

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

THE PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY PLANNING BOARD OF
THE MARYLAND-NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

SADDLE RIDGE
Evidentiary Hearing, SDP-2304

T R A N S C R I P T
O F
P R O C E E D I N G S

COUNTY ADMINISTRATION BUILDING
Upper Marlboro, Maryland
June 13, 2024
VOLUME I of I

BEFORE:

- PETER A. SHAPIRO, Chairman
- DOROTHY F. BAILEY, Vice Chair
- A. SHAUNISE WASHINGTON, Commissioner
- WILLIAM M. DOERNER, Commissioner
- MANUEL GERALDO, Commissioner

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

OTHERS PRESENT:

JILL KOSACK, Staff
MATTHEW TEDESCO, Attorney/Representative

CONTENTS:

PAGE:

KAMITA GRAY	23
MARK CALHOUN	27
KARLEEN POWELL	30
RODNEY TAYLOR	32

P R O C E E D I N G S

1
2 MR. MR. CHAIR: Next, we have Item 9 on our
3 agenda. This is SDP-2304, is that right? Yes, Saddle
4 Ridge. Mr. Tedesco's representing the applicant. Ms.
5 Kosack will be giving the staff presentation. This is an
6 evidentiary hearing. I believe we've a number of folks who
7 signed up to speak in opposition as well as support, as well
8 as staff or part of the team in support.

9 I will swear folks in as we get to them, since
10 this is an evidentiary hearing, and we'll start with the
11 staff presentation. Ms. Kosack, take it away.

12 MS. KOSACK: Yes. Good morning, Mr. Chair and
13 members of the planning board. For the record, I am Jill
14 Kosack with the Urban Design Section. Can you hear me okay?

15 MR. MR. CHAIR: I actually experience she's a
16 little bit soft.

17 COMMISSIONER GERALDO: Um-hum, it is a little.

18 MS. KOSACK: Is that any better?

19 MR. MR. CHAIR: Much better.

20 MS. KOSACK: Much better, okay. Sorry. Item
21 number 9 on the agenda is specific design plan, SDP-2304,
22 for Saddle Ridge, which proposes only infrastructure
23 improvements, including public streets, water, sewer, storm
24 drain utilities, and storm water management facilities.

25 The infrastructure is to support a future

1 residential community as allowed by the District Council
2 approved A-10060, which rezoned the property. An applicant
3 may submit a specific design plan for infrastructure only in
4 order to proceed with limited site improvements. The
5 proposed lots and residential architecture will have to be
6 approved under separate applications that will have to come
7 before the planning board prior to the plotting of the
8 property or issuance of building permits.

9 Future grading allowed as a result of this SDP
10 will be subject to regulatory controls imposed and enforced
11 by the county. The applicant submitted a variance request
12 to remove 33 specimen trees with staff's analysis on pages
13 11 through 14 of the report. Staff supports the removal of
14 22 specimen trees with the remaining 11 specimen trees to be
15 evaluated with the preliminary plan of subdivision.

16 The applicant also submitted a request for 21
17 primary management area impacts. Staff's analysis of this
18 request is on page 14 of the report. Staff supports 20 of
19 these impacts with the remaining 1 to be evaluated at this
20 time he preliminarily plan of subdivision stage.

21 As a matter of housekeeping, the applicant has
22 provided a revised findings and conditions memorandum
23 titled, Applicant's Exhibit 1. Staff has reviewed these
24 revisions and are in agreement with the proposed changes.

25 Staff did receive two letters of opposition from

1 the Brandywine Southern Region Neighborhood Coalition and a
2 group identifying themselves as abutting property owners and
3 affected residents that are in the backup. The items of
4 concern were regarding various impacts, specifically public
5 facilities, traffic, air and water pollution.

6 However, issues raised are not relevant to this
7 SDP, which is for infrastructure only. Traffic and public
8 facilities adequacy will be evaluated at the preliminary
9 plan of subdivision stage. Development aspects of the
10 residential subdivision, again, such as architecture and
11 landscaping, will be evaluated at the full specific design
12 plan phase.

13 Additionally, a referral was received from DPIE
14 dated June 7th and is in the additional backup. Their
15 comments will be addressed with the preliminary plan of
16 subdivision and in the final technical permit plans, and the
17 final resolution will reflect the receipt of that memo.

18 In conclusion, staff recommends the planning board
19 adopt the findings of the report and approve specific design
20 plan, SDP-2304; Type 2 Tree Conservation plan, TCP2-011-
21 2024; and a Variance from Section 25-122(b)(1)(G) for the
22 removal of 22 specimen trees subject to the conditions found
23 in the staff report as revised by Applicant's Exhibit 1.
24 And this concludes staff's presentation. Thank you.

25 MR. MR. CHAIR: Thank you, Ms. Kosack. Ms.

1 Kosack, I want you to just spend one more minute at some
2 level maybe repeating what you said, but about what is
3 before us, that these are infrastructure improvements only.
4 And the reason why is because I know we have a number of
5 folks who signed up to speak, and I want to make sure that
6 the folks who are speaking are speaking to the actual case
7 that is before us. So if you could, sort of, pound that a
8 bit for us, again, and perhaps, Mr. Warner, you could step
9 in as well. That might be helpful. But Ms. Kosack, turn
10 back to you.

11 MS. KOSACK: Yes. A specific design plan for
12 infrastructure is permitted in the zoning ordinance in order
13 for the applicant to proceed with limited site improvements.
14 In this case, what is proposed are public streets, water,
15 sewer and storm drain utilities, and storm water management
16 facilities. Again, this is an optional application that the
17 applicant has chosen to file in order to proceed with these
18 limited site improvements, and the full buildout of the
19 community with architecture and lots and recreational
20 facilities, landscaping, et cetera will be the subject of
21 future specific design plans that would have to come before
22 the board for approval.

23 So again, it's just limited to these
24 infrastructure type of improvements at this time.

25 MR. MR. CHAIR: Thank you, Ms. Kosack. And Mr.

1 Warner, I'd like to hear from you, too, in this, but I just
2 want to say that means for me, as regardless of what happens
3 today, the community will have ample opportunity to have its
4 voice heard in advance of any approval or denial of the real
5 meat of this project. And I just want to make sure that
6 we're clear around that, that this is relatively limited in
7 scope what's before us.

