

Timestamp	First name	Last name	City	State	Zip code	Are you representing yourself?	If no, what organization or whom do you represent?	Legislation	Position	Remarks	Attachment
2024-02-24 10:57:22	Paul	Rensted	Tracys Landing	MD	20779	Yes		Bill 1-24aa: Animal Care & Control – Potentially Dangerous, Dangerous, & Vicious Animals	Oppose	<p>I live in South County and was attacked by the same dog on two occasions, the second time requiring medical attention.</p> <p>On both occasions the owner was playing with the dog off leash in an open field and I was far away taking a walk and the dog bolted towards me. The first time I was able to fend the animal off without getting hurt.</p> <p>After the second incident I filed complaints with Animal Control. The County staff were great - I cannot emphasize that enough. But the existing process places a large burden on the victim to file a complaint and compile and submit evidence. The process requires each violation (e.g. off leash, out of yard, physical attack) have a separate complaint and supporting documentation. I believe I had to file 5 separate forms detailing each violation of the County Code. I had the time and could deal with writing things out, assembling documentation and submitting complaints. Not everyone who is attacked by an animal has the time or resources to file such complaints.</p> <p>The process also provides that if the owner does not respond there is a hearing, rather than a determination based on submitted evidence. This creates another burden for the victim, rather than a consequence for the animal owner who failed to meet the response deadline on a serious matter.</p> <p>In my case, the witnesses were me as the victim and from a distance the animal owner. When you're being attacked you do not stop and take out your iPhone to film the dog tearing at your thigh; you are otherwise occupied. Similarly, when the owner pulls the dog off of you, your priority is medical attention, not taking witness statements or seeing if someone has a Ring camera nearby.</p> <p>If any changes are being contemplated to the Code, they should include ways to support attack victims and streamline administrative processes. The existing standards and definitions for level of danger favor the animal/animal owner over the victim of an attack, and further weakening them makes no sense.</p> <p>I was left with physical scars and have a completely different experience every time I meet a dog or go out for a walk.</p> <p>Changing the County Code to allow for lesser fees for dangerous animals, reconsideration of a threat designation, and weakening the burden of proof is terrible public policy and values an animal which has demonstrated it is a threat over people.</p> <p>The ONLY element in this bill worthy of approval is making people who abuse animals pay for their care by the County. I urge you to amend the bill and remove every single component but that one.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	
2024-03-04 10:39:28	WENDY	COZZONE	Odenton	MD	21113	Yes		Bill 1-24aa: Animal Care & Control – Potentially Dangerous, Dangerous, & Vicious Animals	Support	<p>Dear County Council Members, If your dog were being accused of something that would cost him/her their life...wouldn't you want solid proof? like an eyewitness willing to testify or actual video proof, of course you would. Had this law been in effect when Odin &amp; Lucy were being held on death row for 13 months the county would not have had to spend all the time and money, they did on a case that had NO witness. Daniel Stinchcomb admitted he DID NOT witness the incident, he WOULD NOT appear at the court case, he signed nothing. Since the case has been solved, he openly admits he didn't see it happen but was afraid to say so for fear of getting in trouble with the county. He admitted to the first officer (female) on the scene he didn't witness it but for some reason the a/c administrator sent a different officer (male) out to Daniels home then all of a sudden, he witnessed it! This is just one TRUE STORY of what happens without a true eyewitness or video proof. HEAR SAY KILLS INNOCENT ANIMALS AND DESTROYS FAMILYS. I am just one of the many real rescues in our network that will come forward trying to make change, so many have given up think its hopeless, but all have noticed and would like to thank Councilman Nathan Volke for obviously seeing what would be best for animals standing up for them and voting to keep them safe. Thank You for your time, Wendy Cozzone Cheryl's Rescue Ranch, Inc.</p> <p>I support the bill as written by County Executive Pittman - Eyewitness willing to testify or video proof.</p>	
2024-02-24 11:27:42	Karl	Sovik	Linthicum Heights	MD	21090	Yes		Bill 11-24: Crimes, Civil Offenses, & Fines – Possession or Discharge of Firearms – Property of A	Oppose	<p>This bill is poorly written and far too broad, in that it will require gun ranges, gun clubs, and gun stores to provide written permission PRIOR TO an individual arriving at any of these locations.</p> <p>It does not exempt law enforcement.</p> <p>Many restrictions in this poor bill are already preempted by state (or federal) law, in that in most places n the county it is already illegal to discharge a firearm, exceptions being ranges and other designated locations. In the case of hunting on private property, any non-owner (or close family member) who wishes to hunt must already have written permission.</p> <p>Finally, if passed this nebulous piece of legislation will certainly attract one or more legal challenges, which will require expenditure of county funds to defend. It is my belief that such defenses would certainly fail, meaning that those funds will be wasted.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p>	
2024-02-27 21:47:09	Michael	Carmon	Severna Park	Maryland	21146	Yes		Bill 11-24: Crimes, Civil Offenses, & Fines – Possession or Discharge of Firearms – Property of A	Oppose	<p>This bill would create a significant burden on law-abiding residents and do nothing to discourage criminal use of firearms. This infringement of the right to bear arms is poorly defined, has no provisions for exceptions, and is open to considerable interpretation. As it is written, this bill is inviting a costly legal challenge for the county. Can we focus instead on eliminating the revolving door for those who commit violent criminal acts using firearms?</p>	
2024-02-28 9:51:05	Timothy	Colmus	Brooklyn Park	Maryland	21225	Yes		Bill 11-24: Crimes, Civil Offenses, & Fines – Possession or Discharge of Firearms – Property of A	Oppose	<p>Does the Council not know the meaning of "possessing"? That word in the bill makes it a crime to enter any property in the county without written permission while carrying a firearm. There are thousands of people who have gone through the training and legal process and obtained a concealed carry permit. This bill make us criminals for going into any business or property that we do not own. I see the bill as a minefield for gun owners. Every time you leave your own property while carrying a firearm you are in danger of violating the law if this bill is passed. There are existing laws that prohibit discharging a firearm in proximity to occupied structures as well as trespassing laws.</p>	

