

Comments on the Calvert County Comprehensive Plan, December 2018 Draft  
 Additional Comments from the Public Received through February 24, 2019

NAME	GROUP/AGENCY	TOWN	DATE	# OF PAGES
Miriam Gholl			2/20/2019	1
Harriett Millard			2/21/2019 and 2/22/2019	3
Carolyn Anderson		Chesapeake Beach	2/21/2019	2
Sandra Watkins		Dunkirk	2/21/2019	2
Liudmyla Jones		Chesapeake Beach	2/21/2019	2
Sandy Bell		Chesapeake Beach	2/21/2019	1
Emily Van Ness			2/21/2019	1
Dominic Aeschlimann			2/21/2019	1
Bearl Page, Jr.		Owings	2/22/2019	2
Kenneth Pritchard		Lusby	2/22/2019	2
David Runyon		Chesapeake Beach	2/22/2019	2
Billy Baird		Owings	2/22/2019	2
Daborah Navarro		Owings	2/22/2019	2
John Prideaux		Huntingtown	2/22/2019	2
Betsy Schmid		Dunkirk	2/22/2019	1
Jeff Klapper		Prince Frederick	2/22/2019	2
Carol Ann Penfield		Chesapeake Beach	2/22/2019	2
Randi Vogt			2/22/2019	2
Ruth Mora		Broomes Island	2/22/2019	2
Dorothy Jackson		Dunkirk	2/23/2019	2
Art Fournier		Chesapeake Beach	2/23/2019	2
Darlene Harrod		Huntingtown	2/23/2019	2
Charlene Kriemelmeyer		Dunkirk	2/24/2019	5
Chloe & Bart Ewalt		Prince Frederick	2/24/2019	3

**Harrod, Felicia R.**

---

**From:** Planning and Zoning  
**Subject:** FW: 2 Questions Re: Proposed Comprehensive Plan

**From:** Miriam Gholl <ghollma@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 20, 2019 9:13 AM  
**To:** Plummer-Welker, Jenny L. <Jenny.Plummer-Welker@calvertcountymd.gov>  
**Cc:** Greg & Tamea Bowen <landstewardshipsolutionsllc@gmail.com>; Susan Dzurec <calvertwoman@gmail.com>; Randi Vogt <vogtpr@comcast.net>  
**Subject:** 2 Questions Re: Proposed Comprehensive Plan

Hi Jenny,

I have two questions I would like answered prior to next week's public hearing, if possible. Please forward these questions along with your answers to the Planning Commission as part of the public hearing record.

1. Is it staff's or the Planning Commission's intent to remove the Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance (APFO) for roads and schools from the Zoning Ordinance?

If the intent is to retain the APFO, will it still be enforceable? As you are aware, the new Plan eliminates Action Item #I-1 from the current Plan which states: *"Continue to support policies that link the amount, location and rate of residential growth to County land use objectives, including highway, school, and aquifer capacities."*

Without such language, I don't see how the APFO would be legally enforceable. If the intent is to remove the APFO, please explain why.

2. If the expanded Town Center boundaries are adopted as part of the new Plan, how will citizens be able to oppose those boundaries during the zoning map amendment process? Since State law requires consistency between the Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Ordinance/Maps, there will be no legal argument against them and no way to "undo" those boundaries, correct?

Thank you in advance for addressing these questions,

Miriam

**Harrod, Felicia R.**

---

**From:** Harriett Millard <hrmill3@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, February 21, 2019 1:07 PM  
**To:** Planning and Zoning  
**Cc:** Harriett Millard  
**Subject:** Calvert County Comprehensive Plan December, 2018 Draft---Public Comment

February 21, 2019

Mr. Greg Kernan, Chair  
Calvert County Planning Commission  
175 Main Street  
Prince Frederick, MD 20678

Re: Calvert County Comprehensive Plan December, 2018 Draft ---Public Comment

Dear Mr. Kernan:

Respectfully, this is to provide public comment on the Calvert County Comprehensive Plan December, 2018 Draft as follows:

In order to improve overall quality of life for all citizens of Calvert County under Goals and Visions, all county taxpayers should have access to public sewer and public water (in reference to pg. ES-2).

**CURRENT CONDITION:** A significant percentage of Calvert County taxpayers do not have access to residential public sewer and public water.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** Include in the Comprehensive Plan, vision for all citizens of Calvert County to have access to public sewer and public water to ensure well-being for all residents. At a minimum, include Planning to conduct research, study and develop reports regarding citizen health issues associated with lack of county public water and public sewer in Town Centers where the amenity is not currently made available to residents.

