

Timestamp	First name	Last name	City	State	Zip code	Are you representing yourself?	Who are you representing?	Legislation	Position	Remarks	Attachment
2024-01-02 9:23:35	Leslie	Volkmar	Annapolis	Maryland	21401	Yes		Bill No. 84-23aa: Odenton Town Center Master Plan – Approval (amended)	Oppose		
2024-01-01 17:20:43	Cheryl	Johnson	Annapolis	Maryland	21409	Yes		Bill No. 86-23aa: Zoning & Development – Redevelopment (amended)	Oppose	<p>My husband and I purchased a 6.66 acre parcel of land on Shot Town Rd in 2004. The 1/2 mile of narrow, winding road is nestled in acres of dense trees inhabited by a host of wildlife creatures and creeks and streams making this a perfect environment to raise our 5 children.</p> <p>Recently, it has come to our communities attention that some of the property owners (many who don't reside here) wish to rezone and subdivide their properties presumably for financial gain. Most parcels are zoned RDL which is supported by the majority of our community members.</p> <p>Increased density/population would certainly impose a negative impact including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Lack of environmental protection</li> <li>- Decreased wildlife preservation</li> <li>- Decreased fire station</li> <li>- Mill Creek tributary to Chesapeake Bay</li> <li>-Lack of adequate infrastructure to support increase population/usage</li> <li>- Lack of adequate emergency/safety support</li> </ul> <p>We urge you to protect the environment, the tranquility and the safety of our friends and families on Shot Town Rd</p> <p>Thank you</p>	
2024-01-01 20:28:40	Cheryl	Maisel	Annapolis	MD	21409	Yes		Bill No. 86-23aa: Zoning & Development – Redevelopment (amended)	Oppose	We oppose any change to zoning. We specifically bought this land to get away from the overdevelopment and overcrowded area that we lived in across bay dale drive. Do not allow rezoning.	
2024-01-01 20:37:19	Aaron	Maisel	Annapolis	MARYLAND	21409	Yes		Bill No. 86-23aa: Zoning & Development – Redevelopment (amended)	Oppose	We do not want any change to current zoning. We specifically bought this parcel to get away from the overdevelopment the county and this area specifically is undergoing. It's already a traffic nightmare on bay dale drive and the new condos on old mill bottom are not even sold yet. We lived across bay dale drive right next to where those element condos are being built and specifically moved to shot town rd because it was rural and the lots were large and not overdeveloped. Do not allow more houses! It would be detrimental to this environment around mill creek. They already allowed Koch homes to get a variance to build more homes so close to mill creek. We strongly oppose a zoning change.	
2024-01-02 8:54:52	Aaron	Maisel	Annapolis	MARYLAND	21409	Yes		Bill No. 86-23aa: Zoning & Development – Redevelopment (amended)	Oppose	We do not want any change to current zoning. We specifically bought this parcel to get away from the overdevelopment the county and this area specifically is undergoing. It's already a traffic nightmare on bay dale drive and the new condos on old mill bottom are not even sold yet. We lived across bay dale drive right next to where those element condos are being built and specifically moved to shot town rd because it was rural and the lots were large and not overdeveloped. Do not allow more houses! It would be detrimental to this environment around mill creek. They already allowed Koch homes to get a variance to build more homes so close to mill creek. We strongly oppose a zoning change.	
2024-01-02 9:07:27	Leslie	Volkmar	Annapolis	Maryland	21401	Yes		Bill No. 86-23aa: Zoning & Development – Redevelopment (amended)	Oppose		
2024-01-02 9:10:14	Leslie	Volkmar	Annapolis	Maryland	21401	Yes		BILL NO. 89-23a: Real Property Tax Credit – Disabled or Fallen Law Enforcement Officers & Rescue Workers (amended)	Oppose		
2024-01-02 9:12:27	Leslie	Volkmar	Annapolis	Maryland	21401	Yes		BILL NO. 90-23: Property disposition – Brooklyn Heights Park	Oppose		
2024-01-02 9:13:58	Leslie	Volkmar	Annapolis	Maryland	21401	Yes		BILL NO. 91-23: Real Property Tax Credit – Public Safety Officer	Oppose		
2023-12-29 12:09:38	Mary	Guy	Annapolis	MD	21401	Yes		BILL NO. 92-23: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts	Oppose	Please see the attachment.	YES
2023-12-30 8:37:36	Paul	Arcand	Pasadena	Maryland	21122	No	Lighthouse Baptist Church	BILL NO. 92-23: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts	Support	<p>Lighthouse Baptist Church 195 Ritchie Highway Severna Park, MD</p> <p>January 2, 2024</p> <p>To the Honorable Members of the Anne Arundel County Council,</p> <p>Subject: Support for Bill 92-23 - Small Business Zoning</p> <p>Dear Council Members,</p> <p>I am writing to you as the Pastor of Lighthouse Baptist Church, located at 195 Ritchie Highway in Severna Park, to express our strong support for Bill 92-23, concerning Small Business zoning. This bill represents a thoughtful approach to urban planning, bridging the gap between heavy commercial and residential zones through updating this important transitional zoning designation.</p> <p>1. Promoting Balanced Development: The bill enhances and facilitates a harmonious transition between different zones, benefiting both the community and small businesses. It allows small businesses to thrive in a supportive environment while maintaining the integrity of residential areas. This balanced development is crucial for sustainable community growth.</p> <p>2. Beneficial for Lighthouse Baptist Church: Our church, situated at a key location, has been impacted by the current zoning restrictions. We believe our property is incorrectly zoned as purely residential. Bill 92-23 offers a viable solution by allowing a small business designation, which aligns more closely with our operational needs and community services.</p> <p>3. Support for Proposed Amendment: Furthermore, we strongly support an amendment to Bill 92-23, which would allow for religious organizations to have buildings up to 15,000 square feet. This amendment will enable us to better serve our congregation and community, aligning with our mission of spiritual guidance and community support.</p> <p>In conclusion, Bill 92-23 is a progressive step towards fostering a vibrant and inclusive community where small businesses and religious organizations like ours can coexist harmoniously with residential areas. We urge the Council to pass this bill with the proposed amendment, recognizing its potential to enhance community dynamics and support local needs. Thank you for considering our viewpoint. We look forward to a positive outcome that benefits our community as a whole.</p> <p>Your Friend and Fellow Servant, Paul J. Arcand II, Pastor (443)454-9223 Lighthouse Baptist Church 195 Ritchie Hwy, Severna Park, MD 21146</p>	YES

