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MS. MCNEIL: Okay. Good morning, everyone. I'm Maurene McNeil. I'll be the hearing examiner today. It's December 13, 2023.

We're here on Special Exception 22002, a request to permit a planned retirement community with 57 age-restricted single-family attached dwelling units and AC-23008, a request for alternative compliance from 2 sections of the landscape manual, Section 4.6 and 4.10. If counsel would identify themselves for the record.

MR. HATCHER: Chris Hatcher, counsel for the applicant.

MS. MCNEIL: I understand that People's zoning counsel had to be in court for a little while this morning, you all, but he'll be coming in, Stan Brown. And Mr. Suhar.

MR. SUHAR: Yes. Good morning, Madame Hearing Examiner. My name is Sean Suhar. I'm the attorney for the Wingate Homeowner's Association.

MS. MCNEIL: Okay. So before we begin, for everyone else, this is being recorded hopefully and it
is going to be streamed online. That -- that may be at issue. If it's not streamed online, however, it'll be uploaded as soon as we can after the hearing, but because it's being recorded, everyone needs to stay mute and off camera until -- not the attorneys, until it's your turn to testify or ask a question.

And there -- there may be at least two people on that provided their email but did not provide their home or business address and you must do so to be recognized as a person of record. I can't see if they're on, but it was Mr. Raymond [ph], Dan Trossee [ph] and Ms. Mimi [ph]. And Ms. Mimi, if you're on, you'll have to state your name for me, I apologize.

So if you two appear to -- and speak, I'll have to get your address. So Counsel, if you all are ready, you may begin. Mr. Hather, you're mute. Okay.

MR. HATCHER: Good morning, Madame Examiner. For the record, my name is Chris Hatcher with CL Hatcher with offices in Laurel and I'm pleased to represent the applicant, ESC 8215 Springfield, L.C. for this special exception application.

Madame Examiner, testimony will show that the
subject application proposes a planned retirement community with 57 age-restricted single-family attached dwellings complies with the necessary regulations and standards for approval in the special exception. Specifically, the proposed development is for parcel 131 located on the east side of Springfield Lane approximately 390 feet southeast of its intersection with Lake Glen Drive in Glenn Dale, Maryland.

The property is approximately 12 acres and was previously zoned RR pursuant to the county's zoning ordinance in effect prior to April 1, 2022, which I will refer to today as the prior zoning ordinance. The property is currently zoned RR pursuant to the county's current zoning ordinance.

This special exception application is proposed under the prior RR zone pursuant to Section 27-1904 of the current zoning ordinance. As an application for a planned requirement community with 57 age-restricted single-family attached dwellings in the prior $R R$ zone, the subject application requires special exception approval.

More details will be provided through the
testimony of the five witnesses I plan on calling today. Before I produce the app- -- before I introduce the applicants' witnesses, I would like to take a moment to discuss planning staff and the planning board's actions on SE-22002 specifically as it relates to the transm- -- transmitted special exception case file.

At its October 5th hearing, the planning board transmitted the full special exception case file together with the case file of its companion matter AC23008 to the zoning hearing examiner. Notably, the case file includes applicant's full special exception application, planning staff's September 20th technical staff report which recommended approval of the special exception subject to conditions and an October 4th memorandum from Maryland Capital Park and Planning Commission -- Maryland National Capital Park and Planning Commission Development review staff to the planning board.

Notably, the development review staff's October 4th memorandum, which is identified as Exhibit 3, recommended clarifications and revisions to the
findings and conclusions contained in the September 20th technical staff report.

Specifically, development review staff's October 4th memorandum recommends revisions to the technical staff report to, among other reasons, clarify that the bicycle lane and sidewalk requirements adjacent to and within the proposed development and the community gathering area requirements and several in- -- of the conditions of approval.

As outlined in development review's October 4th memo, planning staff largely supports the applicant's proposed revisions to applicable findings and conditions contained in the September 20th technical staff report.

Accordingly, the applicant's references to development review's staff's proposed technical staff report today will be distinguished as a technical staff report as amended by development review's staff's October 4th clarifying memo.

In order to refer to the technical staff report that accurately reflects staff's recommenda- -recommended finding and con- -- and conditions of
approval, one additional clarification just based on the applicant's experience, it -- it -- it is particularly of note to distinguish a special exception from a rezoning case.

This is not a rezoning matter, this is -- the planned retirement community is a permitted use subject to the approval of a special exception before the hearing -- zoning hearing examiner. Although both applications have similar review processes, it's important to distinguish a rezoning from a special exception matter.

No rezoning is occurring here. With that clarification, I would like to introduce the applicant's witness in attendance here today. The witness here this morning include Mr. David Stewart, attorney in fact for the current property owner, Joanne Stewart [ph]. Mr. Stewart will testify to the proposed planned retirement community use.

The next witness will be Mr. Jude Burke, the applicant's authorized representative who will testify as the applicant's -- to the applicant's proposal. The third witness will be Ms. Amy Sommer, the division
manager of the planning department at Charles $P$. Johnson \& Associates. For convenience purposes, going forward I'll refer to Charles P. Johnson \& Associates as CPJ.

As Amy Sommer -- Ms. Jamie [sic] Sommer will testify as to the plans and related documents prepared by CPJ in connection with the proposed development, the special exception application and $a$-- and a co- -- and a company alternative compliance application. Fourth witness today will be Mr. David Nelson, a transportation engineer with street traffic studies.

Mr. Nelson will testify as to the traffic and transportation planning issues in accordance with the transportation statement prepared in support of the special exception application. The fifth and final witness today is Mr. Mark Ferguson, a land planner, architect and environmental design engineer with RDA site design.

Mr. Ferguson will testify to a description of the site plan, physical characteristics of the property, planning and design elements and proposed planned use retirement use and various other required
findings -- the various other required findings associated with the planned retirement community.

I also have a few other people from CPJ and from my office that may speak from time to time, but they are not signed up as witnesses, they will not testify in support of the application. With that, Madame Examiner, we would like to call our first witness, Mr. David Stewart.

MS. MCNEIL: Before you do that, let me clarify, anybody speaking is a witness and will be sworn as subject to cross-examination, that's number one. Number two, I'm glad you went through that short explanation and that is something I meant to tell everybody.

And so because this request went to several agencies and then back and revisions were made, some of the documents appear to be duplicates, but $I$ always err on the side of making sure everything's in that you all may need and then at the end when I'm writing a decision, I'll explain that it's exactly like Exhibit 3 or Exhibit 7.

If any of you know for a fact that those
exhibits are void, that would be helpful if you would tell me as we're -- you know, as the hearing proceeds. Mr. Suhar, you don't have to say anything at this time, but if you want to say some type of opening, you may.

MR. SUHAR: Thank you very much, Your -Madame Hearing Examiner. I -- I just have argument, I don't have witnesses with me today. And so, you know, if you would like me to make argument at this time, I can do that or if you wanted to re- -- you know, wait until attorney --

MS. MCNEIL: You'll be sticking around; right?
MR. SUHAR: I'm sticking arou- --
MS. MCNEIL: You're not leaving, are you?
MR. SUHAR: Yeah. I'll be here.
MS. MCNEIL: So I'll let you make arguments after the case. That's [inaudible].

MR. SUHAR: Wonderful. Thank you. I appreciate that. I do have -- I do have to -- to go about 11:00, but, you know, hopefully we'll be done by then.

MS. MCNEIL: And if you let us know at that time, you could make your argument then. But tell me --

MR. SUHAR: Okay. Thank you.

MS. MCNEIL: -- I did get your exhibit, but did you explain in there how Wingate dec- -- determined that they were opposed --

MR. SUHAR: Yes.
MS. MCNEIL: -- to the request?
MR. SUHAR: -- we have -- we have met. I met with the -- with the applicant -- we did. We have a planning and zoning committee of the board of directors for Wingate Homeowner's Association. We met -- and then we met after our meeting to discuss our concerns and opposition. We're going to be meeting again in response to the request that you sent this week to confirm their position on this matter and then we'll be sending something to you.

MS. MCNEIL: Okay. So --
MR. SUHAR: Yeah.
MS. MCNEIL: -- I'll allow subject to getting that information; okay? And what it is is just -- I mean, even if the planning and zoning committee is authorized to speak on behalf of the entire association, make it say that or if they're just speaking on their own, make sure it says that and --
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and where they met [inaudible] --
MR. SUHAR: Okay.
MS. MCNEIL: -- you know; okay?
MR. SUHAR: Sure. Right. Yeah.
MS. MCNEIL: All right.
MR. SUHAR: I understand.
MS. MCNEIL: Okay.
MR. SUHAR: Thank you so much. You're --
MS. MCNEIL: Okay. All right.
MR. SUHAR: -- I rea- -- I appreciate that [inaudible].

MR. HATCHER: Madame Examiner --

MS. MCNEIL: Yes, sir.
MR. HATCHER: -- for clarification purposes, does that mean Mr. Suhar has the Wingate Civic Association actually taking a vote on whether they support or not support this?

MS. MCNEIL: He'll take your proffer now knowing you'll follow it up. Yeah. He -- he's right to ask that. If you could answer, Mr. Suhar.

MR. SUHAR: Sure. Yeah. The Wingate Homeowner's Ass- -- all members are -- it's not
required for all members of the Wingate Homeowner's Association to take a vote on every issue. I could -I could equally ask the question of Mr. Hatcher's client, which is a corporation, if they made a -- you know, if they -- they rendered a vote too on this issue, I -- I think to -- you know, for fairness and -and equity in -- in -- in this -- in this matter as well as any other matter that comes before you, Madame Hearing Examiner, you know, it would -- it would -- it would be --

You know, look, I -- I think to try and impose a -- a -- you know, require a vote of 256 lot owners is --

MS. MCNEIL: Okay. Then let me tell you --
MR. SUHAR: -- it -- it -- it's -- it's just too much.

MS. MCNEIL: -- thi- -- this has been --
MR. SUHAR: We have a representative body -there's a governing body that was elected by the membership to make decisions and --

MS. MCNEIL: Okay. Mr. Suhar --
MR. SUHAR: Yeah.

MS. MCNEIL: -- maybe we're not making clear. The issue is to let us know who -- whomever has the right to comment on a zoning case. If it's the committee, then that's what it'll say and that's who it will say took this position --

MR. SUHAR: Right.
MS. MCNEIL: -- but we ask this and the board of appeals does as well and probably the planning board as well --

MR. SUHAR: Okay.
MS. MCNEIL: -- because we -- we don't want someone to come in, make that statement and then 400 other people write us and say, that was never our position, that's all; okay?

MR. SUHAR: Yeah. Well, I -- I appreciate that. I -- I -- I don't know where the -- this requirement is in the rules, but I -- I do know that -my feeling is is that this has come from the People's counsel, Mr. Stan Brown, originally. And so -- but that's just [inaudible].

MS. MCNEIL: Look, you talked him up, here he is.

MR. SUHAR: Yeah.
MS. MCNEIL: Yeah. It's -- it's not just him, I can tell you it's been in -- in practice.

MR. SUHAR: It is not. Okay. All right.
MR. HATCHER: I just think for coordination purposes, since the applicant does continue to do its community outreach, it's -- in the spirit of fairness, it might be helpful to know if they need to be coordinating with the board of directors of the Wingate Civic Association or this committee or was it just the president that told --

We -- we -- I mean, independent of any legal obligation, which I -- I'm not entirely sure there isn't, just for coordination and community outreach purposes, we -- if -- if -- if Mr. Suhar does not indicate that somebody with some authority has in- -has told him that this is the position of the civic association, we're just not entirely sure who he's speaking on behalf of.

MS. MCNEIL: Right. And if we don't get that information, then $I$ would give the testimony or document the proper weight and it probably would be
just Mr. Suhar's opinion. So I think he will get it for me.

MR. SUHAR: Yes.
MS. MCNEIL: Mr. Brown, do you have -- you heard enough to -- do you want to weigh in or --

MR. BROWN: Well, I mean, I know what the issue is. Mr. Suhar, I tried to explain it to you in the case you did a couple of weeks ago.

The reason for the request is, as I'm sure you've already been told, is there are many people in HOAs and civic associations and other nonprofits who come forward and take a position, but they do not necessarily voice the position -- the official position of the organization and that is why we require that an officer of the organization put forth a letter signed on behalf of the organization indicating that a meeting was held, a certain number of participants participated and a vote was taken and then that's the official position of your organization.

Nobody is disputing that you represent them, but the issue becomes whether or not if you've got 100 people in an organization and only 2 of them are active
and 2 of them oppose an application, that's not the official position of the HOA. And so that's the only reason that this is requested and it will be requested of the applicant.

If the applicant comes in here and say they have an organization with 300 people and they're in support of their application but only 2 people show up, they've got to prove to this body that it is the official position of the HOA. It's a very simple requirement.

MS. MCNEIL: And -- and I --
MR. SUHAR: [inaudible]
MS. MCNEIL: -- I would only amend that to say it could be the HOA or it could be that land use committee if the HOA authorized the land use committee to just render its position, but you understand we'll need something --

MR. SUHAR: I understand.
MS. MCNEIL: -- explaining.
MR. SUHAR: I understand what your position is. Thank you so much. You're --

MS. MCNEIL: Okay.

MR. SUHAR: -- I will -- I will -- I will respond.

MS. MCNEIL: And -- go ahead. Go ahead.
MR. SUHAR: Thank you.
MS. MCNEIL: No. Go ahead. Were you finished?
MR. SUHAR: Oh, yeah. I was finished. Yeah. I'm sorry if $I$ interrupted you.

MS. MCNEIL: Okay. And you all, I'll bring up one last thing before we start just for any laypeople that may not have been to one of these hearings. It's important to note that even though we're getting People's position, the zoning decision is not based on the number of people in favor or the number of people opposed.

That's zoning plebiscite they call that. So don't worry, it's not based on that at all, it's based on the law and whether or not applicant meets the burden of all the criteria in the law. So I thought I would put that out there. And Mr. Hatcher, I think now you can call your first witness.

MR. HATCHER: I'd like to call Mr. David Stewart, the attorney in fact, property owner.

MR. STEWART: Good morning, everybody.
MS. MCNEIL: Good morning, Mr. Stewart. Do you swear or affirm under the penalties of perjury that the testimony you shall give will be the truth and nothing but the truth?

MR. STEWART: Yes. I do.
MR. HATCHER: All right. Can you please state your full name and current address for the record?

MR. STEWART: My name is David Morris Stewart [ph] and I currently reside at 6101 Atlantic Avenue, Ocean City, Maryland, zip code 21842.

MR. HATCHER: Are you familiar with the property which is the subject of the application?

MR. STEWART: Oh, most definitely.
MR. HATCHER: When is -- when did Mrs. Stewart appoint you as her attorney in fact?

MR. STEWART: She appointed me on April 25, 2021.

MR. HATCHER: Was this appointment made in writing?

MR. STEWART: Yes. It was.
MR. HATCHER: Madame Examiner, the applicant
requests that Exhibit 95 be brought up on the monitor.
MS. BAH: I'm sorry, which exhibit?
MR. HATCHER: Ninety-five.
MS. BAH: Okay. Hold on one second.
MR. HATCHER: For -- Madame Examiner and People's zoning counsel, for logistics purposes, I'll be requesting many of the exhibits be brought up just for our -- for the witnesses just to review. I don't necessarily need to do that unless you guys would prefer that $I$ do that. I have all of the exhibits that each one will be speaking to and their exhibit number as offered with -- as the exhibit list is offered yesterday.

MS. MCNEIL: I'd like -- it would help me -it would help me if it's any witness with a plan. Those plans are very small and -- and it might help the folks -- this is 95?

MS. BAH: Yes. This is Exhibit 95.
MR. HATCHER: It's actually supposed to be 92. Can you -- can you check all the exhibits [inaudible]? Can you all see the -- the image that's on the screen? MS. MCNEIL: Yes.

MR. STEWART: Yeah. So that is indeed Exhibit

MR. HATCHER: I apologize, is this -- is this -- is this from the exhibit list that was circulated yesterday or is this from the binders? My exhibit references --

MS. MCNEIL: [inaudible]
MR. HATCHER: Yeah. My exhibit references from the exhibit lists that were circulated yesterday. I can cer- -- I certainly can reference the exhibits in the binders, but that's something I would --

MS. BAH: This is the exhibit that I have in binder two. Should I be looking somewhere else?

MR. HATCHER: No. That's the -- that's the accurate documents.

MS. MCNEIL: Let me see.
MS. BAH: Of what $I$ have here of 92 , a certificate of good standing dated 12/5/23, but here, this says Exhibit 92. So -- okay. Let me see [inaudible].

MS. MCNEIL: Wait. I'm sorry, am I -- okay. [inaudible]. Okay. That ne- -- there's another issue
that had been going on with the exhibit list, but the binder exhibits are really the ones everyone saw. So we're going to use the binder exhibits and fix the exhibit lists later if you don't mind. I'm sorry for the inconvenience. So it is 92 in the binder?

MR. HATCHER: Yes, ma'am.
MS. MCNEIL: Okay. Because that's what everyone saw if they went online to look at this.

MS. BAH: Okay. Give me one second, I'm sorry. MS. MCNEIL: Sure. I'm sorry.

MS. BAH: Mm-hmm. No. You're fine.
MS. MCNEIL: And while she's doing that, Mr. Hatcher, the issue probably will pop up more in binder two. All of one is probably the same as the list you have.

MR. HATCHER: I understand. Should we --
MS. MCNEIL: Well, you should, because you all are the ones that kept sending things late. No, I'm just doing a little brevity here, I apologize for the -- for the issue.

MR. HATCHER: -- should we -- how would -- how would you like us to proceed right now?

MS. MCNEIL: I mean, for this witness, there's an exhibit, probably Exhibit 92, that states that Ms. Stewart provided power of attorney to Mr. David Stewart and you can just talk about it.

MR. HATCHER: Right. Okay. Was it made in writing? So according to the exhibit list that was circulated yesterday and I believe the document that was just on the -- on the monitor, which is listed as Exhibit 92, it's supposed to be power of attorney, which is not what's on the monitor right now.

MS. MCNEIL: Well, Mr. Hatcher, the -- the document -- unless someone has a question and we'll get it out shortly --

MR. HATCHER: Right.
MS. MCNEIL: -- the document is in the record as Exhibit 92 on the binders.

MR. HATCHER: Okay.
MS. MCNEIL: You can just question your witness.

MR. HATCHER: Okay. Is that exhibit a true and accurate copy of the power of attorney that contains your appointment to act on Mrs. Stewart's behalf?

MR. STEWART: Yes. I was given the power shown on Page 2 of Exhibit 95, which now we're in question we think is 92. So what do I say?

MR. HATCHER: You know, what -- what is your vision for the future use of the subject property?

MR. STEWART: Well, in keeping with my mother's wishes, she wished the property to be used to provide high-quality housing opportunities for the seniors in the Glenn Dale community and -- go ahead.

MR. BROWN: Madame Examiner, I don't understand what the purpose of this power of attorney is. The document that was placed in the record is a power of attorney for financial matters given to Mr. Stewart on behalf of his mother. It has absolutely nothing to do with this case.

If he wants to testify as an individual on his own behalf, then he should do that, but having power of attorney to decide financial matters is not the same as having general power of attorney to act for an individual. And also, Mr. Hatcher, is there a reason that -- I'm sorry, Mr. Stewart, what is your mother's name again?

MR. STEWART: My mom's sitting right here, her name is Joan Marie Stewart [ph].

MR. BROWN: Why can't she speak for herself?
MR. STEWART: Well, she can, but she's requested that I speak for her. She's of age and she's -- she's nervous, you can understand that, and -- but she is sitting here.

MR. BROWN: She's here and she's present. I mean, she should speak for herself. If you want to testify as an individual, you can do that on behalf of your- -- yourself.

MR. STEWART: I understand. I understand.
MS. MCNEIL: If I may, I would overrule as to just one part, if you could get your mother to state her name and that she would like you to testify because she doesn't want to talk to me, one of the nicest people in the world, that's fine and then you'll say; okay?

MR. STEWART: Go ahead, mom, state your name.
MS. STEWART: Joan Marie Stewart.
MR. STEWART: And --

MS. MCNEIL: And Ms. Stewart, do you swear or
affirm that everything you're about to tell me is the truth and nothing but the truth?

MS. STEWART: Yes, ma'am.
MS. MCNEIL: Okay. Mr. Hatcher, you want to --
MR. HATCHER: Ms. Stewart, does -- does your son have the authority to speak on your behalf of real estate matters, particularly as it relates to the Stewart property?

MS. STEWART: Yes. He does. He has my full support on this.

MR. HATCHER: Okay. Now you may question Mr. Stewart.

MR. HATCHER: So yeah, Mr. Stewart, is there a particular reason you want the subject property developed with the proposed senior housing use?

MR. STEWART: Well, yeah, I do and I'm speaking for my mother as well, but we have talked about it and she -- she would like the property to be used for high-quality housing opportunities for the seniors in the surrounding Glenn Dale area. This -this housing project would, you know, allow for seniors to age in their community.

It will also give the county residents the option to live close to their families and friends, work, shopping but without the activities of an allages community.

MR. HATCHER: Madame Examiner, I have no further questions for Mr. or Mrs. Stewart.

MS. MCNEIL: Mr. Suhar, do you have any questions?

MR. SUHAR: No -- no questions. Thank you very much.

MS. MCNEIL: Mr. Brown, do you have any questions?

MR. BROWN: No questions.
MS. MCNEIL: Okay. Thank you both so much.
MR. STEWART: All right. Thank you.
MR. HATCHER: The applicant would now like to call Jude Burke.

MS. MCNEIL: Mr. Burke.
MR. BURKE: I'm online, hopefully you can hear me. I'm trying to get my camera working here, I apologize.

MS. MCNEIL: Okay. Mr. Hatcher, you -- oh,
there he is. Great.
MR. BURKE: Thank you.
MS. MCNEIL: Mr. Burke, do you swear or affirm under the penalties of perjury that the testimony you shall give will be the truth and nothing but the truth?

MR. BURKE: Yes. I do.
MS. MCNEIL: Okay.
MR. HATCHER: Mr. Burke, can you please state your full name and business address for the record?

MR. BURKE: Jude Burke, 1355 Beverly Road, Suite 240, McLean, Virginia 22101.

MR. HATCHER: Where are you currently employed?

MR. BURKE: Elm Street Development.
MR. HATCHER: What is your current position with Elm Street Development?

MR. BURKE: I'm the vice president.
MR. HATCHER: Can you briefly summarize Elm Street Development's previous work in Prince George's County?

MR. BURKE: I've been working on projects in Prince George's County for Elm Street for 20 years. Our
projects in that time include Glenn Dale Forest, the Ridings at Upper Marlboro and Stonegate Estates, which are all single-family detached houses. The Park at Addison Metro and the Crescent at Cherry Lane in Laurel are both a mix of single-family detached and attached houses.

MR. HATCHER: Okay. Are you authorized to
testify on behalf of ESC 20- -- I mean, 3- -- 8215 Springfield, L.C.?

MR. BURKE: Yes. I'm authorized to testify on behalf of ESC 8215 Springfield, L.C.

MR. SUHAR: I'm just go- -- at this point, I just want to note an objection for the record.

MS. MCNEIL: And that is?
MR. SUHAR: As to a decision that was made by the corporation. He's here in a representative capacity, but he -- the -- the -- there's -- there's -there's no evidence that -- that there was a vote taken by the corporation to authorize him to be here --

MS. MCNEIL: Okay. I was going to say --
MR. SUHAR: -- because that's the standard. Go ahead.

MS. MCNEIL: Okay. I'll rule on it in one second and allow Mr. Hatcher to ask further questions. I didn't hear enough about the tie between those two corporations either. So --

MR. HATCHER: All right.
MS. MCNEIL: -- go ahead.
MR. HATCHER: How -- how is -- how is Elm Street Development affiliated with ESC 8215 Springfield, L.C.?

MR. BURKE: ESC 8215 Springfield, L.C. is a single-purpose limited liability company that we set up for this specific project. Elm Street is the entire owner of ESC 8215 Springfield, L.C. As a vice president of Elm Street, I'm authorized to sign for the corporation and commit us to anything that any acts of corporation can take.

As the limited liability company, I am the manager of the limited liability company, ESC 8215 Springfield, L.C. So again, au- -- authorized to -- to -- to speak for the LLC as well as Elm Street Development.

MR. HATCHER: Madame Examiner, I think -- do -

- do you need further information? You said you were going to rule after you [inaudible].

MS. MCNEIL: Right. So Mr. Suhar, having heard that, I would overrule your objection.

MR. SUHAR: Okay. Thank you.
MR. HATCHER: Mr. Burke, is ESC 8215
Springfield, L.C. authorized to do business in the state of Maryland?

MR. BURKE: Yes. It's registered as a limited liability company in the state of Maryland and is in good standing.

MR. HATCHER: For reference purposes, Mr. Brown and Mrs. -- got you. For ref- -- Madame Hearing Examiner, Ex- -- Exhibit 82, which is a certificate of good standing, which is in the record -- 92, excuse me. Is the app- --

MS. MCNEIL: That's the correct number. Good. Go ahead.

MR. HATCHER: Were you involved in the decisionma- -- the decision to develop the proposed planned retirement community for the location?

MR. BURKE: Yes. I lead the development effor-
-- efforts for the proposed planned retirement community.

MR. HATCHER: Please briefly summarize the decision process to develop the proposed planned retirement community use at the subject property.

MR. BURKE: We considered different types of residential development for the property since the planned retirement community is allowed in the $R R$ zone under both the old and new zoning codes and there's a need for more senior housing in Prince George's County to those -- housing of all types, we decided that the PRC use would be the most appropriate.

An age-restricted community with fee-simple ownership of each house fits in with the residential character of the existing community and it fills the need for more senior housing in Prince George's County as the population ages. It leverages a convenient location and the existing in- -- infrastructure while having a lower impact on traffic and schools in the area than the by right single-family large lots would have.

Senior housing of this type on the subject
property would be a viable option for neighbors to remain in the Glenn Dale community as they age.

MR. HATCHER: How many units of senior housing are proposed with this special exception application?

MR. BURKE: Fifty-seven houses of fee-simple senior housing are proposed.

MR. HATCHER: Approximately how many dwellings proposed per acre?

MR. BURKE: It's about 4.75 dwelling units proposed per acre.

MR. HATCHER: Okay. At -- at this -- at this point, Madame Examiner, Jude's going to be -- Mr. Burke's going to be referencing Exhibits 21 and 22 as he describes the type of units that Elm Street is proposing here. I'm going to continue with my questions, but for purposes of the -- of the record, I just wanted to have that as a reference point. What type of single-family attached units are proposed?

MR. BURKE: They are villas. They're a type of single-family attached house designed for seniors with all of the necessary living spaces, such as owner's suite, kitchen, dining and laundry on the first floor.

There's a smaller upstairs level less -- less than half the footprint of the house with a bathroom and a couple of rooms that can be used as guest bedrooms or study or a reading room, sewing room, that type of thing.

The -- there -- there may be a partial
basement if the lot they're on has a grade decline towards the rear of the house.

MR. HATCHER: Okay. Can you elaborate on the pro- -- the proposed design associated with the villas?

MR. BURKE: We're proposing a 28-foot wide house on every lot, each house will have a 2-car garage. Every house will have a minimum of 60 percent masonry on the front of the house, including the entire first floor.

Houses with highly visible end walls will have masonry on the first floor along with extra -- four points of architecture on the first floor, three points of architectural fenestration on the second floor and enhanced roofline detail and shutters on all windows on those sides.

MR. HATCHER: At this point, we can remove the exhibits from -- from the view. Are any onsite
recreational facilities proposed with this application?
MR. BURKE: Yes. We're going to have several onsite recreational amenities.

MR. HATCHER: Can you testify to the types of recreational facilities proposed?

MR. BURKE: The proposed development will have multiple community amenities to provide opportunities for residents to spend time together outdoors. The amenities include a gathering area with a lighted pavilion and additional seating spaces on a plaza around that pavilion, including a game table and also community gardens. There'll also be three outdoor fitness machines and walking trails in the community.

MR. HATCHER: How -- how will age restrictions be enforced for the proposed senior community?

MR. BURKE: Age restrictions will be enforced through covenants approved by the Prince George's County Council and recorded in the county land records and a draft of the proposed age-restriction covenant was submitted as part of the special exception application.

MR. HATCHER: For reference purposes, Madame

Examiner and People's zoning counsel, Exhibit 10, I believe, is the age restriction covenants that were submitted with this application.

MS. MCNEIL: The -- if I could ask a quick question about those. So the -- the law seems to state that the district council will approve these, but usually, the actual items should be in this record. So this one's a draft. Are you proposing to submit what you consider to be the final draft after the case in the event that you're recommended for approval? Is that what's going on? Because this is clearly just the draft; right?

MR. HATCHER: Yes.
MS. MCNEIL: Exhibit A is totally blank. MR. HATCHER: Yes.

MS. MCNEIL: Okay. Okay. Did somebody else have a question based on that? I thought I heard something.

MR. BURKE: I will let my attorney speak for me. Thanks.

MS. MCNEIL: Okay. Go ahead, Mr. Hatcher. Thanks for that.

MR. HATCHER: In your experience, will the -will the -- will the needs be met for the retirement community with the villas and the recreational facilities you're proposing?

MR. BURKE: Yes. The -- as I said, the -- the villa style house has all the living spaces on the first floor. It has room for guests upstairs, compact yards, we'll have maintenance provided by the homeowner's association. The -- and of course, all the common areas will be maintained by the homeowner's association and the -- the age-restricted community just provides a quieter, calmer neighborhood than an all-ages neighborhood.

The location is extremely convenient and that allows the future residents to maintain their ties to family, friends and the rest of their circle, medical providers, businesses they're used to working with and still stay in the community.

MR. HATCHER: Did the applicant perform any community outreach related to this application?

MR. BURKE: Yes. I contacted the Springfield Manor and the Oakstone Homeowner's -- Homeowner's

Associations since they're the adjacent property owners. I had virtual meetings with Springfield Manor on May 24, 2022 and Oakstone on June 23, 2022. I had a virtual meeting with the Glenn Dale Citizens Association on April 19, 2022.

I had a virtual meeting with the Wingate Homeowner's Association on November 14, 2022 and at each meeting I gave my phone number and email address out and invited the attendees to pass my contact information along to neighbors who couldn't attend and in- -- invited them to contact me to discuss the project further.

And also spoke with other residents adjacent or near the subject property, especially after we sent pre-application mailings in November, 2022, received calls from a few folks and spoke with them and emailed plans to people.

MR. HATCHER: Are you familiar with the technical staff report dated September 20, 2023 as amended by development review staff's October 4, 2023 supplemental memorandum?

MR. BURKE: Yes. September 30, 2023, I think
is the date on the technical staff report and as amended by the supplemental memorandum, yes, I reviewed them.

MR. HATCHER: Do you agree with the analysis contained in there?

MR. BURKE: Yes. I do.
MR. HATCHER: At this point, I have no further questions for Mr. Burke.

MS. MCNEIL: Mr. Suhar, do you have any questions?

MR. SUHAR: Yes. I do, just a -- just a couple questions. Thank you. Morning, Mr. Burke.

MR. BURKE: Morning.
MR. SUHAR: You said that -- you -- you -- you -- you testified that there was a need for planned retirement community in -- in Glenn Dale; is that correct?

MR. BURKE: Yes.
MR. SUHAR: Okay. And what -- what -- what's the basis for your determination?

MR. BURKE: The Bowie area has been asking for more senior housing going back to, again, 20 -- 20
years ago when I started in this business. We've heard from Bowie that they -- they seek more senior housing and that's right next door to Glenn Dale. There's a -just an overall housing shortage and a need for senior housing.

Again, I've been working on projects in the county since 2003 and have seen that there's a -- a shortage of housing of all types and by adding senior housing, tho- -- those families who are in the 55-plus bracket and qualify can move out of their existing houses, sell those to a younger family and move into an age-restricted community just increa- -- so even though it's age-restricted, it helps with the housing stock of the entire county.

MR. SUHAR: Have you conducted surveys?
MR. BURKE: No.
MR. SUHAR: Okay. So what -- what -- what basis are you finding -- you said that there's a need in Bowie. What -- what --

MR. HATCHER: Objection; asked and answered.
MS. MCNEIL: Give him just a little more leeway, Mr. Hatcher, overruled.

MR. SUHAR: Thank you. So --
MR. BURKE: I'm relying on my -- my expertise as a -- a developer in the county for 20 years that we know there's a need for houses and we know there's a need for senior housing in the county. There's a number of other projects, not a lot, but there are other senior housing projects that have been selling strongly to demonstrate that there's a demand for that product in the county and we're -- we're confident that there's a need and a demand for these houses at this location.

MR. SUHAR: So you -- you -- you just said that you're -- you're an expert?

MR. BURKE: I said I'm relying on my expertise with my 20 years of experience developing land in Prince George's County.

MR. SUHAR: Okay. Madame Hearing Examiner, I -- I -- I don't believe that there was any -- any -that -- that the -- that the witness here was designated as an expert.

MR. BURKE: I'm using expertise with a lowercase E, I think, not a capital.

MR. SUHAR: Oh -- oh, okay. All right. So
you're -- you're not an expert then?
MR. BURKE: I --
MS. MCNEIL: He has not been designated as an expert witness.

MR. HATCHER: Yeah. Yeah. Ob- -- objection.
MR. SUHAR: Oh, okay.
MR. HATCHER: He has not been qualified as an expert witness, we didn't proffer him as an expert witness, he's -- as Mr. Jude said, he is relying on his expertise of 20 years of work in Prince George's County on various types of projects throughout the county and also, he referenced documents approved by the council relating to the need, particularly as it relates to Bowie and vicinity.

MR. SUHAR: Just for verification purposes, he said he had expertise. I just wanted to make -- you know, clarify whether he was an expert and you clarified it for me. Thank you. So Mr. Burke -- but -so do -- do you have any -- any -- is there any documentation that you've relied upon in determining the need for planned retirement community in Glenn Dale or even Bowie?

MR. BROWN: I'm going to have to object.
MR. HATCHER: Yeah. Object. Yeah. Sorry, Mr. Brown.

MR. BROWN: And the reason for this is the direct examination was somewhat conflating the issue of whether there is a need for this particular product versus whether or not the needs of the retirement-aged community are met. So $I$ want to clarify it, Mr. Burke, so you understand really what the questions are.

Under 27-395 A1AI, the district council shall find that proposed use will serve the needs of the retirement-aged community. That was the question that was asked by your counsel. The other counsel of need under the same section, Section 3, is in the RA Zone, there shall be a demonstrated need for the facility.

This is not in the RA Zone, it's in the RR Zone. Therefore, there is not a requirement to show need in a community for this particular project. So Mr. Suhar, I say that to you so that maybe you can direct your questions as it relates to need to 27-395 A1A1 [sic], that is the proposed use will serve the needs of the retirement-aged community, because that is the
testimony, which Mr. Burke was giving on his direct examination, not need of the actual facility in the general community.

MS. MCNEIL: So I would sustain, but you did mean there was some conflation in the crossexamination; right? Because you said direct. I'm just trying to make sure.

MR. BROWN: Actually, in both.
MS. MCNEIL: Okay. Okay. Okay. Thank you. So he's sustained. Do you have other questions, Mr. Suhar?

MR. SUHAR: Yeah. So I'll move on, just -just one other question.

MS. MCNEIL: Okay.
MR. SUHAR: Mr. Burke, you said that you met with the Wingate Homeowner's Association on November 14, 2023. I'm sorry, '22.

MR. BURKE: I think that's the date -- you -it was a meeting you were at.

MR. SUHAR: Oh, okay. Right.
MR. BURKE: The Zoo- -- the Zoom meeting we had with them, not in person.

MR. SUHAR: Right. Okay. And at -- at that --
during that meeting, were you proposing the same number of dwelling units as you're proposing now?

MR. BURKE: The -- again, that was a year ago, the plans were still in address state. I don't remember for sure exactly what the unit count was at that point, but I think I was clear that -- at that point, that we were still working on the plans in the -- the proposal.

MR. HATCHER: I object to the relevance of the question.

MS. MCNEIL: Do you have any proffer as to why you're asking it, Mr. Suhar?

MR. SUHAR: Yeah, because he -- he said that he met with our -- with the community. I was just wondering if it was the same -- I -- I want to know from -- from Mr. Burke that it was the same application as he's submitting today.

MR. HATCHER: That's actually a different question you asked.

MS. MCNEIL: Right. He doesn't object to that one. Go ahead.

MR. SUHAR: The same number of dwelling units. It was -- it was more specific than that, same number
of dwelling units, yes or no?
MS. MCNEIL: You could answer that, Mr.
Hatcher if he --
MR. SUHAR: Or if he doesn't know, that's fine.

MR. BURKE: Again, that -- that was prior to the actual application going in or -- or being accepted. And so I'm trying to find the slides I would've used with your group that night, Mr. Suhar, to see what my site plan looked like on November 14 th and I found them. So --

MS. MCNEIL: Well, while he's doing that, Mr. Suhar, do you know that there's a -- a different amount? Could you ask him, isn't it true that it was X amount? That might help him remember.

MR. BURKE: On my -- well, I'm sorry to interrupt, Ms. Hearing Examiner.

MS. MCNEIL: Go ahead. Mm-hmm.
MR. SUHAR: Yeah. I -- I thought that it was over -- over -- over 70, but I'm not recollecting [inaudible].

MR. BURKE: I -- I -- I've definitely never
showed that many and I just found my November 14, 2022 slides and it had 57 houses in a layout that's since been re- -- revised, but -- so we're still showing 57, but I --

MS. MCNEIL: Okay.
MR. BURKE: -- I don't think I've had a 70 or greater unit plan to show anybody on this property.

MR. SUHAR: Okay. Thank you. And did -- did any of the communities that you met with -- did they approve of the -- of your proposed project here, your special re- -- request for special exception?

MR. BURKE: Nobody took a vote in my presence, I just showed them our proposal and took questions.

MR. SUHAR: Okay. Thank you. No -- no further questions.

MS. MCNEIL: Just before Mr. Brown, there are a lot of elevations in this file. Do you know, did you change them over time or are they just different ver- -- versions? Because 21 and 22 are -- and also, 54, 55, 56, 57, those are talking about the porches, etc. Is there a reason why we had so many, if you recall?

MR. BURKE: They may have been in response to
comments from staff during the application and acceptance process, but I think --

MS. MCNEIL: They are pretty similar, I just wondered --

MR. BURKE: -- I think they --
MS. MCNEIL: -- so for -- for example, one second, Ms. Bah [ph], if you could pull up Exhibit 56 just showing him one, $I$ just want to know that --

MS. BAH: Sure.
MS. MCNEIL: -- is still what you propose as the elevations.

MR. BURKE: Sure. And -- and after the hearing, I'll make sure that we whittle it down and say, you know, if there's extras or duplicates, I'll --

MS. MCNEIL: Okay.
MR. BURKE: -- make sure we can pull those.
MS. MCNEIL: So you see this one?
MR. BURKE: Yeah.
MS. MCNEIL: Okay. Okay. That's good. So you'll look afterwards and send me what you really believe to be descriptive of what you might wish to build there. Okay.

