

From: [Greg Smith](#)
To: [Brown, Donna J.](#); [Walker-Bey, James T.](#); [Kumar, Rajesh A.](#); [Stan Brown](#)
Cc: [Norman Rivera](#); sustainhyattsville@gmail.com
Subject: Resending - Suffrage Point DSP 21001 - Response to March 4 Letter from Suffrage Point and Timothy Maloney
Date: Thursday, March 7, 2024 12:09:57 PM
Attachments: [Suffrage Point DSP 21001 - Response to Maloney Letter - G Smith - 20240307.pdf](#)

CAUTION: This email originated from an external email domain which carries the additional risk that it may be a phishing email and/or contain malware.

My apologies. This time with the attachment attached.

March 7, 2024

Donna J. Brown
Clerk of the County Council
Wayne K. Curry Administration Building
1301 McCormick Drive
Largo, MD 20774

Item: Suffrage Point Detailed Site Plan 21001

Response to Suffrage Point's March 4 Letter
Regarding the Planning Board's Failure to Act
within 60 Days of the Council's Reman

Dear Ms. Brown,

I respectfully submit this response to the letter that Timothy Maloney filed on behalf of Suffrage Point (or Suffrage) on the evening March 4, 2023. Please ensure that this letter is made part of the public record regarding DSP 21001. While I had hoped to submit this response sooner, I do this work entirely as an unpaid volunteer, and I needed time to research Mr. Maloney's assertions so I could provide the District Council with an informed and informative response.

Sustainable Hyattsville is prepared to argue the merits regarding DSP 21001 on March 11.

With thanks and best regards,

Greg Smith
4204 Farragut Street
Hyattsville, Maryland
gpsmith@igc.org

March 7, 2024

Donna J. Brown
Clerk of the County Council
Wayne K. Curry Administration Building
1301 McCormick Drive
Largo, MD 20774

Via electronic delivery

Item: Suffrage Point – Detailed Site Plan 21001

Response to Suffrage Point's March 4 Letter Regarding the Planning Board's Failure to Act within 60 Days of the Council's Remand

Dear Ms. Brown,

I respectfully submit this response to the letter that Timothy Maloney filed on behalf of Suffrage Point (or Suffrage) on the evening March 4, 2023. Please ensure that this letter is made part of the public record regarding DSP 21001. While I had hoped to submit this response sooner, I do this work entirely as an unpaid volunteer, and I needed time to research Mr. Maloney's assertions so I could provide the District Council with an informed and informative response.

Mr. Maloney's letter and Mr. Maloney's email transmitting it to you are attached. Mr. Maloney apparently filed his letter at about 8:00pm on March 4. Your office apparently posted Mr. Maloney's letter on the afternoon of March 5. Norman Rivera emailed to me a partial copy of Mr. Maloney's submission shortly before 10:00am on March 5. He emailed Mr. Maloney's letter but not the two exhibits that should have been attached to it. I downloaded Mr. Maloney's letter and exhibits from the District Council's web site on Tuesday afternoon.

The main issue here is that the Planning Board failed to comply with Zoning Ordinance Section 27-285(c)(5), which requires the Planning Board to act on a remanded Detailed Site Plan within 60 days after the date that the District Council's Order of Remand is transmitted to Planning Board. The Board shall (must) either approve, approve with modification, or disapprove the remanded DSP. Alternatively, under 27-290(f), where the Board determines that it cannot comply with the prescriptions of a District Council Order of Remand of a DSP, the Board shall (must) adopt a resolution that embodies its decision and states the reasons that it cannot comply.

In this case, the Council's Order of Remand was transmitted by the Clerk of the Council's office on May 16, 2023. Therefore, the Planning Board had until July 15, 2023, to approve, approve with modifications, or disapprove DSP 18005, or to adopt a resolution stating that the Board could not comply with the prescriptions of the Order of Remand. The Board, however, did not vote to approve with conditions until November 2, 2023, and it did not adopt a resolution reflecting that decision until November 30. Excluding the month of August as the Zoning Ordinance allows, the Board took 139 days to approve with conditions, and 167 days to adopt its resolution, PGCPB No. 2023-15(A).

At the District Council's February 26, 2024, Oral Arguments hearing, People's Zoning Counsel Stan Brown noted that a project opponent had raised this issue during one of the Planning Board's remand hearings of DSP 21001. I am that project opponent, and I raised that issue at the Board's October 5, 2023, hearing when the Board was discussing whether to continue that hearing to October 12 as Werrlein had requested, or to November 2, 2023 as Sustainable Hyattsville and the City of Hyattsville had requested.

Mr. Maloney and his client apparently would like the District Council to ignore the fact that the Planning Board adopted its resolution approving DSP 21001 with conditions *more than four months* after the 60-day action deadline imposed on the Board under Zoning Ordinance Section 27-285(c)(5). They would also like the Council to believe that reasonable continuances sought by Sustainable Hyattsville and the City of Hyattsville were the sole or primary cause of the Planning Board's failure to meet the 60-day deadline.

