OFFICE OF THE ZONING HEARING EXAMINER

FOR PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY

BHC INC. C/O MID ATLANTIC BUILDERS/: Case Nos. A-9802-C KENWOOD VILLAGE : and A-9803-C :

A hearing in the above-entitled matter was held on November 2, 2022, at the Prince George's County Office of Zoning, County Administration Building, Room 2174, Upper Marlboro, Maryland 20772 before:

Joyce Nichols

Hearing Examiner

Page 2	Page 4
	-
APPEARANCES 1 I'm showing is the Site Vicinity Map who have a structure of the	
3 It's part of Exhibit 23, which is the Staf	-
4 it shows, the property is outlined in rec	•
On Behalf of the Applicant: 5 on the southside of White House Road j	
Tom Haller, Esg. 6 interchange with the Beltway and Ritch	
7 The original basic plans for this	property, A-
On Behalf of People's Zoning: 8 9802, A-9803, were approved on Janu	•
9 project was called Kenwood Village and	
Stan Brown 10 basic plans were adopted at that time.	-
11 approved, the decision of the District C	
12exhibit in the record as the basic plan.13J-1113, and that was Exhibit 19 of the	
14 I'm depicting the basic plan that was re-	
15 J-1113, and we submitted this, we got	
Page 16 Council's record and we submitted this	
17 We were, subsequently, contacted by	
Testimony of Jason Dunlap 7 18 McNeill, who noted that the plan was r	ot certified and did
19 not reflect conditions of the original ap	
20 requested that we modify the plan to s	
Testimony of Michael Lenhart 50 21 notes; and as a result, we submitted a	-
22 for the original approval which contains	
Testimony of Mark Ferguson5923 have Mr. Dunlap go through what was a24 this plan then was subsequently certifi	-
Testimony of Charles Renninger 67 25 Examiner on October 26, 2022. So, th	
Page 3	Page 5
1 PROCEEDINGS 1 are proposing to revise as part of this a	application.
2 AUTOMATED SPEAKER: This conference will now be 2 I would note for the record that t	he reason that
3 recorded. 3 there were two Zoning Map Amendment	no rouborr that
	applications all in the
4 MADAM EXAMINER: All right. All right, good 4 same zone is that when the application	applications all in the ns were originally
4MADAM EXAMINER: All right. All right, good4same zone is that when the application5morning, everybody. It is approximately 9:31 on the 2nd of5submitted, there was originally a requered.	applications all in the ns were originally est to rezone a
4MADAM EXAMINER: All right. All right, good4same zone is that when the application5morning, everybody. It is approximately 9:31 on the 2nd of5submitted, there was originally a reque6November, and we are here to amend, on an application to6portion of the property from the RE Zone	applications all in the ns were originally est to rezone a to the RM Zone, and
 MADAM EXAMINER: All right. All right, good morning, everybody. It is approximately 9:31 on the 2nd of November, and we are here to amend, on an application to mend the conditions for A-9802 and A-9803. And, Mr. MADAM EXAMINER: All right. All right, good same zone is that when the application submitted, there was originally a request portion of the property from the RE Zone then the, another portion of the property 	applications all in the ns were originally est to rezone a to the RM Zone, and ty from the RE Zone
 MADAM EXAMINER: All right. All right, good morning, everybody. It is approximately 9:31 on the 2nd of November, and we are here to amend, on an application to amend the conditions for A-9802 and A-9803. And, Mr. Haller, it's a pleasure to see you. amend the LAC Zone. Ultimately, the plane 	applications all in the ns were originally est to rezone a to the RM Zone, and ty from the RE Zone s were both modified
 MADAM EXAMINER: All right. All right, good morning, everybody. It is approximately 9:31 on the 2nd of November, and we are here to amend, on an application to amend the conditions for A-9802 and A-9803. And, Mr. Haller, it's a pleasure to see you. amend the LAC Zone. Ultimately, the plane 	applications all in the as were originally est to rezone a to the RM Zone, and ty from the RE Zone s were both modified to the RS Zone, and
 MADAM EXAMINER: All right. All right, good morning, everybody. It is approximately 9:31 on the 2nd of November, and we are here to amend, on an application to amend the conditions for A-9802 and A-9803. And, Mr. Haller, it's a pleasure to see you. MR. HALLER: Good morning, Madame Examiner. I'm MADAM EXAMINER: All right. All right, good same zone is that when the application submitted, there was originally a request portion of the property from the RE Zone then the, another portion of the propertion to the LAC Zone. Ultimately, the plans to request a rezoning from the RE Zone 	applications all in the as were originally est to rezone a to the RM Zone, and ty from the RE Zone s were both modified to the RS Zone, and ower density range of
 MADAM EXAMINER: All right. All right, good morning, everybody. It is approximately 9:31 on the 2nd of November, and we are here to amend, on an application to amend the conditions for A-9802 and A-9803. And, Mr. Haller, it's a pleasure to see you. MR. HALLER: Good morning, Madame Examiner. I'm pleased to be here this morning and I'd like to start out MADAM EXAMINER: All right. All right, good same zone is that when the application submitted, there was originally a request portion of the property from the RE Zone then the, another portion of the property to the LAC Zone. Ultimately, the plans to request a rezoning from the RE Zone the the value of the property from the RE Zone the the value of the property from the RE Zone the the value of the property from the RE Zone the the value of the property from the RE Zone the the value of the property from the RE Zone the the value of the property from the RE Zone the the value of the property from the RE Zone the the value of the property from the RE Zone the the value of the property from the RE Zone the the value of the property from the RE Zone the the value of the property from the RE Zone the the value of the property from the RE Zone the the value of the property from the RE Zone the the value of the property from the RE Zone the the value of the property from the RE Zone the the value of the property from the RE Zone the the value of the property from the RE Zone the the value of the property from the RE Zone the the value of the property from the RE Zone the the value of the property from the RE Zone the the value of the property from the RE Zone the the value of the property from the RE Zone the the value of the property from the RE	applications all in the ns were originally est to rezone a to the RM Zone, and ty from the RE Zone s were both modified to the RS Zone, and ower density range of c plan that was
 MADAM EXAMINER: All right. All right, good morning, everybody. It is approximately 9:31 on the 2nd of November, and we are here to amend, on an application to amend the conditions for A-9802 and A-9803. And, Mr. Haller, it's a pleasure to see you. MR. HALLER: Good morning, Madame Examiner. I'm pleased to be here this morning and I'd like to start out with just a brief opening statement on an application for contact. I'm sharing my screen and what I'm depicting is just the vicinity view of the property taken from Exhibit 23 MADAM EXAMINER: All right. All right, good same zone is that when the application submitted, there was originally a request portion of the property from the RE Zone then the, another portion of the propert to the LAC Zone. Ultimately, the plans to request a rezoning from the RE Zone that is what was approved; and at the locent of the property taken from Exhibit 23 	applications all in the as were originally est to rezone a to the RM Zone, and ty from the RE Zone s were both modified to the RS Zone, and ower density range of c plan that was n density of 2.18 units ty information at the
 MADAM EXAMINER: All right. All right, good morning, everybody. It is approximately 9:31 on the 2nd of November, and we are here to amend, on an application to amend the conditions for A-9802 and A-9803. And, Mr. Haller, it's a pleasure to see you. MR. HALLER: Good morning, Madame Examiner. I'm pleased to be here this morning and I'd like to start out with just a brief opening statement on an application for contact. I'm sharing my screen and what I'm depicting is just the vicinity view of the property taken from Exhibit 23 which is the Planning Board's back-up from the 	applications all in the as were originally est to rezone a to the RM Zone, and ty from the RE Zone s were both modified to the RS Zone, and ower density range of c plan that was n density of 2.18 units ty information at the units.
 MADAM EXAMINER: All right. All right, good morning, everybody. It is approximately 9:31 on the 2nd of November, and we are here to amend, on an application to amend the conditions for A-9802 and A-9803. And, Mr. Haller, it's a pleasure to see you. MR. HALLER: Good morning, Madame Examiner. I'm pleased to be here this morning and I'd like to start out with just a brief opening statement on an application for contact. I'm sharing my screen and what I'm depicting is just the vicinity view of the property taken from Exhibit 23 which is the Planning Board's back-up from the (unintelligible). MADAM EXAMINER: All right. All right, good same zone is that when the application submitted, there was originally a request portion of the property from the RE Zone to the LAC Zone. Ultimately, the plans to request a rezoning from the RE Zone the the, another portion of the property the vicinity view of the property taken from Exhibit 23 which is the Planning Board's back-up from the So, after the approval of the base 	applications all in the as were originally est to rezone a to the RM Zone, and ty from the RE Zone s were both modified to the RS Zone, and ower density range of c plan that was n density of 2.18 units ty information at the units. ic plan, the
 MADAM EXAMINER: All right. All right, good morning, everybody. It is approximately 9:31 on the 2nd of November, and we are here to amend, on an application to amend the conditions for A-9802 and A-9803. And, Mr. Haller, it's a pleasure to see you. MR. HALLER: Good morning, Madame Examiner. I'm pleased to be here this morning and I'd like to start out pleased to be here this morning and I'd like to start out with just a brief opening statement on an application for contact. I'm sharing my screen and what I'm depicting is just the vicinity view of the property taken from Exhibit 23 which is the Planning Board's back-up from the MADAM EXAMINER: Okay. Let me stop you for just MADAM EXAMINER: Okay. Let me stop you for just 	applications all in the hs were originally est to rezone a to the RM Zone, and ty from the RE Zone s were both modified to the RS Zone, and ower density range of c plan that was n density of 2.18 units ty information at the units. ic plan, the ely a CDP was
 MADAM EXAMINER: All right. All right, good morning, everybody. It is approximately 9:31 on the 2nd of November, and we are here to amend, on an application to amend the conditions for A-9802 and A-9803. And, Mr. Haller, it's a pleasure to see you. MR. HALLER: Good morning, Madame Examiner. I'm pleased to be here this morning and I'd like to start out with just a brief opening statement on an application for contact. I'm sharing my screen and what I'm depicting is just the vicinity view of the property taken from Exhibit 23 which is the Planning Board's back-up from the (unintelligible). MADAM EXAMINER: Okay. Let me stop you for just manual contacts. I'm sharing my screen ont sharing your screen. MADAM EXAMINER: Okay. Let me stop you for just property sat for several years. Ultimate property sat for several years. Ultimate approved in 2005, a Preliminary Plance 	applications all in the as were originally est to rezone a to the RM Zone, and ty from the RE Zone s were both modified to the RS Zone, and ower density range of c plan that was in density of 2.18 units ty information at the units. ic plan, the ely a CDP was of Subdivision was
 MADAM EXAMINER: All right. All right, good morning, everybody. It is approximately 9:31 on the 2nd of November, and we are here to amend, on an application to amend the conditions for A-9802 and A-9803. And, Mr. Haller, it's a pleasure to see you. MR. HALLER: Good morning, Madame Examiner. I'm pleased to be here this morning and I'd like to start out with just a brief opening statement on an application for contact. I'm sharing my screen and what I'm depicting is just the vicinity view of the property taken from Exhibit 23 which is the Planning Board's back-up from the (unintelligible). MADAM EXAMINER: Okay. Let me stop you for just MR. HALLER: Oh, I, well, it Amproved in 2005, a Preliminary Plance approved in 2007 and the SDP was approved in 2007 and the SDP was app	applications all in the as were originally est to rezone a to the RM Zone, and ty from the RE Zone s were both modified to the RS Zone, and ower density range of c plan that was in density of 2.18 units ty information at the units. ic plan, the ely a CDP was of Subdivision was proved in 2013; and
 MADAM EXAMINER: All right. All right, good morning, everybody. It is approximately 9:31 on the 2nd of Movember, and we are here to amend, on an application to amend the conditions for A-9802 and A-9803. And, Mr. Haller, it's a pleasure to see you. MR. HALLER: Good morning, Madame Examiner. I'm pleased to be here this morning and I'd like to start out with just a brief opening statement on an application for contact. I'm sharing my screen and what I'm depicting is just the vicinity view of the property taken from Exhibit 23 which is the Planning Board's back-up from the (unintelligible). MADAM EXAMINER: Okay. Let me stop you for just MR. HALLER: Oh, I, well, it MR. HALLER: Oh, I, well, it 	applications all in the as were originally est to rezone a to the RM Zone, and ty from the RE Zone s were both modified to the RS Zone, and ower density range of c plan that was n density of 2.18 units ty information at the units. ic plan, the ely a CDP was of Subdivision was proved in 2013; and for up to 126 lots,
 MADAM EXAMINER: All right. All right, good morning, everybody. It is approximately 9:31 on the 2nd of November, and we are here to amend, on an application to amend the conditions for A-9802 and A-9803. And, Mr. Haller, it's a pleasure to see you. MR. HALLER: Good morning, Madame Examiner. I'm pleased to be here this morning and I'd like to start out the vicinity view of the property taken from Exhibit 23 which is the Planning Board's back-up from the (unintelligible). MADAM EXAMINER: Okay. Let me stop you for just MR. HALLER: Oh, I, well, it MADAM EXAMINER: So, does Tom have MADAM EXAMINER: So, does Tom have 	applications all in the hs were originally est to rezone a to the RM Zone, and ty from the RE Zone s were both modified to the RS Zone, and ower density range of c plan that was in density of 2.18 units ty information at the units. ic plan, the ely a CDP was of Subdivision was proved in 2013; and for up to 126 lots, by the Preliminary
 MADAM EXAMINER: All right. All right, good morning, everybody. It is approximately 9:31 on the 2nd of November, and we are here to amend, on an application to amend the conditions for A-9802 and A-9803. And, Mr. Haller, it's a pleasure to see you. MR. HALLER: Good morning, Madame Examiner. I'm pleased to be here this morning and I'd like to start out with just a brief opening statement on an application for contact. I'm sharing my screen and what I'm depicting is just the vicinity view of the property taken from Exhibit 23 which is the Planning Board's back-up from the (unintelligible). MADAM EXAMINER: Okay. Let me stop you for just mR. HALLER: Oh, I, well, it MADAM EXAMINER: So, does Tom have MR. HALLER: (Unintelligible.) MR. HALLER: (Unintelligible.) 	applications all in the as were originally est to rezone a to the RM Zone, and ty from the RE Zone s were both modified to the RS Zone, and ower density range of c plan that was in density of 2.18 units ty information at the units. ic plan, the ely a CDP was of Subdivision was proved in 2013; and for up to 126 lots, by the Preliminary e part due to
4MADAM EXAMINER: All right. All right, good4same zone is that when the application5morning, everybody. It is approximately 9:31 on the 2nd of5submitted, there was originally a reque6November, and we are here to amend, on an application to5submitted, there was originally a reque7amend the conditions for A-9802 and A-9803. And, Mr.6portion of the property from the RE Zone8Haller, it's a pleasure to see you.9MR. HALLER: Good morning, Madame Examiner. I'm9to the LAC Zone. Ultimately, the plans10pleased to be here this morning and I'd like to start out111.6 to 2.6 units per acre. And the basi11yitt he vicinity view of the property taken from Exhibit 2314which is the Planning Board's back-up from the15(unintelligible).15So, after the approval of the base16MADAM EXAMINER: Okay. Let me stop you for just16property sat for several years. Ultimate17one second because, because you're not sharing your screen.18MR. HALLER: Oh, I, well, it19MADAM EXAMINER: So, does Tom have19although the basic plan was approved20MR. HALLER: (Unintelligible.)21Plan and the SDT, and this was in larg21MADAM EXAMINER: Yeah.22Condition 7 of the basic plan which esta23okay, hold on. Can you see it now?23sizes of 6,000 square feet and 10,000 sta	applications all in the as were originally est to rezone a to the RM Zone, and ty from the RE Zone a were both modified to the RS Zone, and ower density range of c plan that was in density of 2.18 units ty information at the units. ic plan, the ely a CDP was of Subdivision was proved in 2013; and for up to 126 lots, by the Preliminary e part due to ablished minimum lot quare feet. And, but
 MADAM EXAMINER: All right. All right, good morning, everybody. It is approximately 9:31 on the 2nd of November, and we are here to amend, on an application to amend the conditions for A-9802 and A-9803. And, Mr. Haller, it's a pleasure to see you. MR. HALLER: Good morning, Madame Examiner. I'm pleased to be here this morning and I'd like to start out with just a brief opening statement on an application for contact. I'm sharing my screen and what I'm depicting is just the vicinity view of the property taken from Exhibit 23 which is the Planning Board's back-up from the (unintelligible). (unintelligible). MADAM EXAMINER: Okay. Let me stop you for just MR. HALLER: Oh, I, well, it MADAM EXAMINER: Susie made me an administrator, but, 	applications all in the as were originally est to rezone a to the RM Zone, and ty from the RE Zone a were both modified to the RS Zone, and ower density range of c plan that was n density of 2.18 units ty information at the units. ic plan, the ely a CDP was of Subdivision was proved in 2013; and for up to 126 lots, by the Preliminary e part due to ablished minimum lot quare feet. And, but he property remains

