Workshops Held on Key Issues

To provide an opportunity for public discussion of the five key topics in the update to the Comprehensive Plan, the Department of Planning & Zoning, along with the consultant team, conducted a series of five public Issue Identification Workshops on behalf of the Planning Commission. Each workshop covered one of the key topics identified though public discussions held in 2016.

Prior to the Issue Identification Workshops, an issue paper for the topic was published on the county website. The issue papers provided background information on the topic. The first three issue papers were qualitative in nature, asking for perceptions of the preferred features and appearance of the areas of the county designated for growth. The final two papers provided more quantitative information on the recent and projected levels of growth in residential and commercial development in the county.

At each Issue Identification Workshop, attendees participated in facilitated small group discussions guided by questions related to the specific key issue.

Total attendance at the five workshops was 365 people. The date, topic, and number of people signing in at each meeting, not including Planning Commission members or staff working at the workshops, is listed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Attendees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday, February 6, 2017</td>
<td>Providing an Efficient and Multi-modal Transportation System</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, February 22, 2017</td>
<td>Supporting Options in Community Character: Developing a Place-type Strategy</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday, March 27, 2017</td>
<td>Fostering Vibrant, Walkable Communities with Multi-generational Opportunities</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, April 20, 2017</td>
<td>Preserving Rural Character and Directing Growth to Designated Areas</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday, May 16, 2017</td>
<td>Strengthening Economic Vitality</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Memo to Calvert County Planning Commission from Jacquelyn Seneschal, AICP; June 14, 2017; Comprehensive Plan – Outcomes of Key Issue Discussions. The department’s name was updated to reflect subsequent change.
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Summary of Key Outcomes from the Issue Identification Workshops and Surveys
February – May, 2017

Providing an Efficient and Multi-modal Transportation System

Overall, the participants believe that private automobiles will remain the primary mode of travel in the county for the foreseeable future. Sidewalks to serve local communities enjoyed considerable support with interest in improving local bus service also receiving support. Improved bicycle facilities to serve local travel and recreation demands received some interest.

In addition to the discussion of specific travel modes, there were additional themes that emerged from the evening. Many conversations referred to the importance of the destinations points. Participants stated their travel included destinations throughout the county. Major routes for in county travel were: Dunkirk to Prince Frederick, Plum Point to Prince Frederick, and Huntingtown to Prince Frederick.

Some participants said there were few stores to go to and the creation of new shopping destinations were necessary. Other participants argued the idea that since more people are shopping online, trips to stores might slow down and a focus on transportation directed to retail may not be necessary in the future.

Participants place the highest priority on improvements to numerous state and local roads, most notably to MD 2/4. There is considerable expectation that MD 2/4 is to be widened throughout the county, although SHA only has construction funding to support widening for a short distance in Prince Frederick. The need for more sophisticated tools for understanding how traffic flows in the county and what future conditions might look like was clear from the public comment. Available forecasts from SHA were out-of-date and it was not clear that they were responsive to local land use policies.

The 2010 Comprehensive Plan includes completion of the network of local roads parallel to MD2/4 in Prince Frederick and the charrette report builds the Town Center land use upon these roads. Similar parallel roads systems are in place or should be included in the plans for each designated growth area along MD 2/4.

The participants believe there need to be more safe and comfortable pedestrian and bicycle connections from housing locations to commercial areas. There is considerable support for pedestrian improvements and continuous sidewalk networks in the communities of Dunkirk, Huntingtown, Prince Frederick, and Lusby. Participants believe walking around Town Centers is dependent upon where one is going and
what one has to do. The participants concluded that having more things to do in Town Centers would enhance walkability and bikeability.

While the existing local transit service is generally not perceived as meeting the needs of the participants, there is support for improving service within the currently designated Town Centers and for travel throughout the county.

The preference for addressing automobile travel also dominated among those responding to the online survey. There were a number of comments supporting improvements for walkers and bicyclists, especially in the Town Centers.

Supporting Options in Community Character

The paper proposed a range of place-types that might be used in a future land use map for the county. Five types of communities were proposed, based upon the variety of development patterns in Calvert County. The initial list included Town Centers, Villages, Hamlets, Waterfront Communities, and Residential Transition Zones. The intent of the paper was to seek out suggestions for locations that might fit into each category as a means for developing more specific definitions to reflect Calvert County concerns.

Currently, there are seven designated Town Centers with a wide variety of characters, sizes and development potentials. By grouping similar communities together, the county would be able to develop shared sets of zoning standards that could be applied across multiple locations. Similarly, the rural areas of the county contain both areas designated as priority funding areas in recognition of their small lot sizes and potential need for public facilities as well as other areas with large lot zoning and a very different character and appearance.

Interestingly, some participants expressed immediate concern that the effort to categorize communities as particular place-types would encourage additional growth in all such places. The point was clearly made that some place-types are suited for additional growth, while other place-types are not. Town Centers are suitable for the greatest level of growth. Villages are suited for some growth but not as much as Town Centers. The name “Hamlets” is clearly rejected and the future of isolated rural commercial sites is questionable. Waterfront communities are not places for additional growth. Commercial uses, especially along the water, are acceptable in a few of waterfront communities, but not at all in most. There was not much discussion of the Residential Transition Areas, although some attendees expressed disapproval of that place-type as well.

Each breakout group was asked to classify various locations as place-types. Figure 1 below shows the results of those discussions.
Responses to the online survey were also conflicting. There was a strong consensus in favor of Town Centers and a moderate amount of respondents who were in favor of Villages. However, there was much disagreement on the favorability of Hamlets, Waterfront Communities, and Residential Transition Areas. Many were either confused about the logistics of Hamlets, Waterfront Communities, and Residential Transition Areas or were opposed to them altogether. While some strongly advocated for additional retail, others advocated strongly against adding any areas that could increase retail development. Additionally, there were people who suggested more research be conducted before implementing these place-types. Some research suggestions included environmental impact studies and research on how taxes and property values could be affected. Overall, there was much passion from many sides of the proposal, but little consensus on what should be done.

**Fostering Vibrant, Walkable Communities with Multi-Generational Opportunities**

This meeting offered a second opportunity to discuss how county residents perceive various types of places in the county and to envision how they might look in the future. The paper proposed more specific definitions for each place-type and a set of characteristics that might be applied to each.
Discussion during the evening provided additional insight into how participants view their own communities and other in the county. Following the workshop, residents of Dunkirk and Huntingtown and Lower Marlboro submitted additional thoughts about how their communities should look in the future.

Take-aways from the conversations included:

- Prince Frederick is a Town Center and the recommendations of the charrette should inform the goals for this community in the Comprehensive Plan.
- In general, established waterfront communities are not locations for residential or business growth.
- Hamlets are not a popular concept; continuation of the current rural community designation is preferred.
- Currently there are two-levels of designated growth centers. The 2010 Comprehensive Plan calls them major and minor Town Centers. There is some acceptance of the use of Villages as an alternative to minor Town Center. Some residents from both Huntingtown and Dunkirk prefer this designation for their communities.
- Availability of water and sewer service, building scale and whether multi-family units are permitted are seen as key distinctions between Town Centers and Villages.
- There are some concerns among commercial property owners that restricting the range or intensity of uses in Villages may have a negative effect on their property values.

Place-type Definitions as refined after the workshop:

**Town Center** – These places are designated as Town Centers in the current Comprehensive Plan with a higher intensity and greater variety of commercial and residential development within the plan boundaries. Each has nearby single-family residential development, typically within a one-mile radius of the Town Center.

**Village** – These places are designated as Town Centers in the current Comprehensive Plan but have a lower intensity and more limited variety of commercial and residential development. These locations are suitable for additional commercial development and various forms of single family dwellings. They typically have single-family detached residential development within one mile.

**Waterfront Community** – These mature, built-out residential communities typically pre-date zoning and subdivision regulations. They are not planned for expansion; designation as waterfront communities would preserve the current development pattern and allow redevelopment that complies with
provisions for environmental protection and climate adaptation. Some waterfront communities have had flood mitigation plans prepared.

Figure 2 is a summary of characteristics of place-types based upon discussions at Workshops #2 and #3.

**Figure 2. Characteristics and Potential Features of Place-types in Calvert County**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Town Center</th>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Waterfront Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Priority Funding Area</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water service</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Public health only</td>
<td>Public health only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer system</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Public health only</td>
<td>Public health only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health care facilities</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public safety station</td>
<td>3 or more</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-family units, large (4+ units)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-family units, small (less than 4 units)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot sizes for new development</td>
<td>Varies, 1 acre max</td>
<td>Varies, 1 acre max</td>
<td>Use existing lot sizes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building height (max. stories)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2 occupied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Places of assembly (community center, churches, etc.)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small commercial building, size to be determined</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large commercial buildings size to be determined</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing, warehousing, industrial, etc.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central business area</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalks, pedestrian network</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterfront commercial (marinas, restaurants)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Existing only</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Preserving Rural Character and Directing Growth to Designated Areas**

This paper included a review of the policies outlined in the 2010 Comprehensive Plan, recent and projected growth in population and housing, construction approvals, the results of a build-out analysis and descriptions of the current land preservation programs. At the workshop, staff presented an
overview of the county’s planning efforts. Following the presentation, participants developed and ranked proposals for preserving rural character and directing growth by answering two open-ended questions. The ten most popular answers to each question are shown below.

**Question 1: Preserving farm and forest land has been a priority of Calvert County for 30 years. What actions would you support the county taking to preserve even more land? How should those actions be paid for?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial TDRs</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use TDRs to create greenways (defined greenways)</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use TDR to buy more Land, strengthen TDR market</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing (there is enough preservation)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limit build-out to 37,000 households</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Rural&quot; Character – Let’s own that, claim, and communicate it</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not raise taxes</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase lot size in rural areas and decrease inside Town Centers</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOCC consistently budget money for the Purchase and Retirement fund (Do not place a limit on the number of TDRs that can be purchased from an individual.)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote high value crops and help farmers produce products</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progressive impact fees</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow opt out of TDR program if farmer cannot sell all TDRs</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 2: One way to protect farm and forest land is to direct growth away from them and into designated areas. What incentives would you support the county providing to encourage/attract/direct growth to designated areas?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Build a “Center” in the Town Center; focus on building a sense of community that is walkable and bike-able; high quality amenities</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed use residential on top of retail in Town Center; affordable and denser housing in Town Center; density bonus (More density in Town Center)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resurrect the charrette (increase attractiveness of Town Centers)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthen public process before BOCC can take action - zoning changes transparency</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use a cost/benefit analysis for comprehensive review to guide decisions (Target county’s spending)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build infrastructure before overcrowding</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-retail employment</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand sewer in Town Centers (subsidizing utilities)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take existing enterprise zones and ease regulations to encourage growth there. Streamline review process</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incentives to build in Town Centers and disincentives outside of Town Centers</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to attending the workshop, people had the option to respond to the questions online. In these responses, there was a large consensus over the importance of preserving the county’s rural character and directing growth to designated areas. Many of the respondents voiced suggestions for preserving land. Some suggested increasing the amount of preservation districts, while others suggested deflecting development from rural areas by attracting the development to Town Centers. It was also suggested to have a farmers market in each Town Center farming and direct growth to Town Centers. In regards to directing growth to designated areas, many suggested making the Town Centers more pedestrian and biker friendly, either through the layout of the Town Center or by adding a bypass. Many suggestions also included improving or adding infrastructure in the Town Centers. While there was not a consensus on how to pay for incentivizing the preservation of land, there was agreement throughout the responses that advocated for preserving the county’s rural character and directing growth to designated areas.
Strengthening Economic Vitality

This paper provided information on commuting patterns, large employers, county tax base, tourism, lost retail and service sales, and household income. Following a summary presentation on the paper, participants responded to two open-ended questions about their hopes and concerns for future economic growth in the county. The ten most popular answers to each question are shown below.

Question 1: What are the best actions Calvert County could take to increase the number of well-paying jobs in the county?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve internet access throughout the county, especially to support telecommuting</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy should be based on natural assets (e.g. Bay, river, agriculture, fisheries, etc.)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attract small tech companies and green energy jobs</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attract more technical training and trade skills in high schools and colleges</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educate public officials about the importance of small businesses</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase tourism in Calvert County, focusing specifically on agri-tourism and ecotourism</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use local models to inform economic development (e.g. Leonardtown)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop Patuxent Business Park Plan to encourage businesses, especially research + development, to come to Calvert County</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support creation of more mid-level $30-50,000 jobs, instead of solely high-paying jobs. (&quot;Based on population median salary of $95,000, do we need more high paying jobs?&quot;)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support local agriculture: increase smaller/cooperative types of farms and farm business/agribusiness</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food hubs for distribution</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food-based tourism: Local food, fine dining, casual seafood (MD charm)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build a conference center with lodging</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simplify and speed up building permit process and assign one person to assist through entire process</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 2: What concerns you most about proposals to expand Calvert County’s economy?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of infrastructure/Infrastructure is not suitable</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too many variances to zoning laws</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development should not occur at the expense of the environment</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Pleasant Peninsula&quot;</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress has been made but need more attention to water quality, water access, boat rentals, and marine pump out</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The county should focus on small business development, not expansion of large retail companies</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not lump Town Centers together in the Comprehensive Plan and zoning ordinance so as to avoid cookie cutter towns</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOCC and government officials should adhere to guidelines instead of changing them. BOCC needs to be accessible and accountable and respond to residents’ concerns</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developers are still focused on building more shopping centers, which haven’t worked in the past. Why will they work now?</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquefied Natural Gas should not be expanded</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to think about quality vs. quantity of business type, especially industrial</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic growth seems to conflict with &quot;Keep Calvert Country&quot; theme and residents will not embrace business risk for ROI (return on investment)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on the charrette, the public wants creative, unique, and ecofriendly community design, while builders want generic design</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The county also provided an opportunity to respond to the same questions online. Many of those respondents expressed concern about the long-term viability of retail businesses, especially “big box”
stores, in light of the ease of online shopping. They generally favored smaller, local businesses including farm-based enterprises.
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Providing an Efficient and Multi-modal Transportation System

Concerns about traffic delays, pedestrian amenities, bicycle facilities, and transit service pervade every discussion of the County's condition and future. Calvert County's geography limits accessibility to the county and presents challenges to the creation of a robust internal transportation network. The county is surrounded on three sides by water. The primary road access is in the narrow north end of the county. There is only one highway crossing to the west into Charles County, MD 231 Benedict Bridge, and one to the south into St. Mary's County, MD 4 Thomas Johnson Bridge, which is being studied for replacement and widening. There are no highway connections to the east.

