the County will be inconsistent with the remaining parks in the County. Details of reforms to County residential zoning districts will be addressed in the proposed update to Article 18 (Zoning Code) following adoption of Plan2040. Conflicts between zoning designations and Critical Areas designations will be reviewed during Region Plans and Comprehensive Rezoning.</p>
<p>Include a strategy statement saying the County will ensure more effective support for Homeowners Associations (HOAs) by identifying and properly staffing an office that is principally responsible for coordinating and disseminating policy, education, resources, and solutions for issues concerning HOAs.</p>	<p>Strategy NE4.1.d. Implements a new process for the transfer of responsibility for maintaining stormwater Best Management Practices (BMPs) from developers to Homeowner Associations that considers associated costs and expertise necessary for long term maintenance of BMPs. A stormwater work group is working to finalize the legal issues of HOAs and ultimately update the County Code with new code language.</p>
<p>Object to the inclusion of "Mobile Home Parks" as one of the "Permitted/Anticipated Uses" for the Plan2040 Land Use Designation of "Rural – density averaging or lower than 1 unit per 5 acres" as listed in Plan2040 Volume 2, Table 17, "Plan2040 Permitted Land Use Designations" Vol. 2 page 116. Volume 1 and Volume 2 are in direct contradiction in their specification for permitted/anticipated uses of properties in rural areas. For many years, it has been the public policy of Anne Arundel County to prohibit mobile homes and/or mobile home parks in the County's rural areas. This public policy again received support from the present council during the drafting and passage the revisions to bill 57-20; Control of stormwater runoff from Homeowners Associations (HOAs) - when first developed, the stormwater management facilities are part of the planning process, inspected, approved and ultimately turned over to the HOA to maintain and manage</p>	<p>Mobile Home Parks are currently permitted in all residential zones except R22 by a special exception approval that must meet certain conditions. There are several existing mobile home parks located in the Rural area. These existing uses are anticipated to continue for the planning horizon of Plan2040.</p>
<p>Commitment in policy BE1.3 to provide adequate facilities in a "timely manner" is too vague; needs language (policy and enforcement) to ensure that water and sewer are in place before increasing designated land use intensity, up-zoning, or approving residential or commercial construction in planned service areas (Tier II); Commercial and high-density residential development should not be permitted in areas not planned for water and sewer service.</p>	<p>The County Code requires demonstration of the adequacy of water and sewer prior to development plan approval. Currently, there are no provisions that require every property within Growth Tier II to connect to public sewer. State Law provides for utilization of private septic systems if the proposed development is a minor subdivision (no more than five lots) but requires that the recorded plat state that the use of the private system is interim. The Water and Sewer Master Plan (WSMP) states that an onsite sewage disposal system may not be used where public sewer is available. In addition, the WSMP requires properties to connect to public sewerage and water systems where adequate facilities exist within the defined Required Extension Distance (approximately 50 feet for one dwelling, 150 feet for two to three dwellings, 500 feet for four to ten dwellings). COMAR 26.04.02.04 states that if sewer is adequate and economically available, the approving authority may require connection. Anne Arundel County Sewage Disposal Code also requires new construction to connect to sewer if the main is within 50 feet of the property or 100 feet if in the Critical Area. There are requirements for a property to have adequate soils and area for an onsite sewage disposal system that meet State and County regulations. If a property fails percolation test and sewer is not available, then it could be considered "unbuildable". Best Available Technology systems for nitrogen reduction are only required in areas located within the Critical Area.</p>

Comments on Planning Advisory Board Draft and Office of Planning and Zoning responses

<p>Want to change Growth Tier designation. Ag uses of water has resulted in saltwater intrusion. Residential wells have had to be extended much deeper. Growth Tier III currently. Aging septic systems are a threat to the Bay. We would like potential public utilities in the next 20 years. Requesting Tier II designation.</p>	<p>The County will need to discuss options for utilization of public sewer for this area during the upcoming update to the Water and Sewer Master Plan and the Region Plan process.</p>
<p>Echo MBIA comments plus should provide for the opportunity for the additional 18,000 workers to live in "the best place for all" not just the opportunity to commute in and out of the County on a daily basis; concerns with Development Policy Area Definitions that require development and redevelopment to be "compatible with the existing neighborhood character." To us, this definition could be used as a sword to fight housing concepts such as Missing Middle or Accessory Dwelling Units in all neighborhoods in the County, and frankly, based on history, smells of classism at best, and racism at worst. For instance, the admirable Goal BE3 of including underrepresented communities in the planning process is immediately undercut by Policy BE3.2 which requires that any infill development be compatible in "scale, form and intensity with the surrounding character; also seems contrary to Policy BE11.2 (allowing a variety of residential forms, densities, and sizes in stable communities throughout the County) and Policy BE12.1 (increasing the supply of affordable housing units throughout the County). For other policies in the Plan that limit residential development see also, p. 78, Policy BE1.1, (a)10 (Removing residential uses as permitted or conditional uses in Commercial zoning districts), p. 82, Policy BE3.1(g) (Limiting infill and redevelopment in the Neighborhood Preservation Policy Areas), and p.83, Policy BE4.1(c) (Reducing residential densities on peninsulas).</p>	<p>This issue will be further addressed in update of the Zoning Code (Article 18) to provide more opportunity for a variety of housing types in residential zoning districts and in Region Plans and Comprehensive Rezoning.</p>
<p>GSFC is concerned about the "overlays" on zoned areas which could open the door to unwanted high-density growth in our area. The overlays indicate 'mixed use' commercial while the zoning is commercial along Route 2 on both sides. The land currently houses retail shopping. Overlays' are legally binding, and current legislation passed by the council would allow high density housing in tall buildings in these areas if certain requirements are met, the community is concerned about the overcrowding in our schools and over-capacity on our roadways should this change in use ever come to fruition.</p>	<p>The "overlays" in the Development Policy Areas map are for policy guidance and are not "legally binding" like overlay zoning districts. The Plan2040 Planned Land Use Map does not make any changes to shopping centers along Route 2 in Severna Park relative to the 2009 GDP Land Use Map.</p>
<p>Protect the quality of life of our new "low income" families by NOT allowing Industrial land uses from surrounding their homes on Brockbridge Rd; Require that developers provide public services to ensure low income families moving in will have support services such a community center, tech center (STEM), ballfields for play, parks for family gathering, public transportation, daycare service, etc.; Require OPZ to follow the code and not allow developers to get away on things that affect the quality of life such as traffic, schools seats, open space, recreation areas in walking distance, gathering facilities, etc.; Don't allow developers to increase their building density based on their profits arguments (greed); Don't give developers "incentives" without a through financial modeling done by the county to evaluate what the Return On Investment (ROI) to the citizens would be; Don't make citizens subsidize the developers business; Promote "Out of the Box" brainstorming for future Land Use planning sessions; Ask OPZ to consider, evaluate, and report on the study conducted by RKG which states that all developable land in North and West County will be consumed by 2035; Demand that OPZ provide a vision for how the county will prepare and deal with the housing issues that RKG predicted if not in 2035 surely by 2040; Ask OPZ to do a complete analysis and onsite review of the existing development along Jessup MD-175 and listen to creative ideas for building on what was constructed in the last 15 years; Move the proposed Jessup Village concept about 1 1/2 mile to the east where the density is able to support a Village Center as recommended in the RKG study; Require that OPZ collaborates with the community on the effectiveness and desirability of "Small Business zoning" before making changes to the Code and maps; Recommend that OPZ observes and respects that the citizens of Jessup are already adequately served by commercial and industrial development to the East and West and that additional businesses are not needed; Recommend that OPZ pause any further development in West County until the county can address the traffic on our major roads and also our side roads; Recommend that the Plan2040 preserve any "remaining" green space, farms, and open space just like what is being recommended for South County</p>	<p>Issues of land use and zoning around Jessup will be reviewed during the comprehensive rezoning process associated with Region Plans.</p>
<p>The Plan as is, does not insure adequate infrastructure is in place</p>	<p>Policy BE1.3 and supporting strategies provide for adequate infrastructure</p>
<p>Extremely concerned about increased traffic, infrastructure, and noise abatement.</p>	<p>Plan2040 includes goals, policies and strategies that address traffic, infrastructure, and noise issues.</p>

