

Timestamp	First name	Last name	City	State	Zip code	Are you representing yourself?	Who are you representing?	Legislation	Position	Remarks
2024-04-09 11:58:26	Hannah	Goldbeck	Riva	MD	21140	Yes		General		I am writing to express my opposition to Bill No. 26-24, regarding a drastic reduction in the public notice time frame for applications for zoning changes. This bill is proposed as an emergency change. Zoning matters are not emergencies. These matters impact our neighborhoods and our daily lives. The purpose of government for the people and by the people must include those people! I wanted to provide testimony for this specific bill, but it was not listed as an option. Residents have the right to voice their opinion on changes that affect their surroundings and reducing the notice period from 30 days down to 1 week under the guise of an emergency is unacceptable.
2024-04-09 15:25:37	Ruth	Jobe	Annapolis	MD	21401	Yes		General		Why is Bill 26-24 missing from the list of Legislative bills from which to select as of April 9, 2024 @3:24 p.m.?
2024-04-15 8:29:41	Bishop Eric	Wright Sr.	Baltimore	MD	21211	No	Dep. Chief Jerard Flemings	General		<p>To the members of the County Council,</p> <p>My name is Bishop Eric Wright Sr. I am a member of the faith community and in my time working with and on behalf of the community I was introduced to our beloved Deputy Chief Jerard Fleming. In our initial meeting I recognized a man who is strong, humble and faithful that has love, concern and compassion for this county as well as the communities he serves. After getting to know him over time the genuineness of Chief Fleming would be evident, undeniable and on display for all to witness. Whether driving the Police Bus to take young people to O's game, walking a prayer/peace walk route with concerned clergy and community leaders or manning the grill preparing burgers and dogs for communities that felt uneasy and distrust between Police and community he's always stood on the frontline. He was very instrumental in organizing a group of clergy and officers to extend trust relationships between the two groups safety. Going into the trenches shoulder to shoulder with community leaders such as myself to address inequality in some of our most troubled and poverty-stricken communities in the county. Deputy Chief Fleming has shown consistent dedication, character, and leadership that is to the betterment of Anne Arundel County. After working in some capacity and receiving several benefits of his support over the years I stand in solidarity with those who believe that this wonderful public servant is worthy of all that's due him. Due from a county he's served not once but came out of retirement to serve twice. I beseech you to find in your power to do what is right. I am confident that you will do so on Chief Fleming's behalf. Thank you in advance.</p> <p>Bishop Eric Wright Sr Calvary Pentecostal Ministries</p>
2024-04-15 9:27:07	Ruth	Jobe	Annapolis	MD	21401	Yes		General		<p>To the County Council:</p> <p>As you consider zoning requests; especially those for upzoning and development, please add equal weight to your consideration of the natural environment. Here's recent Federal legislation that encourages landowner participation in voluntary conservation programs. Let's protect the environment and be good stewards of the land and the species it supports.</p> <p>Interior Department Finalizes Action to Strengthen Endangered Species Act Will encourage landowner participation in voluntary conservation programs</p> <p>04/11/2024 Last edited 04/11/2024 Date: Thursday, April 10, 2024 Contact: Interior_Press@ios.doi.gov</p> <p>WASHINGTON — The Department of the Interior today announced that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has finalized Endangered Species Act (ESA) revisions to improve participation in its voluntary conservation programs. The revisions promote native species conservation by clarifying and simplifying permitting under Section 10(a) of the ESA, encouraging more resource managers and landowners to engage in these voluntary programs.</p> <p>President Biden's America the Beautiful initiative set the nation's first-ever goal to conserve and restore at least 30 percent of U.S. lands and waters by 2030. The 10-year, locally led and nationally scaled initiative lifts up efforts to protect, conserve, connect and restore the lands, waters and wildlife upon which we all depend. One of the initiative's goals is to enhance wildlife habitat and improve biodiversity potentially preventing listings and assisting with species recovery through voluntary measures.</p> <p>"The Endangered Species Act's achievements are demonstrated across our nation with hundreds of at-risk species now stable or improving thanks to the collaborative actions of federal agencies, state, Tribal and local governments, industry, conservation organizations and private citizens," said Secretary Deb Haaland. "As we look to the future of ESA implementation, support from President Biden's Investing in America agenda and the America the Beautiful initiative are being leveraged to ensure the ongoing conservation of our species and their habitats."</p> <p>"These revisions reflect decades of learning that we can apply to ensure the Endangered Species Act is relevant for the next 50 years. They also help build on years of collaborative conservation actions on the ground," said U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Director Martha Williams. "Improvements to the rule will encourage more landowners to engage in conservation for declining, candidate and listed species. Through this type of stewardship, we are investing in the future, creating a legacy of resilient habitats to withstand environmental challenges and changes."</p> <p>The revisions improve implementation of the conservation programs associated with the issuance of enhancement of survival and incidental take permits under Section 10(a) of the ESA. One way the Service achieves this is by combining safe harbor agreements and candidate conservation agreements with assurances into one agreement type called a conservation benefit agreement. The Service also adds flexibility to allow permits for both listed and non-listed species and clarifies the requirements for complete applications.</p> <p>These revisions, which will increase efficiency by reducing the time and cost to develop and negotiate permit applications, will encourage more individuals and companies to engage in conservation benefit agreements and habitat conservation plans, generating greater conservation results overall. These revisions do not significantly change the current implementation of the Section 10 program or expand the requirements for species protections.</p> <p>Section 10(a) of the ESA provides a voluntary mechanism for authorizing take of listed and non-listed species associated with beneficial conservation actions or otherwise lawful activities. With some exceptions, the law prohibits taking protected species unless authorized by a permit from the Service or the National Marine Fisheries Service.</p> <p>The ESA was enacted in 1973 as a response to the declining populations of many species of animals and plants. The Act was designed to protect and recover species at risk of extinction and to promote the conservation of ecosystems and habitats necessary for the survival of those species as well as the communities who rely on healthy ecosystems.</p> <p>The ESA provides for the protection of ecosystems, the conservation of endangered and threatened species, and the enforcement of treaties related to wildlife preservation. This landmark law has been highly effective and credited with saving 99% of listed species from extinction. Thus far, more than 100 species of plants and animals have been delisted based on recovery or reclassified from endangered to threatened based on improved conservation status, and hundreds more species are stable or improving thanks to the collaborative actions of Tribes, federal agencies, state and local governments, conservation organizations and private citizens.</p> <p>The final Section 10(a) rule will publish in the Federal Register on April 12, 2024 and is effective 30 days from publication. For information about Section 10 of the ESA, please visit the Service's website.</p>
2024-04-09 21:28:33	Catherine	Vieweg Taylor	Pasadena	MD	21122	Yes		BILL 16-24a: Zoning – Food Service Facilities – Outdoor Seating	Support	I support this amended bill because it has addressed the concerns of residents in residential neighborhoods who should never have a potential nuisance placed within 100 ft of their property without individual review/consideration. This blanket approval has been considerably narrowed from the scope of Bill 85-23 and therefore I now support it.
