

1 BEFORE THE PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY COUNCIL, SITTING AS
2 THE DISTRICT COUNCIL, AND THE PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY
3 PLANNING BOARD OF THE M-NCPPC

4
5 **PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE ENDORSED**
6 **BOWIE-MITCHELLVILLE AND VICINITY**
7 **SECTIONAL MAP AMENDMENT (CR-089-2022 & CR-084-2023)**

8
9 **JOINT PUBLIC HEARING**

10 **February 13, 2024**

11 COUNCIL MEMBERS:

PLANNING BOARD MEMBERS:

12 JOLENE IVEY, Chair

PETER SHAPIRO, Chair

13 SYDNEY J. HARRISON, Vice Chair

DOROTHY BAILEY, Vice Chair (Absent)

14 THOMAS E. DERNOGA, District 1

A. SHUANISE WASHINGTON, Comm.

15 WANIKA FISHER, District 2 (Absent)

WILLIAM DOERNER, (Absent)

16 ERIC C. OLSON, District 3

MANUEL GERALDO, Commissioner

17 INGRID S. WATSON, District 4

18 WALA BLEGAY, District 6

19 KRYSTAL ORIADHA, District 7 (Absent)

20 EDWARD BURROUGHS, III, District 8 (Absent)

21 MEL FRANKLIN, At-Large

22 CALVIN S. HAWKINS, II, At-Large

Ruth Kerker Blair, Transcriptionist
12166 Cavalier Drive
Dunkirk, MD 20754
443-404-0437

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

CHAIR IVEY: Good evening, everyone. Okay. Hello, today is Tuesday, February 13th. We are reconvening as the Prince George's County Council and it's a joint hearing with our Planning Board. The Prince George's County Council, sitting as the District Council, and the Prince George's County Planning Board of the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission joint public hearing on Proposed Amendments to the Endorsed Bowie-Mitchellville and Vicinity Sectional Map Amendment, CR-089-2022 and CR-084-2023.

Pursuant to the Regional District Act within the Land Use Article, Annotated Code of Maryland, as well as Subtitle 27 from the Prince George's County Code, being also the Zoning Ordinance of Prince George's County, Maryland, notice is hereby given that a public hearing will be held to seek public comment and testimony.

So, we are going to have each of my colleagues to introduce themselves. If you could just give your name and which district number you represent, starting with Mr. Dernoga.

MR. DERNOGA: Good evening, Tom Dernoga, Number 1 always.

MR. HAWKINS: Good evening, I'm Calvin Hawkins and I serve as a Council Member at Large.

VICE CHAIR HARRISON: Hello, everyone, my name is Sydney Harrison. I serve in County Council District 9.

CHAIR: Jolene Ivey again, District 5.

MR. OLSON: Eric Olson, District 3.

1 MS. WATSON: Ingrid Watson, District 4.

2 MS. BLEGAY: Wala Blegay, District 6.

3 CHAIR: And I have a few other – oh, Planning Board, go right ahead.

4 MR. SHAPIRO: Thank you, Madam Chair. Peter Shapiro, Prince George's
5 Planning Board Chair.

6 MR. GERALDO: Manuel Geraldo.

7 MS. WASHINGTON: Shuanise Washington.

8 CHAIR: Thank you.

9 The District Council initiated the Sectional Map Amendment on July 12, 2022
10 through the approval of Council Resolution CR-089-2022 authorizing the Planning
11 Department to prepare the Proposed Sectional Map Amendment. Notice of today's
12 hearing was mailed in January 2024 to owners of property for which an amendment
13 is being proposed.

14 The 16 proposed amendments to the Endorsed Sectional Map Amendment
15 we are considering this evening were proposed by the District Council after
16 conducting two public work sessions held on September 12th and 26th, 2023,
17 respectively, and are based on the May 9th, 2023 record of joint public hearing
18 testimony. The amendments are set forth in Council Resolution CR-084-2023.

19 As a second joint public hearing, tonight's testimony is limited in scope. The
20 comments must pertain to the 16 amendments proposed within Council Resolution
21 CR-084-2023. If any testimony given tonight falls outside the scope of the 16
22 proposed amendments to the SMA, the speaker will be warned to focus their
23 comments back to the amendments.

1 In addition, all written testimony submitted to the public hearing record must
2 relate to the amendments proposed by the District Council in Council Resolution
3 CR-084-2023. Written testimony outside the scope will not be considered. The
4 testimony you will hear and provide tonight is part of an ongoing process that will
5 lead to a new Sectional Map Amendment for Planning Areas 71A, 71B, 74A and
6 74B.

7 The Sectional Map Amendment will amend the County Zoning Map for the
8 Bowie-Mitchellville and Vicinity Master Plan Area. Once approved, the Sectional
9 Map Amendment will implement the recommended zoning outlined in the Master
10 Plan, and it will also set the stage for a long-term redevelopment to revitalize the
11 area and enhance the quality of life for years to come.

