



---

---

## TABLE OF PLANNING COMMISSION'S RESPONSE TO PUBLIC HEARING COMMENTS

This section summarizes the comments that were submitted on the Draft Plan; dated January 27, 2006, that was issued for 60-day review by the Planning Commission in accordance with Article 66B of the Annotated Code of Maryland. The Draft was sent to all State agencies and adjacent jurisdictions for review and comment. A public informational meeting was held on March 16, 2006 at the Grasonville Senior Center and a public hearing was conducted on April 12, 2006, pursuant to Section 3.07 of Article 66B of the Annotated Code of Maryland.

The table contained in this section is a summary of the comments received from State agencies and the public as part of the public informational meeting and public hearing. The table outlines the comments and the Planning Commission revisions, if any, as a result of the comment. The table also provides excerpts from the plan as it relates to the comments. The revisions as outlined in the table are incorporated into this document that is forwarded to the County Commissioners.



(Page intentionally blank)



**Kent Narrows Community Plan**  
**Public Hearing of April 12, 2006,**  
**Comments Submitted to Planning Commission with**  
**Planning Commission’s Response / Decision**

Speaker	Issue	Draft Plan Excerpts	For PC discussion	PC Decision
SHA – Letter dated 03/20/2006	Add the following strategy within the transportation section of the Implementation Plan: “Refer to SHA’s Scenic Byway Design Guidelines whenever any type of road improvements occur along the Chesapeake Country National Scenic Byway.”		Route 18 is part of the Chesapeake Country National Scenic Byway, it is not intended to be a regulatory tool.	No changes.
DNR Letter dated 2/1/06	<p>Critical Area Commission has offered the following editorial comments for the Plan.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Page (9) of the Plan references the Critical Area Program adoption date by Queen Anne’s County as 1998. However, the ordinance was actually adopted by the County in 1989.</li> <li>Page twenty-five (25) of the Plan references the definitions of the Critical Area designations. There should be added language to clarify that these are abbreviated definitions.</li> <li>Page twenty-nine (29) of the Plan provides description of the RCA, LDA and IDA. All three definitions are incorrect. The County should refer to the definition as listed in the Queen Anne’s County Critical Area Program or as listed in COMAR 27.01.01.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Page 9:</b> <b>1998 Chesapeake Bay Critical Area Program</b>  In 1998, the County adopted its Chesapeake Bay Critical Area Program and regulations in accordance with State Law.</li> <li><b>Page 25:</b> <b>Chesapeake Bay Critical Area Designation</b>  ... The Critical Areas include Resource Conservation Areas (RCA), Limited Development Areas (LDA), and Intensely Developed Areas (IDA). The following describes each of the areas. ...</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The County ‘s adoption of first Chesapeake Bay Critical Area Program was on June 29, 1988, which was updated on February 15, 1989 and June 4, 1996.  <b>Suggested language:</b> On June 29, 1988, the County adopted its Chesapeake Bay Critical Area Program and regulations in accordance with State Law, which was updated and amended on February 15, 1989 and June 4, 1996.</li> <li>The Plan only says that it is a description and not definition. It can be further clarified with the recommended language.  <b>Suggested language:</b> In order to better clarify, modify the text as follows:  The following briefly describes each of the areas.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Page 9:</b> Revise first sentence as follows:  On June 29, 1988, the County adopted its Chesapeake Bay Critical Area Program and regulations in accordance with State Law, which was updated and amended on February 15, 1989 and June 4, 1996.</p> <p><b>Page 25:</b> Revise the sentence as follows:  The following <b>briefly</b> describes each of the areas:</p> <p><b>Page 29:</b> Revise the language as follows to clarify the intent. “Wetlands are present in each of the three critical areas and comprise more than half (59.7%) of all the land in the RCA areas. Existing land use in the Resource Conservation Areas (RCA) of Kent Narrows includes wetlands, agriculture, residential as well as some commercial uses. Existing land use in Limited Development Areas (LDA) within Kent Narrows also includes wetlands, medium and high density residential as well as commercial uses. And, in the Intensely Developed Areas (IDA) in Kent Narrows, existing land uses includes industrial, commercial, medium density residential, institutional, as well as wetlands.”</p>