As I explain below, nothing could be farther from the truth. Mr. Maloney's client submitted its attempted response to the Order Remand well after the 60-day deadline, requested a continuance nearly two months after the deadline, and submitted a Density Calculation on September 27 (nearly two and half months after July 15). Further, the Planning Board posted a large tranche of Werrlein's submissions – including substantial materials that Werrlein had submitted well after July 15 – very close to the scheduled October 5 hearing date. Many or most of the files had been submitted belatedly by Werrlein as the main part of its attempt to respond to the District Council's Order of Remand.

Those actions are what prompted the City and Sustainable Hyattsville to request a continuance before the Planning Board's scheduled October 5 hearing. Not only did Persons of Record need time to review those files prior to the hearing, but the Hyattsville City Council and staff needed time to discuss the case at one of the Council's regularly scheduled meetings.

Mr. Maloney also refers to the amount of time that DPIE needed to issue a new Floodplain Waiver Letter. Yet DPIE's responses and related submissions by Werrlein's engineer, Dewberry present little or no new analysis. Instead, they rely on the same Floodplain Study and delineations that Dewberry and Werrlein submitted in 2018. In addition, Werrlein failed to move particularly quickly even after DPIE and Dewberry had provided those documents.

At no point does Mr. Maloney acknowledge his client's dominant role or Planning staff's role in the Planning Board's failure to meet the 60-day action deadline. In various ways and at various hearings since July 2018, project opponents have raised most or all of the issues that the Council laid out in its May 2023 Order of Remand and directed the Planning Board to address. The fact that Werrlein and Planning staff took so long *trying* to address those issues on remand, and ultimately failed to address them, speaks volumes. That process appears to be little more than a months-long effort to rescue the project once again. (When the Planning Board first heard Magruder Pointe CSP 18002 on July 26, 2018, early in his testimony, Mr. Rivera thanked staff for rescuing the project.)

Summary Responses to Mr. Maloney's Assertions

- 1. Continuances sought by the City of Hyattsville and Sustainable Hyattsville did not cause the Planning Board to miss the 60-Day deadline.**

The 60-day action deadline fell on July 15, 2023. The City and Sustainable Hyattsville did not request a continuance until at least late September. Our reasonable requests played no role in the Planning Board missing that deadline.

2. Based on the six cases cited by Mr. Maloney, the Planning Board took far longer than usual to act on the Council’s remand in this case.

Mr. Maloney’s statement that “Significantly, in six other remand cases, the Planning Board approvals were returned to the District Council well after the sixty days ran” fails to withstand scrutiny.

One of those cases – DSP 11017 – is simply irrelevant. The District Council remanded the case to the Zoning Hearing Examiner, not the Planning Board.

In two cases – Magruder Pointe CSP 18002 and DSP 2006 – the Planning Board voted its decision and/or adopted its resolution of decision within 60 days after the Clerk of the Council transmitted the Order of Remand.

In the other three cases, the Planning Board took *far* less time to act than it did in this case.

Please see Addendum 1 for a detailed comparison of how long the Planning Board took to act on those six cases v. how long it took to act on DSP 21001.

3. The timeline in Mr. Maloney’s letter is incomplete, inaccurate, and misleading.

Mr. Maloney’s assertion that “Except for a one-week continuance request by Suffrage, all of the other delays were beyond the control of the applicant” lacks merit.

The timeline in Mr. Maloney’s letter omits important dates and actions that demonstrate how Werrlein’s actions played a significant, if not dominant, role in the Planning Board failing to act by July 15. For example:

- On July 25, DPIE sent its remand response letter to the Council DPIE issued its Floodplain Waiver letter on July 25, 2023, after the action deadline had passed.
- DPIE on July 25. (Notably, on July 28, just *three days* after issuing that new floodplain waiver to Werrlein, DPIE issued Revised Techno-gram 007-2016, requiring parties delineating 100-year floodplains to use precipitation rates that are 15 percent than those previously used. This followed a February 2022 revision to Techno-gram 007-2016, in which DPIE ordered parties designing certain stormwater management facilities to use those same higher precipitation rates.)
- On August 7, nearly two weeks after DPIE had issued that waiver and filed that response letter, Werrlein submitted only a *partial* response to the Planning Board, when Mr. Rivera sent Board Chair Peter Shapiro a letter with ten exhibits, including DPIE’s waiver and letter.
- On September 8, nearly two months after the 60-day action deadline, Werrlein requested a continuance (Neither Planning nor Werrlein notified Persons of Record of this request).
- On September 27, Werrlein submitted its *still-noncompliant* Density Calculation to Planning, in a memo to Jill Kosack.

