



July 24, 2024



One Leg Up Pets LLC  
7304 Carroll Avenue, Unit 221  
Takoma Park, MD 20912

Re: Notification of Planning Board Action on  
**Departure from Design Standards DDS-23002**  
**One Leg Up Pets**

Dear Applicant:

This is to advise you that, on July 18, 2024, the above-referenced Departure from Design Standards was acted upon by the Prince George's County Planning Board, pursuant to the Transitional Provisions of Section 27-1700 of the Prince George's County Zoning Ordinance and in accordance with the attached Resolution.

Pursuant to Section 27-239.01 of the prior Zoning Ordinance, the Planning Board's decision will become final 30 calendar days after the date of this final notice (**July 24, 2024**) of the Planning Board's decision, unless:

1. Within the 30 days, a written appeal has been filed with the District Council by the applicant or by an aggrieved person that appeared at the hearing before the Planning Board in person, by an attorney, or in writing and the review is expressly authorized in accordance with Section 25-212 of the Land Use Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland
2. Within the 30 days (or other period specified by Section 27-291 of the prior Zoning Ordinance), the District Council decides, on its own motion, to review the action of the Planning Board.

(You should be aware that you will have to reactivate any permits pending the outcome of this case. If the approved plans differ from the ones originally submitted with your permit, you are required to amend the permit by submitting copies of the approved plans. For information regarding reactivating permits, you should call the County's Permit Office at 301-636-2050.)

Please direct any future communication or inquiries regarding this matter to Ms. Donna J. Brown, Clerk of the County Council, at 301-952-3600.

Sincerely,  
Sherri Conner, Acting Chief  
Development Review Division

By: *Natalia Gomez Rojas*  
Reviewer

Attachment: PGCPB Resolution No. **2024-070**

cc: Donna J. Brown, Clerk of the County Council  
Persons of Record

PGCPB No. 2024-070

File No. DDS-23002

R E S O L U T I O N

WHEREAS, a new Zoning Ordinance, Subtitle 27 of the Prince George's County Code, went into effect on April 1, 2022; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 27-1903(c) of the Zoning Ordinance, proposals or permit applications of any type may utilize the prior Zoning Ordinance to obtain the approvals required for development of property; and

WHEREAS, on April 1, 2024, the Planning Board accepted an application from One Leg Up Pets LLC requesting approval of a departure from certain design standards in the Zoning Ordinance (DDS-23002) and alternative compliance from the applicable provisions of the Landscape Manual; and

WHEREAS, the Prince George's County Planning Board of The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission reviewed this application under the Zoning Ordinance in existence prior to April 1, 2022; and

WHEREAS, after consideration of the evidence presented at the public hearing on June 27, 2024, the Prince George's County Planning Board finds:

1. **Request:** The applicant is proposing to retrofit the subject property with necessary improvements to operate a permitted use (kennel) while the existing dwelling will remain as a permitted accessory building to the primary use. Modifications to the subject property include improving the driveway with a new gravel pull-off area for bypass, new fencing around the property and the dog run areas, and repurposing the existing ±550-square-foot garage for occasionally boarding dogs overnight.

This application requested approval of (i) a departure from certain design standards in Sections 27-554, 27-561 and 27-563 of the prior Prince George's County Zoning Ordinance and (ii) alternative compliance from the requirements of Section 4.7, Buffering Incompatible Uses, of the 2010 *Prince George's County Landscape Manual* (Landscape Manual).

2. **Development Data Summary:** The following chart summarizes the development for the overall property, which will remain unchanged by this application.

|                               | <b>EXISTING</b> | <b>EVALUATED</b>                          |
|-------------------------------|-----------------|---|
| Zone                          | RR (prior R-R)  | RR (prior R-R)                            |
| Use(s)                        | Residential     | Primary: Kennel<br>Accessory: Residential |
| Total Acreage                 | 2.75            | 2.75                                      |
| Number of Lots                | 1               | 1   |
| Total Gross Floor Area (GFA)  | 2,400 sq. ft.   | 550* sq. ft.<br>1,850 sq. ft.             |
| Total area destined to kennel | 0               | ±28,250 sq. ft.                           |

**Parking**

|  | <b>REQUIRED</b> | <b>APPROVED</b>                  |
|--|-----------------|----------------------------------|
| Kennel: 1 space per 500 sq. ft. of 550 sq. ft. GFA | 2               | 2                                |
| One-family detached dwelling                       | 2               | 2                                |
| Total  |                 | 4 (including 1 ADA accessible)** |

**Notes:** \*Nonresidential only.

\*\*Unless an exception is granted by the applicable state and County agencies, pursuant to Section 27-239.01(c) of the prior Zoning Ordinance.

