Public Hearings - Dorchester Country - Program Amendments 1989 MSH_S1830-60

1	DORCHESTER COUNTY PANEL OF CHESAPEAKE BAY CRITICAL AREA COMMISSION
2	
3	IN RE: :
4	PROGRAM AMENDMENTS :
5	County Office Building Room 110
6	Cambridge, Maryland 21613 Monday,
7	January 9, 1989 7:35 p.m.
8	\cdot
9	
10	
11	COMMISSION MEMBERS:
12	Robert R. Price, Jr. William G. Bostian
13	Shepard Krech, Jr. Samuel Bowling
14	Tom Ventre
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	· ·
21	
22	

1			
2			
3			
4	APPEARANCES:		
5 6		Steve Dodd Planning Director Dorchester County	
7		Karen Phillips Assistant Planner	
8			
9	WITNESSES:		
10		John West Skip Miller Scott Wallace	
11		Scott Wallace Sandy McAllister William Ludlow	
12		WIIIIAM DUQIOW	
13 14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
			•

COURT REPORTING • DEPOSITIONS
D.C. AREA 261-1902
BALT. & ANNAP. 974-0947

PROCEEDINGS

MR. PRICE: Good evening, I'm Robert Price. absence of our panel chairman, I've been selected to act tonight. And I'd like to introduce the other members of the Critical Area Commission that are here tonight. Bill Bostian from Wicomico County, Dr. Krech from Talbot County, Sam Bowling from Charles County. And we're a panel of the Critical Areas Commission that is here at an advertised public hearing for a proposed amendment to the Dorchester County Critical Area Program. We will. hear testimony from the staff of Dorchester County and from any other person that would wish to speak. There's a microphone for comments that's on the far table, and the stenographer has requested anybody that wishes to speak to use that.

In addition to the testimony that we have -will hear tonight, we'll keep the record open on this for
10 days, which would be the 19th of -- excuse me -- keep
it open for 7 days, would be the 17th of January, because
we have a commission meeting on the 18th and possibly can
get the matter done. So let's use 7 days, the 17th of
January for any written -- any written comment.

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

R

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

And with that, Steve, do you wish to go ahead and proceed?

MR. DODD: Yes, sir. Thank you, Mr. Price.

Just for the record, my name is Steve Dodd, I am the

Planning Director for Dorchester County. And this is my

associate, Karen Phillips, who is the assistant planner.

I sort of feel like this is old home week because we've

been over this topic several times before, and I'm

hopeful that we're all familiar enough with it and that

we've reached some kind of, at least, tentative agreement

as to how these items should be handled. But as required

by law, a public hearing is required when the county

amends its critical area program, including its critical

area maps. And that is our intent, or that is the intent

of this hearing tonight.

As I see it, there are three, basically three items on the agenda, and if we could take them in this order, I think it would be more useful. First of all, the County Commissioners are asking the Critical Area Commission to adopt certain language that pertains to the county's treatment of interim subdivisions. The language in particular is included and is made a part of the

record as page 3 of the handout. If you can give it to the stenographer a copy of that handout. Page 3, if you will mark that.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

This language was adopted by the County Commissioner on August 23rd, 1988, went into effect in the county September 2nd, 1988. And this is the same language which the County Commissioners, at their December 6th meeting, voted to forward to the Critical Area Commission for their approval. I don't think it's necessary to read the language. I think if we could just go over some of the points so we all understand what the paragraph means, because in the past, there was some confusion or some disagreement as to what the intent of the language is. This language, again, is designed to give special consideration to subdivisions which were submitted to the Dorchester County Planning Office before the Critical Area -- local Critical Area Program was adopted. The -- not only must the subdivision have to have been submitted, but also, two other criteria would have to have been met. For major subdivisions, five lots or more, the subdivision must have received preliminary plat approval from the Dorchester County Planning

Commission and, also, the subdivision must have received critical area assessment approval, also by the Planning Commission. Our critical area assessment was designed to satisfy the findings requirement under Natural Resource Article 8 18 13.

For a minor subdivision, less than five lots, the subdivision would only -- was required to have the critical area assessment or again, the findings requirement met by the Planning Commission.

either or both of those criteria. And we'll get into that later as a different topic. But essentially, this paragraph says that these 19 interim subdivisions do not — are not required to meet the design, the new design requirements for a — and also the word, the word is density — would not be subject to the density provisions of the zoning ordinance, or to the growth allocation provisions of the subdivision regulations. In other words, it's an RCA, if these subdivisions are occurring in an RCA, they are not required to meet the 1 per 20 density, which is required in an RCA subdivision.

Also, the language says, is not to be subject

to the grown allocation provisions of the subdivision regulations. Let me refer to the growth allocation provisions of the subdivision regulations. That's Section 140-51 of the Dorchester County Code. section is -- outlines the procedure that a critical area subdivision requesting growth allocation must follow in order to be eligible to receive growth allocation. Again, this section was written for and intended to cover new subdivisions that were submitted after the local Critical Area Program was adopted, which again, was August 23rd, 1988. This is too lengthy, and I don't want to go over this in too much detail, but essentially, the general provisions are that in order to be eligible, the gross tract of land must be at least 20 acres; that the site must -- the proposed residential density must exceed 1 unit per 20 acres, and there are a number of special submission requirements, including an environmental assessment, a detailed site plan, a narrative statement specifying the impact on the environment. And it goes on to detail what the review procedure would be, when plats can be submitted, when the cutoffs are for submitting those plats, how the plat is reviewed, what

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

R

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

the stages one must go through in order to qualify for allocation. And finally, the chapter ends with a special evaluation and ranking methodology, which essentially is a point system devised by the Planning Commission, which assigns points to 1 of 13 characteristics. For example, is the subdivision proposal, is it located near an existing LDA? What is the average lot size? Is it forested or is it open space? Are there any unique or endangered species on the property? The point here, gentlement, is that these -- the growth allocation submitted under this Section 140-51 is a competitive system. And it's designed to reward plats that are designed to be sensitive to the critical area, to the inventory or to the resources that are being protected through the Critical Area Program. And it's quite possible that the number of subdivision plats submitted under this section might exceed the available growth allocation for that period. So it's quite possible that some submittals will not be funded, if you will, with growth allocation during any six-month period of time.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

We are just trying to demonstrate here that there was a lot of thought that has gone into devising

the system to decide who does and does not qualify for growth allocation, and that it is and has been our intent that these 19 interim subdivisions would, because of the — meeting these special submission requirements, would not be required to compete for growth allocation like future subdivision applications in the critical area.

