

2010 GRASONVILLE COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE
 PLANNING COMMISSION
 PUBLIC HEARING OF SEPTEMBER 9, 2010
 COMMENT SUMMARY TABLE WITH PLANNING COMMISSION DECISIONS, OCTOBER 14, 2010

Speaker	Issue	Draft Plan Excerpts	PC Decision
1(a) Barry Waterman (Written comments)	<p>There are a number of items that lack definition or explanation, such as `existing neighborhood_`, `neighborhoods_` and `manufactured home_` that as a real estate broker with 26 years of local experience I am unclear on exactly what they mean in the context of Grasonville or in some cases in any context. How they are defined could have significant impact on the application of this plan in the future.</p> <p>As a specific example, there are numerous references to `existing neighborhoods_` and `neighborhoods_` throughout the plan. On page 4-1A.a. the plan speaks to restricting infill growth by rezoning neighborhoods. This paragraph goes on to say that residents of an NC zoned neighborhood would have the right by consensus to change the NC designation and that the County should `consult with each neighborhood_` The obvious problem is what constitutes a neighborhood so that individuals and county staff will know what geographic area and who to talk to. Simply put, there are few definable neighborhoods in Grasonville. The plan needs to either define what constitutes a neighborhood, map them, or replace the term with something that has obvious meaning not left to various interpretation.</p>	<p>A. EXISTING RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBORHOODS</p> <p>To achieve the planning objectives for existing residential neighborhoods the following actions are recommended. These recommendations apply to properties designated as "Existing Residential/Infill Development" on the Land Use Concept (Figure 11).</p> <p>a. Rezone existing neighborhoods to a more appropriate zoning classification in cases where the current zoning would allow for more intensive infill development than the actual density of the existing neighborhood. This situation applies primarily to neighborhoods currently zoned Neighborhood Conservation NC-8 (8,000 square foot minimum lot size or approximately 1/5 acre) where the lot sizes of existing homes average 20,000 square feet (approximately 1/2 acre) or larger. By rezoning these neighborhoods to NC-15 or NC-20 (15,000 or 20,000 square foot minimum lot size or approximately 1/3 to 1/2 acre), the objective is to preserve their existing character by prohibiting subdivision that would allow for more intensive infill development (homes on 8,000 square foot lots). Rezonings of this nature should be contingent upon the elimination of new flag lots and the establishment of a minimum lot width, consistent with the average lot width of the NC zone or area. Conversely, if the residents of an NC zoned neighborhood agree that the current zoning designation and density is too low, they should have by consensus the option to change the NC zoning in their neighborhood to allow for additional subdivision lots. Either way, the County should consult with each neighborhood to evaluate the appropriateness of the current zoning and gauge community consensus for changes to the zoning.</p>	See deleted text
1(b) Barry Waterman (continued)	<p>The term manufactured home is used in b. on page 4-2 in a manner that I would be unable to explain to any real estate client. `Single wide manufactured homes_` I believe meaning what is commonly called a mobile home are discouraged. This paragraph expands the confusion by in 3rd from last sentence stating `Double wide manufactured homes should continue as a by-right permitted use` _ Yet in the last sentence is stated, `Some neighborhoods may desire to keep their existing ability to allow new double wide manufactured homes_`. These statements are in conflict. Further, is it that a home is constructed off site, or that it is 12 feet wide and has a nearly flat roof and metal siding that is objectionable? There are stick built homes in Grasonville with vinyl siding that look just like mobile homes, and there are mobile homes with additions that now look just like a</p>	<p>b. Discontinue permitting single-wide manufactured homes by-right in existing Neighborhood Conservation (NC) districts in Grasonville. In many of the NC districts in Grasonville, single-wide manufactured homes are permitted by-right (on the zoning maps these districts are identified with a "T" designation, see Figures 6 and 7). These types of homes are generally not a preferred housing type for County-designated growth areas, because they are not conducive to overall neighborhood stabilization/revitalization and conservation of property values. Single-wide manufactured homes should be permitted as a conditional use for replacements only, and not permitted otherwise in these NC districts. Double-wide manufactured</p>	See deleted text

Speaker	Issue	Draft Plan Excerpts	PC Decision
1(b) Barry Waterman (continued)	custom home. I assert that manufactured is not a commonly defined term in relation to housing; nor is how a home is constructed, but what it looks like and what it is made of that makes it objectionable or attractive.	homes should continue as a by-right permitted use in all residential zoning districts. Again, evaluation of the appropriateness of allowing new manufactured homes in various NC district neighborhoods should be done with input from the neighborhood. Some neighborhoods may desire to keep their existing ability to allow new double wide manufactured homes.	
1(c) Barry Waterman (continued)	As a growth area it seems inappropriate to downzone properties to ½ acre zoning from NC8 when state smart growth criteria set 3.5 units to the acre as a minimum. Not maintaining or increasing density as possible in growth areas will eventually mean using more land elsewhere for growth that could have been much `smarter`.	a. Rezone existing neighborhoods to a more appropriate zoning classification in cases where the current zoning would allow for more intensive infill development than the actual density of the existing neighborhood. This situation applies primarily to neighborhoods currently zoned Neighborhood Conservation NC-8 (8,000 square foot minimum lot size or approximately 1/5 acre) where the lot sizes of existing homes average 20,000 square feet (approximately 1/2 acre) or larger. By rezoning these neighborhoods to NC-15 or NC-20 (15,000 or 20,000 square foot minimum lot size or approximately 1/3 to 1/2 acre), the objective is to preserve their existing character by prohibiting subdivision that would allow for more intensive infill development (homes on 8,000 square foot lots). Rezonings of this nature should be contingent upon the elimination of new flag lots and the establishment of a minimum lot width, consistent with the average lot width of the NC zone or area.	No change
1(d) Barry Waterman (continued)	4-2 d. Rental apartments are absolutely needed in QAC. I believe that the plan is incorrect that reducing rental opportunity stabilizes a community. To the contrary, lack of rental opportunity destabilizes our community by forcing our young adults to move elsewhere where they can afford and find an apartment, restricts housing for people who work in lower paying jobs, restricts opportunity for those on fixed income, and results in longer commutes and more traffic. Beyond this, the requirement of accessory apartments to have an owner occupied primary residence is a recipe for problems. Joe and Mary build an apartment for their sonŭ who gets married and moves to his own homeŭ they rent itŭ they get older and move to a retirement home. At that point under this plan they could not rent their home - only sell their home to an owner occupant. At the time they move to the retirement home, they would have to kick out any existing tenant, or would have to leave both the apartment and home empty to be in compliance with this section. It would be OK to require owner occupancy at the time of construction of the accessory apartment - but that requirement should not be a permanent restriction.	d. Tightly limit the conversion of existing single-family homes, within exclusively residentially zoned neighborhoods, into rental apartments. The objective is to encourage neighborhood stability by maintaining a high rate of owner occupancy. As an exception, the creation of a single accessory rental apartment should be permitted as a conditional use with the requirement that the principal residence must be owner-occupied. This would allow the creation of needed affordable housing units, while at the same time assuring that the property would not be under the responsibility of an absentee landlord. Accessory guest residences and apartments for live-in relatives should also continue to be allowed by-right.	No change
1(e) Barry Waterman (continued)	4-3 Grasonville Neighborhood Commercial 1 st paragraph - states that `all single family detached housing typesŭ and attached duplexes (each unit on and individual lot) should be permitted. _ Pinewood Landing is a duplex community and while each pair of homes is on a separate lot, each unit is not on a separate lot. Thus this section would make those 16 homes non-conforming. That would have serious consequences on those owners, their ability to expand or remodel, or their ability to sell or refinance their homes.	<i>Grasonville Neighborhood Commercial</i> The Grasonville Neighborhood Commercial (GNC) zoning district extends from Perry's Corner Road westward to the commercially zoned area at the intersection of Rt. 18 and US 50/301. The area should support mixed use residential and commercial, with a greater emphasis on residential. In general, this area should have a predominantly single-family residential appearance and character. All single-family detached housing types, exclusive of single-wide manufactured homes, and attached duplexes (each unit on an individual lot) should be permitted. Other types of multi-family housing such as apartments and townhouses would not be appropriate.	See deleted text

