

1 THE PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY PLANNING BOARD OF
2 THE MARYLAND-NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION
3

4
5 HARMONY GARDENS
6 DETAILED SITE PLAN, PPS DET-2024-004
7

8 T R A N S C R I P T
9 O F
10 P R O C E E D I N G S
11

12 COUNTY ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

13 Upper Marlboro, Maryland

14 November 14, 2024

15 VOLUME 1 of 1
16

17 BEFORE:

18 PETER A. SHAPIRO, Chairman

19 A. SHAUNISE WASHINGTON, Commissioner

20 MANUEL GERALDO, Commissioner

21 WILLIAM M. DOERNER, Commissioner
22
23
24
25

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

C O N T E N T S

<u>SPEAKER</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
Joshua Mitchum	3
Nate Forman	5
Kilber Arrington	10

P R O C E E D I N G S

CHAIRMAN: We'll move on to Item 9. Do we need, Commissioners, do we need a quick break?

(No affirmative response.)

CHAIRMAN: Okay. All right. We'll keep going. Item 9 on our agenda is, hold on one sec, Detailed Site Plan DET-2024-004, Harmony Garden. This case was moved from the Planning Board meeting of November 7th. We have Mr. Forman, who is representing the Applicant, and Mr. Mitchum, who is representing the Staff, who is giving the Staff presentation on this. We may have some folks who are signed up to speak as well. This is an evidentiary hearing.

I will turn to Staff first, Mr. Mitchum, for a Staff presentation.

MR. MITCHUM: Yes, good morning, Mr. Chair and members of the Planning Board. For the record, I am Joshua Mitchum with the Urban Design Section. The item before you is Detailed Site Plan DET-2024-004 for Harmony Garden, which proposes the development of 67 single-family attached residential dwelling units. The application also seeks alternative compliance from Section 4.10, street trees along, along streets of the 2018 Landscape Manual through Alternative Compliance Application ACL-2024-004.

The subject site is located on, south of the intersection of Old Baltimore Pike and Ammendale Way in

1 Planning Area 62 in Council District 1. The DET proposes
2 one model, the Arcadia, which will be 20-feet wide with
3 rear-loaded garages that can accommodate up to two vehicles.

4 As a matter of housekeeping, in a phone call that
5 took place yesterday, November 13, 2024, Staff spoke with a
6 community member who expressed opposition to the
7 application. The community member expressed concern
8 regarding parking, a lack of infrastructure and persistent
9 littering issues that they believe will be exacerbated by
10 the approval and development of the application.

11 Furthermore, the Applicant submitted an exhibit
12 prior to the noon deadline on November 12, 2024, requesting
13 minor technical revisions to the public Technical Staff
14 Report. Staff has reviewed the proposed revisions and
15 recommends an alternative version, or revision, to Condition
16 1(c) which will be read into the record as follows.
17 Condition 1(c), revise the plan to demonstrate the existing
18 monument sign for North Creek will be removed or, in the
19 alternative, revise the plans to remove the sign column and
20 pillar details from the detail sheet and location shown on
21 the plans.

22 Lastly, provide the details of the existing or
23 proposed gateway sign with labeling demonstrating
24 conformance to Section 27-61506(b) or Section 27-7500 of the
25 Prince George's County Zoning Ordinance. Based on

1 evaluation and analysis, Urban Design Staff recommend that
2 the Planning Board adopt the findings of this report as
3 modified by Staff and as modified by the technical
4 corrections of the Applicant's exhibit and approve Detailed
5 Site Plan DET-2024-004, Type 2 Tree Conservation Plan TCP2-
6 041-2024, and alternative compliance ACL-2024-004, subject
7 to the conditions of approval as stated within the title of
8 Staff Report. This concludes Staff's presentation. Thank
9 you very much.

10 CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Mitchum. Commissioners,
11 any questions for Staff?

12 (No affirmative response.)