8 Mr. Warner, anything you want to bring to us on
9 that, or add to that as we proceed?

10 MR. WARNER: Thank you, Chair. David Warner,
11 principle counsel. No, Jill adequately, I think, identified
12 what this particular application covers, which we tend to
13 kind of say colloquially as the stuff that's not above the
14 ground, right, and the subsequent approvals, we'll deal more
15 with the things that are going to be above the ground, the
16 buildings and the other improvements. That's one way to,
17 kind of, look at it.

18 And the idea behind a SDP for infrastructure is
19 the development process being a very long one, the council
20 has provided a method whereby some of that development
21 activity can begin before the applicant has perhaps finished
22 the design of the above-ground improvements, whether it be
23 buildings, townhouses, whatever it might be. And so I think
24 Jill encapsulated that in her referral, so I think we're
25 good to go.

1 MR. CHAIR: All right, thank you, Mr. Warner.
2 Commissioner, are there any questions for staff or
3 council?

4 COMMISSIONER GERALDO: I have one -- I have one
5 question, Mr. Chair, just for clarification. I understand
6 it's for infrastructure and they'll be putting streets and
7 the like in, but does that mean, Ms. Kosack, that with a dog
8 park that would come under, when it goes for the SDP?

9 MS. KOSACK: Correct. The future SDPs would
10 provide all the details relative to recreational --

11 COMMISSIONER GERALDO: Okay.

12 MS. KOSACK: -- facilities and other amenities on
13 the property.

14 COMMISSIONER GERALDO: Okay. Thank you.

15 MR. MR. CHAIR: Unless they want to build a dog
16 road, but I don't know if that would be possible.

17 COMMISSIONER GERALDO: That would be good.

18 MR. MR. CHAIR: Right. Right. Right. Any other
19 questions for staff, Ms. Kosack, Mr. Warner? If not, we'll
20 turn to the applicant. Mr. Tedesco, take it away. You can
21 introduce yourself, your team, and if anyone else but you
22 wants to be speaking from your team, we'll swear them in.
23 But turn it to you.

24 MR. TEDESCO: Yes. Good still morning, Mr.
25 Chairman and members of the planning board. For the record,

1 Matthew Tedesco, the Law Firm of McNamee Hosea, here on
2 behalf of the applicants, D.R. Horton, Incorporated. My
3 client, again, is the applicant in this application. I do
4 not represent the owner; however, my client does have a
5 purchase and sales agreement and is acting in pursuant to
6 that, as it has on a number of previous applications related
7 to this project.

8 With me this morning, we have Mr. Matt Muddiman
9 from D.R. Horton. From Rodgers Consulting, which is our
10 land planning civil engineering and environmental planning
11 group, we have Matthew Leakan, he's our expert land planner;
12 Christine Gillette, who is our expert landscape architect;
13 Charlie Howe, our expert civil engineer; Rob Swam, our
14 environmental consultant; Steve Allison, our expert arborist
15 and environmental consultant; and Mr. Mike Lehart from
16 Lenhart Traffic and Consulting.

17 Although not with us, also part of our team is the
18 members of the G.S. Proctor and Associates team who have
19 been actively working with us, as well as with the
20 community, on this project and others in the area, so I just
21 want to publicly thank them for their efforts on this
22 application. I certainly want to thank Ms. Kosack, your
23 environmental planning staff, your transportation planning
24 staff, and other staff members in Urban Design in
25 subdivision section with respect to its review of this

1 application and its preceding applications and ultimately
2 future applications. But always great working with staff
3 and bringing these very important projects to you all. This
4 one similar to the one last week that you heard is related
5 to a project that has a very long history, which I'll go
6 into in a little bit greater detail just to refresh your
7 memory, because I know sometimes with all these cases that
8 you all hear it's important to sometimes reflect a little
9 bit on how we got to where we are.

10 As you may recall, this property, in particular,
11 has a very long history of surface mining, sand and gravel
12 operations that actually date back to the 1960's, and that
13 is outlined in detail in your staff report. I won't go
14 through the specific dates, but dating back to the 60's,
15 70's, and into the 90's, this property was a mining site.
16 From the initiation of this project, from the point in time
17 in which our client, D.R. Horton, Incorporated, commenced on
18 this process, and including our consulting team, that,
19 again, date back before even we did the basic plan, the
20 rezoning which was A-10060, which this board recommended
21 approval on in July of 2021, almost three years ago now.
22 The zoning hearing examiner recommended approval of that
23 rezoning back in May of 2022, and ultimately, the district
24 council approved that rezoning in October of 2022.

25 Our vision, our client's vision, the team's vision

1 and goal was to create the best possible land plan while
2 preserving and enhancing the property's unique environmental
3 features, and those features consist of the Birch Branch and
4 its associated tributaries; thereby creating a very unique
5 and special well-planned and well-designed community.

6 There is no doubt, as supported by the staff
7 report and all reviewing agencies, that the prior CDP that
8 was previously approved last year, that was in October of
9 2023, as well as this next iteration of this specific design
10 plan for infrastructure only further advances the vision and
11 goals and satisfies all the required findings of approval,
12 which are very well articulated in your staff report and
13 also analyzed in great detail in our statement of
14 justification, which we would further incorporate and adopt
15 as further testimony here today.

16 This application, again limited in scope,
17 nevertheless the project as a whole, as the planning board
18 has come to expect and anticipate from this applicant and
19 from this design team, in particular, results in and
20 producing a substantial resilient community in a village-
21 like setting that takes advantage of the natural environment
22 while also improving upon those features.

23 Although this is a specific design plan for
24 infrastructure as articulated by Ms. Kosack and Mr. Warner,
25 i.e. being limited in scope, by providing a well-designed,

1 amenity rich, environmentally sensitive, comprehensively
2 planned community that will offer a mix of products of
3 various sizes and price points, ultimately, we believe this
4 community will directly respond to the housing crisis and
5 implement the county's housing opportunity for all
6 comprehensive housing strategy while also implementing the
7 goals and policies of Plan 2035 in the Subregion 5
8 Masterplan.

9 The ultimate creation of smaller neighborhoods
10 physically connected to larger community by a series of
11 trails and walks creates a village-like setting while also
12 creating a sense of place with much needed housing in close
13 proximity to one of the County's 26 local centers, being the
14 Brandywine Local Community Center. Indeed, the Subregion 5
15 Masterplan specifically states and recommends that much of
16 the future residential development in this subregion and in
17 Brandywine, in particular, will be enlarged masterplan
18 communities, particularly in the north and west of the
19 subregion. The masterplan specifically references Saddle
20 Ridge as one of those properties.