The transportation network in Calvert County is a function of the county's shape—a long narrow peninsula. The long length of the peninsula and large water bodies along it encourage north-south movements. Because the peninsula is narrow, there is limited space for multiple north-south routes. MD 2/4 is the only road that extends for the full length of the county, and at the headwaters of St. Leonard's Creek, it is the only road linking the northern and southern ends of the county. Whether commuting out of the county to the north or south or traveling within the county to Prince Frederick and the other Town Centers, the vast majority of residents travel by car on MD 4 and 2/4 at some point. The county's dependence on auto travel along MD 4 and MD 2/4 corridors is at the center of the concerns related to transportation.

This issue paper proposes strategies for providing a multi-modal transportation network within these limitations. It also discusses the different types of travel movements that occur: within the county, through the county, and within a Town Center. While there is overlap between these categories, it is important to recognize the differences and develop approaches to addressing the needs of each.

Current Conditions

Highways
Highway traffic is a product of Calvert County’s car-centric transportation network, and traffic on MD 4 and 2/4 is the most frequently-mentioned transportation issue. However, despite its dominance as an issue, Calvert County has not seen increasing levels of traffic along the primary county arterial road in recent years. Figures 1 and 2 show annual average daily traffic (AADT) at five points along MD 4 and 2/4 from 2000-2015. Aside from one sharp increase in 2005 at MD 2/4 in Prince Frederick, traffic volumes have been fairly stable. The higher counts are in the middle of the county and moving to the north; the south has significantly lower traffic volumes than the rest of the county, but has seen the most consistent growth in volumes over time.

**Planned Highway improvements**

The Maryland State Highway Administration has begun a six-phase project to upgrade and widen MD 2/4 in Prince Frederick from north of Stoakely Road to south of MD 765A to a six-lane divided highway. This project will accommodate bicycles and pedestrians as appropriate. The second phase of the project, from Fox Run Boulevard to Commerce Lane is scheduled for completion in 2021.

**Figure 2. Traffic Counts 2000-2015**
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The state is also studying the replacement and widening of the Thomas Johnson Bridge, which carries MD 4 over the Patuxent River at the south end of the county. The improved bridge is slated to include accommodations for pedestrians and bicyclists.

**Transit**

The County Government provides seven bus routes in and between the Town Centers: two routes provide service within Prince Frederick, two routes provide service to the northern part of the county, one route serves the middle section of the county, one route serves in the south part, and one route provides service through Lusby and Chesapeake Ranch Estates. Depending on the route, there are between five and 13 trips a day.

There are five daily commuter routes into Washington, DC, and the commuter buses are typically filled to capacity.

**Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities**

There are few connected trails for bicyclists or pedestrians to use, either for recreation or for transportation between developed areas. Providing these connections is challenging because of east-west stream valleys cutting through the county on either side of the ridgeline that MD 2/4 follows.

The volume and speed of vehicles, and in some instances, the lack of shoulders make MD 2, MD 4, and MD 2/4 impediments to pedestrian and bicycle travel. In addition, where the highways bisect developed areas, the lack of signalized pedestrian crossings discourages people from walking, most notably in the Prince Frederick Town Center. While there are sidewalks, they are limited and not fully connected even in developed areas. The lack of pedestrian and bicycle facilities fosters reliance on automobiles and does not provide alternatives to auto travel.

**National Trends**

Several national and regional current trends could lead to increased traffic in the county in the future. First, the Federal Highway Administration has identified a national increase in total vehicle-distance traveled along highways starting in 2014. Washington, DC is consistently ranked as one of the worst metropolitan areas in the country for congestion. In the 2015 Urban Mobility Scorecard produced by Texas A&M Transportation Institute, the Washington, DC Metro Area is ranked first in three of the four categories for congestion. Since 61 percent of county residents commute outside of the county, commuters can expect to deal with increased congestion on their way to work.

Second, the advent of connected and autonomous vehicles is generally anticipated to affect driving patterns in several ways. Commuters may choose to send their cars home rather than paying for daily parking. This practice would double the number of daily work trips for cars whose owners decided to do this. Also, these vehicles with their enhanced safety features may encourage individuals who are not
drivers or who do not drive frequently to travel more often and further distances than they might in less-sophisticated cars.

Beyond auto traffic, increasing numbers of travelers are opting to walk and to bicycle for short daily trips. Communities which provide safe and attractive facilities attract residents and businesses interested in healthier and more affordable travel options.

**Perspectives on Transportation**

**Board of County Commissioners and Planning Commission**

Both the County Commissioners and the Planning Commission consider traffic an issue that must be addressed in the Comprehensive Plan. With only one major road in and out of Calvert County, they are pursuing highway improvements and are seeking viable alternatives to driving such as teleworking, transit and rideshare, and improved bicycle and pedestrian facilities. Specific transportation improvements suggested included additional park-and-ride lots to handle future needs, a new Thomas Johnson Bridge, expanded transit including consideration of light rail, bicycle paths, sidewalks, and trails.

**Comments from public**

Residents consider the future of MD 4 and 2/4 and its traffic a major issue with little consensus. Congestion on MD 4 and 2/4 and the difficulty of getting onto these highways from side streets were often raised as a concern at the workshops. Residents’ concerns about the car-centric travel in the county revolve around the perception that congestion has worsened throughout the county, particularly through Prince Frederick and Dunkirk and on the Thomas Johnson Bridge and MD 231.

Residents recognize that there are limited transportation options in Calvert County, but do not have consensus on solutions. Proposed solutions for MD 2/4 range from “it shouldn’t be widened” to “it should be widened properly at appropriate places.” Many workshop participants noted that the rural landscape of Calvert County presents challenges for a well-connected and efficient bus network. However, some felt that public transportation system was great for the elderly while others argued that transit service is in need of dire repair for all users.

Pedestrian and bicyclists access issues are a growing concern for residents. Workshop participants felt that there are poor walking conditions throughout the county, and called out Solomons as needing improvement. Some residents noted that millennials and seniors prefer walking and biking for daily errands as well as other trip destinations and stressed the importance of bicycle and pedestrian accommodations, not just in rural areas but also in more built-up areas with an on-road and side-path network. Residents suggested filling in missing links to the county’s trail network and better promoting the county’s current transportation alternatives through biking and trails maps.
Sidewalk improvements and bicycle facilities along parts of MD 2/4 and MD 231 were also mentioned. Limited pedestrian crossings of MD 4 and 2/4 are raised as a particular concern in the Town Centers. Moreover, it was felt that Dunkirk Town Center has great pedestrian improvements, but limited bicycle accommodations. The area around Cove Point was felt to be unsafe for pedestrians.

**Desired Outcomes**

Calvert County residents would like to be able to travel throughout the county and within their communities, using a variety of modes, with greater ease. Improving conditions for bicyclists and pedestrians was also expressed, as was a desire to see expanded transit service.

There are several different types of travel needs. There is a need to travel through the county, for example, long distance travel primarily on MD 4 and 2/4. There is a need to travel within the county, that is, shorter distance travel that likely includes some travel on MD 4 or MD 2/4, for example getting from one Town Center to another or from a residential area to a Town Center. There is also a need to travel within a Town Center. While there is some overlap among these categories, it is important to recognize the differences and develop different approaches to fulfilling the needs of each.

The 2010 Comprehensive Plan indicates that preventing severe congestion on MD 4 and 2/4 is important, and the Plan recommends the gradual conversion of MD 4 and 2/4 into a controlled access expressway as a key to resolving future traffic congestion.

With regard to transit, the 2010 Comprehensive Plan calls for the creation of local transit service areas within major Town Centers and express bus service between the Town Centers. The Comprehensive Plan notes that rapid transit, defined as buses or trains traveling in an exclusive right of way, requires higher population densities than Calvert County has today and is unlikely achievable given the county’s desire to promote a rural development pattern with the Town Centers offering relatively small urban concentrations.

The 2010 Comprehensive Plan suggests that waterborne commuter ferry has potential in Calvert County to connect the southern portion of Calvert County across the Patuxent River to Lexington Park.

One of the 10 Visions of the 2010 Comprehensive Plan is that walking and bicycling are practical transportation alternatives. The Plan notes that sidewalks and bikeways should remain a top priority, in accordance with Town Center master plans. Promoting walking and bicycling is one of the objectives of the Plan. There are several actions associated with requiring sidewalks to be constructed and establishing bicycle routes to create connections to residential, commercial, employment, educational, recreational, and open space areas, and specifically enhancing opportunities for walking and bicycling in Town Centers.
A successful transportation element of the Comprehensive Plan will identify transportation concerns at all three levels (through the county, within the county, and within the Town Centers) and recommend short-term and long-term actions for roadways, transit services, bicycle facilities and pedestrian improvements that improve the overall travel experience in the county.

Possible Strategies
The Calvert County Transportation Plan was adopted 1998. An update to this plan should develop a coordinated program of roadway, transit, bicycles and pedestrian improvements to serve needs throughout the county and within designated areas. The Transportation Plan should establish a hierarchy of county roads with appropriate Complete Streets features\(^1\), identify locations for new or expanded transportation facilities, and set standards for the adequacy of the transportation system to guide development approvals and the capital improvements program.

Through County Movements

**MD 2/4**
- Convert MD 4 and MD 2/4 within designated areas like Prince Frederick and Dunkirk to a Complete Street facility with shared access and parallel access roadways and convert MD 4 and MD 2/4 outside designated areas to a managed access highway with new access limited to streets and at-grade intersections.

**Transit**
- Option 1: Expand commuter bus service into Washington, DC and St. Mary’s County.
- Option 2: Continue to plan for transit stations, where passengers can transfer from commuter buses to local buses.
- Option 3: Improve daily transit connections with Charles County and St. Mary’s County.

Within County Movements

**Roadways**
- Option 1: Improve roadways to address coastal and stormwater flooding.
- Option 2: Improve MD 231 to address safety and reduce congestion.

\(^1\) The National Complete Streets Coalition, a coalition of transportation officials and advocates, defines “Complete Streets” as those that “are designed and operated to enable safe access for all users, including pedestrians, bicyclists, motorists and transit riders of all ages and abilities.” (Accessed 1/24/2017, https://smartgrowthamerica.org/program/national-complete-streets-coalition/what-are-complete-streets/).
Option 3: Promote travel demand management such as ridesharing options, preferential parking for carpooling, and expanded park and ride lots.

Transit
The County Transit system configures its service to address the two types of movements—three routes run between Town Centers and four routes operate within a single Town Center. All the routes begin or end at a community or senior center and operate between 7 a.m. and 8 p.m., serving the needs of those attending the senior centers and running daily errands.

- Option 1: Explore the demand among local employers and workers for buses to take employees to and from work places within the county.
- Option 2: Work with Calvert Hospital and the College of Southern Maryland to develop routes likely to encourage transit access for employees, patients and students from throughout the county to include the new College of Southern Maryland campus in Hughesville.
- Option 3: Explore the potential for dedicated bus lanes to expedite transit movements between and through Town Centers during congested traffic periods.
- Option 4: Improve wayfinding (the system that underlies the design of a signage program) and bring to people’s attention the option of public transportation in a creative and inviting way.

Bicycling
While there may be limited demand for bicycle travel extending the entire length of the county from north to south, the geography of the county does support shorter movements between adjacent Town Centers and development and from east to west across the county.

- Option 1: Establish priorities for the creation of marked bike lanes or separate bike facilities along state and county highways connecting to MD 2, MD 4, and MD 2/4 and connecting Town Centers.
- Option 2: Develop a bicycle master plan for the county, to include both on road and off road routes and include priorities to expand or create opportunities for bicycling.
- Option 3: Promote bicycle events around the county to increase awareness of bicycles as a regular means of transportation and to encourage tourism.
- Option 4: Create a wayfinding signage system for bicycle routes.

Local and Town Center Movements
In order to increase the vibrancy of Town Centers, Calvert County needs to create a transportation network within the Town Centers that support vibrancy and vitality. This means prioritizing county transportation dollars toward constructing a transportation network that is more balanced—and focus more on walking and biking—within the Town Centers. A vibrant place is one with people out and about, not one full of speeding cars. In order to help draw people out of their vehicles, it is necessary to create an environment that is pedestrian-friendly. This includes a roadway network made up of short
block lengths with wide sidewalks, pedestrian-scaled lighting, on-street parking buffered from roadways designed to promote slower traffic, destinations to walk to and from, amenities, and street furnishings.

**Streets and Roads**

*Develop north-south roadway systems, parallel to MD 2/4 in Prince Frederick and Dunkirk*

- Option 1: Connect the current roads parallel to MD 2/4 into a complete roadway network that extends the length of MD 2/4 through the Prince Frederick and Dunkirk Town Center areas.
- Option 2: Focus commercial on parallel roads not MD 2/4.

*Establish a Road Connectivity Requirement for New Development*

- Option 1: Establish road and sidewalk/path connectivity requirement based on block length in designated areas and for residential and commercial subdivisions above a certain size to help reduce traffic congestion and improve walkability, especially in Town Centers. Because most subdivisions in Calvert County do not interconnect, even short trips require the use of major arterials, contributing to the overload of MD 4 and MD 2/4.

**Transit**

- Option 1: Review the routes serving Town Centers to include stops at employment centers, consider extending transit hours to serve employees within the Town Centers and adjacent areas.
- Option 2: Review routes connecting major subdivisions to Town Centers. Housing in higher densities, but still outside of the Town Center has the potential to be utilized stops in a transit network.
- Option 3: Increase availability of demand-response public transportation. This call-by-call public transportation would be used to connect the low density areas of the county.

**Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities**

- Option 1: Develop and implement a Complete Street program in each Town Center.
- Option 2: Set aside funding in the capital budget to install sidewalks along both sides of all streets in Town Centers.
- Option 3: Develop a local bicycle system plan for each Town Center.
- Option 4: Establish bicycle parking requirements for commercial, employment, and institutional uses in Town Centers and Employment Centers.
- Option 5: Install traffic calming measures such as roadway narrowing, raised and colored intersections, street chokers (also called neckdowns, they narrow the street by extending the sidewalk), and traffic circles in select locations in Town Centers. These processes focus on reducing the speed of cars and increase alertness of motorists in order to enhance the environment for non-motorists.
Share Your Ideas:

Thank you for reviewing this paper, which is intended to get you thinking about how Calvert County should plan for the future of transportation. You are invited to the public workshop to discuss transportation issues and to share your thoughts via the County Comprehensive Plan website: [http://www.co.cal.md.us/futureCalvert](http://www.co.cal.md.us/futureCalvert).

Use these questions to prepare for the workshop and to provide comments on the website.

1. Think about where and how you currently travel through and around the county. What would need to change for you to use a different method (such as taking transit, walking, or biking) to make those trips?

