

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

GIAC SON BUDDHIST TEMPLE (REMAND)  
DETAILED SITE PLAN, PPS DSP-20002

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  
September 26, 2024  
VOLUME 1 of 1

BEFORE:

- PETER A. SHAPIRO, Chairman
- SHUANISE WASHINGTON, Commissioner
- THOMAS DOERNER, 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

C O N T E N T S

<u>SPEAKER</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
Jill Kosack	5
Traci Scudder	9
Victor Provost	12
Leah Johnson	16
Barbara Sollner-Webb	18

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  
25

CHAIRMAN: Final item on our agenda is Item 7.

This is a remand by the District Council for a Detailed Site Plan, DSP-20002, Giac Son Buddhist Temple. Just a reminder, this case was approved at the Planning Board meeting of September 7, 2023. It was remanded by the District Council on January 25, 2024.

So, this is a, let me just talk for a bit about what's before us, okay? This is a somewhat unique case. This body approved Detailed Site Plan 2002 in September '23. Again, the District Council remanded it in January. Remand hearings are required by law to be held within 60 days, although it has been the practice of the Planning Board to allow participant, applicants, rather, to request additional time if necessary to comply with the requirements of the remand. Shortly before the 60-day period expired in this case, however, the Council issued an order finding there was no authority to extend the 60-day period. The Planning Board, therefore, was not able to act on this remand.

In July, the Council requested the Planning Board take the additional procedural step of holding a hearing, this hearing, and adopting a resolution confirming that the Board was not able to comply with prescriptions of the order of remand.

On a separate note, as the Staff Report for this

1 case explains, even if the Board had held the hearing within  
2 60 days, there would have not been anything to consider  
3 because the Applicant didn't submit any documents or take  
4 any actions required by the remand order.

5           So, so, here's the bottom line. I will open the  
6 hearing now and ask Staff to provide its presentation.  
7 We'll then hear testimony from the public, but such  
8 testimony, please, shall be limited; and any discussion  
9 shall be limited to the procedural issue I have just  
10 discussed. The only thing that is before us is the, is the  
11 remand that the Council has requested us to adopt a  
12 resolution confirming that we were not able to comply with  
13 the prescriptions of the order of remand. That is the only  
14 thing before us.

15           So, again, the only other procedural issue, it may  
16 be difficult, but this is not the time to discuss any  
17 substantive matter related to the Detailed Site Plan. It is  
18 only a hearing on this one procedural issue.

19           So, we may have folks who are signed up to speak.  
20 This is an evidentiary hearing even on this procedural  
21 issue. So, I will be swearing folks in. Ms. Scudder, I  
22 won't be swearing you in, but we may have other folks --  
23 well, I'll wait. If we have other folks to speak, I'll  
24 swear them in at the appropriate time.

25           So, we have a Staff presentation by Ms. Kosack and

1 maybe Mr. Mitchum as well. Ms. Scudder we'll hear from who  
2 is representing the Applicant. And then we'll see if we  
3 have other folks who signed up to speak as well.

4 Any procedural questions from Commissioners?  
5 We're okay?

6 COMMISSIONER WASHINGTON: Yeah.

7 CHAIRMAN: Okay. So, with that, I'll turn to Ms.  
8 Kosack for the Staff presentation on the procedural issue  
9 before us. Did I say, Ms. Kosack, this is only in the  
10 procedural piece?

11 MS. KOSACK: Yes.

12 CHAIRMAN: Okay.

13 MS. KOSACK: Yes, I think I -- good afternoon, Mr.  
14 Chair, and members of the Board. For the record, my name is  
15 Jill Kosack with the Urban Design Section and I will be  
16 taking care of this item today, Item 7, the remand of DSP-  
17 20002 for Giac Son Buddhist Temple. Again, this, due to the  
18 procedural issues with this case, Staff is recommending the  
19 Board take no action on the remand of DSP-20002. As the  
20 Chair already gave a summary of the previous actions on this  
21 case, I will skip right to the remand points. So, if we  
22 could skip to slide 13, please? Thank you.