	Page 6		Page 8
-	-	-	
	'21.	1	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
2	So, the property is now under contract with BHC,	2	
	Inc., which as noted in the justification statement, is an,	3	MR. DUNLAP: Jason Dunlap, Charles P. Johnson and
	is affiliated with Mid Atlantic Homes; and the application		Associates. The address is 1751 Elton Road, Suite 300,
	before you today requests amendments to three conditions and the deletion of a fourth condition of the original basis		Silver Spring, Maryland 20903.
	the deletion of a fourth condition of the original basic	6	MADAM EXAMINER: Thank you. MR. HALLER: Thank you. Jason, how long, I mean
	plan to allow for the introduction of a new single-family	7	
	detached home product type which Mid Atlantic is designing.	8	how, what is your position with Charles P. Johnson & Associates?
9	And so, the conditions which we are proposing to		MR. DUNLAP: I'm a Senior Landscape Architect and
	delete is Condition 4, which relates to trails; and then the	10	•
	three conditions we are proposing to modify are Condition 7,		Project Manager. MR. HALLER: And how long have you held that
	which established the minimum lot sizes; Condition 8 which	12	
	established non-disturbance buffers along the eastern and southern property boundaries; and Condition 13, which	14	position? MR. DUNLAP: Since March of 2021.
	established a 50-foot setback from streams and flood plain	15	
	areas. If these changes are approved, they would allow for		you with prior to that?
	the number of lots to be increased to 124 lots, and minor	10	
	revisions to the basic plan are, are proposed to reflect the		years.
	proposed modification of the conditions.	19	MR. HALLER: And were your responsibilities
20	For the revised basic plan that was originally	20	
	submitted into the record is, is shown on the screen and is		Associates as they are with Charles P. Johnson & Associates?
	Exhibit 21; and that was the one that was submitted with the	22	MR. DUNLAP: Correct, preparing site plans,
	application; and then that has subsequently been modified		landscape plans, specific site plans, detailed site plans,
	for basically two reasons: One, because they reflect the		special exception site plans, mandatory referrals,
	changes that the Examiner requested to the original basic		comprehensive design plans, all the above.
2.5		2.5	comprehensive design plans, all the above.
	Page 7		Page 9
1	-	1	
	plan; and also, to reflect conditions which were recommended	1	MR. HALLER: Okay. And are you a registered
2	plan; and also, to reflect conditions which were recommended by Park and Planning; and the revised basic plan is now in		MR. HALLER: Okay. And are you a registered landscape architect licensed by the state of Maryland?
2 3	plan; and also, to reflect conditions which were recommended by Park and Planning; and the revised basic plan is now in the record as Exhibit 42, and that's what's shown on the	2	MR. HALLER: Okay. And are you a registered landscape architect licensed by the state of Maryland? MR. DUNLAP: Yes.
2 3 4	plan; and also, to reflect conditions which were recommended by Park and Planning; and the revised basic plan is now in the record as Exhibit 42, and that's what's shown on the screen here. So, Exhibit 42 is the basic plan that we are	2 3	MR. HALLER: Okay. And are you a registered landscape architect licensed by the state of Maryland? MR. DUNLAP: Yes. MR. HALLER: And when were you first registered as
2 3 4	plan; and also, to reflect conditions which were recommended by Park and Planning; and the revised basic plan is now in the record as Exhibit 42, and that's what's shown on the screen here. So, Exhibit 42 is the basic plan that we are seeking approval of today.	2 3 4	MR. HALLER: Okay. And are you a registered landscape architect licensed by the state of Maryland? MR. DUNLAP: Yes. MR. HALLER: And when were you first registered as
2 3 4 5 6	plan; and also, to reflect conditions which were recommended by Park and Planning; and the revised basic plan is now in the record as Exhibit 42, and that's what's shown on the screen here. So, Exhibit 42 is the basic plan that we are seeking approval of today. So, so, from, from an exhibit standpoint, the two	2 3 4 5	MR. HALLER: Okay. And are you a registered landscape architect licensed by the state of Maryland? MR. DUNLAP: Yes. MR. HALLER: And when were you first registered as a landscape architect in Maryland? MR. DUNLAP: In 2007.
2 3 4 5 6 7	plan; and also, to reflect conditions which were recommended by Park and Planning; and the revised basic plan is now in the record as Exhibit 42, and that's what's shown on the screen here. So, Exhibit 42 is the basic plan that we are seeking approval of today. So, so, from, from an exhibit standpoint, the two key, basic plan exhibits are Exhibit 33-C, which is the	2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. HALLER: Okay. And are you a registered landscape architect licensed by the state of Maryland? MR. DUNLAP: Yes. MR. HALLER: And when were you first registered as a landscape architect in Maryland? MR. DUNLAP: In 2007. MR. HALLER: Okay. And, and as you noted, during
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	plan; and also, to reflect conditions which were recommended by Park and Planning; and the revised basic plan is now in the record as Exhibit 42, and that's what's shown on the screen here. So, Exhibit 42 is the basic plan that we are seeking approval of today. So, so, from, from an exhibit standpoint, the two	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. HALLER: Okay. And are you a registered landscape architect licensed by the state of Maryland? MR. DUNLAP: Yes. MR. HALLER: And when were you first registered as a landscape architect in Maryland? MR. DUNLAP: In 2007.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	plan; and also, to reflect conditions which were recommended by Park and Planning; and the revised basic plan is now in the record as Exhibit 42, and that's what's shown on the screen here. So, Exhibit 42 is the basic plan that we are seeking approval of today. So, so, from, from an exhibit standpoint, the two key, basic plan exhibits are Exhibit 33-C, which is the signed and certified original basic plan; and Exhibit 42,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. HALLER: Okay. And are you a registered landscape architect licensed by the state of Maryland? MR. DUNLAP: Yes. MR. HALLER: And when were you first registered as a landscape architect in Maryland? MR. DUNLAP: In 2007. MR. HALLER: Okay. And, and as you noted, during your years with Ben Dyer and with CPJ, you have been
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	plan; and also, to reflect conditions which were recommended by Park and Planning; and the revised basic plan is now in the record as Exhibit 42, and that's what's shown on the screen here. So, Exhibit 42 is the basic plan that we are seeking approval of today. So, so, from, from an exhibit standpoint, the two key, basic plan exhibits are Exhibit 33-C, which is the signed and certified original basic plan; and Exhibit 42, which is the revised basic plan that would correspond to the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. HALLER: Okay. And are you a registered landscape architect licensed by the state of Maryland? MR. DUNLAP: Yes. MR. HALLER: And when were you first registered as a landscape architect in Maryland? MR. DUNLAP: In 2007. MR. HALLER: Okay. And, and as you noted, during your years with Ben Dyer and with CPJ, you have been responsible for preparing site and landscape plans for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	plan; and also, to reflect conditions which were recommended by Park and Planning; and the revised basic plan is now in the record as Exhibit 42, and that's what's shown on the screen here. So, Exhibit 42 is the basic plan that we are seeking approval of today. So, so, from, from an exhibit standpoint, the two key, basic plan exhibits are Exhibit 33-C, which is the signed and certified original basic plan; and Exhibit 42, which is the revised basic plan that would correspond to the application that's before you this morning.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. HALLER: Okay. And are you a registered landscape architect licensed by the state of Maryland? MR. DUNLAP: Yes. MR. HALLER: And when were you first registered as a landscape architect in Maryland? MR. DUNLAP: In 2007. MR. HALLER: Okay. And, and as you noted, during your years with Ben Dyer and with CPJ, you have been responsible for preparing site and landscape plans for various types of applications?
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	plan; and also, to reflect conditions which were recommended by Park and Planning; and the revised basic plan is now in the record as Exhibit 42, and that's what's shown on the screen here. So, Exhibit 42 is the basic plan that we are seeking approval of today. So, so, from, from an exhibit standpoint, the two key, basic plan exhibits are Exhibit 33-C, which is the signed and certified original basic plan; and Exhibit 42, which is the revised basic plan that would correspond to the application that's before you this morning. I have four witnesses this morning. I have Mr.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. HALLER: Okay. And are you a registered landscape architect licensed by the state of Maryland? MR. DUNLAP: Yes. MR. HALLER: And when were you first registered as a landscape architect in Maryland? MR. DUNLAP: In 2007. MR. HALLER: Okay. And, and as you noted, during your years with Ben Dyer and with CPJ, you have been responsible for preparing site and landscape plans for various types of applications? MR. DUNLAP: Correct. The majority of my work has
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	plan; and also, to reflect conditions which were recommended by Park and Planning; and the revised basic plan is now in the record as Exhibit 42, and that's what's shown on the screen here. So, Exhibit 42 is the basic plan that we are seeking approval of today. So, so, from, from an exhibit standpoint, the two key, basic plan exhibits are Exhibit 33-C, which is the signed and certified original basic plan; and Exhibit 42, which is the revised basic plan that would correspond to the application that's before you this morning. I have four witnesses this morning. I have Mr. Jason Dunlap with CPJ and Associates, who is going to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. HALLER: Okay. And are you a registered landscape architect licensed by the state of Maryland? MR. DUNLAP: Yes. MR. HALLER: And when were you first registered as a landscape architect in Maryland? MR. DUNLAP: In 2007. MR. HALLER: Okay. And, and as you noted, during your years with Ben Dyer and with CPJ, you have been responsible for preparing site and landscape plans for various types of applications? MR. DUNLAP: Correct. The majority of my work has been in Prince George's County.
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	plan; and also, to reflect conditions which were recommended by Park and Planning; and the revised basic plan is now in the record as Exhibit 42, and that's what's shown on the screen here. So, Exhibit 42 is the basic plan that we are seeking approval of today. So, so, from, from an exhibit standpoint, the two key, basic plan exhibits are Exhibit 33-C, which is the signed and certified original basic plan; and Exhibit 42, which is the revised basic plan that would correspond to the application that's before you this morning. I have four witnesses this morning. I have Mr. Jason Dunlap with CPJ and Associates, who is going to discuss the revisions to the plans; Mr. Kevin Flemming is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. HALLER: Okay. And are you a registered landscape architect licensed by the state of Maryland? MR. DUNLAP: Yes. MR. HALLER: And when were you first registered as a landscape architect in Maryland? MR. DUNLAP: In 2007. MR. HALLER: Okay. And, and as you noted, during your years with Ben Dyer and with CPJ, you have been responsible for preparing site and landscape plans for various types of applications? MR. DUNLAP: Correct. The majority of my work has been in Prince George's County. MR. HALLER: And are you familiar with the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	plan; and also, to reflect conditions which were recommended by Park and Planning; and the revised basic plan is now in the record as Exhibit 42, and that's what's shown on the screen here. So, Exhibit 42 is the basic plan that we are seeking approval of today. So, so, from, from an exhibit standpoint, the two key, basic plan exhibits are Exhibit 33-C, which is the signed and certified original basic plan; and Exhibit 42, which is the revised basic plan that would correspond to the application that's before you this morning. I have four witnesses this morning. I have Mr. Jason Dunlap with CPJ and Associates, who is going to discuss the revisions to the plans; Mr. Kevin Flemming is with BHC, Inc., and is going to discuss the proposed	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. HALLER: Okay. And are you a registered landscape architect licensed by the state of Maryland? MR. DUNLAP: Yes. MR. HALLER: And when were you first registered as a landscape architect in Maryland? MR. DUNLAP: In 2007. MR. HALLER: Okay. And, and as you noted, during your years with Ben Dyer and with CPJ, you have been responsible for preparing site and landscape plans for various types of applications? MR. DUNLAP: Correct. The majority of my work has been in Prince George's County. MR. HALLER: And are you familiar with the provisions of the Prince George's County Code generally
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	plan; and also, to reflect conditions which were recommended by Park and Planning; and the revised basic plan is now in the record as Exhibit 42, and that's what's shown on the screen here. So, Exhibit 42 is the basic plan that we are seeking approval of today. So, so, from, from an exhibit standpoint, the two key, basic plan exhibits are Exhibit 33-C, which is the signed and certified original basic plan; and Exhibit 42, which is the revised basic plan that would correspond to the application that's before you this morning. I have four witnesses this morning. I have Mr. Jason Dunlap with CPJ and Associates, who is going to discuss the revisions to the plans; Mr. Kevin Flemming is with BHC, Inc., and is going to discuss the proposed revisions; Mike Lenhart is going to address the traffic	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. HALLER: Okay. And are you a registered landscape architect licensed by the state of Maryland? MR. DUNLAP: Yes. MR. HALLER: And when were you first registered as a landscape architect in Maryland? MR. DUNLAP: In 2007. MR. HALLER: Okay. And, and as you noted, during your years with Ben Dyer and with CPJ, you have been responsible for preparing site and landscape plans for various types of applications? MR. DUNLAP: Correct. The majority of my work has been in Prince George's County. MR. HALLER: And are you familiar with the provisions of the Prince George's County Code generally related to the preparation of site and landscape plans, including preliminary plans of subdivision, detailed site
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	plan; and also, to reflect conditions which were recommended by Park and Planning; and the revised basic plan is now in the record as Exhibit 42, and that's what's shown on the screen here. So, Exhibit 42 is the basic plan that we are seeking approval of today. So, so, from, from an exhibit standpoint, the two key, basic plan exhibits are Exhibit 33-C, which is the signed and certified original basic plan; and Exhibit 42, which is the revised basic plan that would correspond to the application that's before you this morning. I have four witnesses this morning. I have Mr. Jason Dunlap with CPJ and Associates, who is going to discuss the revisions to the plans; Mr. Kevin Flemming is with BHC, Inc., and is going to discuss the proposed revisions; Mike Lenhart is going to address the traffic issues; and Mr. Mark Ferguson, the planning issues. So, I'd	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. HALLER: Okay. And are you a registered landscape architect licensed by the state of Maryland? MR. DUNLAP: Yes. MR. HALLER: And when were you first registered as a landscape architect in Maryland? MR. DUNLAP: In 2007. MR. HALLER: Okay. And, and as you noted, during your years with Ben Dyer and with CPJ, you have been responsible for preparing site and landscape plans for various types of applications? MR. DUNLAP: Correct. The majority of my work has been in Prince George's County. MR. HALLER: And are you familiar with the provisions of the Prince George's County Code generally related to the preparation of site and landscape plans, including preliminary plans of subdivision, detailed site
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	plan; and also, to reflect conditions which were recommended by Park and Planning; and the revised basic plan is now in the record as Exhibit 42, and that's what's shown on the screen here. So, Exhibit 42 is the basic plan that we are seeking approval of today. So, so, from, from an exhibit standpoint, the two key, basic plan exhibits are Exhibit 33-C, which is the signed and certified original basic plan; and Exhibit 42, which is the revised basic plan that would correspond to the application that's before you this morning. I have four witnesses this morning. I have Mr. Jason Dunlap with CPJ and Associates, who is going to discuss the revisions to the plans; Mr. Kevin Flemming is with BHC, Inc., and is going to discuss the proposed revisions; Mike Lenhart is going to address the traffic issues; and Mr. Mark Ferguson, the planning issues. So, I'd like to start this morning by calling Mr. Jason Dunlap, CPJ	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. HALLER: Okay. And are you a registered landscape architect licensed by the state of Maryland? MR. DUNLAP: Yes. MR. HALLER: And when were you first registered as a landscape architect in Maryland? MR. DUNLAP: In 2007. MR. HALLER: Okay. And, and as you noted, during your years with Ben Dyer and with CPJ, you have been responsible for preparing site and landscape plans for various types of applications? MR. DUNLAP: Correct. The majority of my work has been in Prince George's County. MR. HALLER: And are you familiar with the provisions of the Prince George's County Code generally related to the preparation of site and landscape plans, including preliminary plans of subdivision, detailed site plans, basic plans, comprehensive design plans and specific
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	plan; and also, to reflect conditions which were recommended by Park and Planning; and the revised basic plan is now in the record as Exhibit 42, and that's what's shown on the screen here. So, Exhibit 42 is the basic plan that we are seeking approval of today. So, so, from, from an exhibit standpoint, the two key, basic plan exhibits are Exhibit 33-C, which is the signed and certified original basic plan; and Exhibit 42, which is the revised basic plan that would correspond to the application that's before you this morning. I have four witnesses this morning. I have Mr. Jason Dunlap with CPJ and Associates, who is going to discuss the revisions to the plans; Mr. Kevin Flemming is with BHC, Inc., and is going to discuss the proposed revisions; Mike Lenhart is going to address the traffic issues; and Mr. Mark Ferguson, the planning issues. So, I'd like to start this morning by calling Mr. Jason Dunlap, CPJ and Associates.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. HALLER: Okay. And are you a registered landscape architect licensed by the state of Maryland? MR. DUNLAP: Yes. MR. HALLER: And when were you first registered as a landscape architect in Maryland? MR. DUNLAP: In 2007. MR. HALLER: Okay. And, and as you noted, during your years with Ben Dyer and with CPJ, you have been responsible for preparing site and landscape plans for various types of applications? MR. DUNLAP: Correct. The majority of my work has been in Prince George's County. MR. HALLER: And are you familiar with the provisions of the Prince George's County Code generally related to the preparation of site and landscape plans, including preliminary plans of subdivision, detailed site plans, basic plans, comprehensive design plans and specific design plans?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	plan; and also, to reflect conditions which were recommended by Park and Planning; and the revised basic plan is now in the record as Exhibit 42, and that's what's shown on the screen here. So, Exhibit 42 is the basic plan that we are seeking approval of today. So, so, from, from an exhibit standpoint, the two key, basic plan exhibits are Exhibit 33-C, which is the signed and certified original basic plan; and Exhibit 42, which is the revised basic plan that would correspond to the application that's before you this morning. I have four witnesses this morning. I have Mr. Jason Dunlap with CPJ and Associates, who is going to discuss the revisions to the plans; Mr. Kevin Flemming is with BHC, Inc., and is going to discuss the proposed revisions; Mike Lenhart is going to address the traffic issues; and Mr. Mark Ferguson, the planning issues. So, I'd like to start this morning by calling Mr. Jason Dunlap, CPJ and Associates. MR. DUNLAP: Good morning, everyone.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. HALLER: Okay. And are you a registered landscape architect licensed by the state of Maryland? MR. DUNLAP: Yes. MR. HALLER: And when were you first registered as a landscape architect in Maryland? MR. DUNLAP: In 2007. MR. HALLER: Okay. And, and as you noted, during your years with Ben Dyer and with CPJ, you have been responsible for preparing site and landscape plans for various types of applications? MR. DUNLAP: Correct. The majority of my work has been in Prince George's County. MR. HALLER: And are you familiar with the provisions of the Prince George's County Code generally related to the preparation of site and landscape plans, including preliminary plans of subdivision, detailed site plans, basic plans, comprehensive design plans and specific design plans? MR. DUNLAP: Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	plan; and also, to reflect conditions which were recommended by Park and Planning; and the revised basic plan is now in the record as Exhibit 42, and that's what's shown on the screen here. So, Exhibit 42 is the basic plan that we are seeking approval of today. So, so, from, from an exhibit standpoint, the two key, basic plan exhibits are Exhibit 33-C, which is the signed and certified original basic plan; and Exhibit 42, which is the revised basic plan that would correspond to the application that's before you this morning. I have four witnesses this morning. I have Mr. Jason Dunlap with CPJ and Associates, who is going to discuss the revisions to the plans; Mr. Kevin Flemming is with BHC, Inc., and is going to discuss the proposed revisions; Mike Lenhart is going to address the traffic issues; and Mr. Mark Ferguson, the planning issues. So, I'd like to start this morning by calling Mr. Jason Dunlap, CPJ and Associates. MR. DUNLAP: Good morning, everyone. MADAM EXAMINER: Hi, good morning, Mr. Dunlap. I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. HALLER: Okay. And are you a registered landscape architect licensed by the state of Maryland? MR. DUNLAP: Yes. MR. HALLER: And when were you first registered as a landscape architect in Maryland? MR. DUNLAP: In 2007. MR. HALLER: Okay. And, and as you noted, during your years with Ben Dyer and with CPJ, you have been responsible for preparing site and landscape plans for various types of applications? MR. DUNLAP: Correct. The majority of my work has been in Prince George's County. MR. HALLER: And are you familiar with the provisions of the Prince George's County Code generally related to the preparation of site and landscape plans, including preliminary plans of subdivision, detailed site plans, basic plans, comprehensive design plans and specific design plans? MR. HALLER: Madam Examiner, I have submitted into
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	plan; and also, to reflect conditions which were recommended by Park and Planning; and the revised basic plan is now in the record as Exhibit 42, and that's what's shown on the screen here. So, Exhibit 42 is the basic plan that we are seeking approval of today. So, so, from, from an exhibit standpoint, the two key, basic plan exhibits are Exhibit 33-C, which is the signed and certified original basic plan; and Exhibit 42, which is the revised basic plan that would correspond to the application that's before you this morning. I have four witnesses this morning. I have Mr. Jason Dunlap with CPJ and Associates, who is going to discuss the revisions to the plans; Mr. Kevin Flemming is with BHC, Inc., and is going to discuss the proposed revisions; Mike Lenhart is going to address the traffic issues; and Mr. Mark Ferguson, the planning issues. So, I'd like to start this morning by calling Mr. Jason Dunlap, CPJ and Associates. MR. DUNLAP: Good morning, everyone. MADAM EXAMINER: Hi, good morning, Mr. Dunlap. I need you to raise your right hand. I need to swear you in,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. HALLER: Okay. And are you a registered landscape architect licensed by the state of Maryland? MR. DUNLAP: Yes. MR. HALLER: And when were you first registered as a landscape architect in Maryland? MR. DUNLAP: In 2007. MR. HALLER: Okay. And, and as you noted, during your years with Ben Dyer and with CPJ, you have been responsible for preparing site and landscape plans for various types of applications? MR. DUNLAP: Correct. The majority of my work has been in Prince George's County. MR. HALLER: And are you familiar with the provisions of the Prince George's County Code generally related to the preparation of site and landscape plans, including preliminary plans of subdivision, detailed site plans, basic plans, comprehensive design plans and specific design plans? MR. DUNLAP: Yes. MR. HALLER: Madam Examiner, I have submitted into the record Exhibit 37, which is Mr. Dunlap's resume, and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	plan; and also, to reflect conditions which were recommended by Park and Planning; and the revised basic plan is now in the record as Exhibit 42, and that's what's shown on the screen here. So, Exhibit 42 is the basic plan that we are seeking approval of today. So, so, from, from an exhibit standpoint, the two key, basic plan exhibits are Exhibit 33-C, which is the signed and certified original basic plan; and Exhibit 42, which is the revised basic plan that would correspond to the application that's before you this morning. I have four witnesses this morning. I have Mr. Jason Dunlap with CPJ and Associates, who is going to discuss the revisions to the plans; Mr. Kevin Flemming is with BHC, Inc., and is going to discuss the proposed revisions; Mike Lenhart is going to address the traffic issues; and Mr. Mark Ferguson, the planning issues. So, I'd like to start this morning by calling Mr. Jason Dunlap, CPJ and Associates. MR. DUNLAP: Good morning, everyone. MADAM EXAMINER: Hi, good morning, Mr. Dunlap. I need you to raise your right hand. I need to swear you in, please. Thank you. Do you promise you swear and affirm in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. HALLER: Okay. And are you a registered landscape architect licensed by the state of Maryland? MR. DUNLAP: Yes. MR. HALLER: And when were you first registered as a landscape architect in Maryland? MR. DUNLAP: In 2007. MR. HALLER: Okay. And, and as you noted, during your years with Ben Dyer and with CPJ, you have been responsible for preparing site and landscape plans for various types of applications? MR. DUNLAP: Correct. The majority of my work has been in Prince George's County. MR. HALLER: And are you familiar with the provisions of the Prince George's County Code generally related to the preparation of site and landscape plans, including preliminary plans of subdivision, detailed site plans, basic plans, comprehensive design plans and specific design plans? MR. HALLER: Madam Examiner, I have submitted into the record Exhibit 37, which is Mr. Dunlap's resume, and would ask that, that that be accepted into the record as his resume.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	plan; and also, to reflect conditions which were recommended by Park and Planning; and the revised basic plan is now in the record as Exhibit 42, and that's what's shown on the screen here. So, Exhibit 42 is the basic plan that we are seeking approval of today. So, so, from, from an exhibit standpoint, the two key, basic plan exhibits are Exhibit 33-C, which is the signed and certified original basic plan; and Exhibit 42, which is the revised basic plan that would correspond to the application that's before you this morning. I have four witnesses this morning. I have Mr. Jason Dunlap with CPJ and Associates, who is going to discuss the revisions to the plans; Mr. Kevin Flemming is with BHC, Inc., and is going to discuss the proposed revisions; Mike Lenhart is going to address the traffic issues; and Mr. Mark Ferguson, the planning issues. So, I'd like to start this morning by calling Mr. Jason Dunlap, CPJ and Associates. MR. DUNLAP: Good morning, everyone. MADAM EXAMINER: Hi, good morning, Mr. Dunlap. I need you to raise your right hand. I need to swear you in, please. Thank you. Do you promise you swear and affirm in the matter now pending to tell the truth, the whole truth	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. HALLER: Okay. And are you a registered landscape architect licensed by the state of Maryland? MR. DUNLAP: Yes. MR. HALLER: And when were you first registered as a landscape architect in Maryland? MR. DUNLAP: In 2007. MR. HALLER: Okay. And, and as you noted, during your years with Ben Dyer and with CPJ, you have been responsible for preparing site and landscape plans for various types of applications? MR. DUNLAP: Correct. The majority of my work has been in Prince George's County. MR. HALLER: And are you familiar with the provisions of the Prince George's County Code generally related to the preparation of site and landscape plans, including preliminary plans of subdivision, detailed site plans, basic plans, comprehensive design plans and specific design plans? MR. HALLER: Madam Examiner, I have submitted into the record Exhibit 37, which is Mr. Dunlap's resume, and would ask that, that that be accepted into the record as his resume.

