/ MSA-S-1829-4574

diminants 3/1/65 FL Robert L. Ehrlich, Jr. Governor

Michael S. Steele
Lt. Governor



Martin G. Madden Chairman

Ren Serey
Executive Director

STATE OF MARYLAND CRITICAL AREA COMMISSION CHESAPEAKE AND ATLANTIC COASTAL BAYS

1804 West Street, Suite 100, Annapolis, Maryland 21401 (410) 260-3460 Fax: (410) 974-5338 www.dnr.state.md.us/criticalarea/

April 1, 2005

Lori Rhodes Anne Arundel County Office of Planning and Zoning 2664 Riva Road Annapolis, Maryland 21401

Re: Case No. 2005-0008-V William Trevillian (Lot 2)

Case No. 2005-0005-V Gary Lenz (Lot 1)

Dear Ms. Rhodes:

Thank you for providing information on the above referenced variance and for arranging a site visit to the Lenz and Trevillian properties on March 24, 2005. The applicants are requesting a variance to permit an accessory structure (raised walkway) with less setbacks and Buffer than required. The property has a split designation of Limited Development Area (LDA) and Resource Conservation Area (RCA). Lot 1 and Lot 2 are each currently developed with a single-family dwelling.

Lot 1 and Lot 2 are part of the Herons Watch subdivision, for which a revised plat was approved in 1989 (refer to attached sections of Plat 6170; Plat Book 117, p. 47). Therefore, Lot 1 and Lot 2 are not grandfathered lots. The Critical Area notes on the subdivision plat state that there shall be no disturbance within the 100-foot setback from tidal marsh (refer to #6 in the Critical Area notes). As we discussed during a telephone conversation of March 30, 2005, County staff report that the clearing limits stated on the record plat for the subdivision have been exceeded, following development of the new lots in the subdivision. For this reason, it is my understanding that County staff do not support the current variance request to permit additional clearing on Lot 1 and Lot 2 for construction of a walkway.

This office received a revised site plan for these variances on March 22, 2005. Based on the information provided, this office has the following comments regarding the development proposal and variance request.

1) Based on the revised site plan, the extent of tidal wetlands is identified on Lot 1 and Lot 2. We note that the extent of tidal wetlands on Lot 1 and Lot 2 appears to have changed since

Lori Rhodes
Case No. 2005-0008-V William Trevillian (Lot 2)
Case No. 2005-0005-V Gary Lenz (Lot 1)
April 1, 2005
Page 2

recordation of the 1989 subdivision plat. The 100-foot Buffer (as measured from the edge of tidal wetlands) is shown incorrectly on the revised site plan. Based on the Critical Area maps for Anne Arundel County, it appears that the LDA and RCA lands on Lot 1 and Lot 2 are shown incorrectly on the revised site plan. The applicants should provide a revised site plan showing accurately the 100-foot Buffer and the LDA and RCA lands on Lot 1 and lot 2.

2) As shown on the revised site plan, the applicants propose the following development activities within the Critical Area: a 6 foot by 20 foot ramp on Lot 2; a 6 foot by 85 foot section of raised walkway and a 6 foot by 20 foot ramp along the property boundary of Lot 1 and Lot 2; and a 6 foot by 135 foot wood chip path (a raised walkway was proposed on the original site plan) and a 6 foot by 20 foot ramp on Lot 1. As observed during my site visit, the area of the proposed access path and walkway is relatively flat and forested (refer to the attached photographs), with the exception of the ramp on Lot 2, which is proposed in an area of mowed grass. Based on conversations with the Department of the Environment, Mr. Trevillian and Mr. Lenz have applied for a permit to construct a joint-use walkway over tidal wetlands. The walkway will connect at the shoreline to the piers proposed for each lot.

In developing Lot 1 and Lot 2, the property owners could have retained a clearing allowance to construct an access to the shoreline, particularly since the platted access easement on Lot 1 and the upland areas waterward of the dwelling on Lot 2 are fully forested. Based on the current site conditions, it appears that a joint-use access could be constructed with minimal or no clearing, if the access were limited to a 3 foot wide woodchip path or a joint access easement, wide enough to accommodate a 3 foot wide path in existing cleared areas, were provided on Lot 2 for use by both Lot 1 and Lot 2. As alternatives may exist to provide access for both Lot 1 and Lot 2 without further exceeding the clearing limits for the subdivision, this office does not support the current variance request.

