

Comments on the Proposed Calvert County Comprehensive Plan (May 2018 Draft)
 Additional Comments Received through August 5, 2018

NAME	GROUP/AGENCY	TOWN	DATE RECEIVED	# OF PAGES
Anita Brown		Dunkirk	7/30/2018, 8/1/2018 and 8/5/2018	12
Toni Hoover		Huntingtown	7/31/2018	1
Charlene Kriemelmeyer		Dunkirk	7/31/2018 and 8/3/2018	9
Rebecca Daley		Owings	8/1/2018	1
David Wooldridge		Prince Frederick	8/3/2018	2
David Bury		Chesapeake Beach	8/3/2018	6
Tom Mero		Dunkirk	8/3/2018	2
Patricia Blevins		Dunkirk	8/4/2018	2

Harrod, Felicia R.

From: Anita Brown <anitawb@comcast.net>
Sent: Monday, July 30, 2018 2:50 PM
To: Planning and Zoning
Subject: Comments on Chapter 6 of the 2nd draft of the Comprehensive Plan

Housing: Goal 4 Support Aging in Place. . . . Objective 2

6.4.2.1 Continue to encourage age-restricted (senior or 55+) housing in Town Centers by reducing the full requirements of the Adequate Public Facilities requirements for schools, school excise taxes, and/or the use of Transferable Development Rights to increase allowable.

While I think reducing the full requirements of the APF for schools and school excise taxes for seniors and 55+ in the Town Center housing is worth considering, in order for this not to create other problems, you would have to ensure that the senior or 55+ aged person was not the primary care giver for a school age child. That is not uncommon now days. Should that clarification or caveat be added to this section to ensure it would fully be understood that school aged children could not reside in these housing units with seniors or 55 plus aged parents? Would a reduction in school excise taxes also be offered to seniors living in single family homes outside of the town center? I don't think it would be fair to offer that benefit only to those individuals living in the town center.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on chapter 6.

Anita Brown

 Virus-free. www.avast.com

Harrod, Felicia R.

From: Anita Brown <anitawb@comcast.net>
Sent: Monday, July 30, 2018 2:40 PM
To: Planning and Zoning
Subject: Comments on Chapter 6 of the 2nd draft of the Comprehensive Plan

Housing: Goal 4 – Support Aging in Place
Objective 1

6.4.1.2 Reduce parking requirements for housing to serve the disabled and seniors when reliable alternative transportation options are available to residents. I don't think that approach will work. As a senior, I would still have a vehicle because you will not be able to get to everything using alternative transportation options. Many county residents use doctors in Annapolis as an example. My assumption is that the alternative transportation you are referencing is within the county. You also need to allow parking for friends and family to come visit the disabled and seniors. If you reduce the parking requirement, where are they going to park? I think this statement needs further discussion and you may be creating another problem.

Thank you.

Anita Brown

 Virus-free. www.avast.com

Harrod, Felicia R.

From: Anita Brown <anitawb@comcast.net>
Sent: Monday, July 30, 2018 2:32 PM
To: Planning and Zoning
Subject: Comments on Chapter 6 of the 2nd draft of the Comprehensive Plan

Housing: Sustainability Approach

You state: "This strategy means an adequate percentage of homes needs to be affordable and located away from incompatible uses." I couldn't see where you define "incompatible uses" in the draft document. If it defined elsewhere in the document then perhaps you could footnote the reference. If you don't define it elsewhere in the document, I recommend that you do define "incompatible uses."

Thank you.

Anita Brown



Virus-free. www.avast.com

Harrod, Felicia R.

From: Anita Brown <anitawb@comcast.net>
Sent: Monday, July 30, 2018 11:55 AM
To: Planning and Zoning
Subject: Comments on Chapter 2 of the 2nd Draft of the Comprehensive Plan

I would like to comment on the section entitled Geography.

The following statement is made: “Because Calvert County is a peninsula, it has limited connections to neighboring jurisdictions. This is a benefit in terms of traffic volumes; however, it means that commercial businesses must rely on local demand rather than attracting additional demand from outside travelers. This impacts the amount and type of businesses that Calvert County can support. “ You then again contradict this statement in the Changing Employment Characteristics section when you state: “The county is experiencing an influx of workers from neighboring jurisdictions commuting to the jobs inside Calvert County. In 2007, 8,239 or 47.2 percent of the jobs in Calvert County were filled by employees living outside the county. By 2011, that number had grown to 8,885 or 49.5 percent of the jobs in the county. (Source: On the Map profiles for 2007 and 2011, U.S. Census Bureau).” If 49.5 percent of the jobs in the county are filled by employees living outside the county, how are businesses just relying on local demand? I would recommend that these contradictions be corrected. Which statement is correct?

Thank you,

Anita Brown



Virus-free. www.avast.com

Harrod, Felicia R.

From: Anita Brown <anitawb@comcast.net>
Sent: Monday, July 30, 2018 11:47 AM
To: Planning and Zoning
Subject: Comments on Chapter 2 of the 2nd Draft of the Comprehensive Plan

I would like to comment on the section entitled Geography.

The following statement is made: " The southern end of the county is very connected to the water, and does not have significant connections to major employment centers. Much of the residential development in the southern end was originally built as summer homes and has been converted to year-round use." You contradict this statement yourself in the Changing Employment Characteristics section when you list Exelon/Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant as one of the major employers in the county. Calvert Cliffs is in the southern part of the county as is the LNG plant. I would also add the Pax River Naval Air Station should also be considered a major employment center with residents of the southern end of the county working there.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Chapter 2 of the 2nd draft of the Comprehensive Plan.

Anita Brown



Virus-free. www.avast.com

Harrod, Felicia R.

From: Anita Brown <anitawb@comcast.net>
Sent: Monday, July 30, 2018 11:39 AM
To: Planning and Zoning
Subject: Comments on Chapter 2 of the 2nd Draft of the Comprehensive Plan

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the 2nd draft of the Comprehensive Plan.