- The Technical Staff Memorandum is dated September 28, just one day after Werrlein submitted its Density Calculation, and just nine days before the Planning Board’s scheduled October 5 hearing date. (The Zoning Ordinance requires the Planning Board to publish a TSR at least 14 days prior to hearing. There seems little or no reason not to believe that the timing of this memo was driven in at least in part by the timing of Werrlein’s submissions, as appeared to be the case with CSP 18002 in July 2018.).
- The Planning Board posted large tranches of technical and legal documents, including Werrlein’s late and inadequate submissions, close to the hearing dates; and
- Werrlein filed a lengthy document on October 26, right before the Planning Board’s November 2 hearing and more than one month after the Technical Staff Memo had been posted. The Board included Werrlein’s last-minute submission in a larger file filing entitled “DSP-21001_Additional_Material_11-1-2023,” which the Board posted on its site the day before hearing the case on November 2.

Under Zoning Ordinance Section 27-125.05: “If new information is provided by the applicant or any governmental agency after the technical staff report is published, any party of record shall be allowed a one (1) week postponement if such party so requests.” After I noted Werrlein last-minute submission and requested the required one-week, Mr. Rivera stated his client wished to withdraw its submission, and the Board proceeded with its hearing on November 2. I haven’t checked whether those materials have been removed from the record.

At the close of his letter, Mr. Maloney states: “The District Council has never interpreted the 60-day requirement as preventing approval of an application returned after that date. Indeed, such a requirement would not be constitutional because the timing of the Planning Board approval is beyond the control of the applicant.” While Werrlein could not control the timing of the Planning Board’s decision, Werrlein chose to submit materials weeks and months after the 60-day deadline, and to request a continuance nearly two months after the 60-day deadline. Those actions and others by Werrlein clearly played a significant, if not dominant role, in the timing of the Planning Board’s decision. Based on the timeline above and on the record, Werrlein had provided the Planning Board with little or no responsive materials prior to July 15.

As always, thank you for your time and assistance.

Sincerely,

Greg Smith
4204 Farragut Street
Hyattsville, Maryland 20781
gpsmith@igc.org

Addendum 1

Detailed Comparison of the Timing of the Planning Board's Actions on DSP 21001 and the Six Cases Mr. Maloney Cites

DSP 21001 – Suffrage Point: The Clerk transmitted the remand on May 16, 2023. The Board voted to approve with conditions on November 2, 2023, **170 days** after the Clerk transmitted the remand. The Board adopted PGCPB No. 2023-15(A), approving with conditions, on November 30, 2023, 198 days after the Clerk transmitted the remand. The Zoning Ordinance excludes the month of August, so call it **139 days** to approve the DSP, and **167 days** to adopt the resolution.

DSP 11017 – Hyattsville Subway Sandwich Shop: It is not at all clear why Mr. Maloney included this case. The case history on the Planning Board's website indicates that the District Council remanded the case to the Zoning Hearing Examiner, *not* to the Planning Board. Searching the Council's Legislation and Zoning Information System for DSP 11017 yields no case.

CSP 18002 – Magruder Pointe: The Planning Board adopted its resolution within 60 days of the remand being transmitted. This is, of course, the parent case of DSP 21001. The Clerk of the Council transmitted the remand on or about January 31, 2019. The March 14, 2019 – 42 days after the Clerk transmitted the remand, the Board voted 2-2 on motion to approve CSP 18002 with conditions. A tie vote means the motion to approve failed. No other motion was made. The Board adopted PGCPB No. 18-74(A) on March 28, 2023, **56 days** after the Clerk transmitted the remand.

DSP 20006 – Checkers in Laurel: The Planning Board voted its position within 60 days of the remand being transmitted. The Clerk transmitted the remand on or about March 25, 2021. The Planning Board voted to approve with conditions on May 21, 2021, **60 days** after the Clerk transmitted the remand. The Board adopted PGCPB No. 2020-152(A) on June 17, 2021, **88 days** after the Clerk transmitted the remand.

CSP 21001 – Linda Lane: The Clerk transmitted the remand on September 29, 2023. The Board voted to approve with conditions **69 days later**, on September 7, 2022. The Board adopted PGCPB No. 2023-66(A) on January 4, 2024, **97 days** after the Clerk transmitted the remand. Some days in December might be excluded.

DSP 16004 – Oaklawn: The Clerk transmitted the remand on June 21, 2021. The Board voted to approve with conditions **108 days** later, on October 7, 2021. The Board adopted PGCPB No. 2021-30(A) on October 28, 2021, **129 days** after the Clerk transmitted the remand. The Ordinance excludes the month of August, so call it **77 days** to approve, and **98 days**. DSP 16004 was accepted for review late in 2019, and the applicant waived the 70-day rule.

DSP 20029 – Behnke Property 7-11: The Clerk transmitted the remand on May 27, 2021. The Board voted to approve with conditions **56 days** later, on July 22, 2021. I found no copy of the adopted resolution, PGCPB No. 2021-21(a), on the Board's website.

