



2664 Riva Road, P.O. Box 6675  
Annapolis, MD 21401  
410-222-7450

**Elizabeth Rosborg**  
**Chair, Citizens Advisory Committee**

---

**Plan2040**

**Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC)**

Meeting Notes

August 21, 2019 - 5:00 PM

Chesapeake Conference Room, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
2664 Riva Road, Annapolis, MD

**CAC members present:** Elizabeth Rosborg (Chair), Cate Bower, Anthony Brent, John Clark, Bill Dodd, Thomas Fahs, Joel Greenwell, Melanie Hartwig-Davis, Patricia Huecker, Caren Karabani, Amy Leahy, Patricia Lynch, Charles Mannion, Gary Mauler, William Moulden, Ellen Moyer, Will Shorter

**Office of Planning and Zoning (OPZ) present:** Cindy Carrier, Acting Deputy Planning and Zoning Officer; Patrick Hughes, Long Range Planner; Mark Wildonger, Long Range Planner; Don Zeigler, Long Range Planner

**Attendees:** Susan Cochran, Matt Minahan

**Introduction:**

*Ms. Rosborg, Chair*

The meeting was called to order at 5:04 p.m. Ms. LaToya Staten, representing the Severn Small Area, and Ms. Sofia, the student representative, have resigned. Mr. Korbelak will miss this evening's meeting as well as the September 4<sup>th</sup> meeting due to a family emergency. Ms. Rosborg explained that due to absences and resignations, a lack of representation during meeting discussions occurs. She encouraged members that if they could not attend meetings in person, that they should watch the YouTube video live, watch it on-demand, or review the meeting notes in order to stay current on the discussion, and to contact Ms. Carrier with any questions or comments. Substitutions will no longer be permitted if members are unable to attend. Ms. Rosborg reviewed the CAC Mission Statement and reminded the members that they are to represent their area as well as the County.

**Finalize the Vision Statement (Vision):**

*Ms. Rosborg, Chair*

*Mr. Patrick Hughes, OPZ*

The CAC has expressed an interest in re-visiting the previously agreed upon Vision. Ms. Bower and Ms. Hartwig-Davis have circulated a revised version for discussion. Their version blends comments from Ms. Pauly. Mr. Mauler re-emphasized his displeasure with adapting a Vision from another

jurisdiction. Ms. Lynch agreed with Mr. Mauler and added that the proposed Vision says nothing unique nor does it include many items from the Visioning Sessions.

Ms. Rosborg clarified that the Vision has been tailored to reflect Anne Arundel County and that the Vision Themes, Goals, Policies, and Strategies further support the Vision. Ms. Bower echoed that statement and felt that during review of the General Development Plan (GDP), the CAC should ask whether each Goal, Policy, and Strategy helps achieve the Vision.

A roll call was held for consensus on the Vision. Ms. Lynch voted no. Mr. Mannion said he supported the revised Vision. Mr. Mauler did not support it. Ms. Karabani voted no, saying it is a little generic, is in need of some type of “unification”, and needs to address the County’s culture. Ms. Moyer, though in support of a longer version, does support the current version. Ms. Huecker was in support. Ms. Leahy was in support, but felt the Vision should reference more than just the Chesapeake heritage, such as farming, horses, and sailing. Ms. Bower and Ms. Hartwig-Davis were in support. Mr. Moulden expressed support for the majority. Mr. Greenwell, Mr. Fahs, Mr. Clark, and Mr. Dodd supported the Vision. Mr. Brent abstained. The final tally was 12 yeas, 3 nays, and 1 abstention.

As of August 21, 2019, the Vision is:

By embracing its rich Chesapeake culture and heritage, invaluable ecosystems and emerging opportunities, Anne Arundel County embodies the best of both the past and future, providing its residents a place where all are proud to live, work, learn, and play.

### **Review, Finalize Draft Vision Themes (Themes):**

*Ms. Rosborg, Chair*

*Mr. Patrick Hughes, OPZ*

“Strategic Economic Growth and Redevelopment”: the Theme was revised to focus on smart growth strategies.

“Community Character”: The CAC agreed with Mr. Dodd and Mr. Brent to add the term “thoughtfully designed neighborhoods”.

“Inclusive, Equitable, and Responsive Government”: The term “Inclusive” was added to the Theme title. Edits were made to revise an “evenly” distribution of services to “best management practices are used when delivering resources and services”. Other additions included having the government provide “accurate and up-to-date” information, and adding “creating” to “enforcing zoning and development regulations”, and the term “environmental” to “stewardship”. Members also discussed how the Themes do not use the term “planning”, that there needs to be a reference to how the government receives input from citizens, and property rights of citizens and developers; though it was agreed these were addressed in other Themes or will be addressed in the Goals, Policies, and Strategies.

