

| 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 |
|---------------------|------------|-----------|-----------|-------|----------|--------------------------------|--|---|----------|--|------------|
| 2024-03-17 17:35:17 | Nancy | Guy | Annapolis | MD | 21401 | Yes | | Bill 14-24: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts | Oppose | <p>I Nancy Guy 605 N Bestgate Rd Annapolis, MD 21401 STRONGLY OPPOSE BILL 14-24.</p> <p>This bill reduces the "Architectural Features" requirement, specifies signage dimensions (and number of signs, other than "directional signs" that are "as necessary" - whatever that means). Specifies a minimum lot size if served by public sewer of 11,000, when it was 15,000 sq ft. before Bill 92-23. I STRONGLY OPPSE CHANGING THE LOT SIZE FROM 15,000 TO 11,000 SQ FT.</p> <p>The illumination of signs is again specified by road classification but is an improvement from what Bill 92-23 allows. Dimension for freestanding sign height used to be 6 feet. Now it is up to 10 ft if on a principal arterial road or road of higher classification. Remains at 6 feet if on minor arterial or lower classification. I STRONGLY OPPOSE CHANGING THE SIGNAGE DIMENSIONS. We do not need bigger, brighter signage which interferes with our wildlife.</p> <p>The minimum lot size for a lot with public sewers was reduced from 15,000 sq ft to 11,000 sq ft, which is less than the 15,000 sq ft required by an R2 lot. I am STRONGLY OPPOSED to this as well. The lots on Ridgely were originally zoned as R2 before SB. Conceptually, it doesn't make any sense to have a minimum lot size less than an R2 lot size. Without a public sewer it is 20,000 sq ft as it was before 92-23 passed.</p> <p>I am in agreement with no signage on accessory structures, which is what it was before Bill 92-23 passed, I believe.</p> <p>As I understsnd it the Architectural features would read as follows if Bill 14-24 is adopted.</p> <p>EXTERIOR architectural features for development in a small business district shall be GENERALLY compatible with THE STYLE OF ARCHITECTURAL FEATURES OF residential structures in the neighborhood IN WHICH THE DEVELOPMENT IS LOCATED OR IN THE NEIGHBORHOODS CLOSEST TO THE DEVELOPMENT, and SHALL have a SIMILAR appearance TO DEVELOPMENT IN THOSE NEIGHBORHOODS, AND MAY INCLUDE ARCHITECTURAL FEATURES TYPICAL OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT, such as peaked roofs, cornices and eaves, chimneys, door and window openings and projections, porches, dormers, and awnings.</p> <p>Bill 14-24 does not address that the concept of "SBD" was to allow home-based businesses to operate in a residential district. Many of the uses in Bill 92-23 exceed that original intention. There's no change in usage types in Bill 14-24. Do we really want a convenience store, snack bars, dry cleaning and laundry establishments, hardware store, pets, livestock or foul as permitted by 18-4-104, Restaurants, and all the other types of retail stores not considered as "home-based" businesses? I DON T THINK SO.</p> <p>What protections do residences have from noise disturbances from the SBD?</p> <p>According to the County Code 9-1-707 Noise disturbances as it applies to a residential district. See below:</p> <p>§ 9-1-707. Noise disturbances.</p> <p>(a) Definition. In this section, "residential district" means those districts identified as residential in § 18-2-105 of this Code.</p> <p>(b) Scope. This section does not apply to the use or operation of a device:</p> <p>(1) in the performance of a governmental function by an agency or instrumentality of federal, State, County, or municipal government;</p> <p>(2) in the performance of a public service function by a public service company as defined in § 1-101 of the Public Utilities Article of the State Code;</p> <p>(3) under a valid federal, State, County, or municipal license or permit;</p> <p>(4) in the activities of an educational institution or a bona fide nonprofit charitable or philanthropic organization or civic association; or</p> <p>(5) in farming activities.</p> <p>(c) Prohibitions. A person may not:</p> <p>(1) at any time use, operate, or permit the use or operation of a radio or other music producing device, a television, an amplified musical instrument, or any other audio producing device at an unreasonably loud volume that can be heard in a residential district; or</p> <p>(2) between the hours of 10:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m., use, operate, or permit the use or operation of a musical instrument or a machine, tool, or similar device at an unreasonably loud volume that can be heard in a residential district.</p> <p>(d) Rebuttable presumption. There is a rebuttable presumption that sound generated by a device listed in subsection (c) that can be heard at a distance of 50 feet from the device constitutes a violation under this section.</p> <p>(e) Sanctions for violation. A person who violates subsection (c) is subject to a civil fine for a Class E civil offense as provided in § 9-2-101, and a police officer may issue a citation, as provided in § 9-2-101, for a violation of subsection (c). A police officer is not required to issue a warning before charging a violation of subsection (c). Any person who has been ordered by a police officer to cease using, operating, or permitting the use or operation of a device in violation of subsection (c) and refuses or fails to comply with the order is guilty of a misdemeanor and on conviction is subject to a fine not exceeding \$500 or imprisonment not exceeding 30 days or both, and a violation may be tried on a citation prepared in accordance with the rules of the District Court of Maryland.</p> <p>I am OPPOSED TO ALLOWING the BUSINESSES TO CARRY ON WITH THERE NOISE DISTURBANCE - Radio, the use or operation of a musical instrument or a machine, tool, or similar device at an unreasonably loud volume that can be heard in a residential district from 10pm- 7 am this time frame should be 9pm- 9am Monday through Sunday 365 days of the year with no exceptions.</p> <p>THEREFORE I STRONGLY OPPOSE THIS BILL AND REQUEST AN AMENDMENT TO THIS BILL.</p> <p>Thank you so much</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 |
|---------------------|------------|-----------|-----------|-------|----------|--------------------------------|--|---|----------|--|------------|
