

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

3  
4  
5 REMAND BY THE DISTRICT COUNCIL FOR A CONCEPTUAL SITE PLAN  
6 CSP-21001 LINDA LANE PROPERTY

7 Remand Hearing

8  
9 T R A N S C R I P T

10 O F

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

12  
13 COUNTY ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

14 Upper Marlboro, Maryland

15 December 7, 2023

16 BEFORE:

17 PETER A. SHAPIRO, Chairman

18 DOROTHY F. BAILEY, Madam Vice-Chair

19 MANUEL GERALDO, Commissioner

20 SHUANISE WASHINGTON, Commissioner

21 WILLIAM M. DOERNER, Commissioner

22  
23 OTHER:

24 DOMINIQUE LOCKHART, Staff

25 MATT TEDESCO, Attorney

P R O C E E D I N G S

1  
2 CHAIRMAN: We are still recording, so let us come  
3 back in session. We were on a brief recess. And we're  
4 taking up item 7 on our regular agenda. This is a remand by  
5 the District Council for a conceptual site plan, it's CSP-  
6 21001 Linda Lane property. This case was approved at the  
7 Planning Board meeting of June 1st, 2023 and was remanded by  
8 the Council on September 11th, 2023. We have Mr. Tedesco  
9 representing the applicant. We have a number of folks who  
10 are signed up to speak on this. Ms. Lockhart will give the  
11 staff presentation.

12 Before we do, I just want to read into the record  
13 some thoughts and reactions to this remand. So on June --  
14 this is a procedural issue, but I do want this on the  
15 record. On June 1st, 2023, we, the Planning Board,  
16 conducted a properly-noticed evidentiary hearing on this  
17 application. And we approved it 4-0.

18 Commissioner Doerner, I believe you were absent,  
19 which is why it was 4-0.

20 The District Council elected to review our  
21 approval. And at the Council meeting on September 11th,  
22 several members of the public commented that they missed the  
23 opportunity to appear at our hearing. The Council remanded  
24 the matter to us to take additional testimony.

25 Now, the reason for the remand, as stated in the

1 Council's order, was because persons of record were deprived  
2 -- their words, deprived of their right to give testimony.  
3 I discussed the record of our June 1st hearing with Council  
4 and was advised that all the required notices were given and  
5 that our hearing was otherwise properly conducted. In  
6 short, if members of the public were deprived of the right  
7 to participate in our hearing, it was not through a failure  
8 of the Planning Board.

9           And while I'm personally concerned that remanding  
10 a matter to us without any foundation, there's no error,  
11 nothing on the substance of the issue. I don't want this to  
12 open the door to remand decisions of the Planning Board  
13 because there's additional interest in wanting to speak  
14 because that is not a grounds for a remand. It's just not.

15           Now, I understand that there's several members of  
16 the public who feel that they weren't offered the chance to  
17 provide testimony. And without a doubt, we're happy to hear  
18 from folks in the public on this matter and looking forward  
19 to hearing what folks have to say (indiscernible) with that.  
20 We have the discretion to do that to -- with the remand  
21 before us. So we will be reopening the hearing on CSP-  
22 21001.

23           I just want to make it clear that by any objective  
24 measure, there was not a sufficient basis for remanding this  
25 case to us. Again, I want to make it crystal clear that

1 this is not avoiding an opportunity for public testimony.  
2 And I 100 percent respect the interest of the folks in the  
3 community who want to make sure their voice is heard. I  
4 appreciate your advocacy on this issue. I appreciate you  
5 pushing the District Council. All of this is nothing to do  
6 -- nothing to say about what you're trying to accomplish.  
7 So I'm with you 100 percent. I'm just speaking strictly on  
8 a procedural matter and with the action that the District  
9 Council took, which in our estimation, was an inappropriate  
10 action. So I want to I want to make that clear in the  
11 record.

12 Mr. Warner, anything you want to add on that or  
13 anything I may have missed?

14 MR. WARNER: No, that accurately reflects my  
15 thoughts as well.

16 CHAIRMAN: Okay. All right. I appreciate that  
17 And again for folks in the public, please, please,  
18 please do not take that personally, because without a doubt,  
19 we're looking forward to hearing what you have to say. This  
20 is a procedural matter that I wanted to address between us  
21 and the District Council and on what an appropriate grounds  
22 is for a remand. Okay.

23 So with that, we will begin the process.  
24 Commissioners, any comments or reactions just in terms of  
25 the procedural piece, anything any of you want to add or

1 we're okay to keep moving?

2           COMMISSIONER DOERNER: Just a question for Mr.  
3 Warner perhaps. Should I abstain and I can turn off my  
4 camera if need be since I wasn't in the original hearing?

5           MR. WARNER: If you're well acquainted with the  
6 minutes and the testimony from the meeting on June 1st, you  
7 can participate in this one as well.

8           COMMISSIONER DOERNER: Okay. Yeah. I've read the  
9 materials, so that's fine then. I'll stay on.

10          CHAIRMAN: Great. Thank you. I appreciate you  
11 asking.

12           So again this is CSP-21001, Linda Lane Property  
13 where it's before us on a remand. We have Mr. Tedesco  
14 representing the applicant. Ms. Lockhart will give the  
15 staff presentation. We will be swearing folks in who will  
16 be speaking. We probably have a number of folks who are  
17 already signed up to speak here.

18           Let me ask all those who are preparing to speak.  
19 If you're listening to this, if you could come online,  
20 ideally I'd like to be able to see you. But if not at least  
21 make sure that that I can -- that you're hearing me because  
22 I'm going to swear you all in. Okay. So for all those who  
23 are planning on speaking, and I'll ask as we go along, I'll  
24 ask if you've been sworn in. And for anyone who hasn't been  
25 sworn in, we can swear you in at the time that you're about

1 to speak. So for all of you, if you could please raise your  
2 right hand.

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

5 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I do.

6 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I do.

7 CHAIRMAN: Okay. Consider yourself sworn in.

8 Let us turn to staff.

9 Ms. Lockhart, you will be giving the staff  
10 presentation. Take it away.

11 MS. LOCKHART: All right. Good morning. Doing a  
12 quick sound check. Can you hear me all right?

13 CHAIRMAN: Can hear you fine.

14 MS. LOCKHART: Okay. Thank you. Good morning,  
15 Mr. Chair and members of the Planning Board. For the  
16 record, I am Dominique Lockhart with the zoning section.  
17 Item number 7 on the agenda is conceptual site plan CSP-  
18 21001, titled Linda Lane Property, which proposes a mixed-  
19 use development containing multifamily, commercial, and  
20 retail.

21 Next slide please. The site is located in Western  
22 Prince George's County, as depicted by the red dot within  
23 Planning Area 76(B) and Council District 8.

24 Next slide please. More specifically, the 5.6  
25 acre site, outlined in red, is located in the southwest

1 quadrant of the intersection of Linda Lane and Branch  
2 Avenue. Next slide.