Speaker	Issue	Draft Plan Excerpts	PC Decision
1(f) Barry Waterman (continued)	4-4 paragraph 1 ~ new and re-development will require gabled roofs. There are many non-gabled roofs in Grasonville. Should Willards or Parks service station (or any number of other buildings) be required to install a new roof design if they want to expand or remodel? I suggest this wording be changed to `should be required encouraged`	<p><i>Main Street Design</i></p> <p>Within the Grasonville Village Center (GVC) section of Main Street, buildings should be located close to the street with parking on the sides and rear of buildings. Shared and interconnected parking areas should be encouraged. Pedestrian walkways and landscaped areas should be provided between the front facade of buildings and the sidewalk/street. Design guidelines should be developed and applied to ensure that new development and redevelopment is compatible with the traditional small town character. Gabled roofs and screening of mechanical equipment and service areas should be required <u>for new construction and encouraged for expansions or remodeling</u>. Business signs should be restrained in size and oriented to pedestrian and slow moving vehicular traffic.</p>	Add underlined text
1(g) Barry Waterman (continued)	4-5 g. I believe the PC voted to add this already ~ but I did not see it in the draft issued for 60 day review ~ Utility poles should be relocated away from existing intersections by Delmarva Power`	<p>g. Utilities. To the extent practical, utility poles should be consolidated and any overhead service connections to structures should be buried in conjunction with the road and associated underground utility improvements. The size and scale of the new utility poles installed by regional power providers are out of character for the community. Alternatives to larger and taller power poles should be considered. New utility poles that are out of character for the community are discouraged, especially along Main Street. Any necessary sewer and water line improvements under the road should be made in conjunction with the road improvements to avoid future disturbance/ reconstruction of the road. <u>Utility poles should be relocated away from existing intersections by regional power providers.</u></p>	See underlined text
1(h) Barry Waterman (continued)	4-6 .b. I suggest that before we screen or buffer multi-family units from single family we might want to drive through Gibson's Grant, where townhomes are intermixed with single family and look great and integrate the community instead of segregating it.	<p>C. PLANNED NEW NEIGHBORHOODS</p> <p>The Grasonville Planned Residential Neighborhood Development (GPRN) zoning district is intended to help integrate planned new neighborhoods into the existing community fabric of buildings, streets and open space. This district applies to the few remaining undeveloped residentially zoned tracts. Characteristics of this district include:</p> <p>a. Intent. The GPRN designation is intended to provide environmentally-sensitive design, architectural integration to ensure a unified and coherent plan of development, and functional community open spaces and recreation areas.</p> <p>b. Housing types. A variety of housing types should be permitted provided at least 75 percent of the total housing units are single-family detached. Multi-family units should generally be screened or buffered from adjacent single-family neighborhoods.</p>	No change

Speaker	Issue	Draft Plan Excerpts	PC Decision
1(i) Barry Waterman (continued)	4-7 c. I believe the PC also voted to change this, but it still appears on the 60 day review copy in the original format – there is no reason to permit only these farming activities. If the intent is to prohibit chicken houses or hog feed lots, that should be done, but to allow only crops, nurseries, forestry and stables would prohibit vineyards, aquaculture, and many other agricultural uses that are not objectionable.	c. Other permitted uses. The following agricultural uses should be permitted in this zone on properties that meet the definition of a farm: cultivation of crops, nurseries, forestry and commercial or private stables. Institutional uses are also acceptable.	No change
1(j) Barry Waterman (continued)	4-7 e. Overall gross residential density of a site should be no more than 3.5 du per acre. Smart growth standard is 3.5 per acre minimum. Particularly if, as pointed out earlier, the plan will seek to reduce capacity in other areas of the growth area, then new GPRN should be encouraged, if not required, to reach beyond 3.5 so that the result is real smart growth.	e. Density calculations and performance standards. Net density calculations, resource protection ratios and other aspects of the County's Performance Zoning Ordinance which restrict design creativity should not apply in this district. Overall gross residential density of a site should be no more than 3.5 dwelling units per acre. Modest density bonuses of up to 25 percent should be provided if Transferable Development Rights (TDRs) from elsewhere in the County are used.	No Change
1(k) Barry Waterman (continued)	4.8 j. Fiscal Impact. New GPRN development should not have to demonstrate a positive fiscal impact to the County. This requirement could prohibit the creation of apartment buildings, workforce housing, senior housing, assisted living facilities, and other development that could have a positive impact on the County, the county's population, or the population's quality of life but may not be fiscally positive. This section should be removed.	j. Fiscal Impact. These types of developments should be able to demonstrate a positive fiscal impact to the County and should not be approved unless it is proven to the satisfaction of the County that adequate public facilities are either in place or planned for construction.	No Change
2(a) Dave Letke (Public Hearing and written comments)	Thanked the Planning Commissioners for excluding the expansion area and stated that he was a resident of Wye Harbor for 15 year and expressed concerns about the health of the Wye River. Commented that the expansion area would extend Grasonville close to Moose Lodge in Queenstown. Mr. Letke stated that he supported the construction of the Emergency Room but expanding the area further was not a direction for Grasonville and expressed an ethical concern with the participation of a property owner on the Task Force.		No Change
2(b) Dave Letke (continued)	<p>Mr. Letke provided the following written comments:</p> <p>I am a resident of the Wye Harbor development off Bennett Point road and although I have a Queenstown zip code, Grasonville boundaries are adjacent to our development. I attended the last meeting of the Grasonville Planning Task Force on July 21 and have several comments about their proposal to extend the Grasonville growth area.</p> <p>I understand from the task force that there was no public comment allowed on the expansion plan and their original proposal was not to be included in the QAC overall plan, but the task force was asked to go back and review their proposal for inclusion in the final document. I believe there should be public comment on any plan with the potential impacts that the growth area expansion could have and I have provided several items of concern for your consideration.</p> <p>The inclusion of the growth zones into Grasonville extends the town east to a point that simply makes no sense. Geographically, Grasonville's new growth area, if adopted,</p>		No Change