23 The order of remand from the District Council was  
24 issued on January 25, 2024. It stated the Planning Board's  
25 decision erred as a matter of law on multiple legal errors,

1 first, when it concluded that the proposed development was  
2 exempt from a Preliminary Plan of subdivision approval;  
3 second, when it included a condition for the Applicant to  
4 submit an approved Stormwater Management Concept Plan at  
5 time of certification; third, when the DSP improperly  
6 included land of an adjoining property owner; and, fourth,  
7 and the Board had no evidence that the Applicant has the  
8 necessary maintenance agreements or arrangements to  
9 accommodate overflow parking for larger special events.  
10 Shown here are the four points of remand from the Council's  
11 order that were intended to address these errors.

12           The Staff noticed that as of today, the Applicant  
13 has not filed a Preliminary Plan of Subdivision, not  
14 submitted a revised or amended DSP addressing these points.  
15 Therefore, Staff recommends the Planning Board take no  
16 action on the remand as the Applicant did not address the  
17 points within the required 60-day period.

18           An amended resolution stating this will be placed  
19 on a subsequent hearing date in accordance with Section 27-  
20 290(f) of the prior Zoning Ordinance. Next slide, please.

21           With that, the Planning, the Urban Design Section  
22 recommends the Planning Board adopt the findings in the  
23 additional Staff memo and take no action on the remand of  
24 DSP-20002 for Giac Son Buddhist Temple, and issue an  
25 amendment to resolution number 2023-98 with no new

1 conditions. This concludes Staff's presentation.

2 CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Kosack. So, just so I'm  
3 clear, the Board is recommending, or Staff is recommending  
4 that we take action; but the action that we take is to  
5 communicate that we are not taking action on the remand?

6 MS. KOSACK: Yes, I believe it's in accordance  
7 with 290(f), 27-290(f), if the Board is unable to, I'm  
8 sorry, I don't have that section up in front of me at the  
9 moment; but if the Board is unable to take an action within,  
10 within the 60-day period, it should issue a resolution  
11 stating why and the results of that. And so that's what we  
12 would be doing.

13 CHAIRMAN: Is this simply our action today, if we  
14 take it, would be to communicate, for the Board to  
15 communicate this to the District Council?

16 MS. KOSACK: Yes, correct.

17 CHAIRMAN: In a form of a resolution? Okay.

18 MS. KOSACK: Correct.

19 CHAIRMAN: All right.

20 MS. KOSACK: Yes.

21 CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Commissioners, any  
22 questions for Staff?

23 COMMISSIONER DOERNER: Yes, just following-up on  
24 that. So, it's not that we're, we're, we're trying to not  
25 take action. To just be like specific is that we just don't

1 have sufficient time to provide notice and have both like a  
2 Preliminary Plan hearing and the Detailed Site Plan, and all  
3 these other things that they wanted is, is my understanding,  
4 right, it would be impossible time-wise to do all this stuff  
5 so quickly?

6 MS. KOSACK: Generally

7 MR. HORNER: No, but this --

8 MS. KOSACK: Go ahead.

9 MR. HORNER: Oh, I'm sorry, Jill, go ahead.

10 MS. KOSACK: Oh, no, I'll let you take it, Mr.  
11 Horner.

12 MR. HORNER: Not exactly, Commissioner Doerner.  
13 That, that's the argument that the, the Applicant is making,  
14 that, you know, there wasn't time to, to do the things that  
15 were in the remand order. In this particular case, though,  
16 the, the 60-day period expired without any ability to take  
17 any action by us whether or not they, they had complied, but  
18 they hadn't complied.

19 So, this is just confirming that the section that,  
20 that Ms. Kosack read specifically says when the Planning  
21 Board determines that it cannot comply with the  
22 prescriptions of an order of remand, they're supposed to  
23 adopt a resolution saying so. You know, we sent a letter  
24 saying that we can't comply. They're asking us to put it in  
25 the form of a resolution. That's, that's all that's

1 occurring at this stage.

2 COMMISSIONER DOERNER: Okay. All right. Thank  
3 you.

4 CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Commissioner. If there's no  
5 other questions for Staff, I will turn to the Applicant, Ms.  
6 Scudder. Anything you want to add on this?

