

Timestamp	First name	Last name	City	State	Zip Code	Are you representing yourself?	If no, what organization or whom do you represent?	Legislation	Position	Remarks	Attachments
Bill No. 61-26, as amended											
2026-10-16 18:19:39	Lauren	Loughlin	Severna Park	Maryland	21146	Yes		Bill No. 61-26: (As Amended) AN ORDINANCE concerning: Public Safety – Zoning – Article 18 Update	Oppose	Strongly oppose	
2026-10-17 2:37:22	Bulent	Beyduz	Severna Park	MD	21146-2029	Yes		Bill No. 61-26: (As Amended) AN ORDINANCE concerning: Public Safety – Zoning – Article 18 Update	Oppose		
2026-10-17 20:04:48	Helen	Chapman	Severna Park	MD	21146	Yes		Bill No. 61-26: (As Amended) AN ORDINANCE concerning: Public Safety – Zoning – Article 18 Update	Oppose	The proposed amendment of bill 61-26 would have adverse effects on our local environment. As a result of zoning changes more development of our county would be allowed on more parcels of existing land. By allowing tiny houses and multiplexes community eyesores would be allowed inconsistent with existing suburban homes. People will indicate under false pretenses that they are building a tiny house for their loved ones when in essence they will be building for a future B & B on their property. (Think-let's make money.) What does loosening the restrictions for future development mean? The worsening of the water quality of our creeks, rivers, and Chesapeake Bay, a highly valuable resource, is inevitable. But, if our waterways were really considered valuable, limited, wise development would be favored rather than support for developers. The result in the zoning changes will mean more habitat loss and biodiversity decline; air and water pollution, increased runoff and flooding, and alteration of the land mass like on Ritchie Highway going north which can/does effect the existing houses. Although we live in a beautiful area it is getting more and more developed to our detriment. Commuting time and traffic congestion has increased with more homes, pressure on existing infrastructure (water, electricity, crowded roads, torn-up patched roads, and inconsistent housing units like tiny houses or the building of multiplexes). Our schools are already strained and will be adversely effected. More housing leads to increasing the tax base (which you probably favor), but for the average citizen this leads to higher property taxes because of the additional strain put on public services. I am not in favor of making Open Space Conservation Overlay obsolete. Continued conservation efforts should be made. More and more natural drainage is being effected preventing good water absorption. Less habitat for our wildlife results because more forestation comes down, impervious service increases and fences go up preventing wildlife from roaming for food. How about the strain on local resources for increasing pipe networks and roads? Temporary parking area criteria should remain unchanged. I think last minute revisions for provisions of applications to the hearing officer should not be allowed. Another more complete, revised submission should be made to the hearing officer by beginning the process again for careful consideration of the hearing officer. I also believe that keeping a variance or specific exemption from expiring is not a good idea because conditions surrounding the variance/exception may have/probably had changed. A new application should be submitted for careful review based on current, updated information. Adding legacy provisions applicable to certain development applications and zoning certificate of use is also similar concern for me because approval conditions may have/probably had changed since the original submission. I have lived in Anne Arundel County for many decades. I have seen so much development that is not "smart growth". Please take my concerns to heart. The environmental legacy you leave behind will effect not only us, but yourselves, your children, your grandchildren, and their children.	

Timestamp	First name	Last name	City	State	Zip Code	Are you representing yourself?	If no, what organization or whom do you represent?	Legislation	Position	Remarks	Attachments
2026-10-18 7:53:03	Jennifer	Fold	Linthicum	MD	21090	Yes		Bill No. 61-26: (As Amended) AN ORDINANCE concerning: Public Safety – Zoning – Article 18 Update	Oppose	Please vote against this bill. Linthicum doesn't have the infrastructure or desire for it and the MDOT doesn't have data to support it. Historic Linthicum is known for its charm and unique single-family homes built over 100 years ago, many of which are on the historic register. Adding more high density housing will take away from the historic charm of the community. The light rail station in historic Linthicum offers no public parking and is not well used by the community. The station IS well used by criminals who ride it into Linthicum and other neighborhoods and loiter, use drugs, and commit crimes. As a 19-year resident, I see this every day. My children cannot walk to school, which is less than a mile from our home because they would have to cross the light rail station where there are often individuals passed out, using drugs in the open, or relieving themselves in public (all of this I have witnessed firsthand). I once even saw a woman defecating onto the ground less than four feet from where I was walking. Every study into the light rail and Maryland's public transportation show operating upwards of \$50m, with revenue less than 10% of that. Ridership is still lower than pre-2020 numbers. So why is the MDOT trying to change small local AACO neighborhoods? The premise is transit-oriented development - but the data doesn't support it. Please allow the historic areas in Anne Arundel County to remain that way and reject this bill.	

Timestamp	First name	Last name	City	State	Zip Code	Are you representing yourself?	If no, what organization or whom do you represent?	Legislation	Position	Remarks	Attachments
										Subject: Bill 61-26 — Request to Postpone Adoption Pending Public Safety, Traffic, Infrastructure, and Community Impact Review Dear Members of the Anne Arundel County Council: I am writing as a resident of Linthicum Heights to express serious concerns regarding Bill 61-26 and respectfully request that the Council postpone its adoption until the potential consequences for established communities have been thoroughly evaluated, clearly communicated, and addressed. I recognize the need to periodically modernize zoning regulations, expand housing opportunities, and accommodate responsible economic development. However, growth must be balanced with the County’s demonstrated ability to provide adequate public services, maintain essential infrastructure, and protect the quality of life in existing communities. My concerns are particularly relevant to Linthicum Heights and neighboring communities such as North Linthicum and Ferndale, although the implications of this legislation extend throughout Anne Arundel County. Public Safety and Emergency Services My primary concern is the potential for increased residential density without corresponding improvements in police, fire, and emergency medical services. Our community already faces what I perceive to be challenges involving fire department staffing, limited visible police presence, and increasing public-safety concerns. These observations raise legitimate questions about whether existing resources are sufficient to serve our current population, much less accommodate additional growth. Before expanding development opportunities, the County should demonstrate that police staffing, patrol coverage, fire and EMS resources, emergency response times, and equipment availability can adequately support existing residents and projected population increases. These assessments must consider the cumulative impacts of multiple developments rather than evaluating individual projects in isolation. Traffic Density, Light Rail Crossings, and Roadway Capacity Traffic congestion is an increasingly significant concern throughout Linthicum Heights and surrounding communities. Our area already experiences substantial traffic volumes on local roads, major highways, and the routes connecting residential neighborhoods with commercial districts and regional transportation corridors. A particularly important concern is the impact of the Baltimore Light Rail system on local traffic. When crossing gates close to allow trains to pass, vehicle traffic is temporarily halted, creating backups that can extend beyond the immediate crossings and affect nearby intersections. These interruptions represent an existing constraint on roadway capacity. Additional residential and commercial development could compound the problem by introducing more vehicles into a transportation network where traffic flow is already periodically interrupted. Furthermore, while increased Light Rail ridership does not necessarily mean more frequent gate closures, any future increase in train frequency could create additional interruptions and potentially worsen congestion. These concerns extend beyond inconvenience. Longer vehicle queues and delays can affect emergency vehicle access, neighborhood mobility, pedestrian safety, local businesses, and residents’ ability to travel reliably through their community.	

