

## Carol DeSoto

---

**From:** Charles County Government <applications@charlescountymd.gov>  
**Sent:** Monday, May 13, 2024 3:27 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 #:** 3200167  
**IP Address:** 76.106.126.172  
**Submission Date:** 05/13/2024 3:27  
**Survey Time:** 4 minutes, 18 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

Timothy Kennedy

#### Address

12175 Potomac View Road  
Newburg, MD 20664

#### Phone

(240) 542-9859

#### Email

kennedeaz@gmail.com

#### Are you:

Neutral

#### Comment

PDF of written testimony submitted.

#### Upload File(s)

[Kennedy testimony - Swan Point Docket 250 Amendment 3.pdf](#)

Thank you,  
Charles County, MD

---

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



May 13, 2024

RE: The Villages at Swan Point Development Docket 250, Amendment #3  
TO: The Charles County Board of Commissioners  
FROM: Aericia and Timothy Christian “Chris” Kennedy  
12175 Potomac View Road  
Newburg, MD 20664

Dear Madams and Sirs,

While we do not oppose further development at Swan Point, **we urge further study of the impact on water and sewer resources** prior to approval of the docket amendment.

The concerns raised about potential impact on the aquifer Swan Point shares with nearby neighborhoods are simply too credible and alarming to be set aside. Loss of access to water would make well-dependent homes on Cobb Neck uninhabitable, with all available solutions being both prohibitively expensive and taking years to implement.

The high price of a water shortage would be borne by other Charles taxpayers, too, as the county government would inevitably be forced into years of costly mitigation – and litigation.

County staff have acknowledged that the level of impact from the proposed development on the aquifer is not known. And the petitioner has been less than clear about the expansion’s level of demand, given the ongoing questions about types of units, such as time shares. “We’ll see” is not a sound basis to move forward.

It is also plainly evident to users of the county-managed sewer system that it is under significant strain, based on the volume of one-off maintenance calls needed to keep it functioning.

Approving the requested changes without insisting upon comprehensive information about water and sewer needs exposes your constituents to unnecessary risk. The “do no harm” standard is not being met.

We do not embrace “fear of change” objections to the next Swan Point phase. Charles County’s waterfront is woefully underutilized as a public natural resource, economic development tool, and engine for tax revenue. We support development with proper stewardship. More amenities are badly needed in the south county, and those brought by the Swan Point expansion could potentially be a step in the right direction, provided they are equal to current use with added future demand.

But “stewardship” is indeed the watchword. The county government should dedicate itself to being a model for creating a development framework that maximizes benefits for its citizens and foresees and limits downside.

Please have that be the standard that guides your decision-making.