Timestamp	First name	Last name	City	State	Zip code	Are you representing yourself?	If no, what organization or whom do you represent?	Legislation	Position	Remarks	Attachment
2024-02-28 22:55:23	Richard	Newton	Severna Park	MD	21146-2855	Yes		Bill 11-24: Crimes, Civil Offenses, & Fines – Possession or Discharge of Firearms – Property of A	Oppose	<p>Questions:</p> <p>(1) How many individual(s) have committed this/these offenses and were there any serious injuries or fatalities to justify this bill?</p> <p>(2) Transporting a firearm is addressed under Title 18, Section 926A, of the United States Code, a person who is not prohibited from possessing, transporting, shipping, or receiving a firearm shall be entitled to transport a firearm for any lawful purpose from any place where he may lawfully possess and carry such firearm to any place where he may lawfully possess and carry such firearm if, during such transportation the firearm is unloaded, neither the firearm nor any ammunition being transported is readily accessible or is directly accessible from the passenger compartment. In the case the vehicle does not have a compartment separate from the driver's compartment the firearm or ammunition shall be contained in a locked compartment other than the glove compartment or console.</p> <p>(3) The Bill 11-24 states it would prohibit the possession or discharge of a firearm on the property of another without a written authorization from the property owner, occupant or lessee of the property. The written authorization must specify the dates wherein possession of the firearm or its discharge will occur.</p> <p>** The proposed Bill does not define "property owner" whether it is a private individual, corporation or government agency. Additionally, why would I (the owner) allow an occupant or lessee to give permission on my property; if something happens (i.e. injuries), I believe I would be held accountable.</p> <p>** Another concern is this Bill's provisions could include a wide array of properties such as your favorite hunting grounds, properties that serve the public and restrictions placed on private Fishing and Hunting Clubs.</p> <p>Final thoughts: I'm ALL for GUN SAFETY, but not for something that's not well thought out. I can somewhat understand someone discharging a firearm on my property without permission, but the process part is just out of the park.</p> <p>Thank you and take care!! Retired U.S.Navy Veteran</p>	
2024-02-28 18:01:04	Tracy	Youse	HANOVER	Maryland	21076	Yes		Bill 7-24: Comprehensive Zoning – Region 2	Oppose	<p>I DONT WANT OUR FAMILY PROPERTY ZONING TO CHANGE FROM R1 TO R5. THIS PROPERTY HAS BEEN IN MY FAMILY FOR 80 YEARS. TWO OF MY CHILDREN CURRENTLY HAVE BUILDING PLANS IN THE DESIGN PHASE FOR TWO OF THE LOTS ON YOUSE AVE. WE WILL NEVER WANT OR NEED TOWN HOUSES TO BE BUILT ON ANY OF OUR FAMILYS PROPERTY. THE ONLY HOUSES THAT ARE ON RAE RD AND YOUSE AVE ARE FAMILY THAT HAVE BUILT, OWNED AND LIVED IN THE HOUSES FOR MANY YEARS. THE LAND WAS ORGINALLY PURCHASED BY MY GRADFATHER, AND PASSED DOWN TO MY FATER AND IS BEING PASSED DOWN TO MYSELF AND EVENTUALLY MY CHILDREN. WE ARE REQUESTING THE LAND BETWEEN YOUSE AVE AND RAE RD BE LEFT AT R1 ZONING.</p>	YES
2024-02-23 18:53:05	Stacia	Roesler	Annapolis	MD	21401	Yes		Bill 8-24: General Development Plan – Region 7 Plan	Support	I support the development plan as submitted by OPZ. I do not support any variances to the area of the plan known as the Ridgely Corridor.	YES
2024-02-26 13:46:43	Randolph	Loftus	Annapolis	MD	21401	Yes		Bill 8-24: General Development Plan – Region 7 Plan	Oppose	<p>I am in opposition to Bills 8-24 &amp; 9-24 in Region 7.</p> <p>I am in favor of Residential R2 low density zoning. I am in favor of keeping the area as is. I am against commercial &amp; high density development. I am against a Ridgely Ave. Village Center and Sector plan.</p>	
2024-02-27 12:52:10	JoAnne	Weimer	ANNAPOLIS	MD	21401	Yes		Bill 8-24: General Development Plan – Region 7 Plan	Oppose	See Below	YES
2024-02-27 13:44:38	anita	owens	Annapolis	MD	21401	No	Riverview Manor Community Association	Bill 8-24: General Development Plan – Region 7 Plan	Oppose	<p>Good Morning Everyone,</p> <p>I would like to voice our opposition for the plan for Region 7. This deals with Ridgely Ave. N Bestgate road and Surrounding areas. I live off Riverview Ave. and there are only two ways to leave the Riverview Manor Community. If you go left, you will go over the Weems creek bridge and head into West Annapolis. If you go right, you will go over the overpass for Route 50 which leads to N Bestgate Road.</p> <p>I understand that the county is trying to control the development of the area, but the community has already had enough development. On Riverview Ave. we have The Heroes Pub, a boat yard out of control, Plumbing business, and antique store. When you make the right-hand turn on Ridgely Ave, we have two Medical buildings on either side of Ridgely Ave. You make the turn at N Bestgate road, and you have three churches, one school, Knights of Columbus Hall, and St. Mary's sport field.</p> <p>When you leave N Bestgate Road and turn right there are more business, medical center, and this takes you to the Annapolis Mall. There are also apartments, homes, and town houses. Off of Bestgate Road is the Luminis Health Anne Arundel Medical Center. Our traffic has more than double from Riverview Ave, Ridgely Ave through to N. Bestgate road.</p> <p>We also have to deal with 3 government agencies on Riverview Ave which are the City of Annapolis, Anne Arundel County government and The State of Maryland. Riverview Ave. is located right next to Route 50 and we have a sound barrier wall. We know that the State of Maryland has plans for Ridgely Ave. and I have been sent what they might be planning for us. We are also concerned about what will happen with route 50 over the Severn bridge and the Bay Bridge. How will this impact our community because we have homes on either side of Route 50 which will be impacted.</p> <p>We are a small community and whatever happens with any of these plans would greatly affect our community. Before the County Executive and the County Council make any decisions about the area please come out and take a look at the area that are being considered for change. I would also ask that you find out from the State of Maryland what is coming to our area in the future. Change can be good, but change will be hard for the community.</p> <p>We are for Residential (R2 low density) zoning! We are for Conserve/ Preserve and Protect! We are against Commercial Zoning and Small Business Districts We are against Ridgely Avenue Village Center and Sector Plan!</p> <p>Please distribute these comments to the County Executive and County Council.</p> <p>Anita Owens President of The Riverview Manor Community Association 37 McPherson Rd Annapolis, MD avowens1@verizon.net 410-507-2908</p>	

Timestamp	First name	Last name	City	State	Zip code	Are you representing yourself?	If no, what organization or whom do you represent?	Legislation	Position	Remarks	Attachment