7 MS. SCUDDER: Yes. Good morning, Chairman  
8 Shapiro, members of the Planning Board and Staff. For the  
9 record, I am Traci Scudder. My office address is 4200  
10 Parliament Place, Suite 220 in Lanham, Maryland.

11 This morning I'm appearing on behalf of the Giac  
12 Son Buddhist Temple on this remand matter and I'm  
13 accompanied by a number of, by a number of members from the  
14 Temple. I understand that we're not here to get into the  
15 substantive issues of the case, so I will keep my testimony  
16 limited, as Chairman Shapiro requested, to the procedural  
17 issues on the remand.

18 I did submit a timely letter into the record  
19 regarding this matter. I'll get right to the heart of the  
20 matter. The spirit of the law underlying the 60-day remand  
21 rule is to protect the Applicant from undue delay. We know  
22 that because it's in the legislative history of the Council  
23 Bill that extended the remand period from 30 days to 60  
24 days. Imagine, it used to be 30 days. In my view, such a  
25 narrow window to respond to a Council remand order signifies

1 that the expectation surely cannot be much more than the  
2 Planning Board taking a second look at particular issues in  
3 the case to determine if it committed any errors. That is  
4 about as much as can be done in 60 days.

5           We take issues with how the remand order was  
6 worded. It contained four conditions directing the  
7 Applicant to do certain things that can't be done. For one,  
8 you cannot file a Preliminary Plan and get it through the  
9 Planning Board's process in 60 days. You cannot revise a  
10 DSP and get that revision reviewed and approved in 60 days.  
11 And the rest of the issues that the Council included weren't  
12 even reviewable by the Board from a jurisdictional  
13 standpoint. I am dumbfounded by the Council's order which  
14 directs the Applicant to do things that they know good and  
15 well can't be done in 60 days.

16           During Council oral arguments in this case, the  
17 Council related to the Applicant that it didn't want to deny  
18 the case, so it was going to send it back to the Planning  
19 Board and give the Applicant a chance to address some of the  
20 issues that were raised by the opposition parties; but, in  
21 fact, the Council didn't give the Applicant an opportunity  
22 at all. They set the Applicant up for total failure for the  
23 reasons I've already mentioned.

24           We are humbly before you this morning, and I say  
25 that because this Applicant is a charitable organization and

1 they don't have the resources to continue to fight  
2 everything that gets thrown at them from code enforcement  
3 complaints that lead to rounds of inspections, that led to  
4 citations and violations, that led to appeals and multiple  
5 hearings. Yes, we did that all summer long and they are  
6 just completely tapped out. They still need legal help and  
7 I will continue to stick with them all the way.

8           What we are asking of this Board today is to pass  
9 a resolution that advises the Council that it sent over a  
10 defective remand order. The Planning Board couldn't do  
11 anything with that and based on the latest Staff memo that  
12 was prepared for this hearing, nothing has changed. The  
13 memo from Planning Staff reaffirms the original review was  
14 conducted correctly, no errors were made and none of the  
15 findings that this Board previously made have changed.  
16 Thus, we ask this Board to communicate this determination to  
17 the Council.

18           We specifically ask for two things: That you  
19 advise the Council that it's remand order was defective; and  
20 even if it wasn't defective, this Board stands behind its  
21 original approval resolution in this case. That concludes  
22 our presentation, Chairman Shapiro. Thank you.

23           CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Ms. Scudder, appreciate  
24 that. Commissioners, any questions for the Applicant? No  
25 questions.

1 I'm going to turn to the public. We have a person  
2 or two who signed up to speak. Mr. Provost or Ms. Provost?

3 MR. PROVOST: Yes, I'm here.

4 CHAIRMAN: Okay. That's Victor Provost. Okay.  
5 If you could state your name and address for the record;  
6 and, again, Mr. Provost, I know I'm stating, I'm repeating  
7 myself, but the only thing before us is not the substance of  
8 the issue, but simply on the communicating a, a remand in  
9 the form of a resolution to the Council. That is what's  
10 before us; but please introduce yourself for the record.  
11 Let me swear you in, I'm sorry, I forgot. If you could  
12 raise your right hand, sir? Thank you. Do you solemnly  
13 swear or affirm that your testimony will be the whole truth  
14 and nothing but the truth?

