

## Williams, Jeffrey

---

**From:** Williams, Jeffrey  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 18, 2017 8:00 AM  
**To:** 'Andrew Atwell'  
**Subject:** RE: 11859 Lime Kiln Actual distances

Your refusal eliminated the available use of a portion of the originally approved area on 11859. A revised perc cert was approved showing sewage disposal in the portion that was not upgrade of your existing well. The BAT requirement remained because that portion was still upgrade of the new well at 11865 and BAT was a condition of that variance approval.

---

**From:** Andrew Atwell [mailto:[alt3014906579@gmail.com](mailto:alt3014906579@gmail.com)]  
**Sent:** Monday, July 17, 2017 3:42 PM  
**To:** Williams, Jeffrey  
**Subject:** Re: 11859 Lime Kiln Actual distances

What were there revisions based on my refusal to have a well drilled? Why were they not originally put forth without involving me?

On 7/17/2017 3:22 PM, Williams, Jeffrey wrote:

A BAT system has been a requirement at 11859 from the first perc certification plan signed by the Health Department in 2016. That requirement stems from a variance condition by MDE to allow the system to be upgrade of the well at 11865. I'm not sure what you mean by the BAT not being the original proposal. It was certainly there from the original approval.

---

**From:** Andrew Atwell [mailto:[alt3014906579@gmail.com](mailto:alt3014906579@gmail.com)]  
**Sent:** Friday, July 14, 2017 9:53 AM  
**To:** Williams, Jeffrey  
**Subject:** Re: 11859 Lime Kiln Actual distances

Just an update: I've tried to contact the surveyor I hired to see if well distances were included in his original work.

Can you go into further detail as to why the BAT wasn't the original proposal for the septic system at 11859?

On 6/27/2017 8:36 AM, Williams, Jeffrey wrote:

Our measurements put the well approximately 10 feet to the NE from the location shown on the plan. This would cut into the sewage disposal area on 11859 by about 5 feet or so. That would slightly affect the location of the 2<sup>nd</sup> future replacement system. The location difference does not affect the initial system and is not something that would hold up the building permit. We would still like the surveyor to field locate it to correct the record. Let me know if you want to grant access or we will make adjustments to the plans based on Robert's measurements. Thanks

## Williams, Jeffrey

---

**From:** Williams, Jeffrey  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 20, 2017 1:30 PM  
**To:** 'Andrew Atwell'  
**Subject:** RE: 11859 Lime Kiln Actual distances

I have been in discussion with the surveyor who prepared the perc certification plan and we will be conducting a site visit to assess the conditions. I'll let you know our findings after we finalize our review.

Regarding your concerns about the neighboring system on the Reed property, they installed a repair system several decades ago. The notes did not indicate any discharge across the street. There is also quite a big difference in landscape position between that property and 11859, specifically proximity to a large drainage swale and stream. The disposal area for 11859 is bound by test holes in which the soil passed our regulatory requirements for sewage disposal.

Regarding the property at 11855, our approved certification plan includes notes stating that we will not approve any increase in wastewater flow with the existing downgrade well less than 200' away. We would allow them to make a repair if needed and we would allow them to use the existing system to make modifications to the house as long as the number of bedrooms and living space remained the same.

Jeff

**From:** Andrew Atwell [mailto:[alt3014906579@gmail.com](mailto:alt3014906579@gmail.com)]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, June 14, 2017 9:52 PM  
**To:** Williams, Jeffrey  
**Subject:** Re: 11859 Lime Kiln Actual distances

There is also a drainage pond for the gas station/shopping center directly across the street which leads directly through a culvert to the Howard T. Duckett Reservoir. Being that so much of Mr. Dustin's property was preserved for environmental it seems pointless if there was a rupture, taking into account there may have been one already with a single septic field, but two just seems like asking for it. It doesn't even need to pop up across the street, The reeds front yard is an even shorter path to the stream. Begs the question: why was his allowed there? Is the whole new construction going to be a effectively a drainage pond? A berm to the west as well?

If you can do it there in software, does moving my well 16 feet north to possible actual, render p-183 lot not able to be built on? My well is at least 10 feet further up that radius pointing toward the northeast, if that drawing is to scale. And that property line has a break in it cause there is a marker halfway down it for the break. It might be subtle, but it does determine who's tree is who's. There is a large walnut further east that is well within my side, but puts the next tree to the west ( one on the plan ) entirely on his. We are talking about a 4 foot deflection or so in that line, does that squeeze his square footage north more, to take more field away?

Also the variance to the setback was granted for BOTH parcels, and if the Hearing examiner laughed and said "2 bedrooms and a parlor? That means 3 bedrooms". And that a smallest possible building plan was used...to match the existing house....yet is 3 times bigger in area, with a basement and a second story.....so what could they possibly build on P-182 after all the stuff crammed into P-183? A new one bedroom that is also slanted in people stuffer special? I mean, how much sewage am I meant to be drinking?