| 2024-03-17 17:55:07 | Jane | Malone | Annapolis | MD | 21401 | No | Jane Malone | Bill 14-24: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts | Oppose | <p>I Jane Malone 605 North Bestgate Rd Annapolis, MD 21401 give Nancy Guy permission to submit my comments on my behalf.</p> <p>I Jane Malone, overwhelmingly OPPOSE bill 14-24. Changing the dimensions of signage from 15,000 sq ft to 10,000 means more signage potential, brighter illumination and will impact our wildlife significantly as well as our residence sleeping patterns. Who wants to have bright light shining in the home all hours of the night. I know I don't. As it is our wildlife doesn't have much time to come as it is because of all the noise from traffic and the surrounding highways.</p> <p>I am also in opposition to changing the noise disturbance level in the community to 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m., if anything the noise disturbance should be from 9:00 p.m. to 9:00 a.m. Monday through Friday 365 days of the year with no exceptions. We are a residential area that is coded as R2 and we are also a preservation area.</p> <p>We must PRESERVE AND PROTECT OUR COMMUNITY both noise level as well as our wildlife</p> <p>Therefore I am asking that the County Council to OPPOSE BILL 14-24.</p> <p>Thank you for your time.</p> <p>Jane Malone</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 |
|---------------------|------------|-----------|-----------|-------|----------|--------------------------------|--|---|----------|--|------------|
| 2024-03-17 17:57:39 | Ruth | Jobe | Annapolis | MD | | 21401 | Yes | Bill 14-24: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts | Oppose | <p>The majority of the remarks are in opposition; however, there are a couple of minor points on which to agree. Overall response is that of OPPOSITION.</p> <p>Oppose: The proposed amendments do little to honor the spirit, purpose, and intent of the Small Business District prior to adoption of Bill 92-23 that greatly expanded the Permitted, conditional, and special exceptions, among other provisions. Many of the changes to the Bulk Regulations adopted in Bill 92-23 are unfavorable to the residential area. The Zoning Code pre-adoption of Bill 92-23 was more suited to aligning the Small Business District with the residential area. Recommend revisiting that Code.</p> <p>Please address residential protections and preservation.</p> <p>How did the Small Business District's original concept of allowing home-based businesses within residential districts expand into what passed in Bill 92-23 and much of which Bill 14-24 does not address? The list of home-based businesses differs significantly when compared to Bill 92-23. There are many incompatible uses. A few missing considerations include allowable hours of operation esp. businesses that may operate 24/7 such as a convenience store, noises impacting residences (restaurants with outdoor dining), increased traffic, safety for those neighbors living on two-lane yellow striped roads, i.e., when backing out of driveways onto the roadway, environmental harm, and the list goes on.</p> <p>Furthermore, if there are at least 80 Small Business Districts (SBDs) in Anne Arundel County, how is it that the Office of Planning and Zoning cannot produce a list of properties zoned as "SB" and make it available to the public? Is there not a database from which the list can be drawn? Shouldn't an impact to the community be known and addressed before adoption is sought? Residents should be able to determine if/how this Bill would directly impact them. Please provide the definitions for the road types mentioned in Article 17. Subdivision and Development and in Article 18. Zoning, e.g., "arterial", "principal arterial", and "minor arterial", etc., the name of the government agency/department responsible for making those official roadway determinations, and where maps for each roadway can be found.</p> <p>While it is appreciated that the Amendment attempts to address a few community concerns, more amendments are needed. The timing of Bill 92-23 remains suspect both with the mid-December Bill's introduction and non-disclosure during regions 2, 4, and 7 Plan Development and Comprehensive Zoning process. Agree or not, passage of Bill 92-23 eroded the trust of many and impacted the Council's credibility. Transparency is lacking. Where is the mechanism for community engagement?</p> <p>18-9-403. Bulk Regulations</p> <p>Support: The minimum lot size of 20,000 square feet if not served by public sewer. This is the same requirement as that for R2, the predecessor zoning classification and conforms to the requirement pre-passage of Bill 92-23.</p> <p>Oppose: The minimum lot size of 11,000 square feet if served by public sewer is opposed. The reduction from 15,000 square feet to 11,000 square feet is a decrease of 4,000 square feet. As the prior zoning was R2 before SB and R2 requires 15,000 square feet, reducing the minimum lot size for even more intense business uses as allowed by 18-9-402 Permitted, conditional, and special exception makes no sense. What is the justification? As the Small Business District (SBD) requires that the residential character remain, decreasing lot size from 15,000 to 11,000 diminishes the ability to maintain the residential character. The reduction is OPPOSED.</p> <p>17-7-1101 Architectural Features</p> <p>Oppose: Regardless of road classification, the architectural features are important to maintaining and preserving the residential neighborhood's character. By inserting "GENERALLY" compatible negates the certainty of design features. In a similar way adding "OR" in the neighborhoods closest to the development removes the requirement that it be compatible with the residential structures in the neighborhood in which the development is located. Who decides which neighborhood's architectural features are used?</p> <p>The usage of "GENERALLY" compatible, "SIMILAR" appearance, and "MAY INCLUDE" is subject to too much interpretation. "May include" also introduces an option to exclude architectural features typical of residential development, thereby reducing the importance of the residential Architectural Features requirement. The language prior to the passage of 92-23 is more precise and should be reinstated.</p> <p>"Facades, side and rear exterior walls, and exterior architectural features for development in a small business district shall be compatible with residential structures in the neighborhood and have a residential appearance, such as peaked roofs, cornices and eaves, chimneys, door and window openings and projections, porches, dormers, and awnings."</p> <p>If adopted:</p> <p>EXTERIOR architectural features for development in a small business district shall be GENERALLY compatible with THE STYLE OF ARCHITECTURAL FEATURES OF residential structures in the neighborhood IN WHICH THE DEVELOPMENT IS LOCATED OR IN THE NEIGHBORHOODS CLOSEST TO THE DEVELOPMENT, and SHALL have a SIMILAR appearance TO DEVELOPMENT IN THOSE NEIGHBORHOODS, AND MAY INCLUDE ARCHITECTURAL FEATURES TYPICAL OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT, such as peaked roofs, cornices and eaves, chimneys, door and window openings and projections, porches, dormers, and awnings.</p> <p>18-3-312. Signs in small business districts.