

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	Attachments
Bill No. 2-25											
2025-02-18 9:29:02	Philip	Buckley	Edgewater	MD	21037	Yes		Bill No. 2-25 As Amended: AN ORDINANCE concerning: Subdivision and Development – Zoning – Development Requirements for Particular Types of Development – Redevelopment	Oppose	<p>I strongly oppose the proposed legislation without modification, as it fails to consider the long-term consequences and unintended harm it will cause. While the bill may be well-intended, it ultimately undermines the very principles it seeks to promote and imposes unnecessary burdens on our community. Especially to Routes 2 and 3, which are currently thriving.</p> <p>First, the legislation lacks a comprehensive impact assessment. It introduces sweeping changes without fully evaluating the economic, environmental, and social repercussions. Policies should be based on data-driven solutions, not rushed decisions that may create more harm than good. Without clear evidence of its effectiveness, this bill is more of a political tax grab than a practical solution.</p> <p>Second, the proposal places an undue burden on residents. Increased traffic and costs will stifle economic growth, deter investment, and create increased unwanted population density. Local businesses are already struggling to adapt to existing subpar infrastructure adding another wave of construction pollution will only drive residents away. Instead of fostering innovation and progress, this bill promotes bureaucratic overreach and gratuitous tax revenue. All while lacking investment in needed public works infrastructure.</p> <p>Finally, this legislation fails to address the root causes of the issues it claims to solve. Rather than implementing a broad, one-size-fits-all approach, policymakers should engage with stakeholders to develop targeted, sustainable solutions that benefit everyone. The bill's current form is ineffective and counterproductive, and I urge legislators to reconsider before moving forward. Remove Routes 2 and 3 from this legislation.</p> <p>For these reasons, I strongly urge opposition to this proposal and call for a more thoughtful, well-researched alternative that truly serves the needs of our community.</p>	
2025-02-18 9:34:04	Audrey	Coy	Crofton	MD	21114	Yes		Bill No. 2-25 As Amended: AN ORDINANCE concerning: Subdivision and Development – Zoning – Development Requirements for Particular Types of Development – Redevelopment	Oppose	<p>Prioritizing high-density development along the Rt3 corridor is short sighted and irresponsible. Rt3 and ancillary roads through Crofton, Waugh Chapel, and Gambrillis are already strained beyond capacity. Adding additional traffic load from high-density housing along Rt3 will only exacerbate that strain. Also, schools in the area are also well over capacity due to irresponsible residential develop growth over the last 2 decades and the building of a new high school that was overcapacity before it opened. AACPS is currently working on redistricting plans that may ease some of the overcrowding of area schools but leave no room for additional residential development. Any plans for additional development priorities need to be accounted for in the AACPS redistricting plans as well as include additional public transportation initiatives and improved pedestrian access to minimize the impact on Rt3. Many area residents are employed through federal spending (either as federal employees, contractors, or through grants). The current trend for reductions in this spending will significantly strain the area's job market for career professionals. The County should instead be looking at ways to bring jobs into the area to offset these reductions by encouraging business and corporate development in these critical areas. History has shown that by providing loopholes for development, those loopholes are often exploited. Limiting the prioritized development to studio and 1-bedroom apartments will not be strictly adhered to, as we have previously seen with restriction exemptions for 65+ housing development restrictions.</p>	