Timestamp	First name	Last name	City	State	Zip code	Are you representing yourself?	Who are you representing?	Legislation	Position	Remarks	Attachment
2023-12-30 13:18:45	DOROTHY	GUY	Annapolis	MD	21401	Yes		BILL NO. 92-23: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts	Oppose	This Bill will destroy existing and new neighborhoods by allowing Small Business Districts with incompatible and inappropriate uses to infiltrate and destroy them with denser development, more people, traffic, noise, trash, water pollution, light pollution, loss of the natural environment, crime, etc. Our roadways will become nothing more than a sea of commercial buildings. This Bill will 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. See full comments in attachment. Council Members, please reject HB 92-23.	YES
2023-12-30 14:23:24	Nancy	Guy	Annapolis	MD	21401	Yes		BILL NO. 92-23: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts	Oppose	I am affiliated with 605 and 607 N. Bestgate Road, Annapolis, MD 21401. I oppose Bill No. 92-23 and strongly urge the County Council reject Bill 92-23 in its entirety.  I agree with comments submitted on December 30, 2023 by Dorothy Guy (see attached) and December 29, 2023 by Mary Guy. In addition, I oppose the bill because it will have substantial negative impact on wildlife that rely on wooded and natural environments for survival (food, shelter, etc.)	YES
2023-12-30 19:47:36	Suzanne	Price	ANNAPOLIS	MD	21401	Yes		BILL NO. 92-23: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts	Oppose	This bill 92-32 will further hurt small businesses. This county executive has already decimated small businesses during the pandemic. I adamantly oppose this bad bill. I support strengthening small business not adding continued harm to their existence.	
2023-12-31 13:04:01	Nancy	Guy	Annapolis	MD	21491	No	Jane Malone	BILL NO. 92-23: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts	Oppose	I Jane Malone give Nancy Guy permission to submit these comments on my behalf. I am affiliated with 605 and 607 N. Bestgate Road, Annapolis, MD 21401. I oppose Bill No. 92-23 and strongly urge the County Council reject Bill 92-23 in its entirety.  I agree with comments submitted on December 30, 2023 by Dorothy Guy (see attached) and December 29, 2023 by Mary Guy. In addition, I oppose the bill because it will have substantial negative impact on wildlife that rely on wooded and natural environments for survival (food, shelter, etc.)  File upload, optional Bill 92-23 County Council Comments DG 2023-12-30.pdf (160.73 KB)	
2023-12-31 13:18:01	Jane	Malone	Annapolis	MD	21401	No	Jane Malone	BILL NO. 92-23: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts	Oppose	I Jane Malone give Nancy Guy permission to submit these comments on my behalf. I am affiliated with 605 and 607 N. Bestgate Road, Annapolis, MD 21401. I oppose Bill No. 92-23 and strongly urge the County Council reject Bill 92-23 in its entirety.  I  File upload, optional Bill 92-23 County Council Comments DG 2023-12-30.pdf (160.73 KB)	
2023-12-31 15:07:37	Peggy	Hamilton	Annapolis	MD	21402	Yes		BILL NO. 92-23: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts	Oppose	I would like to second everything that my sister, Ms. Dorothy Guy, wrote in opposition to this bill. I've attached her written statement to this submission.	YES
2023-12-31 17:15:15	Ruth	Jobe	Annapolis	MD	21401	Yes		BILL NO. 92-23: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts	Oppose	See attached pdf and files submitted by Dorothy Guy (submitted 12-30-23) and Mary Guy (submitted 12-29-23).	YES
2023-12-31 18:27:49	Wayne	Nappari	Glen Burnie	MD	21060	Yes		BILL NO. 92-23: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts	Support	I support this common sense legislation.	
2023-12-31 19:18:16	Danny	Pullen	Severn	MD	21144	Yes		BILL NO. 92-23: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts	Support	I strongly support this bill	
2023-12-31 19:21:36	Andrew	Bartley	Gwynn Oak	MD	21207	Yes		BILL NO. 92-23: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts	Support		
2023-12-31 19:22:50	Terri	Davis	Gambrills	MD	21054	Yes		BILL NO. 92-23: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts	Support	Please pass this bill!	
2023-12-31 19:27:24	Kyun	Berwager	Crownsville	Md	21031	Yes		BILL NO. 92-23: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts	Support	I support this common-sense bill.	
2023-12-31 19:32:21	Eli	Antons	Pasadena	MD	21122	Yes		BILL NO. 92-23: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts	Support	We definitely support. Thank you for your work!	