Please include this letter in your file and submit it as part of the record for this variance. Also, please notify the Commission in writing of the decision made in this case.

Sincerely,

Julie V. LaBranche

Natural Resource Planner

Juli V. SaBranche

cc: Scott Mielke (The Permit Coordinators, Inc.)

AA 76-05 revised plan

Robert L. Ehrlich, Jr. Governor

Michael S. Steele



Martin G. Madden Chairman

Ren Serey
Executive Director

STATE OF MARYLAND CRITICAL AREA COMMISSION CHESAPEAKE AND ATLANTIC COASTAL BAYS

1804 West Street, Suite 100, Annapolis, Maryland 21401 (410) 260-3460 Fax: (410) 974-5338 www.dnr.state.md.us/criticalarea/

March 1, 2005

Lori Rhodes
Anne Arundel County
Office of Planning and Zoning
2664 Riva Road
Annapolis, Maryland 21401

Re: Case No. 2005-0008-V William Trevillian (Lot 2)

Case No. 2005-0005-V Gary Lenz (Lot 1)

Dear Ms. Rhodes:

Thank you for providing information on the above referenced variance. The applicants are requesting a variance to permit an accessory structure (raised walkway) with less setbacks and Buffer. Because the raised walkway is proposed on the property boundary between Lot 1 and Lot 2, Mr. Trevillian and Mr. Lenz have each requested variances for the structure. The property has a split designation of Limited Development Area (LDA) and Resource Conservation Area (RCA). Lot 1 and Lot 2 are each currently developed with a single-family dwelling.

Based on the information provided, we have the following comments regarding the development proposal and variance request.

- 1) Lot 1 and Lot 2 are part of the Herons Watch subdivision, for which a revised plat was approved in 1989 (Plat 6170; Plat Book 117, p. 47). Therefore, Lot 1 and Lot 2 are not grandfathered lots. The Critical Area notes on the subdivision plat state that there shall be no disturbance within the 100-foot setback from tidal marsh (refer to #6 in the Critical Area notes).
- 2) Although the 100-foot Buffer is shown on the site plan, the extent of tidal wetlands on Lot 1 and Lot 2 are not identified. Based on GIS information from the Department of Natural Resources and the Anne Arundel County Critical Area maps (Map 13), the RCA portion of the site appears to contain tidal wetlands. The applicants should provide a revised site plan that identifies the RCA lands and the extent of tidal wetlands on Lot 1 and Lot 2.

Lori Rhodes
Case No. 2005-0008-V William Trevillian (Lot 2)
Case No. 2005-0005-V Gary Lenz (Lot 1)
March 1, 2005
Page 2

- 3) As stated in the Critical Area report, 4,000 square feet of disturbance is proposed to construct a 775 foot raised walkway. As shown on the site plan, the proposed raised walkway extends within the 100-foot Buffer on Lot 1 and Lot 2 and through tidal wetlands to the mean high water line. The applicants should provide a revised site plan showing the length of the walkway located within the Buffer and calculations of the area of disturbance proposed within the Buffer as part of the current variance request.
- 4) Based on conversations of February 10, 2005 and February 28, 2005 with Robert Cuthbertson (Department of the Environment), Mr. Trevillian and Mr. Lenz have submitted a permit application for a raised walkway and a pier with an access ramp for each Lot 1 and Lot 2. I understand that the site plan submitted with the permit application does not distinguish between the length of the raised walkway within the Buffer and over tidal marsh and tidal waters. I understand that Mr. Cuthbertson has requested from the consultant on the project (Scott Mielke, The Permit Coordinators, Inc.) that the permit application and site plan be revised to include only the length of the raised walkway located over tidal wetlands and tidal waters, excluding the length of the raised walkway within the Buffer which is the subject of the current variance request.

Without the information requested, this office is unable to complete a review of the variance request. If the information requested is provided, this office may have additional comments regarding the variance. Please contact me at (410) 260-3475 if you have any questions about my comments.

Sincerely,

Julie V. LaBranche

Natural Resource Planner

Juli V. La Branche

cc: Robert Cuthbertson (Department of the Environment)
Scott Mielke (The Permit Coordinators, Inc.)

