



OFFICE OF THE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

To join the meeting by computer please click the link <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/8697557180>. Once connected you can join by computer audio or dial in via the information that is provided on your screen. To join by phone only please dial (301) 715-8592 and enter the Meeting ID 869 755 7180.

**PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
AGENDA
JANUARY 5, 2022**

- I. Call to Order**
- II. Approve the Agenda**
- III. Approval of the minutes of the November 23, 2021 Planning & Zoning Meeting.**
- IV. Public Comment on any item on the agenda: Public comment will be accepted by dialing (301) 715-8592 and enter Meeting ID 869 755 7180. NOTE: There will be a 2-minute limit on comments received.**
- V. Continue review and discuss public comments made or submitted during the 60-day draft Comprehensive Plan Update public review; amend Comprehensive Plan as necessary to address public concerns. List of those public concerns for discussion are attached.**
- VI. Public Comment: NOTE: Public comment will be accepted by dialing (301) 715-8592 and enter Meeting ID 869 755 7180. NOTE: There will be a 2-minute limit on comments received.**
- VII. Adjournment: At approximately 9:00 PM, depending upon meeting progress, Chairman will request a motion to adjourn. If approved, the meeting will end.**

Chairman's list of topics

Jan 5, 2022; Chesapeake Beach Comprehensive Plan Update Session

At the Nov 23, 2021 Commission meeting, written comments on the Chesapeake Beach Comprehensive Plan Update were discussed from Susan Webster-Page, Keith Pardieck, Mercine Marshall, Ilonka Weida, Ken Rasmussen, Melanie Crowder, Mark Giangiulio, Madeleine Blake, Susan Alexander, and most of those from Jeff Foltz.

On Dec 13, 2021, Mercine Marshall provided the following comment in an email addressed to the Town. It is included here for information, but was received after the close of the public comment period, and is not on the Commission agenda for discussion:

“Instead of large multi-family residential buildings that would distract from the small-town charm of Chesapeake Beach (and the ever-shrinking views of its natural beauty), please consider projects that would add to the small-town charm of the area, be financially lucrative to developers, and promote small business growth (instead of residential growth). A plaza, instead of the proposed massive apartment building, would be a welcomed addition. It could be a place where residents (and visitors) could get a cup of coffee, an ice cream cone, or a treat from a bakery, and enjoy it on nicely landscaped patios with seating. Perhaps that would also give the mostly empty parking garage some good use.”

The following comments remain for discussion (distilled / abbreviated):

- A. Written comments received from Jeff Foltz, Cindy Greengold and Chris Jakubiak.
- B. Town Business Public Comments, the Nov 9th Public Hearing comments, and the Comments provided by Maryland State, and by Calvert County, etc. The Town Zoning Administrator, Chris Jakubiak, has provided a spreadsheet dated Dec 21, 2021, organizing these comments by source, including his recommendations. (attached separately). It provides additional detail to the summary below.

A. WRITTEN COMMENTS:

Jeff Foltz

* p.85-86, how does the the plan reconcile the statements in “consider a land use pattern that encourages multiple housing types, at varying densities” while proposing to restrict housing types, locations and heights?

* p.92 Delete: “However, a significant expansion of the Rod-n-Reel Resort is currently underway and the effect this will have on capacity constraints along Bayside Road is not yet know (sic).” And replace with “As part of the Rod-n-Reel Resort expansion project submission, the owner conducted traffic studies, as required by Maryland State Highway Administration. Those traffic studies did not forecast a degradation in the service level of the intersection of MD 261 and Mears Avenue. It is also noteworthy that between 2000 and 2020, a 20-year period of substantial growth in town population, the average annual daily traffic count along MD Routes 260 and 261 only increased by roughly 1100 trips.”

* p. 109, given the restrictive nature of this Plan, what incentive/s does a developer have for beginning a development that enhances “community facilities commensurate with the expected impact of the proposed project.”?

Cindy Greengold:

* Recommends adding this objective to the Housing Chapter:

“Infill development should be constructed to promote a small-town charm. Residents should feel safe, secure and know their neighbors, and be confident that neighboring structures will have a size, design and appeal that is similar to surrounding buildings.”

Chris Jakubiak:

- 1) A 200-acre forested area south of the developed portion of Richfield Station that is protected from any development by a deed of conservation. Mr. Jakubiak will propose a revision to Map 13, Future Land Use Map, to insert a symbol on the parcel indicating its protected status and text explaining it.