3. **Location:** The subject property consists of one lot located in the southwest quadrant of the intersection of Greencastle Road and Birkhall Drive. The property is known as Lot 50 and is in the Residential, Rural (RR) Zone.
4. **Surrounding Uses:** The subject site is bound to the north by Greencastle Road, and single-family detached residences in the RR Zone beyond, and to the west and east by single-family detached residences in the RR Zone. The subject property abuts MD 200 to the south, and across MD 200 is the Little Paint Branch Park in the Reserved Open Space Zone.
5. **Previous Approvals:** There are no prior approvals associated with this application.
6. **Prince George’s County Zoning Ordinance:** The subject application requests the departure from the design standards in Sections 27-554, 27-561, and 27-563 of the prior Zoning Ordinance. Pursuant to Section 27-239.01(a)(1) of the prior Zoning Ordinance, a departure from such design standards may be permitted by the Planning Board subject to the Board finding the applicant meets the requirements of Section 27-239.01(b)(7).

a. **Departure from Section 27-554. - Surfacing**

**All parking lots shall be surfaced in such a manner as to be dust free.**

The applicant requested to retain the existing ±425-foot gravel driveway and parking area. The driveway extends south from Greencastle Road, towards the central portion of the property, and connects with the parking area.

**Required Findings**

- A. **In order for the Planning Board to grant the departure, it shall make the following findings:**
  - (i) **The purposes of this Subtitle will be equally well or better served by the applicant’s proposal;**

The applicant requested to improve the driveway and parking area surface conditions with new gravel where appropriate, to ensure that dust is limited, without repaving both areas with impervious asphalt. In addition, the applicant states that there will be limited traffic in the parking lot, as only five cars will enter and exit the property. Two of those vehicles are designated for personal use, and three vans will transport the dogs to and from the site.

The “purposes” of the prior Zoning Ordinance are set forth in Section 27-102 and will be equally well or better served by the applicant’s proposal. The “purposes” relevant to this application relate to protecting the public from adverse impacts, retaining the character of the community, promoting the relationship between the uses and the land, and protecting environmental features. The applicant’s requested departure will, in part, help ensure that the proposed development will not adversely affect adjoining properties. The applicant is requesting departures from multiple design standards to avoid clearing a significant number of mature trees and wooded area on-site and replacing them with over 400 linear feet of impervious asphalt. Without the requested departures, strict adherence to Section 27-554 and Section 27-563 would negatively impact the Greencastle Road streetscape and adjacent properties by changing its rural residential character.

To this end, preservation of on-site wooded area also advances the prior Zoning Ordinance’s specific purpose in protecting against undue noise and air and water pollution, and to encourage the preservation of stream valleys, steep slopes, lands of natural beauty, dense forests, scenic vistas, and other similar features. Importantly, this departure from Section 27-554 would allow the applicant to retain the existing parking area to (1) preserve existing trees and (2) avoid providing significant impervious surface that may negatively impact stormwater management for the site and surrounding properties.

The Planning Board finds that the new surface conditions and limited circulation within the site will create a limited amount of dust and the gravel parking will be in keeping with and help ensure that the development will not adversely affect the adjacent properties.

- (ii) **The departure is the minimum necessary, given the specific circumstances of the request.**

The departure is the minimum necessary given the location of the parking lot within the wooded lot. Other surfacing methods would not be appropriate for the nature of the surrounding area and cause greater disruption while having little or no impact on the amount of dust generated, given the additional gravel surfacing to be done and the minimal use of the property by vehicles.

**(iii) The departure is necessary in order to alleviate circumstances, which are unique to the site or prevalent in areas of the County developed prior to November 29, 1949;**

The departure is the minimum necessary to alleviate the constraints that are unique to this site. This area of the County retains features prevalent in the County from the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century and the current structure on the property has been in existence since the 1950s. The lot also has an extensive long-standing wooded area. Strict adherence to the code would require clearing a significant number of trees and additional stormwater management (SWM) issues in order to accommodate an impervious surface resulting in a loss of the wooded area character of the property's rural surroundings.