	Page 10		Page 12
1	premised upon Mr. Dunlap's experience developing plans and	1	approval.
	being a registered landscape architect, that he be accepted	2	
	as a registered landscape architect qualified to prepare		McNeill found that wasn't certified. All right. And so,
	site and landscape plans in Prince George's County.		but important to this conversation is Exhibit 42, and Mr
5	MADAM EXAMINER: Mr. Brown?	5	MR. HALLER: Correct.
6	MR. BROWN: And, Mr. Dunlap, did you assist in the	6	MADAM EXAMINER: Dunlap, Mr. Dunlap prepared
	preparation of the Basic Plan and other graphic detail		Exhibit 42?
	that's part of this application today?	8	MR. DUNLAP: Yes, along with the changes to 33-C
9	MR. DUNLAP: Yes.	-	so that it could be certified.
10	MR. BROWN: I have no objection to qualification	10	MADAM EXAMINER: Okay.
	of Mr. Dunlap in the field of landscape architecture.	11	MR. HALLER: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Dunlap. What
12	MADAM EXAMINER: Have you ever testified before a	12	is the current zoning of the property?
	body under oath?	13	MR. DUNLAP: The current zoning is LCD, Legacy
14	MR. DUNLAP: Not before, no.	14	Comprehensive Design; and, previously, it was RS.
15	MADAM EXAMINER: Have you ever testified before a	15	MR. HALLER: Okay. And are you familiar with the
	body not under oath?		current Basic Plan for Kenwood Village?
17	MR. DUNLAP: I don't believe so.	17	MR. DUNLAP: I am.
18	MADAM EXAMINER: This is your first foire?	18	MR. HALLER: And is that Basic Plan the one that
19	MR. DUNLAP: Yes.	19	was referenced in the prior record as Exhibit J-113?
20	MADAM EXAMINER: All right, Mr. Haller, I am going	20	MR. DUNLAP: Correct.
21	to accept Mr. Dunlap as an expert in the field of landscape	21	MR. HALLER: And I, let me pull up again Exhibit
22	architecture.	22	21, which is the original Basic Plan exhibit. Mr. Dunlap,
23	MR. HALLER: Thank you, Madam Examiner. Jason,	23	do you recognize this as the Basic Plan that was found in
24	has Charles P. Johnson & Associates been retained by the	24	the District Council file?
25	Applicant BHC, Inc. in this case to provide landscape	25	MR. DUNLAP: Yes, that was Exhibit J-113.
	Page 11		Down 42
	Fage II		Page 13
1	architecture and project design services related to the	1	
	architecture and project design services related to the		MR. HALLER: Okay. And were you asked to modify
2	architecture and project design services related to the proposed development?	2 3	MR. HALLER: Okay. And were you asked to modify this plan?
2 3 4	architecture and project design services related to the proposed development? MR. DUNLAP: Yes, we have.	2 3 4	MR. HALLER: Okay. And were you asked to modify this plan? MR. DUNLAP: We were. The Basic Plan originally
2 3 4 5	architecture and project design services related to the proposed development? MR. DUNLAP: Yes, we have. MR. HALLER: And were you asked by the Applicant	2 3 4 5	MR. HALLER: Okay. And were you asked to modify this plan? MR. DUNLAP: We were. The Basic Plan originally didn't reflect the conditions of the approval by District
2 3 4 5	architecture and project design services related to the proposed development? MR. DUNLAP: Yes, we have. MR. HALLER: And were you asked by the Applicant in this application to prepare an amended Basic Plan for	2 3 4 5 6	MR. HALLER: Okay. And were you asked to modify this plan? MR. DUNLAP: We were. The Basic Plan originally didn't reflect the conditions of the approval by District Council, so we were asked and it was also never
2 3 4 5 6	architecture and project design services related to the proposed development? MR. DUNLAP: Yes, we have. MR. HALLER: And were you asked by the Applicant in this application to prepare an amended Basic Plan for Kenwood Village?	2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. HALLER: Okay. And were you asked to modify this plan? MR. DUNLAP: We were. The Basic Plan originally didn't reflect the conditions of the approval by District Council, so we were asked and it was also never certified, so we were asked by the Zoning Hearing Examiner to update it to reflect the Basic Plan as approved so that it could be certified.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	architecture and project design services related to the proposed development? MR. DUNLAP: Yes, we have. MR. HALLER: And were you asked by the Applicant in this application to prepare an amended Basic Plan for Kenwood Village? MR. DUNLAP: Yes. MR. HALLER: And did you prepare the Amended Basic Plan included with the Application?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. HALLER: Okay. And were you asked to modify this plan? MR. DUNLAP: We were. The Basic Plan originally didn't reflect the conditions of the approval by District Council, so we were asked and it was also never certified, so we were asked by the Zoning Hearing Examiner to update it to reflect the Basic Plan as approved so that it could be certified. MR. HALLER: And I'm going to pull up Exhibit 33-
2 3 6 7 8 9	architecture and project design services related to the proposed development? MR. DUNLAP: Yes, we have. MR. HALLER: And were you asked by the Applicant in this application to prepare an amended Basic Plan for Kenwood Village? MR. DUNLAP: Yes. MR. HALLER: And did you prepare the Amended Basic Plan included with the Application? MR. DUNLAP: I did, along with help with a few	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. HALLER: Okay. And were you asked to modify this plan? MR. DUNLAP: We were. The Basic Plan originally didn't reflect the conditions of the approval by District Council, so we were asked and it was also never certified, so we were asked by the Zoning Hearing Examiner to update it to reflect the Basic Plan as approved so that it could be certified. MR. HALLER: And I'm going to pull up Exhibit 33- C. And is this, is this a copy of the, of the revised Basic
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11	architecture and project design services related to the proposed development? MR. DUNLAP: Yes, we have. MR. HALLER: And were you asked by the Applicant in this application to prepare an amended Basic Plan for Kenwood Village? MR. DUNLAP: Yes. MR. HALLER: And did you prepare the Amended Basic Plan included with the Application? MR. DUNLAP: I did, along with help with a few people under, under my supervision.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. HALLER: Okay. And were you asked to modify this plan? MR. DUNLAP: We were. The Basic Plan originally didn't reflect the conditions of the approval by District Council, so we were asked and it was also never certified, so we were asked by the Zoning Hearing Examiner to update it to reflect the Basic Plan as approved so that it could be certified. MR. HALLER: And I'm going to pull up Exhibit 33- C. And is this, is this a copy of the, of the revised Basic Plan that you've prepared?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	architecture and project design services related to the proposed development? MR. DUNLAP: Yes, we have. MR. HALLER: And were you asked by the Applicant in this application to prepare an amended Basic Plan for Kenwood Village? MR. DUNLAP: Yes. MR. HALLER: And did you prepare the Amended Basic Plan included with the Application? MR. DUNLAP: I did, along with help with a few people under, under my supervision. MR. HALLER: And what is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. HALLER: Okay. And were you asked to modify this plan? MR. DUNLAP: We were. The Basic Plan originally didn't reflect the conditions of the approval by District Council, so we were asked and it was also never certified, so we were asked by the Zoning Hearing Examiner to update it to reflect the Basic Plan as approved so that it could be certified. MR. HALLER: And I'm going to pull up Exhibit 33- C. And is this, is this a copy of the, of the revised Basic Plan that you've prepared? MR. DUNLAP: Yes, it is.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	architecture and project design services related to the proposed development? MR. DUNLAP: Yes, we have. MR. HALLER: And were you asked by the Applicant in this application to prepare an amended Basic Plan for Kenwood Village? MR. DUNLAP: Yes. MR. HALLER: And did you prepare the Amended Basic Plan included with the Application? MR. DUNLAP: I did, along with help with a few people under, under my supervision. MR. HALLER: And what is MADAM EXAMINER: Just for clarifying, you prepared	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. HALLER: Okay. And were you asked to modify this plan? MR. DUNLAP: We were. The Basic Plan originally didn't reflect the conditions of the approval by District Council, so we were asked and it was also never certified, so we were asked by the Zoning Hearing Examiner to update it to reflect the Basic Plan as approved so that it could be certified. MR. HALLER: And I'm going to pull up Exhibit 33- C. And is this, is this a copy of the, of the revised Basic Plan that you've prepared? MR. DUNLAP: Yes, it is. MR. HALLER: Can you identify specifically the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	architecture and project design services related to the proposed development? MR. DUNLAP: Yes, we have. MR. HALLER: And were you asked by the Applicant in this application to prepare an amended Basic Plan for Kenwood Village? MR. DUNLAP: Yes. MR. HALLER: And did you prepare the Amended Basic Plan included with the Application? MR. DUNLAP: I did, along with help with a few people under, under my supervision. MR. HALLER: And what is MADAM EXAMINER: Just for clarifying, you prepared Exhibit 42?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. HALLER: Okay. And were you asked to modify this plan? MR. DUNLAP: We were. The Basic Plan originally didn't reflect the conditions of the approval by District Council, so we were asked and it was also never certified, so we were asked by the Zoning Hearing Examiner to update it to reflect the Basic Plan as approved so that it could be certified. MR. HALLER: And I'm going to pull up Exhibit 33- C. And is this, is this a copy of the, of the revised Basic Plan that you've prepared? MR. DUNLAP: Yes, it is. MR. HALLER: Can you identify specifically the modifications that were made to Exhibit 33-C as compared to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	architecture and project design services related to the proposed development? MR. DUNLAP: Yes, we have. MR. HALLER: And were you asked by the Applicant in this application to prepare an amended Basic Plan for Kenwood Village? MR. DUNLAP: Yes. MR. HALLER: And did you prepare the Amended Basic Plan included with the Application? MR. DUNLAP: I did, along with help with a few people under, under my supervision. MR. HALLER: And what is MADAM EXAMINER: Just for clarifying, you prepared Exhibit 42? MR. DUNLAP: We prepared Exhibit 42, the Final	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. HALLER: Okay. And were you asked to modify this plan? MR. DUNLAP: We were. The Basic Plan originally didn't reflect the conditions of the approval by District Council, so we were asked and it was also never certified, so we were asked by the Zoning Hearing Examiner to update it to reflect the Basic Plan as approved so that it could be certified. MR. HALLER: And I'm going to pull up Exhibit 33- C. And is this, is this a copy of the, of the revised Basic Plan that you've prepared? MR. DUNLAP: Yes, it is. MR. HALLER: Can you identify specifically the modifications that were made to Exhibit 33-C as compared to the old Exhibit J-113?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	architecture and project design services related to the proposed development? MR. DUNLAP: Yes, we have. MR. HALLER: And were you asked by the Applicant in this application to prepare an amended Basic Plan for Kenwood Village? MR. DUNLAP: Yes. MR. HALLER: And did you prepare the Amended Basic Plan included with the Application? MR. DUNLAP: I did, along with help with a few people under, under my supervision. MR. HALLER: And what is MADAM EXAMINER: Just for clarifying, you prepared Exhibit 42? MR. DUNLAP: We prepared Exhibit 42, the Final Plan, the Revised Basic Plan, but also the Amended Basic	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. HALLER: Okay. And were you asked to modify this plan? MR. DUNLAP: We were. The Basic Plan originally didn't reflect the conditions of the approval by District Council, so we were asked and it was also never certified, so we were asked by the Zoning Hearing Examiner to update it to reflect the Basic Plan as approved so that it could be certified. MR. HALLER: And I'm going to pull up Exhibit 33- C. And is this, is this a copy of the, of the revised Basic Plan that you've prepared? MR. DUNLAP: Yes, it is. MR. HALLER: Can you identify specifically the modifications that were made to Exhibit 33-C as compared to the old Exhibit J-113? MR. DUNLAP: Sure. The first modification that we
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	architecture and project design services related to the proposed development? MR. DUNLAP: Yes, we have. MR. HALLER: And were you asked by the Applicant in this application to prepare an amended Basic Plan for Kenwood Village? MR. DUNLAP: Yes. MR. HALLER: And did you prepare the Amended Basic Plan included with the Application? MR. DUNLAP: I did, along with help with a few people under, under my supervision. MR. HALLER: And what is MADAM EXAMINER: Just for clarifying, you prepared Exhibit 42? MR. DUNLAP: We prepared Exhibit 42, the Final Plan, the Revised Basic Plan, but also the Amended Basic Plan that was submitted to be put on record.	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. HALLER: Okay. And were you asked to modify this plan? MR. DUNLAP: We were. The Basic Plan originally didn't reflect the conditions of the approval by District Council, so we were asked and it was also never certified, so we were asked by the Zoning Hearing Examiner to update it to reflect the Basic Plan as approved so that it could be certified. MR. HALLER: And I'm going to pull up Exhibit 33- C. And is this, is this a copy of the, of the revised Basic Plan that you've prepared? MR. DUNLAP: Yes, it is. MR. HALLER: Can you identify specifically the modifications that were made to Exhibit 33-C as compared to the old Exhibit J-113? MR. DUNLAP: Sure. The first modification that we made was to locate and label the 50-foot non-disturbed
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	architecture and project design services related to the proposed development? MR. DUNLAP: Yes, we have. MR. HALLER: And were you asked by the Applicant in this application to prepare an amended Basic Plan for Kenwood Village? MR. DUNLAP: Yes. MR. HALLER: And did you prepare the Amended Basic Plan included with the Application? MR. DUNLAP: I did, along with help with a few people under, under my supervision. MR. HALLER: And what is MADAM EXAMINER: Just for clarifying, you prepared Exhibit 42? MR. DUNLAP: We prepared Exhibit 42, the Final Plan, the Revised Basic Plan, but also the Amended Basic Plan that was submitted to be put on record. MADAM EXAMINER: That would be Exhibit 21?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. HALLER: Okay. And were you asked to modify this plan? MR. DUNLAP: We were. The Basic Plan originally didn't reflect the conditions of the approval by District Council, so we were asked and it was also never certified, so we were asked by the Zoning Hearing Examiner to update it to reflect the Basic Plan as approved so that it could be certified. MR. HALLER: And I'm going to pull up Exhibit 33- C. And is this, is this a copy of the, of the revised Basic Plan that you've prepared? MR. DUNLAP: Yes, it is. MR. HALLER: Can you identify specifically the modifications that were made to Exhibit 33-C as compared to the old Exhibit J-113? MR. DUNLAP: Sure. The first modification that we made was to locate and label the 50-foot non-disturbed buffers on the south and eastern border. After that, we
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	architecture and project design services related to the proposed development? MR. DUNLAP: Yes, we have. MR. HALLER: And were you asked by the Applicant in this application to prepare an amended Basic Plan for Kenwood Village? MR. DUNLAP: Yes. MR. HALLER: And did you prepare the Amended Basic Plan included with the Application? MR. DUNLAP: I did, along with help with a few people under, under my supervision. MR. HALLER: And what is MADAM EXAMINER: Just for clarifying, you prepared Exhibit 42? MR. DUNLAP: We prepared Exhibit 42, the Final Plan, the Revised Basic Plan, but also the Amended Basic Plan that was submitted to be put on record. MADAM EXAMINER: That would be Exhibit 21? MR. DUNLAP: Correct.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. HALLER: Okay. And were you asked to modify this plan? MR. DUNLAP: We were. The Basic Plan originally didn't reflect the conditions of the approval by District Council, so we were asked and it was also never certified, so we were asked by the Zoning Hearing Examiner to update it to reflect the Basic Plan as approved so that it could be certified. MR. HALLER: And I'm going to pull up Exhibit 33- C. And is this, is this a copy of the, of the revised Basic Plan that you've prepared? MR. DUNLAP: Yes, it is. MR. HALLER: Can you identify specifically the modifications that were made to Exhibit 33-C as compared to the old Exhibit J-113? MR. DUNLAP: Sure. The first modification that we made was to locate and label the 50-foot non-disturbed buffers on the south and eastern border. After that, we added the notes that are shown on the top half of the plan.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	architecture and project design services related to the proposed development? MR. DUNLAP: Yes, we have. MR. HALLER: And were you asked by the Applicant in this application to prepare an amended Basic Plan for Kenwood Village? MR. DUNLAP: Yes. MR. HALLER: And did you prepare the Amended Basic Plan included with the Application? MR. DUNLAP: I did, along with help with a few people under, under my supervision. MR. HALLER: And what is MADAM EXAMINER: Just for clarifying, you prepared Exhibit 42? MR. DUNLAP: We prepared Exhibit 42, the Final Plan, the Revised Basic Plan, but also the Amended Basic Plan that was submitted to be put on record. MADAM EXAMINER: That would be Exhibit 21? MR. DUNLAP: Correct. MR. HALLER: I think it's part of 33-C.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. HALLER: Okay. And were you asked to modify this plan? MR. DUNLAP: We were. The Basic Plan originally didn't reflect the conditions of the approval by District Council, so we were asked and it was also never certified, so we were asked by the Zoning Hearing Examiner to update it to reflect the Basic Plan as approved so that it could be certified. MR. HALLER: And I'm going to pull up Exhibit 33- C. And is this, is this a copy of the, of the revised Basic Plan that you've prepared? MR. DUNLAP: Yes, it is. MR. HALLER: Can you identify specifically the modifications that were made to Exhibit 33-C as compared to the old Exhibit J-113? MR. DUNLAP: Sure. The first modification that we made was to locate and label the 50-foot non-disturbed buffers on the south and eastern border. After that, we added the notes that are shown on the top half of the plan. Note No. 1 states that no direct access to any residential
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	architecture and project design services related to the proposed development? MR. DUNLAP: Yes, we have. MR. HALLER: And were you asked by the Applicant in this application to prepare an amended Basic Plan for Kenwood Village? MR. DUNLAP: Yes. MR. HALLER: And did you prepare the Amended Basic Plan included with the Application? MR. DUNLAP: I did, along with help with a few people under, under my supervision. MR. HALLER: And what is MADAM EXAMINER: Just for clarifying, you prepared Exhibit 42? MR. DUNLAP: We prepared Exhibit 42, the Final Plan, the Revised Basic Plan, but also the Amended Basic Plan that was submitted to be put on record. MADAM EXAMINER: That would be Exhibit 21? MR. DUNLAP: Correct. MR. HALLER: I think it's part of 33-C. MADAM EXAMINER: 33-C, I thought was the original	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. HALLER: Okay. And were you asked to modify this plan? MR. DUNLAP: We were. The Basic Plan originally didn't reflect the conditions of the approval by District Council, so we were asked and it was also never certified, so we were asked by the Zoning Hearing Examiner to update it to reflect the Basic Plan as approved so that it could be certified. MR. HALLER: And I'm going to pull up Exhibit 33- C. And is this, is this a copy of the, of the revised Basic Plan that you've prepared? MR. DUNLAP: Yes, it is. MR. HALLER: Can you identify specifically the modifications that were made to Exhibit 33-C as compared to the old Exhibit J-113? MR. DUNLAP: Sure. The first modification that we made was to locate and label the 50-foot non-disturbed buffers on the south and eastern border. After that, we added the notes that are shown on the top half of the plan. Note No. 1 states that no direct access to any residential lots would be permitted from White House Road or Harry S.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	architecture and project design services related to the proposed development? MR. DUNLAP: Yes, we have. MR. HALLER: And were you asked by the Applicant in this application to prepare an amended Basic Plan for Kenwood Village? MR. DUNLAP: Yes. MR. HALLER: And did you prepare the Amended Basic Plan included with the Application? MR. DUNLAP: I did, along with help with a few people under, under my supervision. MR. HALLER: And what is MADAM EXAMINER: Just for clarifying, you prepared Exhibit 42? MR. DUNLAP: We prepared Exhibit 42, the Final Plan, the Revised Basic Plan, but also the Amended Basic Plan that was submitted to be put on record. MADAM EXAMINER: That would be Exhibit 21? MR. DUNLAP: Correct. MR. HALLER: I think it's part of 33-C. MADAM EXAMINER: 33-C, I thought was the original Basic Plan?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. HALLER: Okay. And were you asked to modify this plan? MR. DUNLAP: We were. The Basic Plan originally didn't reflect the conditions of the approval by District Council, so we were asked and it was also never certified, so we were asked by the Zoning Hearing Examiner to update it to reflect the Basic Plan as approved so that it could be certified. MR. HALLER: And I'm going to pull up Exhibit 33- C. And is this, is this a copy of the, of the revised Basic Plan that you've prepared? MR. DUNLAP: Yes, it is. MR. HALLER: Can you identify specifically the modifications that were made to Exhibit 33-C as compared to the old Exhibit J-113? MR. DUNLAP: Sure. The first modification that we made was to locate and label the 50-foot non-disturbed buffers on the south and eastern border. After that, we added the notes that are shown on the top half of the plan. Note No. 1 states that no direct access to any residential lots would be permitted from White House Road or Harry S. Truman Drive, and that reflects Condition 1 of the Council,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	architecture and project design services related to the proposed development? MR. DUNLAP: Yes, we have. MR. HALLER: And were you asked by the Applicant in this application to prepare an amended Basic Plan for Kenwood Village? MR. DUNLAP: Yes. MR. HALLER: And did you prepare the Amended Basic Plan included with the Application? MR. DUNLAP: I did, along with help with a few people under, under my supervision. MR. HALLER: And what is MADAM EXAMINER: Just for clarifying, you prepared Exhibit 42? MR. DUNLAP: We prepared Exhibit 42, the Final Plan, the Revised Basic Plan, but also the Amended Basic Plan that was submitted to be put on record. MADAM EXAMINER: That would be Exhibit 21? MR. DUNLAP: Correct. MR. HALLER: I think it's part of 33-C. MADAM EXAMINER: 33-C, I thought was the original Basic Plan? MR. HALLER: That is the original Basic Plan that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. HALLER: Okay. And were you asked to modify this plan? MR. DUNLAP: We were. The Basic Plan originally didn't reflect the conditions of the approval by District Council, so we were asked and it was also never certified, so we were asked by the Zoning Hearing Examiner to update it to reflect the Basic Plan as approved so that it could be certified. MR. HALLER: And I'm going to pull up Exhibit 33- C. And is this, is this a copy of the, of the revised Basic Plan that you've prepared? MR. DUNLAP: Yes, it is. MR. HALLER: Can you identify specifically the modifications that were made to Exhibit 33-C as compared to the old Exhibit J-113? MR. DUNLAP: Sure. The first modification that we made was to locate and label the 50-foot non-disturbed buffers on the south and eastern border. After that, we added the notes that are shown on the top half of the plan. Note No. 1 states that no direct access to any residential lots would be permitted from White House Road or Harry S. Truman Drive, and that reflects Condition 1 of the Council, District Council decision. Note No. 2 states that the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	architecture and project design services related to the proposed development? MR. DUNLAP: Yes, we have. MR. HALLER: And were you asked by the Applicant in this application to prepare an amended Basic Plan for Kenwood Village? MR. DUNLAP: Yes. MR. HALLER: And did you prepare the Amended Basic Plan included with the Application? MR. DUNLAP: I did, along with help with a few people under, under my supervision. MR. HALLER: And what is MADAM EXAMINER: Just for clarifying, you prepared Exhibit 42? MR. DUNLAP: We prepared Exhibit 42, the Final Plan, the Revised Basic Plan, but also the Amended Basic Plan that was submitted to be put on record. MADAM EXAMINER: That would be Exhibit 21? MR. DUNLAP: Correct. MR. HALLER: I think it's part of 33-C. MADAM EXAMINER: 33-C, I thought was the original Basic Plan? MR. HALLER: That is the original Basic Plan that was modified to reflect, it's the one that showed on the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MR. HALLER: Okay. And were you asked to modify this plan? MR. DUNLAP: We were. The Basic Plan originally didn't reflect the conditions of the approval by District Council, so we were asked and it was also never certified, so we were asked by the Zoning Hearing Examiner to update it to reflect the Basic Plan as approved so that it could be certified. MR. HALLER: And I'm going to pull up Exhibit 33- C. And is this, is this a copy of the, of the revised Basic Plan that you've prepared? MR. DUNLAP: Yes, it is. MR. HALLER: Can you identify specifically the modifications that were made to Exhibit 33-C as compared to the old Exhibit J-113? MR. DUNLAP: Sure. The first modification that we made was to locate and label the 50-foot non-disturbed buffers on the south and eastern border. After that, we added the notes that are shown on the top half of the plan. Note No. 1 states that no direct access to any residential lots would be permitted from White House Road or Harry S. Truman Drive, and that reflects Condition 1 of the Council, District Council decision. Note No. 2 states that the minimum lot size, the minimum lot sizes that were required,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	architecture and project design services related to the proposed development? MR. DUNLAP: Yes, we have. MR. HALLER: And were you asked by the Applicant in this application to prepare an amended Basic Plan for Kenwood Village? MR. DUNLAP: Yes. MR. HALLER: And did you prepare the Amended Basic Plan included with the Application? MR. DUNLAP: I did, along with help with a few people under, under my supervision. MR. HALLER: And what is MADAM EXAMINER: Just for clarifying, you prepared Exhibit 42? MR. DUNLAP: We prepared Exhibit 42, the Final Plan, the Revised Basic Plan, but also the Amended Basic Plan that was submitted to be put on record. MADAM EXAMINER: That would be Exhibit 21? MR. DUNLAP: Correct. MR. HALLER: I think it's part of 33-C. MADAM EXAMINER: 33-C, I thought was the original Basic Plan? MR. HALLER: That is the original Basic Plan that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MR. HALLER: Okay. And were you asked to modify this plan? MR. DUNLAP: We were. The Basic Plan originally didn't reflect the conditions of the approval by District Council, so we were asked and it was also never certified, so we were asked by the Zoning Hearing Examiner to update it to reflect the Basic Plan as approved so that it could be certified. MR. HALLER: And I'm going to pull up Exhibit 33- C. And is this, is this a copy of the, of the revised Basic Plan that you've prepared? MR. DUNLAP: Yes, it is. MR. HALLER: Can you identify specifically the modifications that were made to Exhibit 33-C as compared to the old Exhibit J-113? MR. DUNLAP: Sure. The first modification that we made was to locate and label the 50-foot non-disturbed buffers on the south and eastern border. After that, we added the notes that are shown on the top half of the plan. Note No. 1 states that no direct access to any residential lots would be permitted from White House Road or Harry S. Truman Drive, and that reflects Condition 1 of the Council, District Council decision. Note No. 2 states that the

