

Legislative Testimony (submitted online) 1-16-2024

Timestamp	First name	Last name	City	State	Zip code	Organization	Legislation	Position	Remarks	Attachment
2024-01-15 19:01:35	D	H	Odenton	MD	21113		BILL 84-23aaa: Odenton Town Center Master Plan – Approval (amended)	No position	I would like to submit the following testimony regarding Bill 84-23aaa. I've noticed there's a substantial amount of wildlife in the Odenton area and would like to request the Council consider ways to assist such wildlife especially species that may not be able to easily relocate once development begins. I routinely see turtles trying to cross local roads in this area as well as roadkill. I would also like to request that when reviewing development in the county as a whole the Council consider using wildlife crossings and other measures to reduce the amount of roadkill in this area. As part of this, one small measure that could be considered is requiring that when curbs are slated to be built, they be sloping rather than squared to allow wildlife to more easily move around. Finally, I recently learned that there are federal grants for wildlife crossings that units of local government may apply for – please see links below – if it helps. Thank you! https://highways.dot.gov/federal-lands/programs/wildlife-crossings https://globe-net.com/protecting-wildlife-in-environmentally-friendly-construction/	
2024-01-12 7:14:08	Tyler	Wright	Pasadena	MD	21122		BILL 91-23a: Real Property Tax Credit – Public Safety Officer (amended)	Support	As a 35 year AA county resident, I support this common sense bill.	
2024-01-09 18:03:52	Pastor	Arcand	Severna Park	Maryland	21146	Lighthouse Baptist Church Severna Park, Maryland	BILL 92-23a: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts (amended)	Support	We at Lighthouse Baptist Church fully support this bill.	
2024-01-10 7:55:38	Paul J.	Arcand II	Pasadena	Maryland	21122		BILL 92-23a: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts (amended)	Support	We would ask that each council member vote for this much needed update to the Small Business Zoning regulations.	
2024-01-10 8:07:24	Staci	Flanagan	Millersville	MD	21108		BILL 92-23a: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts (amended)	Support		
2024-01-10 8:07:50	Matthew	Flanagan	Millersville	MD	21108		BILL 92-23a: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts (amended)	Support		
2024-01-10 8:08:44	Jewel	Evans	Pasadena	MD	21122		BILL 92-23a: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts (amended)	Support		
2024-01-10 8:30:53	Paul	Arcand (Sr)	Pasadena	MD	21122		BILL 92-23a: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts (amended)	Support	I continue to support this common sense bill, including the amendments. This bill is beneficial to the people of the county.	
2024-01-10 8:48:24	Amber	Arcand	Pasadena	Maryland	21122		BILL 92-23a: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts (amended)	Support	Simple needed update. Please support	
2024-01-10 8:58:19	Emma	Arcand	Pasadena	Maryland	21122		BILL 92-23a: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts (amended)	Support	Please Support.	
2024-01-10 9:48:49	Eli	Antons	Pasadena	MD	21122		BILL 92-23a: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts (amended)	Support	This is a good move. We support.	
2024-01-10 14:01:34	Christopher	Whitaker	Pasadena	Maryland	21132		BILL 92-23a: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts (amended)	Support		
2024-01-10 14:42:55	Corine	Flanagan	Pasadena	Maryland	21122		BILL 92-23a: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts (amended)	Support		
2024-01-10 19:43:09	Aaron	Dempsey	Glen Burnie	MD	21060		BILL 92-23a: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts (amended)	Support		
2024-01-10 19:45:15	Terri	Davis	Gambrills	MD	21054		BILL 92-23a: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts (amended)	Support		
2024-01-10 19:52:53	Aaron	Dempsey	Glen Burnie	MD	21060		BILL 92-23a: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts (amended)	Support		