- 2) Provide added or revised text for Chapter 5 that will describe the protective status of the main open spaces that surrounds the Town's large residential subdivisions such as Richfield Station.
- 3) Provide a new map or revise the existing land use map to show the Town's existing critical area boundary and its three critical area zones and add text to describe what the Critical area is.
- 4) Will urge the Commission to reconsider its wording adopted on page 66 of the Plan which says in effect, that the Town would allow low impact recreational and commercial activities through the "Town's Growth and Allocation Method".
- 5) Encourage the Commission to revise a statement which is under the heading "Plans for Vulnerability Zones".

B. TOWN ZONING ADMINISTRATOR'S RECOMMENDATIONS in response to ALL OTHER COMMENTS FROM (see SPREADSHEET):

NOTE: Maryland Department of Planning's comments suggest that the Commission's Draft Plan intentionally constrains the number of residencies that could be built in Town. MDP concern's would be addressed, in part, through the recommendations below that encourage a more flexible land use plan, structured to allow a modest amount new housing development where it can safely and compatibly be planned.

Eric Blitz, Mary Lanham and Wes Donovan:

- (1) Apply the RV-2 land use category to the Stinnetts Place property so that the land might be developed in either single-family detached or single-family attached like the townhouses neighboring the property.
- (2) Allow flexibility in the application of height limits so alternative housing types (where permitted) can be provided to meet the needs for apartments, condominiums, and senior housing provided such housing would not create incompatible relationships with adjoining uses.
- (3) As a matter of planning policy, the Plan could leave open the possibility of housing at the intersection of Harbor Road at Bayside Road where sea level and flooding risks are not significant and where supporting commercial uses, boat slips, and public infrastructure are already in place.
- (4) If the Plan keeps its policy in favor of a 35-foot height limit, the Commission can consider a statement to the Town Council suggesting it reserve flexibility--at least in maritime and commercial zones--so that

flood protection elevations can be achieved while accommodating redevelopment and rebuilding as may be needed in the future.

- (5) re other comments: Maintain the Draft Plan's Resource Conservation (RC) designation on the southwestern tip of the Fishing Creek Marina property and maintain the Draft Plan's recommendations that low intensity and water-related non-residential use may continue there.

Anthony Olekson

- No Change to the land use plan map is recommended.
- "Property 1"; The current use that the Mr. Olekson is proposing for Commercial-Maritime, may continue under the Draft Plan.
- "Property 2", an existing / approved site plan includes a naturalized landscaped parking area for the commercial use, and continued use for commercial fishing activities; uses that are accommodated under the Plan's Resource Conservation designation.

Grant Soderstrom

- Recommend amending the section on Pg. 49 under "Activate the Board of Port Wardens" to include "raising stone revetments" among the list of shoreline protection actions.

Amanda Brown

- Suggest that the Implementation Chapter include a statement such as:

"During comprehensive rezoning and update of the Town's Zoning Map, each zoning map change should be accompanied by a statement of its consistency with the objectives of this Comprehensive Plan and that property owners be provided an opportunity to discuss the impact of the rezoning of their property with the Commission".

Ken Rasmussen (*note - proposed environmental study below was approved at the Nov 23rd Commission meeting*)

- Suggest adding this language to recommendations:

"Brownies Beach is the Town's only public beach providing direct water access to the Chesapeake Bay and access to a unique and sensitive environmental area. Like other shorelines, the viability of

Brownies Beach is under threat due to regular wave action and storm surge events all compounded by the rising levels of the Bay. As a natural shoreline however, it is largely unprotected. The Town should undertake an environmental study and plan to protect Brownies Beach and its natural and recreational amenities primarily using living shorelines techniques to extend its life as an essential community amenity”.

Maryland Department of Planning:

- Add recommendation: Since the plan says residents from Summer City regularly walk to Town, MDP suggests the Plan include a specific recommendation to address providing "the sidewalk from the south end of town to Summer City”.
- In the Implementation section add a reference to the "Reinvest Maryland Toolbox" which provides information on over 100 state and federal and technical assistance programs for community development.
- Fix - the statement on Pg. 21 of Appendix C (the Connectivity Study), that reads "all vegetation removal in [sic] the CBCA must be permitted".
- Include in the Implementation section -- coordination with the Calvert County Land Preservation, Parks and Recreation Plan.