21 I want to turn to this SDP, in particular. As Ms.
22 Kosack indicated, this SDP is for infrastructure only,
23 meaning what's before you for approval, or hopeful approval,
24 is grading, proposed streets, water and sewer utilities,
25 storm drain utilities, and storm water management

1 facilities. We still must file and prepare a preliminary
2 plan of subdivision. That must be reviewed and analyzed by
3 your staff and ultimately approved by you all, along with a
4 certificate of adequacy, and, ultimately, an SDP, as Ms.
5 Kosack indicated, for the actual development. That SDP at
6 that time will include everything that's not included in
7 this SDP, which means the architecture of the homes, the
8 landscaping, the lighting, the recreational amenities that
9 will include a clubhouse as well as other amenities and dog
10 park facilities. All of those details will be at a future
11 specific design plan.

12 Transportation adequacy and other public facility
13 adequacy testing will occur at the time of preliminary plan.
14 Not today. Pursuant to Section 27-527C of the zoning
15 ordinance, only those regulations, submittable requirements,
16 development standards, and site design guidelines that are
17 applicable to an infrastructure SDP shall be considered.
18 This application before you and all of the supporting
19 documents submitted in its support satisfy the requirements
20 of 27-527 as well as 27-528B, which is articulated in your
21 staff report.

22 Simply, Mr. Chairman and members of the board, all
23 findings are met. All applicable conditions of approval
24 have been analyzed. All referring agencies support this
25 application and recommend approval.

1 Turning to the applicants efforts and in response
2 to some of the letters that the citizens have provided, I do
3 want to make clear that, notwithstanding some of the
4 contentions made in those letters, we very much value the
5 citizens' feedback and input and very much enjoy working
6 with the residents in the community, in particular those
7 that have signed up here today. We have a very lengthy
8 history with some. Some, we're still getting to know, but
9 we very much consider them part of the project,
10 notwithstanding they have concerns about the project, which
11 we certainly understand and one would anticipate.

12 The Brandywine community, as you all know, is
13 changing and has changed. From the time of my childhood
14 growing up in the area, it's changed significantly, and from
15 the time that many of these residents have either owned or
16 families have owned property, it's changed significantly.
17 That's been purposeful. It's been purposeful to implement
18 the general plan. It's been purposeful to implement the
19 Subregional 5 Masterplan. That being said, I recognize and
20 the applicant recognizes that change is hard. Change is
21 difficult, but change is coming.

22 That being said, there are very specific rules and
23 guidelines that we must all follow, notwithstanding those
24 planned recommendations and those changes to establish
25 Brandywine as one of the 26 local centers in the county. We

1 must have transportation adequacy tested, public facilities
2 tested, and that will be done. It's just not done at this
3 particular stage.

4 Our efforts with the community date back before
5 the rezoning. We first had community outreach back in June
6 of 2021. That was still very much in the thralls of COVID.
7 We sent out more than 70 mailings to have virtual meetings
8 at that time for the zoning map amendment. In April of
9 2023, we met with Mr. Taylor personally at the Rodgers
10 Consulting office to review the CDP at that time on behalf
11 of himself and his family and his mother, who also are
12 property owners in the area.

13 In September of 2023, we had another outreach
14 meeting for the CDP prior to the planning board hearing. We
15 had members, you all may recall, of the community attend
16 that CDP hearing. Some of their concerns may be raised
17 again today.

18 In December of 2023, we had a meeting at the Union
19 Bethel Church with all those, I believe, who are here today,
20 but also, there were many in attendance, including the
21 Coalition as well as members of the BTB.

22 In January of 2024, we had a meeting with an
23 adjoining property owner along Floral Park Road, Mr. and
24 Mrs. Anderson. We met at their house and informed them of
25 details regarding the project.

1 In March of 2024, we had a follow-up meeting at
2 the Union Bethel Church with representatives who are here
3 today and representatives of the Coalition and BTB.

4 Those meetings, as we've promised in all of them,
5 are ongoing. As Mr. Proctor and I have indicated to this
6 community, we will continue to meet and meet as often and as
7 many times as we are welcomed to meet and provide as much
8 information as we possibly can provide. Some of the
9 information we provide may not be agreed with, and we
10 understand that, and we respect it. We try to inform
11 through our experts and through the process, as well as your
12 staff tries to inform the community as best that we can.

13 But the reality is is that this property has gone
14 through a rezoning to implement the master plans, implement
15 the general plan, as well as a comprehensive design plan to
16 further implement those goals and policies. This
17 development ultimately, although more limited in scope here
18 today regarding the infrastructure SDP, but ultimately as a
19 whole, and you'll probably hear me say this at the time of
20 the preliminary plan and certainly at the time of the
21 specific design plan for the overall development, it is not
22 out of character of the area.

23 In fact, when the rezoning was approved, both the
24 planning board, the zoning hearing (indiscernible) and the
25 District Council all approved the rezoning with a finding

1 that all of the requirements of Section 27-195 were met.
2 Those included master plan and general plan conformance,
3 which I've highlighted a number of times this morning. At
4 that time, the transportation adequacy was looked at.
5 Notwithstanding that, we will be retested at the time of
6 preliminary plan.

7 Other public facilities at that time were also
8 deemed adequate. Again, notwithstanding, those will be
9 further analyzed with the upcoming and forthcoming
10 preliminary plan of subdivision. The environmental
11 relationships were determine to reflect compatibility
12 between the proposed land use type and the surrounding
13 areas, again all recommended by staff, recommended by you,
14 recommended by the zoning hearing examiner, and ultimately
15 approved by the District Council.

16 With the recently approved comprehensive design
17 plan, findings were made by this board and affirmed by the
18 District Council that this project and development, all of
19 the purpose of the zone are met with this project, Section
20 27-511. All development standards are met, 27-513D.
21 compatibility with existing land uses was determine. The
22 plan results in development with a better environment than
23 could be achieved under other regulations was determined.
24 Staging of development will not be an unreasonable burden on
25 available public facilities. The comprehensive design plan

1 demonstrated preservation and/or restoration of regulated
2 environmental features in a nature state to the fullest
3 extent possible. All those findings have previously been
4 made, notwithstanding the fact that as you all know with the
5 preliminary plan and with the specific design plan the
6 greater detailed of the project will further be analyzed and
7 required findings be made at that time.

8 With the utmost respect to the members of the
9 community that are here, some of which we know very, very
10 well and we do consider them partners, notwithstanding
11 agreeing to disagree on certain aspects of the project,
12 respectfully all of the points raised in the letters that
13 are before you in your backup either lack factual support,
14 have already been addressed with the basic plan or the CDP,
15 will be further addressed with upcoming preliminary plans
16 and SDPs and the ADQs, or just not relevant to the
17 application before you, which is a limited scoped
18 infrastructure SDP.