13 CHAIRMAN: Seeing none, we'll turn to the
14 Applicant, Mr. Forman. You can introduce yourself and
15 members of the team, and take it away.

16 MR. FORMAN: Yes, thank you. Good morning, Mr.
17 Chair, members of the Planning Board, it's my pleasure to be
18 here. I'm Nathaniel Forman. I'm an attorney with the
19 Offices of O'Malley, Miles, Nylen & Gilmore. We are located
20 in Greenbelt and it is my pleasure to have with me this
21 morning Mr. Sichao Bai on behalf of the Applicant, Potomac
22 Realty Company. I have Phil Hughes and Amy Sommer, our
23 civil engineers with Charles P. Johnson & Associates; and on
24 behalf of Lennar, the home builder, I have Kilber Arrington
25 and Maxwell Potember.

1 I would like to begin by thanking Staff for their,
2 their assistance throughout this process, and that we agree
3 with Staff's recommendation of approval with revised
4 findings and conditions, and the one that Mr. Mitchum had
5 also read into the record today.

6 With that being said, I do want to say there is
7 just one caveat that I want to bring to the Board's
8 attention so they are aware of it. Our home builder can
9 better explain this if there are questions, but the gist of
10 our concern is that the transparency requirement under
11 Section 2761203(d)(1) of the Neighborhood Compatibility
12 Standards, which requires a certain level of transparency on
13 the first, second and third levels of a townhouse created
14 some awkward conformance issues that we were able to comply
15 with and satisfy, but we do believe impacted the optimal
16 design standards and that consumers prefer and, essentially,
17 the second floor and above were required to provide 20
18 percent transparency. When facing other single-family
19 attached or detailed homes. The practical effect of this is
20 to severely limit the useable, the amount of useable wall
21 space for kitchen counters, furniture, you know, where a TV
22 or couches are, and in some instances the privacy of the
23 bedroom for these future residents.

24 And we have no issue with going to meet, you know,
25 the high-visibility end-unit requirements, we understand

1 that; but we feel that in this instance, the amount of
2 transparency kind of went above and beyond what would be
3 usually, you know, optimal or -- and to the point that we
4 think the customer satisfaction could be compromised.

5 Again, we are able to conform with this requirement, but I
6 wanted to bring this to the Board's attention for future
7 consideration if revisions to this section were to be
8 considered.

9 Nevertheless, you know, the Preliminary Plan of
10 Subdivision for this case, an ADQ, they were before the
11 Planning Board on November 30, 2023; and we find ourselves
12 before you almost a year to the day requesting approval of
13 our Detailed Site Plan. And I'm not only simply requesting
14 67 lots to build townhomes on, we are here today asking this
15 Board to approve the townhouses to be built.

16 We have worked closely with our home builder
17 Lennar in providing a design that is high-quality and
18 compatible with the overall neighborhood. Speaking of the
19 neighborhood, we met with the community throughout the
20 Preliminary Plan and Detailed Site Plan processes to obtain
21 feedback and listen to their concerns. We also made
22 ourselves available to meet with the community and respond
23 to any questions or concerns that arose.

24 We have met all the development, excuse me, all
25 the development standards and findings required for the

1 Detailed Site Plan. This use is approved in the CGO Zone.
2 It is an appropriate individual development given that it is
3 compatible with the neighborhood and the surrounding uses,
4 not to mention that the proposed density, 8.6 dwelling units
5 an acre, is far below the maximum allowed of 20 dwelling
6 units an acre, and significantly below the maximum density
7 of 48 dwelling units an acre for multi-family units, both of
8 which are allowed in the CGO Zone. As a matter of fact, the
9 Applicant had originally considered constructing
10 approximately 250 multi-family dwelling units, but scuttled
11 the idea as he did not believe it was right for this
12 development.

13 In sum and for the reasons included in the case
14 file, Technical Staff Report and the comments we made here
15 today, I respectfully request the Planning Board adopt the
16 Staff's recommendation of approval as amended by the revised
17 findings and conditions. I and the members of my team thank
18 the Chair and the members of the Planning Board for their
19 time and consideration this morning, and we make ourselves
20 available to answer any questions. Thank you.