Addendum 2

The Planning Board Failed to Meet Certain Deadlines Imposed by the Zoning Ordinance and the Board's Rules of Procedure

The Planning Board Failed to Act within 60 Days of Being Notified of the Council Remand

On May 11, 2023, the District Council voted to remand DSP 21001 to the Planning Board, directing the Board to conduct an evidentiary hearing on multiple issues. On May 16, 2023, the Clerk of the Council transmitted to M-NCPPC notice of the Council's decision.

Under Section 27-285(c)(5), once the Clerk of the Council transmitted that notice of remand, the Planning Board had 60 days to approve, approve with modifications, or disapprove DSP 21001. Therefore, the Planning Board was legally required to take one of those three actions by July 15, 2023. Rather than meet that deadline, the Planning Board first scheduled the required hearing for October 5, 2023. Then, at Werrlein's request and after failing to publish the required Technical Staff Report (TSR) at least 14 days prior to October 5, the Planning Board rescheduled its hearing to October 12.

On October 5, the Board heard testimony solely on the question of whether to continue the hearing to November 2 or some later date, as requested by the City of Hyattsville and by Sustainable Hyattsville, who requested that continuance partly because the Board had posted substantial new technical and legal material on its web site just a few days before. Commenting on October 12, Greg Smith of Sustainable Hyattsville noted that the Planning Board had failed to act within 60 days of receiving the Council's notice of remand.

Section 27-285 – Planning Board procedures.

(c) Time limits for action.

(5) For development applications remanded to the Planning Board by the District Council, the Planning Board shall approve, approve with modifications, or disapprove the Detailed Site Plan within sixty (60) days of the transmittal date of the notice of remand by the Clerk of the District Council.

Given the Planning Board's clear failure to meet this and other deadlines, it is unclear what decision and record is or should be before the District Council now. Is it the Planning Board's November 2023 remand decision and the accompanying record, or is it the Board's February 2023 decision, which the Council found to be so deeply flawed on multiple critical points that it remanded the case back to the Planning Board.

The Planning Board Improperly Relied on Documents Submitted by the Applicant and Other Entities After the 60-Day Action Deadline Had Passed

Not only did the Planning Board fail to render its decision within 60 days of the Council remand, it also based its decision on documents submitted by Werrlein weeks and months after that deadline had passed. Those documents include but might not be limited to Norman Rivera's August 7 letter to Planning Board Chair Peter Shapiro, attempting to respond to the Council's Order of Remand, to which Mr. Rivera attached:

- DPIE's new Floodplain Waiver Letter, dated July 25, 2023.
- DPIE's July 25 letter to the Council in response to the Remand Order.
- MDE's July 17, 2023 letter to DPIE, stating that the Werrlein remained out of compliance with Subtitle 4, 5 and 9 of the Maryland Environment Article.
- MDE's March 7, 2022, letter to Werrlein, stating that state environmental regulations require all projects to comply with local zoning laws, and that MDE could not rule on Werrlein's application to disturb the floodplain, wetland, and stream until all local zoning issues are resolved.
- DPIE inspection reports from July 25 and August 3, 2023.
- DPIE's flawed September 27, 2018 Floodplain Waiver Letter.
- Werrlein's undated, flawed argument that there is no issue with its Density Calculation. Even though Mr. Werrlein listed this exhibit as "Density Calculation as to 1.29 Acres net floodplain," he provided no Density Calculation. He submitted a non-compliant Density Calculation nearly seven weeks later, on September 27.
- Werrlein's June 16, 2023, Floodplain Covenant, which claims Werrlein had requested a floodplain waiver and permit to construct "stormwater management system(s) and non-structural recreational facilities on the COUNTY'S recognized 100-year floodplain".

Mr. Rivera also submitted, and the Planning Board apparently accepted, a letter with exhibits attached, right before the Planning Board's November 2 hearing and more than one month after the Technical Staff Memo had been posted. When Sustainable Hyattsville objected at the hearing, Mr. Rivera stated Werrlein wished to withdraw that filing. The Planning Board either should have rejected that filing and stricken it from the record or it should have continued the hearing by one week as the Zoning Ordinance requires.

The Planning Board Failed to Adopt a Resolution – Timely or Otherwise – Stating That It Could Not Meet the Prescriptions of the Order of Remand

Under Section 27-290(f), where the Planning Board determines that it cannot comply with the prescriptions of a District Council Order of Remand, the Board must adopt a resolution that embodies its decision and states the reasons that it cannot comply. Implicit here is the requirement that not only must the Board meet those prescriptions, it must do so within 60 days

of the date that the Council's Order of Remand is transmitted. Here, the Board not only failed to act within the 60 days, it adopted a resolution that fails to meet the prescriptions of the Order of Remand and that cannot be supported based on evidence in the record

Section 27-290 – Appeal of Planning Board's decision

(f) Where the Planning Board determines that it cannot comply with the prescriptions of an Order of Remand adopted by the District Council pursuant to this Section, the Planning Board's findings as to the reasons for its action, and its decision on the Plan shall be embodied in a resolution adopted at a regularly scheduled public meeting. The Planning Board's adoption of a resolution under this subsection shall constitute a decision of the Planning Board on the Plan in accordance with the procedures of this Section and [Section 27-276](#) of this Subtitle.