	Page 14		Page 16
1	decision; Note 3 states that a 50-foot non-disturbance	1	modified with coordination with the Zoning Hearing Examiner.
2	buffer will be provided along the east and southern	2	MR. HALLER: And why did you make what
3	boundaries; and then there would also be a 6-foot-high	3	modifications did you make to this plan and why did you make
	black, vinyl-coated chain link fence along those borders;		it?
	and that was part of Condition 8 of the District Council	5	
	decision; and No. 4 was added to reflect that the same 50-		Zoning Hearing Examiner, they asked for the original Basic
	foot non-disturbance should apply to all streams, expanded buffers, 100-year flood plain, the steep slopes and erodible		Plan to include the notes that I described earlier, the Notes 1 through 5, which noted the specific conditions out
	soils, and that was established by Condition 13 of the		of the District Council decision. So, we justified this one
	District Council decision; and then Note No. 5 was also		to make sure that the same notes applied on the site towards
	indicated, or added to show that all remaining conditions		the bottom right; and then we also, per coordination
	and considerations of the District Council decision would be		planning, they wanted the second, secondary access point
13	addressed at later stages of the development.	13	shown where it connects to Harry S. Truman Drive.
14	Oh, and then also, also at the bottom, the site	14	MR. HALLER: Okay. And does the road come, does
	data, we modified that to separate the land use quantities	15	the revised Amended Basic Plan continue to show the abutting
16	and land use types that were added to the plan, including,		Master Plan rights of way consistent with the Master Plan of
17	stating that the cap on density was the 2.18 dwelling units		Transportation?
18	per acre, and the maximum of 126, 126 dwelling units.	18	MR. DUNLAP: Yes. Yeah, the property still abuts
19	MR. HALLER: So, is it your understanding that the revised Basic Plan now reflects the conditions of approval		White House Road and the future Harry S. Truman Drive extension which are both considered arterial roads for the
	set forth in the final adopted orders by the District	-	Master Plan of Transportation.
	Council?	22	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
23	MR. DUNLAP: Yes.		these roads already been dedicated?
24	MR. HALLER: And, and as reflected on this	24	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
25	exhibit, the Madam Hearing Examiner has now certified the	25	this plan reflects the current right-of-way dedications.
	Page 15		D 47
			Pade 17
_			Page 17
	plan, is that correct?	1	MR. HALLER: Okay. And where is the revised
2	plan, is that correct? MR. DUNLAP: Correct, October 26th.	2	MR. HALLER: Okay. And where is the revised Amended Basic Plan conceptually show access points to the
2 3	plan, is that correct? MR. DUNLAP: Correct, October 26th. MR. HALLER: All right. Let me now pull up	2 3	MR. HALLER: Okay. And where is the revised Amended Basic Plan conceptually show access points to the subject property?
2 3 4	plan, is that correct? MR. DUNLAP: Correct, October 26th.	2 3 4	MR. HALLER: Okay. And where is the revised Amended Basic Plan conceptually show access points to the subject property? MR. DUNLAP: The primary access point is on White
2 3 4	plan, is that correct? MR. DUNLAP: Correct, October 26th. MR. HALLER: All right. Let me now pull up Exhibit 21 which I'm going to ask if you can identify by	2 3 4 5	MR. HALLER: Okay. And where is the revised Amended Basic Plan conceptually show access points to the subject property?
2 3 4 5 6	plan, is that correct? MR. DUNLAP: Correct, October 26th. MR. HALLER: All right. Let me now pull up Exhibit 21 which I'm going to ask if you can identify by this document?	2 3 4 5	MR. HALLER: Okay. And where is the revised Amended Basic Plan conceptually show access points to the subject property? MR. DUNLAP: The primary access point is on White House Road to the northeast corner exactly in the same spot as the previously approved plans.
2 3 4 5 6	plan, is that correct? MR. DUNLAP: Correct, October 26th. MR. HALLER: All right. Let me now pull up Exhibit 21 which I'm going to ask if you can identify by this document? MR. DUNLAP: Sure. And that's the amended,	2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. HALLER: Okay. And where is the revised Amended Basic Plan conceptually show access points to the subject property? MR. DUNLAP: The primary access point is on White House Road to the northeast corner exactly in the same spot as the previously approved plans.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	plan, is that correct? MR. DUNLAP: Correct, October 26th. MR. HALLER: All right. Let me now pull up Exhibit 21 which I'm going to ask if you can identify by this document? MR. DUNLAP: Sure. And that's the amended, revised Basic Plan that CPJ prepared. MR. HALLER: And that was submitted with the initial application?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. HALLER: Okay. And where is the revised Amended Basic Plan conceptually show access points to the subject property? MR. DUNLAP: The primary access point is on White House Road to the northeast corner exactly in the same spot as the previously approved plans. MR. HALLER: Okay. And is there also an area of land which is located west of the proposed extension of Harry S. Truman Drive and can you describe what that area
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	plan, is that correct? MR. DUNLAP: Correct, October 26th. MR. HALLER: All right. Let me now pull up Exhibit 21 which I'm going to ask if you can identify by this document? MR. DUNLAP: Sure. And that's the amended, revised Basic Plan that CPJ prepared. MR. HALLER: And that was submitted with the initial application? MR. DUNLAP: Correct.	2 3 4 5 7 8 9	MR. HALLER: Okay. And where is the revised Amended Basic Plan conceptually show access points to the subject property? MR. DUNLAP: The primary access point is on White House Road to the northeast corner exactly in the same spot as the previously approved plans. MR. HALLER: Okay. And is there also an area of land which is located west of the proposed extension of Harry S. Truman Drive and can you describe what that area is?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	plan, is that correct? MR. DUNLAP: Correct, October 26th. MR. HALLER: All right. Let me now pull up Exhibit 21 which I'm going to ask if you can identify by this document? MR. DUNLAP: Sure. And that's the amended, revised Basic Plan that CPJ prepared. MR. HALLER: And that was submitted with the initial application? MR. DUNLAP: Correct. MR. HALLER: And can you describe the changes to	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11	MR. HALLER: Okay. And where is the revised Amended Basic Plan conceptually show access points to the subject property? MR. DUNLAP: The primary access point is on White House Road to the northeast corner exactly in the same spot as the previously approved plans. MR. HALLER: Okay. And is there also an area of land which is located west of the proposed extension of Harry S. Truman Drive and can you describe what that area is? MR. DUNLAP: That area was shown on the original
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	plan, is that correct? MR. DUNLAP: Correct, October 26th. MR. HALLER: All right. Let me now pull up Exhibit 21 which I'm going to ask if you can identify by this document? MR. DUNLAP: Sure. And that's the amended, revised Basic Plan that CPJ prepared. MR. HALLER: And that was submitted with the initial application? MR. DUNLAP: Correct. MR. HALLER: And can you describe the changes to the amended Basic Plan from what was originally approved on	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11	MR. HALLER: Okay. And where is the revised Amended Basic Plan conceptually show access points to the subject property? MR. DUNLAP: The primary access point is on White House Road to the northeast corner exactly in the same spot as the previously approved plans. MR. HALLER: Okay. And is there also an area of land which is located west of the proposed extension of Harry S. Truman Drive and can you describe what that area is? MR. DUNLAP: That area was shown on the original Basic Plan as being proposed to be dedicated to Park and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	plan, is that correct? MR. DUNLAP: Correct, October 26th. MR. HALLER: All right. Let me now pull up Exhibit 21 which I'm going to ask if you can identify by this document? MR. DUNLAP: Sure. And that's the amended, revised Basic Plan that CPJ prepared. MR. HALLER: And that was submitted with the initial application? MR. DUNLAP: Correct. MR. HALLER: And can you describe the changes to the amended Basic Plan from what was originally approved on the Basic Plan?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. HALLER: Okay. And where is the revised Amended Basic Plan conceptually show access points to the subject property? MR. DUNLAP: The primary access point is on White House Road to the northeast corner exactly in the same spot as the previously approved plans. MR. HALLER: Okay. And is there also an area of land which is located west of the proposed extension of Harry S. Truman Drive and can you describe what that area is? MR. DUNLAP: That area was shown on the original Basic Plan as being proposed to be dedicated to Park and Planning. At that time, the Basic Plan was approved, the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	plan, is that correct? MR. DUNLAP: Correct, October 26th. MR. HALLER: All right. Let me now pull up Exhibit 21 which I'm going to ask if you can identify by this document? MR. DUNLAP: Sure. And that's the amended, revised Basic Plan that CPJ prepared. MR. HALLER: And that was submitted with the initial application? MR. DUNLAP: Correct. MR. HALLER: And can you describe the changes to the amended Basic Plan from what was originally approved on the Basic Plan? MR. DUNLAP: Sure. This one updates the Site Data	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. HALLER: Okay. And where is the revised Amended Basic Plan conceptually show access points to the subject property? MR. DUNLAP: The primary access point is on White House Road to the northeast corner exactly in the same spot as the previously approved plans. MR. HALLER: Okay. And is there also an area of land which is located west of the proposed extension of Harry S. Truman Drive and can you describe what that area is? MR. DUNLAP: That area was shown on the original Basic Plan as being proposed to be dedicated to Park and Planning. At that time, the Basic Plan was approved, the area was calculated to be 14.1 as shown on the original
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	plan, is that correct? MR. DUNLAP: Correct, October 26th. MR. HALLER: All right. Let me now pull up Exhibit 21 which I'm going to ask if you can identify by this document? MR. DUNLAP: Sure. And that's the amended, revised Basic Plan that CPJ prepared. MR. HALLER: And that was submitted with the initial application? MR. DUNLAP: Correct. MR. HALLER: And can you describe the changes to the amended Basic Plan from what was originally approved on the Basic Plan? MR. DUNLAP: Sure. This one updates the Site Data Table at the bottom to reflect the new maximum of 124 units,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. HALLER: Okay. And where is the revised Amended Basic Plan conceptually show access points to the subject property? MR. DUNLAP: The primary access point is on White House Road to the northeast corner exactly in the same spot as the previously approved plans. MR. HALLER: Okay. And is there also an area of land which is located west of the proposed extension of Harry S. Truman Drive and can you describe what that area is? MR. DUNLAP: That area was shown on the original Basic Plan as being proposed to be dedicated to Park and Planning. At that time, the Basic Plan was approved, the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	plan, is that correct? MR. DUNLAP: Correct, October 26th. MR. HALLER: All right. Let me now pull up Exhibit 21 which I'm going to ask if you can identify by this document? MR. DUNLAP: Sure. And that's the amended, revised Basic Plan that CPJ prepared. MR. HALLER: And that was submitted with the initial application? MR. DUNLAP: Correct. MR. HALLER: And can you describe the changes to the amended Basic Plan from what was originally approved on the Basic Plan? MR. DUNLAP: Sure. This one updates the Site Data	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. HALLER: Okay. And where is the revised Amended Basic Plan conceptually show access points to the subject property? MR. DUNLAP: The primary access point is on White House Road to the northeast corner exactly in the same spot as the previously approved plans. MR. HALLER: Okay. And is there also an area of land which is located west of the proposed extension of Harry S. Truman Drive and can you describe what that area is? MR. DUNLAP: That area was shown on the original Basic Plan as being proposed to be dedicated to Park and Planning. At that time, the Basic Plan was approved, the area was calculated to be 14.1 as shown on the original Basic Plan and we've updated per this latest Amended Basic
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	plan, is that correct? MR. DUNLAP: Correct, October 26th. MR. HALLER: All right. Let me now pull up Exhibit 21 which I'm going to ask if you can identify by this document? MR. DUNLAP: Sure. And that's the amended, revised Basic Plan that CPJ prepared. MR. HALLER: And that was submitted with the initial application? MR. DUNLAP: Correct. MR. HALLER: And can you describe the changes to the amended Basic Plan from what was originally approved on the Basic Plan? MR. DUNLAP: Sure. This one updates the Site Data Table at the bottom to reflect the new maximum of 124 units, all single-family detached, similar to the previous. It	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. HALLER: Okay. And where is the revised Amended Basic Plan conceptually show access points to the subject property? MR. DUNLAP: The primary access point is on White House Road to the northeast corner exactly in the same spot as the previously approved plans. MR. HALLER: Okay. And is there also an area of land which is located west of the proposed extension of Harry S. Truman Drive and can you describe what that area is? MR. DUNLAP: That area was shown on the original Basic Plan as being proposed to be dedicated to Park and Planning. At that time, the Basic Plan was approved, the area was calculated to be 14.1 as shown on the original Basic Plan and we've updated per this latest Amended Basic Plan to show that it's previously dedicated since it's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	plan, is that correct? MR. DUNLAP: Correct, October 26th. MR. HALLER: All right. Let me now pull up Exhibit 21 which I'm going to ask if you can identify by this document? MR. DUNLAP: Sure. And that's the amended, revised Basic Plan that CPJ prepared. MR. HALLER: And that was submitted with the initial application? MR. DUNLAP: Correct. MR. HALLER: And can you describe the changes to the amended Basic Plan from what was originally approved on the Basic Plan? MR. DUNLAP: Sure. This one updates the Site Data Table at the bottom to reflect the new maximum of 124 units, all single-family detached, similar to the previous. It also removes the 50-foot non-disturbance buffer along the southern side. It re-establishes that a development envelope based on the current conceptual layout that we've	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. HALLER: Okay. And where is the revised Amended Basic Plan conceptually show access points to the subject property? MR. DUNLAP: The primary access point is on White House Road to the northeast corner exactly in the same spot as the previously approved plans. MR. HALLER: Okay. And is there also an area of land which is located west of the proposed extension of Harry S. Truman Drive and can you describe what that area is? MR. DUNLAP: That area was shown on the original Basic Plan as being proposed to be dedicated to Park and Planning. At that time, the Basic Plan was approved, the area was calculated to be 14.1 as shown on the original Basic Plan and we've updated per this latest Amended Basic Plan to show that it's previously dedicated since it's already gone through; and we updated the square footage to accurately reflect it's 19.1 instead of 14. MR. HALLER: All right. And can you, now can you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	plan, is that correct? MR. DUNLAP: Correct, October 26th. MR. HALLER: All right. Let me now pull up Exhibit 21 which I'm going to ask if you can identify by this document? MR. DUNLAP: Sure. And that's the amended, revised Basic Plan that CPJ prepared. MR. HALLER: And that was submitted with the initial application? MR. DUNLAP: Correct. MR. HALLER: And can you describe the changes to the amended Basic Plan from what was originally approved on the Basic Plan? MR. DUNLAP: Sure. This one updates the Site Data Table at the bottom to reflect the new maximum of 124 units, all single-family detached, similar to the previous. It also removes the 50-foot non-disturbance buffer along the southern side. It re-establishes that a development envelope based on the current conceptual layout that we've prepared; and it also shows along the southern boundary of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. HALLER: Okay. And where is the revised Amended Basic Plan conceptually show access points to the subject property? MR. DUNLAP: The primary access point is on White House Road to the northeast corner exactly in the same spot as the previously approved plans. MR. HALLER: Okay. And is there also an area of land which is located west of the proposed extension of Harry S. Truman Drive and can you describe what that area is? MR. DUNLAP: That area was shown on the original Basic Plan as being proposed to be dedicated to Park and Planning. At that time, the Basic Plan was approved, the area was calculated to be 14.1 as shown on the original Basic Plan and we've updated per this latest Amended Basic Plan to show that it's previously dedicated since it's already gone through; and we updated the square footage to accurately reflect it's 19.1 instead of 14. MR. HALLER: All right. And can you, now can you describe any environmental features which may be located
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	plan, is that correct? MR. DUNLAP: Correct, October 26th. MR. HALLER: All right. Let me now pull up Exhibit 21 which I'm going to ask if you can identify by this document? MR. DUNLAP: Sure. And that's the amended, revised Basic Plan that CPJ prepared. MR. HALLER: And that was submitted with the initial application? MR. DUNLAP: Correct. MR. HALLER: And can you describe the changes to the amended Basic Plan from what was originally approved on the Basic Plan? MR. DUNLAP: Sure. This one updates the Site Data Table at the bottom to reflect the new maximum of 124 units, all single-family detached, similar to the previous. It also removes the 50-foot non-disturbance buffer along the southern side. It re-establishes that a development envelope based on the current conceptual layout that we've prepared; and it also shows along the southern boundary of the site, it shows the proposed Washington Gas line that's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. HALLER: Okay. And where is the revised Amended Basic Plan conceptually show access points to the subject property? MR. DUNLAP: The primary access point is on White House Road to the northeast corner exactly in the same spot as the previously approved plans. MR. HALLER: Okay. And is there also an area of land which is located west of the proposed extension of Harry S. Truman Drive and can you describe what that area is? MR. DUNLAP: That area was shown on the original Basic Plan as being proposed to be dedicated to Park and Planning. At that time, the Basic Plan was approved, the area was calculated to be 14.1 as shown on the original Basic Plan and we've updated per this latest Amended Basic Plan to show that it's previously dedicated since it's already gone through; and we updated the square footage to accurately reflect it's 19.1 instead of 14. MR. HALLER: All right. And can you, now can you describe any environmental features which may be located within the boundaries of the Amended Basic Plan?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	plan, is that correct? MR. DUNLAP: Correct, October 26th. MR. HALLER: All right. Let me now pull up Exhibit 21 which I'm going to ask if you can identify by this document? MR. DUNLAP: Sure. And that's the amended, revised Basic Plan that CPJ prepared. MR. HALLER: And that was submitted with the initial application? MR. DUNLAP: Correct. MR. HALLER: And can you describe the changes to the amended Basic Plan from what was originally approved on the Basic Plan? MR. DUNLAP: Sure. This one updates the Site Data Table at the bottom to reflect the new maximum of 124 units, all single-family detached, similar to the previous. It also removes the 50-foot non-disturbance buffer along the southern side. It re-establishes that a development envelope based on the current conceptual layout that we've prepared; and it also shows along the southern boundary of the site, it shows the proposed Washington Gas line that's currently under construction.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. HALLER: Okay. And where is the revised Amended Basic Plan conceptually show access points to the subject property? MR. DUNLAP: The primary access point is on White House Road to the northeast corner exactly in the same spot as the previously approved plans. MR. HALLER: Okay. And is there also an area of land which is located west of the proposed extension of Harry S. Truman Drive and can you describe what that area is? MR. DUNLAP: That area was shown on the original Basic Plan as being proposed to be dedicated to Park and Planning. At that time, the Basic Plan was approved, the area was calculated to be 14.1 as shown on the original Basic Plan and we've updated per this latest Amended Basic Plan to show that it's previously dedicated since it's already gone through; and we updated the square footage to accurately reflect it's 19.1 instead of 14. MR. HALLER: All right. And can you, now can you describe any environmental features which may be located within the boundaries of the Amended Basic Plan? MR. DUNLAP: Sure. Everything towards the north,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	plan, is that correct? MR. DUNLAP: Correct, October 26th. MR. HALLER: All right. Let me now pull up Exhibit 21 which I'm going to ask if you can identify by this document? MR. DUNLAP: Sure. And that's the amended, revised Basic Plan that CPJ prepared. MR. HALLER: And that was submitted with the initial application? MR. DUNLAP: Correct. MR. HALLER: And can you describe the changes to the amended Basic Plan from what was originally approved on the Basic Plan? MR. DUNLAP: Sure. This one updates the Site Data Table at the bottom to reflect the new maximum of 124 units, all single-family detached, similar to the previous. It also removes the 50-foot non-disturbance buffer along the southern side. It re-establishes that a development envelope based on the current conceptual layout that we've prepared; and it also shows along the southern boundary of the site, it shows the proposed Washington Gas line that's currently under construction. MR. HALLER: Okay. And now I'd like to pull up	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. HALLER: Okay. And where is the revised Amended Basic Plan conceptually show access points to the subject property? MR. DUNLAP: The primary access point is on White House Road to the northeast corner exactly in the same spot as the previously approved plans. MR. HALLER: Okay. And is there also an area of land which is located west of the proposed extension of Harry S. Truman Drive and can you describe what that area is? MR. DUNLAP: That area was shown on the original Basic Plan as being proposed to be dedicated to Park and Planning. At that time, the Basic Plan was approved, the area was calculated to be 14.1 as shown on the original Basic Plan and we've updated per this latest Amended Basic Plan to show that it's previously dedicated since it's already gone through; and we updated the square footage to accurately reflect it's 19.1 instead of 14. MR. HALLER: All right. And can you, now can you describe any environmental features which may be located within the boundaries of the Amended Basic Plan? MR. DUNLAP: Sure. Everything towards the north, along the northern border of White House Road where Mr.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	plan, is that correct? MR. DUNLAP: Correct, October 26th. MR. HALLER: All right. Let me now pull up Exhibit 21 which I'm going to ask if you can identify by this document? MR. DUNLAP: Sure. And that's the amended, revised Basic Plan that CPJ prepared. MR. HALLER: And that was submitted with the initial application? MR. DUNLAP: Correct. MR. HALLER: And can you describe the changes to the amended Basic Plan from what was originally approved on the Basic Plan? MR. DUNLAP: Sure. This one updates the Site Data Table at the bottom to reflect the new maximum of 124 units, all single-family detached, similar to the previous. It also removes the 50-foot non-disturbance buffer along the southern side. It re-establishes that a development envelope based on the current conceptual layout that we've prepared; and it also shows along the southern boundary of the site, it shows the proposed Washington Gas line that's currently under construction. MR. HALLER: Okay. And now I'd like to pull up Exhibit 42 and ask if you can identify this, this drawing?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MR. HALLER: Okay. And where is the revised Amended Basic Plan conceptually show access points to the subject property? MR. DUNLAP: The primary access point is on White House Road to the northeast corner exactly in the same spot as the previously approved plans. MR. HALLER: Okay. And is there also an area of land which is located west of the proposed extension of Harry S. Truman Drive and can you describe what that area is? MR. DUNLAP: That area was shown on the original Basic Plan as being proposed to be dedicated to Park and Planning. At that time, the Basic Plan was approved, the area was calculated to be 14.1 as shown on the original Basic Plan and we've updated per this latest Amended Basic Plan to show that it's previously dedicated since it's already gone through; and we updated the square footage to accurately reflect it's 19.1 instead of 14. MR. HALLER: All right. And can you, now can you describe any environmental features which may be located within the boundaries of the Amended Basic Plan? MR. DUNLAP: Sure. Everything towards the north, along the northern border of White House Road where Mr. Haller is moving the cursor, that's all an environmental
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	plan, is that correct? MR. DUNLAP: Correct, October 26th. MR. HALLER: All right. Let me now pull up Exhibit 21 which I'm going to ask if you can identify by this document? MR. DUNLAP: Sure. And that's the amended, revised Basic Plan that CPJ prepared. MR. HALLER: And that was submitted with the initial application? MR. DUNLAP: Correct. MR. HALLER: And can you describe the changes to the amended Basic Plan from what was originally approved on the Basic Plan? MR. DUNLAP: Sure. This one updates the Site Data Table at the bottom to reflect the new maximum of 124 units, all single-family detached, similar to the previous. It also removes the 50-foot non-disturbance buffer along the southern side. It re-establishes that a development envelope based on the current conceptual layout that we've prepared; and it also shows along the southern boundary of the site, it shows the proposed Washington Gas line that's currently under construction. MR. HALLER: Okay. And now I'd like to pull up	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MR. HALLER: Okay. And where is the revised Amended Basic Plan conceptually show access points to the subject property? MR. DUNLAP: The primary access point is on White House Road to the northeast corner exactly in the same spot as the previously approved plans. MR. HALLER: Okay. And is there also an area of land which is located west of the proposed extension of Harry S. Truman Drive and can you describe what that area is? MR. DUNLAP: That area was shown on the original Basic Plan as being proposed to be dedicated to Park and Planning. At that time, the Basic Plan was approved, the area was calculated to be 14.1 as shown on the original Basic Plan and we've updated per this latest Amended Basic Plan to show that it's previously dedicated since it's already gone through; and we updated the square footage to accurately reflect it's 19.1 instead of 14. MR. HALLER: All right. And can you, now can you describe any environmental features which may be located within the boundaries of the Amended Basic Plan? MR. DUNLAP: Sure. Everything towards the north, along the northern border of White House Road where Mr.

