

W.P.



# Calvert County Planning Commission Annual Report 1979

This annual report is designed to serve several functions: summarize the planning activities of the Planning Commission and Planning Department; serve as a resource pamphlet for land use changes and available publications; project future planning needs and activities; and meet the requirements of Section 3.09 of Article 66B of the Annotated Code of Maryland.

HD  
211  
.M3  
C35  
1980

JANUARY 1980

PLANNING DEPARTMENT, PRINCE FREDERICK, MARYLAND 20678

W.P.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introductory Statement . . . . .	1
II.	Planning in Calvert County . . . . .	3
III.	Planning Activities . . . . .	5
	A. Ongoing Planning . . . . .	5
	B. Specially Funded Projects . . . . .	7
	C. Other Staff Projects . . . . .	8
IV.	Planning Commission and Department Budgets . . . . .	10
V.	Land Use Changes Since the Adoption of the Comprehensive Plan . . . . .	11
VI.	Proposed Planning Projects . . . . .	17
	A. Comprehensive Plan and Master Plans . . . . .	17
	B. Land Treatment Feasibility Study . . . . .	17
	C. Special Town Plans . . . . .	18
	D. Community Piers Study . . . . .	18
	E. Commercial Needs Study . . . . .	18
VII.	Informational Appendices . . . . .	19
	APPENDIX A - Subdivisions Considered by Planning Commission in 1979 ..	20
	APPENDIX B - Zoning Cases Considered by Planning Commission in 1979 .	24
	APPENDIX C - Community Planning Districts Map . . . . .	26
	APPENDIX D - Calvert County Population and Households by CPD . . . . .	27
	APPENDIX E - Residential Building Permits . . . . .	28
	APPENDIX F - Total Dwelling Units/CPD/Year . . . . .	29
	APPENDIX G - Comparative Population Projections . . . . .	30
	APPENDIX H - Calvert County Agricultural Preservation Program Map . .	31
	APPENDIX I - Historical Conservation Plan Outline . . . . .	32
	APPENDIX J - Ongoing Environmental Assessment/Water Quality Analysis .	33
	APPENDIX K - Draft Outline of Citizen Participation Program for Review of the Comprehensive Plan and Development of Master Plans . . . . .	35
	APPENDIX L - Planning Department Staff Duties . . . . .	37
	APPENDIX M - Materials Available from the Calvert County Planning Department . . . . .	39

## I. Introductory Statement

### DON'T READ THIS REPORT

- \* \* \* IF you are completely satisfied with the state of all County activities, or
- \* \* \* IF you are thoroughly familiar with WHO has responsibility for WHAT in planning in Calvert County, or
- \* \* \* IF you feel that planning is no concern of yours, or
- \* \* \* IF you know what is planned for Calvert County's future, or
- \* \* \* IF you don't care!

Calvert County is changing in many ways at an accelerated rate. An agricultural economy is being swallowed by developments housing people who sleep here and work in Metropolitan Washington. The average biennial increase in population is greater than from 1860 to 1950. Since 1974 more than 3,000 residential building permits have been issued. The total assessable base increased from \$87 million in FY-71 to \$158 million in FY-75 to \$819 million in FY-79. State highways and County roads have been greatly improved. There are now four main routes to enter and to leave Calvert. The recreational, educational, and shopping facilities have expanded greatly. The Calvert Marine Museum is a lighthouse attracting more visitors. The Calvert Memorial Hospital is modern and accredited. The Senior Citizens' Center, to be occupied in January 1980, may well serve as a model for rural areas. You can add to the list of change in Calvert County -- some good and some not-so-good.

Changes - there have been, and changes - there will be! This we know. We have the choice of several courses of action:

1. Ignore the change, or
2. Tell it to go away, or
3. Attempt to influence the nature and rate of change.

If you choose the third course, it would be helpful if you knew what goals are stated in the current Comprehensive Plan, who is responsible for planning, who is responsible for carrying out the plan, how well the objectives have been achieved, and where do we go from here.

The purpose of this report is to give you pertinent information and to stimulate your interest in, concern for, and participation in the planning process in Calvert County.

Maurice Dunkle  
Chairman

"...The most effective tool of the planning process  
is citizen involvement..."

- Herbert H. Smith  
*The Citizen's Guide to Planning*

## II. PLANNING IN CALVERT COUNTY

On March 13, 1962, the County Commissioners of Calvert County signed a resolution establishing the Planning Commission for Calvert County. The Commission was charged with the responsibility of making "a complete study of Calvert County." Thus began the first organized effort by Calvert Countians to provide for orderly and proper development of the County by means of a Comprehensive Plan.<sup>1</sup>

On April 1, 1964, an interim Zoning Ordinance<sup>2</sup> was adopted and on June 29, 1967, the first Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Ordinance was adopted by the County Commissioners. Since then, three significant changes and improvements in planning have occurred:

April 4, 1972 - adoption of the Calvert County Subdivision Regulations

October 1, 1974 - adoption of the revised Comprehensive Plan (also known as the "Pleasant Peninsula Plan")

October 12, 1976 - adoption of the Calvert County Road Ordinance

Through the adoption of these and other plans, the County residents, County Commissioners, and Planning Commission have had an increasing role in encouraging organized and proper County development.

### Role of the Planning Commission

Appointed by the County Commissioners in accordance with State law, the Planning Commission serves as a citizen review board on County planning decisions. As set forth in Article 66B of the Annotated Code of Maryland, the Planning Commission is both an advisory and decision-making body. In its advisory capacity, the Commission is required to make recommendations concerning rezoning cases, amendments to ordinances, public structures, improvements and land acquisitions, and other planning decisions. In its decision-making capacity, the Commission approves all subdivision of land. In both capacities, the Commission solicits comments from appropriate county, state, and federal agencies prior to making recommendations or decisions. Other duties include the Commission's creation, approval, and amendment to the Comprehensive Plan subject to adoption by the County Commissioners; the preparation of an Annual Report; and other reports necessary to proper planning or education of the public concerning planning activities.

---

<sup>1</sup>Comprehensive Plans generally include an analysis of area and goals and objectives for future growth.

<sup>2</sup>Zoning Ordinances generally impose use limitations on zoning categories with guidance from the Comprehensive Plan. The land use limitations serve to protect the general public and adjoining properties from adverse uses.

### Meeting Dates

The Planning Commission generally meets on the first and third Thursday of each month in the Courthouse:

1st Thursday at 7:30 p.m. in the Permits & Inspections Office -  
Room 001 (basement)

3rd Thursday at 7:30 p.m. in the Commissioners Hearing Room  
(1st floor)

Contact the Planning Department (535-1600 Ext. 237) to confirm meeting dates.

### Present Membership

Mr. Maurice A. Dunkle, Chairman - Prince Frederick - Term expires February 22, 1984.

Mr. Charles Howes, Vice-Chairman - Dunkirk - Term expires February 22, 1983.

Mrs. Isabelle Berezoski - Huntingtown - Term expires February 22, 1981.

Mrs. Veda Taylor - Lusby - Term expires July 5, 1982.

Mr. Earl Thorne - Prince Frederick - Term expires February 22, 1980.

Mr. Wilbur Ward - Dunkirk - Term expires February 25, 1980.

