

Timestamp	First name	Last name	City	State	Zip code	Are you representing yourself?	Who are you representing?	Legislation	Position	Remarks	Attachment
2024-03-28 20:18:04	Peggy	Hamilton	Annapolis	MD	21401	Yes		Bill 9-24: Comprehensive Zoning – Region 7	No position	<p>Dear Anne Arundel County Council,</p> <p>I am writing to express my opinions on Bill 9-24, particularly that I oppose commercial upzoning, including R2 to SB and SB to C2 or any other combination that would allow further commercial development in Weems Creek.</p> <p>I urge you to maintain the R2 residential zoning throughout Weems Creek to protect the character of the neighborhood and prevent developers and land speculators from prioritizing financial gain over the well-being of the community.</p> <p>Finally, Bill 9-24 should ensure consistency between the Digital Zoning Layer and the amended Region 7 Plan. If necessary, please amend Bill 9-24 to achieve this consistency.</p> <p>Thank you for your time and consideration.</p> <p>Sincerely, Peggy Hamilton</p>	
2024-03-29 14:57:58	Stacia	Roesler	Annapolis	MD	21401	Yes		Bill 9-24: Comprehensive Zoning – Region 7	Oppose	<p>Dear Councilmembers:</p> <p>The parcels of 617 and 623 Ridgely have requested variances from SB zoning to C2, with an attendant increase in allowable impermeable surface; this variance request currently shows as "under consideration by full council". I have attached for your edification the Anne Arundel elevation and watershed maps. These maps show a) elevation in feet, showing that everything on the South side of Ridgely is between 85-75 feet in elevation and therefore does drain into the much lower Cove of Cork stream; and b) the watershed map, showing that the area in question does in fact drain into Cove of Cork. (I believe that the Severn River Association plans to testify to this at the April 15 meeting, as well.)</p> <p>Further, you have heard from not just a few voices, but literally dozens of concerned residents who have written in and attended the PAB and OPZ meetings, as well as Council meetings, who are opposed to further commercialization of the Ridgely corridor for many reasons. It does not seem right that the very few voices seeking development of these parcels should override the dozens of concerned residents who are suffering real monetary and material damage from the poor stormwater management of these properties. We therefore ask you to support Ms Rodvien as well as the PAB and OPZ, all of whom recommend no upzoning to this area of Ridgely, and vote NO for any such upzoning requests. Please support the original zoning as submitted, without Amendment.</p> <p>Thank you, Stacia Roesler 1878 Lindamoore Dr Annapolis MD 21401</p>	YES
2024-03-29 14:59:50	Stacia	Roesler	Annapolis	MD	21401	Yes		Bill 9-24: Comprehensive Zoning – Region 7	Oppose	<p>Dear Councilmembers:</p> <p>The parcels of 617 and 623 Ridgely have requested variances from SB zoning to C2, with an attendant increase in allowable impermeable surface; this variance request currently shows as "under consideration by full council". I have attached for your edification the Anne Arundel elevation and watershed maps. These maps show a) elevation in feet, showing that everything on the South side of Ridgely is between 85-75 feet in elevation and therefore does drain into the much lower Cove of Cork stream; and b) the watershed map, showing that the area in question does in fact drain into Cove of Cork. (I believe that the Severn River Association plans to testify to this at the April 15 meeting, as well.)</p> <p>Further, you have heard from not just a few voices, but literally dozens of concerned residents who have written in and attended the PAB and OPZ meetings, as well as Council meetings, who are opposed to further commercialization of the Ridgely corridor for many reasons. It does not seem right that the very few voices seeking development of these parcels should override the dozens of concerned residents who are suffering real monetary and material damage from the poor stormwater management of these properties. We therefore ask you to support Ms Rodvien as well as the PAB and OPZ, all of whom recommend no upzoning to this area of Ridgely, and vote NO for any such upzoning requests. I support the Bill as submitted by OPZ, with no further amendments.</p> <p>Thank you, Stacia Roesler 1878 Lindamoore Dr Annapolis MD 21401</p>	YES

Timestamp	First name	Last name	City	State	Zip code	Are you representing yourself?	Who are you representing?	Legislation	Position	Remarks	Attachment
2024-03-31 23:03:16	Nancy	Guy	Annapolis	MD	21401	Yes		Bill 9-24: Comprehensive Zoning – Region 7	Oppose	<p>I want to oppose the documents in their entirety.                      Comment: The A. A. County Council must reject the plan as written for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The public has been notified wrongly:</li> <li>• OPZ published the document in January but did not release it to the public until February, which disadvantages the public.</li> <li>• The public has been given insufficient time to review, understand, and digest its contents, which are convoluted, difficult to follow, and not transparent.</li> <li>• OPZ did not solicit the general public and people with disability to fully participate. For example, only # one public meeting was held in the Ridgely Avenue/Weems Creek community. This meeting was held at The Atrium in 2021 and no other meetings were held within the area which is the subject of this document.</li> <li>• OPZ failed to make available documents in a format that the public could readily review. For example, at the OPZ SAB and PAC meetings, the materials were insufficient for public review, maps were incomprehensible, acoustics in the room were poor (no microphones, walls obstructed visual displays, audiovisuals were poorly laid out and so small that the attendees could not determine what was being displayed—lack sufficient detail,</li> <li>• OPZ failed to provide enlarged printed copies to the local library for review by the public.</li> <li>• The documents are in a very small font and typeset that is not conducive to the needs of the general public nor to people with visual impairment or disability. For example, maps are too small to comprehend and do not provide sufficient detail (roads, landmarks, etc.)</li> <li>• The only way to attempt to review all the documents is online, which discriminates against those who do not have internet and IT systems readily available and further implicates the county in serving the public inequitably.</li> <li>• are inconsistent with other documents, including , but not limited to: Plan 2040 and the recommended plan itself, etc.</li> </ul> <p>R7 A. A. County Regional Plan Final Recommended Draft (dated Jan. 5, 2024)                      Comments:                      1. This final recommended draft is dated Jan. 5, 2024. However, in publishing the draft the A.A. County Office of Planning and Zoning (OPZ):                      a. Failed to solicit public comment from all stakeholders and gave a disproportionate amount of time and attention to the developers (e.g., preferential treatment by way of verbal comments, quoted real estate attorney on its website in an attempt to sway public opinion)                      b. Failed to respond to public comments                      c. Did not release it timely to the public.                      d. Used disparaging and deceptive language to refer to the Ridgely Avenue/Weems Creek community as "Greater Annapolis", when this nomenclature has not and should not be used as it convolutes and confuses the public.                      e. Incorporates parts of Bestgate Road and Generals Highway into the Parole area, which is overbearing and extending boundaries beyond their legitimate boundaries.</p> <p>Serving on the SAB was Kate Mahood, who is a direct representative of and is tenant of Mr. Kraus, one of the speculators who is attempting to overtake and markedly change the character of the area.                      2. Introduction (p.6, paragraph 2)—says that the Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC) "held over 20 meetings with the public. How many of those were in the Ridgely Avenue/Weems Creek community? How were they advertised? How many mailings were sent and to whom? To my knowledge, there was only one that was held in 2021 at the Atrium. When stakeholders asked the OPZ to hold additional meetings with those in the Ridgely Avenue/Weems Creek community, OPZ refused. This indicates that OPZ failed to solicit and encourage the public to participate in process, which is a failure of government.                      3. Introduction (p. 6, paragraph 3)—public engagement—OPZ, failed to address the 400+ comments that were submitted by the public on the precursor documents. Comments that were submitted have been removed or hidden on the OPZ website and are not currently available for public review. &gt; Where is the historical data? The summary of the comments that was previously provided by the OPZ was deficient as it failed to accurately evaluate summarize, and address each of the comments                      4. Introduction (p. 7, paragraph 2)—the term "effective development tools"—what does this mean?                      5. Ethics issues with Kate Mahood, who served on the SAC and is a tenant and business partner of Mr. Kraus. The county Ethics Office has failed to address this issue. She also carried on hallway conversations with Mr. Kraus when the SAC was meeting. In addition, the chair of the SAC failed to respond when this was brought to his attention and when Ms. Mahood was asked to describe how she solicited comment from the community she "represented" she provided no evidence of any attempt to conduct community outreach and solicit input and claimed that it was not her "job". She also undertook a write-in campaign of those who rent space from her and Mr. Kraus, which appears to be an unethical business practice.                      6. Introduction (p. 9, paragraph 1)—This statement is misleading. The SAC failed to conduct outreach, failed to allow and respond to public comment, gave preferential treatment to developers and the developers' attorneys, failed to allow the public adequate comment period, provided poor materials, used electronic media and terminology that was not conducive to the general public and those with disability. Failed to involve the residents and taxpayers of the community (i.e., those who do not have an interest in commercial development).                      7. Introduction (p. 11, paragraph 1)—requires the Region 7 Plan "to be consistent with or have consistency with Plan 2040". The Region 7 Plan does not meet this requirement as it:                      8. Introduction (p. 12)—equality means that all people have access, that the government is transparent, etc. In addition, single family homes—not low- or high-density housing—are the best way to achieve equality as they allow people to develop 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 1/2 of an 8.5 x11" page of paper are completely illegible. The color coding of the maps makes it impossible to distinguish areas, etc. The county should be ashamed of its attempt to deceive the public! Where is transparency? How is the public supposed to trust the government which treats its people this way? The maps should be printed on individual pages and sized accordingly. People should not have to use IT equipment to see what is intended.                      10. Introduction (p. 14, paragraph 3)—impervious surfaces—The county does not need more impervious surfaces, it needs less. Need to increase tree canopy by 1) protecting and not removing existing trees, 2) planting more trees                      11. Introduction (p. 15, paragraph 2)—decline of older shopping centers. As we continue to evolve in a post-COVID world, less retail space is needed. Online shopping has taken hold and more people work from home. As stated here, the County indicates that it has a vacancy rate of 10.1% and no new retail space is needed. Existing older shopping centers can be redeveloped, which is consistent with Green Space.                      12. Introduction (p. 15, final paragraph)—"small business development agencies" have widespread and everlasting impacts. They are to be discouraged and not used in the Ridgely Avenue/Weems Creek Community!                      13. Existing Conditions (p. 16, paragraph 1)—Greater Annapolis definition—Ridgely Avenue/Weems Creek is not mentioned. This is an intentional attempt to hide information from the public! No one uses the label "Greater Annapolis"! This term is disparaging and not in keeping with the historical importance and significance of the area. It is an attempt to undermine community involvement and scam the public.                      14. Existing Conditions (p. 16, paragraph 2)—Charts and graphs are said to be on pp. 16-17. This is incorrect. The pages that contain this information are pp. 18-19. This shows lack of attention to detail.                      15. Existing Conditions (p. 19, Top Employers)—Why is A.A. County Government listed twice and with different numbers attributed to each? This shows lack of attention to detail.                      16. Existing Conditions (p. 19, reference to COVID)—The county fails to acknowledge that COVID significantly impacted this plan as people—the residents and taxpayers of the county—were stymied and unable to participate due to concern about life and death, COVID transmission rates, etc. COVID concerns continue to this day, although the epidemic has been deemed to be over. That said, the County did not provide sufficient means by which the public could participate in the planning process</p> <p>I oppose the Ridgely Ave Village Center and Sector Plan. This plan is disguised as Example #2 on page 78-79 of the region Plan. The Planning Advisory Board (PAB) recommended against it. There is NO discussion of the PAB's role of recommendation in the Region 7 Plan. The current Region Plan was drastically changed by the Office of Planning and Zoning (OPZ) after the PAB's recommendation and OPZ did not make their changes available to the public for comments.                      The Ridgely Ave Village Center and Sector Plan is not needed. It is not Smart Growth to develop what is largely a greenfield. This is a low density residential area and a Neighborhood Preservation Area and should remain as such. There is no public sewer on Ridgely Ave and none is planned. Anne Arundel County has plenty of underutilized already developed areas where revitalization and redevelopment should be focused. DO NOT pave over undeveloped areas!                      The Weems Creek Ridgely Ave should NOT be developed. The Comprehensive Zoning Plan says that R2 zoning is to be maintained. The Council MUST retain the R@ in this area.                      The Ridgely Ave Village Center and Sector Plan is just another way for Anne Arundel County and developers to pressure Anne Arundel County landowners into unwanted development. The Anne Arundel Economic Development Corporation will aggressively market the Weems Creek area to developers with disastrous consequences for the area.                      the Ridgely Ave Village Center and Sector Plan will cause the loss of quiet residential neighborhood with mature trees; bring high density, low-income housing; bring traffic congestion, including bus traffic at all hours (see map with new bus stop at the corner of Ridgely Ave and N</p>	

