



)
DETAILED SITE PLAN)
SMITH LAKE ESTATES)
DET-2024-015)
COUNCILMANIC DISTRICT 9)
_____)

PRINCE GEORGE’S COUNTY
COUNCIL, SITTING AS THE
DISTRICT COUNCIL

RESPONDENT D.R. HORTON, INC.’S RESPONSE
TO PETITIONER’S APPEAL OF THE
DECISION OF THE PLANNING BOARD

COMES NOW the Respondent, D.R. Horton, Inc. (the “Respondent”), the applicant below, by and through its attorneys, Matthew C. Tedesco, Carly H. Landolfi, and the law firm of McNamee Hosea, P.A., and files this Response to Petitioner’s Appeal of the Decision of the Planning Board in the above-captioned matter, and in support thereof states the following.

FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

This matter arises from Respondent’s application for a detailed site plan (“DET” or “DET-2024-015”) for the development of 143 dwelling units, including 75 single-family detached units and 68 single-family attached units pursuant to the R-PD (Residential-Planned Development) Zone. The subject property is comprised of approximately 62.52 acres of land located on the west side of Frank Tippett Road, approximately 800-feet southwest of its intersection with Commo Road (hereinafter the “Property”), as depicted below:



The Property has an extensive entitlement history including the approval of a zoning map amendment (ZMA-2022-003-C); three previously approved preliminary plans of subdivision (PPS); and one prior detailed site plan. Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-05035, Smith Property, was approved by the Prince George’s County Planning Board (PGCPB Resolution No. 05-267) on December 15, 2005 for 60 lots and 5 parcels, in support of the development of 60 single-family detached dwellings. Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-09042, Smith Lake Estates, was approved by the Planning Board (PGCPB Resolution No. 11-13) on February 3, 2011 for six lots, in support of the development of six single-family detached dwellings. Detailed Site Plan DSP-07002, Smith Property, was approved on November 9, 2011 by the Development Review Division, as designee of the Prince George’s County Planning Director, for private recreation facilities to accompany 59 single-family detached dwelling units. However, none of this development ever proceeded in accordance with these approvals, and the applications have since expired.

On November 29, 2021, the Prince George’s County District Council approved Council Resolution CR-136-2021, the Countywide Map Amendment (CMA), which reclassified the Property from the Rural Residential (R-R) Zone to the Residential, Rural (RR) Zone, effective on April 1, 2022. Zoning Map Amendment ZMA-2022-003-C was approved by the District Council on March 11, 2024 (Zoning Ordinance No. 1-2024), with the final order of approval effective on June 4, 2024. This ZMA rezoned the Property from the RR Zone to the R-PD Zone. This was the County’s first approved R-PD rezoning. The ZMA includes a basic plan for the Property, which approved a maximum of 150 single-family dwellings on the Property, of which no more than 50 percent are to be single-family attached dwellings. The development proposed with DET-2024-015 is consistent with the approved Basic Plan.

Preliminary Plan of Subdivision PPS-2024-001 was approved by the Planning Board (PGCPB Resolution No. 2024-104) for the subdivision of 143 lots and 17 parcels, to support development of 75 single-family detached and 68 single-family attached units, subject to 19 conditions. Certificate of Adequacy ADQ-2024-001 was approved by the Planning Director on October 3, 2024, subject to four conditions. ZMA-2022-003-C, PPS-2024-001, and ADQ-2024-001 are final and beyond appeal.

DET-2024-015 proposes a total of 143 dwelling units, including 75 single-family detached units and 68 single-family attached units. With a mix of housing sizes and types, the proposal is envisioned as a multigenerational development, with homeownership available at a wide price range, accessible to first time homeowners, those seeking to purchase their “golden years” home to age in place, and all those in between. The proposed development is organized around the existing pond located at the center of the property. The existing pond will serve as a public benefit and centralized gathering place for the community, with convenient access through pedestrian

walkways and trails. Single-family attached units are located to the east of the pond, close to Frank Tippet Road, and single-family detached units are located to the west and northeast of the pond. The proposed development includes one vehicular access point on Frank Tippet Road. Within the Property, public and private roads form the primary vehicular circulation of the site. While public roads provide access to 75 front- or side-loaded, single-family detached units, private roads provide access to 68 front-loaded single-family attached units. The provision of crosswalks, 10-foot-wide trails, and 5-foot-wide sidewalks on both sides of the internal roads and along the property frontage of Frank Tippet Road form the pedestrian circulation for the site. The proposed 10-foot-wide connector trail from the terminus of Road F to the westernmost extent of the site in Parcel Q will provide recreational opportunity and potentially a future pedestrian connectivity to the Cheltenham Wetlands Park.

On November 20, 2025, the Planning Board held an evidentiary hearing on DET-2024-015.

7. DETAILED SITE PLAN (Inquiries call 301-952-3530)
DET-2024-015 SMITH LAKE ESTATES – EVIDENTIARY HEARING
(TCP)(ACL)
Council District: 09 Municipality: None
Location: On the west side of Frank Tippet Road, approximately 800 feet southwest of its intersection with Commo Road
Planning Area: 82A
Growth Policy Area: Established Communities
Zoning: R-PD
Gross Acreage: 62.52 Date Accepted: 09/15/2025
Applicant: D.R. Horton, Inc.
Request: Development of 75 single-family detached and 68 single-family attached (townhomes) residential dwelling units

Planning Board Action Limit: 11/24/2025

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:
 - DET-2024-015 – APPROVAL with conditions
 - TCP2-2025-0066 – APPROVAL with conditions
 - ACL-2025-0007 – APPROVAL with conditions(SUN)

It is important to note that there was no opposition to DET-2024-015 at the Planning Board hearing nor was there any written opposition submitted in the record to the Planning Board objecting to any findings or conclusions. Petitioner’s Notice of Appeal provides that Petitioner “participated via in-person-attendance in this process . . . (also attending the hearing on December 11, 2025)” (Notice of Appeal at p. 3). However, the evidentiary hearing on DET-2024-015 was held on November 20, 2025, and no citizen opponents registered to speak, attend, or participate in/at that hearing. At the conclusion of the evidentiary hearing, the Planning Board closed the record and moved unanimously to approve DET-2024-015. Moreover, on December 11, 2025, resolution PGCPB No. 2025-111 was on the Planning Board’s Consent Agenda as Item 4.B. After the Chairman announced Agenda Item 4.B. and read the case number and resolution number into the record, he asked if there was anyone who wished to oppose the staff recommendation on any of the consent agenda items; hearing none, the Chairman called for a motion to adopt all consent agenda items – including resolution PGCPB No. 2025-111. On December 11, 2025, the Planning Board unanimously adopted resolution PGCPB No. 2025-111. On January 14, 2026, Petitioner, Alica Rosser, filed a Request for Appeal. In response, Respondent files this Response and respectfully requests the District Council to **affirm** the Planning Board’s decision.