Comments on Planning Advisory Board Draft and Office of Planning and Zoning responses

<p>Difficult to forecast growth, market and social forces will control. But need to build in flexibility. Don't lock into a rigid framework. Consequence of rigid planning can be social inequality. Route 3 Corridor is an economic hub for the County is ripe for expanded and upgraded infrastructure and sustainable, diverse growth. Plan2040 calls for Mixed Use land use in this corridor, but our requests for mixed use were deferred to Region Plans. That decision is not consistent with the rest of the plan. The time is now to set the foundation for mixed use along the corridor. Staff relied on existing zoning, rather than looking forward</p>	<p>The Plan2040 planning process has highlighted community concerns about development and traffic in the Route 3 corridor and the need for more detailed planning for this area that includes extensive stakeholder engagement. Plan2040 also recommends revisions to the Mixed-Use zoning district to make it a more effective tool for promoting vibrant, walkable, spaces to live, work, shop, and recreate. It should also be recognized that under existing C1, C2 and C3 zoning districts, residential uses can be approved as conditional uses. This allows development projects aiming to meet an immediate market opportunity to propose a mixed office/retail and residential development project under current land use and zoning designations. For these reasons, County planning staff recommend deferring the referenced applications for change to Mixed-Use land use to the Region Plan process.</p>
<p>Healthy Economy</p>	
<p>Plan2040 says little about the maritime industry in Anne Arundel County. The maritime industry is an integral part of the economy in Anne Arundel County, creates over 2000 jobs in almost 200 businesses generated over \$300 million to our economy, there are over 29,000 registered vessels and over 2,000 wet slips in Anne Arundel County. Maritime industry - lack discussion of industry (# of vessels, etc compared to air industry)</p>	<p>Plan2040 includes the following goals, policies and strategies related to the maritime industry. Policy BE4.2: Ensure that the maritime industry remains a viable driver of economic growth and stability in the County's Peninsula Policy Areas. a. Retain the Maritime land use and designation and the appropriate Maritime zoning district of the existing marinas. b. Analyze small-scale non-conforming marinas in residential areas to determine whether a new zoning district and requirements should be established that are more compatible with the surrounding community. c. Review Maritime use requirements to ensure environmental protection, adaptability to sea level rise, and adequacy of transportation infrastructure. d. Ensure that the maritime industry is represented during the Region Planning process. Policy HE2.6: Promote and sustain commercial fishing and maritime trades. a. Continue to support the Maritime Industry Advisory Board convened by Anne Arundel Economic Development Corporation. b. Implement recommendations of the 2020 Maritime Economic Impact Study. c. Continue to work with maritime businesses to increase awareness and utilization of existing business development resources provided by AAEDC. d. Support the Anne Arundel County Maritime Advisory Board in developing a committee to supply permitting process guidance and resources to existing and potential maritime industry entities. e. Develop a Maritime Workforce Training and Education facility on Anne Arundel Community College's (AACC) Arnold campus, with eventual inclusion in AACC's Clauson Center for Innovation and Skilled Trades, to support the county's maritime industry workforce needs through credit and noncredit skilled trades pathways. Statistics on number of marinas (303) and boat slips (12,035) are stated in Volume II (page 196). Maritime economy is briefly discussed on pages 216 and 217 of Volume II. Additional information on maritime trades, including statistics on number of jobs, wages, and tax revenue generated by maritime industry will be added in Volume I (page 61) and Volume II (page 216).</p>
<p>Other</p>	
<p>...We are creating more and more dysfunction in the community and it needs to stop! Now! No more meetings and discussion. All the developer's plans and the plans Zoning are willing to accept, end in humanity being out of Balance with the rest of Creation....would rather go backward, not forward</p>	<p>Comment acknowledged.</p>
<p>Plan is well-thought out, analyzed and has sound recommendations, particularly for transportation; requesting a subject index - could not find easily find info on maritime industry</p>	<p>A subject index could be developed, but it would have to be manually created and would be difficult to update and maintain through edits and iterative versions of the plan.</p>
<p>Plan 2040 is 400 pages long. Translating that into a General Development Plan piece of legislation will be an enormous challenge.</p>	<p>Legislation adopting the plan is relatively straightforward and will be consistent with previous GDPs. The adopting legislation for Plan2040 will be supported by Volumes I and II. While the total Plan is over 400 pages, Volume I, is only 138 pages. Half of Volume I is the Implementation Plan which does set up an ambitious future legislative agenda for the County Council including updating the Subdivision and Development Code (Article 17) and the Zoning Code (Article 18).</p>
<p>Keep the 2020 GDP plan open for updates as OPZ works through the PAB's suggestions and those coming in by the public since there is no way that OPZ can research and incorporate the large number of request the PAB will receive. There will also not be enough time before the County Council meets in February; Ask OPZ to develop a vision on how people will live in 2035 and beyond. What services will they require and how the county will deliver; Strongly recommend that OPZ complete the Plan2040 by incorporating all the suggestions from PAB and the community within 12 months; Suggest that all OPZ staff read the book: BETTER NOT BIGGER by Eben Fodor</p>	<p>Plan2040 includes a vision for the next 20 years and there is an existing growth management program, described in Plan2040, that addresses adequate provision of public services. Plan2040 also includes policies and strategies to reform and improve the effectiveness of adequate public facilities regulations.</p>

Comments on Planning Advisory Board Draft and Office of Planning and Zoning responses

<p>Note that first comments were before PAB Draft was released. Rewrite the Vision statement so it can be seen where we are in 20 years or at least add "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."; "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; 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; clarity of the plan for our citizens could be vastly improved with a fairly simple crosswalk table.</p>	<p>Staff-addressed these concerns in the Overview section that was added to the PAB Review Draft version of Plan2040</p>
<p>Public Water Access must be a lead goal in the GDP, not referenced as a challenge or hidden away in supporting documentation; The GDP must eliminate the proposed "Peninsula Privilege;" The GDP must create robust funding for Public Water Access funding and eliminate the diversion of public funds for improvement of private community water access facilities.</p>	<p>Increasing public water access is a priority for Anne Arundel County. In Plan2040, Healthy Communities Goal 8 and 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). Plan2040 does not include a specific public water access goal or policy in deference to the Land Preservation Parks and Recreation Plan, which is the County policy document that sets priorities for different recreational amenities. It would not be equitable or fair to include a specific Plan2040 goal or policy for public water access and not additional goals/policies to address the many other recreation opportunities in the County such as ball fields, swimming pools, basketball courts, ice rinks, etc.</p>