AA 76-05

RECEIVED

MAY 9 2005

CRITICAL AREA COMMISSION

IN THE OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS

CASE NUMBERS 2005-0005-V AND 2005-006-V

IN RE: GARY LENZ AND WILLIAM TREVILLIAN

THIRD ASSESSMENT DISTRICT

DATE HEARD: APRIL 7, 2005 LAST EVIDENCE: APRIL 29, 2005

ORDERED BY: STEPHEN M. LeGENDRE, ADMINISTRATIVE HEARING OFFICER

PLANNER: LORI RHODES

DATE FILED: MAY , 2005

PLEADINGS

These are companion cases. Gary Lenz (2005-0005-V) and William Trevillian (2005-0006-V) seek variances to permit a joint-use walkway with less setbacks than required on properties located along the east side of Hickory Point Road, south of Rainbow Drive, Pasadena.

PUBLIC NOTIFICATION

The cases were advertised in accordance with the County Code. The file contains the certifications of mailing to community associations and interested persons. Each person designated in the applications as owning land that is located within 175 feet of the properties was notified by mail, sent to the address furnished with the applications. The applicants confirmed the posting of their properties for more than 14 days prior to the hearing. I find and conclude that the requirements of public notice have been satisfied.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

Case No. 2005-0005-V concerns property with a street address of 317

Hickory Point Road, comprising 1.83 acres, also know as Lot 1 of the Herons

Watch subdivision, Pasadena. Case No. 2005-0006-V concerns property with a

street address of 319 Hickory Point Road, comprising 2.613 acres, which is Lot 2

of the same subdivision. The zoning is R-2 residential with Chesapeake Bay

Critical Area classifications as Limited Development Area (LDA) and Resource

Conservation Area (RCA). These are waterfront lots on Sillery Bay. The applicants seek to construct a joint-use walkway along their shared property line to the shoreline.¹

Anne Arundel County Code, Article 28, Section 10-104(e)(17) requires accessory structures for waterfront lots to be located no closer than 15 feet from the side lot line. Accordingly, the proposal requires a full variance to the side setback for each lot.

Lori Rhodes, a planner with the Office of Planning and Zoning, testified that the lots were platted in 1988. Lot 1 is a flag lot; Lot 2 contains extensive tidal marshland. Both properties are wooded. The purpose of the project is to provide shared access to the waterfront at a reduced cost and decreased impact to the tidal marsh. The witness summarized the agency comments. The County's environmental reviewer supported the variances with mitigation for clearing and a reduction to the width of the walkway. The Development Division opposed the application on the grounds that the development exceeds the platted Critical Area clearing allowance. The Chesapeake Bay Critical Area Commission questioned the accuracy of the 100-foot buffer to tidal wetlands and the boundaries of RCA and LDA lands. The Commission opposed the variances based on alternatives for access within the clearing limits. By way of ultimate conclusion, Ms. Rhodes

¹ Based on the revised site plan, the improvements consist of an elevated wood walkway (6 by 670 feet), "Y"-split (6 by 23 feet and 6 by 32 feet), two ramps (each 6 by 20 feet) and a woodchip path (6 by 135 feet). At the hearing, Mr. Trevillian deleted the ramp serving Lot 2.

offered no objection to a minimum width walkway, provided the clearing allowance is not exceeded.

Scott Mielke, a permit consultant to the applicants, testified that the walkway is consistent with other development in the neighborhood. The proposal requires 4,650 square feet of clearing, including trimming of phragmites, which will grow again.² The applicants have obtained authorization for the wetlands disturbance from the Maryland Department of the Environment. And, he received a favorable verbal response to the proposal from the Development Division on the morning of the hearing, so long as the applicants provide 4:1 mitigation. Finally, the walkway must be six feet wide for the movement of equipment.

Mr. Trevillian testified that the path width is needed to accommodate a golf cart for his grandchild and in-laws, who are unable to walk the distance to the water.

Mr. Lenz testified that he purchased his property eight years ago, at which time the developer included documentation authorizing the construction of a pier.

There was no other testimony in the matter.

Subsequent to the hearing, Mr. Mielke submitted a further explanation of the mitigation proposal and the acceptance by the Development Division (Attachments A, B).