I would like to question the figures shown under the Recent and Projected Growth section. Calvert County is NOT one of the slowest growing areas in the state. Looking at the statistics, the number of counties growing faster and the number of countries growing slower are almost equal. I recommend that someone recheck the facts and revise the following statement: "As a result, Calvert County has gone from being the fastest growing county in Maryland to one of **the slowest** in the metropolitan areas."

Thank you,

Anita Brown
Calvert County Resident since 1979



Virus-free. www.avast.com

Harrod, Felicia R.

From: Anita Brown <anitawb@comcast.net>
Sent: Wednesday, August 01, 2018 7:49 PM
To: Planning and Zoning
Subject: Comments on the Comprehensive Plan - Draft 2

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comment of Chapter 8 – Economic Vitality of the Draft Comprehensive Plan dated May 2018. Since I took the time to read and provide comments on the Chapter, I hope you will take the time to read the comments. As citizens, we are definitely concerned about the future direction of our county.

Page 8-17 Goal 2: Direct business growth to Town Centers while preserving agricultural land in the Farm and Forest District.

8.2.1.1 - 8.2.1.1 Streamline the development review process in Town Centers. Maintain a fast-track permitting process for targeted businesses. [P&Z] Why do targeted businesses get to use a “fast-track permitting process?” The same permitting process should apply to **all** county businesses. The county should not be favoring one business unit or type over another. This gives the appearance of trying to fast track big box stores over locally owned and operated businesses. This statement also contradicts what you have in other parts of the draft Comprehensive Plan where you address the need to have small locally owned businesses start up in the county. Please consider revising this section to ensure a level playing field for all businesses.

Thank you.

Anita Brown



Virus-free. www.avast.com

From: Anita Brown <anitawb@comcast.net>
Sent: Wednesday, August 01, 2018 7:37 PM
To: Planning and Zoning
Subject: Comments on chapter 8 - Comprehensive Plan Second Draft

Chapter 8 – Economic Vitality – Page 8-15 – Utility Extension Policies

“To achieve higher intensity and greater variety of commercial development in the Town Centers, the county needs to develop a strategy to finance the expansion of sewer and water service in these locations.” Why does the county need to develop a strategy for expansion? We were told by Mr. Willis and the County Commissioners that if the residents of Dunkirk did not want water and sewer in the town center, then there would be no public water and sewer, only what the developers install in order to rent space to stores. I assume if the developers in Prince Frederick want to hook up to the existing water and sewer then they would pay to do that or in effect pay to increase the capacity of the current water and sewer service. What is the county paying?

I look forward to seeing an answer to my question. Thank you.

A. Brown



Virus-free. www.avast.com

From: Anita Brown <anitawb@comcast.net>
Sent: Wednesday, August 01, 2018 7:28 PM
To: Planning and Zoning
Subject: Comments on Chapter 8 of the Comprehensive Plan - Second Draft

Chapter 8 Page 8-15- Economic Vitality

I have taken the time to copy the statement that I take exception too. "Dunkirk has the potential to be one of the county's major employment centers due to its proximity to Washington, D.C. and the area's airports, interstate highways, and metropolitan centers. Dunkirk currently serves as a retail and service center, and significant commercial growth is possible." While the developers would like to see significant growth in Dunkirk, the residents of Dunkirk do NOT want to see that. We do not want to be a major retail and service center for commercial growth. How are the wishes of the residents going to be met?

Thank you.

Mrs. Brown



Virus-free. www.avast.com

Harrod, Felicia R.

From: Anita Brown <anitawb@comcast.net>
Sent: Wednesday, August 01, 2018 7:22 PM
To: Planning and Zoning
Subject: Comments on Chapter 8 - Second Draft of the Comprehensive Plan

Chapter 8 – Economic Vitality

Page 8-13 Strategies - Town Center Question: What survey or study supports the following statement: “Additional retail such as restaurants, clothing stores, and personal service businesses would increase the local tax base and satisfy these residents’ currently unmet needs.” What are our current unmet needs? I have lived in the county almost 40 years and didn’t realize I had “unmet needs.” I move here because it was rural and because there was not a shopping center on every corner. I knew what was available shopping wise when I purchased land in Calvert County and built a home. Anyone who purchased a home here knew what was available from a shopping perspective when they do so.

Thank you for considering this input. Hopefully you will answer my question.

Anita Brown



Virus-free. www.avast.com

Harrod, Felicia R.

From: Anita Brown <anitawb@comcast.net>
Sent: Wednesday, August 01, 2018 7:14 PM
To: Planning and Zoning
Subject: Comments on Chapter 8 - second draft Comprehensive Plan

Economic Vitality – Table 8-5 – page 8-12

This table references a 2011 study which seems out of date now. Is there not a more current study that can be referenced?

Since purchasing is shifting more to the internet now, how does this calculate into the Lost Spending category on table 8-5? Having additional stores in the county will not impact that trend. We have plenty of Building Materials, Garden Equipment stores currently, why do we need more? Is it our goal to put the local hardware and garden stores out of business by bringing in a big box store? If you want us to shop local, then let's keep the stores that we have in business.

The Fore Consulting that I see is a UK company. Is that who we used? If so, they certainly do not know Calvert County.

Thank you.

Anita Brown



Virus-free. www.avast.com

Holt, Judy C.

From: Anita Brown <anitawb@comcast.net>
Sent: Sunday, August 05, 2018 8:57 AM
To: Planning and Zoning
Subject: Comments on Chapter 4 of the draft Comprehensive Plan

I only have one comment on Chapter 4 of the draft Comprehensive Plan. On page 4-3, the map shows Dunkirk as a Major Town Center. Dunkirk should be changed to a minor town center or a new category all to itself. Dunkirk does not meet the stated criteria in the plan for a Major Town Center. Please revise the map accordingly.

Thank you.

Anita Brown

 Virus-free. www.avast.com

Harrod, Felicia R.

From: Toni Hoover <keepcalvertcountry@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 31, 2018 11:12 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.

Toni Hoover

Cbsflsteward@gmail.com

Huntingtown

Holt, Judy C.