Ms. Carrier reminded the CAC there will be a glossary in the GDP and some strategies may recommend additional definitions to the County Code. Ms. Bower noted that some discussions have ended noting that particular suggestions would be addressed in the Goals, Policies, and Strategies section. She suggested a record should be kept so as to not lose these thoughts. Ms. Carrier said OPZ has been keeping a file of potential strategies. Ms. Bower suggested the CAC keep its own running list.

“Resilient, Environmentally-Sound, and Sustainable Communities”: The term “and strive to balance good neighborhood planning while...” was added. The term “preserving” was added to “restoring forest cover”. The CAC corrected the last sentence to read “The County will achieve net zero energy use through conservation and renewable energy production”.

The CAC discussed adding the term “diversity”, but did not come to a conclusion because the term is open-ended.

As of August 21, 2019, the proposed Vision Themes are:

***Vision Themes:***

The following overarching themes support this Vision and focus on the critical issues identified in the community visioning meetings that when implemented through Plan2040, will enhance quality of life and ensure residents are proud to live, work, learn, and play in communities throughout the County.

***New and Improved Infrastructure*** – Upgrading our infrastructure is compatible with meeting the County’s Vision for environmental stewardship. Residents will see enhanced multi-modal mobility through mass transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and improved roadways; upgraded public water and sewer and stormwater runoff control; improved quality of parks and open space, greenways and tree cover, and tidal and non-tidal waters; and expanded shoreline upgrades to living shorelines and beach strand habitats.

***Strategic Economic Growth and Redevelopment*** – Mixed-use, mixed-income, and transit-oriented developments incorporating a resilient, sustainable design that demonstrates efficient use of available resources and services throughout the County. There will be a balance of smart growth encouraged in and around areas with existing infrastructure and redevelopment directed to older commercial corridors.

***Community Character*** – Both new and longtime residents will appreciate the well-preserved character of older communities, waterfront neighborhoods, and scenic and historic roadways – assets that set the County apart from neighboring suburban counties. Communities will feature sensible people-oriented development to complement the existing historic scale of corridors and neighborhoods, and will be enhanced with historic and artistic amenities in public and private spaces. The conservation of agricultural lands, parks, forests, open space, and abundant fish and wildlife resources, along with thoughtfully designed neighborhoods, will contribute to the health and well-being of our communities.

***Inclusive, Equitable, and Responsive Government*** – A more inclusive and responsive County government will employ new methods of citizen engagement. With continuous advancements in technology, there will be more opportunities than ever for County government to reach all populations with accurate and up-to-date information. Engaging and empowering all segments of the County’s diverse population will ensure best management practices are used when delivering resources and services, creating and enforcing zoning and development regulations, and implementing the values of sustainability, environmental stewardship, and community building throughout the County.

***Resilient, Environmentally-Sound, and Sustainable Communities*** – Land use decisions affecting future growth and development will recognize the value of, and strive to balance good neighborhood planning, while retaining open space, preserving and restoring forest cover, investing in the health of our rivers and waterways, and increasing the ability of communities to withstand climate change impacts. Agricultural areas will remain important to the character of the County, and efforts to curb stormwater runoff, create living shorelines, and restore oyster populations will contribute to a cleaner and more sustainable environment. The County will achieve net zero energy use through conservation and renewable energy production.

#### **Finalize Draft Community Boundaries / Regions:**

*Mr. Patrick Hughes, OPZ*

Mr. Hughes explained that after comments from the previous CAC meeting, there were two areas that needed further clarification. In regards to the Region 4 Planning Area, Ms. Leahy clarified that the boundary should be Veterans Highway to the west and East West Boulevard to the North. In regards to the Region 6 Planning Area, the northern boundary should extend to MD 3/ I-97 and the Severn Run Natural Environment Area. The Severn Run Natural Environment Area parcel to the east of I-97 will be added to the Region 3 Planning Area. The revised maps will be sent to the CAC.

#### **Review Process / Content, Etc. Region Plans:**

*Ms. Cindy Carrier, OPZ*

Ms. Carrier explained the context for the new Region Planning Area Process. It is based on Bill 21-18 that specifies the GDP layout, implementation process and schedule, and the composition of areas. The first page provides an overall timeframe. The second page identifies the elements that would be included in each plan to ensure consistency among the plans. A “Measurement” element has been added to track and monitor the implementation of the plan. OPZ recommends the Region Planning Area Committees be comprised of 11 people. Ms. Bower asked whether there will be an equal distribution of representatives from each Community will be part of the Region Planning Area Committee. Ms. Carrier said the composition of the Committees will vary among the various Region Planning Areas and that the CAC is not responsible for identifying potential members. This document provides the structure for the Region Planning Area Committees. The Committee will review this document and provide feedback at the next meeting.