Comments on Planning Advisory Board Draft and Office of Planning and Zoning responses

Land Use Change Number	General Property Location	Written Testimony	Oral Testimony	Agree w/ Staff Rec.	Testimony Submitted/Delivered by Owner or Owner's Representative	Testimony Delivered by Resident or Other Stakeholder	Summary of Issue / OPZ Recommendation
NORTH COUNTY							
SR-01	6054 Belle Grove Rd Linthicum Heights	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			Charles Carey, Jr.		Charles Carey, Jr., a property owner in the area considered under SR-01, requested in written testimony that his C-4 zoned property not be classified as Mixed-Use. Staff continues to recommend a Mixed-Use classification for this and the surrounding properties. The subject property accounts for 0.425 acres of the approximately 26 acres of land considered in the SR-01 decision. This area is immediately adjacent to the North Linthicum Light Rail Station and represents an opportunity under Policy BE9.1 and Policy BE15.2d to facilitate a walkable, mixed-use environment supported by transit-oriented development. Further, the decision to retain the Mixed-Use classification is consistent with the Neighborhood Preservation and Transit-Oriented Development Policy Areas.
LUCA-65	6025 Ritchie Hwy Baltimore	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Steven Hyatt, Esq.		Staff agreed with the applicant and recommended for the change in planned land use because the property met the criteria used in determining changes from the 2009 Land Use Map enumerated on page 115 of the Plan2040 Volume II.
LUCA-182	7048 Aviation Blvd Glen Burnie	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Steven Hyatt, Esq.		Staff agreed with the applicant and recommended for the change in planned land use because the property met the criteria used in determining changes from the 2009 Land Use Map enumerated on page 115 of the Plan2040 Volume II.
LUCA-39	1451 Furnace Ave Glen Burnie	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Timothy F. Madden, ASLA		The agent for the applicant, Mr. Timothy Madden, requested in written testimony that the property be designated high or medium density residential that is consistent with R-10 zoning. He stated that the property resides in a neighborhood with multifamily housing at a density of 14 dwelling units per acre; the greater neighborhood area is in dire need of workforce housing; and this site is a logical candidate to contribute to meeting such demands through redevelopment. Staff notes that high density residential land use is defined in draft Plan2040 as having a density of 10-22 dwelling units per acre and corresponds to R15, R22, TC and MXD zoning districts. Medium density residential land use is defined in draft Plan2040 as having a density of 5-10 dwelling units per acre and corresponds to R10, TC, and MXD zoning districts. Staff continues to recommend that neither the requested change to High Density Residential land use, nor the 2009 GDP designated Medium Density land use for this site are consistent with the Neighborhood Preservation Policy Area, the existing zoning or are compatible with the surrounding planned land use. Plan2040 recommends that areas with a density between 2.1 and 5.0 units per acre be designated as Low-Medium Density Residential.
SR-22	7966 Solley Rd Glen Burnie		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Mike Jacobs		The property owner, Mr. Jacobs, testified at the PAB public hearing on January 6, 2021 that he wanted the commercial land use designation maintained to support the third-generation industrial machine shop business on property zoned C-4. Staff notes that this area on the west side of Solley Road has been transitioning from industrial and commercial to residential uses. The entire SR-22 area is 16.51 acres and of that, Mr. Jacobs's property accounts for 3.55 acres. The recommended change from Commercial to Low-Medium Residential is consistent with the Neighborhood Preservation Policy Area, the majority of the existing use in the area, the developed residential density, and it is compatible with the surrounding planned land use.
CENTRAL COUNTY							
LUCA-4	1341 Sunrise Beach Road, Crownsville	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Nick Stanco		In written testimony, Mr. Stanco reiterated his request for Commercial land use for 1341 Sunrise Beach Road (at the intersection with Generals Highway), noting that many area residents have indicated they would like convenience retail for the community at the intersection. The existing vacant Wawa at the intersection, across from his property, may have covenants that would restrict such a use. The site's planned land use has been RA going back to the 1997 GDP land use plan. However, in 2011 during Comprehensive Rezoning, OPZ staff recommended a zoning change from RLD to C1 for the property, and the applicant has submitted a letter from OPZ noting the recommendation at that time. Staff notes that during the 2011 Comprehensive Zoning effort, the zoning for site was retained as RLD due to Council Amendment #12 to the Comprehensive Zoning Bill 12-11. Staff continues to recommend retaining the Rural land use designation and that the decision be considered during the Region Plan process when a more comprehensive land use plan is developed with input from the community stakeholders.

Comments on Planning Advisory Board Draft and Office of Planning and Zoning responses