ARGUMENTS

1. Respondent’s Pre-Application Neighborhood Meeting (PANM) was held in conformance with Section 27-3402(c)(1) of the Zoning Ordinance.

Petitioner incorrectly asserts that Respondent’s Pre-Application Neighborhood Meeting (“PANM”) was fundamentally flawed because the meeting started at 6:00 P.M. on Wednesday, December 11, 2024, and not at 6:30 P.M. Petitioner’s contention is without merit. Petitioner’s argument rests entirely on a misapplication of the governing law. Petitioner incorrectly cites

Section 24-3303(c)(1) of the Subdivision Regulations, which is inapplicable and proves fatal, as Section 24-3303(c)(1) does not apply to DET-2024-015.

Petitioner’s argument and reliance on Section 24-3303(c)(1) is misplaced, as it confuses Subtitle 24 (Subdivision Regulations) of the County Code with Subtitle 27 (Zoning Ordinance) of the County Code. The distinction is straightforward and critical. Subtitle 24 of the County Code governs subdivisions. Subtitle 27 governs zoning matters, including site plan applications such as DET-2024-015. These are separate regulatory frameworks with distinct procedural requirements. DET-2024-015 is required to be reviewed under Subtitle 27, the Zoning Ordinance, not under Subtitle 24, the Subdivision Regulations. By contrast, PPS-2024-001 was reviewed and approved under Subtitle 24, and that approval is final and beyond appeal. Petitioner’s attempt to conflate these separate subtitles cannot manufacture a procedural defect where none exists. The record shows, and Petitioner acknowledges, that the PANM for DET-2024-015 was held on December 11, 2024, and started at 6:00 P.M. The governing provision here, Section 27-3402(c)(1) of the Zoning Ordinance, could not be clearer:

(c) Procedure

If a pre-application neighborhood meeting is conducted, it shall comply with the following requirements:

1. Meeting Location and Time

The meeting shall be held *at or after 6:00 p.m. on a weekday or between 10 a.m. and 4 p.m. on a weekend, at a location that is convenient and generally accessible to neighbors residing in proximity to the land subject to the proposed application, or may be held virtually, as necessary.*

(Emphasis added). The December 11, 2024 PANM began at 6:00 P.M., precisely the time permitted by the Zoning Ordinance. The statute requires that the meeting be held “*at or after 6:00 p.m.*” (Emphasis added). It does not require a 6:30 P.M. start time, nor does it incorporate any

such requirement by reference. Respondent's compliance with the express language of the governing ordinance is undisputed.

The record further confirms full procedural compliance. All written notices and posted signage clearly stated that the meeting would begin at 6:00 P.M. The PANM affidavit, executed by undersigned counsel, attests that the meeting did in fact commence at 6:00 P.M., consistent with Section 27-3402(c)(1). Petitioner acknowledges this fact. There is simply no evidentiary basis for the assertion of noncompliance.

Notably, only two citizens, Petitioner and Lisa Rosser, attended the PANM on DET-2024-015. There is no evidence that any member of the public was misled, confused, or prevented from participating due to the meeting's start time. The meeting was properly noticed, properly convened, and conducted in strict accordance with the applicable requirements of the Zoning Ordinance. Simply, Respondent fully complied with Section 27-3402(c)(1). Petitioner's argument fails because it relies on the wrong statute, misstates the governing requirements, and ignores the undisputed record evidence demonstrating compliance.

2. DET-2024-015 demonstrates the preservation and/or restoration of the regulated environmental features in a natural state, to the fullest extent possible, in accordance with the requirements of Section 27-3605(e)(3) of the Zoning Ordinance.

Petitioner's second argument that the "loss of contiguous forest in this area will cause irreparable harm to the local ecosystem and stormwater management" is wholly conclusory. (Appeal Petition at p. 2). Petitioner offers no evidence, citations in the record, expert or technical analysis, or any competent evidence in support of the contention made. Instead, Petitioner makes a generalized assertion that cannot overcome the substantial record evidence demonstrating that DET-2024-015 preserves and restores regulated environmental features in accordance with Section 27-3605(e)(3) of the Zoning Ordinance.

By contrast, the administrative record contains detailed environmental analysis documenting existing site conditions and the manner in which high-value resources are being protected. The Property is comprised of varying environments that include old agricultural fields, a forested stream valley and associated floodplain, an abandoned farm pond, upland woodlands, and wetlands. The topography varies throughout the site but generally slopes downwards to the north and west towards the existing farm pond and stream valleys. Based on the approved Type 2 Tree Conservation Plan, the overall site contains a total of 22.96 acres of net tract woodlands and 2.18 acres of wooded floodplain. The plan shows a proposal to clear 11.32 acres of net tract woodlands and 0.07 acre of wooded floodplain. The resulting woodland conservation requirement is 15.17 acres, and this *will be met entirely on-site* with 11.59 acres of preservation and 3.58 acres of reforestation. (Emphasis added). Thus, the DET and TCP-2 not only preserve substantial existing woodlands, but affirmatively enhance additional areas through the afforestation of the existing stream buffers where no woodlands exist today. This is precisely the type of preservation and enhancement contemplated by Section 27-3605(e)(3).

The site contains 111 specimen trees, ranging in condition from poor to good. While 34 specimen trees were previously approved for removal with the Preliminary Plan of Subdivision (PPS-2024-001), the DET reflects additional environmental sensitivity: two specimen trees originally approved for removal will now be retained. The Planning Board expressly required revision of the specimen tree table to memorialize this enhanced preservation. Far from demonstrating environmental disregard, the DET improves upon prior approvals by decreasing clearing and increasing the retention of woodlands where feasible. The site contains one perennial and two intermittent stream channels that all drain to the northwest off-site into the Piscataway Creek and its adjacent floodplain. Of the total forested area, more than 11 acres of high- to

medium-priority retention forest, along with 61 of the 111 specimen trees, are located within the stream valleys. These sensitive areas are not only retained but remain buffered and protected. The existing farm pond and associated PFO (palustrine forested), PEM (palustrine emergent), and PUB (palustrine unconsolidated bottom) wetlands are likewise preserved with the reconstruction of the pond, maintaining existing habitat continuity and groundwater-supported ecological function. Moreover, the approved PPS and DET provide opportunities for meadow establishment and/or additional afforestation in the western portion of the site, further reinforcing long-term ecological enhancement. In totality, the plan concentrates development outside the most sensitive environmental areas while preserving stream valleys, floodplains, wetlands, and priority forest stands. This reflects a deliberate and environmentally responsible design consistent with the intent of the R-PD Zone and the 2013 *Subregion 6 Master Plan*.

