

Comments on the Proposed Calvert County Comprehensive Plan (May 2018 Draft)
 Additional Comments Received July 2, 2018 Through July 6, 2018

NAME	GROUP/AGENCY	TOWN	DATE	# OF PAGES
Jerad Boyd		Dunkirk	7/2/2018	2
Ellen McCormack-Ament		Port Republic	7/3/2018	1
Lori Sampson		Huntingtown	7/3/2018	1
Larry Tomko		Dunkirk	7/3/2018	2
Brenda Smith		Dunkirk	7/4/2018	2
Deborah Kay Jamerson		Owings	7/4/2018	2
Tiffany Lewis		Prince Frederick	7/4/2018	1
Gary Pendleton		North Beach	7/4/2018	3
Martine Cantier		Owings	7/4/2018	2
Joseph Schwenk		Dunkirk	7/5/2018	1
Anna Isaienko		Chesapeake Beach	7/5/2018	1
Sharon Fossett		Huntingtown	7/5/2018	2
Audrey Butler		Chesapeake Beach	7/5/2018	1
John Kyler		Dunkirk	7/6/2018	2
Anita Brown		Dunkirk	7/6/2018	4
Jessica Gorman		Dunkirk	7/6/2018	1
Tom Mero		Dunkirk	7/6/2018	1
David Bury		Chesapeake Beach	7/6/2018	3
Jeff Klapper		Prince Frederick	7/6/2018	2
Bessie Watkins		Dunkirk	7/6/2018	2
Jessica Obrien		Chesapeake Beach	7/6/2018	1
Charlene Kriemelmeyer		Dunkirk	7/6/2018	7
Joe Kriemelmeyer		Dunkirk	7/6/2018	2
Von Willey		Huntingtown	7/6/2018	3
Sharon Burcham		Dunkirk	7/6/2018	1

Holt, Judy C.

From: Jerad Boyd <keepcalvertcountry@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 02, 2018 12:15 AM
To: Planning and Zoning
Subject: Request For Studies BEFORE Growth

Calvert County Planning Commission Members:

As you are aware, Maryland Law requires that:

"A Planning Commission shall prepare a Comprehensive Plan by carefully and comprehensively surveying and studying the present conditions and projections of future growth of the local jurisdiction."

While the current draft of the Comprehensive Plan includes information about "present conditions", it lacks evidence that "projections of future growth" have been "carefully and comprehensively studied".

Therefore, I am requesting that no growth be proposed in the Plan until studies are conducted to determine the effects on traffic, schools, the environment, water supply, budget, etc. before the Plan is approved.

Specifically, the Plan should first answer the following basic question:

1 - How many households are projected if the growth in the Town Centers and Residential Areas are approved and if water and sewer is allowed to maximize density, as proposed?

Based on the answer to the above, the following additional questions should be answered:

2 - How much traffic will be generated by the projected households? Can our roads accommodate the additional traffic? If not, what road improvements are needed? How will those improvements be funded?

3 - How many additional schools will be needed? How will they be funded?

4 - What impacts will the proposed growth have on our environment? How will those impacts be mitigated?

5 - Can our aquifers adequately supply water to the projected households? If not, what is the solution?

If studies have in fact been conducted, I request that the results be added to the Plan and that they be shared with the public and the Planning Commission in a public presentation, with adequate time for review, questions and comments.

If studies have not been conducted to answer the above questions, I request that the Planning Commission direct the Consultant and staff to conduct the necessary studies and that the results be presented to the Planning Commission and the public, with adequate time for review, questions and comments, before approval of the Plan.

Thank you.

Jerad Boyd

jgboyd77@hotmail.com

Dunkirk

I have been working on Calvert County roads almost everyday for the past eight years, and every year it gets worse and worse. Tell the the folks that want Calvert City instead of Calvert County to come and work with the state and county workers for a week and then see what they have to say. It can be very scary to say the least.

From: A Concerned Citizen <no-reply@powr.io>
Sent: Tuesday, July 03, 2018 6:11 PM
To: Planning and Zoning
Subject: Comments From ellen.mccormack@verizon.net



1 / 25 submissions received this month. [Upgrade to receive more](#) –

To: Planning Commission & County Commissioners:

From:	Ellen McCormack-Ament
Email Address	ellen.mccormack@verizon.net
Town	Port Republic
My Comments:	Hello, I moved to Calvert County in 1979. When I did so, it was not with the idea that it would evolve over time to look exactly like the place I left behind. People who want so-called progress around their homes have many places from which to choose: Bowie, La Plata, Frederick, on and on and on. If you don't like it here, go there. You, who should be representing me, need to stop selling out to developers and landowners. You are ruining our place, and you don't seem to be able to see past the potential dollars to be had. Building new offices for the government employees seems absurd when we can't afford Animal Control officers on the weekends or reliable public transportation (hashtag 2 hours to get from Lusby to Prince Frederick). I am voting for zero incumbents.
Locale	US

Harrod, Felicia R.

From: Lori Sampson <keepcalvertcountry@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 03, 2018 11:18 AM
To: Planning and Zoning
Subject: Request For Studies BEFORE Growth

Calvert County Planning Commission Members:

As you are aware, Maryland Law requires that:

"A Planning Commission shall prepare a Comprehensive Plan by carefully and comprehensively surveying and studying the present conditions and projections of future growth of the local jurisdiction."

While the current draft of the Comprehensive Plan includes information about "present conditions", it lacks evidence that "projections of future growth" have been "carefully and comprehensively studied".

Therefore, I am requesting that no growth be proposed in the Plan until studies are conducted to determine the effects on traffic, schools, the environment, water supply, budget, etc. before the Plan is approved.

Specifically, the Plan should first answer the following basic question:

1 - How many households are projected if the growth in the Town Centers and Residential Areas are approved and if water and sewer is allowed to maximize density, as proposed?

Based on the answer to the above, the following additional questions should be answered:

2 - How much traffic will be generated by the projected households? Can our roads accommodate the additional traffic? If not, what road improvements are needed? How will those improvements be funded?

3 - How many additional schools will be needed? How will they be funded?

4 - What impacts will the proposed growth have on our environment? How will those impacts be mitigated?

5 - Can our aquifers adequately supply water to the projected households? If not, what is the solution?

If studies have in fact been conducted, I request that the results be added to the Plan and that they be shared with the public and the Planning Commission in a public presentation, with adequate time for review, questions and comments.

If studies have not been conducted to answer the above questions, I request that the Planning Commission direct the Consultant and staff to conduct the necessary studies and that the results be presented to the Planning Commission and the public, with adequate time for review, questions and comments, before approval of the Plan.

Thank you.

Lori Sampson

lasampson@co.pg.md.us

Huntingtown

Harrod, Felicia R.

From: Larry Tomko <keepcalvertcountry@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 03, 2018 6:20 PM
To: Planning and Zoning
Subject: Request For Studies BEFORE Growth

Calvert County Planning Commission Members:

As you are aware, Maryland Law requires that:

"A Planning Commission shall prepare a Comprehensive Plan by carefully and comprehensively surveying and studying the present conditions and projections of future growth of the local jurisdiction."

While the current draft of the Comprehensive Plan includes information about "present conditions", it lacks evidence that "projections of future growth" have been "carefully and comprehensively studied".

Therefore, I am requesting that no growth be proposed in the Plan until studies are conducted to determine the effects on traffic, schools, the environment, water supply, budget, etc. before the Plan is approved.

Specifically, the Plan should first answer the following basic question:

1 - How many households are projected if the growth in the Town Centers and Residential Areas are approved and if water and sewer is allowed to maximize density, as proposed?

Based on the answer to the above, the following additional questions should be answered:

2 - How much traffic will be generated by the projected households? Can our roads accommodate the additional traffic? If not, what road improvements are needed? How will those improvements be funded?

3 - How many additional schools will be needed? How will they be funded?

4 - What impacts will the proposed growth have on our environment? How will those impacts be mitigated?

5 - Can our aquifers adequately supply water to the projected households? If not, what is the solution?

If studies have in fact been conducted, I request that the results be added to the Plan and that they be shared with the public and the Planning Commission in a public presentation, with adequate time for review, questions and comments.

If studies have not been conducted to answer the above questions, I request that the Planning Commission direct the Consultant and staff to conduct the necessary studies and that the results be presented to the Planning Commission and the public, with adequate time for review, questions and comments, before approval of the Plan.

Thank you.

Larry Tomko

larry-2000@comcast.net

Dunkirk

Calvert County is a small county and we need to keep Calvert County Country. Too much growth residential and commercial causes great burden financially for Calvert County Citizens. Large increase in traffic, greater demand for schools and county services. Also a greater demand for water and sewage usage. As a small county there is a limit as to what we can handle as far as growth.

