

From: [Melissa Schweisguth](#)
To: [Clerk of the Council](#)
Subject: Disapprove Detailed Site Plan 22001
Date: Monday, September 29, 2025 10:45:58 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from an external email domain which carries the additional risk that it may be a phishing email and/or contain malware.

Dear Ms. Brown,

I hope this finds you well.

I am a person of record for the Detailed Site Plan 20001 (DSP-22001), McDonalds Ager Road and am writing to ask that the District Council disapprove this proposed development.

As you and the council are certainly aware, the District Council remanded this case, the Planning Board approved it with negligible additional conditions.

I respectfully ask that the council disapprove DSP-22001, as neither the applicant nor the Planning Board addressed the Council's remand issues in a meaningful way. Rather, the applicant and Planning Board reiterated prior arguments and testimony that the Council found insufficient, leading to the remand, effectively dismissing the council's remand order. I ask that the council stand by its remand and disapprove DSP-22001.

Specifically

- The applicant did not evaluate traffic safety impacts or congestion impacts related specifically to the location of the driveway entry/exit adjacent to a busy and high-injury-crash intersection (per the County's Vision Zero High Injury Network list and testimony from me and several others citing MSP crash data). The driveway is clearly part of the DSP, nor did the Planning Board require this. Rather, they reiterated that SHA approved the location with slight modifications to ensure right in/right out access and maintained their argument that "office" impacts are not part of DSP review.

- In taking the above actions, the applicant and Planning Board failed to ensure that the DSP ensures the development meet the purposes of the zoning ordinance, specifically 27-102 (a) (11) *"to lessen the danger and congestion of traffic on the streets, and to insure the continued usefulness of all elements of the transportation system for their planned functions"*

- Neither the applicant nor the Planning Board considered an alternative without a drive through, or with the entry/exit in another location, though the remand indicated the Board should consider approval conditional on removing the drive through.

- The Planning Board did not require a revised Health Impact Assessment (HIA) that conforms to the scope laid out in the Zoning Ordinance, but accepted the initial analysis that concerns construction dust only. The Zoning Ordinance describes the HIA as a tool with which *"a policy, program or project may be evaluated as to its potential effects on the health of a population, the distribution of those effects within the population, and provide a platform to make our communities healthier."*

- In accepting a cursory "desktop Health Impact Assessment," the Planning Board failed to ensure that the proposed development meets two Purposes of the Zoning Ordinance, 27-102 (a) (1) *"To protect and promote the health, safety, morals comfort, convenience, and welfare of the present and future inhabitants of the County,"* and (13) *"To protect against undue noise, and air and water pollution."*

These are just some of the ways in which the applicant and Planning Board effectively dismissed the Council's remand points. Please stand by the District Council's thoughtful, detailed and well-supported remand and disapprove DSP-22001.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Melissa A Schweisguth
5020 38th Ave
Hyattsville, MD 20782