2024-02-27 13:44:42	William	Bentley	Annapolis	MD	21401	Yes		Bill 8-24: General Development Plan – Region 7 Plan	Oppose	<p>Thanks to the County for a comprehensive Region 7 Plan. I laud the motivation behind the plan and fully support access to the bay, peaceful environments, and comfortable mixed level housing for people of the County and State. I note, however, that there are some flaws in what I see from a 20,000 ft level.</p> <p>First, a Ridgely Avenue Village Center and Sector Plan is not needed. Developing what is currently largely green space is counter to the overall concept of providing access to the bay, peaceful environments, and mixed level housing. Moreover, in diving into the details, there are no plans for water and sewer along Ridgely avenue. This seems counter to the notion of building more development in that it does not provide water / sewer accommodations. This however, is a minor issue to me. Instead, the current environment is a peaceful enclave that opens into West Annapolis, which in turn, has enjoyed a rebirth of investment both in terms of restaurants and shops, but also the elementary school. The value of these properties will surely plummet if traffic snarls the Ridgely bridge, like it does Rowe and the Severn River bridge.</p> <p>Please do not encourage development of these spaces. Development along bestgate, where there are already shops that are within walking distance of new housing is far superior in my view. People in West Annapolis walk to Grauls. Rarely does anyone walk from the north side of 50 down to Grauls. This type of environment should be protected and expanded, these zone 7 spaces in question on the north side of 50 should have more options on the north side of 50, along Bestgate, not right near the 50 overpass.</p> <p>The pressure on the water levels and contamination notwithstanding, surely suggest that these tracts remain sparsely developed (as is). I note that your report includes many contaminating metals. This plan makes this worse not better. I would be most supportive of efforts to expand bike paths, access to the boat launch on Turner avenue in West Annapolis, etc.</p> <p>Finally, in looking over the entire document, I find it basically silent on the Annapolis Mall. Instead Parole Town Center is highlighted. What are we doing wrt Annapolis Mall? How is it for example, that we allowed the huge developments along Riva when the Mall's spaces are rapidly becoming vacant and obsolete?</p> <p>Thanks for listening to me.</p>	
2024-02-29 15:33:32	Peggy	Hamilton	Annapolis	MD	21401	Yes		Bill 8-24: General Development Plan – Region 7 Plan	Oppose	My remarks are in the attached document. The same document will also be uploaded on opposition to Bill No. 9-24 since they are linked.	YES
2024-03-01 17:51:48	MARGARET	AHERN	ANNAPOLIS	MD	21401	Yes		Bill 8-24: General Development Plan – Region 7 Plan	Oppose	Weems Creek Community has the type of development that is suited for the needs of our community. Commercial zoning will bring unnecessary traffic and general confusion which accompanies it, which our community is not suited for.	
2024-03-02 10:39:49	Graham	Gutsche	Annapolis	MD	21401	Yes		Bill 8-24: General Development Plan – Region 7 Plan	Oppose	/Users/grahamgutsche/Desktop/Region 7 Plan.docx	
2024-03-03 12:56:58	David	Corddry	Annapolis	Maryland	21401	Yes		Bill 8-24: General Development Plan – Region 7 Plan	Support		YES

Timestamp	First name	Last name	City	State	Zip code	Are you representing yourself?	If no, what organization or whom do you represent?	Legislation	Position	Remarks	Attachment
2024-03-03 15:46:46	Nancy	Guy	Annapolis	MD	21401	Yes		Bill 8-24: General Development Plan – Region 7 Plan	Oppose	<p>I want to oppose the documents in their entirety:                      Comment: The A. A. County Council must reject the plan as written for the following reasons:                      •The public has been notified wrongly:                      •OPZ published the document in January but did not release it to the public until February, which disadvantages the public.                      •The public has been given insufficient time to review, understand, and digest its contents, which are convoluted, difficult to follow, and not transparent.                      •OPZ did not solicit the general public and people with disability to fully participate. For example, only # one public meeting was held in the Ridgely Avenue/Weems Creek community. This meeting was held at The Atrium in 2021 and no other meetings were held within the area which is the subject of this document.                      •OPZ failed to make available documents in a format that the public could readily review. For example, at the OPZ SAB and PAC meetings, the materials were insufficient for public review, maps were incomprehensible, acoustics in the room were poor (no microphones, walls obstructed visual displays, audiovisuals were poorly laid out and so small that the attendees could not determine what was being displayed—lack sufficient detail.                      •OPZ failed to provide enlarged printed copies to the local library for review by the public.                      •The documents are in a very small font and typeset that is not conducive to the needs of the general public nor to people with visual impairment or disability. For example, maps are too small to comprehend and do not provide sufficient detail (roads, landmarks, etc.)                      •The only way to attempt to review all the documents is online, which discriminates against those who do not have internet and IT systems readily available and further implicates the county in serving the public inequitably.                      • are inconsistent with other documents, including , but not limited to: Plan 2040 and the recommended plan itself, etc.                      R7 A. A. County Regional Plan Final Recommended Draft (dated Jan. 5, 2024)                      Comments:                      1. This final recommended draft is dated Jan. 5, 2024. However, in publishing the draft the A.A. County Office of Planning and Zoning (OPZ):                      a. Failed to solicit public comment from all stakeholders and gave a disproportionate amount of time and attention to the developers (e.g., preferential treatment by way of verbal comments, quoted real estate attorney on its website in an attempt to sway public opinion)                      b. Failed to respond to public comments                      c. Did not release it timely to the public.                      d. Used disparaging and deceptive language to refer to the Ridgely Avenue/Weems Creek community as "Greater Annapolis", when this nomenclature has not and should not be used as it convolutes and confuses the public.                      e. Incorporates parts of Bestgate Road and Generals Highway into the Parole area, which is overbearing and extending boundaries beyond their legitimate boundaries.</p> <p>Serving on the SAB was Kate Mahood, who is a direct representative of and is tenant of Mr. Kraus, one of the speculators who is attempting to overtake and markedly change the character of the area.                      2. Introduction (p. 6, paragraph 2)—says that the Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC) "held over 20 meetings with the public. How many of those were in the Ridgely Avenue/Weems Creek community? How were they advertised? How many mailings were sent and to whom? To my knowledge, there was only one that was held in 2021 at the Atrium. When stakeholders asked the OPZ to hold additional meetings with those in the Ridgely Avenue/Weems Creek community, OPZ refused. This indicates that OPZ failed to solicit and encourage the public to participate in process, which is a failure of government.                      