2023-12-31 19:52:24	Keaston	Edwards	Hanover	Maryland	21076	Yes		BILL NO. 92-23: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts	Support		
2023-12-31 19:59:58	Curtis	Kingsland	ODENTON	MD	21113	Yes		BILL NO. 92-23: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts	Support	I highly suggest and request that this bill be voted in favorably. Thank you.	
2023-12-31 20:00:38	Laurie	Pullen	Severn	Maryland	21144	Yes		BILL NO. 92-23: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts	Support	I am very much in favor of Bill 92-23 and ask that the Council pass this common sense Bill.	
2023-12-31 20:01:58	Laurie	Kingsland	ODENTON	MD	21113	Yes		BILL NO. 92-23: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts	Support	please pass this bill as I'm in favor of it. Thank you	
2023-12-31 20:13:22	Staci	Flanagan	Millersville	MD	21108	Yes		BILL NO. 92-23: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts	Support		
2023-12-31 20:13:54	Matthew	Flanagan	Millersville	MD	21108	Yes		BILL NO. 92-23: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts	Support		
2023-12-31 20:14:28	Jewel	Evans	Pasadena	MD	21122	Yes		BILL NO. 92-23: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts	Support		
2023-12-31 20:16:42	Ronald	Anderson	Millersville	MD	21108	Yes		BILL NO. 92-23: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts	Support	Please enact this legislation. Thank you.	
2023-12-31 20:32:09	Paul	Arcand Sr	Pasadena	MD	21122	Yes		BILL NO. 92-23: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts	Support	This is common sense legislation	
2023-12-31 20:47:22	Christine	Janos	Pasadena	Maryland	21122	Yes		BILL NO. 92-23: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts	Support		
2023-12-31 20:53:25	Amber	Arcand	Pasadena	MD	21122	Yes		BILL NO. 92-23: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts	Support	I support this common-sense bill.	
2023-12-31 20:53:29	Ruth	Antons	Pasadena	MD	21122	Yes		BILL NO. 92-23: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts	Support		
2023-12-31 20:57:03	Wayne	Berwager	Crownsville	MD	21032	Yes		BILL NO. 92-23: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts	Support	Thank you for your continued support to our community and endeavor to make it a better and safer place to live and raise our families.  To the Honorable Members of the Anne Arundel County Council,  Subject: Support for Bill 92-23 - Small Business Zoning  Dear Council Members, I am writing to you as the Pastor of Lighthouse Baptist Church, located at 195 Ritchie Highway in Severna Park, to express our strong support for Bill 92-23, concerning Small Business zoning. This bill represents a thoughtful approach to urban planning, bridging the gap between heavy commercial and residential zones through updating this important transitional zoning designation.  1. Promoting Balanced Development: The bill enhances and facilitates a harmonious transition between different zones, benefiting both the community and small businesses. It allows small businesses to thrive in a supportive environment while maintaining the integrity of residential areas. This balanced development is crucial for sustainable community growth.  2. Beneficial for Lighthouse Baptist Church: Our church, situated at a key location, has been impacted by the current zoning restrictions. We believe our property is incorrectly zoned as purely residential. Bill 92-23 offers a viable solution by allowing a small business designation, which aligns more closely with our operational needs and community services.  3. Support for Proposed Amendment: Furthermore, we strongly support an amendment to Bill 92-23, which would allow for religious organizations to have buildings up to 15,000 square feet. This amendment will enable us to better serve our congregation and community, aligning with our mission of spiritual guidance and community support.  In conclusion, Bill 92-23 is a progressive step towards fostering a vibrant and inclusive community where small businesses and religious organizations like ours can coexist harmoniously with residential areas. We urge the Council to pass this bill with the proposed amendment, recognizing its potential to enhance community dynamics and support local needs. Thank you for considering our viewpoint. We look forward to a positive outcome that benefits our community as a whole.	
2023-12-31 20:59:38	Lois	Berwager	Crownsville	MD	21032	Yes		BILL NO. 92-23: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts	Support	Thank you for supporting our church's endeavor to enhance the community we live in!	
2023-12-31 21:28:53	Gabby	Thompson	Pasadena	Md	21122	Yes		BILL NO. 92-23: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts	Support		