Land Use Change Number	General Property Location	Written Testimony	Oral Testimony	Agree w/ Staff Rec.	Testimony Submitted/Delivered by Owner or Owner's Representative	Testimony Delivered by Resident or Other Stakeholder	Summary of Issue / OPZ Recommendation
LUCA-68	8561 and 8601 Veterans Hwy, Millersville	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Steven Hyatt, Esq.; Amy Leahy on Behalf of Greater Severna Park Council; Joyce Rosencranz	See summary statement for detailed information about input on this request.	<p>The agent for the applicant, Steven Hyatt, Esq., requested in written testimony that the property be changed from the recommended Mixed-Use to Commercial. He pointed to the location of the property within the County's Planned Service Area and within a State-designed Priority Funding Area. Mr. Hyatt further cited the justification provided by staff for Mixed-Use as evidence that a Commercial use is compatible.</p> <p>Amy Leahy, on behalf of Greater Severna Park Council (GSPC), wrote in opposition to LUCA-68, citing the existence of private agreements to manage and retain portions of the property zoned Open Space. Ms. Leahy also shared GSPC concerns about the length of time between General Plan updates the challenge of timely rezoning. She stated additional concerns about piecemeal rezoning and overlay zoning that may result in high-density development.</p> <p>Joyce Rosencranz wrote in opposition to LUCA-68 and in support of maintaining the property's Open Space zoning. She cited environmental damage to the Severna River and local watershed that has already occurred, and which may worsen with future development. Ms. Rosencranz also expressed concern that the County broke with its prior policy position to implement Water and Sewer in this area.</p> <p>This proposed change in land use has garnered a significant amount of public input starting with the online open house in August 2020 when two (2) people supported the request, 21 were opposed, and one (1) was neutral. During the open comment period on the preliminary draft Plan2040 approximately 40 people submitted comments against.</p> <p>Staff continues to maintain that the requested change to Commercial land use is consistent with the existing zoning; however, Mixed-Use should be retained until a more comprehensive land use plan is developed for this area with input from community stakeholders.</p>
LUCA-47	Parcel 280 on the south side of Elvaton Rd. & 8215 Hook Rd., Millersville	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			David Plott, Esq.		<p>David Plott, Esq., an agent for Attman Holdings LLC, requested in written testimony to change the property from Low Density Residential to Low-Medium Density Residential. Mr. Plott referenced the property's proximity to the 52-lot Wades Grant subdivision and the Pondview community, as well as its location within a Planned Water Service Area, classification as a Future Sewer Service Area, and adjournment with the Cox Creek Planned Sewer Service Area. Mr. Plott also cited Goal BE11 of Plan2040 to "provide a variety of housing types and designs to allow all residents housing choices at different states of life and at all income levels."</p> <p>Staff continues to find that the requested change to Low-Medium Density Residential land use is not consistent with the Neighborhood Preservation Policy Area, nor compatible with the surrounding planned land use. In addition, staff finds that a Low-Medium Density Residential use would not be consistent with the subject property's existing use or with current R1 zoning. Staff recommends expanding the justification provided to include these additional notes on the property's existing use and zoning in draft Plan2040.</p>
PABR-01 NEW REQUEST	Parcels 420, 504, and 850 on the south side of Ember Dr, Pasadena	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			Phil Dales, Esq.		<p>The attorney for the applicant, Phil Dales, Esq. submitted written testimony initiating a request for the first time that the Low Density Residential land use designation be changed on three parcels (parcel 420 with no street address, parcel 504 at 217 Ember Drive, and parcel 850 at 211 Ember Drive in Pasadena) to a planned land use of Industrial. The attorney argued the three parcels are no longer suitable for residential due to adjacent Industrial and Heavy Commercial uses, traffic and proximity to MD 100 noise.</p> <p>Staff notes that parcel 850 has an existing house and the other two parcels are undeveloped. The 2009 GDP placed the parcels in a land use of low density residential and the current zoning is R1. The three properties are bisected by an ephemeral stream. The requested change to Industrial land use is not consistent with the existing use and zoning. It is recommended that any expansion of Industrial use within the Neighborhood Preservation Policy Area be discussed during the Region Planning process with input from the community stakeholders. This is consistent with our recommendation for other land use change requests for other properties near this transitioning area.</p>
LUCA-162	Holland Point Rd and south of Banbury Rd Gibson Island	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			Ben Wechsler, Esq.		<p>On behalf of Gibson Island Corporation (GIC), Benjamin S. Wechsler, Esq., requested in written testimony that the portion of the property identified in LUCA-162 be changed from Low Density Residential to Maritime. Mr. Wechsler cited the property's unique location near the existing marina, away from shoreline, and away from conflicting residential uses. He asserted that even if the subject parcel were completely paved, the area within the Resource Conservation Area Critical Area would be "far below the 15%" total lot coverage allowed.</p> <p>Staff continues to recommend the retention of Low Density Residential for the subject property. The requested change to Maritime is not compatible with the surrounding planned land use, the Plan2040 Peninsula Policy Area, or Resource Sensitive Policy Area, due to the Critical Area Resource Conservation Area designation. Additionally, staff finds that a Maritime use would not be consistent with the subject property's existing use or with current R1 zoning. Staff recommends expanding the justification provided to include these additional notes on the property's existing use and zoning in draft Plan2040.</p>

Comments on Planning Advisory Board Draft and Office of Planning and Zoning responses

Land Use Change Number	General Property Location	Written Testimony	Oral Testimony	Agree w/ Staff Rec.	Testimony Submitted/Delivered by Owner or Owner's Representative	Testimony Delivered by Resident or Other Stakeholder	Summary of Issue / OPZ Recommendation
LUCA-163	Holland Point Rd and south of Banbury Rd Gibson Island	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			Ben Wechsler, Esq.		<p>On behalf of the Gibson Island Corporation (GIC), Benjamin S. Wechsler, Esq., wrote in support of changing the a portion of the property in LUCA-163 from a planned land use of Low Density Residential to industrial. Mr. Wechsler found that all of Gibson Island is classified as either "Low Density Residential" or "Marina," and he asserted that the community's needs extend beyond these two categories. In addition, Mr. Wechsler submitted that the property is ideal for Industrial classification due to its immediate adjacency to a property that is currently zoned MA1.</p> <p>Staff continues to recommend 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. In addition, staff finds that an Industrial use would not be consistent with the subject property's existing use or with current R1 zoning. Staff recommends expanding the justification provided to include these additional notes on existing use and zoning in draft Plan2040.</p>
SR-36	5189 and 5191 Mtn Rd Gibson Island	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			Ben Wechsler, Esq.		<p>On behalf of the Gibson Island Corporation (GIC), Benjamin S. Wechsler, Esq., requested that two parcels of land owned by GIC be omitted from SR-36, which includes a change from low density residential to rural land use for the Windmill Point area.</p> <p>To support the request, Mr. Wechsler stated that the Windmill Point area is made up of lots between a half acre and 2.5 acres and of the approximately 37 acres closest to the Gibson Island Causeway there are 33 lots, which is a density of approximately one home site per acre. That density is in keeping with the R1 zoning district and 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) densities. 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 avoids deleterious viewshed impacts from Mountain Road, the Magothy River, and from Gibson Island.</p> <p>Staff continues to recommend a planned land use designation for the subject parcels as rural. This 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.</p>
MD 2 CORRIDOR							
PDR-01	195 Ritchie Hwy Severna Park	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			Phil Dales, Esq. Pastor Paul J. Arcand II	See summary statement for detailed information about input on this request.	<p>The attorney for Lighthouse Baptist Church, Phil Dales, Esq. argued that residential use is incompatible for the property due to its location on Ritchie Highway and the existing impervious coverage of the property. He stated that the property was developed as the Coachman Inn in the 1960s, and that the current building was constructed in 1984 and was previously a commercial (office) use before the church purchased the property in 2016. The corridor has been transitioning to a more commercial character, and the church is unable to obtain financing for capital improvements due to the residential land use and zoning.</p> <p>In testimony from Lighthouse Baptist Church minister Paul Arcand, the minister noted that the change from low density residential to commercial would allow more effective management and maintenance of the property, and that it is in line with current use.</p> <p>Fifteen (15) people wrote in support of this proposed change in land use during the PAB's open public comment period. The request to change the land use on this property was initiated during the open comment period for the preliminary draft Plan2040 in fall 2020.</p> <p>Staff continues to recommend retaining Low Density Residential for the site. The surrounding area is planned for Low Density Residential, and commercial is incompatible with that. Changing the planned land use to commercial would open the site to a full range of potentially incompatible commercial uses if the property were to change ownership in the next 20 years. Such an expansion of commercial in the area should 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 Planning Advisory Board Draft and Office of Planning and Zoning responses