21 CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Forman, much
22 appreciated. Commissioners, any questions for the Applicant
23 or members of his team?

24 COMMISSIONER DOERNER: Yeah, I have two questions.

25 CHAIRMAN: Yes.

1 COMMISSIONER DOERNER: One is, Mr. Forman, can you
2 explain a little bit the, the concern about the second and
3 third floor, kind of visibility, or privacy that you were
4 trying to raise because I, I don't quite follow. So, I just
5 wanted to know a little bit more about like what you're
6 concerned about and just for your perspective, like I live
7 in a townhome that's very similar to these kinds of designs.
8 So, I'm, I'm very familiar with like neighbors in my back
9 alley being able to see in and stuff like that. So, I, I
10 hear that; but I just want to understand why because I also,
11 my, from a homeowner's perspective, I absolutely appreciate
12 to have a lot of the natural light coming in from lots of
13 windows. I'm in like a, an interior unit, not a side unit,
14 so I get lots of light coming from like the east and west
15 when the sun is kind of going over our houses because we
16 have so much windows and people can put up blinds and other
17 stuff that they want to have, blackout kind of like privacy
18 stuff; but I also view that as a huge way of me saving on
19 energy costs and not having to have the lights and stuff.
20 So, I'm just kind of interested in hearing the, the sort of
21 justification for that.

22 And then the other question is that since you have
23 angled roofs on, on these units, are you going to be putting
24 in the structure on the roof so you can put in solar because
25 on some of the other units that we see, very commonly around

1 the County, it's, it's flat roofs on the townhomes which
2 don't lend themselves quite as well to some of the solar
3 installations and it's a little bit harder to do; but these,
4 these might, just from the angles, be a little bit better
5 for, for that kind of alternative energy use. So, I just
6 wanted to hear a little bit more on that.

7 CHAIRMAN: Mr. Forman, are you there? We lost you
8 for a second.

9 MR. FORMAN: Yes, sorry, I hit the wrong button.
10 My apologies. No, those are two great questions,
11 Commissioner Doerner. I would ask for Mr. Kilber Arrington
12 from Lennar to respond to your questions. He is much more
13 versed in the requirements of the transparency and also the
14 angles of the roof. So, Mr. Arrington, would you mind? I
15 think you might need to be sworn-in first, though.

16 CHAIRMAN: Yes, sir, you will. Mr. Arrington, if
17 you could raise your right hand, please? Do you solemnly
18 swear or affirm that your testimony will be the whole truth
19 and nothing but the truth?

20 MR. ARRINGTON: Yes, sir.

21 CHAIRMAN: Okay. Consider yourself under oath.
22 Introduce yourself for the record and, yeah, please take it
23 away.

24 MR. ARRINGTON: Very good. My name is Kilber
25 Arrington. I'm the Product Development Manager for Lennar

1 Homes and we work frequently with developers and communities
2 of the Maryland area to produce homes for communities and
3 for the market in those communities to fit and be successful
4 in that particular market. So, we worked pretty hard on
5 this Harmony Gardens community.

6 When we learned about the transparency
7 requirements based on proximity to adjacent properties,
8 there is a, I can't quote it exactly, but it's, it's a,
9 essentially what it does is it requires that when a building
10 is facing a, an existing or adjacent community, that we have
11 to increase the amount of windows in a certain façade. So,
12 what that does to us, particularly on a townhome plan that's
13 already relatively small in living space, is it starts to
14 create challenges with furnishings, et cetera, and even how
15 you build the home. In short, we're adding more windows, so
16 you're taking away wall space for things like cabinets, like
17 Nate was saying earlier, and you might have a TV wall that
18 we had originally programmed that, you know, floor and that
19 wall for that's now, you know, gobbled up by the, by the
20 additional windows. We're asking simply if we can get
21 relief on that requirement because we do believe that our,
22 our elevations are attractive, and I can show them to you on
23 the screen as they are right now.