Maryland Department of Environment

- Town planner needs to investigate the comment about Water Resources Element (WRE) and will revisit the County's WRE before commenting on how to address this comment.

Maryland Department of Transportation

- No changes recommended.

Maryland Department of Housing and Community Development

- No change. The issue of housing is addressed above with respect to MDP's comments.

Calvert County Planning Department

- Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance (APFO; p.112) paragraph - No change is needed; suggest that it include all the standard facilities "schools, parks, streets, water, and sewer.”

- Suggest that a reference to the County Land Preservation, Park and Recreation Plan (LPPRP) be included in the Implementation chapter as also suggested by MDP.
- No change to the Joint Planning Area. The referenced exhibit in the Plan shows a 3-mile radius only as a general and organizing concept. The actual boundary would be developed jointly by the three jurisdictions and should be based upon natural features and not arbitrary lines.



PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION NOVEMBER 23, 2021

- I. Commission Chair Larry Brown called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm. In attendance were Kathleen Berault, Laura Blackwelder, Cynthia Greengold, Jan Ruttkey, Commission Members, Christopher Jakubiak, Planning & Zoning Administrator, and Sharon Humm, Commission Clerk.

II. **Approval of the Planning & Zoning Agenda.**

MOTION: Commissioner Ruttkey moved to approve the November 23, 2021 Agenda as presented. Seconded by Commissioner Berault, all in favor.

III. **Approval of the minutes of the October 27, 2021 Planning & Zoning Commission meeting.**

MOTION: Commissioner Berault moved to approve the minutes of the October 27, 2021 Planning & Zoning meeting. Seconded by Commissioner Greengold, all in favor.

Commissioner Greengold noted for the record that the October 27, 2021 minutes reflect an approved motion to continue its regular Commission meeting after the November 9, 2021 Comprehensive Plan public hearing. For the record, this did not take place.

Approval of the minutes of the November 9, 2021 Comprehensive Plan Public Hearing.

MOTION: Commissioner Berault moved to approve the minutes of the November 9, 2021 Comprehensive Plan public hearing. Seconded by Commissioner Ruttkey, all in favor.

- IV. **Public Comment on any item on the agenda: Public comment will be accepted by dialing (301) 715-8592 and enter Meeting ID 869 755 7180. NOTE: There will be a 2-minute limit on comments received.** None Received.

- V. **Review and discuss public comments made or submitted during the 60-day draft Comprehensive Plan Update public review; amend Comprehensive Plan as necessary to address public concerns.**

Chairman Brown stated the 60-day public comment period has closed and the Commission will begin reviewing all comments received. Tonight's list consists of comments in the order they were received. **Note:** Tonight's list does not include Town Business public comments, comments from

the November 9th public hearing, or comments that were provided by Maryland State Planning, and Calvert County Planning. Those comments will be addressed in future meetings.

With submitted comments noting a number of editorial and typographical errors, and the misspelling of Randle Cliff in the Plan, Chairman Brown offered the following motion:

MOTION: Chairman Brown moved to accept the editorial and typographical comments as received and allow the Zoning Administrator to make those changes. Seconded by Commissioner Ruttkay, all in favor.

The Commission opened deliberation on the following public comments:

1. Susan Webster-Page – requests to leave her neighborhood as currently zoned RV and not change to the proposed RV2.

MOTION: Commissioner Blackwelder moved to approve keeping the current RV district, known as the Middle Subdivision, as RV1 and not change to the proposed RV2. Seconded by Commissioner Greengold. Ayes, Commissioner Blackwelder. Opposed, Commissioners Berault, Greengold, and Ruttkay. **Motion Fails.**

2. Keith Pardieck- Page 62 Proposed Land Use Map:2040 -
The Chesapeake Station HOA townhomes along 17th Street are zoned medium density; shouldn't they be High Density? **Commission agreed. Mr. Jakubiak will correct map to show that townhome section as HD to match with the rest of Chesapeake Station.**
Page 116 - mention PFAS issue with respect to water quality- **Commission agreed to add.**
Page 122 – 35-foot Height limit-why 35-foot? Commissioner Greengold addressed this.
Commission satisfied with decision of 35-foot.
3. Mercine Marshall – Correct spelling to read “Randle Cliff” in Plan. **Agreed.**
4. Ilonka Weida- Submitted through Town website without written comment.
5. Ken Rasmussen- (Green Team member)
IV. Natural Environment (page 38) – Strongly recommends that the Comprehensive Plan Recommendations include a Brownies Beach Environmental Survey, conducted by a “bayside” environmental firm committed to the softest-possible natural solutions (such as “living” shoreline techniques, beach-sand replenishment, etc.) to mitigate the rate at which Brownies Beach will decline in the decades ahead.