R

The language that we're proposing, again, that the Commission accept goes on to say that these subdivisions, these interim subdivisions must have had a growth allocation reserved for them and must have been designed to conform to the Maryland Critical Area criteria. By that, of course, not only the critical area assessment which looked at the endangered species and the habitat of protection areas, the wetlands title and nontitle wetlands have been mapped on all of these 19 interim subdivisions. The forested areas, if it's going to be clear, we've required that the clearance be in accordance with the new criteria.

The point is that these subdivisions were not just given a stamp of approval. We did spend quite a bit of time to make sure that once these subdivisions are platted, they will be able to be developed and homes will

be able to be built on them. And I think the surveyors and engineers that are here tonight to represent these subdivisions will certainly be able to demonstrate to your satisfaction that these subdivisions, if platted, can be built on and still meet the critical area criteria, except for, of course, meeting the 1 for 20 density.

MR. PRICE: Steve, you don't say that here, I don't think, do you? You say it must have been designed to conform with the Maryland Critical Area criteria.

MR. DODD: Meaning the setbacks from the wetlands, the setbacks --

MR. PRICE: But you don't -- but you're not, I mean, you're not saying that the 1 for 20 doesn't apply.

MR. DODD: In the paragraph above it it says that the program --

MR. PRICE: Okay, if you're happy with that.

MR. DODD: -- will not be subject to the density provisions of the zoning ordinance -- density provisions of the RCA. Obviously, if they met that, we wouldn't be here requiring that they get growth allocation. They would not need to go through this

process.

MR. PRICE: It just looks like a grammatical -MR. DODD: This is the language that came
about as a result of a request from the critical area
staff to beef-up or clarify previously drafted language
which certain Commission staff felt was weak. So, I
think we -- I think there's no question that at the
county level, we understand what this means. And we're
trying to have an understanding with the Commission and
the Commission staff which would clear the way for not
only the five subdivisions tonight but the other 14
interim subdivisions which will follow in the future.

Mr. Chairman, that's all I have on the language section of the text amendment section.

MR. PRICE: Do you want to go through two and three while you're doing it?

MR. DODD: Yes.

MR. BOSTIAN: Let me -- excuse me -- just go ahead and go for a second.

MR. PRICE: Yeah.

MR. BOSTIAN: I mean, all I'm suggesting is that it must have been designed to conform to the

Maryland Critical Area criteria except as -- except the density as spoken above, something along those lines. I mean, I know what you're trying to say.

R

MR. DODD: We, quite frankly, Mr. Bostian, we chose to go with this language rather than devise another, a brand new paragraph that changes in any way because we were under the impression that if we were to amend the proposed language, we would then need to go back to the County Commissioners for more hearings. This language will only -- it has a short life span. It's only appropriate for 19 subdivisions and will never, never be used after those 19 subdivisions have come through this process.

I suppose we could go back in the program and pick out virtually any paragraph and really have a debate or discussion or disagreement as to what the language says. I think if we can clarify that and if we have a meeting of the minds that we both understand that this is how this language will be used and for what, I think that's enough.

MR. BOSTIAN: Fine.

MR. PRICE: Why don't we go on to two?

MR. DODD: Okay, there are 19 subdivisions 1 again which meet this qualifying criteria as established 2 in this proposed paragraph. Those 19 subdivisions are 3 again listed in your package, let's see, the last three 4 pages in your handout contains the list. 5 subdivisions are shown on this inch-to-the-mile scale 6 county highway map, which is colored up to show the 7 critical area boundaries, the limited development areas 8 in brown, the resource conservation areas in yellow, and 9 the areas with the blue dots on them correspond to the 19 10 subdivisions, again, the 19 interim subdivisions. 11 blue dots are numbered and correspond to the numbers on 12 your chart, on your handout. The subdivisions which we 13 are -- or the areas, excuse me, the areas we are 14 requesting growth allocation for tonight would be numbers 15 one -- you want to point these out? Heron Harbor, 16 number two, McKeil Point, number six, Bromwells 17 Adventure -- I'm looking for Ruxton Landing. Number 18 five, Ruxton Landing, and number fourteen, which is 19 listed as William Fitzhugh or it's also known as

> MR. PRICE: Where is that?

Fitzhugh/Whitely, and that is (inaudible).

20

21

MS. PHILLIPS: Right here.

MR. PRICE: Is that actually on the water?

MS. PHILLIPS: There is at that one point a creek. There's a creek right up in there (inaudible).

Actually, the entire parcel is (inaudible).

MR. DODD: The specified acreage for each subdivision is listed in your handout. I have not totalled them, and I don't have a calculator. We've got approximately 550 acres.

MR. PRICE: 524, I think.

MR. DODD: Okay, 524. Again, gentlemen, these are the gross -- I believe this represents the gross acreage of each subdivision. And the tidal wetlands, as we all understand, do not -- are not deducted from the growth allocation. Each of these five subdivisions, the developer or surveyor here tonight will have the net acreage minus the tidal wetlands, so we can, I think, come up with an exact figure for the totals as represented here.

The handouts that you have also gives you a little -- gives it a little more detail as to the location of the parcel, the developer's name and address,

the survey and engineering firm, when the application was received, when the plat approval was granted, if it was required, when propriary assessment approval was granted. So I think you can see when each of these was submitted and that there has been quite a length of time between when they were submitted and now.