The Planning Board finds that the historic nature of the surrounding area and the goals to be achieved by not surfacing the driveway and parking area are necessary to alleviate the circumstances relevant to this rural area.

**(iv) The departure will not impair the visual, functional, or environmental quality or integrity of the site or of the surrounding neighborhood.**

As shown on the plan, and as mentioned above, improving the existing gravel driveway and parking area instead of adding an impervious surface would avoid clearing existing trees that contribute to the residential-rural character and that are visible from adjoining properties. As such, the Planning Board finds the requested departure will not impair the visual, functional, or environmental quality of the site, or of the surrounding neighborhood. On the contrary, it would prevent negative consequences of installing asphalt on a property with rural features.

b. **Departure from Section 27-561: Marking**

- (a) **Each parking space (except those provided for, and on the same lot with, one-family dwellings) shall be marked by a permanent, durable, contrasting material.**
- (b) **Signs or arrows shall indicate the directions of traffic movement on driveways.**

This application will provide a total of four parking spaces. However, due to the proposed gravel driveway and parking area, it may not be possible to provide permanent markings to delineate the nonresidential parking spaces.

**Required Findings**

The criteria for approval of a DDS are set forth in Section 27-239.01(b)(7), which states the following:

**A. In order for the Planning Board to grant the departure, it shall make the following findings:**

- (i) **The purposes of this Subtitle will be equally well or better served by the applicant's proposal;**

The applicant notes that it may not be able to demarcate parking lines on a gravel parking lot. The Planning Board finds that public safety will not be jeopardized if the parking spaces are not marked given there are only four spaces and very limited amount of traffic on site. Therefore, the purposes of this Subtitle will be well served by the applicant's proposal.

- (ii) **The departure is the minimum necessary, given the specific circumstances of the request.**

Markings are generally required to delineate individual parking spaces for larger nonresidential enterprises, accommodating more public traffic and use than the proposed kennel. On the contrary, this application is for a small business, which will generate minimal traffic and routine parking patterns. As mentioned, the applicant will utilize transport vans at scheduled times throughout the day, to transport dogs to and from the property. Individual customer's drop-off and pick-up is not a component of the applicant's business model and would only be allowed under unique and isolated circumstances.

The Planning Board finds that marking these spaces is unnecessary due to the minimal traffic and routine parking patterns generated by the proposed use.

**(iii) The departure is necessary in order to alleviate circumstances, which are unique to the site or prevalent in areas of the County developed prior to November 29, 1949;**

The property is largely wooded and improved with an existing gravel driveway and gravel surface parking area. To avoid impacts to this largely wooded property, the applicant requested to retain the existing unique gravel driveway and four standard parking spaces without permanent markings, preserving the wooded rural character of the property.

The Planning Board finds that since it is not possible to stripe the existing gravel parking area with permanent markings to delineate individual spaces, and that the applicant intends to preserve the environmental features of the property, the proposed departure is adequate.

**(iv) The departure will not impair the visual, functional, or environmental quality or integrity of the site or of the surrounding neighborhood.**

The requested relief from marking individual parking spaces in the existing gravel parking area is necessary to avoid clearing trees and adding additional impervious surface on-site. As a result of the existing features of the site, anyone standing adjacent to the property would not be able to see the parking area. Therefore, a lack of parking-space striping would have no effect whatsoever on the visual, functional, or environmental quality of the surrounding neighborhood. On the contrary, both clearing trees and adding additional impervious surface would negatively impact the environmental quality of the property and the surrounding rural residential neighborhood.

The Planning Board finds that the proposed parking is sufficient to functionally accommodate the applicant's business and personal residence, as the four required parking spaces will not need to be delineated with striping to facilitate minimal and routine traffic on-site.



c. **Departure from Section 27-563: Connection to street**

**Every parking lot shall be connected to a street by means of a driveway. This driveway (except those provided for, and on the same lot with, one-family dwellings), shall be at least eleven (11) feet wide for each lane, exclusive of curb return and gutters. In the case of a corner lot, no driveway shall be located less than twenty (20) feet from the existing or proposed ultimate point of curvature of the curb or the edge of the pavement of an uncurbed section (whichever forms the greater distance to the point of curvature of the fillet of the driveway apron).**

The applicant requested to retain the existing ±425-foot gravel driveway that extends south from Greencastle Road, towards the central portion of the property, and connects to the existing single-family dwelling and parking area on-site.

