

**NOTES OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' PUBLIC HEARING ON ULDC  
CHOPTICON HIGH SCHOOL \* MORGANZA, MARYLAND  
Wednesday, July 18, 2001**

**Present:**

**Board of County Commissioners**  
**Julie Randall, President**  
**Shelby Guazzo, Vice President**  
**Joe Anderson, Commissioner**  
**Tommy Mattingly, Commissioner**  
**Dan Raley, Commissioner**

**County Staff**  
**Al Lacer, County Administrator**  
**Jon Grimm, Director, DPZ**  
**Attorneys**  
**Department Heads**  
**DPZ Staff**

The public hearing was called to order at 6:00 p.m. by County Administrator Al Lacer, who provided the introduction. Commissioner Randall offered a welcome and opening remarks. DPZ Director Jon Grimm presented an overview of the draft ULDC document. The legal ad for the public hearing was published in the June 29<sup>th</sup>, July 6<sup>th</sup>, and July 13, 2001 issues of The Enterprise. Speaker #s continue from the 7/17 hearing. Public comments follow:

**Speaker #47 – Tom Tazelaar, Leesburg, VA (property in California)**

- (1) Requests CMX zoning for property on 234, west of MD 4, owned by his family since WWII. Property is proposed RMX but the character of the surrounding area and property across the road is commercial. Airport is industrial and to zone this strip of land anything like residential is a mistake. RMX will leave them with almost no use.

**#48 – Russell Tazelaar, Temple Hills, MD**

- (1) Not developers, just trying to do the best they can for their family. Agrees with brother and requests CMX.

**#49 – Robert M. Heffron, Mechanicsville**

- (1) Not opposed to change as long as there is proper notice. Letters should be sent to each household notifying of the changes and they should be made available for review on the Internet, in the library, or by request to each individual. 60 days is not long enough for review. Then there should be a 6-month cooling off period and then these forums for discussion.
- (2) Crowd does not represent the entire population or just in this small area of Choptico. Problems can't be resolved without the input of everyone.

**#50 – Glen Woods, speaking for mother Virginia Woods, Hollywood**

- (1) Request RMX zoning for mother's property at Tax Map 26, Parcel 175 and her neighbor, Ms. Giovanetti, both of whom have written previous letters requesting it. Both properties are sandwiched between two properties proposed for commercial zoning and across from former Southern Maryland Wood Treatment Plant.

**#51 – Bernardine Johnson, Baptist Church Road, Mechanicsville**

- (1) Small farmer in Choptico. Under IRS all farms are listed as home occupations under which, in the ULDC, you may not sell an animal off of a farm. Affects several other things and gets into personal things that we should have the right to own and things we should have the right to do, such as the number of personal and farm vehicles and parking regulations, which also gets into churches. (Note: Both crop production and livestock are permitted principal uses of agriculture under the code and are not subject to the U. S. Tax Code.)

**#52 – Joe St. Clair, Choptico, representing himself and his family**

- (1) How many property rights have been taken away without our knowledge? The intention of the Top Ten Reasons not to adopt the ULDC was to get everyone involved; another 10 will be in the paper on Friday.
- (2) Table 32.1.a – Density. If you're going to take away the rights of the landowner because of sensitive areas you must compensate them for it or at least explain why you're taking their rights. People should not have to hire an attorney to interpret the code.

#53 – Kenneth Wathen, Leonardtown, representing Wathen Family Partnership

- (1) 46 acres in Breton Bay, TM 40, P59, currently zoned RPD, abuts MetCom property and will abut the conference center and another golf course in the near future, and a combination of single-family homes and condos. Feels an RL or RNC zoning category would be more in line with the surrounding neighborhood.
- (2) July 2001 Letter with regard to the base FAR should show 0.10, but it showed 0.0.

#54 – Joan Turner, Mechanicsville

- (1) Came tonight to address the absurdity of the ULDC.
- (2) Individual rights should never be compromised because it is a two-sided coin, with many rights on one side and many responsibilities on the other.
- (3) People want their property to stay rural. There are too many shopping centers and stores are standing empty because there is no one to occupy them and not enough business.
- (4) Regarding statement that unless we enact a code we won't get state funding; they haven't funded us for anything important in years; maybe what we should do is withhold our money from the state and use it for this county and these people.