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	Attachments
2025-02-18 10:03:33	Blaise	Talbott	Davidsonville	Maryland	21035	Yes		Bill No. 2-25 As Amended: AN ORDINANCE concerning: Subdivision and Development – Zoning – Development Requirements for Particular Types of Development – Redevelopment	Oppose	<p>Dear County Council Members,</p> <p>I am writing to express my support for the proposed amendment to Bill 2-25 that would exclude the Rt 2 and Rt 3 corridors from its provisions. While I understand and appreciate the intent of the bill to revitalize underutilized and blighted commercial properties, I believe that these specific corridors should not be included at this time.</p> <p>Rt 2 and Rt 3 are currently thriving commercial corridors that provide vital services and economic opportunities to our community. Many residents, myself included, have concerns about increased residential density in these areas, particularly regarding traffic congestion, public safety, and the loss of commercial spaces that support our local economy. Without clear definitions or safeguards ensuring that only truly underutilized properties are eligible for redevelopment, this bill could lead to unintended consequences that negatively impact our community.</p> <p>The amendment provides a balanced approach, allowing redevelopment to move forward where it is needed while preserving the character and functionality of Rt 2 and Rt 3. Future redevelopment decisions should be made with direct community input when and if conditions warrant such changes.</p> <p>I urge the council to support this amendment and ensure that any redevelopment efforts align with the needs and priorities of the residents most affected.</p> <p>Respectfully,</p> <p>Blaise Talbott Davidsonville, MD</p>	
2025-02-18 10:15:15	Dana	Strotman	Edgewater	Maryland	21037	Yes		Bill No. 2-25 As Amended: AN ORDINANCE concerning: Subdivision and Development – Zoning – Development Requirements for Particular Types of Development – Redevelopment	Oppose	<p>No one in Edgewater wants more development. We are an area surrounded by water, and there is very little open space (green) land left for us to enjoy. The Edgewater area is maxed out with commercial and residential structures--there is no need to build anymore! If anything, please rehome current vacant structures with new businesses or living spaces, but do NOT build anything else in our hometown. Please listen to the residents. Vote "NO" to this proposed legislation.</p>	
2025-02-18 10:35:46	Suzanne	Trainor	Crofton	MD	21114	Yes		Bill No. 2-25 As Amended: AN ORDINANCE concerning: Subdivision and Development – Zoning – Development Requirements for Particular Types of Development – Redevelopment	Support	<p>As a 20 year resident of Jordan Avenue, Crofton, I support the amendment to Bill 2-25 as prepared by County Councilwoman, Shannon Leadbetter. I do not support an increase to residential uses due to the overcrowding of our schools and roadways. I support the removal of the Rt 2 and Rt 3 corridors from the provisions of this bill which would allow other areas of the county to redevelop as they choose. There are so many safety, environmental, and beautification reasons why Rt 2 and Rt 3 need to be paid attention to. Please do not increase the redevelopment here.</p>	
2025-02-18 10:43:10	Scott	Stephens	Davidsonville	MD	21035	Yes		Bill No. 2-25 As Amended: AN ORDINANCE concerning: Subdivision and Development – Zoning – Development Requirements for Particular Types of Development – Redevelopment	Oppose	<p>Highly oppose. The county needs to stop development without properly receiving compensation from developers. Developers build homes, do not have to pay for the water run off issues, the school crowding issues, the additional wearing down of infrastructure, the destruction of our natural areas. We tax payers take the blunt of these issues. We are currently battling a school redistricting issue, tearing communities apart, all due to over building. Anne Arundel County is causing these issues by allowing the overbuilding of the area and not truly looking into how these developments will cause issues in the future. Where are the school studies, where are the traffic studies, where are the studies of the affect on additional buildings on water run off/destruction of nature. STOP over building unless developers are going to build new schools, pay new teacher salaries, deal with water run off, preserve some of nature. This country is turning into an unpleasant place to live. Stop looking at buildings as new tax dollars and start looking to preserve this county.</p>	
2025-02-19 9:59:12	Glenn	James	Edgewater	MD	21037	Yes		Bill No. 2-25: (As Amended) AN ORDINANCE concerning: Subdivision and Development – Zoning – Development Requirements for Particular Types of Development – Redevelopment	Oppose	<p>As a 40 year resident of Mayo, I adamantly oppose this bill. The county has failed to support infrastructure for this area and as such the communities accessed by Rt2 are traffic laden, inadequately covered by police and fire, and the rapid development is eroding the environment and quality of life. You are proposing further destruction of the unique character of our county, by attempting to overdevelop it. I respectfully request that you consider the environment and quality of life over economic impact.</p>	
2025-02-19 12:35:39	Anna	OConnor	Severna Park	MD	21146	Yes		Bill No. 2-25: (As Amended) AN ORDINANCE concerning: Subdivision and Development – Zoning – Development Requirements for Particular Types of Development – Redevelopment	Oppose		
2025-03-03 7:44:05	Linda	Hanifin Bonner	Annapolis	MD	21401	No	Anne Arundel Connecting Together, Inc.	Bill No. 2-25: (As Amended) AN ORDINANCE concerning: Subdivision and Development – Zoning – Development Requirements for Particular Types of Development – Redevelopment	Oppose		https://www.aacounty.org/system/files/webform/cc_legislative_testimony/50282/march-3-act-redevelopment-statement.pdf
Bill No. 3-25											