 then it proceeds through the center of the site towards the, towards the southern boundary. MR. HALLER: Okay. And, and with regard to these fregulated environmental features that exist on the subject property, will these features and the impacts of them be evaluated at future stages of the development review process? MR. DUNLAP: Correct. All the impacts will, to and evaluated during the future stages. MR. HALLER: Okay. And in your opinion as a Index and the technical requirements of the Zoning Ordinance? MR. HALLER: Okay. And in your opinion as a MR. DUNLAP: Yes, it does. MR. HALLER: Okay. And then one additional exhibit tat was pre-filed by the Applicant, I would like the spice identify what this document is, Mr. MR. DUNLAP: Yes. That's the Conceptual Site Plan the property if the Basic Plan, if the conditions are approved. MR. HALLER: And, and was this document prepared MR. HALLER: Thank you, Mr. Flemming. What is your occupation? 	e? s. ed nk of ur c.,
 2 towards the southern boundary. MR. HALLER: Okay. And, and with regard to these 4 regulated environmental features that exist on the subject 5 property, will these features and the impacts of them be 6 evaluated at future stages of the development review 7 process? MR. DUNLAP: Correct. All the impacts will, to 9 any of the regulated environmental features will be assessed 10 and evaluated during the future stages. 11 MR. HALLER: Okay. And in your opinion as a 12 landscape architect, does the Amended Basic Plan conform 14 MR. DUNLAP: Yes, it does. 15 MR. HALLER: Okay. And then one additional 16 exhibit that was pre-filed by the Applicant, I would like 17 you to describe what it depicts and that, specifically, it's 18 Exhibit 20, and is labeled, Concept Rendering. I'll pull it 19 up. Can you please identify what this document is, Mr. 20 Dunlap? 21 MR. DUNLAP: Yes. That's the Conceptual Site Plan 22 that shows our current proposed development of 124 lots on 23 the property if the Basic Plan, if the conditions are 24 approved. 2 towards the souther moduli towards are 2 manual concept of the conditions are 2 manual concept of the conditions are 24 approved. 2 towards the souther moduli towards are 2 towards the souther moduli towards are 2 manual concept of the conditions are<!--</th--><th>e? s. ed nk of ur c.,</th>	e? s. ed nk of ur c.,
3MR. HALLER: Okay. And, and with regard to these 4 regulated environmental features that exist on the subject 5 property, will these features and the impacts of them be 6 evaluated at future stages of the development review 7 process?3 concerned with as opposed to the LCD Zone, is that accurate 4 MR. DUNLAP: Correct.7process?MR. DUNLAP: Correct. All the impacts will, to 9 any of the regulated during the future stages.MR. DUNLAP: Correct. All the impacts will be assessed 10 and evaluated during the future stages.MR. HALLER: All right. Thank you. No other 6 questions.10and evaluated during the future stages.MR. HALLER: All right. Thank you, Mr. Dunlap.11MR. HALLER: Okay. And in your opinion as a 12 landscape architect, does the Amended Basic Plan conform 13 with all the technical requirements of the Zoning Ordinance?MR. DUNLAP: Thank you for your time.14MR. DUNLAP: Yes, it does.MR. HALLER: Okay. And then one additional 16 exhibit that was pre-filed by the Applicant, I would like 17 you to describe what it depicts and that, specifically, it's 18 Exhibit 20, and is labeled, Concept Rendering. I'll puli t 19 up. Can you please identify what this document is, Mr. 20 Dunlap?MR. DUNLAP: Yes. That's the Conceptual Site Plan 21 MR. DUNLAP: Yes. That's the Conceptual Site Plan 22 that shows our current proposed development of 124 lots on 23 the property if the Basic Plan, if the conditions are 24 approved.MADAM EXAMINER: Thank you. 24 MADAM EXAMINER: Thank you.24MR. HALLER: Thank you, Mr. Flemming. What is	e? s. ed nk of ur c.,
 4 regulated environmental features that exist on the subject 5 property, will these features and the impacts of them be 6 evaluated at future stages of the development review 7 process? 8 MR. DUNLAP: Correct. All the impacts will, to 9 any of the regulated environmental features will be assessed 10 and evaluated during the future stages. 11 MR. HALLER: Okay. And in your opinion as a 12 landscape architect, does the Amended Basic Plan conform 13 with all the technical requirements of the Zoning Ordinance? 14 MR. DUNLAP: Yes, it does. 15 MR. HALLER: Okay. And then one additional 16 exhibit that was pre-filed by the Applicant, I would like 17 you to describe what it depicts and that, specifically, it's 18 Exhibit 20, and is labeled, Concept Rendering. I'll pull it 19 up. Can you please identify what this document is, Mr. 20 Dunlap? 21 that shows our current proposed development of 124 lots on 23 the property if the Basic Plan, if the conditions are 24 approved. 	s. ed hk of c.,
 5 property, will these features and the impacts of them be 6 evaluated at future stages of the development review 7 process? 8 MR. DUNLAP: Correct. All the impacts will, to 9 any of the regulated environmental features will be assessed 10 and evaluated during the future stages. 11 MR. HALLER: Okay. And in your opinion as a 12 landscape architect, does the Amended Basic Plan conform 13 with all the technical requirements of the Zoning Ordinance? 14 MR. DUNLAP: Yes, it does. 15 MR. HALLER: Okay. And then one additional 16 exhibit that was pre-filed by the Applicant, I would like 17 you to describe what it depicts and that, specifically, it's 18 Exhibit 20, and is labeled, Concept Rendering. I'll pull it 19 up. Can you please identify what this document is, Mr. 20 Dunlap? 21 MR. DUNLAP: Yes. That's the Conceptual Site Plan 22 that shows our current proposed development of 124 lots on 23 the property if the Basic Plan, if the conditions are 24 approved. 	ur
 6 evaluated at future stages of the development review 7 process? 8 MR. DUNLAP: Correct. All the impacts will, to 9 any of the regulated environmental features will be assessed 10 and evaluated during the future stages. 11 MR. HALLER: Okay. And in your opinion as a 12 landscape architect, does the Amended Basic Plan conform 13 with all the technical requirements of the Zoning Ordinance? 14 MR. DUNLAP: Yes, it does. 15 MR. HALLER: Okay. And then one additional 16 exhibit 20, and is labeled, Concept Rendering. I'll pull it 19 up. Can you please identify what this document is, Mr. 20 Dunlap? 21 MR. DUNLAP: Yes. That's the Conceptual Site Plan 22 that shows our current proposed development of 124 lots on 23 the property if the Basic Plan, if the conditions are 24 approved. 	ur
7process?7MADAM EXAMINER: All right. I have no questions8MR. DUNLAP: Correct. All the impacts will, to9any of the regulated environmental features will be assessed8Thank you very much.910and evaluated during the future stages.11MR. HALLER: Okay. And in your opinion as a10MR. DUNLAP: Thank you for your time.11MR. HALLER: Okay. And in your opinion as a11MR. HALLER: Now I'd like to call Kevin Flemming.12landscape architect, does the Amended Basic Plan conform13with all the technical requirements of the Zoning Ordinance?14MR. DUNLAP: Yes, it does.13you to turn on your mike and raise your right hand. Than14MR. HALLER: Okay. And then one additional14you. Do you solemnly swear or affirm under the penalties15MR. HALLER: Okay. And then one additional16truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth?17you to describe what it depicts and that, specifically, it's17MR. FLEMMING: I do.18Exhibit 20, and is labeled, Concept Rendering. I'll pull it19mame and business address for the record.20Dunlap?20MR. FLEMMING: Sure. Kevin Flemming, BHC, Inc.21MR. DUNLAP: Yes. That's the Conceptual Site Plan2222that shows our current proposed development of 124 lots on2323the property if the Basic Plan, if the conditions are2324approved.MADAM EXAMINER: Thank you, Mr. Flemming. What is	ur
8MR. DUNLAP: Correct. All the impacts will, to 9 any of the regulated environmental features will be assessed 10 and evaluated during the future stages.8Thank you very much.10and evaluated during the future stages.9MR. HALLER: All right. Thank you, Mr. Dunlap.11MR. HALLER: Okay. And in your opinion as a10MR. HALLER: Now I'd like to call Kevin Flemming.12landscape architect, does the Amended Basic Plan conform13MR. HALLER: Now I'd like to call Kevin Flemming.13with all the technical requirements of the Zoning Ordinance?14MR. DUNLAP: Yes, it does.14MR. DUNLAP: Yes, it does.13you to turn on your mike and raise your right hand. Than14MR. HALLER: Okay. And then one additional14you. Do you solemnly swear or affirm under the penalties15MR. HALLER: Okay. And then one additional16truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth?17you to describe what it depicts and that, specifically, it's17MR. FLEMMING: I do.18Exhibit 20, and is labeled, Concept Rendering. I'll pull it19name and business address for the record.19up. Can you please identify what this document is, Mr.20MR. FLEMMING: Sure. Kevin Flemming, BHC, Inc.21MR. DUNLAP: Yes. That's the Conceptual Site Plan2220852.23the property if the Basic Plan, if the conditions are23MADAM EXAMINER: Thank you.24approved.24MR. HALLER: Thank you, Mr. Flemming. What is	ur
 9 any of the regulated environmental features will be assessed 10 and evaluated during the future stages. 11 MR. HALLER: Okay. And in your opinion as a 12 landscape architect, does the Amended Basic Plan conform 13 with all the technical requirements of the Zoning Ordinance? 14 MR. DUNLAP: Yes, it does. 15 MR. HALLER: Okay. And then one additional 16 exhibit that was pre-filed by the Applicant, I would like 17 you to describe what it depicts and that, specifically, it's 18 Exhibit 20, and is labeled, Concept Rendering. I'll pull it 19 up. Can you please identify what this document is, Mr. 20 Dunlap? 21 MR. DUNLAP: Yes. That's the Conceptual Site Plan 22 that shows our current proposed development of 124 lots on 23 the property if the Basic Plan, if the conditions are 24 approved. 9 MR. HALLER: All right. Thank you, Mr. Dunlap. 10 MR. DUNLAP: Thank you, Mr. Dunlap. 11 MR. HALLER: All right. Thank you, Mr. Dunlap. 12 MR. HALLER: Now I'd like to call Kevin Flemming. I need 13 you to turn on your mike and raise your right hand. Than 14 you. Do you solemnly swear or affirm under the penalties 15 perjury that in the matter now pending you shall tell the 16 truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth? 17 MR. FLEMMING: I do. 18 MADAM EXAMINER: Thank you. Please state you 19 name and business address for the record. 20 MR. FLEMMING: Sure. Kevin Flemming, BHC, Inc. 21 11611 Old Georgetown Road, Second Floor, Rockville, Marylan 22 20852. 23 MADAM EXAMINER: Thank you. 24 approved. 	ed hk of ur c.,
10and evaluated during the future stages.11MR. HALLER: Okay. And in your opinion as a11MR. HALLER: Okay. And in your opinion as a10MR. DUNLAP: Thank you for your time.12landscape architect, does the Amended Basic Plan conform11MR. HALLER: Now I'd like to call Kevin Flemming, I need13with all the technical requirements of the Zoning Ordinance?11MR. DUNLAP: Yes, it does.14MR. DUNLAP: Yes, it does.13you to turn on your mike and raise your right hand. Than16exhibit that was pre-filed by the Applicant, I would like15perjury that in the matter now pending you shall tell the16exhibit 20, and is labeled, Concept Rendering. I'll pull it19name and business address for the record.19up. Can you please identify what this document is, Mr.20MR. FLEMMING: Sure. Kevin Flemming, BHC, Inc.21MR. DUNLAP: Yes. That's the Conceptual Site Plan22that shows our current proposed development of 124 lots on23the property if the Basic Plan, if the conditions are23MADAM EXAMINER: Thank you, Mr. Flemming. What is24approved.MR. HALLER: Thank you, Mr. Flemming. What is	ed hk of ur c.,
11MR. HALLER: Okay. And in your opinion as a11MR. HALLER: Now I'd like to call Kevin Flemming.12landscape architect, does the Amended Basic Plan conform13with all the technical requirements of the Zoning Ordinance?14MR. DUNLAP: Yes, it does.12MADAM EXAMINER: All right, Mr. Flemming, I nee15MR. HALLER: Okay. And then one additional14you. Do you solemnly swear or affirm under the penalties16exhibit that was pre-filed by the Applicant, I would like15perjury that in the matter now pending you shall tell the16exhibit 20, and is labeled, Concept Rendering. I'll pull it19up. Can you please identify what this document is, Mr.18MADAM EXAMINER: Thank you. Please state you20Dunlap?1111611 Old Georgetown Road, Second Floor, Rockville, Marylan21MR. DUNLAP: Yes. That's the Conceptual Site Plan2220852.23the property if the Basic Plan, if the conditions are23MADAM EXAMINER: Thank you.24approved.24MR. HALLER: Thank you, Mr. Flemming. What is	ed hk of ur c.,
 12 landscape architect, does the Amended Basic Plan conform 13 with all the technical requirements of the Zoning Ordinance? 14 MR. DUNLAP: Yes, it does. 15 MR. HALLER: Okay. And then one additional 16 exhibit that was pre-filed by the Applicant, I would like 17 you to describe what it depicts and that, specifically, it's 18 Exhibit 20, and is labeled, Concept Rendering. I'll pull it 19 up. Can you please identify what this document is, Mr. 20 Dunlap? 21 MR. DUNLAP: Yes. That's the Conceptual Site Plan 22 that shows our current proposed development of 124 lots on 23 the property if the Basic Plan, if the conditions are 24 approved. 12 MADAM EXAMINER: Thank you. 12 MADAM EXAMINER: Thank you. 13 you to turn on your mike and raise your right hand. Than 14 you. Do you solemnly swear or affirm under the penalties 15 perjury that in the matter now pending you shall tell the 16 truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth? 17 MR. FLEMMING: I do. 18 MADAM EXAMINER: Thank you. Please state you 19 up. Can you please identify what this document is, Mr. 20 MR. FLEMMING: Sure. Kevin Flemming, BHC, Inc. 21 MR. DUNLAP: Yes. That's the Conceptual Site Plan 22 that shows our current proposed development of 124 lots on 23 MADAM EXAMINER: Thank you. 24 approved. 	ed hk of ur c.,
 13 with all the technical requirements of the Zoning Ordinance? 14 MR. DUNLAP: Yes, it does. 15 MR. HALLER: Okay. And then one additional 16 exhibit that was pre-filed by the Applicant, I would like 17 you to describe what it depicts and that, specifically, it's 18 Exhibit 20, and is labeled, Concept Rendering. I'll pull it 19 up. Can you please identify what this document is, Mr. 20 Dunlap? 21 MR. DUNLAP: Yes. That's the Conceptual Site Plan 22 that shows our current proposed development of 124 lots on 23 the property if the Basic Plan, if the conditions are 24 approved. 	nk of ur c., nd
 MR. HALLER: Okay. And then one additional exhibit that was pre-filed by the Applicant, I would like you to describe what it depicts and that, specifically, it's Exhibit 20, and is labeled, Concept Rendering. I'll pull it up. Can you please identify what this document is, Mr. Dunlap? MR. DUNLAP: Yes. That's the Conceptual Site Plan that shows our current proposed development of 124 lots on the property if the Basic Plan, if the conditions are approved. 	ur c., nd
 16 exhibit that was pre-filed by the Applicant, I would like 17 you to describe what it depicts and that, specifically, it's 18 Exhibit 20, and is labeled, Concept Rendering. I'll pull it 19 up. Can you please identify what this document is, Mr. 20 Dunlap? 21 MR. DUNLAP: Yes. That's the Conceptual Site Plan 22 that shows our current proposed development of 124 lots on 23 the property if the Basic Plan, if the conditions are 24 approved. 16 truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth? 17 MR. FLEMMING: I do. 18 MADAM EXAMINER: Thank you. Please state you 19 name and business address for the record. 20 MR. FLEMMING: Sure. Kevin Flemming, BHC, Inc. 21 11611 Old Georgetown Road, Second Floor, Rockville, Marylan 22 20852. 23 MADAM EXAMINER: Thank you. 24 MR. HALLER: Thank you, Mr. Flemming. What is 	c., nd
 you to describe what it depicts and that, specifically, it's Exhibit 20, and is labeled, Concept Rendering. I'll pull it up. Can you please identify what this document is, Mr. Dunlap? MR. DUNLAP: Yes. That's the Conceptual Site Plan that shows our current proposed development of 124 lots on the property if the Basic Plan, if the conditions are approved. MR. HALLER: Thank you, Mr. Flemming. What is 	c., nd
 18 Exhibit 20, and is labeled, Concept Rendering. I'll pull it 19 up. Can you please identify what this document is, Mr. 20 Dunlap? 11 MR. DUNLAP: Yes. That's the Conceptual Site Plan 22 that shows our current proposed development of 124 lots on 23 the property if the Basic Plan, if the conditions are 24 approved. 18 MADAM EXAMINER: Thank you. Please state you 19 name and business address for the record. 20 MR. FLEMMING: Sure. Kevin Flemming, BHC, Inc. 21 11611 Old Georgetown Road, Second Floor, Rockville, Marylan 22 20852. 23 MADAM EXAMINER: Thank you. 24 MR. HALLER: Thank you, Mr. Flemming. What is 	c., nd
19up. Can you please identify what this document is, Mr.20Dunlap?21MR. DUNLAP: Yes. That's the Conceptual Site Plan22that shows our current proposed development of 124 lots on23the property if the Basic Plan, if the conditions are24approved.	c., nd
20Dunlap?20MR. FLEMMING: Sure. Kevin Flemming, BHC, Inc.21MR. DUNLAP: Yes. That's the Conceptual Site Plan2111611 Old Georgetown Road, Second Floor, Rockville, Marylan22that shows our current proposed development of 124 lots on2220852.23the property if the Basic Plan, if the conditions are23MADAM EXAMINER: Thank you.24approved.MR. HALLER: Thank you, Mr. Flemming. What is	nd
21MR. DUNLAP: Yes. That's the Conceptual Site Plan2111611 Old Georgetown Road, Second Floor, Rockville, Marylan22that shows our current proposed development of 124 lots on2220852.23the property if the Basic Plan, if the conditions are23MADAM EXAMINER: Thank you.24approved.24MR. HALLER: Thank you, Mr. Flemming. What is	nd
22 that shows our current proposed development of 124 lots on22 20852.23 the property if the Basic Plan, if the conditions are23 MADAM EXAMINER: Thank you.24 approved.24 MR. HALLER: Thank you, Mr. Flemming. What is	
23 the property if the Basic Plan, if the conditions are23MADAM EXAMINER: Thank you.24 approved.24MR. HALLER: Thank you, Mr. Flemming. What is	
24 approved.24MR. HALLER: Thank you, Mr. Flemming. What is	
25 MR. HALLER: And, and was this document prepared 25 your occupation?	1
Page 19 Page 1	21
1 by you or by someone under your supervision? 1 MR. FLEMMING: I am the Vice President of Land	
2 MR. DUNLAP: Yes. 2 Acquisition for Mid Atlantic Builders and BHC is a related	4
3 MR. HALLER: And does the rendering retain the 3 company to Mid Atlantic Builders.	
4 same points of access, the same point of access that White 4 MR. HALLER: Okay. And the Applicant in this cas	e
5 House was approved originally for Kenwood Village at the 5 is BHC, Inc.?	-
 6 time that it was previously subdivided? 6 MR. FLEMMING: That's correct. 	
7 MR. DUNLAP: Yep, it, yes, it shows the same point 7 MR. HALLER: And you indicated that they are	
8 of access to White House Road identical to the recorded 8 affiliated with Mid Atlantic Builders?	
9 subdivision plats and the interior, the interior circulation 9 MR. FLEMMING: It is.	
10 is approximately the same as what was shown previously. 10 MR. HALLER: And what his BHC's relationship to	
11 MR. HALLER: All right. Thank you very much. I 11 the property which is the subject of today's application?	
12 have no further questions, Madam Examiner. 12 MR. FLEMMING: It is the contract purchaser of the	э
13 MADAM EXAMINER: Mr. Brown? 13 property.	
14 MR. BROWN: Just one question, and if Mr. Dunlap 14 MR. HALLER: Okay. And is BHC an entity in good	Ł
15 cannot answer it, Mr. Ferguson can answer it when he 15 standing in the state of Maryland?	
16 testifies. You testified that this property is zoned LCD,16MR. FLEMMING: It is.	
17 Legacy Comprehensive Design Zone; but, in actuality, is the17MR. HALLER: All right. I would have you	
18 Applicant not proceeding under the ordinance that was in 18 obtained a certificate of good standing for BHC, Inc.?	
19 effect prior to April 1, 2022?19MR. FLEMMING: We have.	
20 MR. DUNLAP: Correct, we're proceeding under the 20 MR. HALLER: Okay. I'm showing on the screen a	
21 previous zoning ordinance because it is going through the 21 copy of Exhibit 40 and ask if you can identify this	
22 Basic Plan, the CDP process and SDP process. 22 document?	
23 MR. BROWN: And the zoning prior to April 1, 2022, 23 MR. FLEMMING: That is the copy of the	
24 is what? 24 certification of good standing for BHC, Incorporated.	- A
25MR. DUNLAP: RS.25MR. HALLER: All right. Thank you very much. An	a