3. Introduction (p. 6, paragraph 3)—public engagement—OPZ, failed to address the 400+ comments that were submitted by the public on the precursor documents. Comments that were submitted have been removed or hidden on the OPZ website and are not currently available for public review. &gt; Where is the historical data? The summary of the comments that was previously provided by the OPZ was deficient as it failed to accurately evaluate summarize, and address each of the comments                      4. Introduction (p. 7, paragraph 2)—the term "effective development tools"—what does this mean?                      5. Ethics issues with Kate Mahood, who served on the SAC and is a tenant and business partner of Mr. Kraus. The county Ethics Office has failed to address this issue. She also carried on hallway conversations with Mr. Kraus when the SAC was meeting. In addition, the chair of the SAC failed to respond when this was brought to his attention and when Ms. Mahood was asked to describe how she solicited comment from the community she "represented" she provided no evidence of any attempt to conduct community outreach and solicit input and claimed that it was not her "job". She also undertook a write-in campaign of those who rent space from her and Mr. Kraus, which appears to be an unethical business practice.                      6. Introduction (p. 9, paragraph 1)—This statement is misleading. The SAC failed to conduct outreach, failed to allow and respond to public comment, gave preferential treatment to developers and the developers' attorneys, failed to allow the public adequate comment period, provided poor materials, used electronic media and terminology that was not conducive to the general public and those with disability. Failed to involve the residents and taxpayers of the community (i.e., those who do not have an interest in commercial development).                      7. Introduction (p. 11, paragraph 1)—requires the Region 7 Plan "to be consistent with or have consistency with Plan 2040". The Region 7 Plan does not meet this requirement as it:                      8. Introduction (p. 12)—equality means that all people have access, that the government is transparent, etc. In addition, single family homes—not low- or high-density housing—are the best way to achieve equality as they allow people to develop equity, have investment and achieve financial security. Other options (apartments, cooperatives, condominiums, townhouses, etc.) do not allow people to build financial independence and perpetuate indentured living (i.e., constantly having to pay others and never fully own)                      9. Introduction (p. 13)—maps—how is anyone expected to be able to read and understand these maps? The four very tiny maps on ½ of an 8.5x11" page of paper are completely illegible. The color coding of the maps makes it impossible to distinguish areas, etc. The county should be ashamed of its attempt to deceive the public! Where is transparency? How is the public supposed to trust the government which treats its people this way? The maps should be printed on individual pages and sized accordingly. People should not have to use IT equipment to see what is intended.                      10. Introduction (p. 14, paragraph 3)—impervious surfaces—The county does not need more impervious surfaces, it needs less. Need to increase tree canopy by 1) protecting and not removing existing trees, 2) planting more trees                      11. Introduction (p. 15, paragraph 2)—decline of older shopping centers. As we continue to evolve in a post-COVID world, less retail space is needed. Online shopping has taken hold and more people work from home. As stated here, the County indicates that it has a vacancy rate of 10.1% and no new retail space is needed. Existing older shopping centers can be redeveloped, which is consistent with Green Space.                      12. Introduction (p. 15, final paragraph)—"small business development agencies" have widespread and everlasting impacts. They are to be discouraged and not used in the Ridgely Avenue/Weems Creek Community!                      13. Existing Conditions (p. 16, paragraph 1)—Greater Annapolis definition—Ridgely Avenue/Weems Creek is not mentioned. This is an intentional attempt to hide information from the public! No one uses the label "Greater Annapolis"! This term is disparaging and not in keeping with the historical importance and significance of the area. It is an attempt to undermine community involvement and scam the public.                      14. Existing Conditions (p. 16, paragraph 2)—Charts and graphs are said to be on pp. 16-17. This is incorrect. The pages that contain this information are pp. 18-19. This shows lack of attention to detail.                      15. Existing Conditions (p. 19, Top Employers)—Why is A.A. County Government listed twice and with different numbers attributed to each? This shows lack of attention to detail.                      16. Existing Conditions (p. 19, reference to COVID)—The county fails to acknowledge that COVID significantly impacted this plan as people—the residents and taxpayers of the county—were stymied and unable to participate due to concern about life and death, COVID transmission rates, etc. COVID concerns continue to this day, although the epidemic has been deemed to be over. That said, the County did not provide sufficient means by which the public could participate in the planning process</p> <p>I oppose the Ridgely Ave Village Center and Sector Plan. This plan is disguised as Example #2 on page 78-79 of the region Plan. The Planning Advisory Board (PAB) recommended against it. There is NO discussion of the PAB'S role of recommendation in the Region 7 Plan. The current Region Plan was drastically changed by the Office of Planning and Zoning (OPZ) after the PAB's recommendation and OPZ did not make their changes available to the public for comments.                      The Ridgely Ave Village Center and Sector Plan is not needed. It is not Smart Growth to develop what is largely a greenfield. This is a low density residential area and a Neighborhood Preservation Area and should remain as such. There is no public sewer on Ridgely Ave and none is planned. Anne Arundel County has plenty of underutilized already developed areas where revitalization and redevelopment should be focused. DO NOT pave over undeveloped areas!                      The Weems Creek Ridgely Ave should NOT be developed. The Comprehensive Zoning Plan says that R2 zoning is to be maintained. The Council MUST retain the R@ in this area.                      The Ridgely Ave Village Center and Sector Plan is just another way for Anne Arundel County and developers to pressure Anne Arundel County to develop in the undeveloped areas.</p>	