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	Attachments
2025-02-18 9:20:15	Linda	Bruins	Edgewater	Md	21037	Yes		Bill No. 3-25: AN ORDINANCE concerning: General Development Plan – Region 9 Plan	Oppose	The peninsula can not handle more homes/traffic	
Bill No. 4-25											
2025-02-18 10:24:29	David	Harris	West River	MD	20778	No	Edwin A. and John O. Crandell, Inc.	Bill No. 4-25: AN ORDINANCE concerning: Comprehensive Zoning – Region 9	Support	We support Bill 4-25, which eliminated the split zoning on our parcel at 1014 East Benning Rd. in Galesville, MD. CZ-R9-GSV-0401	https://www.aacounty.org/system/files/webform/cc_legislative_testimony/49319/crandell-support-bill-4_24.pdf
2025-02-18 10:33:23	John	Crandell	West River	MD	20778	Yes		Bill No. 4-25: AN ORDINANCE concerning: Comprehensive Zoning – Region 9	Support	When you look at the zoning map you will see 13+ acres of W2 property. Approximately 23, R2 properties are bordering it or in sight. R2 abutting W2 property is not unusual in Galesville. Please keep CZ-R9-GSV-0401 full W2 as presented in Bill 4-25	https://www.aacounty.org/system/files/webform/cc_legislative_testimony/49321/john-crandell-support-bill-4_24.pdf
2025-02-25 17:08:29	Joshua	Crandell	West River	Maryland	20778	Yes		Bill No. 4-25: (As Amended) AN ORDINANCE concerning: Comprehensive Zoning – Region 9	Support	As is relates to the request under CZ-R9-GSV-0401, I believe the removal of split zoning will simplify land use. In the case of 1014 Benning Road, the usable space will be negligible because of setbacks required by W2 zoning. In addition, removing split zoning will make it easier for compliance to county codes and regulations regarding land use within region 9. The increase of traffic has been a concern for the residents near 1014 Benning Rd. However, the removal of split zoning will not increase the traffic. The reasoning for this is because the area already zoned W2 has been used by the owners for industrial work for many decades. Much of this work has been beneficial for many local communities. The amount of work being performed will not increase because the aforementioned setbacks would not allow any practicable work to be performed in the area currently zoned R2. I believe this zoning change will be beneficial and have low impact for all parties involved.	
2025-02-28 13:03:23	Jill	Williams	Galesville	Md.	20765	Yes		Bill No. 4-25: (As Amended) AN ORDINANCE concerning: Comprehensive Zoning – Region 9	Support	Support of amendment to change zoning R2 to MA3 at 1000 Main Street Own adjacent property, fully supportive and aware. Jill and Warren Williams	
Bill No. 14-25											
2025-03-03 8:39:32	Ethan	Bean	Halethorpe	MD	21227	Yes		Bill No. 14-25: AN ORDINANCE concerning: Subdivision and Development – Archaeological Resources	Oppose	<p>I am a professional archaeologist and frequent volunteer with Anne Arundel County's Lost Towns Project, an organization dedicated to documenting the County's archaeological heritage.</p> <p>Anne Arundel County has had the ability to protect and preserve significant archaeological sites under the local development review process for more than 20 years through the existing Article 17-6-502. Bill 14-25 will prevent the County from protecting and preserving even the most significant archaeological sites in future projects.</p> <p>The bill as written gives developers the sole authority to decide whether a significant archaeological site is protected, or whether it is mitigated through Phase III data recovery and then destroyed (Page 2, Line 6 of the bill). Inclusion of the word "either" undermines the notion of preservation by placing it on equal footing with destructive Phase III mitigation. The bill also deletes the authority of the Office of Planning and Zoning to be a party to the decision-making process, leaving the County unable to speak for or protect significant sites.</p> <p>Additionally, the bill is in opposition to the County's own Land Use Policy, which states that a primary goal is to "protect and preserve the significant historic and archaeological resources and cultural heritage of the County; and promote public awareness of the County's history and the stewardship of historic assets" (Goal BE14).</p> <p>I believe the bill as written should be retracted, and a working group should be established to clearly develop acceptable processes for project review. The working group should include professionals in archaeology and cultural resources.</p> <p>Anne Arundel County has such a rich archaeological and cultural heritage, and it would be disappointing to see that heritage, that story, disappear due to unchecked development.</p>	

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	Attachments
2025-03-03 8:41:01	Ethan	Bean	Halethorpe	MD	21227	Yes		Bill No. 14-25: AN ORDINANCE concerning: Subdivision and Development – Archaeological Resources	Oppose	<p>I am a professional archaeologist and frequent volunteer with Anne Arundel County's Lost Towns Project, an organization dedicated to documenting the County's archaeological heritage.</p> <p>Anne Arundel County has had the ability to protect and preserve significant archaeological sites under the local development review process for more than 20 years through the existing Article 17-6-502. Bill 14-25 will prevent the County from protecting and preserving even the most significant archaeological sites in future projects.</p> <p>The bill as written gives developers the sole authority to decide whether a significant archaeological site is protected, or whether it is mitigated through Phase III data recovery and then destroyed (Page 2, Line 6 of the bill). Inclusion of the word "either" undermines the notion of preservation by placing it on equal footing with destructive Phase III mitigation. The bill also deletes the authority of the Office of Planning and Zoning to be a party to the decision-making process, leaving the County unable to speak for or protect significant sites.</p> <p>Additionally, the bill is in opposition to the County's own Land Use Policy, which states that a primary goal is to "protect and preserve the significant historic and archaeological resources and cultural heritage of the County; and promote public awareness of the County's history and the stewardship of historic assets" (Goal BE14).</p> <p>I believe the bill as written should be retracted, and a working group should be established to clearly develop acceptable processes for project review. The working group should include professionals in archaeology and cultural resources.</p> <p>Anne Arundel County has such a rich archaeological and cultural heritage, and it would be disappointing to see that heritage, that story, disappear due to unchecked development.</p>	
Prior Testimony from February 18, 2025 Council Meeting											