12 To ensure compliance with the law, if you intend to speak tonight concerning
13 an intensification of zoning and you did not file the affidavit form, you will not be
14 permitted to speak on this issue. However, you still have an opportunity to
15 complete and submit an affidavit and submit your request testimony in writing and
16 file it with the Clerk of the Council prior to the close of the record on Wednesday,
17 February 28, 2024.

18 Your testimony will then be considered as part of the record. This 15-day
19 period provides an opportunity for written comments to be submitted into the record
20 and officially considered as part of the hearing. Affidavits that have already been
21 submitted are still valid and do not need to be resubmitted.

22 If you wish to submit written remarks to supplement any testimony you may
23 give tonight or if you would prefer to only submit written comments, you may submit
24 your comments via the Council's EComment portal, email address or fax number

1 that is listed on your legal notice and on today's agenda. Testimony and comments
2 will not be accepted via social media, U.S. mail or by telephone voicemail message.

3 Following the close of the record, the Planning Board will review testimony
4 submitted for the record for purposes of providing a recommendation for final action
5 to the District Council. The Planning Board will then transmit recommendations on
6 the amendments to the Endorsed Sectional Map Amendment to the County Council.
7 The Council, in turn, will then consider the Planning Board's recommendations
8 together with all oral and written testimony within the record and will take final action
9 this year.

10 To allow everyone a chance to speak, we are requesting that comments be
11 limited to two (2) minutes per speaker. A timer will be set once you begin to speak,
12 and you will be notified verbally at one minute before the allotted time has elapsed
13 and then will be stopped once no time remains. Your cooperation in immediately
14 concluding your comments is appreciated.

15 At this time, I'd like to call on Thomas Lester, Project Manager, for a
16 presentation on the amendments to the Endorsed Sectional Map Amendment. We
17 will then go to the sign-up sheet and start with any elected officials who wish to
18 speak.

19 MR. LESTER: Thank you and good evening, Chair and Members of the
20 County Council, as well as the Planning Board Chair and Members of the Planning
21 Board. For the record, my name is Thomas Lester with the Prince George's County
22 Planning Department, Community Planning Division. I'm the Project Manager for
23 the SMA. I am joined this evening by Kierre McCune, Supervisor of the Master

1 Plans and Studies Section, as well as Tony Felts, Division Chief of the Community
2 Planning Division.

3 During the September work session held last year, Staff were directed to
4 draft 16 amendments to the Endorsed Bowie-Mitchellville and Vicinity Sectional
5 Map Amendment to be the subject of this second joint public hearing and receive
6 additional public comment on the amendments. As the second joint public hearing,
7 tonight's testimony is limited in scope, and comments must pertain to the 16
8 amendments.

9 Here is a list of the amendments being considered tonight. Amendment 1,
10 the proposed amendment is to retain the RR/CGO split zoning for the two properties
11 that make up Free State Shopping Center. The Endorsed SMA says to correct the
12 split zoning and rezone the entire property to the CGO Zone. The property is within
13 the municipal boundary of the City of Bowie.

14 Amendment 2, this proposed amendment is to rezone the Keller property to
15 the CGO Zone instead of retaining the RR Zone. The Endorsed SMA says to retain
16 the existing RR Zone. I would note that the proposed amendment as it's written
17 currently does not include Parcel 6, which is located fully within Parcel 79. If the
18 rezoning were to go forward, Staff would recommend including Parcel 6. This
19 property is outside the municipal boundary of the City of Bowie.

20 Amendment 3, this proposed amendment is to retain the Wellons property in
21 the RE Zone instead of rezoning to the CS Zone. The Endorsed SMA says to
22 rezone to the CS Zone since the property is just south and under common
23 ownership and are proposed to be rezoned. The property is outside the municipal
24 boundary for the City of Bowie.

1 Amendment 4, the proposed amendment is to rezone the Boys and Girls
2 Club property to the AG Zone instead of retaining the ROS Zone. The Endorsed
3 SMA says to retain the ROS Zone. This property is outside the municipal boundary
4 for the City of Bowie.

5 Amendment 5, this proposed amendment is to rezone the Supreme
6 Landscaping LLC property to the CS Zone instead of retaining the AR Zone. The
7 Endorsed SMA says to retain the AR Zone. This property is outside the municipal
8 boundary of the City of Bowie.

9 Amendment 6, this proposed amendment is to rezone the southern Jesuit
10 property which is really the Sacred Heart Property to the AG Zone instead of
11 retaining the AR Zone. The Endorsed SMA says to retain the AR Zone. This
12 property is outside the municipal boundary.

13 Amendment 7, the proposed amendment is to rezone the Collington Place
14 LLC property to RMF-20 Zone instead of retaining the CGO Zone. The Endorsed
15 SMA says to retain the CGO Zone. The property is within the municipal boundary
16 of the City of Bowie.

