

Comments on the  
First Draft of the *Calvert County Comprehensive Plan (October 2017)*

Additional Comments Received through February 13, 2018

<b>NAME</b>	<b>GROUP/AGENCY</b>	<b>ADDRESS</b>	<b>Date Received</b>	<b># of Pages</b>
Joe Kriemelmeyer, Jr.		Dunkirk	2/5/18	1
Tim Grover		470 Welcome Lane St. Leonard	2/5/18, 2/6/18	4
Dana McAnney		Huntingtown	2/7/18	1
Robin Whitman and Stephen Whitman		Owings	2/7/18	1
Candyce Lord		Lusby	2/7/18	1
Terry Pennington		Huntingtown	2/7/18	1
Karen Larkins		2460 Huntingfields Dr. Huntingtown	2/8/18	1
Gary A. Dzurec		Huntingtown	2/8/18	1
Raymond Posten		Huntingtown	2/11/18	1
Mark Power		Breezy Point Chesapeake Beach	2/11/18	1
Jennifer Hazzard		Huntingtown	2/11/18	1
Charles Reese		113 Windcliff Rd. Prince Frederick	2/12/18	1
Steven Holaus			2/13/18	1

From: A Concerned Citizen [mailto:no-reply@powr.io]  
Sent: Monday, February 05, 2018 6:54 PM  
To: Planning and Zoning <pz@calvertcountymd.gov>  
Subject: Comments From joebeyk@aol.com

To: Planning Commission & County Commissioners:

From: Joe Kriemelmeyer, Jr  
Email Address [joebeyk@aol.com](mailto:joebeyk@aol.com)  
Town Dunkirk

My Comments: Why is there no control of growth mentioned in the new Comprehensive Plan? This is a concern because the previous two C.P.s had "buildout" policy approximated at 37,000 households," based on what infrastructure could handle". This particular kind of information is not only appropriate but entirely necessary when considering that Calvert Co. is a peninsula, surrounded on three sides with water thus limitation which obligate our population to be mindful of resources we have and less dependent on outside areas. If this obligation is understood by all who live in Calvert Co., then it should be obvious why the new Comprehensive Plan should contain policy for growth, as it was in the past. If there is a change or not in the number of households, due to factors that increase or decrease it, citizens of Calvert Co. should be informed and Calvert County Planning Commission and BOCC describe (in new Comprehensive Plan what is projected "buildout growth" and how it will be implemented if necessary. Thus, the obligation.

**From:** Tim Grover [mailto:groverplace@comcast.net]

**Sent:** Tuesday, February 06, 2018 12:52 PM

**To:** Cook, Mary Beth <Marybeth.Cook@calvertcountymd.gov>; Planning and Zoning <pz@calvertcountymd.gov>

**Subject:** Comments on the Comprehensive Plan First Draft

My family has owned property and lived in St. Leonard Town Center and surrounding area since the 1940s. I own 40 acres in four parcels in St. Leonard. I oppose the future land use plan on page 4-15 that would downzone all of our land in St. Leonard.

One of our parcels is divided into two parts by BGE's 500 KV transmission corridor. The part (part of Tax Map 31 Parcel 491) adjoining the east side of the corridor is currently zoned Rural Community District (RCD). Mary Beth Cook in an email dated 2/6/18 (below), indicates she has "researched the portion of the referenced property on the east side of the power lines and have confirmed that it is shown on the proposed Land Use Map as Farm and Forest. Staff has previously identified a few other properties adjacent to town centers which we believe should be Rural Residential. I will add your property to the list to be revised." So it appears this was a mistake and it will be corrected in the next revision. In case this does not happen, for the record - I oppose its downzoning from RCD to Farm and Forest District (FFD). This property, up to this point, has not been subdivided due to a combination of factors: the high cost to run a 1400 ft. road across the transmission corridor from St. Leonard Rd and, until recently, the economy. Currently, this property is within the one-mile radius of the Town Center. Use of Transferable Development Rights (TDRs) is permitted to create higher density residential neighborhoods adjacent to Town Centers in the RCD. This provision does not apply to land zoned FFD, and it is in question whether this provision would eventually apply to property within a one-mile radius of a *Village* in the RCD with updated zoning. Downzoning to FFD would make future development of this property economically infeasible due to lack of a receiving area for TDRs and the requirements it would invoke for clustering. Downzoning in this case harms what was once envisioned and intended for higher density residential neighborhoods. To eliminate this unintended consequence, the Plan should be revised to include a statement that supports optional clustering within the one-mile radius of the Town Centers and Villages and a clearer map depicting the part of Tax Map 31, Parcel 491, adjoining the east side of the BGE's 500 KV transmission corridor as RCD.