MOTION: Commissioner Berault moved to approve Mr. Rasmussen's recommendation for a Brownies Beach Environmental survey. Seconded by Commissioner Ruttkay, all in favor.

6. Melanie Crowder – (Green Team member)
IV. Natural Environment Page 47-48 – Recommends the Comprehensive Plan Recommendations include developing and implementing a plan to protect and sustain the current native vegetation and trees in parks and public spaces; and a structured plan and timeline to

eliminate invasive plant species and replace them with native species in Town parks, and publicly owned spaces. **Commission agreed to include in the recommendations.**

7. Mark Giangliulo – Recommends the Comprehensive Plan include:
-Provisions that encourage a variety of housing types, including, affordable apartments and senior housing. **Commission feels this has been addressed in the RV2 section of Town.**

8. Madeleine Blake – Recommends adding the following comment to the Transportation Section:
*Patrons of Calvert County Public Transportation (CCPT) will benefit from some form of bus shelter while waiting for the bus. The busiest stop is on MD261 near the existing Twin Beach Library. **The Commission agreed.** Mr. Jakubiak will incorporate a recommendation in the Transportation section, under “Coordinate with Calvert County to ensure continued Transit and Paratransit” that would promote amenities that make it easier and more convenient such as bus shelters at busy stops.

9. Susan Alexander - Implement a plan to protect and sustain the current native vegetation and trees in parks and public spaces; and a plan and timeline to eliminate invasive plant species and replace them with native species **The Commission agreed.** Incorporate Ms. Alexander’s comments/recommendations with Ms. Crowder’s recommendation.
The Commission also recommended including a survey of Randle Cliff to Mr. Rasmussen’s recommendation of a Brownies Beach environmental survey.

10. Jeff Foltz –
Municipal Growth– Page 19 – states “Routes 260 and 261 require traffic solutions” and “adding additional pressure to existing infrastructure, an expansive (commercial) intensification...”
“parking will be further burdened”. Suggest providing studies to support this comment. **There are none.**

Page 23 - too restrictive- recommends commercial-residential mixed use in the maritime district and permitting other housing types (example townhomes and duplexes) besides single family homes in Residential Village areas. **Commission discussed; no action taken.**

Page 25-recommends including “Windy Hill Elementary School” to the “Two Towns side by side” section. **Commission agreed.**

Page 74 - Reconsider the second bullet and delete referring to “piers and docks” because they already undergo a rigorous permitting process and substitute a different term than “public safety” that relates better to the concern of rising sea level and erosion of the coastline. **Commission agreed. Mr. Jakubiak will revise.**

Housing - Page 78 - provide an explanation of how the planned restrictive changes to the zoning districts is consistent with the statement “restrictive zoning rules over time worsen affordability”? **Commission discussed but did not reach consensus.**

Page 79- what are the projections for the demand for affordable and workforce housing, and what is the plan for continuing to meet the better than average metrics? **Commission discussed but did not reach consensus.**

Page 85-86, how does the plan reconcile the statements in “consider a land use pattern that encourages multiple housing types, at varying densities” while proposing to restrict housing types, locations, and heights? **The Commission tabled this and will revisit.**

VI. Public Comment- None received.

VII. Adjournment:

There being no further comments, Chairman Brown moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:50 pm. Seconded by Commissioner Ruttkay, all in favor.

Submitted by,

Sharon L. Humm
Commission Clerk

Note: This meeting can be viewed in its entirety on the Town website on the Planning Commission page www.chesapeakebeachmd.gov.



Note: This comment summary list includes those who provided comments in writing and/or in person at the public hearing on Nov. 9, 2021 -- that were not otherwise included on the Chairman's initial meeting agenda.