On Wed, Jun 14, 2017 at 6:00 PM, Andrew Atwell <[alt3014906579@gmail.com](mailto:alt3014906579@gmail.com)> wrote:

Also, Mr. Reed said his septic had to be redone cause his old one was "bubbling up across the street", I imagine someone had to verify that, and he only redid it cause he had to. Was that taken into consideration about where to place the new septic field at Parcel-183? Cause they will be right up against each other.

On Wed, Jun 14, 2017 at 5:56 PM, Andrew Atwell <[alt3014906579@gmail.com](mailto:alt3014906579@gmail.com)> wrote:  
The distance of the new well form the house is 16 feet to the porch (if that counts) and 21 feet to the house itself. It has to be 30'?

On Wed, Jun 14, 2017 at 4:23 PM, Andrew Atwell <[alt3014906579@gmail.com](mailto:alt3014906579@gmail.com)> wrote:  
You have a hard out there 5pm? Or you leave at your discretion?

On Wed, Jun 14, 2017 at 3:29 PM, Andrew Atwell <[alt3014906579@gmail.com](mailto:alt3014906579@gmail.com)> wrote:  
Roger.

On Wed, Jun 14, 2017 at 3:28 PM, Williams, Jeffrey <[jewilliams@howardcountymd.gov](mailto:jewilliams@howardcountymd.gov)> wrote:

I'm reviewing the file now. My direct number is 410-313-4261. Thanks

Jeff

**From:** Andrew Atwell [mailto:[alt3014906579@gmail.com](mailto:alt3014906579@gmail.com)]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, June 14, 2017 3:15 PM  
**To:** Williams, Jeffrey  
**Subject:** Re: 11859 Lime Kiln Actual distances

Also, do you have a direct number there? I don't like bothering receptionist.

On Wed, Jun 14, 2017 at 3:06 PM, Andrew Atwell <[alt3014906579@gmail.com](mailto:alt3014906579@gmail.com)> wrote:

I left a redundant voicemail apologizing for for so much as hanging up there. I think my phone overheated. My phone number is 301-741-7769 please don't hesitate to bring my up to date on this case at anytime, as it would be a relief.

On Wed, Jun 14, 2017 at 2:19 PM, Andrew Atwell <[alt3014906579@gmail.com](mailto:alt3014906579@gmail.com)> wrote:

Can we get an appointment for a county employee to measure these things with I as a witness? I really don't want someone on my property without my supervision. Not that you need only my actual well location. Both the new wells are too close to anything, those can be verified any time.

On Tue, Jun 13, 2017 at 5:28 PM, Andrew Atwell <[alt3014906579@gmail.com](mailto:alt3014906579@gmail.com)> wrote:

Hello Mr. Williams,

You might remember me. I was there with Mr. Nathan Reed late winter 2016, asking questions about a new construction of a building at 11859 Lime Kiln Road.

As there are no public hearings about septic review, or deadlines on signs posted on public roads, or certified letters sent to surrounding properties about this kind of planning next door....I had to wait for an hearing before the Board of Appeals that took place yesterday evening, as the only avenue open to me outside of legal action.

As expected, they entirely passed the buck back to your department, despite an interdependence of permissions between your departments. A idea confirmed to me by one Mr. John Alcorn, who came to check up on the grading being done here some months ago. I asked him directly if the departments were tiered, and he said no, all the departments so much run as committee in these situations.

Hiding behind the classic "this is not the right department" was even more than expected last night. Even when quoting myself to the board, as when I asked you last year how I could appeal the Bureau of Environmental Health's work, their stony silence only implied I should have pursued the matter privately, meaning sue your department.

Precisely the thing I was trying to avoid, as it only costs everyone a lot of money, for no reason if it can be resolved by a simple measuring tape. All the walling off of evidence aside, The Board of Appeals was keen on was my colored in building plan however, which I will attach to this email. One board member asked if I had pictures of my measurements, I shocked, wondered how you can see the notch marks on a 82' measuring tape, said no....in addition to wondering how such a thing could possibly be my burden. All the Public Information Act attachments you sent me last year, have my well listed as "approx". Even 11859 well, is not but some 80' from the tank clean out at 11855 grandfathered in system. On both ends, in a few places, it seems as there is some 40 or more feet missing from what is required by code. Only lots that are only some 100' deep, that is a huge problem.

On the graphic: the 84' is to the silt fence, which I know is not a hard-line for the septic field, but either way I need that marked plain to the maximum radius so that this massively incompetent contractor knows where it is, so there is every last inch so that I don't end up drinking sewage. What is not on that graphic however is 82' to the test well hole (still ungraded almost 2 years later) at the southeast corner of 11855. Maybe 87' to where I saw the end of the "french drain" of the spetic field, when the soil tests were done. Combined with even the drain field being out of the septic tank being farther south than the clean out on the north side, means nearly that whole field is overrun what should be 100' for each well each. The one at 11859, and mine, PLUS the new well at 11855 at a glance not looking like a 100', as the tap would drape over the existing house, I didn't measure it....not really my job anyhow...

My direct question to you at this point: is there anything your department can do in the immediate to halt construction at 11859 Like Kiln Road, so the owner doesn't keep spending money, developing illegally?

Also in messaging you, am I messaging the highest authority there regarding this matter? If not could you please direct me to this person.