The other part of this same property (Parcel 491) adjoins the west side of the corridor, and it is currently zoned Town Center. I oppose its downzoning to Village. The adjoining parcel (Tax Map 31, Parcel 490) is currently zoned Town Center. And adjoining that parcel are our other two parcels (Tax Map 31, Parcel 403 and Parcel 188) that are currently zoned Town Center. I oppose the downzoning of all this property from Town Center to Village on page 4-15 and page 4-21. This property is within the commercial core of the current Town Center, and up to this point, has not been developed any more than it has mostly due to the lack of zoning that would permit one-story buildings along St. Leonard Rd in the commercial core, or a mix of residential and commercial uses in the same building (i.e. mixed use zoning) vs. on the same parcel, and lack of adequate water tower infrastructure.

In 2013, a new Master plan for St. Leonard Town Center was adopted. A great deal of public support went into the development of that Master Plan. It called for and supported mixed-use development in St. Leonard Town Center. Now, this Comprehensive Plan does not call for or support mixed-use zoning in St. Leonard. What has spurn this drastic change since 2013? Mixed-use zoning permits housing stock and long-term market support for existing and future business in the commercial core. This provision would also allow for a needed and -- more importantly in a lot of cases -- the highest and best use for the second floor of a two-story building where the first floor is used commercially. Without it, there will be no apartments over businesses or apartments attached to businesses, which do exist today in our commercial core. These uses are in some cases necessary to compliment the active ground floor uses lining the main road, especially when zoning requires two-story buildings along the main road as is the case in St. Leonard. Even if the requirement changed to no longer require two-story development along the main road, I still support the commercial core also having a concentration of residential housing stock because we are a designated growth area for residential development. The time to get picky about the appropriate types of housing options is later during the zoning process. The point I want to make is: designated growth is not just limited to commercial growth. Designated growth areas were also intended for residential growth. Therefore, we need a statement supporting and reflecting that Villages and

Town Centers have not only a mix of uses but also mixed uses in the same buildings on page 4-20 where it should also include in the statement the fact that villages also include a concentration of residential uses.

Villages and Town Centers should be served by individual, private sewage disposal systems and community sewage treatment systems. Community sewage treatment systems should not just be allowed solely to address public health issues created by older development patterns. This restriction is counterproductive. Community sewer systems in Villages and Town Centers is a must have option for cases in which it is needed in order to satisfy development requirements. Take for example adjoining parcels of land under the same ownership. This is just one example -- but certainly a developer-funded community sewage treatment system should be allowed to serve them in lieu of multiple individual, private sewage disposal systems. Putting in the plan a statement on page 4-20 that would prohibit community septic systems (except for the rare case of a public health issues created by older development patterns) is not supportive of growth within a designated growth area and in many ways casts doubt on the seriousness of efforts to maintain as viable these designated growth areas. Until this Plan, these designated growth areas (keeping in mind their purpose for helping to incent location of development in areas served by infrastructure and away from farms and forest) have held promise for the citizens in our community to help Keep Calvert Country. Viable minor Town Centers contribute to the success of this effort. The downzoning from Town Centers to Villages will needlessly limit the options and uses available for developing new businesses and housing stock that cater to an economic diverse population. This will make these place less viable and compelling places to live, work and play. And while this outcome may be to the possible delight of some who may not fully understand the future ramifications of such short-sighted decisions, it is counterproductive and works to the benefit of the few. Keep in mind that as some try to belittle minor Town Centers by making them less viable for growth, it will be economic growth and vitality in those towns and for those people living near them-- at a time when it is needed in our community -- that are going to suffer. Any little bit of growth that may have otherwise been helped to come to these minor Town Centers will likely go to the other Town Centers or areas not even designated for growth. We will all see the effects. The proposed Town Centers will feed on a frenzy of growth while minor Town Centers wither. This will not be good for either.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Tim Grover  
470 Welcome Lane  
St. Leonard, MD 20685