Kaley Schultze <ccschu24@aacounty.org>

Bill 14-25

1 message

Tina Simmons [REDACTED]

Tue, Feb 25, 2025 at 5:04 PM

To: petersmith@aacounty.org, Allison Pickard <allison.pickard@aacounty.org>, nathan.volke@aacounty.org, Jhummer@aacounty.org, amanda.fiedler@aacounty.org, ccschu24@aacounty.org, expitt99@aacounty.org, lisa.rodvien@aacounty.org, SLeadbetter@aacounty.org

Cc: [REDACTED]

I am an Anne Arundel County resident. I have researched cemeteries in Anne Arundel County for 40 years for the Anne Arundel Genealogical Society. I am on their board. the Coalition to Protect Maryland Burial Sites, and an ad hoc group of cemetery preservationists, Maryland Cemetery Legislative Advocates, working to pass more stringent and standardized cemetery laws in Maryland. I am totally against

Bill 14-25 giving more power to developers to develop land with potential burial sites without adequate oversight. There are a number of the sites in the county with no existing tombstones which are still known to be burial grounds. Many are African American or American Indian. A developer should not be the decisionmaker deciding whether or not a site should be considered as needing preservation. This ties the hands of all involved with preservation and removes the County from any oversight. We have one of the oldest counties and have always been known for its strong preservation efforts. This bill will undermine those efforts. It is confusing, lacks criteria, and would be difficult to enforce for anyone who is not familiar with the rigorous archeological processes.

Christine Simmons



Kaley Schultze <ccschu24@aacounty.org>

Bill 14-25 - Proposed Changes to Article 17-6-502 of the County Code

Ethan Bean [REDACTED]
To: petersmith@aacounty.org

Sun, Mar 2, 2025 at 11:25 PM

Good evening,

I am sending this email to express my concern with the proposed changes to Article 17-6-502 of the Anne Arundel County Code, as described in Bill 14-25 to be heard publicly on March 3, 2025. I am a professional archaeologist and frequent volunteer with Anne Arundel County's Lost Towns Project, an organization dedicated to documenting the County's archaeological heritage.

Anne Arundel County has had the ability to protect and preserve significant archaeological sites under the local development review process for more than 20 years through the existing Article 17-6-502. Bill 14-25 will prevent the County from protecting and preserving even the most significant archaeological sites in future projects.

The bill as written gives developers the sole authority to decide whether a significant archaeological site is protected, or whether it is mitigated through Phase III data recovery and then destroyed (Page 2, Line 6 of the bill). Inclusion of the word "either" undermines the notion of preservation by placing it on equal footing with destructive Phase III mitigation. The bill also deletes the authority of the Office of Planning and Zoning to be a party to the decision-making process, leaving the County unable to speak for or protect significant sites.

Additionally, the bill is in opposition to the County's own Land Use Policy, which states that a primary goal is to "protect and preserve the significant historic and archaeological resources and cultural heritage of the County; and promote public awareness of the County's history and the stewardship of historic assets" (Goal BE14).

I believe the bill as written should be retracted, and a working group should be established to clearly develop acceptable processes for project review. The working group should include professionals in archaeology and cultural resources.

Anne Arundel County has such a rich archaeological and cultural heritage, and it would be disappointing to see that heritage, that story, disappear due to unchecked development. Please vote no on Bill 14-25.

Thank you,
Ethan Bean

[REDACTED]



Kaley Schultze <ccschu24@aacounty.org>

Letter of opposition to Planning authority change in Bill 14-24

1 message

Wayne Clark [REDACTED]
To: ccschu24@aacounty.org

Mon, Feb 24, 2025 at 3:42 PM

The following letter was emailed to all Council members in advance of March 3rd meeting, with a cc to the County Executive

Memorandum

February 22, 2025

To: Honorable (Name of Council Member)

From: Wayne E. Clark, Email: [REDACTED]

Re: Oppose adopting Page 2, Line 6 of Bill 14-25 on March 3rd, ceding County Review authority.