</p> <p>(A)Freestanding signs</p> <p>Oppose: Prior to the adoption of Bill 92-23 the sign allowance was for a "freestanding or identification" sign and limited to one sign that does not exceed 10 square feet in area with a height restriction of six feet.</p> <p>Amendment 14-24 allows both sign types concurrently as detailed in 18-3-312 (A) Freestanding signs and 18-3-312 (B) Identification signs. This doubles the number of signs, i.e., it isn't one or the other it is both. The increase in area from the original 10 to 30 square feet and height increase from six to 10 feet based on road classification makes a noteworthy difference too.</p> <p>While disagreeing with Bill 92-23 that proposed signage the same as that in commercial and industrial districts, this amendment in signing is concerning also. Sign clutter can dominate the landscape, erode community character, degrade historic ambience, and create blight in the entire neighborhood.</p> <p>Please also review the text, "MINOR OR ARTERIAL ROAD OR ROAD OF LOWER CLASSIFICATION" – not sure what a "minor" standalone road is.</p> <p>As proposed: AN ESTABLISHMENT OR USE IN A SMALL BUSINESS DISTRICT MAY HAVE ONE FREESTANDING SIGN THAT DOES NOT EXCEED 10 SQUARE FEET ON A MINOR OR ARTERIAL ROAD OR ROAD OF LOWER CLASSIFICATION, OR AN AREA OF 30 SQUARE FEET ON A PRINCIPAL ARTERIAL ROAD OR A ROAD OF HIGHER CLASSIFICATION. THE HEIGHT OF A FREESTANDING SIGN MAY NOT EXCEED SIX FEET ON A MINOR ARTERIAL ROAD OR A ROAD OF LOWER CLASSIFICATION, OR A HEIGHT OF 10 FEET ON A PRINCIPAL ARTERIAL ROAD OR A ROAD OF HIGHER CLASSIFICATION.</p> <p>Pre-passage of Bill 92-23: 18-3-312 (a) "Freestanding or identification signs. An establishment or use in a small business district may have one sign, freestanding or identification, that does not exceed 10 square feet in area. The height of a freestanding sign may not exceed six feet."</p> <p>(B)Identification signs.</p> <p>Oppose: Please clarify the definition of "facade" as most would interpret as meaning the front of a building. Is there an expectation that the sign will exceed 10 square feet in area as justification for the change to "not exceed 10 percent of the area of the façade"? Depending on the shape of the building, this could be a rather large sign. Recommend being more specific so that the sign does not exceed 10 square feet in area vs. 10 percent of the façade. Opposed to having both a freestanding and an identification sign, which doubles the number of allowed signs related to these two categories.</p> <p>As proposed: AN ESTABLISHMENT OR USE IN A SMALL BUSINESS DISTRICT MAY HAVE AN IDENTIFICATION SIGN ON ONE FACADE, SO LONG AS THE AREA OF THE SIGN DOES NOT EXCEED 10% OF THE AREA OF THE FACADE.</p> <p>Pre-passage of Bill 92-23: 18-3-312 (a) "Freestanding or identification signs. An establishment or use in a small business district may have one sign, freestanding or identification, that does not exceed 10 square feet in area. The height of a freestanding sign may not exceed six feet."</p> <p>(C)Directional signs</p> <p>Support: Hopefully, appropriate judgment is applied to the "as necessary" qualification</p> <p>As proposed: AN ESTABLISHMENT OR USE IN A SMALL BUSINESS DISTRICT MAY HAVE DIRECTIONAL SIGNS AS NECESSARY. EACH SIGN MAY NOT EXCEED SIX SQUARE FEET IN AREA AND FIVE FEET IN HEIGHT.</p> <p>(D)Illumination of signs.</p> <p>Oppose: Oppose the specification of road classification. The same restriction should apply within all SBDs regardless of road classification. No distinction should be made. Neighbors should not be subject to lights shining at all times of the day or night. Neighbors do need to sleep and light infiltration disturbs sleep. Is there another zoning ordinance that protects against light?</p> | 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 |
|---------------------|------------|------------|-----------|----------|----------|--------------------------------|--|---|----------|---|------------|
| 2024-03-17 22:10:19 | Dorothy | Guy | Annapolis | MD | 21401 | Yes | | Bill 14-24: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts | Oppose | The County Council should reverse the changes it adopted in Bill 92-23. Bill 14-24 is no antidote to Bill 92-23 and needs to be much stronger than it is to protect residential areas that are affected by Small Business Districts (SBDs). At a minimum, the County Council should reverse the expansion of permitted, conditional, and special uses in SBDs and adopt restrictions on operating hours, outdoor seating and activities, noise, and exterior lighting generated by businesses in SBDs to protect the local community. Please see attached document for more specific comments and recommendations. Thank you. | YES |
| 2024-03-18 5:55:54 | Peggy | Hamilton | Annapolis | MD | 21401 | Yes | | Bill 14-24: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts | Oppose | I agree with the comments of Dorothy Guy on this bill (attached). | YES |
| 2024-03-18 10:13:41 | Mary | Guy | Annapolis | MD | 21401 | Yes | | Bill 14-24: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts | Oppose | Oppose: The proposed amendments do not maintain the integrity of and small scale intended for a Small Business District (SBD) and will allow major commercial interferences in these areas which are situated within or near residential areas. The Zoning Code before adoption of Bill 92-23 was more favorable to protecting residential areas from the effects of adjacent and nearby SBDs. I highly recommend the County Council reverse the changes made by adopting Bill 92-23. Bill 14-24 essentially opens the door for a variety of exterior architectural features in SBDs by using the permissive term "generally" compatible. I recommend that the word "generally" be removed from Section 17-7-1101. At a minimum, Bill 14-24 should include restrictions on businesses in SBDs on operating hours, outdoor seating and activities, noise, and exterior lighting to protect the local community. Recently, two residents (different households and streets) told me of "drumming" that went on until 10 p.m. Even with closed doors and windows, the drumming was disruptive, annoying, and disturbed the peace and tranquility of their area. How are people are supposed to recharge and rehabilitate when such disturbances are present? What about the impact of the noise on children who have to attend school and are expected to be refreshed and ready to learn? And the annoyance to wildlife as well. We all know that noise and light are two factors that significantly impact the quality of sleep and wellbeing, so let's keep it quiet and with limited lighting !! I concur with a comment made by Dorothy Guy which reads: "Importantly, the Office of Planning and Zoning and the County Council should produce a list of properties zoned as "SB" and make it available to the