Timestamp	First name	Last name	City	State	Zip code	Are you representing yourself?	Who are you representing?	Legislation	Position	Remarks	Attachment
2024-04-01 0:14:02	Dorothy	Guy	Annapolis	MD	21401	Yes		Bill 9-24: Comprehensive Zoning – Region 7	Support	<p>Support of Bill 8-24 and Bill 9-24 is based on the following conditions:</p> <p>1. Bill 9-24 is amended so that it is consistent with amended Bill 8-24. In other words, the Digital Zoning Layer for Region 7 must be consistent with the amended Region 7 Plan. Because Bill 8-24 now includes amendments that change the Region 7 Plan by removing all references to the Ridgely Avenue Village Center and Sector Plan, Bill 9-24 must also be amended so that it adopts, not the original January 5, 2024 Digital Zoning Layer, but a revised Digital Zoning Layer that is consistent with the changes to the Region 7 Plan. Making the two bills consistent with each other is relatively easy and requires only two amendments. First, in Bill 9-24, Section 2 should be amended to read, "And be it further enacted, That a revised Anne Arundel County Digital Zoning Layer for Region Planning Area No. 7 of Anne Arundel County, that is consistent with the region plan for the Region Planning Area No. 7, adopted in whole or in part by Bill No. 8-24, as amended, is hereby adopted and approved." Second, in Bill 9-24, Section 3 should be amended to read, "And be it further enacted, That the revised Anne Arundel County Digital Zoning Layer for Region Planning Area No. 7 that is described in Section 2 of this Ordinance is incorporated by reference as if fully set forth and a certified copy shall be permanently kept on file in the Office of the Administrative Officer to the County Council and in the Office of Planning and Zoning." Based on these amendments and the final adopted bills, the Office of Planning and Zoning would then revise the Region7 Digital Zoning Layer to be consistent with the Region 7 Plan and publish it with an updated date.</p> <p>2. Amendments to Bill 8-24 in Section 1, Items 1 through 12 are adopted and that all references to the Ridgely Avenue Village Center, Sector Plan, Sector Study, Development Policy Area, or other similar terms, etc., including the entire discussion on pp. 78-79 and any maps that reference these terms, are removed from the Region 7 Plan. To avoid any confusion over what the final Region 7 Plan is, the Office of Planning and Zoning publishes a revised version of the Region 7 Plan with these deletions and bearing an updated date.</p> <p>3. The Comprehensive Zoning Change Table: Region 7 is supported only if there is NO upzoning in the Weems Creek/Ridgely Avenue Area, especially for the properties numbered as CZ-R7-GRA-001 thru and including CZ-R7-GRA-009 and that the justification statements are removed for each property. For example, this justification statement or any similar statement is removed: "Future intensification of zoning and use allowances in the area should be detailed through a Village Center Sector Plan process. This will allow for enhanced community engagement and recommendations for tailored tools to guide future development in a manner that preserves the area's special character." The language, "Future intensification of zoning and use allowances in the area" is opposed. This assumes that intensification is going to occur when the community has repeatedly voiced its opposition to it and it may not occur.</p> <p>4. The Comprehensive Zoning Map and all other documents, such as the Region 7 Digital Zoning Layer, Plan2040, etc. reflect the Amendments to Bill 8-24.</p> <p>Additionally, the photos of properties from other states (page 48 of the Region 7 Plan) should be replaced with photos from successful Anne Arundel County Small Business Districts.</p> <p>Comments: Bill 8-24a (Bill 8-24 Amendments) and Bill 9-24                      Prepared for: April 1, 2024 Anne Arundel County Council Meeting                      Submitted April 1, 2024</p>	YES
2024-04-01 7:42:28	Dorothy	Guy	Annapolis	MD	21401	Yes		Bill 9-24: Comprehensive Zoning – Region 7	Oppose	<p>I oppose Bill 9-24 as written and ask the Council to not vote on it until: 1) the vote on Bill 8-24 has been taken, and 2) Bill 9-24 is amended to be consistent with Bill 8-24. The Council has stated that these two bills are related and has held joint hearings on them for three consecutive Council meetings, including tonight. The Region 7 Digital Zoning Layer, the subject of Bill 9-24, depicts the Region 7 Plan which is the subject of Bill 8-24. The Digital Zoning Layer for Region 7 must be consistent with the amended Region 7 Plan. Because Bill 8-24 now includes amendments that change the Region 7 Plan by removing all references to the Ridgely Avenue Village Center and Sector Plan, Bill 9-24 must also be amended so that it adopts, not the original January 5, 2024 Digital Zoning Layer, but a revised Digital Zoning Layer that is consistent with the changes to the Region 7 Plan described in Bill 8-24. By adopting a Region 7 Digital Zoning Layer that is consistent with the Region 7 Plan, the Council will ensure that it causes no technical errors between the two documents. Making the two bills consistent with each other is relatively easy and requires only two amendments. First, in Bill 9-24, Section 2 should be amended to read, "And be it further enacted, That a revised Anne Arundel County Digital Zoning Layer for Region Planning Area No. 7 of Anne Arundel County, that is consistent with the region plan for the Region Planning Area No. 7, adopted in whole or in part by Bill No. 8-24, as amended, is hereby adopted and approved." This amendment removes the date January 5, 2024. Second, in Bill 9-24, Section 3 should be amended to read, "And be it further enacted, That the revised Anne Arundel County Digital Zoning Layer for Region Planning Area No. 7 that is described in Section 2 of this Ordinance is incorporated by reference as if fully set forth and a certified copy shall be permanently kept on file in the Office of the Administrative Officer to the County Council and in the Office of Planning and Zoning." The amendment makes it clear that the Region 7 Digital Zoning Layer being adopted is consistent with the Region 7 Plan being adopted in Bill 8-24. Based on these amendments and the final adopted bills, the Office of Planning and Zoning would then revise the Region7 Digital Zoning Layer to be consistent with the Region 7 Plan and publish new versions of both documents with updated dates of publication. In this way, the Council will consistency and clarity for the Region 7 Plan and its Digital Zoning Layer. Thank you.</p> <p>Comments: Bill 9-24                      Prepared for: April 1, 2024 Anne Arundel County Council Meeting                      Submitted April 1, 2024</p>	YES

Timestamp	First name	Last name	City	State	Zip code	Are you representing yourself?	Who are you representing?	Legislation	Position	Remarks	Attachment
2024-04-01 7:51:55	Dorothy	Guy	Annapolis	MD	21401	Yes		Bill 9-24: Comprehensive Zoning – Region 7	Support	<p>Support of Bill 8-24 and Bill 9-24 is based on the following conditions:</p> <p>1. Bill 9-24 is amended so that it is consistent with amended Bill 8-24. In other words, the Digital Zoning Layer for Region 7 must be consistent with the amended Region 7 Plan. Because Bill 8-24 now includes amendments that change the Region 7 Plan by removing all references to the Ridgely Avenue Village Center and Sector Plan, Bill 9-24 must also be amended so that it adopts, not the original January 5, 2024 Digital Zoning Layer, but a revised Digital Zoning Layer that is consistent with the changes to the Region 7 Plan. Making the two bills consistent with each other is relatively easy and requires only two amendments. First, in Bill 9-24, Section 2 should be amended to read, "And be it further enacted, That a revised Anne Arundel County Digital Zoning Layer for Region Planning Area No. 7 of Anne Arundel County, that is consistent with the region plan for the Region Planning Area No. 7, adopted in whole or in part by Bill No. 8-24, as amended, is hereby adopted and approved." Second, in Bill 9-24, Section 3 should be amended to read, "And be it further enacted, That the revised Anne Arundel County Digital Zoning Layer for Region Planning Area No. 7 that is described in Section 2 of this Ordinance is incorporated by reference as if fully set forth and a certified copy shall be permanently kept on file in the Office of the Administrative Officer to the County Council and in the Office of Planning and Zoning." Based on these amendments and the final adopted bills, the Office of Planning and Zoning would then revise the Region 7 Digital Zoning Layer to be consistent with the Region 7 Plan and publish it with an updated date.</p> <p>2. Amendments to Bill 8-24 in Section 1, Items 1 through 12 are adopted and that all references to the Ridgely Avenue Village Center, Sector Plan, Sector Study, Development Policy Area, or other similar terms, etc., including the entire discussion on pp. 78-79 and any maps that reference these terms, are removed from the Region 7 Plan. To avoid any confusion over what the final Region 7 Plan is, the Office of Planning and Zoning publishes a revised version of the Region 7 Plan with these deletions and bearing an updated date.</p> <p>3. The Comprehensive Zoning Change Table: Region 7 is supported only if there is NO upzoning in the Weems Creek/Ridgely Avenue Area, especially for the properties numbered as CZ-R7-GRA-001 thru and including CZ-R7-GRA-009 and that the justification statements are removed for each property. For example, this justification statement or any similar statement is removed: "Future intensification of zoning and use allowances in the area should be detailed through a Village Center Sector Plan process. This will allow for enhanced community engagement and recommendations for tailored tools to guide future development in a manner that preserves the area's special character." The language, "Future intensification of zoning and use allowances in the area" is opposed. This assumes that intensification is going to occur when the community has repeatedly voiced its opposition to it and it may not occur.</p> <p>4. The Comprehensive Zoning Map and all other documents, such as the Region 7 Digital Zoning Layer, Plan2040, etc. reflect the Amendments to Bill 8-24.</p> <p>Additionally, the photos of properties from other states (page 48 of the Region 7 Plan) should be replaced with photos from successful Anne Arundel County Small Business Districts.</p> <p>Comments: Bill 8-24a (Bill 8-24 Amendments) and Bill 9-24                      Prepared for: April 1, 2024 Anne Arundel County Council Meeting                      Submitted April 1, 2024</p>	
2024-04-01 8:42:58	Bethany	Ahlers	Annapolis	MD	21401-1094	Yes		Bill 9-24: Comprehensive Zoning – Region 7	Oppose	Strongly oppose rezoning any property on Ridgely to commercial. Keep it R2.	
2024-04-01 9:40:55	Ruth	Jobe	Annapolis	MD	21401	Yes		Bill 9-24: Comprehensive Zoning – Region 7	Oppose	Until the Region 7 Plan is adopted (Bill 8-24/8-24a), it is premature to vote on Bill 9-24 that proposes adoption of the comprehensive zoning maps for Region Planning Area No. 7, i.e., adopting the Anne Arundel County Digital Zoning Layer for Region Planning Area No. 7	