#55 – Chris Longmore, Leonardtown (Attorney with Dugan & McKissick but speaking as native born and bred)

- (1) We haven't lost our rural character; doesn't see why we should restrict commercial structures to a 50,000 square foot footprint; the issue is where they are placed.

#56 – Shep Whitner, Charlotte, NC (An owner of Food Lion in Callaway)

- (1) Front portion of Food Lion property is CVC and small portion in the rear is RPD. Requests all one zone.

#57 – Elizabeth Rustin, Mechanicsville

- (1) Thinks we are overdoing it. Has been trying for over two years to get building permits for her children and was told she had to have 3 acres of land; now it will be more. Pretty soon you will need a permit to die. Has two daughters waiting to build. It is her home and she paid for the land, and she wants to be able to get building permits for her children.

#58 – Ben Burroughs, Jr., Mechanicsville

- (1) Thinks it is wrong to encourage farming because it is no longer profitable. Also thinks it is wrong to take too much land off the tax rolls.
- (2) New regulations will allow him to build fewer homes on a piece of land than he could before, and that's not fair.
- (3) No grandfathering of projects that people have invested money in, and that is important to consider.
- (4) If you are going to make developing more restrictive you should give developers something in return; i.e., quicker responses from county agencies.
- (5) A lot costing \$45,000 today in Charlotte Hall will jump to \$65,000 under the ULDC regulations. This is very, very restrictive and will make it tougher for young people to buy homes.

#59 – Donna Dough, Leonardtown

- (1) Attended all the meetings on the ULDC and has been swinging on a pendulum from joy to despair. DPZ was instructed to put in changes on Rural Practice that didn't go in.
- (2) New parking restrictions say 1 parking space for every 250 square feet. Square feet of what – the land, the building, or the facility itself? That would give Pam Chaney 6 spaces and, with 5 employees, she could only have one client a day. Charter fishing boats are getting more consideration than disabled people in the county. 25 years ago she didn't need physical therapy, but you might need it someday yourself, and we need to do something.

#60 – Barbara Thompson, Hollywood

- (1) Thank you for adding the forms and checklist and for having it on the web site; very important.
- (2) What is the purpose of development rights and the agreement? Perhaps that needs to be added.

#60 – Barbara Thompson, Hollywood (cont'd)

- (3) Historic Preservation Districts – appears that they could be initiated by other than the homeowner. Historic Area Work Permit – does that become another approval a landowner would have to seek to make an adjustment on his property?
- (4) Finds development rights in the RPD to be very inequitable. Puts an extra burden on larger landowners. Good government is based on fundamental fairness, and doesn't think what is proposed in the RPD is fair. The people in this room are here because they feel the ULDC is not fundamentally fair, and that's the crux of the issue when you start telling people how many animals they can have on a piece of property. If that is intended for huge hog operations, that's what you should be saying.
- (5) Seems to be some things that, while we want to preserve farming, make it more difficult. The tobacco buyout has impacted farmers and is already having an impact on people who grow hay. There will be a lot of sifting out in the next couple of years of whether farming will be viable and it's very important to look at the ordinance and make sure additional hurdles are not placed on people who will continue to try to farm their property.
- (6) If people want to put ads in the paper about what's in this ordinance, they have every right to speak.

#61 – Shawn Day, of Day & Associates

- (1) Not much in the document about small family-type subdivisions that are mid-stream in the review process, and what grandfathering they will have. What will happen to the farmer who wants to cut out 2 or 3 lots for children and has paid engineers and has paid his review fees?
- (2) Please consider that, if a project has been through TEC and engineers and review fees have been paid, it should be grandfathered.

#62 – Sonny Burch, Mechanicsville

- (1) Document has massive changes that will affect our way of life. FAR and grandfathering issues need to be addressed. We can no longer build a McKay's or other big grocery store in the Town Center of Charlotte Hall. Don't the citizens of the northern end of our county have the right to shop locally? Don't we want that income to stay in our county?
- (2) Has been around for three zoning ordinance adoptions and this one has the least support of any of them. Where is the support for the ULDC? Maybe that's because it's not a better document; perhaps it's time to declare it a noble effort and move on. The document was flawed from the beginning. The commissioners have tried to make the best of a bad situation, but we've been trying to repair a document that is, perhaps, beyond repair. Maybe it's time to step back and begin again. We should determine if there are any "must have" concepts in the ULDC; communication towers is one and the reduction of density in the rural areas may be another. We can amend the current Zoning Ordinance to incorporate these and other sections deemed necessary. This will be easier than trying to amend the ULDC and will not add much time, if any, to the adoption schedule.
- (3) The idea of a unified code document was a good one, but we started out with a poor first draft and have never gotten over it. It's time to look at this process from a different angle. We need to simplify the process and get it completed. If he were a county commissioner, this is not a document that he would want to claim ownership of.