3 CHAIRMAN: Ms. Lockhart, let me pause you for a  
4 second. I don't know if anyone else is having this problem.  
5 I don't see the -- I don't see the slides. Do other people  
6 see the slides? Is it just my camera?

7 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah, I can see them.

8 CHAIRMAN: Okay. All right.

9 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I can see. I can see them,  
10 Mr. Chair.

11 CHAIRMAN: So keep going.

12 MS. LOCKHART: Okay. The current zoning of the  
13 property is CN for commercial neighborhood. The prior  
14 zoning of the property was M-X-T or the mixed-use  
15 transportation oriented zone. The application is proceeding  
16 under the prior zoning ordinance.

17 Next slide please. The property is located within  
18 the military installation overlay height zone. Next slide.  
19 The aerial photograph shows that the site outlined in red is  
20 currently developed. Next slide. The topography map shows  
21 the site is relatively flat with minimal slopes. Next slide  
22 please. This slide shows the master plan rights of way in  
23 the vicinity of the site. Branch Avenue to the east, shown  
24 in orange, is noted as a freeway. Old Branch Avenue to the  
25 west of the site, shown in green, is noted as a collector

1 roadway.

2           Next slide please. This slide shows a closer look  
3 of the developed property. The site is currently developed  
4 with two single-family detached dwellings and a commercial  
5 office building. Next slide please. Shown here is a survey  
6 of the subject parcels detailing their existing conditions.  
7 Next slide. The applicant proposed to develop the property  
8 as a mixed-use development project consisting of multifamily  
9 residential units and commercial retail space. Only one  
10 building is proposed with this CSP.

11           Both surface and structured parking is shown. The  
12 maximum number of dwelling units will be established with  
13 this application, which is requested as 105 multifamily  
14 dwelling units. At the detailed site plan, stage  
15 architecture, landscaping, and parking compliance will be  
16 fully evaluated. Next slide please.

17           The application proposes two access points from  
18 Linda Lane and Old Branch Avenue. The illustrative plan  
19 shows a pedestrian connection from Linda Lane to the mixed-  
20 use building and to the surface parking lot. At the time of  
21 preliminary plan of subdivision, the applicant will be  
22 required to provide a new traffic impact study to aid in the  
23 evaluation of transportation adequacy.

24           Next slide please. In conclusion, based on the  
25 findings presented in the Technical Staff report, staff



1 recommends that the Planning Board approve Conceptual Site  
2 Plan CSP-21001 subject to the conditions as outlined in the  
3 staff report. This concludes staff's presentation. Thank  
4 you.

5 CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Ms. Lockhart.

6 Commissioners, questions for staff?

7 No questions. And again, I would just -- based on  
8 the comments that were provided earlier there, there is  
9 nothing that the District Council has brought to our  
10 attention that we need to be reconsidering beyond allowing  
11 for additional input from the public. So the public may  
12 have some issues that we can be that we can take into  
13 account. But there's nothing specific that the District  
14 Council is asking us to look at, some error or the like that  
15 they're asking us to address. So it's one of the reasons  
16 why we're not hearing anything from staff related to  
17 responding to what the Council has said.

18 So with that I will turn to the applicant. Before  
19 we hear from folks in the public, Mr. Tedesco, the floor is  
20 yours.

21 MR. TEDESCO: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman and  
22 members of the Planning Board. For the record, Matthew  
23 Tedesco with the law firm of McNamee Hosea here on behalf of  
24 the property owner and applicant. Mr. Chairman, for all the  
25 reasons that you stated at the beginning of this hearing and

1 for the reasons you just stated, I wouldn't have anything  
2 further to add that wouldn't otherwise be redundant to  
3 what's already in the record.

4 I would further incorporate and adopt the summary  
5 and presentation from June 1st, and I would -- pursuant to  
6 the remand order item number 2, I would suggest that it's  
7 probably appropriate at this time to hear from the citizens  
8 that have registered to speak today in response to the  
9 remand. And with the Board's permission, I would like to at  
10 least then have an opportunity to respond, if needed, with  
11 any closing comments at that time.

12 CHAIRMAN: Thank you for that. And of course,  
13 that will be our procedure. As the applicant, you will have  
14 the opportunity for rebuttal and close, so thank you.

15 Questions for the applicant, commissioners?

16 Seeing none, we will take testimony from those  
17 who've signed up to speak. I just want to go through my  
18 list and see who is here, just so we can figure out how to  
19 manage our time.

20 So Monique Adams, are you here?

21 Shenyata Rivers, I see Ms. Rivers. Thank you.

22 Monique Taylor, do I see? Yes, I see you, Ms.  
23 Taylor. Thank you.

24 Tony Wilson. Mr. Wilson, you're here.

25 MR. WILSON: Yes, sir. I'm here.

1 CHAIRMAN: Excellent.

2 Janna Parker?

3 MS. PARKER: My name is pronounced [Jay-na].

4 CHAIRMAN: [Jay-na]. I'm sorry, Ms. Parker.

5 Janna Parker. We have Ms. Parker.

6 Yolanda Boyd, I see.

7 Delanta Harrison, Ms. Harrison? No.

8 Cynthia Johnson, I see.

9 Anyone else I've missed? Okay. Great. So we'll  
10 go in the order that we have listed there. You'll each have  
11 up to three minutes to speak. There'll be a clock that'll  
12 show just to help us manage the time. If you could  
13 introduce yourself for the record. As you speak, I'll just  
14 ask each of you to make sure you were sworn in. But as I'm  
15 looking around, I think all of you were sworn in. But I'll  
16 just verify that.

17 So with that, we'll start with Ms. -- Ms. Adams  
18 was not here. So we will start with Ms. Rivers.

19 Take it away. Introduce yourself. And you were  
20 sworn in, correct?

21 MS. RIVERS: Yes, I was. Greetings, everyone.  
22 Before I begin, is it possible to have more than three  
23 minutes or is that the limit?

24 CHAIRMAN: How much time do you need? Let me  
25 know.

1 MS. RIVERS: Six minutes.

2 CHAIRMAN: Other folks -- I want to manage the  
3 time overall, so if there's nobody else who needs a whole  
4 lot more time, I think we can be flexible around that. Is  
5 that okay?

6 MS. RIVERS: Okay. All right. Thank you so much.  
7 Greetings, everyone. Again, for the record, my name is  
8 Shenyata Rivers, and I do appreciate this opportunity to  
9 speak. I've registered to speak today to express concerns  
10 about the development that is coming to Linda Lane. And I  
11 do have five areas that I would like to share.