The standards for granting variances are contained in Section 11-102.1.

² When the lots were developed, the clearing exceeded the platted allowance. The matter has already been resolved through mitigation.

Under subsection (a), zoning variances may be granted only after determining either (1) unique physical conditions, peculiar to the lots, such that there is no reasonable possibility of developing the lots in strict conformance with the code; or (2) exceptional circumstances such that the grant of the variances is necessary to avoid an unnecessary hardship, and to enable the applicants to develop the lots. Under subsection (c), any variance must be the minimum necessary to afford relief; and its grant may not alter the essential character of the neighborhood, substantially impair the appropriate use or development of adjacent property, or be detrimental to the public welfare.

Upon review of the facts and circumstances, I find and conclude that the applicants are entitled to conditional relief from the code. These properties satisfy the test of unique physical conditions, consisting of their configurations, the distance to water and the extent of tidal marshlands, such that there is no reasonable possibility of providing access to the waterfront in strict conformance with the code. I further find that the variances represent the minimum relief and the granting of the variances will not alter the essential character of the neighborhood, the use or development of adjacent property or the public welfare. These findings consider the benefits of shared access and similar construction in the neighborhood. The approvals are subject to the conditions in the Order.

ORDER

PURSUANT to the application of Gary Lenz and William Trevillian, petitioning for variances to permit a joint-use walkway with less setbacks than required; and

PURSUANT to the advertising, posting of the property, and public hearing and in accordance with the provisions of law, it is this day of May, 2005,

ORDERED, by the Administrative Hearing Officer of Anne Arundel

County, that the applicants are hereby **granted** full variances to the side setbacks

for each lot to permit a joint-use walkway in accordance with the revised site plan.

The approvals are subject to the following conditions:

- ➤ 1. The ramp serving Lot 2 shall be deleted from the revised site plan.
 - 2. The applicants shall provide a bonded planting plan satisfactory to the Development Division.
- 3. The applicants shall provide mitigation at a 4:1 ratio as required by the Development Division.
- 4. No other clearing is allowed on either lot.

Stephen M. LeGendre

Administrative Hearing Officer

NOTICE TO APPLICANT

Within thirty days from the date of this Decision, any person, firm, corporation, or governmental agency having an interest therein and aggrieved thereby may file a Notice of Appeal with the County Board of Appeals.

Further Section 11-102.2 of the Anne Arundel County Code states:

A variance granted under the provision of this Article shall become void unless a building permit conforming to the plans for which the variance was granted is obtained within one year of the grant and construction is completed within two years of the grant.

If this case is not appealed, exhibits must be claimed within 60 days of the date of this Order, otherwise that will be discarded.

Attachment A

Mr. Gerczak:

Regarding the comments received from the Environmental Review Section of PAC, the joint-use walkway that was proposed for permits (B02211503 and B02211553) required clearing that exceeded that allowable clearing for the subdivision of 'Herons Watch.' As discussed and verbally agreed to in our phone conversation on the morning of 4/7/05, I am proposing a 4:1 mitigation for the tree clearing at the site. 1 would like to just to clarify what was discussed in our phone conversation as well as what I presented at the variance hearing. In order to install the proposed elevated walkway/wood chip path to the pier would require a total clearing of 4650 SF of which 3180 SF is trimming down of phragmites in tidal waters (these will grow back within 2 months of being trimmed). Therefore the entire proposed clearing of actual woodlands is 1470 SF. The applicants would like to propose a 4:1 mitigation for the 1470 SF which would equate to 5880 SF. The original subdivision allowed for a total of 33,225 SF of clearing. The subdivision when completed exceeded this amount by 2580 SF for a new total of 35,805 SF. This additional clearing was mitigated by a fee-in-lieu payment at completion of the subdivision approvals in 1989. The 35,805 SF of clearing with the original subdivision and the additional 1470 SF proposed with this walkway, would bring the total clearing (at completion of this project) to 37,275 SF, which exceeds the allowable clearing by 4050 SF (37,275 - 33,225). The proposed 4:1 mitigation would bring the final clearing to 31,395 SF. This would not only bring the entire subdivision into compliance, it would exceed it by a total of 1830 SF. As you and I discussed the morning of the hearing, it was my understanding that this would be acceptable 10 you in order for you to sign-off on the project. Mr. LeGendre, the Administrative Hearing Officer that heard the variance, requested that I receive, in writing or via email, concurrence on our verbal agreement, thus this email. Could you please respond back, via email, that you are in agreement with the aforementioned mitigation proposal. I appreciate your cooperation with this difficult permit and look forward to receiving your favorable email. If you have any additional questions, or need additional clarification, please feel free to contact me at (410) 703-8533. I should be noted that State and Corps approvals have be received for this project and will be forwarded to your office as soon as I receive the variance decision.