Timestamp	First name	Last name	City	State	Zip code	Are you representing yourself?	If no, what organization or whom do you represent?	Legislation	Position	Remarks	Attachment
2024-03-03 17:38:38	Joe	Lorentzen	ANNAPOLIS	Maryland	21401	Yes		Bill 8-24: General Development Plan – Region 7 Plan	Support	Please See attached. We join the many local residents who are all requesting "No changes to zoning (and in particular no upzoning to Commercial)". This is the same position as the OPZ's recommendation, to the Council, which was made at a public hearing on 10/19/23 regarding the Region 7 Ridgely Corridor 2040 planning. thank you Joe Lorentzen	YES
2024-03-03 20:16:11	Ruth	Jobe	Annapolis	MD	21401	Yes		Bill 8-24: General Development Plan – Region 7 Plan	Oppose	<p>I stand in opposition to the January 5, 2024 Region 7 Plan especially the section on the Built Environment – Ridgely Avenue and Weems Creek Area. The photos on Page 48 should not be those from Osterville, MA, Powhatan, VA, or Freeport, ME but should be representative of those in Anne Arundel County. I've seen statistics stating that there's more than 80 SBDs. If the SBD is so successful and appropriate for the Weems Creek Community, let's see some local examples. Why would out-of-state locations be needed? Furthermore, given the passage of Bill 92-23, let's show examples representative of those zoning changes. Please don't expect the public to accept the current portrayal as valid. That's false advertising.</p> <p>The statement on Page 48, "The Weems Creek community will be actively engaged during each phase of the Sector Planning Process." Is a lot to promise after the recent experience of lack of community engagement with the SAC and OPZ. The OPZ mentioned that they even printed notices in the Capital Gazette. Please ask to see it. You'll need a magnifying glass to read it.</p> <p>Furthermore, I ask the County Council to compare and contrast Implementation Strategy Example Strategy #2 (Page 76) with prior drafts. It references a "Village Center" Development Policy Area overlay for an area. What happened to the current Neighborhood Preservation Area, which is how residents think of Weems Creek; not a commercially developed area. Furthermore, it also references that OPZ will need to request funding to hire a contractor/consultant to develop a sector plan. The Fiscal Plan states that, "There is no fiscal impact associated with adopting a zoning plan. However, implementation of the plan may have an effect on future revenue related to development." Does this mean that the County Council's simply saying "yea" to the Region Plan doesn't have a fiscal impact? Why is only the word "development" in that sentence? Why not preservation?</p> <p>It is hard to read this plan when there's such limited focus on preservation. Why is that? Why so much attention on development? Do we no longer value nature, the environment, natural and cultural resources? By paving over green areas and allowing more and more impervious surfaces, you are downgrading the environment. Isn't it time to down-zone and stop upzoning?</p> <p>Please consider the investments residents have made in their community and the reasons that make the Weems Creek Community a great place to call home as my family has done for generations. More traffic, more noise, more pollution, more buildings only cause those of us that value our residential community to eventually move away as peace and quiet gets harder and harder to find. Is that what the County Council wants for its residents or is South County expecting to see us relocate there? The zoning choices you make will either show the community that either you value preservation or not. It matters a great deal to more than the six people requesting zoning changes (CZ-R7-GRA-001 through 009). How will you vote?</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p> <p>Word document attached.</p>	YES
2024-03-03 22:56:16	Dorothy	Guy	Annapolis	MD	21401	Yes		Bill 8-24: General Development Plan – Region 7 Plan	Oppose	See attached document. I request that Laura Corby, Administrative Officer, distribute the attached document to the County Executive, County Council Members and their staff, and OPZ's Chritina Pompa and Patrick Hughes in advance of the March 4, 2024 County Council Meeting. I also request that I be added to the list of people requesting to testify in person on Bill No. 8-24. Thank you.	YES
2024-03-04 1:47:51	Earl H	bradley Jr	Annapolis	MD	21403	No	Anne Arundel Group, Sierra Club	Bill 8-24: General Development Plan – Region 7 Plan	Support	See Attachment	YES
2024-03-04 9:24:08	Mary	Guy	Annapolis	MD	21401	Yes		Bill 8-24: General Development Plan – Region 7 Plan	Oppose	<p>Strongly oppose CZ-R7-GRA-001 through 009 including any upzoning to C2. Support maintaining the current R2 zoning. Recommend downzoning the SB parcels to R2 as they may not have been appropriately zoned as Ridgely Avenue is a "connector" road, not an arterial road. Ridgely Avenue and Weems Creek Community is a residential community; not a commercial one. Commercial uses are not warranted. We have enough shopping areas now and for the foreseeable future given the changes and manners in shopping, dining, working in the office, etc. Retail is not needed, and plenty is available within a short distance. The infrastructure, including sewer, water, roads, public safety, etc. does not support additional intensity. More impervious surfaces and degradation is warranted.</p> <p>Ridgely Avenue and the Weems Creek area must be conserved, preserved and protected. The area does not require additional commercial development as the County has plenty of commercial developments that could be redeveloped so that the natural landscape is available for the current and future generations. Development for the sake of a coffee shop or dry cleaners?? REALLY??? It's NOT worth the destructive, everlasting, costly (\$\$\$\$\$\$\$) and negative impact on the environment, the residents, taxpayers, and future generations of Anne Arundel County.</p>	
									15		
2024-02-23 18:53:49	Stacia	Roesler	Annapolis	MD	21401	Yes		Bill 9-24: Comprehensive Zoning – Region 7	Support	I support the development plan as submitted by OPZ. I do not support any variances to the proposed plan in the area known as the Ridgely Corridor.	YES
2024-02-26 15:36:32	Gordon	Roesler	Annapolis	MD	21401	Yes		Bill 9-24: Comprehensive Zoning – Region 7	Oppose	I concur with OPZ's recommendations not to grant C-2 zoning along Ridgely Avenue. I am opposed to any variances to OPZ's recommendations along Ridgely.	YES
2024-02-27 12:14:54	Anita	Owens	Annapolis	Maryland	22401	No	Riverview Manor Community Association	Bill 9-24: Comprehensive Zoning – Region 7	Oppose	I sent an email to the County Council regarding Zone 7 issues	
2024-02-29 15:34:35	Peggy	Hamilton	Annapolis	MD	21401	Yes		Bill 9-24: Comprehensive Zoning – Region 7	Oppose	My remarks are in the attached document. The same document will also be uploaded on opposition to Bill No. 8-24 since they are linked.	YES
2024-03-01 17:47:42	MARGARET	AHERN	ANNAPOLIS	MD	21401	Yes		Bill 9-24: Comprehensive Zoning – Region 7	Oppose	The Weems Creek Community does not need to be re-zoned. We have the zoning that is geared for our needs.	