2024-04-14 13:40:54	Ann	Allam	Pasadena	MD	21122	Yes		BILL 16-24a: Zoning – Food Service Facilities – Outdoor Seating	Support	Now that you have amended the bill to exclude establishments within 100 feet of residential property, I support the bill. The county council needs to always remember to respect the peace and quiet of residential neighborhoods.
2024-04-14 13:47:49	Nina	Benoit	Pasadena	MD	21122	Yes		BILL 16-24a: Zoning – Food Service Facilities – Outdoor Seating	Support	I am glad to see this bill amended so that bars and restaurants near homes won't be swept into this blanket approval for permanent outdoor seating.
2024-04-14 20:39:47	Nina	Benoit	Pasadena	MD	21122	Yes		BILL 16-24a: Zoning – Food Service Facilities – Outdoor Seating	Support	I am glad to see this bill amended so that bars and restaurants near homes won't be swept into this blanket approval for permanent outdoor seating.

Timestamp	First name	Last name	City	State	Zip code	Are you representing yourself?	Who are you representing?	Legislation	Position	Remarks
2024-04-15 8:34:53	Ruth	Jobe	Annapolis	MD	21401	Yes		BILL 16-24a: Zoning – Food Service Facilities – Outdoor Seating	Oppose	<p>Bill 16-24a – Zoning – Food Service Facilities – Outdoor Seating Oppose</p> <p>This Bill provides no relief to those residences that have been negatively impacted by the allowance of outdoor dining during the pandemic, which is declared as "over". Many lives were disrupted during the pandemic and concessions were made. Now is the time to acknowledge and thank the residential owners whose lives were also disrupted because of the noise and other negative effects from outdoor seating. Now is the time to rescind not continue outdoor seating near residences.</p> <p>Let's return to "normal" and rescind; not expand outdoor seating.</p> <p>I steadfastly oppose Bill 16-24a.</p> <p>Submitted: April 15, 2024</p> <p>Submitted to: Anne Arundel County Council</p>
2024-04-15 9:41:03	Nancy	Guy	Annapolis	MD	21401	Yes		BILL 16-24a: Zoning – Food Service Facilities – Outdoor Seating	Oppose	<p>I Nancy Guy 605 North Bestgate Rd Annapolis MD 21401 Strongly oppose this bill 26-24a This Bill provides no relief to those residences that have been negatively impacted by the allowance of outdoor dining during the pandemic, which is declared as "over". Many lives were disrupted during the pandemic and concessions were made. Now is the time to acknowledge and thank the residential owners whose lives were also disrupted because of the noise and other negative effects from outdoor seating. Now is the time to rescind not continue outdoor seating near residences.</p> <p>Let's return to "normal" and rescind; not expand outdoor seating.</p> <p>I steadfastly oppose Bill 16-24a.</p>
2024-04-15 9:51:23	Nina	Benoit	Pasadena	MD	21122	Yes		BILL 16-24a: Zoning – Food Service Facilities – Outdoor Seating	Support	I am glad to see this bill amended so that bars and restaurants near homes won't be swept into this blanket approval for permanent outdoor seating.
2024-04-15 9:52:23	Ted	Krauss	Annapolis	MD	21401	Yes		BILL 21-24: Equity and Human Rights & Human Relations Commission	Support	<p>This confirms the request for a zone change from R2 to SB for the property at 2 Willow Road (parcels 158 and 159).</p> <p>While we previously sought to upzone various Ridgely Avenue properties to C2, we understand that that is not a realistic 2024 goal. We now seek only a modest change for the sake of consistency with the zoning of our contiguous three SB properties on Ridgely Avenue.</p> <p>Our 2 Willow Road property previously served as the office of a telephone company employee federal credit union and has long been crossed by a driveway providing access from Willow Road to our SB properties beyond. Consistent SB zoning is appropriate in the circumstances.</p> <p>As another matter of consistency, Landmark Property LLC has been a consistently good steward of its properties on Ridgely Avenue. As evidence of that responsible role, we are attaching photos to show our preservation almost a decade ago of the historical building at 613 Ridgely Avenue.</p> <p>Landmark Property LLC By Ted Krauss, manager</p>
2024-04-12 20:45:35	Antonio	Palmer	Odenton	Maryland	21113	No	United Black Clergy	BILL 23-24: Pensions – Inter-plan Transfers – Deputy Police Chief	Support	
2024-04-15 10:12:27	Kristen	Flemings	Pasadena	MD	21122	Yes		BILL 23-24: Pensions – Inter-plan Transfers – Deputy Police Chief	Support	
2024-04-15 10:53:55	David	Moon	Annapolis	MD	21401	No	Jared Flemings	BILL 23-24: Pensions – Inter-plan Transfers – Deputy Police Chief	Support	Please find the attached letter sent in support of Bill 23-24.