Speaker	Issue	Draft Plan Excerpts	PC Decision
	spreads the town out to an unrealistic appendage.		
2(c) Dave Letke (continued)	While I realize that no traffic study has been done on the proposed expansion areas, during the meeting I cited the traffic and subsequent safety concerns that would certainly develop, and quite frankly, the feedback from the task force was disappointing. Just yesterday, Saturday 7/24, Rte 50 eastbound to the beach was backed up all day past the Kent Narrows bridge as it usually does during the summer. East bound travelers started diverting to eastbound Rte 18 at the narrows and every other exit before the Rte 50 and 301 split to the point that eastbound Rte 18 was backed up past Bennett Point Road trying to get onto Rte 50 at the outlets. This is not unusual during the summer months and was summarily dismissed by the task force as not being a concern.		No Change
2(d) Dave Letke (continued)	The new emergency center is a welcome addition to our county. It will increase traffic on Rte 18 both eastbound and westbound without any additional development, but again, this was dismissed as questions were asked of the task force. Several attendees proposed the growth area be limited to the property north of Rte 18 and west of the emergency center, past the circle on Nesbit road continuing west to the current Grasonville community center. That tract has more than ample acreage for commercial development and like phase 2 and phase 3 of the ER, could comprise multi story buildings.		No Change
2(e) Dave Letke (continued)	The issue of Queenstown's growth planning was also raised as an issue because the Grasonville expansion gets very close or could touch Queenstown, resulting in a commercial corridor that would include the ER and any related development with the current retail outlets and the proposed development of Wheatland Farms. While I understand Wheatlands cannot currently be developed without an overpass over Rte 50, all of the proposed expansion areas from Grasonville and Queenstown focus on land adjacent to the headwaters of the Wye River which cannot sustain any additional runoff. Storm water issues will become a part of either of these proposals and the Wye River will ultimately end up as the casualty. Please do not allow any additional deterioration of what is quite possibly the most scenic river on the Chesapeake Bay.	<i>Note: The Planning Area Expansion recommended by the Grasonville Task Group was not included in the Planning Commission 60-day review draft Grasonville Plan.</i>	No Change
2(f) Dave Letke (continued)	The property east of the current emergency center and north of Rte 18 that is included in the expansion plan was discussed. Apparently this property is currently a `buffer_ zone between Grasonville and Queenstown. When the task force was asked about this tract, they replied that they thought Grasonville should annex it before Queenstown did the same. This reasoning makes no sense other than it sounds like a `land grab_ maneuver. Keeping a buffer between two towns seems like a smart thing to maintain.		No Change
2(g) Dave Letke (continued)	The tract west of Bennett Point Road and south of Rte 18 was discussed and attendees were told it currently requires 20+ acres per house, however a sewer connection under Rte 18 would certainly make a zoning change possible to high density housing and create even more traffic. We were also told that the tract west of the emergency center, past the Nesbit road circle was actually currently zoned residential and would require a zoning change to develop convenience stores, retail or office uses.		No Change

Speaker	Issue	Draft Plan Excerpts	PC Decision
2(h) Dave Letke (continued)	<p>Lastly, Mr. Price, a member of the Grasonville task force revealed that he either directly owns or has an interest in all of the tracts included in the growth zone expansion plan. While I understand that his inclusion on the task force is legal, it certainly appears to be a direct conflict of interest. This alone should render the proposed Grasonville growth plan invalid.</p> <p>I have listed the major concerns above that must be reviewed before any consideration is given to accept the growth plan proposed by the task force. There are other issues that should be included but I will save those for a time when public comment is requested.</p> <p>This plan is a bad idea with many unfavorable consequences that seem to have been overlooked or ignored by the task force.</p>		No change
3. Bryan Scott (Written Comments)	I am strongly against inclusion of the extra 44 acres and the 32 acres surrounding the new emergency room in the Grasonville Community Plan.	<i>Note: The Planning Area Expansion recommended by the Grasonville Task Group was not included in the Planning Commission 60-day review draft Grasonville Plan.</i>	No change
4(a) Maryland Department of Planning (Written Comments)	<p><u>General Comments on the Draft Comprehensive Plan</u></p> <p>It is unclear what the "Maryland Growth Management regulations" referred to on page 1-2 include. Please consider clarifying this phrase.</p>	There already exists a hierarchy of County and State plans and regulations which affect the future of the Grasonville area. Grasonville is designated as a "growth area" by the 2002 Queen Anne's County Comprehensive Plan. The County Comprehensive Plan conforms with the requirements of the Maryland Growth Management regulations	No change
4(b) MDP (continued)	Please note in the text about the purpose of the "Plan Area Expansion" depicted on Figure 1. We presume that this area refers to the new Emergency Facility and the proposed Mixed Use Concept Plan referred to on page 3-13.	The new Emergency Center requires an expansion to the Planning Area, which is proposed in the County's 2010 Comprehensive Plan update, as well as in this 2010 Grasonville Community Plan update. (Figure 1).	No change
4(c) MDP (continued)	<p><u>Comments on the Community Profile</u></p> <p>The County may wish to consider reorganizing the location of the tables in the final Plan so that the tables are on the same page as the text which discusses them.</p>		No change
4(d) MDP (continued)	The draft Plan refers to information regarding almost 60% of Queen Anne's County residents commuting to employment on the western shore. Is there any information available on the employment patterns in Grasonville, specifically local employment?	There continues to be a trend that newcomers to the County, still work on the Western Shore. Continued improvements to US 50/301 have made commuting over the Bay Bridge from places like Grasonville quite easy. In fact, 58% of the work force of Queen Anne's County was commuting over the Bridge in 2000. Another factor contributing to Grasonville's potential for future growth is the construction and visibility of the new Emergency Center at Nesbit Road.	No change
4(e) MDP (continued)	Of course, recognizing that new Census data is not available, some additional demographic information, including age, race and education of the current residents would help readers better understand the community profile.		No change