24 Adding the windows won't stop us from building
25 the, the, the, the home, but it does create challenges for

1 that particular buyer, and particularly on those homesites
2 that, that have that specific requirement for the extra
3 windows.

4 So, if you can, if I can, I'm going to see if I
5 can go ahead and share the screen for just a minute.

6 CHAIRMAN: I think Staff can assist. We have the
7 slide presentation and perhaps there's an elevation that you
8 want to refer us to?

9 MR. ARRINGTON: Sure.

10 CHAIRMAN: Ms. (indiscernible) maybe you can help
11 with this?

12 MR. ARRINGTON: I don't know where it is placed in
13 this specific presentation. We'll have to drill down to
14 where the, the side elevations are of the, the, the
15 architecture. So, that's --

16 CHAIRMAN: There we go.

17 MR. ARRINGTON: Yeah. Yeah. We're almost there.
18 Let's see if we can get to any side elevation sheets.

19 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I have it at slide 14, oh,
20 we just passed it.

21 MR. ARRINGTON: There we go. Okay. And if we
22 zoom in to the right page there, I don't know if you can get
23 that to, to appear any larger?

24 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That's the front?

25 MR. ARRINGTON: Yeah, so right there, do you have

1 the ability to, to zoom in on the right page of the right
2 sheet? I want to, I want to take a look at the six side
3 elevations there. Okay. So, so right now we have three
4 windows standard on the second floor. The transparency
5 requirement for, for additional transparency would mean that
6 I'd have to add a window on the, somewhere on the left side
7 which is exactly where our kitchen cabinets go; and, of
8 course, you know, you can't hang kitchen cabinets and have
9 countertops right there on the window. We can see that on
10 the floorplan in just a minute.

11 And then on the third floor where you see the two,
12 one window on each end and then the little, tiny, we call a
13 transom window up near the middle, we'd have to add another
14 two windows possibly there. The, the left side is where the
15 primary home bedroom suite is. So, typically, that would be
16 our bedroom wall. We're going to narrow that down by
17 putting another window in there and, and, again, force a
18 customer to downsize their bed potentially.

19 And then, in addition to that, we're going to have
20 to probably add another window to the left of that narrow
21 window inside the walk-in closet which takes away a whole
22 wall of shelf space for clothes, et cetera; and, and some of
23 you may, I think one of you already said that you live in a
24 townhome. You can imagine where storage is pretty precious
25 in a townhome. This creates challenges for those sort of

1 things. So, we're just asking, that's all, if we can get
2 that kind of relief to, to not have to put in those extra
3 windows to meet those transparency requirements. As you can
4 see, we've taken steps to make some attractive elevations.
5 We have stone veneers. We have already some nice
6 fenestration on, on the building, nice gable accents with
7 the round louver, the roof skirt on the bottom of the gable,
8 et cetera. So, it's not what I think doing what the spirit
9 of the law was crafted for. We're avoiding those giant
10 walls of just blank features, you know, so with nothing in
11 it. So, this is already pre-programmed with those
12 fenestrations and, and, wow, maximizing the living space
13 inside for our clients.

14 CHAIRMAN: Okay. And then I think Commissioner
15 Doerner had another question, too.

16 COMMISSIONER DOERNER: Yeah. Just real quick
17 before we, we jump onto the other one. So, the view that
18 we're, what we're talking about is, is that you have to have
19 more windows on the end units, not interior ones?