From: A Concerned Citizen <no-reply@powr.io>
Sent: Wednesday, July 04, 2018 8:10 AM
To: Planning and Zoning
Subject: Comments From brenda.l.smith@census.gov



[My Account](#)

1 / 25 submissions received this month. [Upgrade to receive more](#) →

To: Planning Commission & County Commissioners:

From: Brenda Smith
Email Address: brenda.l.smith@census.gov
Town: Dunkirk
My Comments: I moved to Calvert County in 1980. I moved here to get away from Prince George's County and all the development. I have watched Calvert County change drastically over the years. It is becoming exactly what I moved to get away from. More retail and businesses has increased crime. Roads in Calvert County provide a quick in and out for criminals looking for a quick exit out of the county. Numerous lights in the town centers have increased travel times. More retail buildings keep being built even though current buildings are vacant. We are losing our country feel which is the reason I moved to Calvert County. We are starting to look like Waldorf with all the new development. My husband and I retire in less than 4 years. We are seriously considering moving out of Calvert County because of the development. Ward Road and Brickhouse Roads are country roads. Development on these roads has drastically increased as development has increased.

Accidents have increased as well.
I oppose expanding the Dunkirk
Town Center. #Keep Calvert
Country!. Please pass my
comments to the PlaNing
Commission and the Calvert
County Commisioners.
US

Locale

[View Responses & Analytics](#)

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

Harrod, Felicia R.

From: DEBORAH Kay JAMERSON <keepcalvertcountry@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 04, 2018 10:08 AM
To: Planning and Zoning
Subject: Request For Studies BEFORE Growth

Calvert County Planning Commission Members:

As you are aware, Maryland Law requires that:

"A Planning Commission shall prepare a Comprehensive Plan by carefully and comprehensively surveying and studying the present conditions and projections of future growth of the local jurisdiction."

While the current draft of the Comprehensive Plan includes information about "present conditions", it lacks evidence that "projections of future growth" have been "carefully and comprehensively studied".

Therefore, I am requesting that no growth be proposed in the Plan until studies are conducted to determine the effects on traffic, schools, the environment, water supply, budget, etc. before the Plan is approved.

Specifically, the Plan should first answer the following basic question:

1 - How many households are projected if the growth in the Town Centers and Residential Areas are approved and if water and sewer is allowed to maximize density, as proposed?

Based on the answer to the above, the following additional questions should be answered:

2 - How much traffic will be generated by the projected households? Can our roads accommodate the additional traffic? If not, what road improvements are needed? How will those improvements be funded?

3 - How many additional schools will be needed? How will they be funded?

4 - What impacts will the proposed growth have on our environment? How will those impacts be mitigated?

5 - Can our aquifers adequately supply water to the projected households? If not, what is the solution?

If studies have in fact been conducted, I request that the results be added to the Plan and that they be shared with the public and the Planning Commission in a public presentation, with adequate time for review, questions and comments.

If studies have not been conducted to answer the above questions, I request that the Planning Commission direct the Consultant and staff to conduct the necessary studies and that the results be presented to the Planning Commission and the public, with adequate time for review, questions and comments, before approval of the Plan.

Thank you.

DEBORAH Kay JAMERSON

Deb.jamerson622@gmail.com

Owings

I moved to Calvert over 36 years ago from PG. I mover here to get away from the over population and all the traffic and a little peace and quiet like most of use down here. We moved here not for lower taxes but for the tranquility. That is all being torn apart by all the construction. Most of us knew when we moved down here we would have to travel to get to work or for shopping and none of that mattered to us. We just wanted the peace and quiet at the end of the day. In the 36 years I have lived here more and more construction and more and more homes and more traffic that are roads can not handle. You can add more lanes but the traffic will only get worse. If we had a problem at the power plant and all of us had to get out it would never happen. All I have to say is God help the ones on the lower end of the country. I no myself if the building in Calvert does not end I will be looking for somewhere else to live like a lot of other people. There are already a whole lot of houses up for sale right now. Leave Calvert just the way it is we already have to many stores a gas station. Just let use live in peace and quiet.

Harrod, Felicia R.

From: tiffany <keepcalvertcountry@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 04, 2018 11:08 AM
To: Planning and Zoning
Subject: Request For Studies BEFORE Growth

Calvert County Planning Commission Members:

As you are aware, Maryland Law requires that:

"A Planning Commission shall prepare a Comprehensive Plan by carefully and comprehensively surveying and studying the present conditions and projections of future growth of the local jurisdiction."

While the current draft of the Comprehensive Plan includes information about "present conditions", it lacks evidence that "projections of future growth" have been "carefully and comprehensively studied".

Therefore, I am requesting that no growth be proposed in the Plan until studies are conducted to determine the effects on traffic, schools, the environment, water supply, budget, etc. before the Plan is approved.

Specifically, the Plan should first answer the following basic question:

1 - How many households are projected if the growth in the Town Centers and Residential Areas are approved and if water and sewer is allowed to maximize density, as proposed?

Based on the answer to the above, the following additional questions should be answered:

2 - How much traffic will be generated by the projected households? Can our roads accommodate the additional traffic? If not, what road improvements are needed? How will those improvements be funded?

3 - How many additional schools will be needed? How will they be funded?

4 - What impacts will the proposed growth have on our environment? How will those impacts be mitigated?

5 - Can our aquifers adequately supply water to the projected households? If not, what is the solution?

If studies have in fact been conducted, I request that the results be added to the Plan and that they be shared with the public and the Planning Commission in a public presentation, with adequate time for review, questions and comments.

If studies have not been conducted to answer the above questions, I request that the Planning Commission direct the Consultant and staff to conduct the necessary studies and that the results be presented to the Planning Commission and the public, with adequate time for review, questions and comments, before approval of the Plan.

Thank you.

tiffany

lewis

Prince Frederick

Harrod, Felicia R.

From: Gary R Pendleton <keepcalvertcountry@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 04, 2018 1:31 PM
To: Planning and Zoning
Subject: Request For Studies BEFORE Growth

Calvert County Planning Commission Members:

As you are aware, Maryland Law requires that:

"A Planning Commission shall prepare a Comprehensive Plan by carefully and comprehensively surveying and studying the present conditions and projections of future growth of the local jurisdiction."

While the current draft of the Comprehensive Plan includes information about "present conditions", it lacks evidence that "projections of future growth" have been "carefully and comprehensively studied".

Therefore, I am requesting that no growth be proposed in the Plan until studies are conducted to determine the effects on traffic, schools, the environment, water supply, budget, etc. before the Plan is approved.

Specifically, the Plan should first answer the following basic question:

1 - How many households are projected if the growth in the Town Centers and Residential Areas are approved and if water and sewer is allowed to maximize density, as proposed?

Based on the answer to the above, the following additional questions should be answered:

2 - How much traffic will be generated by the projected households? Can our roads accommodated the additional traffic? If not, what road improvements are needed? How will those improvements be funded?

3 - How many additional schools will be needed? How will they be funded?

4 - What impacts will the proposed growth have on our environment? How will those impacts be mitigated?

5 - Can our aquifers adequately supply water to the projected households? If not, what is the solution?

If studies have in fact been conducted, I request that the results be added to the Plan and that they be shared with the public and the Planning Commission in a public presentation, with adequate time for review, questions and comments.

If studies have not been conducted to answer the above questions, I request that the Planning Commission direct the Consultant and staff to conduct the necessary studies and that the results be presented to the Planning Commission and the public, with adequate time for review, questions and comments, before approval of the Plan.

Thank you.

Gary R Pendleton

gary.pendleton1@gmail.com

North Beach

Absolutely against growth that affects roads, water table, and wild life. This county's citizen wants it to remain as rural as possible with small shopping areas.

I lived in Waldorf before it became the monster community it is today. A nightmare I do not want to see come to this county.

Harrod, Felicia R.

From: Gary Pendleton <gary.pendleton1@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 04, 2018 2:16 PM
To: Planning and Zoning
Subject: Calvert 2040

I am concerned that the consultants recommendations show a lack of analysis on the impact that proposed land changes will have on the County.

I am specifically concerned with potential impact on traffic and the environment as a result of changes to Town Centers.

There should be a numbers based analysis on the impacts the changes will have on traffic volume and other infrastructure.

Please take adequate time to review all aspects of the plan and do not give in to pressure from the County Commissioners, or any group or individuals to finish the work within any time frame except your own.

Please allow additional time for citizens to respond to your recommendations before the plan is submitted to the Commisioners. In addition please wait until a new board of Commissioners is in place before submitting the plan for adoption.

Finally please do your best to follow standard accepted practices and procedures, state law, ethics and principles of good government in your proceedings.