Respectfully submitted.

**Harrod, Felicia R.**

---

**From:** Harriett Millard <hrmill3@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, February 22, 2019 11:29 AM  
**To:** Planning and Zoning  
**Subject:** CALVERT 2040 PUBLIC COMMENTS

February 22, 2019

Mr. Greg Kernan, Chair  
Calvert County Planning Commission  
175 Main Street  
Prince Frederick, MD 20678

Re: CALVERT 2040 COMMENT (Historic District Commission Assistance to Obtain Grant Funding)

Dear Mr. Kernan:

Respectfully, this is to give public comment on the Calvert County Comprehensive Plan, Draft December, 2018.

**CURRENT CONDITION:** Chapter 5. HERITAGE, does not have a mandatory stipulation for the Calvert County Historic District Commission to assist private owners of Historic District designated property where stated agenda is for public benefit with obtaining grant funding and receiving Letter of Support to advance construction projects that have public benefit.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** Include in Chapter 5. HERITAGE , a provision for Calvert County Historic District Commission that would make it a requirement for said Commission to assist private owners of Historic District designated property where stated agenda is for public benefit with obtaining Local, State and Federal grant funding; obtaining Letters of Support from said Commission, Calvert County Historical Society and/or any other county heritage organizations; and in obtaining Letter of Support from Board of County Commissioners as well as said Commissioners' support for Local, State and Federal grant funding of private owner construction projects that have public benefit.

Respectfully submitted.

----- Forwarded Message -----

**From:** Harriett Millard <hrmill3@yahoo.com>  
**To:** Planning and Zoning <pz@calvertcountymd.gov>  
**Cc:**  
**Sent:** Thursday, February 21, 2019 1:06 PM  
**Subject:** CALVERT 2040 PUBLIC COMMENT

February 21, 2019

Mr. Greg Kernan, Chair  
Calvert County Planning Commission  
175 Main Street

Prince Frederick, MD 20678

Re: CALVERT 2040 PUBLIC COMMENT (Public Water and Public Sewer for all Calvert County Residents)

Dear Mr. Kernan:

Respectfully, this is to provide public comment on the Calvert County Comprehensive Plan December, 2018 Draft as follows:

In order to improve overall quality of life for all citizens of Calvert County under Goals and Visions, all county taxpayers should have access to public sewer and public water (in reference to pg. ES-2).

**CURRENT CONDITION:** A significant percentage of Calvert County taxpayers do not have access to residential public sewer and public water.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** Include in the Comprehensive Plan, vision for all citizens of Calvert County to have access to public sewer and public water to ensure well-being for all residents. At a minimum, include Planning to conduct research, study and develop reports regarding citizen health issues associated with lack of county public water and public sewer in Town Centers where the amenity is not currently made available to residents.

Respectfully submitted.

**Harrod, Felicia R.**

---

**From:** Carolyn Anderson <keepcalvertcountry@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, February 21, 2019 8:27 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.

Carolyn Anderson

CalvertPoplarsFarm.crln@gmail.com

Chesapeake Beach

This is very personal. The neighboring development has the FRA sign in the stream on our side of the property, undergrowth, litter and duff removed, and acres of run-off and erosion on our side.

This continued over-development, destruction of forest and multiple vehicles from sixty large homes with vehicles added to traffic are exactly what Calvert County does not need surrounding any more farms.

**Harrod, Felicia R.**

---

**From:** Sandra Watkins <keepcalvertcountry@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, February 21, 2019 9:25 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.

Sandra Watkins

sandramw@comcast.net

## Dunkirk

I'm a resident of Dunkirk and live on Yellow Bank Rd. and it is very hard to cross the highway or make a left onto route 4 already and if you are voting for more growth in Calvert County to see the impact of the traffic I think conducting a studied would be the best thing for the county. There's enough accidents now on route 4. The objective should be how to get some of the traffic off of route 4. Like planning an alternate route.

**Harrod, Felicia R.**

---

**From:** Liudmyla Jones <keepcalvertcountry@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, February 21, 2019 10:07 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.