15 MR. PROVOST: I do.

16 CHAIRMAN: All right. Thank you, sir, very much.  
17 And take it away, the floor is yours. We'll put three  
18 minutes up on the clock and take it away.

19 MR. PROVOST: Okay. I'll just be brief. Back  
20 last February, January, February, March, I was, my wife and  
21 myself, we were asked to help the Buddhists deal with this  
22 remand; and at that time, there was my wife, myself, the  
23 master and Don, and other from the Temple; and we had tried  
24 numerous times during that time from February to a time it  
25 almost expired, or did expire, in trying to let's say deal

1 with these four issues under remand. But it looked like to  
2 me on that remand that I got from the Temple, number three  
3 about the, about the sound, it seemed like to me at that  
4 time that somehow that was agreed to, that there would be no  
5 loud, loud noise.

6 But, anyway, I think there was an attempt at that  
7 time to, to deal with this remand, although we only had 60  
8 days; but I've always thought all along, with or without an  
9 attorney, we could have asked for an extension, I believe;  
10 but it finally came down to let's say the eleventh hour when  
11 it was about ready to expire that we, we had another  
12 attorney at that time, oh no, not another attorney, but an  
13 attorney from Annapolis who we were considering to hire to,  
14 we asked him to get an extension; but that was on the  
15 evening, that very evening that, that, that this was to  
16 expire.

17 I know my time is running out, but I believe we,  
18 we gave it our best we could. I didn't hear at that time  
19 the undue or how this was not fair. Well, I believe around  
20 the table, the Buddhists thought it was unfair; but when I  
21 looked at it, my wife looked at, we thought we could make an  
22 attempt on some of these things, the boundary issues or what  
23 have you; but, you know, yeah, I think we've made an  
24 attempt.

25 And at that time, I got to mention, for your

1 information, you know, one of the things that we asked,  
2 where is the attorney, and all we heard back was that they  
3 were very unhappy with her and that kind of talk. Where is  
4 the attorney? We needed an attorney, that kind of stuff.  
5 And, anyway, at that time, we didn't have no attorney, you  
6 know, advice or, you know, help us shepherd this thing  
7 through. So --

8 CHAIRMAN: Okay.

9 MR. PROVOST: -- but we tried. Thank you.

10 CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Provost, I appreciate  
11 it. Thank you for your patience today. I know it's been a  
12 long day.

13 MR. PROVOST: Thank you.

14 CHAIRMAN: So, do we have anyone else who signed  
15 up to speak on this?

16 MS. SOLLNER-WEBB: I signed up.

17 CHAIRMAN: Ms. Johnson, are you trying to log on?

18 MS. SOLLNER-WEBB: Barbara Sollner-Webb signed up.

19 CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry, Ms. Provost, you want to  
20 sign, you signed up, too?

21 MS. PROVOST: No, I, I waive my time.

22 CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you, ma'am. I appreciate  
23 that. So, the only other person I have signed up is Leah  
24 Johnson. I don't see her online. I'm hearing from Staff  
25 she may be trying to get on. Oh, here we go, perfect. Good

1 timing. Saved by the bell. All right, Ms. Johnson, if you  
2 could, I'm going to swear you in, okay? Do you solemnly --  
3 raise your right hand, please.

4 MS. JOHNSON: Sure.

5 CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Do you solemnly swear or  
6 affirm that your testimony will be the whole truth and  
7 nothing but the truth?