The late Maryland Senator John Cade from Anne Arundel County often stated that, "If it is not broken, don't fix it." He was a fiscal conservative who supported the importance of historic and archaeological preservation. We shared great pride at the success of the Office of Planning and Zoning archaeology review program in working with the development community throughout the three-phase process of survey, testing and mitigation or preservation of archaeological high potential areas of proposed construction. I have applauded the business owners' cooperative support of working with the planning staff to determine if setting aside lot(s) to preserve a fantastic site vs. paying the cost for an expensive Phase III mitigation is in the best interest of all. The current process is not broken, has worked great for twenty years, and does not have to be fixed by the above reference change.

I have 50 years of professional experience in historic and archaeological preservation, museum services and regional planning, in Anne Arundel County and statewide at the Maryland Historical Trust. Born in the County 74 years ago, my first 25 years witnessed the rapid pace of post-WWII development that was built with no consideration of the thousands of archaeological sites (2,600 recorded sites in 2025). The next 25 years saw improvements of review of projects involving state and federal funding or permitting. But these represented only 10 percent of the construction in the County. The model program in Planning and Zoning of Archaeological Review at the county level during the past 20 years has been highly successful.

County citizens, staff and elected leaders are commended for your support. I reflect with great pride my role in the County's purchase of the Beck Northeast site in Davidsonville (occupied 3,000 B.C. to A.D. 1000) and the historic easement on the Magothy Quartzite Quarry site in Glen Burnie (occupied 11,000-3,000 B.C.). These are just two Nationally significant sites now available to future generations.

Thank you for your kind consideration of this recommendation.



Kaley Schultze <ccschu24@aacounty.org>

Opposing Bill 14-25 on management of archaeological resources

1 message

Jay Thomas

[REDACTED]@aacounty.org, nathan.volke@aacounty.org, Jhummer@aacounty.org, amanda.fiedler@aacounty.org, lisa.rodvien@aacounty.org, SLeadbetter@aacounty.org
Cc: spittman@aacounty.org, ccschu24@aacounty.org

Council members:

I am writing in opposition to Bill 14-25, which would amend § 17-6-502 to remove the Office of Planning and Zoning (OPZ) from the final decision to preserve, perform data recovery or destroy archaeological resources on land under development.

I have lived in Edgewater since 1999, and have long experience in historic preservation and cultural resources management. After earning a PhD in historical geography and a certificate in historic preservation from the University of Maryland, I worked for a short time for the county's award-winning Lost Towns Project. From 2000 to 2008 I served as head of the Navy's Cultural Resources Office, where my responsibilities included the Navy's terrestrial archaeology programs. From 2008 until my retirement in 2023, I was the Assistant Director for Collection Management at the Naval History and Heritage Command, where my responsibilities included the Navy's underwater archaeology program.

Although I am not an archaeologist, years of working with them have taught me the power of these irreplaceable resources to illuminate the past, especially for people in our past who don't often appear in other records. Anne Arundel County has many such stories to tell, and the County, working together with developers, has had an extraordinary level of success in sharing the stories from those resources with our citizens using the process outlined in § 17-6-502.

It is always possible that there will be disagreement between developers and the County on standards of historical significance, or on the most appropriate treatment for an archaeological resource. But I don't think the answer is to remove OPZ from the final decision concerning a resource. Nor is the county code necessarily the place to lay out detailed instructions on reviews and appeals.

A County Historic Preservation Master Plan, for example, could provide a high level of transparency and adaptability for the entire review process, while providing an invaluable overall framework for historic preservation in this historic place. In addition, a public advisory board of interested citizens, including those with historic preservation or archaeological expertise, could increase transparency and public confidence in the process as well.

It seems to me that this is a good opportunity for the Council to review § 17-6-502 systematically, build on its successes and adjust what needs adjusting, with input from preservation professionals and other interested citizens, to manage historic resources in this historic county.

I don't think that removing OPZ from the final decision on treatment of archaeological resources helps us reach that management balance, and I encourage you to vote "no" on Bill 14-25.

Thank you very much for considering my comments!

Jay Thomas, PhD
Edgewater, MD



Kaley Schultze <ccschu24@aacounty.org>

Opposition to Bill 14-25 – Protection of Archaeological Sites

1 message

stephanie.sperling@yahoo.com [REDACTED] Wed, Feb 26, 2025 at 3:49 PM
To: "petersmith@aacounty.org" <petersmith@aacounty.org>, "allison.pickard@aacounty.org" <allison.pickard@aacounty.org>, "nathan.volke@aacounty.org" <nathan.volke@aacounty.org>, "Jhummer@aacounty.org" <jhummer@aacounty.org>, "amanda.fiedler@aacounty.org" <amanda.fiedler@aacounty.org>, "SLeadbetter@aacounty.org" <sleadbetter@aacounty.org>, "lisa.rodvien@aacounty.org" <lisa.rodvien@aacounty.org>
Cc: "ccschu24@aacounty.org" <ccschu24@aacounty.org>

Dear County Council Members,

As a professional archaeologist who previously worked in Anne Arundel County, I strongly oppose Bill 14-25, which will undermine your archaeological preservation program by removing the Office of Planning and Zoning's (OPZ) authority to require site preservation. This bill gives developers unilateral control over decisions affecting irreplaceable cultural resources, with no criteria or oversight to ensure preservation is considered.