2024-04-10 9:33:50	Melinda	Mansager	Riva	MD	21140-1441	Yes		BILL 26-24: Amendments to Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance – Notice	Oppose	<p>Bill 26-24 only benefits the property owner seeking a zoning change such that the local community has less time to respond/oppose the zoning change once the sign is posted and the County Council can move forward the Zoning bills faster because fewer "holds" are placed on the proposed legislation while shortening the required number of days for the signage. (Remember, the initial proposal was for 30 days, reduced to 14, now proposed for 7.) How do residents benefit? We do not benefit! You snooze, you lose.</p> <p>Seven days is not enough time for citizens to notice and read the signs, research the implications of the proposed zoning change, coordinate with neighbors, and contact their Council representative.</p> <p>You are sacrificing good government for your convenience.</p> <p>This issue is important because developers will be more than happy to drive through this loophole once it is in place. You are receiving dozens of requests to change zoning from just 25% of the county, with many more to come over the next two years. And in most cases, these requests are bypassing the review by the citizen Stakeholder Advisory Committees, working on these very matters for the past 18 months, and reviews by the Office of Planning and Zoning, and the Planning Advisory Board.</p>
2024-04-11 0:18:20	Britt	Griswold	Annapolis	MD	21409	Yes		BILL 26-24: Amendments to Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance – Notice	Oppose	<p>Don't do this!</p> <p>I am writing in opposition to the proposal to change the notice to neighbors on changes made to property zoning. The most simple reason is that in our modern hectic life most people may not see the notice and have time to respond in such a short period.</p> <p>Practically, neither the County nor the property owner is harmed by a 14 day waiting period. Both have had ample time to consider the change and it's possible effects, but an uneducated homeowner is expected to digest and fully comprehend and respond to the County (and seek legal counsel if needed) in a mere 7 days. Such a proposal is preposterous and shows a bias toward developers over the regular citizens who compose the vast majority of your constituents. We have come so far in making the zoning and Development process more transparent and fair. Don't turn back now for no valid reason I ask you to vote no on this Bill.</p>
2024-04-11 6:33:57	William	Kraus	Edgewater	Md	21037	Yes		BILL 26-24: Amendments to Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance – Notice	Oppose	
2024-04-11 10:35:17	Beverly	Macwilliams	Riva	Md	21140	Yes		BILL 26-24: Amendments to Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance – Notice	Oppose	This proposal allows for even less time to become aware of changes and then to respond.
2024-04-11 20:47:54	Jeff	Leitch	Annapolis	MD	21403	Yes		BILL 26-24: Amendments to Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance – Notice	Oppose	Who ever supports this bill is not working for the people of Anne Arundel County. There is absolutely no good reason for this to pass except to cut the public out of the due process of OUR county development. There will always be growth, the due process cannot be removed.
2024-04-12 9:37:39	Mike	Stiles	Annapolis	MD	21403	Yes		BILL 26-24: Amendments to Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance – Notice	Oppose	Respectfully, AA county residents should be given maximum time to review and respond to zoning changes in our community. I oppose this bill to reduces time to respond from 14 to 7 days. I would be in favor of expanding time given to respond.
2024-04-12 11:11:55	David	Corddry	Annapolis	Maryland	21401	Yes		BILL 26-24: Amendments to Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance – Notice	Oppose	<p>Thank you for your work as county council members. Bill 26-24 has 2 sections. The second of those was explained in the last meeting. It will allow properties for which the region plan recommended up zoning to request that it be amended to allow them to keep their own zoning without requiring posting. That provision makes sense. While it would have been better for the Region 2 SAC to have sorted this out before it came to council, this "emergency" change seems like a reasonable way to recover from that poor work. It is specific enough that it should not have unintended general consequences. The first section of this measure, on the contrary, would have long lasting general consequences by shortening posting requirements for zoning changes of all sorts. There was no reason offered why this part had any "emergency" value or necessity to accomplish the purpose of the measure. It almost seems like it was slipped in to erode the opportunity for community input in zoning changes. My mother taught me to avoid ascribing malice when simple incompetence is sufficient to explain an action. So, I won't assume that the author of this measure was being devious. However, the Council should reject this bill as written, and only entertain a version limited to the necessary part.</p>
2024-04-12 22:35:10	Sharon	Bramble	Annapolis	MD	21401	Yes		BILL 26-24: Amendments to Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance – Notice	Oppose	Needs to be at least 14 days...7 days is not enough

Timestamp	First name	Last name	City	State	Zip code	Are you representing yourself?	Who are you representing?	Legislation	Position	Remarks
2024-04-12 22:39:45	Robert	Musselman	Crownsville	MD	21032	Yes		BILL 26-24: Amendments to Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance – Notice	Oppose	7 days is not enough
2024-04-14 18:05:03	Peggy	Hamilton	Annapolis	MD	21401	Yes		BILL 26-24: Amendments to Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance – Notice	Oppose	I oppose the reduction in notification from 14 to 7 days. How does this help the community? I think it should remain 14 days to allow ample time for the public to see the proposed change and respond.
2024-04-14 20:35:22	Joe	Lorentzen	ANNAPOLIS, MD	Maryland	21401	Yes		BILL 26-24: Amendments to Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance – Notice	Oppose	My wife and I strongly oppose the provision within Bill 26-24 that will SHORTEN property posting requirements from 14 days to 7 days. The inherent purpose of the posting is to allow the community to see and understand a change may come; to decide if they wish to support or oppose it and the time to prepare and present a response if needed. 14 days is already a challenge for many to properly analyze, prepare and respond. Cutting it to 7 days is wrong and will have a county wide impact. The only people who will gain from a reduction to 7 days are those who seek the change. This is VERY UNFAIR to the entire community as such change requests will become far easier to slip through simply because the unsuspecting local community was not given sufficient time to react. thanks Joe Lorentzen and Cindy Posinski
2024-04-14 20:55:26	Debbie	Lodato	Annapolis	Md	21409	Yes		BILL 26-24: Amendments to Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance – Notice	Oppose	I am writing you to OPPOSE Bill 26-24 that would shorten resident rezoning notification time. Any rezoning that involves residents/taxpayers should always allow adequate time for comments. Changing the notification time from 21 to 7 days is NOT adequate notification time.  Taxpayers/residents needs should ALWAYS be considered before developers. If you want people to live here and be happy and tell others during gathering what a great place Anne Arundel County is to live, then allowing them consideration and proper notification is key.  The fact that 21 day notification creates more meetings for county employees is not a resident problem, it's a county operations problem.  I grew up in Fairfax County Virginia and any zoning changes required 30 day sign posted notification always!