public. Additionally, the Bill should define the road types mentioned in Article 17. Subdivision and Development and in Article 18. Zoning, e.g., "arterial", "principal arterial", and "minor arterial", etc. The Office of Planning and Zoning and the County Council should also provide the name of the government agency or department responsible for making those official roadway determinations and provide maps depicting all roadways by their road type. And all of this information should be made public before the County Council takes a vote to determine whether it will adopt Bill 14-24. Only in this way can the public understand what Bill 14-24 is about and how it will affect them. Without this information, the only conclusion the public can reach is that the Office of Planning and Zoning and the County Council has no desire to be transparent or helpful to the public you say that you serve." Support: I support the minimum lot size of 20,000 square feet if not served by public sewer. Oppose: I oppose the minimum lot size of 11,000 square feet if served by public sewer. Reducing the lot size from 15,000 to 11,000 would negatively impact the ability to maintain the residential character. Combination of Support and Oppose: Regarding signage, I concur with comments furnished by Dorothy Guy on sections: 17-7-1101 Architectural Features and 18-3-312 Signs in small business districts, sections A-E. | |
| | | | | | | | | 6 | | | |
| 2024-03-13 19:55:58 | Mary | Ostrowski | Annapolis | MD | 21401 | Yes | | Bill 8-24: General Development Plan – Region 7 Plan | Oppose | I oppose developers and OPZ's drive towards higher density properties and future intensification of zoning and use allowances as it is detrimental to the community. We already have high traffic in the Weems Creek area with frequent bridge openings- then add summer Bay Bridge traffic to the mix and the area is gridlocked! Please do not allow commercial zoning. | |
| 2024-03-13 21:44:16 | Jennifer | Dudley | Arnold | Md | 21012 | Yes | | Bill 8-24: General Development Plan – Region 7 Plan | Oppose | Oppose the Ridgely Avenue Village Center and Sector Plan as they are not needed. It is not Smart Growth to develop what is largely a greenfield. This is a low-density residential (R2), Neighborhood Preservation Area and should remain that way. In addition, the plan does not support the environmental goals of the County | |
| 2024-03-17 11:54:02 | Robert | Hannon | Annapolis | MD | 21401 | Yes | | Bill 8-24: General Development Plan – Region 7 Plan | Oppose | The concept of a Village Center is entirely too vague for resident buy-in. Our community has infrastructure issues that are mentioned in the plan, but no discussion of dealing with those issues prior to trying to expand commercial presence in the area. Traffic, lighting, water, sewage, walkability, and environmental impact are all areas needing improvements without the added stress of increased commercial presence. Trying to invite more business in prior to addressing these issues will reduce the quality of life for current residents and increase risk of those commercial interests ultimately failing. Please consider removing the language around a Village Center and commercial zoning expansion until after such time as the county has had opportunity to correct the current issues in the area. | |
| 2024-03-17 16:39:17 | Michael | Richardson | ANNAPOLIS | Maryland | 21401 | Yes | | Bill 8-24: General Development Plan – Region 7 Plan | Oppose | Reference: Ridgely Avenue Village Center and Sector Plan Region 7 Plan of Bills No. 8-24 and 9-24 Hello County Executive Pittman, Councilmember Rodvien and County Council, I am a resident of the Lindamoor Neighborhood which is located on a peninsula with one-way in and one-way out of Wilson Road onto Ridgely and Bestgate intersection. Please please please reconsider passing any bills that allow any further development in this area that will result in increasing the resident living density and additional commercial development. The area is already reaching a demand breaking point on the supply of natural resources, green space, noise, public and private utilities. Having reviewed the Bills they are underestimating the impact on the upfront and on-going tax supported costs, decrease in quality of life, negative impact on wildlife, impact of historical preservation, and long term damage and erosion to the local environment and Chesapeake Bay critical areas. Please do not pass these Bills. Thank you, Mike Richardson Sr 1902 Lindamoor Drive, Annapolis, MD 21401 410-279-5488 | |
| 2024-03-17 20:08:45 | Peggy | Hamilton | Annapolis | MD | 21401 | Yes | | Bill 8-24: General Development Plan – Region 7 Plan | Oppose | I have also attached this same letter of opposition to Bill No. 9-24 since it's closely related to this Bill. | 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 |
|---------------------|------------|-----------|-----------|-------|----------|--------------------------------|--|-------------|---|---------|--|
| 2024-03-17 23:13:42 | Nancy | Guy | Annapolis | MD | | 21401 | Yes | | Bill 8-24: General Development Plan – Region 7 Plan | Oppose | <p>want to oppose the documents in their entirety:</p> <p>Comment: The A. A. County Council must reject the plan as written for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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. <p>R7 A. A. County Regional Plan Final Recommended Draft (dated Jan. 5, 2024)</p> <p>Comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">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 commentsc. 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>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.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">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. > 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 comments4. 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 trees11. 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>I oppose the Ridgely Ave Village Center and Sector Plan. This plan is disguised as Example #2 on page 78-79 o f 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.</p> <p>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!!</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 |
|---------------------|------------|-----------|-----------|-------|----------|--------------------------------|--|---|----------|---|------------|
| 2024-03-17 23:20:52 | Jane | Malone | Annapolis | MD | 21401 | No | Jane Janr Malone | Bill 8-24: General Development Plan – Region 7 Plan | Oppose | <p>I Jane Malone, give Mamcy Guy permission to submit my comments on my behalf which are as follows:</p> <p>I to 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">• 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. <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. > 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 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</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 |