I'm not prepared to submit each subdivision for you to look at again. As I said last time, I don't believe that's your role or your responsibility, that's the responsibility of the Planning Commission. Again, there are people in this audience who know more about each subdivision, what its layout is, what kind of water and sewer systems there are, and they would, I'm sure, be happy to answer those types of questions.

MR. PRICE: Steve, you said there were three issues and the first one is in line with the second one. You designate these 19 subdivisions as being the second issue.

MR. DODD: The 5 before you tonight, 5 of the 19 interim subdivisions is the second issue.

MR. PRICE: What's the --

MR. DODD: The third issue are the 27 recorded

subdivisions, which, as I understand it, must come off
the allocation and must become LDA. So it must be
redesignated.

MR BOWLING: That's those that have already

MR. BOWLING: That's those that have already been completed.

MR. DODD: Completed and recorded before the local program was adopted, yes.

MR. BOWLING: So really, what that is is a report of growth allocation already utilized.

MR. BOSTIAN: Well, or is it an amendment to the maps?

MR. DODD: It is an amendment to the maps because when the --

MR. BOSTIAN: It is or is not.

MR. DODD: It is.

MR. BOSTIAN: Yes, okay.

MR. DODD: When the maps were created, these subdivisions, these 27 subdivisions did not qualify as RCA because the -- there was no development or little development on these properties at the time. They have been subdivided and recorded in accordance with the county subdivision regulations, and as I understand, it

must be deducted from the growth allocation that the 1 county holds. 2 You mean, they did qualify as RCA. MR. PRICE: 3 They should have been RCA but they were developed as --4 MR. DODD: They were mapped as RCA, properly 5 mapped as RCA because of the lack of development. 6 MR. PRICE: But then they were developed in the 7 interim. 8 MR. DODD: But then they have been developed in 9 the interim period, yes, sir, before that. 10 MR. PRICE: They were already approved? 11 MR. DODD: Yes. 12 MR. PRICE: Have you given anybody a list of 13 those 27? 14 MR. DODD: Yes, the list --15 MR. BOWLING: The last two pages --16 MR. BOSTIAN: They're in our packet. 17 MR. BOWLING: These two pages, gentlemen. 313 18 odd acres. 19 MR. DODD: Correct. 20 MR. PRICE: Really, that represents growth 21 allocation already used. 22

MR. DODD: Yes.

q

MR. PRICE: Let me ask you about the 19, of which you've got 5 you're bringing up tonight?

MR. DODD: Yes.

MR. PRICE: This is my understanding. My understanding is these other 14 are somewhere and may or may not ultimately be brought before the panel at such time.

MR. DODD: That's correct.

MR. PRICE: I mean, it may be that some of them may not go forward for whatever reason. I mean, they may not get Health Department approval or some other approval.

MR. DODD: That's correct. We, in July, we wrote to the developers of all 19 subdivisions and locally gave them two years to get through their growth allocation and final plat approval. So there's a time limit as to how long they can take to come before you and ultimately get plat approval.

MR. PRICE: So those 19 actually go in our record, and they're in your record, and somewhere in the next 2 years may very well come up again.

1	MR. DODD: Yes.
2	MR. PRICE: Does anybody have any okay.
3	MR. BOSTIAN: Bob?
4	MR. PRICE: Yeah.
5	MR. BOSTIAN: Do the maps need to be put on
6	record, do you think, or
7	MR. DODD: We are entering that as an exhibit
8	for you.
9	MR. BOSTIAN: No, I meant the subdivision
10	plats.
11	MR. PRICE: Well, my understanding at this
12	stage is that Mr. Dodd's indicated the 5 designated
13	subdivisions, that there's some spokesman here who can
14	pin down the exact acreage.
15	MR. DODD: Yes.
16	MR. PRICE: And maybe give us some background
17	on the 5. A brief background. Is there anyone here that
18	represents Heron Harbor?
19	MR. WEST: I do.
20	MR. PRICE: Okay, could you I think the
21	if you'll give us a brief view of
22	MR. WEST: kWell, I'll skip to the numbers.

I'm not sure --

MR. PRICE: All right, well, that's what we'd like to see would be the numbers, particularly as to any wetlands.

MR. VENTRE: Gentlemen, for the record, could you identify yourselves and who you represent?

MR. MILLER: My name is Skip Miller representing Andrews/Miller Associates, and John West, who is the developer of Heron Harbor. We have the plats of section 1 and section 2 of Heron Harbor, which combined give a total number of lots of 28 lots, 15 of which are in the critical areas. There are 13 in section 1 here. This is the critical area boundary, and this is going towards Fishing Creek. These are out of the critical areas. But within the critical areas, the total area is a hundred -- the total area is 124.4 acres, and the total that is being asked for the growth allocation is 66.2 acres. That excludes the tidal wetlands and includes just the area within the critical area boundary.

MR. PRICE: What was that first figure, a hundred and --

MR. MILLER: 124.4.