Name of Commenter	Comments	Town Planner's Recommendation	Planning Commission Action
<p>Eric Blitz, Esq. for Rod-n-Reel (at hearing and in writing)</p>	<p>The comments are far reaching and include the writer's view of recent Town planning history including the development of the modern day Fishing Creek Marina. The comments include a review of mapping from the Draft Plan and descriptions of development projects that the Rod-n-Reel proposed. The letter's main thrust is the Draft is a major departure from the currently adopted plan and zoning code. More specific comment are noted below.</p> <p>Opposed to the recommendation for a 35-foot height limit.</p> <p>Opposed to the Plan's policy prohibiting housing, and multi-family housing specifically, in the marina areas.</p> <p>Critical of dividing the commercial areas into four distinct zones.</p> <p>Opposed to RC land use designation on the south-west portion of the Rod-n-Reel property at Fishing Creek Marina.</p> <p>Critical of the sea level rise mapping used for planning purposes in the draft Plan and the planning guidance provided about it.</p> <p>Opposed to the land use designation for the Stinnett Property (i.e. the "building pads" on MD Route 261) that would prevent townhouses there since the Property lies adjacent to other townhouses and the land had previously been raised in coordinating with area infrastructure and the elevation of the MD Route 261.</p>	<p>(1) Apply the RV-2 land use category to the Stinnetts Place property so that the land might be developed in either single-family detached or single-family attached like the townhouses adjoining the property. There are no compatibility issues here, the lots front MD Route 261 which has been elevated, and the site's relatively lower risks of sea level rise can be mitigated. Further, townhouse development would allow a better arrangement of open space and stormwater management than many separate single-family lots allowing an opportunity to incorporate further flood resilience into development. (2) Allow flexibility in the application of height limits so alternative housing types (where permitted) can be provided to meet the needs for apartments, condominiums, and senior housing provided such housing would not create incompatible relationships with adjoining uses. A good example of such a location is along Cox Road in the location of the proposed "Home Place" development planned for the RV-2 zone. (3) As a matter of planning policy, the Plan could leave open the possibility of housing at the intersection of Harbor Road at Bayside Road where sea level and flooding risks are not significant and where supporting commercial uses, boat slips, and public infrastructure are already in place. If the concern is about high density housing, the Plan could allow for lower scale housing that complements the Town's appeal to boating and maritime tourism, improving the Town's assessable base and helping to create a walkable vibrant maritime area. There's no policy basis in the Draft Plan for a land use category that prevents a reasonable amount of housing in this area which has long been part of a planned mixed use center. (4) If the Plan keeps its policy in favor of a 35-foot height limit, the Commission can consider a statement that signals the Town Council ought to reserve flexibility--at least in maritime and commercial zones--so that flood protection elevations can be achieved while accommodating redevelopment and rebuilding as may be needed in the future. I understand that the above four recommendations depart somewhat from the otherwise strict statements in the Plan, but each recommendation is consistent with the overall goals and vision of the Draft Plan. (5) Concerning other comments: Maintain the Draft Plan's Resource Conservation (RC) designation on the southwestern tip of the Fishing Creek Marina property and maintain the Draft Plan's recommendations that low intensity and water-related non-residential use may continue there. This area is low lying and subject to severe flooding and inundation.</p>	
<p>Mary Lanham, representing Rod-n-Reel and Donovan Family</p>	<p>Notes the Plan changes development prospects of property and "over-turns" private real estate plans. Notes that the Plan opposes housing and the variety of housing types that had been planned for a long time in locations where amenities are located.</p>		
<p>Wes Donovan, representing Rod-n-Reel and Donovan Family</p>	<p>Reviewed some of the history of the Town's development including the Creek and building the Fishing Creek Bridge, indicating positive change can happen over time.</p>		
<p>Anthony M. Oleskon, P.E. for Abners</p>	<p>The comments focus on land use designations in the Draft Plan (see Map 13) for the several parcels that comprise the Abner Property. Included are exhibits of the properties that comprise the Abner Property. The commenter's exhibit shows through distinct "properties" that comprise the Abner Property.</p> <p>Recommends that Resource Conservation be removed from a portion of "property 1" and that this portion be designated Commercial-Maritime .</p> <p>Recommends that Resource Conservation be removed from "property 2" and that it be Commercial-Maritime.</p>	<p>No Change to the land use plan map is recommended. Both "property 1" and "property 2" are low-lying and subject to severe flooding and inundation, with a 10% annual probability of inundation by 2050. The current use of that portion of the parcel designated "property 1", that the Mr. Oleskon is proposing for Commercial-Maritime, may continue under the Draft Plan. The Draft Plan's RC land use designation is not meant to prevent the continuation of existing or the initiation of such new low intensity water-related uses. Regarding the parcel designated "property 2", the owner has not improved this parcel per an approved site plan which called for a naturalized landscaped parking area for the commercial use of other parts of the Property. This section continues in use for commercial fishing activities primarily; uses that are accommodated under the Plan's recommended RC designation.</p>	
<p>Grant Soderstrum, 8337 Bay Crest, President Bay Crest Property Owners Assoc.</p>	<p>Commenter focuses on wave action at revetments at Bay Crest. Notes that waves are over the stone revetments. Raising the revetments would also address sea level rise.</p>	<p>While the Draft Plan is not as detailed as to specify the type of shoreline protection to be used in any given location, it does recommend that the Town reconstitute the Board of Port Wardens to provide municipal guidance over shoreline work to promote needed coordination within larger areas subject to sea level rise. Suggest amending the section on Pg. 49 under "Activate the Board of Port Wardens" to include "raising stone revetments" among the list of shoreline protection actions.</p>	
<p>Amenda Brown, at 7537 H St.</p>	<p>Suggests that every zoning change should have an attached document that describes the impact. Notes that the Plan does not adhere to the 12 Visions required by Maryland statute. She said she would provide reasons for this conclusion and more information in writing, but the Town has not received anything in writing.</p>	<p>Suggest that the Implementation Chapter include a statement such as: "During comprehensive rezoning and update of the Town's Zoning Map, each zoning map change should be accompanied by a statement of its consistency with the objectives of this Comprehensive Plan and that property owners be provided an opportunity to discuss the impact of the rezoning of their property with the Commission".</p>	

