

Timestamp	First name	Last name	Email address	City	State	Zip Code	Are you representing yourself?	Legislation	Position	Remarks	Attachments
<b>Bill No. 8-24</b>											
2024-04-16 22:46:27	Janet	Babington	ajbabington@verizon.net	Pasadena	MD	21122	Yes	Bill No. 8-24a: General Development Plan – Region 7 Plan	Oppose	Roads and schools are not being taken into account, extra 300 townhomes means at least 600 or more cars will be added to the already enormous amount of traffic that Mountain Rd. can not handle. The community is not being considered and the people making the decision do not live or work here! We need more trees than houses!	
2024-05-01 9:16:08	Nancy	Guy	Nancyg410@aol.com	Annapolis	MD	21401	Yes	Bill No. 8-24a: General Development Plan – Region 7 Plan	Oppose	I Nancy guy 605 North Bestgate Road opposed bill number 8-24a. I strongly suggest that the County Council oppose this bill for it leaves in the Sector Plan and I also opposed the upzoning to SB for 2 Willow Road and any other unnumbered Willow Road parcel, that OPC should be directed to produce a revision of the region 7 plan to reflect the counselors change concerning the Ridgely Avenue area, and continue to OPPOSE to the Sector Plan in part because it is a totally undefined process with no stated procedure.	
2024-05-02 15:38:10	Catherine	Vieweg Taylor	CatherineLV@rocketmail.com	Pasadena	MD	21122	Yes	Bill No. 8-24a: General Development Plan – Region 7 Plan	Oppose	I oppose this bill because it does not do enough to protect the residents and residential interests of the Ridgely Avenue/Weems Creek area. People buy in residentially zoned areas to protect their right to the peaceful enjoyment of their homes and property. The County Council needs to better protect the quality of life of residents when considering zoning issues.	
2024-05-05 16:14:52	Ruth	Jobe	raj9409@netscape.net	Annapolis	MD	21401	Yes	Bill No. 8-24a: General Development Plan – Region 7 Plan	Oppose	<p>Opposition to upzoning in Region 7's Weems Creek/Ridgely Avenue community has been expressed continually during Region 7's Plan development and during County Council meetings. My position has not changed and is stronger than ever.</p> <p>The timing of the County Council's passing of Bills 92-23 and Bill 14-24 that greatly alters the zoning ordinance for Small Business (SB) districts, is suspect. This greatly disadvantaged Region 7 citizens who had no opportunity to consider the impact these changes would have during Plan development. Other Regions have that benefit.</p> <p>Timing is also an issue for the upzoning request contained within Bill 9-24. I strongly oppose any upzoning on Ridgely Avenue or Willow Road. It is well-known that this is still a rural, residential community, evidenced by lack of public sewer service, with none planned. Roads are narrow, two-lane double-striped roads. North Bestgate Road and Ridgely Avenue are the only means of ingress and egress. The watershed, including the Severn River, Weems Creek, and Luce Creek, are impacted by development.</p> <p>For justification of upzoning, some cite that the presence of the Weems Creek Medical Center and the Ridgely Oaks Professional Center are "commercial" uses, ignoring that these were built in the 1990's when R15 was the allowed zoning and medical offices were allowable uses. This was also a time that the Anne Arundel General Hospital was in a very crowded section of downtown Annapolis. Some will cite the presence of churches, another allowable use in residential areas. Neither citation are compelling reasons to upzone Ridgely Avenue or Willow Road. In fact, the entire area should be zoned as residential as it was always intended.</p> <p>I urge the County Council to vote "No" on Bills 8-24 and 9-24. Commercial development is the wrong move. Do the right thing for the community. Maintain residential zoning.</p>	
2024-05-05 18:12:06	Ruth	Jobe	raj9409@netscape.net	Annapolis	MD	21401	Yes	Bill No. 8-24a: General Development Plan – Region 7 Plan	Oppose	<p>I oppose any upzoning along the Ridgely Avenue corridor, including Willow Road. Turning this neighborhood into a commercial area is opposed. In fact, the area should be returned to its R2 zoning as the Small Business (SB) zoning was likely incorrectly applied to this connector road initially. The County Council should make a full investigation as to zoning impropriety in this area of the county. Developing a Sector Plan is opposed. It will not stop the developer; only zoning will. Only R2 zoning will protect this community, its history, and its environment.</p> <p>Only a "NO" vote from each member of the County Council is acceptable.</p>	
2024-05-05 20:41:30	Nancy	Guy	Nancyg410@aol.com	Annapolis Md.	Md	21401	Yes	Bill No. 8-24a: General Development Plan – Region 7 Plan	Oppose	<p>I, Nancy Guy oppose bill 8-24a General Development Plan -Region 7 Plan Weems Creek/ Ridgely Ave community and Willows Rd for it is a plan to give way to developers, the County Councils political constituents and feeds the pockets of contractors.</p> <p>This plan does not support the communities desire to leave the character of its community the way it has always been - a quite, close-knit community where families could bring up their child in a community that cares and knows and looks each other. Changing the zonings from R2 to SB or Commercial that are meant to be Residential will have a forever negative impact on the character, its land and the environment for decades to come. You will be destroying part of Historic Annapolis area for which will never be able to rebound as well as destroying the watersheds of the Severn River, Weems Creek and Luce Creek and the Chesapeake Bay. We don't even know what the plans are for building a second Bay Bridge and what that impact may be on the land etc around our community.</p> <p>I also oppose the Upzoning of 2 Willows Rd from R2 to SB for this road is NOT an arterial road and lacks public sewer, with none planned. This is still a rural, residential community. North Bestgate Rd and Ridgely Ave which are a two-lane roadway are the only way in and out of the community. We must protect our wildlife, tree canopy and preserve our land for destroying it only to feed the pockets of developers, contractors and to advance political officials is not in the best interest of the community for which the County Council members were sworn as their duty to serve. LISTEN TO THE RESIDENCE OF THE COMMUNITY AND OPPOSE THIS BILL. WE DO NOT WANT NOR NEED ANY UPZONING KEEP THE AREA RESIDENTIAL AND NO SECTOR PLAN.</p>	

Timestamp	First name	Last name	Email address	City	State	Zip Code	Are you representing yourself?	Legislation	Position	Remarks	Attachments
2024-05-05 21:14:53	Janice F.	Booth	janicebooth@gmail.com	Annapolis	MD	21401	Yes	Bill No. 8-24a: General Development Plan – Region 7 Plan	Oppose	NO UPZONING "I oppose any upzoning along the Ridgely Avenue corridor. Turning this neighborhood into a commercial area is opposed. In fact, the area should be returned to its R2 zoning as the Small Business (SB) zoning was likely incorrectly applied to this connector road initially. The County Council should make a full investigation as to zoning impropriety in this area of the county. Developing a Sector Plan is opposed. I also oppose the Section Plan fir Weems Creek-Ridgely Development.	