MR. BURKE: Yeah. Yes, Your Honor.
MS. MCNEIL: Oh, and the square footage is in Exhibit -- I'm sorry, Exhibit 23 I think. Is that still accurate? About how large are these homes?

MR. BURKE: Let's see, I'm trying to pull up the binder in all the exhibits.

MS. MCNEIL: Or maybe I'm -- thank you, Ms.
Bah. Could you pull up Exhibit 23? That's hard to see, though. It's several pages of --

MS. BAH: Sure. [inaudible] open.
MS. MCNEIL: Thank you.
MS. BAH: No problem. I can zoom in.
MS. MCNEIL: Yeah. So he can sort of -- so you know this document --

MR. HATCHER: Yeah.
MS. MCNEIL: -- Mr. Burke?
MR. BURKE: Yes.
MS. MCNEIL: Okay. So about how many -- how -what's the square footage of the homes, a range?

MR. BURKE: I think on the far right, I think they're generally in the 1,800 square foot range.

MS. MCNEIL: Okay. Because somewhere in the
staff report I saw much larger numbers and I was wondering about that. So you think 1,800 or -- oh --

MR. HATCHER: Ma- -- Madame Examiner, if I may?

MS. MCNEIL: Sure.
MR. HATCHER: What -- what we plan on doing is along with what Mr. Jude said, going through the record and identifying any duplicates for purposes of not only the record but of your opinion and in that -- in that document we'll submit, which goes through the -- the -the -- every -- every exhibit in the record. We'll also provide the -- the square footage just for clarity purposes.

MS. MCNEIL: Okay. Because I found it like on Page 5 of the staff report, which $I$ don't think was revised. Yeah. In the front, it says 2,200 to 3,200 square feet.

MR. BURKE: Definitely not that big.
MS. MCNEIL: Okay. So I -- I really need that information. Thank you.

MR. BURKE: Yes, ma'am.
MS. MCNEIL: Okay. Mr. Brown, I'm sorry.

MR. BROWN: I have no questions.
MS. MCNEIL: Okay. Oh, now, is there anyone opposed to this request not represented by Mr. Suhar that has a question of Mr. Burke?

DR. PINE: Hi. This is Pamela Pine. I -- I pardon, I'm not a lawyer, I'm a homeowner right down the block that has never been spoken to, nor do I believe any of my neighbors have been spoken to.

MS. MCNEIL: Wait, wait, wait, Ms. Pine --
DR. PINE: Uh-huh.

MS. MCNEIL: -- state your name and address and make that a question for him.

DR. PINE: Dr. Pamela Pine --
MS. MCNEIL: Okay.
DR. PINE: -- 8100 Springfield Road, Glenn Dale, Maryland 20769. And --

MS. MCNEIL: Can you come on camera? I'm so sorry, Dr. Pine.

DR. PINE: Sure.

MS. MCNEIL: Okay.
DR. PINE: So I'm wondering why none of the neighbors in my area on Springfield Road have ever been
addressed or approached with any concerns about our questions.

MS. MCNEIL: So she's wondering isn't it true that you never addressed any of her neighbors or others on her street? And then you answer.

MR. BURKE: I disagree that I never approached or spoke with any of the neighbors. We -- I apologize if I didn't speak with you Ms. -- Dr. Pine. As a person of record now, you'll be on the list for all future mailings on this project and we sent notification letters to everybody on the park and planning list and I think we've got the certified mail receipts for those.

Did speak on the phone with a couple neighbors who live slightly closer to the subject property than Dr. Pine, but I -- I agree, I have not spoken with Dr. Pine and would be happy to make myself available to her to -- to show her the project in more detail.

DR. PINE: Or Mr. Fendlay or Mr. Hank Alda- -Aldas [sic] -- Alda- -- Aldag, sorry, Aldag. I don't think they've been spoken to either. I want -- I also have a question about whether -- and I know that there
are other witnesses coming up, I recognize that, but have there been any concerns addressed -- any individuals approached about their concerns about traffic issues and pollution issues?

MR. BURKE: So M- -- Mr. Aldag called me last week and we spoke for a while and I stopped by to speak with him yesterday at his house. The other name you mentioned I don't think I've spoken with, but again, happy to provide my phone number and email to every- -everybody out there and come out and meet with you in person with a set of the plans so we can go over that.

I think we're going to cover traffic with my traffic engineer here later. I -- I think we addressed the traffic impacts as required by the county.

DR. PINE: I -- I have one more question, please, if $I$-- if I may, Ms. -- Ms. McNeil, yes, zoning hearing --

MS. MCNEIL: Yes.
DR. PINE: -- I'm sorry, I don't know your full title, I can't see it, zoning hearing commissioner, is it?

MS. MCNEIL: Well, you don't have to say all
of that, Ms. -- Ms. McNeil is fine.
DR. PINE: Oh, okay.
MS. MCNEIL: Go ahead.
DR. PINE: Okay. So I'm also wondering, there had been discussion a few moments ago about the need for senior housing. I have two questions. Has anybody considered the fact that there are three senior housing developments in the nearby area, one which is still going up that is huge on Enterprise Road and -- and -and the ability of that to address the need of the community. That's one question.

MS. MCNEIL: Okay. Let him answer that if he can, Mr. Burke.

MR. BURKE: Yes. We're aware of that -- that project on Enterprise and we have considered that and we feel there is still going to be a need for more housing in the area.

DR. PINE: And in -- in relation to the housing itself, people have expressed -- I have expressed and others have expressed a question about why if this is planned housing for seniors who are known to have issues with joints and climbing and
breath, why these are multi-story homes.
MR. BURKE: The upstairs is generally extra space, a couple of spare bedrooms and a bathroom or they don't have to be bedrooms if, you know, visitors -- if kids or grandkids are visiting or a home office, but -- but everything that you need day to day is on that first floor from the owner's suite, kitchen, dining. Everything's on that first floor.

DR. PINE: Including bedrooms, yes?
MR. BURKE: The -- the owner's bedroom is on the first floor. Yes.

DR. PINE: Uh-huh. And -- and I would like, Ms. McNeil, if I could please invite other members of -- who are on this call like Mr. Aldag to see if he has any questions, because $I$ know he had a number of concerns with regard to zoning and with regard to pollution issues and he's more familiar with those things than $I$ am.

MS. MCNEIL: Ms. Pine, that was going to be my -- that's my job. I was going to ask the others if they wanted to speak.

DR. PINE: Well, right. I -- I -- I -- it's --
it's - -
MS. MCNEIL: But thank you.
DR. PINE: Oh, no -- no problem. It's a problem I've inherited from my mother.

MS. MCNEIL: Okay. So that was Ms. Pine's question. Anyone else opposed not represented by Mr. Suhar who have questions of this witness. Questions? Okay. Mr. Holman.

MR. HOLMAN: Yes. Thank you, Madam Hearing Examiner. I'm Charles Holman, I live at 8306 Driscoll in Bowie. I'm an adjacent property owner to the development here just across the stream from where it's going to go. My questions center on the -- the land on which this is going to be built, which quite an incline.

It's a steep incline that rises towards Springfield Road and on the opposite side of the stream where I live, the land is very flat. So my question to Mr. Burke is what specifically is the developer going to do to minimize runoff which will probably be going into this creek and possibly onto our homes on the other side of this creek or stream?

Because I understand you're going to take out quite a bit of trees and I don't know whether you're going to level off the earth or leave it as it is, but again, my question is about the runoff and the impact on us as adjacent property owners. Can you address that, please?

MR. BURKE: Yes, sir. Good to see you again, Mr. Holman. As -- when we walked back there when I came over to your house last year, the -- the stream itself, the banks are fairly steep, but the Stewart property isn't actually all that steep, but the --

MR. HOLMAN: Oh, no, it is.
MR. BURKE: -- the -- the -- well, respectfully disagree on that, but the --

MR. HOLMAN: I'm looking at it right now.
MR. BURKE: -- so the -- the stream has a buffer and it's protected and we'll -- we'll have sediment controlled measures in place to keep any sediment from running into the stream. The -- the -the -- the ultimate stormwater management condition -or I guess you were -- you were just asking about sediment control I think?

MR. HOLMAN: Well, I -- maybe you can more elaborate on what you mean by sediment control, but my overall concern is all that water which currently goes into the ground and a lot of it is absorbed by many, many trees across the Stewart property. What's going to be done to ensure that adjacent property owners are not going to be affected by that runoff and I raise all this, because there is another development just next to us called Oakcrest, I believe it is, Oak-something.

MR. BURKE: Oakstone.
MR. HOLMAN: Oakstone, thank you. And when that was constructed, the homeowners that are across from that and the development in which I live began to suffer, basements flooding and a number of water issues and we just want to make sure that this land which is even steeper, the -- the Stewart property, that when it's developed, it's not going to create a serious problem for those of us on the other side of the stream.

And I'd like you to address all of the things that you are proposing to do, especially if you're taking down these trees, that's going to ensure that we
don't have a new problem created by this proposed development.

MR. BROWN: Let me interrupt you for a moment, Mr. Holman. Your question is really beyond the scope of the direct examination of Mr. Burke. And Mr. Hatcher, do you have someone else who plans to testify about topography and stormwater management?

MR. HATCHER: Amy Sommer from CPJ will -- will be testifying as well as Mark Ferguson.

MR. BROWN: All right. Mr. Holman, if you can reserve your questions concerning stormwater management for the -- Ms. Sommer who plans to testify, which is later on?

MR. HOLMAN: Well, I'd -- I'd prefer not to do that, because I think $M-$-- Dr. Pine addressed matters which were beyond the scope of the direct examination as well and I'm not here in the capacity as an attorney, I'm here as a property owner wishing to direct these questions to the developer of the land and Mr. Burke and I have had some discussions on this and I thought this was my opportunity to raise questions with him.

Now, if you want to have additional testimony from another witness later on, I certainly would like to hear that, but Madame Hearing Examiner, if you would just give me the opportunity to hear it from Mr. Burke, I would appreciate it.

MS. MCNEIL: I'm going to give just a little leeway. People's zoning counsel is correct, although, the rules of evidence are relaxed, but Mr. Burke, whatever he says, would not -- the expert witness that's coming on later is the one that could give you the most detail. But Mr. Burke, if you can -- if you can, answer the question.

MR. HOLMAN: Thank you.
MR. BURKE: Glad to. And a lot of that is answered by the role of the Department of Permitting, Inspections and Enforcement and Prince George's Soil Conservation District. We have to have very detailed plans through both those agencies for stormwater management, for sediment control during construction and the -- we comply with all the state and county regulations regarding those.

So there -- those laws and regulations are in
place to protect your property and other downstream properties. The -- the -- the stormwater management onsite is going to be submerged gravel wetlands and micro-bioretention. The ultimate condition when the site is built is going to comply with the 2007 Maryland Stormwater Management Regulations.

The -- the goal of those regulations is that post-development the stormwater management discharge is the same as if the land was a wooded area in good condition. So in fact, it's actually more stringent than whatever's existing prior to construction. The -the post-construction condition is that it's got to be the same as a -- a -- a wooded area in good condition.

So we're at, I'll maintain the word, improving the stormwater management discharge off the property.

MR. ALDAG: Hello. I was wondering if I could give a little comment on that if $I$ could?

MS. MCNEIL: Wait, wait, wait, wait --
MR. ALDAG: Oh -- oh.
MS. MCNEIL: -- one second. Mr. Holman, are you finished? We've going -- we're going one at a time

MR. HOLMAN: Yes.
MS. MCNEIL: -- because we're recording this. You know, we're making a transcript.

MR. HOLMAN: Yes, Madame Hearing Examiner. Thank you.

MS. MCNEIL: Okay. And are you Mr. Aldag?
MR. ALDAG: I am. Hi. And --
MS. MCNEIL: Okay. State your name and address and then questions for Mr. Burke.

MR. ALDAG: It's actually Howard and Tanya [ph] Aldag, my wife is here too. We're at 8485 Springfield Road in -- in Glenn Dale, Maryland. We also own 8465 and then we have another property that is 12001 Lanham Severn Road, which is just at the bottom of the street on Lanham Severn Road.

And we, for the most part, basically have actually two items that $I$ wanted to actually talk about. First item is the traffic and --

MS. MCNEIL: Wait, wait, wait --
MR. ALDAG: -- you know -- okay.
MS. MCNEIL: -- I'm so sorry, Mr. Aldag --
MR. ALDAG: Yeah.

MS. MCNEIL: -- are you going to be able to stick around? You're not leaving, are you?

MR. ALDAG: No. I'm not, but I have the environment impact of the Newstop Branch conversation for you.

MS. MCNEIL: Okay.
MR. ALDAG: I hired an expert to actually help us look at the environmental that were involved here.

MS. MCNEIL: Okay. I hear you, but --
MR. ALDAG: Yeah.
MS. MCNEIL: -- you're jumping the gun a little. Right now we can only --

MR. ALDAG: Oh.
MS. MCNEIL: -- do questions of Mr. Burke. So do you have any questions?

MR. ALDAG: Okay. Actually, you know, he was talking about, you know, his mitigation of, you know, the stormwater and how to keep, you know, the stormwater in good shape and also, you have the Newstop Branch water that is behind you and we -- yeah.

And basically, the Maryland Biological Stream Survey of 2018 showed that the stream was in good
shape, but it required having a certain amount of forest and certain amount of permeable land. And -- and so [inaudible] --

MS. MCNEIL: [inaudible]. Okay.
MR. ALDAG: -- the -- the changes that they're about ready to make actually, you know, will compromise a particular branch --

MS. MCNEIL: Okay. Hold on --
MR. ALDAG: Yeah. [inaudible] record --
MS. MCNEIL: -- hold on a second, Mr. Aldag.
Mr. Burke, do you know anything about the Newstop Branch and whether or not it will be impacted by what you're doing or is this something that you think you have another witness that can address it?

MR. BURKE: I think my engineers, Madame Examiner, probably are -- are better to speak to that, but Newstop Branch is the creek that runs kind of on the back of the property separating the property from Springfield Manor and Oakstone Subdivisions and --

MR. ALDAG: Yeah. And --
MR. BURKE: -- we are not actually doing anything in the stream itself. We've got two minor
impacts to the primary management area, the buffer outside the stream where we're connecting to the existing storm sewer and doing the discharge for the submerged gravel wetlands.

MR. ALDAG: Yeah. [inaudible] this is for the record --

MS. MCNEIL: Wait, wait, wait, wait a second, Mr. Aldag.

MR. ALDAG: Yeah.
MS. MCNEIL: So at this point, I think I am going to uphold Mr. Brown's objection, because we're really getting into issues that another witness, maybe even the next witness, is the one that needs to answer all of this. So if you could hold on --

MR. HOLMAN: Okay. Because --
MS. MCNEIL: -- Mr. Aldag for -- for one second.

MR. HOLMAN: -- we did -- yeah. We did a -- a huge amount of research on it, I hired an expert. So I do have an ex- -- expert on it and my letter from Hank and Tonya Aldag on 12/17, if we could have that entered as part of the record --

MS. MCNEIL: I -- I will as soon as I call you.

MR. HOLMAN: Okay. Good. Good. If I --
MS. MCNEIL: I've got to follow a little order here. Okay.

MR. HOLMAN: Okay.
MS. MCNEIL: So Mr. Burke -- anyone else have questions of Mr. Burke based on his testimony?

MR. HATCHER: May I have redirect?
MS. MCNEIL: Wait a minute, I'm looking. I don't see anyone else. And Mr. Brown, did you have any questions? Okay. All right, Mr. Hatcher.

MR. HATCHER: Just Mr. -- Mr. Burke, I know you answered this before, but I think it's -- it's worth just sort of reiterating. In your experience, will the proposed use meet the needs of the retirement age community and how?

MR. BURKE: Yes. It will. The community will be a -- just a -- a safe, comfortable environment for seniors. It'll have the amenities needed to both provide for them and provide that network with the rest of the residents there with the meeting space and the
amenities on site and the type of architecture will meet the needs of the senior population.

MR. SUHAR: I'm going -- I'm going to object at this point to this testimony, because Mr. Burke is not an expert and he's testifying to what $I$ would consider to be expert testimony.

MS. MCNEIL: I recognize that he's not an expert. So I will give that testimony the weight it deserves. I mean, that sounded bad, but the weight --

MR. BURKE: No offense taken.
MS. MCNEIL: -- appropriate weight. I'm sorry, Mr. Burke.

MR. BURKE: No offense taken, Madame Examiner.
MS. MCNEIL: And so I'm going to overrule, although, $I$-- we all recognize he's not an expert witness.

MR. SUHAR: Okay.
MS. MCNEIL: Do you have anything further, Mr. Hatcher, of this witness?

MR. SUHAR: Thank you.
MR. HATCHER: No, ma'am.
MS. MCNEIL: Okay. Thank you so much, Mr.

Burke.
MR. BURKE: My pleasure.
MS. MCNEIL: Who's your next witness?
MR. HATCHER: Ms. Sommer.
MS. MCNEIL: So it's not Schumer [sic]? You
were throwing me off.
MR. HATCHER: I was. Yeah. Sommer, my apologies.

MS. SOMMER: I'm not [inaudible].
MS. MCNEIL: Okay. Ms. Sommer, do you swear or affirm under the penalties of perjury that the testimony you shall give will be the truth and nothing but the truth?

MS . SOMMER: Yes.
MS. MCNEIL: Okay.
MR. HATCHER: Ms. -- Ms. Sommer, can you please state your full name and business address for the record?

MS. SOMMER: My name is Amy Sommer. Business address is 1751 Elton Road, Suite 300, Silver Spring, Maryland.

MR. HATCHER: Where are you currently
employed?
MS. SOMMER: At Charles P. Johnson \&
Associates.
MR. HATCHER: What is your current position at CPJ?

MS. SOMMER: I am a senior landscape architect project manager and I'm transitioning right now to the division manager of the planning department at Charles P. Johnson \& Associates.

MR. HATCHER: Does CPJ provide civil engineering, land planning and survey services to its clients in the ordinary course of business?

MS. SOMMER: Yes. Charles P. Johnson \& Associates provides a full range of civil engineer, survey and land planning services.

MR. HATCHER: Was CPJ retained by the applicant to provide those services for this property?

MS. SOMMER: Yes.
MR. HATCHER: Can you briefly go over -- well, can you go over your -- can you describe your role as division manager in planning department at CPJ?

MS. SOMMER: I manage several projects through
the development and entitlement process, also supervise over a team of about 9 to 10 drafters, landscape designers, registered landscape architects.

MR. HATCHER: Do you have any licenses or certifications in land planning or landscape architecture?

MS. SOMMER: Yes. I'm a registered landscape architect in the state of Maryland and New York.

MR. HATCHER: Are you familiar with the property which is the subject of this application?

MS. SOMMER: Yes.
MR. HATCHER: Did CPJ prepare the site plan and other plans associated with the special exception?

MS. SOMMER: Yes. CPJ prepared the site plan associated with this special exception.

MR. HATCHER: Did CPJ prepare any revisions to that site plan and other plans associated with the special exception?

MS. SOMMER: Yes. CPJ revised the layouts to the site plan in August after -- after SDRC reviewed in order to preserve the specimen trees five through eight on site and comply with the recommendations from the
environmental planning division of --
MR. HATCHER: Okay.
MS. SOMMER: -- and then CTPC.
MR. HATCHER: Did you -- did -- did CPJ submit an exhibit which describes the revisions and why it was necessary?

MS. SOMMER: Yes.
MR. HATCHER: Madame Examiner, People's zoning counsel, $I$ believe that is listed as Exhibit 94. The --

MS. MCNEIL: Admitted.
MR. HATCHER: Okay. Can you describe the content of the exhibit?

MS. SOMMER: It's not up on the screen, but it was a site plan that showed the revisions to the layout to preserve the specimen trees, as previously mentioned.

MR. HATCHER: Have you reviewed the technical staff -- staff reported dated September 20, 2023 as amended by development review staff's October 4, 2023 supplemental memorandum?

MS . SOMMER: Yes.
MR. HATCHER: Do you agree with the technical
staff report and the -- and the associated memorandum?
MS. SOMMER: Yes.
MR. SUHAR: Objection.
MR. HATCHER: Is one of the --
MS. MCNEIL: Wait, there's an objection pending. Why is that, Mr. Suhar?

MR. SUHAR: It doesn't matter as to whether she agrees with the te- -- technical staff report.

MS. MCNEIL: Well, it matters for my decision, because $I$ often state whether applicant objects to any of the staff report or its recommended conditions. So I'm going to overrule.

MR. SUHAR: Okay. All right.
MR. HATCHER: Is one of the plans associated with the special exception a boundary survey of the property?

MS. SOMMER: Yes. There is a property boundary survey.

MR. HATCHER: Madame Examiner, People's zoning counsel, I believe that is listed as Exhibit 40. Can you describe the purposes of the boundary survey?

MS. SOMMER: The purpose is to confirm the
legal boundaries and the overall size of the subject property.

MR. HATCHER: How many acres is reflected on the boundary survey -- survey for the property?

MS. SOMMER: 12.01 acres.
MS. MCNEIL: Ms. -- Ms. Bah, could we pull up Exhibit 40? Thanks. It should be in the first binder.

MR. HATCHER: And just for confirmation purposes, is this the boundary survey that you were referencing?

MS . SOMMER: Yes.
MR. HATCHER: Okay. We can -- we can remove the boundary survey from the monitor if -- if Madame Hea- -- Hearing Examiner would like. We would, however, like the Exhibit 74 be brought up on the monitor and while that's being brought up on the monitor, is another one of the plans associated with the special exception a tree conservation plan type two?

MS. SOMMER: Yes.
MR. HATCHER: Just waiting for it. There you go. As amended by the conditions of approval proposed by technical staff in the staff report, will the site
plan be in conformance with the TCP II plan?
MS. SOMMER: Yes. It will.
MR. HATCHER: Can you describe the location of the on- -- onsite specimen trees?

MS. SOMMER: There are 10 onsite specimen trees, 3 of them are in the center of the property, that would be ST 9, 10 and 11. There is 2 towards the eastern end of the property, ST 3 and 4 and there is a cluster towards the northeast of the property of trees 5 through 8.

MR. HATCHER: Are you familiar with the Prince George's County Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance?

MS . SOMMER: Yes.
MR. HATCHER: Did technical staff provide an analysis and recommendation of a variance to remove specimen trees?

MS. SOMMER: Yes.
MR. HATCHER: In the analysis -- in the anal-
-- in analyzing the variance to remove four specimen trees, did staff analyze the required findings?

MS. SOMMER: Yes. They did.

MR. HATCHER: Do you agree with technical staff's recommendation regarding the variance to remove the specimen trees?

MS. SOMMER: Yes.
MR. HATCHER: Madame Examiner, if there are no further questions, you can remove Exhibit 74 from the monitor. Are you familiar with the Prince George's County Landscape Manual?

MS . SOMMER: Yes.
MS. MCNEIL: Oh, so- -- I'm so sorry, I didn't unmute. We can remove 74 , but $I$ did have one question about the variance. There is a requirement in the law that notice of any request for a variance shall be given to the state's department of natural resources within 15 days of a receipt for a var- -- receipt of a request for a variance. Do you know if that was done in this case or do you know if it's the practice of the county and the state now to not require this?

And if you don't know, I need to leave this record open for you all to address that one provision. It's in Section 25 -- give me one sec. I know it's in D, 25-119 D4. So it's not the criteria, it's just below
the criteria. Do you know anything about that, Ms. Sommer?

MS. SOMMER: I do not. Not offhand.
MS. MCNEIL: Okay. And Mr. Hatcher, I do need to leave this record open to address -- address that. I will state for the record that we had a prior case involving the variance and in that case, park and planning submitted a letter explaining that the state no longer wants it, they no longer do it. I need that kind of information in this record as well. Thank you. So go ahead, I'm sorry.

MR. HATCHER: Thank you, Madame Examiner. Ms. Sommer, are you familiar with the Prince George's County Landscape Manual?

MS. SOMMER: Yes.
MR. HATCHER: Did the technical staff provide an analysis of an alternative compliance?

MS. SOMMER: Yes.
MR. HATCHER: Do you agree with technical staff's recommendation regarding the alternative compliance?

MS. SOMMER: Yes. I do.

MR. HATCHER: At this point, we have no further questions for this -- for this witness.

MS. MCNEIL: Mr. Suhar.
MR. SUHAR: Thank you, Madame Examiner. Good morning, Ms. Sommer. I -- you -- you -- you testified that -- that the specimen trees, you said, 5 through 10, I believe, are being preserved; is that right?

MS. SOMMER: No. Five through eight.
MR. SUHAR: Five through eight.
MS. SOMMER: The total specimen trees on site being preserved are number 2, 4, 5, six, 7, 8 and then there are 3 that are off site that are being preserved, 11, 12 and 13.

MR. SUHAR: Okay. So how many total specimen trees are being removed?

MS. SOMMER: Four.
MR. HATCHER: Okay. And does that comply with the requirements under -- under the -- oh, gosh, the 2010 Prince George's County Landscape Manual requirements?

MS. SOMMER: That does not address specimen trees.

MR. HATCHER: Yeah. I -- I -- I -- I object to the question. Can you clarify it?

MS. MCNEIL: Mr. Hatcher, I think -- I think Ms. Sommer can answer.

MS. SOMMER: Yes. Okay.
MS. MCNEIL: Let her answer first.
MS. SOMMER: That landscape manual does not address specimen trees.

MR. SUHAR: Okay. All right. But your -- your -- your client is asking for a variance so that they can remove specimen trees -- four specimen trees; is that right?

MS. SOMMER: Yes.
MR. SUHAR: Okay. And why is that?
MS. SOMMER: They are being removed, because these four in particular are towards the center of the site and removal is necessary to get the ne- -- the necessary grading infrastructure and construction to develop the site.

MR. SUHAR: Okay. Specifically, pursuant to the technical staff report and -- and you said that you agree with the tech- -- technical staff report, but the
-- the reason is because the applicant will not be able to satisfy the requirement. Planning staff even goes so far as to argue that the applicant has provided the maximum amount of street trees given the space limitations of the proposed age-restricted housing development; is that right? Do you agree with that?

MS. SOMMER: We have pro- -- we have provided the maximum number of street trees given the site constraints.

MR. SUHAR: Site constraints. Okay.
MS . SOMMER: Yes.
MR. SUHAR: And -- and what specifically are those site constraints?

MS. SOMMER: We have front-loaded driveways. We also have lighting, we have stormwater management, other ne- -- other necessary infrastructure that in some places it's in conflict with locations of street trees. We also have other requirements where we cannot place street trees too close to driveways, too close to road intersections.

MR. SUHAR: So what your client is -- is arguing here then is -- is that because of those
constraints, that would be justified to remove the four tree- -- specimen trees?

MS. SOMMER: We're talking about two different things here. We're talking about specimen trees and you're talking about street trees.

MR. SUHAR: Okay. I'm sorry.
MS. SOMMER: Those are two different things.
MR. SUHAR: All right. So back to the -- back to the specimen trees, what are -- what are the -- what are the constraints there? Why -- why -- why is it that the -- is it the same reason that the -- that the -that the four specimen trees need to be removed?

MS. SOMMER: It would be almost impossible to develop a site without addressing those -- removal of those four specimen trees.

MR. SUHAR: But develop the site how, with 57 lots? Is that what you're talking about?

MS. SOMMER: To develop a planned retirement community at this location.

MR. SUHAR: Okay. Is it possible to pla- -develop a planned retirement community with less lots if, you know -- to -- in order to preserve those
specimen trees?
MS. SOMMER: We would have to do an analysis. I can't confirm without looking at the full grading of the site.

MR. SUHAR: Was that even considered?
MS. SOMMER: We have --
MR. HATCHER: Objection; rel- -- if -- in terms of relevance, what -- what was considered, whether it was 70 units like Mr. Suhar inferred earlier or 30 units isn't relevant to the application before the body.

MR. SUHAR: I think it's very relevant.
MS. MCNEIL: I would -- I would overrule only because one of the criteria for the variance is that it's not based on conditions or circumstances caused by the applicant. So I mean, we don't have to go on and on with this, but $I$ think it's a valid question to ask, if you need the variance, because you want to have 57 homes, but if you had 54 homes, you wouldn't need it and staff didn't address that either, so I'm going to allow it.

MR. SUHAR: Thank you.

MS. SOMMER: Can you repeat the question again?

MR. HATCHER: I'm going to object -- I'm so sorry. Objection; I think this question's already been asked and answered and I believe Ms. Sommer indicated it was for grading-related reasons.

MR. SUHAR: With -- with all due respect, Mr. Hatcher, I don't -- she -- she hasn't answered my question in regards to whether the -- you know, that -that -- if -- if it were -- were possible to develop, you know, less -- less lots or if there were something that could be done on this property in order to preserve the four specimen trees.

MS. SOMMER: We haven't done the analysis. So I cannot confirm that. Part of the challenge with these four trees is that they are in the middle of the site --

MR. SUHAR: Okay. So my --
MS. SOMMER: -- making it hard to -- making it challenging to do -- manage the infrastructure necessary for development even if it's less and also for grading of the site.

MR. SUHAR: So back to my question then that drew the objection, what -- was -- what -- were alternatives considered so the variance wouldn't be necessary so that we could -- so that we could, you know, preserve the four specimen trees?

MS. SOMMER: No.
MR. SUHAR: Okay. Thank you.
MS. SOMMER: Well, the alternative layouts were examined. We've updated the -- we have revised the layout in order to preserve an additional four specimen trees, but those four specimen trees in the middle of the site were always considered for removal.

MR. SUHAR: Okay. So there were alternatives considered? Is that what you're saying?

MS. SOMMER: There were not alternatives considered to remove those -- to preserve those four specimen trees.

MR. SUHAR: Oh, okay. Thank you. So then the street trees, the applicant -- pursuant to the technical staff report, the applicant is -- is asking for a variance from Section 4.10C, which requires 1 street tree per 35 linear feet of frontage. In this
case -- and you -- you -- you agreed with the recommendations here; isn't that right?

MS . SOMMER: Yes.
MR. HATCHER: Objection. What variance are you referring to? Can you just clarify what that is, variance two?

MS. MCNEIL: He's talking about alternative compliance. Did you all testify to that yet? I'm sorry.

MR. SUHAR: That's -- that's what I thought that they did.

MS. MCNEIL: Okay.
MR. HATCHER: Yeah. The applicant -- Ms. -Ms. Sommer did speak to alternative compliance, I just wasn't entirely sure what the variance Mr. Suhar was referring to was.

MS. MCNEIL: Well, he means variance in the same way someone else meant expertise, you know, small V, a change from what's required; is that correct, Mr. Suhar?

MR. SUHAR: Yes. Yeah.
MS. MCNEIL: Okay.
MR. SUHAR: I'm -- I'm specifically concerned
about the -- the technical staff report where it says that the applicant has provided a maximum amount of street trees given the space limitations of the proposed age-restricted housing development.

That's concerning and -- and I -- you know, I
-- I -- I just wanted to -- I -- I want to ask the --
the witness here, you know, why -- why -- what space limitations there are and $I$ think that she's -- she answered this before, the -- the space limitations were due to, you know, development, that they -- that they can't develop the site without -- you know, with the -with the required number of street trees.

MR. HATCHER: I --
MS. SOMMER: Go ahead, Chris.
MR. HATCHER: -- you know, if that was a question, can you ask Ms. Sommer a question?

MR. SUHAR: Yeah. I did.
MS. MCNEIL: Ms. Sommer --
MS. SOMMER: The --
MS. MCNEIL: -- what are the constraints on site that limit the number -- limit you to the number -- what are the constraints on site that made you
request alternative compliance?
MS. SOMMER: From 4.10, it was the --
MS. MCNEIL: As to the street trees. Yes.
MS. SOMMER: Yes. As to the street trees,
that's due to the front-loaded, in this case, singlefamily detached. Where we have front-loaded we have limited space between driveways. So it's common for us to request alternative compliance for that. So part of it is the -- some of it we need space for lighting, some of it is it can't be too close to intersections for visibility and some is due to conflicting utilities.

MR. SUHAR: Okay. And so -- thank you. And so what -- what's the alternative? Are -- are -- are -are -- alternative compliance then?

MS. SOMMER: We have worked with park and planning and the alternative compliance review board to make sure we are providing sufficient number of trees. So with alternative compliance, we have to make sure that we are providing an equivalent.

So sometimes in many cases, we have trees, not right on the street but within the right-of-way, but
placed on lot or placed in a common park -- open space so that it's shading the sidewalk. So it serves the same purposes.

MR. SUHAR: But it's in different locations, is that right, not on the street?

MS. SOMMER: It is approximate to the sidewalk. So it's doing the same thing -- serving the same purpose of having a shade tree shade the sidewalk in places where it can't be between the sidewalk and curb.

MR. SUHAR: Okay. Thank you very much. No -no further questions.

MS. MCNEIL: Mr. Brown.
MR. BROWN: Yes. Good morning, Ms. Sommer. Two or three very quick questions. Fatima, would you put back up on the screen the boundary survey, please?

MS. BAH: Sure. What exhibit is it, do you know?

MR. BROWN: I think it's number 40 .
MS. MCNEIL: Forty.
MS. BAH: Thank you.
MR. BROWN: Ms. Sommer, would you point us to
the prescriptive easement that is on this property?
MS. SOMMER: There is an easement towards the north of the property for -- it's a WSSC easement for the sanitary sewer.

MR. BROWN: All right. So the dash line -jagged line that I see going from the western boundary of the property going northeast and then terminating on the eastern boundary of the property that says WSSC right-of-way, $R-W$, that's the prescriptive easement; correct?

MS. SOMMER: That is my understanding.
MR. BROWN: And it's an easement that has been given to WSSC for utilities, but the property or the easement land area is still owned by Joan M. Stewart; is that correct?

MS . SOMMER: Yes.
MR. BROWN: You don't happen to know the square footage of that easement, do you?

MS. SOMMER: No. Not offhand.
MR. BROWN: I'm just not concerned, but I wanted to clarify the issue that staff raises on Page 12 of its report where there's a requirement that
subject property shall contain at least 12 contiguous acres. The easement does not divide the property because it's an easement, it's not a fee-simple transfer of property, but the staff goes on and states in this paragraph, based upon the DPWT confirmation letter, the property has a land area of 12.01 contiguous acres as a result of the prescriptive easement.

To your knowledge, since you helped to prepare the boundary survey, does this property have exactly 12.01 acres?

MS. SOMMER: To clarify, I did not help to prepare the boundary survey, that was done by our surveyor department at CPJ.

MR. BROWN: All right. Mr. Hatcher, is the surveyor planning to testify today?

MR. HATCHER: The surveyor is definitely prepared to testify. He was not one of the people I listed in the beginning, but he is on this link and prepared to testify.

MR. BROWN: All right. Later on I need him to testify to the square footage or rather, the acreage
for the property. My last question, Ms. Sommer, for you goes to the street trees.

You were asked several questions about site constraints and site constraints normally deals with topographical issues related to the property, not proposed development by the applicant and here on Page 17 of the staff report, the justification given by the applicant and confirmed by the staff is that the driveways for single-family attached homes, the narrow space between driveways, the many short blocks and intersections and easement constraints limit the number of tree locations.

Mr. Suhar asked a very relevant question, did you consider alternatives to developing these -- this property that would avoid driveways for single-family attached homes in their current locations, that would consider the narrow space between the driveways and that would consider the many short blocks and intersections and the easement constraints?

In other words, did you prepare an alternative plan that avoided these types of developer mandates? These are not topographical constraints.

MS. SOMMER: We did not.
MR. BROWN: All right. No other questions. Thank you.

MS. SOMMER: I did want to clarify that this -- for front-loaded attached single-family, this is a very common request to -- for alternative compliance for street trees --

MR. BROWN: I mean --
MS. SOMMER: -- because of the nature of the driveways.

MR. BROWN: -- whether it's a common request or not, you are not required to have front-loaded garages. You could've had side-loaded garages, you could've had rear-loaded garages or a number of other alternatives.

You didn't have to have garages at all. And so the question apparent is what are the alternatives to having a retirement community that does not require alternative compliance as it relates to street trees? But there's no other question on the floor. Thank you.

MS. MCNEIL: Ms. Bah, could you bring up Exhibit 35?

MS. BAH: Sure.
MS. MCNEIL: That's the -- the letter from DPWT if anyone -- if that is anything you need, Mr. Brown, about your question or Ms. Sommer may need to refresh. So again, his question is, will there be less than 12 acres as a result of all of this? And if -- I mean, if -- Mr. Hatcher, if you want to make a proffer as to why [inaudible] or Ms. Sommer can answer, please do.

MR. HATCHER: Yeah. I believe that we plan on calling Dan Debault [ph] who -- who worked was the surveyor --

MS. MCNEIL: Okay.
MR. HATCHER: -- after -- after we call Mr. Ferguson.

MS. MCNEIL: Okay. You can take this exhibit down, Ms. Bah. Mr. -- I mean, does anyone else have questions of the witness that's not represented by Mr. Suhar?

MR. HOLMAN: I do. I do, Madame Hearing Examiner.

MS. MCNEIL: Okay. Mr. Holman.

MR. HOLMAN: Thank you. Ms. Sommer, you
mentioned a couple of different types of tree -- trees that would be taken down, specimen trees and street trees. Do you know what the total number of trees are that will be removed by this proposed development?

MS. SOMMER: To clarify, we are not proposing removing street trees, we are proposing removing specimen trees. They are --

MR. HOLMAN: Well, my question is what is the total number of trees that will be removed by this development?

MS. SOMMER: We are proposing the removal of four specimen trees and we are also proposing the removal of 3.63 acres of woodland, however, we do not quantify the total number of trees, as is typical for a tree conservation plan.

MR. HOLMAN: How would we get that information?

MR. ALDAG: I might be able to help you on that. I -- I have that information.

MS. MCNEIL: And what is your -- Mr. Aldag, when it's time, you can ask that question. Ask her,
isn't it true that it's this whatever number that will be removed; okay?

MR. ALDAG: Okay.
MS. MCNEIL: But wait one second, let Mr.
Holman finish.
MR. ALDAG: Okay.
MR. HOLMAN: Yeah. If he can answer, Your Honor, then that's all $I$ have to ask. Thank you.

MS. MCNEIL: Okay. Thank you. Mr. Aldag.
MR. ALDAG: Okay. Great. In -- in paragraph nine of the September 2023 Prince George's County Planning Department technical staff report, it says that 3.63 acres of forest on the Stewart property will be removed, . 9 acres will be planted with trees for a net loss of 3.44 forest acres in the Newstop Branch Watershed and that we have --

You know, basically, with 25.3 percent existing forest in the 621 acre Newstop Branch Watershed, as per the 2018, you know, survey, 157.1 acres of forest there, Stewart's property development would lower the average by 3.44 acres to 153.7 acres in the watershed. Forest cover will go from 25.3 percent
down to 24.7 percent. That should answer the question.
MS. MCNEIL: Actually, I think he wanted to
know the actual number of trees versus the acreage --
MR. ALDAG: Oh, [inaudible] -- I have --
MS. MCNEIL: -- and I guess Ms. Sommer --
MR. ALDAG: -- acres. I didn't have trees.
MS. SOMMER: We do -- we are not required to survey -- we're -- we are required as part of the NRI and conservation laws to survey the acreage of woodlands but not the individual number of trees unless they are considered specimen trees. So we do not know the number of actual trees [inaudible].

