

Timestamp	First name	Last name	City	State	Zip code	Are you representing yourself?	If no, what organization or whom do you represent?	Legislation	Position	Remarks	Attachment
2024-02-15 16:21:53	Kim	Greco	Annapolis	MD	21409	Yes		BILL 1-24a: Animal Care & Control – Potentially Dangerous, Dangerous, & Vicious Animals	No position	<p>During the County Council Meeting held on February 5, 2024, an Amendment to Bill 1-24 was introduced, proposing a restriction on the frequency with which a dog owner could request a re-evaluation of the conditions associated with their dog's assessment, limiting it to once every five years.</p> <p>As a professional dog trainer who was present at the aforementioned meeting on February 5 and was unfortunately denied the opportunity to respond to Council questions, I express my relief that the mentioned Amendment did not gain approval.</p> <p>The demographic data pertaining to the average age of dogs deemed potentially dangerous or dangerous in Anne Arundel County is not systematically recorded. According to Robin Catlett, the Administrator of Animal Care & Control, a significant majority of such dogs fall within the age range of 1 to 5 years. Considering the average lifespan of a dog, which typically ranges from 10 to 13 years, I hold the opinion that a one-year timeframe is appropriate for the re-evaluation of stipulations if an animal has been successfully rehabilitated.</p> <p>Of paramount concern to me is the procedural aspect of the re-evaluation process. For instance, in cases where a dog is mandated to wear a muzzle whenever it leaves its property, the methodology for reassessing such stipulations warrants careful consideration. It is my assumption that the onus lies with the dog owner to demonstrate the absence of a need for the stipulated requirement, ensuring public safety. However, a comprehensive plan outlining the re-evaluation process is imperative. Will there be an assessment involving the presence of the dangerous dog around other dogs and people, demonstrating its ability to remain under control at all times? Furthermore, the crucial question of who will serve as the evaluator arises, necessitating clarification on whether this individual possesses expertise in animal behavior and the capacity to discern subtle signals that may lead to larger problems. The example provided underscores the necessity for thorough deliberation and discussion on the procedural intricacies of how an animal should be re-evaluated.</p> <p>The primary focus of discussion on February 5, 2024, centered around the frequency of re-evaluation for animals, but there are other factors highlighting the need for nuanced consideration of associated procedures and methodologies.</p>	
2024-02-19 11:16:59	Cate	Bower	West River	MD	20778	Yes		BILL 3-24a: Zoning – Maritime Districts – Neighborhood Marina Zoning District	Support	Support this legislation but it doesn't go far enough in protecting neighborhoods with marinas	YES
2024-02-20 11:17:55	Matt	Minahan	Edgewater	MD	21037	No	Growth Action Network	RES. 3-24: Amend Titles 1, 3, 4, & 5 of the Rules of Procedure of the County Council	Support	The Growth Action Network has petitioned the Council since the fall of 2022 to allow for hybrid participation in its meetings. We've been told its the technology, then the staffing, and maybe now it's a leak in the building. We greatly appreciate the rules change in 3-24 to allow hybrid meetings, but look forward with impatience to the Council's actions to make this happen. Thank you.	

In support of Bill 3-24

Cate Bower, , West River, MD

I am writing in support of Bill 3-24 which creates a new maritime zoning classification with uses more appropriate to small commercial marinas in residential areas. But since it only addresses marinas with 20 or fewer slips, it leaves unprotected larger marinas in residential neighborhoods, such as Shady Oaks. We need an additional bill to protect the many similar communities in Anne Arundel County.

For instance, in the current zoning code, all general commercial marina categories allow taverns and restaurants AS UNDENIABLE RIGHTS, no conditions, no special exceptions, and no matter where they are sited – even if in residential communities. These uses can bring community character-changing problems of noise, traffic, parking, and more. This is why they aren't allowed in residential areas anywhere else. Why should they be allowed at marinas when surrounded by neighborhoods?

We commend the fact that Bill 3-24 deals with this issue and others, but lament the fact that it only addresses small marinas. For larger marinas, we support the recommendations for a new bill with a new zoning category -- MA2-B - Light Commercial Marina (Residential). This would be identical to the current MA2-Light Commercial Marina except for a simple change: allow bars, restaurants, and banquet halls ONLY as special exceptions, NOT RIGHTS. The result: continued flexibility for marina operations as in the current code WITHOUT CHANGE – but better oversight regarding IF and HOW bars, restaurants, and banquet halls can be developed at marinas sited in residential areas.

Bill 3-24 is a first step. We hope Council approves it for small marinas and pursues a new bill for larger ones.