**From:** Cook, Mary Beth [<mailto:Marybeth.Cook@calvertcountymd.gov>]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 6, 2018 11:24 AM  
**To:** Tim Grover <[groverplace@comcast.net](mailto:groverplace@comcast.net)>  
**Subject:** RE: Question about Future Land Use Plan

Tim,  
We do not have an electronic form but do accept comments in the form of emails or letters.  
Thank you,  
Mary Beth

**From:** Tim Grover [<mailto:groverplace@comcast.net>]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 06, 2018 10:27 AM  
**To:** Cook, Mary Beth <[Marybeth.Cook@calvertcountymd.gov](mailto:Marybeth.Cook@calvertcountymd.gov)>  
**Subject:** RE: Question about Future Land Use Plan

Can you send me a comment form that I can electronically paste my comments into?

**From:** Cook, Mary Beth [<mailto:Marybeth.Cook@calvertcountymd.gov>]  
**Sent:** Monday, February 5, 2018 2:38 PM

**To:** Tim Grover <[groverplace@comcast.net](mailto:groverplace@comcast.net)>  
**Subject:** RE: Question about Future Land Use Plan

Tim,

No action is required on your part for the change, however if you would like to submit a written comment it will become part of the record of comments received.

Thanks,  
Mary Beth

**From:** Tim Grover [<mailto:groverplace@comcast.net>]  
**Sent:** Monday, February 05, 2018 2:07 PM  
**To:** Cook, Mary Beth <[Marybeth.Cook@calvertcountymd.gov](mailto:Marybeth.Cook@calvertcountymd.gov)>  
**Subject:** RE: Question about Future Land Use Plan

Mary Beth – Thank you!

Just to be clear, do I need to submit a comment for this or is this something that will be corrected because it was mistakenly designated as FFD? When you say to be revised, do I need to do anything else or follow up to make sure it happens?

Thanks again for your help!

Tim

**From:** Cook, Mary Beth [<mailto:Marybeth.Cook@calvertcountymd.gov>]  
**Sent:** Monday, February 5, 2018 1:59 PM  
**To:** [groverplace@comcast.net](mailto:groverplace@comcast.net)  
**Cc:** Willis, Julian M. <[Julian.Willis@calvertcountymd.gov](mailto:Julian.Willis@calvertcountymd.gov)>  
**Subject:** RE: Question about Future Land Use Plan

Tim,

I've researched the portion of the referenced property on the east side of the power lines and have confirmed that it is shown on the proposed Land Use Map as Farm and Forest. Staff has previously identified a few other properties adjacent to town centers which we believe should be Rural Residential. I will add your property to the list to be revised.

Thank you,

*Mary Beth Cook*  
Deputy Director/Zoning Officer  
Calvert County Department of Planning & Zoning  
150 Main Street  
Prince Frederick, MD 20678  
410.535.2348  
[Marybeth.Cook@calvertcountymd.gov](mailto:Marybeth.Cook@calvertcountymd.gov)

*To learn more about our Comprehensive Plan Update and Zoning Ordinance Rewrite, click on the logo below:*



**We welcome your feedback. Please take our [customer satisfaction survey](#).**

**From:** Cook, Mary Beth  
**Sent:** Monday, February 05, 2018 9:15 AM  
**To:** 'groverplace@comcast.net' <[groverplace@comcast.net](mailto:groverplace@comcast.net)>  
**Cc:** Willis, Julian M. <[Julian.Willis@calvertcountymd.gov](mailto:Julian.Willis@calvertcountymd.gov)>  
**Subject:** FW: Question about Future Land Use Plan

Tim,

Mark forwarded me your question regarding the future zoning of your property at 475 St. Leonard Road. The property is currently within the St. Leonard Town Center and there are no changes proposed to the boundaries of St. Leonard. The only change currently proposed by the draft Comprehensive Plan is to change the designation of St. Leonard from a Minor Town Center to a Village. Note that the Land Use map is a draft "broad brush" designation of proposed land uses, not a zoning map.