Petitioner's claim of "irreparable harm" is particularly untenable in light of the Tree Canopy Coverage ("TCC") requirements. Under Subtitle 25, Division 3, properties in the R-PD Zone must provide a minimum of 20 percent tree canopy coverage – resulting in a requirement of approximately 12 acres (or 522,807 square feet) of tree canopy coverage. DET-2024-015, however, provides 20.3 acres (or 886,162 square feet) of tree canopy coverage, well in excess of the statutory minimum. The tree canopy coverage is achieved through on-site woodland conservation and proposed landscaped trees. The project, therefore, substantially exceeds the minimum environmental performance standards mandated by County law.

Regarding the "irreparable harm" as it relates to stormwater management; the site is currently abandoned and unimproved. Stormwater flows freely across the vacant fields directly into the on-site waterways and pond. Section 27-3605(c)(F)(x) of the Zoning Ordinance requires approval of a Site Development Concept Plan (stormwater management concept plan), prior to

acceptance of a DET. A stormwater management concept plan and approval letter were submitted with the DET application (to wit: 53887-2024-SDC/P00119-2024-SDC). Proposed stormwater management facilities far exceed existing conditions and include one (1) large pond, five (5) submerged gravel wetland facilities, four (4) microbioretention ponds, nine (9) grass swales, and forty-seven (47) rooftop disconnect systems.

Finally, the Planning Board's findings are not speculative; they are grounded in technical review and documented analysis. As confirmed in the October 22, 2025 memorandum (Schneider to Sun), DET-2024-015 conforms with Sections 27-3605(c), 27-3605(e)(3), 27-3605(e)(6), 27-6802, 27-6803, 27-6805, 27-6808, and 27-6809 of the Zoning Ordinance's Environmental Protection and Noise Control provisions. These findings are supported by substantial evidence in the record and reflect professional environmental review, not conjecture. While Petitioner offers generalized assertions of alleged environmental harm, the record demonstrates the opposite: preservation of high-value stream valley systems, protection of wetlands and floodplains, retention of priority forest and specimen trees, on-site reforestation, and tree canopy coverage far exceeding statutory requirements, and all required stormwater management. DET-2024-015 satisfies Section 27-3605(e)(3) and reflects a careful, environmentally sensitive approach to site design.

3. Although DET-2024-015 is not required to strictly conform with the Subregion 6 Master Plan, the development of Smith Lake Estates has previously been determined to be consistent with the goals and policies of Plan 2035 and the Master Plan.

Petitioner's contention that DET-2024-015 disregards the County's mandate to balance housing with environmental resilience, prioritizes short-term development over long-term ecological and fiscal health in District 9, and fails to align with the Subregion 6 Master Plan is unsupported by both the governing law and the substantial evidence in the administrative record. As a threshold matter, the Zoning Ordinance does not require a Detailed Site Plan to independently

“conform” to or “align” with the Master Plan. Section 27-3605(e) establishes the governing decision standards for approval of a Detailed Site Plan, and while neither the Zoning Ordinance nor those standards require independent Master Plan conformance at this stage, the Planning Board and Technical Staff nevertheless evaluated the proposal and made affirmative findings that DET-2024-015 is consistent with the applicable Master Plan. Notwithstanding, the law is clear that conformance to a Master Plan is not required for detailed site plan approval, which is fully consistent with controlling Maryland precedent. In *Heard v. County Council of Prince George’s County*, 256 Md. App. 586, 287 A.3d 682 (2022), the Appellate Court held that because preliminary plans of subdivision must conform to the General Plan and applicable Master Plan, master plan conformity is tested at the preliminary plan of subdivision stage and need not be re-examined at the detailed site plan stage. Thus, once conformance has been established through prior approvals, it is not relitigated at the implementation (or detailed site plan) phase. Here, master plan consistency was evaluated and resolved during approval of ZMA-2022-003 and again with the Planning Board’s approval of PPS-2024-001 on October 31, 2024, which expressly found that the rezoning of the Property to R-PD Zone and the subdivision of the Property met the applicable legal requirements of Subtitles 24 and 27 of the County Code – including conformance with Plan 2035 and the Subregion 6 Master Plan. If needed, the District Council may take notice of these prior findings.

The DET merely implements those prior, final determinations. Even if independent conformity were required, the record demonstrates alignment with Plan 2035 and the 2013 *Subregion 6 Master Plan*. The property lies within the Established Communities Growth Policy Area, where context-sensitive, low- to medium-density development is appropriate. The approved development, consisting of 143 dwelling units on 62.52 acres, results in a density well within the

Residential Low category and consistent with the R-PD Basic Plan approved by the District Council. Further, the project advances environmental policies of the Master Plan by protecting Piscataway Creek, preserving approximately 15 acres of forest on-site, retaining and enhancing the existing pond as a functional stormwater and ecological feature, and incorporating micro-bioretenion facilities, grass swales, and submerged gravel wetlands to manage runoff and protect water quality. These measures were formally reviewed by the Environmental Planning Section, which found the application in conformance with the Environmental Protection and Noise Control provisions of the Zoning Ordinance, as well as the environmental goals and policies of the Master Plan.

Petitioner's assertions regarding long-term fiscal harm are equally speculative and contradicted by the record. The development is supported by an approved Certificate of Adequacy and stormwater management concept plan, reflects coordinated infrastructure planning, includes right-of-way dedication and multimodal improvements, and provides public benefits such as parkland dedication and a connector trail enhancing potential future access to Cheltenham Wetlands Park. These are not hallmarks of short-term, unsustainable growth; they reflect deliberate implementation of previously authorized zoning in a manner that preserves high-value environmental resources while providing housing within a designated growth area.

Therefore, the record demonstrates that DET-2024-015 is consistent with prior zoning approvals, aligned with applicable planning policies, environmentally conditioned, infrastructure-supported, and legally sufficient under Section 27-3605(e) of the Zoning Ordinance. Petitioner's argument amounts to a policy disagreement with legislative and quasi-judicial decisions that are already final and entitled to deference, not a legally cognizable defect in the Detailed Site Plan.