2024-01-10 21:18:13	Ronald	Anderson	Millersville	MD	21108		BILL 92-23a: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts (amended)	Support		
2024-01-10 22:42:20	Keaston	Edwards	Hanover	Maryland	21076		BILL 92-23a: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts (amended)	Support	I am an active member at Lighthouse Baptist Church in Severna Park.	
2024-01-11 6:55:33	Andrew	Bartley	Gwynn Oak	MD	21207		BILL 92-23a: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts (amended)	Support		
2024-01-11 11:15:02	Kyle	Pullen	Pasadena	MD	21122		BILL 92-23a: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts (amended)	Support		
2024-01-11 13:02:41	Abigail	Pullen	Pasadena	MD	21122		BILL 92-23a: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts (amended)	Support		
2024-01-11 13:24:40	Curtis	Kingsland	Odenton	MD	21113		BILL 92-23a: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts (amended)	Support	Please vote yes on this bill. Thank you	
2024-01-11 13:27:56	Laurie	Kingsland	Odenton	MD	21113		BILL 92-23a: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts (amended)	Support	Please vote yes. Thanks	
2024-01-11 15:10:16	Anita	Suddoth	Severna Park	MD	21146		BILL 92-23a: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts (amended)	Support		
2024-01-11 15:12:09	Carolyn	Suddoth	Severna Park	MD	21146		BILL 92-23a: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts (amended)	Support		
2024-01-12 8:28:58	Jo-Ann	Shields	Pasadena	Maryland	21122		BILL 92-23a: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts (amended)	Support		
2024-01-12 9:58:43	Patricia	Copsey	Glen Burnie	MD	21061		BILL 92-23a: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts (amended)	Support		
2024-01-12 9:59:23	James	Copsey	Glen Burnie	MD	21061		BILL 92-23a: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts (amended)	Support		
2024-01-12 10:03:08	Howard	Doak	Pasadena	MD	21122		BILL 92-23a: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts (amended)	Support		
2024-01-12 10:03:54	Bernice	Doak	Pasadena	MD	21122		BILL 92-23a: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts (amended)	Support		
2024-01-12 14:11:17	Ruth	Antons	Pasadena	MD	21122		BILL 92-23a: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts (amended)	Support		
2024-01-12 14:46:20	Adriaunna	Edwards	Hanover	MD	21076		BILL 92-23a: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts (amended)	Support	I highly support this bill.	
2024-01-12 19:43:24	Wayne	Berwager	Crownsville	MD	21032		BILL 92-23a: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts (amended)	Support	Thank you for supporting this bill and for you help.	
2024-01-12 23:55:30	Kyun	Berwager	Crownsville	MD	21032		BILL 92-23a: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts (amended)	Support	Thank you for your time and consideration. You are appreciated.	
2024-01-13 14:10:48	Adriaunna	Edwards	Hanover	MD	21076		BILL 92-23a: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts (amended)	Support	I highly support this bill.	
2024-01-13 14:39:06	Bernice	Doak	Pasadena	MD	21122		BILL 92-23a: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts (amended)	Support		
2024-01-13 15:45:37	April	Holmes	Pasadena	Maryland	21122		BILL 92-23a: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts (amended)	Support		
2024-01-14 20:40:30	Katarzyna	Wright	Pasadena	Maryland	21122		BILL 92-23a: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts (amended)	Support	I support the bill	
2024-01-15 0:58:42	Lois	Berwager	Crownsville	Maryland	21032		BILL 92-23a: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts (amended)	Support	Thank you for considering my support for this community strengthening bill.	
2024-01-15 9:56:34	Danny	Pullen	Severn	MD	21144		BILL 92-23a: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts (amended)	Support		
2024-01-15 9:59:34	Laurie	Pullen	Severn	Maryland	21144		BILL 92-23a: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts (amended)	Support	Please pass this common sense Bill. Thank you.	