Mrs. Randi Vogt - Port Republic - Term expires February 22, 1981.

### Staff Support

Mr. Frank A. Jaklitsch, Director of Planning

Mr. William R. Pittman, Jr., Associate Planner

Mr. Gregory A. Bowen, Assistant Planner

Mr. Vivian C. Marsh, Environmental Planner

Mr. H. Wilson Dowell, III, Project Planner

Mr. Linwood Beverly, Draftsman

Ms. Maureen E. Crout, Secretary

Ms. Barbara A. Smith, Clerk Typist

NOTE: See Appendix L for specific staff duties as set forth in the job descriptions adopted by the County Commissioners in November, 1977.

### III. PLANNING ACTIVITIES

The planning activities of the Planning Commission and Planning Department in 1979 can be categorized as follows: "Ongoing Planning," "Specially Funded Projects," and "Other Staff Projects."

#### A. *Ongoing Planning*

1. Subdivision Review. 29 major subdivisions and 73 minor subdivisions were reviewed and approved by the Planning Commission. A total of 656 lots were reviewed and approved (See Section VII for subdivision information and trends). Planning Commission review includes topography, vegetation, roads, recreation area, setbacks, and whether the subdivision is consistent with the goals and objectives of the Comprehensive Plan.

Purpose: By authority of Maryland law, the Planning Commission is responsible for governing the subdivision of land to "... assure sites are suitable for building purposes and human habitation in a harmonious environment."<sup>1</sup>

2. Rezoning Cases. Fourteen rezoning cases were reviewed by the Planning Commission. Thus far, the Commission has forwarded its recommendations on eleven of these cases (See Section VII for cases and actions taken). The staff report provided for each case includes background information, site description, agency comments, findings, analysis, and recommendations of the Planning Director.

Purpose: According to Maryland law, the Planning Commission is required to make a recommendation to the County Commissioners prior to action on a rezoning case by the Commissioners. Providing such recommendations are designed to help the County Commissioners make decisions of maximum benefit to Calvert County.

3. Review of Zoning Ordinance and Subdivision Regulations. Based on recommendations by the Zoning Inspector, the Planning Department and others, the Planning Commission forwarded recommendations for 17 substantive amendments to the Zoning Ordinance and six substantive amendments to the Subdivision Regulations. The following is a synopsis of three of the more substantive amendments:

- a. Minimum lot size in R-1 zone
  - Old: 20,000 s.f. with individual water and sewer
  - New: 40,000 s.f. with individual water and sewer

Purpose: To insure adequately sized lots where community water and sewage are not available.

---

<sup>1</sup>Calvert County Subdivision Regulations, Article 1, p. 1.

b. Site Plan Review

Old: Silent

New: For new commercial, industrial, or multi-family dwelling developments. Lighting, public utilities, screening/buffering, landscaping, common areas, pedestrian and vehicular circulation, and building location and arrangement are to be reviewed by the Planning Commission within 90 days of completed application.

Purpose: To insure safe and proper site development.

c. Open Space Requirements

- (1) Percent of dedicated land 3% slope or less

Old: 25%

New: 75% (25% of land in streams, flood plains or steep slopes)

- (2) Amount of land dedicated

Old: .05 acre per family unit (first three exempt)

New: 6-15 family units - one acre (first five exempt)  
.16+ family units - one plus .10 acre for each additional unit.)

- (3) Reduction in Dedication for Preservation of Historic Buildings

Old: Silent

New: As long as a minimum of one acre is dedicated

Purpose: To insure adequate and suitable recreation areas for new subdivisions.

The revised Zoning Ordinance and Subdivision Regulations are available in the Permits and Inspections Office at a cost of \$6.00.

4. Agricultural Land Preservation Program. With recommendations from the Planning Commission, the County Commissioners amended the Zoning Ordinance so as to implement the Program. At the same time four transfer zones were created by resolution.

Since then three applications for Agricultural Preservation Districts have been accepted by the Agricultural Preservation Advisory Board. After reviewing the suitability of the farms, the Board approved the creation of the three farms as Agricultural Preservation Districts. (See Appendix H for mapping of Transfer Zones and Agricultural Preservation Districts.)

Purpose: In recent years, the County has experienced checker-board development of its good farmland. The purpose of the Program is to form protected farm communities and direct growth away from these areas through transfer of development rights to Transfer Zones.



5. Staff Support. Staff support is given to:

County Commissioners	Environmental Commission
Planning Commission	Historical District Commission
Agricultural Preservation	Maryland Historical Trust
Advisory Board	Committee

The staff support includes special studies, committee coordination and preparation of minutes.

Purpose: To give these boards and committees the needed support and staff expertise as well as insuring coordination of all planning activities.

6. Staff Participation. Members of the staff participate in the following committees and governmental organizations:

Sanitary Commission  
Coastal Resources Advisory Committee  
Tri-County Council for Southern Maryland  
303 and 208 River Basin Planning  
EPA Chesapeake Bay Program

The staff coordinates with the Sanitary Commission to determine whether new subdivisions shall be required to have community water or sewerage. The staff provides County representation to Coastal Resources Advisory Committee, Tri-County Council for Southern Maryland, and 303 and 208 River Basin Planning. The staff provided assistance to Commissioner Bernard Fowler in his capacity as a member of the Steering Committee of the EPA Chesapeake Bay Program.

7. Other Ongoing Projects

- A-95 Review (Federal Projects)
- General preparation of graphics
- Assignment of house numbers throughout the County
- Assistance in subdivision redesign, site analysis, and feasibility studies.

B. *Specially Funded Projects*

1. Community Living Areas Study. As in any locality, Calvert County is comprised of many different communities; including farm communities, water oriented towns, and residential (bedroom) communities. These communities have different needs, densities, household sizes, etc., and should not unnecessarily be lumped together for planning purposes. This study (funded in part by a HUD grant) establishes Community Planning Districts (CPDs) as sub-areas of election districts and organizes all available information

(households, vacant lots, trends, projections, etc.) by these CPDs.

This study has been completed and will help to provide the necessary data base for ongoing planning activities, the proposed review of the Comprehensive Plan, and development of County Master Plans.

Also, included in the study is a detailed analysis of a pilot CPD which will serve as a model for analyzing the remaining CPDs within the County.

2. Historical Conservation Plan. This County was one of the first in the State to adopt an Historical District Ordinance (1974). Since then 25 of the County's sites have been officially recognized as districts. However, many feel that a more coordinated historic planning program for the entire County is needed to establish better guidelines for historical districting of sites or towns. Also, different methods for encouraging historic conservation should be considered, such as: (1) covenants, (2) scenic easements, (3) tax incentives, and (4) federal assistance programs.

The purpose of Historical Conservation Planning is to provide guidance and new ideas for historical conservation in the County. The Plan should be completed by February, 1980 (See Appendix for project outline).

3. Ongoing Environmental Assessment. Often associated with rapid development of an area is deterioration of the environment. Factors contributing to environmental deterioration include erosion on developing sites, creation or expansion of roads and highways, leaking septic systems and dredging. Improper farm practices also can and often do lead to deterioration of the environment.

The purpose of this study is to determine the impacts of land development and land use, so that proper measures can be taken to preserve the environment. Results of the study should be available in 1980. (See Appendix for project outline.)