2. What steps could be taken to create more walkable, bikeable Town Centers? What particular Town Centers or sections/areas of Town Centers should be prioritized for improvement? Why?

3. How can the county make it easier to get between Town Centers and other population centers in the county? What are the ways to encourage more of these trips be by bus or bicycle?

4. How should MD 4 and MD 2/4 be treated when they bisect a Town Center? What improvements, if any, could be/should be made to turn MD 4 and MD 2/4 into a connection rather than a barrier between the different parts a Town Center?

5. Allocate 100 points across the following five areas where Calvert County should invest its time and funding. The more desirable the approach, the more points should be allocated to it.

   ___ Improve through county movements on MD 4 and MD 2/4 by limiting access along it and building over/under passes and interchanges
   ___ Improve local roads that connect residential areas to Town Centers
   ___ Continue/improve bus service that connects the Town Centers
   ___ Make the Town Centers more walkable/bikeable
   ___ Improve/expand transit services that circulate within the Town Centers

   ___ Total (100)
Calvert County Comprehensive Plan Update

Supporting Options in Community Character

Developing a Place-type Strategy
Calvert County citizens favor directing growth to the designated Town Centers. However, the definition of Town Center means different things to different people, and many residents believe that there are several types of Town Center communities in the county. The categories of major and minor “Town Center” may not be sufficient to address the locations suitable for growth in the county. Nor are all population centers appropriate for additional growth. However, these existing communities need to be recognized. This issue paper examines the county’s various population centers and proposes a range of place-types for these population centers. This approach would preserve and enhance sense of place and community character across Calvert County and within the specific population centers.

This paper provides an overview of current conditions for the county and for each of the Town Centers and discusses places in the county with strong identities that are not designated as Town Centers. Finally, it proposes using a hierarchy of place types to recognize and categorize the desirable community characters of the county’s various population centers.

Background
There are nine designated Town Centers in Calvert County. Seven are unincorporated and regulated by the county government: Dunkirk, Huntingtown, Lusby, Owings, Prince Frederick, St. Leonard, and Solomons. Two designated Town Centers are incorporated municipalities with their own regulatory powers: Chesapeake Beach and North Beach.

The Town Centers are where the majority of commercial, civic, and employment activities take place. The county’s Comprehensive Plan provides that Town Centers should be attractive, pleasant, and convenient places to live, work, and shop. The Comprehensive Plan goals include directing growth to appropriate locations, ensuring a wide range of housing opportunities for all incomes and ages, and maintaining and enhancing the quality of residential communities.

Based on feedback from the community during the Fall 2016 workshops, it appears that the designated Town Centers are not meeting residents’ expectations.
Current Conditions
This section provides a baseline understanding of existing conditions and current extent of growth, and provides the current development “snapshot.” This snapshot is important to determining an appropriate framework for how the county can better adjust its policies for these areas.

Town Center Master Plans
Each Town Center has an adopted master plan that describes its development goals and objectives. Many of the Town Centers share a similar vision of the future, but there are some notable differences. The following summary presents the main goals and objectives of each of the adopted Town Center master plans and offers an overview of the key points relevant to community character.

Economic Development
The Town Center master plans focus on attracting appropriate types of retail and designating adequate areas for commercial use. Most Town Center master plans promote a broad mix of commercial, office, and public and institutional uses. Commercial development has the potential to shape the aesthetics and community character of an area. The Town Center master plans encourage commercial and economic development that is compatible with the environmental, cultural, historical, and aesthetic character of each specific Town Center.

Preserve and Expand Residential Areas
Overall, the Town Center master plans focus on protecting existing residential neighborhoods, while encouraging new residential development in appropriate locations. They recommend a variety of housing types to meet the needs of a diverse population. For example, the Prince Frederick Master Plan seeks to retain the residential character of existing neighborhoods through adaptive reuse of existing residential buildings. The Prince Frederick Master Plan also promotes higher density residential development adjacent to existing neighborhoods and good design to ensure privacy and space. The Owings Town Center Master Plan calls for providing the necessary zoning and infrastructure for single-family and multi-family development, including low-to moderate-income and senior housing.

Community Character
Accommodating future growth within Town Centers while maintaining community character is central to many Town Center master plans. The Huntingtown Town Center and Solomons Town Center master plans focus on promoting community character. Huntingtown’s master plan promotes a distinctive identity through the establishment of a community focal point and preservation of visual integrity. The Solomons Town Center Master Plan focuses on water-based activities and enhancing “a mix of uses in the Solomons Island Village Core that are family-friendly, encourage year round activity, and are visually compatible with Solomons architectural heritage.” Solomons could be used as a reference for envisioning the potential for future Town Centers as denser, pedestrian-oriented places.

Transportation and Connectivity
Generally, the master plans promote balanced, complete transportation systems that reduce dependency on personal automobiles and enhance mobility. In addition, Town Center master plans aim for a well-connected, safe, and functional road system to improve traffic safety. The Prince Frederick Master Plan outlines two specific transportation-focused objectives that have county-wide impacts: (1) stage the development of a transportation system to complement the overall development of the county, and (2) maintain MD 2/4 as the main transportation corridor providing for safe and efficient travel. These two objectives complement a more comprehensive transportation vision for the county by developing connections within and between population and employment centers. Mobility connections, such as better public transit within and between communities, sustain and promote development and growth.

Undesignated Population Centers
In addition to the policies and recommendations made in the Calvert County Comprehensive Plan, there are county, state and federal government policies that recognize specific population and employment centers in the county. Maryland’s Priority Funding Areas (PFA) are designated by local governments as places for future growth. Being designated as a PFA makes the areas eligible for state investment including highways, sewer and water construction, economic development assistance, and state leases or construction of new state office facilities.

In Calvert County there are many areas outside the Town Centers that are designated as Priority Funding Areas. These population centers are mostly areas with clustered residential uses and some commercial, civic, and/or other uses. Examples of these areas include Broomes Island, Barstow, and the area around the Chaneyville Road/MD 4 intersection. As discussed in the Potential Strategies section, “place-type” designations for these population centers would help preserve and enhance the unique qualities of these centers based on their established community character.

The federal government maps Census Designated Places (CDP) for which data from the decennial census is reported and interim forecasts of population are developed as part of the American Community Survey. Calvert County’s unincorporated Town Centers are included with CDPs. However, the CDP boundaries do not necessarily match the Town Center boundaries and can include areas outside the Town Centers. For example, the CDP that includes the Owings Town Center includes a larger area than just the Owings Town Center. Chesapeake Ranch Estates and Drum Point are well-established residential areas outside Lusby Town Center. These communities are designated as a CDP, but are not a Town Center. From 2000 to 2009, the population of this CDP has increased from approximately 11,500 to 13,030 or 13 percent.

Land Use and Current Development Patterns
Development within Calvert County is largely dispersed. In general, residential development occurs along the major roads and corridors rather than clustered in and around Town Centers.

---

2 Prince Frederick Master Plan. (1989)
3 Maryland Department of Planning. (2017) Priority Funding Areas. (http://www.mdp.state.md.us/OurProducts/pfamap.shtml)
4 U.S. Census Bureau, 2005-2009 American Community Survey and Census 2000 Summary File 1 (SF 1) 100-Percent Data
Much of Calvert County’s residential development is located north of Prince Frederick, and approximately 20 percent of existing residential land uses in the county is concentrated within one-mile of the Town Centers. Residential development in the south is more concentrated whereas residential development in the north is more dispersed. In addition, 85 percent of residential development is categorized as low or very low density.

Commercial development is mainly focused inside Town Centers with some additional commercial development located in Rural Commercial Zoning Districts, most of which are located along the main roadways: MD 2, MD 4, MD 2/4, MD 231, MD 260 and MD 765. The Calvert County Comprehensive Plan promotes a broad mix of commercial, office, residential, public, and quasi-public development within Town Centers. However, based on observations of the area and community input, the Town Centers have not developed into compact areas as envisioned. Solomons is the only Town Center that that has a pedestrian-oriented street network and a diverse array of smaller shops and uses. This historic core of Solomons was developed in the late 19th century.

**Population Growth**

Calvert County has gone from one of the fastest growing counties in Maryland to one of the slowest growing. This dramatic shift in Calvert County’s growth rate is a response to a downturn in the national economy, changing preferences in the housing market, and the county’s policies and stated goals. Some portion of the change could be attributed to the long-term effects of the transfer of development rights program in combination with the two downzonings that took place in 1999 and 2003. Another contributing factor is Maryland’s Sustainable Growth and Agricultural Preservation Act of 2012 (also known as the “Growth Tiers” or “Septic Bill” Act). Calvert County has not yet adopted a Growth Tier map, so the subdivision activity in many parts of the county is restricted.

The following table represents the growth, and in some cases, decline of population in Calvert County’s CDPs that contain Town Centers.

**Table 1: Population Change in Census Designated Places that contain Town Centers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population Averages</th>
<th>Dunkirk</th>
<th>Huntingtown</th>
<th>Lusby</th>
<th>Owings</th>
<th>Prince Frederick</th>
<th>St. Leonard</th>
<th>Solomons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005 to 2009</td>
<td>2,782</td>
<td>3,412</td>
<td>2,859</td>
<td>1,846</td>
<td>1,834</td>
<td>986</td>
<td>1,736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 to 2014</td>
<td>2,334</td>
<td>3,840</td>
<td>1,504</td>
<td>2,745</td>
<td>3,213</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>1,822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Change</td>
<td>-448</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>-1,355</td>
<td>899</td>
<td>1,379</td>
<td>-412</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Change</td>
<td>-16.1%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>-47.4%</td>
<td>48.7%</td>
<td>75.2%</td>
<td>-41.8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Population data is provided for Census-Designated Places (CDP); the Town Center boundaries, as provided by the county, are slightly smaller than the CDPs. Source: U.S. Census American Community Survey

**Connectivity**

Limited growth within Calvert County and within some of the Town Centers could be attributed to the lack of sufficient connectivity both within and between Town Centers. Public transportation is necessary in order to provide a means of access into central commercial and employment districts for populations that may not have access to a personal automobile. Although the county is served by seven public transit routes in and between Town Centers, the predominate mode is auto-oriented, with a lack of pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure and public transit service gaps, such as limited hours and frequency.
Community Character
Every population center has unique physical features. Residential areas are developed in ways that respond to the surrounding environment, whether that be the waterfront, farmland, or a nearby Town Center. The Town Centers contain most of the county’s commercial and employment activity. Prince Frederick is the largest Town Center and the location of state and county government offices, Calvert Memorial Hospital and adjacent private medical offices, and large retail shopping centers. In general, Lusby, Solomons, and Dunkirk are made up of large commercial centers set back from main roadways in strip centers. Solomons contains a cluster of local retail shops and restaurants on Solomons Island that creates a small waterfront village character. Huntingtown, St. Leonard, and Owings are Town Centers that have the least commercial or employment activity.

Documented Opinions
Based on feedback during recent public workshops, commercial centers within the county are generally not meeting the needs of residents and visitors. The common perception is that the Town Centers are not developed to their full potential in terms of economy, housing and affordability, street network, pedestrian connectivity, recreational opportunities, or population. Many county residents complain that the Town Centers lack specific uses and amenities. These include a walkable center with a variety of places, parks, plazas, and pedestrian and bicycle connections. There is also concern that the Town Centers do not have enough local retail. There is an interest in living and working in well-connected mixed-use, commercial centers, but residents do not perceive the Town Centers as having these features. The community has a vision for the way Town Centers and other place-types should be developed, which is not being achieved.

Desired Outcomes
During the public workshops, residents of Calvert County demonstrated a consensus on focusing growth in currently-designated Town Centers. The public envisions more walkable, developed, mixed-use central commercial and employment centers. They seek additional public spaces, parks, and community amenities that would improve quality of life. Residents would like more attention paid to streetscape design and walking paths, and they requested additional opportunities for pedestrian and bicycle connections between commercial establishments. In addition, they wanted site design standards to improve commercial development in the Town Centers. Furthermore, the community would like Town Centers to include additional employment opportunities beyond the larger retail establishments in shopping centers along the major roadways.

Housing is a key issue that the community would like addressed. There is strong support for creating additional housing options in Town Centers that serve a diversifying population: attracting a younger population and accommodating the existing senior population.

The lack of pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure disconnects residents from recreational opportunities and services. It poses a challenge to linking future housing in population centers to the county’s recreational resources.

Finally, it remains important to the community to identify where new development should and should not be concentrated. There is a consensus to limit sprawl, direct growth to Town Centers, and support mixed-use, infill development, and necessary infrastructure improvements.
Potential Strategies
Since the same development intensity is not appropriate for all population centers, the updates to the new Calvert County Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Ordinance should preserve the on-the-ground conditions and, if desirable, develop population centers through the establishment of a hierarchical system of place-types. The strategies proposed below would preserve and strengthen the unique community character in Town Centers and other population centers throughout the county. The strategies are proposed as ways to ensure that future development in the county’s population centers is reflective of the surrounding area and the community’s aspirations and vision.

Potential Strategy #1: Establish a hierarchical system of “place-types” that better define the character of various population centers and provide a clear policy direction for their preservation and growth.

Calvert County could adopt a place-type community planning strategy that defines various types of population centers and creates development strategies that are more precisely calibrated to their community characters. A place-type designation is a community design tool used to guide building design and function as well as land use and development patterns. To that end, the following five place types are proposed and are reflective of the current distinct character types found the county:

1. Town Center
2. Village
3. Hamlet
4. Waterfront Community
5. Residential Transition Area

The following map illustrates where each place-type designation would be designated throughout Calvert County. Descriptions following the county overview map outline the identifying characteristics of each place type and begin to assign the designations to existing population centers within Calvert County.
**Town Centers**

Town Centers contain a mixture of residential, commercial, and institutional uses. The main role of Town Centers is to accommodate the most intense development in the county, mixing and blending housing, public facilities, employment, and commercial uses together. The most prominent Town Centers are along MD 4 and MD 2/4. These Town Centers would serve a community of all ages, with special attention given to senior citizens and young adults. A traditional plan radiates out from a central point with streets lined with sidewalks and a pedestrian-oriented design of blocks that maintains short walking distances.⁵

Town Centers typically have an associated residential area on the outskirts that provides the market for the core commercial development.

Of the seven currently-designated Town Centers controlled by the Calvert County Government, four are large enough to support this type of development.

Population centers proposed as a Town Center place-type include:

1. Prince Frederick
2. Lusby
3. Solomons
4. Dunkirk
5. Chesapeake Beach
6. North Beach

The municipalities of Chesapeake Beach and North Beach are proposed to continue to be designated Town Centers, under their own planning and zoning authority.