#63 – Alan Cecil, Compton (Attorney)

- (1) Biggest land grab since Lord Calvert talked the Wicomico Indians into giving up St. Clements Island.
- (2) This is an administrative law nightmare that will gut and strip the very nature and character of why we want to live in the county.
- (3) Not since the petroleum company wanted to build a refinery at Piney Point has there been such a threat to our way of life. Put it to referendum, and let the people of St. Mary's County decide how they want to live.

#64 – Keith Harless, Lexington Park

- (1) Massive plan; too little time to review.
- (2) Section 65.2, Section b, - Window signs not to exceed 20% coverage. Why? What does this harm? Seems like a waste of your time and my tax dollars.

#64 – Keith Harless, Lexington Park (cont'd)

- (3) Chapter 54 – Right to Farm – Notice of Potential Nuisance of Agricultural Operations. Doesn't like the title. Not fair to call farmers a nuisance. Text says we support farmers and they are not a nuisance, but this chapter implies that farming is bad.
- (4) Remove 54.1.2 – Agricultural Notice for buyers of nearby property. This will impact property values.

#65 – Stephen Hoopengardner, Hollywood (Veteran Teacher and Farm Manager of award-winning farm)

- (1) 51.3.3.a.2 – Opposed to maximum of one 2,000 lb. animal per 4 acres of land. You can have more under Section 51.2.4.a.1 if you have a site plan approved. There are creative ways to have more cattle with less acreage, such as rotational grazing, several paddocks and management techniques.
- (2) Farmers are already required to have a Nutrient Management Plan and don't need another set of rules. Eliminate the number of animals and any other rules that are already required under the Nutrient Management Plan.

#66 – Phil Dorsey, Leonardtown

Same as July 17<sup>th</sup> comments.

#67 – Don Ervin, Hollywood

- (1) Supports Pam Chaney's physical therapy operation. His wife needs physical therapy but, because they are taking care of her mother, who is ill, his wife cannot always go to physical therapy when Pam has an opening. Requests additional parking so more people can use the physical therapy.

#68 – Billy Fitzgerald, Mechanicsville (Father)

- (1) ULDC will affect the rights of his children and children of future generations. Will they be able to build a house? Will there be farms then, because we are running the Amish and Mennonite farmers out of the county.
- (2) Joe St. Clair says he cannot build an indoor sports facility because of the 50,000 square foot restriction; he needs 80,000 square feet. Please reconsider this requirement.
- (3) Put ULDC to referendum and let the people decide. "If it ain't broke, don't fix it."  
(Note: the 50,000 square foot maximum footprint does not affect sports facilities.)

#69 – Tina Fenwick, Lynch Lane off of Pegg Road, Lexington Park

- (1) Was told by DPZ that where she lives will be changed to commercial zoning. It was a dream come true for her to get her house and that was done through Tri-County Community Action, which is for low-income families. DPZ said no one will come and move her out of her home, but the commercial zoning will have the same result.

#70 – Robert Moreland, Indiantown Farm in Chaptico

- (1) Under the ULDC his family can subdivide their 1100 acres into 7 lots. Today he can subdivide it into 250 lots. TDRs don't work and the ULDC would not even allow them enough lots for him and his brother to give their children.
- (2) Three years ago we voted for you and entrusted you with our property. Now you want us to give our farms away. Farmers are in flux. Under the ULDC our feed lots are illegal. You can put as many cows as you want on an acre if you can feed them.
- (3) You are trying to limit the flexibility of the farmer. It is ludicrous for you to tell me when I have 100 acres that I can't give it to my children.
- (4) St. Mary's County is beautiful. Everyone here has pride. Don't put them all together. Let them live the way they want to live.

#71 – Joe Gough, Leonardtown

- (1) Would like to have something nice to say about the ULDC, but all he can think of is "It certainly is big." Astonished at the process that would allow something like this to grow.
- (2) Is really happy with the way things are in the county now, and doesn't even see how this document could be simplified.
- (3) Suggests taking the existing regulations and improve the areas that may need improvement. If you can't do that, then certainly the citizens are entitled to more than 60 days to review.