2024-04-14 21:33:14	Jumana	Gorman	Annapolis	MD	21401	Yes		BILL 26-24: Amendments to Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance – Notice	Oppose	This bill slips in a provision that includes shortening the posting time for zoning changes from 14 – 7 days as a general rule which would have county wide impact going forward. This is un-necessary to its purpose, and is definitely a pro development move. Please consider removing this provision from the bill.
2024-04-14 23:34:29	Sue	Ricciardi	Arnold		28 21012	Yes		BILL 26-24: Amendments to Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance – Notice	Oppose	This bill reduces the time that the signs have to be posted and notice filed on the county website from 14 days to 7 days for proposed zoning changes on applications that have not gone through the full examination process by SAC, P&Z and PAB. I don't know why late applicants should now get more special favors. They have already eluded the normal examination process. Now county citizens would have even less time to become aware of and then consider the worthiness of proposed zoning changes that have come in late. I ask the County Council to please reject this bill.
2024-04-15 7:13:52	ELIZABETH	MEHL	Annapolis MD	MD	21401	Yes		BILL 26-24: Amendments to Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance – Notice	Oppose	
2024-04-15 7:21:50	Stephen	Miller	Annapolis	Maryland	21409	Yes		BILL 26-24: Amendments to Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance – Notice	Oppose	Council Bill 26-24 is just wrong. Seven days is not enough time for citizens to notice and read the signs proposing a zoning change, research the implications of the proposed zoning change, coordinate with neighbors, and contact their Council representative. The process already bypasses the thorough, transparent work that OPZ and the Stakeholder Advisory Committees did in evaluating zoning change requests submitted during the Region planning process. Stay with fourteen days.
2024-04-15 8:07:50	Carol	Rechner	Annapolis	MD	21409	Yes		BILL 26-24: Amendments to Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance – Notice	Oppose	The comprehensive zoning plan is there for a purpose. Citizens need 60 days to evaluate, research and respond to any changes in zoning. To reduce it further than it already is smacks of undue influence by lobbyists and developers. Remember who votes to keep you in office.
2024-04-15 8:20:27	Ruth	Jobe	Annapolis	MD	21401	Yes		BILL 26-24: Amendments to Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance – Notice	Oppose	Bill 26-24 – Amendments to Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance - Notice Oppose  This Bill creates a very large loophole for those property owners that did not participate during the months- and years-long Comprehensive Zoning process and waited until the very end to request zoning changes. By reducing the signage to only 7 days and not providing the application(s) for public review (none of the Region 2 or Region 7 applications are available to the public currently), the County Council is doing a great disservice to the local community by creating a shield under the guise of an "emergency ordinance". If property owners are requesting the same zoning as pre-Comprehensive Zoning, from where did the proposed change originate and why did it only recently come to light? Look at that process.  Given that zoning decisions have long-lasting effects, the public wants time to research, comment on, and understand the implications of the proposals. By lessening the time available, you are denying citizens of an appropriate amount of response time.  There isn't any emergency except that the County Council might have to hold a Bill, which keeps the public comment period open. Only the County Council and property owners requesting "last minute" changes benefit from this bill. The local community suffers from lack of transparency.  I steadfastly oppose this Bill.  Submitted: April 15, 2024  Submitted to: Anne Arundel County Council
2024-04-15 8:24:15	Stephen	Marley	Tracys Landing	Maryland	20779	No	Advocates for Herring Bay	BILL 26-24: Amendments to Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance – Notice	Oppose	
2024-04-15 9:00:32	Nancy	Guy	Annapolis	MD	21401	Yes		BILL 26-24: Amendments to Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance – Notice	Oppose	I NancyGuy 605 Borth Bestgate Oppose bill 26-24 I find it interesting that when first introduced it was to be a 30 day posting but they ended up passing it with 14 days and now they want to change it to 7 days. This is only so they can get the bills through faster and benefits the owner and developers. If one is out of town for a few days they have lost the chance to review such a change in zoning. This only gives the business owners, developers and the County Council the upper to get the zoning changes made more quickly without the communities involvement.  Just another sneaky way for all to get what they want passed more quickly under the table. You snooze you loose and the owners/ developers and Council member win.  This is poor government at work Not working for it' s community in a positive way it is only benefiting the business owners, developers and the County Council members themselves.  I strongly oppose this bill and you the County Council should too. Do the right thing for the people you serve.
2024-04-15 9:25:01	Marian	Jones	Annapolis	MD	21401	Yes		BILL 26-24: Amendments to Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance – Notice	Oppose	I am in favor of providing citizens more time to respond, not less. 7 days is not enough time.
2024-04-15 9:26:52	Janis	Jarvis	Annapolis	MD	21403	Yes		BILL 26-24: Amendments to Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance – Notice	Oppose	DO NOT PASS the Amendments to Bill 8 - 24. PLEASE KEEP THE PUBLIC 'SECTOR PLAN' as recommended in the REGION 7 Recommendations.  Ridgely Avenue needs to be protected and preserved.  Thank you for not allowing up-zoning for commercial growth.  Please delay ANY actions here so that more community involvement may be coordinated, and greater education on this matter may occur.  Please enable our community to come together and follow the public sector plan process described in the Draft Region 7 Plan for the area.  Please postpone any decisions that would work the matter otherwise. Cutting this from the recommendations is WRONG!  Please deny any decisions that do not ensure greater protections to existing residences and small businesses, the environment, our open spaces, and so many other aspects that need to be better understood and well preserved for this truly special place.  Please help us SAVE Ridgely Avenue as the historic and cultural resource that it is! Thank you.