As a concerned citizen, I will be paying attention as the process moves forward. Thanks for your work on behalf of Calvert and its citizens.

Gary Pendleton
8832 Dayton Ave
North Beach, Md

Holt, Judy C.

From: Martine Cantler <keepcalvertcountry@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 04, 2018 1:51 PM
To: Planning and Zoning
Subject: Request For Studies BEFORE Growth

Calvert County Planning Commission Members:

As you are aware, Maryland Law requires that:

"A Planning Commission shall prepare a Comprehensive Plan by carefully and comprehensively surveying and studying the present conditions and projections of future growth of the local jurisdiction."

While the current draft of the Comprehensive Plan includes information about "present conditions", it lacks evidence that "projections of future growth" have been "carefully and comprehensively studied".

Therefore, I am requesting that no growth be proposed in the Plan until studies are conducted to determine the effects on traffic, schools, the environment, water supply, budget, etc. before the Plan is approved.

Specifically, the Plan should first answer the following basic question:

1 - How many households are projected if the growth in the Town Centers and Residential Areas are approved and if water and sewer is allowed to maximize density, as proposed?

Based on the answer to the above, the following additional questions should be answered:

2 - How much traffic will be generated by the projected households? Can our roads accommodate the additional traffic? If not, what road improvements are needed? How will those improvements be funded?

3 - How many additional schools will be needed? How will they be funded?

4 - What impacts will the proposed growth have on our environment? How will those impacts be mitigated?

5 - Can our aquifers adequately supply water to the projected households? If not, what is the solution?

If studies have in fact been conducted, I request that the results be added to the Plan and that they be shared with the public and the Planning Commission in a public presentation, with adequate time for review, questions and comments.

If studies have not been conducted to answer the above questions, I request that the Planning Commission direct the Consultant and staff to conduct the necessary studies and that the results be presented to the Planning Commission and the public, with adequate time for review, questions and comments, before approval of the Plan.

Thank you.

Martine Cantler

pokeydot98@comcast.net

Owings

Absolutely against growth that affects roads, water table, and wild life. This county's citizen wants it to remain as rural as possible with small shopping areas.

I lived in Waldorf before it became the monster community it is today. A nightmare I do not want to see come to this county.

From: A Concerned Citizen <no-reply@powr.io>
Sent: Thursday, July 05, 2018 1:15 PM
To: Planning and Zoning
Subject: Comments From josephschwenk7@gmail.com



[My Account](#)

3 / 25 submissions received this month. [Upgrade to receive more](#) →

To: Planning Commission & County Commissioners:

From:	Joseph Schwenk
Email Address	josephschwenk7@gmail.com
Town	Dunkirk
My Comments:	I've lived here my whole life and I love this area. It is prefect for commuting to and from DC - where I work, and I now want to keep living here as we are farther away from traffic and highly dense areas. We do not need anymore houses here or stores, especially all corporations as they don't keep money in Calvert. I am unhappy with this planning plan.
Locale	US

[View Responses & Analytics](#)

From: A Concerned Citizen <no-reply@powr.io>
Sent: Thursday, July 05, 2018 1:11 PM
To: Planning and Zoning
Subject: Comments From annaisaienko1@gmail.com



[My Account](#)

2 / 25 submissions received this month. [Upgrade to receive more](#) ↔

To: Planning Commission & County Commissioners:

From:	Anna Isaienko
Email Address	annaisaienko1@gmail.com
Town	Chesapeake Beach
My Comments:	I moved to this county to get away from all the crazy, busy traffic and populated area. This is annoying that now the plan involves expanding the town centers and developing more houses, etc. There are so many other locations in Maryland that are populated, please keep Calvert special and not build a bunch of useless buildings and more houses. The traffic already gotten worse and I do not want it to get worse. Please don't just think about money... think about the people that grew up here and want to leave peaceful, secluded life.
Locale	US

[View Responses & Analytics](#)

Harrod, Felicia R.

From: Sharon Fossett <keepcalvertcountry@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 05, 2018 4:37 PM
To: Planning and Zoning
Subject: Request For Studies BEFORE Growth

Calvert County Planning Commission Members:

As you are aware, Maryland Law requires that:

"A Planning Commission shall prepare a Comprehensive Plan by carefully and comprehensively surveying and studying the present conditions and projections of future growth of the local jurisdiction."

While the current draft of the Comprehensive Plan includes information about "present conditions", it lacks evidence that "projections of future growth" have been "carefully and comprehensively studied".

Therefore, I am requesting that no growth be proposed in the Plan until studies are conducted to determine the effects on traffic, schools, the environment, water supply, budget, etc. before the Plan is approved.

Specifically, the Plan should first answer the following basic question:

1 - How many households are projected if the growth in the Town Centers and Residential Areas are approved and if water and sewer is allowed to maximize density, as proposed?

Based on the answer to the above, the following additional questions should be answered:

2 - How much traffic will be generated by the projected households? Can our roads accommodate the additional traffic? If not, what road improvements are needed? How will those improvements be funded?

3 - How many additional schools will be needed? How will they be funded?

4 - What impacts will the proposed growth have on our environment? How will those impacts be mitigated?

5 - Can our aquifers adequately supply water to the projected households? If not, what is the solution?

If studies have in fact been conducted, I request that the results be added to the Plan and that they be shared with the public and the Planning Commission in a public presentation, with adequate time for review, questions and comments.

If studies have not been conducted to answer the above questions, I request that the Planning Commission direct the Consultant and staff to conduct the necessary studies and that the results be presented to the Planning Commission and the public, with adequate time for review, questions and comments, before approval of the Plan.

Thank you.

Sharon Fossett

SLFossett@comcast.net

Huntingtown

SLFossett@comcast.net

Huntingtown

I am not in favor of the big box store that has been planned for Dares Beach Road either.

Harrod, Felicia R.

From: Audrey Butler <keepcalvertcountry@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 05, 2018 8:28 PM
To: Planning and Zoning
Subject: Request For Studies BEFORE Growth

Calvert County Planning Commission Members:

As you are aware, Maryland Law requires that:

"A Planning Commission shall prepare a Comprehensive Plan by carefully and comprehensively surveying and studying the present conditions and projections of future growth of the local jurisdiction."

While the current draft of the Comprehensive Plan includes information about "present conditions", it lacks evidence that "projections of future growth" have been "carefully and comprehensively studied".

Therefore, I am requesting that no growth be proposed in the Plan until studies are conducted to determine the effects on traffic, schools, the environment, water supply, budget, etc. before the Plan is approved.

Specifically, the Plan should first answer the following basic question:

1 - How many households are projected if the growth in the Town Centers and Residential Areas are approved and if water and sewer is allowed to maximize density, as proposed?

Based on the answer to the above, the following additional questions should be answered:

2 - How much traffic will be generated by the projected households? Can our roads accommodate the additional traffic? If not, what road improvements are needed? How will those improvements be funded?

3 - How many additional schools will be needed? How will they be funded?

4 - What impacts will the proposed growth have on our environment? How will those impacts be mitigated?

5 - Can our aquifers adequately supply water to the projected households? If not, what is the solution?

If studies have in fact been conducted, I request that the results be added to the Plan and that they be shared with the public and the Planning Commission in a public presentation, with adequate time for review, questions and comments.

If studies have not been conducted to answer the above questions, I request that the Planning Commission direct the Consultant and staff to conduct the necessary studies and that the results be presented to the Planning Commission and the public, with adequate time for review, questions and comments, before approval of the Plan.

Thank you.

Audrey Butler

audrb01@comcast.net

Chesapeake Beach

From: A Concerned Citizen <no-reply@powr.io>
Sent: Friday, July 06, 2018 12:03 PM
To: Planning and Zoning
Subject: Comments From jckylr@yahoo.com



[My Account](#)

4 / 25 submissions received this month. [Upgrade to receive more](#) –

To: Planning Commission & County Commissioners:

From: John Kyler
Email Address: jckylr@yahoo.com
Town: Dunkirk
My Comments: Planning Commission and County Commissioners, My wife and I want to start off by stating that we attended a Planning Commission meeting not too long ago after being informed that your commission was planning major changes to Dunkirk Town Center, including sewer. The meeting began with the commission asking who was here from Dunkirk concerning town center changes. Several of us raised our hands and we were insured by the commission that no such plan was underway and that they could and would not do it without the support and coordination of the community of Dunkirk. Now, it seems that those statements may have been misleading at best. I am not a professional, but it seems that the plans for Dunkirk do not seem to make sense, as we are currently finishing up with our second new shopping center in less than twenty years. All three of the existing shopping centers now in Dunkirk were approved and built under the restrictions of a village.