Liudmyla Jones

ludajones@gmail.com

Chesapeake Beach

**Harrod, Felicia R.**

---

**From:** Sandy Bell <actionvpmnow@aol.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, February 21, 2019 10:31 PM  
**To:** Planning and Zoning  
**Subject:** Comprehensive Plan

> My name is Sandy Bell and I live in Breezy Point. I moved to the  
> county in 2001 from Bowie. The reason I moved was the fact they  
> started building houses everywhere, and Bowie lost its somewhat rural feel. Look at it now!  
> Constant traffic, built out everywhere, almost urban, more so than suburban.  
>  
>  
> I moved to Calvert because I wanted some land and a rural way of  
> living. I was very happy to drive to Annapolis when I wanted to shop after moving to Bowie, and I'm very  
happy to drive there now to maintain the style of living I desire.  
>  
> I do not want to see Calvert change much. I know some change is  
> inevitable but I want to see it go very slowly. I think most people in the county feel the same way. Not only  
did the newcomers like me come to the county because it was country, but I believe most long time, and  
lifetime residents want it to stay that way.  
>  
> I would ask you to please reconsider your growth plans and keep Calvert country. That's the way we like it.  
>  
> Sandy  
>  
> 3330 Blue Heron Dr N  
> Chesapeake Beach, MD 20732  
>  
> Sent from my iPad=  
>

**Harrod, Felicia R.**

---

**From:** Emily Van Ness <horseivr8@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, February 21, 2019 10:49 PM  
**To:** Planning and Zoning  
**Subject:** Bridge to Eastern Shore

Good evening,

I do not agree with the bridge idea being built in Calvert. There will be way too much traffic, adding to the traffic that is already here. I also do not believe it will be great either as it will diminish our lands and hurt the agricultural of Calvert.

Thank you,

Emily Van Ness

--

Emily Middleton

**Harrod, Felicia R.**

---

**From:** Dominic A. <aeschdominic@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, February 21, 2019 10:55 PM  
**To:** Planning and Zoning  
**Subject:** Comments from a Young-Adult Resident of Calvert County for the Planning Commission

Hello,

My name is Dominic Aeschlimann, I am 19-years-old, and a graduate of Huntingtown High School's class of 2018. I have lived in Calvert County since I was 3-years-old. My mother was raised in Prince George's County to a single mother who was poor and worked three jobs. My mom grew up with rapes, shootings, robberies, and other crimes right outside of her front door. She and my father moved to Calvert to avoid raising their children in that kind of environment. My little sister and I have lived in the safe community of Queensberry located in Huntingtown. That neighborhood has been an absolute delight to live. As I have grown up, I have watched the county grow and expand. I recognize that some growth is good, but we are growing at a pace that is too fast and unsustainable to maintain. Roads, such as Cox Road in Huntingtown, are already ill-equipped at handling current rates of traffic. Roads such as Dalrymple Road and Stinnett Road, are too curvy and narrow to even dream of supporting a growing population. While it may require a 45 minute commute to go to a major shopping center, it keeps our local community safe. Waldorf is a perfect example of what growth does to rural environments. My dad's parents grew up there, and have witnessed it transform into a crime ridden area that is unrecognizable. Please, do not change Calvert into a place where I will not return to. I voted in the previous election, and played a part in getting some of the County Commissioners voted out of office. We have expressed our voices in this matter, and you have gotten the hint. Please, stop overdeveloping our county. The development is harmful to our safety and to our already struggling bay. Development causes small waterways to be polluted with dirty runoff from construction sites. Hurting the environment also hurts our local economy. Patuxent Seafood, based in Broomes Island, had a slow year last year. Making the water worse, decreases their yield, and hurts local restaurants.

I value the rural charm of Calvert County. There are other young residents that feel the same way. Please listen to our citizens. I do not want my tax dollars going to sustain unwanted and unnecessary development. I implore, please stop ignoring our petitions. Please listen to the people that have the power to vote you out of office and limit your funding.

God Bless Y'all Real Good,  
Dominic Aeschlimann

**Harrod, Felicia R.**

---

**From:** Bearl page &nbsp;spjr <keepcalvertcountry@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, February 22, 2019 2:53 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.

Bearl page jr

Jrpage66@yahoo.com

Owings

**Harrod, Felicia R.**

---

**From:** Kenneth H. Pritchard <keepcalvertcountry@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, February 22, 2019 6:37 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.

Kenneth H. Pritchard

kenpritchard@erols.com

Lusby

**Harrod, Felicia R.**

---

**From:** David Runyon <keepcalvertcountry@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, February 22, 2019 6:59 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.

David Runyon

Drun65@aol.com

Chesapeake Beach

**Harrod, Felicia R.**

---

**From:** Billy Baird <keepcalvertcountry@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, February 22, 2019 7:12 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.

Billy Baird

bbaird575@gmail.com

Owings

**Harrod, Felicia R.**

---

**From:** Deborah Navarro <keepcalvertcountry@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, February 22, 2019 8:09 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 Navarro

debnav0825@aol.com

Owings

**Harrod, Felicia R.**

---

**From:** John Prideaux <keepcalvertcountry@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, February 22, 2019 10:49 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.