Speaker	Issue	Draft Plan Excerpts	For PC discussion	PC Decision
<p>Comments received at the public forum 03/16/2006</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Total height restriction of 45' on all structures. Kent Narrows needs to keep the flavor of the area and not look like Ocean City. Need to consider height limits on all constructions.</li> <li>Proposed water tower should be low or some other water needs solution be sought. Do not want a water tower or towers near the Narrows. Would not be at all attractive – pumping station is bad enough.</li> <li>The public ramp by the Piney Narrows Yacht basin needs to be for recreational boaters and not companies launching and pulling large boats.</li> <li>A great first effort that will lead to be a better Kent Narrows.</li> </ol>	<p><b>1. Page 91 Recommendations Land Use Regulations:</b> <b>3<sup>rd</sup> bullet</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review, analyze and amend the zoning regulations for Waterfront Village Center (WVC) District to be consistent with this plan.                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clarify and establish well defined regulations for implementation of bonus provisions.</li> <li>Maintain existing floor area ratio and height standards.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>2. Page 94: Public Infrastructure &amp; Facilities</b> <i>Water Facilities</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identify needs that can only be met by new facilities such as a water tower.                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Conduct feasibility study to site water storage facilities, determine facility type and impacts on the community such as cost, aesthetics, views and other impacts.</li> <li>Work with citizens and KNDF to address design issues to ensure integration of a water tower with overall character of the community and with gateway amenities.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should the Plan recommend that the maximum height in the WVC district be limited to 45'.</li> <li>Should the plan recommend that the provisions for the bonus height up to 60' be deleted from the WVC district.</li> <li>Work with citizens and KNDF to address design issues to ensure integration of a water tower with overall character of the community and with gateway amenities.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Height</b> Given the fact that Kent Narrows is a destination place where economic development is encouraged, only a small portion of Kent Narrows has vacant lands, and for any project the bonus height of 60' would be considered by the Planning Commission based on factors such as monetary contributions, value of the public amenity/amenities, open space for the public benefit, and intent of the provisions of Chapter 18. The Planning Commission decided to keep provisions for granting bonus in height.</p> <p><b>Water Tower</b> No changes. The Planning Commission determined that the Plan adequately addressed the design issues of a water tower.</p>
<p>Joe Stevens Steven &amp; Associates, L.L.C.  Representing his client Douglas Development Company (Old Outlet Center)  Public Hearing Testimony 04/12/2006 &amp; Letter dated 04/24/2006</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The improvements that are recommended by the draft plan along with visual corridors, public access to water views, creating superior architecture and public spaces and contributing to off-site amenities can be feasible only if the property can be developed with significant amount of non-residential and residential development. The current floor area in the Waterfront Village Center (WVC) district at .30 is lower than any other commercial and/or industrial district that is served by public sewer and/or water (UR and TC are both 0.4 FAR).</li> <li>The County has experienced much success with development proposals in its Planned Development Area where the Planning Commission has established setbacks, height, density, mix of uses and housing types for each individual proposal based on a master plan prepared by the developer. The Planned Development or "PUD" system has also allowed the County to exact significant on- and off- site improvements for the public benefit in exchange for design flexibility. Such a PUD system which allows the Planning Commission to establish residential and non-residential densities within certain parameters may also prove successful in the Kent Narrows.</li> </ol>	<p><b>1. Page 91: Recommendations - Land Use Regulations:</b> <b>3<sup>rd</sup> bullet</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review, analyze and amend the zoning regulations for Waterfront Village Center (WVC) District to be consistent with this plan.                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clarify and establish well defined regulations for implementation of bonus provisions.</li> <li>Maintain existing floor area ratio and height standards.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>WVC District Regulations                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should the Plan recommend that the floor area ratio and height standards be increased.</li> <li>With the bonus under the current zoning regulations for the WVC district, the FAR can be increased to 0.5</li> </ul> </li> <li>Is a Planned Development technique appropriate for the WVC District.</li> </ol>	<p>The Planning Commission determined that the height standards cannot be increased more than the existing WVC district height standards.</p> <p>The Planning Commission, after discussion, decided to consider any changes to the floor area ratio during the zoning ordinance update following the adoption of the plan and modified the text of the Plan as follows: <b>Page 91 Land Use Regulations</b> <b>3<sup>rd</sup> bullet 2<sup>nd</sup> sub-bullet</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Maintain existing height standards</li> <li>Evaluate existing floor area ratio standards.</li> </ul>