17 Amendment 8, the proposed amendment is to rezone the northern Jesuit
18 property to the AG Zone instead of rezoning to the AR Zone. The Endorsed SMA
19 says to rezone to the AR Zone. This property is outside the boundary for the City of
20 Bowie.

21 Amendment 9, the proposed amendment is to retain the TMC 450 LLC
22 property in the AR Zone instead of rezoning to the CS Zone. The Endorsed SMA
23 says to rezone to the CS Zone. The property is outside the municipal boundary.

1 Amendment 10, the proposed amendment is to retain the former Frank's
2 Nursery property in the RE Zone instead of rezoning to the CGO Zone. The
3 Endorsed SMA says to rezone to the CGO Zone. This property is outside the
4 municipal boundary of the City of Bowie.

5 Amendment 11, this proposed amendment is to rezone the M-NCPPC
6 property to the ROS Zone instead of rezoning to the AG Zone. The Endorsed SMA
7 says to rezone to the AG Zone. The property is outside the municipal boundary of
8 the City of Bowie.

9 Amendment 12, the proposed amendment is to retain the
10 Lally/Parker/Williams property in the AR Zone instead of rezoning to the AG Zone.
11 The Endorsed SMA says to rezone to the AG Zone. This property is outside the
12 municipal boundary.

13 Amendment 13, this proposed amendment is to retain the Freeway Airport
14 property in the AR Zone instead of rezoning to the RSF-A Zone. The Endorsed
15 SMA says to rezone to RSF-A Zone. The property is outside the municipal
16 boundary.

17 Amendment 14, this proposed amendment is to rezone the Prince George's
18 County property to the ROS Zone instead of rezoning to the AG Zone. The
19 Endorsed SMA says to rezone to the AG Zone. This property is within the
20 municipal boundary for the City of Bowie.

21 Amendment 15, this proposed amendment is to rezone the property to the
22 AR Zone instead of rezoning to the AG Zone. The Endorsed SMA says to rezone to
23 the AG Zone. This property is outside of the City of Bowie.

1 And then the last amendment, Amendment 16, this proposed amendment is
2 to rezone the BSU Campus Center properties owned by the Prince – owned by
3 Prince George’s County to the ROS Zone instead of retaining the existing
4 NAC/ROS Zone. The Endorsed SMA says to retain the existing zoning. This
5 property is outside the City of Bowie.

6 Just to recap the schedule, we initiated the project on July 12, 2022 and
7 released the proposed SMA in August of the same year. We held the joint public
8 hearing in May of 2023. The Planning Board endorsed the SMA in June of 2023,
9 and the District Council held a series of work sessions last year. With the second
10 joint public hearing today, we are looking at an approval for the SMA come July of
11 this year.

12 And thank you and that concludes Staff’s presentation.

13 CHAIR: Thank you so much. Now, we will go to speakers. Joseph Meinert,
14 City of Bowie. After that, it will be Matt Tedesco and then Sandy Spencer.

15 MR. MEINERT: Good evening, Madam Chair and Mr. Vice Chair and
16 Members of the Planning Board. I’m Joe Meinert, City of Bowie Planning Director.
17 I’m here to transmit to you the recommendations of the Bowie City Council
18 concerning the CR-084. We have a number of properties that are located in the
19 City of Bowie which have been identified by Mr. Lester.

20 Amendment No. 1 relates to the Free State Shopping Center. That property
21 has an RR-zoned buffer area that transitions between the commercial shopping
22 center and the adjacent single-family homes. And so, the City Council believes the
23 zoning buffer should remain. So we support Amendment No. 1.

1 Amendment No. 7, the City has worked with the property owner on Elder
2 Oaks Boulevard, as well as the community members, through a very long process,
3 and we've arrived at the RMF-20 Zone being the best development alternative, and
4 we would request your approval of the Amendment No. 7. We provided a detailed
5 explanation in the City's letter which is dated January 17th.

6 The final City property in the boundary of the City is the South Lake County-
7 owned parcel. We'd like to see that property zoned ROS because it's adjacent to
8 Park and Planning land and it's owned by Prince George's County.

9 To address a couple of the other properties outside the City limits, I wanted
10 to point out, on Page 3 of our letter, we address the, incorrectly, the Jesuit property
11 on the south side of Maryland Route 450. That's really the Sacred Heart Church
12 property. And the correction to our letter is that we stated two dwelling units per
13 acre and five units/dwellings per acre. It should be one dwelling per two acres; one
14 dwelling per five acres. So that's a correction I'd like to make for Amendment No. 6
15 in the City's letter.

