

Plan2040
Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC)
Meeting Notes
February 5, 2020 - 5:00 PM
Chesapeake Conference Room, 2nd Floor
2664 Riva Road, Annapolis, MD

CAC members present: Cate Bower, Anthony Brent, John Clark, Bill Dodd, Thomas Fahs, Joel Greenwell, Melanie Hartwig-Davis, Patricia Huecker, Matthew Korbela, Amy Leahy, Patricia Lynch, Charles Mannion, Gary Mauler, Ellen Moyer, Kristin Pauly, Allan Straughan

County staff present: Christina Pompa, Deputy Planning and Zoning Officer; Cindy Carrier, Long Range Planning Administrator; Patrick Hughes, Long Range Planner; Mark Wildonger, Long Range Planner; Holly Simmons, Long Range Planner; Brent Efune, Long Range Planner; Martha Arzu-McIntosh, Office of Transportation; Erica Matthews; Department of Recreation and Parks; Maury Chaput, Anne Arundel Community College

Attendees: Alexis Dorsey, Ken Green, Jon Korin, Steve Miller

Introduction:

Ms. Cindy Carrier, Long Range Planning Administrator

The meeting was called to order at 5:01 p.m.

Ms. Carrier introduced Mr. Efune as the newest member of the Long Range Planning team. He was previously with the Prince George's Planning Department where he worked on natural resource inventories. She also recognized Mr. Chaput from the Anne Arundel Community College, Ms. Matthews from the Department of Recreation and Parks (DRP), and Ms. Arzu-McIntosh from the Office of Transportation (OOT). A representative from the Economic Development Corporation will plan to attend a future meeting.

Finalize draft textual context, goals, policies, and strategies:

Mr. Patrick Hughes, Planner

Planning for Healthy Communities

Mr. Hughes explained that the purpose of this meeting is to focus on the goals, policies, and strategies for Goals 3 and 8 of the Planning for the Healthy Communities document and that previously discussed sections will not be reviewed at tonight's meeting.

Ms. Bower asked whether the Community College could expand programs to libraries, specifically in South County. Mr. Chaput said the Community College continues to explore opportunities at different locations, but new locations in South County are not identified in their strategic plan due to limited resources and a lack of viability. He said the majority of students come from northern part of the County. Ms. Bower said that the GDP is a 20-year plan and that just because it is not viable now, that there may be interest in the future. Mr. Chaput said the Facilities Master Plan has a 10-year horizon and explained that, based on the direction of the GDP, the Community College does not anticipate any changes in South County that would change their planning. He said the Community College's perspective is to be realistic about the future and that if the population is not anticipated to grow, nor will demand. Ms. Pompa suggested that despite that the Community College not having a recommendation for additional locations in their current strategic plan that the GDP recommend that the Community College explore opportunities for a physical location in subsequent master plans. Ms. Hartwig-Davis added that the Community College offers online programs. Mr. Chaput noted that approximately 25% of their programs are online.

Mr. Mauler suggested that mini parks should be clustered within walking distance to development communities and located to maximize child safety. Ms. Matthews said DRPs' definition of a mini park is less than one acre. She noted; however, that some "mini" parks are owned and managed by an HOA and not owned by the County. In these situations, park location and size is determined by the open space and recreation requirements in the County Code (Code). Mr. Mauler would like to see parks that are walkable from dense developments; and school amenities, such as trails, open to the public. Ms. Pompa suggested the recommendation address the design standards for neighborhood parks and to evaluate the required amount of recreation areas. Ms. Leahy expressed concern that previously approved modifications have allowed for a reduction in recreation area. Ms. Pompa clarified that the direction from the current administration is that modifications need to be justified and the standard for approval is higher than in the past. Mr. Dodd reminded the CAC that not all modifications are bad. Modifications, when used properly, allow flexibility for the applicant to design a publically beneficial project. Ms. Huecker noted that public school amenities are often fenced off to public and that these amenities should not always be counted towards the amount of recreational areas in the area. Ms. Moyer asked if DRP collaborates with the Board of Education (BOE) and other agencies in the design of parks. Ms. Matthews confirmed there is agency coordination. She also explained that if the BOE longer has an interest in a property that has already been acquired, DRP will analyze it to see if they can use it. The two agencies also collaborate about sharing facilities.

Ms. Pauly asked if the Code can be changed to address how modifications are approved. Ms. Pompa said the provisions are already in the Code and that it is a matter of how it implemented. Mr. Dodd agreed that modifications have been misused in the past, but are a necessary planning tool to allow flexibility. Mr. Brent elaborated by stating that if the Code is too rigid, it eliminates the ability for the Office of Planning and Zoning (OPZ) to make appropriate decisions on certain projects. Mr. Brent suggested that the applicants in the development process meet with all community associations within a certain mile radius. Ms. Pompa said that this comment would be better addressed in the land use section. Ms. Carrier said that hopefully the land use section will be ready for CAC review in March.