#### C. *Other Staff Projects*

In addition to answering inquiries by citizens (approximately 20% of the time), the staff also worked on the following projects in 1979. Project status is indicated in parentheses.

1. Identification of Bay access sites to be purchased with Coastal Zone funding. (Complete)
2. Herbicide utilization on B.G. & E. Right-of-Way. (Complete)
3. Comprehensive Plan outline and work program. (Complete)
4. 1980 Budget Preparation for Planning Commission, Planning Department, Historical District Commission, and Environmental Commission. (Complete)

5. Review of 1980 Capital Improvement Program. (Complete)
6. County coordination of H.U.D. Rate Maps for flood insurance rates. (Underway)
7. County coordination of Flood Plain delineation with the Department of Water Resources, 1":200'-topo., mapping of flood plain and recommendation for zoning changes. (Underway)
8. Commuter Parking Location Study. (Underway)
9. Preparation of Scope of Work and outline for the Calvert County Administrative and Judicial Facilities Study. (Underway)
10. 1980 Water & Sewer Plan and 1980 Solid Waste Plan. Prepared by Colonel Lawrence Bowlby; reviewed by staff and Planning Commission. (Complete)
11. Realignment of Precinct Boundaries. Assistance to the Election Board in realignment and written description of precinct boundaries. (Complete)
12. Preparation of base data maps of existing land use and existing zoning. (Complete)
13. Supervision of student interns on two studies:  
(1) Sediment Control and Effects of Erosion on Aquatic Macroinvertebrate Communities, and  
(2) Sensitive Areas Inventory. (Complete)
14. Road name change ordinance revision. (Underway)
15. Revision of subdivision review procedures. (Underway)
16. Review of State Transportation Plan and Budget. (Complete)
17. Assistance to Permits and Inspections Office on revisions to the County Building Code and Sediment Control Ordinance. (Underway)
18. Assistance to Tri-County Council for Southern Maryland in preparing materials for presentation and distribution for the preservation of the Patuxent River. (Underway)

## IV. FY 1980 BUDGETS

PLANNING COMMISSION BUDGET  
NOV 30 1979

DESCRIPTION	BEGINNING BUDGET	BUDGET ADJUSTMENTS	OUTSTANDING ENCUMBRANCES	EXPENDITURES TO DATE	% EXPENDED	BALANCE
OPERATING EXPENSES:						
CONTRACTED SERVICES <sup>1</sup>	3,000.00	0.00	0.00	950.50	31.6	2,049.50
CONFERENCE TRAVEL & REIMB.	1,000.00	0.00	0.00	230.00	23.0	770.00
TOTAL OPERATING EXPENSES:	4,000.00	0.00	0.00	1,180.50	29.5	2,819.50

PLANNING DEPARTMENT BUDGET  
NOV 30, 1979

DESCRIPTION	BEGINNING BUDGET	BUDGET ADJUSTMENTS	OUTSTANDING ENCUMBRANCES	EXPENDITURES TO DATE	% EXPENDED	BALANCE
SALARIES	127,241.00	0.00	0.00	57,086.95	44.9	70,154.05
OPERATING EXPENSES:						
PRINTING & OFFICE SUPPLIES	2,500.00	0.00	381.77	2,513.89	115.8	(395.66)
ADVERTISING	500.00	0.00	8.00	187.82	39.1	304.18
POSTAGE	1,500.00	0.00	0.00	483.97	32.2	1,016.03
TELEPHONE & TELEGRAPH	700.00	0.00	0.00	254.24	36.3	445.76
CONTRACTED SERVICES <sup>1</sup>	29,500.00	28,800.00	13,086.00	18,111.57	53.5	27,102.43
MILEAGE ALLOWANCE	3,000.00	0.00	0.00	1,276.45	42.5	1,723.55
CONFERENCE TRAVEL & REIMB.	1,500.00	0.00	230.00	1,185.66	94.3	84.34
SUBSCRIPTIONS & MEMBERSHIPS	600.00	0.00	61.00	461.84	87.1	77.16
EQUIPMENT REPAIR	200.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.0	200.00
TOTAL OPERATING EXPENSES:	40,000.00	28,800.00	13,766.77	24,475.44	55.5	30,557.79
CAPITAL OUTLAY:						
FURNITURE & EQUIPMENT	400.00	0.00	434.00	0.00	108.5	(34.00)
TOTAL CAPITAL OUTLAY:	400.00	0.00	434.00	0.00	108.5	34.00
TOTAL PLANNING DEPARTMENT:	167,641.00	28,800.00	14,200.77	81,562.39	48.7	100,677.84

<sup>1</sup> This item includes costs for legal, accounting, engineering, consulting, investigative, and other similar professional services.

## V. LAND USE CHANGES SINCE THE ADOPTION OF THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

According to Article 66B of the Annotated Code of Maryland, the annual report is to "index and locate on a map all changes in development patterns . . . and state whether these changes are or are not consistent . . . . with adopted plans of the jurisdiction." As this is the first annual report since the Comprehensive Plan of 1974, this section will generally cover land use changes since that Plan.

Listed below are the Plan's land use objectives followed by a brief review of County efforts to achieve the objective and an evaluation of the results.

Objective - 1: Develop policies, procedures, and regulations which will foster a planned "slow growth" alternative.

County Efforts. In working toward a slow growth objective, it was felt that each year a certain number of parcels would be subdivided, regardless of the number of lots. Therefore, the average lot size in the Agricultural (A-1) zone was increased to five acres (originally, three acre minimum) to reduce the number of available lots.

Effectiveness. Apparently, in the 1970's Calvert County has been increasingly thought of as a desirable place to relocate. To this extent, the number of lots created could have been up to 66% greater without the five acre minimum lot size. Also, numerous residential rezonings could have increased the growth rate beyond the current level. However, "slow growth" has certainly not been achieved. Between 1974 and 1980, the County's total number of dwelling units increased by 36%.

Objective - 2: Maintain a strong County-wide land use planning program to achieve a balance of land uses creating a high quality living and working environment.

County Efforts. Included in the Comprehensive Plan was a general land use plan which described areas suited for development, direction and type of growth, and description of the five County planning (growth) areas. Since then the number of planning projects has expanded and numerous programs have been adopted. For example, a Road Ordinance was adopted; a Solid Waste Plan was developed; and the Water and Sewage Plan has been updated on an annual basis (See Section III for this year's projects). However, there has been no general physical plan developed to implement the Comprehensive Plan.

Effectiveness. A balance of land uses has been provided for. However, development patterns have deviated from the land use plan.

Objective - 3: Coordinate the land use plan with the County Zoning Map and use the land use plan as a guide for zoning decisions.

County Efforts. As mentioned under Objective - 2, the adopted land use plan establishes growth areas (growth nodes). These are always considered in the staff reports on rezoning cases. The exact delineation of the growth nodes is not specified which lends to rezoning requests.

Effectiveness.

Out of 3 residential rezoning requests in growth nodes, 3 were rezoned.  
 Out of 9 commercial rezoning requests in growth nodes, 9 were rezoned.  
 Out of 3 residential rezoning requests not in growth nodes, 1 was rezoned.  
 Out of 10 commercial rezoning requests not in growth nodes, 4 were rezoned.