This means that the developers went through a lot of work and expense to build their own water and waste water systems. The third shopping center has not even opened, which means that the impact on our water systems and traffic congestion is not even being taken into consideration in the new plan. We need to see the impact of having three shopping centers in Dunkirk way before we consider making Dunkirk a large town center. I would think that a minimum of five years and then do a study on the traffic and the water availability before we make these kinds of decisions. We all need to do our best to avoid the issues happening so close to us, one that we really need to watch is the water situation, because aquifers do not know or care about county boundaries. We understand that all of you get pressured by developers and politicians, but we need to remind you that we are paying you to do what is best for the county, not just those with the big bucks. We do appreciate all your work and the opportunity to provide our feedback. John and Carol Kyler Dunkirk, MD 20754 US

Locale

[View Responses & Analytics](#)

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

Harrod, Felicia R.

From: Anita Brown <anitawb@comcast.net>
Sent: Friday, July 06, 2018 1:38 PM
To: Planning and Zoning
Subject: Comments on the 2nd Draft of the Comprehensive Plan

The mission is expressed in a series of 10 visions.

Mission 10: Our government is efficient, open, and responsive to citizen needs and concerns. Our county government may indeed be efficient, but **it is anything but open and responsive to citizen needs and concerns.** If the government were truly open we would not need the Freedom of Information Act to gain access to minutes of meetings between one county Commissioner and a select group of developers under the umbrella of the Chamber of Commerce. If the government were “responsive to citizens needs and concerns” then why does it appear the county is trying to shove the plan down the throats of the citizens without allowing sufficient time for comment. What happened to the open public forums we used to have where we could ask questions about the draft plan? Walking around tables and looking a flip charts may check a box off on a form as to having public meetings, but it does not provide for open discussion nor does it allow you to hear input from others. Another point about this vision, why are all of the comments from the citizens being ignored (case in point the recent sign regulations) if the vision is that “our government is open and responsive to citizen needs and concerns.” That statement could only be considered true for a few of the developers and not the majority of the citizens of Calvert County.

This vision either needs to be removed from the plan since it is not truthful as written; rewritten to reflect what is happening or if indeed it is to remain part of the plan, then the process needs to be followed.

Again, thank you for allowing me to provide comment of the plan.

Anita Brown, Dunkirk



Virus-free. www.avast.com

Harrod, Felicia R.

From: Anita Brown <anitawb@comcast.net>
Sent: Friday, July 06, 2018 1:15 PM
To: Planning and Zoning
Subject: Comments on the 2nd draft of the Comprehensive Plan

Create Vibrant Town Centers – How does adding density to a Town Center create vibrancy. Please explain further in the next draft of the Comprehensive Plan. I see the statement but don't see any explanation of how the county plans to achieve it.

Thank you for allowing me to provide input.

Anita Brown



Virus-free. www.avast.com

Harrod, Felicia R.

From: Anita Brown <anitawb@comcast.net>
Sent: Friday, July 06, 2018 1:24 PM
To: Planning and Zoning
Subject: Comments on Chapter 1 of the 2nd draft of the Comprehensive Plan

The mission is expressed in a series of 10 visions.

Vision 4: Our highways are safe with only moderate congestion and transit is readily available. How can anyone consider Prince Frederick as only having moderate congestion? There is always a lot of traffic in Prince Frederick and you have gridlock for more than an hour in the mornings and evenings. Dunkirk also has a major backup occurring especially in the evenings. It is not uncommon for traffic to back up to Brickhouse Road to get thru the stoplights in Dunkirk. The opening of Harris Teeter and Marshalls is only going to add to the congestion. I am not aware of any enhancements to the intersection at Ward Road to accommodate the increased traffic. Did I miss something? Currently you can sit thru more than one cycle of the stoplight, especially if one of the computer buses has just let off passengers. I have experienced backups at the stoplight in Huntingtown where at rush hour you can sit thru more than one cycle. The backup just then moves to the stoplight by the Bowling Alley. Surely you don't consider that MODERATE CONGESTION, do you? I don't. Traffic flows needs to be addressed as part of the Comprehensive Plan; not an after the fact separate entity.

I hope you will consider this input as this issue is extremely important.

Thank you.

Anita Brown



Virus-free. www.avast.com

Harrod, Felicia R.

From: Anita Brown <anitawb@comcast.net>
Sent: Friday, July 06, 2018 1:11 PM
To: Planning and Zoning
Subject: Comments on Chapt 1 of the 2nd Draft of the Comprehensive Plan

Page 1-3 Preserve Rural Character - Is 40,000 acres still the goal for preserving the rural landscape/character of the county? If in 2017 we were at 27,602, how are we achieving our goal of preserving 40,000 acres? I don't see the methodology to achieve that in Chapter 1.

Thank you.

Anita Brown

 Virus-free. www.avast.com

Harrod, Felicia R.

From: Jessica Gorman <jessiegorman@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 06, 2018 1:40 PM
To: Planning and Zoning; Commissioners
Subject: Comments in regards to "Comprehensive Plan"

Please forward this message to the Planning Commission.

To the Planning Commission,

Thank you for taking the time to thoroughly evaluate this plan, and for giving the community the opportunity to comment as well. Despite the opinion of several county commissioners, the public has not had three years to comment on this plan. This plan, in it's current form, has only been completed for weeks, not years.

In regards to the new draft of the comprehensive plan for Calvert county, I have many, many issues. First and foremost the rushed and hurried nature of the process in general. It is quite obvious that the driving force behind this is developers, pressuring a few commissioners. I would respectfully ask that no further action on officially passing this plan would be taken until after the upcoming elections. I believe the county commissioners are no longer acting in the best interest of the citizens who elected them. I believe the citizens should be given the opportunity to voice our displeasure at the ballot box in November before this plan is finalized as it will affect us all for the next two plus decades.

I also believe the issue of changing town centers from minor to major (or increasing already existing major town centers) should not be included in this plan at all, but rather be addressed separately as has been done in the past.

I also take great issue with the fact that NO traffic study has been done.

Also, I do not believe adequate attention to water sustainability has been given in regards to the proposed development expansion.

I would also like to see a concrete plan to meet the 40,000 acre land preservation goal.

Thank you for taking the time to read just a few of my concerns with the current plan!

Jessica Gorman
Dunkirk, MD

Harrod, Felicia R.

From: Thomas Mero <tjmero@comcast.net>
Sent: Friday, July 06, 2018 2:31 PM
To: Planning and Zoning
Subject: Calvert 2040 Chapter 1 Comments

Dear Planning Commission,

First let me thank you for initiating a chapter by chapter review of the Comprehensive Plan. As you know this is a critical document that defines the growth in our county for the next 20 plus years.

I strongly oppose the main premise of Plan which indicates in the first Chapter that the county's current slow to moderate growth rate is a problem and the cure to create "vibrancy" is an explosion of high-density residential in and around our Town Centers. This would be disastrous for our county and if the Plan were approved in its present form there would be no turning back. The major adverse impacts are as follows:

Traffic – Anyone who drives up and down Route 4 every day knows how bad the traffic is now during rush hour. Adding thousands of high-density housing units in and around Town Centers will add more cars and increase cross traffic which will force a reduction in north/south signal time. The Dunkirk daily evening rush backups that now extend to Brickhouse Road could build to the county line. The widening of Route 4 in Prince Frederick is but a little bandaid which does nothing to reduce the substantial rush hour backups at traffic signals between Prince Frederick and the northern county line. There are seven northbound and five southbound signals that many of our citizens must slug through every work day.

Erosion of our Tax Base – High density housing units typically erode the tax base because apartment and townhouses generally pay less property tax per unit when compared to single family detached houses. That plus the fact that the high density residential owners/renters, with the exception of senior housing, are often younger families which translates to higher numbers of school aged children per unit. Half of our county's budget funds our schools so a significant increase in population will burden our schools which translates to a burden on our county budget.

Citizens/Voter Opposition – The results of the recent primary election which voted a pro-business/pro-developer Commissioner out of office sends a clear message that the voters did not support substantially increasing our residential growth rate. If the Plan is approved in its present form builders and developers stand to make millions while our citizens will be left with higher taxes, traffic gridlock, and the degradation of our rural character we all treasure.

I urge you to substantially scale back the proposed high density residential growth promoted in the present draft Comprehensive Plan.

As always I appreciate the opportunity to provide comments for your consideration during the Plan review.

Tom Mero

Dunkirk

Harrod, Felicia R.

From: David Bury <burydav@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 06, 2018 3:21 PM
To: Sunderland, Carolyn V.; Planning and Zoning
Subject: Calvert 2040 Comments Comp Plan Second Draft Chapter 1
Attachments: 6 July Comp Plan Second Draft Comments.docx

Dear P&Z Staff

Attached in WORD format are my comments on the Comprehensive Plan Second Draft, Chapter One. Can you please pass them to the Planning Commission for their consideration?

