

Comments on the Proposed Calvert County Comprehensive Plan (May 2018 Draft)
Additional Comments Received through November 14, 2018

NAME	GROUP/AGENCY	TOWN	DATE RECEIVED	# OF PAGES
Paul York		Prince Frederick	11/1/2018	1
Brett Darmstead		St. Leonard	11/6/2018	1
Joann Roberts		Owings	11/6/2018	1
Brian Carpenter		Lower Marlboro	11/8/2018	1
Miriam Gholl	Keep Calvert Country	Port Republic	11/14/2018	2

From: Paul York <keepcalvertcountry@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 01, 2018 7:56 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.

Paul York

Paul.york80@gmail.com

Prince Frederick

From: Brett Darmstead <keepcalvertcountry@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 06, 2018 5:11 AM
To: Planning and Zoning
Subject: Request For Studies BEFORE Growth

Calvert County Planning Commission Members:

As you are aware, Maryland Law requires that:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

Brett Darmstead

bdarmstead2.bd@gmail.com

Saint Leonard

From: joann roberts <keepcalvertcountry@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 06, 2018 7:28 PM
To: Planning and Zoning
Subject: Request For Studies BEFORE Growth

Calvert County Planning Commission Members:

As you are aware, Maryland Law requires that:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

joann roberts

riverosprey@yahoo.com

Owings

Harrod, Felicia R.

From: Brian Carpenter <keepcalvertcountry@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 08, 2018 10:12 PM
To: Planning and Zoning
Subject: Citizen Comments Re: Land Use Chapter of Comprehensive Plan

From: Brian Carpenter
Bc1968707@gmail.com
Other

I live in Lower Marlboro. I noted that your plan calls for expansion of public sewer service into our area. What is the motivation behind this development?

From: Miriam Gholi <ghollma@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, November 14, 2018 4:32 PM

To: Plummer-Welker, Jenny L. <Jenny.Plummer-Welker@calvertcountymd.gov>; Sunderland, Carolyn V. <Carolyn.Sunderland@calvertcountymd.gov>; Planning and Zoning <pz@calvertcountymd.gov>

Cc: Greg & Tamea Bowen <landstewardshipsolutionsllc@gmail.com>; Randi Vogt <vogtpr@comcast.net>; Susan Dzurec <calvertwoman@gmail.com>; David Bury <burydav@gmail.com>

Subject: Comments on Consultant's Memo Re Growth Target

Please forward the attached comments from Keep Calvert Country to the Planning Commission. The consultant's memo is dated October 9th but was not released until after the deadline for citizen comments, so we're hoping the attached will be forwarded to the PC before they make any decisions about the growth control issue.

Thanks,
Miriam

Keep Calvert Country's Comments on Consultant's Memo Re: Growth Target (dated 10/9/18)

The following is KCC's analysis and concerns about Ms. Seneschal's memo. It is unfortunate that the memo was not released in time to submit comments on it prior to the 10/26 deadline.

1. MDP's Population Projections are seriously flawed in that they are based on current zoning. **How many more households will be constructed in the expanded areas of the Town Centers and the adjoining Residential Areas?** We have asked this question repeatedly and have yet to get an answer, and the consultant's memo fails to answer it as well.
2. Page 2, Paragraph 1: The argument about real estate values does not take into account the housing bubble that was followed by the Great Recession during the same time period, and is therefore not accurate. It also compares a 10-year period to a 5-year period, which makes no sense. The fact is that **property values in Calvert County have not suffered by the growth control measures in place**. To the contrary, home prices rose by 9.6% between 2016 and 2017 – the 6th highest increase in the State, and are holding steady this year.
3. Page 2, Paragraph 3 talks about the draft Plan's goal of locating the majority of new residential development in Town Centers. **How is this to be accomplished when the Plan allows sewer in areas outside the Town Centers, which in turn increases density in those areas?** Also, the policy to "direct growth away from the Farm & Forest Districts" has been deleted, allowing additional growth outside the Town Centers.
4. Page 2, "Analysis": The analysis references MDP's contention that there is a capacity for about 9,000 residential units without TDRs and 15,00 units if TDRs are used. In fact, **if you don't require TDRs to reach allowable zoning densities, then the capacity increases even more**. TDRs move density. Zoning without TDRs increases density.
5. Page 3, "Considerations": The discussion about adequate public facilities (APFO) **is a great argument in favor of keeping growth control policies in the Plan**. There must be a "rational nexus" between growth policies and regulations that limit growth. The draft Plan deletes the policy which states, **"Link the amount, location, and rate of residential growth to land use objectives including roads, schools and aquifer capacities"**. This must be restored or the APFO will not be enforceable.
6. 2nd Paragraph under "Considerations": The "buildout" policies are not an "absolute cap" because they are tied to adequate facilities. **Such policies have not been successfully challenged in court**; in fact, the courts established the "rational nexus" argument in a landmark case in 1987 and it still stands today.
7. Page 4, 1st Paragraph: Transportation has not been the only issue cited by citizens as a basis for limiting growth. Schools and our aquifers must also be taken into consideration.
8. Same paragraph: The statement that "there is no system-based model to project the effects of increased traffic volumes" is a good argument for completing the Transportation Plan before allowing any expansions of the Town Centers.
9. Same paragraph: "Roadways do not have the same measurable public health impacts that water and sewer systems do." **What about the increased number of traffic accidents directly related to increased congestion?**
10. Page 4, Paragraph 2: Why is there no explanation as to why caps and growth rates are used less often? And what has resulted since Florida repealed its growth management legislation? Why did they repeal it? And what does this have to do with Calvert County? Calvert's growth policies have thus far been successful.
11. Page 4, Paragraph 3: Recommending that Calvert County should use the State's projections would be fine **if those projections were not seriously flawed**.
12. **Finally, why is there no clear recommendation in the memo?**