MR. ALDAG: Right. And the technical staff report did not have that in it?

MS. MCNEIL: I guess because she's not required to.

MR. ALDAG: Yeah.
MS. MCNEIL: Okay.
MR. ALDAG: Yeah.
MS. MCNEIL: All right. Mr. Aldag, did you have other questions of Ms. Sommer?

MR. ALDAG: Regarding that?

MS. MCNEIL: No. On her testimony, any of it?
MR. ALDAG: Okay. Did you actually test the soil as part of your landscape design?

MS. SOMMER: No.
MR. ALDAG: Okay. Because you know, we basically have mostly D and C type soils from the hydraulic soil group which in- --

MS. SOMMER: Well, hold on, we did not -there was a geotechnical analysis of the site, to clarify.

MR. ALDAG: Okay. Can you go through that?
MS. MCNEIL: Is there someone that will testify about that, Mr. Hatcher?

MR. ALDAG: Because my testimony --
MS. MCNEIL: Wait, wait one second, Mr. Aldag.
MR. ALDAG: Oh, yeah.
MR. HATCHER: I have the geotechnical report.
MS. MCNEIL: Mm-hmm. Is there anybody that can
testify about it?
MR. HATCHER: We weren't planning on calling any testimony on the geotechnical support that was -that was submitted as part of the package.

MR. ALDAG: Yeah. And part of my testimony has that in it.

MS. MCNEIL: Okay. Mr. -- then -- then we'll talk about it with you. Do you have other questions of Ms. Sommer?

MR. ALDAG: On the stormwater management of which, you know, they basically submitted in the application an unapproved plan that shows the use of two submerged gravel wetlands, two micro-bioretention facilities and a bio-swell to meet the stormwater requirement site, but the revised layout in SE-22002 is not consistent with the layout that was in the unapproved stormwater management plan that was part of the technical staff report.

But what they did find was the soils that are there aren't really conducive because of impermeability to actually improve the quality of the Newstop Branch water.

MR. BROWN: Yeah. As much as -- as -- as much as I dislike objecting to -- to citizens, I'm not entirely sure that that's what the staff report says and if there is an expert that he plans on calling
which is going to testify to that, I look forward to the opportunity to cross-examine him.

MR. ALDAG: Well, my -- basically, my testimony was off of Richard Pine's, you know, research and he is a technical ex- -- you know, expert --

MS. MCNEIL: Okay.
MR. ALDAG: -- and the last six pages of my testimony gives his qualifications.

MS. MCNEIL: Okay. Mr. -- Mr. Aldag, then we're waiting. That's going to be in your direct --

MR. ALDAG: Okay.
MS. MCNEIL: -- not in her cross --
MR. ALDAG: Okay. Okay. Good. Thank you.
MS. MCNEIL: -- to be able to bring it.
MR. BROWN: Thanks again.
MS. MCNEIL: Does anyone else have questions of Ms. Sommer? Okay. I would like to take a five-minute break before the next witness if you all don't mind. So just stay on and we'll be back in five minutes, it's 11:17. Thank you.

AUTOMATED VOICE: Recording stopped.
[break]

MS. MCNEIL: Thank you, all. Before we start,
Ms. Spencer --
MS. SPENCER: Yes.
MS. MCNEIL: -- I'm seeing a note that you wanted to ask a question. Was it at least of the last witness or was it from like 10 minutes ago? I'm so sorry.

MS. SPENCER: Honestly, I am late, because I couldn't get on first thing this morning and my question is directly related to traffic flow in the plan.

MS. MCNEIL: Okay. You didn't miss anything yet then.

MS. SPENCER: So I'm not [inaudible]?
MS. MCNEIL: They haven't had that witness.
MS. SPENCER: I -- I will sit and wait then.
MS. MCNEIL: Okay.
MS. SPENCER: Thank you.
MS. MCNEIL: Thank you. Where is Mr. Hatcher?
Yeah. So if we have new people that have come on, where we are is the applicant, of course, has the burden and they're doing their own witnesses first. Listen to it
and if you have a question, I'm going to ask if anyone has questions and that'll be the chance to ask them questions about their testimony.

You're going to have another time for you to tell me what you want to tell me about the case. And keep yourself muted and off screen when you're not testifying, because we're recording this and that just helps everything. Thank you, all. So Mr. Hatcher, we're waiting on you.

MR. FERGUSON: Just send him a text, Madame Examiner, I think he was on the phone with Mr. Burke.

MS. MCNEIL: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Ferguson. There he is.

MR. HATCHER: Hello.
MS. MCNEIL: Hello there. So who's your next witness?

MR. HATCHER: Dave Nelson.
MS. MCNEIL: Okay. What number are we at?
Where is Mr. --
MR. NELSON: Can you hear me?
MS. MCNEIL: I can't see you.
MR. NELSON: Good morning.

MS. MCNEIL: Is that Mr. Nelson? That's you that says iPad with no name. Okay.

MR. NELSON: Sorry about that, my computer is [inaudible].

MR. SUHAR: Madame Examiner, I'm sorry, this is Sean Suhar, I had to reconnect. I just wanted to make sure that you all can hear me.

MS. MCNEIL: We can hear you. Yes.
MR. SUHAR: Okay. I'll -- I'll -- I'll mute myself, I just wanted to -- I'm -- I'm now in the car driving to my next meeting. So --

MS. MCNEIL: Okay.
MR. SUHAR: All right. Thank you so much.
MS. MCNEIL: Oh -- oh, do you need to testify now or soon?

MR. SUHAR: Well, I -- I do. My meeting starts at noon. So if we could, you know, get through this witness and then [inaudible].

MS. MCNEIL: You know, we'll let you -- we -Mr. Hatcher doesn't mind, sometimes we take things out of order, you know, to help folks. So Mr. Suhar, now, you don't have a witness, so I'm going to have to swear
you; okay?
MR. SUHAR: You're going to have to swear me?
That's fine, I -- I -- I'm --
MS. MCNEIL: If you wanted to be -- are you --
so you -- if you just want to argue -- this is so weird. If you wa- -- can you come back later or submit your argument in writing or --

MR. SUHAR: Yeah. I could come back -- well, I'm driving right now. I'm participating in the hearing for at least for the next half hour. So -- but I -- I -

- I do have comments that I would like to make. Yeah. I -- I would like to make argument. Yeah.

MS. MCNEIL: Okay. If all you want to do is make argument, I don't have to swear you, but that's all it will be considered is argument. Okay.

MR. SUHAR: Okay.
MR. HASANI: Hello.
MR. SUHAR: And -- and also to bring -- bring that map into the evidence as well. So I mean, if you want to swear me in, that's fine.

MS. MCNEIL: Yeah. To bring any evidence in, you have to be sworn.

MR. SUHAR: Okay. That's fine.
MR. MARTIN: Okay.
MS. MCNEIL: Mr. Hasani [ph], what are you saying?

MS. MARTIN: Yeah. Yeah. While I have time, I just want to -- I don't know who -- who's going -- who this question would be for, but as far as like the flooding, I have a question about the flooding. I actually live 8204 directly across the street from the planned development.

MS. MCNEIL: Okay. Then the next witness, I believe, may be able to help you; is that correct, Mr. Hatcher?

MR. HATCHER: Mr. Ferguson --
MS. MCNEIL: Mr. Nelson is traffic?
MR. HATCHER: -- Mr. Nelson's traffic.
MR. MARTIN: Okay.
MR. HATCHER: And Mr. Suhar, that's -- that's pretty bold, I would -- I would never open myself to cross-examination from opposing counsel.

MS. MCNEIL: I'll get him to think about it for a while.

MR. HATCHER: That was the point.
MS. MCNEIL: Yeah. Okay. Mr. Suhar, we're going to go with Mr. Nelson. Are you going to be gone for the rest of the day?

MR. SUHAR: My meeting is supposed to take probably about a couple hours. So from 12:00 until about 2:00. Yeah.

MS. MCNEIL: I wonder if we'll finish by 2:00. Let me think about it, let's start with Mr. Nelson, though.

MR. SUHAR: Okay.
MS. MCNEIL: And Mr. Hasani, we'll get back to you. So Mr. Nelson, do you swear or affirm under the penalties of perjury that the testimony you shall give will be the truth and nothing but the truth?

MR. NELSON: I do.
MS. MCNEIL: Okay.
MR. HATCHER: Mr. Nelson, can you state your -

- your full name and business address for the record?

MR. NELSON: My name is David Nelson. The business address is 400 Crain Highway Northwest in Glen Burnie. I work for street traffic studies with their
[inaudible] office location.
MR. HATCHER: Where -- where -- where are you currently employed?

MR. NELSON: The firm, Street Traffic Studies, Limited.

MR. HATCHER: What is your current position with Street Traffic Studies -- Street --

MR. NELSON: I'm the senior transportation traffic engineer and I'm also the president of the firm.

MR. HATCHER: Okay. Have you been previously qualified as an expert in transportation engineering and transportation planning before the Prince George's County Zoning and Hearing examiner?

MR. NELSON: Yes.
MR. HATCHER: At this point, I'd like to -Exhibit 91 is Mr. Nelson's resume. We can bring it up if -- if you'd like, Madame Examiner, or People's zoning counsel or $I$ can just continue.

MR. BROWN: Yeah. There's no objection to Mr. Nelson as an expert.

MR. NELSON: Thank you, sir.

MR. HATCHER: Okay. Okay. Yeah. Madame Examiner, at this point --

MS. MCNEIL: Mr. -- Mr. Nelson -- Mr. Nelson, you haven't been rejected as an expert since we've last seen you, have you?

MR. NELSON: No. Actually, never in the last 40 years. So --

MS. MCNEIL: Okay. You will be admitted as an expert in transportation engineering and planning.

MR. HATCHER: Okay.
MR. NELSON: Thank you.
MR. HATCHER: Just to clarify, he has been admitted as an expert; correct?

MS. MCNEIL: Yes, sir.
MR. HATCHER: Thank you. Are you familiar with the property which the subject -- is subject to this application?

MR. NELSON: Yes. I am.
MR. HATCHER: Were you retained by the applicant to evaluate light access and transportation issues pertaining to the subject property as it relates to development of a planned retirement community and
the subject's special exception application?
MR. NELSON: Yes.
MR. HATCHER: Are you familiar with the technical staff report dated September 20, 2023 as amended by the development of use staff's October 4, 2023 supplemental memorandum?

MR. NELSON: Yes. I am.
MR. HATCHER: Do you agree with the technical staff report dated September 20, 2023 as amended by development review staff's October 4, 2023 supplemental memorandum?

MR. NELSON: Especially as it relates to traffic and transportation. Yes.

MR. HATCHER: Does technical staff establish a neighborhood in association with this application?

MR. NELSON: They did. On Page 4 of the staff report, the neighborhood with the same access to Springfield Road but their neighborhood is extended to the north of Ducatel Road to the east of [inaudible] Lane south of [inaudible] Road into the west of Wingate. I would probably extend it just a little bit north, because I consider [inaudible] Good Luck Road
one of the key roads that serves this property too, but in general, it's -- it's the perfect neighborhood. MR. HATCHER: Okay. With the extension to Good Luck Road, do you agree with staff's definition? MR. NELSON: Yes.

MR. HATCHER: Did you prepare a traffic statement dated October 26, 2023 as amended by a revised traffic statement dated December 5, 2023?

MR. NELSON: Yes. I did.
MR. HATCHER: At this point, Madame Examiner, we move that the updated traffic statement listed as December 5, 2023 be entered into the record.

MS. MCNEIL: Okay. Ms. -- Ms. Potit [ph], do you and Ms. Bah have that and do you -- would you give her the -- the next exhibit number? I guess it would be 101.

MS. BAH: Yes. The next exhibit number is 101. MS. MCNEIL: And so it would be the revised --

MS. POTIT: And what was the name of the document, please?

MR. HATCHER: It's going to be a traffic statement originally dated October 26, 2022, but it's
going to be amended with the amendment date being December 5, 2023.

MS. MCNEIL: Thank you.
MR. HATCHER: Just to clarify, has that been accepted into the record as Exhibit 101?

MS. MCNEIL: It will be as soon as we can see it. I'm -- I'm trying to -- so it's something you sent lately?

MR. HATCHER: Within the last week.
MS. MCNEIL: Okay.
MR. HATCHER: It was sent on Monday, December 11th.

MS. MCNEIL: I do not believe this, computers are so -- I do a search and it brings up something from 2020.

MR. HATCHER: Just to clarify, Madame Examiner, we'll just -- we'll just wait until we get an indication that we should proceed; okay?

MS. MCNEIL: Okay. Okay. I found it and I think I just sent it to Ms. Bah.

MR. HATCHER: Okay.
MS. BAH: I just got it.

MS. MCNEIL: Good. Cool. Is that the exhibit, Mr. Hatcher?

MR. HATCHER: Yes, ma'am. Would you -- would you like us to proceed with our line of questioning or you're still coordinating?

MS. POTIT: Ma- -- ma'am, can you scroll up on it so we can read the entirety of the letter?

MR. HATCHER: Madame Examiner, how would you like us to proceed?

MS. MCNEIL: As everyone's slowly reading, if you want to have him explain what's in here, that would be great.

MR. HATCHER: Okay. Dave, can you articulate the differences between what's on this monitor and this Exhibit 101 and Exhibit 28, which is the original traffic statement submitted into the record?

MR. NELSON: Yes. On Page 2 of this traffic statement letter, there's a chart in the middle of the second page and it was just a typo that while we do a traffic review for the special exception, the main focus is the change in -- between what the [inaudible] use is and what's proposed and on Page 2, we have a
table that compares 22 single-family units and what I ori- -- originally was attached to it is not.

So the only change is from a -- in that line is 22 single-family, it should say, detached houses. So in the $R$ Z Zone, we would expect the houses to be on their own separate lots. So that's the only change, but the maps didn't change at all, it was just a matter of one word.

MR. HATCHER: Am I correct to understand that a formal transporta- -- traffic analysis is not required for the approval of a special exception for this property?

MR. NELSON: That's correct.
MR. HATCHER: At what point in the Prince George's County development review process is adequacy a public facilities including adequacy of transportation facilities formally evaluated and established?

MR. NELSON: That's in the preliminary plan of subdivision, which would be the next step of this project assuming it is approved and moves forward.

MS. SPENCER: Madame Examiner, this is Rae
[ph], I have a question. As stated in this, it states that they're --

MS. MCNEIL: Wait, wait, wait, wait, Ms. Spencer, your questions are after his direct. We're sort of like a trial in this proceeding, not just anyone talking.

MS. SPENCER: Thank you, ma'am.
MS. MCNEIL: So you will be able to ask questions; right? Jot things down what he's saying, but we'll get to you right away. Go ahead, Mr. Hatcher.

MR. HATCHER: Yeah. The -- the applicant respectfully requests that Exhibit 72 be brought up to the monitor, it's -- it's the site plan.

MS. MCNEIL: Okay.
MS. BAH: Yes. Just give me one second.
MR. HATCHER: Dave, can you please demonstrate the proposed access point associated with the application?

MS. MCNEIL: Can we make this larger? I know we can ourselves, I guess.

MR. NELSON: So just talk- -- mm-hmm.
MS. BAH: Is this good?

MR. NELSON: Works for me.
MS. BAH: Okay. Thank you.
MR. NELSON: So the -- the project development is located on the east side of Springfield Road, which is shown going almost in a north-south direction on the left-hand side of the [inaudible] and about halfway down it shows that the development, as a retirement community, will be served by a single driveway to Springfield Road but then splits into private drives that serve the community.

The -- the access drive is coordinated with public works. So it will be designed in accordance to their standards. It provides all the -- the offsets, there's a bike lane that's to be provided, the dedication will be required. That'll all be taken care of at the preliminary plan stage.

Unlike traditional $R R$ developments that -which may actually have lost the front [inaudible] on Springfield Road, which is allowable condition as a [inaudible], this entire developer will only have one driveway in and out to Springfield Road.

MR. HATCHER: Okay.

MS. MCNEIL: Can we -- Mr. Nelson, if we made you the -- whatever -- I -- I just need to scroll down to see the entrance. So we're not looking at the entrance right now, right, the one single access?

MR. NELSON: Well, the entrance is what's
shown on the drawing. It's -- if you look at --
MS. MCNEIL: I thought it was a little further down.

MR. NELSON: It's --
MS. MCNEIL: What I'm seeing is a -- a private road.

MR. NELSON: Well, yeah. The -- if you look on the -- the left side of the drawing, it's -- it's not really easy to see, but the left side of the drawing going almost in a north-south direction, this is the existing Springfield Road and you're seeing the right-of-ways, you're seeing the property lines --

MS. MCNEIL: I'm moving it myself, I see. I see.

MR. NELSON: -- and then coming off of that road is a single -- [inaudible] at a 90-degree angle a single driveway in and now with a center median
dividing the two [inaudible] at the driveway at Springfield Road and then it goes into the property and serves kind of a loop around. Does that make sense?

MS. MCNEIL: I see it now.
MR. NELSON: Okay.
MS. MCNEIL: And Mr. Hatcher, I'm sorry, I just want to ask two questions, because I'm looking at it now. One is is that -- what are the reasons you determined that to be the access spot since it seems to be right across from -- is it right across from Springfield from someone's home?

MR. ALDAG: Yes. It's right across from Mr. Martin's.

MS. MCNEIL: Oh, you know better. Wait a minute, Mr. Aldag.

MR. MARTIN: Right. Yeah. That's -- that's my home -- that's my home right there, 8204.

MS. MCNEIL: Wait, wait. Okay. I guess I should say the examiner can ask questions anytime, everyone else has to wait. So Mr. Nelson, is there a reason why you believe -- I mean, did you prepare the access? Is there a reason why it's right there?

MR. NELSON: I did not do the site design. MS. MCNEIL: Okay.

MR. NELSON: We kind of pick up after the site's designed --

MS. MCNEIL: Okay.
MR. NELSON: -- and then we evaluate it on the network. So the -- the civil and the -- the layout engineers would be the best [inaudible]. I know that there was a lot of work in locating it and balancing it with the property, but $I$ was not involved in that.

MS. MCNEIL: Okay. Thank you. And one other thing, so you don't have to do a real traffic analysis at this point, but do you know if at the time of preliminary plan they consider projects such as this one that are in this -- you know, projects that have been moved to preliminary plan but have done these statements, is any of that taken into consideration at preliminary plan when they're looking at you?

And I guess to explain it better is there is an argument that there are other projects in the area that have not arisen to the requirement of a full traffic analysis. So they're doing the same thing
you're doing, but when you get to subdivision, does subdivision consider all these other -- other traffic generated that has not -- proposed for gen- -- proposed to be generated --

MR. NELSON: Mm-hmm.
MS. MCNEIL: -- or does subdivision only look at things that have been built and things that are ready for subdivision when they're considering traffic impact? Do you get the question?

MR. NELSON: Actually, that's a -- that's a -that's a good point and I wrote myself a note to make sure that we end up answering that if it wasn't ans- -asked. Just -- so at the -- at the special exception stage, we're basically just evaluating it more globally is what the difference is, but when you go to the preliminary plan, that's where they make a finding of adequacy.

And there's a -- there's kind of a misunderstanding that because we're under 50 trips that a traffic study is now required, well, the -- the -the criteria is that the applicant is not required to prepare a traffic study, but a -- a traffic study is
prepared by staff --
MS. MCNEIL: Okay.
MR. NELSON: -- and an analysis to meet the APF requirements is conducted. In fact, one of the requirements in order to make it a little easier for staff is we already know that they're going to -- we're go- -- we need to provide them traffic data. So we have to do counts of [inaudible] Road and Springfield and we actually have to do a count just [inaudible] of this to give them the basic -- the -- the data to then conduct an analysis.

And when they do that analysis, they incorporate all the development activity that's in the area. So you know, if there were, you know, a major subdivision, of course they would include it, but if there -- if you went up and down Springfield Road and there were other less than 50 -trip subdivisions, their responsibility is to include those also.

MS. MCNEIL: Thank you for answering the question.

MR. NELSON: So when the finding -- when -when the traffic study is done just not by the
applicant, they have to include anybody who is further along in the process, then -- so in the preliminary plan, they include every approved preliminary plan, site development plan. They don't have to include concept plans, but the approved preliminary plan is included in their analysis.

MS. MCNEIL: Thank you. Thank you, sir. Okay. Back to you, Mr. Hatcher.

MR. HATCHER: Does your October 2- -- does your October 26 th traffic statement as amended by December 5 revised tra- -- traffic statement, analyze the safety conditions associated with Springfield Road?

MR. NELSON: It -- it discusses the fact that, you know, the Springfield Road is a collector highway. In fact, most of the roads around here are either collectors or arterials. So in general, one of the problems that we get into with -- with [inaudible] if they go through residential subdivisions.

In this case, we're accessing directly to a collector, which then traffic flows both north-south to the regional network and again, from a safety perspective, by consolidating the access, not having
multiple access points to Springfield Road, I believe it is a safer condition than it would be otherwise.

MR. HATCHER: All right. Can you please speak to the trip generation and traffic patterns generally associated with single-family residential uses as analyzed in the October 26th traffic statement as amended by the December 5th revised traffic statement?

MR. NELSON: Sure. [inaudible] that we've said now several times is the purpose of our review at this stage is to look at what the difference is between what is a [inaudible] use. In this case, we have a 12-acre parcel that's zoned RR. In general, we -- we just assume 2 units per acre, so 12 acres could've been 24 units.

When we first started looking at it, we thought well, [inaudible] some of our [inaudible] reasons why we may not get up to 24 . So we used 22 , but on Page 2 of our re- -- letter report, we show that 22 single-family homes would be expected to generate 17 trips in the morning and 20 in the afternoon.

And then the study was then -- went on to compare what the proposed use is, which is 57 senior
housing units and there's a little bit that -- that -I hope it's not confusing, but when we were going through the process, the number of units continued to change and we kept submitting requests to staff for approval of our scoping.

And so instead of continually changing it, we said, well, what's the most we'll ever get on a site and that's where the -- the 60 units came from in the -- in the letter report, but, you know, how [inaudible] 60 units compared to the 22? And -- and it's shown in the report it generates [inaudible] 4 trips less and a little more than 4 trips less in the evening and if 60, you know, units generates less than the 22 units, then 57 would certainly generate even less.

And in fact, it generates one less more. So the purpose of this just showed that if the site were developed by [inaudible] as single-family units in the RR Zone, it would generate more traffic than what this proposed use would and therefore -- well, I'll let you ask the next question.

MR. HATCHER: And I think [inaudible] a good point, but I just -- how -- how did the trip generation
and traffic patterns associated with senior housing compared to trip associated with all -- all-age singlefamily residential uses -- uses?

MR. NELSON: Well, in general, there's -there's a number of studies done and the senior housing generates about 30 percent of what a traditional non-age-restricted housing unit would generate. So it's quite a bit less.

MR. HATCHER: How will the proposed planned retirement community affect the existing transportation network?

MR. NELSON: So again, when the -- when the transportation network developed and the master plan was developed, they worked to develop a balance between land use and the highway network. And so in this case, when they did that study, they would've looked at the site with, you know, 22 to 24 units.

So then those units would've generated somewhere in the order of 20 peak hour trips in the evening. So if we put the senior housing on, it generates less traffic. So we're in a case where the proposed special exception would generate less traffic
than the by-right use, therefore, it's -- you know, you're -- it's pretty easy to make the argument that you're consistent with the transportation, you're not going to have any adverse effects.

MR. HATCHER: Are you familiar with the prior zoning ordinances required findings for approval of a special exception?

MR. NELSON: Yes.
MR. HATCHER: In your expert opinion, will the granting of this application be consistent with the standards required in the prior zoning ordinance for the use in this ques- -- in -- in question?

MR. NELSON: Yes. I will -- I don't believe that this site has proposed in the special exception would have an adverse effect on the health, safety and welfare of the community.

MR. HATCHER: Okay. In your expert opinion, will the approval of this application cause any adverse effects upon the adjacent properties and surrounding neighborhood?

MR. NELSON: No.
MR. HATCHER: In your expert opinion, will the
approval of this application have any detrimental effect on the health, safety and welfare of pedestrians and motorists in the area?

MR. NELSON: No. In fact again, comparing the -- the two uses, which is our job in this case, I believe this is better than what we would see if it weren't -- if we were to de- -- develop in a traditional manner.

MR. HATCHER: Madame Examiner, I have no further questions for this witness.

MS. MCNEIL: I have a few. In -- when the staff revised its report, it removed a requirement that you show that large vehicles can circulate on site. Do you know why they did that?

MR. NELSON: I saw that too, but again, I didn't do the site -- internal site layout. And so I don't know the answer.

MS. MCNEIL: Well, as an expert, do you think it's --

MR. NELSON: There will be somebody [inaudible] that will be able to answer.

MS. MCNEIL: -- and as an expert witness, do
you think perhaps large vehicles should be allowed to circulate within the site?

MR. NELSON: There are are requirements that, you know, firetrucks are able to circulate properly. Yes.

MS. MCNEIL: And do you think the right-ofways shown on that site plan are sufficient for that?

MR. NELSON: I did not test it. So I don't know.

MS. MCNEIL: Okay. And then there was a question about sidewalks as well, the sidewalks that were proposed were six feet and they went down to five feet and do you have any knowledge as to why that occurred?

MR. NELSON: I do not.
MS. MCNEIL: Okay. And then the final one was to show the -- I think it's the bicycle -- there's something about the bicycles being shown on the site plan versus them being -- the bicycle lane now will be along the entire frontage, but before it was going to be on the special exception site plan. I guess, I think I understand that one, but do you know anything about
that?

MR. NELSON: No.
MS. MCNEIL: Okay.
MR. NELSON: Other than that's required, but no, I wasn't involved.

MS. MCNEIL: Okay. Thank you. Mr. Aldag, I'm go- -- oh, wait a minute, Mr. Suhar, are you still around?

MR. SUHAR: I -- I am. Yeah. Can you hear me?
MS. MCNEIL: Do you have -- do you have any questions of this witness?

MR. SUHAR: Yes, just one. Mr. Nelson, do you -- you were testifying that -- that the proposed use is less -- that -- that would -- would -- would generate less traffic for trip generation than -- than a use, you know, under by-right on this property; is that right?

MR. NELSON: Yes.
MR. SUHAR: Okay. Now, is that -- is your -your statement there, your opinion, based on the 57 units that would be developed on this property?

MR. NELSON: Yes. And up to 6- --

MR. SUHAR: Even with 57? I'm sorry, go ahead. MR. NELSON: -- even 60 is le- -- was -- well, the same conclusion could be drawn --

MR. SUHAR: Okay.
MR. NELSON: -- but the 57, which is the proposed, is based on using the trip generation rates from the park and planning guidelines, which clearly shows it generates less traffic than -- than the 22 to 24 single-family homes.

MR. SUHAR: Okay. All right. No further questions.

MS. MCNEIL: Thank you. Mr. Aldag, do you have questions?

MR. ALDAG: I do. Hi and good afternoon, Mr. Nelson. Are you aware of the cut-through traffic from USDA Beltsville Farm? It comes right down Springfield Road.

MR. NELSON: I -- I used to actually live very close to this and I do -- I know that there is some traffic that goes to the USDA from here. Yes. I don't -- I don't have a specific percentage of volume. I don't know.

MR. ALDAG: Well, it was actually, you know, pretty substantial. You know, I was actually doing, you know, a count and I was able -- basically, during rush hour, there were like 300 to 500 cars an hour going at rush hour. That's like 1 car ever 14 seconds going down Springfield Road, which is pretty heavy.

Then when we actually look at, you know, this particular project, we went and looked in the master planned transportation 2035 and the 2022 approved Bowie-Mitchellville vicinity plan didn't show that there was a traffic condition report analysis in it, but we not only have the Stewart property but we have 8 to 10 subdivisions that are actually planned on Springfield Road and like within, you know, a baseball throw of Springfield Road.

And has there been a particular study with all of this additional development? They just, above Good Luck Road, started another 12 -- you know, 12-house development right now and basically, with the traffic and the trucks and everything, it's -- we -- we have a -- a huge issue with the traffic load. But have you actually looked at everything with all of the load for
the construction?
MR. NELSON: There were a lot of questions there. First off, as we mentioned to the examiner, next -- the next step of the development process there will be a traffic study conducted. The -- and the purpose of it is, you know -- is to address the [inaudible] facilities and by definition, it -- because of the -we're not required to do it, staff will, but they are required to include all of the development that -that's approved along -- in the study area that they'll define.

So that -- that should set up the basis for the evaluation to make sure that it's not below the acceptable standards. I have never seen traffic volumes on Springfield Road -- so I mean, if you have a count, I'd be interested to look at it. I've never seen the volumes in the 300 to 400 range in the peak hour on Springfield Road, but that --

MR. ALDAG: I --
MR. NELSON: -- that will be the next step to present that and ana- -- analyze it.

MR. ALDAG: Yeah. I actually used a form and
all that they use as a standard form, I can send you that. But we already have a problem on the -- on the traffic load right now. We're -- we're pinned in our driveways sometimes for a minute or two minutes until we can get a break in the traffic to scoot out and that's before they've had all this going on.

And you know, not only do they have the Stewart property, but right below it they have like two other properties that are scheduled for subdivisions too.

MR. BROWN: You have to ask a question.
MR. ALDAG: Yeah.
MR. BROWN: You have to ask a question, you can't make a statement.

MR. ALDAG: Oh, okay. So basically, is it in the approved Bowie-Mitchellville vicinity plan in the transportation 202- -- 2035 plan? So it really hasn't been looked at, has it?

MR. NELSON: Well, $I$ think it's -- and again, for the purpose of what's required at the special exception stage, you know, the analysis that's presented is -- is pretty clear. The next step in the
process is to do an [inaudible] facilities test, which would analyze that. The fact that Springfield Road is a collector highway it is -- and that's its job is to collect traffic from the development along its length on both ends and carry it to the next level of road.

In this case, it would be [inaudible] Road to the south, which is an arterial -- actually, it's an arterial up to Springfield Road and then it becomes a collector as it goes to the east, but -- so I'm not sure what -- again, the -- the land use requirements and the land will -- it should answer your question. I mean, this is [inaudible] -- you know, stay involved, you're a person record.

When it goes through the public -- you know, go through the hearing, transportation and planning should and will be doing the study that says whether those are adequate roads and the standards, that they're met or not met and I believe in this case, from what $I$ know out there, that, you know, it should -- it should be fine, but it's subject to a test and --

MR. ALDAG: Mm-hmm.
MR. NELSON: -- but that's not -- that test is
not now.
MR. ALDAG: Yeah. Now, you were saying that there are single-family houses that you would, in the morning, have 17 cars that would basically, you know, leave that particular area and be on Springfield Road and --

MR. NELSON: It's a -- it's a combination of 1- -- 17 trips, so that would be coming [inaudible] and going inbound and outbound out of the development, in the morning, more load going out, but some of them will be coming in, but that's during the peak hour of the street. So it's not the total traffic going in and out of the development, it's just -- in this case, it's the traffic that was going out between say, 7:45 to 8:45 in the morning is about 17 trips for 22 units [inaudible].

MR. ALDAG: So if you have 57 units and --
MR. NELSON: Mm-hmm.
MR. ALDAG: -- a third of the whole point -or 30 percent, you know, re- -- have a -- a . 3 of, you know, your traffic load at that time, that calculates to 17 plus, you know, trips; right? So it's pretty much a wash.

MR. NELSON: There's -- I think your -- you -you -- your comparison isn't quite right, because you would want to -- you would want them to be equal. And so the answer to your question might be that 57 senior houses is about the same as 17 single-family. So they're equal at that point and then you -- then you would take your reduction from there, but we're saying that, you know, the -- the 57 units would generate about 13 trips in the morning, which is --

Actually, we're sitting as kind of high, because the senior housing, the people -- especially now, I mean, you know, people just don't even leave anywhere, but they don't have to go anywhere during the peak hours, so they don't. And so they -- it doesn't mean that they don't leave, say, at 10:00 o'clock to go get coffee somewhere or something --

MR. ALDAG: Mm-hmm. Well, in the --
MR. NELSON: -- but during the [inaudible] peak is when the -- the traffic tests just developed --

MR. ALDAG: Right.
MR. NELSON: -- and this basically would be between, say, 8:00 and 9:00 in the morning and -- and

4:00 and 5:00 or 5:00 and 6:00 in the evening. So how many trips does it generate during that period? And what we found is that senior housing has a choice, because they don't have to go to work generally.

And so why -- you know, why would they travel during the period? You know, they don't. So that's why it's so much more --

MR. ALDAG: Are we starting at 55 for the -the limitation on age; right?

MS. MCNEIL: Mm-hmm.
MR. NELSON: That's what code is.
MR. ALDAG: And most people are still working at 55 and into their 60s, because, you know, you can't get social security until 62. A lot of people are taking it at 65. So you would have a predominant amount of those people still doing -- you know, when they -basically, [inaudible] --

MS. MCNEIL: Mr. Aldag -- Mr. Aldag --
MR. ALDAG: Yeah. Yes.
MS. MCNEIL: -- questions.
MR. ALDAG: Yeah.
MS. MCNEIL: You've got to let him answer
questions.
MR. ALDAG: Oh -- oh -- oh, okay.
MS. MCNEIL: Does his opinion change if he considers that some of the folks would still be working at 55?

MR. ALDAG: Yeah. Would that -- you know, with what the retirement age is and what social security is, would you contend that, you know, people are still going to be working jobs?

MR. NELSON: I'm not saying they are, I'm not saying some of the people won't, but where the rates come from -- so basically, what you need to do is back into where the rates [inaudible] and where the rates come from is studies were actually done of retirement communities.

So there's different kinds of retirement communities, anywhere from just age-restricted to, you know, all the way to, you know, Alzheimer's care where, you know, of course, they don't drive, but they -- the agencies have gone out, and these are Prince George's County rates, and they match up with national rates where they actually go out and study subdivisions of,
you know, different sizes and count the intersections over a period of time and then they use that to generate the rates based on per unit numbers.

So there's a combination of people. I mean, I
don't know how many people that are in the say, 55 range that -- that -- you know, who still might have kids. And so, you know, that -- that -- that's not something really delving into, but, you know, it would be interesting to see how many people that -- that buy one of these houses is really 55 or are they 60 to 65, are they 70?

But the real world numbers are what's used as a basis for these trip generation numbers that actually count retirement communities for age-restricted and this is what they find. So we did not conduct those studies, those are just based on park and planning rates and national data collection.

MR. ALDAG: Okay. Thank you. Are you actually going to make a traffic study that will, you know, put all of the construction and the Stewart farm together?

MR. NELSON: That's the point that [inaudible] and maybe it's not clear, but because the Prince

George's County has guidelines for preparing traffic studies at different levels of applications, but in the preliminary plan stage, one of the criterias is if a site generates less than 50 peak hour trips, the applicant is not required to do a study.

MR. ALDAG: Mm-hmm.
MR. NELSON: So this obviously [inaudible] we're like 16. So we're a long way from 50.

MR. ALDAG: Yeah.
MR. NELSON: So the applicant's not required to do the study. They can, but they -- they're not required to, but a study is still required, it's just prepared by staff and in this case, in order to aid them, one -- we -- we would be required to provide them with current traffic counts to use as the basis.

So you're physically going out and counting the intersections and passing them on to them.

MR. ALDAG: Yeah. You know, it's interesting, the entrance that goes into this -- you know, into this property is larger -- is actually -- is wide or wider than Springfield Road. Are -- are you tak- -- planning to do anything with Springfield Road that would help,
you know, the traffic flow?
MR. NELSON: Well, they are required to meet county requirements and again, when they get to the preliminary plan stage is when you physically work with public works and make sure that you're design meets to the curb radius, the offsets, the site distance, all those things are met with your design.

I think that what makes this look a little bit wider is that there's a -- a monumental median just to separate the inbound and the outbound flow, but it's really -- it's a two-lane road, it's a one- -- one-lane in, one-lane out and then again, you work with the -we're required to make frontage improvements along the entire length. Those are all detailed by public works -

MR. ALDAG: Okay.
MR. NELSON: -- which is also -- it's really not -- I don't think we're going to get an devia- -deviations from that at all. So --

MR. ALDAG: So as overall development, you wouldn't expect any road improvements?

MR. NELSON: Well, frontage improvements are
pretty significant for a development of this size. So they are making full frontage improvements, but then offsite where we have to go off the intersections, again, that's triggered by the [inaudible] facilities.

If we do the -- if that study's done, you know, [inaudible] county and they showed that there's deficiencies, I mean, there's a criteria that you follow that levels the surface with the intersections and if they're not adequate, then the improvements have to be made --

MR. ALDAG: Mm-hmm.
MR. NELSON: -- but that study hasn't been done yet. So it's hard to say.

MR. ALDAG: Well, being that there's only one way in and one way out, would you ever consider having to put a light there?

MR. NELSON: At this driveway?
MR. ALDAG: Yeah.
MR. NELSON: No. It --
MR. ALDAG: Even if they can't get out, they -- or they're pinned in, you wouldn't consider putting a light there?

MR. NELSON: Well, I mean, none of them [inaudible]. You can't just put a light in. There's -there's criteria that -- called the warrants term based on manual uniform traffic control [inaudible] and it's this test between volumes to [inaudible] accidents and this development. So you have to have -- I don't know if significant is the word, but you have to have a moderate amount of traffic both on the mainline roads plus the approaches.

That number is usually in the hundreds of cars and since we're only generating less than 16 total, you know, which again, is inbound and outbound, we -- we would never approach the volumes that would justify [inaudible] and the reason is that there's criteria for installing them, but when you put in a signal, they can actually cause accidents and if you approve that you put a signal in that wasn't supposed to be there, the attorneys' eyes get really big and you can get sued for it.

So what I'm -- what I'm telling you now is based on my experience, the volumes of this road would never approach those that would allow a signal to be
put in.
MR. ALDAG: Okay. So if they're pinned in, you basically still would not put a sign up?

MR. NELSON: A sign?
MR. ALDAG: You know, if they can't get out of the -- out of the Stewart property, you wouldn't -- you -- you wouldn't put a sign up -- or excuse me, you wouldn't put a -- a -- a light up to help that at all and they would just have to wait is what you're saying?

MR. NELSON: They would -- it -- it's going to be an adequate intersection with a stop sign approach. So Springfield Road would just, you know, free flow north-south [inaudible] and they would have to wait to get out, which is, you know, standard development intersection in all of the county.

And you know, again, the APF, they focus on the intersections, but staff would also look at the site access point to show that based on the volumes on the street plus the other developments that are approved will -- will meet their requirements. It doesn't mean it's not different than what it is today, it just means that there is a level that's considered
acceptable versus unacceptable --
MR. ALDAG: Okay.
MR. NELSON: -- and that's published and it's
all based on the Maryland codes and county zoning ordinances [inaudible] it's all behind.