2024-05-05 21:33:40	Stephen	Hammond	stevehammond02@gmail.com	Annapolis	MD	21401	Yes	Bill No. 8-24a: General Development Plan – Region 7 Plan	Oppose	I would like to thank Councilmembers Rodvien and Smith for listening to the wishes of the residents of the Ridgely Ave. community. To Councilmembers Volke, Pickard, Hummer, Fiedler, and Leadbetter, I wish you would also respect the wishes of a majority of this community, not outside developers, and not upzone any more R2 to SB, or SB to Commercial. More commercial services are not needed in this area, as they already exist a short distance from this community. Thank you for taking your time to read this, and for your consideration. Steve	
2024-05-05 22:15:07	Jane	Malone	Nancyg410@aol.com	Annapolis	MD	21401	Yes	Bill No. 8-24a: General Development Plan – Region 7 Plan	Oppose	I Jsnd Malone, oppose any upzoning along the Ridgely Avenue corridor, including Willow Road. Turning this neighborhood into a commercial area is opposed. In fact, the area should be returned to its R2 zoning as the Small Business (SB) zoning was likely incorrectly applied to this connector road initially. The County Council should make a full investigation as to zoning impropriety in this area of the county. Developing a Sector Plan is opposed. It will not stop the developer; only zoning will. Only R2 zoning will protect this community, its history, and its environment.  Only a "NO" vote from each member of the County Council is acceptable.	
2024-05-05 22:24:55	Jane	Malone	Nancyg410@aol.com	Annapolis	MD	21401	Yes	Bill No. 8-24a: General Development Plan – Region 7 Plan	Oppose	I Jane Malone, oppose any upzoning along the Ridgely Avenue corridor, including Willow Road. Turning this neighborhood into a commercial area is opposed. In fact, the area should be returned to its R2 zoning as the Small Business (SB) zoning was likely incorrectly applied to this connector road initially. The County Council should make a full investigation as to zoning impropriety in this area of the county. Developing a Sector Plan is opposed. It will not stop the developer; only zoning will. Only R2 zoning will protect this community, its history, and its environment.  Only a "NO" vote from each member of the County Council is acceptable.	
2024-05-05 23:36:17	Jane	Malone	Nancyg410@aol.com	Annapolis	MD	21401	Yes	Bill No. 8-24a: General Development Plan – Region 7 Plan	Oppose	I Jane Malone, oppose any upzoning along the Ridgely Avenue corridor, including Willow Road. Turning this neighborhood into a commercial area is opposed. In fact, the area should be returned to its R2 zoning as the Small Business (SB) zoning was likely incorrectly applied to this connector road initially. The County Council should make a full investigation as to zoning impropriety in this area of the county. Developing a Sector Plan is opposed. It will not stop the developer; only zoning will. Only R2 zoning will protect this community, its history, and its environment.  Only a "NO" vote from each member of the County Council is acceptable.	
2024-05-06 5:09:09	Peggy	Hamilton	sixhamiltons@hotmail.com	Annapolis	MD	21401	Yes	Bill No. 8-24a: General Development Plan – Region 7 Plan	Oppose	I firmly oppose any upzoning along the Ridgely Avenue corridor, including Willow Road. The transformation of this neighborhood into a commercial area is unacceptable. Instead, I advocate for reverting the area to its original R2 zoning. It appears that the Small Business (SB) zoning was erroneously applied to this connector road initially, and the County Council should conduct a thorough investigation into this zoning impropriety within our county. While the idea of developing a Sector Plan may be on the table, I remain opposed. Such a plan won't effectively halt the developer' s intentions; only zoning regulations can provide genuine protection. R2 zoning is the key to safeguarding this community, preserving its history, and maintaining a healthy environment. I firmly believe that a unanimous "NO" vote from each member of the County Council is the only acceptable outcome.	
2024-05-06 5:39:38	Linda	Garcia	garcia8865@comcast.net	Annapolis	MD	21403	Yes	Bill No. 8-24a: General Development Plan – Region 7 Plan	Oppose	I oppose upzoning from R2 to SB for 2 Willow Rd/Willow Rd (CZ-R7-GRA-601). More specifically I oppose the amendment that changes the planned land use for the properties known as Parcels 158 and 159 on Tax Map 45H, located at (no number) Willow Road and 2 Willow Road, Annapolis, from Low Density Residential to Commercial.	

Timestamp	First name	Last name	Email address	City	State	Zip Code	Are you representing yourself?	Legislation	Position	Remarks	Attachments
2024-05-06 8:16:12	Ruth	Jobe	raj9409@netscape.net	Annapolis	MD	21401	Yes	Bill No. 8-24a: General Development Plan – Region 7 Plan	Oppose	<p>Regardless of the outcome of the vote on May 6th for Bills 8-24 and 9-24, which I oppose, many serious, lingering questions remain. Here are a few:</p> <p>Did the Office of Planning and Zoning illegally zone properties on Ridgely Avenue as "Small Business", when prior to the passage of Bill 92-23, the zoning required an "arterial" roadway? As a connector road, Ridgely Avenue did not qualify for Small Business zoning. Will the County Council or the Office of Law conduct an investigation?</p> <p>It is known that Ms. Fiedler and Mr. Volke jointly introduced Bill 92-23 proposing changes to the Small Business Ordinance, including road classifications. Ms. Fiedler and Mr. Volke, who approached you about introducing this legislation? Who drafted the initial legislation and subsequent amendment(s)? Did any owner or representative of the Ridgely Avenue or Willow Road properties request the legislation? What is your relationship to them? Have you received campaign contributions from the owner or anyone conducting business on their behalf, e.g., attorneys, lobbyists, etc.?</p> <p>Is the County Council aware that one of the Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC) members, representing Weems Creek has a known financial relationship with one of the Ridgely Avenue owners as well as maintains a personal friendship? No recusal was ever stated by this individual during broadcast SAC meetings.</p> <p>Why is a Sector Plan proposed for Ridgely Avenue area? Have you been unduly influenced in any way? Why do the proposed boundaries encompass current R2 properties on Ridgely? Have the owners been informed by the County by any direct communication?</p> <p>For any County Council member that went to the Ridgely Avenue/Willow Rd properties, did you view the properties as a group or individually? Did any owner or owner's representative accompany you or participate in any way during your visit? Did you also contact the residential owners to give them the same courtesy of a visit? If not, why not?</p> <p>Why does the County Council not respond to comments submitted either online or during testimony? How do those that submitted comments know that the comments were read and considered? One only gets a confirmation of receipt when submitting online.</p> <p>Why did it take multiple requests to get a copy of the Application for CZ-R7-GRA-601? Why was this not available online?</p> <p>How does the Office of Planning and Zoning and the County Council intend to make process improvements to the Region Plan process? Will a Lessons Learned meeting be held with the Districts?</p> <p>What would convince you to ensure that Ridgely Avenue/Willow Road remains as "residential"? Did you already reach a conclusion long before reading or listening to testimony?</p> <p>As mentioned early on, there is general mistrust in the Weems Creek/Ridgely Avenue community by residents. The developers do NOT live in this community. What actions have you taken or will you take to restore trust? Voting "No" on Bills 8-24 and 9-24 would be a start. Vote "No" on upzoning 2 Willow Rd/Willow Rd (Amendment 5) from R2 to SB. Remember, the current use is residential rental; not small business. Vote "No" on the Sector Plan and maintain the exclusion of a Village Center.</p>	