|---------------------|------------|-----------|-----------|-------|----------|--------------------------------|--|---|----------|--|------------|
| 2024-03-17 23:29:44 | Jane | Malone | Annapolis | MD | 21401 | No | Jane Malone | Bill 8-24: General Development Plan – Region 7 Plan | Oppose | <p>Jane Malone, give Nancy Guy permission to submit my comments on my behalf which are as follows:</p> <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">• 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. <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. > 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 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</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 |
|---------------------|------------|-----------|-----------|-------|----------|--------------------------------|--|---|----------|--|------------|
| 2024-03-18 5:53:56 | Peggy | Hamilton | Annapolis | MD | 21401 | Yes | | Bill 8-24: General Development Plan – Region 7 Plan | Oppose | I agree with the comments of Dorothy Guy on this bill (attached). | YES |
| 2024-03-18 7:13:19 | Shirley | Guy | Baltimore | MD | 21207 | Yes | | Bill 8-24: General Development Plan – Region 7 Plan | Oppose | I oppose the Ridgely Ave. Village Center and Sector Plan listed as part of the Region 7 Plan and support continuance of low density R2 zoning throughout Ridgely Ave. and Weems Creek. These areas should remain classified as Neighborhood Preservation Areas. The Village Center and Sector Plan open the door to commercial development and does not support the environmental goals of Anne Arundel County in terms of loss of greenspace, tree canopy, and creation of large areas of impervious surfaces leading to problems with storm runoff and sedimentation. Leaving the area in R2 zoning protects the area from commercial development where it is not needed or wanted and where adequate infrastructure is not in place to support it. | |
| 2024-03-18 9:37:45 | Mary | Guy | Annapolis | MD | 21401 | Yes | | Bill 8-24: General Development Plan – Region 7 Plan | Oppose | 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. There are 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 are NOT warranted. 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 wildlife (including but not limited to migratory and non-migratory birds), the residents, taxpayers, and future generations of Anne Arundel County. The prior study of the Weems Creek area as completed by shows its import to the environment and region. See. "A GREENWAY STRATEGY FOR WEEMS CREEK" as completed by the U.S. Department of Interior and the Maryland Dept of Natural Resources. The OPZ already said it has sufficient housing to meet the identified needs for 2040. New units are not needed when existing units can be used and/or rehabbed. People should be encouraged to purchase their residences, including the LAND, so that they are not in a perpetual state of paying someone for the land and unit and can develop equity and financial stability. Developers and management companies are interested in creating condominiums, townhouses, and land rental units (i.e., build to lease) as they would continue to own the land, bill the residents for ongoing use, maintenance, etc., thus perpetuating an indentured state. | |
| 2024-03-18 10:04:23 | Stephen | Hammond | Annapolis | MD | 21401 | Yes | | Bill 8-24: General Development Plan – Region 7 Plan | Oppose | Hello - I am submitting these remarks in strong opposition to any changes to, or overdevelopment of, the Ridgely Ave./Weems Creek Corridor. The churches have already encroached to change the character of the neighborhood, but the remaining residential zoning is why we reside here. Please - no new businesses/commercial zoning, no zoning variance approvals, high-density or low-income housing, no sidewalks, and do not cater to the land owners and their lawyers that want to commercially develop this area into a "Village Center" or "Sector Plan." If we wanted this, we would move to West Annapolis, or other similar area that already exists. Thank you very much for taking my comments, and for not destroying the residential character and dynamic of this neighborhood for the financial benefit of a few. Stephen Hammond | |
| 2024-03-18 10:16:02 | Mary | Guy | Annapolis | MD | 21401 | Yes | | Bill 8-24: General Development Plan – Region 7 Plan | Oppose | Not sure whether my comments submitted earlier today were received as I did not receive a confirmation. Therefore, I am submitting the following comments. 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. There are 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 are NOT warranted. 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 wildlife (including but not limited to migratory and non-migratory birds), the residents, taxpayers, and future generations of Anne Arundel County. The prior study of the Weems Creek area as completed by shows its import to the environment and region. See. "A GREENWAY STRATEGY FOR WEEMS CREEK" as completed by the U.S. Department of Interior and the Maryland Dept of Natural Resources. The OPZ already said it has sufficient housing to meet the identified needs for 2040. New units are not needed when existing units can be used and/or rehabbed. People should be encouraged to purchase their residences, including the LAND, so that they are not in a perpetual state of paying someone for the land and unit and can develop equity and financial stability. Developers and management companies are interested in creating condominiums, townhouses, and land rental units (i.e., build to lease) as they would continue to own the land, bill the residents for ongoing use, maintenance, etc., thus perpetuating an indentured state. | |

| 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 |
|---------------------|------------|-----------|---------|-------|----------|--------------------------------|--|---|----------|---|------------|