Timestamp	First name	Last name	City	State	Zip Code	Are you representing yourself?	If no, what organization or whom do you represent?	Legislation	Position	Remarks	Attachments
2026-10-18 10:40:20	Nicole	Slawson	Linthicum Heights	MD	21090	Yes		Bill No. 61-26: (As Amended) AN ORDINANCE concerning: Public Safety – Zoning – Article 18 Update	Oppose	As an over 20 year resident of Linthicum MD I strongly oppose this bill. The very last thing we need is more development, especially high density housing. Our roads flood around our home on a regular basis. How quickly we forget what happened to our neighbors in Elliott City. Our town has become a cess pool of crime, of which our police department cannot even keep up with as it is. Our roadways are full of accidents and fatalities, even more so since the new development off Baltimore Annapolis Blvd. We live here, we know. We see it every day, you do not. Is the goal to build up our communities so much that we have not one ounce of free space? Is the goal to run life long residents out of our small town? Is the goal to line your pockets with developers money? This all needs to stop. You're not looking out for who you supposedly represent. We don't want any of it. You work for us. Remember that.	
2026-10-18 11:30:18	Jennifer	Powell	Davidsonville	MD	21034	Yes		Bill No. 61-26: (As Amended) AN ORDINANCE concerning: Public Safety – Zoning – Article 18 Update	Oppose	As a resident of AA County for 40 years, the excessive and over building has to stop. The infrastructure can not support the additional housing, people and the demands that come from building. Until the electricity grid, roads and other infrastructure requirement have been updated the unnecessary building needs to stop. The highway roads in the Lithicum area are terrible and have been for so long it's only a matter of time before more roads can't keep up with the demand.	
2026-10-18 13:25:55	Stacey	Davis	Glen Burnie	Maryland	21060	Yes		Bill No. 61-26: (As Amended) AN ORDINANCE concerning: Public Safety – Zoning – Article 18 Update	Oppose	I continue to oppose bill 61-26 as it continues to provide for over reach of the county by allowing zoning and development changes that will forever impact the quality of lives of county residents and their families for generations. The changes suggested in this bill will dramatically increase traffic, causing harm to families that already have reduced time together due to commutes, time it takes to get to stores, restaurants, schools, and other recreation and would also impact small family owned business' that already struggling. The northern part of Anne Arundel County would benefit from rehabilitation of older areas to provide affordable housing and access as well as re-development of existing commercial zones. Traffic is already an impediment to residents and has lowered housing values in the Northern part of the county as well as the impact of the Key Bridge collapse. Before we consider NEW developments of raw land or land at which is currently not developed, we should be more focused on improving our current infrastructure and facilities. Again, I vehemently OPPOSE this bill.	
2026-10-18 21:02:44	Robin	Smith	Linthicum	MD	21090	Yes		Bill No. 61-26: (As Amended) AN ORDINANCE concerning: Public Safety – Zoning – Article 18 Update	Oppose	The Linthicum community was designed as a single-family home suburb, which to this day has made it an attractive community for those who choose to live in an area with less population density than a city or town. It goes against the will of the people living in Linthicum to attempt to transform the area by adding high density housing, particularly in the center of the community. The encroachment of multiple businesses, busy roads, and even apartments have been added to the outskirts along a commercial area. Placing this in the center of our quiet neighborhood is a betrayal to all who have chosen to live here. I am sure you can find places for the housing you would like to build along bus routes in areas of the county where they would be a better fit than a single-family neighborhood.	
2026-10-19 7:27:16	Mike	Lathroum	Linthicum	MD	21090	Yes		Bill No. 61-26: (As Amended) AN ORDINANCE concerning: Public Safety – Zoning – Article 18 Update	Oppose	We do not need anymore uncontrolled development in Northern AA Co, you are already ruining our communities and destroying our green spaces, STOP	

Timestamp	First name	Last name	City	State	Zip Code	Are you representing yourself?	If no, what organization or whom do you represent?	Legislation	Position	Remarks	Attachments
										Dear Chair and Members of the Anne Arundel County Council, On behalf of the Anne Arundel County Farm Bureau (AACFB), we are writing to express our support for Bill 61-26 and its positive impact on the agricultural community in Anne Arundel County. We appreciate the efforts to clarify the County Code and make it more workable for farmers. Provisions such as allowing food trucks at agritourism operations, removing the Certificate of Use requirement, and providing greater clarity in the code are meaningful steps toward reducing unnecessary barriers and supporting the continued viability of our farms. While we support the bill and recognize the progress it represents, there is still work to be done. AACFB looks forward to working with the newly elected County Council to advance the three amendments that Councilwoman Shannon Leadbetter was preparing to present on behalf of the agricultural community. We believe continued collaboration between the Council and local farmers is essential to developing practical legislation that supports agriculture while meeting the needs of our broader community. We would like to thank the entire County Council for its work on this legislation and for its efforts to help keep agriculture viable in Anne Arundel County. We value the Council's willingness to engage with our agricultural community and look forward to continuing this partnership to ensure that farming remains an important and sustainable part of our county's future.	
2026-10-19 10:27:01	Sierra	Criste	Davidsonville	Maryland	20751	No	Anne Arundel Co	Bill No. 61-26: (As Amended) AN ORDINANCE concerning: Public Safety – Zoning – Article 18 Update	Support	Sincerely, Deana B. Tice, President	
2026-10-19 10:47:52	Niecy	Chambers	Annapolis	MD	21401	No	League of Wome	Bill No. 61-26: (As Amended) AN ORDINANCE concerning: Public Safety – Zoning – Article 18 Update	Support	Written testimony has been emailed to CouncilAdmin@aacounty.org.	

Timestamp	First name	Last name	City	State	Zip Code	Are you representing yourself?	If no, what organization or whom do you represent?	Legislation	Position	Remarks	Attachments
2026-10-19 10:51:13	Anna	Chaney	Lothian	Maryland	20711	Yes		Bill No. 61-26: (As Amended) AN ORDINANCE concerning: Public Safety – Zoning – Article 18 Update	Oppose	October 19, 2026 Anne Arundel County Council 44 Calver Street Annapolis, MD 21401 Re: Bill 61-26 Dear Honorable Council Chair Hummer and Honorable Councilmembers, I am writing as Anna Chaney and am not representing anyone other than myself and will only note the sentiments of the correspondences I have had with innumerable constituents of Anne Arundel County. First, I appreciate the hard work that has been put into this process by our department of Planning and Zoning and the Council's hard work into understanding this bill. I also commend the attempts at amending Bill 61-26 on behalf of hundreds of taxpayers in Anne Arundel County. I am sorry to see that most of them did not pass, and many were not even heard. Witnessing the choice to pass the amendments that were most obvious to the general public sent a message to everyone watching that those who would make the most noise would be quieted. Second, there are many new clauses and changes to the zoning code that are unclear and potentially incomplete which impacts people's rights to notifications about zoning violations, due process subsequent to notification, right to appeal decisions regarding non-conforming uses, changes in expectations of proof that fall upon the hard working business owners, right to enter structures without respectful appointments (appointments seem to be the norm at I&P), and so many updates and changes that are incomprehensible in such a short period of time. I know some like to say this was online for a long time. However, the comment period was brief and there was no discussion amongst stakeholders as you have heard countless times. I had no idea that a "chart", written in unfamiliar language about zoning would result in Bill 61-26. Here is a link to said chart. Please note the lack of public comments and stakeholder comments, and from the very few, are noted in the last column. You can also copy and paste this direct link to the chart: https://www.aacounty.org/sites/default/files/2026-01/article-18-update-list-of-amendments-20251219.pdf A positive step forward is to stop Bill 61-26 tonight and resume immediately with a clear and do-able process (as many stakeholders have requested and volunteered to dedicate their time and engage in this process, unpaid). The easiest road to follow is not always the best path moving forward. I know you will vote based upon your convictions and trust in our commitments to one another. Last, please consider who you are serving, why you are serving, and what your legacy will be. This is a great opportunity to gain support, build trust, and do the right thing for the people you represent. 61-26 is the Bill and tonight is the night. Thank you very much, Anna Chaney Lothian, MD P.S. Here is the link to the online petition, signed by over 2000 Anne Arundel County constituents who will be awaiting your votes tonight. https://c.org/LTbJ7gy9j6	