MR. MARTIN: I have a quick question. 8204 right across the street, Hasani Martin, just -

MS. MCNEIL: Excuse me -- excuse me, Mr.
Martin --
MR. MARTIN: Yes.
MS. MCNEIL: -- are you finished, Mr. Aldag?
MR. ALDAG: I am. Thank you.
MS. MCNEIL: Okay. Okay. Mr. Martin, go ahead.
MR. MARTIN: I'll be quick. I'm -- I'm -- I'm going to always be quick. Just in your professional experience, how -- have you ever seen like 57 units being crammed into 12 acres? Like have you -- like how -- how common is it? I'm just wondering like in your -in your professional experience, how common have -- in -- in a rural area, like how common is this is my main question?

MR. NELSON: I don't think it's uncommon. I
think it's -- again, it's different in this case, because if there were 5- -- again, 57 senior housing units is very different than 5- -- from a traffic perspective -- I mean, it's still jammed.

From a traffic perspective, 57 senior housing units is very different than 57 townhouses, I mean, but, you know, if they were just built as traditional townhouses, that would be generating, you know, 60 percent more traffic, you know, and then we would be having discussions on how do the access points work, whether 1 access point is enough, but again, senior housing developments are very low trip generators, they just -- they are.

MR. MARTIN: So I -- I don't know, do you deal with access to public transportation? Is that your expertise? Because you know, there's no public transportation on Springfield. There's no sidewalk on Springfield Road. The bus stop is on Lanham Severn Road. So you know, they're elderly, so, you know, they're going to be doing a lot of walking in these public transportation --

MR. NELSON: Yeah. Well, there will be
sidewalks on this side when they're done. I mean, I should've quantified that.

MR. MARTIN: I just want to [inaudible] not -not going all the way up Springfield; right?

MR. NELSON: No. But as the developments go forward and, you know, you get the [inaudible] development and as the developments go forward, you get elements of it done and then what happens is the county comes in and it gets petitioned and then they do a project that completes it, but, you know, there's -there's a responsibility of the developer, in this case, just to do his part and that's what the [inaudible].

MR. MARTIN: Okay. Thank you.
MR. NELSON: Mm-hmm.
MS. MCNEIL: Does anyone else have questions of Mr. Nelson?

MS. SPENCER: Yes. This is Mary Spencer.
MS. MCNEIL: Thank you, Ms. Spencer.
MS. SPENCER: [inaudible]. I have a slight question on multiple, 57 units with roughly [inaudible] -- Mr. Nelson, can you hear me?

MS. MCNEIL: Ma'am --
MR. NELSON: You're breaking up a lot.
MS. MCNEIL: Yeah.
MR. NELSON: All I heard was 57 units.
MS. SPENCER: Okay. I'm not going to move to make sure that you can hear me. Are you able to hear me?

MR. NELSON: Yes.
MS. SPENCER: Okay. So currently, the outlet for this property is 57 units with a plan of only 16 in and out trips in the morning and evening; correct?

MR. NELSON: Thirteen in the morning and 16 in the evening. Yes.

MS. SPENCER: Okay. So the site is --
MR. NELSON: There'll be traffic [inaudible] all day.

MS. SPENCER: -- the site is identified for 228 parking spaces whereas if we were to stick to our -- our zoning of half-acre per single-family resident, then it would only be, at max, 24 units; correct?

MR. NELSON: Correct.
MS. SPENCER: Okay. So within traffic, if we
could follow through and approve that 57 units are going to be placed and then you're stating that that would be approved first prior to having an adjustment or assessment on the fact that it's a two-lane road and as identified in your letter, it states there are shoulders on each side and there are not, will this not be addressed prior to approval if this is approved?

MR. NELSON: Well, my -- here's my comment on that, at this point, we're approving the special exception, we're not approving the actual development to go in. The next step is a preliminary plan of subdivision at which point those questions get detailed and approved.

MS. SPENCER: We're approving the special exception -- I'm going to step outside, so that way I know you can hear me loud and clear [inaudible] anything.

We're approving the special exception to go to 57 units on the 12 acres of land, which can accommodate 228 vehicles with the access of coming in -- in and out when PJ County's current employment rate for 55 to 64 years old is 13.13 percent, which is actually higher
than the accounted for, 45 to 54-year-olds for PJ County is 12.83 percent.

So I'm -- I'm trying to see if we move in to accommodate this 57-unit development with 228-vehicle capability, how does -- do those numbers add up on the traffic flow when as Mr. Aldag said, we have counted -I even have cameras on my house to prove that there is 300 to 500 cars and in the morning, the line to turn onto Lanham Severn Road off of Springfield of vehicles is all the way past my house.

So I'm trying to figure out how this is going to be accounted for if a traffic evaluation is not being done prior to approving this 57-unit facility that is also going to add on to the current 26 houses that have already been approved and subdivided on Moriarty Court and Summit Way before you even get to the Stewart property. Do we have an answer?

MR. NELSON: [inaudible]
MR. BROWN: Let him answer your question, ma'am.

MS. SPENCER: I'm sorry.
MR. NELSON: The answer to your question is
that this is -- this is not a zoning request, it's a use request. So what they're determining is whether you're allowed -- and maybe the attorney can step in, make sure I don't say this the wrong way, but is whether this is an allowable use on this property, but the development rights are going to come more through the preliminary plan test in that well, they have to approve that the roads are adequate to support the development.

That will occur at the next step. That's not a requirement at this stage and I'm not sure how else to say it.

MS. SPENCER: My next question is will there be a plan to put in a light at the end of Springfield Road to change the flow of traffic on the Lanham Severn to accommodate the amount of added vehicles? Will there ever be a plan -- is that something that has been looked at?

MR. NELSON: I know historically when we first began working on this project, one of the questions we had was have there been [inaudible] studies conducted for that intersection and that's -- so that's the study
that determined whether it's appropriate and Lanham Severn at Springfield Road is a very different intersection than the site access to Springfield Road, but based on the -- the record, there have been studies where it has found that it wasn't justified at that time.

The community can always request public works, whose responsibility in this case would be [inaudible], it would be public works and state highway administration to conduct a study to determine whether the traffic control is adequate, completely independent of this development, but, you know, whether -- you know, whether that traffic control, which could be a [inaudible], it could be a traffic signal, it could be, you know, roundabouts, all kinds of things.

One of the other appropriate ones [inaudible] the community can always address through the agencies that are out there to make sure that it is safe and it's their responsibility. Will there be tests by the pre- -- preliminary plan? Yes, but that's something that is always available to the community to make sure that it's adequate.

MS. SPENCER: So to clarify --
MR. NELSON: So --
MS. SPENCER: -- at this time, what we are determining is whether or not the property is going to be allowed to build the 57 units versus 24 -- I apologize, I broke up. Where we are is identifying whether or not the property for site use is going to be able to build the 57 units versus 24 and we are not addressing, in any way, the accommodation of traffic at this time; is that correct?

MR. NELSON: We're addressing traffic to the level to determine whether this development creates a burden higher than what could be put on by a right, not what -- so then the next step -- because there's a -there's a step process to evaluate the periods of impact, but right now it's to determine whether the request creates an adverse condition and then it's based on the master plan.

So it's a very more global level, then you get to a next step. Every time you come to the development process, it gets more and more focused on operations, but right now it's a -- it's the high-level planning
review and what we've shown, again, staff's reviewed it and approved it, but it's pretty clear that this application, as proposed, will generate less traffic. There's a lot less, though -- it's four trips less, but again, it's less. So if -- if there were more, then you may see studies to address what the incremental [inaudible].

MS. SPENCER: How are we -- how are you able to identify that bringing in 57 units with 228 parking spaces allotted would generate less traffic with 13 percent being equal to -- in the still percentage of working where 24 units per household most homes only have 2 vehicles? If we even looked at how many times each house was going to go out -- in and out twice a day, we're looking at 48 vehicles versus 228 with the possibility for them to leave and come back at a 55 and over development versus a 65 and over development. How are you able to account for that based on percentage?

MS. MCNEIL: Ms. Spencer --
MS. SPENCER: Yes, ma'am.
MS. MCNEIL: -- I didn't hear any testimony from anyone about the percentage of folks that still
work at 55.
MS. SPENCER: Pghelpzone.org for PG County.
MS. MCNEIL: No. No. No. I didn't hear any testimony.

MS. SPENCER: Okay.
MS. MCNEIL: So what you're going to have to do is testify to that. So for his question, you're asking him to explain, again, why did they find that it would be --

MS. SPENCER: How is it found --
MS. MCNEIL: -- or amounts --
MS. SPENCER: -- [inaudible].
MS. MCNEIL: Right. More -- less trips. Again, Mr. Nelson, why did you de- -- why is it that there are less trips for this use than for the 22 homes that could be built in the zone?

MR. NELSON: The Prince George's County guidelines for transportation studies specifically includes cri- -- trip generation values for different land uses, both residential and office and commercial, but under the residential one in table four of their guidelines, they list what the expected trips are based
on different kinds of residential uses.
And the key to this -- my testimony is that one of them is single-family housing, then we compare that at 22 lots and the other one is senior housing. So the data that they used to make these evaluations is directly out of the guidelines and they're based on formal studies of different uses throughout the region where they -- it was all unit-based, it's not parkingspace based and that's basically what we're required to use.

But also, you know, in the number of studies we've done, the -- the trip rates during the peak hours for senior housing with our findings are they're very, very low. You may have people that can buy the house at a certain age, but it doesn't mean those are the ones that do buy those houses and [inaudible] --

MS. SPENCER: My last question for you -because I apologize, we could go in circles. So my last question is based on the research that you've done and the -- what are the ages of the developments that we are comparing to? What are the current developments that we are comparing to?

Because this is 55 and over versus 62 and over, 65 and over from -- so what is the comparison? What are the development ages?

MR. NELSON: I don't know. The -- the trip rates that are listed within the guidelines of park and planning simply say senior adult housing, singlefamily, senior hou- -- housing mul- -- multifamily. It doesn't break it down further by age and I don't know. I just -- I don't know.

MS. SPENCER: Okay.
MR. SUHAR: Madame Hearing Examiner, I -- I do have to leave.

MS. MCNEIL: Okay.
MR. SUHAR: I've got another -- I've got a conflict here, $I$ do need to step into this -- this other meeting. Would it be possible for me to -- to make my statement for the record on another day or -- I don't know how to address this, because this could keep going on for hours $I$ think with them.

MS. MCNEIL: It could. Mr. Hatcher, do you have anyone that's going to address soil or water, those types of things other than Mr. Ferguson who
probably does not address those things?
MR. HATCHER: We -- we -- we hadn't planned on bringing somebody up to address the soils, because it's not necessarily a required finding with special exception. We certainly can provide that while the record is still open since we are going -- since the record is going to remain open at least to receive some of the materials that -- that -- that you've requested.

We certainly can provide some testimony from the ex- -- the experts to do that. You know, I think if Mr. Suhar would like, we're -- we'd be more than willing just since the record is going to remain open, he can certainly put whatever he was going to say in -in writing, I'm just not entirely sure --

MS. MCNEIL: He did, he mailed it. You have it.

MR. SUHAR: I did. Yeah.
MS. MCNEIL: You had a chance to look at it and have no objection, then -- I didn't --

MR. HATCHER: I wasn't entirely sure what capacity he's -- he's going to be testifying to, though. Is he -- is he testifying? Is he testifying on
behalf of [inaudible]?
MS. MCNEIL: Well, he was going to argue I think.

MR. HATCHER: Yeah.
MS. MCNEIL: But I don't know if there's any testimony in the document. I don't know that, Mr. Suhar, because, you know, I just didn't read it yet, because I knew I would have you. So is there -- are -is there testimony in there about your group -- I mean, maybe we should have one more day for an hour to close this all up.

MR. HATCHER: That would not be the preference.

MR. SUHAR: I wouldn't be opposed to that at all.

MR. HATCHER: That definitely would not be the preference of the applicant. That definitely would not be the preference of the applicant, certainly since we have all our consultants here right now, but if that is the prerogative of the hearing examiner, we would like to be able to get the remaining expert witnesses in while we have everybody here today and again, we don't
necessarily want to --
Because we think we've -- we've made it -- we are going to make our case in chief, we don't necessarily think a continuance is necessary, but that's squarely within your authority.

MS. MCNEIL: If -- if $I$ were thinking of it, are you all available on the 28th?

MR. HATCHER: Of December?
MS. MCNEIL: Mm-hmm.
MR. SUHAR: Ye- -- yes. I am.
MS. MCNEIL: I figure I don't want to be here for --

MR. HATCHER: Counsel will be out of the country, I [inaudible].

MS. MCNEIL: -- it's just -- okay. All right. We'll get -- you know what, how many more people have questions of Mr. Nelson, anyone?

MR. BROWN: We can move on.
MS. MCNEIL: Mr. Hasani, are you saying
something? No. Okay. Okay. Then I -- I want to --
MR. BROWN: I said we can move on.
MR. ALDAG: We're good.

MS. MCNEIL: Who's Tanya [ph]?
MR. ALDAG: Tanya is Tanya Aldag.
MS. MCNEIL: Oh, that's right, it's Ms. Aldag. You already had your questions.

MR. ALDAG: Yeah. I know, we're good.
MS. MCNEIL: Okay. Then you know what, it's 12:32 and I could go forever, but the staff can't. So Mr. -- we're going to take a -- a 30-minute lunch break, but Mr. Suhar, Mr. Hatcher and Mr. Brown, I'll -- I'll be emailing you all, because I do think I need one more day and it would be great if you could iron it out so we can tell everyone on this record. So --

MR. HATCHER: Definitely --
MS. MCNEIL: -- that'll be Mr. Suhar, you've got to get that stuff to us from your client and whatever your document is and it could be that there's some other folks that won't finish today. So we'll see, but -- but right now it's lunch, 30 minutes, we'll be back and I'll email the lawyers. Thank you, everyone.

MR. SUHAR: And -- and so you're -- you're -you're wanting all of us back in a half hour; is that correct?

MS. MCNEIL: No. No. No. No. I'm just emailing you, you are free to go.

MR. SUHAR: Oh, okay. Thank you.
MR. HATCHER: Okay.
MR. SUHAR: So there's going to be another day for us to continue then?

MS. MCNEIL: Yes, sir.
MR. SUHAR: Okay. Thank you so much, Madame Examiner.

MR. HATCHER: If there is indeed -- if there is indeed another day before Mr. Suhar jumps off, will it -- will the testimony be just for those who are speaking on that day, like him?

MS. MCNEIL: Yes. Or anybody you don't finish today, yes, because $I$ don't know if today is going to 6:00 o'clock, but Maurene McNeil can't go to 6:00 o'clock, I apologize. So --

MR. SUHAR: I respect that.
MS. MCNEIL: So everyone, I'll see you at 1:00 o'clock -- 1:03 and I'll email --

MR. SUHAR: All right. Thank you very much.
MS. MCNEIL: Okay. Thank you.

MR. SUHAR: Thank you. All right. Thank you. Have a good day.

AUTOMATED VOICE: Recording stopped. [break]

AUTOMATED VOICE: Recording in progress.
MS. MCNEIL: Okay. So welcome back, everyone. Still didn't pick a date, but I'll get that for you. Before we start, Mr. Hatcher, who are the additional people that you might call as witnesses on here? We're just trying to make sure we have the addresses of everybody that wants to be a person of record. You're muted. Okay.

MR. HATCHER: Yeah. Dan Debolt [ph] is -- is -- his monitor is -- his screen is on. He works at CPJ with --

MS. MCNEIL: No. That's good. We have Mr. Debolt if somebody were wondering about. Who else do you have?

MR. HATCHER: For today --
MS. MCNEIL: Uh-huh.
MR. HATCHER: -- Dan Debolt and Mark Ferguson.
MS. MCNEIL: Oh, just that. So -- okay. Okay.

So we've just got to make sure with Mr. Hughes [ph] and Ms. Richmond [ph] that we have your addresses, maybe you can put them in the chat for us, because if we don't have a home or writ- -- or work address, then you -- preferably home, you may not be qualified to be a person of record to appeal this matter. Okay.

MS. POTIT: Also, the email addresses. Excuse me.

MS. MCNEIL: Well, we -- we must have them; right? Or maybe not.

MS. POTIT: Not for Mr. Hughes and Ms. Richmond, they're not on the list.

MS. MCNEIL: Okay. Somehow they have it. Okay. So we need your emails as well, $M-$-- Mr. Hughes and Ms. Richmond. Okay. So is Br- -- is Stan back? Who is your next witness, Mr. Hatcher?

MR. HATCHER: Mark Ferguson.
MS. MCNEIL: Okay. I know Stan wants to hear all of that, so let's give him a second.

MR. HATCHER: Just a point of clarification, am I -- are -- are we still on the lookout for an email for a potential alternative date or are we comfortable
proceeding today?
MS. MCNEIL: No. We're on the lookout, it's
coming.
MR. HATCHER: Hopefully this year?
MS. MCNEIL: You are the one -- okay. I'll tell you what, can you just send some dates to Ms. Potit and Ms. Rawlings [ph]?

MR. HATCHER: Yes.
MS. POTIT: I'm sorry, you were saying? I'm --
MS. MCNEIL: He's sending some dates to you all to see if any of them would work for us to continue this too.

MR. HATCHER: Does it have to be on a Wednesday or could it be on a different day as well?

MS. MCNEIL: Only in December can it be on a different day.

MR. HATCHER: Oh, I'm going to give you some dates.

MS. MCNEIL: It may not work, but you can try. Go ahead. Okay. Where is Mr. Brown? Some -- some housekeeping, I guess Mr. Ferguson's planning statement should be Exhibit 102.

MR. HATCHER: Two.

MS. MCNEIL: And we have to make sure Ms. Bah has it so she can pull it up if anyone -- I don't know if you were going to pull it up, but --

MR. HATCHER: It certainly was not the applicant's intention to pull it up, but $I$ think there are going to be some other things that -- that Mark might speak to that might need to be pulled up.

MS. MCNEIL: Okay. Okay. Well, we can get started. Mr. Ferguson, do you swear or affirm under the penalties of perjury that the testimony you shall give will be the truth and nothing but the truth?

MR. FERGUSON: Yes. I do.

MR. HATCHER: Mr. Ferguson, can you please state your full name and business address for the record?

MR. FERGUSON: My name is Mark Ferguson and my business address is 5407 Water Street, Suite 206 in Historic Downtown Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

MR. HATCHER: Where are you currently employed?

MR. FERGUSON: At Site Design Incorporated as
a senior land planner.
MR. HATCHER: What is your current position with RDA/Site Design Incorporated?

MR. FERGUSON: I'm sorry, I threw you off, as senior land planner.

MR. HATCHER: Mr. Ferguson, have you ever been qualified as an expert in land use planning before the Prince George's County zoning hearing examiner?

MR. FERGUSON: Yes. I have, on more than 150 occasions.

MR. HATCHER: Is Exhibit 89, which is included in the $Z H E$ record, a copy of your resume and if -- and if so, does it accurately reflect your educational background and professional experience?

MR. FERGUSON: Yes. It does.
MS. MCNEIL: Mr. Ferguson, have you -- have you been declined admission as an expert witness since we last --

MR. FERGUSON: Madame Examiner, I have not been declined. I have only declined in stature as I get older, I get shorter.

MS. MCNEIL: Okay. Mr. Brown, do you have any
questions or objections?
MR. BROWN: Absolutely none whatsoever.
Welcome, Mr. Ferguson.
MR. FERGUSON: Thank you, Mr. Brown. It's nice to see the both of you this morning.

MS. MCNEIL: You will be accepted --
MR. FERGUSON: Or I beg your pardon, this afternoon.

MS. MCNEIL: This afternoon. You will be expe--- accepted as an expert in land use planning.

MR. FERGUSON: Thank you, Madame Examiner.
MR. HATCHER: Did you prepare a land use report associated with the subject application?

MR. FERGUSON: I did.
MR. HATCHER: Madame Examiner, I'd lo- -- it'd be ideal -- we respectfully respect that the land use report be -- provided by Mr. Ferguson be included in the record $I$ think you referenced possibly as Exhibit 102.

MS. MCNEIL: It will be Exhibit 102.
MR. HATCHER: And do you -- Mark, do you further incorporate and adopt your testimony here today
with your land use report?
MR. FERGUSON: I do with one caveat, on Pages 8 and 14 of that report, I indicate incorrectly that the proposed development will be providing 100-year stormwater management controls, that was not -- so I describe it correctly in the description of the proposed use, but I did not catch those earlier statements.

So if you'd strike the references to 100-year management on Pages 8 and 14.

MR. HATCHER: Okay. Are you familiar with the property which is the subject of this application?

MR. FERGUSON: I am.
MR. HATCHER: Are you familiar with the technical staff report dated September 20, 2023 as amended by the development review staff's October 4, 2023 supplemental memorandum?

MR. FERGUSON: Yes. I am.
MR. HATCHER: Do you agree with the technical staff report dated September, 2023 as amended by development review staff's October 4, 2023 supplemental memorandum?

MR. FERGUSON: Largely. I have a caveat with regard to the alternative compliance request, but -but other than that, yes, I do.

MR. HATCHER: Okay. Does technical staff establish a neighborhood in association with this application?

MR. FERGUSON: Unusually, but to their recent practice, yes, they do.

MR. HATCHER: Do you agree with staff's definition of the neighborhood?

MR. FERGUSON: Unusually, to my past practice, yes, I do.

MR. HATCHER: Are you fam- --
MR. FERGUSON: I do. I think Mr. -- Mr. Nelson's amendment to include Good Luck Road is -- is an appropriate extension of -- of Duckettown as the northern border. I agree with that and I think that's with staff's intent as well.

MR. HATCHER: Okay. Are you familiar with the site plan associated with this --

MS. MCNEIL: Oh, ex- -- I'm so sorry. So let me clarify, the northern boundary will now be Good Luck

Road?
MR. FERGUSON: Good Luck Road and Duckettown. So Good Luck Road really dives into Springfield Road and then takes a little jog, if you will, down Springfield Road for a moment and then extends over Good -- Good -- Duckettown Road, which also dives into Spring- -- Springfield Road.

So north of Wingate it's Good Luck Road, north of the subject property in Spring Hill Manor it's Duckettown Road and they're roughly -- they're roughly colinear.

MS. MCNEIL: I'm sorry, go ahead, Mr. Hatcher.
MR. HATCHER: Okay. Yeah. Are you familiar with the site plan associated with the special exception?

MR. FERGUSON: I am.
MR. HATCHER: Have you reviewed the applicant's statement of justification?

MR. FERGUSON: I have.
MR. HATCHER: Do you agree with the statement of justification?

MR. FERGUSON: I do. I do.

MR. HATCHER: Does this application seek approval under the current or prior zoning ordinance? MR. FERGUSON: This is -- this is reviewed under the provisions of the prior zoning ordinance.

MR. HATCHER: Have you reviewed the prior zoning ordinance applicable regulations for this use?

MR. FERGUSON: Yes. I have.
MR. HATCHER: What is the subject property's prior -- prior base zone pursuant to the prior zoning ordinance?

MR. FERGUSON: It was RR, which is depicted then as R-R. Under the current zoning ordinance, it was under the -- the -- the re- -- most recent countywide map amendment. It was transferred into the comparable RR, no hyphen, Zone.

MR. HATCHER: What is the proposed use for the subject property?

MR. FERGUSON: So as you've heard testified, the proposed use is for a planned retirement community of 57 attached single-family dwellings -- or singlefamily villa-style attached dwellings.

MR. HATCHER: Does the pr- -- prior zoning
ordinance permit the proposed use, which is planned retirement community at the subject property?

MR. FERGUSON: It -- it does per- -- permit again the $R R$ Zone. It permits it in less zone -- in less dense zones as well. So certainly, all the way down to the $R A$ or one lot per two-acre zone all the way up through, you know, the -- the -- the most dense single-family zones, the use is permitted by special exception.

MR. HATCHER: Is the pro- -- is the proposed planned retirement community use and special exception site plan in harmony with the purposes of the prior zoning ordinance?

MR. FERGUSON: It is. I do go through that in Pages 5 through -- still flipping, bear with me, 5 through 13 of my land use report. The vast bulk of that analysis is related to the purpose to implement the master plan and the general plan and the functional master plans, which is also one of the required findings, $I$ just do most of my discussion under the purposes, because that comes first.

But broadly, the -- the purposes of the
ordinance look to provide for development, which will be carried forth in areas where the facilities are ad--- adequate to support it and that will, of course, be determined, as Mr. Nelson testified, at the next phase of the approval -- review and approval process should this -- should this application be approved, then the development review process would proceed to the preliminary plan of subdivision where adequacy of public facility is tested.

It looks to promote adequate light, air and privacy to provide bene- -- beneficial relationship between uses. These purposes are incorporated into the more specific regulations of the ordinance, whether it's the use tables, whether it's the criteria for approval of a special exception, whether it's the additional requirements for the approval of -- of a planned retirement community.

So when we go through these, you find that -that largely these purposes are duplicative of more specific approval criteria, which we'll go through shortly.

MR. HATCHER: Is the proposed use in
conformance with the applicable requirements and regulations of the prior ordinance?

MR. FERGUSON: With -- so I have -- I have reviewed the -- the natural resources inventory, the site development concept plan, the -- the special exception site plan, the landscape plan, the type II tree conservation plan, some of which are -- are directly referred to by the zoning ordinance as -- as direct requirements, some of which are adopted requirements that plans that address requirements that are adopted by reference by the zoning ordinance and some of which merely inform the -- the developability -- the physical developability of the -- the property under other regulations.

And based on my review of all of those documents, with the approval of the alternative compliance that's been requested and the variance for the removal of the specimen trees, it will be in -- in conformance with all of the applicable requirements of the zoning ordinance -- the prior zoning ordinance.

MR. HATCHER: Did you review the county's approved general plan as it relates to the proposed
development?
MR. FERGUSON: I did.
MR. HATCHER: What is the applicable area -area under the county's approved general plan?

MR. FERGUSON: So the -- the -- the area broadly is classified as established -- the county's established communities and established communities are really most of the county that are areas that are -that are largely developed and what the plan says about them is that they are the areas outside the county's heart, it says.

And it says, there are areas outside of the designation centers and it recommends that established communities are most appropriate for context-sensitive infill and low to medium density development. Low density development is generally considered to go up to three and a half dwelling units per acre.

Medium density development is generally considered to go up to eight dwelling units per acre. So while special exceptions for planned retirement communities allow medium density development and allow densities up to 8 units per acre, as you've heard
testified earlier today, only 4.75 units per acre are proposed for this, which is -- it is medium density development, but it is only slightly above the upper end of -- of low density development.

MR. HATCHER: So to clarify, do you believe the proposed development conforms to the general plan?

MR. FERGUSON: I do. I do. The general plan doesn't just talk about land use, it does also talk about housing and -- and communities and -- and there was some discussion earlier about need for senior housing.

I agree with Mr. Brown's observation that except for planned retirement communities in the RA Zone, there isn't a requirement to determine if there is a need for development, rather the requirement is to evaluate whether this design meets the needs of the retirement-age community, which I believe it does and we can talk about more in detail later.

But certainly, the general plan does identify that -- that there is a need for specifically the county's aging population creates additional opportunities for new compact communities and infill
development featuring smaller accessible units where residents have the option to age in place and that essentially is what this is.

It's a more compact community, admittedly in the midst of the neighborhood which is typically less dense and typically single-family development, but specifically, this is a -- an infill development featuring smaller accessible units, which is what are proposed where residents have the options to age in place and of course, we heard Mr. Burke's testimony about the character of these units, which provide for all of the living requirements for the -- for the senior occupants to be met on the first level while providing flexibility for visitors or even in-home caregivers to live in the upstairs space.

MR. BROWN: So what about public transportation --

MR. FERGUSON: So this -- this speaks --
MR. BROWN: -- access to public tran- -transportation?

MR. FERGUSON: I'm sorry, Mr. Hatcher, that didn't sound like you.

MR. HATCHER: What is the applicable area of master plan for the subject property?

MR. FERGUSON: The -- this property is governed by the 2022 Bowie-Mitchellville and vicinity master plan. It is worth noting that this property is on the very edge of that plan's applicability.

Across Springfield Road to the west, it's in the 2006 East Glenn Dale sector plan, which I could give you a more precise title of, but I can't spot it, the 2006 approved sector plan and sectional map amended for the East Glenn Dale area portions of planning area 70A. So that's -- that's across the street.

MR. HATCHER: Have you reviewed the -- the 2002 [sic] Bowie plan?

MR. FERGUSON: The 2022 Bowie plan, yes, I have.

MR. HATCHER: Yes. 2022. Yeah.
MR. FERGUSON: Yeah.
MR. HATCHER: Does the master plan provide for any applicable recommendations, strategies, policies or goals for the subject property?

MR. FERGUSON: It -- so specifically, no, not
-- not a specific discussion of the subject property. Map 16 recommends residential low land use just like really all of the surrounding neighborhood, except for the very, very eastern end by Maple Avenue in Old -- in Old Town Bowie, but it does contain a number of more general strategies, some that are applicable to the entire master plan area, some that are applicable to the established communities, part of the entire -- of the master plan area and then some regarding transportation, some regarding the natural environment and so on and so forth.

And I do go through those on Pages 6 through -- 6 through 10 of my report. I can go through those in detail if you'd like, but $I$ think the highlights really, again, are in the housing and neighborhood development -- I'm sorry, the housing and neighborhood's element of the master plan and specifically, strategy HN-2.2, which is expand universal design housing choices, including visitable units, which allow for barrier-free access into the first floor and to a first floor restroom and that's, again, exactly what this development seeks to do.

The plan speaks, again, to the question of need even though that's not a standard, it speaks actually at great length in its existing condition summary of that element about the substantive growth in the over 65 population and the number of houses -- and the number of houses moving out of the Bowie area that are in the lower -- lower age groups and again, it seeks for, "seniors and millennials' increasing demand for dense walkable neighborhoods along with continued anticipated demand for new single-family detached housing presents a range of opportunities strengthening existing those through infill development and creating healthier communities with increased walkability."

So this plan will be addressing the master plan's identified need for senior housing and addressing other of the things, like community gardens, like the bike lanes along Springfield Road, like the trail networks that are proposed, recreational opportunities inside the development.

Really, almost every one of the features of this development goes and hits a particular master plan recommendation.

MR. HATCHER: In your expert opinion, will the proposed use substantially impair the integrity of the approved master plan?

MR. FERGUSON: No. In my -- in my opinion, it will not at all. It -- it really acts actively to implement it.

MR. HATCHER: Okay. What uses and zones are located adjacent to the subject property?

MR. FERGUSON: For really some distance, the property is surrounded by single-family detached dwelling on lots which range from a quarter of an acre in the Springfield Manor or are cluster up to as large as two acres roughly in -- in Wingate to the west.

MR. HATCHER: Okay.
MR. FERGUSON: So Springfield Manor to the -to the east and north, that's actually a very large development. Oak- -- what is it, Oakstone to the north are in the RR Zone. Everything on the west side of Springfield Road is in the RE Zone, which is slightly -

- it's the one -- one zone less -- less dense and again, single-family dwellings.

There are some subdivisions which have been
approved that have not yet been developed in that area and those zones as well as the -- as well as the developed parts that are really the predominant part of the neighborhood, it's already developed.

MR. HATCHER: Are any buffering or screening techniques employed to ensure compatabil- -- compatible relationships with adjoining land uses?

MR. FERGUSON: There are. So certainly, the -the northern edge of the property, which -- which is the Stream Valley of Newstop Branch is preserved as both the stream, its surrounding buffer, an expanded buffer for the 100-year flood plan that's associated it, an even larger area that was preserved in order to accommodate the existence of some specimen trees that are approximate to but not in that buffer were -- were preserved.

So there really will be a very substantive buffer between the development proposed on the subject property and the existing de- -- development to the north and to the east in Oakview [sic] and Springhill [sic] -- and Springfield Manor. Now, along the western boundary, the property has frontage on Springfield

Road.
What the design does, which I find to be very nice, is to angle the proposed units so that they slope away principally from Springfield Road.

So right at the entrance there are two units which are close where there -- which are close to Springfield Road right-of-way where there's already some -- you know, the other activity of the road, but then the -- the -- the units generally step back from -- from Springfield Road both to the northwest and to the southeast, which creates a much larger buffer.

So the provisions of the landscape manual call for a 35-foot buffer between the rear yards of dwellings and collector roadways, which Springfield Road is. What this design of the proposed development does is actually afford an average of 77 or 78 feet of depth, which can then be in- -- landscaped very, very substantively.

So many of the houses are much further than that. So the average buffer that's provided is twice what the landscape manual or more than twice what the landscape manual provides and of course, as you get
further away from the entrance, it -- it exceeds that even more.

So that -- that site design and the landscaping both in the buffer plannings and in additional plannings which are proposed beyond the 35foot official buffer really provide a -- a substantive buffer in between the development and Springhill [sic] -- Springfield Road and the -- the development beyond it to the west.

MR. HATCHER: Okay. In your expert opinion, will the proposed use adversely affect the health, safety and welfare of residents and workers in the area?

MR. FERGUSON: In my opinion, it will not. So certainly, we've heard testimony to that effect from Mr. Nelson, I -- I agree with his testimony. There have been questions about stormwater management that have been -- been raised before.

So what the subject property does is number one, preserve the regulated natural feature of Newstop Branch, number two, it provides full environmental site design, which is intended to replicate the con- -- the
conditions existing on the property as if it were never developed. So right now the property has been developed with, you know, Ms. -- Ms. Stewart's resident, right, and -- and her outbuildings and the area around her house.

The standard for stormwater management, and I believe Ms. Sommer testified to this, is that property needs to be managed such that the water runs off from it at the rate as if it were woods and it never been -you know, had never been developed at all.

So that will provide for a reduction in the flows that -- even now with the property only developed as a single-family house, there will be less runoff coming off after its development than -- with 57 houses than there is now even with 1 and some clearing. So that's -- that's really a substantive -- a substantive improvement.

The environment site design requirements provide for several things. So they provide for water quality and cleaning the runoff and that's accomplished both by infiltration of the water back into the ground where that's feasible as it is up the front of the
property where the hydrologic soils group is -- is group two and the micro-bioretention facilities there will replicate the natural conditions by reinfiltrating that ground water.

And then as the property gets lower, there is less permeable soils, they're classified as sea soils and some may -- may not even be that permeable whereas submerged gravel wetland is the appropriate environmental site design technique and that manages water quality by evapotranspiration allowing the plants that are planted in that facility to metabolize the nutrients that are in the runoff and preserve water quality.

Groundwater recharges included where it's -where it is feasible by the soil. So where it can infiltrate now it will and where it can't it will continue not to but will still get treatment. And then finally, there is a requirement for reduction in quantities so that essentially the streams, like Newstop Branch, don't erode by not getting the flash of -- of spikes in runoff associated from impervious areas.

So the water is held back and -- and managed so that really, you just get -- you just get a genuine trickle coming out of the facilities into New- -Newstop Branch. So that protects the water quality, it also protects the stream bank so that you don't get sedimentation. To that end, I think there's something else that's worth mentioning.

So Newstop Branch is in -- drains into Horsepen Branch, drains into the Upper Patuxent. That is a watershed that has been identified as being impaired by sediment -- too much -- too much sediment in the -- in the runoff. And then secondly, it's classified as a tier two watershed, which means that notwithstanding the sediment, these are recreational waters and the state really wants to keep them in -- in especially good condition.

Because of those classifications, this project will be required to provide a heightened level of sediment controls during construction. So that means the upgrading of certain sediment controls to provide an increased deficiency of -- of sediment filtering. It also means that the -- the stream buffers are larger.

So just that classification, of course, then branch means this property will provide an enhanced level of environmental protections in sediment control as well as in stormwater management.

MR. HATCHER: In your expert opinion, will the proposed use be detrimental to the use or development of adjacent properties or -- or the general neighborhood?

MR. FERGUSON: In my opinion, no and -- and for several reasons. So first, there are the buffers that -- that $I$ just testified to along the northern and eastern perimeters, along Springfield -- Springfield Road. Secondly, there is an inward orientation to the development. This is not an outward-facing development.

The -- the modern planning trend is to take houses and have them make a street for -- along Springfield Road. Were that the case, this might have a -- an impact on the character of the development. Now, that's not the same thing as the use or development, but character is one of the -- is one of the additional requirements that I'll discuss in a moment.

These units are proposed to be two-story, not
a conventional townhouse of three, which is what is typically contemplated by planned retirement communities. So these will be lower in -- lower in height as well.

And then of course, we've heard Mr. Nelson's testimony about how senior housing just statistically generates lower traffic than -- substantively lower traffic than a comparable number of unrestricted single-family dwellings such to the point that if you did a conservation subdivision on the -- on the subject property and you got every last bit of permissible density of 24 units under single-family development.

You would be getting fewer trips out of the 57 units of senior housing that are proposed here. So that -- that, again, is a consequential difference that speaks to this proposed use not adversely affecting the use for development of the surrounding properties and the general neighborhood.

And again, I would add that the overwhelming character of the neighborhood is already developed. The very few properties that are not are the ones that have been referenced in earlier questions by the residents
along Springfield Road, which have been platted -recently platted but aren't yet manifested.

MR. HATCHER: And to clarify, because I think you referenced something that is pretty important, in your expert opinion, do you believe this will change the character of the neighborhood?

MR. FERGUSON: I do not. Again, for the -- for the reasons that it is inward-facing, it's lower development, it's -- it's set back a good deal further than the ordinance requires. No, it will -- it will not.

MR. HATCHER: Okay. Earlier you referenced that you reviewed the TCP2.

MR. FERGUSON: I did.
MR. HATCHER: Is that accurate?

MR. FERGUSON: It is. Yes.
MR. HATCHER: With the amendments contained in the staff report in the memorandum, in your expert opinion, is the site plan in conformance with the TCP2?

MR. FERGUSON: It is. And one of the components, of course, of that TCP2 is the variance for the removal of those four specimen trees. And to expand
a little bit on that, so staff did an analysis in the staff report. I -- I agree with it literally word for word and I think the important background in -- in looking at tree variances is that as the ordinance -the zoning ordinance specific- --

Or I'm sorry, Subtitle 25 specifically states, tree ordinances aren't zoning ordinances and the standard for their approval is -- is different. So --

MR. HATCHER: Clarify, when you say ordinances, you're referring to variances?

MR. FERGUSON: Did I misspeak? Did -- what did I say? I'm sorry.

MR. HATCHER: You said --
MS. MCNEIL: You said, tree ordinances are not zoning ordinan- -- I mean, tree ordinances are not zoning variances.

MR. FERGUSON: That is correct, tree variances are not zoning variances and the --

MS. MCNEIL: Which I wi- -- I wish you all didn't have to say, because I think you're going to confuse people more. Why would there be zoning variances? They're in Subtitle 25.