Speaker	Issue	Draft Plan Excerpts	PC Decision
4(f) MDP (continued)	<p>Comments on the Community Planning Issues</p> <p>It is unclear on page 3-2 whether the recently approved or pending subdivision proposals for 144 lots are within the Grasonville planning area or the Grasonville study area. The same is true with the following statement regarding a build out of approximately 500-600 additional lots. Please clarify these two statements in the final Plan.</p>	<p>Despite the smaller size and more limited overall development potential of the Grasonville growth planning area, residential development interest has rapidly increased in recent years. The County has recently approved or is in the process of reviewing residential subdivision proposals for about 144 new lots within Grasonville. It is estimated that the maximum build-out potential of the few remaining undeveloped larger tracts zoned for residential use is about 500-600 additional lots. In addition, it can be expected that a modest amount of additional residential growth will occur as infill development of vacant lots in older existing subdivisions. Actual build-out of undeveloped lands zoned and approved for development will probably occur slowly over time, and it is unlikely that full build-out would occur within the twenty-year planning period. The changing dynamics of real estate market forces will ultimately determine the actual rate or timing of growth in Grasonville. With this Plan the County and the community have an opportunity to proactively plan for the best way to manage future growth in a beneficial way.</p>	See strike and add text change
4(g) MDP (continued)	<p>MDP commends the recommendation to contain as much new development as possible within the Planning Area to prevent sprawl as indicated on 3-2.</p>	<p>Under this Plan, different parts of Grasonville will ultimately have several distinct characteristics. Most of the Main Street area will retain a village character, with - mixed village-scale commercial and residential uses. The area along US 50/301 will primarily develop as a commercial corridor serving regional needs. The northern and southern parts of the community will be primarily residential. To prevent sprawl into the rural areas surrounding Grasonville, this Community Plan continues to limit growth to areas designated for development within the Planning Area. The boundaries of the growth area Planning Area are generally defined by Countryside zoning district boundaries and waterways. The new Emergency Center requires an expansion to the Planning Area, which is proposed in the County's 2010 Comprehensive Plan update, as well as in this 2010 Grasonville Community Plan update. (Figure 1).</p>	No change
4(h) MDP (continued)	<p>MDP supports the recommendation to continue community involvement in the design of possible future pedestrian and bicycle improvements to Main Street as noted on page 3-9.</p>	<p>Roadway improvements</p> <p>Main Street currently is an open section, two-lane road. As noted above, in 1997, the State Highway Administration began planning a reconstruction of Main Street from Chester River Beach Road to Collier Road. The extent of the improvements was limited by funding, and the narrow, existing right-of-way. Drainage in this low lying area is also a major consideration. A preliminary design concept, first presented in 1997, was to reconstruct the street in closed section (curb and gutter), with two 14-foot wide lanes and sidewalk on one side of the street. Design work with additional opportunities for input from the community and the County should continue and promote options for increased bicycle and pedestrian safety, such as,</p>	No change

Speaker	Issue	Draft Plan Excerpts	PC Decision
		dedicated bike lanes, pedestrian crossings and additional sidewalks.	
4(i) MDP (continued)	The recommendation proposed to consider exempting moderately priced dwelling units consisting of less than 10 units in the Planning Area from the requirements of the Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance described on page 3-15 is promising to incentive this type of construction. However, we would hope that these units are still held to the standards of Smart Growth in design and development.	<p>Schools</p> <p>New residential development in Grasonville and the other County growth areas are severely limited by the availability of school capacity. New school capacity could be accommodated within the Planning Area on parcels designated as Grasonville Planned Residential Neighborhood (GPRN). The County is in dire need of Moderately Priced Dwelling Units (MPDU's). The County should consider exempting small MPDU projects, consisting of less than 10 units, in the Planning Area from the requirements of the Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance.</p>	No change
4(j) MDP (continued)	There appears to be an `a_ missing in line 9 on page 3-16 referring to consideration of the `small roundabout _.	<p><i>Circulation patterns south of Main Street</i></p> <p>In planning for new development south of Main Street, an important consideration is the lack of direct north-south through routes between areas south of Main Street and US 50/301: northbound traffic on Sawmill Lane, Grasonville Cemetery Road, Gravel Run Road and Perry's Corner Road must travel east or west on Main Street to reach one of Grasonville's two full-directional interchanges with US 50/301. As overall traffic in the area increases, this will put more traffic onto Main Street, mixing local traffic with through traffic, and creating the potential for congestion and hazards. A new connecting road between Discovery Lane and Grasonville Cemetery Road may improve overall east-west mobility. There is the potential to consider a small round-about at Grasonville Cemetery Road if a new connector road is considered. The intersections of Main Street with Perry's Corner Road, Gravel Run Road and Grasonville Cemetery Road are particularly at risk because north and westbound traffic must make left turns onto Main Street.</p>	See underlined text
4(k) MDP (continued)	We would encourage you to consider using alternative materials such as pervious pavement where appropriate if there are opportunities to reduce the amount of new impervious surfacing associated with additional sidewalks described on page 3-19.	<p>Drainage</p> <p>Grasonville is low lying and subject to flooding from heavy rainfall and exceptionally high tides. The importance of protecting properties by maintaining drainage ditches was stressed by members of the Task Group. A County sponsored drainage program and a Public Drainage Board should be established to address storm-water management and drainage problems in the Grasonville Planning Area. The proposed reconstruction of Main Street as a closed section road and storm-water management facilities for new developments offer additional opportunities to improve drainage throughout the community. Water quality improvements to area creeks, such as Jackson Creek, should be studied and implemented.</p>	No change