From: Charlene Kriemelmeyer <c.tobeyk@icloud.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 31, 2018 1:39 PM
To: Planning and Zoning
Subject: CALVERT 2040 COMMENTS CH. 6
Attachments: Chapter 6 Comments CTK.pdf

Attached are my comments for Ch. 6

Charlene Tobey Kriemelmeyer
Dunkirk

Calvert County Planning Commission
 CALVERT 2040 COMMENTS CH. 6
 May 2018 Draft Chapter 6 Comments Meeting 8/22/18
 Calvert County Dept. of Planning & Zoning
 175 Main Street
 Prince Frederick, MD 20678
pz@calvertcountymd.gov

JULY 31, 2018

COMMENTS

CHAPTER 6 HOUSING

*Pg. 6-1 **Goal 1:** Provide for full range of housing types in Town Centers to attract **and retain multi-generational communities.***

*Pg. 6-7 **Goal 4:** **Support aging in place** through universal house design housing units and supportive services, especially near health and support services.*

Objective 1: Support aging in place through universal design.

6.4.1.1 Encourage the use of universal design principles in the housing units and communities. [P&Z]

6.4.1.2 **Reduce parking requirements for housing to serve the disabled and seniors when reliable alternative transportation options are available to residents.** [P&Z]

6.4.1.3 Provide opportunities to retrofit existing homes to incorporate universal design features **so that seniors and the disabled can remain in communities longer, if they so choose.** [P&Z]

Objective 2: Locate senior housing near health and other support service

6.4.2.1 Continue to encourage age-restricted (senior or 55+) housing in Town Centers by reducing the full requirements of the Adequate Public Facilities requirements for schools, school excise taxes, and/or the use of Transferable Development Rights to increase allowable density. [P&Z, BOCC]

6.4.2.2 **Develop incentives for assisted living facilities and nursing homes to be constructed in Town Centers.** [P&Z, CR, BOCC]

Pretty words but the reality is in Calvert County most seniors or disabled who want to continue living in their own homes are not getting any help. Be it retrofitting, reasonably priced housing or transportation, there is an income donut hole. The poor and the better off are taken care of but the rest of the population, especially seniors and disabled, are up the proverbial creek.

The transportation supplied by the county is not reliable. The bus routes are limited, and have long, unpredictable waits. Getting to an appointment and back can take most of a day, a difficult situation for people with health and/or cognitive issues. It is a travesty that wheelchair bound citizens do not have access to disability transportation unless they “live within 3/4 miles from the normal bus route stop of the county buses.” Since most of the county’s population does not live in housing within this small service area, I am sure there are many people in Calvert who are stranded in their homes and thus forced to move.

Housing for seniors at all levels, including senior living communities is a necessity throughout the county. In the northern part of the county we find few options, public and private. The available facilities have waiting lists. Hopefully the senior housing and assisted living (with limited parking) attracted will be within “3/4 miles from the normal bus route stop of the county buses” or the residents will still be stranded.

Pg. 6-7 Goal 2 Objective 1: Encourage location of small-scale personal service activities within a walkable distance of residential uses.

6.2.2.1 Accommodate home occupations at an appropriate scale in residential areas. [P&Z]

6.2.2.2 Consider allowing small retail and service uses on the first floor of residential structures along major roads. [P&Z, PC, BOCC]

These two goals can be a two edged sword that must be carefully worded and subsequently watched as they could open the door to businesses outside of the Town Centers, into the Residential areas and the rest of the county . This goes against the Plan's stated guiding value to keep the rural areas rural by to guiding businesses toward the Towns and Town Centers. CAN'T HAVE IT BOTH WAYS.

Holt, Judy C.

From: Charlene Kriemelmeyer <c.tobeyk@icloud.com>
Sent: Friday, August 03, 2018 6:46 PM
To: Planning and Zoning
Subject: Calvert 2040 Comments

Calvert County Planning Commission
CALVERT 2040 COMMENTS CH. 8
May 2018 Draft Chapter 8 Comments Meeting 8/22/18
Calvert County Dept. of Planning & Zoning
175 Main Street
Prince Frederick, MD 20678
pz@calvertcountymd.gov

August 3, 2018

ATTACHED ARE COMMENTS CHAPTER 8 ECONOMIC VITALITY .

PLEASE PAY SPECIAL ATTENTION TO PAGE 3

**Thank you,
Charlene Tobey Kriemelmeyer and Joe Kriemelmeyer, Jr.**

Calvert County Planning Commission
 CALVERT 2040 COMMENTS CH. 8
 May 2018 Draft Chapter 8 Comments Meeting 8/22/18
 Calvert County Dept. of Planning & Zoning
 175 Main Street
 Prince Frederick, MD 20678
pz@calvertcountymd.gov

August 3, 2018

COMMENTS CHAPTER 8 ECONOMIC VITALITY

Vision

We are building a strong local economy based on renewable resources, agriculture, seafood, high technology, retirement, recreation, and tourism.

STATE VISION AND PLAN

This chapter addresses the following Maryland State Visions:

Growth Areas: Growth is concentrated in existing population and business centers, growth areas adjacent to these centers, or strategically selected new centers.

Infrastructure: Growth areas have the water resources and infrastructure to accommodate population and business expansion in an orderly, efficient, and environmentally sustainable manner.

Economic Development: Economic development and natural resource-based businesses that promote employment opportunities for all income levels within the capacity of the State's natural resources, public services, and public facilities are encouraged.

As indicated in the state vision, growth areas are required to be dependent upon our having the resources and the infrastructure to support them. The Comprehensive Plan Draft 2 (Plan) as now written does not have a build-out / growth cap both for residential and business. According to US Geological Survey and Maryland Geological Survey's well water monitoring data, the aquifers that have wells in Calvert County and not in *management level* are in a constant state of *drawdown*, decreasing an average of 2' - 4' per year. Depletion of aquifers increases the concentration level of arsenic in the water. Areas that are stressed by extreme ground water withdrawal from wells display what is known as a *cone of depression*. The existing water in aquifers moves slowly as it is embedded within sand & disbursed over acres and acres underground. In an overtaxed location the aquifer water is being pumped out by the well faster than it can seep back to replenish, causing a *cone*. Example: the Aquia aquifer, which is used by much of Calvert County shows *cones of depression* in North Beach/Chesapeake and also in Solomons. These are areas of high density housing and business. The aquifers are stressed from higher population density, in some areas extremely so, yet the Plan calls for accelerated business and residential growth throughout the county in the next five years!



