



PRO. EXHIBIT# 1
CASE: 2025-0165-V
DATE: 10/30/25

Objection to 327 Arbutus Dr, Edgewater, MD 21037

1 message

Savannah Johnson <savannahrpeck@gmail.com>
To: "zhcolb22@aacounty.org" <zhcolb22@aacounty.org>

Mon, Sep 15, 2025 at 7:02 PM

To the Administrative Hearing Officer,

I am an adjacent property owner to 327 Arbutus Drive, and I am submitting this objection to the pending variance requests for reduced setbacks and for disturbance of slopes 15 percent or greater.

1. Variance Standards under County Code §18-16-305

The Anne Arundel County Code requires specific findings before any variance can be granted:

§18-16-305(a)(1): The property must have unique physical conditions such that strict compliance with zoning requirements would result in practical difficulty.

§18-16-305(a)(2): Any hardship must not be self-created.

§18-16-305(a)(3): The variance must be the minimum necessary to afford relief.

§18-16-305(a)(4): The variance cannot impair the use or enjoyment of adjacent properties or alter neighborhood character.

In this case:

The narrowness and slope of the lot are not unique to this property; many lots in the Glebe Creek/Arbutus Drive area have similar constraints.

The hardship is self-created, as it arises from an attempt to place a dwelling of a size and siting that does not conform to R2 bulk regulations (§18-4-601).

The application does not demonstrate that the relief requested is the minimum necessary—alternative designs or a smaller footprint could avoid encroaching into setbacks and disturbing steep slopes.

2. Steep Slopes and the Critical Area – Title 13 (Natural Resources Article & County Code §18-13-304)

This property lies within the Chesapeake Bay Critical Area. Under County Code §18-13-304, steep slopes (15% or greater) are protected features, and disturbance is prohibited unless a variance is granted under strict conditions.

The variance criteria in the Critical Area are more stringent than standard zoning variances. The applicant must show:

That no feasible alternative exists to avoid disturbing slopes (§18-16-305(b)).

That the variance is consistent with the spirit and intent of the Critical Area law—which is to minimize erosion, runoff, and impacts to water quality.

The applicant has not provided sufficient evidence that there are no feasible alternatives. A smaller structure or relocation of the footprint would reduce or eliminate slope disturbance. Permitting unnecessary disturbance would directly contradict the Critical Area program's protective purpose.

3. Impacts to Adjacent Property and Public Welfare

Reduced setbacks will materially impair my use and enjoyment of my property by diminishing privacy and light, and by altering the established neighborhood character. Disturbance of steep slopes increases stormwater runoff and erosion, which will negatively impact both adjacent properties and the Chesapeake Bay. These impacts are specifically prohibited under §18-16-305(a)(4).

Conclusion

For the reasons above, the applicant has not met the required findings of §18-16-305. The requested variances are self-created, not the minimum necessary, and would cause material harm to adjacent properties and the Chesapeake Bay ecosystem.

This lot is also ungodly close to both me and my neighbors. Building any dwelling there would be an impact on privacy and enjoyment of our properties. The area is extremely narrow, sloped, and where a runoff for flood waters drains into. Building on this lot would severely impact our neighborhoods drainage and runoff which already is facing issues.

Additionally there is already an issue with street parking. Sometimes emergency and maintenance vehicles cannot get through. On average there are 7 cars parked on the street particularly where this dwelling is being proposed. There is no way they could build a driveway that would accommodate their vehicles and I would imagine they would contribute to the already terrible street parking issue. Also they have not maintained that land at all over the past few years. I cannot imagine they'd be any more responsible in building that home. I have had repeated damage to my vehicles due to their negligence.

I respectfully request that the Hearing Officer deny the variances for reduced setbacks and disturbance of slopes $\geq 15\%$ at 327 Arbutus Drive.

Respectfully submitted,

Savannah R Johnson
331 Arbutus Dr, Edgewater MD, 21037



PRO. EXHIBIT# 2
CASE: 2025-0165-V
DATE: 10/30/25

Opposition to Application No. 25.165V - 328 Arbutus Dr

1 message

David Johnson <DavidJohnson85@hotmail.com>

Mon, Oct 20, 2025 at 11:28 PM

To: "zhcolb22@aacounty.org" <zhcolb22@aacounty.org>

Cc: "JOHNSON, DAVID M MSgt USAFR AFRC 512 IS/DOB" <david.johnson.278@us.af.mil>

David Johnson

331 Arbutus Dr

Edgewater, MD 21037

davidjohnson85@hotmail.com | David.johnson.278@us.af.mil

20 October 2025

To:

Anne Arundel County Planning & Zoning Commission

Dear Members of the Commission:

I am writing as a concerned resident/property owner in Anne Arundel County to formally register my strong opposition to Application No. 25.165V (hereinafter "the Application"), as now before you. After reviewing the submitted materials, I believe that the proposed project raises substantial concerns and fails to meet key criteria for approval under the County's land-use, environmental, traffic and community standards. I respectfully ask that you deny the Application based on the reasons set forth below.