Speaker	Issue	Draft Plan Excerpts	PC Decision
4(l) MDP (continued)	<p><u>Comments on the Planning Recommendations</u> The County may wish to consider recommending the development of a master stormwater management plan for the Main Street area to address flooding issues and incorporate stormwater management practices encouraged for new infill and existing development (pages 4-5 and 4-9).</p>		No change
4(m) MDP (continued)	<p>The recommendation to promote village scale design at the gateway to Grasonville along Nesbit Road near the emergency Facility would help establish a sense of place for residents and visitors to Grasonville (page 4-10). We also concur that a master plan for any proposed Medical Campus area would be beneficial as a future amendment to the this [sic] Community Plan</p>		No change
4(n) MDP (continued)	<p>MDP supports the concept of maintaining an open space greenbelt on the southern side of Grasonville as recommended on page 4-11. We also support the redevelop [sic] of the existing transfer station as a future active use park.</p>		No change
4(o) MDP (continued)	<p>We concur with your recommendation that sidewalks should predominantly be on only one side of the road except in the Main Street area, and would again encourage the County to consider opportunities to reduce increases in impervious surfacing pervious options where feasible.</p>		No change
4(p) MDP (continued)	<p>MDP strongly supports the recommendation/policy statement presented on page 4-15 that any lands currently designated as `rural_ in the Community Plan are intended to retain their existing rural character. This includes the recommendation that no water and sewer service should be extended unless needed to correct an environmental health problem.</p>		No change
5(a) Grasonville Task Force (Written comments)	<p>Members of the Grasonville Task Force wish to comment on the Grasonville Community Plan (Plan) during its 60 day review period in order to clarify certain recommendations we proposed in the Plan. During your deliberations on the Plan in April and June, we were not provided an opportunity to explain the reasoning behind our recommendations to expand the Grasonville Planning Area to include the SE and SR zoned property north of Rt 18 and the CS zoned property south of Rt 18. The only portion of the Plan on which we are now commenting is the deletion of the expanded Planning Area we proposed.</p> <p>Our review of the 1998 Grasonville Community Plan was done in accordance with the overreaching goals of the Draft 2010 Comprehensive Plan (2010 Plan) and we believe the following explanation will confirm that these expanded Planning Areas not only support the 2010 Plan but that they are critical to its success.</p>		No change
5(b) Grasonville Task Force (continued)	<p>A. Is there a need to expand the Commercial Mixed Use Planning Area north of Main Street and east of the Emergency Center? (1) The area proposed for expansion joins the Medical Campus on the west, and fronts Maryland Route 18 on the south, and on the north borders Route 50.</p>		No change

Speaker	Issue	Draft Plan Excerpts	PC Decision
5(b) Grasonville Task Force (continued)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A new 16,500 sq. ft. Emergency Center is to open in October 2010. 2. A new 75,000 sq. ft. Medical Office Building is to open in 2011. 3. The Emergency Center and Medical Campus associated with it will bring about 500 new jobs to Queen Anne’s County (Gene Ransom, Star Democrat, Wednesday March 11, 2009). 4. Two additional lots remain undeveloped on the Medical Campus which will bring even more workers and customers. 5. The Grasonville Community Center and Grasonville Elementary School are located nearby with all of their staff and visitors. 6. Other additional medical uses not accommodated by Shore Health Systems that could be located in the expanded Planning Area include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Physical Therapists Dentists Ophthalmologists Chiropractors Dialysis Center Nutritionists Assisted Living Facilities Associated Office uses 7. Commercial Services indentified by Task Force Members that not available or have limited availability in Grasonville and Queenstown: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Drug Store Family Restaurants Grocery Store Coffee Shop Dry Cleaning Hardware Store <p>(2) The new Medical Campus will attract a tremendous volume of patients and their families 24 hours a day, 7 days a week to the Emergency Center and Medical Offices. This will require numerous supporting businesses such as pharmacy, restaurants, book stores, etc.</p>		
5(c) Grasonville Task Force (continued)	<p>B. Is there a need to expand the Residential Planning Area south of Main Street and East of the Church?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Grasonville is one of only 2 Planning Areas in the county that are not in or adjoining an incorporated town (2) Under the 2010 Plan future, residential growth is greatly restricted in the Ag (AG) and Countryside (CS) zoning districts which represents most of Queen Anne’s County. Growth is instead directed to the Grasonville Planning Area, and the Chester Stevensville Planning Area and the incorporated Towns. (3) Four of the incorporated Towns’ Queenstown, Centreville, Church Hill and Sudlersville’ have limited or no sewer available for residential growth at the present time. (4) The area proposed for residential expansion consists of: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. One existing residential community of approximately 17 lots that is not 		<p>Planning Area expanded to include parcels 22, 225, 478, 479, 533 and 794</p>