John Prideaux

mdprideaux@comcast.net

Huntingtown

**Harrod, Felicia R.**

---

**From:** Betsy Schmid <betsys\_schmid@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, February 22, 2019 11:01 AM  
**To:** Planning and Zoning  
**Subject:** I Remain Opposed to the Calvert County Plan for Growth

I have attended several meetings, signed onto petitions, and even worked to elect Commissioners that were against the Calvert Country Growth plan. I am grateful that Dunkirk is no longer being considered as a Major Town Center, but I remain concerned that the remainder of the plan will dramatically change the character of our County.

There are too many unknowns to sign up for this aggressive plan. As far as I know, not one study has been conducted to determine what impact this type of growth would have on our infrastructure - roads, schools, water tables, public safety, the Patuxent River, parks, etc. I have never heard the answer to the most basic question - what problem are we trying to fix with this plan? Is Calvert County at risk of bankruptcy? Is there a list of failing infrastructure that needs to get funded? What other options do we have other than massive growth that will impact the quality of life of all our citizens?

I live in Dunkirk. The traffic is getting worse by the day on Route 4 with the amount of homes and town center growth that we have today. There is an increase in the number of accidents on Route 4 and safety is a growing concern with the number of vehicles on the roads, especially during rush hours. We drive our daughters through Prince Frederick nightly for different practices, and it is already overly congested - how could you possibly consider adding 80%+ growth in that area without a significant cost to ensure the infrastructure supports it?

I love our community and the County. It is a special place that we treasure - please do not jeopardize our way of life for the sake of unsupportable growth.

I would appreciate a response.

Many thanks,  
Betsy Schmid  
4030 Buck Board Lane  
Dunkirk, MD 20754

**Harrod, Felicia R.**

---

**From:** Jeff Klapper <jeffklapper@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Friday, February 22, 2019 11:06 AM  
**To:** Planning and Zoning  
**Subject:** 12:18 comp plan.pdf  
**Attachments:** 1218 comp plan.pdf

Sent from my iPad

# JEFF KLAPPER

486 MAIN STREET

PRINCE FREDERICK, MD 20678

410.535.3334

February 22, 2019

To: Mr. Greg Kernan, Chair, Calvert County Planning Commission

From: Jeff Klapper

Re: Calvert County Comprehensive Plan December 2018 Draft

The recommended Plan is founded on fundamentally flawed and irrelevant population projections which make it impossible to establish the needs addressed in most of the chapters of the plan. Tables 2-2, 3-3, 3-4 and 3-5 are all based on the current Comprehensive Plan and zoning to establish population and growth rate projections. These numbers are nothing more than reference data that could be used to compare to new charts based on the land use and density changes incorporated in the proposed Comprehensive Plan.

Under the current Comprehensive Plan and zoning, the Maryland Department of Planning (MDP) projects an additional 10,000 County residents by 2040. The new Comprehensive Plan calls for the expansion of town centers (by as much as 83% in the case of Prince Frederick) as well as potentially higher densities in designated Residential Areas surrounding town centers. The new plan has also removed any suggestion of an upper limit to the maximum number of households and permits "developer funded" sewer systems to increase residential density. These changes will make the MDP population projections useless as a planning tool, yet the new Comprehensive Plan suggests that these outdated charts relate to the future needs of public safety, schools, water use, sewage treatment, recreation, and traffic. New charts must be developed for population projections under the new Comprehensive plan. This would require a re-evaluation of the infrastructure needed to support the much greater population growth that will be possible under the new plan.

In the alternative, all changes that would affect growth could be removed from the Comprehensive Plan and be decided in the individual town center Master Plans and zoning ordinances with due diligence to the infrastructure that would be needed to support those changes.

Briefly, another matter that deserves consideration is the newly announced transportation plan that was recently contracted. Adopting the Comprehensive Plan prior to the completion of the transportation plan turns the logical planning process upside down. The transportation plan should inform the decisions made in the Comprehensive Plan, not follow it's adoption. Just as "Rural" is the most liked characteristic of Calvert County, "Traffic" is it's most despised. Avail yourselves of the information the County's taxpayers are paying for before making decisions that should take into consideration the recommendations of the transportation plan.

Jeff Klapper

**Harrod, Felicia R.**

---

**From:** Carol Ann Penfield <keepcalvertcountry@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, February 22, 2019 12:55 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.