#### **Summary of MetroQuest Survey Results - Policy Areas:**

*Mr. Patrick Hughes, OPZ*

Mr. Hughes reviewed the results from the Transportation and Land Use section of the latest Visioning survey. There were 1,675 respondents, nearly 34,000 data points, and 1,820 comments. The top communities represented were Severna Park, Pasadena/Lake Shore, and Crofton. The results from this section will inform the Policy Areas and Map.

Results for the Transportation and Mobility section, which will be discussed in more detail during the goals and policies, were as followed:

- Upgrade Corridors and Cores had most #1 rankings (862 votes), followed by Enhance Bike Network (305)
- Most frequently ranked (given any rank): Walkable Communities and Enhance Bike Network
- Best average ranks were Upgrade Corridors and Cores (2.217 – scored from 1-7) and Walkable Communities (2.534)

- Commuter Bus Service (3.479) and Local Bus Routes (3.405) had the lowest average rankings

Results for Development/Redevelopment/Services, broken down by Community and County, were as followed:

- Businesses and Services:
  - o Community: My community does not need, followed by Small Scale Retail/Personal Services
  - o County: The County does not need, followed by Small Scale Retail/Personal Services
- Industrial:
  - o Community: My community does not need, followed by Renewable Energy (Solar, wind, etc.)
  - o County: Renewable Energy, followed by Recycling
- Housing:
  - o Community: My community does not need (over half of responses)
  - o County: The County does not need, followed by single-family homes
- Other needs:
  - o Community: Rehab of existing park/rec facilities and Access to water/green space (nearly tied)
  - o County: Rehab of existing park/rec facilities, followed by Access to water/green space

For context, a document was linked into the survey that described the three Policy Areas – targeted, managed, and rural - in place from the 2009 GDP. The three Policy Areas help establish future land uses and investment in public facilities and are based in natural resources, existing and planned water/sewer facilities, the Priority Funding Area (PFA), and revitalization goals. They provide a framework for implementing the goals, policies, and strategies of the GDP and a means for making cost-effective investments in public facilities and services.

The survey proposed new Policy Areas within the Targeted, Managed, and Rural categories. The follow is a description and the results for each category:

Rural: Resource Sensitive and Rural and Agricultural

- Rural and Agricultural Policy Area:
  - o The character is described as farms, rural residential, limited commercial, and is outside of the PFA and served by private septic. Development is minimized to protect the rural/agricultural heritage and economy. There is a limited extension of public facilities and services.
  - o Results: the average rating was 4.0 out of 5 stars and comments were in general support and suggested the County should invest in agriculture and food production.
- Resource Sensitive Policy Area:
  - o This area adds protection for areas with natural, cultural and physical features of special concern. It is intended for conservation, preservation from development impacts, and development is limited or prohibited.
  - o Results: 4.4 out of 5 stars and commenters expressed general support.

Managed: Peninsula and Neighborhood Preservation

- Peninsula Policy Area:

- Character is primarily residential, surrounded by water and Critical Area, and is often served by a one road corridor. It may be inside or outside of a PFA or public sewer service area.
- This policy area would propose limited development and transportation investment would be prioritized.
- Results: 3.9 out of 5 stars and comments focused on traffic on the main artery, environmental protection is needed, and to limit development.
- Neighborhood Preservation Policy Area:
  - These areas are characterized as stable residential communities and future development is infill and should match existing character. These are existing communities and may include local commercial and industrial uses. They are within a PFA, though are not intended for substantial growth or revitalization. Public sewer exists or is planned and other infrastructure exists but may need improvements.
  - Results: 4.2 out of 5 stars and commenters were supportive and expressed concerns about limiting diversity or promoting inequities, and the need for more housing variety or varied density.

Targeted: Transit-Oriented, Village Center, and Corridor Management: these three would be in addition to the existing Town Centers and Commercial Revitalization Areas.

- Town Centers: The three town centers are Odenton, Parole, and Glen Burnie
  - Existing development is or planned development will be compact, walkable, pedestrian-oriented, higher-density residential and nonresidential mixed-use areas and take the most urban form in character within the County. Implementation is guided by a town center master plan. One example is the Odenton Town Center Master Plan.
- Commercial Revitalization Areas: There are currently nine, primarily in North County, as well as Russett, Mountain Road, Ft Smallwood Road, and North Odenton.
  - These are characterized as corridors where the County has emphasized the need to direct resources and incentives to encourage rehabilitation, revitalization and reuse in order to reduce blight and increase property values. One example in the Brooklyn Park area is the Ritchie Highway Commercial Revitalization Area.
- Transit-Oriented Policy Area:
  - This area would be characterized by compact, walkable, pedestrian-oriented, mixed-use development around transit stations and would be guided by a Transit District Plan.
  - Results: 3.5 out of 5 stars and commenters noted crime concerns, the need to stop all development, the need for housing and density in proximity, and walkable bikeable links from surrounding neighborhoods.
- Village Center Policy Area:
  - These areas would be smaller scale centers with development oriented for the community and guided by a Village Master Plan. These may be existing or would be planned and are suburban or rural in nature.
  - Results: 3.6 out of 5 stars and commenters said they should be tailored to specific areas with community buy-in, create bicycle and pedestrian links to neighborhoods, and they had questions about what the concept is and how it would be implemented in developed areas.
- Corridor Management Policy Area:

- These are existing developed corridors for focused opportunities for infill development, redevelopment, revitalization and mixed-use to serve/preserve adjacent neighborhoods. They would be guided by a Corridor Growth Management Plan with the intent to link residences, businesses, institutions and form a community's economic spine.
- Results: 3.8 out of 5 stars with commenters noting revitalization/redevelopment of developed areas versus development on greenfields, the need to balance infrastructure to support corridors - particularly transportation, and questioned how it would apply to different areas of the County with different characteristics.

Based on survey and existing areas, OPZ proposes going from three to nine Policy Areas to guide environmental protection, future land use, water/sewer and other infrastructure. The CAC was asked to review these and consider any that may be missing or should be added for discussion at the September 4<sup>th</sup> meeting. The PowerPoint presentation and notes would be sent to the CAC.

Ms. Hartwig-Davis noted that several Policy Areas may overlap, for example the Transit-Oriented Policy Area and the Town Center Policy Area. Ms. Bower asked if the expectation is to create maps. Ms. Carrier confirmed that the Policy Areas would be mapped and the County would be divided into Policy Areas where each property would fall within at least one Policy Area. Mapping these Policy Areas will help inform land use planning.

Ms. Hartwig-Davis said the nine proposed Policy Areas may be too many and suggested that some may be consolidated. Ms. Carrier noted that OPZ learned that too few Policy Areas may have caused issues in the past, but some may be dropped or consolidated. These areas also set the framework to for future plans, such as region plans or sector plans. Ms. Moyer noted that how peninsulas would be defined is important, considering the transportation impacts usually begin inland.

Mr. Clark asked if there were any policies for the Neighborhood Preservation Policy Area. There are not, but will be defined in future discussions. Ms. Karabani asked what the difference was between the Town Center and the Village Center. The difference is densities and land area. She agreed that some properties may have more than one Policy Area. Ms. Carrier said reiterated the areas would be mapped and that the Policy Areas would not be contiguous or limited to certain Region Planning Areas.

### **Approval of August 7, 2019 Meeting Notes and Next Steps:**

*Ms. Elizabeth Rosborg, Chair*

*Ms. Cindy Carrier, OPZ*

Mr. Clark motioned to accept the August 7, 2019 meeting notes. Mr. Moulden seconded the motion and the meeting notes were approved.

Ms. Carrier circulated a new CAC meeting calendar. She explained that the GDP is anticipated to be introduced to the County Council in Fall 2020. This extended timeline allows the Council to be finished with adopting the budget and it also gives the CAC more time, but will add approximately three more months to their commitment. She asked that members get in touch with her if they are concerned with the new time commitment. As for upcoming meetings, the next meeting on September 4<sup>th</sup> will be to review the draft Policy Area maps. The meeting on September 18<sup>th</sup> will be a joint meeting with the Citizens Environmental Commission to discuss how environmental issues

will be included in the GDP. Ms. Hartwig-Davis and Mr. Brent will also present the Peninsula Principles. Meetings in October will then lead into the review of Goals, Policies, and Strategies starting with the environment. Background information on demographics and a draft land use plan will be presented at the end of October if the environmental element has been completed. Goals, Policies, and Strategies for the other elements will be discussed at meetings through January. The draft land use plan will be tested by County departments at the end of January. February and March will be discussions on the draft land use plan and public forums to gather input. A summary of these meetings will be presented in the April meetings. By April, the CAC will have reviewed and commented on most of the GDP. A draft GDP will be made available online for public comment and reviewed by the Maryland Department of the Environment in Spring 2020. Revisions to the GDP will be made in the summer 2020 and a final draft will be presented to the Planning Advisory Board in July 2020.

Ms. Rosborg reminded the CAC to provide comments to OPZ by Friday August 30<sup>th</sup>, so they have time to incorporate those changes for discussion at the next meeting. Ms. Rosborg reminded everyone to review the draft documents and become familiar with the Gmail Suite in order to review and comment on materials more easily.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:08 p.m.