1	MR. DODD: I think both section 1 and section
2	2, right, Skip?
3	MR. MILLER: Yes, of which the amount in the
4	critical areas for the growth allocation is 66.2.
5	MR. PRICE: Was the 124.4
6	MR. MILLER: 124.4
7	MR. BOSTIAN: That's the total acreage.
8	MR. MILLER: Total acreage.
9	MR. PRICE: That's total in and out of the
10	critical area?
11	MR. MILLER: Yes, all.
12	MR. PRICE: 66.2 in the critical excluding
13	tidal wetlands.
14	MR. MILLER: Excluding tidal wetlands, yes.
15	MR. VENTRE: Gentlemen, where is it on this
16	rural map?
17	MR. MILLER: Okay, this is identified as No. 1
18	on the on C list.
19	MR. VENTRE: Can all of you see that?
20	MR. MILLER: And these plats are different from
21	the one's you saw at the last meeting, which had the
22	building envelopes, they've all been removed and this is

1	MR. PRICE: Is this the one that had the horse
2	trails or something in the back?
3	MR. MILLER: Yes, that's correct.
4	MR. PRICE: Still have the horse trail?
5	MR. MILLER: Yes. Doesn't go down to the water
6	but
7	MR. PRICE: In the wetlands.
8	MR. MILLER: It's not in any wetlands area.
9	MR. PRICE: Yeah. Anybody have any questions?
10	Bill?
11	MR. BOSTIAN: No.
12	MR. WEST: But this has final Dorchester County
13	Planning Commission approval, Health Department approval,
14	all of the approvals are in place in the subdivision.
15	MR. PRICE: I don't think we have any more
16	questions about do you have another one that you want
17	to
18	MR. MILLER: Yeah.
19	MR. WEST: He's got both.
20	MR. PRICE: Why don't you do the two you have
21	and then we'll
22	MR. MILLER: Okay, we also have the developer

back here, Mr. Scott Wallace, for McKeil Point, which is identified as No. 2 on the map up here. And this is in three sections. The total acreage is 199.8 acres. The total within the critical areas for the growth allocation is 182.6 acres. And the total number of lots are 32. Again, this excludes the tidal wetlands, there's very little of that as you can see here.

MR. VENTRE: This is of section 1.

MR. MILLER: Yes, this is section 1, McKeil Point. Section 2 adjoins section 1, is very few lots, and section 3, which adjoins section 2 and section 1 right there.

MR. VENTRE: And is on the point itself.

MR. MILLER: Yes, that's correct. And again, this subdivision has almost all the approvals in hand right now. Any questions?

MR. PRICE: Tom, do you have questions?

MR. VENTRE: (Shakes head indicating, no.)

MR. BOSTIAN: You said it does have all the

local approvals?

MR. PRICE: Almost, he said.

MR. MILLER: Almost all of them.

MR. BOSTIAN: What's missing, do you know, approvalwise?

MR. WALLACE: The only thing that's missing is we're -- based on the allocation, when we receive the allocation, the Corps of Engineers is supposed to turn over our section 3 on the roads and that's it.

MR. MILLER: The first two sections are approved now. The Corps of Engineers is working on section 3.

MR. PRICE: Sam, do you have any questions?

MR. BOWLING: Any idea why the Corps is holding it up?

MR. WALLACE: Because of the fox squirrel.

MR. MILLER: And there is a recent letter to
Mr. Dodd, in fact, I think we just received it, from the
Department of Natural Resources regarding the fox
squirrel issue, and there's basically three subdivision
-- or development criteria that will be applied to the
lots out on section 3, which will limit the -- one of them
is -- will limit the location of the house, instead of
being 100 feet from the water, it would be 150 feet from
the water. There's a limitation on how much woodland can

be cleared around the house. And what is the third? 1 MR. WALLACE: There's four lots that DNR put 2 restrictions on. 3 MR. DODD: I have the letter, this is my copy, but the courtesy copy to Lee Epstein, so the Commission 5 does have a copy of the record. 6 MR. McALLISTER: For the record, there's an 7 identical copy addressed to Mr. Price, as well, and I 8 assume it's still in the mail. I've gotten a copy of - 9 your letter. 10 MR. PRICE: When did you get yours? 11 MR. DODD: Today. 12 MR. MILLER: What's the date? 13 MR. DODD: The date is the 4th of January. 14 MR. PRICE: I was stretching my memory when you 15 told me I got it a couple weeks ago. 16 MR. MILLER: What date was that letter, Steve? 17 MR. DODD: It's dated the 4th. The letter 18 concludes there are certain requests, if you will, by the 19 Department of Natural Resources as to restriction on 20 where the homes can go on lots 11, 12, 13 and 14. 21 MR. WALLACE: That's in section 3.

MR. VENTRE: (Inaudible). 1 MR. WALLACE: Correct, right here. 2 MR. DODD: And it concludes by saying provided 3 these restrictions are incorporated and enforced, we feel 4 that the Delmarva fox-squirrel habitat on McKeil Point 5 will be able to support fox-squirrel population at 6 current levels. Therefore, the service would have no 7 objection to the LDA designation, given these 8 restrictions. And it's signed by Gary Taylor, Director 9 of Wildlife. 10 MR. PRICE: At current levels, I like that. 11 Did you all agree there were fox-squirrels there or what? 12 MR. WALLACE: No, sir. But this way -- I think 13 this way it satisfies everybody. Nobody's -- the 14 absentee fox-squirrel. 15 MR. PRICE: Okay, anybody have any questions on 16 McKeil Point? 17 MR. WALLACE: It's not the right kind of 18 neighborhood, I don't think. 19 MR. PRICE: Okay, then, Mr. Miller, you want to 20 do your third one here? 21

The third onne is Bromwells

MR. MILLER: Yes.

1	Adventure, which is No. 6 on your list.
2	MR. VENTRE: Just about directly to the south
3	of
4	MR. MILLER: Adjoining McKeil Point.
5	MR. VENTRE: It's near McKeil Point, yeah.
6	MR. MILLER: This has a total area, again in
7	two sections, a total number of lots of 17. The total
8	acreage is 183.0 acres, and the total growth allocation
9	area is 141.7 acres. This is section 1 here, and there's
10	a large area of tidal wetlands here in section 2, which
11	you can see again is has been excluded now.
12	MR. PRICE: What
13	MR. MILLER: And again, this subdivision
14	MR. PRICE: What do they call it, Timber Marsh
15	Lane?
16	MR. MILLER: Timber Marsh Lane.
17	MR. PRICE: Timber Marsh Lane.
18	MR. MILLER: And this project has all
19	approvals.
20	MR. PRICE: Okay, anybody have any questions
21	about
22	MR. MILLER: The fourth one that we represent

is Ruxton Landing, which is No. 5 on your list.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. PRICE: I think he's a newcomer, isn 't he? MR. MILLER: This one is not quite as far along as the others but has received several approvals, but final Health Department approval is still forthcoming from the County Planning Commission. The total area here is 54.5 acres, which the total growth allocation is 51.1 acres, and total of 14 lots. There's a very small amount of tidal wetlands around the outside. Now, there is one area, again, with Department of Natural Resources, with some concern over forest interior birds in this wooded section right here. And there will be a limitation of a maximum of distance that a house or any kind of development will be allowed to go into the woodland area there. For the (inaudible) a maximum of 80 feet, and for any house on lots 12 or 13 or 11 -- 11, 12, or 13, a maximum of 50 feet into the wooded area. So the rest of this wooded area will remain undisturbed.