Objective - 4: Retain the natural amenities of the County, such as shorelines, forested areas, flood plains, stream valleys and wetlands in their natural state, consistent with good management practices.

County Efforts. Since the Comprehensive Plan has been in effect, the following efforts have been made toward the retention of the natural amenities of the County: (1) Planning Staff was expanded to include an Environmental Planner (2) the Harbor Line Study was implemented in Solomons, (3) unsafe land in new subdivisions is now protected from residential development through the subdivision review process, (4) the Environmental Commission and Urban Forester now review preliminary subdivision plans, (5) County stream study and flood plain area study are now underway, and (6) the County has recommended County critical areas to be delineated by the state.

Effectiveness. Many of these efforts are just underway, so it is difficult to gauge their effectiveness. However, since the 1974 Plan, other concerns have been raised, such as shoreline erosion, control of residential piers etc., which were not addressed in the Plan.

Objective - 5: Preserve prime agricultural and open space lands from encroaching urban development by discouraging urban sprawl and strip commercial development.

County Efforts.

Prime Agricultural Land: Concern for preservation of prime agricultural land was first vocalized in the Comprehensive Planning Process of 1974. In 1976, a committee was formed to develop a program to preserve agricultural land and on March 27, 1979 final phases had been recommended by the Planning Commission and approved by the County Commissioners to implement the program. The resulting innovative program established an alternative to the landowner, other than out-right sale of his entire farm. Instead, the landowner can sell his/her right to develop the land to another who wants to increase the development potential of his/her land.

Five hundred and twenty acres are now in the Agricultural Preservation Districts.

Efforts are also now being made to utilize the State Agricultural Preservation Program. However, this and the County program are going to have to be very well utilized in order to effectively preserve prime agricultural land.

**Open Space:** After 1974, a cluster development provision was added to the subdivision regulations to help preserve open space. In brief, the cluster provision allows that the permitted lots within a subdivision may be clustered on a portion of the land, with the rest in open space.

**Strip Commercial Development:** Although the Planning Commission and County Commissioners generally discourage strip commercial development, there are no provisions (regulations, moratoriums, etc.) that prohibit such rezonings.

Effectiveness. Despite the efforts mentioned above, Community Planning Districts (CPDs) not containing growth nodes have grown 34.1% since 1974, while CPDs containing growth nodes have grown only 25.1% (See Appendix F). Also the two fastest growing CPDs are not near designated growth nodes (CPD 5 - 77.9%, CPD 1 - 62.2%; see page 29) and are located in areas where the Comprehensive Plan recommended agricultural preservation. Clearly, the objective has not been met.

**Objective - 6:** New residential, commercial, industrial, and institutional developments be encouraged to locate in and around existing population centers and communities thereby creating development nodes.

County Efforts. Currently all major growth nodes have very limited sewage capacity, if any. Many owners of residentially zoned land have not chosen to develop their property.

The County Industrial Park was created to encourage new industry to locate in one area.

Effectiveness. As stated under Objective - 5, the majority of residential development is not occurring in the designated growth nodes. Little industrial development has occurred, either inside or outside the industrial park.

**Objective - 7:** Initiate and implement the development concept of "Villages" as the basis for granting residential and limited commercial developments and the provisions of community centers.

County Efforts. There are currently no provisions for the village concept.

Objective - 8: Phase the location and extent of development in accordance with existing or scheduled community facilities and services.

County Efforts.

Water and Sewer. The County periodically reviews the Water and Sewage Plan to keep it up to date with newly approved water and sewer systems approved by the Sanitary Commission. To insure that unhealthy situations are not created, the County does not permit building lots less than 40,000 sq. ft. to be created unless public water or sewerage is installed or planned for within 2 years.<sup>1</sup>

Roads. To insure that proper roads are constructed, the County Commissioners adopted the Road Ordinance in 1976 and in recent years the County Commissioners have undertaken a continuous and extensive program to improve County roads. In addition, the Planning Commission may deny subdivision of a parcel unless the developer demonstrates the proposed volume and flow of traffic between the proposed subdivision and the nearest existing County Collector or Arterial road will not create a hazard.<sup>2</sup>

Effectiveness. The 40,000 sq. ft. lot requirement was recently adopted and its effects can only be gauged over a long period of time. Roads for new developments have the capacity to carry increased traffic.

Objective - 9: Provide for more efficient use of land and a high quality of site design through the use of flexible development controls, such as cluster development, historic district zones, critical area zones, density transfers, and density zoning.

County Efforts.

Cluster Development. Also mentioned under Objective - 5, this method is actively used to protect sensitive areas, agricultural land, and to reduce street lengths.

Historical District Zones. Twenty-five historical districts have been established. Within these districts, no exterior structural changes or permits for new construction can be issued without the Historical District Commission's approval.

Unsafe Lands. The Planning Commission requires that unsafe land be designated as unsuitable for residential development on final plats.

---

<sup>1</sup>See Section 16.01 A.2. of the Calvert County Zoning Ordinance

<sup>2</sup>See Section 4.30 of the Calvert County Subdivision Regulations



Critical Areas Recommendations: These have been forwarded to the state for approval and designation.

Density Transfer and Density Zoning. The Calvert County Agricultural Land Preservation Program, mentioned also under Objective - 5, provides for density transfer (Transferable Development Rights - TDRs) to density zones (Transfer Zone).

Effectiveness. All aspects of this objective, except the designation of unsafe land and critical areas, are voluntary. Although not utilized too frequently, cluster development and historical districting have been beneficial when used. The Transferable Development Rights have not been used to date.

Unsafe land designation has proved to be an effective method for proper site design and preservation of critical areas in new subdivisions.

Objective - 10. Provide a transportation system designed to minimize congestion and conflict between resident and commercial traffic while providing the necessary transportation facilities for stable County growth.

County Efforts. Since the 1974 Plan, the County Commissioners adopted the Road Ordinance to insure the necessary transportation facilities; the County Engineer instituted a Traffic Signing and Hazardous Location Program; a limited access policy has been adopted for the new dualized Routes 2 & 4 below Prince Frederick, and the Planning Commission has developed a policy of requiring cul-de-sacs for minor subdivisions where they are practical, so that the number of accesses onto a collector road is reduced.

Effectiveness. The steps taken have improved present and future road conditions.

Objective - 11. Institute and annually update both a ten year capital improvement program and a yearly capital budget.

County Efforts. The yearly Capital Budget has been in effect for many years and has included capital improvements. The Capital Improvements Program (CIP) has been in effect for the past four years.

Effectiveness: The CIP provides an opportunity for the Planning Commission to review projects and their relationship to the Comprehensive Plan as required by Article 66B. The CIP document has not been adopted by the County Commissioners.

## VI. PROPOSED PLANNING PROJECTS

The following is a synopsis of major projects proposed for 1980 and the immediate future.

### A. Review of Comprehensive Plan and Development of Master Plans.

It is stated in the 1974 Comprehensive Plan that "The Comprehensive Plan should not be viewed as a one shot, long term document . . . Planning is a continuing process and this Plan should be updated as conditions and attitudes in the County change." Since the 1974 Plan, the County has experienced a population increase of 30%; making it the second fastest growing county in Maryland during that period. Such growth has depleted the supply of undeveloped commercially zoned land in parts of the County and has raised important questions concerning proper direction of growth.