Timestamp	First name	Last name	Email address	City	State	Zip Code	Are you representing yourself?	Legislation	Position	Remarks	Attachments
2024-05-06 8:39:04	Dorothy	Guy	dmguy13@aol.com	Annapolis	MD	21401	Yes	Bill No. 8-24a: General Development Plan – Region 7 Plan	Oppose	<p>May 6, 2024. My name is Dorothy Guy, 605 N. Bestgate Rd. I am opposed to Bills 8-24a and 9-24a because the Region 7 Plan, approvals of requested upzoning on planned land uses, and approvals of requested upzoning several properties will commercialize Ridgely Avenue and the Weems Creek Area. I ask that this Council AMEND these Bills before voting on them tonight. I ask that the Council amend the bills to: 1) deny upzoning of planned land uses, 2) deny all upzoning requests in the Ridgely Avenue and Weems Creek Area including those for 2 Willow Road, the unnumbered parcel on Willow Road, and 617 and 623 Ridgely Avenue, 3) deny upzoning from R2 to SB for the properties known as Parcels 158 and 159 on Tax map 45, Tax Account Numbers 02-000-09462600 and 02-000-90048560, 4) delete the Sector Plan for Ridgely Avenue from the Region 7 Plan, and 5) correct the property boundaries for the Willow Road properties on the map that was presented in an amendment three (3) weeks ago. If you won't amend Bills 8-24a and 9-24a, then please vote against them. I also encourage the Council to require/direct/recommend that OPZ to produce a final version of the Region 7 plan that makes all the changes to the Plan that the Council ultimately approves, if the Council does not vote against the Region 7 Plan, and vote against upzoning requests for planned land uses and properties in the Ridgely Avenue and Weems Creek Area.</p> <p>Three (3) weeks ago, OPZ should have opposed the upzoning on the Willow Road properties; that is consistent with their and the Planning Advisory Board's other recommendations opposing upzoning in this area. This area is a Neighborhood Preservation Area and you don't preserve a neighborhood of predominantly single-family homes by commercializing it. The justification for upzoning the Willow Road properties was based on the Region 7 Plan including a Village Center; that is not happening now because of the amendment that deleted it. It is a falsehood that much of the surrounding area is commercial; it isn't. The justifications for upzoning other properties on Ridgely Ave and in Weems Creek was based on a falsehood that the area is predominantly commercial; it isn't. The 2022 Master Water and Sewer Service Plan (2022 MWSSP), which this Council approved in Bill No. 53-22, June 6, 2022 with an effective date of July 19, 2022, clearly shows that Ridgely Avenue has NO PUBLIC SEWER SERVICE. NONE IS PLANNED; NONE IS BUDGETED. The 2022 MWSPP also shows that this area has INADEQUATE WATER PRESSURE FROM THE BROAD CREEK 210 WATER PRESSURE ZONE WITH NO SOLUTION. The City of Annapolis has openly stated that it will not provide additional water service; the County has no plans or budget to upgrade water service to the area. County taxpayers should not have to pay for commercial development. Moreover, a good portion of land in this area is undeveloped. It is GREEDY OVERCONSUMPTION OF OPEN LAND to develop this area. The Parole Town Center is already slated for dense development and many other already developed areas need to be revitalized. We don't need or want more commercialization in the area. Commercialization of Ridgely Avenue and Weems Creek will cause a litany of negative environmental and social impacts--which have been discussed at length in previous testimony. Federal funding is going to be provided for the preservation and improvement of Weems Creek. We should preserve it and Cove of Cork and Luce Creek to the north by preserving the open land uphill from these waterways. We don't need more concrete and built areas in Anne Arundel County. We need the natural environment; we deserve the natural environment. Keep it; don't develop it. Period.</p>	<a href="https://www.aacounty.org/system/files/webform/cc_legislative_testimony/24143/2024-05-06%20Bills%208-24a%20and%209-24a%20Opposition.pdf">https://www.aacounty.org/system/files/webform/cc_legislative_testimony/24143/2024-05-06%20Bills%208-24a%20and%209-24a%20Opposition.pdf</a>
2024-05-06 8:40:43	Robert	Scanlon	RSScanlon2020@gmail.com	Annapolis	MD	21403	Yes	Bill No. 8-24a: General Development Plan – Region 7 Plan	Oppose	"I oppose any upzoning along the Ridgely Avenue corridor.	
2024-05-06 9:26:20	Ruth	Jobe	raj9409@netscape.net	Annapolis	MD	21401	Yes	Bill No. 8-24a: General Development Plan – Region 7 Plan	Oppose	<p>I oppose Bill 8-24. Any upzoning in the Weems Creek/Ridgely Avenue/Willow Road area is in direct conflict with Plan2040's Policy as greenfields encompass this area and will be disturbed by commercial activity/upzoning.</p> <p>"Policy BE13.4: Adopt land use policies and plans that prioritize and incentivize development and revitalization of grayfields and brownfields properties over new greenfields development." (See Plan 2040, Page 51.)</p>	

Timestamp	First name	Last name	Email address	City	State	Zip Code	Are you representing yourself?	Legislation	Position	Remarks	Attachments
										<p>I thank the County Council for putting forth amendments to remove all references to the Village Center [including but not limited to Village Center(s), village center(s)] in Bill 8-24.</p> <p>I remain opposed to all upzoning in the Ridgely Avenue/Weems Creek area. Despite what some members of the community may suggest, this is a vibrant, vital neighborhood—not a commercial or business district. Ridgely Avenue is a connector road—not an arterial road—and, therefore, does not legally qualify for additional development. As has been reiterated in testimony submitted by various parties, the Ridgely Avenue/Weems Creek area sits on a peninsula and is a fragile, historic, environmental area that must be PRESERVED, CONSERVED AND PROTECTED!! The area already has a wealth of issues with the traffic, storm water management, silt, clean water pressure, safety, medical buildings, churches, schools, etc. In comparison to other areas within Region 7 which had multiple meetings with OPZ, the Ridgely Avenue/Weems Creek area had ONE public meeting and when additional meetings were requested, OPZ denied the request. AND previously, OPZ agreed to no upzoning in the Ridgely Avenue/Weems Creek area.</p> <p>I remain opposed to the sector plan as it is an undefined process, does not provide a specific goal, has never been used in the County, would require taxpayer funding (and OPZ has already said it has limited resources!), etc. Especially concerning is that it does not specify the composition of the sector plan committee. Such a committee must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Be composed of individual residents and families who are committed to preserving the neighborhood, environment, and availability and adequacy of public services (water, safety, etc.); and</li> <li>•NOT be composed of “other” stakeholders (e.g., developers, businesses, commercial entities, and others interested in money, wealth, and flexing their political influence).