Legislative Testimony (submitted online) 1-16-2024

Timestamp	First name	Last name	City	State	Zip code	Organization	Legislation	Position	Remarks	Attachment
2024-01-15 20:02:23	Nancy	Guy	Annapolis	MD	21401		BILL 92-23a: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts (amended)	Oppose	<p>I Nancy Guy affiliated with 605 and 607 N Bestgate Rd I am opposing Bill no. 92-23a because the issues within this See attached pdf and files submitted by Dorothy Guy (submitted 12-30-23) and Mary Guy (submitted 12-29-23) have NOT been addressed.</p> <p>File upload optional 2023-12-31_Bill 92-23 County Council_Submitted_Comments_JOB_E_Signed.pdf (256.56 KB)</p> <p>I am also opposing it because if the Bulk Regulations adjustments to make the SBD (small business district) more usable means ioening the door all kinds of small business in the Ridgely Ave corridor and North Bestgate and give way to other types of business to follow suit and we as a quiet undisturbed community DO NOT want any of our land, freeways, local roads arterial roads and collectors to change at all. This neighborhood needs to remain as it is today to preserve the character of the Weemss Creek area. Changing the architecture and infrastructure of a land will not help things at all it will only put money into the pockets of onewes who could care less about the land, the neighborhoods as we know them today and the serenity that we have. They could care less about the environmental impact or not only the wildlife but also noise pollution air pollution our waterways being polluted everything the only thing they are looking at is money to feed their pockets they could care less about the people that live here and who have lived here all of their lives in which people who have lived here all their lives want to shelter in place and live out the rest of their lives here not somewhere else.</p> <p>I wholeheartedly oppose phone number 92-23a and anything that goes along with it.</p>	
2024-01-15 22:10:21	Dorothy	Guy	Annapolis	MD	21401		BILL 92-23a: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts (amended)	Oppose	Please see the attached documents. I oppose Bill N. 92-23a in its entirety and urge the County Council to reject it.	Yes
2024-01-15 22:35:42	Wayne	Nappari	Glen Burnie	MD	21060		BILL 92-23a: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts (amended)	Support		
2024-01-16 10:38:19	Mary	Guy	Annapolis	MD	21401		BILL 92-23a: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts (amended)	Oppose	I strongly oppose this bill in its entirety and request that the County Council oppose it, too.	
2024-01-16 10:39:37	Mary	Guy	Annapolis	MD	21401		BILL 92-23a: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts (amended)	Oppose	See attached.	Yes
2024-01-16 10:53:40	Ruth	Jobe	Annapolis	MD	21401		BILL 92-23a: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts (amended)	Oppose	<p>This proposed legislation apparently expands the SBDs to be located along all roadway classifications and is not limited to arterial roads.</p> <p>To allow signage within an SBD to be the same as commercial and industrial areas is not compatible with the residential lots or the nearby community. For example, any business operating 24/7 and allowed to have lights "on" 24/7 is detrimental to the health and well being of the residents, visitors, etc. While lot size does not change, changing the bulk regulations DOES HAVE A SERIOUS IMPACT (i.e., a side lot minimum of 7 feet is less than one half of the length a standard Honda Accord!) With little notice given to those impacted or potentially impacted by this legislation, more time for community engagement is necessary. Why is this legislation being rushed through??</p> <p>Therefore, strong opposition to Bill No. 92-23a is warranted.</p>	
2024-01-16 10:58:23	Jane	Malone	Annapolis	MD	21401	Jane Malone	BILL 92-23a: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts (amended)	Oppose	I Jane Malone, I'm affiliated with 605 and 607 North Bestgate Road. I am strongly opposing bill number 92-23a	
2024-01-15 22:28:52	Dorothy	Guy	Annapolis	MD	21401		BILL 94-23: Zoning – Conditional Uses – Business Complexes in a Residential District	Oppose	<p>I oppose Bill No. 94-23 and urge the County Council to reject it. It is nothing more than a further attempt to commercialize residential districts to the detriment of Anne Arundel County residents and the natural environment. The Council should protect residential districts and not allow all kinds of uses, including this one which would allow more and more business complexes in residential districts. Such uses only impinge upon and degrade the residential districts. Furthermore, the Volunteer Organization should have to own the property. Period. Otherwise, all kinds of shenanigans would be allowed under the language "CONTROLLED BY" MEANS SUBJECT TO A PURCHASE AGREEMENT IN FAVOR OF THE VOLUNTEER ORGANIZATION."</p>	
								1		

DATE: January 15, 2024

TO: Anne Arundel County Planning Advisory Board, County Council Members, and County Executive (planningadvisoryboard@aacounty.org & lorby@aacounty.org)

and

Anne Arundel County Office of Planning and Zoning (OPZ)
(pzpompa22@aacounty.org & pzhugh77@aacounty.org)

FROM: Dorothy Guy, 605 N. Bestgate Road, Annapolis, MD 21401

SUBJECT: Bill No. 92-23a Subdivision and Development – Zoning – Small Business Districts – As Amended, January 2, 2024

My name is Dorothy Guy. I am affiliated with 605 and 607 N. Bestgate Road, Annapolis MD 21401. I am submitting comments regarding Bill No. 92-23a Subdivision and Development – Zoning – Small Business Districts (Bill), as amended, January 2, 2024.

I oppose this Bill and strongly urge that **the County Council reject Bill No. 92-23a, as amended, in its entirety.**

First, I incorporate my original comments made on December 30, 2023 in full. They continue to apply and are valid comments that the County Council should **respond to in writing in full** before making a decision on Bill No. 92-23a. They appear below in a separate section titled “Original Comments on Bill No. 92-23 Submitted December 30, 2023.” Those comments urge the County Council to reject Bill No. 92-23. My position remains unchanged and I continue to urge the County Council to reject Bill No. 92-23a.

Second, the County Council should reject Bill No. 92-23a for the additional reason that the changes in the amended bill would delete the existing limitations on signs in a small business district and replace them with the same requirements for signs in commercial and industrial districts. For a small business district, this is a horrendous, outsized change in the law.