Timestamp	First name	Last name	City	State	Zip Code	Are you representing yourself?	If no, what organization or whom do you represent?	Legislation	Position	Remarks	Attachments
2026-10-19 10:54:58	Matt	Minahan	Edgewater	MD	21037	No	Growth Action Network	Bill No. 61-26: (As Amended) AN ORDINANCE concerning: Public Safety – Zoning – Article 18 Update	Support	Article 18 of the County Code governs development in the county and was last updated in 2005. Since then, hundreds of small, “minor” changes have created a patchwork of conflicts and inconsistencies in the way that land use is managed in the County. GAN has been advocating for a comprehensive update for more than 10 years. We are in strong support now of 61-26, the long-awaited update to the Zoning Code. Highlights include purpose statements for each zoning district which were stripped out of the code in the 2005 revision, many more definitions of terms and uses already in the code, expanded uses in some zoning districts, and it puts the county’s administrative practices into the code so all have clarity and certainty. A number of amendments have clarified some uses and changes. After initial opposition from food truck owners and the Farm Bureau, the Council has worked out amendments that have gained their support. Dozens more amendments should be taken up by the next Council. At tonight’s last meeting of this Council, we strongly urge a “yes” vote on this bill.	
2026-10-19 11:01:13	robert	smith	severna park	md	21146	Yes		Bill No. 61-26: (As Amended) AN ORDINANCE concerning: Public Safety – Zoning – Article 18 Update	Oppose	As written Bill 61-26 is incompatible with the objectives of Plan2040. This last minute bill, introduced by Stuart Pittman, violates the three tenets of Plan 2049: it is not Green, it is not Smart and it is most importantly, not Equitable. The Environment will be damaged by the growth that this bill will introduce. The community inputs and environment reviews in our existing process will be replaced by shortened review times and less opportunities for review and input from impacted parties. The bill is not smart as it will enable exponential growth of Mini houses and Multiplexes, where they were never intended, throughout our county. With 90% of the county already developed, we need to be smart about how we develop the remaining space. This bill will create a free for all of land use with no regard for our existing or planned infrastructure. Corporate acquisition of family homes will result in as many residences as possible on every property. If we want to be smart, lets take the failed shopping malls and convert anchor stores to living spaces. This will revitalize the malls, create jobs, reduce transportation needs. The plan most certainly not Equitable as it takes away the power of the people living in our county to influence and have control over the zoning process and gives an unfair advantage to the developers. This bill will most likely pass on Party lines. The Democratic party has taken control of Anne Arundel County. As much as they claim to be for the environment, they are clearly in the pockets of the developers. Hopefully this is evident to the citizens of Anne Arundel County and will be forefront in their minds as they go to the polling place on November 3rd. We need to restore a balance of power to avoid the situation we now have where “Absolute power corrupts absolutely.” I encourage the County Council to reject Stuart Pittman’s “Big Beautiful Bill” and start again with more public input next session.	
2026-10-19 10:25:53	Sally	Honor	Arnold	MD	21012	Yes		Bill No. 61-26: (As Amended) AN ORDINANCE concerning: Public Safety – Zoning – Article 18 Update	Support	Now that his bill has been clarified and improved with amendments, I urge you to support this bill to update County zoning requirements.	
Bill No. 65-26, as amended											
2026-10-19 10:49:19	Niecy	Chambers	Annapolis	MD	21401	No	League of Women	Bill No. 65-26: (As Amended) AN ORDINANCE concerning: Public Ethics – Campaign Contribution Disclosure and Comprehensive Zoning Integrity Act	Support	Written testimony has been emailed to CouncilAdmin@aacounty.org.	
Bill No. 66-26, as amended											

Timestamp	First name	Last name	City	State	Zip Code	Are you representing yourself?	If no, what organization or whom do you represent?	Legislation	Position	Remarks	Attachments
2026-10-18 14:01:39	Stacey	Davis	Glen Burnie	Maryland	21060	Yes		Bill No. 66-26: (As Amended) AN ORDINANCE concerning: Public Ethics – Enforcement – County Council	Support	Its unfortunate, however, financial negative enforcement seems to be one of the only ways to keep elected officials thinking twice before making statements that negatively impact those they govern just because they disagree.	
Bill No. 70-26, as amended											
2026-10-18 22:11:24	David	Demers	millersville	Maryland	21108	Yes		Bill No. 70-26: (As Amended) AN ORDINANCE concerning: Boards, Commissions, and Similar Bodies – Subdivision and Development – Concept Plan	Oppose	I do not support this bill. I feel that although it may "streamline" the development application process as far as the Office of Planning and Zoning is concerned, it is not in the best interest of the citizens of this county. To quote the Growth Action Network of Anne Arundel County "it is not clear that a County that is about 90% built out needs to streamline the development process to improve the speed and reduce the cost of development and enhance the profit margin for developers. In principle, streamlining might improve housing affordability, but market driven housing prices seem unlikely to respond." More work/revision needs to be done to this Bill before any form of it is ready for Council approval.	
2026-10-19 8:49:43	Trish	Lilek	Millersville	Maryland	21108	Yes		Bill No. 70-26: (As Amended) AN ORDINANCE concerning: Boards, Commissions, and Similar Bodies – Subdivision and Development – Concept Plan	Oppose	After 5 years of discussion and involvement in the process, I was resigned to the loss of our envisioned Millersville Community Park as it morphed into a full fledged county regional thing and tiny map revisions, so small, in fact, they could not even be zoomed for visibility online . I was deeply discouraged when the developers of the Millersville Rd/Rt 3 Intersection "Gambrills Station" thing won a reversal of a 7 to 0 County Council vote against a zoning change to a 5 to 2 County Council vote win after some back room, after the vote, persuasion by developers. It simply extends high intensity traffic north.....nothing essential to the community, nothing but more noise and traffic. Now Mr Pittman wants the last meeting of the current county council to vote on and accept bills 70 -26 and 61 - 25 as written without further discussion or revision so that he can meet a personal deadline and check it off as a big success for his memoirs. I believe time should be taken to review the host of other proposed amendments and, if they stand the test of scrutiny, then okay. This vote to accept as now written without review - real review - the bills in their entirety with the outstanding proposed amendments is just not right. Growth Action Network is right . Two different perspectives in this household both agree - oppose now and let the next council take up where you all left off. Nothing good has come of this way of doing business. Trish Lilek, Resident 70 Linda Lane Millersville MD 21108	

Timestamp	First name	Last name	City	State	Zip Code	Are you representing yourself?	If no, what organization or whom do you represent?	Legislation	Position	Remarks	Attachments
										Bill 70-26 – Concept Plan I urge the County Council to postpone action on Bill 70-26 as it is not ready to be voted on. There is way too much ambiguity in the bill's provisions that actually may become a headache for the Department of Planning and Zoning to implement and enforce. It has been my experience in years of being involved with Arnold Preservation Council in reviewing many development projects, that the saying, "The devil is in the details", is very true. And that is the major flaw in this proposed legislation. It is too much concept and not nearly enough detail. All too often in community meetings, especially those before the "checklist" was instituted, I would listen to the spiel from the developer, and it all sounded so good. Unfortunately, too many inferences were made based on the presentation and, only later, when it was too late to advocate for changes, did it become clear that the full story had not been laid out, and that many more questions should have been asked and followed up on. Indeed, that was the basis for the checklist to be instituted; not enough detail was being provided by the developer to the public. I believe that the proposed process is way too much of a "closed-door" one since the procedures do not appear to include a County-prepared record of the pre-application meeting with a written and publicly distributed assessment of the Concept Plan. Hence, the public will receive less information and will have fewer opportunities to engage in a timely manner in the development process, or to express its views and contest decisions. Additionally, I predict that the lack of stated deadlines to be met as the process proceeds will be a pronounced impediment causing the County to be caught up in a calendar nightmare of its own making. Please, do not pass this bill in its current form. It has the look of a concept of a Concept Plan with not enough accompanying detail, like a draft that's not been fully considered or adequately amended.	
2026-10-19 10:22:47	Sue	Ricciardi	Arnold	MD	21012	Yes		Bill No. 70-26: (As Amended) AN ORDINANCE concerning: Boards, Commissions, and Similar Bodies – Subdivision and Development – Concept Plan	Oppose	Sue A. Ricciardi	
2026-10-19 10:22:48	Sally	Honor	Arnold	MD	21012	Yes		Bill No. 70-26: (As Amended) AN ORDINANCE concerning: Boards, Commissions, and Similar Bodies – Subdivision and Development – Concept Plan	Oppose	The proposed Concept Plan in this bill does not give either County OPZ staff or residents enough time to fully evaluate and comment on a proposed development. Streamlining development such as this does not serve the community and I urge you to wait for a re-write of this bill before supporting it.	
2026-10-19 10:55:46	Teresa	Miller	Annapolis	Maryland	21409	Yes		Bill No. 70-26: (As Amended) AN ORDINANCE concerning: Boards, Commissions, and Similar Bodies – Subdivision and Development – Concept Plan	Oppose	As a concerned citizen of Arnold and member of the Arnold Preservation Council, I oppose Bill 70-26. Although the bill is intended to streamline the development approval process, it fails to adequately protect the public's interests. Not only does the "more efficient" process lack key timelines, but the fact that the bill does not require the County to provide written feedback to the developer after the pre-application Concept Plan meeting is unacceptable. The public loses in the Concept Plan process because it will not allow any appeals until after the Final Plan is submitted. Even if the Concept Plan is going to be optional, the bill should be improved before the Council votes on it.	
Bill No. 71-26											
2026-10-18 14:58:23	Stacey	Davis	Glen Burnie	Maryland	21060	Yes		Bill No. 71-26: AN ORDINANCE concerning: Neighborhood Preservation and Environmental Protection Act	Support		
Bill No. 72-26											