MR. PRICE: What is the smallest lot there, acreagewise?

MR. MILLER: Two acres, 2.3 acres, yeah, two and a quarter acres. And if I added correctly, the grand

total acreage of these four subdivision is 561.7, and the 1 total growth allocation is 431.6, and a total of 91 lots 2 in these four. 3 MR. PRICE: These four? MR. MILLER: Yes. So that's the end of our 5 presentation and representation. 6 MR. KRECH: What again was the total growth 7 allocation that comes off that? 8 MR. MILLER: 431.6 9 MR. KRECH: 431.6, uh-huh, out of a total 10 number of? 11 MR. MILLER: Out of a total of 561.7. 12 MR. KRECH: 561.7, okay. 13 MR. PRICE: Is there anyone here that --14 Fitzhugh/Whitely subdivision that wish to --15 MR. LUDLOW: Yes, sir, I'm William Ludlow, I'm 16 representing Mr. Whitely. I have some extra copies of --17 MR. PRICE: Where is this at? 18 MR. LUDLOW: Gentlemen, I'd be glad to show you 19 where it's at. Gentlemen, anyway, we're -- growth 20 allocation for seven (inaudible), which is 19.3 acres, 21 which lies in the critical area. The total site is just 22

shy of 21 acres, 20.77 acres. This was laid out in two sections, section 1 and 2. Of the 19.3 acres, we have found that after doing a survey, that there is no land -no tidal marsh on the property itself. We front on Blinkhorn Creek, which is approximately a mile east of the Choptank River. That is what makes it in the critical area is the creek. The properties have a fringe of woods surrounding the property which abutts the creek. The rest of the land is farm total soil, which has received preliminary approval from the Health Department. And the rest of the subdivision is in the normal process of approval. As you can see, there are some smaller We have a small portion of the property which is not in the critical area which takes in part of lot 1, the road, and lot 5 and 6. The lots range from a large 5.3 to a small of 1.5. So, we're talking about, compared to the others, we're talking about a small 19.3 acres of growth allocation. If there's any questions, I'll be glad to answer them for you.

1

2

3

5

6

7

Я

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. BOSTIAN: Just out of curiosity, how wide is your Blinkhorn Creek at your lot 2, 3 and 4?

MR. LUDLOW: At 2, 3 and 4, it's not very wide.

FREE STATE REPORTING INC.

1	MR. BOSTIAN: Is it to scale on here?
2	MR. LUDLOW: I don't show the other side. If
3	you look at
4	MR. PRICE: What do you mean, 100, 200 feet?
5	MR. LUDLOW: Let's see, it shows one side.
6	We're talking that small gut portion in there of probably
7	maybe around 50 feet, somewhere in that area, maybe not
8	even that. Most of it, to be honest with you, when the
9	tide's low, there's no creek.
10	MR. KRECH: All these lots perk?
11	MR. LUDLOW: Yes, they're very good soils.
12	MR. KRECH: Good.
13	MR. BOSTIAN: North part of the county.
14	MR. LUDLOW: Yeah, we're in the north part of
15	the county, right.
16	MR. BOWLING: Yeah, that's on low tide.
17	MR. LUDLOW: Yeah, that's what it is.
18	MR. DODD: These lots slope up from the water.
19	MR. LUDLOW: Yes, they do, that's right.
20	There's a difference. As you can see, there's some
21	topography on there, at the edge of the woods, we're
22	talking about an elevation of 7 and ending up at an

elevation of 24. One of the greatest reliefs in the 1 county. 2 MR. PRICE: Bill, do you have any questions? 3 MR. BOSTIAN: No. 4 MR. PRICE: Sam? 5 MR. BOWLING: No, no questions. 6 MR. PRICE: Thank you, Mr. Ludlow. 7 MR. LUDLOW: Sure, thank you. I didn't realize 8 I made that many copies. 9 MR. MILLER: Mr. Price? 10 MR. PRICE: Yes. 11 MR. MILLER: I just discovered why engineers 12 need to carry calculators. I think I may have made an 13 error there. 14 MR. PRICE: All right. 15 MR. MILLER: When I gave you 431, it should be 16 441.6. 17 MR. PRICE: Okay. Does anyone else have 18 anything to state on either regard to the page 39, I call 19 it amendment, or the particular subdivisions? Any of the 20 Commission members have any questions? Mr. Ventre, do 21

you have anything you wish to add?