16 The City did support the majority of the other recommendations in the CR-
17 084. We would also oppose the higher density residential development,
18 Amendment No. 10 and Amendment No. 13 and –

19 CHAIR: Thank you so much. We have your testimony and we also have
20 your writing. We appreciate you.

21 MR. MEINERT: Thank you.

22 CHAIR: Matthew Tedesco, Sandy Spencer and then Andrew Roud.

23 MR. TEDESCO: Good evening, Madam Chair, Mr. Vice Chair, Mr. Chairman
24 of the Planning Board, Planning Board Commissioners and Members of the District

1 Council – County Council, excuse me, sitting as the District Council. My name is
2 Matthew Tedesco with the law firm of McNamee Hosea in Greenbelt here on behalf
3 of the owners as it relates to Amendment 1, 7, 10 and 9, so I'll try to be very brief.

4 Regarding Amendment No. 1, Mr. Meinert just spoke about that. We are in
5 opposition to the amendment. We do request that the Endorsed SMA
6 recommending rezoning of the entire property for Amendment 1 be implemented.
7 Just in response to Mr. Meinert's comments, it's worth knowing that there's 120 to
8 140-foot natural buffer between the subject property and the single-family detached
9 homes to the north.

10 That property is owned by the City of Bowie per its deed conveying that
11 property to the City of Bowie. It was conditioned that that parcel be used for public
12 park, recreation, municipal or drainage uses. Therefore, it cannot be developed.
13 Any development of the Free State Shopping Center would be required to –

14 CLERK: One minute.

15 MR. TEDESCO: - required to conform to the Landscape Manual
16 Neighborhood Compatibility standards and would further implement the Master
17 Plan's recommendation and create economic development for the County and the
18 City.

19 Amendment No. 7, Mr. Meinert had indicated the City is in support of
20 Amendment No. 7. We, too, are in support of Amendment No. 7, as recommended,
21 to the RMF-20 Zone.

22 Amendment No. 9, we are in opposition to Amendment No. 9, support the
23 Master Plan and Endorsed SMA recommendation to rezone the property to the CS
24 Zone. Any future use of this property will be required to conform to the Master Plan

1 zoning requirements which may include a number of different entitlements, including
2 but not limited to subdivision, detailed site plan, special exception, et cetera. Each
3 of these plans would have to conform to the regulations of the new Zoning
4 Ordinance and potentially have final review and approval by the Planning Board and
5 District Council.

6 And finally, Amendment No. 10, we are in opposition to the amendment and
7 would request that the Endorsed SMA be followed. Thank you.

8 CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Tedesco. Sandy Spencer, Andrew Roud, then
9 Robert Antonetti, Jr. Is Sandy Spencer not here? Okay, then next, Andrew Roud
10 and Robert Antonetti.

11 MR. ROUD: Good evening, Madam Chair and the Members of the District
12 Council, Chair Shapiro and the Planning Board. My name is Andrew Roud with St.
13 John Properties, the developer of the Freeway Airport. Just to let everyone know,
14 we've had extensive meetings and dialogue with the citizens, concerned citizens
15 regarding the potential redevelopment of the airport.

16 Because of these efforts, we've come up with a reasonable understanding
17 and consensus on how best to redevelop the airport site. What we've come up with
18 is a new development concept focused exclusively on single-family detached
19 dwellings utilizing the RSF-A Zone standards. Furthermore, this new concept will
20 not only result in the complete elimination of any townhouse units being developed
21 on the property – restate, zero townhouses on the property – but will also lead to
22 the development of less than 2.47 dwelling units per acre, which is low density
23 under the General Plan and the Master Plan.

1 I'd like to thank the concerned citizens for their willingness to discuss the
2 development alternatives for this project. I'd also like to thank all the people in the
3 room who have encouraged consensus and dialogue so we can be in a position to
4 develop a high-quality residential community in Prince George's County and the
5 surrounding –

6 CLERK BROWN: One minute.

7 MR. ROUD: - community that the Rodenhauser family can be proud of.
8 Again, the concerned citizens, it's been a long five-year process, but we're finally
9 there and I am the proverbial horse that has now had a drink. Thank you.

10 MR. ANTONETTI: Good evening, Madam Chair, Mr. Vice Chair, Chair
11 Shapiro and Members of the Planning Board. My name is Robert Antonetti with the
12 law firm of Shipley & Horne here on behalf of Freeway Realty LLC, the developer of
13 the Freeway Airport.

14 First, I would want to associate myself with the testimony of Mr. Roud
15 regarding the new development proposal for the airport and the consensus reached
16 with the local citizens about density for the project. That being said, we are
17 opposed to Amendment 13 in CR-084-2023 seeking to retain the airport land in the
18 AR Zone.

19 Conversely, we do support the Endorsed SMA recommendation for the
20 Freeway Airport calling for the placement of the RSF-A Zone on the property. The
21 RSF-A Zone recommendation in the Endorsed SMA is wholly consistent with the
22 2022 Bowie-Mitchellville and Vicinity Master Plan which specifically calls for the
23 RSF-A Zone for the property.