Timestamp	First name	Last name	City	State	Zip Code	Are you representing yourself?	If no, what organization or whom do you represent?	Legislation	Position	Remarks	Attachments
2026-10-19 5:46:29	Elizabeth	Larsen	Annapolis	MD	21401	Yes		Bill No. 72-26: AN ORDINANCE concerning: Construction and Property Maintenance Codes – International Swimming Pool and Spa Code – Barrier Requirements	Oppose	I would like to submit my opposition to Bill No. 72-26 as written without any grandfathering clause for existing, permitted pools with ASTM F1346 certified locking safety covers. As a previously certified water safety instructor, lifeguard, and current mother of two, I take water safety very seriously. Safety should be the first consideration for any pool owner. When we installed our pool, we did a lot of research on locking safety covers as well as pool-compliant fences. We considered our yard, the adjoining yards with fences, ground slope, and septic reserves. The most encompassing solution for our installation was a locking, automatic, tracked safety cover. This was not an inexpensive decision (more expensive than a pool-compliant fence), and given the above factors, was the most safety-oriented solution for us and our neighbors. We are now faced with the possibility of having to re-implement a previously acceptable pool safety plan. Our property is surrounded on three sides with yards containing other pools. This introduces difficulties for all owners, including those with fences, by having to install a fence that is pool compliant on both sides - multiplying the cost for all owners. By not providing clear guidance on any grandfathering clause for existing permitted pools this bill punishes pool owners who diligently followed county-approved safety codes. Changing these rules will incur a significant financial hardship on mindful county residents; requiring property updates that may cost \$15k-20k, or more. As such, I voice my opposition to this bill as written and hope that you seriously consider the impact to existing pool owners. Thank you for your consideration.	
Bill No. 74-26											
2026-10-13 14:14:40	Staci	Flanagan	Millersville	MD	21108	Yes		Bill No. 74-26: AN ORDINANCE concerning: Public Safety – Miscellaneous Provisions – Repeal of Paper and Reusable Bags Fee Requirement	Support	I believe that this fee should be optional. The paper bags are not sturdy enough to support groceries most of the time, but if we cannot go back to using plastic, then the cost of paper bags should be determined by businesses wishing to sell them.	
2026-10-13 16:25:05	Nancy	Hurman	Pasadena	MD	21122	Yes		Bill No. 74-26: AN ORDINANCE concerning: Public Safety – Miscellaneous Provisions – Repeal of Paper and Reusable Bags Fee Requirement	Support	I live in Pasadena and support the no paper bag fee for retail stores. The is just a nuisance charge that only benefits the stores.	
2026-10-13 18:09:50	Robert	Hayden	Glen Burnie	MD	21061	Yes		Bill No. 74-26: AN ORDINANCE concerning: Public Safety – Miscellaneous Provisions – Repeal of Paper and Reusable Bags Fee Requirement	Support	I live in the Foxchase neighborhood and I strongly support bill 74-26 because it's not fair to give this bag tax to the retailers. I think there is an appearance of impropriety that council members support giving tax money to retailers. My wife works in retail and has to face angry customers who are upset by this tax. Stop it.	
2026-10-13 18:35:35	Gina	Dolezar	Pasadena	MD	21122	Yes		Bill No. 74-26: AN ORDINANCE concerning: Public Safety – Miscellaneous Provisions – Repeal of Paper and Reusable Bags Fee Requirement	Support	I support this bill because currently businesses are able to charge erroneous fees for bags that cost them virtually nothing. All profits from bags go to businesses with no clear benefit for the consumer.	
2026-10-13 21:47:56	Catherine	Wright	Shady Side	MD	20764	Yes		Bill No. 74-26: AN ORDINANCE concerning: Public Safety – Miscellaneous Provisions – Repeal of Paper and Reusable Bags Fee Requirement	Support	This mandate is ridiculous and needs to be repealed. Let businesses make their own decisions. It's one thing to take issue with plastic pollution, but nickel and diming the consumer on a paper product that can easily be composted is too far.	
2026-10-14 12:07:46	Christina	Lane	Gambrills	MD	21054	Yes		Bill No. 74-26: AN ORDINANCE concerning: Public Safety – Miscellaneous Provisions – Repeal of Paper and Reusable Bags Fee Requirement	Support	In full support of this bill. Paying \$0.10 a bag is outrageous in this economy. Not to mention, retailers provide the cheapest, thinnest paper bags that rip, tear or bottom out before you even get to your car! It's literally throwing money away, which is egregious!	
2026-10-15 14:14:03	Greg	Page	Arnold	MD	21012	Yes		Bill No. 74-26: AN ORDINANCE concerning: Public Safety – Miscellaneous Provisions – Repeal of Paper and Reusable Bags Fee Requirement	Oppose	Use of individually provided multi-use reusable bags creates significant waste reduction at no long term cost compared to new throw away bags recurring purchase.	