<p>Ken Rasmussen, 4020 12 St. representing self and Green Team</p>	<p>Brownie's Beach is being impacted by natural erosive effects of waves and tide and with a rising sea level the beach will be increasingly challenged. The Green Team asks that there be a plan to sustain the Beach. Suggests that the Draft Plan include a recommendation that an environmental survey/study/plan be done that would address the role of soft naturalized solutions to extend the useful life of the Beach. Comments are commendatory about Plan's protection of Brownie's Beach and adjoining Natural Heritage Area.</p>	<p>Suggest adding this requested recommendation: "Brownies Beach is the Town's only public beach providing direct water access to the Chesapeake Bay and access to a unique and sensitive environmental area. Like other shorelines, the viability of Brownies Beach is under threat due to regular wave action and storm surge events all compounded by the rising levels of the Bay. As a natural shoreline however, it is largely unprotected. The Town should undertake an environmental study and plan to protect Brownies Beach and its natural and recreational amenities primarily using living shorelines techniques to extend its life as an essential community amenity".</p>	
<p>Maryland Department of Planning</p>	<p>The MDP letter is largely commendatory. It includes a number of non-substantive and technical comments that the town planner is working through, some of which will trigger minor editing refinements. The main focus area for actual suggestions is housing planning, as indicated below.</p> <p>"Planning (i.e. MDP) supports the preservation and conservation of resources but also suggests a balance between the two in meeting the need for affordable housing in the community.</p> <p>"Planning reiterates the suggestion for the town to balance the desire for measured growth with the need for affordable housing."</p> <p>"... however the town should consider balancing any needs for annexation with the objective to increase density within existing developed areas".</p> <p>"Planning commends the Plan's attention to the supply of affordable housing...but suggests that the town also consider direct assistance to homebuyers, renters, and landlords".</p> <p>"Planning suggests further evaluating housing strategies and the growth element to expand the existing supply of housing types in the community and to consider allowing accessory dwelling units as integrated into existing single-family detached units or as separate and distinct units on a property".</p> <p>"As mentioned elsewhere in this review, the Plan's recommendation to restrict residential capacity through zoning changes (pages 23,68) may limit the town's ability to meet the housing supply needs of existing and future residents, particularly low-income and workforce households".</p> <p>"To meet the Plan's stated objective to... , the town may want to consider other strategies ... inclusionary zoning, adjusting zoning to allow for missing middle housing product in the single-family zones, and allowing for small multi-family development in the R-MD zone".</p> <p>"...not all housing varieties are supported across the multiple land use designations" (Table 4 in Chapter 5.)</p> <p>"The plan proposes to eliminate duplexes, townhouses, and multi-family housing types in certain land use and zoning categories for the purpose of promoting compatibility in existing neighborhoods...". "Planning suggest that the town reassess the land use recommendations and evaluate if the recommendations are aligned with the housing goals and objectives in Chapter VI.</p> <p>"Keeping a variety of housing options may help the town address housing affordability in a long term (sic)".</p>	<p>The Commission's Draft Plan does intentionally set out to constrain the number of residencies that could be built in Town by changing zoning categories to eliminate the potential for housing altogether in areas long planned for it (Maritime and Commercial, for example) and suggesting amendments to the Zoning Ordinance to eliminate non single family housing types from other areas where they have been allowed (RV-1 and RC). In previous drafts and at meetings, I've encouraged the Commission to keep options open for a modest amount of new housing especially to facilitate accessory apartments and duplexes where they have long been allowed, but the Commission has worked through the matter and arrived at the Plan as drafted. Fully embracing MDP's many suggestions would mean reversing much of the Commission's recommended policy guidance on land use and housing. If the Commission wishes to undertake the re-evaluation suggested by MDP, I can assist by supplying previous drafts, documents, and presentations on the topic. However, within the context of the Draft Plan as written, the Town Council could still implement thoughtful zoning changes that would encourage housing options like duplexes and accessory apartments in the residential zoning districts. MDP may not know that accessory apartments are permitted in all residential zones and the Plan does not recommended changing that. Townhouses, duplexes and multi-family housing types would still be allowed within the RV-2 zone; albeit a much smaller area than presently existing. MDP also does not have the benefit of evaluating the R-MD zoning district itself and the significant limitations on even modest density increases created by substandard roadway widths and grades, lack of on-street parking, and the limiting effects of very high relief topography on existing residential lots. MDP's concerns would be addressed, at least in part, through the recommendations noted above in this table which encourage a more flexible land use plan structured to allow a modest amount new housing development where it can safely and compatibly be planned.</p>	
	<p>Since the plan says residents from Summer City regularly walk to Town, MDP "suggests the Plan include a specific recommendation to address providing "the sidewalk from the south end of town to Summer City".</p>	<p>Suggest this be added as a recommendation</p>	