#71 – Joe Gough, Leonardtown (cont'd)

- (4) If, after hearing all the complaints you decide not to throw the ULDC in the trash can, get the people who will be most affected to review the regulations and tell you how their areas need to be improved without all the excess regulations.
- (5) If then you have a document anywhere near as complex and as important as this is for the county, then it should be on the ballot.

#72 – Glenn Gass, Colton's Point

- (1) This new ordinance forgets old lessons and will change the rural character of the county.
- (2) Density restrictions will not allow landowners to give lots to their children.
- (3) Costs associated with the document will choke the community; the county itself will become a victim on the Lexington Park Library, because the costs are busting all the budgets.
- (4) If people don't have property rights, they won't want to pay for environmental protection.
- (5) The commissioners are nearing the end of their terms. Don't go back and do a rewrite. I implore you take another look and do something different than what we have here.

#73 – Herb Redmond, Baptist Church Road, Mechanicsville

- (1) Freedom of choice is important. Last night 40-some people spoke to you and tonight there are about 50, and they are farmers from farming community. There is a theme: Economic impact; uncertain direction of our future; 50,000 square foot first floor limitation; elimination of phasing plans; grandfathering of lots; cost of development; enforcement of sign regulations; architectural controls; architectural standards; home occupations; parking; confusion; contradictory language.
- (2) Grandfathering of lots. Financial institutions have backed these people. The bank he serves on in Charles County took a write-off because the commissioners changed the regulations. Lots were not allowed to be developed because they did not have enough allocation in the schools. Adequate facilities is right at the heart of what we can do with our property. If this is adopted, his financial statement to his bank will show him as being much poorer, because what will he do with his farm?
- (3) The document can be simplified, but his great concern is with its enforcement. Will there be a licensed architect in the reviewers? We will need more people to review the document and reviews will have a longer turnaround time. Hopefully you will go back and reconsider the document and come back with something more favorable to all.

#74 – Doris Jones, Leonardtown

- (1) Born and raised on a farm and farmers will lose their rights under the ULDC. Has had the Mattingly farm listed for sale and there is an offer to purchase. Under the ULDC the property will be rezoned and the would-be purchaser will not buy it. Will the county reimburse these people for all the years they have paid taxes on it?
- (2) All citizens of the county should be treated the same. If you are going to enforce the sign regulations, please do it for everyone.
- (3) ULDC is not positive for St. Mary's County. Put it on the ballot.

#75 – Glen Coombs, Oakville

- (1) Born and raised in the county and worked at NAS; fought the traffic like everybody else, but invested in a 60-acre farm in Oakville and spent most of his earnings getting rid of the junk and starting a cattle operation. Subdivided off a lot or two at a time to get along; lot of overhead and not much return. Half-a-million dollars in debt. Saw the ULDC coming and tried to subdivide his land while he could. Stormwater management regulations increase the cost of development and also the cost of farming the land.
- (2) Contrary to your goals, you have made farming harder.
- (3) Please throw out this document.

#76 – R. B. Rice, Mechanicsville

- (2) Need to re-review the plan, because what you have done will deprive the people of the county from living and dreaming the American dream. Restrict a man's land for his livestock and you are hampering his means of earning a living.

#76 – R. B. Rice, Mechanicsville (cont'd)

- (3) Look at the property at 235 and Pegg Lane that is proposed for OBP; it appears like you just took that and plopped it because it is outside the main gate. It's plopped on Immaculate Heart of Mary and Discovery Subdivision and a cemetery. If ULDC goes through, what will you do about the cemetery? You can't build a business park on it, obviously, and you can't dig up the graves.
- (4) In Discovery Subdivision, a lot of those are middle class or starter homes, and if that's zoned to a business park, their property values will drop. It appears that there are 5 pieces of property there and it looks like those owned by black people were zoned to OBP and those owned by white people stayed residential. If you're going to zone it OBP it should be the same for everybody. There are also wetlands between that property and Immaculate Heart and Discovery. His son is in the process of buying a home in Discovery and his advice to his son will be not to buy it because he won't be able to sell it. Business property is more expensive, but they would have to sell their property as a group.