Speaker	Issue	Draft Plan Excerpts	PC Decision
5(c) Grasonville Task Force (continued)	<p>served by sewer or water and does not meet the current standards for septic reserve areas. These lots are grandfathered and restricted from further development. Including this community in the Planning Area will allow for increased property values and redevelopment.</p> <p>b. Two undeveloped parcels, of approximately 13 and 27 acres in size. Both are entirely wooded and were recently timbered with no remaining marketable timber except pulp.</p> <p>c. The Task Force recommended these 2 undeveloped areas be zoned Grasonville Planned Residential Neighborhood (GPRN). The GPRN designation is intended to provide environmentally sensitive design, architectural integration to ensure a unified and coherent plan of development, and functional community open spaces and recreational areas. (Grasonville Community Plan 4-6a).</p> <p>d. The two undeveloped parcels together would accommodate a maximum of 140 units of developed under the GPRN zoning density or a maximum of 174 units if TDR's are used.</p> <p>(5) It is apparent that to provide housing within walking distance of the elementary school, the Medical Campus and other commercial services and adjacent to existing sewer and water and with direct access to Route 50 makes sound planning sense.</p> <p>(6) It is also noted that the GPRN Zoning District allows All institutional uses, such as an assisted living facility, which could compliment the Medical Campus next door.</p>		
5(d) Grasonville Task Force (continued)	<p>C. Does the proposed extension of the Planning Area meet the criteria of the 2010 Draft Plan?</p> <p>(1) Grasonville area is one of the designated growth areas of the county based on its location along the US50/301 corridor and the availability of public sewer and water service. Nesbit Road is only one of two full directional interchanges on US Route 50/301 serving Grasonville.</p> <p>(2) All land in the Grasonville Community Study Area is designated either as being (1) in the Planning Area, or (2) in the rural area. In order to prevent sprawl into the rural areas growth is limited to land in the Planning Area. The criteria provides that land along the US 50/301 corridor along Main Street (MD Route 18) be in the Planning Area and the undeveloped land in the northern and southern part of the Study Area be designated as rural.</p> <p>(3) Under the criteria the Nesbit Road Area should have been included in the Planning Area und the 1998 Community Plan but it was not and was designated rural.</p> <p>(4) In 2009 the County contracted to purchase lands along Nesbit Road for the construction and operation of a 24/7 Emergency Center and Medical Campus to serve the County. Though the land was not designated in the Planning Area, a reconsideration b the Planning Commission and County Commissioners resulted in it receiving the necessary approvals.</p> <p>(5) In order to insure pro-active growth management for the area surrounding</p>		No change

Speaker	Issue	Draft Plan Excerpts	PC Decision
5(d) Grasonville Task Force (continued)	<p>Nesbit Road and to correct the mistake in the 1998 Plan the Task Force has recommended the extension of the Planning Area to include the lands meeting the criteria. Any questions as to the suitability of the Nesbit Road area for managed growth has been resolved by the construction of the new road system, the extension of the sewer and water services, the construction of the Emergency Center and medical office building, and the pending plans for a 92 unit residential development also supported by the County. This area obviously is not rural.</p> <p>(6) The recommended extension of the Planning Area conforms to the County's 2010 Draft Comprehensive Plan which states the new Emergency Center is a major influence on development activities in the easternmost part of the Grasonville Planning Area and recommends supporting offices or commercial development nearby.</p> <p>The Community Plan concludes future changes and growth are inevitable for Grasonville today, as in the past. The principal question that the plan addresses is not whether Grasonville will or should continue to grow but rather how should growth be managed so as to have a positive impact on and add value to the existing community.</p> <p>Correctly designating the extension of the Planning Area to include those lands qualifying under the criteria is the first step to insure consideration for growth management. The inclusion in the Planning Area does not pre-determine use but provides for proper consideration of the area and will eliminate undesirable piece meal changes.</p>		
5(e) Grasonville Task Force (continued)	<p>D. Would these expanded Planning Areas be consistent with the 2010 Comprehensive Plan?</p> <p>(1) The 40 acre parcel proposed for inclusion in the Planning Area is a former marginal farm field allowed to go fallow in the 1960's due to low yields.</p> <p>(2) The 40 acre parcel is <u>presently</u> zoned SE the same zoning classification as the Medical Campus properties.</p> <p>(3) While approximately 2/3 of this parcel next to the ER is located in the critical area the tidal water giving it this designation is separated from the parcel by the 6 lanes of Route 50/301, a service road, and other intervening properties. It has already been suggested by staff that was a mistake when it was originally designated RCA. This site is appropriate for growth allocation redesignation from RCA to IDA.</p> <p>(4) The 2010 Plan Section 5.2 Vision, Governing Goals and Guiding Principles states: "Growth Areas - Growth is concentrated in existing population centers, growth areas adjacent to these centers, or strategically selected new centers. There are no "new centers." The only Growth Areas controlled by the County are Chester-Stevensville and Grasonville.</p> <p>(5) The 2010 Plan Section 5.4.3 states that the Emergency Center "will have a major influence on development activities in the easternmost part of the</p>		No change

Speaker	Issue	Draft Plan Excerpts	PC Decision
5(e) Grasonville Task Force (continued)	<p>Grasonville Planning Area. Where are these development activities to occur since the Medical Campus only has 2 remaining lots to accommodate all the supporting commercial development and they cannot occur north, south or west?</p> <p>(6) Among the `key planning issues_ for Grasonville cited in the 2010 Draft Plan Section 5.4.3 is `Support office and commercial development near the emergency center._ Where is this development supposed to occur if not on the adjacent 40 acres?</p> <p>(7) The Task Force also believes that convenient work force apartments could be created above the office and commercial uses and provides another means of accommodating growth and keeping it out of rural areas.</p>		
5(f) Grasonville Task Force (continued)	<p><u>Conclusions</u> The Task Force trusts the above comments will help explain some of the many reasons why it recommended that the Planning Area be expanded by 40 acres adjacent to the Medical Campus for commercial and residential uses; why the three areas south of Route 18 and across from the Medical Campus provide a logical placement of the residential growth the 2010 Draft Plan seeks to remove from the AG and CS zones and place in the Planning Areas of Chester/Stevensville and Grasonville.</p> <p>The new Medical Campus is probably the largest commercial project in the history of Queen Anne’s County and certainly will be one of its largest employers, but without any of the recommended expansions, there will be little or no room for any of the many businesses it will attract to locate and it will have very limited ability to feed, house and care for its employees and visitors.</p> <p>Planning for the future of Queen Anne’s County should not look forward 6 or 10 years but well into the future. The Grasonville Task Force feels strongly that if we do not plan for residential and commercial growth around the Medical Campus, the opportunity may be lost forever.</p> <p>The Task Force is available to answer any questions the Planning Commission may have in either a work session or monthly meeting; thank you for your reconsideration of your changes to our recommendations.</p>		No change