12 One concern is traffic. The second is parking.  
13 The third is environmental concerns, the fourth is crime.  
14 And then fifth, I just have some questions that need  
15 answers. So for concern 1 with respect to what was in the  
16 CSP for traffic, it is mentioned that Branch Avenue is a  
17 heavily traveled roadway. And just as a resident that lives  
18 nearby, we witness major congestion on a daily basis. I  
19 would say starting from 2:30 in the afternoon all the way to  
20 as late as 6:30 in the evening. And that does not factor in  
21 inclement weather or your run-of-the-mill rainy day. Not to  
22 mention during seasonal holidays when people choose not to  
23 travel I-95 South and they choose to go down Branch Avenue  
24 to make it to Route 301. So we do experience a lot of  
25 traffic. So with that in mind, my question is how does the

1 applicant propose entering the site coming from the beltway?

2           Second, based on the high-density load, what is  
3 the plan for acceleration and deceleration zones on Branch  
4 Avenue? In particular, if I come from Red Lobster as an  
5 example, it's very dangerous to cross and make it to Linda  
6 Lane. So let alone now we have people coming to possibly an  
7 apartment complex or retail, it can possibly be a danger  
8 zone. And then last I think I heard it, but when was the  
9 traffic study done and what year or if it will be done?

10           Concern 2 for parking, what are the requirements  
11 for the number of parking spaces for the occupants in this  
12 development? Are the requirements one to one? So you know,  
13 if we look at the complex as a whole, when someone visits an  
14 occupant and then someone visits retail, where would they  
15 park? Now they're going to be parking in our community. We  
16 already have a problem with abandoned vehicles in our  
17 community, with vehicles that may be oversized and the like.  
18 And so now we're going to increase that if we have more  
19 traffic to our area.

20           Is there an underground parking requirement for  
21 the applicant? If not, there should be because people will  
22 park on Linda Lane, Old Branch Avenue, and then possibly try  
23 Branch Avenue. And as we talked about parking, what about  
24 the pedestrian traffic? Unfortunately, there are no  
25 sidewalks really near where we live. And so now we're

1 introducing another aspect that will enhance the congestion,  
2 if you will. Where are the pedestrians going to go? And  
3 then how do we manage that traffic? If you introduce the  
4 light at Linda Lane, we are going to queue that traffic, not  
5 only onto Branch Avenue, but now onto major interstates such  
6 as 495.

7           Concern 3 is environmental concerns. Once this  
8 project gets underway, what is the pollution? What is the  
9 control for dust and the like once we start getting into  
10 development? How about noise control? What is the length  
11 of time that this project would take? We have not heard  
12 that and so I would be interested in hearing those answers.  
13 And so I do have some concerns in that area.

14           For concern number 4 in particular, it's crime.  
15 And so the proposed plans, it talks about high density  
16 apartment dwellings along with retail. And we've seen this  
17 movie before in our area. In Suitland, Maryland, for  
18 example, there was an apartment complex that had a  
19 reputation for crime and drugs. And there was an article in  
20 the Washington Post that was dated back in 2000, and it  
21 talked about a plan to change the area because of what was  
22 happening in those apartments.

23           And I quote from the article, the density of the  
24 complex, often with four or five and sometimes more people  
25 living in one and two bedroom apartments, has made the place

1 ripe for crime and neglect. It is crime in and around  
2 Suitland Manor that has given all of Suitland, even the  
3 quiet pockets of single family homes, a poor reputation,  
4 residents of the area say, end quote. So if I fast forward  
5 to today, there are several members of my family and just  
6 loved ones that have moved out of high density apartments in  
7 this local area due to crime and illegal activity.

8 Not that long ago, possibly a month ago, there was  
9 a shooting at a local apartment complex down the street from  
10 here. And we had officers come to our civic association  
11 meeting to discuss that and to talk about -- to talk to us  
12 as members of the community to request our help. So this is  
13 not something that we wish to come to our area.

14 Concern number 5 is just questions that need  
15 answers. One, have we identified that there is really a  
16 scarcity of apartments specifically for this area where we  
17 need to put an apartment at that specific location? Two, is  
18 there a way where, you know, we're not interested in  
19 apartments, but neither motel or hotel that was also in the  
20 CSP? And so how can we not have that included?

21 Also, we regard our communities. So with an  
22 addition of more people in our area, then that means our  
23 infrastructure has to increase. So do we have room for more  
24 police, more schools, more fire departments and the like to  
25 address the new people that would be living in our area? We

1 already have a time with emergency response wait time. And  
2 so now what would we do if we have a greater population?  
3 Was a market study done? Is it available publicly?

4 And so I think with those concerns, I don't think  
5 this is a good fit for what the applicant is proposing for  
6 our area with respect to traffic, parking, environmental  
7 concerns, and then possibly crime, and then some of those  
8 questions that I posed. Thank you so much for your time.

9 CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Ms. Rivers. Thanks for  
10 taking the time to speak. And I imagine that the applicant  
11 will be addressing some of these issues in his rebuttal.  
12 Some of these are more relevant at the detailed site plan  
13 level than the conceptual site plan level. But he'll  
14 address that. And I really do appreciate you taking the  
15 time and having your voice heard. Thank you.

16 Next on our list, we have Monique Taylor with the  
17 Camp Springs Civic Association. Ms. Taylor?

18 MS. TAYLOR: Good afternoon --

19 CHAIRMAN: Good afternoon.

20 MS. TAYLOR: -- Chairman Shapiro and the Planning  
21 Board. My name is Monique Taylor. I live in Camp Spring  
22 and I am the president of the Camp Springs Civic  
23 Association. I am here speaking on behalf of the community  
24 that opposes the 105 multifamily unit concept plan proposed  
25 by Curtis Investment Inc. and their representatives.



1 Dropping a five story building in this single family  
2 community does not fit the community, and this is out of --  
3 it's out of place and it's out of character for our area.

4           On May the 11th and September the 5th, we had  
5 meetings that included Mr. Tedesco, who's the  
6 representative, and the residents of Camp Springs, and the  
7 members of the board of directors made it known that the  
8 community do not support or want a multifamily unit on Linda  
9 Lane or the Linda Lane property. Recently we had a meeting  
10 on November the 27th that was a board.

11           The board met with the representative to discuss  
12 and obtain clarity, but re-emphasized the sentiments of the  
13 community that opposes the current concept plan. We also --  
14 the Camp Springs Civic Association, along with Henderson  
15 Road Neighborhood Watch, conducted a survey of the  
16 community. And in that, in the results of the survey, it  
17 was a resounding opposition for the current concept site  
18 plan.

19           That information was sent to you all via, you  
20 know, like, you could upload information, so you have the  
21 results of the survey. It gives you all the details. I  
22 want to emphasize that the community is not -- we are not  
23 opposed to development, but oppose the current mixed-use 105  
24 multifamily unit site plan. We want development that  
25 benefit our community with the voice of the community

1 leading the way. As a result, we sent the Curtis Investment  
2 representative alternative development for this site that  
3 include that includes coffee shops, professional office  
4 buildings to service the community, healthy groceries like a  
5 (indiscernible) cafe, dining, fast casual, casual dining and  
6 include some healthy restaurants in our area.