Thanks very much

David Bury
burydav@gmail.com
4310 King Fisher Ct
Chesapeake Beach, MD 20732
443-684-3924

Comments to the Calvert County Planning Commission and the Planning & Zoning Departments on the Comprehensive Plan Second Draft, Chapter 1.

1. Executive Summary issue: I greatly appreciate the Planning Commission's decision to closely evaluate each chapter of the Comprehensive Plan, one chapter at a time. **I would request that when evaluations of all the chapters are complete, the Planning Commission then use the results to evaluate the Executive Summary.** This would be an appropriate time to alter any Executive Summary language that may be required in order to conform to any changes made to individual chapter text.

2. Transportation Plan issue: I also greatly appreciate the Planning Commission's request that a County-wide Transportation Study be conducted to inform the overall planning process. I was also glad to see the Planning & Zoning Staff's respond to this request by preparing a Statement of Scope for a Transportation Study to be added on to the existing Comprehensive Plan development contract with the AWP contractor. I was disappointed, however, to see that the 10 July 2018 BOCC meeting agenda does not include discussion of approving the additional funding needed for Transportation Plan work to begin. **I would urge the Planning Commission to request that the BOCC discuss and approve Transportation Plan funding at the earliest opportunity.**

3. Comprehensive Plan Approval Timeline Issue: After the Planning Commission review of the Comprehensive Plan Second Draft is completed and all resulting text changes incorporated, please submit it to for County Agency review, State Agency Review, and public comment sequentially, rather than simultaneously, before proceeding to a public hearing and ultimate approval. This assures that the Calvert County public will be able to comment on a final draft that includes all County and State Agency changes, rather than commenting on a draft that has not been completed vetted by the County and State. The County, State and public reviews of the first draft were scheduled simultaneously, and the County and State came back with over thirty pages of change requests that the public was unable to use to inform their own comments. **To maintain transparency and assure the credibility of the Comprehensive Plan review process, please establish a sequential review timeline,** and do not let this simultaneous review happen again.

4. Chapter 1, Page 1-2: Under the Sustainability heading, the meaning on "Natural and geographic boundaries – approaching challenges based on their natural and geographic characteristics, not artificial and political units" is unclear. **Please ask what "artificial and political units" means, and request and include clarifying language.**

5. Chapter 1, Page 1-2: In the final paragraph, **please ask for clarification** of "Calvert County's approach to achieving sustainability begins with approaching land use goals using natural boundaries where possible to separate natural and rural areas (Priority Preservation Areas) from growth areas (Priority Funding Areas)." First, there are natural and rural areas that are not currently PPAs, and growth areas that are not in PPAs, so please ask for more precise language. Second, the text could be taken to imply that natural boundaries are the best way to separate natural and rural areas from growth areas. Depending on the location in the County, this is sometimes true and sometime not true. **Please also request** that the text more precisely define the term, "natural boundary." **Also, please request** that replacement language should clearly state that demarcations between natural/rural areas and growth areas cannot be limited to "natural boundaries."

6. Chapter 1, Page 1-3. Under the Preserve Rural Character heading, the text paints an overly rosy picture regarding County land preservation efforts over the last ten years. **Request that the Planning Commission ask P&Z staff for graphs** showing the amount of land preserved by each land preservation program per year between 1978, when the preservation efforts started, and today. What you'll see is a dramatic decline in the number of acres preserved over the last decade. **Request that such a graph be included in the text, along with explanations** for why the dropoff occurred (there are several reasons). **The text should also be changed to include specific language** on what policy changes the County will make to reinvigorate the land preservation process.

7. Chapter 1, Page 1-5. Under the Create Vibrant Town Centers, the text equates "vibrancy" only with increased residential growth. There are many other ways to create vibrancy that this section needs to discuss, and does not. **Request the Planning Commission please ask the contractor and P&Z staff for a list of other ways to create vibrancy that can be included in the text,** and considered for concrete policy actions when the Town Center Master Plans are developed. I am not opposed to residential growth, so long as it actually does contribute to vibrancy – sometimes it does, but too often it hasn't. Also, if the language in item 3, "Increasing the conventional density in Major Town Centers," is retained, **please add "...consistent with the ability of existing infrastructure to support it."** Rationale: Increases to conventional density must conform to hard data regarding adequate public facilities, including the results of traffic congestion analysis – this may be implied, but I'd be more comfortable here seeing it included here in hard print.

8. Chapter 1, Page 1-5, Under Missions and Visions heading, request please list the four bullets in priority order. Many readers will assume that these are already in priority order, and I hope they are not. **Request that Planning Commission members at the Chapter 1 work session publicly discuss how to prioritize these four bullets. Achieving consensus on this now will be important to inform the rest of the draft review process.** In my view, reversing the order of the four bullets would most accurately reflect prevailing public opinion on priorities. It also better accords with the bulleted list of ten visions directly below, which I assume (and hope) are in priority order.

9. Chapter 1, Page 1-6. For bullet 4, **request please add bracketed text as follows:** "Our highways are safe with only moderate congestion [(Maryland State Highway Administration grades of "C" for County roadways and intersections, and "D" for State highways and intersections) and [public] transit is readily available." Rationale: Without precise definition, the term "moderate congestion" is meaningless. We should retain the same definitions for moderate congestion used in the 2010 Comprehensive Plan.

9. Chapter 1, Page 1-6. For bullet 5, **request please add bracketed text as follows:** "We waste less, consume fewer natural resources, [maintain adequate fresh water supplies in the aquifers,] and properly dispose of waste. Rationale: Aquifer depletion is already emerging as a significant issue in parts of Charles and Anne Arundel Counties that draw from the same aquifers that Calvert does (Charles anticipates importing fresh water at great expense by 2040). In addition, rising arsenic levels in some locations within Calvert are already a worry. The current Chapter 9 text does not adequately address the seriousness of the aquifer depletion issue as a future constraint to growth and should be closely examined by the Planning Commission when the Chapter 9 review occurs. Meanwhile, however, the issue is critical enough to also be specifically cited here in Chapter 1's list of visions.

Harrod, Felicia R.

From: Jeff Klapper <jeffklapper@comcast.net>
Sent: Friday, July 06, 2018 4:58 PM
To: Planning and Zoning
Subject: Comments for July Planning Commission meeting

Please forward to the Planning Commission.

Please address these issues in your examination of the land use section of the comprehensive plan.

(1) On page 3-15 under the heading Rural Commercial is this statement: As a general policy, nonagricultural commercial uses in the Farm and Forest areas and Rural Community areas should be limited to uses that support, complement, and promote farming, forestry, heritage, and ecotourism. Commercial uses in the Farm and Forest areas and Rural Residential areas should be strictly limited to help avoid drawing traffic onto rural roads and creating conflicts with existing residential communities.

On page 3-24 is objective 3.2.1.3: Allow privately-funded community sewage treatment facilities to serve commercial, industrial and employment uses located outside Town Centers and Residential Areas, consistent with economic development goals. [BOCC, PW, P&Z]

These systems are to take place in Growth Areas, but Growth Areas are defines as: Major and Minor Town Centers and Residential areas directly surrounding Major Town Centers are designated Growth Areas. (pg 3-16). The objective on page 3-24 clearly states that these systems are to be located outside growth areas, i.e., outside town centers and residential areas.

All of these statements can not exist in the same place except in the world of quantum mechanics. They appear not to have been authored by the same people. The statement on page 3-15 might have been written by the Sage Group. The objective on 3-24 could have been lifted from the Small Business Interest Group minutes.

Delete all references to developer funded sewage treatment systems. The concept as stated makes a mockery of the Town Center principle and the guidance of development to town centers. In the end, when the sewage systems fail (and they will fail) the County will have to step in and use our taxpayer dollars to fix the problem.

(2) In adjacent paragraphs on page 3-20 describing the Lusby and Solomons town centers, their boundaries are both to be merged and their identities kept separate:

The updated master plan should seek to establish a clear visual boundary between Lusby and the adjacent Solomons Town Center to support the separate identities of the two communities.

The Future Land Use Map expands the Solomons Town Center north to meet the expanded Lusby Town Center boundary.

This is a direct conflict. Just wait until the developers' site plans are rejected because they confuse the "separate boundaries" are violated. Keep the towns separate on the map and your problem is solved.