MR. FERGUSON: They are, but many people don't understand that, Madame Examiner. So it is a -- it is a different -- it is a different part of the county code and -- and the -- the standards for tree variances are based on a different set of presumptions. So what the special -- I'm sorry, I don't know what the new word is, but the -- the spec- -- court of special appeals, what are they now?

MS. MCNEIL: The appellate court --
MR. FERGUSON: The appellate --
MS. MCNEIL: -- and the supreme court.
MR. FERGUSON: -- and yes, I remember the supreme court. I -- I voted against that, but apparently, I didn't have any -- enough votes, Madame Examiner. I'm a crusty old man and I don't like things to change.

The -- the appellate court has -- has said that the applicant has the burden of demonstrating that without a variance, the applicant would be denied a use of the property that is both significant and reasonable and that's generally held to be one that is permitted by -- you know, permitted by the ordinance.

So what we have here is a case where some of the trees are in the regulated areas, those are not in any dispute. Some of the trees were proximate to the regular -- to the regulated areas and those trees were the sub- -- the subject of some negotiation between the applicant staff and substantial revision of their plans to preserve those trees and what everybody has agreed with is that the four trees that are the subject of the variance that are before you are really located in the center of development.

They're located right in the midst of the -the heart of the property, right in the midst of where the infrastructure needs to be and staff opined and I think it's actually worth quoting -- well, sorry, I have a -- bear with me one second, my computer ran out of memory, fortunately, I did not yet.

All right. I'm sorry, I have to go to staff's back- -- memorandum in the backup, which is --begins on Page 136 of the backup and this is a memorandum from Mrs. Anne Nickel [ph] dated August 28th and what she says on Page 10 of -- of her report is that retention of the trees, they're somewhat dispersed yet integral
to the developable port- -- developable portion of the site in that they're more centrally located on the property and not in close proximity to the PMA, which is to say the buffers around the regulated environmental features or any REF, which is a regulated environmental feature.

Retention of these trees and protection of their respect- -- respective CRZs, or Critical Root Zones, would have a considerable impact on the proposed development by creating challenges for adequate circulation and infrastructure through portions of the site and those are the special conditions that caused the unwarranted hardship and they would deprive the applicant of rights commonly enjoyed by others in similar areas, because the trees are unique to the subject property and other developments on other properties are all evaluated under the same criteria.

What -- what staff concludes in this case and in all of the other tree variances that -- that I've been a part of, which is quite a few is that it is the location of the trees and other natural resources that predate the applicant's interest in developing the site
that are -- that are -- that are the conditions based on the request, not so much the -- the applicant's design.

And so looking at alternatives to protect every individual tree is not what's done in any of the tree variance reviews. It's only to see are there -are there reasonable changes that can be made to protect certain trees? And if so, then those should be done, as in this case was done with the redesign of the site to protect the trees to the northwest of the submerged gravel wetland.

MR. HATCHER: Mr. Ferguson, I -- I believe you've -- you've gone through the criteria of the variance and to be clear, do you support staff's recommendation of approval of the variance to remove four specimen trees?

MR. FERGUSON: I do. I agree with their analysis and I agree with their conclusion.

MR. HATCHER: Okay. And since there were some questions earlier, I think it -- it just makes some sense just to ask you, in your capacity as an expert in land planning, is the -- is the -- is the applicant's
request for a variance based on conditions or circumstances which are a result of the actions of the applicant?

MR. FERGUSON: Yeah. And -- and as I -- as I just testified, you know, no, the -- the request is based on conditions or circumstances inherent to the property, namely the location of all of the -- all of the trees and the four in question being in the middle of the development area really propose constraints on development and yielding, in the words of the -- the appellate court, a substantive and reasonable yield. Where's my quote sheet?

MR. HATCHER: And the [inaudible] --
MR. FERGUSON: A significant -- a significant and reasonable -- significant and reasonable use of the property.

MR. HATCHER: Your full analysis is contained in -- in your land use report, which is submitted into the record; correct?

MR. FERGUSON: It is.
MR. HATCHER: Okay. You also referenced earlier that you're familiar with the -- the NRI.

MR. FERGUSON: I am.
MR. HATCHER: Okay. Can you describe where the -- the -- actually, would it be possible to bring up Exhibit 38?

MS. BAH: Sure. Hold on one second. I'm [inaudible] -- are you familiar with what's on the monitor?

MR. FERGUSON: I am.
MR. HATCHER: Okay. Can you please demonstrate the proposed location of the regulated environmental features on site?

MR. FERGUSON: So the area on the northern and eastern boundaries of the subject property is the Stream Valley of Newstop Branch and an unnamed tributary actually to the east and you can see a line that sort of has a bunch of -- of arcs in it that's probably the darkest line on this exhibit and that's -if you zoom in, you will -- you would see that that's -- that's line PMA, line PMA.

PMA stands for Primary Management Area and that reflects a -- a buffer that surrounds the -- the banks of the stream that can be expanded for contiguous
deep slopes, for contiguous nontitle wetland buffers, for 100-year flood plain and -- and that results in this -- this line called the -- the PMA.

What you can see is that some of the specimen trees which are dots surrounded by -- this resolution dot surrounded by faint circles are within the PMA, then there is a cluster roughly in the center of the drawing of the four trees, which are the ones that are also being preserved even though they're not in the regulated -- in the -- in the PMA or in the -- the stream buffer and then there are four other trees that are at further distance, which are the trees that are the sub- -- subject to the variance request.

MR. HATCHER: Have you --
MR. FERGUSON: I should note, by the way, that specimen trees are not regulated natural features, they're just -- they're just specimen trees. Let the record show I used air quotes around just. And the -the regula- -- the regulated natural features are the streams, they are buffers, 100-year flood plain.

MR. HATCHER: Have you reviewed the letter of justification for impacts to environmental features
which is included as Exhibit 77?
MR. FERGUSON: I did.
MR. HATCHER: Do you agree with the analysis and conclusions provided in the letter of justification?

MR. FERGUSON: I do. So two -- two impacts were proposed, both for necessary infrastructure. So the first is for the sewer outfall, as you could see -if we were zoomed in a little bit tighter, there is a sewer main that runs on the property but it is entirely within the PMA or the -- the regulated natural features and their buffers.

So to provide sewage service to the property, it's necessary to temporarily go into the buffer, connect to that sewer and then restore the buffer. The second request is for a small permanent impact to allow for the safe discharge of water from one of the environmental site design measures the submerged gravel wetland on the eastern part of the site.

And so there was a small disturbance that's considered permanent to provide for rock stabilization so that you don't get further degradation or
degradation of the area that's preserved from concentrated flows.

MR. HATCHER: All right. In your expert opinion, does the proposed site plan demonstrate the preservation and/or restoration of regulated environmental features on site in a natural state to the fullest extent possible?

MR. FERGUSON: To the fullest extent possible, yes, it does.

MR. HATCHER: Does your letter of ju- -- does your land use report analyze all of those criteria more fully?

MR. FERGUSON: It does.
MR. HATCHER: Are you familiar with the 2010 Prince George's County Landscape Manual?

MR. FERGUSON: Yes. I am.
MR. HATCHER: Has the applicant requested alternative compliance from the landscape manual?

MR. FERGUSON: They did. So there were two items which were the subject of the request and one of those items is the subject of the caveat I mentioned at the beginning of my testimony. So the first -- the
first request is to allow the corners of the lots on -immediately to either side of the entrance project into the required 35-foot buffer from rear yards to a collector roadway.

One of the criteria for granting -- or for allowing alternative compliance requests and then certainly, for granting it is that what is proposed -an alternative compliance is not a variance, it's not a special approval, it's a way of saying the way we are doing it isn't the same as the requirement, but rather, it's a different way that gives the result that is just as good, if not better.

And so what the applicant has done here is, as I had discussed earlier by laying out the site such that the properties step away from Springfield Road, they are closest to Springfield Road near the -- near the entrance where there already is an outward reaching impact, by providing a greater average buffer and then by providing more planting than what the -- what the landscape manual would require for standard compliance.

What you get is a proposal that's at least as good or better and in my opinion, a good deal better
than what standard -- compliance with the standard, you know, rule would yield.

MR. HATCHER: Do you provide a full analysis of the alternative compliance in your land -- your land use report?

MR. FERGUSON: I do, but what I would -- what I would like to do is actually speak in a little bit more detail about the request for alternative compliance for Section 4.1, which is the requirement for street trees along private streets and what staff cites in their -- in their analysis is that there's a requirement for 1 tree for every 35 feet of road frontage, excluding driveways.

That's actually not the requirement. What that is is a -- it's a line on a sample schedule which is included. What the landscape manual does have is -- is a requirement in Section 4- -- 4.10c2, which provides that tree -- shade trees shall be provided at an average spacing of not less than 25 feet on center nor greater than 50 feet on center.

That's the actual requirement and if you do the math with that requirement, you find that the 41
trees that are proposed meets that requirement. And so in my opinion, alternative compliance is not necessary.

That having been said, staff did analyze the request in addition to the numerical requirement for the number of trees, there's a host of about 10 requirements that specify clearances from utilities, from power poles, from -- utilities, from driveways, from intersections, street lights so that the trees don't interfere with the other necessary functioning of the road.

And it's really the confluence of all of those things conforming to all of those separation requirements which limit the number of trees that are -- that are required.

Now, what the staff and the applicant agreed is that to compensate for, punitively at least, being fewer than the number required of trees required, what they would do instead was number one, plant larger trees so that at the time of the initial development, there would be a greater degree of shade and benefits from -- from the street trees and then secondly, recognize the contribution of trees planted on lots and
common areas which provide that same shading and visual function. So that's reflected in the conditions in the staff report as amended by the memorandum.

MR. HATCHER: Are there specific criteria the proposed development must meet as a planned retirement community?

MR. FERGUSON: There are. Those are provided in Section 27-395 of the prior zoning ordinance.

MR. HATCHER: In your expert opinion, does the proposed development -- development's use meet those criteria?

MR. FERGUSON: It does. I go through those on Pages 15 through 19 -- 19 of my report and what those are, first, and this has been the subject of conversation earlier, is that the proposed use will serve the needs of the retirement-age community.

So the -- the design of the uses, the recreational facilities that are provided, the internal orientation of the development and -- and very particularly, the kind of buildings that are proposed are really all oriented towards the needs of the retirement-age community as opposed to say,
conventional attached housing.
The second criterium is that the proposed use will not adversely affect the character of the surrounding residential community and again, I've testified to that earlier how the properties' inward orientation, being surrounded by preserved-regulated natural features by being provided with enhanced buffers along Springfield Road by the lower character of the proposed dwellings really all combine together to really mitigate the impacts of an attached dwelling development on the surrounding single-family neighborhood.

And I think it's also worth mentioning here again that what is presumed to be a valid use here would be a planned retirement community of eight dwelling units per acre. Only 4.75 are preserved here. So the lower density that's proposed by the applicant also speaks substantively to this criterium for approval. Should I go on or did you have something that you wanted to say?

MR. HATCHER: Please proceed.
MR. FERGUSON: Okay. So the next criterium,
again, Mr. Brown spoke to this earlier, is that in the RA Zone, there shall be a demonstrated need for the facility and this is an appropriate distinction to draw between this provision that does require a finding of need for the use as proposed to the earlier provision which requires you to demonstrate that the proposed use will meet the needs of the retirement-age community and of course, the subject property was not previously classified in the RA Zone.

The next requirement is that the site plan shall set forth the traffic circulation patterns, which it does, that the regulations for the development be provided as a part of and on the special exception site plan, which they are, that the subject property shall contain at least 12 contiguous acres and I believe that Mr. -- I'm sorry, I am blanking on his name, Mr. Debolt [ph] will testify to the specifics of that following, the number of dwelling units per acre shall not exceed 8 per -- for the growth tract area and again, 4.75 are proposed.

In the RA Zone, buildings shall not exceed three stories. Now, we're not in the RA Zone, but we
won't even be three stories, let alone exceeding it. There are specific criteria for properties that were previously classified in the I3 or CO Zones, which this isn't.

MR. HATCHER: Mr. Ferguson, is all this detailed in your land use report?

MR. FERGUSON: It is.
MR. HATCHER: A full analysis of all the criteria associated with the planned retirement community?

MR. FERGUSON: It is.
MR. HATCHER: Okay.
MR. FERGUSON: Do you want me to continue or -

- or rest on that?

MS. MCNEIL: I want you to go to number four and then you can rest --

MR. FERGUSON: I can, Madame Examiner.
MS. MCNEIL: -- because I want to know -- I want to know why a community center or meeting area is satisfied with an outdoor pavilion. Is that what you all usually -- I mean, have you done that in the past [inaudible] to be enclosed? Go ahead.

MR. FERGUSON: The -- this applicant in fact had a proposal for elderly housing attached dwellings, which is not the same use; right? That's not a planned retirement community, but it is -- it will look the same, you know, if you're -- if you're a resident if you're driving by and these facilities are very comparable because of the exercise facilities proposed here.

I think they are greater here than they -they were there, but the meeting area, while outside, is substantive in character. So it's a good-sized pavilion. It's a good-sized plaza beyond that and that plaza accommodates other things beyond seating and picnics and of course, you know, the -- the community gardens, which $I$ think is a pretty cool feature, but that's not expert opinion.

So in -- in my opinion, that -- that outdoor plaza is the meeting area that -- that -- that speaks to this -- this provision. And I would -- I would also say that --

MS. MCNEIL: I'm sorry, so more meeting area than community center? There is as an or there. So
that's [inaudible].
MR. FERGUSON: There is an or. Correct.
MS. MCNEIL: Okay.
MR. FERGUSON: Correct. So I wouldn't say it -- it -- it needs to be a community center. And I think the second thing that's -- that's sort of appropriate to bear in mind is that the homeowner's association, for 57 lots, would have a heck of a burden in carrying the maintenance, upkeep, conditioning of an enclosed space.

And so I think there does need to be some recognition of proportionality of what we're, you know, imposing in terms of an ongoing responsibility and therefore, cost, right, for HOA fees on these residents. And so in my view, this outdoor recreation area is proportionate to the -- to the size of the development and -- and meets, I think, the intent of that -- of that subsection.

MS. MCNEIL: Thank you. Go ahead, Mr. Hatcher, I'm sorry.

MR. HATCHER: Mm-hmm. At this point, I'd like to take the -- this exhibit down and put up Exhibit 72,
which should be the site plan, we've seen it before.
MS. MCNEIL: Oh, while -- while she's doing that, so the visibility study was supposed to show how those houses looked from the neighborhood. I meant for someone to tell me about the visibility. Did you -it's like Exhibit 75, the visibility exhibit. Is that what that was for? I'm just --

MR. FERGUSON: Madame Examiner, I'm not going to lie, I'm not actually familiar with Exhibit 75 -MS. MCNEIL: Okay.

MR. FERGUSON: -- but of course, I'm not going to lie, I'm under oath, but I -- I --

MS. MCNEIL: Thank you.
MR. FERGUSON: -- I am not familiar with Exhibit 75.

MS. MCNEIL: Okay. Okay. Go ahead, Mr. Hatcher, I'm sorry.

MR. HATCHER: To answer the question you just asked, I think the Exhibit 75 is intended to show what will be highly visible dwelling units for purposes of architecture.

MS. MCNEIL: From the other neighbors?

MR. HATCHER: Yes.
MS. MCNEIL: Okay.
MR. FERGUSON: Well, I think -- I think what Mr. Hatcher just said was illustrating which units need enhanced architecture because of their location in the development. So Mr. Burke, I think, had testified to cer- -- certain units will get additional brick, for instance --

MS. MCNEIL: Mm-hmm.
MR. FERGUSON: -- and additional architectural features and I think that's what I understand Mr. Hatcher is saying that visibility expert -- exhibit addresses.

MR. HATCHER: Yes.
MS. MCNEIL: And a fence; right? There's a fence -- you know what, go with this witness. And is Mr. Burke -- Mr. Burke's the only one that can testify to this?

MR. HATCHER: I think there are several people who can testify to it, but he certainly can.

MS. MCNEIL: Okay. Then go ahead with Mr. Ferguson. Thank you.

MR. HATCHER: Okay. Can you demonstrate the location of the recreational facilities we were just talking about on the site plan?

MR. FERGUSON: So there are -- there are several. So there is a trail network that extends from Springhill [sic] -- Springfield Road along the very western boundary out to the end of the private road and the -- the sidewalk network, the northwestern most private road.

There is a trail which extends up along the perimeter of the preserved environmental features and around the submerged gravel wetland and back to the preserved specimen trees and the sidewalk network to the northwest of it. And then the -- the -- the meeting area and the pavilion is along the southern boundary roughly in the center of it.

You can see a darker, looks like a square with its corner cut off and that is the area with the pavilion in the center with the tables, picnic and games scattered around it and then to the east of that are a series of raised beds for the community garden.

MR. HATCHER: Okay. Do you know how age
restrictions will be enforced for the proposed senior community?

MR. FERGUSON: They are to be enforced by covenant as a -- as a requirement for 27-395 and there is a copy of covenants in the -- in the backup to the staff report, which specifies not just age restrictions but also another condition which requires specifying how the common recreational facilities are going to maintain -- going to be maintained and that maintenance provision is part two, I think, of those covenants.

MR. HATCHER: Thank you, Mr. Ferguson. I have no more questions.

MR. FERGUSON: Great. Thank you.
MS. MCNEIL: So I -- I'm so sorry, there's so much paper on this desk.

MR. FERGUSON: And so many words, I apologize for that.

MS. MCNEIL: So Mr. Ferguson, you just -- you just described additional -- the onsite active recreational activities that staff suggested as a condition, the additional ones?

MR. HATCHER: Yes.

MS. MCNEIL: It's a condition, I don't know.
MR. FERGUSON: It is. That went back and forth, I'm sorry, I'm frantically scrolling back to the
$\qquad$

MS. MCNEIL: Yeah. I'm looking at the --
MR. FERGUSON: -- I'm scrolling back to the memorandum.

MS. MCNEIL: This is in their revised October 4th. So it's not the original conditions, but --

MR. FERGUSON: Right. Right.
MS. MCNEIL: -- on Page 10 of that document, it says, providing -- demonstrate conformance to this section by providing additional onsite active recreational activities within or adjacent to the community gathering area.

MR. FERGUSON: Right. My understanding, and I think it's probably best to have Mr. Burke testify to that, is that those were the -- the exercise equipment --

MS. MCNEIL: Okay.
MR. FERGUSON: -- but Mr. -- Mr. Burke can
testify --

MS. MCNEIL: I just want to clarify that so that the community knows what it is so that, you know, not -- you won't add something really odd. I can't imagine what it would be, if this were approved.

MR. FERGUSON: Yeah.
MS. MCNEIL: Okay. So ask Mr. Burke. Okay. Go -- we were -- we're not finished with Mr. Ferguson, are we?

MR. HATCHER: Yes. We are.
MS. MCNEIL: Okay. Mr. Ferguson, I had one question just to get your expert opinion. If the master plan says low residential --

MR. FERGUSON: Yes.
MS. MCNEIL: -- but the zoning ordinance notes that this use can go up to, what is it, eight --

MR. FERGUSON: Up to eight.
MS. MCNEIL: Mm-hmm.
MR. FERGUSON: -- up to eight if we --
MS. MCNEIL: How do you -- how do you find -how do you find that the master plan does not substantially --

MR. FERGUSON: Impair?

MS. MCNEIL: -- impair?
MR. FERGUSON: Well, I think the -- the -- the master plan certainly has to be read as a whole; right? And so you do need to look at both the land use recommendation as well as the specific language saying, hey, we want senior housing in a denser form throughout -- throughout the area, which includes these -- which includes these areas.

And I think the second thing you also really need to do is look at the zoning ordinance which says, this use is an appropriate use by special exception in zones that range from, as -- as sparse as the RA Zone, one lot per two acres all the way up to the densest single-family zones, you know, R- -- R- -- RT even.

So I think that the -- that -- that -- that question also has to be viewed in the -- in the light of impacts that you expect from a use like this, which is, we've heard, are much, much lighter than for conventional residential -- conventional residential low development, both in terms of traffic and -- and general levels of activity.

So I think when you look at the master plan
comprehensively and -- and certainly, the master plan and the zoning ordinance together which is why we have protections like those in 27-295 to talk about if we're going to put this in these places, let's make sure that it's compatible.

MS. MCNEIL: Thank you. Tell me the -- in the same conditions amended by staff, the sidewalk went down from six feet, which was in the approved Bowie master plan to five feet wide. Do you know why that is?

MR. FERGUSON: I -- I -- I do. So the -- that master plan requirement was for particular types of development, which this is not. So if you give me a moment, $I$ can -- can get to that recommendation.

MS. MCNEIL: Thank you.
MR. FERGUSON: Oh, goodness.
MR. HATCHER: I believe the recommendation was for commercial and industrial uses, not --

MR. FERGUSON: It -- it -- it was. Yeah. I was looking to quote the -- I was looking to quote the exact number, but -- I'm sorry, I'm just flipping through my master plan, even electronically, as quickly as $I$ can to find that policy. Yeah. Mr. Hatcher is
exactly correct, that is what the -- the condition was six-foot -- six-foot sidewalks in denser areas.

I'm just trying to give you the -- the specific policy number. Chris, do you -- Mr. Hatcher, do you recall? Sorry to throw you under the bus there. We can race to the answer. So minimum 6-foot sidewalk policy, TM-6.8 along any street that has a bus stop, which this does not.

MS. MCNEIL: Okay. You're just saying it's in the master plan, I'll find that. [inaudible]

MR. FERGUSON: Yeah. It is policy TM-1.3. And I apologize, I started at the end and worked my way to the beginning, streets constructed to serve new commercial multifamily or mixed-use developments should contain, at a minimum, six- -- six-foot wide sidewalks on both sides, but this is not multifamily, it's single-family attached development.

MR. HATCHER: Okay. And --
MR. FERGUSON: Page -- Page 113.
MS. MCNEIL: Thank you. And are -- was your testimony that the neighborhood is primarily residential?

MR. FERGUSON: It is. It is. Staff did say it's residential and commercial. There is really one commercial use in the neighborhood. There's a -- a vehicle -- a ga- -- a gas station and vehicle repair -MS. MCNEIL: Right.

MR. FERGUSON: -- very close to Wingate entrance on Lanham Severn Road and there are a couple of churches, but really, this is single-family detached neighborhood on lots from a quarter of an acre to -- to two acres. In Old Bowie all the way up towards Maple Avenue, there's some smaller lots, but --

MS. MCNEIL: Okay. So I'm trying to get a legal -- so do you think that the requested use here would be more adverse than anywhere else in the neighborhood?

MR. FERGUSON: I do not and -- and I do speak to that in my -- in my report, but there's -- there's a number of reasons and again, the -- the presumed valid use is up to 8, only 4.75 are proposed.

The enhanced buffers along Spring- -Springfield Road at an average of more than twice of what the landscape manual requires, the inward
orientation, the -- the lower nature of the units. You know, all of -- all of these -- all of these suggest lower impact, not -- not greater.

MS. MCNEIL: I said one question. Okay.
Really, there's one more for now and I'll turn it over. Is there going to be any kind of sign in the front of this property and is it shown on the site plan?

MR. FERGUSON: I do not recall -- I do not recall.

MS. MCNEIL: Thank you.
MR. FERGUSON: You can ask Mr. Burke when he comes back on.

MS. MCNEIL: Thank you. Mr. Brown.
MR. BROWN: Yes. I've got a few questions concerning the prescriptive easement.

MR. FERGUSON: Yes, sir.
MR. BROWN: Earlier, Mr. Ferguson, I mistakenly misled Ms. Sommer to believe the prescriptive easement that was discussed in the May 18, 2022 letter from DPWNT referred to the WSSC easement and -- and it does not. And so I apologize, Ms. Sommer. So Fatima, could you pull up what we're going to call

People's zoning counsel exhibit? And it's an excerpt of three pages from the binder. Do you have it up? Okay. That's it.

All right. Now, go back up to the letter itself. So Mr. Ferguson, looking at Page 12 of the staff report and the requirement that subject property shall contain at least 12 contiguous acres.

MR. FERGUSON: Yes, sir.
MR. BROWN: You see that; correct?
MR. FERGUSON: I do. I am familiar with that requirement. Yes, sir.

MR. BROWN: And then read that paragraph, it's misleading. It seems to conclude that this DPWNT letter of May 18, 2022 confirms the property has 12 contiguous acres and it doesn't confirm that and I'm asking --

MR. FERGUSON: It doesn't -- it doesn't directly, Mr. Brown, but I think the highlighted portion of that letter is -- is really what you're speaking to.

MR. BROWN: Okay.
MR. FERGUSON: So because this property is -has an -- let's say, an old title history, in the old
days, it was very common for title ownership to be described as extending out to the center line of roadways, that's the case here.

MR. BROWN: Right.
MR. FERGUSON: And so even though there -there is a public road leading over, you know, roughly the -- the first 10 feet of the property boundary along -- along Springfield Road, which would be the prescriptive easement that -- that you're referring to, what DPW has said is that that area has not been conveyed by deed so that the fee rights still vest in -- in Mrs. Stewart and in that case, right now the property has those gross acres.

After subdivision, 40 feet from that -- from that current boundary will be dedicated to public use and at that point, it will be part of a dedicated public right-of-way and therefore, ultimately get subtracted from the gross area, but it is the -- it is the practice of park and planning uniformly when dealing with gross to deal with that at the start of development, not later on.

So the approval, whether at the special
exception time of -- of review or at the preliminary plan of subdivision looks at the property's configuration at the time those properties -- those processes, excuse me, begin. And so right now because that property had never been dedicated or conveyed out, it remains part of the gross.

MR. BROWN: All right. And that's what I wanted to clarify. So Fatima, go down to the next page that I've attached to this letter. All right. Now, on this is an excerpt from the record and I've highlighted all the yellow ones, all four of these pages. The yellow area there is the prescriptive easement on Springfield Road; okay?

MR. FERGUSON: So I would -- I would disagree slightly with you, at least -- and M- -- perhaps Mr. Debolt [ph] will testify differently. My experience of prescriptive easements is that they're typically limited just to the area that is used by the public, which is to say the paved area. Now, many surveyors will look at an old provision in state law that talks about presuming --

MR. BROWN: We don't -- we don't even -- we
don't need to --
MR. FERGUSON: -- the -- the right-of way.
MR. BROWN: -- we don't need to quibble right now the exact meets and bounds of the prescriptive easement --

MR. FERGUSON: Okay.
MR. BROWN: -- but you can -- prescriptive easement is determined by use.

MR. FERGUSON: Yes.
MR. BROWN: And go to the next page, Fatima. This is also from the record.

MR. FERGUSON: Right.
MR. BROWN: It also shows the -- what we're going to say generally is the area of the prescriptive easement on Springfield Road.

MR. FERGUSON: Yeah. So I guess what -- I guess all I would say, Mr. Brown, is that $I$ would limit the area that is highlighted to the very bottom part of what you have highlighted, but I would say that the area you have highlighted will ultimately be dedicated.

MR. BROWN: And I want to make sure you and I agree on that. And then go down to the next page,

Fatima. This also shows prescriptive easement generally on Springfield Road. Now, this raises the problem of my critical question.

MR. FERGUSON: Yes, sir.
MR. BROWN: The staff has concluded that there are 12.01 acres here --

MR. FERGUSON: Yes, sir.
MR. BROWN: -- and there's a minimum of 12 contiguous acres that are required.

MR. FERGUSON: Yes, sir.
MR. BROWN: If you deduct the square footage of the right-of-way prescriptive easement, would you have concluded, and I agree, will be deducted in the future because it must be dedicated as part of Springfield Road? How much square footage is deducted from this 12.01 acres and then are you below 12 acres? I know you probably cannot answer that question right now, but it's --

MR. FERGUSON: I -- I can answer the second part of the question. And yes, you absolutely would be below 12 acres post-dedication.

MR. BROWN: All right. So that raises the
question, do we have a special exception that has 12 contiguous acres when you do not include what is -- not arguably what is actually a roadway, Springfield Road, which is actually a prescriptive easement which cannot be used by the property owner or a special exception or anything else? We don't have 12 contiguous acres, do we?

MR. FERGUSON: No. I -- I disagree with that. I think because of the deed, you do have the 12 acres. So certainly, there are all -- there are other areas of the property which have already been dedicated as easements or sewers; right? And those sewer easements also restrict the use of the property.

MR. BROWN: Oh, but, no, that's different. Sewer easement is an easement that goes underground. You can still use the property above ground, although, you can't build upon it.

MR. FERGUSON: Right. That -- that -- that -that matters. That's a -- that's a pretty relevant -that's a pretty relevant restriction; right?

MR. BROWN: A prescriptive easement, you are actually deducting the square footage of the land so
that you -- in other words, if we -- let's just say for the sake of discussion, the prescriptive easement is one acre, and $I$ know it's not one acre --

MR. FERGUSON: Right.
MR. BROWN: -- but for the sake of discussion, it's one acre --

MR. FERGUSON: Right.
MR. BROWN: -- in the future, that one acre must be deducted from this property, it cannot be used with special exception, it will be used as a roadway. So --

MR. FERGUSON: So -- so I --
MR. BROWN: -- let me make an argument, let me finish.

MR. FERGUSON: Sure.
MR. BROWN: How do you make the argument that we are approving a special exception with 12 contiguous acres and 1 acre, for the sake of discussion, is a prescriptive easement that cannot be used for a special exception?

MR. FERGUSON: So I guess the -- the -- the part of your argument that $I$ don't agree with is just
simply that last -- that last clause or last phrase is that the one acre cannot be used for the special exception. So what -- and -- and this really does go to the difference between gross and net; right?

So certainly, I would agree that there are not 12 net acres, because not only is there a -- a prescriptive easement along Springhill [sic] Road, there's also 100-year flood plain, but the ordinance specifically says gross so that they can say, what does your deed say? Your deed says 12, great, you can proceed to develop --

MR. BROWN: Well, then [inaudible] --
MR. FERGUSON: -- and then you go and do your development and all of that development will go and subtract -- it will subtract roads, it will subtract other things, it might subtract a -- a -- a -- a mandatory park dedication, for instance, but --

MR. BROWN: The ordinance doesn't make a distinction between gross and net as it relates to the criterion for the special exception. The criterion is the subject property shall contain at least 12 contiguous acres.

MR. FERGUSON: Right.
MR. BROWN: At the time of final approval for this special exception, it will not contain 12 contiguous acres, because the prescriptive easement will be deducted.

MR. FERGUSON: For -- so certainly, I agree with that, Mr. Brown. I guess I would say is the uniform -- my uniform experience in evaluating development applications, that that evaluation is made at the beginning of the review process, not at the end
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MR. BROWN: Right.
MR. FERGUSON: -- and that's why starting with
12 today --
MR. BROWN: Right. I see that.
MR. FERGUSON: -- gets you there.
MR. BROWN: Taking --
MR. FERGUSON: That's my -- that's my experience.

MR. BROWN: -- taking that analogy, if we have 12 acres today and the county has indicated, by imminent domain, they're going to take 6 acres in 2
years, we can approve the special exception even though we know the county's going to take 6 and that's the same thing here.

MR. FERGUSON: Yes. So -- so assuming that there's not a -- there's not a -- well, yes, I would agree with that. I would agree with that and certainly, I can think of a number of occasions where reserved property does go and -- and -- and count to development density and things like that before it's actually conveyed out.

So my -- my -- again, I -- I understand your argument, I'm just saying that my -- my experience is that the evaluation is done at the beginning rather than at the end.

MR. HATCHER: A point of clarification, my understanding is that area is not going to be dedicated until the plat is ultimately submitted, which is the very end of the process.

MR. FERGUSON: Correct.
MS. MCNEIL: But -- but Mr. Brown has a -- a -- a legal argument that I guess should be addressed, because he's correct, this may be de- -- deminimis, but
what if it was two acres? The issue becomes the use is not going to be constructed; correct? So we're looking today and saying, okay, they'll have this, they'll have that, but if you start taking away the acreage, will they have that?

MR. FERGUSON: Right.
MS. MCNEIL: I don't know. So I think --
MR. FERGUSON: No. I know. So I think --
MS. MCNEIL: -- I think this is --
MR. FERGUSON: -- no. I think Mr. Brown -- Mr. Brown is --

MS. MCNEIL: No. But Mr. Ferguson -- excuse me, one second.

MR. FERGUSON: No. [inaudible]
MS. MCNEIL: I really think it's more of a legal that --

MR. FERGUSON: No. It is and -- and I would say it's -- it's even of -- of a greater pointiness than -- than you've characterized it, because I think he and I both agree that we are so little above the 12acre gross threshold.

MR. BROWN: And so --

MR. FERGUSON: It's not a matter of one or two acres or the uncertainties of the development process, but --

MR. BROWN: -- so -- so what we need to have in the record is --

MR. FERGUSON: Yeah.
MR. BROWN: -- the actual square footage of the prescriptive easement in the right-of-way on Springfield Road. We need to know that.

MR. SUHAR: Madame Examiner, I'm -- I'm back, I -- I just wanted to let you know and -- and I -- I have to say that I agree with Mr. Brown's -- Stan Brown's arguments here, that -- that -- that -- that's concerning and $I$ was not previously aware of this issue.

MR. HATCHER: As -- as -- as a point of clarification --

MS. MCNEIL: And that's Mr. Suhar, excuse me, for the record and one more, Chr- -- one more, Mr. Hatcher, I want Mr. Brown's exhibit, even though it's made up of several pages in the record, to be marked as Exhibit 103, everybody. Thank you.

MR. HATCHER: Right. Right.
MS. MCNEIL: Go ahead. Who was speaking, Mr. Hatcher?

MR. HATCHER: This is Chris -- Chris Hatcher. As a -- as a point of clarification, my understanding of the development process is that what -- what really articulates the boundaries of a zoning application is the zoning sketch map and associated documents that are ultimately accepted by park and planning, the reviewing agency.

From that, you're always going to have dedications, whether it's roadway dedications, if the roads are public or private and -- and candidly, as -as fee simple lots are sold out, the ownership is ultimately going to change from each one of those. So it's all going to be within the geographic boundaries of the original special exception, which according to the survey and at least supported by DPWNT is beyond 12 acres.

Now, ultimately, what the -- the development ends up being is -- is largely going to be dependent on what's approved and what's sold out and what's donated
or dedicated to government, but the application at its initiation, as defined by the zoning sketch map and the associated plans, is -- is what establishes the overall acres is my understanding.

However, I understand that you may need additional information, we can certainly provide that in the record.

MR. BROWN: Mr. Hatcher, whatever the staff accepts from the applicant at the initiation of an application does not determine whether or not a particular criteria has been complied with.

MR. HATCHER: I agree with that. Yes.
MR. FERGUSON: So Mr. Brown, I think there's something that's probably useful and I'm going to refer everybody to Section 27-101.1A, 108, which is the definition of gross tract area, which is the total area of a tract of land including all area which is to be conveyed for public facilities.

So that -- that really speaks to it. You know, it's all of that area which is to be conveyed, which includes the area of Springhill [sic] Road is part of the gross tract area by definition.

MS. MCNEIL: But is gross tract area equivalent to contiguous acreage? That's what the law says.

MR. FERGUSON: It -- it usually is, Madame Examiner. There are sometimes when a property is separated by roadways, that -- that you have a gross tract area that all of that acreage is not contiguous. That's not [inaudible].

MR. SUHAR: It defeats the purpose of the rule.

MR. BROWN: I -- I'm -- I -- I -- I'm not going to solve the issue now. I raise it, because it's problematic. So again, you need to put in the record what the square footage is of the prescriptive easement.

MR. FERGUSON: Yeah. No. I --
MR. SUHAR: I agree with you, Mr. Brown.
MR. FERGUSON: -- Mr. Brown, I -- thank you, Mr. Brown.

MR. SUHAR: I think it is problematic.
MS. MCNEIL: Let the record reflect that Mr. Suhar and Mr. Brown agree. I don't see you on the
camera, Mr. Suhar.
MR. SUHAR: Thank you very much, Madame -yeah. I'm so sorry, I'm -- I'm coming from a meeting and -- and should be back in my office here, but I'll -- I'll go on camera.

MS. MCNEIL: Okay. Well, we've got to give Mr. Ferguson a slight break before others may have questions of him and that is the continuance date is the 20th if $I$ don't hear otherwise from you all.

MR. FERGUSON: Twentieth of December, Madame Examiner?

MS. MCNEIL: Of December.
MR. FERGUSON: I -- I hope I will be done by then.

MS. MCNEIL: Huh? Excuse me?
MR. FERGUSON: I -- I -- I hope I won't be cross-examined --

MS. MCNEIL: Oh, you can't come the 20th?
MR. FERGUSON: Okay.
MS. MCNEIL: You got me with that one. Okay. So I didn't hear anything, that's the date. Continue on, Mr. Hatcher.

MR. SUHAR: The -- the 20th I'm available, just letting you know. Thank you.

MS. MCNEIL: Okay. That's great to know. Okay.
MR. HATCHER: I'll definitely need to -- to coordinate with my various consultants to make sure that works, but I'll get back to you before close of business today. Well, tomorrow.

MS. MCNEIL: Okay. Wait a minute -- wait one second, I'm sorry, I don't -- no, we were on cross. We were -- so Mr. Brown, you finished?

MR. BROWN: Yes. I was done. Thank you.
MR. FERGUSON: Thank you, Mr. Brown.
MS. MCNEIL: Okay. Anyone else have questions of Mr. Ferguson? Questions?

MR. HOLMAN: Mr. Brown, do you know how many trees in total will be removed by this proposed development?

MR. BROWN: Mr. Brown would never know the answer to that question.

MR. HOLMAN: I'm sorry, not Mr. Brown, Mr. Ferguson. Thank you, Mr. Brown.

MR. FERGUSON: I was going to say, who me? Mr.

Holman, in -- in terms of the total number of individual trees, no, I don't -- I don't think anybody does. What Ms. Sommer testified to is that the -- the development review process requires you to know specifically the number of specimen trees, which are almost always trees larger than 30 inches in diameter, but once they're smaller, that just becomes generalized woods.

And so the staff report, which is based on the tree conservation plan numbers reflect the areas of woodland which generally contains trees that are -that are smaller than 30 inches in diameter, but as to the individual numbers, that number isn't known.

MR. HOLMAN: Okay. And my second question is how are the proposed water runoff features that are being proposed here better in dealing with water runoff than what is presently there, which is one home of an elderly person in dense woods on a steep slope?

MR. FERGUSON: Sure. So first of all, it's -at least legislatively, I -- I know you believe it is steep. According to the county's definitions, it is not. That requires slopes to be in excess of 15
percent, which it only really appears in the -- you know, the banks of the stream and that's a protected -a protected area.

So what -- what you have is -- is several things. So right now existing today you have a house which has a driveway and it has roofs and the outbuildings have -- have roofs and you have cleared area which has -- which has grass. All of that, even though it -- it -- it -- it may be minimal, is still a greater amount of stormwater runoff than if the property were entirely wooded.

So what the stormwater management regulations of the state and the county require is that you manage the stormwater so that the -- the -- the discharge is equal to or less than what would come off it if the property were entirely wooded. So -- so the design is done really to improve the stormwater conditions over what is there today after you build those 57 houses and that's done through various means.