19 Mr. Chairman and members of the board, we had one
20 exhibit that Ms. Kosack referenced in her presentation and
21 related to fairly minor clarifications related to
22 recommended findings and conditions. They are more or less
23 consistent with amendments made and adopted by the board in
24 the case from last week, which is Dobson Ridge, but they
25 seek to just provide clarification to the recommended

1 findings and conditions, and as Ms. Kosack indicated, staff
2 is in agreement with Applicant's Exhibit 1.

3 We do have the assembled team with us to respond
4 to any questions that the board may have, and we certainly
5 welcome the opportunity, Mr. Chairman, to respond after the
6 citizens have had a chance to be heard, and we would submit
7 at this time and reserve any prior questions, or subsequent
8 comments, excuse me, until there may be questions and/or
9 response to the community.

10 So with that, Mr. Chairman, we thank you for your
11 indulgence. We thank you for your time with the very
12 important project, and we stand ready to respond further as
13 needed.

14 MR. CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Tedesco. I appreciate
15 it.

16 Commissioner, are there any questions for the
17 Applicant before we hear from the public? Don't see any.

18 Okay, in terms of managing the time of this, I
19 want to make sure that parties in opposition have roughly
20 the same amount of time as the Applicant has. The Applicant
21 took about 15 minutes. I see five members in the party of
22 opportunity. We can allocate your time as you see fit, if
23 you want to change it up a bit, but otherwise, we'll assume
24 it's three minutes per person.

25 Let me just read through to see who we have here.

1 Matt Muddiman. (Audio interference).

2 MR. MUDDIMAN: (Audio interference) a
3 representative of D.R. Horton, the Applicant, Mr. Chairman.

4 MR. CHAIR: Okay, thank you. I thought that was
5 an error. I just want to make sure.

6 So then, we have Kamita Gray. Are you there?

7 MS. GRAY: Yes, I'm here.

8 MR. CHAIR: Okay, Ms. Gray.

9 Mark Calhoun, are you there?

10 MR. CALHOUN: Yes, I'm here.

11 MR. CHAIR: All right, thank you, Mr. Calhoun.
12 Karleen Powell?

13 MS. POWELL: Yes, I'm protesting.

14 MR. CHAIR: Thank you, Ms. Powell.

15 Oh, Mr. Calhoun, I see you there. I apologize for
16 that.

17 And Rodney Taylor? Mr. Taylor?

18 MR. TAYLOR: (Audio interference).

19 MR. CHAIR: Do I hear you, Mr. Taylor? I can't
20 tell.

21 Ms. Powell or Mr. Calhoun, do you know if Mr.
22 Taylor is there on the line? Have you talked to him
23 beforehand, or staff, do we know?

24 MR. CALHOUN: Sir, I do not.

25 MR. TAYLOR: I don't know. Kamita may know.

1 MR. CHAIR: Okay. We'll see as it plays along.
2 So for Ms. Gray, Mr. Calhoun, Ms. Powell, and Mr. Taylor, if
3 you're there, if you could raise your right hands, please?

4 Do you solemnly swear or affirm that the testimony
5 will be -- your testimony will be the whole truth and
6 nothing but the truth?

7 MR. CALHOUN: Yes.

8 MR. TAYLOR: Yes.

9 MS. POWELL: Yes.

10 MR. CHAIR: Okay, consider yourself under oath.
11 Again, I see four of you who are signed up to speak, if we
12 have Mr. Taylor, so unless you all want to organize your
13 time differently, you'll have up to four minutes each to
14 speak, okay? And you don't have to use all that time,
15 obviously, but that's the time that we have allotted for
16 you.

17 So I'll go in the order that I have listed here.
18 We'll start with Ms. Gray, the BTB Coalition, and Ms. Gray,
19 you don't have to bring your camera on, but we don't see you
20 just in case, but we did hear you.

21 MS. GRAY: Yes, I do apologize. My MAC graphic
22 display does not have a camera.

23 MR. CHAIR: Yeah, no worries at all. We can hear
24 you fine, so we'll put a clock up here. Four minutes on the
25 clock, and take it away. The floor is yours. I do, Ms.

1 Gray, I do want to way, as I would with all of you, I'm
2 certainly going to provide some latitude, some
3 reflexivity, with you all around your testimony, but to be
4 clear, this is a limited scope SDP related to
5 infrastructure. So I'm going to ask you to be mindful of
6 that, and issues around transportation adequacy, issues
7 around broader design issues, or amenities and things like
8 that are not pertinent to this case before us. They're just
9 not. Again, we can provide a little bit of latitude. We're
10 happy to have you here and advocating for what you believe,
11 but I'm going to be not totally strict but a little strict
12 if you're bearing too much into issues, topics that are off
13 from what is before us, which is, as Mr. Warner very
14 thoughtfully said, it's all the stuff that's below the
15 ground rather than above the ground. That's what's before
16 us, okay? So with that, I will start with you, Ms. Gray,
17 and if you can introduce yourself on the record, the floor
18 is yours.

19 MS. GRAY: I do have one question before we start.
20 Your site describes SDP as including landscaping plans, tree
21 conservation plans, and recreational facility plans. Is
22 that not true today?

23 MR. CHAIR: Let me ask staff to address that
24 specific. I appreciate you bring that up, and let me ask
25 staff to address that specifically.

1 Ms. Kosack, did you hear the question?

2 MR. KOSACK: Can you restate the question one more
3 time?

4 MR. CHAIR: Yeah. Ms. Gray, restate the question,
5 please.

6 MS. GRAY: In Park and Plannings detailed
7 description of what a SDP includes, it says, detailed
8 landscaping plans, tree conservation plans, recreational
9 facility plans, and exterior buildings evaluations.

10 MR. KOSACK: Okay, yes, that is what a typical
11 specific design plan does encompass. The specific design
12 plan for infrastructure is a optional application type that
13 is limited to infrastructure only that the applicant apply
14 for prior to doing the typical specific design plan, which
15 does include the full landscaping and buildings and things
16 like that. So what you're describing is a typical one.
17 However, there is the ability to do an infrastructure only,
18 which is what this case before the board is today.

19 MR. CHAIR: So to be clear, Ms. Gray, most of what
20 you just described is actually not before us. Only the
21 infrastructure.

22 MS. GRAY: Okay, thank you.

23 MR. CHAIR: Thank you. And again, take it away.
24 The floor is yours. If you can introduce yourself for the
25 record.