Carol Ann Penfield

penfield07@comcast.net

Chesapeake Beach

**Harrod, Felicia R.**

---

**From:** RANDI VOGT <vogtpr@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Friday, February 22, 2019 1:14 PM  
**To:** Planning and Zoning  
**Cc:** Commissioners  
**Subject:** Comments for February 26th Planning Commission hearing  
**Attachments:** Comments to Planning Commission February 2019.docx

Please distribute before the February 26th public hearing.

Thank you,

Randi Vogt

410-586--0067

February 22, 2019

Dear Chairman Kernan and Members of the Planning Commission,

Please consider the following four changes to the draft Comprehensive Plan. They do not contradict any of the positions you have already taken but they do provide some flexibility during the implementation of the Plan. They are an effort at resolving conflicts through compromise.

**#1: Town Centers** - Please remove all maps showing proposed additions to the Town Centers and all specific zoning changes within Town Centers and residential districts adjacent to Town Centers (other than Dunkirk, which you have already addressed). Address these issues during Town Center Master Plan and Zoning Ordinance updates.

*Note: This single change will cover several of the most contentious issues in the draft plan while keeping the door open to further Town Center expansion. It would allow for more detailed analysis before any actions are taken and give residents and business owners opportunities to participate. It is also consistent with the way Town Center planning has been done since 1983.*

**#2: Growth Management** - Please add back the following two action statements:

“Continue to support policies that link the amount, location and rate of residential growth to County land use objectives, including highway, school, and aquifer capacities.”

“Monitor residential growth and evaluate the effectiveness of existing regulations to meet growth management objectives.”

*Note: This avoids mentioning a specific build-out number but retains the requirement to manage growth.*

**#3 Privately-funded sewage treatment facilities** - Please change the word “Allow” to “Consider” in the following action statement which is already in the draft:

~~“Allow~~ Consider 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.”

*Note: This at least addresses concerns that privately funded sewage treatment facilities will end up becoming burdens on taxpayers while keeping the door open.*

**#4: Land Preservation** - Please add the sentence in bold to the following statement which is already in the draft:

“Continue to support the goal of permanently preserving a minimum of 40,000 acres of prime farm and forestland through County, state and federal land preservation programs. **Strengthen and adequately fund the County’s land preservation programs.**”

Thank you,  
Randi Vogt  
cc. Board of County Commissioners

**Harrod, Felicia R.**

---

**From:** Ruth Mora <keepcalvertcountry@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, February 22, 2019 2:17 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.

Ruth Mora

remora63@msn.com

Broomes Island

**Harrod, Felicia R.**

---

**From:** Dorothy Jackson <keepcalvertcountry@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Saturday, February 23, 2019 9:27 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.

Dorothy Jackson

Dorjacks@usa.net

Dunkirk

We've continued to tell the commission that we want slow growth in Calvert County. Please do not go through with the plan as written.

**Harrod, Felicia R.**

---

**From:** Art F Fournier <keepcalvertcountry@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Saturday, February 23, 2019 10:17 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.

Art F Fournier

afournier1863@gmail.com

Chesapeake Beach

Why do the Developers have to win this issue???

**Harrod, Felicia R.**

---

**From:** Darlene Harrod <keepcalvertcountry@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Saturday, February 23, 2019 9:43 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.

Darlene Harrod

dmharrod@verizon.net

Huntingtown

**Harrod, Felicia R.**

---

**From:** Charlene Kriemelmeyer <c.tobey@icloud.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, February 24, 2019 6:21 PM  
**To:** Planning and Zoning  
**Subject:** CALVERT 2040 COMENTS  
**Attachments:** Comments FEB 2019 C T Kriemelmeyer.pdf

Attached are my Comments on the December 2018 Draft of the Comprehensive Plan for the Planning Commission Special Meeting on Tues. February 26, 2019 .

Please send acknowledgment of receipt.

Thank you,

Charlene Tobey Kriemelmeyer

Dunkirk

***Part 1 Presented at the Planning Commission Special Meeting February 26, 2019***

I carefully went over the entire December 2018 Comprehensive Plan Draft (CP12/18), looking at the marked-up version of the May Comprehensive Plan showing changes made. With each page I became more and more disappointed. I have read the many, many thoughtful, intelligent comments by the citizens of this county, both sent in to the Planning Commission and made at the many meetings that citizens were invited to attend throughout this process of rewriting the County Comprehensive Plan. My husband and I went to the meetings from the very beginning where citizens were requested to give their input. Yet so little of what the citizens have asked for has been implemented. This last draft, our last chance, has mostly just grammatical corrections. The very few changes made will not make much difference in preserving the balance Calvert County must maintain: the ability to grow (within the limits of our public facilities) and yet preserve our resources, the excellence of our schools, our priceless rural ambience and heritage. Yes, that means the Comprehensive Plan must reinstate a cap on growth and benchmarks for quality of roads and water.