Timestamp	First name	Last name	City	State	Zip code	Are you representing yourself?	Who are you representing?	Legislation	Position	Remarks	Attachment
2023-12-31 21:46:03	Jo-Ann	Shields	Pasadena	Maryland		21122	Yes	BILL NO. 92-23: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts	Support		
2023-12-31 22:15:13	Katarzyna	Wright	Pasadena	Md		21122	Yes	BILL NO. 92-23: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts	Support	I support.	
2023-12-31 22:15:30	Tyler	Wright	Pasadena	MD		21122	Yes	BILL NO. 92-23: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts	Support	I, a 35 year district 3 resident, support this common sense bill.	
2024-01-01 8:55:41	Aaron	Dempsey	Glen Burnie	MD		21060	Yes	BILL NO. 92-23: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts	Support		
2024-01-01 8:55:54	Aaron	Dempsey	Glen Burnie	MD		21060	Yes	BILL NO. 92-23: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts	Support		
2024-01-01 8:56:16	Julia	Dempsey	Glen Burnie	MD		21060	Yes	BILL NO. 92-23: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts	Support		
2024-01-01 10:02:05	Aaron	Dempsey	Glen Burnie	MD		21060	Yes	BILL NO. 92-23: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts	Support		
2024-01-01 12:17:59	Kyle	Pullen	Pasadena	MD		21122	Yes	BILL NO. 92-23: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts	Support	I support this common sense bill as it would be a benefit to small businesses.	
2024-01-01 12:18:52	Abigail	Pullen	Pasadena	MD		21122	Yes	BILL NO. 92-23: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts	Support	I support this bill for our county.	
2024-01-01 12:22:09	Patricia	Copsey	Glen Burnie	MD		21061	Yes	BILL NO. 92-23: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts	Support	I support this bill.	
2024-01-01 12:23:07	James	Copsey	Glen Burnie	MD		21061	Yes	BILL NO. 92-23: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts	Support	I support this bill	
2024-01-01 15:47:57	April	Holmes	Pasadena	Maryland		21122	Yes	BILL NO. 92-23: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts	Support		
2024-01-01 15:53:51	Christine	Janos	Pasadena	Maryland		21122	Yes	BILL NO. 92-23: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts	Support		
2024-01-01 18:51:52	Joanne	Triantafyllides	Annapolis	Maryland		21403	Yes	BILL NO. 92-23: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts	Oppose	I believe this area should not see more development of businesses.	
2024-01-01 21:27:57	Adriaunna	Edwards	Hanover	MD		21076	Yes	BILL NO. 92-23: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts	Support	I highly support this bill.	
2024-01-02 0:00:04	Adriaunna	Edwards	Hanover	MD		21076	Yes	BILL NO. 92-23: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts	Support	I highly support this bill.	
2024-01-02 1:49:35	Lynn	Nappari	Glen Burnie	MD	21060-6912	Yes		BILL NO. 92-23: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts	Support	Considering that many AACO small businesses were adversely affected by the pandemic, Bill 92-23 is one way the Council can act to lessen the burden on these constituencies as they continue struggling to recover from those hardships. Thank you.	
2024-01-02 8:36:17	Ruth	Jobe	Annapolis	MD		21401	No	Jessica S. Guy Family Trust BILL NO. 92-23: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts	Oppose	See attached file.	YES
2024-01-02 8:47:46	Leslie	Volkmar	Annapolis	Maryland		21401	Yes	BILL NO. 92-23: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts	Oppose		
2024-01-02 8:57:56	Patricia	Meinhold	Annapolis	Maryland		21401	Yes	BILL NO. 92-23: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts	Oppose	I request that the County Council reject bill 92-23. It is too broad a bill, and grants too many freedoms to small businesses at the expense of the residents and the broader community. Thank you, Patricia Meinhold	
2024-01-02 9:55:12	Peggy	Williams	Severna Park	MD		21146	Yes	BILL NO. 92-23: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts	Support	I support this bill because it allows small businesses to more easily find locations to set up. We need to protect small businesses in our communities.	
