Public Hearings - Queen Anne's Country - Two Amendments 1990 MSA_J1830-23 BEFORE THE CHESAPEAKE BAY CRITICAL AREA COMMISSION

1

2

IN THE MATTER OF:

TWO AMENDMENTS TO QUEEN ANNE'S COUNTY CRITICAL AREA PROGRAM

3

4

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Thursday, March 29, 1990

Pursuant to Notice, the above-entitled hearing was held before JAMES E. GUTTMAN, CHAIRMAN, at the County Office Building, 208 North Commerce Road, Centreville, Maryland 21617, commencing at 7:00 p.m., there being present on behalf of the respective parties: ON BEHALF OF THE CHESAPEAKE BAY CRITICAL AREA COMMISSION:

JAMES E. GUTTMAN, Chairman SHEPARD KRECH, Board Member ROBERT PRICE, Board Member JOE ELBRIGHT, Board Member PAT PUDELKEWICZ, Staff MR. REN SEREY, Staff

RECEIVED

APR 10 1990

CRITICAL AREA COMMISSION



Court Reporting and Litigation Support Serving Baltimore, Washington and Annapolis

ALSO PRESENT:

FRANCIS ASHLEY, Queen Anne's County Commission WHEELER BAKER, Queen Anne's County Commission MARGARET C. KAII, Department of Planning and Zoning, Queen Anne's County

MR. RICHARD E. RICE

MR. BUTTERWORTH MR. MIKE WHITEHILL

REPORTED BY: MARVIN W. GATZ, NOTARY PUBLIC

U



Court Reporting and Litigation Support Serving Baltimore, Washington and Annapolis

PROCEEDINGS

CHAIRMAN GUTTMAN: Good evening. My name is

James E. Guttman, and tonight I will be chairing this

hearing for the Critical Area Commission. We have a

couple map amendments, as well as program amendments, to

deal with for Queen Anne's County.

First, I'd just like to have the other members of our Critical Area Commission introduce themselves for the record. And we'll start over here at the end with Dr. Krech.

MR. KRECH: My name is Shepard Krech,

Talbot County. I represent the Upper Eastern Shore atlarge.

MR. PRICE: Robert Price from Queen Anne's County.

MR. ELBRIGHT: Joe Elbright, representing Anne Arundel County.

CHAIRMAN GUTTMAN: As I say, my name is James E. Guttman, and I'm a member at-large of the Commission for the Western Shore.

With us also is our staff person, Pat



Court Reporting and Litigation Support Serving Baltimore, Washington and Annapolis

301 647-8300 800 950-DEPO

Pudelkewicz, over here to my left, to your right.

The proceedings tonight will be recorded, and the record for the proceedings for these issues will remain open for written comment to the Commission through next Tuesday, for any further elaborations, if anybody wishes to send anything in writing beyond what might be said tonight. As I mentioned, we do have a court reporter taking down everything that will be said this evening.

Are there any local officials with us this evening for the county? Would you please introduce yourselves?

MS. ASHLEY: I'm Francis Ashley, County Commission.

CHAIRMAN GUTTMAN: All right.

MR. BAKER: Wheeler Baker, County Commission.

CHAIRMAN GUTTMAN: Do either one of you care to make a statement at this time? Please do.

MR. BAKER: Well, sir, I was going to make a statement after Mr. Butterworth makes his statement, if it's all right with you.



Court Reporting and Litigation Support Serving Baltimore, Washington and Annapolis 301 647-8300 800 950-DEPO

CHAIRMAN GUTTMAN: As you see fit.

All right. Additionally, from the staff of the Critical Area Commission, we have Mr. Ren Serey, who has just joined us.

I think we'll be very lenient with the normal ground rules of saying only a three to five minute presentation. There are not that many here this evening, so I don't think we'll be all that stern about sounding the gavel.

I would like to mention, however, that the purpose of this hearing is for members of this Commission to hear the perspective of those in the county, and we really will not be entering into any dialogue or trying to respond to any of the issues this evening. We're principally here to gather some facts.

So, I think at this point I would ask if there's a representative of the county who wishes to introduce the amendments under consideration?

MS. KAII: Do you want to look at them one at a time, or --

CHAIRMAN GUTTMAN: Why don't you go through



21

them in sequence? Yes.