Our citizens made so many wonderful suggestions for each and every chapter. Please take the time to reread those suggestions, as they are still very applicable, and seriously give them consideration. Especially, I hope you read mine and my husband's because we spent countless hours and days working on them.

The Final Comprehensive Plan does not need to be completed until the end of 2020. The Planning Commission has time to step back and think about all of the repercussions of rushing through the plan as it is now written.

Charlene Tobey Kriemelmeyer  
Dunkirk

\*\*\*\*\*

***Part 2 Submitted as Email February 24, 2019***

Calvert County Planning Commission  
CALVERT 2040 COMMENTS for Comprehensive Plan December 2018 Draft  
Planning Commission Meeting February 26, 2019  
Calvert County Dept. of Planning & Zoning  
175 Main Street  
Prince Frederick, MD 20678  
[pz@calvertcountymd.gov](mailto:pz@calvertcountymd.gov)

February 24, 2019

THANK YOU for listening to the citizens of Dunkirk and keeping it a Minor Town Center. Unfortunately when I look throughout CP12/18, although Dunkirk is now called a Minor Town Center it is still treated as a Major Town Center. The change appears to be a change in name only. Policies, statements, maps and charts still treat Dunkirk as a Major Town center, often just substituting the word Minor for Major or moving a paragraph word from the Major Town Center section to the Minor Town Center section but keeping the rest of the of the section intact.

The following description of Dunkirk was moved from the Major Town Center Section to the Minor Town Center Section. But, no other changes were made.

*Pg. 3-21 Dunkirk is the gateway to Calvert County from the Washington, DC metropolitan area, is bisected by MD 4, and is the only Major Town Center served by private community sewer systems. These characteristics require a unique set of land use policies specific to this area of approximately 200 acres at the northern end of the county. The Town Center is dominated by commercial uses oriented to MD 4. Surrounding the Town Center are large areas of single-family homes served by individual, private, septic systems.*

**It still looks like the “unique set of land use policies” in CP12/18 contrive to get that accelerated growth, High density by ramming water and sewer down Dunkirk’s throat one way or the other.**

*Page 3-12 Table 3-5 “Calvert County New Household Capacity by Generalized Zoning District Scenario 6 - NHC Full TDR with Septic Law and Full Constraints” simply took Dunkirk’s calculated 100 households calculated with the parameters allowed for high density housing for a MAJOR Town center and transferred the full 100 households to the Minor Town Center line, basically transferring the denser growth and zoning. The “revised” Table 3-5 “with full TDR and septic laws , full constrains,” “ The Minor Town Centers could now support 500 new households” (by adding Dunkirk’s s STILL HIGH DENSITY COMPUTED 100)*

*Pg. 3-12 “...Comparing the projected growth with the projected capacity in the county shows that while the county’s policies indicate a preference for new development to locate within Town Centers, there is greater capacity to absorb new growth in the areas outside the Town Centers.”*

**There is the septic capacity, but we do not have infrastructure, clean water, traffic, evacuation routes and schools, which would be overloaded.**

**That UN-RECALCULATED move of Dunkirk capacity is also a shout out to developers saying, “DUNKIRK IS STILL OPEN TO HIGH DENSITY DEVELOPMENT,” and does not take into account the citizens’ strong desire to never become overdeveloped like Waldorf, Bowie nor Crofton.**

Are developers near the Minor Town Centers, especially Dunkirk, given loopholes to grow into de facto Major Town Centers in CP12/18 ?\_It appears so.



**Figure 3-1 Growth Tier Map Pg. 3-7 NOTE THE SHAPE OF DUNKIRK TOWN CENTER IN ORANGE. The Maps listed in CP12/18 (Figures. 1-2, 3-1, 3-3, 4-1, 4-2, 7-2, 7-5, 9-1) have changed the boundary of Dunkirk Town Center to include the entire Red Tier I area.**

**Orange = Tier I: Areas already served by public sewerage systems and mapped as a locally designated growth area or is in a municipality that is a Priority Funding Area served by public sewerage systems. ( which includes funding for sewer and water construction, economic development**

**assistance and state leases or construction of new office facilities ) In Tier I, a residential subdivision plat may not be approved unless all lots are to be served by public sewer. Red= Tier II: Areas proposed to be served by public sewerage systems or mapped as locally designated growth areas.**

We have been told that Minor Town Centers do not have the one mile radius high density Residential Areas around them. Yet throughout CP12/18, this manipulation of the maps still show Dunkirk surrounded by one, now annexing the Tier II acreage. The Comprehensive Plan should not be setting down boundaries not changing them. Since zoning ordinance regulations must follow what is set forth in the Comprehensive plan this is a huge problem.