Speaker	Issue	Draft Plan Excerpts	For PC discussion	PC Decision
<p>Cathy Szostak Georgette Towes Ellen Filler Public Hearing Testimony 04/12/2006</p>	<p>1. <b>Height:</b> Would like to see all building height restricted to 45' and don't like waivers for any building/facilities similar to what was done for Hilton Garden. The height of the building needs to be measured to the peak of the building roof and not the mid point of the roof. Super tall, industrial type of buildings will be detrimental to the region.</p> <p>2. <b>Lighting:</b> Hilton Garden when opened had too much lighting, which was eventually reduced. Would like to see restrictions on light and glare. Prefer amber light and would like to see the lighting standards to remain where they are now.</p> <p>3. <b>Full Time Manager:</b> These responsibilities should fall to Planning &amp; Zoning Commission or Chamber of Commerce. There is no need to have a full time manager.</p>	<p><b>1. Page 91 Recommendations - Land Use Regulations:</b> <b>3rd bullet</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review, analyze and amend the zoning regulations for Waterfront Village Center (WVC) District to be consistent with this plan.                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Clarify and establish well defined regulations for implementation of bonus provisions.</li> <li>○ Maintain existing floor area ratio and height standards.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>2. Page 98 WVC Design and Architectural Guidelines</b></p> <p><b>Exterior Lighting:</b> Exterior lighting should be of a design and size compatible with buildings and adjacent uses. Lighting should be restrained in design, and excessive brightness or glare should be avoided. Lighting for pedestrian areas, streetscapes, sidewalks, boardwalks and public trails/walkways should be aesthetically pleasing and adequate for public safety, as well as keeping with the working waterfront design theme.</p> <p><b>3. Page 96 Organizational Structure and Leadership</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improve the organizational structure tasked to attract, manage and sustain economic development within Kent Narrows.                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Continue to strengthen the leadership of the KNDF and involvement in implementation of the plan.</li> <li>○ Continue dedication of County staff to support future development, infrastructure improvements and event organization in Kent Narrows and to act as a liaison to the business community providing an array of technical assistance. Such assistance should include facilitation of technical aspects of community development, grants writing/administration and public/private partnership development to support plan implementation.</li> <li>○ Create a full-time position to staff a Kent Narrows Manager with an emphasis on programming, promotion and coordination of activities and year-round events, foster public/private partnership development and manage facility improvements in Kent Narrows.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>...</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should the Plan recommend that the maximum height in the WVC district be limited to 45'.</li> <li>• Should the plan recommend that the provisions for the bonus height up to 60' be deleted from the WVC district.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Height</b> Given the fact that Kent Narrows is a destination place where economic development is encouraged, only a small portion of Kent Narrows has vacant lands, and for any project the bonus height of 60' would be considered by the Planning Commission based on factors such as monetary contributions, value of the public amenity/amenities, open space for the public benefit, and intent of the provisions of Chapter 18. The Planning Commission decided to keep provisions for granting bonus in height.</p> <p><b>Lighting</b> No changes. The Planning Commission Determined that the Plan adequately addressed the lighting issues under WVC Design and Architectural Guidelines.</p> <p><b>Full Time Manager</b> After careful consideration of the need to have a fulltime Kent Narrows Manager position and funding issues the Planning Commission revised the text as follows:</p> <p><b>Page 96. Organizational Structure and Leadership.</b> <b>1<sup>st</sup> bullet and 3<sup>rd</sup> sub-bullet.</b> Consider creating a full-time position to staff a Kent Narrows Manager with an emphasis on programming, promotion and coordination of activities and year-round events, foster public/private partnership development and manage facility improvements in Kent Narrows</p>