The following map of Prince Frederick has been chosen to illustrate the current land use conditions that make this an appropriate population center for Town Center designation. Prince Frederick is the largest master plan-designated Town Center in the county and contains a mix of commercial and institutional uses concentrated along North Solomons Road and Dares Beach Road. Prince Frederick could support the level and intensity of development proposed under the Town Center place type. Through the Town Center place-type designation it is anticipated that Prince Frederick could potentially expand and through infill development, be more commercially dense in the core.

---

Villages

Villages are residential communities with less development intensity than Town Centers. Villages contain a mix of uses, with concentrations of commercial, retail, and civic and/or community uses. Villages, like Town Centers, have a central point from which development extends. However, villages have more local commercial uses whereas Town Centers may serve a larger geography and contain greater opportunities for employment. Similar to the minor town center designation in the Calvert County Comprehensive Plan, the village place-type would serve as a local convenience center. Villages typically have an associated residential area on the outskirts that provides the market for the core commercial development.

Population centers proposed as a Village place-type include:

1. Huntingtown
2. Owings
3. St. Leonard

Based on a comparison of developed areas within the county, three of the currently-designated Town Centers, Huntingtown, Owings, and St. Leonard, could be reclassified as a Village place-type. These places contain smaller developable areas, which would be better served by smaller scale development.

The following map of St. Leonard has been chosen to illustrate the current conditions that make this an appropriate area for a Village place-type designation. St. Leonard is currently designated as a minor Town Center by the current Calvert County Comprehensive Plan. Based on the current level of commercial and institutional development, St. Leonard has the potential to be developed into a village place-type with additional commercial uses that serve the local community. The street network allows for a concentrated commercial area surrounded by varying levels of residential density.
Hamlets
Hamlets are smaller than villages and are categorized as clustered communities that contain several significant commercial or civic uses; the remainder of development is low-to-mid density residential. It is not anticipated that these hamlets would undergo much development or future growth.

Population centers proposed as a Hamlet place-type include:

1. Sunderland/Mount Harmony
2. Chaneyville
3. Barstow
4. Lower Marlboro
5. White Sands

The following map of Barstow has been chosen to illustrate the current conditions that make this an appropriate area for a hamlet place-type designation. Barstow is an undesignated population center south west of Prince Frederick. Barstow represents a smaller clustered community of low-density residential uses and select commercial and institutional uses along Hallowing Point Road. Based on Barstow’s proximity to Prince Frederick, there does not seem to be a demand or need for much more commercial development in this population center.
Waterfront Communities

Waterfront communities are clustered small population centers located along Calvert County’s waterfront. This place type recognizes these population centers as unique places within the county. Future development within these population centers would be limited.

Population centers proposed as a Waterfront Communities place type include:

1. Plum Point
2. Dares Beach
3. Cove Point
4. Summer City
5. Scientists Cliffs
6. Calvert Beach - Long Beach
7. Broomes Island

The following map of Broomes Island has been chosen to illustrate the current conditions that make this an appropriate area for a Waterfront Community place-type. Broomes Island is an undesignated population center that contains water-focused commercial uses that are typical of other waterfront communities along the county’s Chesapeake Bay shoreline.
Residential Transition Areas

Residential Transition Areas are intended to ensure that the physical transition from higher intensity population centers outward to rural areas is of an appropriate and graduated scale. These areas would be more clearly defined by a step down of residential density from the Town Center or village to agricultural land. The proposed Residential Transition Areas would be defined and regulated as zoning districts in the Zoning Ordinance, would have use and dimensional standards, and be mapped along the periphery of the Town Centers and villages.

Specific locations for proposed Residential Transition Areas have not been identified. However, Chesapeake Ranch Estates and Drum Point are a good illustration of a population center appropriate for this designation. The area is dominated by low-density residential uses, is directly adjacent to the Town Center of Lusby, and supports the more intense commercial development there.

The following map of the Chesapeake Ranch Estates and Drum Point area shows its adjacency to the Lusby Town Center and the character of the residential development that make this an appropriate area for a Residential Transition Area place-type designation.
Potential Strategy #2: Develop land use and design guidelines for each place type and incorporate in the *Calvert County Comprehensive Plan* and Zoning Ordinance.

The revised comprehensive plan would set out principles for each place-type to guide development and to foster community character. These principles would be translated into regulations in the zoning ordinance.

In the future, it may be appropriate to develop more detailed small areas plans for those places selected to accommodate future growth. These small area plans could provide land use and design guidelines concerning the location of uses and site design, and the relationship between residential, commercial, civic, and institutional development. In addition, land use and design guidelines could be responsive to the surrounding rural nature of the county and the vision of the community. The land use and design guidelines could describe the kind of development, its placement on a lot, and its relationship to surrounding uses and include illustrations.

**Conclusion**

The potential strategies outlined above would create a framework for targeting future growth and development into more concentrated areas within the county. In combination, these strategies would provide more precise tools to preserve, enhance, and maintain community character and appearance within and around Calvert County’s population centers.

**Share Your Ideas**

- Do you agree with the place types proposed: Town Centers, Villages, Hamlets, Waterfront Communities, and Residential Transition Areas? What are your thoughts on these types? If not, what place-types would you suggest?

- Do you agree with the places proposed for each place-type?
  - **Town Centers:** Dunkirk, Prince Frederick, Lusby and Solomons
  - **Villages:** Huntingtown, Owings, and St. Leonard
  - **Hamlets:** Sunderland/Mount Harmony, Barstow, Chaneyville, Lower Marlboro, and White Sands
  - **Waterfront Communities:** Plum Point, Dares Beach, Cove Point, Summer City, Scientists Cliffs, Calvert Beach, Long Beach, and Broomes Island

- What changes would you make to the proposed designations?

- What characteristics would a Town Center or Village need to have for you to live and/or work there?

- What areas would you suggest for the Residential Transition Area?
Fostering Vibrant, Walkable Communities with Multi-Generational Opportunities

Introduction

The Calvert County Department of Community Planning & Building Department staff and the WSP|Parsons Brinckerhoff consultants are working on behalf of the Planning Commission and the Board of County Commissioners to update the Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Ordinance.

The intent of the Calvert County Comprehensive Plan update is to ensure the visions for Calvert County are still valid, including the twin overarching visions of preserving the rural character while directing new growth to appropriate locations, along with the vision of building a strong local economy. The update will address the county’s changing demographics and issues, including land use, environment, economy, housing, and transportation. In addition, the update will address new state land use requirements, including plan elements and the Sustainable Growth and Agricultural Preservation Act.

In the summer of 2016, informational meetings were held where the public could learn about the update process and share their ideas about the challenges facing Calvert County. In September and October four interactive workshops were held where citizens, staff, and the consultants discussed issues in small groups. The discussions at workshops helped set the stage for the current phase, discussing key issues that should be addressed in the updated Comprehensive Plan. Five workshops are being held in the winter and spring of 2017. Fostering Vibrant, Walkable Communities with Multi-Generational Opportunities is the third in the series of issue papers and workshops.

The Supporting Options in Community Character issue paper proposed a series of place-types to characterize both the designated Town Centers and other existing population centers for the purpose of preserving and enhancing the sense of place in each community and across Calvert County. Participants at the workshop on February 22 provided reactions to the initial concepts and suggested how various population centers should be classified. This follow-up paper further defines each place-type and proposes principles for making these places vibrant, walkable communities serving the multi-generational population of Calvert County.
**Current Policy Direction**

The Calvert County Comprehensive Plan (adopted in 2004, amended in 2010) outlines the goals, vision, and objectives that direct growth, development, and conservation in the county. The goals of the Comprehensive Plan are to:

1) Promote sustainable development,
2) Encourage a stable and enduring economic base,
3) Provide for safety, health, and education, and
4) Preserve the natural, cultural, and historic assets of Calvert County.

The vision of the Comprehensive Plan is to create Town Centers that are attractive, convenient, and interesting places to live, work, and shop, with a benchmark goal of attracting 35 percent of all new households to Town Centers or areas immediately surrounding Town Centers.

The current Calvert County Comprehensive Plan describes major and minor Town Centers:

“Major town centers are to serve as regional centers, providing goods and services that attract visitors from the entire County and/or from outside the County (as in tourism). Minor town centers are to serve as local convenience centers unless individual town center master plans determine otherwise.” (Page 9)

In the time since the adoption of Calvert County’s Town Center concept in the 1983 Comprehensive Plan, the State of Maryland authorized counties and municipalities to designate Priority Funding Areas (PFA) appropriate for growth for targeting state investment in infrastructure. These locations include not only growth areas but also areas designated as enterprise zones, neighborhood revitalization areas, heritage areas and existing industrial land. Calvert County in consultation with the State of Maryland, designated Priority Funding Areas that include a wide range of places outside designated Town Centers. These areas are further recognized in the draft Growth Tier Map currently under consideration in Calvert County. The place-type strategy provides a policy framework for recognizing these locations in the updated comprehensive plan and supporting zoning ordinance.

The proposed place-type strategy is consistent with the overall goals and objectives for growth in the county and promotes compact, walkable communities that provide high quality of life along with economic and recreational opportunities for all generations. The place-type strategy builds upon and refines the original Town Center concept by proposing

---

**Priority Funding Areas (PFAs)** are existing communities and places designated by local governments as locations suitable for state investment to support future growth. In addition, PFAs include areas designated as enterprise zones, neighborhood revitalization areas, heritage areas and existing industrial land.

Growth-related projects covered by the legislation include most state programs that encourage or support growth and development such as highways, sewer and water construction, economic development assistance and state leases or construction of new office facilities.

development and preservation strategies to allow appropriate growth, redevelopment and preservation strategies to each place-type.

Feedback from February 22 Workshop
The Supporting Options in Community Character issue paper proposed five place-types for developed areas of the county:
- Town Center
- Village
- Hamlet
- Waterfront Community
- Residential Transition Area

The community provided reactions to the Supporting Options in Community Character issue paper at a workshop on February 22, 2017, and through comments submitted via an online survey. The structured discussion and most comments focused on the first four place-types, leaving discussion of the residential transition area until after the initial place types are more clearly defined. Summaries of the workshop and the survey results are available on the Calvert 2040 website (www.co.cal.md.us/futureCalvert).

Participants generally agreed to a narrower list of Town Centers, agreeing that it includes Dunkirk, Prince Frederick, Lusby, and Solomons. These places are the most intensely developed of the designated Town Centers in the current Comprehensive Plan. Each has nearby single-family residential development typically within the one-mile radius described in the Comprehensive Plan.

Most participants in the workshop accepted the village place-type and most applied it to Huntingtown and St. Leonard. One group preferred to retain the designation of these two places as Town Centers. Two groups suggested designating Barstow and Sunderland/Mt. Harmony as Villages. One group also designated Chaneyville as a Village.

One group saw no need to change the current designation of Town Center.

Hamlet was the designation with the greatest variety of response. Only three groups applied the place-type to one or more locations in the county. Barstow and Chaneyville were identified as hamlets by two groups of participants. Notably, Owings, an existing minor Town Center, was classified by two groups as a Hamlet. Sunderland/Mt. Harmony was identified as a hamlet by one group. Several groups did not like the term itself, and there is confusion about the intent or potential to create growth in these communities. Alternative names for this place-type include rural crossroads communities and rural activity centers.

The waterfront community place-type was applied by four groups to a total of five locations: Broomes Island, Cove Point, Dares Beach, Plum Point (including the Breezy Point and Neeld Estates communities), and White Sands. These mature, built-out communities typically pre-date zoning and subdivision regulations. Several groups saw potential for marina and restaurant development in these communities.
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Two groups concluded that there is no need for the new designations of hamlet and waterfront community.

Table 1 provides a high-level summary of the place-type classification of population centers during the February workshop.

Table 1. Proposed Place-Type Designation, Workshop on February 22, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locations</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
<th>Group 4</th>
<th>Group 5</th>
<th>Group 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dunkirk</td>
<td>Town Center</td>
<td>Village/Hamlet*</td>
<td>Town Center</td>
<td>Town Center</td>
<td>Town Center</td>
<td>Town Center/Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntingtown</td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>Town Center</td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lusby</td>
<td>Town Center</td>
<td>Town Center</td>
<td>Town Center</td>
<td>Town Center</td>
<td>Town Center</td>
<td>Town Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince Frederick</td>
<td>Town Center</td>
<td>Town Center</td>
<td>Town Center</td>
<td>Town Center</td>
<td>Town Center</td>
<td>Town Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Leonard</td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>Town Center</td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solomons</td>
<td>Town Center</td>
<td>Town Center</td>
<td>Town Center</td>
<td>Town Center</td>
<td>Town Center</td>
<td>Town Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Town Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hamlet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barstow</td>
<td>Hamlet</td>
<td>Hamlet</td>
<td>No Designation</td>
<td>No Designation</td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>Hamlet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaneyville</td>
<td>Hamlet</td>
<td></td>
<td>No Designation</td>
<td>No Designation</td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>Hamlet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunderland/ Mt. Harmony</td>
<td>Hamlet</td>
<td></td>
<td>No Designation</td>
<td>No Designation</td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>Hamlet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broomes Island</td>
<td>Waterfront</td>
<td>Waterfront</td>
<td>No Designation</td>
<td>No Designation</td>
<td>Waterfront</td>
<td>Waterfront</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cove Point</td>
<td>Waterfront</td>
<td></td>
<td>No Designation</td>
<td>No Designation</td>
<td>Waterfront</td>
<td>Waterfront</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dares Beach</td>
<td>Waterfront</td>
<td></td>
<td>No Designation</td>
<td>No Designation</td>
<td>Waterfront</td>
<td>Waterfront</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plum Point</td>
<td>Waterfront</td>
<td></td>
<td>No Designation</td>
<td>No Designation</td>
<td>Waterfront</td>
<td>Waterfront</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Sands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Waterfront</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Village could be an agreed upon designation if sewer is not required under the specifications of a Village place-type.

Table updated to match 3/27/18 presentation handout.
Defining Place-Types in Calvert County

Based upon the reactions to the initial description of place-types, the definitions are refined to better fit the vision of Calvert County. The place-type approach is proposed to preserve existing community character and allow for growth in the designated Town Centers and Villages. Two of the new proposed place-types focus on preservation of the current development patterns and land use types, while permitting redevelopment: Hamlet and Waterfront Community. Expanded definitions and descriptions for each place-type are provided below.

Definitions

**Town Center** - These places are designated as Town Centers in the current Comprehensive Plan with a higher intensity and greater variety of commercial and residential development within the plan boundaries. Each has nearby single-family residential development, typically within a one-mile radius of the Town Center.

**Village** - These places may be designated as Town Centers in the current Comprehensive Plan but have a lower intensity and more limited variety of commercial and residential development. These locations are suitable for additional commercial development and various forms of single family attached and detached dwellings. They typically have single-family detached residential development within one mile.