</li> </ul> <p>That said, the County and County Council must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Ensure that all digital maps are accurate, up to date, and published on the Office of Planning and Zoning website;</li> <li>•Ensure that OPZ publishes and makes readily available the Anne Arundel County Region 7 Plan FINAL document with all amendments included rather than allow the current draft-final plan to remain on the OPZ website!</li> <li>•Hold owners of dilapidated properties accountable and get them up to code—they should not be allowed to degrade the neighborhood for their future profit.</li> </ul> <p>IMPORTANT CLARIFICATIONS: The two properties on Willow Road have BEEN RESIDENTIAL FOR MANY YEARS and were NEVER designated commercial or small business. And they must not be upzoned now, especially since the justification for upzoning included the Village Center AND THE VILLAGE CENTER language has been removed from the Region 7 Plan!! The current owner of the properties bought both lots as R2, they are being used as residential, and they should remain residential (R2). Thank you.</p>	
2024-05-06 10:05:07	Mary	Guy	mguy3208@gmail.com	Annapolis	MD	21401	Yes	Bill No. 8-24a: General Development Plan – Region 7 Plan	Oppose		
2024-05-06 10:44:58	Trisha	Thomas	tstthomas00@yahoo.com	Annapolis	Md	21403	Yes	Bill No. 8-24a: General Development Plan – Region 7 Plan	Oppose		
<b>Bill No. 9-24</b>											
2024-05-01 9:18:09	Nancy	Guy	Nancyg410@aol.com	Annapolis	MD	21012	Yes	Bill No. 9-24a: Comprehensive Zoning – Region 7	Oppose	I Nancy Guy 605 North Bestgate Road opposed bill number 8-24a. I strongly suggest that the County Council oppose this bill for it leaves in the Sector Plan and and I also opposed the upzoning to SB for 2 Willow Road and any other unnumbered Willow Road parcel, that OPC should be directed to produce a revision of the region 7 plan to reflect the counselors change concerning the Ridgely Avenue area, and continue to OPPOSEto the Sector Plan in part because it is a totally undefined process with no stated procedure.	
2024-05-02 15:39:15	Catherine	Vieweg Taylor	CatherineLV@rocketmail.com	Pasadena	MD	21122	Yes	Bill No. 9-24a: Comprehensive Zoning – Region 7	Oppose	I oppose this bill because it does not do enough to protect the residents and residential interests of the Ridgely Avenue/Weems Creek area. People buy in residentially zoned areas to protect their right to the peaceful enjoyment of their homes and property. The County Council needs to better protect the quality of life of residents when considering zoning issues.	



Timestamp	First name	Last name	Email address	City	State	Zip Code	Are you representing yourself?	Legislation	Position	Remarks	Attachments
2024-05-05 16:38:44	Ruth	Jobe	raj9409@netscape.net	Annapolis	MD	21401	Yes	Bill No. 9-24a: Comprehensive Zoning – Region 7	Oppose	<p>I hope the County Council will prove my expectations wrong during the May 6, 2024 vote on Bills 8-24 and 9-24. Despite consistently expressing opposition to the Sector Plan and any upzoning on Ridgely Avenue/Willow Road, I suspect that what is most likely to occur is the County Council will overwhelmingly favor developers/commercial interests over the residential community even when the residential community has expressed opposition to upzoning throughout the Region Plan development process.</p> <p>This favoritism is particularly visible in the Region 7 Plan, especially in the Weems Creek/Ridgely Avenue community. With no public sewers (none planned), septic service only, with water pressure and service issues, with known environmental concerns to the watershed (Severn River, Weems Creek, Luce Creek), traffic capacity issues with two-lane double striped roads, ingress and egress limited to North Bestgate Road, and the Weems Creek draw bridge, the County Council presses forward with Bills 8-24 and 9-24 and Amendments that favor commercial interests. A Zoning Amendment introduced by a Council Member not residing in the District where the property is located, i.e., Willow Road further erodes any public trust remaining. Amendment No. 5 is an affront to residents; especially to those with long-term interests that continuously owned residential property on Willow Road since the 1960's while the developer only recently purchased in 2021. The upzoning request for CZ-R7-GRA-601 from R2 to SB is strongly OPPOSED.</p> <p>Passage of Bills 92-23 and 14-24 related to the Small Business Zoning Ordinance did nothing to assist the residential community - a situation that must be rectified by those of good character and conscience, not those politically motivated.</p> <p>I hope the County Council will use its common sense and vote "NO" on Bills 8-24 and 9-24 before irreparable damage is done to the environment, the neighborhood, and the community.</p>	
2024-05-05 18:01:45	Ruth	Jobe	raj9409@netscape.net	Annapolis	MD	21401	Yes	Bill No. 9-24a: Comprehensive Zoning – Region 7	Oppose	<p>I oppose Bill 9-24 including Amendment 5. Exhibit C's Justification Statement is misleading, Plan2040 Goal HE2 that's used as justification, is INCONSISTENT with Goals BE3 and BE4 that establish recommendations to protect the character of existing communities and Peninsula Policy Areas.</p> <p>Remember, this area is a designated Neighborhood Preservation Areas that, by definition, primarily limits new development with public investments in walking and biking infrastructure, parks, and schools. A change in zoning is not needed for infrastructure improvements. Given a choice, it is likely that the Ridgely Avenue Community would prefer doing without the infrastructure improvements to maintain the residential character and to avoid the taking of anyone's land for such improvements.</p> <p>If upzoned, there will be visual conflict and noise, fumes and light impacts of intensive non-residential areas on residential neighborhoods. There are other residential properties directly opposite 2 Willow Rd/Willow Road and another that shares a common boundary. Those R2 properties have been totally ignored. Do you want to have your house share a common boundary with a commercial use, e.g., a 40 ft. tall structure, a restaurant with outdoor dining, a convenience store, and with people and vehicles coming in and out all hours of the day and night? No buffer is offered to the residentially zoned property. Remember, Bills 92-23 and 14-24 unfavorably changed the bulk regulations for small business, including lot lines, signage, and architectural features.</p> <p>It is a well-known goal of this developer to purchase more and more land in this corridor. If 2 Willow Rd/Willow Rd is upzoned to SB, what recourse will any of the remaining R2 landowners/residents have? What protections are available to them? Seems like a strategy to force people out.</p> <p>As a multi-generation owner, I ask that you put political interests aside and protect the residents that have invested so much of their lives in the local area and who choose to age in place as others before them and others to come. We know that the County has an excess of commercial real estate by at stated 10%. We don't need more. Shopping at the Parole Town Center and/or Annapolis is nearby. Is it worth disrupting the entire community to provide more commercial uses? I think not.</p> <p>A "yes" vote for Bill 9-24 sends a clear message to the community that only developers and those with attorneys and lobbyists representing them matter; residential interests do not. I urge a "no" vote from all County Council members. Support residents with your "no" vote.</p>	