It will have the effect in small business districts of increasing the number of signs tremendously (i.e., signs on multiple building facades, freestanding signs at each road frontage, signs at each service entry and at service windows, signs for additional businesses, and directional signs). It also will increase the size of the signs disproportionately. Why does any small business need a sign that is up to 250 square feet [e.g., 10 feet x 25 feet] and up to 30 feet high? It will also allow interior lighting of signs, which will bring an abundance of garish signs with all of their light pollution--digital signs, LED signs, and neon signs. These types of signs are not needed in small business districts and are especially not wanted in residential areas adjacent to any small business districts. In other words:

Sign, sign,
Everywhere a sign,
Blockin' out the scenery
Breakin' my mind"

Signs, Five Man Electric Band (1970),

Third, Bill No. 92-23a is a further unwanted, brazen attempt by its sponsors to **commercialize every possible square inch of Anne Arundel County, including existing residential areas**, regardless of and without care to the detriment that will be inflicted upon Anne Arundel County residents and the natural environment. This bill should be resoundingly rejected by the County Council

**Original Comments on Bill No. 92-23 Submitted December 30, 2023
(Please read these comments again.)**

The Bill is nothing more than a land and sky grab (i.e., taller buildings) by developers who want to commercialize and monetize every square inch of Anne Arundel County, so they can gain a profit at the expense of Anne Arundel County residents, property owners, and taxpayers. This Bill would destroy both existing and new neighborhoods by allowing Small Business Districts with incompatible and inappropriate uses to infiltrate them and destroy them with more people, traffic, noise, trash, water pollution, light pollution, loss of the natural environment, crime, etc. Furthermore, it would destroy more and more of Anne Arundel County's natural environment and eliminate open space by paving over and building on practically all land that has frontage on almost any road--all for the sake of developers' profit. Our roadways will become nothing more than a sea of commercial buildings. This Bill would also add to the current stress on our already inadequate public infrastructure to the detriment of Anne Arundel County taxpayers who must pay for that infrastructure. This is not smart zoning, nor is it Smart Growth.

These are my general comments.

1. As an initial matter, I ask that the **County Council respond in writing to all comments received from the public on this Bill and publish the County Council's responses in writing on its website at least 30 days before the County Council takes any further action on this Bill.** Only in this way can transparency and open government be assured. The public deserves to know that the County Council considered the public's comments and the County Council's specific response to those comments.

2. The County Council has allowed inadequate time for public review and comment. The Bill was introduced on December 4, 2023 with a hearing scheduled on January 2, 2024 and written comments due by 11 a.m. that day. That's fewer than 30 days for public review and comment. The due date/time for public comments and the date of the hearing is especially ludicrous considering the Christmas and New Year's holidays will have just ended and people are only just getting back to work and school. In fact, I know people who are not able to submit comments because of their holiday commitments to family and religion. One can only assume that the County Council purposely scheduled the introduction of the Bill and a hearing on it on these dates in the hope that the public would not notice the Bill or otherwise would be too busy to submit comments or testify on it. The County Council should be ashamed of itself for trying to push this Bill through at this time of the year. Therefore, I urge the **County Council to extend the public comment period on this Bill until at least February 2, 2024 and hold a second public hearing on it after that date.** This would give the public a reasonable opportunity to review and comment on this Bill.
3. Extending the County Council's hearing until as late as 11:30 p.m. also is ludicrous and anti-public participation. The County Council's hearings should not be the legislative version of "Night Court" and no one from the public who wants to appear before the County Council should be forced to remain until this late hour in order to be heard. The County Council should end its hearings no later than 9 p.m. Any additional hearings that are needed to allow the public time to appear before the County Council also should be scheduled at a time that is convenient for the public. Therefore, also taking into consideration my comment in 1., above, I urge the **County Council to extend the public comment period on this Bill until at least February 2, 2024 and hold a second public hearing on it after that date.** This would give the public a reasonable opportunity to be heard before the County Council.
4. I oppose Bill No. 92-23 and urge the **County Council to vote against the Bill.** To my knowledge, **there has not been any impact analysis for this Bill, there should be, and it should be made public on the Office of Planning and Zoning and the County Council's websites for at least 30 days before the County Council takes further action on this Bill.** Chiefly, this Bill: 1) takes away protections currently afforded to neighborhoods located near a Small Business District, 2) greatly increases the types of businesses (i.e., uses) that are permitted (as a right that will be impossible to challenge) to be located in a Small Business District, 3) adds alcoholic beverage uses as accessory to other uses as a conditional use in a Small Business District, and 4) allows all of these businesses to be larger and taller and squashed together with minimal setbacks—all to the detriment of the livability of the neighborhood and the survival of the natural environment.