Standing in line with professional archaeological ethics, Anne Arundel County regulations currently prioritize preservation with mitigation as a last resort. Bill 14-25 reverses this approach, presuming destruction through mitigation rather than exploring alternatives. The existing framework has successfully balanced development and preservation since 2005. Instead of weakening protections, the County could consider alternatives such as developing an independent review panel, including an alternative for transparency and oversight, or postponing the bill until a Historic Preservation Master Plan is developed.

I urge the Council to reject Bill 14-25 and uphold the County's commitment to archaeological preservation.

Thank you for your consideration,
Stephanie Sperling



Kaley Schultze <ccschu24@aacounty.org>

Opposition to Bill 14-25

Nancy Carter [REDACTED]

Mon, Mar 3, 2025 at 1:11 PM

To: expitt99@aacounty.org, nathan.volke@aacounty.org, ccschu24@aacounty.org

Dear Members of the Anne Arundel County Council,

I am writing to share my concerns about Bil 14-25, which makes a substantive change in how (or if) Anne Arundel County protects its archaeological resources during the development process. This bill places a great deal of discretion in the hands of the developer to decide if they want to protect and preserve as important archaeology site, or if they would prefer to destroy it through the Phase III data recovery process. It is also most concerning that the bill removes the ability of the Office of Planning & Zoning to approve or deny the Developer's decision, which is their role as a development review agency under the current code. Though the bill cuts out the professional staff's evaluation process and assessment, it does not offer any additional guidance or criteria for when or how that decision is made by the developer.

I am concerned as the County claims in its General Development Plan that they aspire to "Protect and preserve the significant historic and archaeological resources and cultural heritage of the County; and promote public awareness of the County's history and the stewardship of historic assets" (*Goal BE14:*) It appears that this bill will do the opposite, and if adopted, would actually prevent the County from protecting significant archaeological sites, leaving that call to the developers.

As a former board member of the Londontown Foundation, I am familiar with the value and importance of archaeological resources, and understand that they are non-renewable resources. Once they are destroyed, even with data mitigation, that loss is permanent. And given the rapid changes in scientific methods, it is preferable whenever possible to leave them protected in place as time capsules for the future.

I am writing to ask that the Council consider these consequences, and vote NO on Bill 14-25. If the Council feels there are clarifications that need to be made about the current archaeology review process, I urge you to study the issue with the input of professional archaeologists and with transparency and involvement of concerned citizens, rather than passing a bill that reverses the County's 20-plus year track record of protecting and preserving important archaeological resources.

Sincerely,

Nancy Trimble
Edgewater, MD



Kaley Schultze <ccschu24@aacounty.org>

Please vote NO on Bill 14-25

Christine West [REDACTED]
To: ccschu24@aacounty.org

Mon, Feb 24, 2025 at 7:16 PM

Dear Officer Schultze -
Please vote NO on Bill 14-25 because this bill would prevent the County from protecting and preserving even the most significant of archaeological sites in the future. AA county has very rich archaeological and historical significance and the County Office of Planning and Zoning, as well as the county" Lost Towns Program have done a wonderful job trying to study, retrieve, interpret, publicize and honor these sites.

PLEASE VOTE NO on Bill 14-25.

Warm regards,

Christine West
[REDACTED]
Annapolis



Kaley Schultze <ccschu24@aacounty.org>

Tonights Council Meeting re: Proposed Bill 14-25

Kate Mahood [REDACTED]
To: ccschu24@aacounty.org

Mon, Mar 3, 2025 at 12:25 PM

KATHERINE K MAHOOD
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Date: March 3, 2025
Name: Dr. Katherine K. Mahood

Address: [REDACTED]
Region Number: Region Seven (7)
Representing Tax Account Numbers for properties at [510 Pafel Road](#) and [510A Pafel Road](#)

Dear Honorable Council Members for Anne Arundel County :

I am writing as a long-time resident of the County, and as a professional architectural historian and preservationist who has dedicated a career of over two decades to preserving and protecting cultural landscape, historic structures and archeological sites through the Mid-Atlantic, in both public and private service. With this background, and as someone who in the past consulted with the Office of Planning & Zoning on historic preservation issues, I am reaching out to express my grave concern with Bill 14-25.