20 MR. ARRINGTON: Correct.

21 COMMISSIONER DOERNER: Okay. Yeah, I'm, I'm
22 actually fine with, with all the explanation with, I, I
23 don't live in an end-unit, but I've been in them and I know
24 that that it's great to have the, the side views where you
25 have the lights coming. This looks fairly good to me in

1 terms of like the, the number of finishings that you have in
2 there; and absolutely understand that the lack of space when
3 you have like the kitchen cabinets and stuff because you
4 have on one side for those who don't live in those units and
5 one side of the kitchen you've got usually a pantry that's
6 small in these kinds of units; and the other side you have
7 the, the kitchen cabinets. If we take away that space, then
8 you're losing one of the two; and the, the amount of closet
9 space in these kinds of units is extremely tight, so much so
10 that people have to go out and rent storage units or you
11 have to figure out how to hang things in the garage above
12 cars. So, taking away closet space upstairs and then
13 downstairs in the kitchen, I think, is not terrible
14 desirable and it might actually detract from the finished
15 product on this. So, I'm, I'm totally on, onboard with,
16 with those kinds of comments.

17 CHAIRMAN: Okay. And the second question?

18 COMMISSIONER DOERNER: On the solar, yeah.

19 CHAIRMAN: On solar? Are they solar-ready or
20 solar-installed, or what's the roof situation?

21 MR. FORMAN: I'll jump in. I don't know exactly
22 if we've considered that specific issue. I think it's
23 something we can certainly look into more. I don't see why
24 based upon the angle of the roof there's any prohibition on
25 it; but, you know, we, we just, we're not necessarily

1 prepared to say whether they were or were not solar-ready.
2 Part of it is because there is the option for a fourth floor
3 like roof deck area and that may impact the available space
4 for solar on that, and that is an option that the customer
5 can opt into. So, I don't know if we want to say that they
6 all are going to be solar-ready because sometimes I think on
7 the model itself it could impact how it could be done.

8 Mr. Arrington, do you have any additional comments
9 to that?

10 MR. ARRINGTON: Yeah, yes. If I may add to that,
11 I, I would agree with, with, with Nate there that we, we
12 didn't really spend time with, dealing with that particular
13 question; but if you go back a few pages, you'll see the
14 front elevations. We have five front elevations that we're
15 offering. Three of those five have roof features already
16 built into them. Like that right there, the reverse gable,
17 you can go up another page and you'll see another one with
18 dorm windows. And that, that is limiting for solar panels,
19 and not to mention the fact that they are going to be facing
20 the streets most of the time and I don't know if we've given
21 thought to, or even presented this to the community to
22 discuss what the streetscape impact would be to that. So --

23 COMMISSIONER DOERNER: So, would you, would you at
24 least be able to build out the rooftop so it would be able
25 to support solar because sometimes the challenge is that it,

1 it, these units aren't even built to be able to put the
2 solar on top, they can't support it. So, I understand like
3 the practical concerns like on the back rear side, if you
4 have like a, the balcony, kind of like patio, I've got one
5 of those on my, on my unit --

6 MR. ARRINGTON: Right.

7 COMMISSIONER DOERNER: -- it just, it, you don't
8 have the ability to put solar, at least like in that
9 particular area. You could still do it potentially on the
10 top of the roof if it, if that turns into a flat one; or if
11 you don't have that unit, then you would have the ability to
12 actually put it on. The challenge becomes that if you guys
13 decide not to build a roof structure to actually support it,
14 then the future homeowner is going to have that option. So,
15 I, I realize that like you're not necessarily going to have
16 them installed immediately on there, but at least building
17 the roof to be able to sustain that for people who want to
18 do that would be, I think, very good in terms of looking,
19 looking ahead to the, the future.

20 MR. ARRINGTON: I, I don't anticipate that there,
21 there would be a problem with installing, retrofitting solar
22 panel units onto the roof. They are designed to withstand
23 significant snow loads in this area, at least 30 pounds in
24 that region; and, however, I will say this, that that could
25 also, the customer would have to be advised that, you know,

1 penetrating the roof with any kind of a panel or attachments
2 would, could void their warranty and they need to be, make
3 an educated decision about that.