Timestamp	First name	Last name	City	State	Zip code	Are you representing yourself?	If no, what organization or whom do you represent?	Legislation	Position	Remarks	Attachment
2024-03-03 16:33:55	Nancy	Guy	Annapolis	MD	21401	Yes		Bill 9-24: Comprehensive Zoning – Region 7	Oppose	<p>I want to oppose the documents in their entirety:                      Comment: The A. A. County Council must reject the plan as written for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The public has been notified wrongly:</li> <li>• OPZ published the document in January but did not release it to the public until February, which disadvantages the public.</li> <li>• The public has been given insufficient time to review, understand, and digest its contents, which are convoluted, difficult to follow, and not transparent.</li> <li>• OPZ did not solicit the general public and people with disability to fully participate. For example, only # one public meeting was held in the Ridgely Avenue/Weems Creek community. This meeting was held at The Atrium in 2021 and no other meetings were held within the area which is the subject of this document.</li> <li>• OPZ failed to make available documents in a format that the public could readily review. For example, at the OPZ SAB and PAC meetings, the materials were insufficient for public review, maps were incomprehensible, acoustics in the room were poor (no microphones, walls obstructed visual displays, audiovisuals were poorly laid out and so small that the attendees could not determine what was being displayed—lack sufficient detail,</li> <li>• OPZ failed to provide enlarged printed copies to the local library for review by the public.</li> <li>• The documents are in a very small font and typeset that is not conducive to the needs of the general public nor to people with visual impairment or disability. For example, maps are too small to comprehend and do not provide sufficient detail (roads, landmarks, etc.)</li> <li>• The only way to attempt to review all the documents is online, which discriminates against those who do not have internet and IT systems readily available and further implicates the county in serving the public inequitably.</li> <li>• are inconsistent with other documents, including , but not limited to: Plan 2040 and the recommended plan itself, etc.</li> </ul> <p>R7 A. A. County Regional Plan Final Recommended Draft (dated Jan. 5, 2024)                      Comments:                      1. This final recommended draft is dated Jan. 5, 2024. However, in publishing the draft the A.A. County Office of Planning and Zoning (OPZ):                      a. Failed to solicit public comment from all stakeholders and gave a disproportionate amount of time and attention to the developers (e.g., preferential treatment by way of verbal comments, quoted real estate attorney on its website in an attempt to sway public opinion)                      b. Failed to respond to public comments                      c. Did not release it timely to the public.                      d. Used disparaging and deceptive language to refer to the Ridgely Avenue/Weems Creek community as "Greater Annapolis", when this nomenclature has not and should not be used as it convolutes and confuses the public.                      e. Incorporates parts of Bestgate Road and Generals Highway into the Parole area, which is overbearing and extending boundaries beyond their legitimate boundaries.</p> <p>Serving on the SAB was Kate Mahood, who is a direct representative of and is tenant of Mr. Kraus, one of the speculators who is attempting to overtake and markedly change the character of the area.                      2. Introduction (p.6, paragraph 2)—says that the Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC) "held over 20 meetings with the public. How many of those were in the Ridgely Avenue/Weems Creek community? How were they advertised? How many mailings were sent and to whom? To my knowledge, there was only one that was held in 2021 at the Atrium. When stakeholders asked the OPZ to hold additional meetings with those in the Ridgely Avenue/Weems Creek community, OPZ refused. This indicates that OPZ failed to solicit and encourage the public to participate in process, which is a failure of government.                      3. Introduction (p. 6, paragraph 3)—public engagement—OPZ, failed to address the 400+ comments that were submitted by the public on the precursor documents. Comments that were submitted have been removed or hidden on the OPZ website and are not currently available for public review. &gt; Where is the historical data? The summary of the comments that was previously provided by the OPZ was deficient as it failed to accurately evaluate summarize, and address each of the comments                      4. Introduction (p. 7, paragraph 2)—the term "effective development tools"—what does this mean?                      5. Ethics issues with Kate Mahood, who served on the SAC and is a tenant and business partner of Mr. Kraus. The county Ethics Office has failed to address this issue. She also carried on hallway conversations with Mr. Kraus when the SAC was meeting. In addition, the chair of the SAC failed to respond when this was brought to his attention and when Ms. Mahood was asked to describe how she solicited comment from the community she "represented" she provided no evidence of any attempt to conduct community outreach and solicit input and claimed that it was not her "job". She also undertook a write-in campaign of those who rent space from her and Mr. Kraus, which appears to be an unethical business practice.                      6. Introduction (p. 9, paragraph 1)—This statement is misleading. The SAC failed to conduct outreach, failed to allow and respond to public comment, gave preferential treatment to developers and the developers' attorneys, failed to allow the public adequate comment period, provided poor materials, used electronic media and terminology that was not conducive to the general public and those with disability. Failed to involve the residents and taxpayers of the community (i.e., those who do not have an interest in commercial development).                      