7 We also sent, to the representative, a letter  
8 dating back -- an email dating back to February of 2018 that  
9 identified the stipulation for this property as the Civic  
10 Association supported the new zoning at that time. And the  
11 stipulation were as follows: We wanted the opportunity to  
12 consult on the changes to the rezoning plans. We said that  
13 we do not want a twenty-four hour development, no adult  
14 entertainment or liquor store, no marijuana dispensary and  
15 wanted to be reassured efforts will be made to address all  
16 potential traffic issues.

17 Currently, Linda Lane and Old Branch avenues are  
18 two lane and is being impacted from the massive traffic from  
19 Branch Avenue in the beltway. Traffic, as you all know, is  
20 a beast in this region. It seems like no one cares or have  
21 any solution, but we just build and build and let the  
22 community deal with the impact of the traffic. The County  
23 is promoting mixed-use communities by the metro station.  
24 This concept plan that is being presented is appropriate and  
25 better suited for the Branch Avenue Metro station, not

1 dropped into an established single-family home community.

2 We are also concerned with the effort of the  
3 environment. And I --

4 CHAIRMAN: Ms. Taylor?

5 MS. TAYLOR: Yes?

6 CHAIRMAN: Let me ask -- let me ask you to wrap up  
7 soon, okay?

8 MS. TAYLOR: Okay. So I'll just say, as she said,  
9 environment. We have luscious mature trees. And when you  
10 say, in the new concept, it takes 30 years for these  
11 saplings to develop, I think that the county, we all are  
12 being affected by us just tearing down all the trees in the  
13 community.

14 They talk about retail, and our history, about  
15 retail units being part of -- it's very sketchy for us. We  
16 can -- example is Tribeca at Camp Springs, where the retail  
17 spaces was there empty for years. Currently, they just got  
18 a nail shop, dental office, and a daycare center and is  
19 still empty spaces. Restaurant row behind that development,  
20 there's still a lot of empty spaces. How would this be  
21 different on this site?

22 We find it problematic issues with multifamily  
23 housing. We can take the Courts of Camp Springs, which have  
24 crimes for car rings, car thefts, carjackings, shootings,  
25 stabbings, and drug dealing. And Ms. Rivers referenced the

1 2000, but I have a 2020 about this at the Courts of Camp  
2 Springs. We have Apollo Apartments. They have a secure  
3 parking lot, but they've had numerous of break-ins or car  
4 thefts in that community. I will wrap it up with that. But  
5 I want to reemphasize, we support development. We support  
6 the Curtis and their representative, but we cannot support  
7 this concept plan as presented. Thank you for your time.

8 CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Ms. Taylor. Appreciate you  
9 taking the time.

10 Next we have Mr. Wilson, Tony Wilson, Henderson  
11 Road Neighborhood Watch.

12 MR. WILSON: Yes, sir. Good afternoon and  
13 greetings, everyone. My name is Tony Wilson. I'm vice  
14 president of the Henderson Road Neighborhood Watch and a  
15 proud resident of Camp Springs. Mr. Chairman, with respect  
16 to your comment on the meeting, personally, I did not  
17 receive a notice to meet after June 1 or on June 1. I did  
18 not -- even though I signed up in May, after seeing the  
19 notice that was on the property, I still did not receive a  
20 notice.

21 I did, however, receive a notice for the meeting  
22 today from Ms. Lockhart. And so for that, I'm grateful. I  
23 did receive your findings. I did provide an 11-page  
24 response to those findings at the time. But I think also to  
25 the developer's credit, they did post and they did perform

1 as requested. But I can admit personally on my part, some  
2 ambiguity to knowing the process.

3 Be that as it may, I provided two video emails  
4 outlining not only the results of the recent Camp Springs  
5 survey that was conducted in response to the District  
6 Council remand, but I've also provided additional remarks  
7 for the record. And the supplemental details provided, we  
8 ask to be admitted for the official record, but also  
9 forwarded to the District Council as they move to vote on  
10 any final determinations for this project.

11 Initially, opposition was due to both traffic and  
12 public safety concerns. We also want it to be known that  
13 the Camp Spring community is not against development. Not  
14 at all. But we are about helping with the process to shape  
15 smart development. The developer's representatives in a  
16 recent call last week, that was on November 27th, they  
17 assured several members of the community that this  
18 application is for future development possibilities. And  
19 they did not foresee any development plans (indiscernible)  
20 in the near future. For that, we were grateful.

21 When asked if there is any financial project  
22 numbers or cost numbers within the developer's budget that  
23 had been established for these efforts, the developer's  
24 representative said no. This we found a little strange, but  
25 we moved to reserve judgment. So in the spirit of goodwill,

1 we pressed forward in an effort to not only cooperate, but  
2 to hear them out. Upon conclusion of the meeting, the  
3 community members gathered approximately seven days later,  
4 prior to the scheduled meeting, to get a consensus.

5 In our discussions, we also found additional  
6 evidence of a previous approval of a two-story development  
7 on this site. As such, this aligns with the results of the  
8 community survey included in the record. The community, we  
9 have said no overwhelmingly on this project in its current  
10 state, but we're willing to support the zoning changes for  
11 this parcel, if any, and we're also willing to consider any  
12 future development at the site as suggested by the  
13 developers, but with the stipulations that we agreed upon  
14 back on February 6th of 2018. And we provided a copy of  
15 that email for the record for review and for consideration.  
16 And with that, I yield my time.

17 CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. I appreciate  
18 that, Mr. Wilson. I appreciate again with the others,  
19 appreciate you taking the time.

20 Next we have Janna Parker, Ms. Parker.

21 MS. PARKER: Yes.

22 CHAIRMAN: Let me just -- Ms. Parker, and for  
23 others, I just want to make sure. I forgot to ask if you  
24 were all sworn in.

25 Mr. Wilson, you were sworn in?

1 Ms. Taylor, you were sworn in, correct?

2 MR. WILSON: Yes, sir. Yes. That's correct.

3 CHAIRMAN: Ms. Parker, you were sworn in, right?

4 MS. PARKER: Yes, I was sworn in.

5 CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Parker. The  
6 floor is yours.

7 MS. PARKER: Yeah. I --

8 CHAIRMAN: And we'll put three minutes up to help  
9 manage the time. Okay?

10 MS. PARKER: Thank you. I want to first address  
11 the things that you said when you opened up this meeting.  
12 And I want to be very clear that it is very inappropriate to  
13 tell us not to take it personal, that essentially this  
14 shouldn't have been remanded when several of the community  
15 members came to the County Council and said they did not get  
16 proper notification. That's inappropriate. And I do take  
17 that personal.

18 I think this is indicative of what a lot of  
19 members across Prince George's County, a lot of residents  
20 and constituents have said across Prince George's County and  
21 feeling as though, as a resident and as a constituent, the  
22 elected officials and people in office of certain degrees  
23 that are designed to listen to the constituents do not take  
24 our feedback and our feelings into consideration when they  
25 make decisions that directly impact and affect us.