Timestamp	First name	Last name	City	State	Zip code	Are you representing yourself?	Who are you representing?	Legislation	Position	Remarks
2024-04-15 9:29:51	Marian	Jones	Annapolis	MD	21401	Yes		BILL 26-24: Amendments to Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance – Notice	Oppose	<p>I am in favor of providing citizens more time to respond, not less. 7 days is not enough time.</p> <p>It is necessary to comment upon and refute contents of a Volume 2, April 14, 2024 Newsletter distributed by Ms. Amanda Fiedler, District 5 which is the source of the quotes contained herein.</p> <p>Quote: "Bill 26-24 does two things, it makes it easier for the County Council to prevent a zoning change, and restore the existing zoning, and helps us improve the process as we navigate the new requirement of sign postings in certain circumstances."</p> <p>Comment: Ask yourself, from where did the original zoning change originate. In many cases, it was the Office of Planning and Zoning (OPZ). Ask yourself, how and when was the original zoning change first identified by the property owner? Why is it necessary to "prevent a zoning change and restore existing zoning" unless OPZ miscalculated, or owners were not well-informed. As evidenced during the testimony for Bills 6-24, 7-24, 8-24, and 9-24 lack of communication is noted during Region Plan development. Look to change that process and you will find a great reduction in the number of late applications. Fewer late applications will allow the current 14 days to be applied as intended.</p> <p>Quote: "We are notifying the public more than has ever been done in the past. Not only are there physical signs posted on a property, but amendments intended for introduction are posted on our website in advance of being introduced to the council, which is unlike amendments to standard bills. You can find that amendment here and you can see where there are amendments that will require a sign on the property and the advanced notice that an amendment will be introduced and the date it may be introduced: <a href="https://www.aacounty.org/county-council/council-zoning-app">https://www.aacounty.org/county-council/council-zoning-app</a>"</p> <p>Comment: The Amendment is posted on a totally separate website, i.e., not the Region's Comprehensive Zoning website that most would be used to using, e.g., Region 7   Region Plan Hub (<a href="http://arcgis.com">arcgis.com</a>). At least post the URL on the Region's Plan Hub. The application is still not available for public viewing. For transparency all applications need to be posted. The application for CZ-R7-GRA-601 was received by the County Council in late February and is still unavailable to the public, which is far more than 14 days. Perhaps the County Council should change the date for which late applications can be submitted?</p> <p>Quote: "As many of you have learned, Bill 26-24 also reduces the time that signs have to be posted from 14 days to 7 days due to the challenges that Regions 2 and 7 have faced with timing. This includes, the time a late application takes to process, our legislative meeting schedule, consideration and discussion of potential amendments, creation of the signs, pickup and placement of the signs, certification of the signs being posted, and the time it takes our staff to draft amendments once certification of sign placement is met. 14 days is essentially 30 days when you calculate all these steps."</p> <p>Comment: The statement, "...due to the challenges that Regions 2 and 7 have faced with timing" attempts to put responsibility for the late changes on those within the Region. When will A.A. County Government take responsibility for its poor communication process during Plan development? Furthermore, how gullible do you think the public is, "14 days is essentially 30 days when you calculate all these steps". The public doesn't have 14 days of awareness if the sign is only posted for 7 days and is the most visible means of notification. Remember, not everyone has computer access.</p> <p>Overall Conclusion: There is an overall lack of communication during the Comprehensive Zoning process. Ask yourselves what process changes are needed to avoid these late applications? If there had been sufficient communication, many of these applications would be unnecessary.</p> <p>Lingering questions: Do we owe "thanks" to the County Council for more notification than in the past when it is still insufficient; especially notification is codified? Is it not a reasonable expectation that additional resources are needed during Comprehensive Zoning, including additional County Council meetings?</p> <p>Ms. Amanda Fiedler's Volume 2, April 14, 2024 Newsletter, does not persuade me whatsoever to change my strong opposition to Bill 26-24. Government should work for all the people and not just serve a few.</p> <p>I urge all County Council members and all County residents to vehemently oppose Bill 26-24 regardless of the District in which you reside. Transparency is needed; not disenfranchisement.</p>
2024-04-15 10:59:47	Ruth	Jobe	Annapolis	MD	21401	Yes		BILL 26-24: Amendments to Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance – Notice	Oppose	<p>Submitted: April 15</p>
2024-04-14 21:47:47	Jamar	Adams	Jessup	MD	20794	Yes		BILL 7-24a: Comprehensive Zoning – Region 2	Oppose	<p>When my wife and I found Jessup we instantly fell in love. It was close to everything but still had a small town homey feel that was lacking everywhere else.</p> <p>But that feeling of home has been drifting away as we continue to see more businesses and cramped real estate continue to be built. While traffic and school crowding issues continue to go unsolved.</p> <p>You all preach you want what's best for residents but how does more gas stations, a new school already overcrowded, and forcing people into cramped living help anyone?</p> <p>Before deciding on zoning for region 2 of Jessup, please take a step back and think like a resident and not someone under the pressure of companies only interested in the bottom line.</p> <p>Jessup is an amazing place to live in and giving the green light for more construction would cause more flooding, traffic, emergency vehicle response times, and schools than we already have.</p> <p>Thank you, Jamar Adams</p>