#77 – Gary Ferko, Teddy Way, Lexington Park (Business owner and resident)

- (1) Government derives its just power from the consent of the people governed. Title 42 of the U. S. Code, Sections 1983, 1985, and 1986. Title 18 of the U. S. Code, Sections 241 and 242. This states that every person who, under the code of this law, deprives any citizen of rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the constitution are subject to civil and criminal penalties up to a \$10,000 fine or 10 years in prison, or both. It is life imprisonment if death results. 3 years ago there was a situation where an individual deprived of his property rights went to the Supreme Court. The Court ruled that individuals have the right to do what they want to do with their property without interference from Planning & Zoning.
- (2) Doesn't trust government to manage his personal and business affairs. Please take into consideration what has been said here and act accordingly

#78 – John Tifford, Dentist with practice in Waldorf and lives in California

- (1) Hopes to move his practice to California to finish his dental career.
- (2) Limited use regulation for medical and dental obviously wasn't drawn up by medical people; it allows for one doctor to practice in up to 5,000 square feet of office space, with four employees and parking for ten people. His present office has one doctor and six employees, and they have 22 parking spaces, slightly more than what is required in Charles County. That seems a lot more appropriate to him. Don't need that regulation.
- (3) His land is near the airport and on an island of land separated by 235 and Mervell Dean Road. The most usable piece of the property is zoned RPD and the small remaining piece is RMX, but the RMX doesn't have enough depth to be of any use. Seems like the airport approaches would make a nice division between the Lexington Park and Hollywood development districts. Properties in major and smaller cities do very well when they abut each other.

#79 – Kenneth Booth, Booth Farm Lane, Great Mills

- (1) Agrees with 95% of what has been said this evening. Third generation farmer. Doesn't feel the plan helps him as a farmer and will decrease his property values. Doesn't feel he's being treated fairly in relationship to other people in the RPD.
- (2) More important is the respectability the plan engenders toward the citizens of the county. Has always thought he was a member of the community and expected to participate in the community, and be treated on an equal basis with the other citizens. Doesn't think this plan engenders that concept. Feels it is destructive of rural character as he knows it. The future will be less attractive to county residents and our young people in terms of being more expensive and more regulatory.
- (3) Doesn't think Smart Growth is all smart. We'd be better off to go back to our present plan or at least bring this massive document to referendum. If the public wants it, at least you'd have some confirmation of that.
- (4) Doesn't think many farmers have participated in formulating the plan. We have to look at how it will affect farmers now and in the future. Ask the farmers this question: "Are you better off now than you were 4 years ago, or 8 years ago? That is the question.

- (5) Don't overburden the citizens with hidden costs. We have state mandates with lack of funds and lack of accountability in the Smart Growth process. That's another issue in and of itself, but he thinks the people are being had.

#80 – Donald Insley, Hollywood (served on Board of Appeals for 7-8 years)

- (1) He knows there are no students of Thomas Jefferson associated with county government, because he said, "The government that governs least, governs best." This document is certainly not of that philosophy. He totally believes it was done with the best of intentions, but the road to hell is paved with good intentions and he totally believes that's where this ordinance is leading.
- (2) Market forces are better suited and do a far better job of determining things such as building size.
- (3) Doesn't think anybody understands the document; it's a disaster. It'll be really great for lawyers because it will take a lot of them to straighten it out. There is nothing easy to understand. It's fertile ground for that 2% who always want to mind somebody else's business, because there's always somebody who will come in and complain about what their neighbor is doing.
- (4) No one who wrote this document knows anything about farming. The Amish are leaving county now, but this will guarantee that they're all going to leave.
- (5) Doesn't know if the commissioners will be here in a couple of years, but if they adopt this we will have to live with it forever. It will behoove the commissioners to go out in the community to the stores and bars, and ask people what they really think.

#81 – John William Quade, Appraiser, Leonardtown

- (1) The people at these meetings have given the commissioners an honest shot. They've tried to explain what is really going on in the community. It's something people have been feeling for some time. Particularly the people who have spoken here tonight – these people were chairmen of boards and commissions in the county for long years. As an appraiser, it's an ongoing concern for him each day, when he tries to give people some advice about what direction they should take in regard to their property.
- (2) Can't even get an engineer to give him a bid for somebody's property if they need to subdivide it now; they're in a state of limbo because of this document. He can't explain where this document is going; it's been a 3-year work in progress, and it's time for it to come to an end for the betterment of the county. He understands that everyone has worked hard here and it's going to be a tough decision, but it has to be made. The people who have spoken here are not against the commissioners, they're trying to help and they want you to listen.
- (3) 325-acre estate in Calvert County with 223 TDRs. The County paid \$27,000 for 12 TDRs and assessed the remainder of the property at \$200,000 per lot, but he can't sell the lots and he's going in the hole paying the taxes.