1           I do think that you should give every member of  
2 the community on this call extra time as that Mr. Tedesco,  
3 the applicant -- the representative for the applicant will  
4 not only have to rebut our comments, but will also have the  
5 closing.

6           So that being said, I'm going to give back some of  
7 my time so that my -- other people can speak, but I wanted  
8 to address that first. I wanted to also say that I've been  
9 on several community meetings in with Camp Springs Civic  
10 Associations throughout the community. And all of them have  
11 said, within the directly impacted zone and outside of it,  
12 for people who have to travel through that area that they do  
13 not approve of this site plan, that they do not agree with  
14 it, they do not like it, they do not want it to go through,  
15 and that they are willing to, across the county, people who  
16 not only live in that direct area, but who have to work  
17 there, who come there to eat and things of that nature, will  
18 come and make additional statements on this and provide  
19 testimony to their Council members directly, because we do  
20 not agree with this particular site plan.

21           I want to end by reaffirming that to talk about a  
22 process that the residents say that they weren't fully  
23 invested in or informed about, and not acknowledge that  
24 there have been times in where this Board in particular has  
25 not informed certain residents within Prince George's



1 County. We can talk about Westphalia or we don't have to,  
2 but that that has happened in the past as well. And  
3 subsequently that has cost the County thousands of dollars.  
4 So we're here as a community saying that we do not want  
5 this.

6 CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Ms. Parker. I appreciate  
7 you taking the time.

8 MS. PARKER: You're welcome.

9 CHAIRMAN: Next we have Yolanda Boyd.

10 And you were sworn in, Ms. Boyd? Correct? Hey,  
11 Ms. Boyd, we can't hear you. Your mic is on, but we can't  
12 hear you. No, sorry. We can't hear you. Take your time.  
13 Okay. My guess is you have to change the setting on your  
14 computer. Can't hear you. If worse comes to worse, Ms.  
15 Boyd, you can call in and then -- with your phone, and then  
16 we'll be able to hear you.

17 And maybe somebody from the staff can help Ms.  
18 Boyd.

19 We're not going to forget you, Ms. Boyd, but I'm  
20 going to move on and so you can figure out your technology.  
21 We will come back to you. And let me ask somebody from the  
22 staff to reach out and see if we can get you with the phone  
23 number so you can call in. Okay.

24 So let's move on. We'll come back to Ms. Boyd. I  
25 have Ms. Johnson, Cynthia Johnson.

1           And Ms. Johnson, you were sworn in, correct?

2           MS. JOHNSON: Yes, I was. Can you hear me?

3           CHAIRMAN: Yes, ma'am. So same --

4           MS. JOHNSON: Okay.

5           CHAIRMAN: -- thing. We'll put three minutes up  
6 on the clock up in front of you. And if you could introduce  
7 yourself for the record, and the floor is yours.

8           MS. JOHNSON: Sure. My name is Cynthia Johnson.  
9 I'm a proud homeowner and long-term PG County resident.  
10 Most recently, I've lived in the Temple Hills area for about  
11 eight years. I do want to thank you for allowing me to  
12 speak. This is the first time I'm speaking before the  
13 Commission, so I apologize if maybe some of the things I'm  
14 saying are without -- are not within your reach and you  
15 can't act on.

16           And I also do want to point out that I did not  
17 participate in that survey. I had no idea about that  
18 survey, but I thought the results were very illuminating.  
19 They're right along with my same thought process. And I  
20 appreciate everyone else who has come in and kind of said  
21 the same thing. So I guess I'm going to probably echo a lot  
22 of what they were saying.

23           So my first concern is I want to make note that  
24 this community has faced a lack of targeted smart  
25 development and improvements, at least since I've lived

1 here, which have exacerbated issues such as traffic, crime,  
2 and further crumbling our inadequate road infrastructure. I  
3 don't know if any of you have driven down Old Branch, but I  
4 know someone who actually had to have their car towed  
5 because the road messed their vehicle up so bad.

6           So the current structure and design of Route 5,  
7 Allentown Road and Old Branch junctions is just wholly  
8 insufficient, leading to increased challenges for all of the  
9 residents. I provided an illustration showing the widening  
10 of Linda Lane, which is the road coming off of Route 5, and  
11 Old Branch to accommodate a dedicated turn lane that would  
12 go into the development, and then a dedicated turn lane that  
13 would go into the community off of Linda Lane to hopefully  
14 decrease traffic congestion there.

15           I also had a chance to look through some of the  
16 comments that were submitted, and I haven't read them all,  
17 but I did want to emphasize a few points that many others  
18 didn't touch on which they may. I haven't heard them speak.  
19 But I do have safety concerns as far as it relates to access  
20 to the development via foot, particularly on Middleton Lane  
21 and Henderson Road, which are the two main thorough roads in  
22 the area that connect over to Old Branch.

23           There is zero sidewalk infrastructure. So saying  
24 that this is a proposed development that will be walkable is  
25 laughable to be honest. It falls short from reality because

1 there's zero capability of getting to the development. I  
2 mean, I guess you could if you want to get ran over.  
3 Middleton is a very heavily, heavily trafficked road that  
4 already has speed bumps on it because people fly down that  
5 road so much.

6 I would suggest that mandatory installation of  
7 sidewalks, at least on one side of Middleton Lane and one  
8 side of Henderson Road, is crucial for the safety and the  
9 well-being of the community in conjunction with this  
10 development. And I will say that we should probably have  
11 sidewalks regardless of the development of this project  
12 because there is no way of getting out of the neighborhoods.

13 Additionally, the crime issues that already exist  
14 in the shopping centers at Allentown and Old Branch  
15 conjunction pose a significant risk to the community by  
16 bringing it closer into our homes. While the County Council  
17 now mandates security cameras for properties with over 100  
18 housing units, which I have a feeling they'll say, oh, we  
19 have 99, we don't need surveillance. The transient nature  
20 of the visitors that will come in and out of a mixed-use  
21 development demands increased security surveillance. We  
22 cannot afford to have an influx of people coming into our  
23 community without having proper security measures.

24 And I didn't even think about the fact that it  
25 does take a very long time to get police to respond.

1 Therefore adding in additional people, when we already have  
2 a situation where we have an insufficient amount of a police  
3 force is concerning. And also someone else mentioned how  
4 multiple generations will live in these communities, in  
5 these apartments. And so if you have one person living  
6 there, they more than likely have five or six other people  
7 who are there. So we're not bringing in 105 new people.  
8 We're potentially bringing in 500 new people, plus everyone  
9 coming into the businesses. That is a lot of additional  
10 police work, firefighter, ambulance, all of the critical  
11 services to the community.

12 I have two more points. The green building design  
13 is also crucial for sustainability. We have not had much  
14 smart design in the community. I propose making this a  
15 green building design requirement. And that includes  
16 building supplies, parking material, insulation, alternative  
17 energy sources. Because let's be real, retrofitting post-  
18 facto is costly, environmentally burdensome, and a scenario  
19 that we can just avoid by putting these standards in place  
20 now.