2024-04-12 11:50:21	David	Corddry	Annapolis	Maryland	21401	Yes		BILL 9-24a: Comprehensive Zoning – Region 7	No position	<p>I want to follow up on oral testimony I made at the April 1st meeting. Thank you for your dedication and hard work sorting through the complex details of planning and zoning. Many stakeholders have conflicting views, which does not make the work fun or easy for you. Out of respect for your time, I will try to avoid repetition, and be succinct.</p> <p>The central point I tried to make on April 1 is that although the Ridgely Ave community largely agrees that increased density or change in type of development are unwanted, the voices that argued against a Sector plan, resulting in amendment 3, are a small but loud minority. Some of us who observed the SAC process saw the Sector plan as a positive outcome.</p> <p>Our community of Lindamoore (80+ households) had our annual community meeting this week. I can say now that it is not just some of us, but many of us. I don't know how many will make the effort to express their views directly to you. I hope it is many, and that they are brief, focused, and respectful. But the overwhelming response was support for the idea of a Sector plan and the opportunity it offers to create and lock in the best possible vision for the Ridgely Neighborhood. There was nary a voice for sticking our heads in the sand and hoping for the best, which is what removing the Sector plan seems to be.</p> <p>I have to acknowledge that the degree of mistrust we have seen and the use of alarming half-truths and innuendo by some in the neighborhood will remain a challenge and could make even the best managed planning process difficult. I get the feeling that OPZ may have, of "why bother/ great idea/ we tried, but not going to be worth it". You on the council have also had a taste (OK, a torrent) of the negativism and closed-mindedness that isn't likely to go away and may threaten the success of a Sector plan. However, I have also seen a core group of neighbors who recognize these challenges but nonetheless are committed and energetic to make this work. We may have been less visible, as we have not been flooding the zone with noise. But we are here if that influences your decision.</p>
2024-04-12 12:35:59	David	Corddry	Annapolis	Maryland	21401	Yes		BILL 9-24a: Comprehensive Zoning – Region 7	No position	<p>Again, I thank you for your consideration.</p> <p>I want to make one additional but critical point in addition to my earlier comment. In reading through comments from those opposing a sector plan that you received for the past two meetings, a common thread seems to be the assumption that embarking on a Sector Plan is tantamount to allowing increased development. I believe that is a logical fallacy. I have had direct discussion about this with people at OPZ, and my understanding is that a Sector Plan does not presuppose any change in zoning or development. I have made this point in the past (testimony to PAB) but not directly to you. So here it is. I think it is an important part of my argument that the upside of Sector plan outweighs the risks.</p> <p>Additionally, if the opposition to a sector plan is based on a faulty assumption, it seems to me that the opportunity to correct that assumption is an opportunity to mitigate the risk that the process is torpedoed by the disgruntled. I cannot stress enough that building some trust among stakeholders will be critical to making a Sector Plan worthwhile. There would be value to clear communication from OPZ and CC that a Sector plan is a path to finding and implementing the communities wishes and does not have an expectation that it will include development.</p>

Timestamp	First name	Last name	City	State	Zip code	Are you representing yourself?	Who are you representing?	Legislation	Position	Remarks
2024-04-14 21:29:28	Jumana	Gorman	Annapolis	MD	21401	Yes		BILL 9-24a: Comprehensive Zoning – Region 7	No position	<p>The community is in great agreement over what we don't want. However, the SAC process was not adequate to fully develop a positive vision, and thus recommended a sector plan as a process to do so. This was based on extensive input and discussion.</p> <p>There is a risk of leaving the door open to the influence of those who want to profit at the community's expense through development. This is alarming to some, and you have heard that alarm. I do not question the sincerity of those who are skeptical of the process, or those on Council who have heard and responded to those voices.</p> <p>My counterpoint is, if developing a sector plan leaves a door open, at least it is the front door, and we all are welcome to mind the foyer. If Mr. Krauss makes proposals via the front door, we will have an opportunity to engage and to push back. I like our chances at that in an open and above-board discussion.</p> <p>If we close that front door as amendment 3 would, who really believes he or others won't be poking around for a way in through the back door. I worry that that will be much harder to monitor, and will require vigilance for a much longer time. One of the speakers at the last meeting referenced that back door as a way that unfortunate things have happened in the past. There is an opportunity for better relative to the status quo.</p> <p>If this question is couched as a win-lose one for the community and the developers, amendment 3 is at best a small win for the community and a temporary loss for the developers. I think a Sector plan, if done well, offers a better opportunity for both.</p> <p>I hate to see the thoughtful work of the SAC tossed without due consideration. Is it possible to revisit amendment 3?</p>
2024-04-14 21:30:26	Eric	Gorman	Annapolis	MD	21401	Yes		BILL 9-24a: Comprehensive Zoning – Region 7	No position	<p>The community is in great agreement over what we don't want. However, the SAC process was not adequate to fully develop a positive vision, and thus recommended a sector plan as a process to do so. This was based on extensive input and discussion.</p> <p>There is a risk of leaving the door open to the influence of those who want to profit at the community's expense through development. This is alarming to some, and you have heard that alarm. I do not question the sincerity of those who are skeptical of the process, or those on Council who have heard and responded to those voices.</p> <p>My counterpoint is, if developing a sector plan leaves a door open, at least it is the front door, and we all are welcome to mind the foyer. If Mr. Krauss makes proposals via the front door, we will have an opportunity to engage and to push back. I like our chances at that in an open and above-board discussion.</p> <p>If we close that front door as amendment 3 would, who really believes he or others won't be poking around for a way in through the back door. I worry that that will be much harder to monitor, and will require vigilance for a much longer time. One of the speakers at the last meeting referenced that back door as a way that unfortunate things have happened in the past. There is an opportunity for better relative to the status quo.</p> <p>If this question is couched as a win-lose one for the community and the developers, amendment 3 is at best a small win for the community and a temporary loss for the developers. I think a Sector plan, if done well, offers a better opportunity for both.</p> <p>I hate to see the thoughtful work of the SAC tossed without due consideration. Is it possible to revisit amendment 3?</p>