1. Inadequate compliance with comprehensive plan and zoning standards

1. The Application appears to conflict with the County's adopted Comprehensive Plan and relevant zoning and overlay district requirements. If the project introduces a use or density inconsistent with the land-use designation for this area, it undermines the plan's integrity and the expectations of adjacent property owners.
2. The materials provided in the Application lack sufficient demonstration of how the proposed use fits with the existing character of the neighborhood, the scale of development, and the goals of the community's growth management strategy.
3. The Application does not convincingly show that the change (or variance) sought is the only feasible alternative, or that extraordinary circumstances justify a deviation from the standards. Without such justification, granting the Application would set an impermissible precedent and erode Zoning Board discipline.

2. Traffic and transportation impact concerns

1. The Application documentation does not adequately assess the traffic impacts that will flow from the proposed project — for example, increased vehicle trips, turning movements at intersections, queuing effects, or spill-over parking into adjacent streets.
2. The local road network (name the roads) is already operating near capacity or has safety deficiencies (narrow lanes, limited sight-distance, pedestrian hazards). Adding additional development without proper infrastructure upgrades will exacerbate congestion and reduce traveler safety.
3. The Application fails to present a comprehensive mitigation plan—such as intersection improvements, signalization, pedestrian/bike accommodations, and parking management—that would sufficiently offset the impacts generated by the project.

3. Environmental and stormwater concerns

1. The Application does not adequately demonstrate how stormwater runoff, erosion control, sedimentation impacts, or water quality concerns will be addressed. Given the County's emphasis on preserving waterways and protecting

the Chesapeake Bay watershed, the applicant must show compliance with all relevant stormwater management and environmental protection requirements.

2. The project location may be in close proximity to sensitive environmental features (wetlands, flood-prone areas, steep slopes, tree canopy). The Application materials do not appear to include a thorough site assessment or justify disturbance of these features, nor do they provide a robust landscape/vegetation retention plan.
3. The impact on neighboring properties — in terms of drainage direction, runoff, potential flooding, or increased impervious surface — is not sufficiently analyzed. Granting the Application without full disclosure and mitigation could create adverse environmental consequences.

4. Neighborhood/community character and public welfare

1. The proposed development (or variance) threatens to alter the existing neighborhood scale, character, and quality of life for current residents. If the Application envisions a larger building footprint, higher density, greater height, or more intensive use than is typical in the surrounding area, it will undermine the cohesion of the area.
2. The Application does not show how adjacent property owners were engaged or how the project will integrate with existing residential uses. A lack of community outreach or failure to respond to neighbors' concerns raises questions about the social equity and public welfare impacts of the proposal.
3. Public facilities and services (schools, fire/emergency services, utilities, parks) may already be at or nearing capacity in the area; adding more users without provision to offset service demand places an unfair burden on existing taxpayers and residents.

5. Insufficient mitigation and conditions proposed by applicant

1. The submitted documentation lacks sufficient detail on how the applicant proposes to mitigate the impacts described above, including traffic, environmental, drainage, noise, lighting, site screening, and neighborhood compatibility.
2. If the application is approved without strong binding conditions (and adequate performance guarantees), there is risk that promised mitigations will not occur, or may prove insufficient, leading to long-term negative effects.
3. The burden of proof is on the applicant to show that the project will result in no substantial harm to the community or environment. The documentation falls short of this standard, and therefore the Application should not be approved as presented.

6. Request for additional information / alternative scenarios

For the Commission's thorough evaluation, I respectfully request that, if not denied outright, the applicant be required to provide:

- A full traffic impact study with intersection analysis, peak hour vehicle counts, and mitigation proposals.
- A detailed stormwater management plan showing existing vs proposed impervious surface, drainage paths, retention/infiltration design, and downstream effects.
- A full environmental resource assessment (including tree canopy, floodplain, wetlands, slopes) and landscape/vegetation retention plan.
- A visual impact study showing how the proposed project will look from adjacent residences/streets, including building height, massing, lighting, screening.
- Documentation of community outreach efforts, and responses to neighbors' concerns.
- A revised plan that scales down density/footprint (if feasible) or alters the design to better fit the neighborhood context.

Conclusion

For the reasons set forth above, I respectfully urge the Commission to either **deny** Application No. 25.165V or, if the Commission determines to approve it, to impose stringent conditions that protect the health, safety, welfare and character of the neighborhood and environment. Approval as submitted would set a precedent that risks undermining the County's planning objectives and the legitimate expectations of current residents. The bottom line; this plan jams another small house, on a small lot, adding to increased traffic on a crowded road. The increased density of a new home will not only increase the number of cars that will park on the street, but it will remove a major avenue for drainage within the community. A home on this lot will do harm to the community and the environment.

Thank you for considering my concerns. I request that my letter be entered into the official record and that I be notified of any hearing date, decision or subsequent action regarding this Application.

Sincerely,