1 MS. GRAY: Good afternoon. My name is Kamita
2 Gray, lifelong resident of Brandywine, on behalf of the
3 Brandywine TB Southern Region Neighborhood Coalition. As
4 the administrative chair of the ECCB, a place-based member
5 organization dedicated to encourage a smart and sustainable
6 development in Brandywine in Southern Maryland. We do work
7 for the greater good of the community to ensure that
8 Brandywine and the surrounding area receives its fair share
9 of benefits without shouldering an unfair share of its cost
10 and immediate enviros for which we are disproportionately
11 impacted by adverse land use approvals while preventing
12 development of future homes or activities.

13 I do want to say the Applicant did meet with the
14 abutting property owners but not with the BT Coalition or
15 its members. Therefore, we are submitting this synopsis or
16 testimony for the record as it relates to SDP-2304 Saddle
17 Creek proceedings and providing our adverse suppositions.
18 Testimony submitted is based on evidences and the
19 considerate humble opinion of our community members and our
20 membership.

21 Inappropriate adequate public facility policy, we
22 ask that adequacy should be met with substantial and
23 immediate impact concurrently not in unpredicted future
24 having no budgets or plans. As far as landscape
25 conservation, the plan demonstrates that the regulated

1 environment of features are preserved in minimal areas when
2 this has been matured forested trees for over seven decades.

3 Also, I want to duly note the 172 acres on the
4 Floral Park Road side have never been mined. As far as the
5 Applicant mentioned in his justification that Saddle Ridge,
6 specifically, identified in the Brandywine area
7 (indiscernible) for the masterplan subdivision is very
8 close. However, five miles is a lot of area to cover when
9 they're in proper public facilities to make appropriate and
10 necessary connections, specifically as it relates to
11 recreation and community trails throughout as we associate
12 with Columbia, Maryland having such connectivity. Having
13 been esteemed evaluation of what we would consider for the
14 Brandywine area neighborhoods.

15 The BTR staff in this review believes that the
16 dedication of 11 acres proposed on Floral Park Road would
17 contribute toward leading the community land for usable
18 active recreation in the Brandywine community. The 11 acres
19 proposed is not tangible and has been in the plans since
20 2007. Without proper infrastructure, public schools,
21 students, teachers face consequences that go far beyond
22 their physical (indiscernible) and should be treated as
23 human rights issue.

24 This is a 72 percent black community as records.
25 Minor discriminatory practice is that we lack appropriate

1 public facilities, and it goes against the very fabric of
2 what our constitution provides as citizen right and the duty
3 of care that our government agencies are to protect and
4 serve them.

5 A determination must be made as the public will
6 adequately be served by the appropriate facilities now and
7 not in a probable, more likely than not outlook of
8 assumptions that are discriminatory, having causation and
9 the desperate impacts and overburdens on the Brandywine
10 community. We do respect Mr. Tedesco's comments in looking
11 forward in working together. We do know that there are
12 compromises on both sides, but we expect to at least have an
13 appropriate seat at the table. Having presented this
14 synopsis, or testimony, from our written comments,
15 therefore, we request that our full written testimony
16 document in support of this testimony be added to the record
17 that will be submitted today by email. Thank you for your
18 time and consideration.

19 MR. CHAIR: Thank you, Ms. Gray. Much
20 appreciated.

21 We now will hear from Mr. Calhoun, Mark Calhoun.
22 If you introduce yourself for the record? We'll put four
23 minutes up for you, as well, and introduce yourself and take
24 it away.

25 MR. CALHOUN: How are you doing? My name is Mark

1 Calhoun. My (indiscernible) at 641 Floral Park Road,
2 Brandywine, Maryland 20613. I'm sitting in the middle of
3 this project. Okay. I come here today with the concerns of
4 the development of how close this project is going to be to
5 the borders of my house, and everything that's going to be
6 going on underground facilities. I have a water well. I've
7 been using the water well several, especially for the last
8 couple years at the house. We've been using it the entire
9 time for the last 40 years. I want to make sure whatever
10 they're doing in the ground doesn't mess up the water tank
11 and continues -- well, basically, not disturb my ability to
12 use my water well. And that these property lines end right
13 away next to my home isn't encroached on, and that these,
14 also, that I have a sewage facility, basically a separate
15 facility and a drain field. So I need to make sure that
16 whatever they're doing into the ground close to my house
17 doesn't disturb my living that we've been enjoying for all
18 these years.

19 So also, this, and I want to make sure that I have
20 some type of understanding of where these lines are when it
21 comes to these easements for the electrical lines or
22 whatever it is that written into the deeds of whatever
23 properties that they received from some family members of
24 mine when they got the property from.

25 My main concern is, since we're going to keep it

1 just on what this is today, is that the water tables and the
2 work that they're going to be doing close to my house
3 doesn't affect anything that would -- basically doesn't
4 affect our living, and that's why I'm here for. And I would
5 like to have some further plans. I didn't see anything
6 specific in what I was reading. I'll go back over it. I've
7 tried to go through some of it today and some of it
8 yesterday when I first got a chance to look at it and see
9 whatever else I have laid out to explain what it is that
10 they're going to be doing around my home. And basically, at
11 what time and what these -- the effects that could be.
12 Because right now, I really don't have a good understanding
13 of exactly how much work, and since you've gone from about
14 400 houses to a thousand, I'm pretty sure there's going to
15 be a lot more constructive or whatever has to take in, you
16 know, just a whole, those number of houses, what you have to
17 put into the ground to deal with that. Because that's a lot
18 more houses, which means you have to do a lot more to the
19 ground to deal with those houses, which requires putting in
20 wires and putting in pipes, so it's going to be a lot more
21 than what it was.

22 Now, a little clarification on all of that and
23 these easements. That's what I'm here for. Thank you.

24 MR. CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Calhoun. I appreciate
25 the questions and certainly appropriate questions and

1 concerns, and I'm sure Mr. Tedesco will address some of that
2 in his rebuttal. The staff may have some comments on that,
3 as well, Mr. Calhoun. So thank you. Thank you very much.