The Planning Board Failed to Comply with Its Own Rules of Procedure Regarding Resolutions of Decision

Under Section 13(f) of the Planning Board's Rules of Procedure, once the Board renders a decision on an application, a resolution reflecting the Board's decision must be completed and filed with the Board within 21 days of that date the Board renders that decision.

SECTION 13 – Final Decisions, Resolution and Appeal Rights

(c) Time for Filing – The resolution reflecting the Board's decision shall be completed and filed with the Board within twenty-one (21) calendar days of the Board's decision.

Source: Planning Board Rules of Procedure, page 6.

The Board voted to approve DSP 21001 with conditions on November 2, 2023. Therefore, Resolution PGCPB No. 2023-15(A) should have been filed with the Board no later than November 23. That appears not to have happened in this case. The draft resolution appears to have been created on November 27, based on data in the file's Properties field. The Board did not vote to approve that resolution until November 30. The signed resolution appears to have been created on December 1, based on data in the file's Properties field.

From: [Timothy Maloney](#)
To: [Clerk of the Council](#); [Brown, Donna J.](#); [Walker-Bey, James T.](#)
Cc: [Norman Rivera](#); [Timothy Maloney](#); [Marion J. Holland](#)
Subject: Suffrage Point Remand Letter March 4 2024
Date: Monday, March 4, 2024 7:53:12 PM
Attachments: [Suffrage Point Remand Letter March 4 2024.pdf](#)

CAUTION: This email originated from an external email domain which carries the additional risk that it may be a phishing email and/or contain malware.

TIMOTHY F. MALONEY, ESQ
JOSEPH GREENWALD & LAAKE, PA
tmaloney@jgllaw.com | **OFFICE:** 301.220.2200 | **eFax:** 240.553.1737

Greenbelt Office – Mailing Address

6404 Ivy Lane, Suite 400, Greenbelt, Maryland 20770
T: 301.220.2200 | **F:** 301.220.1214 | www.jgllaw.com

Rockville Office

111 Rockville Pike, Suite 975, Rockville, Maryland 20850
T: 240.399.7900 | **F:** 240.399.7901 | www.jgllaw.com

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This e-mail and files transmitted with it are confidential, and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom this e-mail is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible to deliver it to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you are not one of the named recipient(s) or otherwise have reason to believe that you received this message in error, please immediately notify sender by e-mail, and destroy the original message. Thank you.

March 4, 2024

Via Electronic Mail Only:

ClerkoftheCouncil@co.pg.md.us; djbrown@co.pg.md.us

Prince George's County Council
Sitting as the District Council
c/o Donna J. Brown, Clerk
Prince George's County Council
Largo, Maryland 20772

RE: DSP 21001 – Remand
Suffrage Point
March 11, 2024 District Council Session

To the District Council:

This office represents Suffrage Point in connection with the above-referenced detailed site plan which was remanded to the Planning Board. The hearing in this matter is now set for March 11, 2024, having been continued from February 26, 2024.

We understand that parties of record in opposition to this detailed site plan are objecting to the approval based upon the “60 day rule” in 27-256(c)(5), as enacted in CB 83-2015. This legislation was enacted for the protection of the applicants so that their applications do not remain indefinitely “in limbo” before the Planning Board on remand.

Here, the same parties of records raising the “60-day rule” successfully sought numerous postponements before the Planning Board, effectively preventing the Board from completing its work in 60 days. They cannot now be heard to object to the delays before the Planning Board when these days were caused by their own postponement motions.

The following is a timeline of the consideration before the Planning Board which demonstrates multiple continuances obtained by the City of Hyattsville and/or other parties of record in opposition, including a month continuance requested by the opposing parties of record from the October 5, 2023 hearing:

- 1-5-23 Planning Board hearing on merits of the DSP, multiple requests to continue from City and opposition to 1-12-23 then again by opposition to 2-2-23;

March 4, 2023

Page 2

- 2-2-23 Planning Board on the merits and approved;
- 4-16-23 Smith request to Continue Council hearing set 4-24-23
- 4-20-23 City Request to Continue Council hearing of 4-24-23 and granted to 5-8-23;
- 5-8-23 Council remand hearing;
- 5-8-23/5-11-23 Dewberry files floodplain waiver data for DPIE review
- 5-16-23 Council directs Planning Board to conduct remand process;
- 7-25-23 DPIE issues revised Floodplain waiver approval and 7-25-23 DPIE response to Remand Order;
- 8-7-23 Suffrage files Remand response;
- Planning Board hearing posted for 10-5-23;
- 9-8-23 Suffrage files one week continuance of 10-5-23 Planning Board hearing
- 10-5-23 Planning Board posted;
- Smith and City request continuances to 11-2-23;
- 11-2-23 Planning Board hearing and approval

There were additional delays before the Planning Board because of the necessity of DPIE to review the application for flood plain waiver. Except for a one-week continuance request by Suffrage, all of the other delays were beyond the control of the applicant.