As I understand it, this proposed Bill will remove the role that the Office of Planning and Zoning currently has to approve or deny the destruction of an archaeological site through a Data Mitigation plan. The bill language places that determination into the hands of a developer to decide whether to preserve a site – or whether they want to perform data recovery so they can destroy archaeological resources on land under development.

This is a ‘determination’ that the language seems to cede to the Developer, which frankly just does not make sense to me. It strikes me as allowing the proverbial ‘fox to guard the hen house.’

Even if we are to consider such a strange idea, the bill language offers no criteria or standards for how the developer makes such a decision. Without the County’s input or ability to intervene, the potential threat to significant archaeological resources is very real.

I have questions. I ask you:

How do you think a determination will be made by the developer, absent a professional County representative to even hold the public interest?

Is the developer to consider solely if destroying the site might help them achieve a higher and better use for a property or to maximize profit? Are there other considerations?

Does the rarity, research potential of a site, or importance to local history, or the connections to a descendant community for whom the site holds special meaning, come into consideration as a developer makes their call?

Has the developer done any ‘due diligence’ and considered alternatives? Have they explored compromises to allow for both site preservation, and the reasonable use of the land?

Is there a way to appeal a developer’s decision? And how would I or anyone else have the standing to do so?

Much is left to question and debate. It is clear, this Bill should NOT become law. If it does, the County staff certainly will be unable to do their jobs, and when a significant site is threatened, it would likely end up in appeals or worse, based on its lack of detail and clarity, to say the least. I strongly encourage the Council to vote ‘No’ on this poorly written document and let this idea go.

I also hope that this can be seen as a call to empower the Office of Planning and Zoning to work and with the Council to address whatever concerns may have brought this bill to this draft form. Please support the Office of Planning and Zoning, and engage with all stakeholders as they review 17-6-502 systematically or consider what changes may be needed.

Please do what you can to enable the County to protect existing historic resources, rural and semi-rural landscapes, and archaeological sites. (Do not put the proverbial foxes in charge of hen houses!) In fact, we need stronger protections from my professional perspective.

Please find ways to strengthen and protect our environmental, cultural, and historic resources overall. And please do not enable or allow efforts to undermine the County’s existing ability to protect important archaeological sites.

Sincerely,
Dr. Kate Mahood

February 24, 2025



Members of the Anne Arundel County Council
Annapolis, MD 21401
By Email

Dear Councilmembers:

I am writing in opposition to Bill Number 14-25.

This bad piece of legislation is an anti-preservation bill that would reduce the land-use regulatory powers of the county government and give developers more freedom than they already have to damage or destroy historic resources whenever it pleases them to do so.

I have heard that this bill was introduced at the request of a developer. If so, that seems to be typical of the way things have worked in this county for far too long.

It is time for that situation to change.

This bill should be either defeated outright or else amended to reverse its legal thrust: i.e., strengthen the historic preservation program of Anne Arundel County instead of weakening it.

My name is Richard Striner.

I am a retired history professor, the author of fifteen books, and a career preservationist. In 1993, I was awarded the Renchard Prize for Historic Preservation by the Historical Society of Washington, D.C., and I led the campaign that made the 1938 Silver Theater in Silver Spring the East Coast home of the American Film Institute.

My wife and I have lived in Anne Arundel County since 1989.

Bill 14-25 would jeopardize archaeological resources by giving developers more freedom than they already have to determine how these resources are treated in development projects. Under the current system, the county's preservation staff have some authority in these matters, but Bill Number 14-25 would reduce that authority and give the final say to developers regarding the treatment of archaeological resources.

That's outrageous.

Even under the current system, developers call most of shots because the law allows them to control the way in which archaeological studies pertaining to their own projects are conducted.

In fact, they are given the power to conduct these archaeological studies themselves.

That's a blatant conflict of interest: this procedure violates every basic tenet of protecting the public interest. This is not rocket science: it is Government 101, a hypothetical course that the people who designed our current system would surely have flunked if schools were teaching such courses anymore.

At the present time the law requires developers to conduct and pay for archaeological studies pursuant to development applications. That might sound like a financial burden on developers, but it is no such thing: it is a case of the fox guarding the hen house, pure and simple, the cost of doing business if historic preservation is an obstacle to developers.

He who pays the piper calls the tune. Allowing developers to determine who conducts these archaeological studies, and to pay these people out of their own pockets, is corrupt.

I repeat: corrupt.

Case in point: the Mount Misery case in which the developer's bought-and-paid-for archaeologist found no evidence to confirm the existence of buried remains of a Civil War fort on the site in question when research by volunteers of the Magothy River Association found indisputable archival evidence proving that a fort was built there.

