

By Stephen H. Rogers

RE: Forest Drive/Eastport Sector Study

The first subject to be addressed is the set of **Premises** stipulated in

The current 4th draft of the Sector Study. It is unclear who set the premises for the Study.

The Following Study **Premises are inconsistent** with the Character of Eastport and the Connection of Eastport to Forest drive is a mistake since the two areas are dissimilar except for traffic that flows back and forth:

- That there will be growth ----not in Annapolis
- That density and intensity is needed ---can not fit into old town
- That more low income housing brings jobs—just the opposite
- Growth is needed to increase the tax base income
- Need for change to implement the vision----what vision?
- Similar growth potential exists in the City and the County—very different
- What are opportunity areas? Urban low, urban commercial, urban center
- If 80 percent of residents in the study area leave the area for work, then
- It makes no sense to emphasize mass transit and more business in the Study Area.
- It is inconceivable to think the City can manipulate jobs-to-residents Status. How can a ratio be good or bad. Who defines this social Engineering?

Factors not stressed

Institutional entities do not pay taxes to pay for services received
And that imbalance exacerbates that City Services to Revenue ratio.

A subtle fact exists that jobs in Annapolis can not support the High Taxes
And High residential taxes.

One Alternative not presented is that Premise that Annapolis is not suited for development and to preserve the character development of certain types should be prevented. The community is currently reacting to reducing the type and scale of any development in Eastport. Annapolis has geographical limitations and functional limitations. The Study ignores these realities.

The study fails to examine alternatives. **A Second Alternative** is the thought That the Forest Drive Corridor is the feeder for Annapolis because is has the available space and can still provide additional Low Income Housing area.

Figure 7 is a graphic representation that debugs the need for growth since over 90 percent of the Eastport area is residential, recreational, and Institutional. None of this area is suited to higher density and business type growth. Recently I visited an area near Sacramento, California called Roseville. It is all new within the last 10 years and has been well planned. I had to drive 2 miles to find a gas station Or grocery store. The residential areas a well separated from business zones.

Guiding principles of the study were to Preserve and enhance Community Character, Maintain Vibrant Economy, and promote a Green Annapolis. The study language wonders into area that are not guiding Principles. The Study does not examine the Principles.

Figure 8 should be an exact overlay of Figure 7. It is not. This conflict is Graphic and needs to be corrected. It generates most of the Appeals Issues.

Solutions

The City must develop a relationship with the County that is financially sound and balanced. Currently, the City pays an unfair share of Property taxes to the County for NO Services received. This must be stopped. Either the County pays their Property Taxes and other Services fees or City should initiate removal of County Taxes from residential and Commercial property in Annapolis that goes to the County.

- Redo the Study to focus on the Principles.
- Develop a Vision that is consistent with citizens desires.
- Create Alternatives such as limited growth and limited types of Growth
- Preserve our community Character do not destroy it.
- Stop aborting the Zoning Planning process.

Submitted

Stephen H. Rogers

443-871-5610