4. District Council review of the Planning Board's decision on a Detailed Site Plan is limited to evidence in the record, and, therefore, Petitioner's challenge to the

validity of the site characterization premised on extra-record materials raised for the first time on appeal must be disregarded as a matter of law.

a. Petitioner’s challenge to the validity of site characterization is premised on allegations outside the record and cannot be considered on appeal.

Petitioner’s challenge to the validity of the technical data submitted by Respondent as part of DET-2024-015 is based on information outside the record, and, therefore, must be disregarded as part of this on-the-record appeal. The Planning Board’s unanimous approval of DET-2024-015 was properly based on the evidence and testimony contained in the administrative record compiled in accordance with Subtitle 27 of the Prince George’s County Code. *See* Section 27-3605(d)(7). As stated *supra*, at the November 20, 2025 evidentiary hearing, no citizen opponents—including Petitioner—registered to speak, attend, or participate in that hearing. Moreover, on December 11, 2025, resolution PGCPB No. 2025-111 was on the Planning Board’s consent agenda as item 4.B. The Chairman announced Agenda Item 4.B. and read the case number and resolution number into the record, and asked if there was anyone who wished to oppose the staff recommendation on any of the consent agenda items. Hearing none, the Chairman called for a motion to adopt all consent agenda items, including PGCPB No. 2025-111. At no point prior to or during the November 20, 2025 or December 11, 2025 proceedings did Petitioner submit written or oral evidence into the record related to the allegations set forth in item 4 of Petitioner’s Request for Appeal.

Pursuant to Section 27-3605(d)(10)(E) of the Zoning Ordinance, when the District Council reviews the Planning Board’s decision, the District Council is bound by the record developed before the Planning Board. Section 27-3605(d)(10)(E) specifically provides that “[t]he Council’s decision on the *appeal shall be based on the record on appeal*[.]” (Emphasis added). The Planning Board has original jurisdiction over DSP applications, and “the District Council’s review of such decisions is appellate in nature.” *Heard v. Cnty. Council of Prince George’s County*, 256 Md. App.

586, 611 (2022). The District Council's role is not to conduct a de novo evidentiary proceeding, but to determine, based on the existing record, whether the Planning Board's decision is supported by substantial evidence and is not arbitrary, capricious, or contrary to law. *Id.* at 611–12 (citing *County Council of Prince George's County v. FCW Justice, Inc.*, 238 Md. App. 641, 674–75 (2018)).

Maryland appellate courts have consistently held that, when acting in an appellate capacity, a local legislative body (here, the District Council) may not consider evidence or arguments that were not presented to the administrative body in the first instance. *County Council of Prince George's County v. Zimmer Dev. Co.*, 444 Md. 490, 578–79 (2015) (District Council review is limited to evidence in the record); *Heard*, 256 Md. App. at 611. In *County Council of Prince George's County v. Zimmer Dev. Co.*, the Supreme Court of Maryland (then, the Maryland Court of Appeals), emphasized that where a local body's jurisdiction is appellate, judicial-type review is confined to the evidentiary record made before the initial decision-maker, and new evidence may not be introduced on appeal. 444 Md. 490, 573–583. Similarly, in *Heard v. Cnty. Council of Prince George's County*, the Appellate Court of Maryland reaffirmed that, when the District Council acts in its appellate capacity under the Zoning Ordinance, it is limited to the record before the Planning Board and may not rely upon materials or theories first raised on appeal. 256 Md. App. at 606–08, 611–12.

This principle is grounded in longstanding administrative law. *See, e.g., Board of Cnty. Comm'rs v. Holbrook*, 314 Md. 210, 218–19 (1988) (holding that an appellate administrative body is confined to the record made before the agency below and the reviewing body must not engage in fact finding or substitution of agency judgment); *Dep't of Labor, Licensing and Regulation v. Muddiman*, 120 Md. App. 725, 733 (1998) (reviewing bodies may not make their own findings of

fact or supply findings made by the agency). The substantial evidence test, which governs review under Section 27-3605(d)(10)(E), necessarily presupposes a closed record; it does not permit supplementation with extra-record technical critiques or post hoc analyses. *See Zimmer*, 444 Md. at 606–07.

Here, the challenge to the validity of Respondent’s technical data relies on materials and assertions that were never submitted to the Planning Board and are not part of the administrative record.¹ Those contentions were not the subject of testimony, cross-examination, or agency evaluation below. To consider them now would improperly convert this appellate review into a de novo evidentiary proceeding, contrary to Section 27-3605(d)(10) and controlling Maryland case law. Because the alleged deficiencies are premised entirely on extra-record materials raised for the first time on appeal, they are not properly before the District Council and must be disregarded as a matter of law.

Accordingly, the only question before the District Council is whether the Planning Board’s approval of the Detailed Site Plan is supported by substantial evidence in the existing record. DET-2024-015 contained the requisite surveys, elevations, landscape plans, and site characterization studies, and, therefore, the approval is supported by substantial evidence in the record. Absent any record-based showing that the Planning Board erred as a matter of law or that its findings lack substantial evidentiary support, the appeal must be denied.

b. The allegations in Petitioner’s Request for Appeal that Respondent illegally trespassed are without factual or legal basis.

To the extent the District Council considers the extra-record allegations contained in Petitioner’s request for appeal, Respondent denies that it, or its contractors/consultants, illegally

¹ Petitioner’s Request for Appeal acknowledges that her arguments presented in Item 4 were not part of the record, as she notes that, through her written request for appeal, “[Petitioner is] formally placing on the record” the allegations cited therein.

trespassed onto the Rosser Property located at 10611 Frank Tippet Road, Cheltenham, Maryland (“Rosser Property”), as alleged. Respondent contracted with Rodgers Consulting to conduct a Boundary Survey of the Walton Maryland, LLC parcels comprising the Smith Lake Estates project from February 2021 through April 2021. During this timeframe, multiple access points along Frank Tippet Road were utilized to access the Property. One access point was the common driveway located along the common boundary line between the Property and the Rosser Property. An alternate access point was a gravel entrance located on Frank Tippet Road, approximately 160 feet south of the common driveway. Rodgers Consulting’s access was authorized by Walton Maryland, LLC. *See* Property Access Authorization Letter, attached as Exhibit A.