Micro-bioretention facilities are sort of like a constructed swamp, but nicely landscaped that both allow water to infiltrate into the soil and allows
plants to use their -- their roots and their -- and their living -- you know, living nature to metabolize the nutrients that are in the runoff. So runoff rainfall generally absorbs nitro- -- nitrogen and phosphorus components that come out of principally car exhaust.

And when rainfall -- rain forms, those -those nitrogen and phosphorus components go into the rain, drops fall onto the ground and make their way, you know, in developed areas onto impervious surfaces and then without management directly into stream bodies, which cause eutrophication or it causes the algae to go, hey, fertilizer and eat it all and multiply and then they use up all the oxygen and then everything in the water dies.

So the idea is metabolize all of that -- all of those nutrients with plants in micro-bioretention, in the submerged gravel wetland before it's discharged out into the environment and by creating pools, you also impact the water so that it has time to evap- -infiltrate into the soil, it has time to be metabolized by the plants and only trickles out of the facility at
low rates, which accom- -- which -- which are designed to match what the property would be if it had never been developed, if it wasn't even a single-family house but rather was entirely wooded.

MR. HOLMAN: How many pools?
MR. FERGUSON: So two bio-retention facilities are proposed and then one large what's called a submerged gravel wetland. And so what the submerged gravel wetland does is actually, you build a non-title wetland and you get treatment both through the metabolization by plants and you get an -- an anaerobic condition in the -- the -- the -- the base media of the submerged gravel wetland.

And so it effectively acts analogously to a septic tank and you get anaerobic bacteria me- -metabolizing nutrients and other pollutants as well and they work really very, very well. So this is why the state went to mandate the use of these facilities in state law beginning in 2007 and then the requirement was really every project in the county after 2013 that hadn't had a previously grandfathering.

MS. MCNEIL: Anyone else have questions of Mr.

Ferguson?
MR. ALDAG: I do, Hank Aldag.
MS. MCNEIL: Okay.
MR. FERGUSON: Hi. Good afternoon, Mr. Aldag.
MR. ALDAG: Hi. How are you?
MR. FERGUSON: Good.
MR. ALDAG: So the soil that is on the Stewart property there, basically, you have mostly, you know, A, B and C soils; right?

MR. FERGUSON: I'm -- I'm sorry, did you start by referring to a swale?

MR. ALDAG: No. I'm talking about the type of soil --

MR. FERGUSON: Or did you say soil? Soil. Got it. Yes, sir. Okay.

MR. ALDAG: -- which is from the hydrologic soil group.

MR. FERGUSON: You have -- you have A, B -- B and C. Yes, sir.

MR. ALDAG: Yeah. And so the particular -what you just described where you have the -- the wetlands -- the gravel wetlands, the -- the two micro
bio-retentions and the bioswale, they actually require --

MR. FERGUSON: I don't believe the bio- -- I don't -- I'm sorry for interrupting, I apologize.

MR. ALDAG: No. Yeah.
MR. FERGUSON: I'm was just going to say that the bioswale, I believe, is no longer a part of the proposal.

MR. ALDAG: Okay. Because that was --
MR. FERGUSON: [inaudible] defines that there's maintenance problems with those, so they don't like to approve those anymore.

MR. ALDAG: Yeah, because that was part of the September, 20- -- 2023 technical staff report, that's where I got that.

MR. FERGUSON: Yeah. I understand.
MR. ALDAG: So we're looking at this -- you know, so we're looking at this and it actually says that, you know, those things are great, but they don't actually clean the soil and do what you were just saying unless you have the proper soil underneath it and, you know -- so you basically have, you know, more
or less the impermeable soil where -- up towards north where there's a lot of -- of your development and then you have the permeable down at the bottom.

And so there will actually, with your site plan, be a degradation of the water that actually comes out of, you know, the Newstop Branch and --

MR. FERGUSON: Sure. But -- so that's -that's a great question and I guess what -- what I would -- what I would do is -- is -- well, okay. So let me -- let me sort of rephrase a little bit of what I -what I said before. There's -- or expand. There's, as I mentioned, two micro bio-retention facilities and a submerged gravel wetland.

So those two facilities -- two types of facilities are very different in their -- in their function. So micro bio-retention facilities are suited to areas where the soil is permeable and in this -- in the case of this site, that is the class -- or the type B hydrologic -- B as in boy, hydrologic soils group soils --

MR. ALDAG: Yeah.
MR. FERGUSON: -- which are up towards Spring-
-- Springfield Road and that's where those micro bio- -- micro bio-retention facilities are. So in that case, they are able to infiltrate and perform the function that they're supposed to do.

On the northern and eastern parts of the site as you get towards Newstop Branch, then the soil characterizations change to $C$ and probably as you get even a little bit more below the -- below the surface level, D and in that case, those soils are impermeable or in -- in various degrees.

And so the use of micro bio-retention is not suitable there. So what you do -- where you have that -- those soil conditions is you use a facility like a submerged gravel wetland, which is explicitly designed to treat the water by different means, as I said, some anaero- -- developing an anaerobic layer in -- below a -- a local water table that does the treatment and then you get -- you -- you get discharge of the water as opposed to infiltration, but you were always getting that already because of the soils type.

So both of those facilities act to maintain the natural characteristics -- the natural hydrologic
characteristics of the site prior to development and that's -- that's what's proposed here.

MR. ALDAG: Right. With the proper soils, that actually is what's required to make it work.

MR. FERGUSON: Right.
MR. ALDAG: Would -- would you agree with the statement that, you know, if you reduce the impervious surfaces, that that would help, you know, the -- the runoff and those particular two types of cleaning mechanisms and --

MR. FERGUSON: Not -- not with stormwater management. No. I mean, I think the -- the -- the point of doing stormwater management is to provide active devices. They're not active, they sit there and -- and do things naturally, but provide advices to affirmatively treat water rather than passively just saying, well, we won't do anything and -- and -- and manage stormwater by lack of activity.

So you can certainly say that impervious areas generate adverse soil -- adverse runoff characteristics, but that's -- it's not enough to say that. You have to say, well, are those -- are those
adverse characteristics mitigated by stormwater management measures and that's what's done by stormwater management design and that's what's done for this development.

So the county certainly and the state have a substantive interest in protecting the water of Newstop Branch and below and as I mentioned at the outset of my testimony, actually, a greater impact -- a greater interest for that stream in particular --

MR. ALDAG: Mm-hmm.
MR. FERGUSON: -- because the watershed is a ty- -- a tier II -- a tier II watershed. And so what the county does is impose additional requirements to provide a higher level of protection for Newstop Branch than it would elsewhere. Across the street in Wingate, that's actually a completely different watershed.

The water there flows to Folly Branch, which has to make its way all the way to Upper Marlboro before it -- it comes back into the Patuxent River. I think that's the -- that's there, it's not a tier II watershed. I think Horsepen Branch is, but Western Branch is not. So Wingate -- if this property were
being developed in Wingate or in Wingate's watershed, it would have a lower degree of required protections than it does, because it's literally on the other side of the road in Horsepen watershed.

MR. ALDAG: Yeah. Yeah. That just think -helpful I think. And you said you don't have to show that this requirement is needed, right, in your -- in your submittal?

MR. FERGUSON: The -- the -- in other words, that there is a public need for the use.

MR. ALDAG: Right.
MR. FERGUSON: Yes. That's my -- that is my opinion and that's -- that's drawn out by a distinction that's made where- -- whereas were this project classified in the RA Zone instead of the RR Zone, then yes, there would be a requirement to show that it's needed. My presumption, and it's just a presumption, is the district council said, well, look, the RA Zone is a less dense zone, basically one lot per two acres-based density as opposed to two lots per acre.

MR. ALDAG: Yeah.
MR. FERGUSON: So if we're going to have a
development which could be as dense as eight units per acre, we really want to make sure there that we need it - -

MR. ALDAG: Yeah.
MR. FERGUSON: -- but that -- that requirement doesn't exist for the RR Zone.

MR. ALDAG: So with the two huge projects that they just have up towards Temple Reed and -- and Green [inaudible] five miles away --

MR. FERGUSON: Mm-hmm.
MR. ALDAG: -- they're huge complexes of many, many, many acres and basically, they haven't, you know, filled them up or anything yet.

MR. FERGUSON: Mm-hmm.
MR. ALDAG: So that didn't come into any play at all whether it's actually needed or not.

MR. FERGUSON: Well, I think Mr. -- Mr. Burke spoke to that earlier. You know, I'm not a -- I'm not a market analyst. So $I$ can't really opine on need, except to point you to things that are in my ambit, like the master plan, which says we need all we can get.

MR. ALDAG: Right. Well, you know, with the
old -- with the old people, and I'll qualify this, I actually own an elderly care facility, so I'm very attuned to this, it is a -- it is a -- it is a small age range that you have that actually get to a part where then they can't function in there. So as a part of the population, it's a very short period and a very small actual amount of the total population.

MR. FERGUSON: Madame Examiner, I need -- my memory was just tickled, I need to state --

MR. ALDAG: Yeah.
MR. FERGUSON: -- for the record that I was a witness for Mr. Aldag of your Bowie Assisted Living facilities some number of years ago when you did an -an expansion of that.

MR. ALDAG: Right. Yeah.
MR. FERGUSON: That does affect my testimony, Madame Examiner.

MR. ALDAG: Yeah. Wow. You do have a memory.
MS. MCNEIL: Okay. You're out, that's it.
MR. ALDAG: Okay. Actually, I didn't even remember that. Okay.

MR. FERGUSON: Yeah.

MR. ALDAG: Okay.
MR. SUHAR: I've got a question if Mr. Aldag is finished --

MR. ALDAG: Yeah. Yeah.
MR. SUHAR: -- unless you have more questions.
MR. ALDAG: Not -- I was going to talk about the easement that's already in use on Springfield Road --

MR. SUHAR: Go ahead.
MR. ALDAG: -- and, you know, that's like, you know, giving it back and using it twice.

MR. FERGUSON: I understand your -- your argument. I guess the point was it was never given and what the prescript- -- what -- what the prescriptive easement means is that it's been taken enough that we can keep taking it and using it is really what a prescriptive easement is.

So you can't pick us off the land, we've been using it too long. It's still yours, but you can't let us -- you know, you can't kick us off from -- from using it as Springfield Road. So I don't know, Mr. Brown can --

MR. ALDAG: Never underestimate the government.

MR. FERGUSON: Yeah. Mr. Brown could say whether or not that's relevant.

MR. ALDAG: Okay. Yeah. And I'm good. Hey, thank you very much.

MR. FERGUSON: Thank you, Mr. Aldag.
MR. ALDAG: Okay.
MS. MCNEIL: [inaudible] before Mr. Suhar and it's just because you've had a long day, no, the examiner will say what's relevant. What is wrong with you people? Okay. [inaudible]

MR. FERGUSON: I apologize, Madame Examiner, I -- I -- I apologize. I do know better.

MR. SUHAR: Who -- who's up next?
MS. MCNEIL: Mr. Suhar.
MR. SUHAR: Oh, thank you. Thank you. Yeah. Just a couple questions, Mr. Ferguson.

MR. FERGUSON: Yes, sir.
MR. SUHAR: I -- when -- when you testified that there was no im- -- no adverse impact from this -this proposed planned retirement community on the
neighborhood, I'm wondering how you come to that conclusion.

MR. FERGUSON: Yeah. So that's -- that's -that's actually a very good question and I think what -- what I probably need to have done was to have been specific in the way that $I$ was in the response to Madame Examiner's question, which is what the legal standard is. So -- and -- and I shorthanded my answer improperly.

This -- the requirement is not that there is no adverse impact. Every change in land use has some kind of impact that could be reviewed in some way as adverse no matter how -- how minimum. So it really is incorrect to say there is no adverse impact.

So what the -- the law has evolved is to charge people like me opining on questions like that is to say is there a greater adverse impact than one would expect for this use, which is presumed to be valid here as opposed to generically somewhere else in the same zone in the county.

And so from that perspective, that's really how you have to view my -- view my answer. So all --

MR. SUHAR: Okay. But -- but -- but you said -

MR. FERGUSON: -- all senior -- I'm sorry, let me -- let me just --

MR. SUHAR: Go ahead. Sure.
MR. FERGUSON: -- briefly go on. All -- all planned retirement communities will have some additional traffic, for instance. So anybody could look at -- say if you put two more cars on the street in the peak hour, that would be an adverse impact, but because that would prohibit any special exception ever from being granted, what $I$ have to say is well, you know, would this provide a greater adverse impact?

And -- and in this case, because there were fewer houses than those that are -- those that are proposed, they're lower, they're more set back, as I testified earlier, and you may have been away for that testimony, I don't know, that -- that the -- the impact from this development would, in my opinion, be less than it would be for a generic planned retirement community, as provided for by the -- the regulations at -- at sites generically in the $R R$ Zone.

MR. SUHAR: Okay. Yeah. I think it was Mr. Burke that testified that -- that there are -- will be -- with 57 lots, there's going to be 4.5 lots per acre and -- and this --

MR. FERGUSON: 4.- -- yeah. 4.75 is the -MR. SUHAR: 4.75, I'm sorry.

MR. FERGUSON: Yes, sir.
MR. SUHAR: 4.75. Yeah. Thank you.
MR. FERGUSON: Yes, sir.
MR. SUHAR: So -- so what that means, if you -- if -- if -- if, you know, the zoning would allow for two lots per acre without a special exception, then -then we're talk- -- what we're talking about is more than double, almost triple the amount of density on this particular lot and we're not -- when -- when we say that there are -- you know, the -- the zoning is RR and RE, that -- that's -- that --

When you said there -- you said that there was -- it was primarily $R R$ and $R E$ Zoning in the neighborhood, except for one commercial lot or something. Is that what you said?

MR. FERGUSON: Yes, sir.

MR. SUHAR: So -- so you know, it -- it's surprising to me as to how you could come to the conclusion that there wouldn't be -- well, initially, you -- you said no impact -- no -- no adverse impact -or no adverse impact, but that there is really not much adverse impact.

I -- I just -- I'm -- I guess I'm -- I'm wondering what -- what -- in what case would there be adverse impact if this -- if this doesn't match and, you know, it's not as, you know -- if this doesn't present adverse impact in this case?

MR. FERGUSON: I'm sorry, I don't actually understand what you're asking me. Could you please, yeah, rephrase or --

MS. MCNEIL: And Mr. Suhar, I feel like he answered, but it's not the answer you wanted. So you're more in argument. He's saying that he -- the use has the same impact everywhere in the same zone in the neighborhood. So that's -- that's what he said.

MR. SUHAR: Uh-huh. Yeah, but in this
community -- I'm -- I'm talking about -- the neighborhood we're talking about now is -- is that
we're -- we're -- we're -- we're -- we're -- we're - we have a community -- there's -- there -- there are no other uses in this community -- in this neighborhood, Mr. Ferguson, that are as dense as what the -- the proposed development is going to be; is that correct?

MR. FERGUSON: That is correct.
MR. SUHAR: Yeah. And -- and -- and -- but we're talking about allowing now, through a special exception, more than double, almost triple the amount of density.

MR. FERGUSON: Yes, sir. And -- and Mr. Burke could've quadrupled it under the provisions of the -of the regulations.

MR. SUHAR: Okay. All right.
MR. FERGUSON: It's what the ordinance provides for.

MR. SUHAR: Okay. So I'm going to move onto some testimony about WSSC. In the planning technical sta- -- sta- -- planning staff report, there was a mention about WSSC not responding -- there was no response from WSSC to planning staff. Why -- was -- did WSSC submit a letter of -- of findings in this case and
make recommendations as to sewer upgrades -- water and sewer upgrades?

MR. FERGUSON: So I did not testify to that and I'm not familiar with how far the development has proceeded towards its water and sewer systems. Maybe Mr. Burke could testify to that if he were on direct, but I -- I have no knowledge of -- of their -- their water and sewer engineering.

MR. SUHAR: Okay. Thank you. I -- I don't have any further questions. Thank you, Madame Examiner.

MR. FERGUSON: Thank you, Mr. Suhar.
MS. MCNEIL: Thank you. Anyone else have questions of Mr. Ferguson? Okay.

MR. FERGUSON: Okay.
MS. MCNEIL: Mr. Hatcher, do you have another -- thank you, Mr. Ferguson.

MR. FERGUSON: Thank you, Madame Examiner.
MR. HATCHER: Yeah. And -- and --
MS. MCNEIL: Mr. Hatcher --
MR. HATCHER: -- in light of the testimony that -- that we've heard and the questions that we've had over this prescriptive easement, I think it's
probably best to have Mr. Debolt testify at the next hearing after we've been able to submit into the record the -- the legal justification that -- that Mr. Brown was -- was referencing.

However, we would like to call Jude Burke back up, because $I$ believe you had some questions for him, Madame Examiner.

MS. MCNEIL: Okay. What did I have to ask Mr. Burke? Mr. Burke.

MR. BURKE: Yes, ma'am.
MS. MCNEIL: There you are. You're still under oath.

MR. BURKE: Yes, ma'am.
MS. MCNEIL: What did I have to ask you?
MR. BURKE: You asked about a fence.
MS. MCNEIL: While I'm thinking, did anyone else have a question of Mr. Burke?

MR. BURKE: Madame Examiner, you had asked me if there was a fence involved I think.

MS. MCNEIL: Oh, right, you were telling me about the visibility study.

MR. BURKE: Right.

MS. MCNEIL: Can you explain what that is if we pull it up and --

MR. BURKE: Well -- so that -- whether it's up or not, it was generally -- the highly visible sides of the units that have increased architectural el- -elements to them and most of them you're only going to see from inside the -- the -- the community itself.

MS. MCNEIL: Okay. And -- and one second. One second. Ms. -- Ms. Bah, could you pull up Exhibit 75? Because I think your testimony would help me understand the exhibit too.

MS. BAH: Okay.
MS. MCNEIL: I didn't see -- let's see what's going on.

MR. HATCHER: And also, Mr. B- -- we're -we're hoping, Madame Examiner, that the -- the scope of the -- the questions really relate to things that have been brought up so he can address them directly as opposed to any new questions, but I did believe you had a question related to any signage as well and where it's [inaudible].

MS. MCNEIL: Right. I did. Yeah. If there's a
sign and is it showing on the site plan.
MR. BURKE: Yes. It is --
MS. MCNEIL: Okay.
MR. BURKE: -- and it's on the south side of the entrance, $a$-- a monument wall with a -- a community sign on it.

MS. MCNEIL: Okay. So this is showing me what?
MR. BURKE: So that's -- the highlighting in red is showing the end units that are particularly exposed where we're going to have the enhanced architectural treatments on the ends of those units.

MS. MCNEIL: Okay. And on this one, there's the entrance. Were you also the one that can testify as to why the entrance -- the access is there? Because Mr. Nelson could not. Why are we accessing the site right across from someone's house on the other side?

MR. BURKE: There's a lot of different elements that go into the neighborhood layout. We -- we didn't intentionally put it right across, $I$ think it's Mr. Martin's house, but it -- it's fairly centrally located on the -- the subject property frontage and, you know, ju- -- just the way that the site plan laid
out with the -- the environmental constraints on the back side of it it -- it just works better there.

MS. MCNEIL: Okay. And --
MR. HATCHER: [inaudible], I think you had a question as well.

MS. MCNEIL: -- and the quick -- the quick -there's going to be a fence around --

MR. BURKE: Along the southern property line. Sou- -- south of the property is another single-family lot. There's a -- a house there now, but it doesn't look inhabitable, but it is -- it's a single-family lot. So -- so we're showing a six-foot fence along that property line.

MS. MCNEIL: And -- and this is additional, but some of your adjacent properties belong to HOAs and -- and will not be developed? I mean, am I reading that into it, that it's just their --

MR. BURKE: That's correct. Common area -- the -- so on the -- where -- where the property line basically goes straight up the page but at an angle away from Springfield Road, everything to the left of that is Springfield Manor's --

Wait, I'm sorry, that's Oakstone's common area and then to the -- the -- the north -- northeast boundary line there, that is Springfield Manor common area and then that short length of property line that sort of is angled towards the southeast, that is the two single-family lots that are part of -- also part of the Springfield Manor subdivision and then the whole south titled, but generally south property line, that's that other single-family lot I referenced that faces Springfield Road and has a driveway on Springfield but not part of Springfield Manor.

MS. MCNEIL: Okay. I think I have mine. Anyone else have questions based on mine?

MR. BURKE: I can also answer Mr. Suhar's question about WSSC. We -- we do have a --

MS. MCNEIL: Okay.
MR. BURKE: -- letter of findings and hydraulic planning analysis approved from WSSC for the -- the -- the -- this layout. Yes.

MS. MCNEIL: Do we have them in the record?
MR. BURKE: No. We just got -- I mean, we had one for the old layout, then when we did the revisions
in August, September, we put in to WSSC for revising it just to match a new layout and we just got that back, I think, last night or the night before --

MS. MCNEIL: And it's totally up to you --
MR. BURKE: -- but I -- I don't need to [inaudible] --

MS. MCNEIL: -- but if you want to put them in the record, you all may.

MR. BURKE: If it's needed for special exception, great, I think that's more of a preliminary issue, but I'm going to defer to my counsel and --

MS. MCNEIL: Okay.
MR. BURKE: -- if it's required, we -- we can pull it up -- or I mean, send it in.

MS. MCNEIL: Okay. And so that's tied to you getting the right category. I think he was talking about the -- the fact in the staff report that it says you need to get category -- the next category before you can build.

MR. BURKE: It's W4S4 right now and I think that's an administrative step to get to w3S3 as we go through preliminary plan and final plat and Mr. Hatcher
can probably correct me on that if I'm wrong.
MS. MCNEIL: So I am finished, but I will turn to Mr. Suhar, does that answer your question? And Ms. Bah, you can take the exhibit down. Thanks.

MR. SUHAR: Yeah. So long as the findings are --

MS. BAH: Okay.
MR. SUHAR: -- are made part of the record. I'd like them to be, but that's -- I -- I understand it was pretty recent.

MS. MCNEIL: Okay. Do you have any other questions of the witness based on mine?

MR. SUHAR: No. Thank you.
MS. MCNEIL: Okay. Does anyone have questions of the witness based on mine? Okay. Thank you, Mr. Burke.

MR. BURKE: You're welcome.
MS. MCNEIL: Oh, so we could turn now -- so Mr. Hatcher, you only have the other witness for later. So we could turn to see is anyone here that would like to be sworn and testified as to their position on this request? Surely, Mr. -- I was getting ready to say it.

MR. ALDAG: Aldag. Yes.
MS. MCNEIL: All right. Start with Mr. Aldag.
MR. ALDAG: Okay.
MS. MCNEIL: Do you swear or affirm under the penalties of perjury that the testimony you shall give will be the truth and nothing but the truth?

MR. ALDAG: I do.
MS. MCNEIL: Okay. And do you want to use that exhibit -- Mr. Aldag had an exhibit prepared by Mr. Klein [ph]. Mr. Klein is not here today?

MR. ALDAG: No, but I'd like to use it and I'd like to actually have it part of the record.

MS. MCNEIL: Right. So give me one --
MR. HATCHER: I would object to the idea that the expert testimony is being submitted when I haven't had an opportunity to cross-examine the expert.

MR. ALDAG: Well, then $I$ will give my -- I'll -- I'll give mine a -- you know, what findings I have. MR. HATCHER: Yeah.

MR. ALDAG: Okay.
MS. MCNEIL: Okay. All right.
MR. ALDAG: You know -- and it's -- well, my
testimony actually is pretty simple, it covers two concerns, traffic and environmental. And I'll -everything okay? I guess. Okay. The residents on Springfield Road have traffic concerns. That includes substantial cut-through traffic from U.S.D.A. Beltsville Agricultural Research Center.

The current traffic volume is such that it is difficult to turn onto Springfield Road from driveways and intersecting resident streets. Area residents experience substantial delays in turning from driveways to Springfield Road and from stop sign-controlled intersections, such as Springfield Road-Lanham Severn Road, Springfield Road-Lake Gle- -- Glenn Road, Good Luck Road-Springfield Road and when turning from Springfield Road onto Lanham Severn Road.

These concerns are valid and could be exacerbated by the traffic from the Stewart property plus other future developments affecting the Springfield area. This added traffic could lead to significant safety concerns and delay for me and my neighbors owning property abutting Springfield Road. The Stewart property development will further
-- just one moment. Here I go. Well, unfortunately, it appears that the Stewart property trip generation falls below the threshold for a full traffic impact study. It is likely that other development -- other -- or under construction or proposed for Springfield Road corridor may also fall below the -- the TIS threshold as a result in assessment of cumulative impacts for existing and future traffic volume does not appear to exist.

I have counted 300 to 400 cars per hour passing by the intersection of Good Luck Road and Springfield Road during rush hour drive times. That is approximately 1 car every 14 seconds today before the Stewart property and 8 to 10 other planned subdivisions are built or abutting -- are built on or abutting Springfield Road.

The cumulative effect will make it impossible to have reasonable access and travel to our properties on and in the vicinity of Springfield Road. Unfortunate- -- it's for this reason that $I$ urge you to call upon the zoning hearing examiner to withhold approval of the Stewart property special exception until a cumulative traffic impact study is completed
and shows that safety concerns of the motorists, cyclists and pedestrians will not be jeopardized and without causing excessive congestion and delay. And the second part of my testimony is on the environmental impact for the Newstop Branch. The Maryland Biological Stream Survey shows that Newstop Branch was of good quality based on the recent -- most recent sampling done in 2008, which was about a mile downstream of the Stewart property site.

A good quality stream like Newstop Branch usually supports an abundance of fish and other organisms that are sensitive to pollution. A fair quality stream has usually lost most of the pollutionsensitive species.

At the 2018 MBSS, that's Maryland Biological Stream Survey, sampling location a mile below the Stewart property, the Newstop Branch drains . 97 square miles or 6- -- 621-acre watershed that has -- as of 2010 and 2011, has a 25 percent forest cover and 14 percent has coverage by buildings, streets and other impervious surfaces.

Generally, you know, to maintain a good
quality stream requires a minimum of 40 percent of the watershed is a forest and impervious surfaces cover no more than 10 percent of watershed.

Based on the U.S.G.S. Stream Stats Data at 25 percent forest covers nonstop [sic] -- Newstop Branch is considerably below the good quality threshold and 14 percent pervious cover puts the Newstop watershed above the 10 percent threshold for good quality usually declines to fair. In other words, the Newstop Branch is on the cusp of separating as a stream fit for most human uses and one where area residents could become leery of being near these waters.

The following -- in the -- the first paragraph -- let's see. In the first paragraph on Page 9 of the September 20, 2023 Prince George's County Planning Department technical staff reports notes that 3.63 acres of the forest on the Stewart property site will be removed, . 19 acres will be planted with trees for a net loss of 3.44 forest acres in the Newstop Branch watershed.

The 25.3 percent existing forest in the 621acre Newstop Branch watershed at the 2018 MBSS sampling
point, there were 157.1 acres of forest. Stewart's property development will lower the forest acreage by 3.44 acres to 153.7 acres, watershed forest cover will go from an existing 25.3 percent down to 24.7 percent.

At an average lot size of .21 acres, the 12.01 acre site could be 38 percent impervious based on Table 2-2A in U.S.D.A. report urban hydrology for small watersheds. The Stewart property would add 4.56 acres impervious surface to the Newstop Branch watershed. Newstop Branch watershed impervious cover acres would increase from the existing 84.5 acres to 89 acres.

The Stewart property development would raise Newstop Branch watershed impervious cover from 13.6 percent to 14.3. By further reducing the forest cover and increasing the watershed impervious area, the Stewart property, as proposed, increases the likelihood of stream quality declining from good to fair.

The following description of the proposed wa--- stormwater management measures proposed for the Stewart property appear on Page 23, second paragraph of September 20, 2023 technical staff. And in quote, "An unapproved stormwater management plan was submitted
with application."
The unapproved plan shows the use of two submerged gravel wetlands, two micro retention facilities and a bioswale to meet the stormwater requirements for the site. The revised layout of the SE-22002 is not consistent with the layout shown on the unimproved stormwater management plan.

Well, these proposed measurements -- measures can be highly effective in mitigating impervious stormwater impacts. The soil on the Stewart property site is not suitable to obtaining the full benefits of these highly effective measures. Stormwater measures are mostly effective when located on [inaudible] to highly permeable soils.

Soil permeability is rated with a system called hydraulic soil groups, which range from A to D. The A soils are the most permeable, the D soils are the least. Maximum benefits are obtained with highly effective stormwater measures, are located on $A$ and $B$ soils and more permeable than C soils.

The soils on the Stewart property site are mostly D with some C soils, because the soils are
impermeable. The Stewart property development will further degrade Newstop Branch even with stormwater measures that are usually highly effective.

Further degradation would be reduced if the density of the proposed housing units was reduced, which would also reduce impervious surfaces area, the reduced number of units placed on the portions of the site which presently lack forest and occupy C soils.

The fact presented in these comments should show that one of the most important environmental features of the site, the Newstop Branch, will not be protected by preserving the primary management area and the proposed stormwater management system.

I recommend that you call upon the zoning hearing examiner to deny the special exception or add conditions requiring the new impervious surfaces be restricted to the portions of the site that lack forest and where runoff from new impervious surfaces can be directed to highly effective stormwater measureme- -measures placed within the $C$ soils. And that is my testimony. Thank you.

MS. MCNEIL: Thank you. Can you read the very
last sentence again? I'm actually here scribbling. So I --

MR. ALDAG: Oh, okay.
MS. MCNEIL: -- have, require new impervious surfaces to be restricted, keep going.

MR. ALDAG: Okay. Portions of the site that lack forest and where runoff from new impervious surfaces can be directly to highly effective stormwater measures placed within the C soils.

MS. MCNEIL: Okay.
MR. ALDAG: Okay.
MS. MCNEIL: Thank you.
MR. ALDAG: Thank you.
MS. MCNEIL: Mm-hmm. Does anyone have questions of Mr. Aldag?

MR. BROWN: Mr. Aldag, have you submitted --
MR. ALDAG: Yes.
MR. BROWN: -- that statement for the record?
MR. ALDAG: I have. I submitted last Thursday and asked for it to be part of the record.

MR. BROWN: Okay.
MS. MCNEIL: The problem is it's -- it's --
it's in the form of coming from the expert. So Mr.
Aldag would have to re- --
MR. BROWN: Yeah. If you can just redact --
MS. MCNEIL: -- change it to coming from you.
MR. ALDAG: Okay. I can do that.
MR. BROWN: [inaudible] referencing the expert and resubmit it with your signature.

MR. ALDAG: I will.
MR. BROWN: Thank you.
MR. ALDAG: Okay. And thank you.
MS. MCNEIL: Go ahead, Mr. Hatcher, you have questions?

MR. HATCHER: No questions for this witness.
MS. MCNEIL: Okay. Thank you, sir. Does anybody else wish to testify?

MR. MARTIN: Okay. I will briefly.
MS. MCNEIL: Mr. Martin.
MR. MARTIN: Mr. Martin, 8204, across the street. I'm going to be --

MS. MCNEIL: Okay. Do you swear -- do you swear or affirm under the penalties of perjury that the testimony you shall give will be the truth and nothing
but the truth?
MR. MARTIN: Yes. I do, so help me God.
MS. MCNEIL: Okay.
MR. MARTIN: So -- yeah. So you know, M- --
Mr. Hank Al- -- Al- -- Aldag -- Al- -- Aldag -- or Aldag, he's -- he's got everything covered. I just want to just simply put do we really need 5- -- 57 units? Can we cut it down? And I think that's kind of the conclusion that everybody's kind of been saying here for the last nine hours or so -- eight hours is, you know, as far as the traffic, the stormwater runoff.

My personal testimony is of access to public transportation, there's no -- there's no bus stop within, I don't know, half a mile -- [inaudible] is going to be half a mile or so. As far as these elderly -- you know, I have elderly parents and grandparents who don't drive. So honestly, I have a few of them that might even want to move in there, but I'm just concerned about public transportation.

So I just think 57 units is -- is just a little bit extreme. I just -- from what I've been hearing, I've been here for -- for the most part all
day. What I've been hearing is that the community is not against development, but just not so many crammed into one -- one area. So -- and that's -- and that's pretty much all I have to say.

And that's it for me. Thank you for everybody. Thank you, everybody here for hearing me and hearing us, I appreciate everybody. And until next time, yes, I'll be following up and thank you, everybody. And that's it for me.

MS. MCNEIL: Thank you, Mr. -- thank you, Mr. Martin. Does anyone have questions of Mr. Martin? Okay. Thank you. Does anyone else have -- wish to testify?

MR. SUHAR: Just to clar- -- just to confirm, Madame Examiner, that my comments will be heard on the 20th; is that right?

MS. MCNEIL: Yes.
MR. SUHAR: Okay.
MS. MCNEIL: And it would be ideal if you had that other information we requested at that time.

MR. SUHAR: I will -- I will try to send that to you be- -- before then.

MS. MCNEIL: Okay.

MR. SUHAR: Yeah. Is that going to be at the same time, 9:30 in the morning; is that right?

MS. MCNEIL: Yes.
MR. SUHAR: Okay. Excellent.
MR. HATCHER: Again, we just want to -- I'm going to need to just coordinate with -- with some of my witnesses and my client just to make sure the 20 th works. So if I could just respond more definitively tomorrow, that would be great, tomorrow a.m. before 10:00.

MR. SUHAR: I'm flexible.
MS. MCNEIL: The problem becomes if it's not the 20th, then I have to send out notices.

MR. SUHAR: Oh.
MS. MCNEIL: I can continue it at this hearing. So -- so -- and that's fine, it'll just be beyond the 20th at that point, though.

MR. SUHAR: Yeah.
MS. MCNEIL: So let's say it's the 20th --
MR. HATCHER: Let's say it's the 20th.
MS. MCNEIL: -- but if it's not, then I'll be sending out notices.

MR. HATCHER: That works.
MS. MCNEIL: Okay.
MR. HATCHER: Yes.
MR. SUHAR: Thank you.
MS. MCNEIL: Okay. Then if no one else wants to talk to me -- oh-oh --

MR. HOLMAN: You've got one more.
MS. MCNEIL: Okay. Mr. Holman.
MR. HOLMAN: I'm going to be very, very brief. I just want to state at this point, as a homeowner on the other side of this -- this creek or stream whose property goes right up to the common area that -- that goes to the stream, I'm very concerned despite the testimony today from these so-called experts about what's going to happen to the water that's going to be coming down this hill.

And we can quibble over the legal definition of what is a steep hill and what is a hill, but the fact of the matter is it is a hill.

On the other side of the hill where I live, the land is very flat and I'm just concerned that when you add all these additional roofs in -- in this new
development and the new streets, you're going to have way more surface that's covered with dwellings than what you have right now with that single home and its outer buildings and I don't want to have to face the possibility down the road of trying to figure out who it is I have to sue because you've made my property less valuable and I just -- I think this project needs to be re-thought and scaled back.

MS. MCNEIL: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Holman. Anyone have questions? Okay. Then I thank everyone for being here today. We will continue this case until December 20th. You can -- you -- you can receive the link to come back, but there won't be any other testimony unless you have questions of whatever witness Mr. Hatcher may call.

And if -- if it's not going to be on the 20th, then it'll be at a later date and everyone that's a person of record, so that's everybody here, will receive an -- a letter from the ZHE explaining when the new date will be.

MR. SUHAR: Yeah. And -- and -- and I'll be able to give my comments at that time as well; is that
correct?

MS. MCNEIL: No. Mm-mm. Yes. Mr. Suhar, you will give your comments at that time as well.

MR. HATCHER: I would like to say on behalf of the applicant, we really appreciate your time, Madame Examiner, your time, People's Zoning Counsel Brown --

MR. SUHAR: Yes.
MR. HATCHER: -- and your time, Mr. Suhar and -- and all --

MR. SUHAR: Thank you very much.
MR. HATCHER: -- and -- and all the citizens who were able to participate, really appreciate your time.

MS. MCNEIL: Thank you.
MR. SUHAR: That's very nice of you, Mr. Hatcher and same to you. And I -- I express the same appreciation to everyone, including the zoning hearing examiner and Mr. Brown and everybody you just stated. So same -- same feelings, thank you.

MS. MCNEIL: I'm loving this. Let's end now on a high note. [laughter]
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See you all next week or shortly thereafter. Thank you.

MR. SUHAR: All right. Sounds great. Thank you. Have a good one.