If Dunkirk is truly to be treated as a Minor Town Center, Pages 3-6 and 3-7 Figure 3-1 The "2017 Growth Tier Map" should indicate that Dunkirk is no longer a Major Town Center and the red Tier II Residential Area should be removed around Dunkirk on that map plus all of the others within CP12/18. Furthermore Dunkirk's surrounding land Growth Tier designation as a Tier II should be revised to the status as other Minor Town Centers.

Page 3-24 This updated Comprehensive Plan retains the policy of permitting a higher residential density with the use of TDRs within a one-mile radius of a defined central point for the Minor Town Centers of Dunkirk, Owings, Huntingtown, and St. Leonard. The policy will be reviewed during the update of the zoning ordinance regulations.

**As I read yet again through CP21/18 this section** continues to be more than just troublesome as it sounds like it could devolve into a full fledged high density Residential Area. Although it is good to see that this policy will be reviewed where it belongs: in zoning, it never should be here in CP12/18.

Allowing builder supplied sewer and water and TDRs plus maintaining the Tier II status surrounding Dunkirk has the potential to increase the density of this area into a high density Residential Area without calling it one! The citizens have been and will continue to be opposed to this and would be quite upset.

I mentioned at an earlier date, Town Center Master Plans and Town Architectural Committees (Minor and Major) should be given authority over this 1 mile radius, for any building which will be used for commercial, retail, industrial, multi-family units (over 2); institutional, service, medical, nursing homes, assisted living facilities, etc.

Public access and information about what is being considered by zoning is often quite esoteric, incomplete or late to public scrutiny. Since neither Minor Town Architectural Review Committee (ARC) nor the citizens, as CP12/18 is now written, have oversight nor a means of warning, there is the potential for misuse and unrestricted growth. The public needs a means of being allowed to have some input about this sort of growth in its infancy.

SUGGESTION: The ARCs only have control within the exact town center boundary. The people who actually live and work here are the ones who should have a say in how we are going to develop. Extend the jurisdiction of the ARCs to include the mile radius around each Town Center (Major and Minor) and give us a say in how we are going to develop. The people and businesses who are in the post office ZIP Code should be notified whenever there is a permit application, with detailed descriptions of all proposed buildings which will be used for commercial, retail, industrial, multi-family units (over 2); institutional, service, medical, nursing homes, assisted living facilities, etc., being built within the Dunkirk area so that we can be alerted. The same goes for any Town in the county.

Page 8-14 writes, "*Dunkirk has the potential to be one of the county's major employment centers ... Dunkirk currently serves as a retail and service center, and additional commercial growth is possible.*" This goes against the whole concept behind the fight we just had to change from a Major back to a Minor Town, we are not large enough and don't want it. The Town Center is pretty much already built out, so where will this new commercial growth be allowed, perhaps in Tier II? No thank you.

Now add the two following items to this double-talk about the status of Dunkirk.

Page 3-21 Development in the Minor Town Centers is guided by individual master plans. These adopted plans should be updated to reflect the policies of this Comprehensive Plan.

Page 3-22 The Dunkirk Town Center master plan should be updated to reflect current demographic, land use, and market conditions as well as the policies of this Comprehensive Plan.

Why is it that the other **Minor** Town Centers do not mention updating their Master Plans to “reflect current demographic, land use, and market conditions”? **This is because the description of Dunkirk is still the one of a MAJOR Town Center as it was moved word for word to the Minor Town Center section. The description needs to be rewritten, as this a loophole capable of pushing Dunkirk back into Major Town Center status.**

Requiring that the Dunkirk, (and all Towns’) Master Plan “should be updated to reflect the policies of this Comprehensive Plan” is just wrong as this strips the citizen’s proclaimed power away. The people who actually live here are the ones who should have a say in how we are going to develop, how we will grow and what we want our town to look like through our Dunkirk Master Plan, which is serving us quite well. We are quite happy with things as they are.

The policies in CP 12/18 are still based upon statistics, and assumptions which were compiled using the assumption that the existing cap in growth would remain. Ignoring that fact is a recipe for future failure of our resources. With no growth cap, and no longer linking growth to a strong Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance and allowing each builder’s project to go ahead and begin after six years even though there are still not Adequate Public Facilities just means builders will automatically include that time lag into projections, allowing our roads, schools, aquifers , etc., to become overtaxed to the point of no return.