MR. VENTRE: I have no comments. MR. PRICE: Okay, with that -- I think the 2 stage where we are right now is after the panel has this 3 meeting, we'll bring it up at the Commission. 4 MR. KRECH: I don't know about you, but I see 5 no reason why we can't bring it up the 18th. 6 MR. BOWLING: I don't either. 7 MR. PRICE: Yeah. And at which time, if it's 8 approved, then it will be sent back to you for adoption. 9 So maybe the County Commissioners will get tired. 10 Okay, any questions about that part of the -- okay, if 11 not, then we'll declare the meeting adjourned. 12 (Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 13 8:20 p.m.) 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21

1 CERTIFICATE 2 3 This is to certify that the foregoing transcript 4 in the matter of: 5 DORCHESTER COUNTY PANEL OF CHESAPEAKE BAY 6 CRITICAL AREA COMMISSION 7 IN RE: PROGRAM AMENDMENTS 8 9 BEFORE: Robert R. Price, Jr. 10 11 DATE: Monday, January 9, 1989 12 PLACE: County Office Building, Room 110 Cambridge, Maryland 21613 13 14 represents the full and complete proceedings of the 15 aforementioned matter, as reported and reduced to 16 typewriting. 17 18 19 20

21



DORCHESTER COUNTY CRITICAL AREA COMMISSION

PROGRAM AMENDMENT

This matter came before the public on March 30, 1989, at 7:30 p.m.

RECEIVED

APR 25 1989

DNR CRITICAL AREA COMMISSION

FREE STATE REPORTING INC.

COURT REPORTING • DEPOSITIONS D.C. AREA 261-1902 BALT. & ANNAP. 974-0947



1	Critical Area Commissioners:
2	ROBERT SCHOEPLEIN, Chairman THOMAS VENTRE, Critical Area Staff
3	WILLIAM BOSTIAN
4	SHEPARD KRECH ROBERT PRICE, JR.
5	SAMUEL BOWLING
6	Director of Planning, Dorchester County:
7	STEVEN DODD
8	Andrews, Miller & Associates:
9	JAMES R. WILSON
10	Representing the State Planning Commission, Salisbury:
	BRUCE BOGMAN
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	·
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	

PROCEEDINGS

MR. BOSTIAN: My name is William Bostian, B-o-s-t-i-a-n. I'm the representative from Wicomico County, on the Critical Areas Commission. And on my right is Dr. Shepard Krech of Talbott County. On my left is Bob Price, from Queen Anne's County, and Sam Bowling from Charles County. Is that correct?

MR. BOWLING: Correct.

MR. BOSTIAN: We're here tonight to look at, how many, one minor subdivision, as a program amendment to the Dorchester County program. We do have a record, taken by the Court Reporter. What is your name, ma'am?

REPORTER: My name is Breta Bernstein.

MR. BOSTIAN: Breta Bernstein. And if there is anyone who would like to add anything quick to the record, we'll hold the record open for two weeks in Annapolis. And any such comments may be directed to the Critical Areas Commission at their new office at 875, 275 West Garrett Place in Annapolis, and the Zip, I guess, is still 21401. And I'll be happy to hand over the Chairmanship of this town to the Chairman who has just entered.

MR. SCHOEPLEIN: My apologies, gentlemen.

FREE STATE REPORTING INC.

COURT REPORTING • DEPOSITIONS D.C. AREA 261-1902 BALT. & ANNAP. 974-0947

MR. BOSTIAN: Bob Schoeplein. With that, Steve, take it away.

MR. DODD: Members of the Commission Panel, the Dorchester County Commission has directed the Critical Areas Commission to review and approve a request for program amendment, more specifically, to redesignate a portion of a parcel of land from LDA, from RCA, "resource conservation area", to LDA, "limited development area". The total growth allocation in question tonight is 28.2 acres. The allocation is needed to allow a four-lot residential subdivision located off of Town Point Road on the Little Choptank River in the Dorchester County critical area.

This subdivision is covered and addressed in the Dorchester County Critical Area Protection Program, Volume 1, last paragraph on page 39. The language I'm referring to was approved by The Critical Area Commission at their meeting on January 18, 1989, and it says: Subdivision plats that were undergoing evaluation by the Dorchester County Planning Commission prior to the effective date of the Dorchester County Planning Commission, prior to the effective date of the Dorchester County Planning Commission, prior to the effective date of the Dorchester County Critical Area Protection Program, will not be subject to the density provisions of the zoning

FREE STATE REPORTING INC.

ordinance or to the growth allocation provisions of the subdivision regulations. These subdivisions must have growth
allocations reserved for them and must have been designed to
conform to the critical area criteria. Additionally, approval
must have been granted for the preliminary plat, in the case
of major subdivisions, and for the findings of fact required
by Natural Resource Article 8.18.13, in the case of minor
subdivisions.

This subdivision did receive a critical area assessment approval by the Dorchester County Planning Commission in, I believe it was May of 1988, prior to the adoption of the Critical Area Program.

The Planning, the Dorchester County Planning

Commission at their December 7, 1988 meeting recommended

approval of the growth allocation for this subdivision and

sent the request to the Dorchester County County Commissioner,

Dorchester County Commissioner, for their action. The

Dorchester County Commissioners met on January 24, 1989 at

a public hearing. And at that public hearing, the County

Commissioners made a motion by Bill Lingett, seconded by

Jack Coleman and unanimously passed the request for allocation

and forwarded the allocation request to the Critical Area

FREE STATE REPORTING INC.

Commission in a letter dated January 31, 1989.

The proposed subdivision is before you tonight.

Again, as I've said every time we've met, it's not your job,

nor your responsibility to approve subdivisions. That is

the job of the Dorchester County Planning Commission. However,

the approval of the redesignation of the property from RCA to

LDA is considered a program amendment by the Critical Area

Commission, and therefore, this hearing is required.

As far as the location of this area to be developed, it is shown on the top right-hand portion of the proposed plat, and the vicinity map is also shown here on the County-wide map, a copy of which was given to the Commission in December of '88. The location is right here (indicating), from the Little Choptank River, again off of Town Point Road.

The, from Andrews & Miller Associates, who prepared the subdivision plat, is here, is represented here tonight, and is available to address the technical aspects of the subdivision. And I'd be glad to answer any questions about the County's Critical Area Program or the growth allocation process

MR. BOSTIAN: If I may, what is the difference between the site acreage of 31.1 and the growth allocation total of 28.2?

FREE STATE REPORTING INC.