1 Freeway Realty intends to utilize this RSF-A Zone designation to propose a
2 single-family detached only community on the property that will utilize the lot
3 standards and development standards in the RSF-A Zone. The project will not have
4 any townhouses. The development will cause permanent closure of the airport.
5 The redevelopment of the site will also be facilitated through the appropriate
6 entitlement processes spelled out in the new Zoning Ordinance and the subdivision
7 regulations.

8 As part of this process, Freeway Realty looks forward to continuing its
9 positive engagement with local citizens in order to achieve a high-quality residential
10 community. For these reasons, we oppose Amendment 13 in CR-083-2023 [sic]
11 and support and Endorsed SMA recommendation of the RSF-A Zone for the
12 Freeway Airport property. Thank you for your consideration.

13 CHAIR: Thank you. Russell Shipley, David Iannucci, Janet Gingold.

14 MR. SHIPLEY: Thank you very much, Madam Chair. Madam Chair and
15 Members of the District Council, Chairman of the Planning Board and Members of
16 the Planning Board, good evening. My name is Russell Shipley from the firm of
17 Shipley & Horne and I speak on behalf of Tom A. Wellons family with reference to
18 Amendment No. 3.

19 Would it be possible to put that up on the – it's a lot better looking than I am
20 anyway. If you could put Number 3 picture on the – they say a picture is worth a
21 thousand words, and I couldn't say a thousand words in two minutes anyway. But
22 this is a small piece of property which had been recommended, as you can see – I
23 hope you can see that in a little, light-colored green area encircled in red.

1 It had been recommended for the CS Zone along with the two lots below it,
2 which are also in light green which are still recommended for the CS Zone. To the
3 immediate left of that is – is a two-acre parcel that's owned by the State Highway
4 Administration, and the little purple square in the lower right-hand corner is also
5 owned by Wellons. All the property that is not owned by the State is owned by
6 Wellons and, together, it only comprises a couple of acres. The Wellons family has
7 owned the property for over 30 years.

8 In the existing commercial zone, they have a small office which operates an
9 outdoor facility, which is usually used for storing cars that have been in accidents
10 and are awaiting repair in a rather substantial collision center that's on the right-
11 hand side of the northbound lanes. And we would like to see it – it makes sense to
12 retain it in the CS Zone. It's under two acres. It can't possibly be developed RE.

13 CHAIR: Thank –

14 MR. SHIPLEY: I've used up my time. Thank you very much.

15 CHAIR: Thank you so much.

16 And we've been joined by Council Member Mel Franklin virtually. We see
17 you. Thank you.

18 Mr. Iannucci and then Janet Gingold.

19 MR. IANNUCCI: Thank you, Madam Chair, Members of the Council,
20 Members of the Planning Board, David Iannucci representing the Economic
21 Development Corporation in opposition to Amendment 16 to this Resolution, the site
22 otherwise known as the Bowie MARC Station site.

23 Long identified for its economic development potential, we clearly recognize
24 a need to preserve the more than hundred acres or so for environmental reasons,

1 but it's the southern acres that has extreme opportunity for economic development
2 and growth through the County's corporate and community – excuse me,
3 commercial real estate property taxes.

4 The TOD and the data centers opportunities, I think, are very clear in terms
5 of jobs but also growth of the commercial tax base. But I'd like to spend my time
6 particularly talking about a recommendation that is in the County's strategic plan,
7 and that's the opportunity to create corporate innovation centers near our
8 universities, particularly Bowie State University, the State's oldest HBCU.

9 We envision the opportunity for partnerships with corporations that create –
10 CLERK: One minute.

11 MR. IANNUCCI: - centers for advanced research in such areas as artificial
12 intelligence, cybersecurity and other technology areas where the university could
13 partner with corporations, such as the University of Maryland already does and such
14 as universities around the state do.

15 So, we think there are many examples where these – this type of academic
16 research connected to corporate research could be very lucrative for the County
17 but, at the same time, a great growth opportunity for Bowie State University. There
18 are many examples of these partnerships that I've said, so the EDC respectfully
19 urges the Council and the Planning Board to reject Amendment 16 and preserve
20 these economic development opportunities for the County and for Bowie State
21 University. Thank you.

22 CHAIR: Thank you. Janet Gingold and then Denise Robinson, Karen
23 Johnson Shaheed.

1 MS. GINGOLD: Good evening, I'm Janet Gingold speaking today on behalf
2 of the Prince George's County Sierra Club. The Sierra Club thanks the Planning
3 Board and sponsors of these sensible amendments, and we have previously
4 expressed our concerns regarding developments of Freeway Airport near the
5 Sacred Heart property near Melford and near Fairwood. We believe these
6 amendments will help decrease development where it doesn't belong.