**Required Findings**

The criteria for approval of a DDS are set forth in Section 27-239.01(b)(7), which states the following:

**A. In order for the Planning Board to grant the departure, it shall make the following findings:**

**(i) The purposes of this Subtitle will be equally well or better served by the applicant's proposal;**

The “purposes” of the prior Zoning Ordinance, as provided by Section 27-102, such as promoting the most beneficial relationship between the uses of land and buildings and protecting landowners from adverse impacts of adjoining development, will not be impaired by the applicant's proposal to retain the driveway in its almost-current condition. Rather, the applicant's requested departure will, in part, help ensure that the proposed development will not adversely impact adjoining properties. The applicant is primarily requesting this departure to avoid clearing a significant number of mature trees and wooded area on-site and avoid having to double the width of the existing driveway and pave it. Without the requested departure, strict adherence to Section 27-563 would negatively impact the Greencastle Road streetscape and adjacent properties by changing its rural residential character.

The existing driveway is approximately 11 feet wide and runs alongside significantly wooded area on the northern portion of the property and is currently surfaced with gravel. The 22-foot-wide driveway continues south from the Greencastle Road connection, for 35 feet, before it tapers to 11 feet for the remainder of its length toward the parking area.

With the requested modifications and improvements, the existing driveway will accommodate safe and efficient vehicular circulation for primary kennel use, personal residence, and deliveries.

These modifications include providing a new gravel pull-off area for bypass space, to allow more than one vehicle to circulate without obstructions, a designated pick-up and drop-off location for the kennel use, and additional gravel towards the southern terminus of the driveway and parking area, to provide an adequate vehicle turnaround.

The Planning Board reviewed the submitted vehicle circulation plan which resulted in minor modifications to the driveway that include expansion of the driveway in the entrance of the property, in the middle, and at the end where it is adjacent to the single-family dwelling on-site.

The extended pavement areas will be 22 feet wide and are necessary to facilitate two or more vehicles using the driveway at the same time. Given the proposed modifications, and the applicant's accommodation to preserve the existing trees, the Planning Board finds that the driveway and parking area will be able to function as their intended purpose and allow vehicles to pass safely without obstruction, and the purposes of the Zoning Ordinance will be equally or better served by the applicant's proposal.

**(ii) The departure is the minimum necessary, given the specific circumstances of the request.**

The departure is the minimum necessary, given the lower traffic expected in the property, and the applicant's preference to preserve the wooded area as much as possible. As mentioned previously, the applicant requested to retain the existing gravel driveway width and improve specific areas of the driveway with new gravel surfacing where appropriate.

Since the applicant will utilize transport vans at scheduled times throughout the day, to transport dogs to and from the property, the existing  $\pm 11$  feet wide driveway is sufficient to accommodate vehicular traffic generated by the existing single-family dwelling and the proposed kennel use. Therefore, a 22-foot-wide connection to Greencastle Road, for the purpose of

accommodating frequent two-way traffic, is unnecessary for this property.

While the driveway does not meet the design standards for width, the Planning Board finds that the applicant has shown through the vehicle circulation plan that the existing width is the minimum required for the site to function for its intended purpose, and it is acceptable to the Planning Board.

**(iii) The departure is necessary in order to alleviate circumstances, which are unique to the site or prevalent in areas of the County developed prior to November 29, 1949;**

The departure is the minimum necessary to alleviate the constraints that are unique to this site that is mostly wooded and is currently improved with an existing gravel driveway. Strict adherence to the code would require the removal of the existing trees to accommodate the need for a 22-foot-wide drive aisle. The applicant's proposed improvements to the driveway, and the limited traffic expected on-site to support the operations of a proposed kennel, are adequate.

**(iv) The departure will not impair the visual, functional, or environmental quality or integrity of the site or of the surrounding neighborhood.**

As mentioned above, in combination with the requested departure from Section 27-554, the requested departure will retain the visual, functional, and environmental quality of the subject property and surrounding neighborhood. The property will retain its rural character along Greencastle Road. If the existing driveway is widened to 22 feet, the property's frontage would resemble a large through street compared to other driveways on surrounding properties. Importantly, this departure will also prevent the addition of substantial impervious surface on-site, which would negatively impact SWM on-site and in the surrounding neighborhood.