(3) The population growth information presented in the 2nd draft that you are considering contains data so misleading as to cloud the viability of the whole plan. The figures you are working with are derived from *present zoning*. You are being asked to increase density, vastly increase the size of town centers, reduce TDR requirements and accept the numbers based on current zoning as valid! Just considering housing projects already approved or in process for Prince Frederick alone makes the population projection ridiculous. Having asked the question of PZ staff at the public presentation of the plan, it was affirmed that these housing plans constitute 10 to 15 % of the total population increase projected to 2040. It takes no great effort to see a huge disconnect between the plan's numbers and reality.

I know that an analysis of the possible population growth outcome of the 2nd draft called "Details Matter" has been submitted to the Planning Commission. Please examine it and consider it's possibilities in your deliberations. None of the plan will be accurate if you do not know how many residents you are planning for. Please ask PZ staff to provide their own realistic projection and take no action until you have the information necessary to make an informed decision.

Thank you,
Jeff Klapper
Prince Frederick

Sent from my iPad
Please

Harrod, Felicia R.

From: Bessie Watkins <keepcalvertcountry@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 06, 2018 5:08 PM
To: Planning and Zoning
Subject: Request For Studies BEFORE Growth

Calvert County Planning Commission Members:

As you are aware, Maryland Law requires that:

"A Planning Commission shall prepare a Comprehensive Plan by carefully and comprehensively surveying and studying the present conditions and projections of future growth of the local jurisdiction."

While the current draft of the Comprehensive Plan includes information about "present conditions", it lacks evidence that "projections of future growth" have been "carefully and comprehensively studied".

Therefore, I am requesting that no growth be proposed in the Plan until studies are conducted to determine the effects on traffic, schools, the environment, water supply, budget, etc. before the Plan is approved.

Specifically, the Plan should first answer the following basic question:

1 - How many households are projected if the growth in the Town Centers and Residential Areas are approved and if water and sewer is allowed to maximize density, as proposed?

Based on the answer to the above, the following additional questions should be answered:

2 - How much traffic will be generated by the projected households? Can our roads accommodate the additional traffic? If not, what road improvements are needed? How will those improvements be funded?

3 - How many additional schools will be needed? How will they be funded?

4 - What impacts will the proposed growth have on our environment? How will those impacts be mitigated?

5 - Can our aquifers adequately supply water to the projected households? If not, what is the solution?

If studies have in fact been conducted, I request that the results be added to the Plan and that they be shared with the public and the Planning Commission in a public presentation, with adequate time for review, questions and comments.

If studies have not been conducted to answer the above questions, I request that the Planning Commission direct the Consultant and staff to conduct the necessary studies and that the results be presented to the Planning Commission and the public, with adequate time for review, questions and comments, before approval of the Plan.

Thank you.

Bessie Watkins

sandramw@comcast.net

Dunkirk

Keep Calvert County (Yellow Bank Rd.) a rural area, please. I want the country environment. We don't need the Dunkirk area turned into the suburbs. I need my wooded area. I have enough problems now trying to get out of Yellow Bank Rd. No more residential communities are needed on Yellow Bank Rd. Please don't include Yellow Bank Road proposed reclassification.

Thank You!

Harrod, Felicia R.

From: Jessica obrien <keepcalvertcountry@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 06, 2018 6:15 PM
To: Planning and Zoning
Subject: Request For Studies BEFORE Growth

Calvert County Planning Commission Members:

As you are aware, Maryland Law requires that:

"A Planning Commission shall prepare a Comprehensive Plan by carefully and comprehensively surveying and studying the present conditions and projections of future growth of the local jurisdiction."

While the current draft of the Comprehensive Plan includes information about "present conditions", it lacks evidence that "projections of future growth" have been "carefully and comprehensively studied".

Therefore, I am requesting that no growth be proposed in the Plan until studies are conducted to determine the effects on traffic, schools, the environment, water supply, budget, etc. before the Plan is approved.

Specifically, the Plan should first answer the following basic question:

1 - How many households are projected if the growth in the Town Centers and Residential Areas are approved and if water and sewer is allowed to maximize density, as proposed?

Based on the answer to the above, the following additional questions should be answered:

2 - How much traffic will be generated by the projected households? Can our roads accommodate the additional traffic? If not, what road improvements are needed? How will those improvements be funded?

3 - How many additional schools will be needed? How will they be funded?

4 - What impacts will the proposed growth have on our environment? How will those impacts be mitigated?

5 - Can our aquifers adequately supply water to the projected households? If not, what is the solution?

If studies have in fact been conducted, I request that the results be added to the Plan and that they be shared with the public and the Planning Commission in a public presentation, with adequate time for review, questions and comments.

If studies have not been conducted to answer the above questions, I request that the Planning Commission direct the Consultant and staff to conduct the necessary studies and that the results be presented to the Planning Commission and the public, with adequate time for review, questions and comments, before approval of the Plan.

Thank you.

Jessica obrien

Jessica.byle@gmail.com

Chesapeake Beach

Harrod, Felicia R.

From: Charlene Kriemelmeyer <c.tobeyk@icloud.com>
Sent: Friday, July 06, 2018 9:27 PM
To: Planning and Zoning
Subject: Calvert 2040 Ch. 1 Comments
Attachments: calvert 2040 june 6 2018 Ch 1 CTK comments .pdf

TO: Calvert County Planning Commission
Calvert County Dept. of Planning & Zoning
175 Main Street
Prince Frederick, MD 20678

Calvert County Comprehensive Plan - Draft 2

COMMENTS - June 6, 2016
CHAPTER 1. PURPOSE, MISSION, AND VISIONS
ATTACHED

THANK YOU FOR GIVING US THE TIME TO BE ABLE TO MAKE COMMENTS ON INDIVIDUAL CHAPTERS.

FROM Charlene Kriemelmeyer
Charlene Tobey Kriemelmeyer
10241 Three Doctors Road
Dunkirk, MD 20175-99404
410-257-2108
c.tobeyk@icloud.com

TO:

Calvert County Planning Commission
CALVERT 2040 COMMENTS CH. 1
May 2018 Draft Chapter 1 Comments
Calvert County Dept. of Planning & Zoning
175 Main Street
Prince Frederick, MD 20678
pz@calvertcountymd.gov

**CALVERT COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN - DRAFT 2
COMMENTS - JUNE 6, 2016
CHAPTER 1. PURPOSE, MISSION, AND VISIONS**

This Chapter, which appears to not only be a guide but also an overview, therefore I hope you will review it after you have gone through all the other chapters and their comments as you may find you will need to make some changes.

1-1 PURPOSE

“The Board of County Commissioners, the Planning Commission, and county departments use the Plan as a guide when preparing functional plans and small area plans, evaluating proposed projects or considering changes to legislation, such as the zoning ordinance.”

Let’s be honest and call the Plan what it is. The Plan is a legal document It is not a “vision” or a guide as indicated. Once approved it will be **THE** “Official Policy Document for Calvert County.” The county will be locked into what is contained within it. So it is especially frightening that for the first time in the history of the Calvert County Comprehensive Plan & Updates it is putting the cart before the horse: zoning is included. As the Plan now stands, it would lock in Pro-Accelerated Will Growth Policies. Zoning ordinances should come later. Locking in now open the County up to law suits if changes are made later during the normal zoning ordinance process.

“... list of functional and small area plans, several of which are incorporated into the Comprehensive Plan by reference. These more detailed and specific documents both inform the Plan and will need to conform to it in their subsequent updates. ... These functional and small areas plans include, but are not limited to: ... Town Center master plans... Development regulations such as the zoning ordinance. ... These plans and regulations provide much greater detail about specific locations, financing, and resources than the Comprehensive Plan publication.”

The Plan states the Town Center Master Plans be updated as *“they will need to conform to it in their subsequent updates.”* In the past the Citizens of the Town Centers played a major, integral part in writing their Master Plans. So basically the Plan is overriding what we might want. There was a

forum, then a public hearing, then a draft then comments& leading up to the first draft and the process continued all along giving the town citizens a say in how we wanted our towns to grow and look. However this Plan takes the power out of our hands. At the rushed draft round robin presentation held in Dunkirk on 6/12/18. I asked Mark Willis about this issue, specifically if we could change/control: the density of units in the Town Center & Residential areas; water; sewer; signs; ect. Mr Willis' answer was that we would be able to "fine tune the plan." The Architectural Review Boards have been stripped of much of their power, now this. Watering down Town Center Master Plans to pieces of paper that just mirror the County Plan is not acceptable.

1-2 VALUES

"SUSTAINABILITY

- Oriented to Future Generations
- Bounded by community growth limits ...
- Means to sustainability..."