| 2024-03-18 10:43:19 | Ruth | Jobe | Herndon | VA | | 20171 | Yes | Bill 8-24: General Development Plan – Region 7 Plan | Oppose | <p>The Region 7 Plan requires clarification in the following ways:</p> <p>There is no acknowledgement that the Severn River is a designated Maryland Scenic River – an important designation by the State of Maryland. Please include the "Maryland Scenic River" in the plan.</p> <p>On Page 24 in the "Annapolis Neck" section, Riverview Avenue is specifically mentioned; however, elsewhere it is included as part of the Weems Creek Community/Ridgely Avenue. If it is on the Annapolis Neck, a peninsula, zoning should be checked for consistency with the peninsula requirements. Perhaps Riverview Avenue is located in a Peninsula Policy Area.</p> <p>"...The built character of this area is primarily single-family homes in low density communities, though there are areas of neighborhood commercial nodes within the community, such as the local commercial cluster along Riverview Avenue..."</p> <p>In many instances, Tables, Figures, Photo Credits, etc. are missing. All sources should be identified, including where statistics are cited.</p> <p>On Page 48 a "charrette" is mentioned. The average reader may not understand this terminology. It should be removed and replaced with a word(s) readily understood by readers.</p> <p>On Page 53, please confirm that the "Taylor Avenue Trail" is the name of a trail. A Google search did not find such a trail. "Area transportation projects, including the Poplar Trail Extension, the MD-450 bicycle trail retrofit project, the Parole Transportation Center, and the Taylor Avenue Trail."</p> <p>Wherever the "Bestgate Road corridor" is mentioned, a distinction between "North Bestgate Road" and Bestgate Road should be made. North Bestgate Road is a small two-lane yellow striped corridor vs. the balance of Bestgate Road.</p> <p>The Existing Conditions section for Bay Ridge (Page 25), Highland Beach (Page 26), Riva (Page 27), indicate a vision for future activities, "Development should be limited to single family residential infill of a scale and form that is consistent with the surrounding neighborhood." A similar statement should be made for the Weems Creek Community/Ridgely Avenue.</p> <p>The Natural Environment section is of major importance to protecting natural resources. There's strong public support for protecting and improving water quality. In Plan2040 Goal NE4 focused on improving and protecting water quality by reducing impacts from stormwater runoff, wastewater discharge, and septic systems. Any upzoning in Weems Creek Community/Ridgely Avenue area, an area without public sewers, is contrary to Goal NE4; especially when development increases impervious surfaces creating more stormwater runoff. We know that Luce Creek has already been negatively impacted and that Luce Creek empties into the Severn River. The river's water quality does not meet Federal Clean Water Act standards. Development is not warranted.</p> <p>In Plan2040, Goal NE2 called for retaining existing forest cover, increasing forest replanting efforts, and increasing urban tree canopy, for which residents are advocating; therefore, the Walk & Roll Anne Arundel Plan Region 7 Proposed Bike Path that creates a shared-use path from Parole to North Bestgate will involve removing trees in the center islands, is contrary to Goal NE2, and should be revisited. Actions speak louder than words. If the County removes these trees, the words in Plan2040 have no substance. Removing trees along Bestgate Road for a shared-use bike path does the opposite of retaining tree canopy.</p> <p>Built Environment - Land Use and Zoning - Ridgely Avenue and Weems Creek Area - Page 46 – 47 (TIMING OF CHANGES IS WRONG! – churches (check dates – Weems Creek Church 1950's – 1960's) and medical center buildings (1990) came first before conversion of a few single family homes – SBD created in 2005. The Paragraph inserted below is misleading. It doesn't recognize that churches are an allowable use and that the medical centers were approved when Anne Arundel County General Hospital was located in downtown Annapolis long before its relocation to Jennifer Road. Please explain what you consider a "retail" business in this neighborhood. "The prevailing historic character of development along Ridgely Avenue, from approximately Bestgate Road North to Weems Creek, dates to the late 19th and early 20th century. The area is now a mix of uses, with historic single-family homes (some of which have been converted to small businesses), retail businesses, and a restaurant along Riverview Avenue; later additions of large office buildings and churches contrast with this earlier development pattern. The character of the surrounding community is predominantly low-density single-family homes."</p> <p>On Page 46, please consider changing the Title from "Ridgely Avenue and Weems Creek Area to "Weems Creek Community and Ridgely Avenue" or use "Weems Creek Community".</p> <p>On Page 48, it is unknown why photos from non-Anne Arundel County locations were selected as examples. With Anne Arundel County having more than 80 Small Business Districts, it is more appropriate to show local locations vs. out-of-state. If there aren't any similar examples, why deceive Region 7 residents with non-representative examples? Let's maintain transparency; especially given the recent passage of Bill 92-23 and the changes it brings to zoning.</p> <p>Developing the Weems Creek Area negates protecting Neighborhood Preservation and Conservation and Peninsula Policy Areas from significant increases in development. We look to the Zoning and Subdivision and Development provisions of the County Code to support preservation, conservation, and protection. The County acknowledges that, for years, it has focused growth into the Parole Town Center in order to maintain the built neighborhood character and lower density of other parts of the Region. Let's ensure that the lower density focus remains in the Weems Creek Community.</p> <p>The Zoning of Small Business District (SBD) on Ridgely Avenue is suspect as the Zoning Code prior to the February 2024 adoption of Bill 92-23 specifies an "arterial" road, which Ridgely Avenue is not. As development has not occurred on Ridgely and the properties were purchased as "R2" (perhaps one very recently as "SB"), the County Council should recommend returning these properties to "R2". This will preserve the properties over greenfield development and will further acknowledge this area as a Neighborhood Preservation Policy Area that limits new development with public investments in walking and biking infrastructure, parks, and schools.</p> <p>Page 74 Opportunities: "High redevelopment potential in Parole Town Center, and other aging strip mall areas such as Bay Ridge Road across from Giant, Riverview Avenue Area, etc." It is unknown why Riverview Avenue Area is identified as "high redevelopment potential" and the text identifies it as a "strip mall", which it isn't. Please review and update so that the description is not misleading or remove the reference to it altogether as it is out of place.</p> <p>Corresponding changes to Plan2040 are also called for to ensure preservation, conservation, and protection of our land.</p> <p>Let's ensure the Region 7 Plan preserves the character and attributes which make Region 7 a great place to live.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration of the above comments and recommendations.</p> | 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 |