MS. KAII: I guess we should probably start off with Mr. Butterworth's, if that's all right with you. The petition is for a critical areas change from LDA to IDA. If you wouldn't mind, I'd like to just let Mr. Rice explain his situation --

CHAIRMAN GUTTMAN: That'd be fine.

MS. KAII: -- and present his case.

CHAIRMAN GUTTMAN: Surely. Please do.

MR. RICE: Chairman Guttman and panel members, I would like to say at the outset that there's certain justice in the world. Mr. Elbright, tonight, gets a chance to cross-examine me, rather than vice versa.

MR. ELBRIGHT: Don't hold that against me. I won't hold it against you.

MR. RICE: I'm sure he'll enjoy this to no end. I just warned him. I have not been sworn.

MR. ELBRIGHT: That doesn't help you.

MR. RICE: I was afraid of that. I'm happy to say for my client that I believe this evening's petition on behalf of Thompson Creek Townhomes and the Joint



Court Reporting and Litigation Support Serving Baltimore, Washington and Annapolis

16

17

18

19

20

21

Venture and the corporation is very straightforward. In December of 1985, this entire section of land, which comprises in excess of 20 acres, was developed residentially to the extent of the developments that are shown here marked in brown.

And there were over 100 units already in existence, 100 drawn units already in existence, as indicated on the map. This entire residentially zoned area in excess of 20 acres is approximately 30 acres. If you take the 100 and some dwelling units that were in existence as of December 1, 1985, and divide by the area in question, you come up with a density of 3.5 units per acre, which meets one of the primary considerations for intense development area.

If you also consider this 7.5 acre block to the north of the property, it was part of the commercial development along Route 50, and it assists in the analysis of the criteria applicable to this site because of one of the criteria, which you know better than me, is that commercial land use is predominant in the area. And they do. Here, we have commercial uses. We have



residential uses; and in fact, there were industrial uses in this area, which is now zoned suburban industrial.

So the other criteria that are mentioned in the Natural Resources Article with respect to intense development are, "Is there a lack of vegetation in this area?" And there certainly is a lack of vegetation in the area, not only because of the residential development that existed down here, but also because of the clearing that had already taken place years and years ago in this area.

In fact, this one site, this 5.3 acre site of Thompson Creek Townhomes, Inc., was a spoil basin first for the county's dredging project, which enabled the public landing that is located just a little further in that direction, and then secondly, as the spoil area for the dredging that was performed by Mr. Butterworth, who is the principal for the townhomes project.

There is a stormwater management facility located approximately here, where it says, "Existing pond." That pond was sized and approved, both by Anne



Court Reporting and Litigation Support Serving Baltimore, Washington and Annapolis 301 647-8300 800 950-DEPO

Arundel County and the State of Maryland, and was an integral requirement for the wetlands permit that was obtained for the dredging -- I should say State weapons license that was obtained for the dredging.

MR. ELBRIGHT: Not Anne Arundel County.

MR. RICE: Queen Anne's County.

I'm sorry. I'm sorry. The tongue does funny
things -- don't learn from me.

Really, that leaves us with the only issue that's not graphically shown on just this simple plat, and that deals with the existence of water and sewer to the area, in general, as of December 1, 1985. We have a second plat, which is Applicant's Exhibit 1-B that addresses that remaining issue.

Ignoring, initially, all of the modern water and sewer lines that run through this area today, in 1985, there existed a public utility known as Stevens Village Utility Corporation, that had been formed by a developer in this area well before Mr. Butterworth came on the scene. As of that date, it was providing water to these projects that were located in this area. It



was also providing water to the several industrial establishments here, and to the part of the shopping center that was located adjacent to these areas just to the north.

When the two petitioners here this evening acquired their properties in this area, they also obtained the stock to the Stevens Village Utility Company, with the idea, of course, of extending water and sewer service to those specific projects to be built by them. But I wish to emphasize that at that point in time that utility was already providing sewage service and water service to these areas — this entire area.

Right about at the time the petitioners here acquired their land, the county was extending a vacuum sewer. You can see the vacuum sewer lines coming down Thompson Creek Road. And in fact, just about at this time, the vacuum sewer replaced the old sewage treatment plant, which has been shown here in red. It was the old sewage treatment plant which, as of -- prior to 1985, was operated by the Stevens Village Utility Company, and subsequent to that date, was taken over and replaced by



Court Reporting and Litigation Support Serving Baltimore, Washington and Annapolis

the vacuum sewer service.