Timestamp	First name	Last name	City	State	Zip Code	Are you representing yourself?	If no, what organization or whom do you represent?	Legislation	Position	Remarks	Attachments
2026-10-15 14:25:42	Nancy	Rupp	Glen Burnie	MD	21060	Yes		Bill No. 74-26: AN ORDINANCE concerning: Public Safety – Miscellaneous Provisions – Repeal of Paper and Reusable Bags Fee Requirement	Oppose	Please continue to support and encourage consumers to utilize reusable bags. This is a very simple step that eliminates the need to deplete natural resources to create paper bags seldom reused or recycled. If this council is truly interested in economic relief consider focusing on the fee for service Marylanders pay to simply use a credit card.	
2026-10-15 14:48:17	James R	Monroe	Churchton	MD	20733	Yes		Bill No. 74-26: AN ORDINANCE concerning: Public Safety – Miscellaneous Provisions – Repeal of Paper and Reusable Bags Fee Requirement	Support	Please choose reusable bags; get rid of the plastic.	
2026-10-15 15:20:12	Anne	Pearson	Edgewater	MD	21037	Yes		Bill No. 74-26: AN ORDINANCE concerning: Public Safety – Miscellaneous Provisions – Repeal of Paper and Reusable Bags Fee Requirement	Oppose	I submitted a copy of my testimony two weeks ago and remained until it was clear the Bill would not be taken up by the Council. I look forward to being able to testify on Monday.	
2026-10-15 17:32:37	Barbara	Beck	Annapolis	MD	21403	Yes		Bill No. 74-26: AN ORDINANCE concerning: Public Safety – Miscellaneous Provisions – Repeal of Paper and Reusable Bags Fee Requirement	Oppose		
2026-10-15 19:45:48	Shannon	Robinson	Glen Burnie	MD	21061	Yes		Bill No. 74-26: AN ORDINANCE concerning: Public Safety – Miscellaneous Provisions – Repeal of Paper and Reusable Bags Fee Requirement	Oppose	There is no "free bag". I can pay 10 cents if I forget my own bag but I have plenty of my own to use.	
2026-10-17 14:04:38	Kim	Moninghoff	Crownsville	Maryland	21032	Yes		Bill No. 74-26: AN ORDINANCE concerning: Public Safety – Miscellaneous Provisions – Repeal of Paper and Reusable Bags Fee Requirement	Oppose	There's no reason to repeal the fee requirement. Shoppers are either bringing their own bags, or paying the fee as required. Those of us who bring our own bags shouldn't have to subsidize those who don't. Thank you.	
2026-10-18 8:36:52	Jennifer	Powell	Davidsonville	MD	21035	Yes		Bill No. 74-26: AN ORDINANCE concerning: Public Safety – Miscellaneous Provisions – Repeal of Paper and Reusable Bags Fee Requirement	Support	Repeal the bag fee! There are no set standards for the stores to use. Some stores are using heavy duty large bags while other use small paper thin bags causing people to have to double bag causing tax payers even more. Instead of charging a fee, offer buyers a credit for bringing their own bag.	
2026-10-18 11:15:41	Carol	Vasques	Glen Burnie	MD	21061	Yes		Bill No. 74-26: AN ORDINANCE concerning: Public Safety – Miscellaneous Provisions – Repeal of Paper and Reusable Bags Fee Requirement	Oppose		
2026-10-18 12:04:10	John	Oliva	Annapolis	MD	21401-7808	Yes		Bill No. 74-26: AN ORDINANCE concerning: Public Safety – Miscellaneous Provisions – Repeal of Paper and Reusable Bags Fee Requirement	Oppose	I OPPOSE BILL 74-26. HOW DOES ELIMINATING THE 10 CENTS CHARGE FOR CHOOSING A PAPER BAG HAVE ANYTHING TO DO WITH PUBLIC SAFETY? THERE IS NO SUCH THING AS A FREE PAPER BAG. SHOPPERS WILL PAY HIGHER PRICES. I WOULD LIKE TO KNOW IF THE SUPPORTERS OF BILL 74-26 WERE OPPOSED TO ELIMINATING PLASTIC BAGS?	
2026-10-18 14:20:04	Stacey	Davis	Glen Burnie	Maryland	21060	Yes		Bill No. 74-26: AN ORDINANCE concerning: Public Safety – Miscellaneous Provisions – Repeal of Paper and Reusable Bags Fee Requirement	Support		
2026-10-18 14:27:09	Nicole	Stewart	Annapolis	Maryland	21409	Yes		Bill No. 74-26: AN ORDINANCE concerning: Public Safety – Miscellaneous Provisions – Repeal of Paper and Reusable Bags Fee Requirement	Support	The bag tax is ridiculous. It is just another overreaching money grab. Regardless if it is repealed or not, I will continue to use my cloth bags 90% of the time. I'm opposed to continuously being fee'd and taxed to death by the government. Also, I find it incredibly ridiculous to expect consumers to carry around bags when shopping for clothing, household goods, etc.	

Timestamp	First name	Last name	City	State	Zip Code	Are you representing yourself?	If no, what organization or whom do you represent?	Legislation	Position	Remarks	Attachments
2026-10-18 21:45:56	Priscilla	Kania	Annapolis	MD	21401	Yes		Bill No. 74-26: AN ORDINANCE concerning: Public Safety – Miscellaneous Provisions – Repeal of Paper and Reusable Bags Fee Requirement	Oppose	Our county successfully implemented a plastic bag ban, strongly encouraging residents to bring their own bags. There was a massive amount of testimony, amendments, discussion & compromise. As a retired psychotherapist, I can tell you that behavioral change doesn't occur unless one or more pieces of the existing system change. To disrupt inertia, merchants are allowed to sell bags to customers for a minimum of 10 cents per bag. They may not give them away except during promotions. The charge accomplishes 3 goals: 1. It makes customers aware that bags aren't free unless you bring your own; 2. The merchants recoup some of the cost of the bags; 3. The cost of the bags does not get passed on to the customers who bring their own bags. Merchants cannot & will not absorb the cost of bags. They will pass it on to all customers. Prices have escalated across the board. Do you really want them to increase more for everyone because some of your constituents don't want to pay for something they are purchasing? To be clear, the bag is a purchase- not a gift. Please leave #74-26 in tact and vote NO!	
2026-10-19 1:31:55	Sierra	Bacani	Glen Burnie	MD	21061	Yes		Bill No. 74-26: AN ORDINANCE concerning: Public Safety – Miscellaneous Provisions – Repeal of Paper and Reusable Bags Fee Requirement	Oppose	We never ever ever had this fee ever in all the years I have lived here , everything is up in price it's a small fee but one that adds up and isn't necessary especially when if you use self check out people probably arnt even recording and "stealing " bags . It's nonsense	
2026-10-19 9:58:53	Ruby	Abrams	Laurel	MD	20724	Yes		Bill No. 74-26: AN ORDINANCE concerning: Public Safety – Miscellaneous Provisions – Repeal of Paper and Reusable Bags Fee Requirement	Support	I support repealing bill no. 74-26 so we don't get charged for bags when we buy items at any store. It's a waste and we have too many taxes, fees, etc. that have been put on Marylanders' during this administration. I refuse to pay for bags after paying for merchandise.	
Bill No. 75-26											
2026-10-18 14:19:13	Stacey	Davis	Glen Burnie	Maryland	21060	Yes		Bill No. 75-26: AN ORDINANCE concerning: Current Expense Budget – Supplementary Appropriations – Chief Administrative Office – Technical Corrections of Annual Budget and Appropriation Ordinance	Oppose		
Resolution No. 36-26											
2026-10-18 14:14:09	Stacey	Davis	Glen Burnie	Maryland	21060	Yes		Resolution No. 36-26: RESOLUTION approving the revision of certain terms and conditions of the private disposition of certain County-owned property in Glen Burnie, Maryland, known as 7409 Baltimore-Annapolis Boulevard	Oppose	I oppose due to lack of impact fee's required to be paid by the developer. Acts such as this cause expenses to be passed to existing residents of the county. Developers have continued to sidestep impact fee's and other costs to build to the county and caused over crowding in our schools (regardless of the county's description of what is over-crowded) - ask the teachers; over crowding and excessive wear and tear on our county utilities and roadways. I am not specifically against the development but I OPPOSE without the builder paying full impact and all cost to build fee's a private builder would incur to the county.	



WRITTEN TESTIMONY TO THE ANNE ARUNDEL COUNTY COUNCIL

Bill No. 61-26 (As Amended) AN ORDINANCE concerning: Public Safety – Zoning – Article 18 Update

POSITION: Support

BY: Karen Agee, Vice President, League of Women Voters of Anne Arundel County

DATE: October 19, 2026

Bill 61-26, as amended, brings Anne Arundel County's zoning code in line with present times and actual practice by updating outdated terminology or provisions, adding and revising allowed uses, addressing inconsistencies, and improving the overall applicability of the zoning provisions in Article 18 of the County code.

The League of Women Voters of Anne Arundel County supports passage of Bill 61-26 based on our Planning and Zoning position, which endorses controlled growth and strong enforcement of existing land use controls. Control and enforcement both require clearly defined standards, which are lacking in Article 18 currently.