MR. DODD: The growth allocation request does not include tidal wetlands on the property. The total site is 31.1 acres, and the tidal wetlands have been deducted from the allocation, netting 28.2 acres.

MR. BOSTIAN: Are you including the wetlands at the heart of the two middle lots? Is that what you're talking about?

MR. DODD: Yes. They would be included.

MR. BOWLING: Is that "tidal" or "non-tidal"?

MR. SCHOEPLEIN: I thought that was "non-tidal".

I'm looking over here at tidal over here.

MR. DODD: Showing a hundred-foot buffer. We're assuming that it's tidal. That engineering firm, again, is available for comment.

MR. SCHOEPLEIN: We may be discussing two different, there's one in the upper right-hand corner of the property that appears to be tidal wet-, in fact, it's identified as "tidal wetlands". Then, in the heart ...

MR. BOSTIAN: That would be the one in the heart, don't you think? If you're looking at one of those lots, Lot 1 and Lot 2 are 4.6 acres, and you're talking about something on the order of almost 3 ...

FREE STATE REPORTING INC.

MR. BOWLING: Well, actually, it doesn't show any 1 connection in tidewater, so it would almost have to be non-2 tidaled. 3 MR. WILSON: It's, we've been told to deal with it as tidal wetlands. I don't think that the determination has 5 ever been really finally made in the field as to whether it 6 was tidal or non-tidal. MR. KNECH: Is that existing pond, the tidal pond? 8 9 MR. WILSON: We're dealing with it as tidal. MR. KNECH: Yeah, that existing pond is a tidal 10 11 pond, in other words. MR. DODD: It would have to be in order to connect. 12 MR. WILSON: I think that was probably the connec-13 tion that would consider the ... 14 15 MR. BOSTIAN: Does that answer the question? 16 MR. KNECH: Yeah. Where is that linked up to the Little Choptank, except possibly through the wetlands, the 17 18 ditch there ... 19 MR. BOWLING: Well, actually if it were non-tidal, 20 the buffer would only be 25 feet as opposed to 100 feet, so 21 it must be considered tidal, since you're dealing with 100-

FREE STATE REPORTING INC.

22

foot buffer.

1	MR. DODD: Either that or it's mis-identified.
2	MR. BOWLING: Buffer is fine. Leave it alone.
3	MR. WILSON: Well, we decided
4	MR. DODD: This is a shared facility, i.e., there
5	are no individual septic tanks on each lot. It will be
6	served by a central shared facility as indicated by a
7	40,000 square foot sewage reserve area. There are no building
8	envelopes. We're including all the acreage in the subdivision
9	minus the tidal wetlands.
10	MR. BOSTIAN: It would appear that you would have
11	to put the houses fairly close to the road, at least on Lots
12	2 and 3. Is that
13	MR. DODD: Well, the required building restriction
14	lines are indicated on the plat. And they would be required
15	to be at least 50 feet from the proposed road.
16	MR. BOSTIAN: How far do they have to be away from
17	the -, old fish pond?
18	MR. WILSON: Actually, they can be built right up
19	to the side wall of the sewage reserve area if you want it to
20	MR. PRICE: What did you do, pump the sewage from
21	Lot 1, 2, down to 2?
22	MR. DODD: Down where, down the private road?

1	MR. WILSON: It's force manner. They put a small
2	pump station in front of each building.
3	MR. PRICE: Reserve the easement across, the road
4	right-of-way, is that
5	MR. WILSON: It's in the road right-of-way, right.
6	MR. PRICE: What kind of elevations do you have on
7	these properties?
8	MR. DODD: They're probably, unless you have any
9	benchmark here, with six-seven feet.
10	MR. WILSON: This one averages about four to seven
11	feet.
12	MR. BOWLING: Above mean high?
13	MR. DODD: Uh-huh.
14	MR. BOWLING: Most, 60 percent of the counties in
15	the 100-year flood plain, is six feet or less above sea level.
16	MR. DODD: So, it's not uncommon to have these
17	properties be low. But the wall of the berm must be built
18	above the
19	MR. BOWLING: That means that in four decades
20	they're all gonna be under water, huh?
21	MR. DODD: If the water continues to rise, it's
22	what they call "greenhouse effect".

i	MR. SCHOEPLEIN: The existing house is Lot 4?
2	MR. WILSON: Right.
3	MR. BOWLING: The strip, adjacent to Lot 1, along
4	the shoreline there (indicating), is that part of this propert
5	MR. WILSON: No, the owner is reserving that for
6	his own use.
7	MR. BOWLING: Preserving that for his own use, okay
8	It buts the cul-de-sac. It becomes another lot, really,
9	though.
10	MR. DODD: It's not approved in the building law
11	for a development.
12	MR. BOWLING: It would have to come back with a
13	subdivision. Does the owner own land on the opposite side of
14	the road to this that connects to that?
15	MR. WILSON: Yes, he owns 292 acres total there.
16	MR. BOWLING: Then I see, one parcel?
17	MR. WILSON: Yes.
18	MR. SCHOEPLEIN: Wrapping around, it wraps around
19	the whole subdivision?
20	MR. WILSON: Yes, all the way down the complex.
21	MR. SCHOEPLEIN: Because, Sam, I don't think you
22	could develop that lot, if that were a lot, so it's tidal

1 wetlands in here. 2 MR. BOWLING: They've still got several acres of 3 You could probably build a lot, make a lot ground there. 4 out of that. 5 MR. PRICE: What's this look like out, well, what 6 does this land look like, when you look at a plat like this 7 one would wonder with all the constraints on it why somebody 8 would, you know, would develop it. MR. WILSON: We have a photograph of the ... 10 MR. BOWLING: Like to see them? 11 MR. SCHOEPLEIN: We really would. 12 MR. PRICE: Yeah, in looking at it, it looks like 13 you've got to build almost behind this wetland, almost seven 14 or 800 feet in the water. 15 MR. BOWLING: It's open ground, bare ground. 16 MR. WILSON: I think the one with the fellow 17 standing and it's shot from over here near the side of the 18 property, near Lot 1 looking down towards Lot 4. 19 MR. PRICE: Right. The cedar trees are down near 20 the existing house, I guess, on this road? 21 MR. WILSON: Yeah, basically, around the house. 22

FREE STATE REPORTING INC.