7 We particularly want to express our support of Amendment 16, which applies
8 to the County-owned property located between Bowie State MARC Station and the
9 Patuxent Research Refuge. The Sierra Club supports transit-oriented development
10 as a way to decrease our reliance on cars and decrease greenhouse gas emissions
11 through transportation. However, we also stand strongly for the need to preserve
12 and protect the forests and wetlands that protect us from the impacts of climate
13 change.

14 We hope to see carefully planned mixed-use development in a tightly
15 circumscribed area immediately adjacent to the train station while maintaining the
16 forest as a buffer to protect the Patuxent Research Refuge –

17 CLERK: One minute.

18 MS. GINGOLD: - from adverse effects of development. As one of our
19 County's special conservation areas, the Refuge deserves special protection as
20 changes are contemplated for land nearby.

21 We also want to see the threatened Patuxent River protected from sediment
22 and runoff related to any construction in the area. By keeping this regenerating
23 forest area as Reserved Open Space, we can hope that it will become a place
24 where BSU students and other MARC train users can enjoy the out of doors,

1 connect with nature and make good use of the resources at the Patuxent Research
2 Refuge without needing to get into a car.

3 We urge you to continue to focus development in already developed areas
4 and protect our remaining green spaces. We hope you will put the long-term
5 interests of the people ahead of corporate profits in your land use decisions as we
6 face a changing world. Thanks.

7 CHAIR: Denise Robinson, there we go, then Karen Johnson Shaheed and
8 Jacqueline West-Spencer.

9 MS. ROBINSON: Good evening, Madam Chair, fellow Members of the
10 District Council and Planning Board. My name is Denise Robinson. I am the
11 Executive Director of the Revenue Authority for Prince George's County. I'm
12 testifying today to express my strong opposition to the proposed amendment,
13 specifically Amendment 16.

14 Our opposition is grounded in the potential ramifications of this amendment
15 which would change the existing zone to Reserved Open Space. The Revenue
16 Authority is a quasi-governmental entity that, among other responsibilities, serves
17 as the economic development finance agency for the County. Related to this
18 capacity, the Revenue Authority, in conjunction with Bowie State University, is
19 currently managing the request for proposal for the planned mixed-use transit-
20 oriented project at the Bowie State MARC Station.

21 This future development is critical to the success of the County's vision for
22 economic development and environmental sustainability. Environmental
23 considerations are at the forefront of this project. As a proposed transit-oriented

1 development aims to improve public transit connectivity and enhance the walkability
2 of the area by reducing urban sprawl –

3 CLERK: One minute.

4 MS. ROBINSON: - cars usage and promoting sustainable practices, the
5 development fosters a more environmentally conscious community. It is also
6 important to highlight that, while the County owns over 200 acres of land in this
7 area, it is only planning to develop approximately 94 acres, preserving the rest of
8 their land.

9 These considerations were, in part, informed by ongoing stakeholder
10 engagement efforts that span more than a decade. This visionary project seeks to
11 establish a mixed-use transit-oriented village encompassing housing, commercial,
12 recreation and university-related facilities. It is not merely a real estate transaction
13 but a strategic initiative to catalyze regional growth in economic development.

14 It aligns with the County's goals of creating permanent jobs, fostering
15 housing opportunities and supporting the expansion efforts of Bowie State
16 University, the State's oldest historically Black university. My opposition to the
17 proposed amendments is rooted in understanding that altering the Endorsed
18 Sectional Map Amendment jeopardizes the entire development. It would also mean
19 missing a transformative opportunity to create catalytic change within Bowie and the
20 County as a whole.

21 CHAIR: Thank you so much, Ms. Shaheed.

22 MS. ROBINSON: Robinson. Thank you.

1 CHAIR: Robinson. Is it – oh no, you're right. You're Denise Robinson and
2 you're Karen – I'm sorry. I just have so many names in front of me, and I'm trying to
3 keep myself straight and then I'm not. So Karen Johnson Shaheed. Thank you.

4 MS. JOHNSON SHAHEED: I can think of worse people to be confused with.
5 I'm okay with that. Good evening, Madam Chair, Mr. Vice Chair and Members of
6 the County Council and the Planning Board. I am Karen Johnson Shaheed. I'm the
7 Executive Vice President, General Counsel and Chief of Staff at Bowie State
8 University. And I am here this evening to also express my strong opposition to
9 Amendment 16, the proposed zoning change for the County-owned undeveloped
10 land adjacent to the Bowie State University campus and the MARC train station.

11 Specifically, we urge you to reconsider the decision to designate this land as
12 Reserved Open Space as we believe that will have a detrimental effect not only on
13 Bowie State University but also on the transit-oriented development designation that
14 was granted to us by the State. As you know, we're the oldest HBCU in Maryland,
15 and we're committed to providing educational opportunities for our students but also
16 fostering economic development and community engagement in Prince George's
17 County.