|---------------------|------------|------------|-----------|----------|----------|--------------------------------|--|---|----------|---|------------|
| 2024-03-18 10:48:21 | sarah | bouchard | annapolis | Maryland | 21401 | Yes | | Bill 8-24: General Development Plan – Region 7 Plan | Oppose | also oppose 9-24, specifically the Ridgely Ave, Willow Road and Dubois Road (et al) requested zoning changes beyond R2 low density residential and any requirement that a non defined ,village sector overlay' be entirely removed from comments pertaining to this area and any properties therein. | |
| 2024-03-18 10:58:30 | Ruth | Jobe | Annapolis | MD | 21401 | Yes | | Bill 8-24: General Development Plan – Region 7 Plan | Oppose | Opposition comments submitted by Dorothy Guy also represent my position in greater detail. | |
| 2024-03-13 19:57:25 | Mary | Ostrowski | Annapolis | MD | 21401 | Yes | | Bill 9-24: Comprehensive Zoning – Region 7 | Oppose | I oppose developers and OPZ's drive towards higher density properties and future intensification of zoning and use allowances as it is detrimental to the community. We already have high traffic in the Weems Creek area with frequent bridge openings- then add summer Bay Bridge traffic to the mix and the area is gridlocked! Please do not allow commercial zoning. | |
| 2024-03-13 21:45:12 | Jennifer | Dudley | Arnold | Md | 21012 | Yes | | Bill 9-24: Comprehensive Zoning – Region 7 | Oppose | Oppose the Ridgely Avenue Village Center and Sector Plan as they are not needed. It is not Smart Growth to develop what is largely a greenfield. This is a low-density residential (R2), Neighborhood Preservation Area and should remain that way. In addition, the plan does not support the environmental goals of the County | |
| 2024-03-13 21:50:46 | Mary | Ostrowski | Annapolis | MD | 21401 | Yes | | Bill 9-24: Comprehensive Zoning – Region 7 | Oppose | I oppose developers and OPZ's drive towards higher density properties and future intensification of zoning and use allowances as it is detrimental to the community. We already have high traffic in the Weems Creek area with frequent bridge openings- then add summer Bay Bridge traffic to the mix and the area is gridlocked! Please do not allow commercial zoning. | |
| 2024-03-17 11:54:53 | Robert | Hannon | Annapolis | MD | 21401 | Yes | | Bill 9-24: Comprehensive Zoning – Region 7 | Oppose | The concept of a Village Center is entirely too vague for resident buy-in. Our community has infrastructure issues that are mentioned in the plan, but no discussion of dealing with those issues prior to trying to expand commercial presence in the area. Traffic, lighting, water, sewage, walkability, and environmental impact are all areas needing improvements without the added stress of increased commercial presence. Trying to invite more business in prior to addressing these issues will reduce the quality of life for current residents and increase risk of those commercial interests ultimately failing. Please consider removing the language around a Village Center and commercial zoning expansion until after such time as the county has had opportunity to correct the current issues in the area. | |
| 2024-03-17 16:40:08 | Michael | Richardson | ANNAPOLIS | Maryland | 21401 | Yes | | Bill 9-24: Comprehensive Zoning – Region 7 | Oppose | Reference: Ridgely Avenue Village Center and Sector Plan Region 7 Plan of Bills No. 8-24 and 9-24 Hello County Executive Pittman, Councilmember Rodvien and County Council, I am a resident of the Lindamoor Neighborhood which is located on a peninsula with one-way in and one-way out of Wilson Road onto Ridgely and Bestgate intersection. Please please please reconsider passing any bills that allow any further development in this area that will result in increasing the resident living density and additional commercial development. The area is already reaching a demand breaking point on the supply of natural resources, green space, noise, public and private utilities. Having reviewed the Bills they are underestimating the impact on the upfront and on-going tax supported costs, decrease in quality of life, negative impact on wildlife, impact of historical preservation, and long term damage and erosion to the local environment and Chesapeake Bay critical areas. Please do not pass these Bills. Thank you, Mike Richardson Sr 1902 Lindamoor Drive, Annapolis, MD 21401 410-279-5488 | |
| 2024-03-17 20:09:47 | Peggy | Hamilton | Annapolis | MD | 21401 | Yes | | Bill 9-24: Comprehensive Zoning – Region 7 | Oppose | I have also attached this same letter of opposition to Bill No. 8-24 since it's closely related to this Bill. | 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 |
|---------------------|------------|-----------|-----------|-------|----------|--------------------------------|--|-------------|--|---------|---|
| 2024-03-17 23:06:48 | Nancy | Guy | Annapolis | MD | | 21401 | Yes | | Bill 9-24: Comprehensive Zoning – Region 7 | Oppose | <p>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">• 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. <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.> 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 o f 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!!</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 |
|---------------------|------------|-----------|-----------|-------|----------|--------------------------------|--|--|----------|--|------------|
| 2024-03-17 23:21:43 | Dorothy | Guy | Annapolis | MD | 21401 | Yes | | Bill 9-24: Comprehensive Zoning – Region 7 | Oppose | I oppose the Region 7 Plan as presented on Jan. 5, 2024. I support amending the Region 7 to remove all references to a Village Center and Sector Plan for Ridgely Avenue and the Weems Creek Community. I support amending Bill 8-24 to codify that a Village Center and Sector Plan is prohibited or otherwise not permitted for Ridgely Avenue and the Weems Creek Community. I also urge the County Council: 1) to deny any requested upzoning that is included in the Region 7 Plan for the Ridgely Avenue and Weems Creek Community, and 2) to deny the requested upzoning from SB to C2 for 617 and 623 Ridgely Avenue that was received on Feb. 16, 2024 as Zoning Change Council Application # CZ-R7-GRA-001. OPZ appropriately recommended that these properties remain zoned as SB. | YES |