	<p>Re: Implementation : Planning suggests referencing the "Reinvest Maryland Toolbox" which provides information on over 100 state and federal and technical assistance programs for community development.</p> <p>Concerning Pg. 21 of Appendix C (the Connectivity Study), consider fixing the statement that reads "all vegetation removal in [sic] the CBCA must be permitted".</p> <p>Re: Implementation -- Include coordination with the Calvert County Land Preservation, Parks and Recreation Plan.</p>	<p>Suggest this be added.</p> <p>Suggest this be fixed or at least clarified.</p> <p>Suggest this be added.</p>	
Maryland Dept of Environment (MDE)	MDE's comments are generic and generally not applicable and/or non-actionable, except for last paragraph on the topic of Water Resources wherein MDE recommends updating data from the last Water Resources Element (WRE).	Town planner needs to investigate the comment about Water Resources Element (WRE) and will revisit the County's WRE before commenting on how to address this comment.	
Maryland Dept of Transportation (MDOT)	MDOT's comments are all commendatory.	No change.	
Maryland Dept. of Housing and Community Development MHCD)	DHCD suggests the Plan add explanatory text related to some demographic data such as unemployment, household income; ask what is Town's plan for addressing school capacity, and suggests the Town reconsider single-family zoning in favor of high density housing and restricting development in flood prone areas.	No change. The issue of housing is addressed above with respect to MDP's comments.	
Calvert County Planning Dept.	<p>Suggests the draft plan's section on APFO include a reference to school facilities.</p> <p>Encourages the Town to participate in the County Land Preservation, Park and Recreation Plan which is maintained by the County.</p> <p>Like the State, the County Planning Dept. commends the Commission for the joint planning idea and northeast sector planning study but suggests the planning area should be drawn based on natural features rather than a generalized radius that cuts through such features.</p>	<p>No change is needed as a future Town Council will decide what type of facilities to include in an AFPO if one were drafted and adopted. However, if the Commission where to consider a change here, suggest that the referenced paragraph include all the standard faculties "schools, parks, streets, water, and sewer facilities.</p> <p>Suggest that a reference to the LPPRP be included in the Implementation chapter as also suggested by MDP.</p> <p>No change. The referenced exhibit in the Plan shows a 3 mile radius only as a general and organizing concept. The actual boundary for joint planning would be developed jointly by the three jurisdictions.</p>	