4 Next, we have Karleen Powell.

5 MS. POWELL: Yes. Good afternoon.

6 MR. CHAIR: Yes, we can hear you.

7 MS. POWELL: Okay. Good afternoon. I am Karleen
8 Powell. (Audio interference) I hear an echo. Are you
9 hearing --

10 MR. CHAIR: We hear it, too.

11 COMMISSIONER GERALDO: Yes.

12 MR. CHAIR: Yeah, we hear it, too.

13 MR. TAYLOR: Okay. All right.

14 MR. CHAIR: Ms. Powell --

15 MS. POWELL: There have been many --

16 MR. CHAIR: Ms. Powell, is there any chance you
17 have two devices on, like a phone and a computer?

18 MS. POWELL: Let me check. It should not be.

19 MR. CHAIR: Now, we can't hear either of you.

20 MS. POWELL: Okay. Oh (audio interference).

21 MR. CHAIR: That's good. That's good. That's
22 good. We can hear you fine.

23 MS. POWELL: All right. Thank you. As I said, I
24 am Karleen Powell. I don't know what the echo is, but okay.
25 A lifelong resident of Brandywine, Maryland. There have

1 been many housing development projects in Brandywine with
2 (audio interference) or improved infrastructure. And
3 Brandywine has changed, but again, infrastructure is much
4 needed. I live at the intersection of Branch Avenue and
5 Moores Road in Brandywine, Maryland. Residents on Moores
6 Road, east side and west side, are greatly affected with
7 additional traffic as a result of housing development
8 entering onto the 301, Branch Avenue, traveling northbound
9 and southbound.

10 And (audio interference) for us to travel
11 anywhere, we must enter the Branch Avenue at the Branch
12 Avenue intersection. It is a daily path, and safety issues
13 to enter the highway to travel either way, northbound or
14 southbound, at any given time. Nearly ten years or more ago
15 (audio interference) community residents of Brandywine and
16 Clinton (audio interference) Branch Avenue (audio
17 interference) traffic, and that was more than ten years or
18 ago.

19 Some of the residents have met (audio
20 interference) representatives from MDOT and SAK with the
21 state senator addressing a list of concerns resulting in
22 aggressive drivers, accidents, fatal and serious injuries,
23 intersection (audio interference) all of this is happening
24 at the intersection of Moores Road due to lack of
25 infrastructure before, after, or (audio interference).

1 At this time, I'm going to read a quote that was
2 written in an email to me fall of 2023 from a representative
3 from the Maryland Department of Transportation (audio
4 interference), and it reads as follows, quote, to provide
5 (audio interference) construction (audio interference)
6 Maryland (audio interference) from just south of Brandywine
7 Road to just north of (indiscernible) Drive the original
8 southbound lane of Maryland finds it's constructed in 1956,
9 and the northbound was constructed in 1969. There has been
10 (audio interference) expansion or (audio interference) in
11 this area since 1969. There have been many operational
12 improvements since that time, such as (audio interference)
13 but no roadway expansion, unquote. And I can speak to that
14 about 1969, and I can tell you I know the road (audio
15 interference) with my eyes closed. The road (audio
16 interference) I live, Branch Avenue, has been the same since
17 I was in high school. Even though there was mining before
18 and after that, we have a difficult time getting on the
19 highway, and a lot of the residents have been
20 (indiscernible) accidents and deadly accidents. We need
21 that infrastructure before we can move forward with any
22 further housing development. Thank you for your time. In
23 closing, I am in support with the BT Coalition testimony.
24 Thank you.

25 MR. CHAIR: Thank you, Ms. Powell. Much

1 appreciated.

2 Mr. Taylor, glad you're able to get online. We
3 see you.

4 MR. TAYLOR: Good to see you, Mr. Chair.

5 MR. CHAIR: Yeah, it's good to see you. If you
6 could formally introduce yourself for the record, and we'll
7 put four minutes up on the clock, and the floor is yours.

8 MR. TAYLOR: Thank you. Mr. Rodney Taylor here.
9 I'm speaking on behalf of myself and my mom, who resides at
10 6201 Floral Park Road in Brandywine. Several other of the
11 seniors that live on that same street, the abutting
12 properties to this proposed development. And let me say,
13 well, start by saying, we've had meetings with the
14 developer, Mr. Proctor, with our community and some good
15 meetings and trying to work through some challenge that we
16 see. But I would also say that speaking with the seniors,
17 they are very concerned that even as we talk about this
18 phase of the project, just the project in general, the
19 infrastructure is a major issue right now in all the
20 buildings going on. As you know, a development has already
21 been built across the street from them, and currently, my
22 mom is having difficulty with water underground. Her yard
23 is like a sponge now, and we think that's coming from the
24 water coming from across the street. There's just so many
25 issues. There's fools. I mean, it's just -- it's just a

1 growth of the building that's going on that have these
2 seniors very concerned, and they really feel like, and I
3 explained this to Mr. Proctor, and we've been talking, I
4 will say that they feel like they're not getting anything
5 out of this other than taxes are going to go up, and they're
6 all on fixed incomes. So I just have a major concern with
7 the seniors that we're now adding more houses for Floral
8 Park Road. It's a single lane road going up and down. I
9 know this is going to come somewhere in this process where
10 they'll look at the traffic study and the infrastructure.
11 I've been to several meetings. I hear this all the time.
12 But at this point in time, I just need to hear more before I
13 feel comfortable with what sayings that this project is
14 something we want to see on Floral Park Road. And that from
15 my mother, as well, and she wanted to make sure I say that,
16 so I'm saying that, along with some of the seniors right
17 there abutting the property of this development. And I want
18 to thank you for your time.

19 MR. CHAIR: Thank you. Thank you for bringing
20 your voice for this, and thank you for doing what you're
21 told as a son, as well.

22 MR. TAYLOR: Thank you.

23 MR. CHAIR: All right, we don't have anyone who's
24 signed up to speak on this. I will turn back to the
25 Applicant for any rebuttal and then close. Mr. Tedesco,

1 you've heard some specific concerns, some of which actually
2 are pertinent to this infrastructure issue. We're not
3 expecting you to address the ones that aren't pertinent, but
4 if you could address the ones that are specific to the
5 infrastructure, it will be helpful for us in the rebuttal.
6 And then, you have the close, as well.

7 MS. TEDESCO: Yeah, thank you, Mr. Chairman. I
8 want to thank, certainly, all of the citizens, Ms. Gray, Mr.
9 Calhoun, Ms. Powell, Mr. Taylor on behalf of Ms. Taylor. I
10 do, just for housekeeping purposes, just to cover everyone's
11 bases, Mr. Chairman, I don't know if Mr. Taylor was on or
12 received the oath. I just -- just to belt and suspenders
13 make sure his testimony was sworn for his benefit and the
14 benefit of the board.