Timestamp	First name	Last name	City	State	Zip code	Are you representing yourself?	Who are you representing?	Legislation	Position	Remarks	Attachment
2024-04-01 10:47:22	Mary	Guy	Annapolis	Maryland	21401	Yes		Bill 9-24: Comprehensive Zoning – Region 7	Oppose	<p>Strongly oppose Bill 9-24 - Ridgely Avenue and the Weems Creek area must be CONSERVED, PRESERVED AND PROTECTED!!! The legacy of this County Council must be one of protecting the environment, the community, the wildlife, the people (all ages, all ethnic groups), and the health and wellbeing of all!!!</p> <p>The area does not warrant additional commercial development as the County has plenty of existing commercial developments that could be redeveloped so that the natural landscape is available for the current and future generations. The tree canopy must be preserved, protected, etc. as it determines the health and well being of the area—water quality, air quality, rivers, creeks, mental and physical health of residents and visitors, buffers noise, etc.—and cannot be discounted!!! Look at the problems created along Riva Road—traffic, visually unappealing, buildings on top of the highway! And the full impact of has yet to be felt as building in along Riva Road continues!</p> <p>The County cannot support its current water requirements for this area (residents report the water pressure is so poor that they cannot have more than one spigot working at a time, and the aquifers cannot support an increased load!!!)</p> <p>Development for the sake of a coffee shop, dry cleaners, nail salon, beating of drums?? REALLY??? It is NOT worth the destructive, everlasting, and costly (\$\$\$\$\$\$\$) and negative impact on the environment and the residents, taxpayers, visitors, and future generations of Anne Arundel County. The health and well being of people are directly related to their residential satisfaction—having a safe, comfortable haven where they can reside, rest, recharge, etc. from the stressors of the modern world. Let us continue to support that and not further development. Anne Arundel County has enough shopping areas now and for the foreseeable future given the changes and manners in shopping, dining, working in the office, etc. with virtual work, e-commerce, etc. More retail zoning and development is NOT needed. The infrastructure, including sewer, water, roads, public safety, etc. does not support additional intensity.</p> <p>Strongly oppose Bill 9-24 and the landowners/developers who are pursuing the upzoning for their own personal benefit. Assembling parcels on Willow Road and Ridgely Avenue for commercial use is horrific. The community is better served by leaving the land as residential and environmentally intact. Development is not needed or warranted. Plenty of commercial properties in Anne Arundel County are vacant or underutilized and could be developed/redeveloped, Ridgely Avenue and Weems Creek do not need or want development. Instead, it must be CONSERVED, PRESERVED, AND PROTECTED!!!</p> <p>Also strongly oppose Bill 9-24 for, including but not limited to, the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.Plans and Zoning Changes—These documents were not made readily available to the public despite being published in January 2024. Additionally, the documents include multiple changes that were not presented to the community during the SAC or PAB meetings.</li> <li>2.Advertising/Outreach—The County failed to conduct regular and periodic outreach and meetings with the Ridgely Avenue and Weems Creek taxpayers and residents of Region 7. Of the “20 meetings with the public” (e.g., Region 7 A. A. County Regional Plan Final Recommended Draft (dated Jan. 5, 2024), p. 6, paragraph 2), how many of those were in the Ridgely Avenue and Weems Creek Community? How were they advertised? How many meetings were sent out by and to whom? To my knowledge, there was one community meeting at The Atrium in 2021. When the community asked for additional meetings with OPZ, OPZ refused. In addition, the meeting in 2021 was held during COVID, and COVID remains a public health issue which has grossly limited input. The County has courted the developers who are vigilant, well-funded and not concerned about the residents, taxpayers and future generations of the Region 7 area.</li> <li>3.Ethics issues—We know that the Stakeholders Advisory Committee was packed with people whose job it was to work with the developers. Even the Region 7 representative is in business with the developer (Mr. Krauss) and acted unethically. The chair of the committee failed to address these issues, despite bringing them to his attention.</li> <li>4.Housing—The OPZ, specifically Mr. Patrick Hughes testified that the County has more than adequate housing to meet its anticipated needs for the foreseeable future. In addition, the County should encourage and support single family housing as it is the best way for people to develop equity in a home, have investment and independence, and achieve financial security. Other options (apartments, condominiums, cooperatives, townhouses, etc.) do not allow people to build financial independence and perpetuate indentured living (i.e., constantly having to pay others for amenities, repairs, upkeep, etc. and never fully own).</li> <li>5.Commercial development—This area (i.e., Region 7 and the Ridgely Avenue/Weeks Creek Community) does not require commercial development. It is an environmentally sensitive area that supports the health and well-being of the rivers, creeks, groundwater, residents, taxpayers, etc. of A. A. County and the Chesapeake Bay. The County needs to promote the mantra of “CONSERVE! PRESERVE! PROTECT!” now and for future generations. In addition, the OPZ has determined that there is sufficient stock/vacancy rates within the area to achieve commercial goals.</li> <li>6.Bestgate Road and Generals Highway areas are not Parole—The County is overbearing and broadening the definition of Parole beyond its legal boundaries. Bestgate Road and Generals Highway are not Parole.</li> <li>7.“Greater Annapolis”—This is a disparaging, deceptive term. Ridgely Avenue and the Weems Creek Community are viable areas and are not known as “Greater Annapolis”. This nomenclature is convoluted and used to confuse the public and should not be used.</li> <li>8.Equality issues—The documents that relate to this bill are not user-friendly, are printed in such small format and in insufficient detail that they are illegible (e.g., Region 7 A. A. County Regional Plan Final Recommended Draft (dated Jan. 5, 2024) and restrict the stakeholders from testifying and commenting on them, which demonstrates that the County failed to address equality issues for people who do not have ready access to IT equipment, are not computer savvy, have low reading levels, have low acuity levels, etc.</li> <li>9.Format of the plan—How is anyone even with good eyesight and savvy expected to read four very tiny maps of half of an 8.5x11” sheet of paper? The maps should be printed and available in a readily legible format with sufficient detail so that people do not have to use IT equipment to understand them.</li> </ol>	YES
2024-04-01 10:48:55	Ruth	Jobe	Annapolis	MD	21401	Yes		Bill 9-24: Comprehensive Zoning – Region 7	Oppose	Please provide the Zoning Application for CZ-R7-GR-601 to an online location where the public has access to the information. Transparency is needed.	
2024-04-01 10:57:46	Mary	Guy	Annapolis	MD	21401	Yes		Bill 9-24: Comprehensive Zoning – Region 7	Oppose	I am writing to clarify that I oppose the bill unless the amendments are enacted!!	
2024-03-28 20:16:52	Peggy	Hamilton	Annapolis	MD	21401	Yes		Bill 8-24a: General Development Plan – Region 7 Plan	Support	<p>Dear Anne Arundel County Council,</p> <p>I am writing to express my support for amended Bill 8-24 on the condition that it incorporates the following amendments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- All references to the Ridgely Avenue Village Center and Sector Plan, as well as Example Strategy #2 on pages 78-79 of the Region 7 Plan (which appears to be a disguised version of the Village Center and Sector Plan), must be removed entirely.</li> <li>- The Digital Zoning Layer needs to be amended to ensure consistency with the amended Region 7 Plan.</li> </ul> <p>Thank you for your time and consideration.</p> <p>Sincerely, Peggy Hamilton</p>	

Timestamp	First name	Last name	City	State	Zip code	Are you representing yourself?	Who are you representing?	Legislation	Position	Remarks	Attachment
2024-03-31 19:05:23	Ruth	Jobe	Annapolis	MD	21401	Yes		Bill 8-24a: General Development Plan – Region 7 Plan	Support	<p>Support of Bill 8-24 is conditional with caveats:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Amendments in Section 1, Items 1 through 12 are adopted in that all references to the Ridgely Avenue Village Center, Sector Plan, Development Policy Area, including maps, etc. are removed.</li> <li>2. The Comprehensive Zoning Change Table: Region 7 is supported if there is no upzoning in the Weems Creek/Ridgely Avenue Area esp. for the properties contained within CZ-R7-GRA-001 thru and including CZ-R7-GRA-009 and that the justification statements are removed for each, e.g., "Future intensification of zoning and use allowances in the area should be detailed through a Village Center Sector Plan process. This will allow for enhanced community engagement and recommendations for tailored tools to guide future development in a manner that preserves the area's special character." The language, "Future intensification of zoning and use allowances in the area" is opposed. This assumes that intensification is going to occur when it may not be. It projects an unknown future state.</li> <li>3. The Comprehensive Zoning Map reflects the Amendments and are so reflected in any other documents, i.e., Zoning Map Layer, Plan2040, etc.</li> </ol> <p>It is further recommended that the photos of properties from other States (page 48) be replaced with those from other successful Anne Arundel County Small Business Districts. It is unclear why there aren't any available photos for local SBDs.</p> <p>Comments: Bill 8-24a (Bill 8-24 Amendments)                      Prepared for: April 1, 2024 Anne Arundel County Council Meeting                      Submitted March 31, 2024</p>	YES