" While the current draft of the Comprehensive Plan includes information about "present conditions," it lacks evidence that "projections of future growth" have been "carefully and comprehensively studied," as mandated by Maryland Law." Keep Calvert Country (KCC)

As it now stands the Plan misrepresents the growth potential and underestimates projected growth rate as they relate to the land. The draft Plan includes "projections" based on current zoning, the County, for Town Centers in the Plan and Residential Areas numbers do not add up. This in turn is responsible for a cascade of incorrect calculations leading to false estimates and the subsequent the impact expansion.

The Plan calls for 5,940-acre expansions proposed for the TCs & 17,200 acres in Residential Areas , that is a lot of people, extra stress on the county infrastructure. The Plan should include the true expansion in each town center in terms of dwelling Units. This would enable accurate projections on how our infrastructure, aquifers, environment, budget& would be affected.

Two examples of errors/omissions:

- 1.) The chart in the Plan says Dunkirk will not expand but your own staff has verified that in fact, the residential area will be 400 acres larger! (At the first round robin meeting I specifically pointed out that the Dunkirk Residential area had grown to more than a mile, and was told I was wrong by the gentleman at the station with the poster showing land use, including the Town Center and Residential The exact same poster and man were there for last month's meeting.
- 2.) Fortunately, Greg Bowen of KCC is working on pulling the zoning maps and working on figuring out the true expansion as the average resident would not even begin to know how to do this. So far he has calculated growth in Prince Fredrick and it does not match the Plan. Here is a very shortened version of his chart for Prince Frederick :

The final table combines the two tables above to show the total number of dwelling units possible and then shows calculations for how many new residents would be expected to occupy those units. TOTAL INCREASE IN DWELLING UNITS BETWEEN & RESIDENTS IN THE PRINCE FREDRICK AREA. TOWN CENTER AND RESIDENTIAL AREA COMBINED.

of Dwelling Units = between 7,294 & 16,432 *

of New Residents = Between 15,817 & 34,507 **

*Range based on 14 units/acre or 24 units/acre

**# of dwelling units multiplied by 2.1 people per unit.

Just think of the extra traffic ect.

For more details <https://www.keepcalvertcountry.com/single-post/2018/07/03/Planning-Commission-Details-Matter>

If you look at the zoning maps, planned development, the true expansion is much higher than predicted by the Plan. (see Greg Bowen's calculations on KCC) In fact the Plan is tremendously under calculated. The county would reach the projected 2030 growth much sooner.

These examples make every calculation in the Plan suspect. The true numbers must be clearer and in the plan before it can be approved. Residents should not have to guess what the plan means.

“ · Public participation – focusing on desired outcomes and broadening the process by which a community discovers, considers and tackles issues.”

There cannot be full public participation without accurate information. All of quantitative information referred to above must be put into the Plan with true projections, so the community can have a basis to truly discover, consider, and tackle issues. I am requesting that no growth be proposed in the Plan until there are accurate projected growth numbers. Studies must be done by certified specialists. (Examples: the Consultant's section on Traffic is blatantly erroneous; for water Exelon and Dominion were not even taken into consideration.) Studies should be conducted to determine the effects on traffic, schools, the environment, the aquifers and alternative means for water as the aquifers are stressed at current population levels, budget, etc., **before** the Plan is approved.

I do not feel that we really experienced Public Participation because at NONE of the forums, meetings, round robin presentations or any other interactions with Planning and Zoning or the Consultants was it ever mentioned that Dunkirk was anything other than a Town Center nor was it mentioned that it would be changed& Then suddenly in this draft of the Plan Dunkirk has been elevated to a MAJOR Town Center, without consulting the citizens. We do not want to be another

Prince Frederick. We do not want the gateway to Calvert to be another Waldorf. That most assuredly will not welcome tourists nor new residents.

The last round of meetings were so badly attended because people were not given enough notice . The local papers did not even have time to publish the dates. Also this process is being rushed through during the summer when many who would love to participate are unfortunately out of town.

The complete text of all comments submitted to the Planning Commission should be readily and easily accessible to citizens for at least the duration of the writing of and passing of the completed Plan. That includes having them posted online.

Changing the format for interacting with Citizens to meetings where the citizens circulate through round robin stations instead of town hall or forum style is not conducive to transparency. The public does not have access to what is said by the officials, nor the other attendees. There is no permanent record of what was said, what happened. At those meetings which were supposedly meant to present the drafts, ironically copies of the draft was not available, only a few cherry picked pages. Many of the people manning the stations could not answer our questions. At the June 2018 round of meetings, several of the posters appeared to be exactly the same as those used for the first draft meeting. Last month's 3 meetings should have highlighted the changes between the 1st and 2nd drafts. We left both of those meetings feeling very manipulated and disappointed.

1-6 PRESERVE RURAL CHARACTER

Back it up with \$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$ and do not let the funds for Agricultural Preservation be robbed. Offer a decent financial incentive to land owners to put their land into preservation.

1-5, 1-6 CREATE VIBRANT TOWN CENTERS

“Direct development to the Town Centers and to encourage development that creates the vibrancy county residents are seeking.”

Which Residents are you referring to? I say this because I attended ALL of the 2040 forums because at the forums and the meeting at Dunkirk and the presentations given after each draft at Dunkirk and Read everything I could find in the various news outlets. Overwhelmingly, the residents of this county ARE NOT seeking the vision of vibrancy that this Plan is proscribing. This Plan's vision is that of the "Small Business Interest Group" (SBIG), pro-accelerated growth with no growth cap.

THE PLAN ACTUALLY QUOTES THE SBIG MINUTES! You know how this happened as the SBIG Minutes show members of your staff were there!

The BOCC and staff were able to circumvent Maryland State Transparency laws and keep their meetings with the “Small Business Interest Group” (SBIG) secret from the public because only 1 or 2 of the Board of County Commissioners at a time met with SBIG. Keep Calvert Country had to file under Freedom Of Information Act to get the minutes, which are now posted on their site. They show that the organization has been telling Heijle, Slougenhaupt and Hart and you exactly what to do.

“In minutes* from their meetings, these developers brag about how they got Commissioners elected who favor accelerated growth, and how they need to adopt the Plan before a new Board is voted in.

*https://docs.wixstatic.com/ugd/3d51d8_f9dee4f8188d4dcc932240187beae72d.pdf

& To get the Plan adopted quickly, the Board of Commissioners have not only put pressure on the consultant and staff but have also shortened the amount of time citizens have been given to participate.” Keep Calvert Country (KCC)

“...direct development to the Town Centers and to encourage development that creates the vibrancy county residents are seeking. These policy actions include:

1. Better defining the boundaries of Major and Minor Town Centers and for Town Centers, the growth areas adjacent to them;”

The Plan should include exact maps of the boundaries of all zoning maps with streets as Citizens can't tell who is affected by the current tiny vague maps. Where are the true bounties of the Town Centers and new high density Residential areas around the Town Centers? Without knowing the true bounties of the Town Centers and Residential areas around the Town Centers? How can we verify the accuracy of the Plan's projected growth in housing and in traffic? The Planning Commission should expect that the County staff will provide such numbers before the members can vote on the Plan. How else can they project the impact of the changes on roads, schools, potable water, and the environment as required by state law?

“2. Using wastewater treatment facilities and other public infrastructure investments to attract and direct growth to appropriate locations within the Town Centers; “

DUNKIRK DOES NOT WANT HISTORY REPEATED. IN OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY DEVELOPERS HAVE BUILT SUBSTANDARD SYSTEMS WHICH THE COUNTY WAS THEN FORCED TO TAKE OVER. Once that happens, the door would be open for Dunkirk to balloon into a full fledged Prince Frederick style Major Town Center. SBIG would be very happy, but not us nor the majority of residents of the county.

“3. Increasing the conventional density in Major Town Centers.
Conventional Density = Number of permitted Dwellings and intensity of development
allowed without special approval or the purchase of TDRs.”

DON'T WE GET A SAY? Do Not lock in Zoning now, see above.

1-6 MISSIONS AND VISIONS

VISIONS

One glaring omission is the removal of Benchmarks from visions of the Plan. It is of utmost importance that progress is constantly monitored. KCC's two examples of deleted benchmarks show how watered down this Plan is in items of great importance to the citizens. **These benchmarks, and all the others should be reinstated:**

“& traffic/failing intersections and the budget. “As an example, the following transportation benchmark was removed: “A level of service “D” is attained on MD 2/4 and on Town Center roads. A level of service “C” is maintained on County roads and outside Town Centers.”Another example relates to County debt: “the ration of debt service to total revenue is not to exceed 9.5%.” KCC

MISSIONS AND VISIONS

Please read this Missions and Visions section every time you sit down to evaluate a section. If you are not living up to the Mission and Visions, start over. Too much of the Plan has been co-opted by pro-aggressive growth proponents.