2024-01-02 9:57:53	Stephen	Hammond	Annapolis	MD		21401	Yes	BILL NO. 92-23: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts	Oppose	Hello, I am stating my OPPOSITION to Bill No. 92-23. I feel like it would degrade the character of residential areas that we work hard to reside in - specifically, the Ridgely Avenue corridor. Currently, within one mile of the proposed "Village Center" overlay for this area, there are at least ten restaurants, two convenience stores, two gas stations, and a grocery store. There are enough services within this mile to cater to the residents of this area. We do not need a commercial, West-Annapolis-like "Village Center" to appease the few (or one) property owner that request commercial zoning of their residential properties. Please take into account the majority of residents that live in these residential areas to be away from commercial/city areas. If we want to be in a Village Center, we would move to the city. We do not want more traffic, more stop lights and intersections, sidewalks, and light and noise pollution. We work very hard to own and live in these quiet residential areas for a reason. Please don't sacrifice our way of life for the benefit of a few property owners that do not even live here. Thank you very much for considering my input, and your vote to oppose Bill No. 92-23.	
2024-01-02 10:04:02	Gregory	Ostrowski	Annapolis	MD		21401	Yes	BILL NO. 92-23: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts	Oppose	The proposed bill includes a significant expansion of allowable uses to a quiet neighborhood atmosphere.  It is clear from previous hearings that those who want big changes are those that do not live in the area -- rather they want to buy property so that they can develop and profit from our local community. It appears they don't care what changes the neighborhood has as long as they can own and develop the property for profit. What is needed is to actually listen to all residents that live in Lindamoor, Dreams Landing, along Ridgely Avenue, West Annapolis, etc... as they will be the most affected on a daily basis. Also, what happens to Ridgely Avenue South of the Route 50 bridge as there is no room for expansion? Traffic-wise, West Annapolis will be considerably affected since the area is already congested during afterschool pickup and in the Summertime when there are Bay Bridge backups People in the area have turned down all the proposals so far -- how are council members continuing to propose these changes? Several committee members appear to have a conflict of interest -- working for those most in-favor of the development. How are those conflicts to be mitigated? Run-off. Any development would seem to have potential run-off concerns as it relates to the Severn River, Weems Creek and ultimately the Chesapeake Bay. Runoff from Route 50 is already exacerbating water-health-concerns in Weems Creek. Any of these concerns should be addressed prior to moving further in any fashion with the components within the proposed bill. Further, prior to any expansion, sidewalks, bike lanes and repaving should occur.	
2024-01-02 10:14:13	Mary	Ostrowski	Annapolis	MD		21401	Yes	BILL NO. 92-23: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts	Oppose	The proposed bill includes a significant expansion of allowable uses to a quiet neighborhood atmosphere. It is clear from previous hearings that those who want big changes are those that do not live in the area -- rather they want to buy property so that they can develop and profit from our local community. It appears they don't care what changes the neighborhood has as long as they can own and develop the property for profit.  What is needed is to actually listen to all residents that live in Lindamoor, Dreams Landing, along Ridgely Avenue, West Annapolis, etc... as they will be the most affected on a daily basis.  Also, what happens to Ridgely Avenue South of the Route 50 bridge as there is no room for expansion? Traffic-wise, West Annapolis will be considerably affected since the area is already congested during afterschool pickup and in the Summertime when there are Bay Bridge backups (the latter being crippling!).  People in the area have turned down all the proposals so far -- how are council members continuing to propose these changes? Several committee members appear to have a conflict of interest -- working for those most in-favor of the development. How are those conflicts to be mitigated?  Run-off. Any development would seem to have potential run-off concerns as it relates to the Severn River, Weems Creek and ultimately the Chesapeake Bay. Runoff from Route 50 is already exacerbating water-health-concerns in Weems Creek. Any of these concerns should be addressed prior to moving further in any fashion with the components within the proposed bill. Further, prior to any expansion, sidewalks, bike lanes and repaving should occur.	