Speaker	Issue	Draft Plan Excerpts	For PC discussion	PC Decision
<p>Cathy Szostak Georgette Toves Ellen Filler Public Hearing Testimony 04/12/2006</p>	<p><b>Water Tower:</b> There is a proposal to build a water tower at exit 42 which would be 17 stories tall. This is unacceptable. The present white tower (pumping station) itself has an effect on the value of the houses in Oyster Cove. If there is a need, some other location or solution needs to be sought. Problem with water pressure is very minimal and it happened only once during Hurricane Isabel, which was a natural disaster. To build a water tower that will affect the region needs a better reason.</p>	<p><b>Page 94: Public Infrastructure &amp; Facilities</b> <b>Water Facilities</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Identify needs that can only be met by new facilities such as a water tower.                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conduct feasibility study to site water storage facilities, determine facility type and impacts on the community such as cost, aesthetics, viewsapes and other impacts.</li> <li>• Work with citizens and KNDF to address design issues to ensure integration of a water tower with overall character of the community and with gateway amenities.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Work with citizens and KNDF to address design issues to ensure integration of a water tower with overall character of the community and with gateway amenities.</li> </ul>	<p>No changes. The Planning Commission determined that the Plan adequately addressed the design issues of a water tower.</p>
<p>Cathy Szostak Georgette Toves Ellen Filler Public Hearing Testimony 04/12/2006</p>	<p><b>Big box:</b> Hilton Garden seems like a big box in the Kent Narrows disturbing the serene atmosphere. Such buildings make us feel like we are in Ocean City and if someone wants Ocean City, it is not too far for them to drive to Ocean City.</p>	<p><b>Page 97: WVC Design and Architectural Guidelines</b> All new development and redevelopment in the WVC District should make a practical and good faith effort to comply with the following design guidelines. The Planning Director and/or Planning Commission shall consider these guidelines and the applicable design objectives of the Kent Narrows Community Plan when reviewing and approving development and redevelopment within the WVC District. The purpose of these architectural guidelines is to build consistency while allowing flexibility for unique design opportunities. Concepts depicting a few examples of desired types and combinations of architectural features, materials and colors are contained in this section. These concepts depicted in <i>Figure 9: Architectural Design Concepts</i> not to be replicated exactly as depicted, instead these illustrated concepts provide a visual impression when addressing architectural design elements for new structures and existing structures scheduled for rehabilitation. . . .</p> <p><b>Page 99: Building Design Characteristics:</b> New construction, redevelopment and rehabilitation of existing structures should be designed and built to blend with existing structures in Kent Narrows, encouraging innovative and creative solutions in terms of formal characteristics such as shape, height, massing, roof shapes and door and window proportions. All architectural renderings and construction materials will be subject to review by the KNDF, which shall forward a recommendation to the Department of Planning and Zoning or to the Planning Commission. . . .</p>		<p>No changes. The Planning Commission determined that the Plan has adequately addressed design issues under WVC Design and Architectural Guidelines.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Planning Commission also considered the fact that Kent Narrows is a destination place where economic development is encouraged, and only a small portion of Kent Narrows has vacant lands, and for any project the bonus height would be considered by the Planning Commission based on factors such as monetary contributions, value of the public amenity/amenities, open space for the public benefit, and intent of the provisions of Chapter 18. Therefore, the Planning Commission decided to keep provisions for bonus height.</p>



Speaker	Issue	Draft Plan Excerpts	For PC discussion	PC Decision
<p>Cathy Szostak Georgette Towes Ellen Filler Public Hearing Testimony 04/12/2006</p>	<p><b>Year Round Destination:</b> There is so much in the plan about Year Round Destination but there is very little in Kent Narrows to attract a family and to keep them here from going to some place else. Before we loose them to other places, we need to create attractions that cater to all age groups and for people from all walks of life.</p>	<p><b>Page 96: Economic Development (includes tourism)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Create a destination place by promoting small-scale businesses and/or landscaped areas to break up the continuous paved surfaces between the travel lane shoulders and parking lots of the existing establishments.</li> <li>• Use special tax district funds for public improvements such as extension of the Cross Island Trail eastward along Route 18, wayfinding signage, streetscape improvements, additional public parking, public space improvements, off-road pedestrian connections and boardwalks.</li> <li>• Pursue the development of small businesses in <i>niche markets</i> to meet the needs of year-round residents, slip holders and visitors/tourists.</li> <li>• Develop promotional strategies specific to Kent Narrows.</li> <li>• Pursue the development and redevelopment of opportunity sites with uses that expand tourism attractions that build upon the concept of geo-tourism: geography, heritage, natural environment and culture of Kent Narrows. Development and redevelopment opportunities include:                         <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Convention center and resort development</li> <li>○ Mixed-use commercial center</li> <li>○ Museum/entertainment center                                 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Initiate feasibility study to establish a Watermen’s Heritage Museum consisting of indoor and outdoor exhibits and activities.</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Restaurant and small scale commercial development along waterfront</li> <li>○ Office mixed with residential development</li> <li>○ Public parking with small-scale commercial development</li> <li>○ Public parking with shuttle and bike rental</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		<p>No changes. The Planning Commission determined that the Plan has made several recommendations to promote economic development by promoting small scale businesses, pursuing the development of small businesses in niche markets to meet the needs of year-round residents and visitors, which in turn will contribute towards making Kent Narrows a destination place. The Plan also includes recommendation to expand tourism attractions that build upon the concept of geo-tourism.</p>