These changes **add many uses to a Small Business District that are not suitable for being located in or adjacent to a residential neighborhood**, including alcoholic beverage uses (think liquor stores and bars), convenience stores (think 7-Eleven, Royal Farms, etc.), dry cleaning and laundry plants, farms, personal fitness studios, pharmacies (think cannabis dispensaries), and tobacco shops). **These types of**

businesses do not add to a neighborhood, but drag it down by introducing any number of unwanted elements such as traffic, noise and light pollution, hazardous chemicals and air pollution, and crime.

The bulk regulation changes will add tremendous density to an area by allowing larger and taller buildings to be built, in the process destroying the natural environment and open space and replacing it with a concrete jungle where there is not even enough natural ground left to plant a tree. The changes to the bulk regulations: 1) reduce the minimum lot size required for a Small Business District by 25% where there is no public sewer (resulting in **more groundwater and surface pollution from failed septics**), 2) greatly increase the maximum allowable lot coverage to 50% for structures built in the Small Business District (**adding density and eliminating the natural environment and open space**), 3) greatly reduce the minimum setbacks for principal structures in a Small Business District (**adding density and eliminating the natural environment and open space**), 4) greatly reduce front and side setbacks for properties adjacent to developed lots (**adding density and eliminating open space**), 5) greatly reduce all setbacks for accessory structures by 25% or more (**adding density and eliminating the natural environment and open space**), 6) increase the maximum height limitation for accessory structures such that a third or even a fourth floor could be added (**adding density and negatively changing the vertical profile of an area**), 7) eliminate the minimum width at front building restriction line (**adding density and eliminating the natural environment and open space**), 8) on properties with frontage on minor arterial road or higher (however these are defined), allow a greater maximum floor area for principal structures of 10,000 square feet and for accessory structures of 3,000 square feet (which is three times [3x] higher than that previously allowed for accessory structures on a larger arterial road or higher) (**adding density and eliminating the natural environment and open space**), and 9) presumably on all other roads (this is not clear), greatly expand the maximum floor area for principal structures by almost twice the size (2x) to 5000 square feet and for accessory structures by twice the size (2x) to 2000 square feet (**adding density and eliminating the natural environment and open space**).

Collectively, these changes will **overly commercialize any Small Business District and ruin the residential areas surrounding or adjacent to any Small Business District**. Furthermore, the changes to the bulk regulations only serve to increase the amount of acreage that may be paved over and built upon in a Small Business District, eliminating the natural environment and open space that is necessary to maintain the “small” feel of these Small Business Districts and the residential character of surrounding or adjacent neighborhoods. **Such destruction should not be the County Council’s goal.**

Instead, the County Council’s goal should be to conserve, preserve, and protect Anne Arundel County’s natural environment and open space and existing and planned neighborhoods. Instead of building and paving over greenfields and eliminating the natural environment and open space and destroying existing and planned

neighborhoods, the **County Council should ensure smart zoning and redevelopment of those previously developed areas that are in need of rejuvenation**. Anne Arundel County does not need more new commercial development—even the Office of Planning and Zoning has concluded that it has enough--especially on previously undeveloped land. It needs smart zoning and redevelopment. This Bill is not smart zoning nor does it promote redevelopment.

These are my specific comments:

- 5. The terms “minor arterial road” or “road of a lower classification” or “minor arterial road or a road of a lower classification” should be defined.** Neither the existing Anne Arundel County Code nor the Bill defines them. If a definition of these terms is in the Anne Arundel County Code or the County Council is relying upon any definitions in any Article of the State Code, those legal references should be included in this Bill. If these terms are not defined elsewhere, they should be defined in this Bill. Because these terms are not defined, it is: 1) impossible for the public to determine what a minor arterial road or a road of a lower classification is, and 2) impossible for the public to know the true impacts of this Bill-which it has a right to know. **I oppose the Bill for this reason (and others).** No matter where a Small Business District exists or is planned, it must be compatible with the neighborhood surrounding and adjacent to it. This Bill would take away protections that guard against the infiltration of Small Business Districts in any neighborhood and will be especially detrimental to neighborhoods that are located on a “minor arterial road or a road of a lower classification”, no matter how these term(s) are defined.
- 6. “Alcoholic Beverage Uses as Accessory to Other Uses” as a conditional use should be deleted from this Bill.** No Small Business District needs alcoholic beverage uses and this use is incompatible with a residential neighborhood.
- 7. “Civic Facilities, Community Centers, Libraries, and Museums” as a permitted use should be changed from a permitted use to either a conditional use or a special exception use.** These facilities can be very large in scale and bring a high volume of traffic such that they are not truly “small businesses” or would not fit in to a neighborhood. The public should have a say in whether these uses are appropriate for the neighborhood.
- 8. “Convenience Stores, Gift Shops, and Newsstands” as a permitted use should be deleted from this Bill.** Convenience stores do not belong in or adjacent to a neighborhood; they are nuisances and cause lots of traffic and numerous other social and environmental problems. Gift Shops and Newsstands are covered by the “Retail Specialty Stores or Shops for Retail Sales” category.