8 MS. JOHNSON: Yes, sir.

9 CHAIRMAN: Okay. So, we're going to put three  
10 minutes on the clock. As I talked to you, with other folks,  
11 too, this is not about the substance of the case, of the  
12 Temple. This is just about the procedural issue. What's  
13 before us is simply putting what we communicated in an email  
14 that the District Council is asking us to communicate so  
15 that, in writing in the form of a resolution. That's the  
16 only thing that's before us. I know that feel, may feel --

17 MS. JOHNSON: Oh, okay. I, I'm sorry, sir, please  
18 continue on.

19 CHAIRMAN: Okay. No, that's it. So, that's, so,  
20 the floor is yours. You have up to three minutes to speak.  
21 If it's --

22 MS. JOHNSON: I apologize because --

23 CHAIRMAN: -- if it's more than three minutes,  
24 then --

25 MS. JOHNSON: -- I, I apologize. I didn't hear

1 any of the testimony because I was on the call with a Staff  
2 person trying to get connected to the, yes, so, I, I don't  
3 really know what any of my other colleagues have said. I  
4 just wanted to login and I don't even know how I look on  
5 this camera, if I'm too close or not close enough.

6 CHAIRMAN: No, you look, you look good.

7 MS. JOHNSON: But I did want to just --

8 CHAIRMAN: You look fine.

9 MS. JOHNSON: Thank you so much.

10 CHAIRMAN: You represent well.

11 MS. JOHNSON: Thank you. I just wanted to say,  
12 though, thank you all so much for taking your time to listen  
13 to our case and to, to evaluate the Temple's plans and to  
14 make sure that the Temple honors everything that the County  
15 expects for the Temple to be and do, to be as far as good  
16 neighbors are concerned to the community around them; and  
17 that they should uphold all the laws and all the steps, and  
18 all of the policies and procedures that should be in place;  
19 and that all of the rest of the community has to adhere to,  
20 they should also have to adhere to them as well.

21 And also, that all the things that were required  
22 and requested of them to do at the previous hearings, they  
23 have not done yet; and they have not honored yet. So, and I  
24 don't think they intend to honor those things and it's very  
25 disheartening to me, one, because I'm the, literally the

1 next door neighbor and that they continuously still intend  
2 on breaking the rules and breaking the rules that you guys  
3 asked for them to not do, one being the, the, using of the  
4 property in the back of my house.

5 MS. SCUDDER: Objection.

6 MS. JOHNSON: They still --

7 MS. SCUDDER: Objection, Chairman Shapiro. I  
8 think Ms. Johnson didn't hear you because she was trying to  
9 get logged in, but this is supposed to be limited to the  
10 procedural issues of the remand.

11 MS. JOHNSON: Okay. No problem at all. So, I  
12 just would like for the things that they were required to do  
13 that was asked of them to do in the prior hearings to be  
14 adhered to; and at this point in time, they have not done  
15 so. So, that's all I have to say.

16 CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Ms. Johnson, I appreciate  
17 it. Thank you for your patience --

18 MS. JOHNSON: Thank you so much.

19 CHAIRMAN: -- today. And I'm glad we worked  
20 out --

21 MS. JOHNSON: Yes.

22 CHAIRMAN: -- the technology issue, too.

23 MS. JOHNSON: Thank you much --

24 CHAIRMAN: All right. I do --

25 MS. JOHNSON: -- and I appreciate you.

1           CHAIRMAN: Sure. Thank you. I do see one more  
2 person on the list who I think is not with the Applicant's  
3 team, Ms. Sollner-Webb.

4           MS. SOLLNER-WEBB: Thank you, yes.

5           CHAIRMAN: Yes --

6           MS. SOLLNER-WEBB: I appreciate you taking --

7           CHAIRMAN: -- if you could, I'm going to swear,  
8 I'm going to wear you in, Ms. Sollner-Webb, okay?

9           MS. SOLLNER-WEBB: Okay.

10          CHAIRMAN: If you could raise your right hand,  
11 please? Do you solemnly swear or affirm that your testimony  
12 will be the whole truth and nothing but the truth?

13          MS. SOLLNER-WEBB: Absolutely.

14          CHAIRMAN: Okay, good. Then you are under oath,  
15 the floor is yours, we'll put three minutes on the clock. I  
16 know it's hard because you have lots of feelings about this  
17 like everybody; but the only thing before us is we are  
18 putting a remand notice in, from the form of an email to the  
19 form of a resolution. That's all that's before us.