Timestamp	First name	Last name	City	State	Zip code	Are you representing yourself?	Who are you representing?	Legislation	Position	Remarks	Attachment
2024-01-02 10:17:18	Rachel	Bartgis	ANNAPOLIS	MD	21401-2747	Yes		BILL NO. 92-23: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts	Support	I have live in downtown Annapolis for 18 years and one big reason I bought my home there is the ability to easily and safely run many of my errands on foot or bicycle due to mixed use zoning combined with there being sidewalks everywhere. I think creating more mixed-use areas focused on SMALL developments will improve quality of life elsewhere in the county by encouraging walking and decreasing car use.  However, I wish that this legislation included small grocery stores. I also wish there were requirements for reviewing any proposed 'small business district' and the neighborhoods around it for pedestrian access and creating a plan for filling in any gaps in sidewalk coverage, building crosswalks, etc. as part of building anything new. I know from personal experience as someone who didn't own a car until 2018 and mostly got around the Annapolis area on foot and bicycle that the suburban areas beyond downtown Annapolis have inconsistent sidewalk coverage and are dangerous to navigate on foot or bike, in some cases because of a blind corner with no shoulder or a short section of road - small areas that might be invisible to a resident or government official who has only ever gotten around by car but have a big impact on someone's decision to walk vs getting into a car. Building 'small business districts' that people still have to drive to even if they live a few blocks away doesn't address the underlying issue the county faces of needing to end car-dependent development patterns before we all get swallowed in traffic.	
2024-01-02 10:20:08	Sabrina	Ostrowski	Annapolis	MD	21401	Yes		BILL NO. 92-23: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts	Oppose	-The proposed bill includes a significant expansion of allowable uses to a quiet neighborhood atmosphere. -It is clear from previous hearings that those who want big changes are those that do not live in the area -- rather they want to buy property so that they can develop and profit from our local community. -It appears they don't care what changes the neighborhood has as long as they can own and develop the property for profit. -What is needed is to actually listen to all residents that live in Lindamoor, Dreams Landing, along Ridgely Avenue, West Annapolis, etc... as they will be the most affected on a daily basis. - Also, what happens to Ridgely Avenue South of the Route 50 bridge as there is no room for expansion? - Traffic-wise, West Annapolis will be considerably affected since the area is already congested during afterschool pickup and in the Summertime when there are Bay Bridge backups. -People in the area have turned down all the proposals so far -- how are council members continuing to propose these changes? -Several committee members appear to have a conflict of interest -- working for those most in-favor of the development. How are those conflicts to be mitigated? -Run-off. Any development would seem to have potential run-off concerns as it relates to the Severn River, Weems Creek and ultimately the Chesapeake Bay. Runoff from Route 50 is already exacerbating water-health-concerns in Weems Creek. Any of these concerns should be addressed prior to moving further in any fashion with the components within the proposed bill. -Further, prior to any expansion, sidewalks, bike lanes and repaving should occur.	
2024-01-02 10:29:24	Dr. John	Ostrowski	Annapolis	MD	21401	Yes		BILL NO. 92-23: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts	Oppose	The proposed bill includes a significant expansion of allowable uses to a quiet neighborhood atmosphere. It is clear from previous hearings that those who want big changes are those that do not live in the area -- rather they want to buy property so that they can develop and profit from our local community. It appears they don't care what changes the neighborhood has as long as they can own and develop the property for profit. What is needed is to actually listen to all residents that live in Lindamoor, Dreams Landing, along Ridgely Avenue, West Annapolis, etc... as they will be the most affected on a daily basis. Also, what happens to Ridgely Avenue South of the Route 50 bridge as there is no room for expansion Traffic-wise, West Annapolis will be considerably affected since the area is already congested during afterschool pickup and in the Summertime when there are Bay Bridge backups People in the area have turned down all the proposals so far -- how are council members continuing to propose these changes? Several committee members appear to have a conflict of interest -- working for those most in-favor of the development. How are those conflicts to be mitigated? Run-off. Any development would seem to have potential run-off concerns as it relates to the Severn River, Weems Creek and ultimately the Chesapeake Bay. Runoff from Route 50 is already exacerbating water-health-concerns in Weems Creek. Any of these concerns should be addressed prior to moving further in any fashion with the components within the proposed bill. Further, prior to any expansion, sidewalks, bike lanes and repaving should occur.	
2024-01-02 10:34:10	Maeve	Ostrowski	Annapolis	MD	21401	Yes		BILL NO. 92-23: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts	Oppose	The proposed bill includes a significant expansion of allowable uses to a quiet neighborhood atmosphere. It is clear from previous hearings that those who want big changes are those that do not live in the area -- rather they want to buy property so that they can develop and profit from our local community. It appears they don't care what changes the neighborhood has as long as they can own and develop the property for profit. What is needed is to actually listen to all residents that live in Lindamoor, Dreams Landing, along Ridgely Avenue, West Annapolis, etc... as they will be the most affected on a daily basis. Also, what happens to Ridgely Avenue South of the Route 50 bridge as there is no room for expansion Traffic-wise, West Annapolis will be considerably affected since the area is already congested during afterschool pickup and in the Summertime when there are Bay Bridge backups People in the area have turned down all the proposals so far -- how are council members continuing to propose these changes? Several committee members appear to have a conflict of interest -- working for those most in-favor of the development. How are those conflicts to be mitigated? Run-off. Any development would seem to have potential run-off concerns as it relates to the Severn River, Weems Creek and ultimately the Chesapeake Bay. Runoff from Route 50 is already exacerbating water-health-concerns in Weems Creek. Any of these concerns should be addressed prior to moving further in any fashion with the components within the proposed bill. Further, prior to any expansion, sidewalks, bike lanes and repaving should occur.	
2024-01-02 10:49:04	Michael & Wen	Ostrowski	Annapolis	MD	21401	Yes		BILL NO. 92-23: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts	Oppose	The proposed bill includes a significant expansion of allowable uses to a quiet neighborhood atmosphere. It is clear from previous hearings that those who want big changes are those that do not live in the area -- rather they want to buy property so that they can develop and profit from our local community. It appears they don't care what changes the neighborhood has as long as they can own and develop the property for profit. What is needed is to actually listen to all residents that live in Lindamoor, Dreams Landing, along Ridgely Avenue, West Annapolis, etc... as they will be the most affected on a daily basis. Also, what happens to Ridgely Avenue South of the Route 50 bridge as there is no room for expansion Traffic-wise, West Annapolis will be considerably affected since the area is already congested during afterschool pickup and in the Summertime when there are Bay Bridge backups People in the area have turned down all the proposals so far -- how are council members continuing to propose these changes? Several committee members appear to have a conflict of interest -- working for those most in-favor of the development. How are those conflicts to be mitigated? Run-off. Any development would seem to have potential run-off concerns as it relates to the Severn River, Weems Creek and ultimately the Chesapeake Bay. Runoff from Route 50 is already exacerbating water-health-concerns in Weems Creek. Any of these concerns should be addressed prior to moving further in any fashion with the components within the proposed bill. Further, prior to any expansion, sidewalks, bike lanes and repaving should occur.	
2024-01-02 10:52:35	Wendy	Ostrowski	Annapolis	Maryland	21401	Yes		BILL NO. 92-23: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts	Oppose	No change of zoning, Ridgely Ave, Weems Creek, Lindamor we cannot have increased car traffic. Also Ridgely Oaks was illegally built by adding a third story to the building. Now their septic system is failing. Remember these builders and county are crooks and turn a blind eye	