21 Finally, I will say that it is very critical.  
22 There has been a lack of transparency in this project  
23 communication to the community. Recently, I have seen the  
24 attorneys speak to the community. Their retrospective and  
25 theoretical nature of all of their discussion has left this

1 community completely uninformed with the lack of details  
2 that they have been telling us. Transparent and truthful  
3 communication is essential to build trust with this  
4 community, and I urge for a more comprehensive sharing of  
5 information, ensuring that we all have a well-informed and  
6 we are able to make our voices heard on this. Our community  
7 is at stake, and I do not believe the commission should  
8 approve this project as is. I trust that you will take  
9 these into consideration and take proper action. And thank  
10 you for your time.

11 CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Ms. Johnson. I appreciate  
12 it.

13 Let's go back to Ms. Boyd and see if we can.  
14 Hopefully, she's able to call in.

15 Ms. Boyd, do we hear you?

16 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Excuse me, Mr. Chair, this  
17 is Jessica. I'm on the line with Ms. Boyd. She had to log  
18 off. She's trying to call in now. So if you can just give  
19 us a little bit more time.

20 CHAIRMAN: Okay. All right. Let's take a five-  
21 minute break and hopefully we'll get this worked out. So  
22 it's 12:45, and we'll come back at 12:50.

23 (OFF THE RECORD)

24 (ON THE RECORD)

25 CHAIRMAN: Excellent. We can hear you. Okay.

1 Hold on one second. Let everybody gather back, and I'll  
2 give you the opportunity to speak. Just one second here,  
3 Ms. Boyd.

4 MS. BOYD: Thank you.

5 CHAIRMAN: Okay. I think we are all here. We're  
6 back from a brief break. The next person on our speakers  
7 list is Yolanda Boyd.

8 Ms. Boyd, if you could introduce yourself for the  
9 record. And again, we'll put the clock up to help us manage  
10 the time. And the floor is yours.

11 MS. BOYD: Okay. First, let me say good afternoon  
12 to all, and I'm sorry for the technical difficulties that I  
13 have with my laptop. It did say that you had muted me and  
14 that I needed to be unmuted by you. But I just want to say  
15 I have four concerns. The first concern is traffic. The  
16 second concern is theft and theft -- theft and vandalism,  
17 safety, and noise.

18 We have had -- I think this -- I am opposed to  
19 this because I believe that building will stand out as a  
20 white elephant. If you look around, there is no mixed-use  
21 areas around. And there are many vacant properties, retail  
22 properties, in our area already. So are we just going to  
23 add to more empty spaces?

24 I just think that there should be a smarter  
25 development issue brought up. I'm just not opposed to it.

1 But I just think that concept is wrong. And I just, you  
2 know, thank you for the time and I wish everybody happy  
3 holidays.

4 CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Ms. Boyd.

5 MS. BOYD: That's it.

6 CHAIRMAN: And I'm glad we worked through the  
7 technology issues and I'm glad we got to hear your voice.  
8 Thank you very much.

9 MS. BOYD: Thank you.

10 CHAIRMAN: Did I miss anyone else? Is there  
11 anyone else who signed up to speak? Okay. Then we have no  
12 one else signed up. I will now turn to the applicant for  
13 any rebuttal and then close.

14 MR. TEDESCO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. For the  
15 record, Matthew Tedesco, again, on behalf of the owner and  
16 applicant, subsidiaries and affiliates of Curtis Investment  
17 Group, Incorporated. First and foremost, I want to thank  
18 all of the citizens who took time today to provide their  
19 thoughts and commentary. As a representative of the owner  
20 and the applicant, we take all of their thoughts and  
21 considerations quite seriously.

22 Both myself and the GS Proctor (phonetic sp.)  
23 team, who have been actively meeting with and continue to  
24 meet with the residents and the community with respect to  
25 this project or any project in the immediate area, we take



1 it very seriously, and I want to thank them for that. I  
2 want to thank -- I don't want to start naming people by  
3 name, but I do want to thank Ms. Taylor for her  
4 accommodations in facilitating us to meet both back on May  
5 11th as well as September 5th and then just recently on  
6 November 27th.

7 I do think those meetings are exceptionally  
8 important. And we do try to provide as much information as  
9 we know it at the time to all the residents and will  
10 continue to engage in that dialog as we move forward. I  
11 think the critical issue for this property -- I don't want  
12 to say project, but for this property is the circumstances  
13 in which we all find ourselves in as it relates to this  
14 application, not project, but application.

15 And I explained this to you all in June, and we've  
16 tried to explain this to the community as best we can,  
17 although I readily admit that it's quite confusing and can  
18 be certainly misunderstood. So allow me the indulgence  
19 again, for the record and for you all, as I indicated in  
20 June, and as we -- Mr. Proctor and I have indicated to the  
21 community members, this application is circumstantially  
22 based. And what I mean by that is this property went  
23 through a zoning map amendment, a piecemeal rezoning ZMA  
24 which was A-10043 back in 2017, 2018, culminating in the  
25 approval of the rezoning by the District Council in July of

1 2018.

2           That's where it has sat for the last five years,  
3 with just that property being placed in the M-X-T zone. And  
4 but for the countywide map amendment that was adopted and  
5 took effect on April 1st, 2022, that has a transitional  
6 period as it relates primarily to all properties in the  
7 County, but in particularly the M-X-T zone. As we all know,  
8 and as you have heard, not all the M-X-T zones were placed  
9 in comparable zones. There was a matrix that was done, and  
10 as a result there's a transitional period in the County with  
11 respect to M-X-T zone properties.

12           And if a conceptual site plan is approved, then  
13 the owners or the applicants, in this case, the owner has  
14 flexibility going forward under the conceptual site plan,  
15 under the old zoning ordinance or under the new zoning  
16 ordinance. So the property owner, who is Curtis Investment  
17 Property, is owned and operated primarily by Mr. George  
18 Curtis, who is a resident of Prince George's County for the  
19 last 80 years, lives in Brandywine. This is their  
20 headquarters for their real estate company. All of his  
21 employees go to this facility every day and work on behalf  
22 of the real estate company.

23           We were approached, as far as the sunseting of  
24 the existing two-year transitional period, and asked what  
25 happens to our M-X-T zoning and the development in the

1 future if a conceptual site plan is not advanced? And so we  
2 explained to them what that meant and what the transitional  
3 period allowed for to provide and have the greatest  
4 flexibility possible, to facilitate some future  
5 redevelopment at some date, to have the ability to either  
6 use the prior M-X-T zone, which has been an exceptionally  
7 successful zone in the County, or to go down an unknown new  
8 zone which has not yet been tested or proven. To have the  
9 flexibility, we have to file a conceptual site plan  
10 application. That's what we've done.