18 The proposed zoning change would hinder our efforts to fulfill our mission by
19 limiting opportunities for us to expand and develop and to partner with local public
20 and private stakeholders. Bowie State University is growing.

21 CLERK: One minute.

22 MS. JOHNSON SHAHEED: Not all campuses can say that, and we expect
23 to continue growing in the next ten years. And so, we need to be able to expand
24 our footprint and to accommodate our growing student body and enhance our

1 academic programs. We receive record funding from the State of Maryland to
2 develop new academic programs. That funding will continue in the next ten years.
3 We need to be able to accommodate that growth.

4 We've been working, as you've heard, with the County to – on an RFP to
5 support development that would support the university as an anchor institution and
6 recognize our role as an economic engine in the region. We were thrilled with the
7 prospect of having an innovation hub located on the site, as Mr. Iannucci
8 mentioned, so that businesses can co-locate and work with our award-winning
9 faculty researchers and students.

10 The zoning change would foreclose all these wonderful opportunities. And I'll
11 add finally that we have a robust sustainability program at Bowie State University
12 involving our faculty researchers, staff and students. The TOD designation reflects
13 our commitment to sustainable development and transit accessibility and
14 community revitalization.

15 CHAIR: Thank you –

16 MS. JOHNSON SHAHEED: And we respectfully urge you to reject the
17 proposed amendment. Thank you.

18 CHAIR: Thank you so much. Jacqueline West-Spencer and then Lisa Babin
19 or Babin.

20 MS. WEST-SPENCER: Good evening, Madam Chair, the honorable Council
21 Members and Members of the Planning Board. My name is Jacqueline West-
22 Spencer. I'm the Executive Director of the Redevelopment Authority of Prince
23 George's County. I'm here to testify in opposition to Amendment No. 16.

1 The RDA is supporting the efforts of the Revenue Authority of Prince
2 George's County, Bowie State University and stakeholders on a monumental effort
3 which is essential to the County's broader economic development goals, the growth
4 and expansion of an historic institution while addressing the needs of the
5 surrounding community.

6 The proposed legislation endangers the vision for public-private partnership
7 that creates a transformative mixed-use transit-oriented community that delivers
8 housing, commercial and retail opportunities, university-related and recreational
9 uses. The impact of this transformative transit-oriented opportunity potentially
10 creates over 250,000 square feet of mixed-use development which supports
11 population growth, responding to increasing demands for additional university-
12 adjacent housing, while creating the demand and critical mass for commercial and
13 retail investment in the community –

14 CLERK: One minute.

15 MS. WEST-SPENCER: - resulting in the expansion of the commercial tax
16 base. As a TOD, this development will create greater access and connectivity for
17 students, visitors and an additional work force to live, work and visit this historic
18 community while concentrating TOD investment at the core in preserving over a
19 hundred acres of County-owned land.

20 Amending the Endorsed Sectional Map Amendment will eliminate the
21 possibility of a transformative investment at Bowie State University and would
22 prevent greater connectivity of the MARC station with the community. If this TOD
23 opportunity is unable to proceed due to the implementation of Amendment No. 16,
24 the investment in the community, job creation, housing opportunities, as well as the

1 investment in the only historical Black institution of higher education in Prince
2 George's County is potentially eliminated. Thank you very much.

3 CHAIR: Thank you. Lisa – is it Babin or Babin?

4 MS. BABIN: Babin?

5 CHAIR: Babin. See, I was totally wrong. And then Edward Gibbs.

6 MS. BABIN: Greetings and [inaudible] special greeting to our District 4
7 Council Member Watson and Council Member Blegay for proposing Resolution CR-
8 084-2023. I would also like to greet Councilwoman Ivey, Mayor Adams, but I don't
9 see any members of the Bowie City Council here. Members of the Prince George's
10 County Council, Members and the Planning Board.

11 To ensure that we maintain – my purpose today is to ensure that we maintain
12 the integrity of the Covington community. I'm here to speak on behalf of the
13 Covington community. I moved into my home 27 years ago on February 14th, 1997.
14 This is my love gift to myself and my daughter. Thanks to Joe Meinert, our journey
15 to decipher the Bowie-Mitchellville Master Plan and the Sectional Map Amendment
16 for zoning –

17 CLERK: One minute.

18 MS. BABIN: - property has been enlightening and helpful. We have learned
19 many vital lessons about unifying, community engagement and researching and
20 identifying allies.

21 I'd like to see that the property at 3610 Elder Oaks Boulevard be permanently
22 changed from CGO Zone – from a CGO Zone to an RMF-20 Zone. We have forged
23 a strong relationship with Mr. Andy Kalivas (phonetic) and the Kalivas Group, who is
24 the property owner, and members of the Bowie City Council to ensure that we

1 maintain the integrity of the Covington community. And this is going to help us to
2 continue to forge ahead in our community. Thank you.