4 I'm, I'm, I could tell you if we had to go through
5 the process of vetting the product, we, I, I can't think of
6 one structural engineer who would answer the question as to
7 whether or not the roof could support anything without first
8 seeing the product proposed and then they making their
9 evaluation on that; but, in general, I don't think it's a
10 problem for someone to retrofit it, but I could tell you for
11 a fact that, that would cause warrant issues if, should a
12 leak arise around or associated with those solar panels.
13 So, it's probably worth a, a, a deeper look maybe, a
14 separate conversation; but as of right now, I could tell you
15 that Lennar would not support putting it on.

16 COMMISSIONER DOERNER: I'm sorry, my suggestion
17 would be like take the look in terms of like if you can add
18 that as an option in, because then you could finance it, you
19 roll it into the mortgage, right? So, if you could do it
20 at, at, at initial build, then you guys would be able to
21 figure out how to potentially offer it as another option and
22 then get it done so it doesn't void the warranty because,
23 yeah, I know that if you, if you puncture any of the, the
24 wrap on there, it, you can have huge problems with, with
25 water leaks and stuff like that coming down. We've had a

1 few neighbors that have had that happen; but if it's an
2 option that the builder can handle it and do it, maybe even
3 on some of like the rear sides of these units, that offers
4 additional optionality to, to the buyer. It would make just
5 more attractive kind of features within the, the area.

6 MR. ARRINGTON: I understand. I could, I could
7 propose it, but I can't promise it in this meeting that we
8 would want to move forward with that.

9 COMMISSIONER DOERNER: That's fine.

10 MR. FORMAN: Yeah, I think it's perfectly, I
11 appreciate those comments. And I think if we can explore
12 them and consider them as this product is, you know, going
13 to market as to how exactly it could be done; but I think
14 that is a good suggestion for making them, exploring how to
15 make them potentially consumer-ready to be constructed with
16 that, with the solar panels. I just think, yeah, as Mr.
17 Kilber said, we just are not in a position to agree to that
18 completely today.

19 CHAIRMAN: Thank you. So, just a couple
20 questions. I don't know, Commissioner Geraldo, Commissioner
21 Washington, if you have any questions? I have a few.

22 COMMISSIONER GERALDO: Okay. I have a question.
23 Is it, I didn't see anything, any provision for putting, I
24 know the development isn't that large, but at least dog
25 waste stations for the, for the homeowners.

1 MR. FORMAN: We are across the street from Park
2 and Planning-owned property right next to Vansville
3 Elementary School. I think they may have facilities, but if
4 they don't, we can certainly explore the implementation,
5 implementation of possible, you know, a dog waste station.

6 COMMISSIONER GERALDO: Okay. Thank you.

7 CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Yeah, so just a couple.
8 What is, this is a question for Staff. In terms of the
9 fenestration and the, the, the transparency, how much
10 flexibility, I mean this is a Detailed Site Plan. How much
11 flexibility do we have on that because I'm, I'm inclined to
12 agree with Commissioner Doerner. I, I'm happy, based on
13 what I have heard, I'm happy to give them the discretion to
14 design that a little bit more the way they're inclined to.
15 Do we, we have that ability, right? We can make that
16 decision if we choose to?

17 MR. MITCHUM: I'm going to have to also defer to
18 counsel, but from my understanding, this isn't something
19 that can be deviated from at this stage. It is hard-coated
20 into the Zoning Ordinance, but that, that's my position at
21 this time.

22 CHAIRMAN: Okay, Mr. Mitchum. Yeah, Mr. Warner or
23 Ms. Connor, do you know about if we do or don't have that
24 flexibility, or is Mr. Mitchum correct?

25 MR. WARNER: No. I can speak to just the, the,

1 the general requirement for development standards. Yes,
2 there are a number of them that don't provide the kind of
3 discretion that the Planning Board normally has to make the
4 best choices about the design of a project. I believe in my
5 experience this is one of those provisions that doesn't
6 allow for any kind of discretion or a departure. The
7 counsel did limit that quite significantly for a number of
8 the development standards.