MS. MCNEIL: You too.
AUTOMATED VOICE: Recording stopped.
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| 187:20, 188:6, | circulated | 50:12 | 74:9, 179:12, |
| 203:3, 203:8, | 21:4, 21:9, | class | 196:7 |
| 206:11 | 23:7 | 242:18 | code |
| characteristics | circulation | classification | 19:11, 134:11, |
| 8:20, 243:22, | 192:11, 204:11 | 186:1 | 190:3 |
| 244:1, 244:21, | circumstances | classifications | codes |
| 245:1 | 81:15, 194:2, | 185:17 | 32:9, 142:4 |
| characterizations | 194:6 | classified | coffee |
| 243:7 | cites | 173:6, 184:6, | 133:16 |
| characterized | 200:11 | 185:13, 204:9, | colinear |
| 229:19 | citizens | 205:3, 246:15 | 168:11 |
| charge | 38:4, 97:20, | clause | collect |
| 251:16 | 279:11 | 226:1 | 131:4 |
| charles | city | clean | collection |
| 8:1, 8:3, | 19:11 | 241:20 | 136:17 |
| 56:10, 69:2, | civic | cleaning | collector |
| 69:8, 69:13 | 12:15, 15:10, | 183:20, 244:9 | 119:14, 119:20, |
| chart | 15:17, 16:11 | clear | 131:3, 131:9, |
| 110:18 | civil | 14:1, 45:6, | $181: 14, \quad 199: 4$ |
| chat | 69:10, 69:14, | $130: 22, \quad 136: 22,$ | collectors |
| 161:3 | 116:7 | 146:16, 151:2, | 119:16 |
| check | cl | 193:14 | combination |
| 20:20 | 3:18 | clearances | 132:7, 136:4 |
| cherry | clar | 201:6 | combine |
| 29:4 | 275:13 | cleared | 203:9 |
| chief | clarification | 237:7 | come |
| 157:3 | 7:1, 7:13, | clearing | 14:12, 14:18, |
| choice | 12:14, 161:20, | 183:15 | 16:12, 51:17, |
| 134:3 | 228:15, 230:17, | clearly | 53:10, 99:20, |
| choices | 231:5 | 36:11, 127:7 | $102: 6,102: 8,$ |
| 177:19 | clarifications | client | 135:12, 135:14, |
| chr | $5: 22$ | 13:4, 78:10, | 148:6, 150:20, |
| 230:19 | clarified | 79:21, 158:15, | 151:16, 234:18, |
| chris | 42:18 | 276:7 | 237:15, 238:5, |
| 2:12, 3:18, | clarify | clients | 247:15, 251:1, |
| 85:14, 216:4, | 6:5, 9:10, | 69:12 | 254:2, 278:13 |
| 231:4, 281:2, | 42:17, 43:8, | climbing | comes |
| 281:17 | 78:2, 84:5, | 54:22 | 13:8, 17:5, |
| christian | 88:21, 89:12, | close | 127:16, 144:9, |
| 1:22 | 91:4, 93:6, | 27:2, 79:19, | 170:21, 218:12, |
| churches | 96:10, 106:12, | 86:10, 127:19, | 242:5, 245:19 |
| 217:8 | 109:4, 109:16, | $156: 10, \quad 181: 6$ | comfortable |
| circle | 150:1, 167:22, | 192:3, 217:6, | 66:19, 161:22 |
| 37:16 | 174:5, 188:3, | 235:6 | coming |
| circles | 189:9, 213:1, | closer | 2:16, 53:1, |
| 153:18, 196:6 | 221:8 | 52:15 | 60:10, 114:20, |
| circulate | clarifying | closest | 132:8, 132:11, |
| 124:13, 125:2, | 6:19 | 199:16 |  |
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|  |  | 206:7 <br> compare <br> 120:22, 153:3 <br> compared <br> 121:10, 122:2 <br> compares <br> 111:1 <br> comparing <br> 124:4, 153:21, <br> 153:22 <br> comparison <br> 133:2, 154:2 <br> compatabil <br> 180:6 <br> compatible <br> 180:6, 215:5 <br> compensate <br> 201:16 <br> completed <br> 266:22 <br> completely <br> 149:11, 245:16 <br> completes <br> 144:10 <br> complexes <br> 247:11 <br> compliance <br> 2:8, 8:9, <br> $76: 17,76: 21$, <br> 84:8, 84:13, <br> 86:1, 86:8, <br> 86:15, 86:17, <br> 86:19, 91:6, <br> 91:19, 167:2, <br> 172:17, 198:18, <br> 199:6, 199:8, <br> 199:20, 200:1, <br> 200:4, 200:9, <br> 201:2 <br> complied <br> 232:11 <br> complies <br> 4:3 <br> comply $60: 20,61: 5$ <br> 70:22, 77:17 <br> components <br> 188:21, 238:5, | $238: 8$ comprehensively $215: 1$ compromise $64: 6$ computer $101: 3, \quad 191: 15$ computers $109: 13$ con $6: 22, \quad 182: 22$ concentrated $198: 2$ concept $119: 5, \quad 172: 5$ concern $58: 3$ concerned $84: 22, \quad 88: 20$, $274: 19, \quad 277: 13$, $277: 21$ concerning $59: 11, \quad 85: 5$, $218: 15, \quad 230: 14$ concerns $11: 10, \quad 52: 1$, $53: 2, \quad 53: 3$, $55: 16, \quad 26: 2$, $265: 4,265: 16$, $265: 20,267: 1$ conclude $219: 13$ concluded $223: 5, \quad 223: 13$ concludes $192: 18$ conclusion $127: 3, \quad 193: 18$, $251: 2, \quad 254: 3$, $274: 9$ conclusions $6: 1,197: 4$ condition $57: 20, \quad 61: 4$, $61: 10, \quad 61: 12$, $61: 13, ~ 113: 19$, $120: 2, \quad 128: 11$, $150: 17, \quad 178: 3$, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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| creates | cumulative | data | debault |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 150:12, 150:17, | 266:7, 266:16, | 118:7, 118:10, | 92:11 |
| 174:21, 181:11 | 266:22 | 136:17, 153:5, | debolt |
| creating | curb | 268:4 | 160:13, 160:17, |
| 178:12, 192:10, | 87:10, 138:6 | date | 160:21, 204:16, |
| 238:19 | current | 39:1, 44:17, | 221:16, 257:1 |
| creek | 4:14, 4:17, | 109:1, 160:7, | dec |
| 56:21, 56:22, | 7:16, 19:8, | 161:22, 234:8, | 11:2 |
| 64:17, 277:11 | 28:15, 69:4, | 234:21, 278:17, | december |
| crescent | 90:16, 105:6, | 278:20 | 1:11, 2:4, |
| 29:4 | 137:15, 146:21, | dated | 108:8, 108:12, |
| cri | 147:14, 153:21, | 21:18, 38:19, | 109:2, 109:11, |
| 152:19 | 164:2, 169:2, | 71:18, 107:4, | 119:11, 120:7, |
| criteria | 169:12, 220:15, | 107:9, 108:7, | 157:8, 162:15, |
| 18:18, 75:22, | $265: 7$ | 108:8, 108:22, | 234:10, 234:12, |
| 76:1, 81:14, | currently | 166:15, 166:20, | $278: 12,281: 16$ |
| 117:21, 139:7, | 4:13, 19:10, | $191: 20$ | decide |
| 140:3, 140:14, | 28:12, 58:3, | dates | 24:18 |
| 171:14, 171:20, | 68:22, 105:3, | 162:6, 162:10, | decided |
| 192:17, 193:13, | 145:9, 163:20 | 162:18 | 32:11 |
| 198:11, 199:5, | cusp | dave | decision |
| 202:4, 202:11, | 268:10 | 100:17, 110:13, | 9:20, 18:12, |
| 205:2, 205:9, | cut | 112:16 | 29:15, 31:20, |
| 232:11 | 210:18, 274:8 | david | 32:4, 72:9 |
| criterias | cut-through | 7:15, 8:10, | decisionma |
| 137:3 | 127:15, 265:5 | 9:8, 18:21, | 31:20 |
| criterion | cyclists | 19:9, 23:3, | decisions |
| 226:20 | 267:2 | 104:20 | 13:20 |
| criterium | D | day | declare |
| $\begin{aligned} & 203: 2, \quad 203: 18, \\ & 203: 22 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 55: 6, \quad 104: 4, \\ & 145: 16, \quad 151: 15, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 281: 2, \quad 281: 12 \\ & \text { decline } \end{aligned}$ |
| critical | $75: 22$ | $\begin{aligned} & 145: 16, ~ 151: 15, \\ & 154: 17, \\ & 156: 10, \end{aligned}$ | decline $34: 6$ |
| 192:8, 223:3 | dale 4.8 24.9 | 158:11, 159:5, | declined |
| cross | $\begin{aligned} & 4: 8, \quad 24: 9, \\ & 26: 20, \quad 29: 1, \end{aligned}$ | 159:11, 159:13, | $164: 17, \quad 164: 20$ |
| $44: 5, \quad 98: 12,$ | $33: 2,38: 4,$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{ll} 160: 2, & 162: 14, \\ 162: 16, & 250: 10, \end{array}\right.$ | declines |
| $235: 9$ | $39: 16,40: 3,$ | $\begin{aligned} & 162: 16, ~ 250: 10, \\ & 275: 1 \end{aligned}$ | $268: 9$ |
| cross-examination $9: 11,103: 20$ | $42: 21, \quad 51: 16,$ | days | declining |
| cross-examine | $\begin{aligned} & 62: 12,176: 8, \\ & 176: 11 \end{aligned}$ | $75: 15, \quad 220: 1$ | $\begin{aligned} & 269: 17 \\ & \text { dedicated } \end{aligned}$ |
| 98:2, 264:16 | dan | de | 220:15, 220:16, |
| cross-examined | $3: 11, \quad 92: 11,$ | 124:7, 152:14, | 221:5, 222:20, |
| 234:17 | $160: 13, \quad 160: 21$ | $\begin{aligned} & 180: 19,228: 22 \\ & \text { deal } \end{aligned}$ | 223:14, 224:11, |
| crusty | darker | deal | 228:16, 232:1 |
| 190:15 | $210: 17$ | 143:14, 188:9, | dedication |
| crzs | darkest | 199:22, 220:20 | $113: 15,226: 17$ |
| 192:8 | 195:17 | dealing | dedications |
| ctpc | dash | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 220:20, 236:16 } \\ & \text { deals } \end{aligned}$ | 231:12 |
| 71:3 | 88:5 | $90: 4$ | deduct |
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| deducted | delays | depicted | detached |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 223:13, 223:15, | 265:10 | 169:11 | 29:3, 29:5, |
| 225:9, 227:5 | delving | deprive | 86:6, 111:4, |
| deducting | 136:8 | 192:13 | 178:10, 179:10, |
| 224:22 | demand | depth | 217:8 |
| deed | 41:8, 41:10, | 181:17 | detail |
| 220:11, 224:9, | 178:8, 178:10 | describe | 34:19, 52:18, |
| 226:10 | deminimis | 69:20, 71:11, | 60:11, 174:18, |
| deep | 228:22 | 72:21, 74:3, | 177:14, 200:8 |
| 196:1 | demonstrate | 166:6, 195:2 | detailed |
| defeats | 41:8, 112:16, | described | 60:17, 138:14, |
| 233:9 | 195:9, 198:4, | 211:19, 220:2, | 146:12, 205:6 |
| defer | $204: 6, \quad 210: 1,$ | $240: 21$ | details |
| 262:11 | 212:12 | describes | 4:22 |
| deficiencies | demonstrated | 33:14, 71:5 | determination |
| 139:7 | 43:15, 204:2 | description | 39:20 |
| deficiency | demonstrating | 8:19, 166:6, | determine |
| 185:21 | 190:18 | 269:18 | 149:10, 150:12, |
| define | denied | descriptive | 150:16, 174:14, |
| 129:11 | $190: 19$ | $48: 21$ | 232:10 |
| defined | dense | deserves | determined |
| 232:2 | 170:5, 170:7, | 67:9 | 11:2, 115:9, |
| defines | 175:6, 178:9, | design | 149:1, 171:4, |
| 241:10 | 179:20, 236:18, | 8:17, 8:18, | $222: 8$ |
| definitely | 246:19, 247:1, | 8:21, 34:9, | determining |
| $19: 14, \quad 46: 22$ | $255: 4$ | 96:3, 116:1, | $42: 20,148: 2$ |
| $50: 18, \quad 89: 17,$ | denser | 138:5, 138:7, | $150: 4$ |
| $156: 16,156: 17$ | 214:6, 216:2 | 163:22, 164:3, | detrimental |
| $158: 13, \quad 235: 4$ | densest | 174:16, 177:19, | $124: 1, \quad 186: 6$ |
| definition | 214:13 | 181:2, 181:15, | develop |
| $108: 4,129: 7 \text {, }$ | densities | 182:3, 182:22, | 31:20, 32:4, |
| 167:10, 232:16, | $173: 22$ | $\text { 183:18, } 184: 9,$ | $78: 19, \quad 80: 14,$ |
| 232:22, 277:17 | density | 193:3, 197:18, | $80: 16, \quad 80: 18,$ |
| definitions | 173:15, 173:16, | $202: 17,237: 16, ~$ $245: 3$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 80: 21, & 82: 10, \\ 85: 11 . & 122: 14 \end{array}$ |
| $236: 21$ | 173:18, 173:21, | $245: 3$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{ll} 85: 11, & 122: 14, \\ 124: 7, & 226: 11 \end{array}\right.$ |
| definitively | 174:2, 174:4, | designated $41: 19,42: 3$ | developability |
| $276: 8$ <br> degradation | $\begin{aligned} & 187: 12, \quad 203: 17, \\ & 228: 9, \quad 246: 20, \end{aligned}$ | designation | $\begin{aligned} & \text { developability } \\ & \text { 172:12, 172:13 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 197:22, 198:1, | $253: 14,255: 10,$ | $173: 13$ | developable |
| 242:5, 271:4 | 271:5 | designed | 192:1 |
| degrade | deny | 33:20, 113:12, | developed |
| 271:2 | 271:15 | 116:4, 239:1, | 26:15, 58:17, |
| degree | department | 243:14 | 121:17, 122:13, |
| 114:21, 201:20, | 8:1, 60:15, | designers | 122:14, 126:21, |
| 246:2 | 69:8, 69:21, | 70:3 | 133:19, 173:9, |
| degrees | 75:14, 89:14, | desk | $180: 1,180: 3,$ |
| 243:10 | 94:12, 268:16 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 211:15 } \\ & \text { desoite } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 180: 4, \quad 183: 2, \\ & 183: 10, \quad 183: 12, \end{aligned}$ |
| delay $265: 20,267:$ | dependent $231: 21$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { despite } \\ & 277: 13 \end{aligned}$ | 183:10, 183:12, |

## Transcript of Hearing

Conducted on December 13, 2023


## Transcript of Hearing

Conducted on December 13, 2023

| ```215:8, 221:8, 222:22, 242:3, 263:4, 269:4, 274:8, 277:16, 278:5 downstream 61:1, 267:9 downtown 163:19 dpw 220:10 dpwnt 218:20, 219:13, 231:18 dpwt 89:5, 92:3 dr 51:5, 51:10, 51:13, 51:15, 51:18, 51:19, 51:21, 52:8, 52:16, 52:19, 53:15, 53:19, 54:2, 54:4, 54:18, 55:9, 55:12, 55:22, 56:3, 59:15 draft 35:19, 36:8, 36:9, 36:12 drafters 70:2 drains 185:8, 185:9, 267:17 draw 204:3 drawing 114:6, 114:13, 114:14, 196:8 drawn 127:3, 246:13 drew 83:2 driscoll 56:10 drive 4:8, 113:11,``` | 135:19, 266:11, 274:17 <br> drives \|113:9 <br> driveway 113:8, 113:21, 114:22, 115:1, 139:17, 237:6, $261: 10$ <br> driveways $79: 14,79: 19,$ $86: 7,90: 9$ $90: 10, \quad 90: 15$ $90: 17, \quad 91: 10,$ 130:4, 200:13, 201:7, 265:8, $265: 10$ <br> driving 101:11, 102:9, $\text { 206: } 6$ <br> drops $238: 9$ <br> ducatel 107:19 <br> duckettown $167: 16,168: 2 \text {, }$ $168: 6,168: 10$ <br> due $82: 7,85: 10,$ $86: 5,86: 11$ <br> duplicates <br> 9:17, 48:14, 50:8 <br> duplicative $171: 19$ during <br> 45:1, 48:1, 60:19, 128:3, 132:11, 133:13, 133:18, 134:2, 134:6, 153:12, 185:19, 266:11 dwelling $\begin{aligned} & 2: 7, \quad 33: 9, \\ & 45: 2, \quad 45: 21, \\ & 46: 1,173: 17, \\ & 173: 19, \quad 179: 11, \\ & 203: 10, \quad 203: 16, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 204:18, 208:20 } \\ & \text { dwellings } \\ & 4: 3,4: 19, \\ & 33: 7,169: 20, \\ & 169: 21,179: 21, \\ & 181: 14, \quad 187: 9, \\ & 203: 9, \quad 206: 2, \\ & 278: 2 \end{aligned}$ <br> E <br> each <br> 20:11, 32:14, <br> 34:11, 38:8, <br> 146:6, 151:14, <br> 231:15 <br> earlier <br> 81:9, 166:7, <br> 174:1, 174:10, <br> 187:22, 188:12, <br> 193:20, 194:22, <br> 199:14, 202:15, <br> 203:5, 204:1, <br> 204:5, 218:17, <br> 247:18, 252:17 <br> earth <br> 57:3 <br> easement <br> 88:1, 88:2, <br> 88:3, 88:9, <br> 88:12, 88:14, <br> 88:18, 89:2, <br> 89:3, 89:8, <br> 90:11, $90: 19$, <br> 218:15, 218:19, <br> 218:20, 220:9, <br> 221:12, 222:5, <br> 222:8, 222:15, <br> 223:1, 223:12, <br> 224:4, 224:15, <br> 224:21, 225:2, <br> 225:19, 226:7, <br> 227:4, 230:8, <br> 233:15, 249:7, <br> 249:15, 249:17, <br> 256:22 <br> easements <br> 221:17, 224:12 <br> easier <br> 118:5 | ```east 4:6, 107:19, 113:4, 131:9, 176:8, 176:11, 179:16, 180:20, 195:15, 210:20 eastern 74:8, 88:8, 177:4, 186:12, 195:13, 197:19, 243:5 easy 114:14, 123:2 eat 238:13 edge 176:6, 180:9 educational 164:13 effect 4:11, 123:15, 124:2, 182:15, 266:16 effective 270:9, 270:12, 270:13, 270:19, 271:3, 271:19, 272:8 effectively 239:14 effects 123:4, 123:19 effor 31:22 efforts 32:1 eight 70:21, 77:8, 77:9, 173:19, 203:15, 213:15, 213:16, 213:18, 247:1, 274:10 either 30:4, 52:21, 81:20, 119:15, 199:2 el 258:5``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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| elaborate | emailing | ensure | equipment |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 34:8, 58:2 | 158:10, 159:1 | 58:6, 58:22, | 212:18 |
| elderly | emails | 180:6 | equity |
| 143:19, 206:2, | 161:14 | entered | 13:7 |
| 236:18, 248:2, | employed | 65:21, 108:12 | equivalent |
| 274:15, 274:16 | 28:13, 69:1, | enterprise | 86:20, 233:2 |
| elected | 105:3, 163:21, | 54:9, 54:15 | erode |
| 13:19 | 180:6, 281:6 | entire | 184:20 |
| electronically | employment | 11:20, 30:12, | err |
| 215:21 | 146:21 | 34:13, 40:14, | 9:17 |
| element | enclosed | 113:20, 125:20, | esc |
| 177:17, 178:4 | 205:22, 207:9 | 138:14, 177:7, | 1:16, 3:20, |
| elements | end | 177:8 | 29:8, 29:11, |
| 8:21, 144:8, | 9:19, 34:15, | entirely | 30:8, $30: 10$, |
| 258:6, 259:18 | 74:8, 117:12, | 15:13, 15:18, | $30: 13,30: 18$, |
| elevations | 148:14, 174:4, | 84:14, 97:21, | 31:6 |
| 47:17, 48:11 | 177:4, 185:6, | 155:14, 155:20, | especially |
| elm | 210:7, 216:12, | 197:10, 237:11, | 38:14, 58:21, |
| 28:14, 28:16, | 227:10, 228:14, | 237:16, 239:4 | 107:12, 133:11, |
| 28:18, 28:22, | 228:18, 259:9, | entirety | 185:16 |
| 30:7, 30:12, | 279:20 | 110:7 | essentially |
| 30:14, 30:20, | ends | entitlement | 175:3, 184:19 |
| 33:14 | 131:5, 231:21, | 70:1 | establish |
| else | 259:11 | entrance | 107:14, 167:5 |
| 2:22, 21:13, | enforced | 114:3, 114:4, | established |
| $36: 16,56: 6$ | 35:15, 35:16, | $114: 5, \quad 137: 19,$ | 111:18, 173:6, |
| $59: 6,66: 7,$ | 211:1, 211:3 | $181: 5,182: 1,$ | $173: 7,173: 13,$ |
| $66: 11, \quad 84: 17$ | enforcement | $199: 2,199: 17,$ | $177: 8$ |
| $92: 17, \quad 98: 16,$ | $60: 16$ | $217: 7,259: 5$ | establishes |
| $115: 20,144: 16,$ | engineer | $259: 13,259: 14$ | 232:3 |
| 148:11, 160:17, | 8:11, 8:17, | environment | estate |
| 185:7, 217:14, | 53:13, 69:14, | 63:4, 66:19, | 26:7 |
| 224:6, 235:13, | 105:9 | 177:10, 183:18, | estates |
| 239:22, 251:19, | engineering | 238:19 | 29:2 |
| 256:12, 257:17, | 69:11, 105:12, | environmental | etc |
| 261:13, 273:15, | 106:9, 256:8 | 8:17, 63:8, | $47: 20$ |
| 275:12, 277:5 | engineers | 71:1, 182:21, | eutrophication |
| elsewhere | 64:15, 116:8 | 184:9, 186:3, | $238: 12$ |
| 245:15 | enhanced | 192:5, 192:6, | evaluate |
| elton | 34:19, 186:2, | $195: 10,196: 22,$ | 106:20, 116:6, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 68: 20 \\ & \text { email } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 203: 7, \quad 209: 5, \\ & 217: 20, \quad 259: 10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 197: 18, & 198: 6, \\ 210: 11, & 260: 1, \end{array}$ | 150:15, 174:16 |
| 3:8, 38:8, | enjoyed enjer | $265: 2,267: 5$ | evaluated 111:17, 192:17 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 53: 9, \quad 158: 19, \\ & 159: 20.161: 7 \end{aligned}$ | $192: 14$ | $271: 10$ | evaluating |
| $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & 159: 20,161: 7 \\ & 161: 21 \end{aligned}\right.$ | enough $16: 5,30: 3 .$ | equal $133: 3,133: 6,$ | $117: 14,227: 8$ |
| emailed | $\begin{aligned} & 16: 5, \quad 30: 3, \\ & 143: 11, \quad 190: 14, \end{aligned}$ | $151: 11, \quad 237: 15$ | evaluation ${ }^{\text {129:13, 147:12, }}$ |
| 38:16 | 244:21, 249:15 | equally | $227: 9,228: 13$ |
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| 147:10, 151:14, | $\begin{array}{ll} 214: 6, & 271: 5 \\ 21, \end{array}$ | $74: 1, \quad 172: 6,$ | impervious |
| 153:14, 183:5, | howard | $245: 12, \quad 245: 20$ | 184:21, 238:10, |
| 183:13, 237:5, | $62: 10$ | illustrating | $244: 7,244: 19,$ |
| 239:3, 259:16, | however | $209: 4$ | 267:21, 268:2, |
| 259:20, 260:10 | $3: 2,73: 14,$ | im | 269:6, 269:9, |
| household | $\begin{aligned} & 3: 2,73: 14, \\ & 93: 14,232: 5 . \end{aligned}$ | $250: 21$ | 269:10, 269:13, |
| 151:12 | $\begin{aligned} & 93: 14, ~ 232: 5, \\ & 257 \cdot 5 \end{aligned}$ |  | 269:15, 270:9, |
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| important | 55:9, 111:16, | inferred | integral |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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| 165:17, 184:14, | individual | installing | 139:3, 139:8, |
| $197: 1, \quad 200: 16$ | 24:16, 24:20, | 140:15 | 141:17, 201:8, |
| includes | 25:10, 95:10, | instance | 265:12 |
| 5:12, 152:19, | 193:5, 236:2, | 209:8, 226:17, | introduce |
| 214:7, 214:8, | 236:13 | 252:8 | 5:2, 7:13 |
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| including | 53:3 | 121:6, 201:18, | 172:4 |
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|  | 215:17 |  | 55:13 |
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| invited | jamie | 100:6, 154:18, | 17:15, 35:18, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 38:9, 38:11 | 8:5 | 185:15, 249:16, | 41:14, 56:13, |
| involved | jammed | 272:5 | 56:18, 58:15, |
| 31:19, 63:8, | 143:4 | keeping | 59:19, 61:9, |
| 116:10, 126:5, | jeopardized | 24:6 | 64:2, 69:11, |
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| 58:14, 65:12, | 7:19, 27:17, | 156:8 | 181:22, 198:15, |
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| 3:2, 14:4, | $63: 11$ | known | 182:4 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 66:20, 276:16, } \\ & 278: 17 \end{aligned}$ | jumps | 54:22, 236:13 | lane |
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|  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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|  | ```215:1, 215:9, 215:11, 215:21, 216:10, 247:21 match 135:21, 239:2, 254:9, 262:2 materials 155:8 math 200:22 matter 5:10, 7:5, 7:11, 11:13, 13:7, 13:8, 72:7, 111:7, 161:6, 230:1, 251:13, 277:19 matters 24:13, 24:18, 26:7, 59:15, 72:9, 224:19 maurene 2:3, 159:16 max 145:20 maximum 79:4, 79:8, 85:2, 270:18 maybe 14:1, 43:19, 49:7, 58:1, 65:12, 136:22, 148:3, 156:10, 161:2, 161:10, 256:5 mbss 267:15, 268:22 mclean 28:11 mean 11:19, 12:15, 15:12, 16:6, 23:1, 25:9, 29:8, 44:5, 58:2, 67:9, 81:16, 91:8, 92:7, 92:17, 102:19, 115:21,``` |  | $16: 16, \quad 38: 4$, $38: 6, \quad 38: 8$, $44: 18, \quad 44: 20$, $45: 1, \quad 66: 22$, $101: 11, \quad 101: 16$, $104: 5, \quad 154: 16$, $205: 19, \quad 206: 10$, $206: 18, \quad 206: 21$, $210: 14, \quad 234: 3$ meetings $38: 2$ meets $18: 17, \quad 138: 5$, $174: 16, \quad 201: 1$, $207: 17, \quad 222: 4$ members $12: 22, \quad 13: 1$, $55: 13$ membership $13: 20$ memo $6: 11, \quad 6: 19$ memorandum $5: 16, \quad 5: 21$, $6: 4, \quad 38: 21$, $39: 2, \quad 71: 20$, $72: 1, \quad 107: 6$, $107: 11, \quad 166: 17$, $166: 22, \quad 188: 18$, $191: 18, \quad 191: 19$, $202: 3, \quad 212: 7$ memory $191: 16, \quad 248: 9$, $248: 18$ mention $255: 20$ mentioned $53: 8, \quad 71: 16$, $93: 2, \quad 129: 3$, $198: 21, \quad 242: 12$, $245: 7$ mentioning $185: 7, \quad 203: 13$ merely $172: 12$ met $11: 6, \quad 11: 9$, $11: 10, \quad 12: 1$,, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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|  | ```216:16 multiple 35:7, 120:1, 144:21 multiply 238:14 must 3:9, 161:9, 202:5, 223:14, 225:9 mute 3:5, 3:16, 101:9 muted 100:6, 160:12 myself 52:17, 101:10, 103:19, 114:18, 117:11``` N <br> naaden $1: 22,281: 2$ $281: 17$ <br> name $\begin{aligned} & 2: 19, \quad 3: 13, \\ & 3: 18, \quad 19: 8, \\ & 19: 9, \quad 24: 22, \\ & 25: 2, \quad 25: 15, \\ & 25: 19, \quad 28: 9, \\ & 51: 11, \quad 53: 7, \\ & 62: 8, \quad 68: 17, \\ & 68: 19, \quad 101: 2, \\ & 104: 19, \quad 104: 20, \\ & 108: 19, \quad 163: 15, \\ & 163: 17, \quad 204: 16 \\ & \text { namely } \\ & 194: 7 \\ & \text { narrow } \\ & 90: 9, \quad 90: 17 \\ & \text { national } \\ & 5: 17, \quad 135: 21, \\ & 136: 17 \\ & \text { natural } \\ & 75: 14, \quad 172: 4, \\ & 177: 10, \quad 182: 20, \\ & 184: 3, \quad 192: 21, \\ & 196: 16, \quad 196: 19, \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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| ```neighborhood's 177:17 neighborhoods 178:9 neighbors 33:1, 38:10, 51:8, 51:22, 52:4, 52:7, 52:14, 208:22, 265:21 neither 281:5 nelson's 103:16, 105:17, 167:15, 187:5 nervous 25:6 net 94:15, 226:4, 226:6, 226:19, 268:19 network 66:21, 116:7, 119:21, 122:11, 122:13, 122:15, 210:5, 210:8, 210:13 networks 178:18 never 14:13, 46:22, 51:7, 52:4, 52:6, 103:19, 106:6, 129:14, 129:16, 140:13, 140:22, 183:1, 183:9, 183:10, 221:5, 235:18, 239:2, 249:13, 250:1 new 32:9, 59:1, 70:8, 99:20, 174:22, 178:10, 185:3, 190:6, 216:13, 258:19, 262:2, 271:16, 271:18, 272:4,``` |  | ```nine 94:11, 274:10 ninety-five 20:3 nitro 238:4 nitrogen 238:4, 238:8 nobody \(16: 20,47: 12\) non 122: 6 non-title 239:9 none 51:21, 140:1, 165:2 nonprofits 16:11 nonstop 268:5 nontitle 196:1 noon 101:17 normally 90:4 north 88:3, 107:19, 107:22, 168:8, 179:16, 179:17, 180:20, 242:1, 261:2 north-south 113:5, 114:15, 119:20, 141:13 northeast 74:9, 88:7, 261:2 northern 167:17, 167:22, 180:9, 186:11, 195:12, 243:5 northwest 104:21, 181:10, 193:10, 210:14 northwestern 210:8``` | ```nos 1:15 notably 5:11, 5:20 note 7:3, 18:11, 29:13, 99:4, 117:11, 196:15, 279:21 notes 213:14, 268:16 nothing 19:4, 24:15, 26:2, 28:5, 68:12, 104:15, 163:12, 264:6, 273:22 notice 75:13 notices 276:13, 276:22 notification 52:10 noting 176:5 notwithstanding 185:14 november 38:7, 38:15, 44:15, 46:10, 47:1 nri 95:8, 194:22 number 9:11, 9:12, 16:17, 18:13, 20:11, 31:17, 38:8, 41:5, 45:1, 45:21, 45:22, 53:9, 55:15, 58:14, 77:11, 79:8, 85:12, 85:21, 86:18, 87:19, 90:11, 91:14, 93:4, 93:10, 93:15, 94:1, 95:3, 95:10,``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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| ```95:12, 100:18, 108:15, 108:17, 121:3, 122:5, 140:10, 153:11, 177:5, 178:5, 178:6, 182:19, 182:21, 187:8, 201:5, 201:13, 201:17, 201:18, 204:18, 205:15, 215:20, 216:4, 217:18, 228:7, 236:1, 236:5, 236:13, 248:13, 271:7 numbers 50:1, 136:3, 136:12, 136:13, 147:5, 236:10, 236:13 numerical 201:4 nutrients 184:12, 238:3, 238:17, 239:16 o'clock 133:15, 159:16, 159:17, 159:20 oak 179:17 oak-something 58:9 oakcrest 58:9 oakstone 37:22, 38:3, 58:10, 58:11, 64:19, 179:17 oakstone's 261:1 oakview 180:20 oath 208:12, 257:12 ob 42:5``` | ```object 43:1, 43:2, 45:8, 45:19, 67:3, 78:1, 82:3, 264:14 objecting 97:20 objection 29:13, 31:4, 40:20, 42:5, 65:11, 72:3, 72:5, 81:7, 82:4, 83:2, 84:4, 105:20, 155:19 objections 165:1 objects 72:10 obligation 15:13 observation 174:12 obtained 270:18 obtaining 270:11 obviously 137:7 occasions 164:10, 228:7 occupants 175:13 occupy 271:8 occur 148:10 occurred 125:14 occurring 7:12 ocean 19:11 october 5:8, 5:16, 5:21, 6:4, 6:10, 6:19, 38:20, 71:19, 107:5,``` | ```107:10, 108:7, 108:22, 119:9, 119:10, 120:6, 166:16, 166:21, 212:8 odd 213:3 of-ways 114:17 offense 67:10, 67:13 offered 20:12 offhand 76:3, 88:19 office 9:4, 55:5, 105:1, 152:20, 234:4 officer 16:15 offices 3:19 official 16:13, 16:18, 17:2, 17:9, 182:6 offsets 113:13, 138:6 offsite 139:3 often 72:10 oh 18:6, 19:14, 27:22, 41:22, 42:6, 44:19, 49:2, 50:2, 51:2, 54:2, 56:3, 57:12, 61:19, 63:13, 75:10, 77:18, 83:18, 95:4, 96:16, 101:14, 115:14, 126:7, 130:15, 135:2, 158:3, 159:3, 160:22, 162:17,``` |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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| onsite | opposing | 16:16, 16:19, | 266:13, 267:11, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 34:22, 35:3, | 103:20 | 16:22, 17:6 | 267:20, 268:9, |
| 61:3, 74:4, | opposite | ori | 275:19, 277:11, |
| 74:5, 211:19, | 56:17 | 111:2 | 277:20, 278:13 |
| 212:13 | opposition | orientation | others |
| open | 11:11 | 186:13, 202:19, | 52:4, 54:20, |
| 49:10, 75:20, | option | 203:6, 218:1 | 55:20, 192:14, |
| 76:5, 87:1, | 27:2, 33:1, | oriented | 234:7 |
| 103:19, 155:6, | 175:2 | 202:21 | otherwise |
| 155:7, 155:12 | options | original | 120:2, 234:9, |
| opening | 175:9 | 110:15, 212:9, | 281:7 |
| 10:4 | order | 231:17 | ourselves |
| operations | 6:20, 66:4, | originally | 112:20 |
| 150:21 | 70:21, 80:22, | 14:19, 108:22, | out |
| opine | 82:12, 83:10, | 111:2 | 18:19, 23:13, |
| 247:19 | 101:21, 118:5, | other | 38:9, 40:10, |
| opined | 122:19, 137:13, | 6:5, 8:22, 9:1, | 53:10, 57:1, |
| 191:13 | 180:13 | 9:3, 13:8, | 101:20, 113:21, |
| opining | ordinan | 14:13, 16:11, | 130:5, 131:19, |
| 251:16 | 189:15 | 38:13, 41:6, | 132:9, 132:10, |
| opinion | ordinance | 43:13, 44:10, | 132:12, 132:14, |
| 16:1, 50:9, | 4:11, 4:12, | 44:12, 53:1, | 135:20, 135:22, |
| 123:9, 123:17, | 4:14, 4:17, | 53:7, 55:13, | 137:16, 138:12, |
| 123:22, 126:20, | 74:13, 123:11, | 56:22, 58:18, | 139:15, 139:20, |
| 135:3, 179:1, | 169:2, 169:4, | 61:1, 70:13, | 141:5, 141:6, |
| 179:4, 182:10, | 169:6, 169:10, | 70:17, 79:16, | 141:14, 145:11, |
| 182:14, 186:5, | 169:12, 170:1, | 79:18, 90:20, | 146:20, 147:11, |
| 186:9, 188:5, | 170:13, 171:1, | 91:2, 91:14, | 149:18, 151:14, |
| 188:19, 198:4, | 171:13, 172:2, | 91:20, 95:21, | 153:6, 157:13, |
| 199:22, 201:2, | 172:8, 172:11, | 97:4, 116:11, | 158:12, 178:6, |
| 202:9, 206:16, | 172:20, 188:10, | 116:20, 117:2, | 185:3, 187:13, |
| 206:17, 213:11, | 189:4, 189:5, | 118:17, 126:4, | 191:15, 199:14, |
| 246:13, 252:19 | 190:22, 202:8, | 130:9, 141:19, | 210:7, 220:2, |
| opportunities | 213:14, 214:10, | 149:16, 153:4, | 221:5, 228:10, |
| 24:8, 26:19, | 215:2, 226:8, | 154:16, 154:22, | 231:14, 231:22, |
| 35:7, 174:22, | 226:18, 255:15 | 158:17, 163:7, | 238:5, 238:19, |
| 178:11, 178:19 | ordinances | 167:3, 172:14, | 238:22, 242:6, |
| opportunity | 123:6, 142:5, | 178:16, 181:8, | 246:13, 248:19, |
| 59:21, 60:4, | 189:7, 189:10, | 192:16, 192:19, | 260:1, 276:13, |
| 98:2, $264: 16$ | 189:14, 189:15 | 192:21, 196:11, | 276:22, 278:5 |
| oppose | ordinary | 201:9, 206:13, | outbound |
| 17:1 | 69:12 | 208:22, 224:10, | 132:9, 138:10, |
| opposed | org | 225:1, 226:16, | 140:12 |
| 11:3, 18:14, | 152:2 | 239:16, 246:3, | outbuildings |
| 51:3, 56:6, | organisms | 246:9, 255:3, | 183:4, 237:7 |
| 156:14, 202:22, | 267:12 | 259:16, 261:9, | outcome |
| 243:19, $246: 20$, | organization | $\begin{aligned} & 263: 11, \\ & 265: 18, \end{aligned} 263: 19,$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} 281: 7 \\ \text { outdoor } \end{array}$ |
| 251:19, 258:19 | 16:14, 16:15, | 265:18, 266:4, | $35: 12, \quad 205: 20$ |
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| ```68:11, 104:14, 163:11, 264:5, 273:21 penalty 281:3 pending 72:6 people 3:7, 9:3, 14:13, 16:10, 16:22, 17:6, 17:7, 18:13, 25:17, 38:17, 54:19, 89:18, 99:20, 133:11, 133:12, 134:12, 134:14, 134:16, 135:8, 135:11, 136:4, 136:5, 136:9, 153:14, 157:16, 160:9, 189:21, 190:1, 209:19, 248:1, 250:12, 251:16 people's 2:14, 14:18, 18:12, 20:6, 36:1, 60:7, 71:8, 72:19, 105:18, 219:1, 279:6 percent 34:12, 94:17, 94:22, 95:1, 122:6, 132:19, 143:9, 146:22, 147:2, 151:11, 237:1, 267:19, 267:20, 268:1, 268:3, 268:5, 268:7, 268:8, 268:21, 269:4, 269:6, 269:14 percentage 127:21, 151:11, 151:18, 151:22 perfect 108:2``` | perform <br> 37:19, 243:3 <br> perhaps <br> 125:1, 221:15 <br> perimeter <br> 210:11 <br> perimeters <br> 186:12 <br> period <br> 134:2, 134:6, <br> 136:2, 248:6 <br> periods <br> 150:15 <br> perjury <br> 19:3, 28:4, <br> 68:11, 104:14, <br> 163:11, 264:5, <br> 273:21, 281:3 <br> permanent <br> 197:16, 197:21 <br> permeability <br> 270:15 <br> permeable <br> 64:2, 184:6, <br> 184:7, 242:3, <br> 242:17, 270:14, <br> 270:17, 270:20 <br> permissible <br> 187:11 <br> permit $2: 6, \quad 170: 1$ $170: 3$ <br> permits $170: 4$ <br> permitted $7: 6, \quad 170: 8$ $190: 21,190: 22$ <br> permitting $60: 15$ <br> person $\begin{aligned} & 3: 10, \quad 44: 21, \\ & 52: 8, \quad 53: 11, \\ & 131: 13, \quad 160: 11, \\ & 161: 6, \quad 236: 18, \\ & 278: 18 \end{aligned}$ <br> personal <br> 274:12 <br> perspective <br> 119:22, 143:4, | 143:5, 251:21 <br> pertaining <br> 106:21 <br> pervious <br> 268:7 <br> petitioned <br> 144:9 <br> pg <br> 152:2 <br> pghelpzone <br> 152:2 <br> ph <br> 3:11, 3:12, <br> 7:17, 19:10, <br> 25:2, 48:7, <br> 62:11, 92:11, <br> 103:3, 108:13, <br> 112:1, 158:1, <br> 160:13, 161:1, <br> 161:2, 162:7, <br> 191:20, 204:17, <br> 221:16, 264:10 <br> phase <br> 171:4 <br> phone <br> 38:8, 52:14, <br> 53:9, 100:11 <br> phosphorus <br> 238:5, 238:8 <br> phrase <br> 226:1 <br> physical <br> 8:20, 172:13 <br> physically <br> 137:16, 138:4 <br> pick <br> 116:3, 160:7, <br> 249:18 <br> picnic <br> 210:19 <br> picnics <br> 206:14 <br> pine <br> 51:5, 51:9, <br> 51:10, 51:13, <br> 51:15, 51:18, <br> 51:19, 51:21, <br> 52:8, 52:16, |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { planted } \\ & 94: 14, \quad 184: 11, \\ & 201: 22, \quad 268: 18 \\ & \text { planting } \\ & 199: 19 \\ & \text { plants } \\ & 184: 10, \quad 238: 1, \\ & 238: 17, \quad 238: 22, \\ & 239: 11 \\ & \text { plat } \\ & 228: 17, \quad 262: 22 \\ & \text { platted } \\ & 188: 1, \quad 188: 2 \\ & \text { play } \\ & 247: 15 \\ & \text { plaza } \\ & 35: 10, \quad 206: 12, \\ & 206: 13, \quad 206: 18 \\ & \text { please } \\ & 19: 7, \quad 28: 8, \\ & 32: 3, \quad 53: 16, \\ & 55: 13, \quad 57: 6, \\ & 68: 17, \quad 87: 16, \\ & 92: 8, \quad 108: 20, \\ & 112: 16, \quad 120: 3, \\ & 163: 14, \quad 195: 9, \\ & 203: 21, \quad 254: 13 \\ & \text { pleased } \\ & 3: 19 \\ & \text { pleasure } \\ & 68: 2 \\ & \text { plebiscite } \\ & 18: 15 \\ & \text { plus } \\ & 40: 9, \quad 132: 21, \\ & 140: 9, \quad 141: 19, \\ & 265: 18 \\ & \text { pma } \\ & 192: 3, \quad 195: 19, \\ & 195: 20, \quad 196: 3, \\ & 196: 6, \quad 196: 10, \\ & 197: 11 \\ & \text { point } \\ & 29: 12, \quad 33: 12, \\ & 33: 17, \quad 34: 21, \\ & 39: 7, \quad 45: 5, \\ & 45: 6, \quad 65: 10, \\ & 67: 4, \quad 77: 1, \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 87:22, 104:1, 105:16, 106:2, 108:10, 111:14, 112:17, 116:13, <br> 117:11, 121:22, <br> 132:18, 133:6, <br> 136:21, 141:18, <br> 143:11, 146:9, <br> 146:12, 161:20, <br> 187:9, 207:21, <br> 220:16, 228:15, <br> 230:16, 231:5, <br> 244:12, 247:20, <br> 249:13, 269:1, <br> 276:17, 277:10 <br> pointiness <br> 229:18 <br> points <br> 34:17, 120:1, 143:10 <br> poles <br> 201:7 <br> policies <br> 176:20 <br> policy <br> 215:22, 216:4, <br> 216:7, 216:11 <br> pollutants <br> 239:16 <br> pollution <br> 53:4, 55:17, <br> 267:12, 267:13 <br> pools <br> 238:19, 239:5 <br> pop <br> 22:13 <br> population <br> 32:17, 67:2, <br> 174:21, 178:5, <br> 248:6, 248:7 <br> porches <br> 47:20 <br> port <br> 192:1 <br> portion <br> 192:1, 219:18 <br> portions <br> 176:11, 192:11, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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| 271:7, 271:17, | pre-application | 222:14, 223:1, | presumptions |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 272:6 | 38:15 | 223:12, 224:4, | 190:5 |
| position | precise | 224:21, 225:2, | pretty |
| 11:13, 14:5, | 176:9 | 225:19, 226:7, | 48:3, 103:19, |
| 14:14, 15:17, | predate | 227:4, 230:8, | 123:2, 128:2, |
| 16:12, 16:13, | 192:22 | 233:14, 249:14, | 128:6, 130:22, |
| 16:19, 17:2, | predominant | 249:17, 256:22 | 132:21, 139:1, |
| 17:9, 17:16, | 134:15, 180:3 | presence | 151:2, 188:4, |
| 17:20, 18:12, | prefer | 47:12 | 206:15, 224:19, |
| 28:15, 69:4, | 20:10, 59:14 | present | 224:20, 263:10, |
| 105:6, 164:2, | preferably | 25:8, 129:21, | 265:1, 275:4 |
| 263:21 | 161:5 | 254:11 | previous |
| possibility | preference | presented | 28:19 |
| 151:16, 278:5 | 156:13, 156:17, | 130:22, 271:9 | previously |
| possible | 156:18 | presently | 4:10, 71:15, |
| 80:20, 82:10, | preliminary | 236:17, 271:8 | 105:11, 204:8, |
| 154:16, 195:3, | 111:19, 113:16, | presents | $205: 3, \quad 230: 14,$ |
| 198:7, 198:8 | 116:14, 116:16, | $178: 11$ | $239: 21$ |
| possibly | 116:18, 117:16, | preservation | primarily |
| 56:21, 165:18 | 119:2, 119:3, | 198:5 | 216:21, 253:19 |
| post-construction | 119:5, 137:3, | preserve | primary |
| 61:12 | 138:4, 146:11, | 70:21, 71:15, | 65:1, 195:20, |
| post-dedication | 148:7, 149:20, | 80:22, 82:13, | 271:12 |
| 223:21 | 171:8, 221:1, | 83:5, 83:10, | prince |
| post-development | 262:10, 262:22 | 83:16, 182:20, | 1:2, 1:10, |
| 61:8 | prepare | 184:12, 191:7 | 28:19, 28:22, |
| potential | 70:12, 70:16, | preserved | 32:10, 32:16, |
| 161:22 | 89:9, 89:13, | 77:7, 77:11, | 35:17, 41:15, |
| potit | 90:20, 108:6, | 77:12, 180:10, | 42:10, 60:16, |
| 108:13, 108:19, | 115:21, 117:22, | 180:13, 180:16, | 74:11, 75:7, |
| 110:6, 161:7, | 165:12 | 196:9, 198:1, | 76:13, 77:19, |
| 161:11, 162:7, | prepared | 203:16, 210:11, | 94:11, 105:13, |
| 162:9 | 8:6, 8:14, | 210:13 | 111:14, 135:20, |
| power | 70:14, 89:18, | preserved-regula- | 136:22, 152:17, |
| 23:3, 23:9, | 89:20, 118:1, | ted | 164:8, 198:15, |
| 23:21, 24:1, | 137:13, 264:9 | 203:6 | 268:15 |
| 24:11, 24:13, | preparing | preserving | principally |
| 24:17, 24:19, | 137:1 | 271:12 | 181:4, 238:5 |
| 201:7 | prerogative | president | prior |
| pr | 156:20 | 15:11, 28:17, | 4:11, 4:12, |
| 169:22 | prescript | 30:13, 105:9 | 4:16, 4:19, |
| practice | 249:14 | presumed | 46:6, 61:11, |
| 15:3, 75:17, | prescriptive | 203:14, 217:18, | $76: 6, \quad 123: 5,$ |
| $167: 8,167: 11$, $220: 19$ | 88:1, 88:9, | 251:18 | $\begin{aligned} & 123: 11, \quad 146: 3, \\ & 146: 7, \quad 147: 13, \end{aligned}$ |
| pre | 218:19, 220:9, | $221: 21$ | 169:2, 169:4, |
| $32: 12$ | $221: 12,221: 17,$ | presumption | $\begin{aligned} & 169: 5, \quad 169: 9, \\ & 169: 22, \quad 170: 12, \end{aligned}$ |
| pre | 222:4, 222:7, | $246: 17$ | 169:22, 170:12, |
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| $172: 2, \quad 172: 20$, $202: 8, \quad 244: 1$ privacy $171: 11$ private $113: 9, \quad 114: 10$, $200: 10, \quad 210: 7$, $210: 9, \quad 231: 13$ pro $34: 9, \quad 79: 7$, $170: 10$ probably $14: 8, \quad 15: 22$, $22: 13, \quad 22: 14$, $23: 2, \quad 56: 20$, $64: 16, \quad 104: 6$, $107: 21, \quad 155: 1$, $195: 17, \quad 212: 17$, $223: 17, \quad 232: 14$, $243: 7, \quad 251: 5$, $257: 1, \quad 263: 1$ problem $49: 12, \quad 56: 3$, $56: 4, \quad 58: 18$, $59: 1, \quad 130: 2$, $223: 2, \quad 272: 22$, $276: 12$ problematic $233: 13, \quad 233: 20$ problems $119: 17, \quad 241: 11$ proceed $22: 22, \quad 109: 18$, $110: 4, \quad 110: 9$, $171: 7, \quad 203: 21$, $226: 11$ proceeded $256: 5$ proceeding $112: 5, \quad 162: 1$ proceeds $10: 2$ process $32: 4, \quad 48: 2$, $70: 1, \quad 111: 15$, $119: 2, \quad 121: 3$, $129: 4, \quad 131: 1$, $150: 15, \quad 150: 21$, | 171:5, 171:7, 227:10, 228:18, 230:2, 231:6, 236:4 <br> processes $7: 9, \quad 221: 4$ <br> produce <br> 5:2 <br> product <br> 41:8, 43:6 <br> professional <br> 142:15, 142:19, 164:14 <br> proffer $12: 18,42: 8$ $45: 10, \quad 92: 7$ <br> progress <br> 160:5 <br> prohibit <br> 252:11 <br> project <br> 26:21, 30:12, <br> 38:12, 43:18, <br> 47:10, 52:10, <br> 52:18, 54:15, <br> 69:7, 111:21, <br> 113:3, 128:8, <br> 144:10, 148:20, <br> 185:17, 199:2, <br> 239:20, 246:14, <br> 278:7 <br> projects <br> 28:21, 29:1, <br> 40:6, 41:6, <br> 41:7, 42:11, <br> 69:22, 116:14, <br> 116:15, 116:20, <br> 247:7 <br> promote <br> 171:10 <br> proper <br> 15:22, 241:21, <br> 244:3 <br> properly <br> 125:4 <br> properties <br> 61:2, 123:19, <br> 130:9, 186:7, |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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| ```remove 34:21, 73:12, 74:16, 74:20, 75:2, 75:6, 75:11, 78:11, 80:1, 83:16, 193:15 removed 77:15, 78:15, 80:12, 93:5, 93:10, 94:2, 94:14, 124:12, 235:16, 268:18 removing 93:7 render 17:16 rendered 13:5 repair 217:4 repeat 82:1 rephrase 242:10, 254:14 replicate 182:22, 184:3 report 5:14, 6:2, 6:5, 6:14, 6:17, 6:18, 6:21, 38:19, 39:1, 50:1, 50:15, 72:1, 72:8, 72:11, 73:22, 78:21, 78:22, 83:20, 85:1, 88:22, 90:7, 94:12, 95:14, 96:17, 97:14, 97:21, 107:4, 107:9, 107:17, 120:18, 121:9, 121:11, 124:12, 128:11, 165:13, 165:17, 166:1, 166:3, 166:15, 166:20, 170:16,``` |  |  | ```131:10, 138:3, 141:20, 171:16, 172:1, 172:9, 172:10, 172:19, 175:12, 183:18, 186:21, 201:6, 201:13, 245:13, 270:5 requires 4:20, 83:21, 188:10, 204:6, 211:7, 217:22, 236:4, 236:22, 268:1 requiring 271:16 research 65:19, 98:4, 153:19, 265:6 reserve 59:11 reserved 228:7 reside 19:10 resident 145:19, 183:3, 206:5, 265:9 residential 32:7, 32:14, 119:18, 120:5, 122:3, 152:20, 152:21, 153:1, 177:2, 203:4, 213:12, 214:19, 216:22, 217:2 residents 27:1, 35:8, 37:15, 38:13, 66:22, 175:2, 175:9, 182:12, 187:22, 207:15, 265:3, 265:9, 268:11 resolution 196:5 resources 75:14, 172:4,``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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| ```192:21 respect 82:7, 159:18, 165:16, 192:8 respectfully 57:14, 112:12, 165:16 respective 192:8 respond 18:2, 276:8 responding 255:20 response 11:11, 47:22, 251:6, 255:21 responsibility 118:18, 144:11, 149:8, 149:19, 207:13 rest 37:16, 66:21, 104:4, 205:14, 205:16 restoration 198:5 restore 197:15 restrict 224:13 restricted 271:17, 272:5 restriction 36:2, 224:20 restrictions 35:14, 35:16, 211:1, 211:6 restroom 177:21 resubmit 273:7 result 89:7, 92:6, 194:2, 199:11, 266:7 results 196:2 resume 105:17, 164:12``` | ```retained 69:16, 106:19 retention 191:21, 192:7, 270:3 retirement 2:6, 4:1, 7:6, 7:18, 8:22, 9:2, 31:21, 32:1, 32:5, 32:8, 37:2, 39:16, 42:21, 66:16, 80:18, 80:21, 91:18, 106:22, 113:7, 122:10, 135:7, 135:14, 135:16, 136:14, 169:19, 170:2, 170:11, 171:17, 173:20, 174:13, 187:2, 202:5, 203:15, 205:9, 206:4, 250:22, 252:7, 252:20 retirement-age 174:17, 202:16, 202:22, 204:7 retirement-aged 43:7, 43:12, 43:22 review 5:18, 5:20, 6:3, 7:9, 20:8, 38:20, 71:19, 86:17, 107:10, 110:20, 111:15, 120:9, 151:1, 166:16, 166:21, 171:5, 171:7, 172:15, 172:21, 221:1, 227:10, 236:4 review's 6:10, 6:16, 6:18 reviewed 39:2, 70:20, 71:17, 151:1,``` | ```168:17, 169:3, 169:5, 172:4, 176:13, 188:13, 196:21, 251:12 reviewing 231:9 reviews 193:6 revised 47:3, 50:16, 70:19, 83:9, 97:11, 108:8, 108:18, 119:11, 120:7, 124:12, 212:8, 270:5 revising 262:1 revision 191:6 revisions 5:22, 6:4, 6:12, 9:16, 70:16, 71:5, 71:14, 261:22 rezoning 7:4, 7:5, 7:10, 7:12 richard 98:4 richmond 161:2, 161:12, 161:15 ridings 29:2 right-of 125:6, 222:2 right-of-way 86:22, 88:9, 181:7, 220:17, 223:12, 230:8 rights 148:6, 192:14, 220:11 rises 56:16 river 245:19 road-lake 265:13``` | ```road-lanham 265:12 road-springfield 265:14 roads 108:1, 119:15, 131:17, 140:8, 148:8, 226:15, 231:13 roadway 199:4, 224:3, 225:10, 231:12 roadways 181:14, 220:3, 233:6 rock 197:21 role 60:15, 69:20 roofline 34:19 roofs 237:6, 237:7, 277:22 room 34:4, 37:7 rooms 34:3 root 192:8 roots 238:1 roughly 144:21, 168:10, 179:13, 196:7, 210:16, 220:6 roundabouts 149:15 rr 4:10, 4:13, 4:16, 4:19, 32:8, 43:16, 111:5, 113:17, 120:12, 121:18, 169:11, 169:15, 170:4, 179:18, 246:15, 247:6, 252:22, 253:16,``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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| 253:19 | 120:8, 121:7, | 17:5, 17:13, | 212:12, 213:12, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| rt | 147:6, 157:21, | 24:3, 25:17, | 214:10, 226:9, |
| 214:14 | 189:13, 189:14, | 29:20, 43:19, | 226:10, 233:3, |
| rule | 190:17, 201:3, | 48:14, 53:22, | 241:18, 247:21, |
| 30:1, 31:2, | 209:4, 218:4, | 111:4, 115:19, | 262:17 |
| 200:2, 233:10 | 220:10, 242:11, | 132:14, 133:15, | scaled |
| rules | 243:15, 246:6, | 133:22, 136:5, | 278:8 |
| 14:17, 60:8 | 246:18, 252:1, | 139:13, 148:4, | scattered |
| running | 253:18, 253:21, | 148:12, 154:6, | 210:20 |
| 57:19 | 254:4, 254:19 | 155:13, 189:9, | schedule |
| runoff | sake | 189:12, 189:20, | 200:15 |
| 56:20, 57:4, | 225:2, 225:5, | 192:4, 202:22, | scheduled |
| 58:7, 183:13, | 225:18 | $203: 20,206: 20$ | 130:9 |
| 183:20, 184:12, | same | 207:4, 217:1, | schools |
| 184:21, 185:12, | 22:14, 24:18, | 219:22, 221:19, | 32:19 |
| 236:15, 236:16, | 43:14, 45:1, | 222:14, 222:17, | schumer |
| 237:10, 238:3, | 45:14, 45:15, | 222:19, 225:1, | 68:5 |
| 244:9, 244:20, | 45:21, 45:22, | 226:9, 226:10, | scoot |
| 271:18, 272:7, | 61:9, 61:13, | 227:7, 229:18, | 130:5 |
| 274:11 | 80:11, 84:17, | 230:12, 235:22, | scope |
| runs | 87:3, 87:7, | 240:14, 241:6, | 59:4, 59:16, |
| 64:17, 183:8, | 87:8, 107:17, | 244:19, 244:21, | 258:16 |
| 197:10 | 116:22, 127:3, | 244:22, 250:3, | scoping |
| rural | $\begin{array}{lr} 133: 5, & 186: 19, \\ 192 \cdot 17 r & 199 \cdot 10 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 250: 11, \quad 251: 14, \\ & 251: 17, \quad 252: 9, \end{aligned}$ | $121: 5$ |
| $142: 20$ rush | $\begin{aligned} & 192: 17, \quad 199: 10, \\ & 202: 1, \quad 206: 3, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 251: 17, & 252: 9, \\ 252: 12, & 253: 16, \end{array}$ | screen |
| rush $128 \cdot 3,128: 5$, | $\begin{aligned} & 202: 1, ~ 206: 3, \\ & 206: 5, \end{aligned}$ | $263: 22,275: 4,$ | 20:21, 71:13, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 128: 3, \quad 128: 5, \\ & 266: 11 \end{aligned}$ | 228:3, 251:19, | $276: 19, \quad 276: 20$ | $\begin{aligned} & 87: 16, \quad 100: 6, \\ & 160: 14 \end{aligned}$ |
| S | $\begin{array}{ll} 254: 18, & 276: 2, \\ 279: 16, & 279: 19 \end{array}$ | $279: 4$ <br> saying | screening |
| safe $66: 19,149: 18$ | sample | $83: 14,103: 4,$ | $\begin{aligned} & 180: 5 \\ & \text { scribbling } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 66: 19, \quad 149: 18, \\ & 197: 17 \end{aligned}$ | $200: 15$ | $112: 9, \quad 132: 2,$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Scribbling } \\ & 272: 1 \end{aligned}$ |
| safer | sampling | $\begin{aligned} & 133: 7, \quad 135: 10, \\ & 135: 11, \\ & 141: 9, \end{aligned}$ | scroll |
| 120:2 | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & 267: 8, \quad 267: 16, \\ & 268: 22 \end{aligned}\right.$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{ll} 135: 11, & 141: 9, \\ 157: 19, & 162: 9, \end{array}\right.$ | 110:6, 114:2 |
| safety | sanitary | 199:9, 209:12, | scrolling |
| 119:12, 119:21, | $88: 4$ | $214: 5,216: 9$ | $212: 3,212: 6$ |
| 123:15, 124:2, | satisfied | 228:12, 229:3, | sdrc $70: 20$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 182: 12, \quad 265: 20, \\ & 267: 1 \end{aligned}$ | 205:20 | 241:21, 244:17, | $\begin{aligned} & 70: 20 \\ & \text { se } \end{aligned}$ |
| said | satisfy | $\begin{aligned} & 254: 17,274: 9 \\ & \text { savs } \end{aligned}$ | $1: 15,5: 5,$ |
| 31:1, 37:5, | 79:2 | says | 97:11, 270:6, |
| 39:14, 40:18, | saw | $150$ | 281:19 |
| 41:11, 41:13, | $22: 2, ~ 22: 8, ~$ | $85: 1,88: 8$ | sea |
| 42:9, 42:16, | 50:1, 124:15 | $94: 12, \quad 97: 21$ | 184:6 |
| 44:6, 44:14, | say | $101: 2,131: 16,$ | sean |
| 45:12, 50:7, |  | 173:9, 173:11, | 2:19, 101:6 |
| 77:6, 78:21, | $\begin{aligned} & 11: 21, ~ 14: 4, \\ & 14: 5,14: 13, \end{aligned}$ | $173: 12,191: 21,$ | search |
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| ```seating 35:10, 206:13 sec 75:21 second 20:4, 22:9, 30:2, 34:18, 48:7, 61:20, 64:10, 65:7, 65:17, 94:4, 96:15, 110:19, 112:15, 161:19, 191:15, 195:5, 197:16, 203:2, 207:6, 214:9, 223:19, 229:13, 235:9, 236:14, 258:8, 258:9, 267:4, 269:20 secondly 185:12, 186:13, 201:21 seconds 128:5, 266:12 section 2:9, 4:16, 43:14, 75:21, 83:21, 200:9, 200:17, 202:8, 212:13, 232:15 sectional 176:10 sections 2:9 sector 176:8, 176:10 security 134:14, 135:7 sediment 57:18, 57:19, 57:22, 58:2, 60:19, 185:11, 185:14, 185:19, 185:20, 185:21, 186:3 sedimentation 185: 6 see 3:10, 20:21,``` | ```21:16, 21:19, 46:10, 48:17, 49:5, 49:8, 53:20, 55:14, 57:7, 66:11, 88:6, 100:21, 109:6, 114:3, 114:14, 114:18, 114:19, 115:4, 124:6, 136:9, 147:3, 151:6, 158:17, 159:19, 162:11, 165:5, 193:6, 195:15, 195:18, 196:4, 197:8, 210:17, 219:9, 227:15, 233:22, 258:7, 258:13, 263:20, 268:14, 280:1 seeing 99:4, 114:10, 114:16, 114:17 seek 40:2, 169:1 seeks 177:22, 178:8 seems 36:5, 115:9, 219:13 seen 40:7, 106:5, 129:14, 129:16, 142:16, 208:1 sell 40:11 selling 41:7 send 48:20, 100:10, 130:1, 162:6, 262:14, 275:20, 276:13 sending 11:13, 22:18, 162:10, 276:22 senior 26:15, 32:10,``` |  | 107:9, 166:15, 166:20, 241:14, 262:1, 268:15, 269:21 <br> septic <br> 239:15 <br> series <br> 210:21 <br> serious <br> 58:17 <br> serve <br> 43:11, 43:21, <br> 113:10, 202:16, <br> 216:13 <br> served <br> 113:8 <br> serves <br> 87:2, 108:1, <br> 115:3 <br> service <br> 197:13 <br> services <br> 69:11, 69:15, <br> 69:17 <br> serving <br> 87:7 <br> set <br> 30:11, 53:11, <br> 129:12, 188:9, <br> 190:5, 204:11, <br> 252:16 <br> several <br> 6:8, 9:15, <br> 35:2, 49:9, <br> 69:22, $90: 3$, <br> 120:9, 183:19, <br> 186:10, 209:19, <br> 210:5, 230:21, <br> 237:4 <br> severn <br> 62:14, 62:15, <br> 143:18, 147:9, <br> 148:15, 149:2, <br> 217:7, 265:12, <br> 265:15 <br> sewage <br> 197:13 <br> sewer $65: 3,88: 4,$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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|  | villa-style | W | 205:13, 205:15, |
|  | 169:21 | w3s3 |  |
|  |  | 262:21 |  |
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|  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