2024-04-14 22:16:42	Jennifer	Lagrotteria	Annapolis	MD	21401	Yes		BILL 9-24a: Comprehensive Zoning – Region 7	Support	<p>Thank you for not considering upzoning for the Ridgely Corridor.</p> <p>In an effort to further protect Cove of Cork and the mitigate the environmental impact of any zoning changes to Region 7s Ridgely Corridor I am writing to request a delay in the vote on 8-24 and 9-24. 9-24 still refers to the Village Center Sector Plan for all of the Ridgely Avenue and Willow Avenue properties as follows: 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 recommendaons for tailored tools to guide future development in a manner that preserves the area's special character (type-o's as written in plan).</p> <p>I have been learning about the opportunities inherent to a sector plan when community members are included in the planning and believe it should be written back into 8-24.</p> <p>I, along with many of my neighbors, am very hopeful that the vote for the Region 7 Plan gets delayed so that the Ridgely Avenue corridor can have more time to better understand (and perhaps reinstate) the Village Overlay/Sector Plan and revisit the original Recommended Draft of Region 7 Plan that the SAC and OPZ worked so diligently on. Please consider delaying the vote so that our community can meet internally on April 22 to discuss this in more detail.</p> <p>Right now we can only submit testimony for 9-24A, but that amendment from April 1, 2024 is inconsistent with amendments to 8-24 as it pertains to the Village Center Sector Plan. But before any changes are made I believe the community should have more time to revisit the Recommended Draft of the Region 7 Plan, including the Sector Plan. Thank you.</p>
2024-04-15 5:57:55	Martha	Hartman	Annapolis	Md	21401	No	Community of Lindamoor	BILL 9-24a: Comprehensive Zoning – Region 7	Oppose	<p>Please deny any zoning requests for properties in the Ridgely corridor to go from residential (R2) to commercial (C2)</p>
2024-04-15 7:23:10	Jennifer	Lagrotteria	Annapolis	MD	21401	Yes		BILL 9-24a: Comprehensive Zoning – Region 7	Oppose	<p>I strongly oppose any up-zoning to the Ridgely Corridor, including Willow Road. Willow Road properties should not be rezoned to SB. I do not understand why Mr. Volke, from a different district, would be the one leading this since it's not his district. I previously stated that I was for 9-24a, but that was before I knew that it was about upzoning a specific piece (s) of property. We had already established the many reasons why upzoning is a horrible idea for this part of the region.</p> <p>No upzoning to Ridgely Corridor including Willow Road. I am writing to counteract my previous testimony which said I supported it. I do not. Not at all.</p>

Timestamp	First name	Last name	City	State	Zip code	Are you representing yourself?	Who are you representing?	Legislation	Position	Remarks
2024-04-15 8:04:58	Nancy	Guy	Annapolis	MD	21401	Yes		BILL 9-24a: Comprehensive Zoning – Region 7	Oppose	<p>I Nancy Guy 605 N Bestgaye Rd Annapolis, MD 21401 Strongly Oppose the Ridgely Avenue Village Center and Sector Plan. The Region 7 Plan must be changed to remove ALL references to the Village Center and Sector Plan. In addition, the County Council must amend the bills (Bill No. 8-24 and 9-24) to specifically state that they are not adopting any part of the Village Center and Sector Plan, including Example Strategy # 2 on pp. 78-79 of the Region 7 Plan (the Village Center and Sector Plan in disguise). Oppose the Ridgely Avenue Village Center and Sector Plan as they are not needed. It is not Smart Growth to develop what is largely a greenfield. This is a low-density residential (R2), Neighborhood Preservation Area and should remain that way. In addition, the plan does not support the environmental goals of the County. Oppose development in Weems Creek as it does not have public sewer and none is planned. The area also does not have adequate water pressure. The County has plenty of underutilized, already-developed areas with adequate public facilities, including the Annapolis Mall/Parole Town Center area where revitalization and redevelopment must be focused. Do not create more impervious surfaces!</p> <p>Oppose developers' and Office of Planning and Zoning's (OPZ's) drive toward higher-density properties and future intensification of zoning and use allowances as it is detrimental to the community. The Ridgely Avenue and Weems Creek Community must not be commercially developed.</p> <p>Oppose the Ridgely Avenue Village Center and Sector Plan as they will cause the loss of a quiet residential neighborhood with mature trees and wildlife; bring high density, low-income housing; bring traffic congestion, including bus traffic at all hours (see map with new bus stop at corner of Ridgely Avenue and N. Bestgate Road on p. 59); introduce all kinds of unneeded commercial businesses; cause water pressure problems; contribute to well contamination and failures; cause all sorts of pollution including stormwater runoff and sedimentation, septic pollution, light pollution, noise pollution, air pollution, and trash; bring drugs, vagrancy, and crime that doesn't exist in the area now; and more. Stop pressuring A. A. County landowners into unwanted and unnecessary development. Tell the County Council that the Anne Arundel Economic Development Corporation should not "aggressively market the Weems Creek Community to developers" as commercialization and high-density housing will have disastrous and permanent consequences for the area.</p> <p>Oppose commercial rezoning and further development and support R2 zoning throughout Weems Creek. Keep developers and land speculators from destroying the neighborhood for their financial gain!</p> <p>Oppose the Village Center and Sector Plan as it is not defined in County Code and will only bring more commercial development to the area. It is an unknown, undefined plan! As they have shown already, OPZ and the County Council will not be sensitive to individual property owners concerns!</p> <p>State that the fiscal notes for Bill No. 8-24 and 9-24 does not acknowledge development costs that always require taxpayer funding, i.e., infrastructure and services such as public sewer and water, new or improved roads, schools, fire, and police protection, etc.</p> <p>Support revitalization of already developed areas. Current development plans provide enough residential and commercial space to meet future needs. The County already has 10% commercial vacancies, and congestion and gridlock on existing roadways; the County cannot support additional development from a traffic perspective.</p> <p>Protect the natural environment, especially the tree canopy and greenfields. They are vital to psychological and physical health and well-being, purify the air, buffer noise, prevent sediment runoff, promote water quality, etc.</p> <p>Preserve the Weems Creek Community's historical and cultural resources (e.g., Ridgely Avenue School, historic Black communities, Native American use).</p> <p>Oppose future intensification of zoning and use allowances in the Weems Creek and Ridgely Avenue Community!</p>