As noted in the legislative summary, Bill 61-26 marks "the completion of a multi-year effort between staff and stakeholders...and will be a significant legacy accomplishment." We respectfully urge the County Council to make passage of Bill 61-26 a noteworthy addition to your already admirable legacy as elected representatives of the residents of Anne Arundel County.



WRITTEN TESTIMONY TO THE ANNE ARUNDEL COUNTY COUNCIL

Bill No. 65-26 (As Amended) AN ORDINANCE concerning: Public Ethics – Campaign Contribution Disclosure and Comprehensive Zoning Integrity Act

POSITION: Support

BY: Karen Agee, Vice President, League of Women Voters of Anne Arundel County

DATE: October 19, 2026

When campaign contributions intersect with decisions that can have significant financial consequences, transparency matters.

The League of Women Voters of Anne Arundel County supports Bill 65-26, as amended, based on our national organization's position on Money in Politics, which states, in part: "The League of Women Voters of the United States believes that the methods of financing political campaigns should...ensure transparency...and combat corruption and undue influence in government."

Bill 65-26 advances these principles by bringing greater transparency to campaign contributions connected to land-use matters before the County and establishing targeted safeguards against undue influence.

The League believes that the public has a right to understand the financial relationships surrounding decisions that can significantly affect property owners, applicants, and the community. Clear disclosure requirements give the public that information and help strengthen confidence in County government.

The League appreciates the public service County Council members generously provide to our county. We believe Bill 65-26 protects the public interest, promotes transparency, and helps build trust in our government.

The League of Women Voters of Anne Arundel County respectfully urges the County Council to pass Bill 65-26.

October 19, 2026

Anne Arundel County Council
44 Calver Street
Annapolis, MD 21401

Re: Bill 61-26

Dear Honorable Council Chair Hummer and Honorable Councilmembers,

I am writing as Anna Chaney and am not representing anyone other than myself and will only note the sentiments of the correspondences I have had with innumerable constituents of Anne Arundel County.

First, I appreciate the hard work that has been put into this process by our department of Planning and Zoning and the Council's hard work into understanding this bill. I also commend the attempts at amending Bill 61-26 on behalf of hundreds of taxpayers in Anne Arundel County. I am sorry to see that most of them did not pass, and many were not even heard. Witnessing the choice to pass the amendments that were most obvious to the general public sent a message to everyone watching that those who would make the most noise would be quieted.

Second, there are many new clauses and changes to the zoning code that are unclear and potentially incomplete which impacts people's rights to notifications about zoning violations, due process subsequent to notification, right to appeal decisions regarding non-conforming uses, changes in expectations of proof that fall upon the hard working business owners, right to enter structures without respectful appointments (appointments seem to be the norm at I&P), and so many updates and changes that are incomprehensible in such a short period of time. I know some like to say this was online for a long time. However, the comment period was brief and there was no discussion amongst stakeholders as you have heard countless times. I had no idea that a "chart", written in unfamiliar language about zoning would result in Bill 61-26. Here is a [link](https://www.aacounty.org/sites/default/files/2026-01/article-18-update-list-of-amendments-20251219.pdf) to said chart. Please note the lack of public comments and stakeholder comments, and from the very few, are noted in the last column. You can also copy and paste this direct link to the chart:

<https://www.aacounty.org/sites/default/files/2026-01/article-18-update-list-of-amendments-20251219.pdf>

A positive step forward is to stop Bill 61-26 tonight and resume immediately with a clear and do-able process (as many stakeholders have requested and volunteered to dedicate their time and engage in this process, unpaid). The easiest road to follow is not always the

best path moving forward. I know you will vote based upon your convictions and trust in our commitments to one another.

Last, please consider who you are serving, why you are serving, and what your legacy will be. This is a great opportunity to gain support, build trust, and do the right thing for the people you represent. 61-26 is the Bill and tonight is the night.

Thank you very much,

Anna Chaney
Lothian, MD

P.S. Here is the [link](#) to the online petition, signed by over 2000 Anne Arundel County constituents who will be awaiting your votes tonight. <https://c.org/LTbJ7gy9j6>



Kaley Schultze <ccschu24@aacounty.org>

Fwd: Bill 61-26 - Support

1 message

Allison Pickard <Allison.Pickard@aacounty.org>
To: Kaley Schultze <ccschu24@aacounty.org>

Mon, Oct 19, 2026 at 11:13 AM

For the record.
Kristin

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Anne Arundel County Farm Bureau** <annearundelcountyfarmbureau@gmail.com>

Date: Mon, Oct 19, 2026 at 10:32 AM

Subject: Bill 61-26 - Support

To: <petersmith@aacounty.org>, <allison.pickard@aacounty.org>, <Nathan.volke@aacounty.org>, <jhummer@aacounty.org>, <amanda.fiedler@aacounty.org>, <lisa.rodvien@aacounty.org>, Shannon Leadbetter <sleadbetter@aacounty.org>

Dear Chair and Members of the Anne Arundel County Council,

On behalf of the Anne Arundel County Farm Bureau (AACFB), we are writing to express our support for Bill 61-26 and its positive impact on the agricultural community in Anne Arundel County.

We appreciate the efforts to clarify the County Code and make it more workable for farmers. Provisions such as allowing food trucks at agritourism operations, removing the Certificate of Use requirement, and providing greater clarity in the code are meaningful steps toward reducing unnecessary barriers and supporting the continued viability of our farms.

While we support the bill and recognize the progress it represents, there is still work to be done. AACFB looks forward to working with the newly elected County Council to advance the three amendments that Councilwoman Shannon Leadbetter was preparing to present on behalf of the agricultural community. We believe continued collaboration between the Council and local farmers is essential to developing practical legislation that supports agriculture while meeting the needs of our broader community.

We would like to thank the entire County Council for its work on this legislation and for its efforts to help keep agriculture viable in Anne Arundel County. We value the Council's willingness to engage with our agricultural community and look forward to continuing this partnership to ensure that farming remains an important and sustainable part of our county's future.

Sincerely,

Deana B. Tice

Deana B. Tice, President

Anne Arundel County Farm Bureau



Kaley Schultze <ccschu24@aacounty.org>

Fwd: Concerns. Response Requested

1 message

Allison Pickard <Allison.Pickard@aacounty.org>
To: Kaley Schultze <ccschu24@aacounty.org>

Mon, Oct 19, 2026 at 10:18 AM

Forwarding for official record.
Kristin

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Nick Cosentino** [REDACTED]
Date: Sun, Oct 18, 2026 at 1:41 PM
Subject: Concerns. Response Requested
To: <petersmith@aacounty.org>, <Linda.harris@aacounty.org>, <allison.pickard@aacounty.org>, <kristin.etzel@aacounty.org>

Dear Members of the Anne Arundel County Council:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to Bill 61-26 and to demand greater transparency regarding its potential consequences for established residential communities, particularly North Linthicum and Ferndale.

My concerns are heightened by the Maryland Department of Transportation's April 2026 Baltimore Region Transit-Oriented Development Strategy, which expressly promotes higher-density, mixed-use development around existing light rail and Metro stations.

Residents deserve to know whether Bill 61-26 will facilitate these development objectives, where increased density may be permitted, and what protections will remain for existing homeowners.

Our communities are already experiencing serious public safety concerns. Residents have documented repeated vehicle thefts, individuals entering vehicles, attempted break-ins, bicycle thefts, and other property crimes. Another vehicle was reportedly stolen in our neighborhood just this past week.

Residents have installed security cameras, shared evidence, contacted law enforcement, and repeatedly requested greater police visibility. Yet these incidents continue, and residents are left questioning what meaningful enforcement measures are being implemented.

Against this backdrop, County officials are advancing sweeping zoning changes while the State promotes increased development around transit infrastructure.

Where is the coordinated plan to protect the people who already live here?

Before asking residents to accept changes that could increase development intensity, traffic, parking demand, and pressure on public services, the County must demonstrate that existing infrastructure and public safety resources can adequately support those changes.