Charlene Tobey Kriemelmeyer
10241 Three Doctors Road
Dunkirk, MD 20175-99404
410-257-2108
c.tobeyk@icloud.com

Harrod, Felicia R.

From: Joe <kjojrpf@aol.com>
Sent: Friday, July 06, 2018 9:28 PM
To: Planning and Zoning
Subject: Fwd: Calvert 2040 Comments
Attachments: CHAPTER 1, Draft #2 C.P..pdf

-----Original Message-----

From: Joe <kjojrpf@aol.com>
To: pz <pz@calvertcounty.gov>
Sent: Fri, Jul 6, 2018 9:20 pm
Subject: Calvert 2040 Comments

See attached pdf for comments regarding Comprehensive Plan -Draft #2.

Joe Kriemelmeyer, Jr
10241 Three Doctors Rd
Dunkirk, MD 20754
phone: 410-257-2108

Calvert Co. Comprehensive Plan- Draft #2

CHAPTER 1. Purpose, Mission and Visions

Pages: 1-1 to 1-6

Comments July 6, 2018:

Values, outlines the importance for “Sustainability” in the Comprehensive Plan (C.P.) for our county. Three of the six “principles to achieve an outcome of sustainable community design” are given inadequate weight when the full scope of proposed build-out and growth is presented. From 2020 to 2040 an additional 3700 households are projected in the following pages of the C.P. draft. Fair to say, this could likely be upward of 8000 people added to the Calvert population.

The three principles shorted on importance are in bold type (pg. 1-2):

Bounded by community growth limits- Where are the growth limits shown in Draft #2 of the C.P.?

Natural and geographic boundaries- Calvert Co. is a peninsula (surrounded on three sides by water limiting access and travel both in and out).

Means to sustainability- Aquifers are the main source of clean drinking water for the entire county and are in constant *drawdown* averaging 2’-4’ per year and closely related to population growth and higher levels of arsenic.

Where is sustainability when an aquifer reaches 80%, referred to as “management level” in our region because we are close to large bodies of salt and brackish water? Typically, an aquifer would no longer be a reliable source for clean water when at “management level” due to contamination from the larger body of salt water.

Mission and Visions (pgs. 1-5, 1-6) statements such as: “Promote sustainable development”; “We waste less, consume fewer natural resources.....; We are building a strong economy based on renewable resources,.....; are all invalid if we are not paying attention to and protecting our most valuable resource, clean water and how to make sure we have enough not just for human consumption but agriculture and business also.

Without sustainable clean drinking water or plans to mitigate future shortages by conservation involving a slower pace for growth, reservoirs and desalination facilities, the future in Calvert County does not look comfortable or affordable. It will likely be more expensive than we could imagine.

Name: Joe Kriemelmeyer, Jr

Address: 10241 Three Doctors Rd. Dunkirk, MD 20754

Email: kjojrpf@aol.com

Harrod, Felicia R.

From: Von Willey <vonwilley@mac.com>
Sent: Friday, July 06, 2018 11:55 PM
To: Planning and Zoning
Subject: 2040 Calvert Comprehensive Plan Chapter One Comment 2

While I appreciate the efforts of Planning & Zoning in seeking public input on the creation and eventual implementation of the 2040 Calvert Comprehensive Plan, more could be done to involve and engage the citizens of the county.

I believe that, as this second draft is examined and dissected by the Planning Commission it would be beneficial to publicize in The Recorder and other local newspapers a synopsis of each chapter review and give ample opportunity for the public to weigh in with their input.

Sincerely,
Von Willey

From: Von Willey <vonwilley@mac.com>
Sent: Friday, July 06, 2018 11:49 PM
To: Planning and Zoning
Subject: 2040 Calvert Comprehensive Plan Chapter One Comment

Page 1-2

“...supporting, encouraging, and directing growth toward the Town Centers limits development within the rural areas and creates more activity and vibrancy within the Town Centers”.

The proposed expansion of the Town Centers is at odds with “limiting development within rural areas” simply because it expands into those rural areas.

Page 1-3

“The 2010 Comprehensive Plan set a benchmark that 35 percent of new households locate in Town Centers or immediately around Town Centers. The County appears to have been achieving this goal.”

“Nearly 85 percent of Calvert County residential development is categorized as low or very-low density development. This implies that the development that occurs within the Town Centers is not occurring at densities needed to create vibrancy.”

We are “achieving this goal” so why expand the Town Centers? I would like to point out that the implication that density equates to “vibrancy” is, at best, an assumption. A “sense of place” does not occur because there are 15,000 people living within just a few square miles. A sense of place and vibrancy occurs when the people who live in an area have pride in where they live. That pride could generate from geographical features, cultural amenities, historical significance, or the combination of those factors. I’ve never heard anyone proud of living in a Town because of its population, traffic, or how many fast food establishments it has.

Increasing density within the Town Centers is guaranteed to achieve two things.

The first is that a select subset of businesses (such as developers and construction oriented contractors) will greatly benefit financially.

The second is that the remainder of the constituents of Calvert County will be paying for the Infrastructure necessary to create any semblance of the “sustainability” of the proposed increased residential density in Town Centers.

Infrastructure such as:

-First responders. And everything necessary for them to do their work. Buildings, technology, equipment, salaries, insurance, health care, etc.

-Water. Eventually increased density is going to draw down the Aquia aquifer, likely just past the “foreseeable future” which is the best guess the Maryland Geological Survey can offer, and then expanded water treatment facilities will need to be funded and built to provide potable water for ALL county residents...not just those within and adjacent to Town Centers.

-Sewage Treatment facilities funded by developers and “paid for by those who use them” is certainly a wonderful thought. The reality is that eventually the county will be responsible in some form or fashion for ensuring the systems are maintained and functioning as necessary.

-Transportation. Public transportation, roads, sidewalks, bike paths, roads, bridges, etc. all require Maintenance...and Maintenance will be as important a cost to consider as the actual creation of a viable system of navigating through the proposed expansion of the Town Centers...two of which straddle the main artery of Rt.4.

-Schools. Increased density will require additional schools and all the costs of buses, staffing, insuring, maintenance, etc. Unless, of course, the proposed increased residential density of Town Centers is going to be limited to allowing only seniors and high school graduates to live there.

-Technology. An additional estimated 83,000+ trips through Prince Frederick should be enough to get someone looking at the extremely limited Internet services available in Calvert. Simply put, higher paying jobs which require reliable, high speed Internet accessibility are not readily available within Calvert County. This lack equates to more commuters, more traffic, more need for everything from first responders and deputies to road maintenance.

Economic development would be off the charts in the Town Centers and the jobs wouldn't be just lower paying retail or food service if Tech companies had the infrastructure to locate here.

Those are just a few of the infrastructure needs that are guaranteed to be necessary should the proposal go forward to expand Town Centers and increase the residential density within and around those expanded areas.

I look forward to hearing the Planning Commission's thoughts on this chapter in their upcoming meeting on July 18, 2018.

Von Willey

Harrod, Felicia R.

From: Sharon Burcham <keepcalvertcountry@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 06, 2018 9:11 AM
To: Planning and Zoning
Subject: Request For Studies BEFORE Growth

Calvert County Planning Commission Members:

As you are aware, Maryland Law requires that:

"A Planning Commission shall prepare a Comprehensive Plan by carefully and comprehensively surveying and studying the present conditions and projections of future growth of the local jurisdiction."

While the current draft of the Comprehensive Plan includes information about "present conditions", it lacks evidence that "projections of future growth" have been "carefully and comprehensively studied".

Therefore, I am requesting that no growth be proposed in the Plan until studies are conducted to determine the effects on traffic, schools, the environment, water supply, budget, etc. before the Plan is approved.

Specifically, the Plan should first answer the following basic question:

1 - How many households are projected if the growth in the Town Centers and Residential Areas are approved and if water and sewer is allowed to maximize density, as proposed?

Based on the answer to the above, the following additional questions should be answered:

2 - How much traffic will be generated by the projected households? Can our roads accommodate the additional traffic? If not, what road improvements are needed? How will those improvements be funded?

3 - How many additional schools will be needed? How will they be funded?

4 - What impacts will the proposed growth have on our environment? How will those impacts be mitigated?

5 - Can our aquifers adequately supply water to the projected households? If not, what is the solution?

If studies have in fact been conducted, I request that the results be added to the Plan and that they be shared with the public and the Planning Commission in a public presentation, with adequate time for review, questions and comments.

If studies have not been conducted to answer the above questions, I request that the Planning Commission direct the Consultant and staff to conduct the necessary studies and that the results be presented to the Planning Commission and the public, with adequate time for review, questions and comments, before approval of the Plan.

Thank you.

Sharon Burcham

Spburcham1@aol.com

Dunkirk