*Pg 5-2 “The greenest building is the one that is already built” is a phrase that captures the relationship between our heritage resources and sustainability. This Plan promotes the preservation of historic buildings and supports the application of best practices in preserving them and adapting them for new uses. This Plan promotes the conservation of places and archaeological sites that signify and define Calvert County.”*

**Page 7-9 RE: Chesapeake Bay Crossing Study, CP18 must strongly state that we do not have the roads, nor does our peninsula’s geography have the capacity to support building the feeder roads for a Chesapeake Bay Bridge Crossing. Our population does not want the urbanization, pollution and traffic woes that such an endeavor would bring.**

*Pg. 5-5 Objective 1: Promote the documentation and protection of Calvert County’s heritage. 5.1.1.5 Adopt an archaeological site protection ordinance that is applicable county-wide. [P&Z, PC, BOCC]*

5.1.1.5 is of highest priority. If a project that will negatively affect an archaeological site is proposed on a property in Prince Frederick, St. Leonard, or Solomons, then the county government has the authority to require an archaeological survey, **I was shocked to learn that with our rich history, in most areas of the county archaeology and historic architectural documentation can only be recommended in the rest of the county.**

Thank you,  
Charlene Tobey Kriemelmeyer  
Dunkirk

**Harrod, Felicia R.**

---

**From:** Barton Ewalt <briarpatchbart@msn.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, February 24, 2019 9:30 PM  
**To:** Planning and Zoning  
**Subject:** 2040 Draft Comprehensive Plan  
**Attachments:** Planning Commission.docx

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Please see the attached document. Thanks,

Chloe Briscoe Ewalt

Chloe and Bart Ewalt  
3855 Adelina Road  
Prince Frederick, MD  
20678

February 24, 2019

Dear Chairman Kernan and Members of the Planning Commission,

Change is inevitable, but change without careful thought and planning is unconscionable, with possibly devastating results. Calvert County has always been recognized for its uniqueness in many areas, and many years ago was referred to as “the land of pleasant living”. But as a life-long resident of a Calvert County farming family, I have been greatly disturbed by some of the changes that have occurred in the past 30 years.

So, as we look to the future of Calvert County, careful consideration should be given to not only how to maintain the rural character of the county, but also the integrity of the ecosystem. These should be top priorities in any decision made by county officials. After all, these are some of the main reasons so many families have decided to call this county home in the last fifty years.

Critical to the future of Calvert County is the 2040 draft of the Comprehensive Plan. Several key issues emerge when compared to the 2010 Comprehensive Plan:

- Agricultural Preservation –

Although the 2040 draft appears to support land preservation, the action statements seem to be allowing more residential development in the Farm and Forest Districts. Critical in the 2010 Comprehensive Plan and not evident in the 2040 Plan is “to continue to look for ways to direct residential growth away from the Farm and Forest Districts.” Additionally, lacking is also “Give priority to farming (such as “right to farm” regulations), forestry, wildlife habitat protection, and heritage/ecotourism within the Farm and Forest Districts.” And, the 2040 draft Plan weakens land preservation programs by reducing the need for Transferable Development Rights with no plan to replace or improve the current program.

- Growth Management –

The 2040 draft Plan no longer addresses the many issues associated with growth management. Driving through any of the County’s town centers results in the painful realization that the existing infrastructure can no longer adequately support the current, much less the future, traffic situation. No traffic study has been performed to validate expanding the town centers and residential zoning. The ability of the aquifers to support any more growth is also questionable, as no study has been conducted. Potentially catastrophic in the 2040 draft Plan is the removal of “growth control mechanisms that relate to adequacy of infrastructure (water, roads, land capacity, etc.)” Consequently, there is no monitoring of future growth.

- Possible New Chesapeake Bay Bridge in Calvert County –

The 2040 draft Plan does not address the many serious issues concerning the possibility of locating the new Bay Bridge in Calvert County. The multitude of problems associated with creating the necessary infrastructure to locate a new Bay Bridge in this county would be exacerbated if a major disaster should occur at either the nuclear power plant or the LNG plant.

The future well-being and happiness of Calvert County residents depends on all of us. As elected county officials, it is incumbent that you make informed decisions based on the input of all those concerned with the future growth of Calvert County. As the saying goes, “preservation is progress”. Thank –you in advance for considering all of the concerns of Calvert County citizens.

Sincerely,

Chloe Briscoe Ewalt