11 I fully understand, and we understand, and my  
12 client understands, the concerns related to what is shown on  
13 paper as it relates to this project -- as it relates to this  
14 application. But it is an application. We do not have --  
15 and I will state it again, we do not have any immediate  
16 plans for redevelopment of the site. Everything on this  
17 conceptual site plan, admittedly, is prospectively  
18 aspirational as it relates to the M-X-T zone, the permitted  
19 tables of uses, and the permitted density that's allowed.

20 It does not mean that this is what will ultimately  
21 be developed on this property. We do not have any  
22 development plans at this point, outside of a conceptual  
23 site plan application that has to show some level of  
24 density, because under the section of the zoning ordinance,  
25 as it relates to conceptual site plans in the M-X-T zone,

1 the density must be provided and it cannot be exceeded. So  
2 we have set the ceiling at a 1.39 FAR. M-X-T allows for  
3 1.4. The reality of that is again very prospective in  
4 nature.

5           So this application is more of what it isn't than  
6 what it is. And I welcome and I thank the comments that  
7 we've heard today with respect to the concerns, because that  
8 will continue to help frame, from our perspective, a  
9 potential future redevelopment that hopefully, if this is  
10 approved, has the flexibility to utilize the well-  
11 established, successfully implemented M-X-T zone or the CN  
12 zone in the future if that proves to be the best mechanism  
13 for redevelopment.

14           This gives us the best of both opportunities and  
15 is solely the reason why we filed this application. I stand  
16 before you, and I mentioned this at the meeting on November  
17 27th, but for the countywide map amendment, I would not be  
18 before you today with a conceptual site plan because we are  
19 not advancing a redevelopment of this property at this time.  
20 It is the home office for the Curtis Investment property is  
21 two single family detached homes which are occupied by  
22 tenants currently. I want to just abundantly make that  
23 clear.

24           As with respect to the concerns that we've heard,  
25 the common theme really is centered around adequate public

1 facilities, whether that be traffic, whether that be police  
2 fire, whether that be sidewalks and pedestrian connectivity,  
3 we refer to as BPIS, Bike Pedestrian Impact Statements, and  
4 then crime. As you all know, that will be adequately tested  
5 and determined at the time of the preliminary plan of  
6 subdivision. We are not advancing a preliminary plan of  
7 subdivision. We do not have a preliminary plan of  
8 subdivision proposed. We do not have one that's  
9 forthcoming.

10 But nevertheless, any development of any  
11 redevelopment of this property will require a preliminary  
12 plan of subdivision if there's a residential component  
13 associated with it. At that time, as you all know, the law  
14 and the code requires, whether it's under the old or the  
15 new, a preliminary plan of subdivision and a certificate of  
16 adequacy for which transportation adequacy, schools, police,  
17 fire, water, sewer, bike, ped, sidewalks, et cetera, will be  
18 analyzed and tested.

19 To Ms. Johnson's exhibit, if any of that testing,  
20 when it's done at that time, based upon an actual  
21 development plan that can't be any more dense than this, in  
22 all likelihood, it has to be less and will be less, if it  
23 even -- even if one were to move forward, if there are  
24 offsite improvements that are required as it relates to  
25 traffic impact and adequacy, those will have to be done.

1 Whether those are decel and accel lanes, merge lanes, a  
2 traffic light, et cetera, all that will be tested at the  
3 time of preliminary plan.

4           This property was tested for adequacy,  
5 transportation adequacy, among others at the time of  
6 rezoning. But the code does provide that with the piece ZMA  
7 rezoning to the M-X-T zone, a new traffic study is not  
8 required at the time of conceptual site plan. It will be  
9 required at the time of preliminary plan. You all, in your  
10 resolution approving this, implemented a condition that  
11 specifically speaks to that and requires a new traffic  
12 scoping agreement, as well as a new traffic impact study at  
13 the time of preliminary plan. It also requires bike ped  
14 analysis at the time of the preliminary plan of subdivision.

15           Those findings and those conditions are in the  
16 staff report and in the resolution that you adopted after  
17 the June 1st hearing. And we had no objection to them. We  
18 acknowledged them, and we stand behind them as it relates to  
19 any future development project for this property. And I  
20 just want to highlight that in your staff report at pages 13  
21 and 16.

22           I want to thank Ms. Taylor also for providing us  
23 with the February 2018 email that references certain types  
24 of uses. Again, we have no objection to that email. We  
25 stood behind it back five years ago. We stand behind now.

1 We have no future commercial retail uses for this property.  
2 And we intend, upon any redevelopment of this property, to  
3 continue to work with the community and try to identify uses  
4 that the community would like to see here, understanding  
5 that we are bound by the table of uses and what's permitted  
6 in either the M-X-T or the CN zone.

7           And then I think I'll just close with just saying  
8 one thought for the comment Ms. Johnson said with respect to  
9 transparency. We are being as transparent as we possibly  
10 can be on this project -- or on this application as it  
11 relates to this property. A lot of the questions that we  
12 got asked from Mr. Wilson and others with respect to, you  
13 know, what is the pro forma for this development and what is  
14 what is the investment? We don't have that because there is  
15 no pro forma. There is no redevelopment plan.

16           This is a conceptual site plan solely for the  
17 utilization of being able to satisfy the transitional  
18 provisions, to have the flexibility to move forward in the  
19 future with the M-X-T zone. And so I will never be before a  
20 community and answer a question with an answer other than I  
21 don't know if I truly don't know. And a lot of the  
22 questions that we were asked, we just don't know because we  
23 don't have the details. There is no architecture. There's  
24 no landscape plan. This is a box on a paper showing what it  
25 could be, not what it will be.

1           And so with that, Mr. Chairman, it is very  
2 prospective. It's being done solely for the reason of  
3 transition going to from old to new, M-X-T to CN. And I  
4 submit before you that, notwithstanding the concerns that  
5 you heard, all of those issues will be addressed either by  
6 this applicant going forward in any future plans or  
7 addressed through the code and the law that requires such  
8 testing and adequacy determinations at future applications.

9           And with that, Mr. Chairman, again, I just want to  
10 publicly thank all the citizens. I know I speak for Mr.  
11 Proctor and myself. We very much look forward to continuing  
12 the dialog, continuing to work together collaboratively and  
13 getting to a place that is beneficial for everybody. So  
14 with that, Mr. Chairman, members of the Planning Board,  
15 thank you for your indulgence. Thank you for allowing me to  
16 just summarize that. And we would respectfully request your  
17 support and approval of this conceptual site plan to  
18 facilitate the flexibility that any owner that had M-X-T in  
19 the property would otherwise enjoy. Thank you.

20           CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Tedesco.

21           Commissioners, we've heard from the applicant on  
22 this, heard from staff. We have heard from folks in the  
23 community who are in opposition. Let me open it up to you  
24 with any questions, concerns. Where are we?

25           COMMISSIONER WASHINGTON: Mr. Chairman, I guess



1 I'll comment. And I too would like to thank all the  
2 citizens for coming out and certainly having the opportunity  
3 to listen to their impassioned comments about this. But  
4 what I would say is it's indicative of, quite frankly, a lot  
5 of times citizens just not really understanding the process.  
6 And we know it's difficult.