Timestamp	First name	Last name	City	State	Zip code	Are you representing yourself?	Who are you representing?	Legislation	Position	Remarks	Attachment
2024-03-31 23:07:48	Nancy	Guy	Annapolis	MD	21401	Yes		Bill 8-24a: General Development Plan – Region 7 Plan	Oppose	<p>I Nancy Guy want to oppose the documents in their entirety:                      Comment: The A. A. County Council must reject the plan as written for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The public has been notified wrongly:</li> <li>• OPZ published the document in January but did not release it to the public until February, which disadvantages the public.</li> <li>• The public has been given insufficient time to review, understand, and digest its contents, which are convoluted, difficult to follow, and not transparent.</li> <li>• OPZ did not solicit the general public and people with disability to fully participate. For example, only # one public meeting was held in the Ridgely Avenue/Weems Creek community. This meeting was held at The Atrium in 2021 and no other meetings were held within the area which is the subject of this document.</li> <li>• OPZ failed to make available documents in a format that the public could readily review. For example, at the OPZ SAB and PAC meetings, the materials were insufficient for public review, maps were incomprehensible, acoustics in the room were poor (no microphones, walls obstructed visual displays, audiovisuals were poorly laid out and so small that the attendees could not determine what was being displayed—lack sufficient detail,</li> <li>• OPZ failed to provide enlarged printed copies to the local library for review by the public.</li> <li>• The documents are in a very small font and typeset that is not conducive to the needs of the general public nor to people with visual impairment or disability. For example, maps are too small to comprehend and do not provide sufficient detail (roads, landmarks, etc.)</li> <li>• The only way to attempt to review all the documents is online, which discriminates against those who do not have internet and IT systems</li> <li>• are inconsistent with other documents, including, but not limited to: Plan 2040 and the recommended plan itself, etc.</li> </ul> <p>R7 A. A. County Regional Plan Final Recommended Draft (dated Jan. 5, 2024)                      Comments:                      1. This final recommended draft is dated Jan. 5, 2024. However, in publishing the draft the A.A. County Office of Planning and Zoning (OPZ):                      a. Failed to solicit public comment from all stakeholders and gave a disproportionate amount of time and attention to the developers (e.g., preferential treatment by way of verbal comments, quoted real estate attorney on its website in an attempt to sway public opinion)                      b. Failed to respond to public comments                      c. Did not release it timely to the public.                      d. Used disparaging and deceptive language to refer to the Ridgely Avenue/Weems Creek community as "Greater Annapolis", when this nomenclature has not and should not be used as it convolutes and confuses the public.                      e. Incorporates parts of Bestgate Road and Generals Highway into the Parole area, which is overbearing and extending boundaries beyond their legitimate boundaries.</p> <p>Serving on the SAB was Kate Mahood, who is a direct representative of and is tenant of Mr. Kraus, one of the speculators who is attempting to overtake and markedly change the character of the area.                      2. Introduction (p.6, paragraph 2)—says that the Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC) "held over 20 meetings with the public. How many of those were in the Ridgely Avenue/Weems Creek community? How were they advertised? How many mailings were sent and to whom? To my knowledge, there was only one that was held in 2021 at the Atrium. When stakeholders asked the OPZ to hold additional meetings with those in the Ridgely Avenue/Weems Creek community, OPZ refused. This indicates that OPZ failed to solicit and encourage the public to participate in process, which is a failure of government.                      3. Introduction (p. 6, paragraph 3)—public engagement—OPZ, failed to address the 400+ comments that were submitted by the public on the precursor documents. Comments that were submitted have been removed or hidden on the OPZ website and are not currently available for public review. &gt; Where is the historical data? The summary of the comments that was previously provided by the OPZ was deficient as it failed to accurately evaluate summarize, and address each of the comments                      4. Introduction (p. 7, paragraph 2)—the term "effective development tools"—what does this mean?                      5. Ethics issues with Kate Mahood, who served on the SAC and is a tenant and business partner of Mr. Kraus. The county Ethics Office has failed to address this issue. She also carried on hallway conversations with Mr. Kraus when the SAC was meeting. In addition, the chair of the SAC failed to respond when this was brought to his attention and when Ms. Mahood was asked to describe how she solicited comment from the community she "represented" she provided no evidence of any attempt to conduct community outreach and solicit input and claimed that it was not her "job". She also undertook a write-in campaign of those who rent space from her and Mr. Kraus, which appears to be an unethical business practice.                      6. Introduction (p. 9, paragraph 1)—This statement is misleading. The SAC failed to conduct outreach, failed to allow and respond to public comment, gave preferential treatment to developers and the developers' attorneys, failed to allow the public adequate comment period, provided poor materials, used electronic media and terminology that was not conducive to the general public and those with disability. Failed to involve the residents and taxpayers of the community (i.e., those who do not have an interest in commercial development).                      7. Introduction (p. 11, paragraph 1)—requires the Region 7 Plan "to be consistent with or have consistency with Plan 2040". The Region 7 Plan does not meet this requirement as it:                      8. Introduction (p. 12)—equality means that all people have access, that the government is transparent, etc. In addition, single family homes—not low- or high-density housing—are the best way to achieve equality as they allow people to develop 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 1/2 of an 8.5 x11" page of paper are completely illegible. The color coding of the maps makes it impossible to distinguish areas, etc. The county should be ashamed of its attempt to deceive the public! Where is transparency? How is the public supposed to trust the government which treats its people this way? The maps should be printed on individual pages and sized accordingly. People should not have to use IT equipment to see what is intended.                      10. Introduction (p. 14, paragraph 3)—impervious surfaces—The county does not need more impervious surfaces, it needs less. Need to increase tree canopy by 1) protecting and not removing existing trees, 2) planting more trees                      11. Introduction (p. 15, paragraph 2)—decline of older shopping centers. As we continue to evolve in a post-COVID world, less retail space is needed. Online shopping has taken hold and more people work from home. As stated here, the County indicates that it has a vacancy rate of 10.1% and no new retail space is needed. Existing older shopping centers can be redeveloped, which is consistent with Green Space.                      12. Introduction (p. 15, final paragraph)—"small business development agencies" have widespread and everlasting impacts. They are to be discouraged and not used in the Ridgely Avenue/Weems Creek Community!                      13. Existing Conditions (p. 16, paragraph 1)—Greater Annapolis definition—Ridgely Avenue/Weems Creek is not mentioned. This is an intentional attempt to hide information from the public! No one uses the label "Greater Annapolis"! This term is disparaging and not in keeping with the historical importance and significance of the area. It is an attempt to undermine community involvement and scam the public.                      14. Existing Conditions (p. 16, paragraph 2)—Charts and graphs are said to be on pp. 16-17. This is incorrect. The pages that contain this information are pp. 18-19. This shows lack of attention to detail.                      15. Existing Conditions (p. 19, Top Employers)—Why is A.A. County Government listed twice and with different numbers attributed to each? This shows lack of attention to detail.                      16. Existing Conditions (p. 19, reference to COVID)—The county fails to acknowledge that COVID significantly impacted this plan as people—the residents and taxpayers of the county—were stymied and unable to participate due to concern about life and death, COVID transmission rates, etc. COVID concerns continue to this day, although the epidemic has been deemed to be over. That said, the County did not provide sufficient means by which the public could participate in the planning process</p> <p>I oppose the Ridgely Ave Village Center and Sector Plan. This plan is disguised as Example #2 on page 78-79 of the region Plan. The Planning Advisory Board (PAB) recommended against it. There is NO discussion of the PAB's role of recommendation in the Region 7 Plan. The current Region Plan was drastically changed by the Office of Planning and Zoning (OPZ) after the PAB's recommendation and OPZ did not make their changes available to the public for comments.                      The Ridgely Ave Village Center and Sector Plan is not needed. It is not Smart Growth to develop what is largely a greenfield. This is a low density residential area and a Neighborhood Preservation Area and should remain as such. There is no public sewer on Ridgely Ave and none is planned. Anne Arundel County has plenty of underutilized already developed areas where revitalization and redevelopment should be focused. DO NOT pave over undeveloped areas!                      The Weems Creek Ridgely Ave should NOT be developed. The Comprehensive Zoning Plan says that R2 zoning is to be maintained. The Council MUST retain the R@ in this area.                      The Ridgely Ave Village Center and Sector Plan is just another way for Anne Arundel County and developers to pressure Anne Arundel County landowners into unwanted development. The Anne Arundel Economic Development Corporation will aggressively market the Weems Creek area to developers with disastrous consequences for the area.                      the Ridgely Ave Village Center and Sector Plan will cause the loss of quiet residential neighborhood with mature trees; bring high density, low-income housing; bring traffic congestion, including bus traffic at all hours (see map with new bus stop at the corner of Ridgely Ave and N</p>	