Making Dunkirk a major Town Center will further stress the aquifers in north county. Expanding Prince Frederick and Lusby/Solomons is just irresponsible.

Maryland law says "sustained yield" must be maintained so drawdown "cannot exceed recharge capacity" of the well. This will allow aquifers to function in perpetuity.

Obviously the law is not intended to be followed in the Plan.

 Despite the denials in the Plan that there is a traffic problem, at some point the ostrich must take its head out of the sand and admit we do have a problem with unacceptable traffic back ups on Route 4. Is there a pattern of denial?

 We cannot afford the rapid growth encouraged in the Plan, period.

It is stated for every residential tax dollar the County takes in, a dollar is spent on services by the County. The Plan calls for increasing housing density with TDRS in Town Centers and the surrounding Residential areas. For every dollar in taxes taken in for high density housing buildings, much, much more than a dollar is spent in services. How is this a good economic practice?

The reasoning in the Plan for attracting new businesses is that for every tax dollar received from businesses, the county spends less than a dollar. But the Plan is calling for giving LOTS of tax breaks and assistance to businesses. I fear the only people who will come out making money will be the stakeholders, (members of SBIG, including land holders in the new Residential areas, and SBIG advisory committee), who dictated many parts of this Plan to certain BOCC members and the consultants.

****Calvert County Small Business Interest Group (SBIG) Minutes obtained by Freedom of Information Act.** (Thank you Keep Calvert Country)

****12/14/15. Comprehensive Plan Update Minutes Comprehensive Plan -**

“Discussion Barnett (Randy Barrett, R.A. Barrett & Assoc.) stated they have met with the consultants and have met with the BOCC and the Planning Commission. They plan to schedule interviews with stakeholders in January. In coordination with the BOCC and Planning Commission they are trying to figure out who the stakeholders would be and how the process will work. Barnett advised they expect to have an advisory committee of maybe 20 – 25 people, and would then have subcommittees that would deal with about six specific topics. Barnett stated this is where they will be looking for help from the BOCC, the Planning Commission and then leadership such as is sitting in this room. The timeline will be approximately 1 1/2 - 2 years. When complete, this will produce a brand new comprehensive plan and zoning ordinance.”

“Williams (Anthony Williams, Bultrite Homes) commented we have all seen what happened with the last one (Comp. Plan) and we are all feeling the pain of no growth, adding we need to get this moving forward and we need to get it right. It is going to get progressively worse until we make these necessary changes to be more business friendly and get a growth plan in the county. We all know what we have to do and we have to move forward quickly... We all know what is going on so everything we can do in this room to move this thing forward as quickly as we can is very important”

I have heard that the 2 new stores Marshalls and Harris Teeter are having trouble finding employees because there are not enough people in the area to work at those wages nor public transportation for the workers to get to the shopping center. With the type of five year accelerated growth as indicated in the Plan, everything can and probably will backfire as there must be a balance between adding businesses and adding residential units. That is why so many citizens are calling for a balanced slower, smarter growth which will adjust, allowing us to keep our rural character while growing.

Goals and Objectives

1 Objective 3: Attract retirees to Calvert County.

8.1.3.1 Define a specialized Retirement Location brand.

[ED] 8.1.3.2 Continue to promote the county's quality of life. [ED]

Many, not all proposals within the Plan do not mix well with our citizen's ideas for the future: Major town centers, heavy traffic and No build-out cap will destroy the Rural Ambience, forest, farmland, our River and Bay; the Pleasant Peninsula. **The Retirement Marketing Niche is probably going to succeed better than any other economic growth plan.** Older people appreciate this Rural County. That is why they are leaving the megalopolis, the traffic, the noise, the crowded living conditions: the hustle and bustle of city and suburban life and moving here to retire. There are so many recreational opportunities in the county for active seniors: golf; charter fishing; boating; swimming...The nature of the geography of Calvert as described in Ch 2 explains why Calvert will never be able to support rapid growth. If the Plan focuses on the niche market specializing on this booming business of care for the aging instead of just commercial or tourist attractions, Calvert can have a plethora of economic growth. Build Nursing Homes, Assisted Living, Nursing Facilities, Communities for those over age 55 to get them comfortable here sooner, and a Leisure World in bucolic surroundings and they will come in droves. Naturally we will have more homes and shops for employees too.

As the Plan is written now, the quality of life will suffer when we loose our rural character due to the indiscriminate pro-accelerated growth, pro business policies of this Plan, making us into another Waldorf. Hard to attract retirees to the county when there are not enough facilities for active seniors nor for those needing assisted living. It is especially hard when there is not a decent, transportation system, including one for disabled and wheelchair bound seniors. Calvert will be unsavory to seniors as no cap on growth means more traffic. Making Dunkirk into a Major Town Center as described in the plan and making Prince Frederick Town Center Into an even larger nonwalkable T.C. will definitely not attract seniors. Running out of drinking water is not conducive to good press either.

Goal 1, and objectives Perfect, keep supporting agriculture and watermen. I love having farmer's markets, in each town Center, but what happens to Trott's, and Bowen's, both tourist and local mainstays for generations?

8.1.2.4 Clarify provisions for temporary uses (e.g. temporary pop-up businesses, outdoor sales, mobile food service, and farmers' markets) on private property. [P&Z]

How? Clarify this statement. What is the Plan's intent? Is the Plan pro or against these things? Will the Plan honor County's rural tradition of local farm stands? Will it prevent on over abundance of commercial pop-ups?

8.1.4.1 Research and develop land use policies to allow for solar energy production consistent with county preservation, economic development and land use policies. [P&Z]

8.1.4.2 Offer farmers opportunities to lease their land for solar arrays under appropriate conditions. [P&Z]

I do not see how vast arrays of solar panels adds to farming, nor the rural character of our county. They certainly will not add to the ambience wanted to attract tourists. The issue of solar panels, like windmills has many facets. Due to complications, conflicts of interests and impact on the environment, indigenous animals, policy & placement should be approved only through an autonomous voter elected committee, so the BOCC cannot fire them at will, within a new county agency overseeing energy and environment.