Hence, the existing driveway proves to be sufficient to accommodate the minimum vehicular traffic generated by the existing single-family dwelling and the proposed kennel use without the need to alter the visual, functional, or environmental quality or integrity of the site or of the surrounding neighborhood.

Therefore, the Planning Board finds that the proposed modifications, which allow all turning movements and directional travel to be completed on-site without conflicts, contribute to providing safe access to and from the site.

7. **2010 Prince George’s County Landscape Manual:** The development is subject to the Landscape Manual and has an approved Alternative Compliance (AC-23013) from Section 4.7, Buffering Incompatible Uses, and Section 4.9, Sustainable Landscape Requirements.

The Planning Board finds that the combination of approved plantings and fencing as proposed by the applicant and discussed at the public hearing will buffer any incompatible uses in a manner equal to or better than the requirements of Section 4.9.

8. **Prince George’s County Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance:** This property is subject to the woodland conservation threshold requirements of 20 percent for developments in the RR Zone. The site has a Natural Resources Inventory Plan (NRI-007-2024) that was issued on January 26, 2024. No regulated environmental features or County-regulated 100-year floodplain are mapped within the proposed limits of disturbance.

9. **Prince George’s County Tree Canopy Coverage Ordinance:** This application is exempt from the requirements of the Prince George’s County Tree Canopy Coverage Ordinance because the project proposes less than 5,000 square feet of site disturbance.

10. **Referral Comments:** The subject application was referred to the concerned sections and divisions. The referral comments are summarized as follows, and are incorporated herein by reference:

- a. **Subdivision**—The Planning Board reviewed and adopts the memorandum dated May 28, 2024, which recommended approval of the subject DDS, with no conditions.
- b. **Permit Review**—The Planning Board reviewed and adopts the memorandum dated May 1, 2024, which provided seven recommendations that were addressed by the applicant in their revised package received on May 23, 2024.
- c. **Community Planning**—The Planning Board reviewed and adopts the memorandum dated May 2, 2024, which provided an evaluation of the application stating that while master plan conformance is not a required finding for this DDS, “the proposed departure from design standards fails to align this property with the character of its environs [sic]. The neighboring properties of the applicant have dust free parking surfaces, and paved driveways.” However, the Planning Board found that requiring the applicant to resurface the driveway with an impervious material may present adverse environmental impacts.
- d. **Environmental Planning**—The Planning Board reviewed and adopts the memorandum dated April 29, 2024, which recommended approval of the subject DDS, with no conditions.

- e. **Transportation Planning**—The Planning Board reviewed and adopts the memorandum dated May 28, 2024, which recommended approval of the DDS application, subject to one condition, which is included herein.
  - f. **Historic Preservation**—The Planning Board reviewed and adopts the memorandum dated June 4, 2024, which recommended approval of the subject DDS, with no conditions.
11. **Community Feedback:** During a community meeting held by the applicant on April 19, 2024, attendees expressed their concerns about the noise generated by the dogs, the increase in traffic on Greencastle Road, possible trespassing onto their properties by the dogs, how the dogs' waste would be managed, runoff water to the properties adjacent on the west, and the potential loss of the neighborhood's character. The Planning Board finds that these concerns are not relevant to whether the driveway is gravel or impervious, parking spaces are demarcated, or the driveway width at a certain point is less than 22 feet wide. With regard to impacts on the neighboring properties, however, the Planning Board finds the applicant's proposal will address such concerns with the measures being proposed to mitigate noise and traffic issues. Importantly, the Planning Board also finds that the proposed development plan is designed to preserve the property and neighborhood character to the greatest extent possible which further ensures the neighborhood's rural character will be protected.

In addition, staff received phone calls from nearby neighbors inquiring about the proposed kennel and expressing their apprehensions regarding the commercial use in a residential area. To address these questions, staff explained that the kennel is a permitted use in the RR Zone and that this application was to request departure from certain development standards to allow a development that is consistent with the zone.

12. **Planning Board Hearing:** Prior to the public hearing on June 27, 2024, the applicant submitted an exhibit to the record withdrawing the departure from Section 27-566, Parking Facilities for the Physically Handicapped. In the same exhibit, the applicant requested to revise Condition 2e, and the removal of Condition 3 related to the departure requested pursuant to Section 27-566. In addition, the applicant submitted a noise study evaluating future noise impacts generated by dogs at the proposed dog kennel, which was presented at the public hearing by the applicant and their witness, in response to the community feedback discussed in Finding 11.

