

## Carol DeSoto

---

**From:** Charles County Government <applications@charlescountymd.gov>  
**Sent:** Monday, May 13, 2024 12:09 PM  
**To:** Public Record  
**Subject:** \*NEW SUBMISSION\* 5/14/2024 - Proposed Amendment to Indenture - Docket 250, Villages at Swan Point

**[External Content Warning]** This message is from an external sender. Please exercise caution when opening attachments and hover over any links before clicking.

### 5/14/2024 - Proposed Amendment to Indenture - Docket 250, Villages at Swan Point

**Submission #:** 3199372  
**IP Address:** 98.218.255.246  
**Submission Date:** 05/13/2024 12:08  
**Survey Time:** 7 minutes, 52 seconds

You have a new online form submission.

Note: all answers displaying "\*\*\*\*\*" are marked as sensitive and must be viewed after your login.

### Public Hearing Comment Form

#### Questions or More Information 240-776-6709

#### Name

Debra McKern

#### Address

15431 Potomac River Dr  
Cobb Island, MD 20625

#### Phone

(301) 752-8285

#### Email

otisnixon@hotmail.com

#### Are you:

Against Topic

#### Comment

See uploaded file.

#### Upload File(s)

[Charles Co Planning Com Swan Point.docx](#)

Thank you,

Charles County, MD

---

This is an automated message generated by Granicus. Please do not reply directly to this email.



I attended the presentation by Charles Rice and Jason Groth on Apr. 8 regarding the Swan Pt amendments to Docket 250. I am gravely concerned about the bias shown by the Planning & Growth Management staff in favor of the developers. I read the revision to Docket 250 and my reading does not align with what they presented as changes which were 'largely typos'.

Like others in attendance at that meeting, as a local resident, I object to the following major problems: raising the road elevation by 6-½ feet; allowing new units to be leased, sold as time-shares or as fractional ownership; and disregard for the impact of such an expansion on the depleting water table we all share. As Tina Wilson stated at the meeting, we need better representation for Cobb Neck. If we wanted to live in Waldorf, we would live there.

It is important to those of us residing in Cobb Neck to preserve the environment in which we live. Before I read Docket 250, I expected the updates to reflect greater attention to environmental issues, given the passage of time since it was first approved. On the contrary, the revised document weakens the original language, allowing more freedom to the developers to make changes without returning to the Planning Commission for approval and giving them latitude to do less because the language has become more vague.

The issue of eroding shorelines, for example. In the original document, developers were responsible for stabilizing 'ALL eroding shorelines'. The new language says 'any shoreline stabilization' and limits stabilization to the Potomac River on the western and southern property edges. This allows them to stabilize some but not all of the shoreline. Yet this was described at the meeting as an improvement over the previous language because they added adherence to county, state, and federal regulations. The revision should have said 'All eroding shorelines shall be stabilized and conform to all applicable county, state, and federal regulations'.

Another example of the weakening of language is in Element #11. A conceptual stormwater management plan is not good enough. Complete is the correct term. Stormwater management is a critical issue in Cobb Neck. Flooding is commonplace on Cobb Neck. Since the additional units will create more impervious surfaces, has the developer researched rainwater harvesting or other environmental solutions?

Finally, the original language in Element #31 should stand because without it, there is no accountability to the County. It states that the developers will be given written notice of any failures and a 'reasonable opportunity to cure'. Without accountability the developers can do as they please. If there needs to be more latitude given, it could be done by specifying what amount of time is 'reasonable'.

It is disconcerting to listen to Charles County Planning & Growth Management staff speak on behalf of developers rather than express concern about the proposal on behalf of those county residents who will be affected. Commissioner Bowling was listening so I'm writing this in the hopes that there are others who share our concern for the environment.

Debra McKern

Cobb Island  
May 13, 2024