8.1.2.1 Encourage entrepreneurship in Calvert County by providing technical and financial support for new businesses. [ED]

Objective 2: Provide incentives for business development in Town Centers and Employment Centers.

8.2.2.1 Consider loans, tax reduction, and changes in taxing policies within State designated Priority Funding Areas (PFAs), grants, infrastructure, and training for workers. [BOCC, ED]

Good but once again costly. Where are the financial benefits to the county?

8.1.2.2 Allow a broad range of home-based businesses with **appropriate limitations** on size and number of employees. [P&Z]

8.1.2.3 Consider developing/encouraging incubator spaces for new businesses and encourage businesses to locate in small incubator spaces when their activities are not suitable as a home occupation or have outgrown home-based locations. [ED, P&Z]

8.1.2.2 What happened to guiding businesses to Town Centers? Who decides what size is “appropriate “? As it is now written this goal is too vague. The Plan should specify really small home based or farm /winery based. It might be best to encourage 8.1.2.3 as there are many empty store and office spaces throughout the county that fledgling small businesses could share.

1 Objective 5: Provide access to broadband throughout the county.

8.1.5.1 Prioritize the provision of broadband in Town Centers. [BOCC]

Once again the county is spending big bucks to benefit businesses. This might help bring some government or high tech business to north county which would bring much needed customers to the stores. However in the long run, is the broadband going to cost more than we gain? Studies show most people shop either online or near where they work a reality the Plan has not addressed. Most of our working population works outside of the county, so they spend their dollars elsewhere. Many of our stores fail after a few years.

Goal 2: Direct business growth to Town Centers while preserving agricultural land in the Farm and Forest District.

8.2.1.1 Streamline the development review process in Town Centers. Maintain a fast-track permitting process for targeted businesses. [P&Z]

DO NOT SKIP THE ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARDS! GIVE THE PUBLIC AMPLE TIME TO COMMENT ON ZONING CHANGES AND THE “DEVELOPMENT REVIEW PROCESS.” What are the targeted businesses? Who decides? Are the True Decision Makers the group described above in the SBIG minutes? As to “targeted businesses,” do not forget to include 1 Objective 3: Attract retirees to Calvert County and the Retirement Market Niche mentioned in our comments.

WHAT CORNERS WILL BE CUT FOR THE FAST TRACK AND WHAT WILL BE LOST IN THE PROCESS?

8.2.1.2 **Provide for adequate amounts of land zoned for business development in appropriate locations in Town Centers. Provide flexibility in the zoning regulations related to business development.** [P&Z]

8.2.1.3 **Explore the use of TDRs to increase commercial intensity in Town Centers.** [P&Z]

THIS IS OPENING THE DOORS FOR OVERDEVELOPMENT AND TOWN CENTER SPRAWL.

Is this why the Plan says Dunkirk Town Center is not going to be expanded, yet there actually is an additional 400 acre expansion? Is this how P & Z makes a town Center onto a MAJOR Town Center without any prior notice to the residents of Dunkirk?

*Objective 3: **Make improvements to public services and facilities in Town Centers.***

*8.2.3.1 **Direct public investment to infrastructure, services, and support facilities in Town Centers.***

[BOCC, PW, GS]

*8.2.3.2 **Develop cost-sharing strategies that leverage private sector investment in water and sewer extensions in Town Centers in order to protect environmental health or support county-identified economic development goals.** [PW]*

Even when the people of Dunkirk do not want public water and sewer in the Town Center , nor do they want to be made a MAJOR Town Center?

Please make provisions to be SURE private sector water and sewer extensions are properly built, meet high to excellent specifications, so they do not fail prematurely. When they have failed in the past in other places in the county, the County was forced to take over the system and fix it and maintain it.

Goal 3: Expand Calvert County's tourism industry.

All the ideas are wonderful, but Calvert will not attract a single tourist if the Plan does not keep the rural ambiance of Calvert Country. If it does not overdevelop by increasing TDRs. If Dunkirk, "The Gateway to The County," looks like Waldorf. If there is no build out cap on growth. If nothing is done in advance to save our aquifers. If the Plan is not proactive and does not admit there is a traffic problem and that it will only get worse with the accelerated growth the plan is supporting.

I do not like this excerpt from the SBIG minutes. County officials were present. It shows manipulation, without the knowledge of Calvert County citizens and taking decisions out of the hands of our hands:

*** SBIG minutes 8/1/16*

Mike Moore (Southern Maryland Black Chamber of Commerce) commented that, with regard to the expansion of the town centers, if any changes are going to be made they need to be consistent to avoid having to come back in 10 years to make another change. Let's try to make changes that make sense, he said. Williams advised that town centers with water and sewer will have the most impact on the TDR program. Mike Moore suggested that maybe there should be some discussion on that now, not after the fact.

Williams stated it would be a great idea if the rural counties could adopt legislation that would force the people that have the land for water and sewer to purchase TDRs. Gertz (Rodney Gertz, Quality Built Homes) agreed, stating a set dollar amount could be used that could then be put toward the TDR fund program and distributed to other counties in the state. Williams added that if it were possible to sell TDRs outside the county, our TDR program might grow again. Mike Moore (Michael Moore, Southern Maryland Black Chamber of Commerce) commended Williams for his idea and recommend further discussions with (State Senator) Mike Miller to see if Miller could convey this idea to this colleagues.

Tom Hejl stated that county staff was planning to attend the Maryland Association of Counties meeting at the end of the month and could discuss this with the Rural County Coalition.

Thank you,
Charlene Tobey Kriemelmeyer and Joe Kriemelmeyer, Jr.
Dunkirk

** FULL DOCUMENT CONTAINING SBIG MINUTES 12/14/16 - 8/14/17 OBTAINED THROUGH FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT LAWSUIT BY KEEP CALVERT COUNTY AT

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

Harrod, Felicia R.

From: Rebecca Daley <keepcalvertcountry@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 01, 2018 5:59 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.

