



Education Work Group PlanMaryland Recommendations July 25, 2011

Identification of Recommendations for PlanMaryland

- a. Identify Local Role in PlanMaryland. "County" is not referenced in the PlanMD document.
- b. Add neat lines around all photos, see page 2-13 and compare to 2-2 and 2-3
- c. Identify whether document will be listed in Volumes and/or Chapters to allow for future modifications
- d. Discussion of local planning efforts that expressly recognizes the changes over the last several decades made to address good land use planning and smart growth precepts. (Included in Chap 2)
- e. An analysis of the effect of past regulations and subdivision development of old subdivisions that may account for the development of substantial amounts of land outside the priority funding areas (PFAs). Statement in conclusion of Chapter 2 should be amended to reflect this fact, i.e., "Without changes in policy, Maryland will remain subject to decentralized development. . ." Is this really true or do we simply need time for local policies to kick in. An analysis of this issue would make the plan's strategy more effective.
- f. An analysis of current zoning and its impact on the location and density for future development would be instructive in assessing the current state of regulations and whether they will produce smart growth or add to sprawl. The plan at this point says things are not working and we need to change. We are not sure this is true. The conclusion asserts that there is an "absence of policies and strategies for containing development and prioritizing the highest and best use of all land in the State. . . Without analyzing existing zoning, how can this statement be made?
- g. A strategy to countervail the need to "drive until you qualify", i.e., housing affordability. This is not mentioned as an issue or force driving development; it is the prime mover.
- h. A composite map of county/town comprehensive plans and it should discuss how the state's plan will coordinate/differ for local planning efforts.
- i. Be more explicit that one its main focus is to serve as a blueprint for state agencies and is not a prescription of local land use planning. This emphasis has been stated verbally at meetings about the plan, but the plan document does not give it sufficient emphasis. State agency coordination is not mentioned as an issue, vision or objective in Chapter 3. It should be identified as an issue and an objective.
- j. Address why if infill is so highly desired, it doesn't happen more often. (Goal 1 page 3-7)
- k. Address the lack of input into the growth print process.
 - a. Only 15 jurisdictions commented.
 - b. Possible cause: lack of understanding that it would at some point be used as a fundamental land use policy tool.

1. Using priority funding areas as the basis for future growth would result in many locations in high hazard areas being designated for growth. Past development patterns, the basis for priority funding areas, do not provide necessarily the proper location for concentrations of future growth. Future growth location should begin with the local comprehensive plan and its designated growth areas.

PRO's:

- a. Master Plan 2010 Goals include the strive for excellent public education
- b. Identifies all jurisdictions must be on board to discourage sprawl
- c. Encourages private-public partnership
- d. Encourages local zoning efforts to be in line with and get the by-in of developers
- e. Strong focus on transportation and identifies the differences between rural and urban needs
- f. Ch 4. C. 7 Promotes long-term community planning tools that encourage investment in existing school programs to meet the educational challenges facing lower income communities and to meet the needs of new growth areas

CON'S:

- a. If a jurisdiction has recently completed its Comprehensive plan, should it be changed to mirror PlanMaryland?
- b. Unclear if there is a funding stream (if needed) to assist jurisdictions in their implementation of the plan