In February 2025, Respondent contracted with Rodgers Consulting to perform a Hydrographic Survey of the existing pond located on the Property. The same access points previously used during the 2021 Boundary Survey were utilized at the outset of this work. Access via the common driveway was discontinued after Petitioner and other owners of the Rosser Property requested Rodgers Consulting to refrain from using that driveway. No surveying work was performed by Respondent or its contractor/consultant on August 26, 2025, and the Rosser’s Property was not utilized for surveying on that date.

Although Respondent and their contracted surveyor respected the Rossers’ request to refrain from using the common driveway sometime after February 2025, Respondent disputes the Rossers’ unilateral authority to restrict use of the common driveway because the driveway is not private land solely owned by the Rossers. Pursuant to the deed to the Rosser Property, recorded among the Land Records of Prince George’s County in Book 22044 at Page 149 (*see* Rosser Deed attached as Exhibit B), the legal description of the Rosser Property is as follows:

THAT TRACT OF LAND, SITUATED IN THE ELEVENTH (11TH) DISTRICT OF PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY, MARYLAND, AND MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED AS:

BEING PART OF THE LAND OF RALPH WELCH AND LAURA A. WELCH, DECEASED (EST#37211) AS DESCRIBED IN CONVEYANCE RECORDED AMONG THE LAND RECORDS OF PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY, MARYLAND IN LIBER 8329, FOLIO 806 AND DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

BEGINNING FOR THE SAME AT AN IRON PIPE LYING IN A CENTER OF A GRAVEL EXISTING ROADWAY INTERSECTING THE WESTERLY RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF FRANK TIPPET ROAD, 30 FEET WIDE FROM CENTERLINE THEREOF AS SHOWN ON PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY RIGHT OF WAY PLAT #746 AND MARKING THE COMMON FRONT CORNER BETWEEN THE AFORESAID LAND OF WELCH AND THE LAND OF DANIEL H. SMITH AT AL, (LIBER 4940, FOLIO 117), AND THENCE RUNNING WITH THE CENTER OF THE AFORESAID ROADWAY, ALSO BEING THE LINE OF DIVISION BETWEEN THE AFORESAID WELCH AND SMITH LANDS,

1. NORTH 87 DEG. 12'20" WEST, 637.95 FEET TO AN IRON PIPE; THENCE RUNNING ALONG PART OF THE LINE DIVISION BETWEEN THE AFORESAID LAND OF WELCH AND THE LAND OF FLOYD L. SMITH ET OX, (LIBER 1643, FOLIO 279).
2. NORTH 30 DEG. 28'23" EAST, 280.93 FEET TO AN IRON PIPE; THENCE RUNNING ACROSS THE AFORESAID WELCH LAND,
3. SOUTH 87 DEG. 12'20" EAST, 510.16 FEET TO AN IRON PIPE LYING IN THE AFORESAID WESTERLY RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF FRANK TIPPETT ROAD AS SHOWN ON THE AFORESAID PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY RIGHT OF WAY PLAY #746; AND THENCE RUNNING ALONG THE AFORESAID CENTERLINE THEREOF,
4. 16.64 FEET ALONG THE ARC OF A CURVE DEFLECTING TO THE RIGHT, HAVING A RADIUS OF 1115.92 FEET AND A LONG CHORD BEARING AND DISTANCES OF SOUTH 01 DEG 58'34" WEST, 163.94 FEET TO A CONCRETE MONUMENT FOUND, THEREOF
5. SOUTH 06 DEG. 10'37" WEST, 85.45 FEET TO THE PLACE OF BEGINNING, CONTAINING 143.6552 SQUARE FEET OR 3.2978 ACRES OF LAND.

SUBJECT TO THE EASEMENT AREA AS SHOWN ON PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY RIGHT OF WAY PLAT #746. **SUBJECT TO AND TOGETHER WITH ANY RIGHT OF INGRESS AND EGRESS THAT MAY EXIST**

OVER THE EXISTING GRAVEL ROADWAY RUNNING ALONG THE 1ST NORTH 87 DEG. 12'20" WEST, 637.95 FOOT COURSE DESCRIBED ABOVE. SUBJECT TO OTHER ENCUMBRANCES, IF ANY, OF RECORD.

BEING ALL THE SAME PROPERTY OBTAINED BY DEED DATED JANUARY 25, 1994 AND RECORDED AMONG THE LAND RECORDS OF PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY, MARYLAND IN LIBER 9353, FOLIO 664 FROM ANDREW W. DYER AND ROBERT Y. CLAGETT, TRUSTEES TO RALPH WELCH.

(Emphasis added). The gravel roadway referenced in the legal description of the Rosser Property is the common driveway previously used as an access point by Respondent and their contracted surveyors to access the Property. Pursuant to the Rosser Deed, the common driveway is not private land exclusively owned by the Rossers, but a roadway straddling a common boundary line which serves both the Rosser Property and the Property.

Even though Respondent and their contracted surveyor respected the Rossers' request to refrain from using the common driveway, the Rossers do not have the authority to unilaterally restrict the use of the common driveway because it is not private land exclusively owned by the Rossers. Because the common driveway is not private land owned by the Rossers, the allegation that Respondent or their contractors trespassed in order to conduct surveys as a part of DET-2024-015 is without legal basis. Accordingly, there is no evidence in the record that any technical data submitted as a part of DET-2024-015 was obtained illegally or that the data is invalid, and the District Council should affirm the Planning Board's approval of DET-2024-015.

CONCLUSION

In accordance with the arguments set forth above, the substantial evidence in the record, and the Planning Board's decision that Section 27-3605(e) of the Zoning Ordinance has been met, the District Council must **AFFIRM** DET-2024-015, as requested.

Respectfully submitted,

D.R. HORTON, INC.