- 9. “Snack Bars” as a permitted use should be deleted from this Bill.** This term is not defined in the Code and is certain to be a nuisance and not in keeping with a Small Business District located in or adjacent to a residential neighborhood.
- 10. “Dry Cleaning and Laundry Establishments, including Pick-up Stations, Package Plants, and Coin-Operated Facilities, Limited to Establishments with Less than 4,000 Square Feet of Floor Area” as a permitted use should be deleted from this Bill.** These facilities use noxious and hazardous substances that do not belong in Small Business Districts and are incompatible with a residential neighborhood.
- 11. “Farming” as a permitted use should be deleted from this Bill.** Farming activities, including the growing of cannabis, does not belong in a Small Business District and is generally incompatible with a residential neighborhood.
- 12. “Hardware Stores” as a permitted use should be deleted from this Bill.** These facilities can be very large in scale such that they are not truly “small businesses” or would not fit in to a neighborhood. Most small hardware stores have gone out of business, making this category unnecessary.
- 13. “Personal Fitness Studios” as a permitted use should be deleted from this Bill.** These facilities can be very large in scale such that they are not truly “small businesses” or would not fit in to a neighborhood.
- 14. “Pharmacies” as a permitted use should be deleted from this Bill.** These facilities are corporately owned and can be very large in scale such that they are not truly “small businesses” or would not fit in to a neighborhood. Furthermore, this category may include cannabis dispensaries, which do not belong in a Small Business District and certainly not in a residential neighborhood.
- 15. “Tobacco” and “Video Tapes” as a permitted use should be deleted from the “Retail Specialty Stores or Shops for Retail Sales” category.** Neither of these types of stores promote a social good. As a society, we should not promote any use of tobacco. Additionally, the only stores selling/showing video tapes now are adult X-rated stores catering to pornography. These uses do not belong in a Small Business District and certainly not in a residential neighborhood.
- 16. Regarding the bulk regulations, none of them for a Small Business District should be changed.** The changes in Bill No. 92-23 will only add density, change the character of the surrounding and adjacent neighborhood, and eliminate the natural environment and open space.
- 17. Regarding the bulk regulations, the minimum lot size requirements should not be changed.** The larger lot size of 20,000 square feet should continue to be required for any lot not served by public sewer to minimize the number of businesses on septic and contamination of groundwater and land surface. The

larger square footage is also needed to put in septic that is adequate enough to serve the lot and the business.

- 18. Regarding the bulk regulations, the maximum coverage by structures requirements should not be changed.** Maximum coverage by structures with direct access to a principal arterial road or higher should remain at 40% of gross area. Similarly, maximum coverage by all other structures should remain at 30% of gross area. Increasing the % of gross area of coverage by structures will only serve to turn Anne Arundel County into a concrete jungle. The changes will add density, change the character of the surrounding and adjacent neighborhood, and eliminate the natural environment and open space. There will be no earth left in which to plant and grow any kind of natural landscaping, including mature upper story trees.
- 19. Regarding the bulk regulations, the setbacks—minimum or otherwise—should be changed.** Decreasing the setbacks will only serve to turn the Small Business Districts in Anne Arundel County into concrete jungles. The changes will add density, change the character of the surrounding and adjacent neighborhood, and eliminate the natural environment and open space. There will be no earth left in which to plant and grow any kind of natural landscaping, including mature upper story trees.
- 20. Regarding the bulk regulations, maximum height restrictions should not be changed.** Allowing for taller buildings will add density, change the character of the surrounding and adjacent neighborhood, destroy the viewshed, and contribute to the concrete jungle.
- 21. Regarding the bulk regulations, the minimum width at front building restriction line should not be deleted.** Doing so would eliminate the line beyond which an exterior wall of any building of a development could be constructed or project. This would mean that exterior building walls could be extended and connected to enclose an area. This would change the character of the surrounding and adjacent neighborhood, “wall off” the viewshed, and eliminate the natural environment and open space.
- 22. Regarding the bulk regulations, the maximum floor area for structures should not be changed. The changes are not understandable, nor are they good changes.** Are you trying to eliminate altogether any maximum floor area for structures “with direct access to a principal arterial road or higher”? What do you mean by “maximum floor area for all other structures”? Where would these structures be located? Also see my previous comments objecting to the lack of definitions for “minor arterial road” or “road of a lower classification” or “minor arterial road or a road of a lower classification.” Furthermore, these changes would greatly increase the maximum floor area of all structures by two (2x) or three times (3x). Allowing for larger structures will add density, change the character of the surrounding and adjacent neighborhood, destroy the viewshed, and contribute to the concrete jungle.