20          MS. SOLLNER-WEBB: Okay. Thank you very much.  
21 This is Barbara Sollner-Webb and I applaud the Staff's  
22 recommendation to put this application basically in the  
23 circular file. And I would like to address Ms. Scudder's  
24 arguments that the district, our, where, my understanding,  
25 or as I was listening, what I understood her to say, is that

1 the District, that the District Council's requirements in  
2 the remand, as well as DPIE, asking that the Temple conform  
3 to the County regulations is basically harassment; and that,  
4 therefore, the Planning Board should approve the plan as  
5 they incorrectly did last year.

6           And I'd like to make an argument that her  
7 arguments are completely fallacious. The original  
8 application by the Temple is incredibly defective. I spent  
9 quite a while going over this and my comments on their  
10 original application were ironically, incredibly similar to  
11 what the District Council and their advisor, wonderful  
12 attorney, Stan Brown, said was defective in this plan; and  
13 then that they required corrections of this in the remand.  
14 So, it's not that the District Council is in any way  
15 harassing the Applicant with asking for crazy requirements  
16 in the remand. They're just asking it to be a decent  
17 application. And if the application wasn't reasonable in  
18 the first place, okay, and it maybe takes more than 60 days  
19 to make it reasonable, well, the County shouldn't have to  
20 wait for that. They should have done the application  
21 correctly in the first place.

22           Similarly, the, Ms. Scudder suggesting, or  
23 implying, that DPIE giving citations to the Temple is  
24 harassment, they have bent over backwards to try to get the  
25 Temple to follow the County noise, health regs, et cetera,

1 requirements and the Temple kept continually violating it,  
2 or them. So, eventually, DPIE, yeah, started giving  
3 citations; but why shouldn't the County regulations be  
4 followed? That's what County regulations are there for.  
5 Just because the Temple, or this group claims to be a temple  
6 and does things that violate what the County requires should  
7 not let them off scot-free.

8           So, I feel that Ms. Scudder's argument against the  
9 deep sixing of the, or following the remand requirements are  
10 completely fallacious and I recommend that you end this  
11 application.

12           CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Ms. Sollner-Webb, I  
13 appreciate that. So, do we have anyone else from the public  
14 who has signed up to speak, besides members of the  
15 Applicant's team? I don't see anyone on the list.

16           All right. I'm going to turn back to the  
17 Applicant to give you a final word, Ms. Scudder. I, as you  
18 know, what I've said a million times, which is the only  
19 thing that's before us is the remand, converting this from  
20 an email to the former resolution; but the floor is yours.

21           MS. SCUDDER: Thank you. In response to Ms.  
22 Sollner-Webb's comments, I never used the word harassment.  
23 And I guess I would just say that, you know, all of those  
24 citations that were issued over the summer were dismissed  
25 or, you know, the fines were reduced down because those

1 things we appealed and they were dismissed. So, I just,  
2 that's the final thing I would, I would, I would say.

3 I, Chairman Shapiro, I believe that, you know, the  
4 Council knew when they sent that remand order over that what  
5 they were directing the Applicant to do was impossible.  
6 They didn't want to deny the case but, you know, they pretty  
7 much set the application, Applicant up for failure. And I  
8 think that it would just be wrong for the Planning Board to  
9 accept an application, a remand order that is, you know,  
10 defaultive, default, defective from the start. I mean every  
11 condition in the remand order was impossible to fulfill.  
12 And, you know, even from a jurisdictional standpoint, they  
13 put things in there that, you know, this Board couldn't  
14 possibly have enforced.

15 So, again, you know, I'm not really asking for  
16 anything other than what I think you all were already  
17 planning to do anyway, which was send back over a  
18 communication to the Council that you were taking no action.  
19 I'm just asking you to take a step further and communicate  
20 also to them that in your view, this remand order could not  
21 have been fulfilled in 60 days. And --

22 CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Ms. Scudder.

23 MS. SCUDDER: -- that condition.

24 CHAIRMAN: I appreciate that. Commissioners, if  
25 there's no other questions for the Applicant or Staff, I'm

1 going to close this public hearing. Ms. Sollner-Webb --

2 MS. SOLLNER-WEBB: May I make one comment still?

3 CHAIRMAN: We have a process that's in place. I,  
4 I, if your, if your purpose is to --

5 MS. SOLLNER-WEBB: Something, what Ms. Scudder  
6 said is completely wrong and I'd like to correct it --

7 CHAIRMAN: That's --

8 MS. SOLLNER-WEBB: -- for the record.

9 CHAIRMAN: If, if you go again, I'm going to have  
10 Ms. -- if you go again, I'm going to have Ms. Scudder go  
11 again, and but she gets the final word, Ms. Sollner-Webb.