| 2024-03-17 23:27:36 | Dorothy | Guy | Annapolis | MD | 21401 | Yes | | Bill 9-24: Comprehensive Zoning – Region 7 | Oppose | I oppose Bill No. 9-24 and ask that the County Council reject Bill No. 9-24. I ask that the County Council oppose future intensification of zoning and use allowances in the Ridgely Avenue/Weems Creek Community! This area includes, but is not limited to, Ridgely Avenue, Willow Road, Riverview Avenue, North Bestgate Road, and Dubois Road and the surrounding Weems Creek Community. I also ask that the County Council deny the upzoning requests from SB to C2 and from R2 to C2 for CZ-GRA-001 through and including CZ-GRA-008 and any other upzoning requests in the Ridgely Avenue/Weems Creek Community and that any requested Land Use Changes reflect these denials. I also urge the County Council to support the OPZ recommendations for low-density residential R2 zoning in the Ridgely Avenue/Weems Creek Community. | YES |
| 2024-03-18 5:55:07 | Peggy | Hamilton | Annapolis | MD | 21401 | Yes | | Bill 9-24: Comprehensive Zoning – Region 7 | Oppose | I agree with the comments of Dorothy Guy on this bill (attached). | YES |
| 2024-03-18 10:07:30 | Stephen | Hammond | Annapolis | MD | 21401 | Yes | | Bill 9-24: Comprehensive Zoning – Region 7 | Oppose | Hello - I am submitting these remarks in strong opposition to any changes to, or overdevelopment of, the Ridgely Ave./Weems Creek Corridor. The churches have already encroached to change the character of the neighborhood, but the remaining residential zoning is why we reside here. Please - no new businesses/commercial zoning, no zoning variance approvals, high-density or low-income housing, no sidewalks, and do not cater to the land owners and their lawyers that want to commercially develop this area into a "Village Center" or "Sector Plan." If we wanted this, we would move to West Annapolis, or other similar area that already exists. Thank you very much for taking my comments, and for not destroying the residential character and dynamic of this neighborhood for the financial benefit of a few. Stephen Hammond | |
| 2024-03-18 10:31:05 | Elizabeth | Donohoe | Annapolis | MD | 21401 | Yes | | Bill 9-24: Comprehensive Zoning – Region 7 | Oppose | I oppose the Ridgely Avenue Village Center and Sector Plan. This extensive development is not needed - there is abundant apartment-style housing in the county and more under development. This is a low-density residential (R2) neighborhood and preservation area - it needs to retain this designation. Our county cannot sustain unchecked growth - the infrastructure does not exist to support more traffic and households, especially in this neighborhood. Bill 8-24 must also be revised to reflect these concerns. Please listen to the needs of the residents and the community - not the needs of the developers. | |
| 2024-03-18 10:34:59 | Mary | Guy | Annapolis | MD | 21401 | Yes | | Bill 9-24: Comprehensive Zoning – Region 7 | Oppose | I remain steadfastly opposed to this plan for all the reasons I provided previously to the County Council, the Stakeholders Advisory Committee, and the Planning Advisory Board. Comprehensive Zoning is a far-reaching endeavor that would permanently impact current and future generations, property owners, visitors, the environment (land, water, air quality), light, wildlife, health and wellbeing of residents, recreation, taxpayers, etc. and should not be taken lightly. Outreach to the public has been hampered by a variety of conditions including, but not limited to, not providing materials in a format that is user-friendly, materials in legible paper format, requirements of needing to search various data bases and use complicated software, restricting access of revised materials to the public, not holding regular meetings in and with the community, failure to provide settings for meetings such that audiovisual quality allows for full participation (i.e., room at the Office of Planning and Zoning was ill-equipped, visuals were not displayed for the audience to see and understand, explanations were limited and incomplete, questions and comments were curtailed, some committee members were self-serving, etc., etc.), limited mailings and community events, not responding in writing to written comments, not tallying and furnishing credible summary of comments and responses, showing favoritism to developers and their associates, combining testimony on bills (i.e., restricting testimony on 2 bills to 2 minutes total rather than 2 minutes per bill), etc., etc. If this has happened in Region 7, what has happened in the other Regions? The County needs to assess and rectify these issues so that the planning process is transparent, inclusive, and serves its residents and promotes the principles of PROTECTION, CONSERVATION, AND PRESERVATION!!! | |
| 2024-03-18 10:55:28 | Ruth | Jobe | Annapolis | MD | 21401 | Yes | | Bill 9-24: Comprehensive Zoning – Region 7 | Oppose | --Oppose the Ridgely Avenue Village Center and Sector Plan. The Region 7 Plan must be changed to remove allreferences to the Village Center and Sector Plan. In addition, the County Council must amend the bills (Bill No. 8- 24 and 9-24) to specifically state that they are not adopting any part of the Village Center and Sector Plan. This plan is disguised as Example Strategy# 2 on pages 78-79 of the Region 7 Plan. --The Ridgely Avenue Village Center and Sector Plan are not needed. It is not Smart Growth to develop what is largely a greenfield. This is a low-density residential (R2), Neighborhood Preservation Area and should remain that way. In addition, the plan does not advance the environmental goals of the county. --Oppose development along Ridgely Avenue as it does not have public sewer and none is planned. The roadways cannot support additional traffic. The County has plenty of underutilized, already-developed areas where revitalization and redevelopment must be focused. Do not create more impervious surfaces! --Oppose any upzoning, commercial rezoning and any commercial development along N. Bestgate Road, Ridgely Avenue, and Riverview Avenue. Maintain Willow Road and Dubois Rd. as R2. Keep developers and land speculators from destroying the neighborhood for their financial gain! --Review the original SB zoning of Ridgely Avenue as it is not an arterial road, which was specified in zoning code prior to the February 2024 adoption of Bill 92-23, which is suspect as to timing and content. --All previously submitted opposition comments still pertain; however, are not reattached herein for brevity. --Changes to Region 7 Plan must also be reflected in Plan2040. --Call upon the County Council to conduct a "Lessons Learned" meeting with local residents regarding the development of the Region 7 Plan and Zoning Changes. Thank you for your consideration. | |
| 2024-03-18 10:57:11 | Ruth | Jobe | Annapolis | MD | 21401 | Yes | | Bill 9-24: Comprehensive Zoning – Region 7 | Oppose | Opposition is also reflected in comments submitted by Dorothy Guy, with which I wholeheartedly concur. | |

| 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 10:39:28 | 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 & 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> | |
| | | | | | | | | | 1 | | |