I am particularly concerned that the Council is considering legislation containing numerous substantive amendments without ensuring that ordinary residents fully understand how their properties and neighborhoods may be affected.

I am requesting written answers to the following:

Has the County evaluated Bill 61-26 in conjunction with MDOT's Baltimore Region Transit-Oriented Development Strategy?

Could the proposed zoning changes facilitate increased residential density or mixed-use development near the North Linthicum and Ferndale light rail stations?

What protections will prevent incompatible development from adversely affecting established single-family neighborhoods?

What analysis has been conducted regarding traffic, parking, stormwater infrastructure, emergency response times, and

police staffing?

What specific steps are being taken to address the ongoing vehicle thefts and property crimes currently affecting our communities?

Why should residents have confidence in the County's ability to manage additional development when their existing public safety concerns remain unresolved?

Let me be clear: I am not opposed to responsible development or improvements to public transportation. I am opposed to advancing substantial land-use changes without demonstrating that neighborhood safety, infrastructure capacity, and the interests of existing homeowners have been adequately considered.

The responsibility of elected officials is not simply to accommodate development objectives. It is to protect the welfare, safety, and quality of life of the residents they represent.

The County cannot reasonably expect residents to embrace its vision for future development while those same residents are increasingly concerned about the safety and stability of their existing neighborhoods.

I urge the Council to VOTE NO on Bill 61-26 in its current form, require a transparent assessment of its relationship to regional development initiatives, and provide meaningful opportunities for affected communities to review and challenge substantive changes.

I also request a written response addressing the questions raised above and ask that this correspondence be entered into the official legislative record.

Our neighborhoods are not merely development opportunities on a planning map. They are established communities where people have invested their savings, raised families, and built their lives. They deserve protection, transparency, and accountability.

Sincerely,

Nick Cosentino

--

Allison M. Pickard

Anne Arundel County Council Second District

44 Calvert Street, 1st Floor

Annapolis, MD 21401

Office 410-222-1401


Allison.Pickard@AACounty.org

To sign up to receive District 2 email newsletters click [HERE](#).



Kaley Schultze <ccschu24@aacounty.org>

Formal Opposition to Bill 61-26 - Public Safety, Transit Orientated Development and Neighborhood Protection

2 messages

Siobhan [REDACTED]
To: ccschu24@aacounty.org

Sun, Oct 18, 2026 at 9:16 AM

Dear Members of the Anne Arundel County Council:

I am writing to express my **strong opposition to Bill 61-26** and to demand greater transparency regarding its potential consequences for established residential communities, particularly North Linthicum and Ferndale.

My concerns are heightened by the Maryland Department of Transportation's April 2026 *Baltimore Region Transit-Oriented Development Strategy*, which expressly promotes higher-density, mixed-use development around existing light rail and Metro stations.

Residents deserve to know whether Bill 61-26 will facilitate these development objectives, where increased density may be permitted, and what protections will remain for existing homeowners.

Our communities are already experiencing serious public safety concerns. Residents have documented repeated vehicle thefts, individuals entering vehicles, attempted break-ins, bicycle thefts, and other property crimes. Another vehicle was reportedly stolen in our neighborhood just this past week.

Residents have installed security cameras, shared evidence, contacted law enforcement, and repeatedly requested greater police visibility. Yet these incidents continue, and residents are left questioning what meaningful enforcement measures are being implemented.

Against this backdrop, County officials are advancing sweeping zoning changes while the State promotes increased development around transit infrastructure.

Where is the coordinated plan to protect the people who already live here?

Before asking residents to accept changes that could increase development intensity, traffic, parking demand, and pressure on public services, the County must demonstrate that existing infrastructure and public safety resources can adequately support those changes.

I am particularly concerned that the Council is considering legislation containing numerous substantive amendments without ensuring that ordinary residents fully understand how their properties and neighborhoods may be affected.

I am requesting written answers to the following:

1. Has the County evaluated Bill 61-26 in conjunction with MDOT's Baltimore Region Transit-Oriented Development Strategy?
2. Could the proposed zoning changes facilitate increased residential density or mixed-use development near the North Linthicum and Ferndale light rail stations?
3. What protections will prevent incompatible development from adversely affecting established single-family neighborhoods?
4. What analysis has been conducted regarding traffic, parking, stormwater infrastructure, emergency response times, and police staffing?
5. What specific steps are being taken to address the ongoing vehicle thefts and property crimes currently affecting our communities?
6. Why should residents have confidence in the County's ability to manage additional development when their existing public safety concerns remain unresolved?

Let me be clear: **I am not opposed to responsible development or improvements to public transportation. I am opposed to advancing substantial land-use changes without demonstrating that neighborhood safety, infrastructure capacity, and the interests of existing homeowners have been adequately considered.**

The responsibility of elected officials is not simply to accommodate development objectives. It is to protect the welfare, safety, and quality of life of the residents they represent.

The County cannot reasonably expect residents to embrace its vision for future development while those same residents are increasingly concerned about the safety and stability of their existing neighborhoods.

I urge the Council to **VOTE NO on Bill 61-26** in its current form, require a transparent assessment of its relationship to regional development initiatives, and provide meaningful opportunities for affected communities to review and challenge substantive changes.

I also request a written response addressing the questions raised above and ask that this correspondence be entered into the official legislative record.

Our neighborhoods are not merely development opportunities on a planning map. They are established communities where people have invested their savings, raised families, and built their lives. They deserve protection, transparency, and accountability.

Sincerely,

Siobhan J. Poole

Kaley Schultze <ccschu24@aacounty.org>

Mon, Oct 19, 2026 at 8:59 AM

To: Kaley Schultze <ccschu24@aacounty.org>

Cc: Meredith Beach <ccbeac24@aacounty.org>, Pamela Groves <ccgrov26@aacounty.org>

Bcc: Peter Smith <ccsmit23@aacounty.org>, Linda Harris <ccharr00@aacounty.org>, Allison Pickard

<ccpick33@aacounty.org>, Kristin Etzel <cetze33@aacounty.org>, Nathan Volke <ccvolk33@aacounty.org>, Sara Gannon

<ccgann33@aacounty.org>, Julie Hummer <jhummer@aacounty.org>, Brian Kemmet <bkemmet@aacounty.org>, Amanda

Fiedler <ccfied33@aacounty.org>, Pam Scarbro <ccscar00@aacounty.org>, Lisa Rodvien <lisa.rodvien@aacounty.org>,

Courtney Buiniskis <ccbuin24@aacounty.org>, Shannon Leadbetter <sleadbetter@aacounty.org>, Jessica Ewing

<jewing@aacounty.org>

Good morning Council,

Please see the testimony below. Thanks!

Kaley

[Quoted text hidden]



Growth Action Network

of Anne Arundel County, Inc.

P.O. Box 748 • Arnold, MD 21012 • www.growthaction.net

Article 18 of the County Code governs development in the county and was last updated in 2005. Since then, hundreds of small, “minor” changes have created a patchwork of conflicts and inconsistencies in the way that land use is managed in the County.

GAN has been advocating for a comprehensive update for more than 10 years.

We are in strong support now of [61-26](#), the long-awaited update to the Zoning Code. Highlights include purpose statements for each zoning district which were stripped out of the code in the 2005 revision, many more definitions of terms and uses already in the code, expanded uses in some zoning districts, and it puts the county’s administrative practices into the code so all have clarity and certainty.

A number of amendments have clarified some uses and changes. After initial opposition from food truck owners and the Farm Bureau, the Council has worked out amendments that have gained their support. Dozens more amendments should be taken up by the next Council.

We urge a yes vote tonight.



Kaley Schultze <ccschu24@aacounty.org>

Fwd: Comments Regarding the October 5 County Council Meeting and Bill 61-26

2 messages

Nathan Volke <ccvolk33@aacounty.org>

Thu, Oct 8, 2026 at 7:35 AM

To: Kaley Schultze <ccschu24@aacounty.org>

Cc: Janssen Evelyn <exevel22@aacounty.org>, Stuart Pittman <spittman@aacounty.org>

Kaley, can you please add this to the public record of comments for Bill 61-26? I think it's important to memorialize the feedback from constituents on this Bill, including public reactions to the public meeting. Thanks, Nathan

Sent from my mobile device. Please excuse typos.