9 I know we were looking at that a little bit in CV-
10 15 but, Sherri, I don't recall if we did anything that
11 changed this particular provision. We did look at some
12 transparency issues, but do you recall?

13 CHAIRMAN: Actually, I, go ahead, Ms. Connor, I'm
14 sorry.

15 MS. CONNOR: No, I was just going to agree with
16 Mr. Warner, and to the analysis that's been provided in the
17 Technical Staff Report and to what Mr. Mitchum has provided.

18 CHAIRMAN: Thank you. So, it sounds like, Mr.
19 Forman, you even recognized yourself in your language that
20 you can confer, you can, you can meet the standards that we
21 have required and you're asking us to look at this down the
22 road, see if we can find some more flexibility. So, it
23 sounds like that's our only option on this. So, thank you.

24 So, in terms of the solar, I had a bit of a
25 reaction to, Mr. Arrington, what you were saying. I've been

1 doing this a long time and I can't tell you how many folks
2 come to us with solar-ready townhomes, and you are a major,
3 major homebuilder. I can't imagine that you, I'm just
4 shocked, if I may say, that the idea of solar-ready
5 townhomes just can't be done.

6 MR. ARRINGTON: I'm not saying they can't. I'm
7 just saying that it's not part of our usual array of product
8 offerings and options for our customers. Before we get
9 there, we have to really carefully evaluate the product
10 proposed and, and the impact to the structure. So, not at
11 all saying that it can't be done. I'm just saying that it
12 is not in our programming. And as, as far as national
13 builders go, we are the second largest builder in the
14 country and I don't even know of another national builder
15 that does this even as an option. Maybe a smaller regional
16 builder that, that, that's willing to be that flexible, but
17 for most of us larger builders, it's, it's been an area
18 that, that we've just kind of shied away from. Maybe we
19 need to take another look at it and, and see what --

20 CHAIRMAN: Yeah, please.

21 MR. FORMAN: I like, I think it's more about
22 Prince George's County being on the vanguard of asking these
23 situations, asking for this; and, you know, some of the
24 larger national builders working in other jurisdictions
25 aren't getting this question because maybe they're not as,

1 of those, those reviewing agencies aren't as, you know,
2 concerned with it. So, I think that's just something that
3 it sounds like, you know, Mr. Arrington wants to take back
4 to the shop and see what they can do or what products they
5 can, what, work on and revise. So --

6 CHAIRMAN: I'm thinking and, Ms. Connor, if you
7 can sort of work this into the, with, with Director Haller
8 or others, just a, a little research around this, too,
9 because we, I mean, again, you know, you, you've been doing
10 this a while, Ms. Connor. You know, we get a lot of product
11 that is solar-ready. So, I'm trying to understand the
12 disconnect between that and what I'm hearing now; and,
13 again, it just might be my ignorance; but I'm, I'm a bit
14 shocked. But, so it sounds like on both these issues we'll,
15 you know, you've heard us on the solar. We don't have much
16 flexibility on the elevation, on the, on the transparency.

17 Let me get back to our process here. If there's
18 no other questions for Staff, for the Applicants --
19 Commissioner --

20 COMMISSIONER DOERNER: Like so, I don't think it's
21 true that nobody in this area does solar. I, in fact, I
22 know that's wrong.

23 CHAIRMAN: Commissioner, I'm a hundred percent
24 with you and that's why we're going to have Staff look at it
25 because you know like I know that's not our experience at

1 all.

2 COMMISSIONER DOERNER: Yeah, there, there, there
3 are rough-in, your competition provides rough-in ready
4 floorplans and they, they operate in Prince George's County
5 and there's stuff that's going into D.C. that --

6 CHAIRMAN: All the time. Yeah.

7 COMMISSIONER DOERNER: So, I'm --

8 CHAIRMAN: I'm with you.

9 COMMISSIONER DOERNER: -- I'll be looking into it.

10 MR. ARRINGTON: Again, I'm not saying that they're
11 not; I'm just saying that I'm not aware, that's all.

12 COMMISSIONER DOERNER: Okay.

13 CHAIRMAN: With you. Okay. All right. So, we
14 have one person who signed up to speak on this. I don't
15 know if she's here. Is Wanda Myers here on the line? Ms.
16 Myers?