	Page 22	Page 24
1	are you authorized by BHC, Inc., to testify today before the	1 Center and in Parkside at Westphalia, which are communities
		2 to the south of Kenwood that incorporated townhome
3	MR. FLEMMING: I am.	3 communities where we have been kind of incorporating what we
4	MR. HALLER: Okay. I would like to first ask you	4 think are kind of the latest kind of in urban design and
5	some questions about Mid Atlantic Builders. How long has	5 open concept living in indoor/outdoor space.
6	Mid Atlantic Builders been building homes in Prince George's	6 MR. HALLER: Is it fair to say that Mid Atlantic
7	County?	7 Homes does not have one style of townhouse or one style of
8	MR. FLEMMING: Since the 1980s.	8 single-family home that it builds in every community that
9	MR. HALLER: Yeah. I'm going to ask if you could,	9 it, it, it builds projects in, or builds homes in?
	I'm going to pull up an exhibit and ask if you can identify	10 MR. FLEMMING: That's fair to say. I think we
	this, it's Exhibit 39 in the record; and can you identify	11 tried to develop new designs and new architecture for the
12	what this document reflects?	12 uniqueness of the community that we're going into.
13	MR. FLEMMING: Sure. This is a listing of all the	13MR. HALLER: And you indicated that you're doing
	communities that we have built or developed in the County.	14 work in the Westphalia area that generated your interest in
	I believe it represents 33 communities and approximately	15 the subject Kenwood Village property?
	2,300 homes since the, the 1980s.	16 MR. FLEMMING: It was. We, we developed, or we
17	MR. HALLER: Okay. And I'm going to also pull up	17 built in two communities, as I mentioned, Westphalia Town
	Exhibit 38 and ask if you can identify that document?	18 Center where we build a hundred homes, two different styles
19	MR. FLEMMING: Sure. This is the exhibit, this is	19 of townhomes, and then Parkside at Westphalia, where I
	one photograph of, of, I think we submitted 15 or 20	20 believe we built about 150 homes between single families and
	different house pictures of homes that we've constructed throughout the County. I think this is kind of a	21 towns, and the, the experience in, in both those22 communities, and primarily in the Westphalia community where
	representation of the, of our architecture breadth, of our	23 we designed two different styles of townhouses, and one
	library, our styles, our looks, and it includes, again,	24 specific style that really lived more like a single-family
	pictures from - that's a current picture from our current	25 home, that really became the beginning of our thought
	F	
	Page 23	Page 25
1	Page 23 community called the Villages at Savannah in Brandywine.	Page 25 1 process for how we could do something unique at Kenwood
1 2	C C	
2	community called the Villages at Savannah in Brandywine.	 process for how we could do something unique at Kenwood Village. MR. HALLER: Okay. And how long have you been,
2 3 4	community called the Villages at Savannah in Brandywine. MR. HALLER: Now when you develop projects, are there any signature features that Mid Atlantic is known for? MR. FLEMMING: Sure. The first thing we start	 process for how we could do something unique at Kenwood Village. MR. HALLER: Okay. And how long have you been, been actually looking at Kenwood Village?
2 3 4 5	community called the Villages at Savannah in Brandywine. MR. HALLER: Now when you develop projects, are there any signature features that Mid Atlantic is known for? MR. FLEMMING: Sure. The first thing we start with is the community itself. We try to include a unique	 process for how we could do something unique at Kenwood Village. MR. HALLER: Okay. And how long have you been,
2 3 4 5 6	community called the Villages at Savannah in Brandywine. MR. HALLER: Now when you develop projects, are there any signature features that Mid Atlantic is known for? MR. FLEMMING: Sure. The first thing we start with is the community itself. We try to include a unique entrance feature. I think if, if, Mr. Haller, if you	 process for how we could do something unique at Kenwood Village. MR. HALLER: Okay. And how long have you been, been actually looking at Kenwood Village? MR. FLEMMING: We've been looking at the project since 2013.
2 3 4 5 6 7	community called the Villages at Savannah in Brandywine. MR. HALLER: Now when you develop projects, are there any signature features that Mid Atlantic is known for? MR. FLEMMING: Sure. The first thing we start with is the community itself. We try to include a unique entrance feature. I think if, if, Mr. Haller, if you scroll to the end, you'll see some of our communities where	 process for how we could do something unique at Kenwood Village. MR. HALLER: Okay. And how long have you been, been actually looking at Kenwood Village? MR. FLEMMING: We've been looking at the project since 2013. MR. HALLER: And are you aware that the property
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	community called the Villages at Savannah in Brandywine. MR. HALLER: Now when you develop projects, are there any signature features that Mid Atlantic is known for? MR. FLEMMING: Sure. The first thing we start with is the community itself. We try to include a unique entrance feature. I think if, if, Mr. Haller, if you scroll to the end, you'll see some of our communities where we have done water features; we have a community called	 process for how we could do something unique at Kenwood Village. MR. HALLER: Okay. And how long have you been, been actually looking at Kenwood Village? MR. FLEMMING: We've been looking at the project since 2013. MR. HALLER: And are you aware that the property is currently platted for 72 single-family detached dwelling
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	community called the Villages at Savannah in Brandywine. MR. HALLER: Now when you develop projects, are there any signature features that Mid Atlantic is known for? MR. FLEMMING: Sure. The first thing we start with is the community itself. We try to include a unique entrance feature. I think if, if, if, Mr. Haller, if you scroll to the end, you'll see some of our communities where we have done water features; we have a community called Woodmore, which is Woodmore North, which is on 450 in Bowie	 process for how we could do something unique at Kenwood Village. MR. HALLER: Okay. And how long have you been, been actually looking at Kenwood Village? MR. FLEMMING: We've been looking at the project since 2013. MR. HALLER: And are you aware that the property is currently platted for 72 single-family detached dwelling units?
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10	community called the Villages at Savannah in Brandywine. MR. HALLER: Now when you develop projects, are there any signature features that Mid Atlantic is known for? MR. FLEMMING: Sure. The first thing we start with is the community itself. We try to include a unique entrance feature. I think if, if, Mr. Haller, if you scroll to the end, you'll see some of our communities where we have done water features; we have a community called Woodmore, which is Woodmore North, which is on 450 in Bowie where we've done an extensive entrance feature with water.	 process for how we could do something unique at Kenwood Village. MR. HALLER: Okay. And how long have you been, been actually looking at Kenwood Village? MR. FLEMMING: We've been looking at the project since 2013. MR. HALLER: And are you aware that the property is currently platted for 72 single-family detached dwelling units? MR. FLEMMING: I am.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	community called the Villages at Savannah in Brandywine. MR. HALLER: Now when you develop projects, are there any signature features that Mid Atlantic is known for? MR. FLEMMING: Sure. The first thing we start with is the community itself. We try to include a unique entrance feature. I think if, if, Mr. Haller, if you scroll to the end, you'll see some of our communities where we have done water features; we have a community called Woodmore, which is Woodmore North, which is on 450 in Bowie where we've done an extensive entrance feature with water. The other project that we just talked about, the Villages of	 process for how we could do something unique at Kenwood Village. MR. HALLER: Okay. And how long have you been, been actually looking at Kenwood Village? MR. FLEMMING: We've been looking at the project since 2013. MR. HALLER: And are you aware that the property is currently platted for 72 single-family detached dwelling units? MR. FLEMMING: I am. MR. HALLER: And did you evaluate the feasibility
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	community called the Villages at Savannah in Brandywine. MR. HALLER: Now when you develop projects, are there any signature features that Mid Atlantic is known for? MR. FLEMMING: Sure. The first thing we start with is the community itself. We try to include a unique entrance feature. I think if, if, Mr. Haller, if you scroll to the end, you'll see some of our communities where we have done water features; we have a community called Woodmore, which is Woodmore North, which is on 450 in Bowie where we've done an extensive entrance feature with water. The other project that we just talked about, the Villages of Savannah, which is the next, one more picture, I think,	 process for how we could do something unique at Kenwood Village. MR. HALLER: Okay. And how long have you been, been actually looking at Kenwood Village? MR. FLEMMING: We've been looking at the project since 2013. MR. HALLER: And are you aware that the property is currently platted for 72 single-family detached dwelling units? MR. FLEMMING: I am. MR. HALLER: And did you evaluate the feasibility of purchasing the property as it is currently platted and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	community called the Villages at Savannah in Brandywine. MR. HALLER: Now when you develop projects, are there any signature features that Mid Atlantic is known for? MR. FLEMMING: Sure. The first thing we start with is the community itself. We try to include a unique entrance feature. I think if, if, Mr. Haller, if you scroll to the end, you'll see some of our communities where we have done water features; we have a community called Woodmore, which is Woodmore North, which is on 450 in Bowie where we've done an extensive entrance feature with water. The other project that we just talked about, the Villages of Savannah, which is the next, one more picture, I think, there it is, this is our current community under	 process for how we could do something unique at Kenwood Village. MR. HALLER: Okay. And how long have you been, been actually looking at Kenwood Village? MR. FLEMMING: We've been looking at the project since 2013. MR. HALLER: And are you aware that the property is currently platted for 72 single-family detached dwelling units? MR. FLEMMING: I am. MR. HALLER: And did you evaluate the feasibility of purchasing the property as it is currently platted and simply limiting the development to 72 lots that were
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	community called the Villages at Savannah in Brandywine. MR. HALLER: Now when you develop projects, are there any signature features that Mid Atlantic is known for? MR. FLEMMING: Sure. The first thing we start with is the community itself. We try to include a unique entrance feature. I think if, if, Mr. Haller, if you scroll to the end, you'll see some of our communities where we have done water features; we have a community called Woodmore, which is Woodmore North, which is on 450 in Bowie where we've done an extensive entrance feature with water. The other project that we just talked about, the Villages of Savannah, which is the next, one more picture, I think, there it is, this is our current community under development. We've done additional water features on this	 process for how we could do something unique at Kenwood Village. MR. HALLER: Okay. And how long have you been, been actually looking at Kenwood Village? MR. FLEMMING: We've been looking at the project since 2013. MR. HALLER: And are you aware that the property is currently platted for 72 single-family detached dwelling units? MR. FLEMMING: I am. MR. HALLER: And did you evaluate the feasibility of purchasing the property as it is currently platted and simply limiting the development to 72 lots that were platted?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 5	community called the Villages at Savannah in Brandywine. MR. HALLER: Now when you develop projects, are there any signature features that Mid Atlantic is known for? MR. FLEMMING: Sure. The first thing we start with is the community itself. We try to include a unique entrance feature. I think if, if, Mr. Haller, if you scroll to the end, you'll see some of our communities where we have done water features; we have a community called Woodmore, which is Woodmore North, which is on 450 in Bowie where we've done an extensive entrance feature with water. The other project that we just talked about, the Villages of Savannah, which is the next, one more picture, I think, there it is, this is our current community under development. We've done additional water features on this and we actually just won an award from the Builder's	 process for how we could do something unique at Kenwood Village. MR. HALLER: Okay. And how long have you been, been actually looking at Kenwood Village? MR. FLEMMING: We've been looking at the project since 2013. MR. HALLER: And are you aware that the property is currently platted for 72 single-family detached dwelling units? MR. FLEMMING: I am. MR. HALLER: And did you evaluate the feasibility of purchasing the property as it is currently platted and simply limiting the development to 72 lots that were platted? MR. FLEMMING: We have.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	community called the Villages at Savannah in Brandywine. MR. HALLER: Now when you develop projects, are there any signature features that Mid Atlantic is known for? MR. FLEMMING: Sure. The first thing we start with is the community itself. We try to include a unique entrance feature. I think if, if, Mr. Haller, if you scroll to the end, you'll see some of our communities where we have done water features; we have a community called Woodmore, which is Woodmore North, which is on 450 in Bowie where we've done an extensive entrance feature with water. The other project that we just talked about, the Villages of Savannah, which is the next, one more picture, I think, there it is, this is our current community under development. We've done additional water features on this and we actually just won an award from the Builder's Association for this for, for a land development project for	 process for how we could do something unique at Kenwood Village. MR. HALLER: Okay. And how long have you been, been actually looking at Kenwood Village? MR. FLEMMING: We've been looking at the project since 2013. MR. HALLER: And are you aware that the property is currently platted for 72 single-family detached dwelling units? MR. FLEMMING: I am. MR. HALLER: And did you evaluate the feasibility of purchasing the property as it is currently platted and simply limiting the development to 72 lots that were MR. FLEMMING: We have.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	community called the Villages at Savannah in Brandywine. MR. HALLER: Now when you develop projects, are there any signature features that Mid Atlantic is known for? MR. FLEMMING: Sure. The first thing we start with is the community itself. We try to include a unique entrance feature. I think if, if, Mr. Haller, if you scroll to the end, you'll see some of our communities where we have done water features; we have a community called Woodmore, which is Woodmore North, which is on 450 in Bowie where we've done an extensive entrance feature with water. The other project that we just talked about, the Villages of Savannah, which is the next, one more picture, I think, there it is, this is our current community under development. We've done additional water features on this and we actually just won an award from the Builder's Association for this for, for a land development project for the year, for 2021.	 process for how we could do something unique at Kenwood Village. MR. HALLER: Okay. And how long have you been, been actually looking at Kenwood Village? MR. FLEMMING: We've been looking at the project since 2013. MR. HALLER: And are you aware that the property is currently platted for 72 single-family detached dwelling units? MR. FLEMMING: I am. MR. HALLER: And did you evaluate the feasibility of purchasing the property as it is currently platted and simply limiting the development to 72 lots that were platted? MR. FLEMMING: We have. MR. HALLER: And what prevented you from doing that?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	community called the Villages at Savannah in Brandywine. MR. HALLER: Now when you develop projects, are there any signature features that Mid Atlantic is known for? MR. FLEMMING: Sure. The first thing we start with is the community itself. We try to include a unique entrance feature. I think if, if, Mr. Haller, if you scroll to the end, you'll see some of our communities where we have done water features; we have a community called Woodmore, which is Woodmore North, which is on 450 in Bowie where we've done an extensive entrance feature with water. The other project that we just talked about, the Villages of Savannah, which is the next, one more picture, I think, there it is, this is our current community under development. We've done additional water features on this and we actually just won an award from the Builder's Association for this for, for a land development project for	 process for how we could do something unique at Kenwood Village. MR. HALLER: Okay. And how long have you been, been actually looking at Kenwood Village? MR. FLEMMING: We've been looking at the project since 2013. MR. HALLER: And are you aware that the property is currently platted for 72 single-family detached dwelling units? MR. FLEMMING: I am. MR. HALLER: And did you evaluate the feasibility of purchasing the property as it is currently platted and simply limiting the development to 72 lots that were platted? MR. FLEMMING: We have. MR. HALLER: And what prevented you from doing that?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	community called the Villages at Savannah in Brandywine. MR. HALLER: Now when you develop projects, are there any signature features that Mid Atlantic is known for? MR. FLEMMING: Sure. The first thing we start with is the community itself. We try to include a unique entrance feature. I think if, if, Mr. Haller, if you scroll to the end, you'll see some of our communities where we have done water features; we have a community called Woodmore, which is Woodmore North, which is on 450 in Bowie where we've done an extensive entrance feature with water. The other project that we just talked about, the Villages of Savannah, which is the next, one more picture, I think, there it is, this is our current community under development. We've done additional water features on this and we actually just won an award from the Builder's Association for this for, for a land development project for the year, for 2021. So, we, we take the cue from the entrance features	 process for how we could do something unique at Kenwood Village. MR. HALLER: Okay. And how long have you been, been actually looking at Kenwood Village? MR. FLEMMING: We've been looking at the project since 2013. MR. HALLER: And are you aware that the property is currently platted for 72 single-family detached dwelling units? MR. FLEMMING: I am. MR. HALLER: And did you evaluate the feasibility of purchasing the property as it is currently platted and simply limiting the development to 72 lots that were platted? MR. FLEMMING: We have. MR. HALLER: And what prevented you from doing that? MR. FLEMMING: We determined after kind of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	community called the Villages at Savannah in Brandywine. MR. HALLER: Now when you develop projects, are there any signature features that Mid Atlantic is known for? MR. FLEMMING: Sure. The first thing we start with is the community itself. We try to include a unique entrance feature. I think if, if, Mr. Haller, if you scroll to the end, you'll see some of our communities where we have done water features; we have a community called Woodmore, which is Woodmore North, which is on 450 in Bowie where we've done an extensive entrance feature with water. The other project that we just talked about, the Villages of Savannah, which is the next, one more picture, I think, there it is, this is our current community under development. We've done additional water features on this and we actually just won an award from the Builder's Association for this for, for a land development project for the year, for 2021. So, we, we take the cue from the entrance features and, and the lifestyle, and then we incorporate that same	 process for how we could do something unique at Kenwood Village. MR. HALLER: Okay. And how long have you been, been actually looking at Kenwood Village? MR. FLEMMING: We've been looking at the project since 2013. MR. HALLER: And are you aware that the property is currently platted for 72 single-family detached dwelling units? MR. FLEMMING: I am. MR. HALLER: And did you evaluate the feasibility of purchasing the property as it is currently platted and simply limiting the development to 72 lots that were platted? MR. FLEMMING: We have.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	community called the Villages at Savannah in Brandywine. MR. HALLER: Now when you develop projects, are there any signature features that Mid Atlantic is known for? MR. FLEMMING: Sure. The first thing we start with is the community itself. We try to include a unique entrance feature. I think if, if, Mr. Haller, if you scroll to the end, you'll see some of our communities where we have done water features; we have a community called Woodmore, which is Woodmore North, which is on 450 in Bowie where we've done an extensive entrance feature with water. The other project that we just talked about, the Villages of Savannah, which is the next, one more picture, I think, there it is, this is our current community under development. We've done additional water features on this and we actually just won an award from the Builder's Association for this for, for a land development project for the year, for 2021. So, we, we take the cue from the entrance features and, and the lifestyle, and then we incorporate that same forward-thinking into our designs. And so, in most all of	 process for how we could do something unique at Kenwood Village. MR. HALLER: Okay. And how long have you been, been actually looking at Kenwood Village? MR. FLEMMING: We've been looking at the project since 2013. MR. HALLER: And are you aware that the property is currently platted for 72 single-family detached dwelling units? MR. FLEMMING: I am. MR. HALLER: And did you evaluate the feasibility of purchasing the property as it is currently platted and simply limiting the development to 72 lots that were platted? MR. FLEMMING: We have. MR. HALLER: And what prevented you from doing that? MR. FLEMMING: We determined after kind of extensive review of the 72-lot design that the current product that was proposed did not really, did not create a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	community called the Villages at Savannah in Brandywine. MR. HALLER: Now when you develop projects, are there any signature features that Mid Atlantic is known for? MR. FLEMMING: Sure. The first thing we start with is the community itself. We try to include a unique entrance feature. I think if, if, Mr. Haller, if you scroll to the end, you'll see some of our communities where we have done water features; we have a community called Woodmore, which is Woodmore North, which is on 450 in Bowie where we've done an extensive entrance feature with water. The other project that we just talked about, the Villages of Savannah, which is the next, one more picture, I think, there it is, this is our current community under development. We've done additional water features on this and we actually just won an award from the Builder's Association for this for, for a land development project for the year, for 2021. So, we, we take the cue from the entrance features and, and the lifestyle, and then we incorporate that same forward-thinking into our designs. And so, in most all of our communities, we're, we're designing unique and different	 process for how we could do something unique at Kenwood Village. MR. HALLER: Okay. And how long have you been, been actually looking at Kenwood Village? MR. FLEMMING: We've been looking at the project since 2013. MR. HALLER: And are you aware that the property is currently platted for 72 single-family detached dwelling units? MR. FLEMMING: I am. MR. HALLER: And did you evaluate the feasibility of purchasing the property as it is currently platted and simply limiting the development to 72 lots that were platted? MR. FLEMMING: We have. MR. FLEMMING: We determined after kind of extensive review of the 72-lot design that the current product that was proposed did not really, did not create a circumstance where we could get to a, a price point of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	community called the Villages at Savannah in Brandywine. MR. HALLER: Now when you develop projects, are there any signature features that Mid Atlantic is known for? MR. FLEMMING: Sure. The first thing we start with is the community itself. We try to include a unique entrance feature. I think if, if, Mr. Haller, if you scroll to the end, you'll see some of our communities where we have done water features; we have a community called Woodmore, which is Woodmore North, which is on 450 in Bowie where we've done an extensive entrance feature with water. The other project that we just talked about, the Villages of Savannah, which is the next, one more picture, I think, there it is, this is our current community under development. We've done additional water features on this and we actually just won an award from the Builder's Association for this for, for a land development project for the year, for 2021. So, we, we take the cue from the entrance features and, and the lifestyle, and then we incorporate that same forward-thinking into our designs. And so, in most all of our communities, we're, we're designing unique and different product for that community to address the needs that, that	 process for how we could do something unique at Kenwood Village. MR. HALLER: Okay. And how long have you been, been actually looking at Kenwood Village? MR. FLEMMING: We've been looking at the project since 2013. MR. HALLER: And are you aware that the property is currently platted for 72 single-family detached dwelling units? MR. FLEMMING: I am. MR. FLEMMING: I am. MR. HALLER: And did you evaluate the feasibility of purchasing the property as it is currently platted and simply limiting the development to 72 lots that were platted? MR. FLEMMING: We have. MR. FLEMMING: We have. MR. FLEMMING: We have. MR. FLEMMING: We determined after kind of extensive review of the 72-lot design that the current product that was proposed did not really, did not create a circumstance where we could get to a, a price point of feasibility for the project based on where the current
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	community called the Villages at Savannah in Brandywine. MR. HALLER: Now when you develop projects, are there any signature features that Mid Atlantic is known for? MR. FLEMMING: Sure. The first thing we start with is the community itself. We try to include a unique entrance feature. I think if, if, Mr. Haller, if you scroll to the end, you'll see some of our communities where we have done water features; we have a community called Woodmore, which is Woodmore North, which is on 450 in Bowie where we've done an extensive entrance feature with water. The other project that we just talked about, the Villages of Savannah, which is the next, one more picture, I think, there it is, this is our current community under development. We've done additional water features on this and we actually just won an award from the Builder's Association for this for, for a land development project for the year, for 2021. So, we, we take the cue from the entrance features and, and the lifestyle, and then we incorporate that same forward-thinking into our designs. And so, in most all of our communities, we're, we're designing unique and different product for that community. Recently, we've been building	 process for how we could do something unique at Kenwood Village. MR. HALLER: Okay. And how long have you been, been actually looking at Kenwood Village? MR. FLEMMING: We've been looking at the project since 2013. MR. HALLER: And are you aware that the property is currently platted for 72 single-family detached dwelling units? MR. FLEMMING: I am. MR. HALLER: And did you evaluate the feasibility of purchasing the property as it is currently platted and simply limiting the development to 72 lots that were platted? MR. FLEMMING: We have. MR. FLEMMING: We have. MR. FLEMMING: We determined after kind of extensive review of the 72-lot design that the current product that was proposed did not really, did not create a circumstance where we could get to a, a price point of feasibility for the project based on where the current market conditions were; and, and, additionally, the, the