Land Use Change Number	General Property Location	Written Testimony	Oral Testimony	Agree w/ Staff Rec.	Testimony Submitted/Delivered by Owner or Owner's Representative	Testimony Delivered by Resident or Other Stakeholder	Summary of Issue / OPZ Recommendation
LUCA-53	845 Ritchie Hwy Severna Park	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Ana L. Henry, Esq. Richard May (oral testimony)	See summary statement for detailed information about input on this request.	<p>Ana L. Henry, Esq., wrote on behalf of the property owner in opposition to staff's decision to retain Low Density Residential use. She expressed support for Commercial use, asserting that the property's location on a congested arterial road and in proximity to other Commercial uses makes Low Density Residential incompatible. Ms. Henry pointed to the potential impact of residential development on traffic and school capacity, and stated that commercial development will have a less damaging impact on the environmental features. Further, Ms. Henry asserted that all public comments received were in support of the requested change to Commercial.</p> <p>This proposed change in land use has garnered a significant amount of public input starting with the online open house in August 2020 when nine (9) people supported the request and 20 opposed it. During the open comment period on the preliminary draft Plan2040 approximately 30 people submitted comments in favor of the change to commercial land use.</p> <p>The current zoning for the property is R2/OS, and the site has significant environmental features. Staff continues to find that the requested change to Commercial land use is not consistent with the Neighborhood Preservation Policy Area. Further, the 2009 GDP-designated Low-Medium Density Residential land use for this site is not consistent with the existing zoning. Plan2040 recommends that areas with a density between 0.2 and 2 units per acre be designated as Low Density Residential. The recommended change to Low Density Residential is consistent with the existing zoning and surrounding planned land use.</p> <p>Staff further recommends removing the following statement from the Justification in the planned land use map for the property: "During the development of this site, any sensitive areas will be evaluated and protected with a conservation easement." While it is true that sensitive areas will be evaluated, the protection mechanism may vary. A similar recommendation is made for LUCA-45 and LUCA-84 that contain the same statement at the end of their justification statements in draft Plan2040.</p>
PABR-02 NEW REQUEST	1212 Ritchie Hwy	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Steven Hyatt		<p>Steven Hyatt, Esq. wrote on behalf of the property owner initiating for the first time, a commercial land use for a property currently used as an animal hospital, noting the request is compatible with development trends on Ritchie Highway and has served local needs as a commercial use (animal hospital) for years. He stated the request should be considered a consistency change to reflect development types and densities that are existing and planned to remain over the long term.</p> <p>The 2009 Land Use Plan places the site in Low Density Residential land use, and current zoning is R1. Surrounding planned land use on the west side of MD 2 is Low Density Residential. Staff continues to recommend retaining Low Density Residential land use for the subject property and the area, and any expansion of commercial land use in the Neighborhood Preservation Policy Area should be discussed during the Region Planning process with input from community stakeholders.</p>
OOHR-12	1185 Bait-Annap Blvd Arnold	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		David Katz, Esq.		<p>David Katz, attorney for the owner, argues that the Council's adoption of the Broadneck Small Area Plan included a recommendation to rezone the R1 portion of the existing industrial node in the area to W2; therefore, an Industrial planned land use would be consistent with the SAP. The Severn School seeks improvements in the Industrial area, and Mr. Katz notes that redevelopment to low density residential is not possible due to site constraints, proximity to industrial uses and heavy traffic on roadway. He suggests that the justification for changing the planned land use to Industrial should be similar to that given for LUCA 42.</p> <p>Staff notes that Planned Land Use in the 1997 GDP, the 2001 Broadneck SAP, and in the 2009 GDP all show the site in Low Density Residential land use. The SAP recommendation for Industrial planned land use referred to the abutting property, where staff at the time had recommended changing the adjacent property from R1 to W2. Further expanding Industrial land use here at this time is incompatible within the larger context of the neighborhood. Although the adjacent properties to the south and east are Industrial, the northern and western boundaries of the parcel abut several existing single-family homes which face the property. In general, the Broadneck SAP advised against changing residential properties to higher intensity uses, particularly on Baltimore Annapolis Boulevard which is designated as a Scenic and Historic Road. A change from Low Density Residential to an Industrial land use and zoning has the potential to increase traffic and allow for incompatible uses within the neighborhood context. Note that LUCA 42 (nearby) has requested Industrial land use for multiple nonconforming uses, but staff recommended Commercial to fit the majority of the site's nonconforming uses. The subject site for LUCA 42 is also distinguished from OOHR-12 in that it is accessed by MD 2, not Baltimore-Annapolis Boulevard.</p> <p>Staff continues to recommend maintaining Low Density Residential for the Severn School site.</p>
BROADNECK							
LUCA-171	273 and 277 Peninsula Farm Rd, Arnold	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Steven Hyatt, Esq.		Staff agreed with the applicant and recommended for the change in planned land use because the property met the criteria used in determining changes from the 2009 Land Use Map enumerated on page 115 of the Plan2040 Volume II.

Comments on Planning Advisory Board Draft and Office of Planning and Zoning responses

Land Use Change Number	General Property Location	Written Testimony	Oral Testimony	Agree w/ Staff Rec.	Testimony Submitted/Delivered by Owner or Owner's Representative	Testimony Delivered by Resident or Other Stakeholder	Summary of Issue / OPZ Recommendation
LUCA-67	491 College Pkwy Arnold	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Alan Hyatt, Esq.		<p>Alan Hyatt, Esq., wrote on behalf of the property owner in support of changing the planned land use from Low Density Residential to either Commercial or Medium Density Residential. Mr. Hyatt stated that the site is an existing commercial business, and he stated that higher density residential uses in the surrounding area suggest compatibility with a more intensive land use.</p> <p>However, the subject property is immediately adjacent to Arnold Park Open Space, and bordered by Low Density Residential. Staff continues to recommend that the requested change to Commercial or Medium Density Residential land use is not consistent with the Neighborhood Preservation Development Policy Area, nor compatible with the surrounding planned land uses. Low Density Residential has been expanded for the entire parcel as the recommended replacement for the Government / Institutional land use (Public Use), which is not appropriate for this site. Further, the decision to retain Low Density Residential is consistent with County effort under Policies BE3.1g and BE3.2 to limit infill and redevelopment to that which is compatible with existing built character and compatible in use and intensity with the surrounding neighborhood character.</p>
LUCA-22	424 Broadneck Rd Annapolis	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			Ana L. Henry, Esq.		<p>The attorney for the applicant, Ana Henry, Esq., testified on behalf of the owner, John Longergan, Jr., that the requested change from Low Density Residential to Industrial land use is consistent with the property's existing use as a school bus facility, which has been in operation since 1982. Ms. Henry stated that a Public Use property across the street suggests compatibility with an Industrial use for the subject property.</p> <p>Staff continue to find that the requested change to Industrial land use is not consistent with the Neighborhood Preservation Policy Area, nor compatible with the surrounding planned Low Density Residential and Rural and Agricultural land uses. The requested change is also inconsistent with the site's existing R1 zoning. Further, the property has frontage on a road that is unsuitable for expansion of Industrial uses in this area.</p> <p>Staff continue to recommend retention of the planned Low Density Residential use.</p>
LUCA-122	161 Ferguson Rd Annapolis	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			Ben Wechsler, Esq.		<p>Ben Wechsler, Esq., attorney for the applicant who has requested commercial land use, notes that the character of area changed with construction of the Bay Dale Road and US 50 interchange. Most other properties on the road are Commercially zoned, with car dealerships that store cars on both sides of the road, including in front of the existing residence. The commercial uses along the road have expanded since 2011. Mr. Wechsler also noted that an adjacent gun club is a noisy use that is incompatible with residential use, and that recent Critical Area remapping has removed nearly all of the subject property from the Critical Area.</p> <p>Staff continues to recommend retaining a Rural land use for the site, noting that Commercial is incompatible with the Rural and Agricultural Policy Area and the surrounding planned land use.</p>
WEST COUNTY							
LUCA-48	1460 Dorsey Rd, Hanover	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			Ana L. Henry, Esq.		<p>The attorney for the applicant, Ana L. Henry, Esq., wrote in support of LUCA-48, a request to change the planned land use from Industrial to High-Density Residential. Ms. Henry pointed to the ability of multifamily residences to serve the needs of a growing community, as well as the potential for a residential classification to protect the character of the residence and church to the east of the property. Ms. Henry claimed that industrial developers will not find this property attractive, owing perhaps to its smaller, six-acre size.</p> <p>Staff points out that this is one parcel in a large area of planned industrial land use north of MD 176 that serves the BWI Airport to the east. Staff continues to recommend the subject property be classified as Industrial. Changing the designation to High Density Residential would impact the County's limited inventory of Industrial land use within the Critical Economic Policy Area.</p>
LUCA-187	Parcel 265 on the north side of Jessup Road/MD 175	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			Alan Hyatt, Esq.		<p>Staff agreed with the applicant and recommended for the change in planned land use because the property met the criteria used in determining changes from the 2009 Land Use Map enumerated on page 115 of the Plan2040 Volume II.</p>