Timestamp	First name	Last name	City	State	Zip code	Are you representing yourself?	Who are you representing?	Legislation	Position	Remarks	Attachment
2024-03-31 23:24:58	Nancy	Guy	Annapolis	MD	21401	Yes		Bill 8-24a: General Development Plan – Region 7 Plan	Support	<p>I am in Support of Bill 8-24 is conditional with caveats:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Amendments in Section 1, Items 1 through 12 are adopted in that all references to the Ridgely Avenue Village Center, Sector Plan, Development Policy Area, including maps, etc. are removed.</li> <li>The Comprehensive Zoning Change Table: Region 7 is supported if there is no upzoning in the Weems Creek/Ridgely Avenue Area esp. for the properties contained within CZ-R7-GRA-001 thru and including CZ-R7-GRA-009 and that the justification statements are removed for each, e.g., "Future intensification of zoning and use allowances in the area should be detailed through a Village Center Sector Plan process. This will allow for enhanced community engagement and recommendations for tailored tools to guide future development in a manner that preserves the area's special character." The language, "Future intensification of zoning and use allowances in the area" is opposed. This assumes that intensification is going to occur when it may not be. It projects an unknown future state.</li> <li>The Comprehensive Zoning Map reflects the Amendments and are so reflected in any other documents, i.e., Zoning Map Layer, Plan2040, etc.</li> </ol> <p>It is further recommended that the photos of properties from other States (page 48) be replaced with those from other successful Anne Arundel County Small Business Districts. It is unclear why there aren't any available photos for local SBDs.</p> <p>Comments: Bill 8-24a (Bill 8-24 Amendments) Prepared for: April 1, 2024 Anne Arundel County Council Meeting Submitted March 31, 2024</p>	
2024-03-31 23:33:47	Nancy	Guy	Annapolis	MD	21401	Yes		Bill 8-24a: General Development Plan – Region 7 Plan	Support	<p>I am in Support of Bill 8-24 is conditional with caveats:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Amendments in Section 1, Items 1 through 12 are adopted in that all references to the Ridgely Avenue Village Center, Sector Plan, Development Policy Area, including maps, etc. are removed.</li> <li>The Comprehensive Zoning Change Table: Region 7 is supported if there is no upzoning in the Weems Creek/Ridgely Avenue Area esp. for the properties contained within CZ-R7-GRA-001 thru and including CZ-R7-GRA-009 and that the justification statements are removed for each, e.g., "Future intensification of zoning and use allowances in the area should be detailed through a Village Center Sector Plan process. This will allow for enhanced community engagement and recommendations for tailored tools to guide future development in a manner that preserves the area's special character." The language, "Future intensification of zoning and use allowances in the area" is opposed. This assumes that intensification is going to occur when it may not be. It projects an unknown future state.</li> <li>The Comprehensive Zoning Map reflects the Amendments and are so reflected in any other documents, i.e., Zoning Map Layer, Plan2040, etc.</li> </ol> <p>It is further recommended that the photos of properties from other States (page 48) be replaced with those from other successful Anne Arundel County Small Business Districts. It is unclear why there aren't any available photos for local SBDs.</p> <p>Comments: Bill 8-24a (Bill 8-24 Amendments) Prepared for: April 1, 2024 Anne Arundel County Council Meeting Submitted March 31, 2024</p>	
2024-04-01 0:11:01	Dorothy	Guy	Annapolis	MD	21401	Yes		Bill 8-24a: General Development Plan – Region 7 Plan	Support	<p>Support of Bill 8-24 and Bill 9-24 is based on the following conditions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bill 9-24 is amended so that it is consistent with amended Bill 8-24. In other words, the Digital Zoning Layer for Region 7 must be consistent with the amended Region 7 Plan. Because Bill 8-24 now includes amendments that change the Region 7 Plan by removing all references to the Ridgely Avenue Village Center and Sector Plan, Bill 9-24 must also be amended so that it adopts, not the original January 5, 2024 Digital Zoning Layer, but a revised Digital Zoning Layer that is consistent with the changes to the Region 7 Plan. Making the two bills consistent with each other is relatively easy and requires only two amendments. First, in Bill 9-24, Section 2 should be amended to read, "And be it further enacted, That a revised Anne Arundel County Digital Zoning Layer for Region Planning Area No. 7 of Anne Arundel County, that is consistent with the region plan for the Region Planning Area No. 7, adopted in whole or in part by Bill No. 8-24, as amended, is hereby adopted and approved." Second, in Bill 9-24, Section 3 should be amended to read, "And be it further enacted, That the revised Anne Arundel County Digital Zoning Layer for Region Planning Area No. 7 that is described in Section 2 of this Ordinance is incorporated by reference as if fully set forth and a certified copy shall be permanently kept on file in the Office of the Administrative Officer to the County Council and in the Office of Planning and Zoning." Based on these amendments and the final adopted bills, the Office of Planning and Zoning would then revise the Region7 Digital Zoning Layer to be consistent with the Region 7 Plan and publish it with an updated date.</li> <li>Amendments to Bill 8-24 in Section 1, Items 1 through 12 are adopted and that all references to the Ridgely Avenue Village Center, Sector Plan, Sector Study, Development Policy Area, or other similar terms, etc., including the entire discussion on pp. 78-79 and any maps that reference these terms, are removed from the Region 7 Plan. To avoid any confusion over what the final Region 7 Plan is, the Office of Planning and Zoning publishes a revised version of the Region 7 Plan with these deletions and bearing an updated date.</li> <li>The Comprehensive Zoning Change Table: Region 7 is supported only if there is NO upzoning in the Weems Creek/Ridgely Avenue Area, especially for the properties numbered as CZ-R7-GRA-001 thru and including CZ-R7-GRA-009 and that the justification statements are removed for each property. For example, this justification statement or any similar statement is removed: "Future intensification of zoning and use allowances in the area should be detailed through a Village Center Sector Plan process. This will allow for enhanced community engagement and recommendations for tailored tools to guide future development in a manner that preserves the area's special character." The language, "Future intensification of zoning and use allowances in the area" is opposed. This assumes that intensification is going to occur when the community has repeatedly voiced its opposition to it and it may not occur.</li> <li>The Comprehensive Zoning Map and all other documents, such as the Region 7 Digital Zoning Layer, Plan2040, etc. reflect the Amendments to Bill 8-24.</li> </ol> <p>Additionally, the photos of properties from other states (page 48 of the Region 7 Plan) should be replaced with photos from successful Anne Arundel County Small Business Districts.</p> <p>Comments: Bill 8-24a (Bill 8-24 Amendments) and Bill 9-24 Prepared for: April 1, 2024 Anne Arundel County Council Meeting Submitted April 1, 2024</p>	YES
2024-04-01 8:41:59	Bethany	Ahlers	Annapolis	MD	21401-1094	Yes		Bill 8-24a: General Development Plan – Region 7 Plan	Oppose	<p>This area of Ridgely should remain R2 in alignment with the AACO 2040 plan and the requests of residents in that area. No single developer should be allowed to redesign and commercialize a residential area for personal gain working against the wishes of the community and the Council.</p>	



Timestamp	First name	Last name	City	State	Zip code	Are you representing yourself?	Who are you representing?	Legislation	Position	Remarks	Attachment
2024-04-01 9:54:12	Ruth	Jobe	Annapolis	MD	21401	Yes		Bill 8-24a: General Development Plan – Region 7 Plan	Oppose	<p>Here are a few examples of how upzoning in the Weems Creek/Ridgely Avenue Area is out of alignment with Plan 2040:</p> <p>In the "Opportunity" section, Plan 2040 states, "Limit Development in Existing Residential Neighborhoods: Protect the physical character and respect the limitations of infrastructure, public services, and natural environment". (Opportunity - Plan2040, Page 13). The Village Center plan ignores the infrastructure limitations as City of Annapolis-provided water is limited and for some, well water is the only option. Public sewers are unavailable, and a septic system is the proposed alternative. The Village Center proposal is out of synch with Plan2040.</p> <p>Plan 2040, Page 7 also defines the Neighborhood Preservation Areas, which this area is, as an area that primarily limits new development with public investments in walking and biking infrastructure, parks, and schools. (Plan2040, Page 7). Zoning changes are not required to improve infrastructure. Public investment, not private development is recommended for Neighborhood Preservation Areas, not a Village Center Overlay. The Village Center proposal is out of synch with Plan2040.</p> <p>Plan2040, Page 18 states, "Guide the majority of development to targeted areas where there is existing infrastructure (emphasis added to "existing infrastructure") and a mix of employment, residential, commercial, and recreation opportunities." This is not a targeted development area. Given the lack of existing infrastructure including water and sewer, the Village Center proposal is out of synch with Plan2040.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p>	
2024-04-01 9:59:29	Mary	Guy	Annapolis	MD	21401	Yes		Bill 8-24a: General Development Plan – Region 7 Plan	Support	<p>I am writing to for several purposes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To remind and instill in the County Council and the Office of Planning and Zoning the importance of: CONSERVE! PROTECT! PRESERVE! The County has plenty of unused office space and has met its requirements for housing for the foreseeable future. The Ridgely Avenue/Weems Creek area cannot afford to be developed given the detrimental impact that it would have on the area itself and the far-reaching impact it would have on the waterways, water supply in Anne Arundel County, traffic (already maxed out for the area), etc. This ground/area has not been disturbed for many years and does not need to be disturbed now!</li> <li>To remind the County Council that the need to CONSERVE! PROTECT! PRESERVE! Is representative of the overwhelming stance of residents, homeowners, tax payers, etc. in the Ridgely Avenue/Weems Creek area—NOT JUST A FEW AS HAS BEEN ALLEGED. The County has done a horrible job of outreach and involvement of the community. I have personally spoken with many residents who said they never heard anything from the County about plans to change zoning, develop, etc. It is WRONG AND NOT IN KEEPING WITH DUE PROCESS that the OPZ held one meeting in the community and REFUSED to hold any others in the community. The meager and very tiny print in the newspapers was not conducive to public participation either. The County cannot afford to allow a few real estate developers to monopolize the area and distance the County from the people it is supposed to serve and be responsive to!!</li> <li>To tell the County that the term "Great Annapolis" as used to refer to the Ridgely Avenue/Weems Creek area is a farce, misleading, and does not promote transparency. It should be forever stricken from the documents. The correct term for this community/neighborhood is Ridgely Avenue/Weems Creek.</li> <li>To echo comments made by Ruth Jobe re: Bill 8-24                     <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. Amendments in Section 1, Items 1 through 12 are adopted in that all references to the Ridgely Avenue Village Center, Sector Plan, Development Policy Area, including maps, etc. are removed.</li> <li>B. The Comprehensive Zoning Change Table: Region 7 is supported if there is no upzoning in the Weems Creek/Ridgely Avenue Area esp. for the properties contained within CZ-R7-GRA-001 thru and including CZ-R7-GRA-009 and that the justification statements are removed for each, e.g., "Future intensification of zoning and use allowances in the area should be detailed through a Village Center Sector Plan process. This will allow for enhanced community engagement and recommendations for tailored tools to guide future development in a manner that preserves the area's special character." The language, "Future intensification of zoning and use allowances in the area" is opposed. This assumes that intensification is going to occur when it may not be. It projects an unknown future state.</li> <li>C. The Comprehensive Zoning Map reflects the Amendments and are so reflected in any other documents, i.e., Zoning Map Layer, Plan2040, etc.</li> </ul> </li> </ol> <p>It is further recommended that the photos of properties from other States (page 48) be replaced with those from other successful Anne Arundel County Small Business Districts. It is unclear why there aren't any available photos for local SBDs."</p>	YES
2024-03-20 21:29:22	Shamai	Wellons	Hanover	MD	21076	Yes		Bill 7-24: Comprehensive Zoning – Region 2	Support	<p>We support the county's current stance to MAINTAIN the area's zoning as R1 immediately south of the Waterbury Forest community just off Race Road. (CZ-R2-JSP-600 and CZ-R2-JSP-003). Changing zoning to R2 for these two areas - would have a negative impact to the character, peace and serenity for our area. The very reason why we bought our home 13+ years ago, in the Waterbury Forest community, was the attractiveness of the wooded areas, undisturbed nature and low noise/traffic environment. We have not seen, read, or heard about any Race Road expansion plans, sound barriers along the BW parkway, or any other improvements that would be needed to accompany a shift to R2. Nor would the increased density / traffic be safe or compatible for the Waterbury community near the two proposed areas off Race Road.</p>	
2024-03-30 7:08:29	Kevin	Fields	Jessup	MD	20794	Yes		Bill 7-24: Comprehensive Zoning – Region 2	Oppose	<p>Remove CZ-R2-Han-103-1 for the legislation. The up zones our properties without our permission and without our request. This increase in zoning will increase our property taxes and we have no intention of developing our properties into your workforce housing. Please leave us alone.</p>	
2024-04-01 9:00:46	Kathleen	Holbrook	Hanover	Maryland	21076	Yes		Bill 7-24: Comprehensive Zoning – Region 2	Oppose	<p>I oppose the proposed Comprehensive Zoning/Consistency change and Overlay planning (**in particular) as it is severely flawed. Rational</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-AACo lack of and inability to manage storm water in a very WET community, our property and others in the Community have lost use of large portions of property due to water/flooding see attachments</li> <li>-AACo inability to slow traffic and manage illegal traffic on Forest Ave, we had to move our mailbox due to safety concerns.</li> <li>-Has and will forever change this Community's character. Proposed upzoning will only contribute to the demise of the Community's ambience, traffic congestion and flooding.</li> </ul> <p>I question the County's consistency rational. For what? To support development/potential higher taxes. Are developers part of these suggestions? None are acceptable.</p> <p>NO further development should occur without comprehensive engineering &amp; traffic involvement with plans to correct the current &amp; future water and traffic issues before someone is hurt/killed.</p> <p>**Small business zoning-PLU-R2-JSP-101 - Recommended Draft Plan p.106-Changes- North side of Rt 175 from SB/R1 to commercial  **Jessup Road-PLU-R2-JSP-108 &amp; PLU-R2-JSP-108 - Recommended Draft Plan p.106 – multiply properties from SB to Industrial.  **Mixed use for Jessup Road-west of Jessup Elementary School-DLU-R2-JSP-106 Recommended Draft Plan p. 107  **Mixed use overlay - DPA-R2-JSP-104 - Recommended Draft Plan p. 103  **Transit overlay DPA-R2-JSP-301- Recommended Draft Plan p. 103  **CZ-R2-JSP-003 – 1806 Montevideo Road - Homeowner request to rezone from R1 to R2 6.58 acres  **CZ-RS-JSP-600 – 2 properties 7630 Race Rd. Councilman Smith added an amendment to change from R1 to R2. 22 acres</p>	YES