**DATE:** December 30, 2023

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

and

Anne Arundel County Office of Planning and Zoning (OPZ)  
([pzpompa22aacounty.org](mailto:pzpompa22aacounty.org) & [pzhugh77@aacounty.org](mailto:pzhugh77@aacounty.org) )

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

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

---

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. 92-23 Subdivision and Development – Zoning – Small Business Districts (Bill).

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

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. 92-23.** Thank you.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Dorothy M. Guy". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Dorothy M. Guy

**DATE:** December 29, 2023

**TO:** Anne Arundel County Planning Advisory Board, County Council Members, and County Executive ([planningadvisoryboard@aacounty.org](mailto:planningadvisoryboard@aacounty.org) & [lcoby@aacounty.org](mailto:lcoby@aacounty.org))

And

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

**DATE:** December 30, 2023

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

and

Anne Arundel County Office of Planning and Zoning (OPZ)  
([pzpompa22aacounty.org](mailto:pzpompa22aacounty.org) & [pzhugh77@aacounty.org](mailto:pzhugh77@aacounty.org) )

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

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

---

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. 92-23 Subdivision and Development – Zoning – Small Business Districts (Bill).

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

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. 92-23.** 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, stylized initial 'D'.

Dorothy M. Guy







**DATE:** December 30, 2023

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

and

Anne Arundel County Office of Planning and Zoning (OPZ)  
([pzpompa22aacounty.org](mailto:pzpompa22aacounty.org) & [pzhugh77@aacounty.org](mailto:pzhugh77@aacounty.org) )

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

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

---

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. 92-23 Subdivision and Development – Zoning – Small Business Districts (Bill).

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

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. 92-23.** 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 'G'.

Dorothy M. Guy

**DATE:** December 31, 2023

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

and

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

**FROM:** Ruth Jobe, 605 N. Bestgate Road, Annapolis, MD 21401

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

---

My name is Ruth Jobe. I am affiliated with 605 and 607 N. Bestgate Road, Annapolis MD 21401. I am submitting comments regarding Bill No. 92-23 Subdivision and Development – Zoning – Small Business Districts (Bill).

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

This Bill offers no protections to the residential community or the cultural and natural environment in which we reside but only benefits those with commercial development plans as evidenced by the language, “BY repealing and reenacting, with amendments: §§ 17-7-1101; 18-9-402; and 18-9-403 Anne Arundel County Code (2005, as amended).” Where are the protections for the residents; especially those with Residential zoning?

We are witnessing how elderly residents are being approached to sell their residential parcels to those who have no intention of maintaining the residential nature of the area but who seek/sought upzoning to Small Business District zoning or higher to destroy the neighborhood’s character without regard to those who have multi-generational interests in the community. Commercialization does not offer those with residential interests any protection.

Many elderly realize that a quality of life will be destroyed with development. Development brings more people, traffic, noise, trash, water pollution, light pollution, loss of the natural environment, crime, etc. There are instances where land buyers have not maintained property, i.e., not improved property and now who can and do profess that the area is “dilapidated” and should become a development area. That is a great disservice to the local community, which values the natural and cultural environment. This Bill does nothing to alleviate the current stress on an inadequate public infrastructure, including roads, sewers, water lines, etc., but adds to the burden of Anne Arundel County taxpayers who must pay for that expanded infrastructure.

During the development of the Region plans, there's little evidence to see where the publicly submitted comments were read or considered in their entirety. I trust the same will not occur with these. Transparency and open government is needed here. If the public takes the time to respond, the same should be expected from government; otherwise, there is no evidence that the process is working as intended.

I note that introducing a Bill on December 4, 2023 and scheduling a public hearing on January 2 is inadequate time for the public to respond. This Bill is an especially important one for residential communities because of its long-term zoning impacts. Many Homeowner's Associations only meet quarterly and have finished annual business meetings. Many people are traveling for the holidays, on vacation, and not otherwise available. Given the placement on the Agenda and the late hour, it is not feasible for me to speak at the hearing itself. This does not bode well for transparent or open government. How is equity and inclusion being served within the confines of these limitations? Perhaps the County Council intended to impose these difficulties so that those with commercial interests would prevail as they can be represented by others without inconveniencing themselves as individuals with residential interests will be doing.

As for 17-7-1101. Architectural Features it is unclear why only a "SMALL BUSINESS DISTRICT LOCATED ON A MINOR ARTERIAL ROAD OR A ROAD OF A LOWER CLASSIFICATION" is specifically singled out. The requirements should not be limited by a certain type of road but by the architecture of the residential structures in the neighborhood. By specifying only "minor arterial road or a road of a lower classification", does this mean there aren't any restrictions for roads of a higher classification? If so, this would destroy the existing neighborhood character including those containing natural and cultural resources along these higher classifications of roadways.