Timestamp	First name	Last name	Email address	City	State	Zip Code	Are you representing yourself?	Legislation	Position	Remarks	Attachments
2024-05-05 21:16:41	Nancy	Guy	Nancyg410@aol.com	Annapolis Md.	Md	21401	Yes	Bill No. 9-24a: Comprehensive Zoning – Region 7	Oppose	<p>I, Nancy Guy STRONGLY OPPOSE the upzoning and the Sector plan for our community. You, the County Council are NOT supporting the wishes of the people to which you are supposed to serve come. We as a community from DAY 1 have made it known upzoning and a Sector plan is NOT NEEDED OR WANTED. Even the OPZ was opposed to upzoning and a Sector plan but favoritism has now set in with developers and political constituents. With no public sewer only septic service, with water pressure issues and known environmental watershed issues in the Severn River, Luce Creek and Weems Creek, traffic capacity issues leading in and out the the area along North Betgate and Ridgely Ave with is a two-lane road way and the Weems Creek Draw Bridge leaves the community already congested especially when there is events in the Annaplis area. I.E. Naval Academy graduations, football games, or even when with community schools traffic, etc. Upzoning in and around the WEEMS Creek, Ridgely Ave, North Bestgate rd and Willows Rd is not warrented or needed. Upzoning from residential to commerical or small business will forever change the charcter of our land. We must develop in areas throughout the county for which have already been developed but are not currently in use. Protect and preserve our land for our next generation to enjoy. Destroying it will never help further generations.</p> <p>I respectfully ask that you please honor those who live in the communities and DO THE RIGHT THING "OPPOSE" THIS BILL 9-24a.</p>	

Timestamp	First name	Last name	Email address	City	State	Zip Code	Are you representing yourself?	Legislation	Position	Remarks	Attachments
										<p>I Jane Malone, 605 N Bestgate 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).</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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! 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 allowal 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).</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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>	



Timestamp	First name	Last name	Email address	City	State	Zip Code	Are you representing yourself?	Legislation	Position	Remarks	Attachments
2024-05-06 5:10:04	Peggy	Hamilton	sixhamiltons@hotmail.com	Annapolis	MD	21401	Yes	Bill No. 9-24a: Comprehensive Zoning – Region 7	Oppose	<p>I strongly oppose Bill 9-24, including Amendment 5. The justification statement in Exhibit C is misleading, and the use of Plan2040 Goal HE2 as justification is inconsistent with Goals BE3 and BE4, which aim to protect the character of existing communities and Peninsula Policy Areas. This area is designated as a Neighborhood Preservation Area, which primarily limits new development in favor of public investments in walking and biking infrastructure, parks, and schools. Infrastructure improvements do not require a change in zoning. Given the choice, the Ridgely Avenue Community would likely prefer to maintain its residential character and avoid any land takings for infrastructure.</p> <p>If upzoned, there will be visual conflicts, noise, fumes, and light impacts from intensive non-residential areas on residential neighborhoods. Other residential properties directly opposite 2 Willow Rd/Willow Road have been ignored. Imagine having your house share a boundary with a 40 ft. tall structure, a restaurant with outdoor dining, or a convenience store, with people and vehicles coming and going at all hours. No buffer is offered to the residentially zoned property. Bills 92-23 and 14-24 also negatively changed bulk regulations for small businesses.</p> <p>It's well-known that the developer aims to acquire more land in this corridor. If 2 Willow Rd/Willow Rd is upzoned to SB, what recourse will remaining R2 landowners/residents have? What protections are available to them? It seems like a strategy to force people out.</p> <p>As a multi-generation owner, I implore you to prioritize residents over political interests. Many have invested their lives in this local area and choose to age in place. The County already has excess commercial real estate (approximately 10%). We don't need more. Shopping centers in Parole and Annapolis are nearby. Disrupting the entire community for additional commercial uses is not worth it.</p> <p>A "yes" vote for Bill 9-24 sends a clear message that only developers and those with attorneys and lobbyists matter; residential interests do not. I urge all County Council members to vote "no" and support residents.</p>	
2024-05-06 5:41:29	Linda	Garcia	garcia8865@comcast.net	Annapolis	MD	21403	Yes	Bill No. 9-24a: Comprehensive Zoning – Region 7	Oppose	<p>I oppose upzoning from R2 to SB for 2 Willow Rd/Willow Rd (CZ-R7-GRA-601). More specifically I oppose the amendment that changes the planned land use for the properties known as Parcels 158 and 159 on Tax Map 45H, located at (no number) Willow Road and 2 Willow Road, Annapolis, from Low Density Residential to Commercial.</p>	

Timestamp	First name	Last name	Email address	City	State	Zip Code	Are you representing yourself?	Legislation	Position	Remarks	Attachments
2024-05-06 8:17:50	Ruth	Jobe	raj9409@netscape.net	Annapolis	MD	21401	Yes	Bill No. 9-24a: Comprehensive Zoning – Region 7	Oppose	<p>Regardless of the outcome of the vote on May 6th for Bills 8-24 and 9-24, which I oppose, many serious, lingering questions remain. Here are a few:</p> <p>Did the Office of Planning and Zoning illegally zone properties on Ridgely Avenue as "Small Business", when prior to the passage of Bill 92-23, the zoning required an "arterial" roadway? As a connector road, Ridgely Avenue did not qualify for Small Business zoning. Will the County Council or the Office of Law conduct an investigation?</p> <p>It is known that Ms. Fiedler and Mr. Volke jointly introduced Bill 92-23 proposing changes to the Small Business Ordinance, including road classifications. Ms. Fiedler and Mr. Volke, who approached you about introducing this legislation? Who drafted the initial legislation and subsequent amendment(s)? Did any owner or representative of the Ridgely Avenue or Willow Road properties request the legislation? What is your relationship to them? Have you received campaign contributions from the owner or anyone conducting business on their behalf, e.g., attorneys, lobbyists, etc.?</p> <p>Is the County Council aware that one of the Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC) members, representing Weems Creek has a known financial relationship with one of the Ridgely Avenue owners as well as maintains a personal friendship? No recusal was ever stated by this individual during broadcast SAC meetings.</p> <p>Why is a Sector Plan proposed for Ridgely Avenue area? Have you been unduly influenced in any way? Why do the proposed boundaries encompass current R2 properties on Ridgely? Have the owners been informed by the County by any direct communication?