The petitioners here contributed to the construction of a new water plant, which replaced the old facility that was in approximately the same location. But that new water plant, which was constructed subsequent to 1985, only replaced the facility that was there ahead of time and was already in place in 1985.

In fact, the existing water plant operated by Stevens Village Utility initially provided water service, not only to these projects that existed as of December 1, 1985, but continued to provide water service both to Thompson Creek Colony and to the Thompson Creek townhomes development, which was already well under way subsequent to December 1, 1985, before the new water plant was built.

So, I believe that all the criteria necessary for classification of this area in 1985 as intense development existed as of December 1, 1985, and it was, indeed, a mistake for the county to designate this land's limited development area.



Court Reporting and Litigation Support Serving Baltimore, Washington and Annapolis

That brings us, I think, just to a simple explanation of how that happened. The property was classified suburban residential. Under the county's mapping policy, all suburban residential properties were categorized as limited development area. So the critical area classification was automatic because of the mistake in the zoning.

Last July, I believe it was -- it was last year in 1989, the same petitioners went before the county commissioners here in Queen Anne's County and obtained rezoning of these two parcels, on the basis of mistake, from suburban residential to urban residential. If, under the county's mapping policy, these properties had been zoned correctly urban residential at the time that the critical area maps were developed, then these properties would have been routinely designated as intense development.

So we're asking, tonight, that you grant this request. It was definitely a mistake. And it will assist us greatly as of this time. This is not part of your concern, I don't believe. But I just wish to



Court Reporting and Litigation Support Serving Baltimore, Washington and Annapolis

mention affecting the two petitioners in this case is a unique financing problem.

You may be aware that Liberty Federal Savings
Bank was taken over by the Office of Thrift Supervision
right around Christmastime of last year. And Liberty
was a joint venture. In fact, the Thompson Creek
Townhomes Joint Venture is, in part, Randallstown
Service Corporation, which is a solely owned, wholly
owned subsidiary of Liberty Savings Bank. When Liberty
was taken over, the federal regulators -- and even just
before it was taken over, the federal regulators
prohibited Liberty from assisting or providing
additional financing to this development. So there has
been no construction here for some time.

All the facilities are in. All the impervious area has already been constructed except for actual dwelling units in certain locations. This chart will tell you specifically what has been built and what will be built. I don't think I need to get into that. If it becomes relevant, you can see it.

But my point simply is that it's been a



Court Reporting and Litigation Support Serving Baltimore, Washington and Annapolis 301 647-8300 800 950-DEPO

terrible hardship having to hold up construction here after the infrastructure was already in place, because obviously, the loan had to be carried for the infrastructure, but no additional units could be built. And there's no ability to finance out of this situation to get a different lender in place until this error, which I believe occurred in the critical area map, has been corrected.

So I thank you for your patience. If you have any questions, Mr. Whitehill from McCrone Engineering is here to answer technical questions, and Mr. Butterworth, who is the principal in both of the petitioner entities, is here to answer questions about development.

CHAIRMAN GUTTMAN: Before you sit down, I wonder if I just inquire. You say there was a rezoning last summer?

MR. RICE: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN GUTTMAN: What was the position of the planning commission on that?

MR. RICE: It was in support of it, and that the opinion of the -- I could let Ms. Kaii speak to that



Court Reporting and Litigation Support Serving Baltimore, Washington and Annapolis

if you'd like to.

MS. KAII: The county commissioners approved the rezoning on the basis of the mistake of the zoning because of the site plan that was submitted in -- to the Department of Planning and Zoning for the potential build-out which is shown here on the plan. Had this property been zoned as -- as Mr. Rice said, had it been zoned urban residential at the time, it would have been designated IDA at the time of the critical area zoning.

CHAIRMAN GUTTMAN: Was there any opposition to that rezoning?

MS. KAII: Not at the hearing.

MR. RICE: There were some questions, but there was no opposition.

CHAIRMAN GUTTMAN: What was the nature of those questions?

MR. RICE: The question was basically what type of construction would be taking place if this petition were granted, and the representation was made that it's identical to the type of structures that already exist in this area which the same developer is

800 950-DEPO



-- the same principal. It's not the same developmental entities, but the same developer has already constructed.

The same developer -- the same principal, Mr.