**Hamlet** - These traditional settlements provide limited commercial services and may include residential and commercial development that is not consistent with current zoning provisions. These places would recognize the existing uses and development patterns, would retain local serving businesses and would restrict expansion of residential and non-residential development.

**Waterfront Community** - These mature, built-out communities typically pre-date zoning and subdivision regulations. They are not planned for expansion; they preserve these communities and allow redevelopment that complies with provisions for environmental protection and climate adaptation. Some waterfront communities have potential for additional marina and restaurant development. Some waterfront communities have had flood mitigation plans prepared.

Table 2 summarizes some of the key features envisioned for each place-type. Following the table are principles applicable to each place-type to inform updates to the comprehensive plan and zoning ordinance. The principles are organized into three primary planning elements: Land Use and Development Patterns, Circulation, and Building Form.
Table 2. Characteristics and Potential Features of Place-types in Calvert County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Town Center</th>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Hamlet</th>
<th>Waterfront Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Priority Funding Area</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Retail and business services</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water service</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer system</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health care facilities</td>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public safety station</td>
<td>3 or more</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-family units, large (4+ units)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-family units, small (less than 4 units)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot sizes</td>
<td>Varies, 1 acre max for new residential</td>
<td>Varies, 1 acre max for new residential</td>
<td>2 or more acres for new lots</td>
<td>Varies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building height (max. stories)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 occupied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Places of assembly (community center, churches, etc.)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small commercial building, less than 5,000 square feet</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial buildings of more than 5,000 square feet</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing, warehousing, industrial, etc.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central business area</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalks, pedestrian network</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterfront commercial (marinas, restaurants)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Town Center**

Town Centers exhibit the greatest mix of land uses, higher development densities, stronger connectivity, and a variety of building types.

**Land Use and Development Patterns**

- There is a well-defined center of activity that is nodal or linear,
There is a mix of uses intended to serve a community of all ages, with special attention paid to senior citizens and young adults;

There is a variety of lot sizes and housing stock that cater to an economically diverse population;

Commercial uses include destination retail uses and services, and tend to be clustered within the central business area or along a commercial corridor;

Commercial uses are more diverse with a focus on large scale retail sales and have a regional draw;

A mix of housing types is provided in proportionate quantities throughout the community by:
  o Intermixing single-family attached and detached units of similar appearance but different in size;
  o Providing apartments over commercial uses; and
  o Allowing garage apartments and the conversion of large existing structures into rental units;

There is one or more major employment center (e.g., governmental employment, institutional employment, and retail employment);

There are parks, civic and institutional uses that serve large portions of the county, and

Higher-density housing is incorporated into the central business area and transitions to lower-density residential at the Town Center fringes.

**Circulation**

- There is a street and block system that provides a favorable physical framework for private redevelopment;
- A grid street network that provides connections from the urban center to rural edges;
- Rectilinear blocks (ideally less than 600 feet) that create a walkable pedestrian environment in the central business area;
- Sidewalks are provided, ideally at least 6-foot wide in commercial areas to allow for higher pedestrian volumes;
- Streets are wide enough to include dedicated 5-to-6 foot bicycle lanes for each travel direction;
- Connections through parks and public squares and mid-block pedestrian passageways exist or are planned to provide additional pedestrian routes;
- Pedestrian infrastructure at intersections, including pedestrian signals and striped cross walks;
- Transit within the Town Center and to areas outside the Town Center, and
- On-street parallel or angled parking where possible to control traffic speed, improve pedestrian safety, and evenly distribute parking spaces.

**Building Form**

- Building heights are between one and five stories;
- Buildings create a comfortable pedestrian scale on the street through the use of varied building facades;
• Active ground floor uses are located on key segments of the commercial corridor or surrounding a public space;
• Commercial and mixed-use buildings have some setback from the sidewalk;
• Multi-family housing is located along retail corridors;
• Appropriate building types include:
  o Apartments above shops (multi-level mixed-use building);
  o Apartment buildings;
  o Townhouses;
  o Semi-detached houses;
  o Detached house with rental apartments;
  o Detached single-family house;
  o Single-story or multi-level civic buildings; and
  o Light industrial buildings/warehouses; and
  o Multi-tenant retail buildings.
• Public spaces are provided and sized appropriately to break up long building walls;
• Small parking lots or garages are located in the interiors of the block in order to maintain the street wall; and
• Parking is sited alongside and behind buildings.

**Town Center Place-type Example - Prince Frederick**

The Prince Frederick Town Center contains a central business area oriented along a commercial corridor, which provides a relatively high concentration of employment and civic uses. Most of Prince Frederick is auto-dependent and not easily accessible by walking or bicycling. There are provisions for multiple travel modes, including transit options; however, a stronger multi-modal network could be provided through future redevelopment to improve pedestrian and bicycle access for a range of age and income groups. A denser mixed-use commercial center could be developed with a focus on multi-family housing and publicly accessible open space.

There is a small historic downtown area with pedestrian connections through parks and public squares and mid-block pedestrian passageways. The sidewalk network is limited to a few blocks before it becomes intermittent or nonexistent.

The greatest challenge in Prince Frederick is the modification of the current street grid to foster compact, mixed-use development. The creation of a system of parallel local roads intended to draw local travelers off the larger through highway has the potential to assist in development of a more robust grid pattern of streets. However, community resistance to interconnection of separate subdivisions and limitations on new access points to the highway make development of the grid challenging.

Another challenge is addressing the scattered pattern of low-density residential development surrounding the Town Center. This pattern results in a poor definition of the boundaries of the “Town Center” development.
**Village**

Villages are envisioned to be residential communities with less development intensity than Town Centers. Villages contain a mix of uses, with small concentrations of commercial, retail, and civic and/or community uses.

**Land Use and Development Patterns**

- Villages are similar to Town Centers, but are typically smaller and oriented around an activity center rather than a commercial corridor;
- The central business area is smaller than that of a Town Center, with active ground floor uses typically lining a main square or along two to three main intersections;
- There is a variety of lot sizes and housing stock that cater to an economically diverse population;
- Smaller housing units are provided in proportionate quantities throughout the community by:
  - Providing apartments over commercial uses; and
  - Allowing garage apartments and conversion of large structures into rental units;
- There are one or two small to medium-size employment centers (e.g., institutional, retail, and service employment);
- Higher density residential tends to be integrated into a central business area and is gradated to lower density housing at its fringes; and
- Open space and public spaces may be provided.

**Circulation**

- The street system has less interconnectivity than a Town Center;
- Sidewalks are provided on blocks and there is on-street parking within the central business area;
- Bicycle infrastructure is provided in the form of shared lanes;
- There is pedestrian infrastructure at intersections, including striped crosswalks;
- Transit is available, but less frequent and less convenient than in a Town Center; and
- On-street parallel parking or angled parking to control traffic speed, improve pedestrian safety, and evenly distribute parking spaces.

**Building Form**

- Building heights are between one to three stories;
- Buildings create a comfortable pedestrian scale on the street through the use of varied building facades;
- Active ground floor uses are located in the central business area;
- Commercial and mixed-use buildings are setback from the sidewalk;
- Appropriate building types include:
  - Apartments above shops (multi-level mixed-use building);
  - Townhouses;
- Detached houses with rental apartments;
- Detached single-family houses;
- Single-story or multi-level civic buildings; and
- Small industrial buildings.

- Parking is sited alongside and behind buildings.

**Village Place-type Example - St. Leonard**

Although St. Leonard is currently designated as a Town Center, its physical characteristics are more representative of a Village. St. Leonard has an activity center and is laid out on a modified street grid. Commercial uses are concentrated at the intersection of Calvert Beach Road and St. Leonard Road where there is a mix of restaurants, retail, and community facility uses. Most commercial uses are single-story and setback from the sidewalk. Residential uses surrounding commercial uses are predominately clustered single family housing on small parcels.

The commercial center of St. Leonard is centered at the intersection of St. Leonard Road (MD 765) and Calvert Beach Road with a small cluster of local businesses extending one or two blocks in each direction. The types of businesses able to flourish in St. Leonard are constrained by the limited visibility of the commercial core from MD 2/4. The commercial area contains a mix of one-story buildings with no unifying theme. There is a common decorative lamp post along St. Leonard Road.

Since the adoption of the St. Leonard Town Center Master Plan, the Maryland State Highway Administration and the Calvert County government have worked together to create a sidewalk network along St. Leonard and Calvert Beach Roads. These sidewalks serve the commercial area, except for an area with parking directly in front of businesses. There are also sidewalks available in some of the nearby residential areas. A sidewalk on the east side of St. Leonard Road extends from the roundabout at the intersection of St. Leonard and Calvert Beach roads north to the post office beside Woods Road. There are no sidewalks connecting St. Leonard Elementary School to the commercial core, a distance of about 0.7 mile.

As indicated by the road name, Calvert Beach Road serves as the principle access to the waterfront communities of Calvert Beach and Long Beach. There are no sidewalks or paths connecting these residential areas with the commercial core of St. Leonard, and there are there no shoulders along Long Beach Road and Calvert Beach road east of the powerlines.
**Hamlet**

Hamlets are smaller than Villages and contain a few commercial and/or civic uses; the remainder of development is low-to-mid density housing. Community character preservation is a focus of the planning principles applied in these locations.

**Land Use and Development Patterns**

- A Hamlet is a small cluster of commercial uses at a central intersection surrounded by a residential community of small single family housing.
- Hamlets include locally-serving and convenience retail services, and small offices.
- There is minimal to no perceptible density transition between residential neighborhoods and adjacent agricultural land;
- Residential parcels are relatively small and primarily developed with single family housing; and
- Public spaces, if provided, are in the form of small public squares or passive recreational open space near commercial uses.

**Circulation**

- The commercial areas and surrounding residential development may be organized on a modified street grid system with limited through streets and block connectivity;
- Transit is generally not easily available to the community; and
- Bicycle infrastructure is provided in the form of shared roads or dedicated lanes, where feasible.

**Building Form**

- Building heights are between one and two stories;
- Appropriate building types include:
  - Apartments above shops (multi-level mixed-use building);
  - Detached single-family house; and
  - Single-story or multi-level civic buildings; and
- Mixed-use commercial buildings in the central business area tend to be setback from the street.

**Hamlet Place-type Example – Barstow**

Barstow is a predominately residential and agricultural area with a few commercial uses located along Hallowing Point Road. The existing commercial uses are not clustered around a single intersection. Barstow could create a focal point where future public space and commercial uses could be clustered. Pedestrian infrastructure in the form of sidewalks and marked crossings could be developed to support a more walkable area.
**Waterfront Community**

Waterfront Communities are clustered small population centers located along Calvert County’s Chesapeake Bay, Patuxent River and tidal creek shorelines. These population centers are unique places within the county and need to be preserved. New development within these population centers is not encouraged, but redevelopment is likely due to the risk of damage to structures due to age and weather events.

**Land Use and Development Patterns**

- The street grid system runs parallel to the shoreline;
- If provided, commercial uses are oriented along a corridor or the waterfront and mixed with small-scale civic uses;
- The waterfront is primarily in private ownership, and includes private residences and may include commercial marinas and restaurants;
- Open space, if provided, is in the form of small shoreline parks;
- The mix of uses serves a multi-generational community;
- There are water-dependent uses, such as enhanced docking facilities and kayak launches; and
- There is no employment district, but rather smaller local service or sales retail that accommodates the local population and/or tourists.

**Circulation**

- Development is organized on a modified street grid system with limited thru streets and block connectivity;
- Sidewalks;
- There are lower traffic volumes compared to Town Centers, Villages, and Hamlets;
- Transit is not easily available; and
- Bicycle infrastructure, if provided, is on shared roadways, where feasible.

**Building Form**

- Building heights are between 1 and 2 occupied stories;
- A few mixed-use buildings may provide apartments above ground-floor retail uses;
- Mixed-use commercial buildings have some setback from the street; and
- Detached single family residential buildings, and small-scale mixed use or retail buildings are the most prevalent building types.

**Waterfront Community Place-type Example – Broomes Island**

Broomes Island’s street grid is parallel to the shoreline. Broomes Island Road runs north-south and contains commercial uses and some water-related uses in its mid-section. The remaining area is rural with low-density residential development concentrated along the shoreline. Broomes Island could develop a more centralized commercial core to serve local needs and water-related uses. A more defined pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure would better support local travel options.
Conclusion and Next Steps

The place-type principles described above can begin to shape updates to the Comprehensive Plan Update and countywide zoning ordinance. This community planning approach can address the need to preserve community character and guide future growth by providing development standards aligned to the built characteristics of the county’s designated Town Centers and population centers.

The following steps would need to be taken to integrate this place-based approach to community planning and zoning in the county.

For the Comprehensive Plan update:
- Determine which locations in Calvert County are appropriate for each place-type.
- Finalize guiding principles for future growth in each place-type and incorporate them in the draft updated Comprehensive Plan.
- Establish place-type boundaries in the draft updated Comprehensive Plan, including changing the boundaries of the existing Town Center proposed to continue as Town Centers.

For the Zoning Ordinance update:
- Review existing zoning to determine which zoning districts are consistent with the principles applicable to each place-type and which require modification.
- Develop zoning text with size, height, and area regulations, site design, and landscape design standards that reflect the on-the-ground conditions and expectations of the communities and the vision of the county for the new place-types and refine the Town Center regulations.
- Prepare a series of graphics that convey dimensional regulations and design standards stipulated by the new zoning text.
- Identify, draft, and map zoning districts within each place-type.
Preserving Rural Character and Directing Growth to Designated Areas

Introduction
The Calvert County Department of Community Planning & Building Department staff and the WSP|Parsons Brinckerhoff consultants are working on behalf of the Planning Commission and the Board of County Commissioners to update the Calvert County Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Ordinance.

The intent of the Comprehensive Plan update is to ensure the visions for Calvert County are still valid, including the twin overarching visions of preserving the rural character while directing new growth to appropriate locations, along with the vision of building a strong local economy. The update will address the county’s changing demographics and issues, including land use, environment, economy, housing, and transportation. In addition, the update will address new state land use requirements, including plan elements and the Sustainable Growth and Agricultural Preservation Act.

In the summer of 2016, informational meetings were held where the public could learn about the update process and share their ideas about the challenges facing Calvert County. In September and October four interactive workshops were held where citizens, staff, and the consultants discussed issues in small groups. The discussions at workshops helped set the stage for the current phase, discussing key issues that should be addressed in the updated Comprehensive Plan. Five workshops are being held in the winter and spring of 2017. Preserving Rural Character and Directing Growth to Designated Areas is the fourth in the series of issue papers and workshops.