Two other reasons enforce the need to review the Comprehensive Plan. The first is that our changing world has introduced new concerns (e.g., energy) that were not addressed in the 1974 Plan. Secondly, as indicated in Section V, not all goals and objectives have been met. These goals and objectives should be re-evaluated and new strategies set if they are still applicable.

After the Comprehensive Plan is reviewed, the County plans to create a physical plan (Master Plan) for each election district. The purpose of the Master Plans is to insure planning and implementation of the Comprehensive Plan's goals and objectives. (See Appendix for outline and time frame for these projects.)

### B. Land Treatment Feasibility Study

It has been common practice to discharge treated effluent directly into the closest stream. There is a major problem that exists with this type of operation: eutrophication. This is over-enrichment of water bodies by heavy concentrations of nitrogen and phosphorous which are characteristic of waste water. In addition, heavy concentrations of residual chlorine and other toxics which are discharged are harmful to aquatic organisms.

Eight major waste water treatment plants located in Prince George's, Howard, and Montgomery Counties were discharging 24.49 million gallons per day (mgd) of effluent into the Patuxent River in 1975. This is programmed to rise to 73.36 mgd in 1990 and 94.38 mgd in 2000. This means that of the total fresh water input to the Patuxent, 76% will be waste water treatment plant effluent by the year 2000; up from a recent 43% in 1973. Currently we are

at about a 55% level. This is obviously unacceptable if life in and around our estuaries is to continue as we now know it.

Calvert County can set a good example by developing a method of disposing of present and projected sewerage effluents in a manner which will not pollute fresh water streams or adjacent estuaries. One option that should be explored is land application of sewerage effluents. This method has been used successfully in other areas (e.g., Charles County) and indications are that it is cheaper and more environmentally acceptable than traditional sewerage disposal.

It would seem desirable to have a study to determine the feasibility of land application of sewerage effluents in Calvert County.

C. Special Town Plans - for Prince Frederick, Solomons, North Beach, etc.

In Maryland, special studies have been initiated by citizens in as many as a dozen towns. The purpose of these studies has been to improve the economy and esthetics of the towns by taking an organized approach to town growth and/or renovation. Often reviewed in such special studies is signage, landscaping, coordination of daily business openings and closings, store front designs and new growth location. Such planning usually results in both esthetic and economic benefits and should be initiated in Calvert County as desired by the town residents.

D. Community Piers Study.

Based on their concern for the capacity of Calvert County's waterways to handle increased marine traffic, the County Commissioners declared a moratorium on the construction of community piers, beginning October 16, 1979. The matter has been referred to the Planning Department for study and recommendation during a twelve (12) month period.

Although some background data have been gathered, the majority of the study will be conducted in 1980.

E. Commercial Needs Study.

Residential growth in the past decade has depleted the supply of undeveloped commercially zoned land in parts of the County. Therefore, a study is needed to recommend locations for comprehensive rezoning of land to commercial.

It is hoped that this study can be conducted in concert with preparation of Master Plans for the County.

## VII. INFORMATIONAL APPENDICES



APPENDIX A

SUBDIVISIONS CONSIDERED BY  
PLANNING COMMISSION IN 1979

Reference Number	Subdivision Name	Size (Acres)	Number of lots	Zoning	No. of lots	Community Planning District	Recreation Area (Acres)	Date Rec'd	Preliminary Approval	Recorded
78-9	Fishing Creek Estates	91.1	26	R-1 & F-1	---	6	3.40	3/21/78	Action deferred 3/15/79 at request of applicant	
79-1	Chapel Hill Estates	137.9	26	A-1	1	11	3.70	1/12/79	3/15/79	
79-2	Stone Farm, Section 2	83	19	A-1	---	5	.55	1/12/79	4/19/79	
79-3	Owen Soper Estates	235	53	A-1	9	8	2.7	2/9/79	7/19/79	
79-4	Friday Creek Estates	49.64	11	A-1	3	2	---	3/6/79 Revised 6/21	9/20/79	
79-5	Grapevine Cove Estates	83.5	17	A-1	---	15	.7*	3/7/79	5/3/79	
79-6	Joy Lee Acres	55.34	12	A-1	---	8	.55	3/8/79	5/3/79	10/2/79 ABE 1/25 & ABE 1/26
79-7	Margaret Nelson	5.35	10	R-1	---	17	---	3/8/79 Revised 8/2	Application revised to create only one lot; preliminary approval 8/14/79	
79-8	Folly Woods	20.68	7	A-1	3	11	---	3/14/79	5/3/79	6/29/79 ABE 1/101 ABE 1/102 ABE 1/103 & 8/13/79 ABE 1/109 7/13/79 ABE 1/104
79-9	Grantham Hall	161.58	39	A-1	3	3	1.55	4/2/79	5/3/79	
79-10	Roy Beall Subdivision	16.603	4	A-1	---	4	---	4/2/79	5/3/79	

\* Total Required

SUBDIVISIONS CONSIDERED BY  
PLANNING COMMISSION IN 1979


Reference Number	Subdivision Name	Size (Acres)	Number of lots	Zoning	No. of 1 ac. lots	Community Planning District	Recreation Area (Acres)	Date Rec'd	Preliminary Approval	Recorded
79-11	Valley Lee	22.39	6	A-1	---	11	---	4/6/79	6/7/79	10/11/79 ABE 1/136
79-12	Terre Verda	11.055	6	A-1	3	4	---	4/11/79	6/21/79	11/26/79 ABE 1/156
79-13	Resubdivision, Lot 3 Park Chesapeake	12.39	3	R-1	---	17	---	4/30/79	6/7/79	6/15/79 ABE 1/87
79-14	Mosley Acres	99.37	7	A-1	---	15	---	6/1/79	8/16/79	
77-44	Buena Vista Woods	248.092	48	A-1	---	9	---	12/8/77 Revised 5/10/79	8/2/79	
79-15	Morsell Subdivision	3.56	1	A-1	---	11	---	6/19/79	7/15/79	8/2/79 ABE 1/107 & ABE 1/108
79-16	Carol Court	37.58	50	R-1	---	17	2.5	6/27/79	9/20/79	
77-21	Summer City	84.871	64	R-1	---	6	1.7	7/14/77 Action suspended 9/21/77 per applicant's request; case reopened 9/17/78; revised plats 10/19/79, name changed to Brookside.		
79-17	Quince View Meadows, Section II	78.90	18	A-1	3	4	---	6/29/79	9/20/79	11/7/79 ABE 1/153 & ABE 1/154