Butterworth, built Thompson Creek Colony and Thompson

Creek Condominiums, as well as the existing units in

Thompson Creek Townhomes. I believe there were people

representing the Kent Cove condominium adjacent to these

developments who were concerned with the type of

construction that might take place, particularly on this

5.3 acre site. Again, representation was made that it's

the same type of physical construction that's already

taken place in this area.

CHAIRMAN GUTTMAN: All right.

MR. ELBRIGHT: What kind of approvals had been secured, either as of '85 or prior to the critical area plans and maps being adopted by the county?

MR. RICE: Permits had already issued for the construction of Marion Quimby Drive, for the construction of water and sewer facilities within Marion Quimby Drive. The wetlands permit to build the docking



facilities and to dredge this area had already been issued. Stormwater management approval had been issued for the stormwater management pond. Let's see.

MR. ELBRIGHT: Had any of the layout as far as the units or the parking areas or anything like that for the site been approved at that time?

MR. RICE: I -- I'll have to defer to Mr. Whitehill. Honestly, I have to defer to him.

MR. WHITEHILL: Yes. As -- well, we presented a comprehensive plan that would show the total build-out to the zoning office at that time. However, when we got started in 1983 and 1984, the definition of "site plan approval" was later to become fairly controversial.

These did not receive a formal -- what we would understand today as a site plan approval, mainly because it wasn't a requirement. It wasn't a technical site plan the way we have it today.

So what essentially we had done was to meet the local jurisdiction requirement for stormwater management and sediment and erosion control, the normal survey standards. Condominium, incidentally, wasn't



Court Reporting and Litigation Support Serving Baltimore, Washington and Annapolis 301 647-8300

NT REPORTING 800 950-DEPO

even written in the 1964 ordinance. So it was totally unheard of -- well, not unheard of, but unregulated concept at the time.

And the plans that we had prepared, and which still basically we would hope to pick up with, were done without regulation. It wasn't part of the ordinancing as we would now know it today.

MR. KRECH: Is this entire area within the critical area itself?

MR. RICE: Yes, sir.

MR. KRECH: The entire area is?

MR. RICE: Yes, sir. This area up here -- you can see the IDA line. This dash line. All this is zoned IDA, and the limited development area that we're talking about -- I'm just going to run my finger -- this is along the mean high water line. Then it --

MR. KRECH: Yes. But, the lower right-hand part is still in the critical area, is it?

MR. RICE: Yes, sir.

MR. KRECH: Yes. Okay.

CHAIRMAN GUTTMAN: Any further questions? Any



further questions? All right.

MR. RICE: Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN GUTTMAN: I think you've now suggested Mr. Butterworth's would --

MR. RICE: If he needs to correct anything else I said incorrectly.

CHAIRMAN GUTTMAN: Well, no. But I would just give him the option if you have anything further you'd care to clarify.

MR. RICE: One thing I would like to make part of the record is the critical area assessment that was made as of January 29, 1985. That's not part of the record that was before the County Planning Commission, and I think that might make our record a bit more complete. I'd like to submit it to you at this time.

CHAIRMAN GUTTMAN: Sure. All right. We will certainly add this to the record, and I guess mark it Exhibit 1 for the Applicant at this time.

(Whereupon, the document was marked for identification as Applicant's Exhibit No. 1 and received in evidence.)



CHAIRMAN GUTTMAN: All right. Anyone care to pose any questions of Mr. Rice or Mr. Butterworth at this time, or shall we move along to the next?

MR. PRICE: I believe Commissioner Baker was going to speak on it.

CHAIRMAN GUTTMAN: Yes. Commissioner Baker.

Certainly. Whatever you -- whatever you wish.

MR. BAKER: I guess just a general overview from our point of view. You have to understand sir, we came into office in '86. We started working on -- we were working on a comprehensive plan. We picked it up from a previous administration. And this plan, when it was adopted April of 1987 -- and we went over hundreds of pieces of property -- it's obvious that we made a mistake in zoning this suburban residential rather than -- or, yes, urban rather than urban residential.

When you look at -- you've got the shopping center out in the front part towards Route 50, and back towards Thompson Creek you have high density dwellings there. This is way in between. With infrastructure pretty much in place, it was obvious that that should



have been zoned urban residential. If it hadn't been, sir, this would have been classified IDA now.

So the planning commission heard this last year and gave it their blessing and brought it to us.

And we concurred that we'd, in fact, made a mistake.