Comments on Planning Advisory Board Draft and Office of Planning and Zoning responses

Land Use Change Number	General Property Location	Written Testimony	Oral Testimony	Agree w/ Staff Rec.	Testimony Submitted/Delivered by Owner or Owner's Representative	Testimony Delivered by Resident or Other Stakeholder	Summary of Issue / OPZ Recommendation
LUCA-128	Parcels 156 and 157 on the south side of Jessup Road/MD 175	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Alan Hyatt, Esq.		<p>In his written testimony about LUCA-187, Alan Hyatt, Esq., also wrote on behalf of property owners to express opposition to the staff decision to forego an Industrial use for LUCA-128. Mr. Hyatt asserted that residential use of any sort is inappropriate for this property, as the area south of Jessup Rd. is "generally zoned W1." Mr. Hyatt found that the split use will lead to Low-Density Residential surrounded by Commercial, which is not sustainable planning.</p> <p>Staff continues to find that 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. Staff continues to recommend 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>
LUCA-177	Parcel 62 on the west side of Race Road, Jessup	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Alan Hyatt, Esq.		<p>In his written testimony about LUCA-177, Alan Hyatt, Esq., stated the property's proximity to Fort Meade necessitated a more intensive use from low density residential to commercial. The planned and funded realignment of Race Road will take a portion of the property making the property no longer suitable for low density residential. Creating a local commercial hub will support the surrounding neighborhood and will promote walkability.</p> <p>Staff continues to recommend that the current Low Density Residential land use be retained until a more comprehensive plan for the Jessup Village Center is done during the Region Plan process, with community input.</p>
SR-27	Multiple parcels south of Brock Bridge Road and west of Washington Street in Laurel	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Phil Dales, Esq.		<p>In his written testimony, Phil Dales, Esq., attorney for property owners Hatfield Properties LLC and Centralia Properties LLC, supported SR-27 that recommends a planned land use of Mixed-Use. Hatfield and Centralia own a number of properties within the larger approximately 33-acre SR-27 area that is positioned west of MD 32, south of Brock Bridge Road, and east of Dorsey Run Road, in close proximity to the Savage MARC Station. Per staff's recommendation, the designation of Mixed-Use recognizes the area as an opportunity for creating a dense, walkable, mixed-use environment through Transit Oriented Development.</p>
LUCA-16	8410 Brock Bridge Rd, Laurel	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Timothy F. Madden, ASLA		<p>The agent for the applicant, Mr. Timothy Madden, requested in written testimony that the property be designated high or medium density residential that is consistent with R-10 zoning. He stated that the subject property resides within a neighborhood that already includes immediately adjacent townhouse communities including Spring Creek and Fieldstone that developed between 2004 and 2018. The Fieldstone development located on 27 acres across Brock Bridge Road contains 258 townhouse units for a density of roughly 15 dwelling units per acre and the adjacent Spring Creek development currently under construction will include 116 units. Mr. Madden also indicated that the site is located less than a mile from the 63-acre Laurel Park Station located on the Howard County side of Laurel Park Racetrack and that construction has begun on that state priority redevelopment project. Laurel Park is being redeveloped as a Transit Oriented Development District (TOD) to include; 1,000 Multi-family residential units, 127,000 square feet of retail, and 650,000 square feet of office space.</p> <p>Staff continues to recommend that the requested change to High Density Residential land use is not consistent with the Neighborhood Preservation Policy Area and existing zoning nor is it compatible with the adjacent environmentally sensitive Oxbow Natural Area.</p>
LUCA-70	8402 Brock Bridge Rd, Laurel	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Alan Hyatt, Esq.		<p>The attorney for the applicant, Mr. Alan Hyatt, requested in written testimony that the property be designated medium density residential, stating that leaving the property in low density residential land use does not support the Plan2040 goal of providing an adequate supply of housing that is affordable for a range of income levels. He also notes that the adjacent residential uses are in medium density residential.</p> <p>Staff continues to recommend that the requested change is not consistent with the current zoning, the surrounding planned land use or the Neighborhood Preservation Policy Area.</p> <p>Staff does recommend a minor correction to the stated justification to note the requested land use was Medium Density Residential, not High Density Residential.</p>
MD 3 CORRIDOR							
LUCA-18	331 Gambrells Rd, Gambrells	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	David Kaufmann		<p>The property currently has a planned land use of Commercial and draft Plan2040 recommends the planned use remain Commercial. In his letter the applicant asks for the entire property to be zoned commercial. This process does not include comprehensive rezoning, which is intended to occur as part of the region planning process.</p>

Comments on Planning Advisory Board Draft and Office of Planning and Zoning responses