SUBDIVISIONS CONSIDERED BY  
PLANNING COMMISSION IN 1979

Reference Number	Subdivision Name	Size (Acres)	Number of lots	Zoning	No. of l ac. lots	Community Planning District			Recreation Area (Acres)	Date Rec'd	Preliminary Approval	Recorded
79-18	Resubdivision, Lot 7 Park Chesapeake	11.81	3	R-1	---	---	17	---	---	7/12/79	9/6/79	10/24/79 ABE 1/147
79-19	Sunderland Star	20.31	6	A-1	3	---	5	---	---	7/13/79	9/20/79	
79-20	Quince View Meadows, Section III	25	5	A-1	---	---	4	.02	---	7/17/79	Revised to 35 acres & 7 lots 10/3/79; Preliminary approval 11/15/79	
79-21	Owings Proper	32.25	9	A-1	3	---	4	---	---	8/1/79	10/18/79	
79-22	Resubdivision, Section I Calvert Beach Estates	36.508	25	R-1	---	---	13	included in JLB 3/3	---	8/13/79	10/18/79	
79-23	Romar View	4.745	8	C-2	---	---	17	---	---	9/13/79	Action pending	
76-22	Rolling Hill Farms	31.32	8	A-1	2	---	6	.05	---	6/24/76	Preliminary approval expired 6/24/79; application resub- mitted 10/15/79; Preliminary approval granted 12/6/79	
79-24	Michael Court	7.867	13	R-1	---	---	15	.0826	---	10/22/79	Action pending	
79-25	Nostalgia	43.694	63	R-1	---	---	14	6.3	---	11/9/79	Action pending	
79-26	Section 5-C Chesapeake Ranch Ests.	11.3	7	C-2	---	---	17	2.3	---	11/14/79	Action pending	



# LOCATION OF REZONINGS CONSIDERED BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION IN 1979




APPENDIX B

ZONING CASES CONSIDERED BY PLANNING COMMISSION-1979

<u>Applicant</u>	<u>Case #</u>	<u>CPD</u>	<u># Acres</u>	<u>Present Zoning</u>	<u>Proposed Zoning</u>	<u>Summary of Action</u>
A. Chesapeake Ranch Club, Inc.	78-694	17	9.0	C-2	C-3	Staff Report 5/15/78; denial recommended 8/17/78; remanded to Planning Commission by County Commissioners after 11/14/78 public hearing; denial again recommended 4/19/79; rezoning denied by County Commissioners 10/2/79; Resolution #26-79.
B. C&C Builders, Inc.	78-699	6	47,000 sq. ft.	R-1	C-2	Staff Report 2/1/79; action suspended until Health Department concerns are addressed.
C. Planning Commission	78-700-0	---	Ordinance Change			Recommendation by Planning Commission 5/28/79 & 8/16/79; approved by the County Commissioners 10/9/79.
D. Planning Commission	78-SR-2	---	Ordinance Change			Recommendation by Planning Commission 5/28/79 & 8/16/79; approved by the County Commissioners 10/9/79.
E. Paris Plaza	78-701	4	43.24	R-1	C-1	Staff Report 1/25/79 & 2/9/79; applicant requested deferral until further notice - 2/14/79.
F. Chesatuxent	79-702	9	23	C-2 & R-2	C-2	Staff Report 3/12/79; approval recommended 3/15/79; approved by County Commissioners 6/26/79; Resolution #16-79.
G. Chesapeake Heights on the Bay	77-691	10	261	A-1	R-1	Staff Report 3/18/78; approval recommended 12/6/79; no hearing date set.
H. Burton Foote	79-703	15	1.0	A-1	C-2	Staff Report 6/18/79; denial recommended 7/19/79; no action to date by County Commissioners.
J. Frank Cleary	79-705	2	1.63	A-1	C-1	Staff Report 6/20/79; denial recommended 7/19/79; case referred back to Planning Commission by County Commissioners 12/4/79.
K. Fritz Grupp	79-706	16	8.0	A-1	C-2	Staff Report 8/18/79; denial recommended 12/6/79; no action by County Commissioners.
L. Golden Arch Realty Corp.	79-707	10	55,748 sq. ft.	R-1	C-2	Staff Report 8/8/79; denial recommended 9/20/79; public hearing 12/4/79; no action by County Commissioners.
M. G. L. Fleming	79-708	4	1.0	A-1	C-2	No action to date.
N. Axley & Rogers	79-709	9	.94	R-1	C-2	Staff Report 7/13/79; denial recommended 12/6/79; no action by County Commissioners.
O. New Century Corp.	79-710	---	Ordinance change - Section 17.10 G			Staff Report 11/8/79; applicant requested deferral until 1/17/79.

## APPENDIX C Community Planning Districts



APPENDIX D  
CALVERT COUNTY  
POPULATION AND HOUSEHOLDS  
BY COMMUNITY PLANNING DISTRICT (CPD)

CPD	NUMBER OF HOMES - 1970	POPULATION <sup>1</sup> IN 1970	NEW HOMES <sup>2</sup> BET. 1/70 - 1/80	ADDITIONAL POP: 1/70 - 1/80 <sup>3</sup>	TOTAL HOMES	TOTAL POP. - 1/80
1	256	820	765	1,970	1,021	2,790
2	169	540	177	450	346	990
3	231	740	117	300	348	1,040
4	362	1,160	286	740	648	1,900
5	300	960	567	1,460	867	2,420
6	306	980	212	540	518	1,520
18	893	2,860	159	430	1,062	3,290
M.C.D3	2,517	8,060	2,293	5,890	4,810	13,950
7	159	510	100	260	259	770
8	624	2,000	299	770	923	2,770
9	285	910	86	220	371	1,130
10	375	1,200	347	890	722	2,090
11	494	1,590	244	630	738	2,220
M.C.D2	1,937	6,210	1,076	2,770	3,013	8,980
12	465	1,040	154	400	619	1,440
13	668	1,490	363	930	1,031	2,420
14	192	430	60	150	252	580
15	346	770	172	440	518	1,210
16	31	70	8	20	39	90
17	1,166	2,600	695	1,790	1,861	4,390
M.C.D1	2,868	6,400	1,452	3,730	4,320	10,130
	7,322	20,670	4,821	12,390	12,143	33,060

<sup>1</sup>1970 Census Data

<sup>2</sup>Based on building permit data.

<sup>3</sup>Additional population figured at 2.57 persons per new household. 2.57 is the ratio of the difference between 1977 and 1970 Census Department estimates and the number of new residential building permits issued during that period.

APPENDIX E  
Residential Building Permits<sup>1</sup>  
January 1, 1970 - December 31, 1979  
By Community Planning District (CPD)

CPD	1/70- 12/70	1/71- 12/71	1/72- 12/72	1/73- 12/73	1/74- 12/74	1/75- 12/75	1/76- 12/76	1/77- 12/77	1/78- 12/78	1/79- 12/79	TOTAL
1	47	123	73	81	38	78	103	102	81	39	765
2	6	12	15	30	22	21	30	23	8	10	177
3	6	7	12	12	7	11	9	18	15	20	117
4	9	2	13	25	22	20	37	73	63	22	286
5	18	32	35	67	47	70	85	108	68	37	567
6	3	7	12	18	10	23	30	39	34	35	212
7	7	12	6	6	8	8	12	17	14	10	100
8	10	24	21	28	26	30	38	62	32	28	299
9	3	10	2	8	6	8	8	18	14	9	86
10	14	19	18	44	5	43	86	47	56	15	347
11	14	15	19	13	19	17	50	31	35	31	244
12	11	18	10	17	17	13	11	25	11	21	158
13	20	44	33	40	37	53	32	51	37	16	363
14	2	2	5	6	9	5	3	9	6	13	60
15	11	12	17	19	22	17	28	21	10	15	172
16	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	8
17	62	104	69	99	63	58	81	71	52	36	695
18	0	2	1	6	2	21	63	31	19	24	169
TOTAL	244	446	364	519	360	496	706	748	556	382	4,821