Rebecca Daley

RavensReef@comcast.net

Owings

Harrod, Felicia R.

From: David Wooldridge <keepcalvertcountry@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, August 3, 2018 11:13 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.

David Wooldridge

dbw@batchingsystems.com

Prince Frederick

Harrod, Felicia R.

From: David Bury <burydav@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, August 3, 2018 4:55 PM
To: Planning and Zoning
Subject: CALVERT 2040 Comments on Comprehensive Plan Chapters 2, 6, 8
Attachments: 3 Aug Comp Plan Second Draft Comments.docx

Dear Sir/Ma'am

Attached are my comments of the Calvert County Comprehensive Plan Second Draft, Chapters 2, 6 and 8, which are scheduled for Planning Commission discussion at their 22 August work session. Please pass these comments on to Planning Commission members and include them in the public record.

Thank you 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, Chapters 2, 6 and 8.

1. Work Session Substantive Discussions issue: **Please include more active Planning Commission discussion of substantive Comprehensive Plan issues, including public comments, during work sessions.** I greatly appreciate the Planning Commission's decision to closely evaluate each chapter of the Comprehensive Plan at dedicated work sessions. However, at the first work session devoted to Chapter 1, aside from the discussion on sending the second draft for State agency comment, the only substantive discussion was whether to add a graphic depicting the interrelationships between the various types of County Plans (a great idea, BTW).

Because there is no separate work session devoted to chapter 11, I strongly recommend that future work sessions on the other various chapters include substantive discussion of each specific policy recommendation contained at the end of those chapters and repeated in Chapter 11. Many of these policy recommendations represent significant changes for the County. While many are excellent, some may be overly expensive, counterproductive or have unintended consequences. Planning Commission examination and discussion of these is essential if the Comprehensive Plan is to be the best it can be.

Re public comments specifically, over 100 members of the public provided comments and provided serious recommendations for the first work session, *none of which were discussed at all*. This continues to feed into broad public misperceptions that the County does not take public participation in the planning process seriously. Other examples include the poorly-publicized, short notice announcement of Comprehensive Plan open house schedules this June, and most recently the short-notice announcement of the deadline for submission of public comments for the 22 August work session on Chapters 2, 6 and 8.

2. Executive Summary issue: **After evaluations of all the Comprehensive Plan second draft chapters are complete, please use those 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. The current work session schedule does not explicitly include an Executive Summary discussion.

3. Transportation Study issue: **Please request that the BOCC discuss and approve Transportation Study funding at the earliest opportunity.** I 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 respond to this request by preparing a Statement of Scope for a Transportation Study. I was disappointed, however, to see that the 7 August 2018 BOCC meeting agenda still does not include discussion of approving the additional funding needed for Transportation Plan work to begin. Assuming that this projected 8-month study is approved and begun in September 2018, results would not be available until May 2019. Yet, the results of this study will be essential for the development of responsible Town Center Master Plans and the Zoning Ordinance.

4. Chapter 2, Table 2.2, Use of MDP Growth Projection Data issue: Please add text that explicitly includes something like the following caveat: "Projecting growth so far into the future is inherently difficult. These 2017 MD Dept of Planning population growth estimates use a standard U.S. Census

Bureau methodology based on broad regional birth, death and migration trends, but does not take into account future County decisions on zoning, building and town center expansion. The actual future population growth in Calvert County will be greatly affected by these decisions.”

According to my conversations with Mr Gita-Krishna Akundi at the Maryland Department of Planning, their projections use the U.S. Census Bureau’s Cohort-Component Method, which relies solely on broad regional birth, death and migration trends and *does not* take into account the potential population growth allowed under current zoning, *nor* the impact of future decisions on zoning, building and town center expansion. MDP produces new population growth estimates every three years, and my review of past MDP estimates shows that their projections sometimes varied significantly from the County population growth that actually occurred.

For these reasons, publishing the MDP 2030 and 2040 population growth numbers without such a caveat gives a false sense of security about the growth that might actually occur, and on the resulting impact to County infrastructure. These numbers are inherently, albeit inadvertently, misleading.

5. Chapter 2, Page 2.2: Please correct “The southern end of the county is very connected to the water, and does not have significant connections to major employment centers” to read “The southern end of the county is very connected to the water, and is connected by a single two-lane bridge to significant major employment centers associated with Patuxent Naval Air Station.” Rationale: Accuracy, and important to emphasize both the importance of Pax River to the Calvert economy, and the need to replace or expand the Johnson bridge with greater capacity.

6. Chapter 2, Page 2.2: Re: “Because Calvert County is a peninsula, it does not receive much through traffic. This is a benefit in terms of traffic volumes; however, it means that commercial businesses must rely on local demand rather than attracting additional demand from outside travelers.”

Should the accuracy of the first sentence be challenged, please note that the Maryland State Highway Administration has no data to support the assertions made by one County official that 60 or 67% of Calvert County traffic is pass-through, based on my conversations with SHA personnel.

Also, Prince Frederick seems to draw a significant number of shoppers from eastern Charles and northern St Marys Counties. Recommend check with Economic Development to see if any figures are available.

7. Chapter 2, Page 2.2: Re: “In many areas within the Town Centers, the housing stock is predominately single family dwellings on mid-size lots, and the commercial areas are dispersed and vehicle-oriented. It will be difficult to transform these areas to mixed-use, pedestrian-friendly, vibrant communities without an influx of jobs and houses into these areas.”

Please change the second sentence to read: “It will be important to transform these areas to mixed-use, pedestrian-friendly, vibrant communities and meet the demand for affordable work force housing by explicitly addressing these issues in detail in the individual Town Center Master Plans and associated zoning and building regulations.”

Vibrancy does not necessarily depend on huge job growth, and “influx of houses” should not imply “influx of more big, expensive single-family houses.” We should place more emphasis on increasing Town Center vibrancy by encouraging development of more affordable “work force” housing (rents at about the

\$1200-1300/month level), so that teachers, police officers, County employees and others who are currently forced to commute into the County from lower-coast areas of Charles and St Marys can afford to live in Calvert. This does not require additional job creation, but it does require building and zoning regulations that mandate that a certain percentage (say, 15%) of new residential development within Town Centers be priced at this level. There are creative ways this can be done with duplexes and quads, developments of new “very-small house” designs, and mixed-size apartment developments. It requires policy changes, some of which are included in the Chapter 11 policy implementation section, that more strongly encourage a deliberate shift away from the large single-family house developments that would otherwise continue to occur within Town Centers.