By its attorneys,



Matthew C. Tedesco, Esq.
Carly H. Landolfi, Esq.
McNamee, Hosea, P.A.
6404 Ivy Lane, Suite 820
Greenbelt, Maryland 20770
(301) 441-2420 Telephone
mtedesco@mhlawyers.com
clandolfi@mhlawyers.com

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on the date set forth below, a copy of the foregoing Response to Petitioner's Appeal of the Decision of the Planning Board was served by electronic mail upon the following:

Rajesh A. Kumar, Esq.
Principal Counsel
Prince George's County Council
Wayne K. Curry Administration Building
1301 McCormick Drive, Suite 3-126
Largo, Maryland 20774
RAKumar@co.pg.md.us
Attorney for Prince George's County District Council

Stan D. Brown, Esq.
People's Zoning Counsel
1300 Caraway Court, Suite 202
Largo, Maryland 20774-5462
attorney@stanbrown.law

A copy of the foregoing Response to Petitioner's Appeal of the Decision of the Planning Board was served by first class upon the following:

All Parties of Record:

KEITH PIERCE
807 SANGERVILLE CIRCLE
UPPER MARLBORO MD 20774

MS.KATRINA J PINDER
10703 MEYNELL DRIVE
CHELTENHAM MD 20623 -1208

CHRISTINE GILLETTE
RODGERS CONSULTING
1101 MERCANTILE LANE SUITE 280
LARGO MD 20774

GRIFFIN BURNS
D.R. HORTON, INC.
137 MITCHELL'S CHANCE ROAD SUITE 300
EDGEWATER MD 21037

LAWANA J CHISLEY
10604 NORTH FRANK TIPPETT ROAD NORTH
CHELTENHAM MD 20623

MS. ALICIA ROSSER
10611 FRANK TIPPETT ROAD
CHELTENHAM MD 20623

Date: February 26, 2026



Matthew C. Tedesco, Esq.

February 18, 2021

PROPERTY ACCESS AUTHORIZATION LETTER

Property Name: Smith Lake Estates

Property Location: Cheltenham, MD

Property Description: Approx. 62.5 acres located along Frank Tippet Road and Commo Road

Property Boundary: See attached Map and Parcel listing

To whom it may concern.

The Company and/or Individual(s) bearing this letter hereby has authorization by the property owner and/or property manager to access the named property's boundaries for the reasons listed below, but not specifically limited to:

- Land Surveying (ie: boundary surveys, topographic surveys, tree location surveys, etc.)
- Environmental Site Assessments
- Wetlands Investigations
- Tree Inventory & Analysis
- Natural Resource Inventories
- Site Photos
- Site Measurements
- Geo-technical Studies
- Geo-technical borings and site sampling
- Cultural Investigations
- Stream Assessments
- General property cleanup

Under no condition shall anyone have authorization to Hunt, Hike, Bird Watch, drive Motorized Vehicles (ie: motorcycles, 4-wheelers, side-by-sides, Jeeps, etc.), ride mountain bikes, or generally Explore this property for any other recreational type of purpose.

Should anyone question an individual's authorization to access the named property above, please contact the Walton employee listed below:

Respectfully,



Adam Morman

General Manager Mid-Atlantic

Phone: (O) 571.297.9071 or (M) 703.657.9749

Email: amorman@walton.com

EXHIBIT A

Smith Lake Estates - Parcels

Tax Account	Owner Name	Premise Address
1183177	WALTON MARYLAND LLC	FRANK TIPPETT RD, CHELTENHAM, MD 20623
1182690	WALTON MARYLAND LLC	10605 FRANK TIPPETT RD, CHELTENHAM, MD 20623
1182690	WALTON MARYLAND LLC	10605 FRANK TIPPETT RD, CHELTENHAM, MD 20623
1183151	WALTON MARYLAND LLC	10609 FRANK TIPPETT RD, CHELTENHAM, MD 20623
1183151	WALTON MARYLAND LLC	10609 FRANK TIPPETT RD, CHELTENHAM, MD 20623
1177740	WALTON MARYLAND LLC	10703 FRANK TIPPETT RD, CHELTENHAM, MD 20623



Brennan Title Company
File No. 1050603
Tax ID # 11 2833713

PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY, MD
APPROVED BY UM
#06

MAY 06 2005

Clerk of the
Circuit Court

22044 149

\$ 1,742.40 RECORDATION TAX PAID
\$ 3,544.00 TRANSFER TAX PAID

2005 MAY 11 PM 3:16

This Deed, made this 31st day of March, 2005, by and between Willie R. POWELL, Sr. and Hattie M. POWELL, parties of the first part, Grantors; and David ROSSER, Sr. and Lisa ROSSER, parties of the second part, Grantees.

PR 650 00 MD #9

- Witnesseth -

That for and in consideration of the sum of Three Hundred Ninety Six Thousand And 00/100 Dollars (\$396,000.00), which includes the amount of any outstanding Mortgage or Deed of Trust, if any, the receipt whereof is hereby acknowledged, the said Grantors do grant and convey to the said David ROSSER, Sr. and Lisa ROSSER, as tenants by the entirety unto the survivor of them, his or her heirs and assigns, in fee simple, all that lot of ground situate in the City of Cheltenham, County of Prince George's, State of Maryland and described as follows, that is to say:

THAT TRACT OF LAND, SITUATED IN THE ELEVENTH (11TH) DISTRICT OF PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY, MARYLAND, AND MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED AS:

BEING PART OF THE LAND OF RALPH WELCH AND LAURA A. WELCH, DECEASED (Est#37211) AS DESCRIBED IN CONVEYANCE RECORDED AMONG THE LAND RECORDS OF PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY, MARYLAND IN LIBER 8329, FOLIO 806 AND DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

BEGINNING FOR THE SAME AT AN IRON PIPE LYING IN A CENTER OF A GRAVEL EXISTING ROADWAY INTERSECTING THE WESTERLY RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF FRANK TIPPETT ROAD, 30 FEET WIDE FROM CENTERLINE THEREOF AS SHOWN ON PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY RIGHT OF WAY PLAT #746; AND THENCE MARKING THE COMMON FRONT CORNER BETWEEN THE AFORESAID LAND OF WELCH AND THE LAND OF DANIEL H. SMITH ET AL, (LIBER 4940, FOLIO 117), AND THENCE RUNNING WITH THE CENTER OF THE AFORESAID ROADWAY, ALSO BEING THE LINE OF DIVISION BETWEEN THE AFORESAID WELCH AND SMITH LANDS,

IMP FD SURE \$ 20.00
RECORDING FEE 20.00
IN TAX STATE 1,988.00
REASSIGN 2,020.00
REASSIGN Rcpt # 72241
STANDARD Blk # 6527
MAY 11 2005 03:15 PM

1. NORTH 87 DEG. 12'20" WEST, 637.95 FEET TO AN IRON PIPE; THENCE RUNNING ALONG PART OF THE LINE DIVISION BETWEEN THE AFORESAID LAND OF WELCH AND THE LAND OF FLOYD L. SMITH ET AL, (LIBER 1643, FOLIO 279).
2. NORTH 30 DEG. 28'23" EAST, 280.93 FEET TO AN IRON PIPE; THENCE RUNNING ACROSS THE AFORESAID WELCH LAND,
3. SOUTH 87 DEG. 12'20" EAST, 510.16 FEET TO AN IRON PIPE LYING IN THE AFORESAID WESTERLY RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF FRANK TIPPETT ROAD AS SHOWN ON THE AFORESAID PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY RIGHT OF WAY PLAT #746; AND THENCE RUNNING ALONG THE AFORESAID CENTERLINE THEREOF,
4. 16.64 FEET ALONG THE ARC OF A CURVE DEFLECTING TO THE RIGHT, HAVING A RADIUS OF 1115.92 FEET AND A LONG CHORD BEARING AND DISTANCES OF SOUTH 01 DEG 58'34" WEST, 163.94 FEET TO A CONCRETE MONUMENT FOUND, THEREOF
5. SOUTH 06 DEG. 10'37" WEST, 85.45 FEET TO THE PLACE OF BEGINNING, CONTAINING 143.652 SQUARE FEET OR 3.2978 ACRES OF LAND.