The bought-and-paid-for developer-paid archaeologist found no such evidence.

How hard did he look? What methods did he use? Would an archaeologist who was unentangled with developers have worked harder, probed deeper, and come to different conclusions?

The county's own staff in the Office of Planning and Zoning co-sponsored a documentary film about the Civil War fort at Mount Misery — Fort Grey — a fort that was built by the New York Eighth Regiment in 1861 to guard the approaches to Washington a few weeks after the Fort Sumter battle when Maryland secession was a real possibility.

This documentary film was funded by the Anne Arundel County Arts Council. The filmmaker Charles Germain was given an award for this film by County Executive Pittman, and the award was presented by Councilmember Amanda Fiedler at a public screening of the film that was hosted in Severna Park by the Magothy River Association.

And yet the developer's bought-and-paid-for archaeological consultant says that he could find no evidence about Fort Grey. His language was flippant and evasive. "Details are wanting" were the words that he used.

A one-day research trip to the National Archives by a staff member of the county government could have settled this matter conclusively. But that is not the way we are used to doing things in Anne Arundel County. Not when it comes to land-use regulation.

No, we do these things the slipshod way when it comes to protecting our heritage. The Mount Misery case was resolved behind closed doors. There was no public hearing. No opportunity for public-interest advocates to cross-examine witnesses. No transparency. No accountability. No public participation at all.

And it is time for this situation to change. NOW.

February 24, 2025
Members of the Anne Arundel County Council
Page Three

This county, which contains one of the crown jewels of East Coast historic preservation — historic Annapolis — is the one and only jurisdiction in this part of the state without a county historic preservation ordinance. This county has no historic preservation commission and almost no legal power to prevent or to punish the illegal demolition of historic resources.

The situation is scandalous.

We are the laughingstock of the preservation movement in Maryland.

And bill number 14-25 would make the situation even worse.

I call upon you to kill this bill and then start working on new legislation that will make our county respectable again in preservation circles.

Sincerely,
Richard Striner

FRANKLIN A. ROBINSON, JR.



February 27, 2025
Ms. Julie Hummer
Chair, Anne Arundel County Council

RE: Bill 14-25 repealing and reenacting, with amendments: § 17-6-5026 Anne Arundel County Code

Dear Ms. Hummer,

As a preservation, archivist, and history advocate, I am writing to you to express my concerns about the proposed Bill 14-25, which would repeal and reenact with amendments § 17-6-5026 Anne Arundel County Code (2005, as amended). Bill 14-25 will prevent Anne Arundel County from protecting and preserving even the most significant archaeological sites in the future. Anne Arundel County has had the ability to protect and preserve significant archaeology sites under the local development review process for more than 20 years. The County serves as a model for other counties in Maryland which have their own historic preservation ordinances and those that wish to develop them. This bill, as proposed, would greatly weaken a long-standing ability to protect archaeological sites, and stands in direct opposition to the adopted land use goals that state that the County should “protect and preserve significant archaeological resources.” When such an action is taken by one Maryland county, it places the preservation goals of all Maryland counties at risk.


The bill, as written, provides the developer with the sole authority to decide whether a significant archaeological site is protected, or whether it is mitigated through Phase III excavation and then destroyed. In the current code, there is a presumption that archaeological sites shall be preserved, which is in alignment with the federal Secretary of Interior Standards. By adding the word “either” (Page 2 Line 6), the Bill 14-25 places preservation and destruction through a Phase III mitigation on equal footing. This undermines the basic tenets of preservation and could lead to needless destruction of irreplaceable history.

Dozens of important sites in Anne Arundel County have been protected and are under protective easement— all while allowing development to proceed through negotiations which require all parties to consider alternatives to destruction. Bill 14-25 removes the authority of the Office of Planning and Zoning to be a party to that decision-making process (Page 2 Line 12), leaving the County unable to speak for or protect important sites, or to even engage in negotiations that could perhaps result in a revised plan that would avoid or reduce impacts to such resources.

In the past, there have been cases where avoidance has not been feasible or possible, and in those cases, the County has authorized a Phase III data recovery or mitigation to occur, but only after thoughtful and extensive considerations of alternatives to minimize damage and impacts as far as possible. Notably, this process has never prevented development from being able to proceed. Archaeology preservation, development, and fair and reasonable use of the land

can and do coexist. Therefore, I respectfully request that the bill, as constructed, is not passed, and instead, request that Anne Arundel County establish a working group that includes professional archaeologists, developers, property owners, and the interested public, to clearly identify the concern this legislation is attempting to address, and work to develop new legislation which achieves that goal. Thank you for your time and consideration. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at the address or phone number given.

Sincerely,



Franklin A. Robinson, Jr.
[Redacted]