The public hearing began with a technical staff presentation, followed by an applicant presentation. The applicant's counsel addressed the required findings and also called on a noise consultant who testified at the hearing and, following testimony from the property owner, called on a civil engineer to provide additional testimony. The applicant and staff agreed on all conditions of approval, including the revised conditions in the applicant's exhibit.

Members of the community voiced their opposition to the subject application during the public hearing. Their testimony included a discussion about the potential impacts of a kennel in a residential neighborhood. These impacts ranged from noise and odors to the potential presence of mosquitoes and rodents, run-off water to neighboring properties, increase in traffic, and reduction of the required buffers. Other comments were related to confusions regarding a potential

widening of the driveway and providing a handicap street parking space. These concerns were addressed by the applicant and the Chair advised that they were not relevant to the specific issues before the Board other than the questions concerning buffering as related to the applicant's request for alternative compliance.

During rebuttal, the applicant, the engineering consultant, and the property owner testified about the proposed mitigation for the mentioned impacts. Mitigation measures include preserving the existing wooded areas and limiting impervious areas, and installing a double-sided fence around the property to reduce the noise level coming from the dogs, as shown in the noise study. Lastly, the applicant stated that the site will be properly regulated, licensed, and inspected by the County on a regular basis.

Following this discussion, the Planning Board voted to approve Departure from Design Standards DDS-23002, and Alternative Compliance AC-23013, subject to conditions, which included revisions to Condition 2.e.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that pursuant to Subtitle 27 of the Prince George's County Code, the Prince George's County Planning Board of The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission adopted the findings contained herein and APPROVED the above-noted application, subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to certification, the departure site plan shall be revised, as follows:
  - a. The applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall demonstrate the 80-foot ultimate right-of-way (40 feet from the centerline) along Greencastle Road, including dedication, if necessary.
  - b. Include the height of all existing structures.
  - c. Include the required and provided lot coverage.
2. Prior to certification, the landscape plan shall be revised, as follows:
  - a. Depict a 6-foot-high fence around the entirety of the property, but excluding the bamboo area, and revise the Section 4.7 schedule of the 2010 *Prince George's County Landscape Manual* accordingly.
  - b. Add a continuous row of evergreen shrubs immediately adjacent to the dog boarding structure, with appropriate separation distance from existing plant materials.
  - c. Add evergreen shrubs on either side of the northern dog run, proximate to the neighboring single-family detached homes. Plantings shall include appropriate separation distance from existing trees. A continuous row of evergreen shrubs is required to be installed and maintained.

- d. Add a row of evergreen shrubs on either side of the southern dog run. Plantings shall include appropriate separation distance from existing trees. A continuous row of evergreen shrubs is required to be installed and maintained.
- e. Provide the approximate location, label, and detail for a root barrier, which will generally begin at the southeast terminus of the gravel driveway, extend southeast, and terminate at the eastern property line adjacent to the dog boarding structure, to help prevent the existing bamboo at this location from spreading on-site. The root barrier shall be provided at this location, unless the operating agency determines that installation would result in (1) disturbance of on-site woodland, or (2) cumulative woodland clearing that exceeds 5,000 square feet, and thus, invalidates approved Woodland Conservation Ordinance Exemption E-006-2024, or triggers stormwater management concept plan requirements.
- f. Provide a label and detail for the soundproofing materials to be used in the dog boarding structure.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that an appeal of the Planning Board's action must be filed with the District Council for Prince George's County, Maryland within thirty (30) days of the final notice of the Planning Board's decision.


\* \* \* \* \*

PGCPB No. 2024-070  
File No. DDS-23002  
Page 14

This is to certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the action taken by the Prince George's County Planning Board of The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission on the motion of Commissioner Washington, seconded by Commissioner Geraldo, with Commissioners Washington, Geraldo, Bailey, Doerner, and Shapiro voting in favor of the motion at its regular meeting held on Thursday, June 27, 2024, in Largo, Maryland.

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 18th day of July 2024.

Peter A. Shapiro  
Chairman

By   
Jessica Jones  
Planning Board Administrator

PAS:JJ:NGR:tr

APPROVED AS TO LEGAL SUFFICIENCY



David S. Warner  
M-NCPPC Legal Department  
Date: July 17, 2024