And we just want to come here and let you know that it's our fault.

CHAIRMAN GUTTMAN: You're pleading guilty?

MR. BAKER: Pleading guilty. Yes, sir.

That's about all I have to say, sir.

CHAIRMAN GUTTMAN: All right. Very fine. I thank you. All right. If there's no further questions, let's move along to the -- you've got some text amendments, also.

MS. KAII: The text amendment is an amendment to the critical area -- the Queen Anne's County Critical Area Ordinance, Section 6007, which is the development standards and the resource conservation area. Subsection (B)(1)(F).

Currently, this section prohibits certain uses in the RCA. Currently, it prohibits commercial



industrial uses as defined by the Queen Anne's County
Zoning Ordinance. The amendment proposes to change the
prohibition of specifically light industrial -- let's
see -- effluent disposal and extraction and disposal
uses within the RCA, since this amendment, in effect,
would allow new communication towers and minor
extraction and dredge disposal uses to be developed in
the RCA.

CHAIRMAN GUTTMAN: Any questions? Panel members? Any further statement anyone wishes to make, or questions to add at this point?

MR. BAKER: Sir?

CHAIRMAN GUTTMAN: All right. Please.

MR. BAKER: I'm not prompted for this. But I just -- I'm familiar with one part about the dredge disposals and RCA. We have a marina that we're trying to develop for -- we're trying to help a man develop for commercial watermen down at the tip of Kent Point because the watermen have such a tough time to moor their boats, and it's not practical to go out of the RCA. You've got a field right next to it. The man is



Court Reporting and Litigation Support Serving Baltimore, Washington and Annapolis

offering the use of that field for this dredge disposal, and if I'm not mistaken, that's the reason for that change. Right, Margaret?

MS. KAII: That's right. That's right. The property where the marina exists is IDA, with the property adjoining it which is zoned agriculture is RCA. The man who owns the agriculture land has offered to let the person who owns the marina deposit the dredge despoil on his farm. And we don't see any adverse effect in allowing that as a minor extraction disposal use. We have a limit of disturbance of five acres under minor extraction and disposal.

MR. ELBRIGHT: They would be still subject to complying with the other critical area standards, such as the limit of clearing and stuff like that, so they would meet the RCA standards for that development?

MS. KAII: Yes. Yes.

CHAIRMAN GUTTMAN: Any further questions on that provision?

All right. Anything further? Let's see. Do we have another -- is there any other text amendment



that you wanted to bring up at this time? 1 MS. KAII: That is it. Just the text 2 amendment and the two map and zonings. 3 CHAIRMAN GUTTMAN: All right. Anyone else 4 have anything further to add at this time? Any 5 statement that you want to make on the record or 6 questions? 7 All right. Well, if there be no further 8 testimony, questions, or statements, I think we'll stand 9 adjourned. 10 And just a reminder. We will accept written 11 comments at the offices of the Critical Area on West 12 Street -- 275 West Street -- until the close of business 13 next Tuesday. And with that, I'll now declare that this 14 hearing is adjourned. 15 (Whereupon, at 7:45 p.m., the above-16 entitled hearing was adjourned.) 17 (Exhibit not attached.) 18 19 20



21

	•	CONTENTS		
1.	PRESENTATION		PAGE	
2	MR. RICE		6	
3	MS. KAII		15	
4	MR. WHITEHILL		17	
5	MR. BAKER		20	
6	MS. KAII		21	
	MR. BAKER		22	
7	MS. KAII		23	
8				
9		EXHIBITS		
10	APPLICANT'S	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	MARKED	REC'D
10	No. 1	Critical Area Assessment	19	19
11		·		
12				
13				
14				



Court Reporting and Litigation Support Serving Baltimore, Washington and Annapolis

CERTIFICATE OF NOTARY

I, MARVIN W. GATZ, the officer before whom the foregoing testimony was taken, do hereby certify that the witness whose testimony appears in the foregoing transcript was duly sworn by me; that the testimony of said witness was taken by me by magnetic tape and thereafter reduced to typewriting by me or under my direction; that said testimony is a true record of the testimony given by said witness; that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the action in which this testimony is taken; and, further, that I am not a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel employed by the parties hereto, nor financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of the action.

MARVIN W. GATZ

Notary Public in and for the State of Maryland

My Commission Expires:



Court Reporting and Litigation Support Serving Baltimore, Washington and Annapolis