15 MR. CHAIR: I appreciate you flagging it.

16 Mr. Taylor, were you sworn in?

17 MR. TAYLOR: Yes. Yes, I was sworn in. I was on.

18 MR. CHAIR: Okay.

19 MR. TAYLOR: I was listening.

20 MR. CHAIR: Okay.

21 MR. TAYLOR: And I did raise my right hand.

22 MR. CHAIR: All right, thank you.

23 Thanks for checking, Mr. Tedesco.

24 MR. TEDESCO: Yeah, the only reason I did because
25 we had -- Mr. Taylor wasn't there originally, so I just

1 wanted to make sure the record was perfectly clear that he
2 did swear and affirm, so that's great.

3 But no, I think to start kind of in reverse order,
4 if I may, with Mr. Taylor. I want to thank Mr. Taylor for
5 his acknowledgement of the efforts of both myself, the
6 Applicant, and Mr. Proctor and his team with regarding the
7 outreach. And this kind of ducktails into Mr. Calhoun's
8 testimony, which certainly I think any neighbor adjacent to
9 any development project, regardless of size, is certainly
10 concerned of those components associated with adverse
11 impacts associated with just, if anything else, the
12 construction alone. And so I do want to make sure that Mr.
13 Calhoun and Mr. and Mrs. Taylor are aware, and all the
14 residents along Flora Park are aware, of the safeguards and
15 the protections that the county and the state regulations
16 impose with respect to any type of land development, and
17 those, I don't need to go through a litany of what those
18 are, but the permitting is not just with park and planning
19 and/or park and planning permit review section. We have
20 agencies, both state and federal as well as local, that
21 review and actually permit all components of any particular
22 development project. We're not there yet in that process;
23 however, all of those regulations, local, state, and
24 federal, must be adhered to, to ensure there are no adverse
25 impacts with respect to adjoining properties, whether that

1 be storm water, water runoff, any impacts to existing septic
2 or sewer systems and/or water and well systems.

3 I know Mr. Taylor's mentioned before, and he
4 mentioned it here, publicly with respect to what do we get
5 out of this, what does the community get out of this, et
6 cetera. That's always a tough question to answer because
7 the impacts associated with any development project go far
8 and beyond that particular project, both from an economic
9 standpoint to the county to addressing housing issues for
10 the county as well as the region. Certainly financial
11 impacts associated with impact fees, permitting fees,
12 surcharge fees. This project alone, those figures will be
13 in the millions, so those are actual benefitting,
14 contributing factors to the local economy as well as to the
15 community. Moreover, as Mr. Taylor knows, we have been
16 working very closely with him as well as some of the other
17 neighbors in looking into and spending Applicant's monies on
18 consulting fees looking into the ability and opportunities
19 and the cost effectiveness of potentially providing sewer
20 connections to some of the existing residents that are
21 currently on septic. Whether that will be something that
22 can ultimately be facilitated, we don't know yet, we are,
23 full disclosure, struggling with some of that because of the
24 grade and ETOPO and just how things flow. But we have spent
25 a considerable amount of time in requests made by the

1 community adjacent property owners to look into those
2 things, which we have and will continue to do, and look
3 forward in continuing to work with Mr. Taylor and his
4 neighbors in that regard.

5 To kind of conclude on Mr. Calhoun's comments,
6 notwithstanding the answer that there are a number of
7 permits that must be acquired in order to facilitate any
8 development, even if the board approves this today, which we
9 hope they do, that doesn't mean we have permits in hand and
10 we get to go. There's still a lot of regulatory review that
11 must occur. However, we did, and I think I've said this
12 publicly on a number of times because Mr. Calhoun was very
13 much involved in the rezoning, he attended the planning
14 board hearing, the zoning hearing, examiner hearing, as well
15 as the District Council hearing. There was concerns about
16 property lines at that point, acreages, and things of that
17 sort. We've provided Mr. Calhoun, on five different
18 occasions, surveys of his property as it relates to this
19 property. I think we've publicly offered to meet with Mr.
20 Calhoun. I will, again, publicly offer to meet with Mr.
21 Calhoun. We're happy to come to his residence. We're happy
22 to have him at any one of our offices or actually on the
23 property to go through actually what the specific grading
24 plans look like, the buffers, the landscaping, when we get
25 to the point when we can actually show those in greater

1 detail, but as far as much detail as we have right now,
2 we're happy to share and show. We certainly do not want to
3 cause any impacts, whether perceived or otherwise, to Mr.
4 Calhoun or his property, and we don't anticipate and don't
5 believe that we will be. I think just knowledge is power
6 and key, and we want to share as much of that as we can, but
7 we have to be given the opportunity to sit down and meet.
8 Having dialogue through quasi-judicial evidentiary hearings
9 is not the way to do it, so I would just, again, implore and
10 encourage Mr. Calhoun to please allow us the opportunity to
11 come and meet.

12 Regarding Ms. Powell's testimony, and Ms. Powell
13 and I know each other, and we've worked together for many
14 years, and I certainly, as a former educator and a son of
15 somebody who was in the school system of Prince George
16 County, I certainly can applaud Ms. Powell for her
17 commitment to her community and commitment to making sure
18 that things are done appropriately.

19 We have agreement to disagree with respect to some
20 testimony regarding the infrastructure in the overall
21 Brandywine community and Maryland-5 and US-301. I'm not
22 going to go into great detail about that. We did that back
23 in October of 2023, less than a year ago, on the CDP with
24 similar testimony regarding improvements or the testimony of
25 the belief of lack thereof on 301 and 5. I would further

1 just reference our responses back on October 19, 2023 in
2 reference to that. We went through it at that time, Mr.
3 Chairman. You may recall five or six different projects
4 that have actually made improvements to that transportation
5 network in the Brandywine area that were not just road club
6 payments but either payments that were actually used for
7 improvements or actual improvements that were made as part
8 of a developer participation agreement in lieu of making
9 road club payments. And at the time of CDP, and I'm sure
10 you'll hear me at the time of preliminary plan, in addition
11 to our frontage improvements along Accokeek Road, which will
12 be substantial, and Floral Park Road, this project is
13 obligated to contribute to the Brandywine Road Club. That
14 will be a seven figure number, but as we have done recently
15 with other projects in Brandywine to and include Calm
16 Retreat and Timothy Branch, we are trying to initiate either
17 letter agreements or developer participation agreements to
18 actually implement MPOT improvements in lieu of paying the
19 road club so that actual improvements get made instead of
20 just paying into a club that monies are collected and then
21 over time get implemented. It's been successful on a
22 handful of recent projects in the Brandywine area. Calm
23 Retreat just to the south of here, which is just off the
24 screen of this slide to the south, is actually putting in a
25 third, Mike Lenhart's here, he can correct me, but a third

1 through lane on more than a larger portion than its frontage
2 along 301. The shopping center, put in a third or fourth
3 through lane northbound 301. Timothy Branch, obviously,
4 both through private and public funding through the road
5 club and developer funding, constructed the spine road
6 through that project. Steven's Crossing to the north, we'll
7 do the same. So we intend to follow that road map, no pun
8 intended, with respect to, how do we start, not just
9 providing road club fees, although that's the requirement
10 for adequacy, is there an opportunity to actually make other
11 improvements along the network. So those will be explored
12 in greater detail at the time of preliminary plan.