For a history of Calvert County’s planning efforts to preserve the rural character and to direct growth, see the appendix.

Current County Policies
Calvert County has worked to preserve its rural character through a combination strategies intended to preserve agricultural, forest, and sensitive lands and to direct growth to suitable locations, promoting economic growth, and practicing stewardship of the Chesapeake Bay and the land for over 30 years.

2010 Calvert County Comprehensive Plan
The 2010 Calvert County Comprehensive Plan includes several visions, benchmarks, and strategies related to these ongoing goals. The visions were initially adopted in the 1997 Comprehensive Plan, reaffirmed in the 2004 plan, and retained when the plan was amended in 2010.

Visions, Benchmarks and Objectives Related to Rural Preservation and Directing Growth:

Our landscape is dominated by forests and fields. Related benchmarks:

- At least 40,000 acres of farm and forestland are preserved.
- 90% of existing forest is retained.
Our Town Centers are attractive, convenient, and interesting places to live, work and shop. Related benchmarks:

- 35% of all new households are located in Town Centers or immediately around Town Centers.
- One ECTC [Employment Center/Town Center] office park is established in each election district by 2008.

The Plan includes the following Land Use and Growth Management Objectives:

- As an alternative to functioning primarily as a "bedroom community", adopt policies that will promote the county as a desirable location for high-technology industries, vacation destination, farming and aquaculture region, resource protection area (i.e., "greenbelt"), and retirement community.
- Manage the amount, location and rate of residential growth.
- Preserve the rural character of the county, its prime farmland, contiguous forests, historic resources, and environmentally sensitive areas.
- Develop Town Centers as attractive, pleasant, and convenient places to live, work, and shop.
- Direct commercial and industrial uses to appropriate locations; provide necessary infrastructure.
- Direct residential growth to appropriate locations; ensure a wide range of housing opportunities for all incomes and ages; maintain and enhance the quality of residential communities.

Town Centers, Priority Funding Areas, and Priority Preservation Areas

The 1983 Calvert County Comprehensive Plan called for the creation of Town Centers in order to accomplish several goals:

- Avoid scattered and/or strip commercial development along MD 2/4.
- Expand the choice of housing options by providing zoning and infrastructure for multifamily development, including low- and moderate-income and elderly housing.
- Reduce dependence on vehicles.
- Reduce growth within agricultural and forest areas.1

Town Centers are the county’s primary designated growth areas, and they are also designated Priority Funding Areas.

Priority Funding Areas (PFAs) as defined by the Maryland Department of Planning are existing communities and places designated by local governments where they want state investment to support future growth or to maintain the character of the community.

In 2010, the county adopted amendments to the 2004 Comprehensive Plan and designated Priority Preservation Areas. This element was required in order for local jurisdictions to remain certified under Maryland’s Agricultural Certification Program. The plan included the action to “Reserve the Farm and Forest District (Priority Preservation Areas) for farming and natural resource-related uses and direct residential growth away from these areas.” (Action I-4, Page 6)

Priority Funding Areas, Priority Preservation Areas, and Town Centers are shown in Figure 1.

---

1 Calvert County Comprehensive Plan, Adopted 2004, Amended 2010, Page 7
Figure 1 Calvert County Priority Funding Areas, Priority Preservation Areas, and Town Centers

Source: Calvert County Department of Community Planning and Building
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Figure 1 Calvert County Priority Funding Areas, Priority Preservation Areas, and Town Centers
Source: Calvert County Department of Community Planning and Building
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After the adoption of the 1997 Comprehensive Plan that called for reducing the total build-out, the county adopted a program in 1999 to reduce the build-out that included a combination of zoning ordinance changes with new funding and new incentives for voluntary land preservation. The program set a target to reduce the build-out to 37,000 households, or approximately 100,000 people. This target required reducing the county’s then-current growth rate, which was the highest of any county in the state. To meet the build-out target, the county adopted policies intended to slow residential growth and reduce overall housing potential. Additional build-out reductions were adopted in 2003. Figure 2 shows the projected growth in population and households included in the 2010 Comprehensive Plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Persons</td>
<td>20,682</td>
<td>34,638</td>
<td>51,372</td>
<td>74,563</td>
<td>90,700</td>
<td>96,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households</td>
<td>5,540</td>
<td>10,731</td>
<td>16,986</td>
<td>25,447</td>
<td>31,300</td>
<td>35,500</td>
<td>37,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons Per Household</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2 Total Population in Calvert County by Decades
Source: Calvert County Department of Community Planning and Building

Recent and Projected Growth
Implementation of the Comprehensive Plan policies has successfully reduced the county’s growth rate, which has continually decreased since its peak in the 1970’s. The growth rate is projected to continue to slow into the future (Figure 3 and Figure 4). As a result, Calvert County has gone from being the fastest growing county in Maryland to one of the slowest.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9,528</td>
<td>10,484</td>
<td>12,100</td>
<td>15,826</td>
<td>20,682</td>
<td>34,638</td>
<td>51,372</td>
<td>74,563</td>
<td>88,737</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent Change (By Decade)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>67.5%</td>
<td>48.3%</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>12.9% *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3 Total Population in Calvert County by Decades
Source: Maryland Department of Planning, 2014  * Projected

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>2040</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>91,650</td>
<td>95,600</td>
<td>100,200</td>
<td>101,450</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent change
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.3%*</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4. Population Projections for Calvert County

2 Comprehensive Plan, Calvert County, Maryland, 2010, page v.
Construction
In recent decades, Calvert County has constructed fewer residential units and fewer multi-unit residential buildings than surrounding counties. Housing construction in Charles and St. Mary’s counties has recently begun to increase while Calvert County’s construction has remained unchanged as shown in Figure 5.

The three Southern Maryland counties are constructing different types of housing. In Calvert County, almost all of the new residential construction has been single family homes. In comparison, Charles and St. Mary’s counties have developed more multi-unit housing structures.

Figure 5. Year to Year Residential Construction Permits Building and Total Housing Units
Source: U.S. Census

Existing Residential Land Use
In Calvert County 20 percent of all residential development is inside the Town Centers or within their one mile radii. Figure 6 shows that residential development use is more scattered north of Prince Frederick, while residential development to the south is more concentrated, leaving larger areas with an open and rural character. Overall, 85 percent of the residential development in the county is categorized as low or very low density development (large lot single family housing).
Figure 6. Residential Areas in Calvert County Map
Source: Maryland Department of Planning
The 2010 Comprehensive Plan set a benchmark that 35 percent of new households locate in Town Centers or immediately around Town Centers. The county is achieving this goal. While the geographic areas of Town Centers and the one-mile radii are not exactly comparable to the Priority Funding Areas (PFAs), Figure 7 shows over the last five years, 41 percent of permits for new residential units have been constructed inside Priority Funding Areas.

While this distribution of new households is consistent with the 2010 benchmark, it has not produced the development patterns envisioned in the Comprehensive Plan or by the Town Center Master Plans.

**Build-out Capacity Analysis**

The Maryland Department of Planning prepared a preliminary analysis of the build-out for the existing zoning pattern in Calvert County coupled with recent provisions in state law. The analysis projected that the current zoning can accommodate approximately 9,000 additional housing units, without the use of transferable development rights (TDRs) and approximately 15,000 additional housing units with the use of TDRs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>2040</th>
<th>Projected Buildout without TDRs</th>
<th>Projected Buildout with TDRs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Persons</td>
<td>91,650</td>
<td>95,600</td>
<td>100,200</td>
<td>101,450</td>
<td>108,000*</td>
<td>124,000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households</td>
<td>32,225</td>
<td>34,325</td>
<td>37,350</td>
<td>38,125</td>
<td>41,000</td>
<td>47,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons Per Household</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2.63*</td>
<td>2.63*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Estimated based upon 2.63 Persons per household with no other considerations (vacancy rate, group quarters, etc.)
Land Preservation Activities

Ever since the first Calvert County Comprehensive Plan was adopted, one of the county’s primary goals has been the preservation of its rural character. In 1978, the Agricultural Preservation Advisory Board set a goal of preserving 20,000 acres. In 1997, Calvert County celebrated the enrollment of 20,000 acres of prime farm and forestland in County and State land preservation programs. A goal to preserve an additional 20,000 acres was adopted that year.

Calvert County uses several strategies to preserve agricultural, forest, and natural resource land. Almost 30,000 acres of land have been preserved through the combined efforts of state and local governments and land trusts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land in Preservation</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County Agricultural Preservation Program</td>
<td>21,839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland Agricultural Land Preservation Foundation (MALPF)</td>
<td>4,542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Legacy</td>
<td>1,636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland Environmental Trust (MET)</td>
<td>713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>28,730</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 9. Land in Preservation*

*Source: Calvert County Department of Community Planning and Building, March, 2017*

**Calvert County Agricultural Land Preservation Program**

Calvert County adopted the first Transferable Development Rights program in the state in 1978. The county does not “acquire” easements but requires that covenants be recorded prior to the initial sale of developments rights. Property owners voluntarily apply for Agricultural Preservation District (APD) designation. The designation remains in effect for a minimum of five years.

Once the district is established, the owner may petition for the certification development rights, which can be sold to another party and transferred to a receiving area to increase the number of residential lots/units or to satisfy forest conservation requirements via a “forest” TDR. Owners of parcels of land enrolled in districts from which no development options have been conveyed may withdraw their land after five or more years by giving a one-month notice of such intent. There are three mechanisms for preserving properties in the county program: Transferable Development Rights (TDRs), Purchase and Retirement (PAR), and Leveraging and Retirement (LAR).

The County Department of Community Planning and Building estimates that there are approximately 9,500 TDRs currently certified and available for purchase and approximately another 3,000 TDRs that could be certified in APDs. In 2013 the county placed a moratorium on the creation of new APDs.

The market for TDRs has varied over time. Between 1978 and 2013, 14,442 TDRs were sold.

In 2013 a Calvert County Community Department Planning & Building review of the county’s TDR program concluded that TDR sales had averaged between 500 and 600 per year but that the Great Recession had a profound impact on the use of TDRs and “total sales went from 716 in 2003 to 72 in 2012....” The same report recommends that the county purchase and retire about 200 TDRs per year while encouraging developer usage of approximately 300 TDRs per year.

By 2015, sales had rebounded, and 647 TDRs were sold for development. Zoning ordinance amendments adopted in November 2015 modify the TDR ratio in the Prince Frederick, Lusby, and

---

3 *Proposal to Improve the Calvert County Land Preservation Program*, 2013
Solomons Town Centers, which have public water and sewer service. The changes are intended to increase the market for purchase and use of TDRs.

The most notable of the recent changes is that the number of TDRs required to increase density on a site varies based upon the location and the type of unit. Five TDRs are needed for each additional residential lot or dwelling unit in most areas of the county. In the Prince Frederick, Lusby, and Solomons Town Centers, three TDRs are required for additional small-lot single family dwellings, two TDRs for each attached dwelling, and one TDR for each apartment unit.

Purchase and Retirement (PAR) Program
Currently the county has a Purchase and Retirement (PAR) Fund. Its purpose is to purchase and permanently remove (“retire”) development rights from the transferable development rights market. The development rights are retired rather than sold to transfer development elsewhere. Funding for the purchase of development rights has come from the agricultural land transfer tax, the recordation tax, local government funds, and matching funds from the Southern Maryland Agricultural Development Commission and the Tobacco Buyout Fund. Owners may apply through PAR to sell a limited number of development rights from land in an Agricultural Preservation District. Owners of any APD from which no development rights have been sold to others may apply to sell additional development rights.

Since 1993 the County has purchased and retired 2,379 development rights through PAR at a total cost of $9.7 million. The most recent data available is for 2015 when 265 development rights were purchased at a cost of $993,750.

Leveraging and Retirement (PAR) Program
The county also has a Leveraging and Retirement (LAR) Fund. The Leveraging Program is similar to the PAR Fund in that the Board of County Commissioners buys development rights from APD owners and permanently retires the development rights. The primary differences between the two programs include the amount of development rights that may be sold and the method of payment. The number of development rights that may be sold is not limited. The owner receives annual tax-free interest payments and a lump sum payment constituting the principal at the end of a 10, 15, or 20 year term. An installment purchase agreement is signed between the county and the seller.

Since the LAR Program began in 1999, the county has purchased and retired 2,597 development rights.
Figure 10 Calvert County, MD Agricultural Preservation District Map, 2016
Source: Calvert County Department of Community Planning and Building
Community-Expressed Desired Outcomes

During public workshops, participants listed the following items as elements of Calvert’s rural landscape and character: family farms; tobacco barns; beach communities; waterfront heritage; watermen; making a living from farming; forested and wooded areas; peace and quiet; Chesapeake Bay and Patuxent River access; Calvert Cliffs; and the county’s history, heritage, and historical sites.

The participants strongly support retaining the rural character of Calvert County. Some recommended connecting preserved properties together to create a more consistent, non-interrupted rural landscape. They believed that protecting the most productive farms should be the preservation priority. Participants recognized that there is value in maintaining sensitive natural areas. It was noted that a rural lifestyle can be more expensive in both personal and government costs. Participants recognized the potential conflict between the preservation of rural character and continued economic growth and wondered how farm and forest could be saved while still maintaining economic viability.

Part of the discussion about preserving Calvert’s rural character included the desire to make the Town Centers more attractive for development. Town Centers should be attractive so that individuals would want to live and shop there and businesses would want to locate there. Many participants said that infrastructure was needed to develop the Town Centers as dense and walkable. Participants said that additional Town Centers should not be designated until the existing Town Center areas are filled in. It was suggested that Town Centers not straddle MD 2/4 because it limits their walkability and accessibility.

Some participants thought that it was important to encourage the younger generation to stay. These citizens promoted affordable housing and a variety of housing types to keep young adults and households in the county. Others thought it was acceptable for young adults to leave during their early working years and return when they are able to afford market rate housing in the county.

Discussions about the TDR program focused on concern that it has slowed down and whether there is a need to re-incentivize it. Some participants felt that there are limited areas to sell TDRs, making it difficult for land owners who want to preserve their property. Some participants thought that requiring the purchase of TDRs to increase residential development raises the cost of housing, making it unaffordable.

Participants suggested that regulations be changed and incentives provided (infrastructure such as roads and sewer) so that developers build within the Town Centers rather than in the rural landscape. That is, make it easier for them to build what the County wants and where the county wants it built.

Possible Strategies

Directing Growth into Designated Areas

For over forty years, Calvert County has had policies to preserve its rural character by direct growth away from the rural areas. Existing policies to direct future growth to designated growth areas could be strengthened and new ones adopted. This section outlines possible strategies to consider for directing development and establishing clear boundaries between rural and developed areas. These strategies could encourage development in the designated areas, restrict development in rural areas, and buffer rural areas from growth areas in order to limit scattered residential development.