Significantly, in six other remand cases, the Planning Board approvals were returned to the District Council well after the sixty days ran. A listing of those cases has attached as Exhibit #1. The District Council has never interpreted the 60-day requirement as preventing approval of an application returned after that date. Indeed, such a requirement would not be constitutional because the timing of the Planning Board approval is beyond the control of the applicant.

Copies have been sent to the parties of record in the attachment as Exhibit #2.

Very truly yours,
JOSEPH, GREENWALD & LAAKE, P.A.



By: Timothy F. Maloney

Attachments (2)

cc: JTWalkerBey@co.pg.md.us

27.1

Reference No.	Type	Status	Title	Remand Review Timeframe
CSP-21001 Remand	Conceptual Site Plan	Oral Arguments	Linda Lane Property	Notice 10/25/23 PB Action 12/7/23 Council Hearing 2/26/24 Decision not yet listed
DSP-21001 Remand	Detailed Site Plan (Prior Ordinance)	Oral Arguments	Suffrage Point	Notice 1/24/24
DSP-16004 Remand	Detailed Site Plan (Prior Ordinance)	Planning Board Decision is Final	Oaklawn	Notice 6/25/21 PB Continuance 9/23/21 PB Action 10/7/21 No Request to Hear
DSP-20029 Remand	Detailed Site Plan (Prior Ordinance)	Planning Board Decision is Final	Behnke Property 7-Eleven	Notice 5/27/21 PB Action 7/22/21 No Request to Hear
DSP-20006 Remand	Detailed Site Plan (Prior Ordinance)	Final	Checkers Laurel (Remand)	Notice 3/25/21 PB Action 5/20/21 Council Approval 10/13/21
CSP-18002 Remand	Conceptual Site Plan	Final	Magruder Pointe (Remand Pursuant to Court Order)	Notice 1/31/19 PB Action 3/14/19 Council Approval 5/13/19
DSP-11017 AmendCond Remand	Amendment of Conditions	Final	Hyattsville Subway Sandwich Shop (Amendment of Conditions) (REMAND)	Records aren't clear. DAMS indicates remand was to ZHE.

Ex. 2.

Copies sent to the following Parties of Record:

CASE NO: DSP-21001
CASE NAME: SUFFRAGE POINT
PARTY OF RECORD: 75
PB DATE: 11-30-2023

SCOTT WILSON
P.O.BOX 483
COLLEGE PARK MD 20741 -
483 (CASE NUMBER: DSP-
21001)

BRENDEN SLOAN 5512 39TH
AVENUE
HYATTSVILLE MD 20781 (CASE
NUMBER: DSP-21001)

EMILE ROMERO
5515 38TH
HYATTSVILLE MD 20782
(CASE NUMBER: DSP-
21001)

MARK GRAHAM 5600 38TH
AVENUE
HYATTSVILLE MD 20782 (CASE
NUMBER: DSP-21001)

DANNY L SCHAIBLE
5416 39TH AVENUE
HYATTSVILLE MD 20781
(CASE NUMBER: DSP-
21001)

GERMAN ROCHEZ 5515 38TH
AVENUE
HYATTSVILLE MD 20782 (CASE
NUMBER: DSP-21001)

ALICIA
MELENDEZ
P.O.BOX 792
BLADENSBURG MD
20710 -792 (CASE
NUMBER: DSP-
21001)

RUBY SABINA
6400 40TH AVENUE
HYATTSVILLE MD 20782
(CASE NUMBER: DSP-
21001)

DAV
ID
REA
SE
5206
41ST
AVE
NUE
HYATTSVILLE
MD 20781
(CASE
NUMBER:
DSP-21001)

MARY GRAHAM

5600 38TH

AVENUE

HYATTSVILLE MD 20782

(CASE NUMBER: DSP-
21001)

MIRAN
DA
CARTER
5512
39TH
AVENU
E
HYATTSVILLE
MD 20781
(CASE
NUMBER:
DSP-21001)

JESSICA WEISS
5606 43RD AVENUE
HYATTSVILLE MD 20781
(CASE NUMBER: DSP-
21001)

JESSALYN SCHWARTZ
5722 39TH AVENUE
HYATTSVILLE MD 20781
(CASE NUMBER: DSP-21001)

«Next Record»JESSALYN
SCHWARTZ 5722 39TH
AVENUE
HYATTSVILLE MD 20781
(CASE NUMBER: DSP-21001)

«Next Record»JESSALYN
SCHWARTZ 5722 39TH
AVENUE
HYATTSVILLE MD 20781
(CASE NUMBER: DSP-21001)