</p> <p>For any County Council member that went to the Ridgely Avenue/Willow Rd properties, did you view the properties as a group or individually? Did any owner or owner's representative accompany you or participate in any way during your visit? Did you also contact the residential owners to give them the same courtesy of a visit? If not, why not?</p> <p>Why does the County Council not respond to comments submitted either online or during testimony? How do those that submitted comments know that the comments were read and considered? One only gets a confirmation of receipt when submitting online.</p> <p>Why did it take multiple requests to get a copy of the Application for CZ-R7-GRA-601? Why was this not available online?</p> <p>How does the Office of Planning and Zoning and the County Council intend to make process improvements to the Region Plan process? Will a Lessons Learned meeting be held with the Districts?</p> <p>What would convince you to ensure that Ridgely Avenue/Willow Road remains as "residential"? Did you already reach a conclusion long before reading or listening to testimony?</p> <p>As mentioned early on, there is general mistrust in the Weems Creek/Ridgely Avenue community by residents. The developers do NOT live in this community. What actions have you taken or will you take to restore trust? Voting "No" on Bills 8-24 and 9-24 would be a start. Vote "No" on upzoning 2 Willow Rd/Willow Rd (Amendment 5) from R2 to SB. Remember, the current use is residential rental; not small business. Vote "No" on the Sector Plan and maintain the exclusion of a Village Center.</p>	

Timestamp	First name	Last name	Email address	City	State	Zip Code	Are you representing yourself?	Legislation	Position	Remarks	Attachments
2024-05-06 8:40:20	Dorothy	Guy	dmguy13@aol.com	Annapolis	MD	21401	Yes	Bill No. 9-24a: Comprehensive Zoning – Region 7	Oppose	<p>May 6, 2024. My name is Dorothy Guy, 605 N. Bestgate Rd. I am opposed to Bills 8-24a and 9-24a because the Region 7 Plan, approvals of requested upzoning on planned land uses, and approvals of requested upzoning several properties will commercialize Ridgely Avenue and the Weems Creek Area. I ask that this Council AMEND these Bills before voting on them tonight. I ask that the Council amend the bills to: 1) deny upzoning of planned land uses, 2) deny all upzoning requests in the Ridgely Avenue and Weems Creek Area including those for 2 Willow Road, the unnumbered parcel on Willow Road, and 617 and 623 Ridgely Avenue, 3) deny upzoning from R2 to SB for the properties known as Parcels 158 and 159 on Tax map 45, Tax Account Numbers 02-000-09462600 and 02-000-90048560, 4) delete the Sector Plan for Ridgely Avenue from the Region 7 Plan, and 5) correct the property boundaries for the Willow Road properties on the map that was presented in an amendment three (3) weeks ago. If you won't amend Bills 8-24a and 9-24a, then please vote against them. I also encourage the Council to require/direct/recommend that OPZ to produce a final version of the Region 7 plan that makes all the changes to the Plan that the Council ultimately approves, if the Council does not vote against the Region 7 Plan, and vote against upzoning requests for planned land uses and properties in the Ridgely Avenue and Weems Creek Area.</p> <p>Three (3) weeks ago, OPZ should have opposed the upzoning on the Willow Road properties; that is consistent with their and the Planning Advisory Board's other recommendations opposing upzoning in this area. This area is a Neighborhood Preservation Area and you don't preserve a neighborhood of predominantly single-family homes by commercializing it. The justification for upzoning the Willow Road properties was based on the Region 7 Plan including a Village Center; that is not happening now because of the amendment that deleted it. It is a falsehood that much of the surrounding area is commercial; it isn't. The justifications for upzoning other properties on Ridgely Ave and in Weems Creek was based on a falsehood that the area is predominantly commercial; it isn't. The 2022 Master Water and Sewer Service Plan (2022 MWSSP), which this Council approved in Bill No. 53-22, June 6, 2022 with an effective date of July 19, 2022, clearly shows that Ridgely Avenue has NO PUBLIC SEWER SERVICE. NONE IS PLANNED; NONE IS BUDGETED. The 2022 MWSPP also shows that this area has INADEQUATE WATER PRESSURE FROM THE BROAD CREEK 210 WATER PRESSURE ZONE WITH NO SOLUTION. The City of Annapolis has openly stated that it will not provide additional water service; the County has no plans or budget to upgrade water service to the area. County taxpayers should not have to pay for commercial development. Moreover, a good portion of land in this area is undeveloped. It is GREEDY OVERCONSUMPTION OF OPEN LAND to develop this area. The Parole Town Center is already slated for dense development and many other already developed areas need to be revitalized. We don't need or want more commercialization in the area. Commercialization of Ridgely Avenue and Weems Creek will cause a litany of negative environmental and social impacts--which have been discussed at length in previous testimony. Federal funding is going to be provided for the preservation and improvement of Weems Creek. We should preserve it and Cove of Cork and Luce Creek to the north by preserving the open land uphill from these waterways. We don't need more concrete and built areas in Anne Arundel County. We need the natural environment; we deserve the natural environment. Keep it; don't develop it. Period.</p>	<a href="https://www.aacounty.org/system/files/webform/cc_legislative_testimony/24144/2024-05-06%20Bills%208-24a%20and%209-24a%20Opposition.pdf">https://www.aacounty.org/system/files/webform/cc_legislative_testimony/24144/2024-05-06%20Bills%208-24a%20and%209-24a%20Opposition.pdf</a>
2024-05-06 9:27:42	Ruth	Jobe	raj9409@netscape.net	Annapolis	MD	21401	Yes	Bill No. 9-24a: Comprehensive Zoning – Region 7	Oppose	<p>I oppose Bill 9-24. Any upzoning in the Weems Creek/Ridgely Avenue/Willow Road area is in direct conflict with Plan2040's Policy as greenfields encompass this area and will be disturbed by commercial activity/upzoning.</p> <p>"Policy BE13.4: Adopt land use policies and plans that prioritize and incentivize development and revitalization of grayfields and brownfields properties over new greenfields development." (See Plan 2040, Page 51.)</p>	
2024-05-06 10:00:43	Chris	Marshall	cmarshal@live.com	Annapolis	Maryland	21401	Yes	Bill No. 9-24a: Comprehensive Zoning – Region 7	Oppose	<p>I am writing to strongly oppose several of the zoning changes included in Bill No. 9-24. Specifically, CZ-R7-GRA-019, which allows for development of the Liberty Marina site would exacerbate the ongoing traffic problems on Route 2 and threaten the critical environmental area on the shores of the South River. CZ-R7-GRA-010, which zones an area next to the environmentally sensitive Broad Creek Park to TC would allow denser development than Riva Rd. and the current infrastructure can support. Finally, CZ-R7-GRA-011 would allow development in an extremely congested part of Riva Rd. that has seen explosive growth over the last few years. These proposed changes do not have the existing road infrastructure in place to support them, threaten critical environmental resources, and are not in the best interest of the community; I urge you to reject them. Thank you for your consideration.</p>	

Timestamp	First name	Last name	Email address	City	State	Zip Code	Are you representing yourself?	Legislation	Position	Remarks	Attachments