Mr. Mauler asked if someone is taking notes. Ms. Carrier confirmed notes are being taken and that they should be read before every meeting.

Ms. Moyer noted that modifications have also reduced the size of the County's greenway network. Ms. Pompa said there is a recommendation to update the current 2002 Greenways Master Plan.

Ms. Moyer commented that there should be collaboration with the City of Annapolis to ensure continuity on greenways, bike paths, and program enhancements including first class maintenance of school parks in the City, DRP should work closely and cooperatively with the County Cultural Resources staff on recognizing heritage sites and fostering event planning, there should be opportunities for new equestrian and hiking facilities, there should be a more defined partnership between schools and DRP for community sports and recreation centers and summer day camps, questioned if there is space for the Bayhawks, and asked how the County celebrates great County athletes. Ms. Matthews said there is a County Hall of Fame for County athletes but that they do not acquire land for private entities, such as the Bayhawks. Ms. Matthews confirmed DRP partners with the City of Annapolis, the County's Cultural Resources Division, and BOE. She also pointed to the previously presented Land Preservation Parks and Recreation Plan (LPPRP) to indicate that DRP is working to develop equestrian facilities, a Countywide and City trail network, and to address equity of facilities. She noted that DRP hosted a meeting to discuss equestrian facilities, but no one from the equestrian community was present. DRP is not an enforcement agency and cannot enforce the Greenways Master Plan. DRP does participate on the Bicycle Advisory Commission to help facilitate connections between communities.

Ms. Pauly asked if there should be a strategy to develop a plan for community gardens. Ms. Matthews said the only school with a community garden is Park Elementary. There are several gardens at Kinder Farm Park. She re-emphasized that community gardens is a popular item that people want as surveyed for the LPPRP.

Mr. Mauler asked if BOE could transfer unused land to the County. Ms. Matthews explained that the County currently does this. Ms. Moyer asked why, instead of changing the title, just have a cooperative agreement. Ms. Matthews explained that land is purchased specifically for certain agencies. In the event land cannot be used, there are mechanisms for that land to be transferred within County agencies. In some cases, funding can be pooled among agencies, such as DRP and BOE to fund the development of a school and joint parkland.

Mr. Clark asked if there is a document that shows what amenities are missing in the County. Ms. Moyer asked if there were enough baseball fields for County residents. Ms. Matthews reiterated that this type of specific information is in the LPPRP (available on the County's website). The document looks at the demand for recreational amenities. Mr. Clark asked when DRP has public meetings. Ms. Matthews said they have meetings on specific projects during when schematic design is at 30%, and depending upon feedback another meeting at 60%, and then before construction. Ms. Pompa clarified that these are two issues - what is required from developer of which OPZ is responsible for and what DRP is responsible for. She suggested a recommendation be added that evaluates active and passive requirements in the Code. The other needs are referenced in the LPPRP. Ms. Matthews said there is no master plan that identifies the County's on-road trails because DRP does not own the rights of way. Ms. Arzu-McIntosh added that OOT works closely with DRP and any type of trail is coordinated with various agencies to make sure connections are made.

Mr. Korbelak asked if DRP has explored the use of mall space, similar to what Libraries has done. Ms. Matthews said the idea has come up and they are looking into it.

Mr. Mauler asked if a subcommittee should be developed to review the goals, policies, and strategies. Ms. Pompa said the purpose of OPZ sending out the documents in advance is to get feedback on the goals, policies, and strategies and the time to provide that feedback is during that review and during the meetings. She emphasized that if CAC members have suggestions for additional goals, policies, and strategies that they be added as a comment in the document.

Planning for the Built Environment

Ms. Arzu-McIntosh explained that the background information, goals, policies, and strategies are from the recently adopted *Move Anne Arundell!* transportation master plan. Mr. Mauler asked how the County plans to address connecting low-income housing with transportation issues. Ms. Arzu-McIntosh said that it is addressed by introducing a new model of transit. Mr. Korin added that *Move Anne Arundell!* embraces that theme and the plan identifies a goal for reducing single occupancy trips. He identified a need for land use policies dovetailed with the transportation strategies.

Ms. Moyer asked how the plan defines peninsula roads. Ms. Arzu-McIntosh said the plan studied major corridors, such as peninsula roads, but because peninsula roads are not formally classified by the Functional Classification Map, they are not specifically defined in the plan. Ms. Carrier noted that the proposed development policy area map includes a Peninsula Policy Area that will include a definition and related policies.

Mr. Brent asked what the responsibilities are of OOT in the development review process. Ms. Arzu-McIntosh said their office reviews plans. Ms. Pompa said that the policy areas will help determine what needs to be managed and how they will be managed. OPZ will administer the adequate public facilities ordinance, but other agencies contribute to the review. Ms. Carrier said adequacy of facilities this is a topic for the land use chapter. Ms. Leahy noted that when a development is proposed, the adjacent community often does not want connecting roads and that if the CAC wants walkability, then the planning process needs to reflect that. Ms. Arzu-McIntosh said this is addressed in a recommendation. Mr. Korin said County Bill 78-18 legislated this type of issue.