Land Use Change Number	General Property Location	Written Testimony	Oral Testimony	Agree w/ Staff Rec.	Testimony Submitted/Delivered by Owner or Owner's Representative	Testimony Delivered by Resident or Other Stakeholder	Summary of Issue / OPZ Recommendation
LUCA-25	292 Charles Hall Dr, Millersville	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Ronald Poole		<p>The property owner, Ronald Poole, wrote in support of changing the land use from Rural to Low Density Residential, and his zoning from Residential Low Density to R-1 in order to subdivide the property for his children. Mr. Poole stated that residential properties near to his have been developed at 1DU per acre, which is the density permitted for R-1. Mr. Poole also called attention to R-1 zoning that exists in the area with some proximity to his property. However, the Plan2040 process does not include comprehensive rezoning; at issue is the land use.</p> <p>The requested change to Low Density Residential is not consistent with the Rural and Agricultural Policy Area or the Rural Sewer Service category, and is not compatible with the surrounding planned land use of Rural and Conservation. Staff continue to recommend Rural land use.</p>
LUCA-172	1699 Millersville Rd and 679 MD 3 North, Millersville	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			Steven Hyatt, Esq.	Patricia Lilek and David Demers See summary statement for detailed information about input on this request.	<p>The attorney for the applicant, Steven Hyatt, Esq., indicated in written testimony that he agreed with the staff recommendation to change parcels 353 and 357 to a planned land use of commercial. It appears Mr. Hyatt has not noticed that the smaller parcel (parcel 357) was changed to Rural in the PAB draft of Plan2040. Staff changed its recommendation because neither the existing use nor the RLD zoning on parcel 357 meet the criteria on page 115 of Volume II of the draft Plan2040. The fact that a development application had been filed is irrelevant.</p> <p>In separate correspondence, Ms. Lilek and Mr. Demers of Millersville asked that the larger parcel (parcel 353) be changed to greenspace similar to the smaller parcel (parcel 357). There is not a planned land use category called greenspace.</p> <p>This proposed change in land use has garnered a significant amount of public input starting with the online open house in August 2020 when three (3) people supported the request, 65 opposed it, and two (2) were neutral. During the open comment period on the preliminary draft Plan2040 approximately 25 people submitted comments against the request.</p> <p>Staff recommends that the justification for LUCA-172 should be changed to the following: "The requested change to Commercial for Parcel 353 is consistent with the existing zoning and development application that is currently under consideration. The requested change to Commercial for Parcel 357 is not consistent with the use of the property or the RLD zoning, therefore, staff recommends retaining the Rural Land Use designation for this parcel. Further evaluation of Parcel 357 should be considered during the Region Plan process when a more comprehensive land use plan is developed for the MD 3 corridor with input from the community stakeholders."</p>
LUCA-174	Multiple parcels on the west side of MD 3 South and south of McKnew Rd in Gambrills	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Steven Hyatt, Esq.		<p>The attorney for the applicant stated in their correspondence that the staff justification is short-sighted for a forward-looking planning document intended to guide actions over the next 20 years; ignores many of the goals and policies of Plan2040; and is inconsistent with the GDP process. The attorney further states that OPZ's justification acknowledges that the requested land use change to Mixed Use is appropriate, yet offers inconsistent land use designations. The attorney urges that the time for the land use to change is now during the GDP process.</p> <p>The criteria that was used to analyze land use change requests by individual property owners is contained on page 115 of Volume II of Plan2040. Staff consistently recommended where the requested planned land use was consistent with the Plan2040 Development Policy Area but different or inconsistent with the existing land use and zoning that the decision be considered during the Region Plan process when a more comprehensive land use plan is developed with input from the community stakeholders.</p>
LUCA-180	814 MD 3 South, Gambrills	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Steven Hyatt, Esq.		<p>The attorney for the applicant, Steven Hyatt, Esq. stated in his correspondence that the staff justification is short-sighted for a forward-looking planning document intended to guide actions over the next 20 years; ignores many of the goals and policies of Plan2040; and is inconsistent with the GDP process. Mr. Hyatt further stated that a Mixed Use zoning classification is more appropriate and questions delaying decisions on planned land use when the zoning does not match the land use that has been requested by the applicant. The attorney urged that the time for the land use to change is now during the GDP process.</p> <p>The criteria that was used to analyze land use change requests by individual property owners is contained on page 115 of Volume II of Plan2040. Staff continues to recommend where the requested planned land use was consistent with the Plan2040 Development Policy Area but different or inconsistent with the existing land use and zoning that the decision be considered during the Region Plan process when a more comprehensive land use plan is developed with input from the community stakeholders.</p>

Comments on Planning Advisory Board Draft and Office of Planning and Zoning responses

Land Use Change Number	General Property Location	Written Testimony	Oral Testimony	Agree w/ Staff Rec.	Testimony Submitted/Delivered by Owner or Owner's Representative	Testimony Delivered by Resident or Other Stakeholder	Summary of Issue / OPZ Recommendation
LUCA-175	West side of MD 3 South, Gambrills	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Steven Hyatt, Esq.		<p>The attorney for the applicant, Steven Hyatt, Esq., stated in his correspondence that the staff justification is short-sighted for a forward-looking planning document intended to guide actions over the next 20 years; ignores many of the goals and policies of Plan2040; and is inconsistent with the GDP process. Mr. Hyatt further stated that OPZ's justification acknowledges that the requested land use change to Mixed Use is appropriate, yet offers a land use designation based on existing conditions rather than planned future potential to better achieve the goals and policies of Plan2040. The attorney urged that the time for the land use to change is now during the GDP process.</p> <p>The criteria that was used to analyze land use change requests by individual property owners is contained on page 115 of Volume II of Plan2040. Staff continues to recommend where the requested planned land use was consistent with the Plan2040 Development Policy Area but different or inconsistent with the existing land use and zoning that the decision be considered during the Region Plan process when a more comprehensive land use plan is developed with input from the community stakeholders.</p>
LUCA-79	Eastern corner of the intersection of MD 3 North and Saint Stephens Church Rd, Millersville	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Steven Hyatt, Esq.		<p>The attorney for the applicant, Steven Hyatt, Esq., stated in his correspondence that the staff justification is short-sighted for a forward-looking planning document intended to guide actions over the next 20 years; ignores many of the goals and policies of Plan2040; and is inconsistent with the GDP process. Mr. Hyatt further stated that there is no opportunity to increase density during the Region Planning process unless the underlying land use designation is changed now to be consistent with the future zoning that allows for increased density. The attorney urged that the time for the land use to change is now during the GDP process.</p> <p>Staff notes that planned land use designations can be changed during the Region Plan processes. The criteria that was used to analyze land use change requests by individual property owners is contained on page 115 of Volume II of Plan2040. Staff continues to recommend where the requested planned land use was consistent with the Plan2040 Development Policy Area but different or inconsistent with the existing land use and zoning that the decision be considered during the Region Plan process when a more comprehensive land use plan is developed with input from the community stakeholders.</p>
LUCA-173	Multiple parcels on the east side of MD 3 North in the vicinity of Church View Rd, Gambrills	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Steven Hyatt, Esq.		<p>The attorney for the applicant, Steven Hyatt, Esq., stated in his correspondence that the staff justification is short-sighted for a forward-looking planning document intended to guide actions over the next 20 years; ignores many of the goals and policies of Plan2040; and is inconsistent with the GDP process. Mr. Hyatt further stated that OPZ's justification acknowledges that the requested land use change to Mixed-Use is appropriate, yet offers inconsistent land use designations. The attorney urged that the time for the land use to change is now during the GDP process.</p> <p>The criteria that was used to analyze land use change requests by individual property owners is contained on page 115 of Volume II of Plan2040. Staff continues to recommend where the requested planned land use was consistent with the Plan2040 Development Policy Area but different or inconsistent with the existing land use and zoning that the decision be considered during the Region Plan process when a more comprehensive land use plan is developed with input from the community stakeholders.</p>
LUCA-157	2525 Evergreen Rd, Odenton	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Steven Hyatt, Esq.		Staff agreed with the applicant and recommended for the change in planned land use because the property met the criteria used in determining changes from the 2009 Land Use Map enumerated on page 115 of the Plan2040 Volume II.
LUCA-158, 159, 160 and 161	Various locations along Evergreen Rd and Brickhead Rd, Gambrills	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Steven Hyatt, Esq.		Staff agreed with the applicant and recommended for the change in planned land use because the property met the criteria used in determining changes from the 2009 Land Use Map enumerated on page 115 of the Plan2040 Volume II.
ANNAPOLIS AREA							
LUCA-66	Multiple parcels at the northwestern corner of the intersection of MD 178 and Housely Rd, Annapolis	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Alan Hyatt, Esq.		Staff agreed with the applicant and recommended for the change in planned land use because the property met the criteria used in determining changes from the 2009 Land Use Map enumerated on page 115 of the Plan2040 Volume II.
LUCA-179	820 Bestgate Rd, Annapolis	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Steven Hyatt, Esq.		Staff agreed with the applicant and recommended for the change in planned land use because the property met the criteria used in determining changes from the 2009 Land Use Map enumerated on page 115 of the Plan2040 Volume II.
LUCA-178	623 Ridgely Ave, Annapolis			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Steven Hyatt, Esq.		Staff agreed with the applicant and recommended for the change in planned land use because the property met the criteria used in determining changes from the 2009 Land Use Map enumerated on page 115 of the Plan2040 Volume II.
LUCA-184	600 Ridgely Ave, Annapolis	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Steven Hyatt, Esq.		Staff agreed with the applicant and recommended for the change in planned land use because the property met the criteria used in determining changes from the 2009 Land Use Map enumerated on page 115 of the Plan2040 Volume II.

