
A G E N D A I T E M S U M M A R Y

Reference No: CR-72-1992

Draft No: 3

P r i n c e G e o r g e ' s

Meeting Date: 7/28/92

C o u n t y C o u n c i l

Requester: CO. EXEC.

Item Title: To amend the 1988 Comprehensive Ten
Year Water & Sewerage Plan - April 1992
Amendment Cycle

Sponsors MC F

Date Presented	___/___/___	Executive Action	___/___/___	___
Committee Referral	(1) 6/16/92	H&ED	Effective Date	8/18/92
Committee Action	(1) 7/22/92	FAV(A)		
Date Introduced	6/16/92			
Pub. Hearing Date	(1) 7/14/92	1:30	PM	
Council Action	(1) 7/28/92	Adopted		
Council Votes	CA: __, B_: A_, C_: A_, D_: A_, F_: A_, MC: A_, M_: A_, P_: A_, WI: A_, __: __, __: __, __: __			
Pass/Fail	P			

Remarks _____

Drafter: Jeffrey A. Nixon DER	Resource John Porcari, Office of Personnel: the County Executive
---	---

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

HOUSING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

DATE: 7/22/92

Committee Vote: Favorable as amended, 3-0 (In favor: Fletcher, Bell and MacKinnon).

The Committee accepted the County Executive's recommendations on all the applications except the following:

92/W-004 Belt Property (request 5 to 4)

The Executive recommended denial of the request based on substantial WSSC estimated CIP cost of \$1.3 million and potential wetland disturbance. John McDonough, attorney for the applicant, submitted a written statement indicating that an alternative alignment of the water mains required for this development will not affect the the Belt Woods State Park as earlier assumed by WSSC. Mr. McDonough's statement also indicated that the applicant has been working closely with the Maryland Department of Natural Resources, the City of Bowie,

and the Belt Property Task Force to address the wetland issue.

Correspondence was received from the above parties verifying these efforts. As a result the Committee recommended category four.

92/W-009 Prospect Hills West (request S4 to S3)

92/W-010 Prospect Hills East (request 4 to 3)

The Executive recommended denial of both of these requests based on the absence of an approved preliminary plan of subdivision. Subsequent to the transmittal of the Executive's recommendations preliminary plan numbers 4-92078 and 4-92079 were filed for these developments, meeting the criteria for category 4C, which was recommended by the Committee.

92/P-013 National Church of God (request 4 to 3)

The Executive recommended denial of this request since preliminary plan #4-92042 submitted for this property only included the residential portion of the development and will not come before the Planning Board until 9/24/92. However, a minor subdivision plan for the Church portion of the property (#4- 92041) was approved on 5/29/92. The Committee recommended category 3 for the Church portion and category 4 for the residential portion.

Attachment A to the resolution was also amended to include the County Executive's recommendation for 4C on application #92/W-011 Presidential Corporate Center, which was not included in the original transmittal. This recommendation was also accepted by the Committee.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION/FISCAL IMPACT

(Includes reason for proposal, as well as any unique statutory requirements)

The County's Comprehensive Ten Year Water and Sewerage Plan provides for three cycles to amend the Plan. This resolution represents the April Cycle of Amendments.

The 1988 Ten Year Water and Sewerage Plan was adopted by CR-17-1988, and amended by CR-12-1988, CR-67-1988, CR-103-1988, CR-27-1989, CR-60- 1989, CR-84-1989, CR-102-1989, CR-14-1990, CR-45-1990, CR-53-1990, CR- 61-1990, CR-67-1990, CR-84-1990, CR-11-1990, CR-44-1991, CR-53-1992, CR-86-1991, CR-90-1991 and CR-14-1992. The April Cycle of Amendments contains twenty-one requests for a category change, one request for a point of discharge, and one request for a water withdrawal. Ten of the category change requests are in the Western Branch WWTP basin, eight in the Piscataway basin, and two in the Mattawoman basin.

Environmental Article, Title 9, Subtitle 5 sets procedures for amendments and revisions to the Plan. At least 30 days prior to the public hearing on the amendments, the County Council must submit to the WSSC and M-NCPPC a copy of the proposed resolution for their recommendations.