7. Introduction (p. 11, paragraph 1)—requires the Region 7 Plan "to be consistent with or have consistency with Plan 2040". The Region 7 Plan does not meet this requirement as it:                      8. Introduction (p. 12)—equality means that all people have access, that the government is transparent, etc. In addition, single family homes—not low- or high-density housing—are the best way to achieve equality as they allow people to develop equily, have investment and achieve financial security. Other options (apartments, cooperatives, condominiums, townhouses, etc.) do not allow people to build financial independence and perpetuate indentured living (i.e., constantly having to pay others and never fully own)                      9. Introduction (p. 13)—maps—how is anyone expected to be able to read and understand these maps? The four very tiny maps on 1/2 of an 8.5x11" page of paper are completely illegible. The color coding of the maps makes it impossible to distinguish areas, etc. The county should be ashamed of its attempt to deceive the public! Where is transparency? How is the public supposed to trust the government which treats its people this way? The maps should be printed on individual pages and sized accordingly. People should not have to use IT equipment to see what is intended.                      10. Introduction (p. 14, paragraph 3)—impervious surfaces—The county does not need more impervious surfaces, it needs less. Need to increase tree canopy by 1) protecting and not removing existing trees, 2) planting more trees                      11. Introduction (p. 15, paragraph 2)—decline of older shopping centers. As we continue to evolve in a post-COVID world, less retail space is needed. Online shopping has taken hold and more people work from home. As stated here, the County indicates that it has a vacancy rate of 10.1% and no new retail space is needed. Existing older shopping centers can be redeveloped, which is consistent with Green Space.                      12. Introduction (p. 15, final paragraph)—"small business development agencies" have widespread and everlasting impacts. They are to be discouraged and not used in the Ridgely Avenue/Weems Creek Community!                      13. Existing Conditions (p. 16, paragraph 1)—Greater Annapolis definition—Ridgely Avenue/Weems Creek is not mentioned. This is an intentional attempt to hide information from the public! No one uses the label "Greater Annapolis"! This term is disparaging and not in keeping with the historical importance and significance of the area. It is an attempt to undermine community involvement and scam the public.                      14. Existing Conditions (p. 16, paragraph 2)—Charts and graphs are said to be on pp. 16-17. This is incorrect. The pages that contain this information are pp. 18-19. This shows lack of attention to detail.                      15. Existing Conditions (p. 19, Top Employers)—Why is A.A. County Government listed twice and with different numbers attributed to each? This shows lack of attention to detail.                      16. Existing Conditions (p. 19, reference to COVID)—The county fails to acknowledge that COVID significantly impacted this plan as people—the residents and taxpayers of the county—were stymied and unable to participate due to concern about life and death, COVID transmission rates, etc. COVID concerns continue to this day, although the epidemic has been deemed to be over. That said, the County did not provide sufficient means by which the public could participate in the planning process</p> <p>I oppose the Ridgely Ave Village Center and Sector Plan. This plan is disguised as Example #2 on page 78-79 of the region Plan. The Planning Advisory Board (PAB) recommended against it. There is NO discussion of the PAB'S role of recommendation in the Region 7 Plan. The current Region Plan was drastically changed by the Office of Planning and Zoning (OPZ) after the PAB's recommendation and OPZ did not make their changes available to the public for comments.                      The Ridgely Ave Village Center and Sector Plan is not needed. It is not Smart Growth to develop what is largely a greenfield. This is a low density residential area and a Neighborhood Preservation Area and should remain as such. There is no public sewer on Ridgely Ave and none is planned. Anne Arundel County has plenty of underutilized already developed areas where revitalization and redevelopment should be focused. DO NOT pave over undeveloped areas!!                      The Weems Creek Ridgely Ave should NOT be developed. The Comprehensive Zoning Plan says that R2 zoning is to be maintained. The</p>	

Timestamp	First name	Last name	City	State	Zip code	Are you representing yourself?	If no, what organization or whom do you represent?	Legislation	Position	Remarks	Attachment
2024-03-03 19:04:52	Ruth	Jobe	Annapolis	MD	21401	No	Jessica S. Guy Family Trust	Bill 9-24: Comprehensive Zoning – Region 7	Oppose	Opposition to CZ-R7-GRA-001 through 009 including any upzoning to C2. Support maintaining the current R2 zoning. Recommend downzoning the SB parcels to R2 as may not have been appropriately zoned due to Ridgely Avenue is on a "connector" road; not an arterial road. Weems Creek Community is a residential community; not a commercial one. Commercial uses are not warranted. We have enough shopping areas as it is now. Retail is not needed. The infrastructure, including sewer and water does not support additional intensity.  Note: The Word document (Part 1 of response) is uploaded herein. I will submit the related Excel file (Part 2 of the response) as a separate file. If there is a way to upload multiple files of different file types, please let me know. Thanks.	YES
2024-03-03 19:13:01	Ruth	Jobe	Annapolis	MD	21401	No	Jessica S. Guy Family Trust	Bill 9-24: Comprehensive Zoning – Region 7	Oppose	Oppose Bill 9-24 and the six landowners who are pursuing the upzoning for their own personal benefit. Mr. Krauss, Landmark Property goal is to assemble together the parcels on Willow Road and Ridgely for commercial use. The community is better served by leaving the land as residential. Development is not needed or warranted. There are plenty of commercial properties in Anne Arundel County that are vacant. Weems Creek does not need or want development.  The attached Excel file accompanies the Word document to the comments submitted on behalf of the Jessica S. Guy Family Trust.  If there is a way to submit multiple files of different file types, please let me know.	YES
2024-03-04 8:56:59	Shirley	Guy	Annapolis	MD	21401	No	Shirley Guy	Bill 9-24: Comprehensive Zoning – Region 7	Oppose	I oppose this bill and respectfully request that ALL the County Council members do the same. This bill will bring no good to our community and will have a negative impact on the community, its water ways and wildlife for years if not decades to come.  We must preserve protect and save our precious natural resources.  I strongly urge the Council members to preserve our greenfield and waterways for without those we as human being will not survive.  Thank you for your time.	