Timestamp	First name	Last name	City	State	Zip code	Are you representing yourself?	Who are you representing?	Legislation	Position	Remarks	Attachment
2024-04-01 9:03:10	Kathleen	Holbrook	Hanover	Maryland	21076	Yes		Bill 6-24: General Development Plan – Region 2 Plan	Oppose	I oppose the proposed Comprehensive Zoning/Consistency change and Overlay planning (**in particular) as it is severely flawed. Rational *AACo lack of and inability to manage storm water in a very WET community, our property and others in the Community have lost use of large portions of property due to water/flooding see attachments *AACo inability to slow traffic and manage illegal traffic on Forest Ave, we had to move our mailbox due to safety concerns. *Has and will forever change this Community's character. Proposed upzoning will only contribute to the demise of the Community's ambience, traffic congestion and flooding. I question the County's consistency rational. For what? To support development/potential higher taxes. Are developers part of these suggestions? None are acceptable. NO further development should occur without comprehensive engineering & traffic involvement with plans to correct the current & future water and traffic issues before someone is hurt/killed. **Small business zoning-PLU-R2-JSP-101 - Recommended Draft Plan p.106-Changes- North side of Rt 175 from SB/R1 to commercial **Jessup Road-PLU-R2-JSP-108 & PLU-R2-JSP-108 - Recommended Draft Plan p.106 – multiply properties from SB to Industrial. **Mixed use for Jessup Road-west of Jessup Elementary School-DLU-R2-JSP-106 Recommended Draft Plan p. 107 **Mixed use overlay - DPA-R2-JSP-104 - Recommended Draft Plan p. 103 **Transit overlay DPA-R2-JSP-301- Recommended Draft Plan p. 103 **CZ-R2-JSP-003 – 1806 Montevideo Road - Homeowner request to rezone from R1 to R2 6.58 acres **CZ-RS-JSP-600 – 2 properties 7630 Race Rd. Councilman Smith added an amendment to change from R1 to R2. 22 acres	
2024-04-01 10:16:27	Linda	Hanifin Bonner	Annapolis	MD	21401	No	Anne Arundel Connecting Together, Inc.	Bill 20-24: Zoning – Mixed Use Districts – BWI/Fort Meade Growth Area – Multifamily Residential Uses	Support		YES
2024-04-01 10:14:50	Linda	Hanifin Bonner	Annapolis	MD	21401	No	Anne Arundel Connecting Together, Inc.	Bill 19-24: Zoning – Requirements for Conditional Uses – Workforce Housing	Support		YES
2024-03-28 0:47:55	Kyle	Nordike	Glen Burnie	MD	21060	Yes		Bill 18-24: Board of Appeals – Compensation – Per Diem Allowance	Oppose		
2024-03-23 10:14:30	Tina	Miller	Pasadena	MD	21122	Yes		Bill 16-24: Zoning – Food Service Facilities – Outdoor Seating	Oppose	It isn't right to do this near residential property. Drop this bill or don't let it include any bar or restaurant within 100 feet of residential property. It is not fair to the residents, most of which don't even know about this bill so they can't object.	
2024-03-24 21:38:35	John	Jasen	Pasadena	MD	21122	Yes		Bill 16-24: Zoning – Food Service Facilities – Outdoor Seating	Oppose	This needs to be carefully thought out, with attention paid to noise abatement, distances to the nearest residences, and residential noise restrictions.  People are as entitled to their evening peace and quiet as they are to enjoying the weather with a good drink, and the council should carefully include all stake holders.	
2024-03-25 9:15:16	Catherine	Vieweg Taylor	Pasadena	MD	21122	Yes		Bill 16-24: Zoning – Food Service Facilities – Outdoor Seating	Oppose	This bill needs to exclude businesses that are within 100 feet residential property. No resident on residential property should suffer blanket approval of a potential noise nuisance (which outdoor dining certainly is). These sites should be individually considered through the usual zoning process.	
2024-03-25 9:47:46	Ann	Allam	Pasadena	MD	21122	Yes		Bill 16-24: Zoning – Food Service Facilities – Outdoor Seating	Oppose	This bill needs to exclude residents in residential neighborhoods from being impacted. It's not reasonable to deny them notice of a commercial outdoor seating area becoming permanent near their home. Plus, they need a real opportunity to influence the decision which they cannot have if they don't know about the decision.	
2024-03-25 10:00:22	Nina	Benoit	Pasadena	Md	21122	Yes		Bill 16-24: Zoning – Food Service Facilities – Outdoor Seating	Oppose	This bill will give permanent permission for outdoor seating for various businesses without any constraint regarding their location in or near residential neighborhoods. The public is not being told which businesses or where they are located. People's homes need to be protected and respected.	
2024-03-25 22:09:58	Lisa	Phipps	Pasadena	MD	21122	Yes		Bill 16-24: Zoning – Food Service Facilities – Outdoor Seating	Oppose	This bill should exclude bars or restaurants that are in residential areas. There are plenty throughout the county! During Covid, I rented a house in Delaware that was right next to a bar and I felt like the band was right in my living room until 2 am. It was miserable! At least I went home after the week. Anne Arundel Co residents deserve peace and quiet in their own homes!	
2024-03-26 21:20:26	Susan	Greentree	Arnold	Maryland	21012	Yes		Bill 16-24: Zoning – Food Service Facilities – Outdoor Seating	Oppose	I oppose the blanket outdoor dining. This is so close to residential housing. Its disruptive to those living in the immediate area. The occasional event with outdoor dining on tge sidewalks during a schedule event fine. To have this across the sidewalk, noise & disruption to residents is not appropriate.	
2024-03-27 14:55:04	Ruth	Jobe	Annapolis	MD	21401	Yes		Bill 16-24: Zoning – Food Service Facilities – Outdoor Seating	Oppose	Bill 16-24 provides no protection to residents that live within earshot of the outdoor noise created by outdoor seating (or from other business), only benefits those with commercial/for-profit interests. The residents need relief from the noise created by business uses. This Bill should be defeated so that peace and quiet is restored to residents that sacrificed so much during COVID and during the various timeline expansions. Enough is enough. Let's restore tranquility to the neighborhoods; not create more disharmony.	
2024-03-28 0:37:43	Kyle	Nordike	Glen Burnie	MD	21060	Yes		Bill 16-24: Zoning – Food Service Facilities – Outdoor Seating	Support		
2024-04-01 10:26:47	Todd	Taylor	Pasadena	Maryland	21122	Yes		Bill 16-24: Zoning – Food Service Facilities – Outdoor Seating	Oppose	I oppose the bill without an amendment that keeps commercial outdoor activities at least 100' from residentially zoned properties.	

Timestamp	First name	Last name	City	State	Zip code	Are you representing yourself?	Who are you representing?	Legislation	Position	Remarks	Attachment
2024-03-31 17:06:46	Ruth	Jobe	Annapolis	MD	21401	Yes		Bill 14-24a: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning -- Small Business Districts	Oppose	<p>The previously adopted Bill 92-23 greatly changed the zoning ordinance for Small Business Districts that negatively impacts the residential neighborhood in which they are located and added specific road classifications thus allowing SBDs to be located on any road. Given the prior requirement (pre-adoption of Bill 92-23) for SBDs to be located along an "arterial" road, the current Small Business (SB) zoning in the Weems Creek Community/Ridgely Avenue area has been erroneously applied as Ridgely Avenue is a connecting road, not an arterial road. It is incumbent upon the County Council to immediately call upon the appropriate county office to conduct a complete and thorough investigation as to how upzoning from R2 to SB occurred and the legality of the zoning pre-adoption of Bill 92-23, the timing of which is suspicious as are the actions of Council Members (Fiedler and Volke) that introduced Bill 92-23. Furthermore, the County Council should request and make public an inventory of all SBD locations in Anne Arundel County – a list for which has been asked but not provided, i.e., was told to consult the Zoning Map – a cumbersome process in and of itself.</p> <p>More troublesome is that Bill 92-23 now specifies road classifications, e.g., "minor arterial or lower road classification". For those following and participating in the Region 7 Comprehensive Zoning process, we know that this "discovery" of "SB" designation on property not on an "arterial" road has the appearance and effect of backdoor zoning. To address community concerns, Bill 14-24 has been introduced, but it is a one-size fits all – take the Bill or leave it and live with Bill 92-23 with all its flaws – or is this an incorrect assessment?</p> <p>Unfortunately, it is unclear how one can support Bill 14-24 in its entirety based on the following:                      Short summary: The proposed Bill 14-24 Amendments, further weaken the Architectural Features requirements that maintain the residential appearance including totally exempting religious facilities from the architectural features requirement, include both freestanding signs and identification signs (only one sign type was allowed before passage of Bill 92-23), and reduces the minimum lot size from 15,000 (1/3rd acre) to 11,000 square feet (1/4th acre), if the lot is served by public sewer.</p> <p>Here's a more detailed assessment of the major Amendments (Opposition comments only):</p> <p>18-9-403. Bulk Regulations:                      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                      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? 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. "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>18-3-312. Signs in small business districts.                      (A) Freestanding signs 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. 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. 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 ambiance, and create blight in the entire neighborhood.</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. 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 facade"? 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 facade. 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. 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>(D) Illumination of signs.                      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?                      As proposed: A SIGN IN A SMALL BUSINESS DISTRICT ON A MINOR ARTERIAL ROAD OR A ROAD OF LOWER CLASSIFICATION MAY BE ILLUMINATED ONLY BY LIGHTING EXTERIOR TO THE SIGN.</p> <p>In conclusion, Bill 14-24 does not go far enough to undo what Bill 92-23 changed. Various uses should be excluded, e.g., convenience stores, restaurants, etc. Bulk regulations are unfavorable, e.g., reduction in setbacks and lot lines, architectural features need to be honored pre-enactment of Bill 92-23. Protections for the residential community are missing while allowing for encroachment by commercial enterprises. The spirit and intent of the original SBD is violated. As designed, this was to allow home-based business to be conducted from residential units. Legislation needs to support those intentions.</p> <p>Comments submitted re: Bill 14-24                      Submitted for: April 1, 2024 Anne Arundel County Council Meeting</p>	YES