8. Chapter 2, Page 2.3: Please ask P&Z staff or the consultant if there are any more recent statistics available since 2011 on the number and percentage of jobs in the County filled by non-County residents. These figures are seven years old, when we were still just emerging from the Great Recession, and may not still be accurate.

9. Chapter 2, Page 2.3: Re: **“These higher incomes belong to residents working at jobs outside Calvert County in the Washington, DC, Annapolis, MD, and Baltimore, MD regions.”** Please add, **“..or associated with Patuxent Naval Air Station.”** Rationale: Accuracy.

10. Chapter 2, page 2-4. The text refers to an Appendix A. Please request that this be made available for Planning Commission and public review prior to the final work session.

11. Chapter 2, Page 2-5. Re: **The 2010 Comprehensive Plan calls for the construction of other sections of the Prince Frederick Loop Road, the network of local roads parallel to MD 2/4 in Prince Frederick. The 2013 Prince Frederick Charrette Report bases its recommended Town Center land use upon these roads. Similar parallel roads systems are in place or should be included in the plans for each designated growth area along MD 2/4.** Recommend delete this last sentence. The combination of geographic constraints, road construction funding constraints, and citizen resistance to the seizure of privately-owned land under eminent domain that would be required to build new parallel roads in other designated growth areas along Rt 2/4 all make this proposal unrealistic.

12. Chapter 2, Page 2-7. After **“Currently there are two-levels of designated growth centers. The 2010 Comprehensive Plan calls them major and minor Town Centers. There was some acceptance of the use of Villages as an alternative to minor Town Center. Some residents from Huntingtown and Dunkirk preferred the designation “Village” for their respective communities.”** please add **“Dunkirk-area residents were overwhelming opposed to designating Dunkirk as a Major Town Center.”** Rationale: Accuracy. This continues to be a major issue of concern for many in Dunkirk, as was strongly expressed at the session.

13. Chapter 2, page 2-4 and 2-7. The characterization of takeaways from citizen participation in the Key Issue Workshops should explicitly note that participants in one of the workshops overwhelming supported retention of the 37,000 household buildout goal. Unfortunately, this important finding has been consistently omitted from the prepared summaries of the workshops. On page 2-7, please add the bracketed text to **“This issue paper included a review of the policies outlined in the 2010 Comprehensive Plan, recent and projected growth in population and housing, construction approvals, the results of a build-out analysis, and descriptions of the current land preservation programs. At the workshop, staff presented an overview of the county’s planning efforts. Following the presentation, participants developed and ranked proposals for preserving rural character and directing growth by answering two**

open-ended questions. [This included an expression of overwhelming support for retaining the 2010 Comprehensive Plan's 37,000 household buildout goal.]” Rationale: Accuracy.

14. Chapter 2, page 2-7. Re: **“Preserving Rural Character and Directing Growth to Existing Settlements: “Make it easier for people to build what the county wants, where it wants it.”** This is a very vague sentence that. It’s not clear what “the County” wants, or where it wants it. Does “existing settlements” mean Town Centers, or something else? Taken out of context, this sentence could imply that people want a significant relaxation in zoning restrictions, which was certainly not what was expressed at the workshops. Recommend reword as simply **“Preserving Rural Character and Directing Growth to Town Centers”**

15. Page 6-1. Recommend change **“Related County Plans (incorporated by reference)”** to **“Related County Plans and Other Key Planning Documents (incorporated by reference)”**. Then add under this the Zoning Ordinance, Water and Sewer Plan, Transportation Plan, and the other applicable documents. This would also be a great place (in addition to Chapter 1) to add the graphic that one Planning Commissioner requested at the first work session that shows the inter-relationship of all these plans and other documents. Rationale: Completeness and accuracy.

16. Page 6-2. Recommend change **Most housing is out of reach for low-income families and for young adults.** to **Most housing is out of reach for lower-income families and for young adults. In addition, other key segments of the workforce, including many teachers, policemen, local government employees and others have few housing options available if they rely on single incomes.** Rationale: Need to more explicitly note how much wider a population is affected by this problem.

17 Page 6-2. Table 6-1 title should be changed from 1990-2015 to 1990-2016.

18. Page 6-7 and 11-12. Add to goal 3 on page 6-7 a requirement for building and zoning regulations that mandate that 15 percent of new residential development within Town Centers be priced at a level affordable for someone on a single income with a salary equivalent to what an average County teacher, policeman or local government worker makes. There are creative ways this can be done with duplexes and quads, developments of new “very-small house” designs, and mixed-size apartment developments. Rationale: Without such a requirement, even new developments like the Beechtree apartments going into Prince Frederick that are currently advertised as “workforce housing” at \$1400-\$1700/month will be priced beyond the reach of this segment of the populace. Based on the current salaries for the people noted above, a rent of \$1200-\$1300/month is what would be required.

19. Page 8-2. Re: **“(3) proximity to major employment centers in Washington, D.C. and Virginia”, add Patuxent Naval Air Station.**

20. Page 8-2, Re: **The most recent projections estimated the total employment in Calvert County in 2015 at 34,000, which is projected to increase to 44,300 (by 30 percent) by 2045.** It is hard to reconcile this 30 percent job growth with the MDP population growth projections on page 2-1, which estimate only a 10 percent population growth (about 10,000 people) between 2015 and 2040. Unless something remarkable happens between 2040-45, this would require a new job appearing for every additional Calvert County resident, man, woman, child and retiree, and that all these new jobs appear in the County instead of elsewhere. Please request P&Z staff examine the assumptions and methodologies for these two incompatible projections, and add language that caveats the uncertainties involved in these estimates appropriately, if either or both are to be retained (see my comment #4 above).