 Nathan Volke
 Anne Arundel County Councilman
 District 3
Nathan.Volke@aacounty.org

Sara Gannon
 Legislative Aide - District 3
ccgann33@aacounty.org
 410-222-2413

Visit my blog for up to date information:

<https://www.aacounty.org/departments/county-council/councilmembers/district-3>

** Communications with the County Council office, County Council Member or Legislative Aide become part of the public domain and may be subject to disclosure under the Maryland Public Information Act or the Anne Arundel County Charter - www.aacounty.org

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **margie chase** [REDACTED]
 Date: Wed, Oct 7, 2026 at 7:48 PM
 Subject: Comments Regarding the October 5 County Council Meeting and Bill 61-26
 To: Julie Hummer Anne Arundel County Council District 4 <jhummer@aacounty.org>, Shannon Leadbetter <sleadbetter@aacounty.org>, Nathan Volke County Council Dist 3 <nathan.volke@aacounty.org>, Amanda Fiedler County Council dist 5 <amanda.fiedler@aacounty.org>, Allison Pickard County Council Dist 2 <allison.pickard@aacounty.org>, Peter Smith Anne Arundel County Council District 1 <petersmith@aacounty.org>, Lisa Rodvien County Council dist 6 <lisa.rodvien@aacounty.org>
 CC: County Executive Stuart Pittman <countyexecutive@aacounty.org>

My name is Margaret Chase, and I reside in District 7. Although I was unable to attend the October 5 County Council meeting in person, I watched the meeting on October 6 and would like to share several comments regarding the proceedings, particularly those surrounding the amendments to Bill 61-26.

First, I want to commend Ms. Fiedler, Ms. Leadbetter, and Mr. Volke for maintaining a professional demeanor throughout what was, at times, a contentious meeting. I especially appreciated Mr. Volke's willingness to question the parliamentary procedures surrounding the motions to move amendments out of order. I also appreciated that Ms. Leadbetter, Mr. Volke, and Ms. Fiedler voted NO on those motions.

I further appreciated comments from Ms. Fiedler and Ms. Leadbetter regarding the importance of allowing constituents' amendments to be addressed rather than moving topics around or selectively choosing which matters to consider first. Constituents have invested considerable time reviewing these proposals and deserve the opportunity to have their concerns considered by the Council.

I was very disappointed by comments made by Ms. Rodvien at 11:58pm regarding a colleague allegedly wasting time with seven bills and the suggestion that this had "clearly been a game all along." Regardless of how she may have viewed the situation, I believe comments of that nature were inappropriate and unnecessary in a public Council meeting. I was also concerned by the decision to specifically question when the Agricultural Commission had received the bill. I did not hear the same line of questioning regarding when the Maritime, Food Trucks, or other parties had received it.

I appreciated Ms. Leadbetter's effort to de-escalate the situation by suggesting there may have been a misunderstanding or miscommunication. Her response demonstrated the level of professionalism and respect that I believe should characterize Council discussions, even when there are disagreements.

I was similarly disappointed by the snarky comment(s) made by Mr. Evelyn toward Mr. Volke. Regardless of anyone's personal opinion regarding how Mr. Volke has presented his concerns, I believe comments of that nature are inappropriate and unnecessary during a public County Council meeting. Given his position within county government; as the Deputy Chief Administrative Officer of Anne Arundel County, I believe it is especially important that he maintain a professional and respectful demeanor when addressing or responding to elected officials in a public forum. Personal opinions or disagreements should be expressed appropriately and professionally, rather than through remarks that can be perceived as dismissive or disrespectful.

Most importantly, I am concerned that, after the considerable amount of time constituents have spent reviewing a 239-page bill and its numerous amendments, not all of those amendments were given the opportunity to be fully heard and considered. Constituents deserve a transparent process and the opportunity to have their concerns addressed before the Council moves toward a final vote.

For these reasons, I strongly urge you to stop rushing this legislation through the process and to vote **NO on Bill 61-26**. At a minimum, this bill should be delayed so that the Council can fully consider the outstanding amendments and the concerns raised by its constituents.

Please take the time necessary to ensure that this legislation receives the thoughtful, thorough, and transparent consideration that the residents of the county deserve; don't pass it as is and think you can fix it later.

Thank you for your time and for considering my concerns.

Sincerely,

Margaret Chase - District 7 constituent

Margie Chase



Kaley Schultze <ccschu24@aacounty.org>
To: Nathan Volke <ccvolk33@aacounty.org>

Thu, Oct 8, 2026 at 11:07 AM

I will add it for the October 19 meeting. Thanks!

Kaley
[Quoted text hidden]



Kaley Schultze <ccschu24@aacounty.org>

Opposition to Bill 61-26: please pause and divide the bill

1 message

Valerie Calabrese

Thu, Oct 15, 2026 at 4:30 PM

To: "jhummer@aacounty.org" <jhummer@aacounty.org>, "petersmith@aacounty.org" <petersmith@aacounty.org>, "allison.pickard@aacounty.org" <allison.pickard@aacounty.org>, "nathan.volke@aacounty.org" <nathan.volke@aacounty.org>, "amanda.fiedler@aacounty.org" <amanda.fiedler@aacounty.org>, "lisa.rodvien@aacounty.org" <lisa.rodvien@aacounty.org>, Shannon Leadbetter <seadbetter@aacounty.org>, "ccschu24@aacounty.org" <ccschu24@aacounty.org>, "CouncilAdmin@aacounty.org" <counciladmin@aacounty.org>

Dear Chair Hummer and Members of the County Council,

I am writing to state my opposition to Bill 61-26 in its current form and to ask that you pause it. My family lives in District 7 and also owns a second home in District 3. We operate a family farm in Davidsonville, and we have attended council meetings on this bill. Our daughter has testified at the last two.

I do not oppose updating the zoning code. I understand it has not been comprehensively revised since 2005. My objection is to the process. Bill 61-26 is a 244-page rewrite of Article 18 that has been amended three times, with, by press accounts, roughly 150 amendments. Residents, small farms and homeowners have been asked to read, understand and respond to it while the text keeps changing. Many of the people I speak with are still trying to learn what the bill does to their own property.

I am frustrated that, despite the large and sustained response from constituents asking for more time, the council has not agreed to pause. People from across the county have written, called and testified. Pausing is a reasonable request, and it does not mean rejecting the work. It means making sure the people affected can understand it.

I respectfully ask the council to:

1. Pause Bill 61-26 and not pass it before it expires on October 23.
2. Ask the next council to take it up in smaller, separate bills, organized by subject, such as agriculture and agritourism, accessory structures, housing and rental provisions, nonconforming uses, and enforcement. Residents could then review and testify on each part.
3. Publish a clean, current version of the bill and a plain-language summary of each change before any further hearing.

I also have two questions that I would like answered publicly:

First, at the October 5 meeting, why were certain amendments moved to the front of the line for a vote? What criteria decided the order, and how were residents told in advance?

Second, if the code has gone unrevised for roughly 20 years, why is there a rush to pass it now, when constituents are asking for time to understand it? A few more months of review would be a small cost against the 20 years the code has been in place. A rushed rewrite could create problems that take years to correct.

Provisions of concern to us include the new right of entry for inspections, the cap on total accessory-structure space, the expanded 50-foot setback for animal and manure storage, the limits on farm events, and the ban on using a recreational vehicle as a dwelling unit, which has no farm exception. These are only examples. A bill this large should be reviewed in pieces.

Thank you for your service and for considering this request. I would welcome the chance to discuss it with any of you, and my family will continue to participate.

Respectfully,

Valerie & Chris Calabrese