	Page 26		Page 28
1	that current density of design.	1	unique and different and take advantage of the flexibility
2	MR. HALLER: So, you mentioned the road	2	of that, of that zone. And in looking at that kind of
3	improvements. What road improvements are you referring to?	3	opportunity on the product, we also recognized that we
4	MR. FLEMMING: So, there's a requirement to build	4	needed to address these offsite road improvements. So, we
5	a half section of White House Road across the frontage of	5	felt that if we could come up with a creative and unique
6	the property.		product design that could allow us to get closer to the
7	MR. HALLER: And are you aware of any prior		approved density at 124 units, that we could basically
	discussions with DPIE regarding what frontage improvements		create a product solution that was unique and different,
	would be required in conjunction with the development of the		creative, and at the time same create the, the financial
	property?		resources to be able to lead to all the offsite road
11	MR. FLEMMING: I am.		improvement.
12	MR. HALLER: And were those road improvement plans	12	MR. HALLER: And what do you envision the market
14	actually approved? MR. FLEMMING: To the best of my knowledge, they	14	being for the units that you're proposing here? MR. FLEMMING: So, we, we anticipate that our
	were, yes.		buyer profile here is going to likely be young families with
16	MR. HALLER: And that was done by the prior		children. We also, that was based on our experience at
	owners, or the current owner of the property?		Westphalia and Parkside. We expect we'll also see couples
18	MR. FLEMMING: Yeah, the, yes, the prior owners	18	
	took the project, I believe with, all the way through full		buyers because the product that we're proposing has more of
20	approvals. Ultimately, the project didn't get its final	20	a convenience lifestyle to it; a little bit more of what we
21	approval because it was, I guess this was in the, in the	21	call lock and leave, less lawn maintenance, less exterior
22	change when the County Zoning Ordinance over stormwater	22	maintenance, and we have put the, the indoor/outdoor spaces
	management, it was unable to get itself grandfathered; and		kind of in the, in the back of the home which gives people
	so, that plan, those final plans were not the project was		their, their privacy; and, and what we're also trying to
25	never able to go forward because of that.	25	achieve here, and you see it in this picture, we're trying
	Page 27		Page 29
1	C C	1	Page 29
1	MR. HALLER: And have you obtained any preliminary		to get the amenities, we're trying to get the, if you will,
2	MR. HALLER: And have you obtained any preliminary estimates for the cost of constructing the road improvements	2	to get the amenities, we're trying to get the, if you will, the, the swing sets and the things like that over in the
2	MR. HALLER: And have you obtained any preliminary	2 3	to get the amenities, we're trying to get the, if you will,
2 3 4	MR. HALLER: And have you obtained any preliminary estimates for the cost of constructing the road improvements that are required?	2 3 4	to get the amenities, we're trying to get the, if you will, the, the swing sets and the things like that over in the common areas, not necessarily in backyards. So, we feel
2 3 4 5	MR. HALLER: And have you obtained any preliminary estimates for the cost of constructing the road improvements that are required? MR. FLEMMING: We have. We anticipate that those	2 3 4 5	to get the amenities, we're trying to get the, if you will, the, the swing sets and the things like that over in the common areas, not necessarily in backyards. So, we feel like based on what we've learned at Parkside and Westphalia,
2 3 4 5	MR. HALLER: And have you obtained any preliminary estimates for the cost of constructing the road improvements that are required? MR. FLEMMING: We have. We anticipate that those costs are somewhere between 1 1/2 and, and approximately \$2	2 3 4 5 6	to get the amenities, we're trying to get the, if you will, the, the swing sets and the things like that over in the common areas, not necessarily in backyards. So, we feel like based on what we've learned at Parkside and Westphalia, we can aggregate the common area amenities into one location
2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. HALLER: And have you obtained any preliminary estimates for the cost of constructing the road improvements that are required? MR. FLEMMING: We have. We anticipate that those costs are somewhere between 1 1/2 and, and approximately \$2 million to build the offsite roads.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	to get the amenities, we're trying to get the, if you will, the, the swing sets and the things like that over in the common areas, not necessarily in backyards. So, we feel like based on what we've learned at Parkside and Westphalia, we can aggregate the common area amenities into one location and then we can give people more of this convenience lifestyle which we're hearing more and more from our customers is the, you know, they don't want to mow as much
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. HALLER: And have you obtained any preliminary estimates for the cost of constructing the road improvements that are required? MR. FLEMMING: We have. We anticipate that those costs are somewhere between 1 1/2 and, and approximately \$2 million to build the offsite roads. MR. HALLER: And you've indicated that in your experience, a 72-lot subdivision could not absorb those costs?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	to get the amenities, we're trying to get the, if you will, the, the swing sets and the things like that over in the common areas, not necessarily in backyards. So, we feel like based on what we've learned at Parkside and Westphalia, we can aggregate the common area amenities into one location and then we can give people more of this convenience lifestyle which we're hearing more and more from our customers is the, you know, they don't want to mow as much grass, if you will. So, we're looking for ways to, to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. HALLER: And have you obtained any preliminary estimates for the cost of constructing the road improvements that are required? MR. FLEMMING: We have. We anticipate that those costs are somewhere between 1 1/2 and, and approximately \$2 million to build the offsite roads. MR. HALLER: And you've indicated that in your experience, a 72-lot subdivision could not absorb those costs? MR. FLEMMING: That's correct. When you kind of	2 3 6 7 8 9	to get the amenities, we're trying to get the, if you will, the, the swing sets and the things like that over in the common areas, not necessarily in backyards. So, we feel like based on what we've learned at Parkside and Westphalia, we can aggregate the common area amenities into one location and then we can give people more of this convenience lifestyle which we're hearing more and more from our customers is the, you know, they don't want to mow as much grass, if you will. So, we're looking for ways to, to design houses that are more accommodating of that kind of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. HALLER: And have you obtained any preliminary estimates for the cost of constructing the road improvements that are required? MR. FLEMMING: We have. We anticipate that those costs are somewhere between 1 1/2 and, and approximately \$2 million to build the offsite roads. MR. HALLER: And you've indicated that in your experience, a 72-lot subdivision could not absorb those costs? MR. FLEMMING: That's correct. When you kind of look at the cost of that, that represents about 30 percent	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	to get the amenities, we're trying to get the, if you will, the, the swing sets and the things like that over in the common areas, not necessarily in backyards. So, we feel like based on what we've learned at Parkside and Westphalia, we can aggregate the common area amenities into one location and then we can give people more of this convenience lifestyle which we're hearing more and more from our customers is the, you know, they don't want to mow as much grass, if you will. So, we're looking for ways to, to design houses that are more accommodating of that kind of lock and leave convenience lifestyle.
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. HALLER: And have you obtained any preliminary estimates for the cost of constructing the road improvements that are required? MR. FLEMMING: We have. We anticipate that those costs are somewhere between 1 1/2 and, and approximately \$2 million to build the offsite roads. MR. HALLER: And you've indicated that in your experience, a 72-lot subdivision could not absorb those costs? MR. FLEMMING: That's correct. When you kind of look at the cost of that, that represents about 30 percent of what a typical land development cost would be for a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	to get the amenities, we're trying to get the, if you will, the, the swing sets and the things like that over in the common areas, not necessarily in backyards. So, we feel like based on what we've learned at Parkside and Westphalia, we can aggregate the common area amenities into one location and then we can give people more of this convenience lifestyle which we're hearing more and more from our customers is the, you know, they don't want to mow as much grass, if you will. So, we're looking for ways to, to design houses that are more accommodating of that kind of lock and leave convenience lifestyle. MR. HALLER: Okay. And so, are the amendments to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. HALLER: And have you obtained any preliminary estimates for the cost of constructing the road improvements that are required? MR. FLEMMING: We have. We anticipate that those costs are somewhere between 1 1/2 and, and approximately \$2 million to build the offsite roads. MR. HALLER: And you've indicated that in your experience, a 72-lot subdivision could not absorb those costs? MR. FLEMMING: That's correct. When you kind of look at the cost of that, that represents about 30 percent of what a typical land development cost would be for a single-family detached community and when you add that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	to get the amenities, we're trying to get the, if you will, the, the swing sets and the things like that over in the common areas, not necessarily in backyards. So, we feel like based on what we've learned at Parkside and Westphalia, we can aggregate the common area amenities into one location and then we can give people more of this convenience lifestyle which we're hearing more and more from our customers is the, you know, they don't want to mow as much grass, if you will. So, we're looking for ways to, to design houses that are more accommodating of that kind of lock and leave convenience lifestyle. MR. HALLER: Okay. And so, are the amendments to the Basic Plan, which have been proposed, and the amendments
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. HALLER: And have you obtained any preliminary estimates for the cost of constructing the road improvements that are required? MR. FLEMMING: We have. We anticipate that those costs are somewhere between 1 1/2 and, and approximately \$2 million to build the offsite roads. MR. HALLER: And you've indicated that in your experience, a 72-lot subdivision could not absorb those costs? MR. FLEMMING: That's correct. When you kind of look at the cost of that, that represents about 30 percent of what a typical land development cost would be for a single-family detached community and when you add that additional 30 percent on top of the normal development	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	to get the amenities, we're trying to get the, if you will, the, the swing sets and the things like that over in the common areas, not necessarily in backyards. So, we feel like based on what we've learned at Parkside and Westphalia, we can aggregate the common area amenities into one location and then we can give people more of this convenience lifestyle which we're hearing more and more from our customers is the, you know, they don't want to mow as much grass, if you will. So, we're looking for ways to, to design houses that are more accommodating of that kind of lock and leave convenience lifestyle. MR. HALLER: Okay. And so, are the amendments to the Basic Plan, which have been proposed, and the amendments to the conditions intended to address both the product-type
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. HALLER: And have you obtained any preliminary estimates for the cost of constructing the road improvements that are required? MR. FLEMMING: We have. We anticipate that those costs are somewhere between 1 1/2 and, and approximately \$2 million to build the offsite roads. MR. HALLER: And you've indicated that in your experience, a 72-lot subdivision could not absorb those costs? MR. FLEMMING: That's correct. When you kind of look at the cost of that, that represents about 30 percent of what a typical land development cost would be for a single-family detached community and when you add that additional 30 percent on top of the normal development costs, we determined it, it was not feasible.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	to get the amenities, we're trying to get the, if you will, the, the swing sets and the things like that over in the common areas, not necessarily in backyards. So, we feel like based on what we've learned at Parkside and Westphalia, we can aggregate the common area amenities into one location and then we can give people more of this convenience lifestyle which we're hearing more and more from our customers is the, you know, they don't want to mow as much grass, if you will. So, we're looking for ways to, to design houses that are more accommodating of that kind of lock and leave convenience lifestyle. MR. HALLER: Okay. And so, are the amendments to the Basic Plan, which have been proposed, and the amendments to the conditions intended to address both the product-type issue, as well as the constructability of the road
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. HALLER: And have you obtained any preliminary estimates for the cost of constructing the road improvements that are required? MR. FLEMMING: We have. We anticipate that those costs are somewhere between 1 1/2 and, and approximately \$2 million to build the offsite roads. MR. HALLER: And you've indicated that in your experience, a 72-lot subdivision could not absorb those costs? MR. FLEMMING: That's correct. When you kind of look at the cost of that, that represents about 30 percent of what a typical land development cost would be for a single-family detached community and when you add that additional 30 percent on top of the normal development costs, we determined it, it was not feasible. MR. HALLER: Okay. Now, you mentioned that the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	to get the amenities, we're trying to get the, if you will, the, the swing sets and the things like that over in the common areas, not necessarily in backyards. So, we feel like based on what we've learned at Parkside and Westphalia, we can aggregate the common area amenities into one location and then we can give people more of this convenience lifestyle which we're hearing more and more from our customers is the, you know, they don't want to mow as much grass, if you will. So, we're looking for ways to, to design houses that are more accommodating of that kind of lock and leave convenience lifestyle. MR. HALLER: Okay. And so, are the amendments to the Basic Plan, which have been proposed, and the amendments to the conditions intended to address both the product-type issue, as well as the constructability of the road improvements?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. HALLER: And have you obtained any preliminary estimates for the cost of constructing the road improvements that are required? MR. FLEMMING: We have. We anticipate that those costs are somewhere between 1 1/2 and, and approximately \$2 million to build the offsite roads. MR. HALLER: And you've indicated that in your experience, a 72-lot subdivision could not absorb those costs? MR. FLEMMING: That's correct. When you kind of look at the cost of that, that represents about 30 percent of what a typical land development cost would be for a single-family detached community and when you add that additional 30 percent on top of the normal development costs, we determined it, it was not feasible. MR. HALLER: Okay. Now, you mentioned that the product type that was originally approved really didn't fit	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	to get the amenities, we're trying to get the, if you will, the, the swing sets and the things like that over in the common areas, not necessarily in backyards. So, we feel like based on what we've learned at Parkside and Westphalia, we can aggregate the common area amenities into one location and then we can give people more of this convenience lifestyle which we're hearing more and more from our customers is the, you know, they don't want to mow as much grass, if you will. So, we're looking for ways to, to design houses that are more accommodating of that kind of lock and leave convenience lifestyle. MR. HALLER: Okay. And so, are the amendments to the Basic Plan, which have been proposed, and the amendments to the conditions intended to address both the product-type issue, as well as the constructability of the road
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. HALLER: And have you obtained any preliminary estimates for the cost of constructing the road improvements that are required? MR. FLEMMING: We have. We anticipate that those costs are somewhere between 1 1/2 and, and approximately \$2 million to build the offsite roads. MR. HALLER: And you've indicated that in your experience, a 72-lot subdivision could not absorb those costs? MR. FLEMMING: That's correct. When you kind of look at the cost of that, that represents about 30 percent of what a typical land development cost would be for a single-family detached community and when you add that additional 30 percent on top of the normal development costs, we determined it, it was not feasible. MR. HALLER: Okay. Now, you mentioned that the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	to get the amenities, we're trying to get the, if you will, the, the swing sets and the things like that over in the common areas, not necessarily in backyards. So, we feel like based on what we've learned at Parkside and Westphalia, we can aggregate the common area amenities into one location and then we can give people more of this convenience lifestyle which we're hearing more and more from our customers is the, you know, they don't want to mow as much grass, if you will. So, we're looking for ways to, to design houses that are more accommodating of that kind of lock and leave convenience lifestyle. MR. HALLER: Okay. And so, are the amendments to the Basic Plan, which have been proposed, and the amendments to the conditions intended to address both the product-type issue, as well as the constructability of the road improvements? MR. FLEMMING: Yes, they are.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. HALLER: And have you obtained any preliminary estimates for the cost of constructing the road improvements that are required? MR. FLEMMING: We have. We anticipate that those costs are somewhere between 1 1/2 and, and approximately \$2 million to build the offsite roads. MR. HALLER: And you've indicated that in your experience, a 72-lot subdivision could not absorb those costs? MR. FLEMMING: That's correct. When you kind of look at the cost of that, that represents about 30 percent of what a typical land development cost would be for a single-family detached community and when you add that additional 30 percent on top of the normal development costs, we determined it, it was not feasible. MR. HALLER: Okay. Now, you mentioned that the product type that was originally approved really didn't fit the market today. Can you explain your (unintelligible)	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	to get the amenities, we're trying to get the, if you will, the, the swing sets and the things like that over in the common areas, not necessarily in backyards. So, we feel like based on what we've learned at Parkside and Westphalia, we can aggregate the common area amenities into one location and then we can give people more of this convenience lifestyle which we're hearing more and more from our customers is the, you know, they don't want to mow as much grass, if you will. So, we're looking for ways to, to design houses that are more accommodating of that kind of lock and leave convenience lifestyle. MR. HALLER: Okay. And so, are the amendments to the Basic Plan, which have been proposed, and the amendments to the conditions intended to address both the product-type issue, as well as the constructability of the road improvements? MR. FLEMMING: Yes, they are. MR. HALLER: And if the Basic Plan Amendment that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. HALLER: And have you obtained any preliminary estimates for the cost of constructing the road improvements that are required? MR. FLEMMING: We have. We anticipate that those costs are somewhere between 1 1/2 and, and approximately \$2 million to build the offsite roads. MR. HALLER: And you've indicated that in your experience, a 72-lot subdivision could not absorb those costs? MR. FLEMMING: That's correct. When you kind of look at the cost of that, that represents about 30 percent of what a typical land development cost would be for a single-family detached community and when you add that additional 30 percent on top of the normal development costs, we determined it, it was not feasible. MR. HALLER: Okay. Now, you mentioned that the product type that was originally approved really didn't fit the market today. Can you explain your (unintelligible) you're exploring?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	to get the amenities, we're trying to get the, if you will, the, the swing sets and the things like that over in the common areas, not necessarily in backyards. So, we feel like based on what we've learned at Parkside and Westphalia, we can aggregate the common area amenities into one location and then we can give people more of this convenience lifestyle which we're hearing more and more from our customers is the, you know, they don't want to mow as much grass, if you will. So, we're looking for ways to, to design houses that are more accommodating of that kind of lock and leave convenience lifestyle. MR. HALLER: Okay. And so, are the amendments to the Basic Plan, which have been proposed, and the amendments to the conditions intended to address both the product-type issue, as well as the constructability of the road improvements? MR. FLEMMING: Yes, they are. MR. HALLER: And if the Basic Plan Amendment that you thought is approved, is it your intention to construct
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. HALLER: And have you obtained any preliminary estimates for the cost of constructing the road improvements that are required? MR. FLEMMING: We have. We anticipate that those costs are somewhere between 1 1/2 and, and approximately \$2 million to build the offsite roads. MR. HALLER: And you've indicated that in your experience, a 72-lot subdivision could not absorb those costs? MR. FLEMMING: That's correct. When you kind of look at the cost of that, that represents about 30 percent of what a typical land development cost would be for a single-family detached community and when you add that additional 30 percent on top of the normal development costs, we determined it, it was not feasible. MR. HALLER: Okay. Now, you mentioned that the product type that was originally approved really didn't fit the market today. Can you explain your (unintelligible) you're exploring? MR. FLEMMING: Sure. Sure. So, so, we think that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	to get the amenities, we're trying to get the, if you will, the, the swing sets and the things like that over in the common areas, not necessarily in backyards. So, we feel like based on what we've learned at Parkside and Westphalia, we can aggregate the common area amenities into one location and then we can give people more of this convenience lifestyle which we're hearing more and more from our customers is the, you know, they don't want to mow as much grass, if you will. So, we're looking for ways to, to design houses that are more accommodating of that kind of lock and leave convenience lifestyle. MR. HALLER: Okay. And so, are the amendments to the Basic Plan, which have been proposed, and the amendments to the conditions intended to address both the product-type issue, as well as the constructability of the road improvements? MR. FLEMMING: Yes, they are. MR. HALLER: And if the Basic Plan Amendment that you thought is approved, is it your intention to construct the road improvements that were approved by DPIE for this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. HALLER: And have you obtained any preliminary estimates for the cost of constructing the road improvements that are required? MR. FLEMMING: We have. We anticipate that those costs are somewhere between 1 1/2 and, and approximately \$2 million to build the offsite roads. MR. HALLER: And you've indicated that in your experience, a 72-lot subdivision could not absorb those costs? MR. FLEMMING: That's correct. When you kind of look at the cost of that, that represents about 30 percent of what a typical land development cost would be for a single-family detached community and when you add that additional 30 percent on top of the normal development costs, we determined it, it was not feasible. MR. HALLER: Okay. Now, you mentioned that the product type that was originally approved really didn't fit the market today. Can you explain your (unintelligible) you're exploring? MR. FLEMMING: Sure. Sure. So, so, we think that we're very fortunate because of the, of the RS Zone, which really encourages and is designed to kind of create unique product, and there are not many opportunities to do that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	to get the amenities, we're trying to get the, if you will, the, the swing sets and the things like that over in the common areas, not necessarily in backyards. So, we feel like based on what we've learned at Parkside and Westphalia, we can aggregate the common area amenities into one location and then we can give people more of this convenience lifestyle which we're hearing more and more from our customers is the, you know, they don't want to mow as much grass, if you will. So, we're looking for ways to, to design houses that are more accommodating of that kind of lock and leave convenience lifestyle. MR. HALLER: Okay. And so, are the amendments to the Basic Plan, which have been proposed, and the amendments to the conditions intended to address both the product-type issue, as well as the constructability of the road improvements? MR. FLEMMING: Yes, they are. MR. HALLER: And if the Basic Plan Amendment that you thought is approved, is it your intention to construct the road improvements that were approved by DPIE for this project? MR. FLEMMING: Yes, it is. MR. HALLER: Okay. So, let me address each of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MR. HALLER: And have you obtained any preliminary estimates for the cost of constructing the road improvements that are required? MR. FLEMMING: We have. We anticipate that those costs are somewhere between 1 1/2 and, and approximately \$2 million to build the offsite roads. MR. HALLER: And you've indicated that in your experience, a 72-lot subdivision could not absorb those costs? MR. FLEMMING: That's correct. When you kind of look at the cost of that, that represents about 30 percent of what a typical land development cost would be for a single-family detached community and when you add that additional 30 percent on top of the normal development costs, we determined it, it was not feasible. MR. HALLER: Okay. Now, you mentioned that the product type that was originally approved really didn't fit the market today. Can you explain your (unintelligible) you're exploring? MR. FLEMMING: Sure. Sure. So, so, we think that we're very fortunate because of the, of the RS Zone, which really encourages and is designed to kind of create unique product, and there are not many opportunities to do that throughout the County, that we were kind of presented with	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	to get the amenities, we're trying to get the, if you will, the, the swing sets and the things like that over in the common areas, not necessarily in backyards. So, we feel like based on what we've learned at Parkside and Westphalia, we can aggregate the common area amenities into one location and then we can give people more of this convenience lifestyle which we're hearing more and more from our customers is the, you know, they don't want to mow as much grass, if you will. So, we're looking for ways to, to design houses that are more accommodating of that kind of lock and leave convenience lifestyle. MR. HALLER: Okay. And so, are the amendments to the Basic Plan, which have been proposed, and the amendments to the conditions intended to address both the product-type issue, as well as the constructability of the road improvements? MR. FLEMMING: Yes, they are. MR. HALLER: And if the Basic Plan Amendment that you thought is approved, is it your intention to construct the road improvements that were approved by DPIE for this project? MR. FLEMMING: Yes, it is. MR. HALLER: Okay. So, let me address each of the conditions which you have requested to modify, which is what
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MR. HALLER: And have you obtained any preliminary estimates for the cost of constructing the road improvements that are required? MR. FLEMMING: We have. We anticipate that those costs are somewhere between 1 1/2 and, and approximately \$2 million to build the offsite roads. MR. HALLER: And you've indicated that in your experience, a 72-lot subdivision could not absorb those costs? MR. FLEMMING: That's correct. When you kind of look at the cost of that, that represents about 30 percent of what a typical land development cost would be for a single-family detached community and when you add that additional 30 percent on top of the normal development costs, we determined it, it was not feasible. MR. HALLER: Okay. Now, you mentioned that the product type that was originally approved really didn't fit the market today. Can you explain your (unintelligible) you're exploring? MR. FLEMMING: Sure. Sure. So, so, we think that we're very fortunate because of the, of the RS Zone, which really encourages and is designed to kind of create unique product, and there are not many opportunities to do that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	to get the amenities, we're trying to get the, if you will, the, the swing sets and the things like that over in the common areas, not necessarily in backyards. So, we feel like based on what we've learned at Parkside and Westphalia, we can aggregate the common area amenities into one location and then we can give people more of this convenience lifestyle which we're hearing more and more from our customers is the, you know, they don't want to mow as much grass, if you will. So, we're looking for ways to, to design houses that are more accommodating of that kind of lock and leave convenience lifestyle. MR. HALLER: Okay. And so, are the amendments to the Basic Plan, which have been proposed, and the amendments to the conditions intended to address both the product-type issue, as well as the constructability of the road improvements? MR. FLEMMING: Yes, they are. MR. HALLER: And if the Basic Plan Amendment that you thought is approved, is it your intention to construct the road improvements that were approved by DPIE for this project? MR. FLEMMING: Yes, it is. MR. HALLER: Okay. So, let me address each of the