Furthermore, please provide the definition of and inventory of the current "minor arterial roads or roads of a lower classification" so that residents can determine the impact this bill would have to them. I could find no analysis of any impact study.

As for 18-9-402 Permitted, conditional, and special exception uses. There's nothing in expanding the list that gives any assurances to the residential community that the current environment will be maintained and how commercialization will ultimately benefit the community, at large. Indeed, several uses are known to negatively impact the environment including dry cleaning and coin-operated laundries esp. in areas without sewers. Convenience stores are known for an escalation in crime and light and noise pollution.

As for 18-9-403 Bulk Regulations, for visualization purposes, consider that the average length of a Honda Accord is approximately 16 feet. Using this as one example, many of the proposed setbacks are less than a car length, e.g., principal structures side lot line =



7 feet; minimum setbacks for accessory structures, side lot line, rear lot line = 7 feet; corner side lot line = 15 feet. Does this seem adequate to you?

Ask yourself, if you owned a residential dwelling next to a parcel designated as Small Business District, would you want to live next to a 40 foot structure that blocks your sunlight and view of what is now your current neighbor's single story dwelling unit all because zoning regulations allow it? I think not. In this instance, the developers are hoping that you won't want to either and they will swoop in and offer you a low price for your parcel so that they can build yet another 40 foot structure. Residential protections are needed.

For unimproved lots, it is unclear why the "lesser" measurement would be used instead of the "greater". There are instances where the former residential owner has a dwelling unit on one parcel and has an abutting unimproved parcel. The new owner now has a stated intention to "assemble" the parcels to create a larger parcel. By developing the unimproved parcel, the very character of the neighborhood is changed. There are intentionally unimproved lots containing only forested areas. Where are the protections for these parcels and residents?

There are areas of the county not served by public sewers. Reducing the minimum lot size in those instances from 20,000 to 15,000 square feet will negatively impact the environment. The minimum lot size with/without sewers should remain and/or even increased.

Throughout 18-9-403, I can find nothing that protects the current residential area from becoming an overbuilt environment when Small Business District zoning is applied. What I can surmise is that impervious surfaces will increase.

Per the article found at the accompanying URL: [Replacing Anne Arundel's Lost Forests - Bay Weekly](#), "Anne Arundel County has lost close to 2,500 acres of tree canopy since 2013—more than any other county in the state. Most of that loss occurred on private land, due to development like new strip malls and subdivisions." Let's not continue this trajectory. Let's protect our residential areas and reduce the impacts of these Small Business Districts that damage the environment and destroy the sense of community and wholesomeness. Less development is needed; not more.

My overarching concerns include that 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.

Please also refer to documentation/attachments submitted by Dorothy Guy and Mary Guy. I wholeheartedly support their detailed assertions as well as hereby asserting my personal **OPPOSITION** to Bill 92-23 in its entirety.

In closing, the preservation of the residential neighborhood characteristics including the natural, cultural, and environmental resources is severely overshadowed by the focus on development and commercial interests and is abundantly clear as stated in proposed Bill No. 92-23. The residential residents of Anne Arundel County deserve better. It is incumbent upon you, the County Council, to protect the residential community from those who will encroach upon their lands. Therefore, you must **OPPOSE** Bill No. 92-23.

Thank you for your consideration.



605 N. Bestgate Road  
Annapolis, MD 21401

January 2, 2024

Subject: Opposition to Bill 92-23

My name is Ruth Jobe. On behalf of the Jessica S. Guy Family Trust and the affiliated properties at 605 and 607 N. Bestgate Road, Annapolis MD 21401, I am submitting **OPPOSITION** comments regarding Bill No. 92-23 Subdivision and Development – Zoning – Small Business Districts (Bill).

It is strongly urged that the County Council **reject** Bill No. 92-23 in its entirety.

This Bill offers no protections to the residential community or the cultural and natural environment in which we reside. It drastically changes the contents of the current Ordinance. We take exception to defining the required architectural features by the type of roadway instead of considering the neighborhood itself. The expansion of the permitted and conditional uses is incompatible with the residential neighborhood. Amending the bulk regulations to reduce minimum lot size from 20,000 sq ft to 15,000 sq ft for those lots without public sewer is irresponsible. Realistically, lot size for those not served by public sewers should be increased; not decreased.

The proposed legislation provides more impervious surfaces that will increase the environmental risk to natural resources. Reducing setbacks, allowing the “lesser” calculation for properties adjacent to developed lots (or even adding text specifically relating to “properties adjacent to developed lots”), increasing maximum floor areas for structures based on “frontage on a minor arterial road or higher” is detrimental to the local, residential community. The unequal emphasis on development and not preservation must be alleviated.

Please protect the residents from intrusion of small businesses, provide protections for the natural and cultural resources, and reduce the impact to the environment.

The proposed bill No. 92-23 does none of those things. It is up to you to **OPPOSE** it.

Thank you for your consideration.