17 (No affirmative response.)

18 CHAIRMAN: Okay. So, we have no one who signed up
19 to speak on this case. Are there any other questions for
20 Staff or for the Applicant? If not, let me turn to you, Mr.
21 Forman, if you want the final word on this before we close
22 this public hearing.

23 MR. FORMAN: No, thank you, I think this has just
24 been a very interesting conversation over the transparency
25 for the incompatibility standards. I appreciate your

1 consideration of how that standard may, could be tweaked or
2 modified going forward; and I also thank you for the
3 discussion on the solar panels, solar readiness and it
4 sounds like that's just something that we as a team want to
5 consider what we can do with this product, and maybe what
6 Lennar can do going forward with other products in this
7 County. Otherwise, we do agree with Staff's recommendation
8 and with their revised findings and conditions of approval
9 and ask for this Planning Board to approve the Detailed Site
10 Plan, the alternative compliance and the TCP2.

11 CHAIRMAN: And did I hear correctly that you were
12 proffering dog waste stations if they are not in the park
13 across the street?

14 MR. FORMAN: Yes, we will offer one dog waste
15 station if it's not, they're not in the park across the
16 street. Thank you.

17 CHAIRMAN: Okay. That's what I thought I heard.
18 I just wanted to make sure.

19 COMMISSIONER GERALDO: I thought I heard that,
20 too.

21 CHAIRMAN: All right. All right. There we go.
22 All right. So --

23 COMMISSIONER GERALDO: I do --

24 CHAIRMAN: -- with, with that, I will close this
25 public hearing. Commissioners, any deliberation? If not,

1 is there a motion?

2 COMMISSIONER WASHINGTON: Mr. Chairman, I move
3 that we adopt the findings of Staff to include the finding
4 as modified by Application Exhibit No. 1 and approve DET-
5 2024-004, ACL-2024-004 and TPCP2-041-2024 subject to the
6 conditions as outlined in Staff's Report and Conditions 1JM
7 and N as modified by Applicant Exhibit No. 2, and Condition
8 1C as modified and read into the record by Staff with the
9 addition of Applicant-proffered condition with regards to
10 dog waste stations if not, if there is not one provided
11 across the street at the park.

12 COMMISSIONER GERALDO: Second.

13 COMMISSIONER WASHINGTON: Appropriate language to
14 being, to be drafted.

15 COMMISSIONER GERALDO: Second.

16 CHAIRMAN: Commissioner Washington has made the
17 motion. Commissioner Geraldo has seconded it. Any further
18 discussion on the motion?

19 (No affirmative response.)

20 CHAIRMAN: Seeing none, Commissioner Washington?

21 COMMISSIONER WASHINGTON: I vote aye.

22 CHAIRMAN: Commissioner Geraldo?

23 COMMISSIONER GERALDO: I vote aye.

24 CHAIRMAN: Commissioner Doerner?

25 COMMISSIONER DOERNER: I vote aye.

1 CHAIRMAN: I vote aye as well. The ayes have it
2 4-0. Thank you all very much for your time and for the
3 fruitful conversation. I much appreciate it, Mr. Bai, good
4 to see you again.

5 MR. FORMAN: Thank you, Your Honor.

6 CHAIRMAN: Thanks, everybody.

7 MR. BAI: Thank you all Board members. Thank you.

8 COMMISSIONER WASINGTON: Thank you.

9 CHAIRMAN: All right.

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

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

DIGITALLY SIGNED CERTIFICATE

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

HARMONY GARDENS

Detailed Site Plan, PPS DET-2024-004

By: Tracy Hahn Date: January 19, 2025
Tracy Hahn, Transcriber