EXHIBIT B



PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY CIRCUIT COURT (Land Records) REP 22044 p.0149 MSA_CE_64_22125. Date available 6/2/2005. Printed 2/25/2026.

SUBJECT TO THE EASEMENT AREA AS SHOWN ON PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY RIGHT OF WAY PLAT #746. SUBJECT TO AND TOGETHER WITH ANY RIGHT OF INGRESS AND EGRESS THAT MAY EXIST OVER THE EXISTING GRAVEL ROADWAY RUNNING ALONG THE 1ST OR NORTH 87 DEG. 12' 20" WEST, 637.95 FOOT COURSE DESCRIBED ABOVE. SUBJECT TO OTHER ENCUMBRANCES, IF ANY, OF RECORD.

BEING ALL THE SAME PROPERTY OBTAINED BY DEED DATED JANUARY 25, 1994 AND RECORDED AMONG THE LAND RECORDS OF PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY, MARYLAND IN LIBER 9353, FOLIO 664 FROM ANDREW W. DYER AND ROBERT Y. CLAGETT, TRUSTEES TO RALPH WELCH.

BEING the same property which, by Deed dated July 18, 2001, and recorded among the Land Records of the City of Cheltenham, County of Prince George's, State of Maryland, in Liber No. 14837, folio 715, was granted and conveyed by Ralph Welch unto Willie R. POWELL, Sr. and Hattie M. POWELL.

The Buyer/Grantee hereby swears or affirms under the penalty of perjury that the property herein conveyed is intended to be used as my principal residence by actually occupying the residence

Together with the buildings and improvements thereon erected, made or being; and all and every, the rights, alleys, ways, waters, privileges, appurtenances and advantages thereto belonging, or in anywise appertaining.

To Have and To Hold the said tract of ground and premises above described and mentioned, and hereby intended to be conveyed, together with the rights, privileges, appurtenances and advantages thereto belonging or appertaining unto and to the proper use and benefit of the said David ROSSER, Sr. and Lisa ROSSER, as tenants by the entirety unto the survivor of them, his or her heirs and assigns, in fee simple.

And the said parties of the first part hereby covenant that they have not done or suffered to be done any act, matter or thing whatsoever, to encumber the property hereby conveyed; that they will warrant specially the property hereby granted; and that they will execute such further assurances of the same as may be requisite.

As Witness the hands and seals of said Grantors, the day and year first above written.

WITNESS:

Willie R. Powell Sr. {Seal}
Willie R. POWELL, Sr.

Hattie M. Powell {Seal}
Hattie M. POWELL

STATE OF MARYLAND, COUNTY OF PRINCE GEORGE'S, to wit:

I hereby certify that on this 31st day of March, 2005, before me, the subscriber, a Notary Public of the State and County aforesaid, personally appeared Willie R. POWELL, Sr. and Hattie M. POWELL, the Grantors herein, known to me (or satisfactorily proven) to be the persons whose names are subscribed to the within instrument, and acknowledged the same for the purposes therein contained, and further acknowledged the foregoing Deed to be their act, and in my presence signed and sealed the same, giving oath under penalties of perjury that the consideration recited herein is correct.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I hereunto set my hand and official seal.

Notary Public
My commission expires: 5-1-06


THIS IS TO CERTIFY that the within Deed was prepared by, or under the supervision of the undersigned, an Attorney duly admitted to practice before the Court of Appeals of Maryland.

THIS IS CERTIFY THAT THIS DOCUMENT WAS PREPARED UNDER THE SUPERVISION OF AN ATTORNEY ADMITTED TO PRACTICE BEFORE THE COURT OF APPEALS OF MARYLAND.

J. M. B.
JOHN M. BRENNAN, ATTORNEY

John M. Brennan
Attorney

AFTER RECORDING, PLEASE RETURN TO:
Brennan Title Company
5865 Allentown Road
Camp Springs, MD 20746

PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY CIRCUIT COURT (Land Records) REP 22044 p.0151 MSA_CE_64_22125. Date available 6/2/2005. Printed 2/25/2026.

**Certification of Exemption from Withholding Upon Disposition of Maryland Real Estate
Affidavit of Residence or Principal Residence**

Based on the certification below, Transferor claims exemption from the tax withholding requirements of §10-912 of the Tax-General Article, Annotated Code of Maryland. Section 10-912 provides that certain tax payments must be withheld and paid when a deed or other instrument that effects a change in ownership of real property is presented for recordation. The requirements of §10-912 do not apply when a transferor provides a certification of Maryland residence or certification that the transferred property is the transferor's principal residence.

1. Transferor Information	
Name of Transferor	Willie R. Powell

2. Reasons for Exemption	
Resident Status	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> I, Transferor, am a resident of the State of Maryland. <input type="checkbox"/> Transferor is a resident entity under § 10-912(A)(4) of the Tax-General Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland, I am an agent of Transferor, and I have authority to sign this document on Transferor's behalf.
Principal Residence	<input type="checkbox"/> Although I am no longer a resident of the State of Maryland, the Property is m principal residence as defined in IRC §121.

Under penalty of perjury, I certify that I have examined this declaration and that, to the best of my knowledge, it is true, correct, and complete.

3a. Individual Transferors	
Witness _____ Name _____ Signature _____	Willie R Powell Sr Name _____ Signature _____
3b. Entity Transferors	
Witness/Attest _____	Name of Entity _____ By _____ Name _____ Title _____

**Certification of Exemption from Withholding Upon Disposition of Maryland Real Estate
Affidavit of Residence or Principal Residence**

Based on the certification below, Transferor claims exemption from the tax withholding requirements of §10-912 of the Tax-General Article, Annotated Code of Maryland. Section 10-912 provides that certain tax payments must be withheld and paid when a deed or other instrument that effects a change in ownership of real property is presented for recordation. The requirements of §10-912 do not apply when a transferor provides a certification of Maryland residence or certification that the transferred property is the transferor's principal residence.