<sup>1</sup>Information Source: Calvert County Department of Inspections & Permits

Prepared by: HWD, III, GAB - January, 1980

# APPENDIX F

Total Dwelling Units/CPD/Year<sup>1</sup>  
January 1, 1970 - January 1, 1980

CPD	1/70	1/71	1/72	1/73	1/74	1/75	1/76	1/77	1/78	1/79	1/80	% Increase Since 1/70	Avg. Annual Increase
3rd District	1	256	303	426	499	580	618	696	799	901	982	1021	14.8%
	2	169	175	187	202	232	254	275	305	328	336	346	7.4%
	3	231	237	244	256	268	275	286	295	313	328	348	4.2%
	4	362	371	373	386	411	433	453	490	563	626	648	6.0%
	5	300	318	350	385	452	499	569	654	762	830	867	11.2%
	6	306	309	316	328	346	356	379	409	448	482	518	5.4%
2nd District	18	893	893	895	896	902	904	925	988	1019	1038	1062	1.7%
	2517	2606	2791	2952	3191	3339	3583	3940	4334	4622	4810		6.7%
	7	159	166	178	184	190	198	206	218	235	249	259	5.0%
	8	624	634	658	679	707	733	763	801	863	895	923	4.0%
	9	285	288	298	300	308	314	322	330	348	362	371	2.7%
	10	375	389	408	426	470	475	518	604	651	707	722	6.8%
1st District	11	494	508	523	542	555	574	591	641	672	707	738	4.1%
	1937	1985	2065	2131	2230	2294	2400	2594	2769	2920	3013		4.5%
	12	465	476	494	504	521	538	551	562	587	598	619	2.9%
	13	668	688	732	765	805	842	895	927	978	1015	1031	4.4%
	14	192	194	196	201	207	216	221	224	233	239	252	2.8%
	15	346	357	369	386	405	427	444	472	493	503	518	4.1%
County Wide	16	31	32	33	36	36	36	36	36	38	39	39	2.3%
	17	1166	1228	1332	1401	1500	1563	1621	1702	1773	1825	1861	4.8%
	2868	2975	3156	3293	3474	3622	3768	3923	4102	4219	4320		4.2%
	7322	7566	8012	8375	8895	9255	9751	10457	11205	11761	12143		5.2%

<sup>1</sup>Information Source: 1976 Calvert County Housing Survey, published February  
Department of Inspections & Permits

Prepared by: HWD, III, GAB - January, 1980


## APPENDIX G

## COMPARATIVE POPULATION PROJECTIONS (7)

SOURCE	1970	1975	1980	1985	1990	2000
Md. Dept. of Planning (1)	21,900	25,965	27,232	28,579	30,281	31,778
Md. Dept. of Planning (2)	21,900	26,319	34,500	39,197	41,598	45,089
Md. Dept. H & M H (3)	----	26,940	32,800	----	----	----
Tri-County Council, S. Md. (4)	20,682	25,816	32,593	39,105	45,902	55,023
Calvert County Planning Dept. (5)	20,000	25,000	32,800	40,000	48,400	64,000
U.S. Dept of Commerce (6) Bureau of Census	20,682	27,600	----	----	----	----


- (1) Md. Projection Series, 1975-90, Population & Employment, May 1977 Revisions  
 (2) Ltr. Md. DSP, to County Commissioners, dated May 1, 1978  
 (3) Md. Population Est., Md. Center for Health Statistics, June, 1977  
 (4) Tri-County Council Staff Paper No. 10, July 1977  
 (5) Projections prepared 10/31/77  
 (6) CIR P-26, No. 7620, Aug. 1977, Population as of July 1, 1977  
 (7) Table 1 COMAR 10.03.04

GRAPH OF POPULATION PROJECTIONS



APPENDIX H  
**CALVERT COUNTY, MD.**  
 Agricultural Preservation Program

31



DESIGNATED AGRICULTURAL AREAS

1st. Election District 9,100 Ac.  
 2nd Election District 7,575 Ac.  
 3rd Election District 6,075 Ac.  
 COUNTY 22,750 Ac.



## HISTORICAL CONSERVATION PLAN

## I. Private Options:

## A. Citizen Participation

1. Local support
  - a. voluntary associations
  - b. community historic preservation organizations
2. Public education program
  - a. folklife and rural traditions, oral history project
  - b. lecture forums
  - c. historic resource center
3. Land use controls
  - a. community covenants
  - b. "future interest" agreements

## B. Private Recycling

## II. Public Options:

## A. Zoning

1. Demolition by neglect controls
2. Community wide historic district zoning
3. "Floating zones"

## B. Taxation

1. Property tax credits
  - a. preferential assessments
  - b. present use assessments

## C. Transfer of development rights

## D. Federal and State assistance

## E. Revolving funds

## F. Public recycling

## III. Amendments to Historic District Ordinance

## A. Community conservation

## B. Building restrictions

1. height controls
2. maintenance controls
  - a. cleaning technology

## C. Clarification of historic value definitions

## APPENDIX J

## ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT/WATER QUALITY ANALYSIS

## Scope of Work

Purpose of Investigation

This study is being initiated as a pilot study by Calvert County in response to increasing concerns of the effects land use may be having on valuable fresh and esturine waters surrounding Calvert County.

The overall objective of this study is to identify water quality problems that may exist in three major watersheds which have resulted from adjacent land uses; and to identify potential land use practices which may have adverse effects on water quality.

The final product shall be a report which discusses in detail all water quality parameters tested, the results of the tests performed and to what degree those parameters appear to be influenced by land uses in the surrounding drainage basin.

Schedule of Work

The field work for this study will be accomplished from August 1, 1979 to July 31, 1980, with a final report due September 31, 1980. An interim report due February 15, 1980 shall be required which will outline tasks accomplished to date and preliminary findings.

Work to be Performed

## Sampling Interval:

Monthly samples will be taken at each station for a one year (12 months) period.

In addition, five (5) additional sets of samples (for all stream and parameters) may be taken during stress conditions.

## Sampling Locations:

Three streams will be studied: St. Leonards Creek, Hall Creek and Parkers Creek. There will be five (5) sampling stations on St. Leonards Creek and four (4) sampling stations each on Halls Creek and Parkers Creek. This equates to thirteen (13) sampling stations on the three tributaries. Sampling station sites will be selected that are mutually agreeable to both parties.

#### Sampling Consistency:

Sampling on the three tributaries will be consistent, in that all thirteen (13) stations will be sampled on the same day and on the same day each month. (Example: Sampling Days would be January 15th, February 15th, March 15th .....)

Five (5) additional sets of samples may be taken during stress periods.

#### Reports:

Two reports will be required, the interim and final. Three copies of the interim report shall be furnished by the time specified in the schedule of work.

A final draft report will be prepared by the contractor, which will contain descriptions of the purpose, objectives and background of the study, along with the methods employed, results and conclusion. The text should be accompanied with tables and figures appropriate for the presentation of results of each task. Pertinent explanation and discussion relative to the procedures involved in each task should also be provided to support methods and conclusions. The contractor shall furnish three (3) copies of the final draft report to Calvert County for review and approval of formats, method of presentation, and compliance with applicable contract requirements. Thirty days should be allowed for review by Calvert County.