#82 – Al Guy, Sr., Baptist Church, Hollywood

- (1) Would take him 6 months to read the document, and he just got it tonight. Has had a grass-mowing business for most of his life and works from his home, but he looks like he'll have to go out of business, and so will a lot of other people.
- (2) St. Mary's County citizens never intended to live in Montgomery County; the mean income for the county is something like \$35,000 but we have people in the county making \$90,000 - \$120,000 a year in salaries.
- (3) Is the county prepared to pay him \$150,00 for the loss of three lots on a 50-acre farm? He took it as part of his inheritance. Has given four of his children land and wants to give his son 3-4 acres, and he and his wife plan to move onto the farm as soon as they can sell their house, if they can get it subdivided.
- (4) The little farmer in St. Mary's County is only subsidizing big business.
- (5) The county has let big businesses come in and build big buildings like K-Mart and didn't limit their sizes. It's not fair for the future of the county to limit sizes on anything,

#83 – Steve Reeves, Chaptico

- (1) The way this draft reads, it seems to imply that the only good farmer is a small farmer. His father believed it was the economic basis of agriculture that had to grow to benefit the county and the people that worked in it.

- (2) Lovely document but terrible law. Use it for vision but don't act irrationally. Do it a little at a time if you need to do it at all.

#84 – Deborah Beaver, Avenue

- (1) 6<sup>th</sup> generation countian. Understands that we need to control growth but is concerned about grandfathering. People won't be able to pass their land on to their children. Will hurt the Amish and Mennonite communities. They don't make \$50,000 a year. Will hurt other low-income families with a lot of children.
- (2) Page 51-48 – Recreational Vehicles. Only allowed one camping or recreational trailer on the owner's lot in the RPD. Has relatives that come down in their RVs 2-3 times a year and they park their RVs in two acres behind her house and have a reunion, coming from all over the east coast. According to the ULDC, only one of them can come down at a time. Where will she do with the rest of them – send them up the road, to a campground? Also says a camper or RV must be completely screened from the view of dwellings on adjacent lots by a fence or evergreen buffer.
- (3) The ULDC needs to be re-evaluated. Find the flaws, the errors, and typos. Needs to be looked over completely and we need more time to review it. Just got the document today and only had about 2 hours to look through it. Finding more and more things that she doesn't like and doesn't agree with.

#85 – Gladys Siegel, St. Mary's City

- (1) Supports Pam Chaney Physical Therapy. Has talked to all the commissioners and planning commissioners and is grateful for them putting Rural Practice back in the document. It means that after attending practically every meeting and the workshops, we've finally done something that will be good for these people.
- (2) After listening to comments last night and tonight, she sees they concur with some of her concerns. What she heard were the cries of St. Mary's Countians concerned about their property rights.
- (3) Farming is very, very important to our county and she did not know how much this document impacts them, so hope you're listening to those comments.
- (4) Scrap the document? Whether you do or not, she asks that we retain the Rural Practice, and the people are asking for three things: Simplification, less restrictions overall, and less environmental restrictions. We are already overburdened with environmental restrictions from the Critical Area and other environmental acts where, if you want to cut a tree or mow your lawn or plant something and you're on waterfront property, for which people pay higher taxes, you can't do it. Under this law, she probably won't be able to put a garage on her property. Something has to be done to lessen the restrictions and the burden of the environmental aspects.
- (5) Please take out the restriction of one parking space for 250 square feet for Rural Practice; it is very, very restrictive. Appreciates everything you have done so far.

#86 – Karen Hemmes, Patuxent River

- (1) Thank you for the challenge of interpreting this document. Respectfully request that you deny the ULDC.
- (2) With all your efforts, you have successfully managed to stifle the productivity of the rural practitioner. The growth of the county includes increased medical care for the larger population. The parking limitations of the ULDC on Page 64-6, Line 37 are too limiting. Even a small practice in a small office requires more than a half-dozen parking spaces. It is unreasonable and limits the income required for overhead and profit. Rural Practice is the only business limited as to employees. Discrimination of this manner is addressed in the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment of the Constitution.

This concluded public comment. The hearing was closed at 9:30 p.m. The record will remain open for written comment for 60 days, or until close of business on September 17, 2001.