«Next Record»JESSALYN
SCHWARTZ 5722 39TH
AVENUE
HYATTSVILLE MD 20781
(CASE NUMBER: DSP-21001)

«Next Record»JESSALYN
SCHWARTZ 5722 39TH
AVENUE
HYATTSVILLE MD 20781
(CASE NUMBER: DSP-21001)

«Next Record»JESSALYN
SCHWARTZ 5722 39TH
AVENUE
HYATTSVILLE MD 20781
(CASE NUMBER: DSP-21001)

«Next Record»JESSALYN
SCHWARTZ 5722 39TH
AVENUE
HYATTSVILLE MD 20781
(CASE NUMBER: DSP-21001)

«Next
Record»JESSALYN
SCHWARTZ 5722 39TH
AVENUE
HYATTSVILLE MD 20781
(CASE NUMBER: DSP-
21001)

«Next
Record»JESSALYN
SCHWARTZ 5722 39TH
AVENUE
HYATTSVILLE MD 20781
(CASE NUMBER: DSP-
21001)

«Next
Record»JESSALYN
SCHWARTZ 5722 39TH
AVENUE
HYATTSVILLE MD 20781
(CASE NUMBER: DSP-
21001)

«Next
Record»JESSALYN
SCHWARTZ 5722 39TH
AVENUE
HYATTSVILLE MD 20781
(CASE NUMBER: DSP-
21001)

«Next
Record»JESSALYN
SCHWARTZ 5722 39TH
AVENUE
HYATTSVILLE MD 20781
(CASE NUMBER: DSP-
21001)

«Next
Record»JESSALYN
SCHWARTZ 5722 39TH
AVENUE
HYATTSVILLE MD 20781
(CASE NUMBER: DSP-
21001)

«Next
Record»JESSALYN
SCHWARTZ 5722 39TH
AVENUE
HYATTSVILLE MD 20781
(CASE NUMBER: DSP-
21001)

MS.ELIZABETH ARNOLD
125 HEDGEWOOD DRIVE
GREENBELT MD 20770
(CASE NUMBER: DSP-21001)

WERRLEIN WSSC LLC
522 DEFENSE HIGHWAY
ANNAPOLIS MD 21401
(CASE NUMBER: DSP-21001)

ALLISON KOLE
55506 43RD PLACE PLACE
HYATTSVILLE MD 20781
(CASE NUMBER: DSP-21001)

SHANNA E FRICKLAS
5008 40TH PLACE
HYATTSVILLE MD 20781
(CASE NUMBER: DSP-21001)

SHANNA FRICKLAS
5008 40TH PLACE
HYATTSVILLE MD 20781
(CASE NUMBER: DSP-21001)

MR.JASON SWIFT
4906 40TH PLACE
HYATTSVILLE MD 20781
(CASE NUMBER: DSP-21001)

MS.IRENE MARSH
4912 40TH PLACE
HYATTSVILLE MD 20781
(CASE NUMBER: DSP-21001)

MS.SHERRY WILDER
5009 40TH PLACE SUITE 208
HYATTSVILLE MD 20781
(CASE NUMBER: DSP-21001)

MS.JANINE M WILSON
4460 3842 0478
4914 40TH PLACE
HYATTSVILLE MD 20781
(CASE NUMBER: DSP-21001)

MS.LESLEY MURDOCK
5009 40TH PLACE SUITE 201
HYATTSVILLE MD 20781
(CASE NUMBER: DSP-21001)

ANDREW TSUI
3901 QUEENSBURY ROAD
HYATTSVILLE MD 20782
(CASE NUMBER: DSP-21001)

NINA S FAYE
4004 QUEENSBURY ROAD
HYATTSVILLE MD 20782
(CASE NUMBER: DSP-21001)

KARA P VEIGAS
4010 HAMILTON STREET
HYATTSVILLE MD 20781
(CASE NUMBER: DSP-21001)

HELEN H BUTT
3906 MADISON STREET
HYATTSVILLE MD 20781 -1749
(CASE NUMBER: DSP-21001)

KATE CALLOWAY
4025 HAMILTON STREET
HYATTSVILLE MD 20781
(CASE NUMBER: DSP-21001)

JORGE AGUILAR BARRANTES
4208 FARRAGUT STREET
HYATTSVILLE MD 20781
(CASE NUMBER: DSP-21001)

JIM CHANDLER
CITY OF HYATTSVILLE
4310 GALLATIN STREET
HYATTSVILLE MD 20781
(CASE NUMBER: DSP-21001)

HOLLY SIMMONS
CITY OF HYATTSVILLE
4310 GALLATIN STREET
HYATTSVILLE MD 20781
(CASE NUMBER: DSP-21001)

DANIEL BRODER
3929 MADISON STREET
HYATTSVILLE MD 20781
(CASE NUMBER: DSP-21001)