Final technical reports shall be provided to Calvert County in eight (8) copies and the Coastal Zone Unit in two (2) copies with one original on good quality bond paper, 8 1/2" x 11", with a 2" binding margin on the left side. Tables of contents will be required along with a preface, executive summary, abstract, acknowledgements, references, glossary and a list of tables and figures. Mapping done as part of the evaluation procedure need not be reduced and bound with the report, but can be provided separately at full size.

## APPENDIX K

Draft Outline of Citizen Participation Program  
For Review of the Calvert County Comprehensive  
Plan & Development of County Master Plans<sup>a</sup>

DATES

## I. Organization of Citizen Participation and Generation of Public Interest.

- A. Presentation of Citizen Participation techniques to Planning Commission.
- B. Inform County Commissioners of Citizen Participation techniques.
- C. Develop "shopping list" of problems and determine accomplishments of Comprehensive Plan - i.e. which goals and objectives have been met and which have not been met (prepared by Planning Department).
- D. Generation of Public Interest

- 1/3/80 1) Bulk rate mailing to all county households (including questionnaires).
- 11/28/79 - 1/25/80 2) Presentations to key civic organizations of intentions to conduct public meetings and evaluate Comprehensive Plan.
- 11/21/79 3) Provide media information (to be continued throughout revision of Comprehensive Plan and development of Master Plans).  
- approximately 8 to 10 weeks -

## 1/26/80 II. Review of Comprehensive Plan

## A. Conduct Public Mass Meetings (Calvert Senior High School (9 AM - 4 PM)

- 1) Presentation by Planning Department staff of key issues and problems.
- 2) Conduct "Nominal Group Workshops" - to surface problems and concerns, and relate them to our current goals and objectives - i.e. perhaps we may need to eliminate some or add others.  
- approximately 2 to 3 weeks -

- 3/20/80 B. Present results of mass meetings, including revision of goals and objectives (if any), to Planning Commission (prepared by Planning Department).

- 4/14/80 C. Present draft of Comprehensive Plan to County Commissioners.  
- approximately 4 to 6 weeks -

DATES

## III. Development of Master Plans (by election districts)

- 4/80 - 4/81      A. Citizen Participation in Preliminary Master Plans
- 1) Coordination with County Commissioner's Citizen Advisory Committee.
  - 2) Coordination with an Advisory Committee of "Liasons."
  - 3) Conduct forum meetings - to keep general public informed.
- 5/81              B. Present Preliminary Master Plans to Planning Commission (Public Hearing).
- C. Present Preliminary Master Plans to County Commissioners (Public Hearing).

## APPENDIX L

## PLANNING DEPARTMENT

## STAFF DUTIES

Staff Support

Mr. Frank A. Jaklitsch, Director of Planning - directs County planning activities including the formulation and administration of comprehensive plans. This is a high level professional planning and administrative position requiring a comprehensive knowledge of the physical, social and economic implications of local planning activities, and the ability to integrate diverse planning projects with the overall objectives of the County. The Planning Director serves as the Administrator and Secretary of the County Planning Commission as well as the Director of the Planning Department. The work is performed under the policy direction of the Administrative Director.

Mr. William R. Pittman, Jr., Associate Planner - performs professional level planning duties within a wide range of assignments relating to subdivision of land and physical development of the County, administration of regulations and review and preparation of regulations and ordinances; does related work as required. Difficult County planning activities are performed, involving knowledge of the principles and practices of planning and an understanding of the physical, social and economic concepts underlying planning. The Associate Planner interprets and administers land use regulations and prepares the necessary information to keep the plans, regulations and policies of the County and the Planning Department current and reflective of the long range development goals of the County. He also identifies existing and potential problems associated with growth and development. The work is performed under the general supervision of and in accordance with procedures and policies laid down by the Planning Director. Supervision is exercised over subordinate planners and drafting personnel.

Mr. Gregory A. Bowen, Assistant Planner - performs professional field and office investigative work pertaining to planning problems. Performs substantive planning work involving knowledge of the principles and practice of the physical, social and economic concepts underlying planning. Employees in this class receive general supervision and perform duties in accordance with procedures and policies established by the Planning Director.

Mr. Vivian C. Marsh, Environmental Planner - performs professional field and office investigative work pertaining to environmental planning problems. Does related work as required. Performs substantive planning work involving knowledge of the principles and practices of environment,

resources and land planning. Employees in this class receive general supervision and perform duties in accordance with procedures and policies established by the Planning Director.

Mr. H. Wilson Dowell, III, Project Planner - this is responsible professional work in rural planning. Prepares and implements planning studies designed to promote the orderly growth and development of the County as a whole and of the various sub-areas and communities contained within its boundaries. Work involves the identification and analysis of problems; the development of goals and objectives; the design of programs and alternatives thereto to meet the objectives and the implementation, monitoring, and evaluation of programs. Work is performed with considerable latitude for independent judgment and action within the scope of office programs and policies. General direction is received in performing projects, and work is reviewed through conferences, reports, and observations of results.

E. Linwood Beverly, The Draftsman - is responsible for sub-professional work in the Planning Office. The employee in this class is expected to prepare plats, plans and other drawings as well as maps. Drawings must be neat and accurate and are checked both in process and upon completion for adherence to instructions.

Maureen E. Crout, Secretary III - performs difficult stenographic and clerical tasks requiring responsible clerical decisions in accordance with established policies. Considerable judgment and independent action in establishing or adapting work procedures to new situations is also involved. The employee in this class frequently acts as an intermediary for a superior and is delegated responsibility for handling minor administrative details. Public contact is frequently a major function of the position. Work is normally reviewed only for results obtained. A Secretary III may exercise supervision over the work of secretarial or clerical assistants.

Barbara A. Smith, Clerk Typist I - engages in repetitive clerical work. Detailed instructions are given for new or difficult assignments and work is reviewed in process or upon completion for accuracy. As the employee becomes familiar with particular procedures, she then works with more independence. Since this is the beginning class in the typist series, alertness and a willingness to learn and prepare for assignments of progressively increasing difficulty are essential. The Clerk Typist I does not exercise direct supervision. The employee in this position performs tasks for both the Planning Department and the County Engineer.

## APPENDIX M

## Materials available from the Calvert County Planning Department

Water & Sewerage Plan	\$5.00	
Solid Waste Plan	5.00	
Comprehensive Plan	3.00	
Housing Survey	2.50	
County Street Map	1.75	
Official Zoning Maps	1.50 sheet	\$50.00 set
Soils Maps	1.50 sheet	\$50.00 set
Aerial Photo Maps	1.50 sheet	\$50.00 set
Miscellaneous County Maps	1.50	
Overall Zoning Map		
Land Use Map		
Water Plan Map		
Sewerage Plan Map		
General Plan Map		
Public Facilities Map		
Historic Sites Map		
Designated Agricultural Sites Map		
etc.		
Copy of recorded subdivision plats	1.50	

## Complimentary materials available from the Calvert County Planning Department

Population projections and information

Yearly building permit information

Agricultural Preservation Program information

Tourism Brochure



NOAA COASTAL SERVICES CTR LIBRARY



3 6668 14110272 5