Define Growth Boundaries More Clearly

The 2010 Comprehensive Plan designates Town Centers and their one-mile radius as growth areas. In practice there is little visible distinction between the designated growth areas and the surrounding rural
land. Better defining the limits of the growth areas through zoning designations, site selection for public buildings, utility extension policy, and road construction standards could create a greater sense of difference between areas proposed for development and those intended for preservation and protection.

**Redefine Growth Areas around Designated Town Centers**
The 2010 Comprehensive Plan defines a one-mile radius around each Town Center as a location for additional growth, limited primarily to single-family detached homes on private well and septic systems. These boundaries could be better defined based upon existing land use patterns, the size of the core community, the roadway network, utility extension policies, preservation priorities and environmental constraints. Redefining these boundaries would make future development in these locations more predictable and better identified with the associated Town Center. If the place-type Village is adopted in the Comprehensive Plan update, define growth areas for them.

**Use Wastewater Infrastructure to Direct Development**
Encouraging investment in sewer service inside Town Centers would allow the construction of new housing types and, possibly, more affordable housing that would better serve the needs of young and senior adults. The areas with existing capacity could be prioritized to support additional growth. This strategy can be effective at accommodating new development within existing systems and could increase the use of TDRs.

**Create Appropriate Densities in the Town Centers**
A strong course of action would be to require minimum densities in areas designated for growth where public water and sewer are available. This strategy could encourage development at the higher densities preferred in Town Centers.

**Permit Increases in Commercial Intensity through the Use of TDRs**
Allowing construction of larger or taller commercial structures if the developer uses TDRs would encourage the protection of rural land as a trade-off for more intense development.

**Cluster Development to Transition from Town to Countryside**
Clustering new lots created on parcels at the periphery of the Town Centers could help establish a clear distinction between growth and rural areas. Clustering would allow the property owner to concentrate development on one part of a site, the part nearest to the Town Center or Village (if Villages are adopted in the updated Comprehensive Plan). When the owner permanently restricts the rest of the property to open space or farmland, it contributes to the visual boundary at the edge of the growth area.

**Preserving Rural Character**
Rural preservation strategies can protect the rural landscape, give preference to active agricultural operations and provide predictability for residents and landowners. The following strategies can be continued or initiated.

**Continue to Fund the Purchase and Retirement (PAR) Program**
Funding and pursuing the purchase and retirement of development rights in locations where there are active farms or in locations with particular value as open space would advance a number of policy goals. This strategy might include removing the restrictions on the number of development rights the county purchases from a single property. The greater challenge for this program is identifying funding. Sources could include county transfer taxes or similar local sources, the Maryland Agricultural Land Preservation Foundation (MALPF), local and state land trusts as well as the Department of Defense in order to reduce development that may negatively impact the Patuxent Naval Air Station and its operational mission.
**Require Development Rights be Used for Family Conveyance Lots**
The family conveyance exception allows property owners to create additional lots over and above the current zoning limit as long as the lot is intended for a member of the owner’s family. The number of conventional lots may be doubled through the use of family conveyance lots up to a total maximum of seven lots if the minimum lot size requirements can be met. Lots may be transferred out of the family after seven years; lots may be transferred out of the family sooner if five TDRs are applied to each lot. The creation of family conveyance lots allows creation of more lots in the rural area without any offsetting reduction in potential build-out of the county.

**Review Design Standards for Rural County Roads**
Preserving the look and limiting the capacity of the rural roads may help to maintain the rural character of Calvert County. While still providing safe roads, people in many rural areas want to avoid conventional roadway design that can alter that character of the community and promote higher speeds. By using standards for local rural roads, engineers for the county and developers can respond to design standards that accommodate autos, bikes and, where appropriate, pedestrians, in a way that also recognizes the visual impact of roads on the rural character of select parts of the county.

**Create Green Corridors**
Natural areas such as wetlands, wildlife habitat, beaches, and steep slopes are important from an environmental perspective, and they also help create the special character of rural areas. The county should look for opportunities to connect protected natural areas to create a connected network of green spaces (green infrastructure). Where appropriate, this network could include hiking trails to create recreation opportunities for residents and visitors. These greenways could provide real benefits to the local economy by bringing more tourism to the county while still supporting the environment, working farmlands, forests, and fisheries.

**Support Productive Agriculture**
Identifying and supporting working agricultural lands can help reduce the financial pressure for conversion of farmland. Calvert County’s ongoing efforts to support agri-tourism and to develop new markets for local produce could continue to protect a connected rural landscape.

**Share Your Ideas**

1. Preserving farm and forest land has been a priority of Calvert County for over 40 years. What actions would you support the county taking to preserve even more land? How could those actions be paid for?

2. One way to protect farm and forest land is to direct growth away from them and into designated areas. What incentives would you support the county providing to encourage/attract/direct growth to designated areas?
APPENDIX

History of Calvert County Planning

First Comprehensive Plan. Calvert County's first Comprehensive Plan was adopted in 1967. A central focus of the plan was to retain the rural character of the County. Utilizing one of the few planning tools available at the time, the county adopted 3 acre zoning in an effort to minimize the impact of residential development on nearby farm operations and direct growth toward areas that were already developed.

Pleasant Peninsula Plan. In 1974, the County adopted its first update to the Comprehensive Plan. Referred to as the Pleasant Peninsula Plan, this plan emphasized the need to protect the natural environment, maintain the county's rural lifestyle and limit the demand for public services. A primary goal was to promote planned slow growth. Minimum lot sizes in rural areas were increased from three acres to five acres in a further effort to discourage development in these areas. This plan set a standard for encouraging strong public participation in the county planning process.

Farm Preservation Programs. By the late 1970's, Calvert residents recognized that while large lot zoning effectively reduced the number of households located within rural areas, it destroyed prime farm and forest land by taking it out of production permanently. To address this concern, Calvert led the state and much of the country in adopting the use of Transferable Development Rights (TDRs) to protect prime farms and forest land. The law enabled owners of prime land to sell their development rights on the open market. Shortly after the county adopted its Transferable Development Rights program, the State of Maryland adopted a Purchase and Retirement Program (PAR). This allowed property owners of prime land to sell their development rights to the State. In 1993, the County adopted its own PAR fund to supplement the TDR program.

1983 Comprehensive Plan. The County updated its Comprehensive Plan in response to two seemingly contradictory public mandates: to "protect rural character" and to "promote economic development". The primary means of fulfilling this mandate was to establish a series of Town Centers for the purpose of directing both commercial and higher density residential growth away from farms, environmentally sensitive areas, and highways and toward areas that could be provided with adequate infrastructure and services.

Environmental Regulations. During the 1980's, the county instituted strong conservation techniques to protect wetlands, flood plains and steep slopes. In 1989, the state mandated the establishment of the Critical Area, all land within 1,000 feet of the mean high tide line of tidal water or tidal wetland. The allowable density within most of this area was reduced to 20 acres per dwelling unit. The Forestry Management Act, adopted in 1993 and designed to protect large contiguous forested areas, was also mandated by the state.

Adequate Public Facilities. In 1988, the county adopted adequate Public facilities regulations to help ensure that schools and roads would be able to accommodate rapid growth. During the early 1990's, this ordinance effectively stopped the approval of most new subdivisions until new schools could be built to accommodate the growth in student population. An impact fee was imposed on all new developments to help pay for new school construction.

Mandatory Clustering. In 1992, large lot zoning again came under intense public review. Despite strong efforts and considerable success at preserving prime farms and forests, the county was leading the state in
the amount of farm and forest land being converted to residential use. To address the problem, the county adopted mandatory clustering together with the designation of three zoning overlay categories: 1) Farm Communities, 2) Resource Preservation Districts, and 3) Rural Communities. This new provision required that lots be clustered onto 50% of any given parcel within a Rural Community and 20% of any given parcel within a Farm Community or Resource Preservation District. Design standards were included to protect productive fields, forests and scenic vistas.

Employment Districts. In 1993, a new zoning category called Employment District was adopted. Employment Districts were designated for non-retail related uses and were required to be adjacent to Town Centers in order to avoid commercial sprawl.

1997 Comprehensive Plan. The central focus of the 1997 Plan was to establish measurable benchmarks to determine appropriate residential build-out. The Plan also established a set of visions with benchmarks to monitor progress on implementing the visions. The land preservation goal was increased from 20,000 acres to 40,000 acres.

1999 Build-out Reduction. After conducting a thorough analysis of the costs and benefits of reducing build-out and developing options for public review and comment, the county adopted a program to reduce build-out that included a combination of zoning ordinance changes with new funding and new incentives for voluntary land preservation. One of these incentives was the Leveraging and Retirement Program (LAR), which provided an additional means for the county to purchase and retire development rights.

2003 Build-out Reduction. The residential build-out issue was revisited in 2003 and further reductions were made to meet the build-out goals established in 1999. Changes were also made to the adequate public facilities regulations to further slow residential growth.

2004 Comprehensive Plan. After a two-year period of analysis and review of the progress in implementing the 1997 Comprehensive Plan and assessing the need for course corrections and additions, the revised Comprehensive Plan was adopted. All 10 visions from the 1997 plan were retained, with a slight modification to the environmental vision, and the benchmarks were updated.

2010 Comprehensive Plan Amendments. Amendments to Chapter I of the 2004 Comprehensive Plan were adopted in 2010 to address changes in state planning law. The adoption was the culmination of a public review process initiated in 2008. The amendments addressed three state laws: Agricultural Stewardship (House Bill 2), Water Resources (House Bill 1141), and Smart, Green, and Growing (Senate Bill 273). The first two laws, adopted by the Maryland General Assembly in 2006, required new and expanded elements in all comprehensive plans, specifically a water resources element and a Priority Preservation Area element, which was required in order for local jurisdictions to remain certified under Maryland’s Agricultural Certification Program. The third law, adopted in 2009, replaced the State of Maryland’s eight planning visions with 12 new visions.
Calvert County Comprehensive Plan Update
Strengthening Economic Vitality

Introduction
The Calvert County Department of Community Planning & Building staff and the WSP | Parsons Brinckerhoff consultants are working on behalf of the Planning Commission and the Board of County Commissioners to update the Calvert County Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Ordinance.

The intent of the Comprehensive Plan update is to ensure the visions for Calvert County are still valid, including the twin overarching visions of preserving the rural character while directing new growth to appropriate locations, along with the vision of building a strong local economy. The update will address the county’s changing demographics and issues, including land use, environment, economy, housing, and transportation. In addition, the update will address new state land use requirements, including plan elements and the Sustainable Growth and Agricultural Preservation Act.

In the summer of 2016, informational meetings were held where the public could learn about the update process and share their ideas about the challenges facing Calvert County. In September and October of 2016 four interactive workshops were held where citizens, staff, and the consultants discussed issues in small groups. The discussions at workshops helped set the stage for the current phase, discussing key issues that should be addressed in the updated Comprehensive Plan. Five workshops are being held in the winter and spring of 2017. Strengthening Economic Vitality is the fifth in the series of issue papers and workshops.

Current County Policies
Strengthening Calvert’s economic vitality is a theme present throughout numerous cycles of adopted county comprehensive plans. The current Calvert County Comprehensive Plan goal states this explicitly:

“The goal of the Comprehensive Plan is to maintain and/or improve the overall quality of life for all citizens of Calvert County by:

a. promoting sustainable development,

b. **encouraging a stable and enduring economic base,**

c. providing for safety, health, and education, and

d. preserving the natural, cultural, and historic assets of Calvert County.”¹ (emphasis added)

¹ Comprehensive Plan, Calvert County Maryland, Adopted 2004, Amended 2010, p. iii.
The current County Comprehensive Plan includes 10 visions. One of the visions states, “We are building a strong local economy based upon renewable resources, high technology, retirement, recreation, and tourism.” This vision, originally adopted in the 1997 Calvert County Comprehensive Plan, was retained in the 2004 Plan. The vision’s benchmarks call for expanding the commercial real property tax base, increasing the number of in-county jobs, and increasing the number of visitors.

Today, Calvert County’s economy is stable and has exhibited limited, but steady, upward growth. Residents earn above average wages as compared to other Southern Maryland counties and the State of Maryland. Based upon median household income, Calvert is one of the wealthiest counties in Maryland and the wealthiest in Southern Maryland, in part because of the proximity to federal agency and contracting jobs. However, many of those jobs exist in the surrounding counties, and the share of residents commuting out of Calvert County to work has increased in the past decade, but the county has also experienced an influx of individuals from other neighboring jurisdictions that commute to jobs in Calvert County.

The Calvert County Department of Economic Development is charged with the task of promoting growth in the local economy. The Department, in cooperation with the Economic Development Commission, has two activities underway that will need to be considered in developing the updated Comprehensive Plan. Those activities are the Five-Year Strategic Plan and the targeted market analysis, which is being conducted for the Southern Maryland region in cooperation with the Maryland Department of Commerce. The first Economic Development Strategic Plan was adopted in 1997.

**Current Conditions**

The economy of Calvert County is largely dependent on the economies of both the State of Maryland and the Washington metropolitan area. While the Great Recession has ended, recovery from its effects has been slow and the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments projects that federal employment in the region will continue to shrink in coming years. Nevertheless Calvert has seen some economic growth between 2010 and 2015, with strong business growth in the county, the development of liquefied natural gas import facility at Dominion Cove Point, the current expansion of the Dominion LNG liquefaction export project also at Dominion Cove Point scheduled for completion in 2017, and expansion among local employers. Private sector jobs in the county grew by 1,510 (9 percent) in the five-year period.

**Commuting**

Prince Frederick is 30 miles from the Capital Beltway and 40 miles from the U.S. Capitol Building. This proximity to Washington, D.C., and to Baltimore and Annapolis, influences employment locations for residents of Calvert County. As shown in Table 1, approximately 60 percent of Calvert County residents commute out of Calvert County for their jobs. The percentage of people commuting out of the county has increased over the past ten years.
Table 1: Number and percentage of Calvert County residents who work in and out of the county

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In County</th>
<th>Out of County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005 to 2009 average</td>
<td>19,315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 to 2014 average</td>
<td>17,899</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In County</th>
<th>Out of County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005 to 2009 average</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 to 2014 average</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: American Community Survey, US Census Bureau, 2014 Five-year Estimates

Local Employment

Historically, Calvert County’s local economy is based upon agriculture, tourism, construction, energy production, and local-serving retail and service businesses. Major energy-related activities include Exelon/Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant and Dominion Cove Point’s liquefaction export project. Calvert County’s largest five employers are the Calvert County Public Schools, Calvert County Government, Calvert Memorial Hospital, Exelon/Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant, and the Arc of Southern Maryland (see Table 2). Most of the remaining top ten employers are service and retail businesses.