The updated zoning map will be done along with the update to the Calvert County Zoning Ordinance, following the adoption of the Comprehensive Plan.

Please contact me if you have any additional questions.

Thank you,

*Mary Beth Cook*

Deputy Director/Zoning Officer  
Calvert County Department of Planning & Zoning  
150 Main Street  
Prince Frederick, MD 20678  
410.535.2348  
[Marybeth.Cook@calvertcountymd.gov](mailto:Marybeth.Cook@calvertcountymd.gov)

*To learn more about our Comprehensive Plan Update and Zoning Ordinance Rewrite, click on the logo below:*



**We welcome your feedback. Please take our [customer satisfaction survey](#).**

**From:** Tim Grover [<mailto:groverplace@comcast.net>]  
**Sent:** Monday, February 05, 2018 6:56 AM  
**To:** Willis, Julian M. <[Julian.Willis@calvertcountymd.gov](mailto:Julian.Willis@calvertcountymd.gov)>  
**Subject:** Question about Future Land Use Plan

Hey Mark,

I've noted what looks to be a change in future zoning for property I own. Can you confirm one way or the other the County is proposing future zoning of 475 St. Leonard Rd (Tax Map 31, Parcel 491) to be farm and forest? If so, at the earliest when would this change take effect?

Thanks,  
Tim Grover  
41-586-9819

From: A Concerned Citizen [mailto:no-reply@powr.io]  
Sent: Wednesday, February 07, 2018 1:29 PM  
To: Planning and Zoning <pz@calvertcountymd.gov>  
Subject: Comments From themcanneys@aol.com

To: Planning Commission & County Commissioners:

From: Dana McAnney  
Email Address themcanneys@aol.com  
Town Huntingtown

My Comments: We, the good people of Calvert County, demand that a traffic impact study be performed by a certified company to make a determination of the amount of the additional traffic projected to occur based on the proposal to build out the town centers and proposed villages along the Route 2/4 corridor before the new comprehensive plan is adopted, and that the proposed buildout and traffic impact study be presented to all the citizens for review and be open for public comment for a period of not less than 90 days thereafter. If I had wanted to live in a city, I could have moved to Montgomery County. Have you ever driven on Route 355? I wanted to move to Calvert County for the charm and character of a small town. I am sad that you allowed the tree lined buffer to be removed from Route 4 near the 7-11 at Cox Rd. The traffic from Huntingtown to Prince Frederick grows every day. I do not want Huntingtown to be expanded!! I love Huntingtown just as it is! Please listen to the citizens, and follow our wishes!!

From: A Concerned Citizen [mailto:no-reply@powr.io]  
Sent: Wednesday, February 07, 2018 2:02 PM  
To: Planning and Zoning <pz@calvertcountymd.gov>  
Subject: Comments From Robinwremax@gmail.com

To: Planning Commission & County Commissioners:

From: Robin A Whitman and Stephen Whitman  
Email Address Robinwremax@gmail.com  
Town Owings

My Comments: I am pleading with the Commissioners and the Planning Commission members to stop and consider the future of Calvert County. We have a jewel here that needs to be preserved by planning smartly for the future. Have a traffic study done and present it to the people for approval. That is your job! You were not elected by the business community but by the citizens of this County.

From: A Concerned Citizen [mailto:no-reply@powr.io]  
Sent: Wednesday, February 07, 2018 3:04 PM  
To: Planning and Zoning <pz@calvertcountymd.gov>  
Subject: Comments From cbk407@gmail.com

To: Planning Commission & County Commissioners:

From: Candyce Lord  
Email Address cbk407@gmail.com  
Town Lusby

My Comments: To Calvert County commissioners, I cannot fathom how you can even consider building more apartments, homes, and town centers without increasing the road infrastructure. The majority of the county commutes to the DC metro via Route 4. Since i moved here in 2005, it takes me at least 30 minutes more for that commute, and i leave Lusby at 4:30 am, coming home in the afternoon its at least a 2 hour communte and sometimes as much as 4 hours. If you are going to allow this developer ruin Calvert County, the least you should do is force them to widen Route 4 and put in some overpasses to eleviate the current issue. Sincerely, Candyce Lord