For all of these reasons, I urge the County Council to reject Bill No. 92-23a. Thank you.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Dorothy M. Guy". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial 'D' and a long, sweeping underline.

Dorothy M. Guy

DATE: January 16, 2024

TO: Anne Arundel County Planning Advisory Board, County Council Members, and County Executive (planningadvisoryboard@aacounty.org & lorby@aacounty.org)

and

Anne Arundel County Office of Planning and Zoning (OPZ)
(pzpompa22@aacounty.org & pzhugh77@aacounty.org)

FROM: Mary Guy, 605 N. Bestgate Road, Annapolis, MD 21401

SUBJECT: Bill No. 92-23a Subdivision and Development – Zoning – Small Business Districts – As Amended, January 2, 2024

My name is Mary Guy. I am affiliated with 605 and 607 N. Bestgate Road, Annapolis MD 21401. I am submitting comments regarding Bill No. 92-23a Subdivision and Development – Zoning – Small Business Districts (Bill), as amended, January 2, 2024.

I oppose this Bill and strongly urge that **the County Council reject Bill No. 92-23a, as amended, in its entirety.**

First, I incorporate my original comments made on December 29, 2023 in full. I believe they continue to apply and are valid comments that the County Council should **respond to in writing in full** in advance of making a decision on Bill No. 92-23a. They appear below in a separate section titled “Original Comments on Bill No. 92-23 Submitted December 29, 2023.” Those comments urge the County Council to reject Bill No. 92-23. My position remains unchanged and I continue to urge the County Council to reject Bill No. 92-23a.

Second, the County Council should reject Bill No. 92-23a because the changes in the amended bill would remove the existing limitations on signs in a small business district and replace them with the same requirements for signs in commercial and industrial districts. For a small business district, a change in signage to the proposed magnitude would be abhorrent as well as an over-the-top and disastrous nightmare for those taxpayers, voters, residents, and visitors in the residential district. It would destroy the residential character of places where residents, visitors, and property owners are supposed to benefit from non-interference of outside forces, including commercial establishments and their traffic (foot, vehicle, etc.), lighting, signage, noise, trash, pollution, etc.

Third, Bill No. 92-23a is an unnecessary assault on the residential areas and desire of commercial businesses to impinge on the lifestyle, health and well-being of its residents and visitors.

This bill should be rejected in its entirety by the County Council.

**Original Comments on Bill No. 92-23 Submitted December 29, 2023
(Please review these comments again.)**

DATE: December 29, 2023

TO: Anne Arundel County Planning Advisory Board, County Council Members, and County Executive (planningadvisoryboard@aacounty.org & lcorby@aacounty.org)

And

Anne Arundel County Office of Planning and Zoning (OPZ) (pzpompa22aacounty.org and pzhugh77@aacounty.org)

FROM: Mary Guy, 605 N. Bestgate Road, Annapolis, MD 21401

SUBJECT: Bill No. 92-23 Subdivision and Development – Zoning – Small Business Districts

My name is Mary Guy. I am affiliated with 605 and 607 N. Bestgate Road, Annapolis MD 21401. I am submitting comments regarding Bill No. 92-23.

Here are my comments:

First, Bill 92-23 would change existing setbacks, structures, etc. by significantly minimizing the area required for each. It would also result in consumption of virtually every square inch of land and result in considerable loss of open space within the County.

Recommendation 1: I oppose the bill in its entirety and highly recommend that the County Council oppose all proposed changes.

Second, I understand that this bill was introduced to the County Council in mid-December 2023 and is now for vote on January 2, 2024. This brief window of time is inadequate for public review and comment, especially given the holidays that occur from late November and into January (i.e., people being on travel and away from their homes and communities; people having additional child care, religious, and other responsibilities; people distracted and not attentive to the news outlets, etc.)

Recommendation 2: I recommend extending the public review, comment and voting period for several weeks until such time as the public has a reasonable amount of time to consider the bill and comment on it.

Third, in reviewing the Bill 92-23, it appears that the bill would significantly change areas that are zoned residential by promoting or adding small businesses and additional types of small businesses within those residential areas. This would significantly destroy the character of these residential communities, increase the built environment, add impervious concrete and other surfaces, cause irrevocable harm to the environment, stress already inadequate public infrastructure, result in more traffic and noise, etc.

Recommendation 3: I recommend the County furnish examples of where these kinds of small businesses are currently located, planned, etc. and provide an impact analysis (e.g., stress on existing infrastructure—water, sewer, public safety, environmental impact, etc.) for such areas to the public on the bill's impact on residential communities, then allow time for sufficient public review and comment.