3 CHAIR: Thank you. Ed Gibbs and then Jill Oliver.

4 MR. GIBBS: Good evening, Chair Ivey, Vice Chair Harrison and Members of
5 the Council, Chair Shapiro and Members of the Planning Board, Edward Gibbs, an
6 attorney with offices in Largo here representing Sacred Heart parish and the
7 Catholic Archdiocese of Washington.

8 I've only recently been retained to represent the interests of Sacred Heart
9 and the Archdiocese. I will be filing a written testimony subsequent to the hearing. I
10 just want to say this is a 35-acre parcel on the south side of 450 just west of the
11 intersection of 301. It's surrounded by property owned by the Jesuit order. We are
12 distinct from their property ownership. We are different. They are vacant. We are
13 improved with a church and a rectory and a hall.

14 Simply put, we do not believe that we conform to the provisions of Policy
15 CZ2.1 found on Page 83 of the SMA text document, which would authorize a
16 downzoning of this property from its current –

17 CLERK: One minute.

18 MR. GIBBS: - AR Zone to the AG Zone. And so, we feel that the analysis of
19 the Staff, when they considered the testimony given in the SMA hearings, was
20 correct. They agreed with the downzoning of the Jesuit property to the AG Zone.
21 They did not agree with the downzoning of the Sacred Heart property. They
22 recommended retaining it in the AR Zone because the tenets of the SMA did not
23 prescribe it should be downzoned.

1 It is an institutional property not a residential property. It is not intended for
2 development. And for all of those reasons, we would respectfully request that you
3 retain the AR Zone for this property. Thank you very much.

4 CHAIR: Thank you. Jill Oliver, Phillippa Johnston and then Paul McDonald.

5 MS. OLIVER: Good evening, Madam Chair and the District Council
6 Members and the Members of the Planning Board. For the record, my name is
7 Jill Oliver, and I am a Fairwood resident. I happen to be the President of the
8 Fairwood Community Association, which represents almost 2,000 homes. Fairwood
9 residents have asked me to come and represent their interests today.

10 Fairwood – the Fairwood Community Association has gone on the record
11 many, many times, as you know, in opposition of changes to the zoning relative to
12 Frank’s Nursery property. We’re supporting Amendment No. 10 put forth by the
13 County Council to retain the zoning of the Frank’s Nursery’s property as RE.

14 As a reminder, we’re only here because the developer petitioned the prior
15 County Council to circumvent the RE zoning designation to allow townhouse
16 development via text amendment, which normally would not have been allowed in
17 that zone. The letter – a letter dated March 3rd, 2022 by the Planning Board
18 Technical Staff to the Planning Board already opined on this issue. It rejected the
19 prior Council’s last-minute changes intended to override the Planning Board and the
20 community’s RE zoning recommendation for the property.

21 We are in total appreciation of the new County Council for what they have
22 been doing – what you all have been doing to right this wrong by putting in this
23 amendment in the Sectional Map Amendment to restore the original RE zoning.

1 I've also brought a copy of that technical report recommendation that – the
2 March 3rd letter for your consideration for the record.

3 CHAIR: Thank you so much.

4 MS. OLIVER: Thank you.

5 CHAIR: We appreciate you. Phillippa Johnston and Paul McDonald.

6 MS. JOHNSTON: I already testified [off mic - inaudible].

7 CHAIR: Thank you. You get extra points. Paul McDonald.

8 MR. MCDONALD: Good evening, Madam Chair and the Board, Council –
9 Members of the Council. My name is Paul McDonald. I'm the owner of Supreme
10 Landscaping. I'm here in favor of Amendment 5 and 15 of the rezoning properties
11 that I currently own. I'm an African-American business owner who has been in the
12 County 20-plus years.

13 Rezoning from Agricultural to Commercial will allow me both, my general
14 business contracting and landscaping, to operate in this location and contribute to
15 the Prince George's County tax base. Currently, I employ between 20 to 40 people
16 a year. This will allow me to continue that with landscape workers, tree experts,
17 construction and so forth. And I'd ask you just to be in favor of that. Thank you.

18 CHAIR: Thank you so much.

19 Is there a motion to adjourn?

20 MR. HAWKINS: So move.

21 MR. DERNOGA: Second.

22 CHAIR: Okay. We have a motion by Council Member Hawkins. Was the
23 second by – oh, okay, by Chair Emeritus Dernoga. By show of hands we are
24 adjourned.

1 (Whereupon, the joint public hearing was concluded.)

2

3

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIBER

4

5

6

I, Ruth Kerker Blair, hereby certify that the excerpt of the testimony given in the above-entitled matter was transcribed by me, and that said transcript is a true record, to the best of my ability, of said testimony.

7

8

9


I further hereby certify that I am neither a relative to nor an employee of any attorney or party herewith, and that I have no interest in the outcome of these proceedings.

10

This 17th day of February, 2024.

11

12



13

RUTH KERKER BLAIR

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24