										<p>I thank the County Council for putting forth amendments to remove all references to the Village Center [including but not limited to Village Center(s), village center(s)] in Bill 8-24.</p> <p>I remain opposed to all upzoning in the Ridgely Avenue/Weems Creek area. Despite what some members of the community may suggest, this is a vibrant, vital neighborhood—not a commercial or business district. Ridgely Avenue is a connector road—not an arterial road—and, therefore, does not legally qualify for additional development. As has been reiterated in testimony submitted by various parties, the Ridgely Avenue/Weems Creek area sits on a peninsula and is a fragile, historic, environmental area the must be PRESERVED, CONSERVED AND PROTECTED!! The area already has a wealth of issues with the traffic, storm water management, silt, clean water pressure, safety, medical buildings, churches, schools, etc. In comparison to other areas within Region 7 which had multiple meetings with OPZ, the Ridgely Avenue/Weems Creek area had ONE public meeting and when additional meetings were requested, OPZ denied the request. AND previously, OPZ agreed to no upzoning in the Ridgely Avenue/Weems Creek area.</p> <p>I remain opposed to the sector plan as it is an undefined process, does not provide a specific goal, has never been used in the County, would require taxpayer funding (and OPZ has already said it has limited resources!), etc. Especially concerning is that it does not specify the composition of the sector plan committee. Such a committee must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Be composed of individual residents and families who are committed to preserving the neighborhood, environment, and availability and adequacy of public services (water, safety, etc.); and</li> <li>•NOT be composed of “other” stakeholders (e.g., developers, businesses, commercial entities, and others interested in money, wealth, and flexing their political influence).</li> </ul> <p>That said, the County and County Council must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Ensure that all digital maps are accurate, up to date, and published on the Office of Planning and Zoning website;</li> <li>•Ensure that OPZ publishes and makes readily available the Anne Arundel County Region 7 Plan FINAL document with all amendments included rather than allow the current draft-final plan to remain on the OPZ website!</li> <li>•Hold owners of dilapidated properties accountable and get them up to code—they should not be allowed to degrade the neighborhood for their future profit.</li> </ul> <p>IMPORTANT CLARIFICATIONS: The two properties on Willow Road have BEEN RESIDENTIAL FOR MANY YEARS and were NEVER designated commercial or small business. And they must not be upzoned now, especially since the justification for upzoning included the Village Center AND THE VILLAGE CENTER language has been removed from the Region 7 Plan!! The current owner of the properties bought both lots as R2, they are being used as residential, and they should remain residential (R2).</p>	
2024-05-06 10:07:17	Mary	Guy	mguy3208@gmail.com	Annapolis	MD	21401	Yes	Bill No. 9-24a: Comprehensive Zoning – Region 7	Oppose	Thank you.	
2024-05-06 10:26:30	Ted	Krauss	takrauss@krausswhiting.com	Annapolis	MD	21401-1611	Yes	Bill No. 9-24a: Comprehensive Zoning – Region 7	Support	See attached.	<a href="https://www.aacounty.org/system/files/webform/cc_legislative_testimony/24164/Support%20for%20Ridgely%20Sector%20Study%2C%205-6-24.PDF">https://www.aacounty.org/system/files/webform/cc_legislative_testimony/24164/Support%20for%20Ridgely%20Sector%20Study%2C%205-6-24.PDF</a>
2024-05-06 10:42:17	Kristen	Larson	kristenjanelarson@yahoo.com	Annapolis	MD	21401	Yes	Bill No. 9-24a: Comprehensive Zoning – Region 7	Oppose	I am writing to strongly oppose several of the zoning changes included in Bill No. 9-24. Specifically, CZ-R7-GRA-019, which allows for development of the Liberty Marina site would exacerbate the ongoing traffic problems on Route 2 and add more cars and people into an already existing neighborhood. CZ-R7-GRA-010, which zones an area next to the environmentally sensitive Broad Creek Park to TC would allow denser development than Riva Rd. and the current infrastructure can support. Finally, CZ-R7-GRA-011 would allow development in an extremely congested part of Riva Rd. that has seen explosive growth over the last few years. These proposed changes do not have the existing road infrastructure in place to support them, threaten critical environmental resources, and are not in the best interest of the community; I urge you to reject them. Thank you for your consideration.	
2024-05-06 10:46:22	Trisha	Thomas	tstthomas00@yahoo.com	Annapolis	Md	21403	Yes	Bill No. 9-24a: Comprehensive Zoning – Region 7	Oppose		
<b>Bill No. 16-24</b>											

Timestamp	First name	Last name	Email address	City	State	Zip Code	Are you representing yourself?	Legislation	Position	Remarks	Attachments
2024-04-27 17:06:38	George	Lambert	geoismo@gmail.com	PASADENA	MD	21122	Yes	Bill No. 16-24a: Zoning – Uses – Food Service Facilities – Outdoor Seating Related to Food and Beverage Service	Oppose	The right to enjoy one's life at home in reasonable quiet should be sacrosanct, and of primary importance in legislation. Noise ordinances were written for that purpose. For an ordinance to be proposed that contravenes that for some citizens is revolting and disturbing. The previous standard for restaurants and bars that limited outside activity near residential zoning was temporarily changed for the benefit of all citizens to provide safer, fresh air venues during Covid. Now that the Covid crisis has subsided, the previous standard should obviously be reinstated. If there are establishments that deserve exceptions, then they should go through the existing zoning exception process. That is what it is for. Nothing could be clearer.	
2024-04-28 12:58:03	Ann	Allam	annvallam@yahoo.com	Pasadena	MD	21122	Yes	Bill No. 16-24a: Zoning – Uses – Food Service Facilities – Outdoor Seating Related to Food and Beverage Service	Oppose	I oppose this unless a setback from residential property is included. No one should have a permanent outdoor seating area next to their home without at least an individual evaluation and approval. This can be a noise nuisance and there is no information about how many bars or restaurants would get this approval or where they are located.	
2024-04-28 13:51:19	Nina	Benoit	ninabenoit@hotmail.com	Pasadena	MD	21122	Yes	Bill No. 16-24a: Zoning – Uses – Food Service Facilities – Outdoor Seating Related to Food and Beverage Service	Oppose	Oppose as written. This bill should not pass without protection put in place to protect residents near the places that are going to be given permanent blanket approval. These seating areas can be a real problem near residential neighborhoods. Outdoor seating areas near residential neighborhoods should be reviewed individually, not be given blanket approval.	
2024-04-30 10:07:38	Nina	Benoit	ninabenoit@hotmail.com	Pasadena	MD	21122	Yes	Bill No. 16-24a: Zoning – Uses – Food Service Facilities – Outdoor Seating Related to Food and Beverage Service	Oppose	Oppose as written. This bill should not pass without protection put in place to protect residents near the places that are going to be given permanent blanket approval. These seating areas can be a real problem near residential neighborhoods. Outdoor seating areas near residential neighborhoods should be reviewed individually, not be given blanket approval.	