Fourth, the bill uses the term “minor arterial road” but does not define this term, its scope, the number, name, and location of such roads with Anne Arundel County, the volume of traffic that such roads support, etc.

Recommendation 4: I request that the County Council:

- Provide the legal definition of “minor arterial road” and volume of traffic associated with this term
- State how many lanes and what type of shoulder these roads have
- State whether these roads contain bike lanes and sidewalks
- Indicate how many, the name and segments of the roads, where these roads exist within Anne Arundel County, and the safety record (e.g., accidents, causalities, complaints) for each road
- Identify the entity that determines what constitutes a “minor arterial road”
- Identify who is responsible for each road's care and maintenance (e.g., paving, pothole repair, signage, snow and ice removal, monitoring of traffic, trash removal, etc.)
- Identify the number and type of entrances and egress points and visual/site requirements (e.g., field of vision when entering or leaving, site distance) for each
- Identify whether these roads have street lights, stop lights, intersections, rotaries/traffic circles, etc.

Fifth, by way of the businesses that would be allowed along these roads, what protections would there be for the community? For example, would liquor, cannabis, substance abuse treatment facilities and businesses be allowed? Would smoke shops, dry cleaners, fast food, convenience stores, auto/vehicle repair, and other businesses that have high levels of pollutants be allowed in the residential community? What would be the lighting, security, and trash removal requirements? What about Smart Growth—how is the County using it to maintain the non-built environment, tree canopy, and health and well-being of the county, its land, and waterways? We already know that the County has a relatively poor record of enforcing zoning codes, so what assurances

would the stakeholders (i.e., residents, taxpayers, voters) have of code enforcement and compliance?

Recommendation 5: I request that the County Council respond to the Comment 4 questions and concerns.

Sixth, given the language of the bill, the County Council's approval would result in a significant increase in the built environment and cause irrevocable harm to the residents and environment. Anne Arundel County is a unique and beautiful area and the County Council must CONSERVE, PRESERVE, AND PROTECT the County's natural resources and not allow them to be plowed under, paved, and built upon for the sake of profit for the developers and taxes for the County. The County Office of Planning and Zoning (OPZ), in documents presented earlier this year, already noted that it has plenty of commercial and residential space and does not need more, e.g., the Region 7 Plan. OPZ recommends redeveloping areas that have already been developed and need improvement. Bill No. 92-23 does not align with OPZ's plan or the other plans that the County has put forth.

Recommendation 6: Revisit this bill and align the bill with Smart Growth principles and the County's stated interest in redeveloping already developed areas, maintaining a more-than-satisfactory quality of life rating. CONSERVE, PRESERVE, AND PROTECT. Then, allow for additional public review and comment on the bill, including additional meetings.

Seventh, I understand that the County Council proposes to hold its public meetings to as late as 11:30 p.m. This ending time is unacceptable as most people are neither away from their homes nor participating on teleconferences on a weekday night at this late hour (i.e., minutes before the stroke of midnight!) Although there may be a select, small group of people who are able to participate until late into the night, most do not have the flexibility, stamina, or economic luxury to do so. Holding meetings into the night poses serious questions concerning transparency and openness and is not conducive to public participation. In addition, holding meetings until this hour poses significant public safety concerns (e.g., walking in poorly lit and empty streets, accessing dark parking garages, driving and transportation issues, etc.)

Recommendation 7: I recommend that all County Council meetings not extend past 9 p.m. and, if necessary, start at 5:30 or 6:00 p.m. to ensure adequate time for the meeting. I also recommend that the County Council extend the opportunity for the public to comment before the County Council by holding additional meetings at these same times, if needed.

Eighth, as we've noted with the Office of Planning and Zoning (OPZ) and the Public Advisory Board, meeting minutes and updated reports are not completed and published timely, limiting the public's ability to review them and prepare comments. For example, we continue to await the publication and posting of the OPZ Stakeholder Advisory Board meeting minutes for the September 2023 Region 7 Plan meeting. How can you (the

County Government) claim to have transparency in government when information is withheld from the public? Also, how can you (the County Government) ensure that all of the public's comments were reviewed and addressed, when the summary of such comments is deficient and not reflective of the scope and depth of comments this County Council, County Offices, and County Boards and Committees received??

Recommendation 8: I request that the County respond timely and in writing, including publishing responses on the County Council's website, to all comments that it receives related to this Bill No. 92-23 and others that are put forth to the County Council before the County Council takes any further action on each bill, including delaying the County Council's vote until it has fully responded publicly to comments received.

Thank you.

/s/

Mary Guy