Speaker	Issue	Draft Plan Excerpts	PC Decision
6. Merle Rockwell (Public Hearing comments)	Stated that she approves and supports the Planning Commission decision to remove the expanded Planning Area in the Grasonville Plan and that there is no compelling reason to develop the wooded area east of the Emergency Room and there is very good environmental reasons not to develop the area. There is pre-approved capacity at the Emergency Room site for two more 75,000 sq. ft. medical office buildings and there is no additional need. Believes that the expansion area would only benefit two people that own the property. Any development along the Wye River would have a negative environmental impact the river and it cannot withstand to be further degraded from development. Stated that she believed that it was an ethical violation to have Mr. Price involved in the Grasonville Plan Task Force.		No change
7. Ed Modell (Public Hearing Comments)	Stated that he lives at the headwaters of the Wye River and believes that the developers of the Wheatlands project in Queenstown will now try to get approval through the Grasonville Plan if it can't receive approval through the Queenstown Plan. Believes that the mediated language included in the Queenstown Plan related to traffic improvements, traffic safety and design should be applied to the Wheatlands project whether tries to come through Queenstown or Grasonville.		No change
8(a) Rich Altman (Public Hearing Comments and written comments)	Stated that he admired the Plan felt it was concise, easy to understand and might be a model for future Community Plans and particularly liked the Circulation Plan - Figure 10. Stated that he supported the Planning Commission decision to remove property from the Planning Area around Route 50 and 18. Suggested that the Planning Commission decision was not as clear as it could be in explaining the Planning Area and Study Area. Suggested that the Planning Commission ask staff to remove the Planning Area and Study Area from the maps because although the Plan technically does what was asked, the Plan leaves ambiguities that could be lead to future water and sewer extensions and zoning changes. Recommended adoption of the plan with the change.		No change, however, PC recommended changes to Planning Area and Map Figure will address clarity.
8(b) Rich Altman (continued)	<p>Mr. Altman submitted the following written comments:</p> <p>This letter is to provide comment, critique and suggest modifications t the 60-day review Draft of the Grasonville Community Plan:</p> <p><u>Overall:</u> The Draft's text and maps are clear, concise and a pleasure to review by comparison to the voluminous and complex 2010 Queen Anne's County Draft Comprehensive Plan. I specifically applaud the <i>Grasonville Circulation Plan, Figure 10</i>. It proposes a flexible, achievable, street grid and is a stark contrast to the unworkable street plans that are proposed in the Centreville and Queenstown Plans.</p> <p>In many ways, I believe that Grasonville has succeeded and will continue to succeed as a well planned compact town while the County's other 5 currently indentified growth areas have yet to find a convincing planning concept and vision.</p>		No change, however, PC recommended changes to Planning Area and Map Figure will address clarity.

Speaker	Issue	Draft Plan Excerpts	PC Decision
8(c) Rich Altman (continued)	<p><u>Proposed Clarification</u> There is, however, one major aspect to the Plan that I suggest needs further review and refinement.</p> <p>This flows from the initial inclusion and later removal by the Planning Commission of a proposed expansion of Study Area and Planning Area northeastward from the Emergency Room (ER) site along Route 50/301, straddling Route 18 (Main Street) and extending northeastward to Slippery Hill Lane.</p> <p>While it seems appropriate to include both parcels flanking Nesbit Road and the existing single-family area across Main Street from the ER in the expanded Planning Area and Study Area both demarcations should stop there.</p>	<p>CHAPTER 2: COMMUNITY PROFILE</p> <p>The Grasonville Planning and Study Areas Defined</p> <p>The Grasonville Study Area is the area generally surrounding the Grasonville Planning Area. The Study Area extends west towards the Kent Narrows, abutting the Lippincott Marina on the south side of US 50/301, and is generally bound by the Chester River to the north, Marshy Creek and Cabin Creek to the southwest, Perry's Corner Road to the south, Walsey Creek to the northeast of US 50/301 and Bennett Point Road to the east, including parcels north of Main Street, east and west of Nesbit Road (see Figure 1).</p>	<p>No change, however, PC recommended changes to Planning Area and Map Figure will address clarity.</p>
8(c) Rich Altman (continued)	<p>The large linear wooded parcel between Route 50/301 and Main Street and the substantial wooded parcel in the southern quadrant of the Main Street and Bennett Point Road intersection should not be included in either the Planning Area <u>or</u> Study Area. (This will require minor modification to most of the existing maps Figures 1-11). To do otherwise invites certain pressure to extend public sewer and water to these tracts.</p> <p>These two parcels are predominately wooded wetlands with sensitive species habitat. Over 50% of the northern property is located in the RCA Critical Area (See Figure 8) and is unlikely to qualify for Growth Allocation. The existing zoning of the northern parcel, along Route 50 is Suburban Estate (SE) and the parcel south of Route 18 is Countryside (CS). (See Figure 7)</p> <p>If the changes to the Grasonville Community Plan recommended above are made, the two parcels described above retain their county zoning. Ideally these properties would remain an undeveloped buffer between Grasonville and Queenstown Planning Areas. Current county zoning coupled with the presence of wetland soils, sensitive species habitat, and RCA critical area are all consistent with this concept.</p> <p>Longer term, these lands and the other critical woodland flanking the `Split_ in Queenstown should be targeted for preservation when the proposed Route 50 Corridor Study begins.</p> <p>The Plan proposes a new Medical Campus be created in Grasonville anchored by the new Emergency Center. As the Mixed-Use Concept Plan shown in Illustration 3-1 (page 3-13) shows, carefully master planned development east of Nesbit Road coupled with the planned, twin 75,000 sq ft medical office buildings on the ER Parcel offers substantial capacity for medical offices, labs and related uses, without the need to expand the planning or study area at this time.</p> <p>The current draft plan <i>can</i> be interpreted to accomplish all this is requested above. However, the Plan will be straightforward, unambiguous and not subject to future erroneous interpretations if the proposed changes are made.</p>	<p>CHAPTER 3: COMMUNITY PLANNING ISSUES ...(p 3-1)</p> <p>However, Grasonville has significant environmental resources, particularly wetlands and forests, that are a significant constraint to major growth (See Figure 8). These environmental considerations, and the presence of conservation lands on the perimeter of the community dictate that Grasonville will have limited growth potential.</p> <p>ŭ (p3-2)</p> <p>Under this Plan, different parts of Grasonville will ultimately have several distinct characteristics. Most of the Main Street area will retain a village character, with - mixed village-scale commercial and residential uses. The area along US 50/301 will primarily develop as a commercial corridor serving regional needs. The northern and southern parts of the community will be primarily residential. To prevent sprawl into the rural areas surrounding Grasonville, this Community Plan continues to limit growth to areas designated for development within the Planning Area. The boundaries of the growth area Planning Area are generally defined by Countryside zoning district boundaries and waterways. The new Emergency Center requires an expansion to the Planning Area, which is proposed in the County's 2010 Comprehensive Plan update, as well as in this 2010 Grasonville Community Plan update. (Figure 1).</p> <p>ŭ</p>	