Table 2: Top Ten Calvert County Employers (as of November 2016)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Employer</th>
<th>Employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Calvert County Public Schools</td>
<td>2,133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Calvert County Government</td>
<td>1,226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Calvert Memorial Hospital</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Exelon/Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant</td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The Arc of Southern Maryland</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Asbury Solomons</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Chesapeake Beach Resort &amp; Spa</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>DirectMail.com</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Safeway – Prince Frederick</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Calvert County Nursing Center</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Calvert County Department of Economic Development, 2017
Tax Base

Calvert County is heavily dependent on real property taxes as a source of revenue. However, between 2011 and 2016, the county’s real property assessable base has experienced a decrease in value of $3.18 billion. Figure 1 shows that the greatest decreases in the assessable base occurred between 2010 and 2013. Since 2013 the assessable base has stabilized and begun to rise slowly.

Figure 1: Calvert County, MD: Real Property Assessable Base ($ Billions), FY2007-FY2016

![Graph showing real property assessable base from FY2007 to FY2016](source: Calvert County Comprehensive Annual Financial Report for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2016)

The greatest portion of the assessable tax base is residential real property as shown in Table 3. Between 2011 and 2016, the county’s residential real property value has experienced a net decrease of $1.9 billion, and growth in commercial real property value has not completely offset this loss.

Table 3: Calvert County Assessable Base, FY2011 v. FY2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2011 ($ Millions)</th>
<th>FY 2016 ($ Millions)</th>
<th>Net ($ Millions)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential Real Property*</td>
<td>$12,051.74</td>
<td>$10,123.57</td>
<td>-$1,928.18</td>
<td>-16.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Real Property*</td>
<td>$1,260.79</td>
<td>$1,281.56</td>
<td>$20.77</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Utility</td>
<td>$747.96</td>
<td>$878.73</td>
<td>$130.78</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Property</td>
<td>$126.40</td>
<td>$127.32</td>
<td>$0.93</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Including Corporations and Banks)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Assessable Tax Base</td>
<td>$14,186.88</td>
<td>$12,411.18</td>
<td>-$1,775.70</td>
<td>-12.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Calvert County Department of Finance & Budget
Another factor to consider in the discussion of the real property tax base is the comparison of revenue from various land use types to the costs of services required to support those uses. Residential uses, particularly single-family detached units, historically have required more than a dollar in services for each dollar of tax revenue they provide. In contrast, commercial and agricultural uses require considerably less than a dollar in services for each dollar in tax revenue contributed. The recent reduction in housing values has probably made the disparity between revenue collection and cost of services more pronounced for residential uses. Calvert County’s housing stock is comprised predominately of single-family detached units.

Tourism
Calvert County has many natural, cultural, recreational, and historical resources that appeal to residents and visitors alike. The impact of the travel/visitor industry on the county’s economy is significant.

In 2015 the tourism industry employed 2,071 workers in Calvert County. Total tourism tax receipts were $37.7 million. Calvert County’s 2015 visitor counts increased by 109,264 visitors, or 33.4 percent over 2010. Total tourism industry sales increased from $125 million in 2010 to $146.8 million in 2015. (See Table 5.)

Table 5: Impact of Travel and Tourism on Calvert County (CY 2015)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tourism Industry Sales</td>
<td>$ 146.8 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism Labor Income</td>
<td>$ 79.7 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Tourism Tax Receipts</td>
<td>$ 37.7 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism Employment</td>
<td>2,071 workers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Tourism Economics, An Oxford Economics Company

Agriculture
Farms comprised 32,901 acres or 24 percent of the land area in Calvert County, according to the 2012 Census of Agriculture by the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Also according to the 2012 census, most farms in Calvert County were less than 180 acres, with an average size of 122 acres. In fiscal year 2014, agriculture accounted for $272.5 million, or 2 percent of the total tax base.

Of the 269 farms reporting in 2012, 121 of the farm operators were full-time operators. There were a significant number of farms raising cattle, other livestock and horses: over 80 farms were involved in the equine industry. Farm operations have shifted away from tobacco to commodity crops, specialty crops, like fruit and vegetables, and value-added products, such as meat processing, plus farm-to-table businesses and agri-tourism. In 2012, the market value of products sold was $11.1 million, an increase of
175 percent from the previous census in 2007 when the market value of products sold was $4 million. Of the 2012 value, 95 percent was from crop sales and 5 percent was from livestock sales. The County Commissioners have directed the Department of Economic Development to enhance agricultural marketing operations. As a result, a new position dedicated to support the agricultural community was added in FY17.

**National and Regional Trends**

Calvert County does not exist in a vacuum. It is part of the larger Washington, D.C. metropolitan region and is influenced and impacted by the conditions across the region. In addition, Calvert County competes with other parts of the greater Washington, D.C. area, Baltimore and Annapolis, and within Southern Maryland for jobs, workers, and residents.

**Regional Employment Growth**

The Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments prepares forecasts of growth in population, housing and employment for each county in the metropolitan area, including Calvert County. The most recent projections (Round 9.0, approved in November 2016) estimated the total employment in Calvert County in 2015 at 34,000, which is projected to increase to 44,300 or 30 percent by 2045. This percentage increase is comparable to the projected growth in the other Maryland counties in the region. (See Table 4.)

**Table 4: Employment Forecasts for Maryland Counties within the Washington Metropolitan Region**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JURISDICTION</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>2035</th>
<th>2040</th>
<th>2045</th>
<th>2015 to 2045</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thousands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery County</td>
<td>520.2</td>
<td>543.5</td>
<td>572.5</td>
<td>604.5</td>
<td>627.4</td>
<td>653.9</td>
<td>678.7</td>
<td>158.5, 30.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince George’s County</td>
<td>338.6</td>
<td>349.0</td>
<td>366.3</td>
<td>375.7</td>
<td>385.5</td>
<td>393.3</td>
<td>402.1</td>
<td>63.6, 18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calvert County (1)</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>10.3, 30.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles County</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>14.9, 32.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary’s County (1)</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>70.4</td>
<td>74.3</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>79.1</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td>84.5</td>
<td>18.5, 28.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederick County</td>
<td>106.2</td>
<td>110.6</td>
<td>115.6</td>
<td>121.3</td>
<td>127.8</td>
<td>133.9</td>
<td>140.2</td>
<td>34.0, 32.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Projections from 2015 to 2040 prepared by the Maryland Department of Planning, Historical and Projected Total Jobs by Place of Work, January 2015

Regional Median Household Income
Calvert County residents enjoy an above-average wage when compared to the other Southern Maryland counties as well as the State of Maryland. Based upon income and poverty statistics, Calvert County is one of the wealthiest counties in the state. (See Figure 1.)

Figure 1: Median Household Income 2014


Demand for Retail and Personal Services
In 2011, the county completed a retail leakage report for Calvert County. The study demonstrated how much Calvert County residents are spending outside the county in different retail and personal service categories. Two of the top three categories (foodservice & drinking places and clothing & clothing accessories) are those residents frequently express a desire to see more represented in Calvert County. The report also estimates the additional gross leasable area needed to accommodate the local demand for retail services. (See Table 5.)
### Table 5: Estimated Lost Spending and Additional Retail Space Demand from County Resident Retail Spending Outside of the County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Retail Category</th>
<th>“Lost” Spending</th>
<th>Additional Retail Space Demand (Square Feet of Gross Leasable Area)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Furniture &amp; Home Furnishings</td>
<td>$ 30,389,414</td>
<td>202,596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronics and Appliances Stores</td>
<td>$ 21,282,271</td>
<td>35,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Materials, Garden Equipment Stores</td>
<td>$ 113,020,637</td>
<td>452,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; Personal Care Stores</td>
<td>$ 27,513,762</td>
<td>29,906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing &amp; Clothing Accessories</td>
<td>$ 73,462,961</td>
<td>222,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Merchandise Stores</td>
<td>$ 55,511,443</td>
<td>170,804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Store Retailers</td>
<td>$ 23,494,797</td>
<td>78,316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foodservice &amp; Drinking Places</td>
<td>$ 88,665,383</td>
<td>264,673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$ 460,727,356</td>
<td>1,583,843</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Retail Purchase Power Analysis, Calvert County, Maryland (Conducted by Fore Consulting, December 2011)

---

**Perspectives on Economic Vitality**

**Board of County Commissioners and Planning Commission**

A long-standing Comprehensive Plan objective has been to increase the commercial tax base and broaden Calvert County’s economy by strengthening the existing business base and generating new business opportunities. Calvert County’s elected officials would like to expand and diversify the county’s tax base. Real property tax is the county’s largest revenue source, and while it includes residential, commercial, and utility properties, much of the revenue is generated by residential development. To provide for additional, sustainable revenue sources, to protect the county from the negative revenue effect of residential property devaluation, and to reduce the government’s direct reliance on its residents for revenue, the Board of County Commissioners would like to increase the commercial real property tax base to provide revenue and offset reliance on the residential taxpayer. It is important to note, however, that commercial, in general across the United States, cannot keep pace with residential tax base growth.

Increasing commercial development and the associated real estate tax base can also reduce the county’s reliance upon income taxes, the second largest revenue source for Calvert County. Income taxes are paid by residents, including those who do not own property.
Payments in Lieu of Taxes (PILOTs) from the county’s energy industries are another large component of the county’s tax revenues. The Exelon/Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant provides approximately $20 million each year via a PILOT payment. Additionally, Calvert County government and Dominion Cove Point entered into a 15-year PILOT and tax credit agreement. In FY18, the county government will receive a one-time $25 million pre-payment from Dominion Cove Point. PILOT payments will begin in FY19 and locks in the existing equipment value at $15.1 million for the first 5 years of the PILOT (without the agreement, the existing equipment was projected to decline). A tax credit begins in the sixth year of the PILOT, providing a 42 percent tax credit on new and repurposed equipment. The county will receive approximately $40 million (on average) per year in tax revenue once the facility is operational.

Whenever a jurisdiction relies on a few large sources of revenues, it is appropriate for it to seek out opportunities to diversify its portfolio and spread the revenue risk and responsibility across a larger group of sources. The Board of County Commissioners recognizes this and would like to expand the county’s economic opportunities and create new and sustainable revenue sources.

A key concern of the Board of County Commissioners is ensuring that Calvert County offers a regulatory environment that is conducive to economic growth. This means creating opportunities for local businesses to open or expand and making Calvert County an attractive option to businesses looking to enter the Southern Maryland market.

**Desired Outcomes**

Calvert County residents and elected officials want to accommodate employment and business growth in a manner that respects the environment and is sensitive to the fiscal and social needs of the county. In addition to satisfying the retail needs and desires of residents, Calvert County is interested in expanding its job base. Ideally, those jobs would be higher paying, professional service jobs and could build upon the existing professional service opportunities already located in the community and continuing to target industries that reflect the existing labor force. Focusing commercial and employment development in a limited number of Town Centers is crucial to creating the energy and vibrancy necessary to attract additional businesses. Communities that attract new mid-sized businesses offer a variety of housing types and price points, are walkable and attractive and have good schools and recreation opportunities to attract young families and emerging professionals.

One of the 2010 Comprehensive Plan’s 10 Visions is for the Town Centers to be attractive, convenient, and interesting places to live, work, and shop. The implication of this vision is to focus growth in well-planned Town Centers instead of in strip malls and business parks scattered throughout the county. Measurable goals for assessable tax base, floor area ratios, jobs, affordable housing units and office space could be used to measure economic progress.
Comments from Public

During the public workshops, many people expressed interest in economic development. In particular, they see the designated Town Centers as focal points which should provide increased shopping, dining, and entertainment opportunities. As one attendee put it, “keep more money home in Calvert.” However, other attendees like the county’s rural character and say that people who choose Calvert County do so knowing that the services and amenities may not match those available in more developed areas.

Workshop participants recognized the link between housing affordability and economic development, but reached no consensus. Some participants felt that more housing choices would provide housing options for young people and those who work at retail and personal service jobs. However, others said that it would be better to focus on highly-paid residents who could afford higher priced homes.

There was some discussion at the workshops about increasing professional service jobs and other types of non-retail jobs within the county. Suggestions included providing improved workforce development skills through the schools and providing assistance to local entrepreneurs.

Growing Calvert County’s agricultural industry was also mentioned as an important part of the county’s economic development activities. This included expanding associated businesses such as wineries and breweries and creating opportunities for increased demand for agricultural products (for example, farm-to-table restaurants, farmers markets, and community-supported agriculture (CSAs)).

Workshop participants felt that the different parts of the county lend themselves to different economic development approaches. Dunkirk and the northern part of the county, with their proximity to the Washington, DC area and the best access to areas outside the county, could develop into more of a gateway into Calvert County with commercial and residential development. The middle part of the county, with Prince Frederick at its heart, is the administrative, educational, and medical hub of the county and could capitalize on these resources. Armory Square is ripe to be developed as a walkable, mixed-use area filled with shops and housing. The southern part of the county, Solomons especially, has a more waterfront-focused feel. Expanding water-themed, retirement, and relaxation activities could be the emphasis here.

Tourism is another important tool in Calvert County’s economic development toolbox. The Comprehensive Plan can focus on the policies, programs, and infrastructure necessary to create a place attractive to visitors and to support an environment that allows the attractions to thrive. The zoning ordinance regulates where and under what circumstances tourist-centered businesses are permitted. The regulations typically address the potential impacts that tourist-oriented agricultural business uses, museums, and historic sites may have on rural residential and agricultural preservation areas.
When workshop attendees were asked about tourism, they expressed support for expanded promotion of existing attractions and mentioned a number of strategies for increasing the attractiveness of Calvert County to visitors. Suggested strategies included improving and expanding local dining and shopping; creating more walkable, bikeable, and connected Town Centers; offering weekend shuttles serving Washington, DC to attract travelers who may be visiting the area without cars; and providing more and better access to the water. Expanding agricultural activities, such as festivals and cooking classes where local farmers provide the produce and chefs teach people how to prepare it, that attract visitors was also discussed.

Share Your Ideas

This paper was prepared to provide background information for discussion of possible strategies for strengthening Calvert County’s economic vitality that could be included in the updated Calvert County Comprehensive Plan. You are invited to the public workshop to discuss economic vitality issues and to share your thoughts via the County Comprehensive Plan website:
http://www.co.cal.md.us/futureCalvert.

1. What are the three to five best actions Calvert County could take to increase the number of well-paying jobs in the county?

2. What concerns you most about proposals to expand Calvert’s economy?