From: A Concerned Citizen [mailto:no-reply@powr.io]  
Sent: Wednesday, February 07, 2018 10:50 PM  
To: Planning and Zoning <pz@calvertcountymd.gov>  
Subject: Comments From [REDACTED]

To: Planning Commission & County Commissioners:

From: Terry Pennington  
Email Address [REDACTED]  
Town Huntingtown

My Comments: To whom it may concern: Calvert's trademark land preservation protections and "build out" limits are why I and many others enjoy living here. These are being weakened in the draft comprehensive plan. The draft comprehensive plan needs a traffic study. Currently, because we do not yet have hovercraft and flying cars, there is only one way in and out of the county. That route is the emergency evacuation route Rt. 4. Have you driven Rt. 4 in rush hour? If there is an emergency, how do you propose to get the citizens out? Rt. 4 should be maintained as an easily traveled corridor to allow citizens to easily go south to points south such as Solomons The comprehensive plan, is being rushed before the election. The citizens are involved but their concerns are being dismissed. There are too many sessions in too short of a time. The comprehensive plan has a push for reckless growth (that the citizens have overwhelmingly written to say they do not want). I do not want this. I live near Prince Frederick. I do not want big box stores and apartment buildings. We enjoy quality of life here in Calvert County. Why destroy that? Our county culture has been one of protectionism of our land, acres, farms, quality of life. We saw this in Dunkirk where Walmart was limited in size. Thank you for your consideration. Sincerely, Terry L. Pennington Huntingtown, MD

From: A Concerned Citizen [mailto:no-reply@powr.io]  
Sent: Thursday, February 08, 2018 2:54 PM  
To: Planning and Zoning <pz@calvertcountymd.gov>  
Subject: Comments From KLarkins@si.edu

From: Karen Larkins  
Email Address KLarkins@si.edu  
Town Huntingtown

My Comments: To Whom It May Concern, We moved to Calvert County specifically because of its tight zoning restrictions and its long history of protecting open land. Its rural character is what makes the county special. If any zoning changes are made, I believe that EVERYONE who lives in the county should agree to them. The way it appears now is that the commissioners are acting in their own narrow interests and could care less with what the majority of residents think. Sincerely, Karen Larkins 2460 Huntingfields Dr. Huntingtown, MD

**From:** Susan and Gary Dzurec [mailto:bayserenity@yahoo.com]

**Sent:** Thursday, February 08, 2018 5:39 PM

**To:** Planning and Zoning <pz@calvertcountymd.gov>

**Subject:** Traffic Impact Study

Planning Commission c/o Planning and Zoning,

We, the good people of Calvert County, demand that a traffic impact study be performed by a certified company to make a determination of the amount of additional traffic projected to occur based on the proposal to build out the town centers and proposed villages along the Route 2/4 corridor before the new comprehensive plan is adopted, and that the proposed buildout and traffic impact study be presented to all citizens for review and be open to public comment for a period of not less than 90 days thereafter.

At Tuesday's work session with the Planning Commission, Commissioner Slaughenhaupt dismissed the need for a traffic impact study with his ridiculous proposal that flying cars will be the answer to the county's future traffic woes. The fact that none of the other Commissioners or the Planning Commission members spoke out about his comments leads me to conclude that, 1.) They all agree with his hair-brain thinking, which is really scary, or 2.) They lack the courage to voice your own opinion. In either case, Calvert County citizens deserve better than what they bring to the office.