Sincerely,

Scott Mielke, PE and Representative for Trevillian and Lenz

FROM : The Permit Coordinators

FAX NO. :4104219161

May. 03 2005 12:30PM P2

Page 1 of 1

Attachment B

Subj:

Var. 2005-005 & 006

Date:

4/29/05 1:55:21 PM Eastern Daylight Time

From:

Dgerczak@aacounty.org

To:

GetMyPermit@aol.com

CC:

lpcarr10@aacounty.org

Sent from the Internet (Details)

Scott, I will support these variance requests if the woodland calculations on the record plat are brought back into compliance, a workable planting plan is approved and bonded to do this and any new woodland removal is mitigated at 4 to 1. dan

America Online: GetMyPermit

CRITICAL AREA REPORT

1. Explanation of Variance Request:

A variance is requested for the construction of a joint-use $6' \times 775'$ walkway, which includes a $10' \times 20'$ T-turnaround, $2-6' \times 20'$ ramps, and $2-6' \times 6'$ sets of steps. The variance requested is as follows:

1. A variance of 15' to the minimum 15' side yard setback on the south property line.

The proposed walkway is requested to allow the applicant access to the shoreline and pier. Each of the lots has enough space and setback to allow construction of a walkway without a variance. However, due to the irregular shape of the lots and the extreme distance to the shoreline, the applicant and his neighbor would like to construct one walkway that can be shared in order to minimize cost of construction as well as impact to the marsh and buffer. The area where the proposed walkway is located has no impact to impervious coverage and no impact to steep slopes. The T-turnaround is requested in order to allow each of the applicants to be able to turnaround a golf cart or store equipment at the shoreline when utilizing their piers/boats.

2. Vicinity Map:

See attached site plan.

3. Narrative Statement:

- A. Type of predominant trees on lot mostly consists of maples, oaks, and holly. The proposed walkway construction work will result in the removal of a minimal amount of vegetation or trees.
- B. The proposed pier will have no impact to storm water management.
- C. Efforts to minimize impacts on water quality will include be the elevation of the walkway a minimum of 3' above MLW in order to allow sunlight to penetrate to the substrate below.
- D. Square footage of the lot that is currently wooded is 48,136 SF or 60% of the entire lot. Square footage to be disturbed for construction is 4000 SF. Total square footage of the site is 79,845 SF. 2325 SF of reforestation will be provided at completion of the project. Total existing impervious surfaces is 6871 SF and total impervious surface added will be 0 SF. Total impervious coverage after construction is 6871 SF. The property is RCA/LDA therefore the allowable impervious coverage is 15% or 11,977 SF.
- E. There are no habitat protection areas located on this site.

4. Plan:

Has been provided with this package.

5. Copy of Notification of Project Application

Has been provided with this package.

00054

EXPLANATION OF VARIANCE REQUEST

A variance is requested for the construction of a joint-use 6' x 775' walkway, which includes a 10' x 20' T-turnaround, 2-6' x 20' ramps, and 2-6' x 6' sets of steps. The variance requested is as follows:

2. A variance of 15' to the minimum 15' side yard setback on the south property line.

The proposed walkway is requested to allow the applicant access to the shoreline and pier. Each of the lots has enough space and setback to allow construction of a walkway without a variance. However, due to the irregular shape of the lots and the extreme distance to the shoreline, the applicant and his neighbor would like to construct one walkway that can be shared in order to minimize cost of construction as well as impact to the marsh and buffer. The area where the proposed walkway is located has no impact to impervious coverage and no impact to steep slopes. The T-turnaround is requested in order to allow each of the applicants to be able to turnaround a golf cart or store equipment at the shoreline when utilizing their piers/boats.