7           And as Mr. Tedesco said, and us not taking sides,  
8 this this may not be apartments. This may not be -- there's  
9 the CSP, there's the preliminary plan, there's a detailed  
10 site plan. And different things have to be considered at  
11 every step of the way. And largely what I heard from the  
12 citizens are things that would never be considered or dealt  
13 with or addressed at the conceptual site plan level.

14           I would encourage you to please stay involved. I  
15 am certainly not in a position to dispute one way or the  
16 other those who said that they received something or didn't  
17 receive something was not aware. Our staff are available  
18 every day to not only make sure your information is included  
19 and is accurate. But I would also encourage you to reach  
20 out to our staff just to have a conversation about what the  
21 process is, just so you have a clearer understanding of what  
22 takes place at what particular time.

23           So that's -- I just wanted to offer that because  
24 we often have citizens, and we encourage citizen involvement  
25 and engagement and input. But if you don't do this every

1 day, it's oftentimes quite difficult to follow what's  
2 happening. But please know that our staff is available and  
3 should be considered a resource in that regard.

4 CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Commissioner.

5 Other Commissioners?

6 MADAM VICE CHAIR: Yeah, Mr. Chairman, I want to  
7 associate myself again with Ms. Washington's comments. I  
8 think one of the keywords is the conceptual site plan. It's  
9 nothing that is in stone, nothing that we have to look at,  
10 no buildings or anything like that being proposed at this  
11 time. But a thought, you know, sometimes you have a thought  
12 this way. And then the next day it may be another thought.  
13 So I think we all need to take a moment back, I know I do,  
14 in looking at this and realizing that this is nothing in  
15 stone.

16 Some (indiscernible) future that we will have to  
17 make a decision on, but not today. And the keyword to me,  
18 for me is conceptual site plan.

19 CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Madam Vice-Chair.

20 Commissioner Geraldo, Commissioner Doerner,  
21 anything to add?

22 COMMISSIONER GERALDO: Well, I have nothing to  
23 add, just to share in the comments of Commissioner  
24 Washington and Vice-Chair Bailey. I understand -- I'm  
25 familiar with the neighborhood, and I'm familiar with having

1 lived not far from there, and I know the problems that do  
2 exist on Old Branch Avenue and Branch Avenue and that whole  
3 area. But as my colleagues have said, this is only a  
4 conceptual site plan, and it's consistent with the zoning  
5 that was placed by the Council several years ago. But you  
6 do have -- you do have friendly ears on the board. Thank  
7 you again.

8 CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Commissioner.

9 COMMISSIONER DOERNER: Yeah. So I also see myself  
10 in the comments of my other colleagues. And just mention to  
11 the citizens that I think all of us are pretty good --  
12 pretty big advocates of the citizens getting involved and  
13 applicants working with them. We routinely will tell  
14 applicants to just go back to the table and postpone their  
15 cases if they haven't made efforts to meet with the with the  
16 citizens and kind of work through problems or hear their  
17 voices.

18 So it's important that you didn't feel like you  
19 got your voice or had an opportunity to get your voice heard  
20 in the earlier case. But I'm hopeful that you can rest  
21 assured that we are taking it seriously now and listening to  
22 -- I just jumped up here. And listening to your comments  
23 today and stay involved in the process. You're people of  
24 records now at this point. And the applicant knows who you  
25 are. So I would say continue to stay involved, however the

1 vote goes with this, but also other cases in your area as  
2 well. Make sure you continue to stay involved.

3           It's frustrating sometimes when stuff comes in  
4 that you don't want to see or that you feel like you haven't  
5 been fully heard or that stuff just doesn't go the way that  
6 you want it to go. But this is how we get things done a lot  
7 of times. And voicing your concerns is what makes our  
8 democracy extremely efficient and extremely reflective of  
9 what we want. And we live in a country that has the ability  
10 for us to voice our concerns whether we're pro or against  
11 things. And that's a very special thing to have. So thank  
12 you for coming out today and expressing your thoughts.

13           CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Commissioner.

14           I'll just close by saying I associate myself with  
15 most of all my colleagues. I'm in the same place with this.  
16 I appreciate the voice of the residents on this. Yes, up  
17 the front, I expressed some concerns about the process. And  
18 this had -- please know this had nothing to do with the  
19 merits of the case and your all voices and the opportunity  
20 for your voices to be heard. This is more of a procedural  
21 issue related to the authority of the District Council and  
22 what is required for a remand. That's what that comment was  
23 about.

24           So in any case, Commissioners, we have heard from  
25 folks in the community, we've heard from rebuttal proposed

1 by the applicant, and it's up to us. What is your pleasure  
2 on this item, on the remand?

3 MR. WILSON: Mr. Chairman.

4 CHAIRMAN: Who's speaking?

5 MR. WILSON: This is Tony Wilson, if I may. I had  
6 my hand raised. I wanted to make sure, as a part of the  
7 record, that the community understands, as well as the  
8 respective body, we are in support of the of the increase of  
9 density with Mr. Tedesco. We are in support of that. We're  
10 just not in support of the project itself in this iteration.  
11 I just wanted to make sure that the correct -- the record  
12 stood.

13 CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Wilson. Again, we  
14 (indiscernible) hearing and Mr. Wilson, glad you got your  
15 full statement, sir. But to be clear, the public hearing  
16 portion of this is closed. But noted, Mr. Wilson, what you  
17 have said. Okay.

18 Commissioners, if there's no further deliberation,  
19 what's your pleasure?

20 COMMISSIONER WASHINGTON: Mr. Chairman, I move  
21 that we adopt the findings of staff and approve CSP-21001  
22 along with the associated conditions as outlined in staff's  
23 report.

24 MADAM VICE CHAIR: Second.

25 CHAIRMAN: Got a motion by Commissioner

1 Washington, a second by Vice-Chair Bailey. Discussion on  
2 the motion? Seeing none, I will call the roll.

3 Commissioner Washington?

4 COMMISSIONER WASHINGTON: I vote aye.

5 CHAIRMAN: Vice-Chair Bailey?

6 MADAM VICE CHAIR: I vote aye.

7 CHAIRMAN: Commissioner Geraldo?

8 COMMISSIONER GERALDO: I vote aye.

9 CHAIRMAN: Commissioner Doerner?

10 COMMISSIONER DOERNER: I vote aye.

11 CHAIRMAN: I vote aye as well. The ayes have it  
12 5-0.

13 For folks in the community, I imagine we'll be  
14 seeing you again on this as things -- if and when things  
15 move forward. So thank you for taking the time. And you  
16 all have good holidays. Thank you very much.

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

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:

7. REMAND BY THE DISTRICT COUNCIL FOR A CONCEPTUAL SITE PLAN  
CSP-21001 LINDA LANE PROPERTY  
Remand Hearing, PPS 4-87035

By: Valerie Baxter Date: January 26, 2024

Valerie Baxter, Transcriber