21. Page 8-6. Re: “Between 2011 and 2016, the county’s residential real property value has experienced a net decrease of \$1.95 billion. This decline is not completely offset by the growth in commercial real property value during the same period.” and “To provide for additional, sustainable revenue sources, to protect the county from the negative revenue effect of residential property devaluation, and to reduce the government’s direct reliance on its residents for revenue, the Board of County Commissioners seek to increase the commercial real property tax base to provide revenue and offset reliance on the residential taxpayer.”

The numbers quoted in the first sentence are also based on *estimated* 2016 values before the actual figures became available. They are available now and should be used here – as should the 2017 figures, which should also be available. In addition, implicit in this last sentence is the assumption that the 2011-2016 decline in the residential property tax base will continue, and therefore must be made up for in future property taxes from increased commercial development. However, local residential property values are actually finally showing a significant increase following the effects and aftereffects of the Great Recession. The decline in residential property tax base as late as 2016 in part reflects that residential property values are only reassessed every three years, and as properties are increasingly being reassessed to reflect the recent increases in property value, the residential property tax base will start increasing again. Strongly recommend looking at the 2017 numbers to see if this has not already begun. There are other arguments for increasing commercial development, but this is not one of them. Please update to reflect actual 2016 and 2017 data, and change the existing text to reflect what the most recent residential tax base trend, and how it is likely to behave over the next few years.

22. Page 8-12. Re: **Table 8-5 Estimated Lost Spending and Additional Retail Space Demand from County Resident Retail Spending Outside of the County, 2011**. This study should not be included in the Comprehensive Plan because of several serious problems. First, the data used is over eight years old, and does not reflect the increase in some retail sectors in the County since then. Second, the proportion of retail purchases done over the internet has markedly increased since 2011 – some perceived retail shortfalls in 2011 are now met through internet shopping, and do not require increased local retail businesses to fulfill. Third, the study assumes that commuters will not continue to shop outside the County on their way home from work, if some equivalent retail space is built anywhere, not matter where, within the County. Will a Solomons/Lusby resident who commutes to Pax River really stop shopping at Charlotte Hall if there’s an equivalent store up in Dunkirk? And, finally, there are some types of retail (e.g. high-end luxury items, high volume furniture) that Calvert will simply never have the population base to support, and thus will never come here – yet the study figures still show these as local retail “shortfalls.”

Holt, Judy C.

From: Thomas Mero <tjmero@comcast.net>
Sent: Friday, August 03, 2018 6:18 PM
To: Planning and Zoning
Subject: Calvert 2040 Comments

Comments on the draft Comprehensive Plan 2040 – Key Issues, Housing, and Economic Vitality

The following are the comments I am submitting for the Planning Commission's work session on August 22. I tried to pick a couple topics in each section and keep my comments brief as I suspect you will be receiving a lot of comments on this document that sets the future of our county.

Key Issues (Chapter 2)

This draft of the Comprehensive Plan (CP) indicates slow population growth is a problem. **I strongly disagree.** The county is growing at a reasonable, manageable rate with new subdivisions popping up on a regular basis. The citizens of the county do not want to go back to the days of out of control growth and having to build a new school a year to keep up. As has been said many times, our only major highway, Route 4, is over capacity during rush hour. A substantial population increase will translate to gridlock. Funding is not available now and won't be within the next 20 years for major improvements to Route 4 such as bypasses and widening that would bring the traffic flow back to an acceptable level. The purported need for an explosion of high density residential units is driven by builders and developers who stand to make millions if today's draft plan were to be implemented. They make millions and the citizens of Calvert would be left with the aftermath and see the quality of life we cherish diminished.

Housing (Chapter 6)

Regarding the county's over 65 population, the CP indicates in 1990, 12% of our population was over 65, in 2010 the number over 65 dropped to 11%. However, it also claims by 2040 our over 65 population will jump by 250% to 25% of our population. This is a bogus projection that uses general population estimates with no plausible explanation for the huge jump. People over 65 are leaving Maryland which is ranked 48 as far the most desirable states for retirement. This is a fudged projection in an attempt to justify the plan's premise that the county needs an explosion of high-density housing units. The CP also mentions that seniors need to be close to drug stores, another bogus claim as most medications are delivered directly to the residence. In fact, the majority of prescription plans mandated mail order medication purchases.

The CP housing goals promotes "walkable, mixed use communities", in other words let's turn Calvert into Annapolis. That is not what the vast majority of our county citizens wanted or they would have moved elsewhere. The goals talk about "increasing housing affordability" which sounds good, however, with today's laws there is no mechanism to steer affordable housing to county residents. What happens in reality is that almost all of the new "affordable" high-density house units this plan promotes would be purchased by people outside the county. The result, a substantial increase in our population, eroding tax base as high density/affordable housing is generally a net loss to the tax base, more overcrowded schools, and gridlock on Route 4.

Economic Vitality (Chapter 8)

This section contains a lot of boiler plate with unrealistic goals. The CP promotes the false premise that Dunkirk has the potential to be one of the county's major employment centers in part because of its proximity to airports. The majority of citizens and businesses would not consider a 45-50 minute slug up 301 to BWI as close proximity to an airport. If Dunkirk were to expand and develop as the CP suggests it would become a major choke point on Route 4. Our citizens

who commute through Dunkirk each day would face a significant increase in their commute times. As I have said before, Dunkirk should remain a minor town center!

Part of Goal 2 has an objective to streamline the development review process in Town Centers. This was put in here by SBIG who want to eliminate the Architectural Review Committees (ARC) for Town Centers. The reality is the ARC process does not significantly delay town center development. Dunkirk is an example of an efficient ARC process that enhances the quality of development while supporting business development. Dunkirk is about to open its third major grocery store within the town center and there is a high occupancy rate for the commercial spaces, all with the ARC process in place.

Thank you for your detailed review of the draft CP and I appreciate your consideration of the comments I've provided.

Tom Mero
Dunkirk

Holt, Judy C.

From: Patricia A. Blevins <keepcalvertcountry@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, August 04, 2018 9:47 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.

Patricia A. Blevins

trishablevins3@aol.com

Dunkirk