2024-03-04 9:09:51	Nancy	Guy	Annapolis	MD	21401	No	Jane Malone	Bill 9-24: Comprehensive Zoning – Region 7	Oppose	I oppose this bill and respectfully request that ALL the County Council members do the same. This bill will bring no good to our community and will have a negative impact on the community, its water ways and wildlife for years if not decades to come.  We must preserve protect and save our precious natural resources.  I strongly urge the Council members to preserve our greenfield and waterways for without those we as human being will not survive.  Thank you for your time	
2024-03-04 10:23:59	Dorothy	Guy	Annapolis	MD	21401	Yes		Bill 9-24: Comprehensive Zoning – Region 7	Oppose	See attached document. Opposition to CZ-R7-GRA-001 through 009 including any upzoning to SB or C2. Support maintaining the current R2 zoning. Recommend downzoning the SB parcels to R2 as may not have been appropriately zoned previously when the SB use came into being. Ridgely Avenue/Weems Creek Community is a low-density residential R2 community; not a commercial one and should not be turned into another Parole Town Center. Commercial uses are not warranted and are environmentally and socially destructive. We have enough commercial areas of all sorts and housing in Region 7 as it is now, as noted in the draft Region 7 Plan. The public facilities infrastructure, including sewer and water does not support additional intensity. Public sewer does not exist at all on Ridgely Avenue; none is planned and none is budgeted for. Water pressure that does not meet standards is a problem and no fixes are planned.	YES
2024-03-04 10:24:54	Mary	Guy	Annapolis	MD	21401	Yes		Bill 9-24: Comprehensive Zoning – Region 7	Oppose	Strongly oppose Bill 9-24 - Ridgely Avenue and the Weems Creek area must be CONSERVED, PRESERVED AND PROTECTED!!! The area does not require additional commercial development as the County has plenty of commercial developments that could be redeveloped so that the natural landscape is available for the current and future generations. Development for the sake of a coffee shop or dry cleaners?? REALLY???? It's NOT, worth the destructive, everlasting, costly (\$\$\$\$\$\$\$) and negative impact on the environment and the residents, taxpayers, visitors, and future generations of Anne Arundel County. We have enough shopping areas now and for the foreseeable future given the changes and manners in shopping, dining, working in the office, etc. More retail zoning and development is NOT needed. The infrastructure, including sewer, water, roads, public safety, etc. does not support additional intensity.  Strongly oppose Bill 9-24 and the landowners/developers who are pursuing the upzoning for their own personal benefit. Assembling parcels on Willow Road and Ridgely for commercial use is horrific. The community is better served by leaving the land as residential and environmentally intact. Development is not needed or warranted. Plenty of commercial properties in Anne Arundel County are vacant or underutilized and could be developed/redeveloped. Ridgely Avenue and Weems Creek does not need or want development. Instead, it must be CONSERVED, PRESERVED, AND PROTECTED!!!	YES

Timestamp	First name	Last name	City	State	Zip code	Are you representing yourself?	If no, what organization or whom do you represent?	Legislation	Position	Remarks	Attachment
2024-03-04 10:54:00	Ruth	Jobe	Annapolis	MD	21401	Yes		Bill 9-24: Comprehensive Zoning – Region 7	Oppose	<p>Oppose both the upzoning requests and the Village Center Sector Plan for Weems Creek and Ridgely Avenue. The properties are within a Neighborhood Preservation Area many of which lack access to public sewers.</p> <p>According to Landmark Property's Articles of Organization filed on 9/10/2012, the stated LLC Purpose is, ..."Real estate rental and development." It is documented that Landmark Property has been intentionally and systematically acquiring property in the Weems Creek community since the LLC was registered in the State of Maryland and is seeking upzoning for all properties.</p> <p>Landmark Property recently bought 216A and 216B Dubois Road in May 2023. Both are currently zoned as Residential "R2". In less than three months after acquisition, Landmark Property submitted a Zoning Application to change from residential (R2) to Commercial (C2) zoning. This clearly shows no intention of holding this property for residential. All Zoning Applications submitted by Landmark Property, LLC including CZ-R7-GRA004 (216A and 216B Dubois) and CZ-R7-GRA-007 (611, 613, and 615 Ridgely Avenue), and CZR7-GRA-008 (2 Willow Rd) -- request a zoning change to C2. If changed to C2, this will forever change the residential nature of this neighborhood. Note that Landmark Property also bought 621 N Bestgate Road on 9/9/2021 – it's on the corner of Dubois Rd and N. Bestgate Rd across from St. John Neumann Catholic Church. What is going on? Why is Landmark Property acquiring so many properties, if not for commercial development?</p> <p>Looking at the map, if "assemblage" of the properties covered by CZ-R7-GRA-001 to CZ-R7-GRA-009 or any combination occurs, the entire neighborhood character will be destroyed. Not only is there opposition to upzoning from R2 to C2 or SB to C2, the recent adoption of Bill 92-23 has the propensity to change the neighborhood character.</p> <p>Please remember that to access these properties, one must either use the Weems Creek draw bridge or North Bestgate Road - both are narrow two-lane roads. Safety is always a concern for the North Bestgate Road property owners given how heavily traveled this road is. It is unsafe to back out of driveways now. What will it be if development of any variety increases traffic counts? There will be unintended consequences.</p> <p>The watershed must also be protected as Luce Creek and Weems Creek flow into the Severn River, a State of Maryland Scenic River. The Severn River flows into the Chesapeake Bay. More impervious land only increases runoff and causes environmental issues.</p> <p>Therefore, any upzoning of CZ-R7-GRA-001 through CZ-R7-GRA-009 must be denied. In fact, it is likely that any property zoned SB on Ridgely Avenue should never have been zoned as SB. Ridgely is a "connector" road; not an arterial roadway - a fact that has been overlooked for years.</p> <p>Please ask for the zoning history of these properties and the narrative that accompanied them. The public deserves more information and transparency that has been lacking throughout the development of the Region 7 Plan and Zoning Application phases.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p>	
									14		