Comments on Planning Advisory Board Draft and Office of Planning and Zoning responses

Land Use Change Number	General Property Location	Written Testimony	Oral Testimony	Agree w/ Staff Rec.	Testimony Submitted/Delivered by Owner or Owner's Representative	Testimony Delivered by Resident or Other Stakeholder	Summary of Issue / OPZ Recommendation
LUCA-27	607 Ridgely Ave and a 1,036 sq. ft. property on the south side of Willow Rd, Annapolis	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Alan Hyatt, Esq.		<p>The attorney for the applicant, Alan Hyatt, Esq., stated in written testimony that a planned land use of commercial is more appropriate for all of the parcels in the application rather than just three of them because they about highly trafficked roads which generate high noise levels; the area is no longer a sustainable residential community; any remaining residential is wedged between commercial uses; the vast majority of the residences are no longer occupied by owners and the properties are not likely to be rehabilitated over time; and the properties are all served by antiquated septic systems. The attorney further states that a commercial land use designation will support neighborhood serving commercial services and will reduce trips from beyond the neighborhood.</p> <p>Staff continues to recommend retaining the planned land use of parcel 163 as low density residential. The staff justification for the decision is as follows: The requested change to Commercial land use is not consistent with the surrounding planned land use in the Willow Road neighborhood. It is recommended 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>
SOUTH COUNTY							
LUCA-13	3422 and 3424 Pike Ridge Rd, Edgewater	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			Susan Cochran, Edgewater Citizens Association	<p>Ms. Cochran testified at the PAB public hearing on January 6, 2021 on behalf of the Edgewater Citizens Association that she was concerned a commercial request in a residential area was delayed to the Region Plan but not recommended for denial. She is concerned this creates potential for piecemeal rezoning prior to the region plan process.</p> <p>Staff continues to recommended where the requested planned land use is not consistent with the Plan2040 Development Policy Area or is inconsistent with the existing land use and zoning that the decision be considered during the Region Plan process when a more comprehensive land use plan is developed with input from the community stakeholders.</p>
LUCA-69	6.55 ac parcel on the south side of MD 2 west of land owned by Anne Arundel County	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Alan Hyatt, Esq.	Susan Cochran, Edgewater Citizens Association	<p>The attorney for the applicant, Alan Hyatt, Esq., made the following statements in written testimony: "Plan2040 seeks to provide hubs of limited commercial and community services in rural or suburban areas. The intersection of Route 2 and Route 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 Medium Density Residential in order to allow for housing that would fulfill the goal of providing an adequate supply of housing in a neighborhood that has limited affordability to those of moderate income. Designating the Property as Rural is a complete misnomer at this location. High trafficked Routes 2 and 214 at a nearby intersection certainly do not allow a 6.554 acre parcel (the size of this Property) to be utilized as Rural or Agricultural in any fashion."</p> <p>Ms. Cochran testified at the PAB public hearing on January 6, 2021 on behalf of the Edgewater Citizens Association that she was concerned a commercial request should be denied because this is a historical agricultural area. She noted the same property was denied a change 10 years ago and that the parcel should be acquired by the County and added to the adjacent Park.</p> <p>Staff continues to recommend where the requested planned land use is not consistent with the Plan2040 Development Policy Area or is inconsistent with the existing land use and zoning that the decision be considered during the Region Plan process when a more comprehensive land use plan is developed with input from the community stakeholders.</p>
LUCA-176	Northeast side of the intersection of MD 214 and Riva Rd, Edgewater	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Steven Hyatt, Esq.		Staff agreed with the applicant and recommended for the change in planned land use because the property met the criteria used in determining changes from the 2009 Land Use Map enumerated on page 115 of the Plan2040 Volume II.
PDR-03	1024 Carrs Wharf Rd, Edgewater	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			Phil Dales, Esq.		<p>The agent for the applicant, Phil Dales, Esq. requested changes to the split designation proposed by staff in the draft planned land use map, namely to retain Low Density Residential for the center of the site (for two existing dwellings and a historic house), and to change the periphery (along the water, the northern end and the eastern periphery of the site) to Maritime. This would split the land use designation for several parcels. The split would retain residential over the historic home and the two other existing residences and allow for the existing marina to continue.</p> <p>Staff do not agree with the requested revision and continue to recommend placing Maritime land use on Parcels 353 and 354 and only a portion of 278. This would support the existing marina operations. Staff is concerned that a split of residential and maritime land use as requested could lead to conflicts with the marina operations if zoning followed suit, due to minimum lot size requirements. For Parcel 278, staff continues to recommend splitting the Planned Land Use with Maritime on the western portion of the property where the marina operations are concentrated and Low Density Residential around the historic house.</p>

Comments on Planning Advisory Board Draft and Office of Planning and Zoning responses

Land Use Change Number	General Property Location	Written Testimony	Oral Testimony	Agree w/ Staff Rec.	Testimony Submitted/Delivered by Owner or Owner's Representative	Testimony Delivered by Resident or Other Stakeholder	Summary of Issue / OPZ Recommendation
LUCA-151	454 E Bay Front Rd, Deale	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			See summary statement for detailed information about input on this request.	<p>Pamela Parks is seeking a land use change to commercial for 9 acres of her property on MD 258 in Deale. She stated in earlier written comments that she intends to donate five (5) acres to the Deale volunteer fire department for a new fire house. One (1) acre is already commercial (planned land use and zoning) so if the land use was changed and the property were donated, that would leave Ms. Parks with four (4) additional acres of planned commercial land use for a total of five (5) acres.</p> <p>Karen George delivered oral testimony and 162 people submitted written testimony to the PAB supporting the change of nine acres to a planned land use of commercial. Two people submitted comments opposing the request. This proposed change in land use has garnered a significant amount of public input starting with the online open house in August 2020 when nine (9) people supported the request and again during the open comment period on the preliminary draft Plan2040 when six (6) people submitted comments in favor, including a petition signed by approximately 50 people.</p> <p>Staff continues to recommend retaining the current split land use of rural and commercial because the requested change to commercial land use is not consistent with the Rural and Agricultural Policy Area or the Resource Sensitive Policy Area due to the Critical Area Resource Conservation Area (RCA) designation; existing agricultural use; existing zoning; Rural Sewer Service Area; nor is it compatible with the surrounding planned land use. A fire station does not need commercial land use or zoning, and changing the land use opens the potential for the site to introduce a wide range of commercial land uses that would be incompatible with the surrounding area. The existing Rural Agricultural (RA) zoning permits volunteer fire stations, per Article 18-4-106 of County Code.</p>