1. Transferor Information	
Name of Transferor	Hattie M. Powell

2. Reasons for Exemption	
Resident Status	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> I, Transferor, am a resident of the State of Maryland. <input type="checkbox"/> Transferor is a resident entity under § 10-912(A)(4) of the Tax-General Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland, I am an agent of Transferor, and I have authority to sign this document on Transferor's behalf.
Principal Residence	<input type="checkbox"/> Although I am no longer a resident of the State of Maryland, the Property is my principal residence as defined in IRC §121.

Under penalty of perjury, I certify that I have examined this declaration and that, to the best of my knowledge, it is true, correct, and complete.

3a. Individual Transferors	
Witness _____ 	Name <u>Hattie M. Powell</u> Signature <u>Hattie M. Powell</u>
3b. Entity Transferors	
Witness/Attest _____ 	Name of Entity _____ By _____ Name _____ Title _____

State of Maryland Land Instrument Intake Sheet

[] Baltimore City [X] County: Prince George's
 Information provided is for the use of the Clerk's Office and State Department of
 Assessments and Taxation, and the County Finance Office only.
 (Type or Print in Black Ink Only All Copies Must Be Legible)

1	Type(s) of Instruments	([] Check Box if Addendum Intake Form is Attached.)																	
		1	Deed	<input type="checkbox"/>	Mortgage	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other										
2	Conveyance Check Box	2	Deed of Trust	<input type="checkbox"/>	Lease	<input type="checkbox"/>	Multiple	<input type="checkbox"/>	Not an Arms-Length Sale [9]										
		Improved Sale		Unimproved Sale		Arms Length [3]		Arms-Length [1] Arms-Length [2]											
3	Tax Exemptions (if Applicable)	Recordation																	
		State Transfer																	
		County Transfer																	
Cite or Explain Authority																			
4	Consideration and Tax Calculations	Consideration			Amount		Finance Office Use Only												
		Purchase Price/Consideration			\$ 396,000.00		Transfer and Recordation Tax Consideration												
		Any New Mortgage			\$ 343,800.00		Transfer Tax Consideration		\$										
		Balance of Existing Mortgage			\$ 240214.47		x () %		\$										
		Other: Balance of Existing Mortgage (2 nd)			\$ 17696.89		Less Exemption Amount		\$										
		Other:			\$		Total Transfer Tax		\$										
		Full Cash Value			\$ 396,000.00		Recordation Tax Consideration		\$										
					x () per \$500		\$												
					TOTAL DUE \$														
5	Fees	Amount of Fees		Doc. 1		Doc. 2		Agent: Tax Bill: C.B. Credit: Ag. Tax/Other:											
		Recording Charge		\$ 40.00		\$ 40.00													
		Surcharge		\$ 0.00		\$ 0.00													
		State Recordation Tax		\$ 1,742.40		\$ 0.00													
		State Transfer Tax		\$ 1,980.00		\$ 0.00													
		County Transfer Tax		\$ 5,544.00		\$ 0.00													
		Other		\$		\$													
		Other		\$		\$													
6	Description of Property	District	Property Tax ID No.(1)	Grantor Liber/Folio	Map	Parcel No.	Var. LOG												
		11	2833713	14837/715	7	136	[] (5)												
		Subdivision Name		Lot (3a)	Block (3b)	Sec/AR (3c)	Plat Ref.	SqFt/Acreage (4)											
		Location/Address of Property Being Conveyed (2)																	
		10611 Frank Tippett Road, Cheltenham, MD 20623																	
		Other Property Identifiers (if applicable)				Water Meter Account No.													
		Residential [X] or Non-Residential []			Fee Simple [X] or Ground Rent []			Amount: \$N/A											
		Partial Conveyance? [] Yes [X] No			Description/Amt. of SqFt/Acreage Transferred:			N/A											
		If Partial Conveyance, List Improvements Conveyed: N/A																	
7	Transferred From	Doc. 1 - Grantor(s) Name(s)				Doc. 2 - Grantor(s) Name(s)													
		Willie R. POWELL Sr.				David Sr. ROSSER													
		Hattie M. POWELL				Lisa ROSSER													
		Doc. 1 - Owner(s) of Record, if Different from Grantor(s)				Doc. 2 - Owner(s) of Record, if Different from Grantor(s)													
8	Transferred To	Doc. 1 - Grantee(s) Name(s)				Doc. 2 - Grantee(s) Name(s)													
		David Sr. ROSSER																	
		Lisa ROSSER																	
		New Owner's (Grantee) Mailing Address																	
15471 Bayden Westwood Road, Brandywine, MD 20613																			
9	Other Names to Be Indexed	Doc. 1 - Additional Names to be Indexed (Optional)				Doc. 2 - Additional Names to be Indexed (Optional)													
						FREMONT INVESTMENT AND LOAN													
10	Contact/Mail Information	Instrument Submitted By or Contact Person						<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Return to Contact Person											
		Name: DAWN MARCONI						<input type="checkbox"/> Hold for Pickup											
		Firm: Brennan Title Company						<input type="checkbox"/> Return Address Provided											
		Address: 5865 Allentown Road Camp Springs, MD 20746																	
		Phone: Telephone 301-423-5556																	
11 IMPORTANT: BOTH THE ORIGINAL DEED AND A PHOTOCOPY MUST ACCOMPANY EACH TRANSFER																			
Assessment Information		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Will the property being conveyed be the grantee's principal residence?																
		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	Does transfer include personal property? If yes, identify: _____																
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Was property surveyed? If yes, attach copy of survey (if recorded, no copy required)																
Assessment Use Only - Do Not Write Below This Line																			
[] Terminal Verification			[] Agricultural Verification			[] Whole [] Part			[] Tran. Process Verification										
Transfer Number:		Date Received:		Deed Reference:		Assigned Property No.:													
Year	Land	Buildings	Total	Geo.	Zoning	Use	Town Cd.	Map	Grid	Parcel	Section	Sub	Plat	Ex. St.	Ex. Cd.	Block	Lot	Occ. Cd.	
REMARKS:																			

PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY CIRCUIT COURT (Land Records) REP 22044 p.0154 MSA_CE_64_22125. Date available 6/2/2005. Printed 2/25/2026.