CHRISTINE BLACKERBY
SUSTAINABLE HYATTSVILLE
3706 JEFFERSON STREET
HYATTSVILLE MD 20782
(CASE NUMBER: DSP-21001)

EDWARD PORTER
4204 FARRAGUT STREET
HYATTSVILLE MD 20781
(CASE NUMBER: DSP-21001)

EDGAR B BUTT
3906 MADISON STREET
HYATTSVILLE MD 20781
(CASE NUMBER: DSP-21001)

JENNIFER HANNA
4102 LONGFELLOW STREET
HYATTSVILLE MD 20781
(CASE NUMBER: DSP-21001)

JULIE WOLF
4008 HAMILTON STREET
HYATTSVILLE MD 20781
(CASE NUMBER: DSP-21001)

THERESA IMMORDINO
4112 EMERSON STREET
HYATTSVILLE MD 20781
(CASE NUMBER: DSP-21001)

LEIGH ALTMAN
4209 FARRAGUT STREET
HYATTSVILLE MD 20781
(CASE NUMBER: DSP-21001)

FLAWN WILLIAMS
4100 GALLATIN STREET
HYATTSVILLE MD 20781
(CASE NUMBER: DSP-21001)

HILARY FORSLUND
5802 LUSTINE STREET
HYATTSVILLE MD 20781
(CASE NUMBER: DSP-21001)

MAC ALTMAN
4209 FARRAGUT STREET
HYATTSVILLE MD 20781
(CASE NUMBER: DSP-21001)

SARAH EISEN
4001 JEFFERSON STREET
HYATTSVILLE MD 20781
(CASE NUMBER: DSP-21001)

KARA P VEIGAS
KARA VEIGAS MSW INC
4010 HAMILTON STREET
HYATTSVILLE MD 20781
(CASE NUMBER: DSP-21001)

MR.GREG SMITH
SAVE OUR SUSTAINABLE HYATTSVILLE
(SUSTAINABLE HYATTSVILLE)
4204 FARRAGUT STREET
HYATTSVILLE MD 20781
(CASE NUMBER: DSP-21001)

MR.T CARTER ROSS
3915 LONGFELLOW STREET
HYATTSVILLE MD 20781 -1743
(CASE NUMBER: DSP-21001)

MR.GREG SMITH
4204 FARRAGUT STREET
HYATTSVILLE MD 20781
(CASE NUMBER: DSP-21001)

MR.WILLIAM PARKHURST
4100 FARRAGUT STREET
HYATTSVILLE MD 20781
(CASE NUMBER: DSP-21001)

MR.CHRISTOPHER CURRIE
4100 CRITTENDEN STREET
HYATTSVILLE MD 20781
(CASE NUMBER: DSP-21001)

MS.AMANDA EISEN
4028 HAMILTON STREET
HYATTSVILLE MD 20781
(CASE NUMBER: DSP-21001)

MS.SARAH HARPER
4103 GALLATIN STREET
HYATTSVILLE MD 20781
(CASE NUMBER: DSP-21001)

MS.JENNIE REINHARDT
4105 GALLATIN STREET
HYATTSVILLE MD 20781
(CASE NUMBER: DSP-21001)

MS.AMANDA EISEN
4028 HAMILTON STREET
HYATTSVILLE MD 20781
(CASE NUMBER: DSP-21001)

MS.GRETA MOSHER
4002 CRITTENDEN STREET
HYATTSVILLE MD 20781
(CASE NUMBER: DSP-21001)

MS.NANCY J MEYER
4007 WEST 4007 STREET EAST
HYATTSVILLE MD 20781 -1736
(CASE NUMBER: DSP-21001)

MRS.VICTORIA E BOUCHER
4101 GALLATIN STREET
HYATTSVILLE MD 20781
(CASE NUMBER: DSP-21001)

MRS.MARSHA K MAZZ
4016 JEFFERSON STREET
HYATTSVILLE MD 20781
(CASE NUMBER: DSP-21001)

MRS.VICTORIA BOUCHER
SUSTAINABLE HYATTSVILLE
4101 4101 GALLATIN ST. STREET 4101
GALLATIN ST.
HYATTSVILLE MD 20781
(CASE NUMBER: DSP-21001)

DR.TIMOTHY DAVIS PHD
4700 BANNER STREET
HYATTSVILLE MD 20781
(CASE NUMBER: DSP-21001)

MR.WILLIAM H PARKHURST II
4100 FARRAGUT STREET
HYATTSVILLE MD 20781
(CASE NUMBER: DSP-21001)

MITCHELL BERNARD
PETRA DEVELOPMENT
4102 HAMILTON STREET
HYATTSVILLE DC 20781
(CASE NUMBER: DSP-21001)

TREY SHERARD
RIVERKEEPER, ANACOSTIA
RIVERKEEPER 45 SOUTHWEST L STREET
SUITE 70565 WASHINGTON DC 20024
(CASE NUMBER: DSP-21001)