Another squeaky wheel,

Gary A. Dzurec  
Huntingtown, MD

**From:** A Concerned Citizen [mailto:no-reply@powr.io]  
**Sent:** Sunday, February 11, 2018 11:51 AM  
**To:** Planning and Zoning <pz@calvertcountymd.gov>  
**Subject:** Comments From rposten@comcast.net

---

## To: Planning Commission & County Commissioners:

**From:**  
**Email Address**  
**Town**  
**My Comments:**

Raymond Posten  
[rposten@comcast.net](mailto:rposten@comcast.net)  
Huntingtown

Why would this idea even be discussed or considered? The “only” reason for moving to Calvert County 34 years ago was the rural tranquility. That translates for us, safety at home and on the highway. Please disallow this and other over-development of the route 4 corridor. You will be giving away the uniqueness of Calvert County.

**From:** A Concerned Citizen [<mailto:no-reply@powr.io>]  
**Sent:** Sunday, February 11, 2018 11:48 AM  
**To:** Planning and Zoning <[pz@calvertcountymd.gov](mailto:pz@calvertcountymd.gov)>  
**Subject:** Comments From [mpower1112@comcast.net](mailto:mpower1112@comcast.net)

---

## To: Planning Commission & County Commissioners:

**From:**  
**Email Address**  
**Town**  
**My Comments:**

Mark Power  
[mpower1112@comcast.net](mailto:mpower1112@comcast.net)  
Chesapeake Beach  
( located in Breezy Point). I am against a Faststop in Huntingtown. Calvert County has more than enough franchises esp. liquor stores and convenience stores. We need to encourage private businesses to come to Huntingtown and Prince Frederick, restaurants in particular. That would enhance the rural aspect of the county. More franchises do nothing to enhance quality of life here. Thank you. Mark Power

**From:** A Concerned Citizen [mailto:no-reply@powr.io]  
**Sent:** Sunday, February 11, 2018 2:13 PM  
**To:** Planning and Zoning <pz@calvertcountymd.gov>  
**Subject:** Comments From beingshortisokay@yahoo.com

---

## **To: Planning Commission & County Commissioners:**

<b>From:</b>	Jennifer Hazzard
<b>Email Address</b>	<a href="mailto:beingshortisokay@yahoo.com">beingshortisokay@yahoo.com</a>
<b>Town</b>	Huntingtown
<b>My Comments:</b>	I am afraid of how much planned building is being allowed here. My husband and I moved here to get away from all the building going on in Charles county, but it seems that my commissioners here are set to make this into another Waldorf. The schools here aren't rated as highly as they used to be as well, which was another reason we chose Calvert. I intend to make my vote count and really wish our commissioners would actually do what is in the best interest of the citizens and not their pockets.

[Manage](#) your email preferences. POWr Inc. 340 Pine Street 700, San Francisco, CA 94104

"We, the good people of Calvert County, demand that a traffic impact study be performed by a certified company to make a determination of the amount of additional traffic projected to occur based on the proposal to build out the town centers and proposed villages along the Route 2/4 corridor before the new comprehensive plan is adopted, and that the proposed buildout and traffic impact study be presented to all the citizens for review and be open for public comment for a period of not less than 90 days thereafter."

2-8-18

Mr. Charles Reese  
113 Windcliff Rd  
Prnc Frederck, MD 20678-4304



RECEIVED

FEB 12 2018

Community Planning  
and Building

**From:** steven holaus [mailto:stevenanna@hotmail.com]

**Sent:** Tuesday, February 13, 2018 1:40 PM

**To:** Hart, Michael R. <Mike.Hart@calvertcountymd.gov>; Hejl, Thomas C. <Tom.Hejl@calvertcountymd.gov>; Nutter, Patrick H. <Pat.Nutter@calvertcountymd.gov>; Slaughenhaupt, Jr., Evan K. <Evan.Slaughenhaupt@calvertcountymd.gov>; Weems, Steven R. <Steve.Weems@calvertcountymd.gov>; Planning and Zoning <pz@calvertcountymd.gov>

**Subject:** Traffic Impact Study

We, the good people of Calvert County, demand that a traffic impact study be performed by a certified company to make a determination of the amount of additional traffic projected to occur based on the proposal to build out the town centers and proposed villages along the Route 2/4 corridor before the new comprehensive plan is adopted, and that that proposed build out and traffic impact study be presented to all the citizens for review and be open for public comment for a period of not less than 90 days thereafter.

Traffic already is horrendous on route 2/4.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.