## Transcript of Hearing

Conducted on December 13, 2023

| ```246:14 whether 12:16, 16:21, 18:17, 42:17, 43:6, 43:7, 52:22, 57:2, 64:12, 72:7, 72:10, 81:9, 82:9, 91:11, 131:16, 143:11, 148:2, 148:5, 149:1, 149:10, 149:12, 149:13, 150:4, 150:7, 150:12, 150:16, 171:13, 171:14, 171:15, 174:16, 220:22, 231:12, 232:10, 247:16, 250:4, 258:3 whittle 48:13 whole 132:18, 214:3, 261:7 whomever 14:2 wi 189:19 wide 34:10, 137:20, 215:9, 216:15 wider 137:20, 138:9 wife 62:11 wildlife 74:12 willing 155:12 windows 34:19 wingate 2:20, 11:2, 11:9, 12:15, 12:21, 13:1, 15:9, 38:6, 44:15, 107:21,``` |  | 124:10, 124:22, <br> 126:11, 161:16, <br> 164:17, 209:16, <br> 248:12, 263:12, <br> 263:15, 263:19, <br> 273:13, 278:14 <br> witnesses <br> 5:1, 5:3, 9:5, <br> 10:7, 20:8, <br> 53:1, 99:22, <br> 156:21, 160:9, <br> 276:7 <br> wonder <br> 104:8 <br> wondered <br> 48:4 <br> wonderful <br> 10:17 <br> wondering <br> 45:14, 50:2, <br> 51:21, 52:3, <br> 54:4, 61:16, <br> 142:18, 160:17, <br> 251:1, 254:8 <br> wooded <br> 61:9, 61:13, <br> 237:11, 237:16, <br> 239:4 <br> woodland <br> 74:12, 93:14, 236:11 <br> woodlands <br> 95:10 <br> woods 183:9, 236:8, <br> 236:18 <br> word <br> 61:14, 111:8, <br> 140:7, 189:2, <br> 189:3, 190:6 <br> words $90: 20,194: 10,$ <br> 211:16, 225:1, <br> 246:9, 268:9 <br> work $\begin{aligned} & 27: 3, \quad 28: 19, \\ & 42: 10, \quad 104: 22, \\ & 116: 9, \quad 134: 4, \end{aligned}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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| 23:6, 102:7, | yourself | 169:4, 169:6, | 159:20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 155:14 | 25:11, 100:6 | 169:9, 169:12, | 1,800 |
| wrong | Z | 169:22, 170:13, | 49:21, 50:2 |
| 148:4, 250:11, | zhe | 172:8, 172:11, | 1.3 |
| 263:1 | 164:12, 278:19 | 172:20, 189:5, | 216:11 |
| wrote | zip | 189:7, 189:15, | 10 |
| 117:11 | 19:11 | 189:16, 189:18, | 36:1, 70:2, |
| wSsc | zone | 189:21, 202:8, | 74:5, 74:7, |
| 88:3, 88:8, | $4: 16,4: 19,$ | 213:14, 214:10, | 77:7, 99:6, |
| 88:13, 218:20, | $\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{ll} 4: 10, & 4: 19, \\ 32: 8, & 43: 14, \end{array}\right.$ | 215:2, 219:1, | 128:13, 133:15, |
| 255:18, 255:20, | $43: 16,43: 17$ | 231:7, 231:8, | 177:13, 191:21, |
| 255:21, 255:22, | 111:5, 121:18, | $\begin{aligned} & 232: 2, \quad 253: 11, \\ & 253: 16 . \quad 253: 19 . \end{aligned}$ | 201:5, 212:11, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 261: 15, \quad 261: 18 \\ & 262: 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 152: 16, & 169: 9, \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 253: 16, ~ 253: 19, \\ & 266: 20, ~ 271: 14, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 220: 7, & 266: 13, \\ 268: 3, & 268: 8, \end{array}$ |
| Y | $\text { 170:6, } 174: 14,$ | 279:6, 279:17 | 276:10 |
| yards | 179:18, 179:19, | zOO $44: 20$ | 100 |
| $37: 8,181: 13$, 199.3 | 179:20, 204:2, | 44:20 zoom | $\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{ll} 16: 21, & 166: 4, \\ 166: 9, & 180: 12, \end{array}\right.$ |
| 199:3 ye | $\begin{aligned} & 204: 9, \quad 204: 21, \\ & 204: 22, \quad 214: 12 \end{aligned}$ | 44:20, 49:12, | 196:2, 196:20, |
| ye $157: 10$ | $246: 15,246: 18,$ | 195:18 | 226:8 |
| year | 246:19, 247:6, | zoomed | 101 |
| 45:3, 57:9, | 251:20, 252:22, | 197:9 | 108:16, 108:17, |
| 162:4, 166:4, | 254:18 | - | 109:5, 110:15 |
| 166:9, 180:12, | zoned | . 19 | 101.1 |
| 196:2, 196:20, | 4:10, 4:13, | 268:18 | 232:15 |
| 226:8 | 120:12 | . 21 | 102 |
| year-olds | zones | 269:5 | 162:22, 165:19, |
| 147:1 | 170:5, 170:8, | . 3 | 165:20 |
| years | 179:7, 180:2, | 132:19 | 103 |
| 28:22, 40:1, | 192:9, 205:3, | . 9 | 230:22 |
| 41:3, 41:14, | 214:12, 214:14 | 94:14 | 108 |
| 42:10, 106:7, | zoning | . 97 | 232:15 |
| 146:22, 228:1, | 1:10, 2:14, | 267:17 | 11 |
| 248:13 | 4:10, 4:12, | 0 | 10:18, 74:7, |
| yellow | $4: 14,4: 17$, |  | 77:13, 98:20, |
| 221:11, 221:12 | $\begin{aligned} & 5: 11, \quad 7: 8, \quad 11: 8, \\ & 11: 19, \quad 14: 3 . \end{aligned}$ | $10: 18,104: 6,$ | $113$ |
| yesterday | 11:19, 14:3, | 104:7, 104:8, | \|216:19 |
| 20:13, 21:5, | $\begin{aligned} & 18: 12, \quad 18: 15, \\ & 20: 6,32: 9, \end{aligned}$ | $133: 15,133: 22,$ | $119$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 21: 9,23: 7,53: 7 \\ & \text { yield } \end{aligned}$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{ll} 20: 6, & 32: 9, \\ 36: 1, & 53: 17, \end{array}\right.$ | $134: 1,159: 16,$ | $75: 22$ |
| 194:11, 200:2 | 53:20, 55:16, | 159:19, 276:10 | 12 |
| yielding | 60:7, 71:8, | 159:20 | 4:9, 65:21, |
| 194:10 | $\begin{aligned} & 72: 19, \quad 105: 14, \\ & 105: 19, \quad 123: 6 . \end{aligned}$ | 1 | $\begin{aligned} & 77: 13, \quad 88: 22, \\ & 89: 1, \quad 92: 6, \end{aligned}$ |
| York $70: 8$ | 123:11, 142:4, | 1 | $104: 6, \quad 120: 11$ |
| younger | 145:19, 148:1, | 132:8, 159:19, | 120:13, 128:18, |
| $40: 11$ | 164:8, 169:2, |  | 142:17, 146:19, |
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| 219:5, 219:7, | 157.1 | 276:13, 276:17, | 166:17, 166:20, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 219:14, 223:8, | 94:19, 269:1 | 276:19, 276:20, | 166:21, 241:14, |
| 223:16, 223:21, | 16 | 278:12, 278:16, | 268:15, 269:21, |
| 224:1, 224:6, | 137:8, 140:11, | 281:21 | 281:16 |
| 224:9, 225:17, | 145:10, 145:12, | 2002 | 2035 |
| 226:6, 226:10, | 177:2 | 176:14 | 128:9, 130:17 |
| 226:21, 227:3, | 17 | 2003 | 206 |
| 227:14, 227:21, | 65:21, 90:7, | 40:7 | 163:18 |
| 229:20, 231:18, | 98:20, 120:19, | 2006 | 20769 |
| 281:19 | 132:4, 132:8, | 176:8, 176:10 | 51:16 |
| 12.01 | 132:15, 132:21, | 2007 | 21 |
| 73:5, 89:6, | 133:5 | 61:5, 239:19 | 33:13, 47:19 |
| 89:11, 223:6, | 1751 | 2008 | 21842 |
| 223:16, 269:5 | 68:20 | 267: 8 | 19:11 |
| 12.83 | 18 | 2010 | 22 |
| $147: 2$ | 218:19, 219:14 | 77:19, 198:14, | 33:13, 44:16, |
| $12001$ | 19 | 267:19 | 47:19, 111:1, |
| 62:14 | 38:5, 202:13 | 2011 | 111:4, 120:17, |
| 13 | 1904 | 267:19 | 120:18, 121:10, |
| 1:11, 2:4, | 4:16 | 2013 | 121:13, 122:17, |
| 77:13, 133:9, | 2 | 239:20 | 127:8, 132:15, |
| 151:10, 170:16, | $2$ | 2018 | 152:15, 153:4 |
| 281:19 | $104: 7, \quad 104: 8,$ | $63: 22, \quad 94: 19$ | 22002 |
| 13.13 | 119:9 | $267: 15,268: 22$ | $1: 15,2: 5,5: 5,$ |
| $146: 22$ | 2,200 | 202 | $97: 11, \quad 270: 6,$ |
| $13.6$ | 2,200 | 130:17 | $281: 19$ |
| 269:13 | 2-2a | 2020 | 22101 |
| 131 | 269:7 | 109:15 | 28:11 |
| 4:6 | 2-car | 2021 | 228 |
| $1355$ | $34: 11$ | 19:18 | 145:18, 146:20, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 28: 10 \\ & 136 \end{aligned}$ | $2.2$ | $2022$ | 147:4, 151:9, |
| 136 | 177:18 | 4:11, 38:3, | $\begin{aligned} & 151: 15 \\ & 23 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 191: 19 \\ & 14 \end{aligned}$ | 2/5/23 | 38:5, 38:7, | 23 |
| 38:7, 44:16, | 21:18 | 38:15, 47:1, | $\left[\begin{array}{ll} 38: 3, & 38: 19, \\ 49: 3, & 49: 8, \end{array}\right.$ |
| 46:10, 47:1, | $20$ | $176: 4, \quad 176: 15,$ | $71: 18,107: 4,$ |
| $128: 5,166: 3,$ | $6: 13,28: 22,$ | $176: 17,218: 20,$ | $\begin{array}{lr} 107: 9, & 166: 15, \\ 241 \cdot 14 & 268 \cdot 15 \end{array}$ |
| $\begin{array}{ll} 166: 10, & 266: 12, \\ 267: 19, & 268: 6 \end{array}$ | $29: 8,38: 19,$ | $\begin{aligned} & 219: 14 \\ & 2023 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 241: 14, \\ & 269: 20, \\ & 269: 21, \end{aligned}$ |
| $14.3$ | 39:22, 41:3, | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & 2023 \\ & 1: 11, \quad 2: 4 \end{aligned}\right.$ | $\begin{aligned} & 269: 20,269: 21, \\ & 281: 19 \end{aligned}$ |
| 269:14 | $\begin{array}{lll}41: 14, & 42: 10, \\ 71: 18, & 107: 4,\end{array}$ | 38:19, 38:20, | 23008 |
| $15$ | 107:9, 120:20, | $38: 22,44: 16,$ | $1: 15,2: 8,$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 75: 15, \quad 202: 13, \\ & 236: 22 \end{aligned}$ | $122: 19,166: 15,$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 71: 18, & 71: 19, \\ 94: 11, & 107: 4, \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5: 11, \quad 281: 19 \\ & 24 \end{aligned}$ |
| $150$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 234: 9, & 234: 18, \\ 235: 1, & 241: 14 \end{array}$ | $107: 6,107: 9,$ | 38:3, 120:13, |
| 164:9 | $268: 15,269: 21,$ | 107:10, 108:7, | 120:17, 122:17, |
| 153.7 | $275: 15,276: 7$ | 108:8, 108:12, | 127:9, 145:20, |
| 94:21, 269:3 | 275.15, 276.7, | 109:2, 166:15, | 150:5, 150:8, |
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| 151:12, 187:12, | 122:6, 132:19, | 41 | 145:4, 145:10, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 281:21 | 158:8, 158:18, | 200:22 | 146:1, 146:19, |
| 24.7 | 236:6, 236:12, | 45 | 147:4, 147:13, |
| 95:1, 269:4 | 276:2 | 132:14, 147:1 | 150:5, 150:8, |
| 240 | 300 | 48 | 151:9, 169:20, |
| 28:11 | 17:6, 68:20, | 151:15 | 183:14, 187:13, |
| 25 | 128:4, 129:17, | 4th | 207:8, 237:18, |
| 19:17, 75:21, | 147:8, 266:9 | 5:16, 5:21, | 253:3, 274:7, |
| 75:22, 189:6, | 32 | $6: 4,6: 11,6: 19$, | 274:20 |
| 189:22, 200:19, | 158:7 | 212:9 | 5th |
| 267:19, 268:4 | 35 | 5 | 5:8, 120:7 |
| 25.3 | 83:22, 91:22, | 5 | 6 |
| 94:17, 94:22, | 181:13, 182:5, | 134:1, 143:2, | 6 |
| 268:21, 269:4 | 199:3, 200:12 | 143:3, 274:7 | 126:22, 134:1, |
| 256 | 38 | 50 | 159:16, 267:18 |
| 13:12 | 195:4, 269:6 | 117:19, 118:17, | 6-foot |
| $26$ | $390$ | 137:4, 137:8, | 216:6 |
| 108:7, 108:22, | $4: 7$ | 200:20 | 6.8 |
| 119:10, 120:6, | $395$ | 500 | 216:7 |
| 147:14, 281:16 | 43:10, 43:20, | 128:4, 147:8 | 60 |
| 27 | 202:8, 211:4 | 519340 | 34:12, 121:8, |
| 4:16, 43:10, | 4 | 1:20, 281:19 | 121:10, 121:12, |
| 43:20, 202:8, | 4 | 54 | 127:2, 134:13, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 211: 4, \quad 215: 3, \\ & 232 \cdot 15 \end{aligned}$ | 134:1, 200:17 | 47:19, 81:19, | 136:10, 143:8 |
| $232: 15$ | 4.1 | 147:1 | 6101 |
|  | 200:9 | 5407 | 19:10 |
| 34:10, 110:15, | 4.10 | 163:18 | 62 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 157: 7,191: 20 \\ & 280 \end{aligned}$ | 2:10, 83:21, | $55$ | $\text { 134:14, } 154: 1$ |
| 281:8 | 86:2, 200:17 | 40:9, 47:19, | $621$ |
| 281:8 | 4.5 | 134:8, 134:13, | 94:18, 267:18, |
| 1:21 | 253:3 | 135:5, 136:5, | 268:21 |
| 295 | 4.56 | 136:10, 146:21, | 64 |
| 215:3 | 269.6 | $154: 1$ | 65 |
| 3 | 2:9 | 56 | 134:15, 136:10, |
| 3 | 4.75 | 47:20, 48:7 | 151:17, 154:2, |
| 29:8 | 33:9, 174:1, | 57 | 178:5 |
| 3,200 | 203:16, 204:19, | 2:7, 4:2, 4:18, | 7 |
| 50:16 | 217:19, 253:5, | 47:2, 47:3, | 7 |
| 3.44 | 253:6, 253:8 | 47:20, 80:16, | 132:14 |
| 94:15, 94:21, | 40 | 81:18, 120:22, | 70 |
| 268:19, 269:3 | 72:20, 73:7, | 121:14, 126:20, | 46:20, 47:6, |
| 3.63 | 87:19, 106:7, | 127:1, 127:5, | 81:9, 136:11, |
| 93:14, 94:13, | 220:14, 268:1 | 132:16, 133:4, | 176:12 |
| 268:16 | 400 | 133:8, 142:16, | 72 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 30 \\ & 38: 22, \quad 81: 10, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 14: 12, \quad 104: 21, \\ & 129: 17, \quad 266: 9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 143: 2, & 143: 5 \\ 143: 6, & 144: 21, \end{array}$ | 112:12, 207:22 |

Transcript of Hearing
Conducted on December 13, 2023