You can see the house in the background.

(Discussion of photograph. Everyone speaking at 1 once.) 2 MR. KNECH: You really can't get an accurate 3 picture of it from the photographs. MR. SCHOEPLEIN: Out of curiosity, how do you treat 5 the sewage in that common septic field? 6 MR. WILSON: It's treated before it gets excavated, 7 the septic tank, it goes to a small pump station. 8 MR. SCHOEPLEIN: Okay. 9 MR. DODD: Is it big ... 10 It's a pond, yeah. An infiltration MR. WILSON: 11 pond. 12 MR. SCHOEPLEIN: Okay. 13 MR. PRICE: When you have the community facilities 14 for this type of sewage, does that require another master 15 sewer plan? 16 MR. DODD: Well, it's funny that you brought that 17 up because up.to, maybe a couple of weeks ago, we always 18 19 processed the major subdivisions, five or more, on a pond, treated water and sewer plan, and then we always exempted 20 21 minors and DOE's is basically balked at now, and saying that

FREE STATE REPORTING INC.

everything that's shared must be a water/sewer plan.

22

1	MR. BOWLING: Everything that's shared?
2	MR. DODD: Two or more individual lots. If you
3	have two users on a single lot, they could share a pond without
4	having the health
5	SPEAKER: They won't let them share septic
6	systems back
7	MR. PRICE: When you're talking about two users
8	it may be a main house and guest house, single ownership.
9	MR. DODD: Or a father-daughter.
10	MR. SCHOEPLEIN: Do we need a motion to approve
11	the subdivision?
12	MR. BOWLING: I think we just recommend it to the
13	Commission. Isn't that right, Robert?
14	MR. SCHOEPLEIN: Are there any other questions to
15	members of the Panel? The lot sizes? The buffers? The
16	tidal wetlands? Growth allocations?
17	MR. BOWLING: No questions.
18	MR. SCHOEPLEIN: Are there any other comments from
19	anyone from the floor? The record will stay open until two

weeks from this evening. Are there any other comments?

Hearing no other comments, then, this meeting is adjourned.

The record will stay open for two weeks. And you can reach

20

21

22

1 the Critical Areas Commission on West Street in Annapolis, 2 Maryland. The number is 974-2426. 3 (Whereupon, at 7:56 p.m. on Thursday, March 30, 4 1989, the hearing adjourned.) 5 (Whereupon, the hearing re-opened for a few minutes of comments.) 6 MR. VENTRE: Yeah, that would be the other point 8 as I mentioned, at least alluded to in my remarks to you in a brief memorandum, when the Dorchester Planning Office had 10 sent, had notified us of the three upcoming, that we just 11 touched on again. It would all depend, really, at what point 12 they are in the process, when they are all at the same point 13 relatively, in that process. It would seem to me 14 expeditious to assemble (inaudible) 15 SPEAKER: We have no idea. 16 SPEAKER: I was going to suggest taking them no 17 matter what points they are. 18 SPEAKER: Well, they're not all in the same ... 19 SPEAKER: -- give up these plans and they just 20 saw another reason to stop. 21 SPEAKER: But, then that might conflict with how 22 the Dorchester County subdivision review process is operating.

FREE STATE REPORTING INC.

They may not be already at the, I don't know if that's the 1 case. 2 What I meant was the Dorchester County 3 SPEAKER: Commissioners amend their programs so that these all would 4 be awarded growth allocations to continue (inaudible), and 5 SPEAKER: That's what we planned to do anyhow. 6 Let's check signals on this, because SPEAKER: 7 it was not an approved subdivision. We do review the final 8 plat plans with regard to ... Not as a growth allocation amendment, 10 MR. PRICE: though, which is what this is. I mean, this is a project 11 approval. If you want to intervene and look at the project, 12 you can, of my understanding of the way it is handled now. 13 MR. SCHOEPLEIN: And what we ordinarily would be 14 looking at, locational criteria and everything else, has 15 already been raised by the grandfather, so, (inaudible). 16 MR. PRICE: Yeah. 17 MR. DODD: If you would suggest that and we will 18 propose that in writing, I'll be glad to take it to our 19

MR. VENTRE: To whom should we address such a

FREE STATE REPORTING INC.

County Commissioner. I'm sure that the Planning Commission

would be happy to do it all along.

20

21

22

letter to, Commissioner Cravers, or to the President of the 1 Planning Commission ... 2 MR. DODD: Since it is the County Commissioners 3 who ultimately must amend the program, locally, I would say to them. 5 MR. BOWLING: This is an unique one here. 6 MR. DODD: But, I only have to drive five minutes. 7 MR. SCHOEPLEIN: My car is totally depreciated. 8 I just want to direct something to the MR. KNECH: 9 Court Reporter because Bill made the introductions before he 10 came in. Tom Ventre of the Commissioner's staff was not 11 mentioned. I just want to make sure that that is recorded 12 in the minutes. 13 MR. SCHOEPLEIN: Adjourn. 14 (Whereupon, at 8:01 p.m. on Thursday, March 30, 15 1989, the hearing adjourned.) 16 17 18 19 20 21 22

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript in the matter of: Dorchester County Critical Area Commission of Cambridge, Maryland BEFORE: ROBERT SCHOEPLEIN, Chairman DATE: Thursday, March 30, 1989 PLACE: County Administration Building, Room 110 represents the full and complete proceedings of the aforementioned matter, as reported and reduced to typewriting. Broto Bernstein Breta Bernstein FREE STATE REPORTING, INC.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

FREE STATE REPORTING INC.