Speaker	Issue	Draft Plan Excerpts	PC Decision
	I hope you will direct the planning staff to do so.		
9. Jean Sadler (Public Hearing Comments)	Indicated that she was speaking as a member of the Grasonville Plan Task Force and wanted to provide reasons for recommending the extended Planning Area. They had recently attended a meeting with a representative of the Emergency Room. They wanted to know what was happening with the cleared area across the street from the ER. Was hopeful that food, snack and deli areas with 24-hour service would be available nearby for patrons/employees. The Plan didn't call for more medical office buildings but for support services such as pharmacies, delis and bookstores. The Grasonville area only has a pizza and beauty shop and patron/employees have to go to Kent Island, Kent Narrows or Centreville for service as Grasonville currently has very little to attract small business. Would like to see Grasonville grow in a moderate way in the Town Center. Task Group wanted to attract new commercial away from Route 50 orientation to reduce strip mall character. The Task Group also recommended a reserve location as an ideal spot for a new school.		No change
9. Jean Sadler (continued)			
10. Erney Maher (Public Hearing Comments)	Stated that he was a Queenstown native and resident of the Western Shore for 50 years. Observed how Baltimore County Howard County and Carroll County transformed from farmland to suburbia and part of Washington D.C. Enjoy unique of towns and villages of Queen Anne's County. Grasonville/Queenstown/Centreville could become a continuous merged suburb. Referenced Smithsonian Institute research findings on water quality and wildlife that concluded that more people closer to the shoreline resulted in the loss of crabs, fish and wildlife. The Wye River is muddy because of impervious surface increase. Do not encourage expanding areas for the benefit of a few developers.		No change
11. Robert Shuerholz (Public Hearing Comments)	Stated that he was a resident of Wye Harbor and supports the Planning Commission decision to exclude the expansion area. Believes that the expansion is unwise and unneeded. There are 50 acres of land available east of the Emergency Room that could be rezoned to support the ER. Water and Sewer extension open up more development opportunity and puts more pressure on the headwaters of the Wye River. Stated that more development would be disastrous for the Wye River. Explained that the Wye River is very fragile and does not flush well. A study conducted in the 1990's by Dr. Wolman concluded that the use of Best Management Practices would still result in toxic run-off that was 2 to 3 times more. The Wye River is a natural and economic asset. The decline in the Wye River water quality could decrease property values that could impact the County's tax base. Agreed with Mr. Altman to put something in the Plan to address future expansion.		No change
12(a) Mary Margaret Revell Goodwin (Public Hearing Comments and written comments)	Stated that had presented materials about the War of 1812 and Slippery Hill to the PC prior and was disappointed that the Grasonville Plan did not make any reference to this history. Indicated that money would be available from the Star Spangled Banner Trail program to support a hiking/biking trail but needed the Plan to mention the War of 1812 to support a funding request. Indicated a need for a small area in the vicinity of Route 18 to support a trailhead and interpretive sign. Indicated that she would provide appropriate comments to staff.		Add underlined text below.

Speaker	Issue	Draft Plan Excerpts	PC Decision
<p>12(b) Mary Margaret Revell Goodwin (continued)</p>	<p>Ms. Goodwin provided the following written comments:</p> <p><i>(Chapter 2 Insert)</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">HISTORY OF GRASONVILLE</p> <p><u>The early history of Grasonville has always been written as the connection between Kent Island and the county seats of Queen Anne’s County, first Queenstown and then Centreville. However in August of 1813 Grasonville became the county’s stage for its contribution to the new American nation’s fight for freedom from Great Britain. On the 5th of August of 1813 the British took over Kent Island, both for the Chesapeake Campaign’s command headquarters and for the bivouacking of some 2000 plus British troops. While the local expectation was that Kent Island would be the staging lands for an attack on St. Michael’s in Talbot County, the locals knew there would be major forays onto the mainland of Queen Anne’s County, always on the only existing connecting road from the Narrows through the area now known as Grasonville.</u></p> <p><u>During the night of August 13th the British marched from the Narrows up the causeway road through the little village (now Grasonville), heading for Queenstown. This march was part of a pincer movement by land and by water to take on the American militia made up entirely of QAC men. At the point in the road that is now in the vicinity of the new medical facilities, and then known as the farm at Slippery Hill, the British met with unexpected fire from the small band of men placed there as a defensive warning of any British approach. The British fired first, but the return volleys were to the advantage of the Americans as they well knew their way amongst the cornstalks of the farm. The attacks came twice from the British against the small band of local farmers, lawyers and businessmen who stood their ground until they could reach their main troops on the Centreville road from Queenstown. Their actions were significant in saving the main body of Queen Anne’s County militia from capture or worse, and were documented as such by their commanding officer, Major W. H. Nicholson.</u></p>		<p>Add underlined text.</p>
<p>12(c) Mary Margaret Revell Goodwin (continued)</p>	<p><u>PAGE 3-5 OF CHAPTER 3: "The County should continue to work with the Scenic Byway Program, the new 1812 Byway program and the 1812 Star Spangled Banner Trail system in Queen Anne's County to create a master plan....."</u></p> <p>**This will allow for any monies we have available to be allocated towards tourism development, trail building, signage, etc.</p> <p><u>APPROPRIATE PAGE IN CHAPTER 3: "In the vicinity of Emergency Medical Campus along Route 18, open or civic spaces may be provided to accommodate a commemorative kiosk explaining the British actions in the Battle of Slippery Hill and the defense of the county undertaken by a small band of County patriots. This kiosk area would have enough room for ceremonies, school groups, etc. to view the layout of the battle actions at the kiosk. On-site or nearby parking should be available."</u></p>	<p><i>C. HOW SHOULD MAIN STREET DEVELOP IN THE FUTURE AND WHAT SHOULD BE ITS FUTURE APPEARANCE AND CHARACTER?</i></p> <p>Infill development is development on existing vacant or undeveloped land in partially developed areas.</p> <p>...</p> <p>The County should continue to work with the Scenic Byway Program to create a master plan for the reconstruction of Main Street to support new development and redevelopment. The master plan should be incorporated into the US 50 Corridor Study to consider land use planning strategies, and architectural and design standards that complement and support the preservation of the area’s heritage and character.</p>	<p>Add underlined text.</p>

Speaker	Issue	Draft Plan Excerpts	PC Decision