Mr. Mannion asked if there should be a strategy to increase mobility for individuals who live outside the County, but work within the County. Ms. Arzu-McIntosh said OOT recognizes the County's location between Baltimore and Washington and works with surrounding jurisdictions to ensure a cohesive transportation network. For example, the County is a member of the Maryland Regional Transportation Agency who provides transportation options between Howard and Anne Arundel County. One recommendation of *Move Anne Arundell!* is to join the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments.

Ms. Hartwig-Davis suggested incentives to install additional bicycle amenities such as secure bike storage, locker, and shower facilities to reduce need for short vehicle trips. Ms. Arzu-McIntosh will confirm it is in *Move Anne Arundell!* and follow up.

Ms. Hartwig-Davis indicated that there are situations where the Complete Streets policy has unintended consequences, such as destroying community character and requiring more than reasonable destruction of forests and green spaces. There needs to be flexibility in the design

standards. Mr. Brent agreed and said the improvement of streets is not so more development can go in, but to improve quality of life. Ms. Arzu-McIntosh said community character is taken into account. She clarified that the County is in communication with State Highway Administration (SHA), but it is ultimately their decision if they have jurisdiction. Ms. Pompa proposed the recommendation address an analysis of the design manual.

Ms. Hartwig-Davis suggested the County will need to de-incentivize single car use by reducing parking in areas as well as incentivize some and should add electric vehicle station access as a strategy to advance a new model for transit. Ms. Arzu-McIntosh said these strategies are in *Move Anne Arundell!* and there are in performance measures to ensure accountability.

Ms. Hartwig-Davis asked for clarification about the term “connected vehicles”. Ms. Arzu-McIntosh said this is a technology for autonomous cars, connected cars (cars that communicate with the driver and other vehicles), and advanced driver assistance systems. She added that the infrastructure also needs to be in place for this type of system to work.

Planning for a Healthy Economy

Mr. Hughes said the County will continue to use the term “smart growth”, which is a planning term that has a defined set of principles and has been endorsed by Mr. Pittman per the CAC kick-off meeting. Utilizing these principles is a management tool. Mr. Mauler said he had an issue with term “smart growth” and felt the word should be updated because he feels it will mean more growth for west County. He prefers to see the goal “manage” growth. Mr. Dodd clarified that the definition of “smart growth” is to manage growth.

Mr. Hughes clarified that development around BWI Airport will need to be compatible with the airport. The Maryland Aviation Administration (MAA) is currently in the process of updating the five-year noise zones. The County will work with them to define compatible uses.

Mr. Mauler said the County should plan for future development. Ms. Carrier said that despite the 28,000 unit projection from the Land Use Market Study; the County’s infrastructure may not be able to accommodate this much. A preliminary land use plan will be tested for impacts to infrastructure to determine a threshold of how many units the County can support within the proposed policy areas.

Ms. Huecker said the County should not allow development to happen until transit access has been provided.

Ms. Bower questioned whether the policies within the goal “Provide a variety of housing opportunities to serve the full range of housing needs in the County” should specify a limit to the expansion of housing. Ms. Carrier said the CAC has been explicit about limiting expansion through developing policy areas. This will be refined in a land use exercise. The 28,000 projected units and where the CAC placed them is a planning tool that will be used to test what the threshold is. The County may not be able to accommodate this many units given constraints such as sewer capacity and Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) limits. Furthermore, after the land use plan is adopted, ultimate growth will be determined by adequacy of other facilities, roads, schools etc.

Ms. Moyer asked what the barriers are to overcome issues. Ms. Pompa stated again that if the CAC has suggestions on goals, policies, and strategies that those comments need to be added to the

document during the review period the week before the meeting. Ms. Carrier emphasized the importance of providing substantive comments or questions about the goals, policies, and strategies; rather than wordsmithing. Ms. Huecker said she intends the GDP to be a document that she can take to the Region Areas that will support her in controlling growth in her neighborhood. Ms. Pompa said the GDP is not regulatory. She explained that the GDP is meant to be a “to do” that will affect Code changes and to ensure that a development is consistent with the land use plan.

Ms. Leahy reiterated her concern that the administration is putting forth bills that affect the GDP and the CAC is not able to provide input.

Administrative items: Adopt January 15, 2020 meeting notes; Next steps

Ms. Carrier noted that a new schedule will be shared shortly. The Region Area Plan boundaries with public comment will be sent to the CAC in advance and discussed at the February 19th meeting. The draft policy area maps will also be discussed in conjunction with a land use map bubble exercise.

The Land Use Applications are posted online and the public is asked to provide comment through March 1, 2020. Staff is evaluating the applications as well as developing a Countywide Land Use map.

The January 15, 2020 meeting minutes were approved unanimously as circulated. The meeting was adjourned at 7:29pm.