2024-05-05 16:44:39	Ruth	Jobe	raj9409@netscape.net	Annapolis	MD	21401	Yes	Bill No. 16-24a: Zoning – Uses – Food Service Facilities – Outdoor Seating Related to Food and Beverage Service	Oppose	I oppose this Bill as it provides no relief to residents nearest to the noise, odors, etc. from residential dining. The pandemic is over. The outdoor dining restrictions should be reinstated. Stop favoring business interests over residents.	
2024-05-05 21:38:36	Nancy	Guy	Nancyg410@aol.com	Annapolis Md.	Md	21401	Yes	Bill No. 16-24a: Zoning – Uses – Food Service Facilities – Outdoor Seating Related to Food and Beverage Service	Oppose	I, Nancy Guy STRONGLY OPPOSE this bill for it provides no relief to its residents due to the noise, the hours of operation, unrest within the neighborhood and the odors for which are given off from eating outside.  The disruption of a peaceful neighbor, elderly not getting their nightly rest and childrens sleep disrupted from the noise given off from the businesses is not in the best interest of the community and its residents. It only feeds into the business owners and their guests. The outdoor dining restrictions should be reinstated.  Think about it---If you lived next to a business that has outdoor seating and can have guests with loud music, odor issues, etc til way hours into the early morning would you want to live next to them? I don't think so!! So why should they?  Give back to the community for which gave up so much during covid. STOP feeding into the business owners and start looking into helping your residents for which you are supposed to serve. I respectfully request that you "OPPOSE" bill 16-24a.	
2024-05-05 22:09:54	Jane	Malone	Nancyg410@aol.com	Annapolis	MD	21401	Yes	Bill No. 16-24a: Zoning – Uses – Food Service Facilities – Outdoor Seating Related to Food and Beverage Service	Oppose	I, Jane Malone OPPOSE 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.	
2024-05-06 5:10:57	Peggy	Hamilton	sixhamiltons@hotmail.com	Annapolis	MD	21401	Yes	Bill No. 16-24a: Zoning – Uses – Food Service Facilities – Outdoor Seating Related to Food and Beverage Service	Oppose	I strongly oppose Bill 16-24a because it fails to provide any relief to residents. The noise, extended hours of operation, neighborhood unrest, and outdoor dining odors are detrimental to the community.  The disruption caused by businesses affects peaceful neighbors, prevents the elderly from getting proper rest, and disrupts children's sleep due to noise. These negative impacts do not serve the best interests of the community and its residents; instead, they benefit business owners and their guests. I believe that outdoor dining restrictions should be reinstated.  Imagine living next to a business with outdoor seating, where guests enjoy loud music and create odor issues until the early morning hours. Most people would not want to live in such proximity. Therefore, why should residents have to endure this?  During the COVID pandemic, our community sacrificed a great deal. It's time to prioritize residents over business interests. I respectfully request that you oppose Bill 16-24a.	



Timestamp	First name	Last name	Email address	City	State	Zip Code	Are you representing yourself?	Legislation	Position	Remarks	Attachments
2024-05-06 7:25:24	Catherine	Vieweg Taylor	CatherineLV@rocketmail.com	Pasadena	MD	21122	Yes	Bill No. 16-24a: Zoning – Uses – Food Service Facilities – Outdoor Seating Related to Food and Beverage Service	Oppose	<p>I oppose Bill 16-24 unless amended to include a setback provision to protect residents in residentially zoned neighborhoods from this blanket, permanent approval for commercial outdoor seating at bars, restaurants, and clubs.</p> <p>Our beautiful county has rural areas and population dense areas. Both communities deserve to have their needs respected and they should never be pitted against each other. Win-win solutions are possible, and the only way to successfully manage a county with both types of communities present.</p> <p>Nobody wants a noise nuisance within earshot of their home. Nobody wants the streets of their residential neighborhood to be forced to handle overflow commercial parking because the seating capacity of the bar or restaurant exceeds their parking lot capacity.</p> <p>Ethan Hunt has stated that the establishments that Rep. Leadbetter is concerned about would be expected to be approved through the zoning variance procedure, which is a procedure routinely used throughout the county. If the Council's goal is to minimize the commercial establishments who need to use the zoning variance procedure to gain approval for the continuation of their outdoor seating begun during COVID and protect the residents in our population dense county areas, then consider:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.Include a 100ft setback from the house on the residential property, rather than from the residential property line.</li> <li>2.Include a 100ft setback from all residentially zoned property other than RLD (Residential Low Density) which should exclude most/all of Rep Leadbetter's establishments of concern.</li> <li>3.Include this provision: if the establishment otherwise qualifies under this bill, and if a zoning variance has been requested of OPZ relating to the residential setback criteria, delay the effective date until whichever comes first: OPZ decides the variance, or, October 1, 2024.</li> </ol> <p>Putting the peace and quiet of population dense residential neighborhoods at risk to protect a very small number of bars or restaurants from having to use the very routine zoning variance procedure is not a reasonable approach.</p>	
2024-05-06 10:57:52	Todd	Taylor	ttaylor@tekcore.com	Pasadena	MD	21122	Yes	Bill No. 16-24a: Zoning – Uses – Food Service Facilities – Outdoor Seating Related to Food and Beverage Service	Oppose	<p>I oppose the bill unless it is amended to include a setback protecting neighboring residents from commercial noise, like county regulations have done to date. While restaurants have been the primary focus of Bill 16-24 discussions, I live next to a tavern that has been allowed 50+ outdoor seats due to the COVID permissiveness bills. This outdoor seating is less than 40 feet from our home, effectively putting dozens of people in my back yard. The tavern does not staff the outdoor area; their employees spend one minute of every hour checking the service area and leave it unmonitored for the remainder of the time. Due to this, we, along with our family, friends, and visitors, have been deprived of the enjoyment of our own backyard. Spending time in our yard requires us to regularly listen to vulgar language and off-color remarks coming over the fence. On the other side of the same tavern lives a family with children of mixed race who also endure these same inappropriate conversations when they play in their yard. While some establishments wish to continue outdoor seating, neighboring families and children have the right to avoid negative outcomes that can result from it. This bill needs to be written in a way that protects neighbors from becoming a victim of it. If this can't be accomplished, we need to contemplate whether eating lunch outdoors justifies the cost neighboring families will pay for this luxury.</p>	
<b>Bill No. 25-24</b>											
2024-04-22 19:03:55	Kyle	Nordike	iwantcouponsforme@gmail.com	Glen Burnie	Maryland	21060	Yes	Bill No. 25-24: Construction and Property Maintenance Codes – Codes and Supplements	No position	See attached file regarding amendment	<a href="https://www.aacounty.org/system/files/webform/cc_legislative_testimony/22885/Anne%20Arundel%20County%20Council%20-%20Bill%2025-24.docx">https://www.aacounty.org/system/files/webform/cc_legislative_testimony/22885/Anne%20Arundel%20County%20Council%20-%20Bill%2025-24.docx</a>