Timestamp	First name	Last name	City	State	Zip code	Are you representing yourself?	Who are you representing?	Legislation	Position	Remarks	Attachment
2024-03-31 22:16:42	Nancy	Guy	Annapolis	MD	21401	Yes		Bill 14-24a: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning -- Small Business Districts	Oppose	<p>Nancy Guy 605 North Bestgate Rd Annapolis, MD 21401.</p> <p>I strongly oppose bill 14-24a and here is why you should too:</p> <p>The previously adopted Bill 92-23 greatly changed the zoning ordinance for Small Business Districts that negatively impacts the residential neighborhood in which they are located and added specific road classifications thus allowing SBDs to be located on any road. Given the prior requirement (pre-adoption of Bill 92-23) for SBDs to be located along an "arterial" road, the current Small Business (SB) zoning in the Weems Creek Community/Ridgely Avenue area has been erroneously applied as Ridgely Avenue is a connecting road, not an arterial road. It is incumbent upon the County Council to immediately call upon the appropriate county office to conduct a complete and thorough investigation as to how upzoning from R2 to SB occurred and the legality of the zoning pre-adoption of Bill 92-23, the timing of which is suspicious as are the actions of Council Members (Fiedler and Volke) that introduced Bill 92-23. Furthermore, the County Council should request and make public an inventory of all SBD locations in Anne Arundel County – a list for which has been asked but not provided, i.e., was told to consult the Zoning Map – a cumbersome process in and of itself.</p> <p>More troublesome is that Bill 92-23 now specifies road classifications, e.g., "minor arterial or lower road classification". For those following and participating in the Region 7 Comprehensive Zoning process, we know that this "discovery" of "SB" designation on property not on an "arterial" road has the appearance and effect of backdoor zoning. To address community concerns, Bill 14-24 has been introduced, but it is a one-size fits all – take the Bill or leave it and live with Bill 92-23 with all its flaws – or is this an incorrect assessment?</p> <p>Unfortunately, it is unclear how one can support Bill 14-24 in its entirety based on the following:  Short summary: The proposed Bill 14-24 Amendments, further weaken the Architectural Features requirements that maintain the residential appearance including totally exempting religious facilities from the architectural features requirement, include both freestanding signs and identification signs (only one sign type was allowed before passage of Bill 92-23), and reduces the minimum lot size from 15,000 (1/3rd acre) to 11,000 square feet (1/4th acre), if the lot is served by public sewer.</p> <p>Here's a more detailed assessment of the major Amendments (Opposition comments only):</p> <p>18-9-403. Bulk Regulations:  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  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? 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. "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>18-3-312. Signs in small business districts.  (A) Freestanding signs 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. 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. 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 ambiance, and create blight in the entire neighborhood.</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."  (B) Identification signs. 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 facade"? 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 facade. 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. 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>(D) Illumination of signs.  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?  As proposed: A SIGN IN A SMALL BUSINESS DISTRICT ON A MINOR ARTERIAL ROAD OR A ROAD OF LOWER CLASSIFICATION MAY BE ILLUMINATED ONLY BY LIGHTING EXTERIOR TO THE SIGN.</p> <p>In conclusion, Bill 14-24 does not go far enough to undo what Bill 92-23 changed. Various uses should be excluded, e.g., convenience stores, restaurants, etc. Bulk regulations are unfavorable, e.g., reduction in setbacks and lot lines, architectural features need to be honored pre-enactment of Bill 92-23. Protections for the residential community are missing while allowing for encroachment by commercial enterprises. The spirit and intent of the original SBD is violated. As designed, this was to allow home-based business to be conducted from residential units. Legislation needs to support those intentions.</p> <p>Comments submitted re: Bill 14-24  Submitted for: April 1, 2024 Anne Arundel County Council Meeting</p>	

Timestamp	First name	Last name	City	State	Zip code	Are you representing yourself?	Who are you representing?	Legislation	Position	Remarks	Attachment
2024-03-31 22:17:33	Nancy	Guy	Annapolis	MD	21401	Yes		Bill 14-24a: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning -- Small Business Districts	Oppose	<p>Nancy Guy 605 North Bestgate Rd Annapolis, MD 21401.</p> <p>I strongly oppose bill 14-24a and here is why you should too:</p> <p>The previously adopted Bill 92-23 greatly changed the zoning ordinance for Small Business Districts that negatively impacts the residential neighborhood in which they are located and added specific road classifications thus allowing SBDs to be located on any road. Given the prior requirement (pre-adoption of Bill 92-23) for SBDs to be located along an "arterial" road, the current Small Business (SB) zoning in the Weems Creek Community/Ridgely Avenue area has been erroneously applied as Ridgely Avenue is a connecting road, not an arterial road. It is incumbent upon the County Council to immediately call upon the appropriate county office to conduct a complete and thorough investigation as to how upzoning from R2 to SB occurred and the legality of the zoning pre-adoption of Bill 92-23, the timing of which is suspicious as are the actions of Council Members (Fiedler and Volke) that introduced Bill 92-23. Furthermore, the County Council should request and make public an inventory of all SBD locations in Anne Arundel County – a list for which has been asked but not provided, i.e., was told to consult the Zoning Map – a cumbersome process in and of itself.</p> <p>More troublesome is that Bill 92-23 now specifies road classifications, e.g., "minor arterial or lower road classification". For those following and participating in the Region 7 Comprehensive Zoning process, we know that this "discovery" of "SB" designation on property not on an "arterial" road has the appearance and effect of backdoor zoning. To address community concerns, Bill 14-24 has been introduced, but it is a one-size fits all – take the Bill or leave it and live with Bill 92-23 with all its flaws – or is this an incorrect assessment?</p> <p>Unfortunately, it is unclear how one can support Bill 14-24 in its entirety based on the following:  Short summary: The proposed Bill 14-24 Amendments, further weaken the Architectural Features requirements that maintain the residential appearance including totally exempting religious facilities from the architectural features requirement, include both freestanding signs and identification signs (only one sign type was allowed before passage of Bill 92-23), and reduces the minimum lot size from 15,000 (1/3rd acre) to 11,000 square feet (1/4th acre), if the lot is served by public sewer.</p> <p>Here's a more detailed assessment of the major Amendments (Opposition comments only):</p> <p>18-9-403. Bulk Regulations:  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  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? 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. "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>18-3-312. Signs in small business districts.  (A) Freestanding signs 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. 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. 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 ambiance, and create blight in the entire neighborhood.</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."  (B) Identification signs. 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 facade"? 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 facade. 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. 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>(D) Illumination of signs.  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?  As proposed: A SIGN IN A SMALL BUSINESS DISTRICT ON A MINOR ARTERIAL ROAD OR A ROAD OF LOWER CLASSIFICATION MAY BE ILLUMINATED ONLY BY LIGHTING EXTERIOR TO THE SIGN.</p> <p>In conclusion, Bill 14-24 does not go far enough to undo what Bill 92-23 changed. Various uses should be excluded, e.g., convenience stores, restaurants, etc. Bulk regulations are unfavorable, e.g., reduction in setbacks and lot lines, architectural features need to be honored pre-enactment of Bill 92-23. Protections for the residential community are missing while allowing for encroachment by commercial enterprises. The spirit and intent of the original SBD is violated. As designed, this was to allow home-based business to be conducted from residential units. Legislation needs to support those intentions.</p> <p>Comments submitted re: Bill 14-24  Submitted for: April 1, 2024 Anne Arundel County Council Meeting</p>	