12 MS. SOLLNER-WEBB: Just that she said that  
13 everything that DPIE has complained about has been thrown  
14 out. Well, why is there going to be a hearing in November  
15 then that we have already been told we should come to and be  
16 prepared about because of all of the unfulfilled,  
17 unfulfilled problems that DPIE has cited against the Temple?  
18 The County wouldn't be --

19 CHAIRMAN: Okay.

20 MS. SOLLNER-WEBB: -- holding a hearing if there  
21 was nothing.

22 CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Ms. Sollner-Webb. Ms.  
23 Scudder, back to you for the final word.

24 MS. SCUDDER: Your Honor, I'm not aware of, of  
25 that at all; but I do know that DPIE has, you know, the

1 Temple has tried to fulfill their, you know, any, anything  
2 that the DPIE inspectors told them to do as far as applying  
3 for permits, they have done that. They have permits right  
4 now that they can't get approved until the DSP is approved.  
5 So, you know, they're kind of, they're kind of between a  
6 rock and a hard place because on one hand, you know, the  
7 community wanted them to cure all violations; but in order  
8 to cure the violations, you know, this Detailed Site Plan  
9 has to be approved. So, I don't know what, how they get out  
10 of this fix they're in. So, that's --

11 CHAIRMAN: All right.

12 MS. SOLLNER-WEBB: -- that's all I have to say.

13 CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you. So, with that,  
14 Commissioners, unless there's any other questions for the  
15 Applicant or Staff, I'm going to close this public hearing.  
16 We have before us a resolution which is converting an,  
17 basically converting an email to a resolution. I know  
18 there's lots of feelings around his on all sides, but what's  
19 before us is fairly straightforward. Commissioners, what is  
20 your pleasure on this item?

21 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So, I, just can I interrupt  
22 real quickly?

23 CHAIRMAN: Yes, sir.

24 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: The resolution will come  
25 back for your approval. You don't have the resolution

1 before you, but, but the decision is what you'll be making  
2 the motion on, right?

3 CHAIRMAN: All right. So, the resolution will  
4 come to us on the consent agenda on a later, on the next  
5 meeting, is that correct?

6 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Correct.

7 COMMISSIONER WASHINGTON: Mr. Chairman, I move  
8 that we adopt the findings detailed in Staff's report that  
9 no action be taken on this remand; and as such, approve an  
10 amendment to PGC, PGCPB 2023-98 conveying that no action was  
11 taken.

12 COMMISSIONER DOERNER: Second.

13 CHAIRMAN: Got a motion by Commissioner  
14 Washington, seconded by Commissioner Doerner. If there's no  
15 discussion on the motion, I will call the roll.  
16 Commissioner Washington.

17 COMMISSIONER WASHINGTON: I vote aye.

18 CHAIRMAN: Commissioner Doerner.

19 COMMISSIONER DOERNER: I vote aye.

20 CHAIRMAN: I vote aye as well. The ayes have it,  
21 3-0. Ms. Sollner-Webb, Mr. Provost, Ms. Scudder, thank you  
22 all very much. Mr. Warner, Ms. Kosack, everybody, I don't  
23 believe we have any further business before us unless I hear  
24 otherwise from staff. Ms. Conner, anything to add?

25 MS. CONNER: No, that will conclude our agenda.

1 Thank you.

2 CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you very much, Ms. Conner.  
3 Then without objection, Commissioners, this meeting is  
4 adjourned. Everybody have a good day.

5 MS. SCUDDER: Thank you, everyone.

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

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

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:

GIAC SON BUDDHIST TEMPLE (REMAND)  
DETAILED SITE PLAN, PPS DSP-20002

By: Tracy Hahn Date: November 20, 2024  
Tracy Hahn, Transcriber