13 And finally, with Ms. Gray and her comment, the
14 only thing that I would offer just for the record, and Ms.
15 Gray and I know each other for many decades, and I want to
16 thank her for her involvement on behalf of her community and
17 her role in that capacity, but I just want the record to be
18 clear, the testimony today was we had not met with BTB.
19 I've emailed, and we've gotten emails from BTB half a dozen
20 times in the last three months. In every one of those
21 emails, we've offered to meet. Mr. Gray attended the
22 December 21st and March 14th meetings as the administrative
23 chair, as she referenced her title as to BTB. She was
24 there. Other members of BTB were in both of those meetings.
25 Ms. Gray has personally met with Mr. Proctor in his office.

1 So I just, in fairness to the Applicant and my role as
2 preservation of the record, it's inconsistent with fact to
3 say that we have not or are not meeting with BTB. That's
4 just factually not correct. So with that, Mr. Chairman, we
5 don't have anything further to add in rebuttal other than to
6 say, we do understand the community's concerns. We look
7 forward to the continued dialogue. I welcome additional
8 dialogue, but I'm not going to just show up on someone's
9 doorstep unannounced or uninvited, so I would just welcome
10 the opportunity to continue to have this dialogue and
11 continue to provide information in the hopes that we can try
12 to obviate these types of conversations in a quasi-judicial
13 public setting. So with that, Mr. Chairman, thank you so
14 much for the board's indulgence. Thank you to the community
15 and thank you to my team, although I don't think we need to
16 hear from them, for being here, and we're happy to answer
17 any questions.

18 MS. TEDESCO: You're muted, Mr. Chairman.

19 MR. CHAIR: Yeah, sorry about that. Thank you,
20 Mr. Tedesco.

21 Commissioners, are there any questions for the
22 Applicant or any final questions for staff? Seeing none.
23 I'm going to close the public hearing.

24 Commissioners, it's to us for any deliberation.

25 I'm sorry.

1 MS. GRAY: Excuse me. I do have some questions
2 before you close the record, if I may?

3 MR. CHAIR: Ms. Gray, I'm sorry. I've closed the
4 hearing, and the Applicant has the last word.

5 MS. GRAY: Okay.

6 MR. CHAIR: Thank you all the same.

7 So Commissioners, we're under deliberation.
8 Anything that you want to react to, thoughts, comments, and
9 if there's no deliberation, then I would look for a motion,
10 but let's pause for a second to see if there's any thoughts
11 or comments or reactions from anybody.

12 Okay, the only thing I would say --

13 MADAM VICE CHAIR: Mr. Chairman (audio
14 interference) the only thought (audio interference) --

15 MR. CHAIR: Ms. Bailey?

16 MADAM VICE CHAIR: Are we both talking? Just
17 wanted to thank the citizens for coming, Mr. Taylor, Ms.
18 Powell, Ms. Gray, and Mr. Calhoun. We always appreciate
19 citizens coming before us and sharing their opinion, their
20 thoughts, and their concerns. And we also always take them
21 into consideration, so I just want to acknowledge the
22 presence and thank them for coming and sharing with us
23 today.

24 MR. CHAIR: Thank you. Well said. I'll certainly
25 associate myself with those remarks, Madam Vice Chair.

1 The only thing I would add in addition is that
2 this is a more limited scope. I actually appreciate the
3 comments from folks in the public to work to keep it to what
4 is before us, which is a more limited scope infrastructure
5 improvements SDP in general, so that was helpful. I
6 appreciate that.

7 And with that, Commissioners, if there's no
8 further discussion, I would look for a motion.

9 COMMISSIONER WASHINGTON: Mr. Chairman, also would
10 like to thank the citizens for coming out and sharing their
11 perspective, as well as their testimony, and with that, I
12 would like to move that we adopt the findings of staff to
13 include the updated finding as detailed in Applicant Exhibit
14 Number 1 and approve SDP-2304, TCP2-011-2024, and Variance
15 to Section 25-122B1G along with the conditions and
16 consideration as outlined in staff's report and the
17 conditions and consideration as further modified by
18 Applicant Exhibit Number 1.

19 COMMISSIONER GERALDO: Second (audio
20 interference).

21 MR. CHAIR: We have a motion by Commissioner
22 Washington, a second by Commissioner Geraldo. Discussion?

23 COMMISSIONER GERALDO: I would just like to thank
24 the citizens and residents for coming out to speak. It's
25 always helpful for the board to get that perspective. I'm

1 familiar with the area, and I know the concerns, and I would
2 just encourage the residents to continue to work with Mr.
3 Tedesco in meetings outside of prior to coming here to try
4 to resolve any issues that they may have.

5 MR. CHAIR: Yeah, I certainly associate myself
6 with those remarks, and for all of you who spoke, I
7 appreciate you taking the time. We're quite attentive to
8 your concerns, and we encourage you to stay active.

9 Any further discussion? If not, I will call the
10 role. Commissioner Washington?

11 COMMISSIONER WASHINGTON: I vote aye.

12 MR. CHAIR: Commissioner Geraldo?

13 COMMISSIONER GERALDO: I vote aye.

14 MR. CHAIR: Commissioner Doerner?

15 COMMISSIONER DOERNER: I vote aye.

16 MR. CHAIR: Vice Chair Bailey?

17 MADAM VICE CHAIR: Vote aye.

18 MR. CHAIR: I vote aye, as well. The ayes have
19 it, 5-0.

20 Thanks, everybody. Much appreciated.

21 **(Whereupon, the proceedings were concluded.)**

22

23

24

25

DIGITALLY SIGNED CERTIFICATE

ESCRIBERS, LLC, hereby certified that the attached pages represent an accurate transcript of the electronic sound recording of the proceedings before the Prince George's County Planning Board in the matter of:

SADDLE RIDGE

Specific Design Plan, PPS, SDP-2304

By: Jocelyn Finocchiaro Date: August 27, 2024
Jocelyn Finocchiaro, Transcriber