Timestamp	First name	Last name	City	State	Zip code	Are you representing yourself?	Who are you representing?	Legislation	Position	Remarks	Attachment
2024-03-31 22:28:02	Jane	Malone	Annapolis	MD	21401	No	Jane Malone	Bill 14-24a: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning -- Small Business Districts	Oppose	<p>I Jane Malone, give my sister Nancy Guy permission to speak on my behalf.</p> <p>I oppose bill 14-24-a</p> <p>The previously adopted Bill 92-23 greatly changed the zoning ordinance for Small Business Districts that negatively impacts the residential neighborhood in which they are located and added specific road classifications thus allowing SBDs to be located on any road. Given the prior requirement (pre-adoption of Bill 92-23) for SBDs to be located along an "arterial" road, the current Small Business (SB) zoning in the Weems Creek Community/Ridgely Avenue area has been erroneously applied as Ridgely Avenue is a connecting road, not an arterial road. It is incumbent upon the County Council to immediately call upon the appropriate county office to conduct a complete and thorough investigation as to how upzoning from R2 to SB occurred and the legality of the zoning pre-adoption of Bill 92-23, the timing of which is suspicious as are the actions of Council Members (Fiedler and Volke) that introduced Bill 92-23. Furthermore, the County Council should request and make public an inventory of all SBD locations in Anne Arundel County – a list for which has been asked but not provided, i.e., was told to consult the Zoning Map – a cumbersome process in and of itself.</p> <p>More troublesome is that Bill 92-23 now specifies road classifications, e.g., "minor arterial or lower road classification". For those following and participating in the Region 7 Comprehensive Zoning process, we know that this "discovery" of "SB" designation on property not on an "arterial" road has the appearance and effect of backdoor zoning. To address community concerns, Bill 14-24 has been introduced, but it is a one-size fits all – take the Bill or leave it and live with Bill 92-23 with all its flaws – or is this an incorrect assessment?</p> <p>Unfortunately, it is unclear how one can support Bill 14-24 in its entirety based on the following:  Short summary: The proposed Bill 14-24 Amendments, further weaken the Architectural Features requirements that maintain the residential appearance including totally exempting religious facilities from the architectural features requirement, include both freestanding signs and identification signs (only one sign type was allowed before passage of Bill 92-23), and reduces the minimum lot size from 15,000 (1/3rd acre) to 11,000 square feet (1/4th acre), if the lot is served by public sewer.</p> <p>Here's a more detailed assessment of the major Amendments (Opposition comments only):</p> <p>18-9-403. Bulk Regulations:  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  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? 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. "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>18-3-312. Signs in small business districts.  (A) Freestanding signs 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. 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. 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 ambiance, and create blight in the entire neighborhood.</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."  (B) Identification signs. 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 facade"? 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 facade. 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. 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."  (D) Illumination of signs.  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?  As proposed: A SIGN IN A SMALL BUSINESS DISTRICT ON A MINOR ARTERIAL ROAD OR A ROAD OF LOWER CLASSIFICATION MAY BE ILLUMINATED ONLY BY LIGHTING EXTERIOR TO THE SIGN.</p> <p>In conclusion, Bill 14-24 does not go far enough to undo what Bill 92-23 changed. Various uses should be excluded, e.g., convenience stores, restaurants, etc. Bulk regulations are unfavorable, e.g., reduction in setbacks and lot lines, architectural features need to be honored pre-enactment of Bill 92-23. Protections for the residential community are missing while allowing for encroachment by commercial enterprises. The spirit and intent of the original SBD is violated. As designed, this was to allow home-based business to be conducted from residential units. Legislation needs to support those intentions.</p> <p>Comments submitted re: Bill 14-24  Submitted for: April 1, 2024 Anne Arundel County Council Meeting</p>	

Timestamp	First name	Last name	City	State	Zip code	Are you representing yourself?	Who are you representing?	Legislation	Position	Remarks	Attachment
2024-03-31 22:37:12	Nancy	Guy	Annapolis	MD	21401	Yes		Bill 14-24a: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning -- Small Business Districts	Oppose	<p>Nancy Guy 605 North Bestgate Rd Annapolis, MD 21401.</p> <p>I strongly oppose bill 14-24a and here is why you should too:</p> <p>The previously adopted Bill 92-23 greatly changed the zoning ordinance for Small Business Districts that negatively impacts the residential neighborhood in which they are located and added specific road classifications thus allowing SBDs to be located on any road. Given the prior requirement (pre-adoption of Bill 92-23) for SBDs to be located along an "arterial" road, the current Small Business (SB) zoning in the Weems Creek Community/Ridgely Avenue area has been erroneously applied as Ridgely Avenue is a connecting road, not an arterial road. It is incumbent upon the County Council to immediately call upon the appropriate county office to conduct a complete and thorough investigation as to how upzoning from R2 to SB occurred and the legality of the zoning pre-adoption of Bill 92-23, the timing of which is suspicious as are the actions of Council Members (Fiedler and Volke) that introduced Bill 92-23. Furthermore, the County Council should request and make public an inventory of all SBD locations in Anne Arundel County – a list for which has been asked but not provided, i.e., was told to consult the Zoning Map – a cumbersome process in and of itself.</p> <p>More troublesome is that Bill 92-23 now specifies road classifications, e.g., "minor arterial or lower road classification". For those following and participating in the Region 7 Comprehensive Zoning process, we know that this "discovery" of "SB" designation on property not on an "arterial" road has the appearance and effect of backdoor zoning. To address community concerns, Bill 14-24 has been introduced, but it is a one-size fits all – take the Bill or leave it and live with Bill 92-23 with all its flaws – or is this an incorrect assessment?</p> <p>Unfortunately, it is unclear how one can support Bill 14-24 in its entirety based on the following:  Short summary: The proposed Bill 14-24 Amendments, further weaken the Architectural Features requirements that maintain the residential appearance including totally exempting religious facilities from the architectural features requirement, include both freestanding signs and identification signs (only one sign type was allowed before passage of Bill 92-23), and reduces the minimum lot size from 15,000 (1/3rd acre) to 11,000 square feet (1/4th acre), if the lot is served by public sewer.</p> <p>Here's a more detailed assessment of the major Amendments (Opposition comments only):</p> <p>18-9-403. Bulk Regulations:  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  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? 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. "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>18-3-312. Signs in small business districts.  (A) Freestanding signs 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. 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. 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 ambiance, and create blight in the entire neighborhood.</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 not exceed 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."  (B) Identification signs. 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 facade"? 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 facade. 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. 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>(D) Illumination of signs.  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?  As proposed: A SIGN IN A SMALL BUSINESS DISTRICT ON A MINOR ARTERIAL ROAD OR A ROAD OF LOWER CLASSIFICATION MAY BE ILLUMINATED ONLY BY LIGHTING EXTERIOR TO THE SIGN.</p> <p>In conclusion, Bill 14-24 does not go far enough to undo what Bill 92-23 changed. Various uses should be excluded, e.g., convenience stores, restaurants, etc. Bulk regulations are unfavorable, e.g., reduction in setbacks and lot lines, architectural features need to be honored pre-enactment of Bill 92-23. Protections for the residential community are missing while allowing for encroachment by commercial enterprises. The spirit and intent of the original SBD is violated. As designed, this was to allow home-based business to be conducted from residential units. Legislation needs to support those intentions.</p> <p>Comments submitted re: Bill 14-24  Submitted for: April 1, 2024 Anne Arundel County Council Meeting</p>	

Timestamp	First name	Last name	City	State	Zip code	Are you representing yourself?	Who are you representing?	Legislation	Position	Remarks	Attachment
2024-03-31 22:37:32	Nancy	Guy	Annapolis	MD	21401	Yes		Bill 14-24a: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning -- Small Business Districts	Oppose	<p>Nancy Guy 605 North Bestgate Rd Annapolis, MD 21401.</p> <p>I strongly oppose bill 14-24a and here is why you should too:</p> <p>The previously adopted Bill 92-23 greatly changed the zoning ordinance for Small Business Districts that negatively impacts the residential neighborhood in which they are located and added specific road classifications thus allowing SBDs to be located on any road. Given the prior requirement (pre-adoption of Bill 92-23) for SBDs to be located along an "arterial" road, the current Small Business (SB) zoning in the Weems Creek Community/Ridgely Avenue area has been erroneously applied as Ridgely Avenue is a connecting road, not an arterial road. It is incumbent upon the County Council to immediately call upon the appropriate county office to conduct a complete and thorough investigation as to how upzoning from R2 to SB occurred and the legality of the zoning pre-adoption of Bill 92-23, the timing of which is suspicious as are the actions of Council Members (Fiedler and Volke) that introduced Bill 92-23. Furthermore, the County Council should request and make public an inventory of all SBD locations in Anne Arundel County – a list for which has been asked but not provided, i.e., was told to consult the Zoning Map – a cumbersome process in and of itself.</p> <p>More troublesome is that Bill 92-23 now specifies road classifications, e.g., "minor arterial or lower road classification". For those following and participating in the Region 7 Comprehensive Zoning process, we know that this "discovery" of "SB" designation on property not on an "arterial" road has the appearance and effect of backdoor zoning. To address community concerns, Bill 14-24 has been introduced, but it is a one-size fits all – take the Bill or leave it and live with Bill 92-23 with all its flaws – or is this an incorrect assessment?</p> <p>Unfortunately, it is unclear how one can support Bill 14-24 in its entirety based on the following:  Short summary: The proposed Bill 14-24 Amendments, further weaken the Architectural Features requirements that maintain the residential appearance including totally exempting religious facilities from the architectural features requirement, include both freestanding signs and identification signs (only one sign type was allowed before passage of Bill 92-23), and reduces the minimum lot size from 15,000 (1/3rd acre) to 11,000 square feet (1/4th acre), if the lot is served by public sewer.</p> <p>Here's a more detailed assessment of the major Amendments (Opposition comments only):</p> <p>18-9-403. Bulk Regulations:  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  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? 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. "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>18-3-312. Signs in small business districts.  (A) Freestanding signs 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. 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. 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 ambiance, and create blight in the entire neighborhood.</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 not exceed 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."  (B) Identification signs. 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 facade"? 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 facade. 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. 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>(D) Illumination of signs.  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?  As proposed: A SIGN IN A SMALL BUSINESS DISTRICT ON A MINOR ARTERIAL ROAD OR A ROAD OF LOWER CLASSIFICATION MAY BE ILLUMINATED ONLY BY LIGHTING EXTERIOR TO THE SIGN.</p> <p>In conclusion, Bill 14-24 does not go far enough to undo what Bill 92-23 changed. Various uses should be excluded, e.g., convenience stores, restaurants, etc. Bulk regulations are unfavorable, e.g., reduction in setbacks and lot lines, architectural features need to be honored pre-enactment of Bill 92-23. Protections for the residential community are missing while allowing for encroachment by commercial enterprises. The spirit and intent of the original SBD is violated. As designed, this was to allow home-based business to be conducted from residential units. Legislation needs to support those intentions.</p> <p>Comments submitted re: Bill 14-24  Submitted for: April 1, 2024 Anne Arundel County Council Meeting</p>	



Timestamp	First name	Last name	City	State	Zip code	Are you representing yourself?	Who are you representing?	Legislation	Position	Remarks	Attachment
2024-04-01 10:19:38	Mary	Guy	Annapolis	Maryland	21401	Yes		Bill 14-24a: Subdivision, Development, & Zoning – Small Business Districts	Oppose	<p>The bill was not developed to benefit or protect the resident community and should NOT be passed! It degrades individual ownership and the healthy lifestyle of residents (infants, children, adults, older adults, people with disability) by advocating on behalf of business owners, who want to utilize every inch of the property to their benefit. Increased signage, more lighting, more noise, more business districts, etc. are not beneficial to a community or its residents.</p> <p>Anne Arundel County is an urban area (like New York City, Washington, DC) and should not be treated as one The County Council has an opportunity to vote against the bill to benefit and protect residents and visitors and must do so. Amending the bill on the back end is not efficient and not in keeping with effective, efficient County Government.</p> <p>I concur with Ruth Jobe's comments as submitted on March 31 and join her in opposing the bill.</p>	