2024-04-15 8:05:44	Ruth	Jobe	Annapolis	MD	21401	Yes		BILL 9-24a: Comprehensive Zoning – Region 7	Oppose	<p>Bill 9-24 - AN ORDINANCE concerning: Comprehensive Zoning – Region 7 Oppose: In its current format, the Zoning Consistency Change Table contains erroneous Tap Map Numbers in that many Tax Map numbers require an "alpha" letter to identify the specific property in SDAT. For example, CZ-GRA-R7 1246, Tax Map 45, Parcel 0782, 540 Francis Nicholson Way is identified in SDAT at Tax Map 045H. Another example: CZ-GRA-R7-1521, 6038 Admiral Dr, Tax Map 45, Parcel 0153 is found as Tax Map 045H. Many other properties are Tax Map 045F; not just Tax Map 45.</p> <p>By excluding the "alpha" letter for the Tax Map, a property may be incorrectly identified. Look at Riverview Avenue, Tax Map 45, Parcel 712. Using the Tax Map and Parcel numbers, SDAT shows this as a property on Severn Grove Road. It is only when Tax Map 45I, Parcel 712 is entered that Riverview Avenue is found. Furthermore, Tax Map 45I, Parcel 712 is also identified as 3 Riverview Avenue. If a property has the same Tax Map and Parcel number, it is unclear what is being rezoned. More detail is needed to ensure everyone is clear which properties the Zoning Consistency Table references.</p> <p>Before voting on Bill 9-24, the Office of Planning and Zoning should provide an explanation for why only two digits for the Tax Map are provided. It would be helpful to have the Tax Account Number(s) provided for cross-reference and accuracy. Only when properties are correctly identified can the related maps be issued.</p> <p>Submitted: April 15, 2024</p> <p>Submitted to: Anne Arundel County Council</p>
2024-04-15 9:06:04	Venetia	Bailey	Annapolis	Maryland	21401	Yes		BILL 9-24a: Comprehensive Zoning – Region 7	Oppose	<p>DO NOT PASS the Amendments to Bill 8 - 24. Nature PLEASE KEEP THE PUBLIC 'SECTOR PLAN' as recommended in the REGION 7 Recommendations.</p> <p>Ridgely Avenue needs to be protected and preserved. It is important that we promote safeguarding and insulate the environment from additional harm.</p> <p>Thank you for not allowing up-zoning for commercial growth. As a community we have a responsibility to protect the natural landscapes and resources from over development.</p> <p>Please delay ANY actions here so that more community involvement may be coordinated, and greater education on this matter may occur.</p> <p>Please enable our community to come together and follow the public sector plan process described in the Draft Region 7 Plan for the area.</p> <p>Request postponement of any decisions that would work the matter otherwise. Promoting legislation with insufficient consideration does more harm than good. Removing this from the recommendations is WRONG!</p> <p>We ask the council to deny any decisions that do not ensure greater protections and safeguards to existing residences and small businesses, the environment, our open spaces, and so many other aspects that need to be better understood and well preserved for this truly special place.</p> <p>As a community we MUST all act responsibly to safeguard our environment. Please help us SAVE Ridgely Avenue as the historic and cultural resource that it is! Thank you very much!</p>
2024-04-15 9:22:20	Marian	Jones	Annapolis	MD	21401	Yes		BILL 9-24a: Comprehensive Zoning – Region 7	Oppose	<p>I am in favor of low density residential zoning on Ridgely Ave and Willow Rd</p>
2024-04-15 10:15:04	Owen	Smith	Annapolis	MD	21401	Yes		BILL 9-24a: Comprehensive Zoning – Region 7	No position	<p>I am a strong proponent of the inclusion of language establishing sector planning resources in the Ridgely area of Region 7 in Plan2040. My feelings are shared by a large number of voting households in my neighborhood.</p> <p>Language calling for a sector plan was tortuously arrived at during the SAC and PAB Plan2040 process amidst a good faith and successful effort to accommodate the substantial concerns of residents about both unchecked development and untapped potential. This process, promoted by and important to the administration, should be respected.</p> <p>As one of the first zones in the county to undergo this longterm planning process, the precedent the Council sets here will be critical to the long-term success of the process in other zones. The future involvement of volunteers in other zones is dependent upon their faith that their time and work will be respected by the Council.</p> <p>The tiring and vocal minority, who at this stage continue to erroneously confuse the sector planning process with a pro development conspiracy were faithfully heard at every prior stage of the SAC and PAB Plan2040 process. Indeed and in fact, their most informed concerns are accommodated by the inclusion of sector planning language because many of those concerns are widely shared by area residents.</p> <p>The inclusion of the sector plan concept is indeed a triumph of both the SAC process and more broadly of civil society. The continued misunderstandings held by a vocal and at times uncivil minority have been a frustrating part of this process for all involved in the SAC and PAB process. It would be a tragedy to see the patient work done in the face of such contentious proceedings by the SAC, OPZ, and PAB stricken from Plan2040.</p> <p>I am Ridgely area resident, an involved father, a husband, a caretaker, and a neighbor. I am also a staunch and informed conservationist. The opportunity to participate in the sector plan process appeals to me in all of these capacities.</p> <p>Without a strong vision of what it actually wants, the Ridgely area will continue to be a place poorly served by its physical patchwork of municipal stewardships. With State roads, City water, and County representation, critical liaison work needed to properly govern the area needs a unifying vision. It's time for us to step up as neighbors. I am confident that the inclusion of sector plan language in Plan2040 gives us our best shot.</p>