Speaker	Issue	Draft Plan Excerpts	For PC discussion	PC Decision
<p>Cathy Szostak Georgette Towes Ellen Filler Public Hearing Testimony 04/12/2006</p>	<p><b>Road Access:</b> Only access is RT 50 and RT 18 which are always backed up during summer weekends. Anyone would need at least 3 hours to cross the Bay Bridge. Even though there is very limited opportunity, would like to see something done about it.</p> <p><b>Parking:</b> Parking standards are waived so that hotels and restaurants can get build in Kent Narrows. We see people parking on both sides of the streets causing problems to others. Visitors who are not familiar with the region just park on the street. Emergency vehicle could not get to Jetty when there was an emergency because of the vehicles parked on both sides of the street.</p>	<p><b>Page 93: Traffic Congestion</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identify traffic congestion solutions based upon a study of both existing and forecasted conditions in conjunction with the location of existing and proposed parking facilities.</li> </ul> <p><b>Page 95: Public Parking:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enforce parking requirements.</li> <li>• Use wayfinding signage to direct visitors to public parking.</li> <li>• Provide information kiosks at key locations in public spaces and public parking lots that include maps and information about various attractions and services.</li> <li>• Provide adequate lighting for safety.</li> <li>• Provide clearly marked pedestrian connections from parking lots to other locations.</li> <li>• Promote shared parking arrangements and agreements.                         <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>? Utilize a valet parking service to best utilize existing public and private parking facilities.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Enhance the trail system with additional parking lots at key locations.</li> <li>• Conduct parking analysis to include capacity analysis and feasibility assessment for new facilities.                         <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>? Conduct a parking capacity analysis of existing and future parking needs.                                 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>? Review parking standards based upon needs in Kent Narrows with the 25% reduction to parking requirements provided off-site somewhere in Kent Narrows.</li> </ul> </li> <li>? Conduct a feasibility study (including a cost/benefit analysis) to identify key locations for the development of public parking through private/public partnerships to meet current and future needs.                                 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>? Target the location of public parking facilities (lots and structures) to inland lots and lots on the edge of the Growth Area that will help reduce traffic congestion.</li> <li>? Establish satellite parking areas with shuttle service for employees.</li> <li>? Provide adequate parking for boat trailers.</li> <li>? Provide on-street parking at appropriate locations.</li> <li>? Assess feasibility of a parking structure under the bridge.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>		<p>No changes. Recognizing the need for public parking and relief for traffic congestions in Kent Narrows, The Planning Commission also determined that the Plan has adequately addressed the issues and made recommendation for consideration to alleviate some of the problems or to conduct future studies on the issues.</p>



Speaker	Issue	Draft Plan Excerpts	For PC discussion	PC Decision
<p>Georgette Towes</p> <p>Public Hearing Testimony 04/12/2006</p>	<p><b>Preservation of Viewscapes:</b> Chapter 4 talks about preserving viewscapes and there is nothing about preserving viewscapes at Wells Cove.</p>	<p><b>Page 107: Preservation and Enhancements of Viewscapes</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Viewpoint #7 (Enhance and Preserve):</b> The ability for the public to view and access the water from Wells Cove is a tremendous asset to this waterfront community. Enhancement and preservation of this site as a unique gateway and public open space for water and land travelers is crucial. Further development of this site should provide for public access to the water and preserve views of the Bay. Development on adjacent site should be complementary of this public use and allow for continued public access and viewscape.</li> </ul>	<p>The Plan addresses the preservation of viewscapes from Wells Cove under Viewpoint # 7.</p>	<p>No changes.</p>
<p>Ellen Filler</p> <p>Public Hearing Testimony 04/12/2006</p>	<p><b>Public Landing:</b> Big commercial boats are being launched at the public landing and the recreational boaters never get a chance to launch the boat because of the big boats. The public landing is intended for recreational boaters and was not designed to handle big boats. If the commercial boats are being launched by the boat dealers, then they should pay the County to use the public landing.</p>		<p>Greg Todd, Deputy Director, of the Department of Parks and Recreation made a presentation to the Planning Commission addressing the issue. The following information was provided to the Planning Commission for consideration:</p> <p>The Department of Parks and Recreation has been aware of the issue for the past several years. However, the County does not have the authority prohibit permit commercial haulers at the public landings. In order to address this issue and make commercial haulers pay a proportional fee for their use, in March 2006, the Parks and Recreation Advisory Board re-evaluation the commercial haulers landing permits fee as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• \$ 300 for commercial haulers and \$ 50 for every additional trailer that is attached.</li> </ul> <p>Landing permit fee for recreational boaters was not modified and it remains \$ 25.</p>	<p>No changes</p>