	Page 30	Page 32
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Condition 7, which says that the minimum lot sizes shall be 6,000 square feet in development envelopes A through D, and 10,000 square feet in development N below P. What changes are you proposing to make to this minimum lot size? MR. FLEMMING: We'd like to address, adjust the minimum lot size from those down to 4,200 square feet which would basically be a lot that's 42-feet wide and a hundred feet deep. And that MADAM EXAMINER: That's for all the lots? MR. FLEMMING: That's correct, ma'am. MADAM EXAMINER: All MR. FLEMMING: Yes, all lots. All lots would go, all lots would be 42 by 100, which would give us a 4,200 square foot lot, which is sufficient to accommodate our proposed designs, our house designs which are approximately 30-feet wide and 60-feet deep. MR. HALLER: And, and the, have you asked your engineer to prepare a concept layout of what that would look like? MR. FLEMMING: We have and it's before you. MR. HALLER: Okay. And this is the concept layout that we pulled earlier which is Exhibit, hold on, 20. It's Exhibit 20. And could you walk us through the Concept Plan and describe what it depicts?	 transportation, we have more than enough capacity within the 124 lots that we're proposing to be accommodated by that single point of access. MR. HALLER: Okay. Now have you developed the product which you can build on these lots? MR. FLEMMING: We have. We're currently in the concepts of those. I don't know if you want to share those. We can talk through them. MR. HALLER: Okay. Is this the first time, let me, this is MR. FLEMMING: All right. MR. HALLER: Exhibit 47; and is, is, before you address the concept, is this the first time that you've designed a product in Prince George's County that's responsive to changing market price? MR. FLEMMING: No, not at all. As I mentioned previously, in most of our communities, we are designing new concepts for each of the communities. So, in the case of the Westphalia product that I referenced, those were all new designs. Parkside community was all new design. We're currently building homes in a new project called South Lake. Those are all new designs. So, we tend to, to start with, with a new design or a, at worst, we're adapting something
25	MR. FLEMMING: Sure. So, if you start, so we have	25 case of Kenwood, this is a complete, or this is a complete
	Page 31	Page 33
2 3 4 5 6 7	maintained the connection that was previously approved at White House Road. We will have a divided median that we anticipate landscaping extensively. We will do, our, our plan is to have a signature entrance feature similar to what we have done in our past at, at the front of the community. As you arrive in the community, you'll have, you'll have this very similar road network to what was previously approved. We tried to manage within the original areas of	 Page 33 new design to, to meet the configuration of the lot sizes that we're proposing. MR. HALLER: Okay. Can you, using this exhibit, can you describe the proposed homes; how, how they function and how it meets the needs of the buyers in the current marketplace? MR. FLEMMING: Sure. So, what, what we learned at, at, at Westphalia was that our customers were, were

	Page 34		Page 36
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	see it again, the house is 30 feet, and this one is 54. We're going to show you some other ones. These are the elevations that we're currently working on developing. The concept for this is more of a craftsman, modern farmhouse; but what these plans are really showing you is we're, we're, we've, we've got an offering or collection of homes here that are three to 4-bedroom homes; they're going to, we believe that will be somewhere between 2,200 and call it 3,000 square feet, probably by the time we're all done on, on the, on the two living levels. We'll have the opportunity for multiple bedrooms. If you keep sliding down a little further, we, we've, this next plan introduces what we've kind of done in our other communities where we're going to introduce a primary suite or a study, basically, a bedroom on the lower level. We call this multi-generation. We see a dramatic need in the County with our customers for, for being able to have family members move back in and want to be on the, on the, on the primary level of the house; and so, this concept incorporates that kind of multi-generational function down on this house and, and this is a 4-bedroom design as well. And, again, it's, it's the combination of really the open concept, the, if you look to the rear of the house, we've got the indoor/outdoor space that we're seeing so much as	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	anticipate will have basements. So, there will be even additional storage there. And then we, we designed the site so that not only can we get two spaces in the garage, but we'll have two spaces in the driveway. We recognize that our customers like their automobiles. So, we've designed for it. MR. HALLER: All right. Thank you. Now the next two conditions which you're proposing to modify are Conditions 8 and 13, which relate to the buffers. Condition 8 requires the 50-foot buffers along the east and southern boundaries, and requires, or, and requires that they be non- disturbance buffers. I'm going to pull back up the Concept Plan, and you referenced this earlier. Just, again, to reiterate what you're proposing to modify with regard to Condition 8? MR. FLEMMING: So, the, so, the buffers on the east side of the site against the Rauch property, we're going to maintain the same buffer that was there before; we've just asked the ability to allow us to install the stormwater management pond inside that buffer. And then the buffer to the south, we have asked to reduce that from a 50- foot buffer to a 25-foot landscape buffer; and the reason that we did that was that with the installation of the gas line, it's created a natural buffer on the south side of the
	desired by our customers. So, we're, we're trying to take,		property; and so, we, we felt that, that, that any future
	Dogo 25		Dogo 27
1	Page 35	-	Page 37
	if you will, all of the things that we've learned from the customers, our focus groups to kind of incorporate into a		housing or any future development on that side of the property would be buffered from us now because of the gas
	house design that, to the best of our knowledge, has not		lines.
5 6	been built in the County; but we, we think based on, on the, on the lessons that we've learned elsewhere, that this lifestyle, this programming style is going to be very, very well-received.	6	MR. HALLER: Okay. And the, one question. The, the conditions also mentioned a black, vinyl-clad, chain- link fence along the property. Are you proposing to, to continue to, to fence the property as well?
8 9	MR. HALLER: Okay. Let me just see. Are there any other highlights you want to reference on the	8 9	MR. FLEMMING: Yeah, we will, we will fence it. I don't think we will use a black, vinyl, chain-link fence.
10	MR. FLEMMING: I think, I think as you, as you		That's not necessarily a material that, that would be our
	move through these house plans, what you're seeing is the,		preference; but, but we're happy to put fencing, you know,
	we're adding a bedroom; we're adding a bed, we're adding a bedroom upstairs; we're adding a bedroom downstairs; we're	12 13	in those buffers. MR. HALLER: Did you learn where that condition
14	changing some of the, the openness of the, of the	14	came from?
	staircases. Again, we've, we've, in one of the plans we've introduced our signature spa bathroom. So, we're trying to	15 16	MR. FLEMMING: I believe that condition came from Mrs. Rauch who wanted a, a, a buffer, or, or actually a
	come up with different structural features and interior		fence to keep the livestock from her property to coming onto
19	features that will allow this kind of collection of houses to, to create a more affordability across a spectrum of square footage.		the property. So, I think that's where the chain-link fence came in. MR. HALLER: Okay. And, but you just wanted the
21	MR. HALLER: Okay. Will each of the homes have 2- car garages?	21	flexibility to be able to upgrade that fence a little bit from chain-link?
23 24	MR. FLEMMING: Yes, that, that's one of our requirements is that we, we want two cars, plus storage in the garage. These houses will have basements, at least we	23 24	MR. FLEMMING: If we can upgrade the fence, I think that's our expectation, that we would upgrade the fence.

	Page 38		Page 40
1	MR. HALLER: Okay. The Condition 13 referenced a	1	justification statement; but the examiner may recall the,
2	50-foot non-disturbance buffer along the streams and the	2	when the environmental regulations were updated in 2010, the
3	flood plains and what revision have you proposed to make for	3	buffers increased from 50 feet to 75 feet.
4	this condition?	4	MADAM EXAMINER: Yeah.
5	MR. FLEMMING: So, the, the, my understanding, the	5	MR. HALLER: I think this property was originally,
6	current ordinance requires that to be 75 feet, so we've gone	6	I mean grandfathered under the prior subdivision, but a new
7	ahead and addressed our design to accommodate 75-foot		subdivision will be required; so, the grandfather will be
8	buffer.	8	lost. So
9	MR. HALLER: Okay. The final conditions that	9	MADAM EXAMINER: Yeah.
	you've asked to modify, or actually to delete is Condition	10	MR. HALLER: it's just, there's just a
11			different requirement now; and so, the condition that was in
12	MADAM EXAMINER: Whoa, whoa, whoa, whoa, whoa.		the former Basic Plan, while it reflected what was required
13	MR. HALLER: I'm sorry. I'm sorry.		back in 1993, it, it conflicts with what the current
14	MADAME EXAMINER: I'm sorry, back up, 75-foot		regulations are, so there's no point in the way it was.
	undisturbed buffer?	15	MADAM EXAMINER: Okay. Great. Okay. Thank you.
16	MR. HALLER: I'll, along the environmental	16	3
	features.		I was referencing Condition 4, which required that the
18	MADAME EXAMINER: I thought you wanted a 25-foot landscaped buffer?		location with the internal trails proposed shall be
20	MR. HALLER: No, that, there, there are actually,		evaluated and determined by the trails coordinator prior to the Phase 2 approval and you requested that condition be
	there's actually three separate buffers that are referenced		deleted. Why did you make that request?
	in the former conditions. There's a non-disturbance buffer	22	MR. FLEMMING: In the subsequent approvals of
	along the eastern boundary line.		Kenwood Village previously, the, the trail conditions were
24	MADAME EXAMINER: That's 50 feet?		removed; and so, we took the position that since they were
25	MR. HALLER: Right. And then there was a, a non-		removed as it went through the prior development
	······································		······
	Page 39		Page 41
1	disturbance buffer along the southern boundary line which	1	applications, that, and it was approved that way, we would
2	we're asking Mr. Flemming say that they want to have reduced	2	just ask to have the removed. We didn't also see any
3	to 25 feet; and then instead of being non-disturbance, be a	3	connectivity here with anything else, so it seemed logical
4	landscape buffer	4	to ask for that to be removed.
5	MADAM EXAMINER: Okay.	5	MR. HALLER: Okay. Now have you had an
6	MR. HALLER: and then, and then the third		opportunity to review the Technical Staff Report prepared by
	buffer, which is and those two buffers are referenced in		Park and Planning?
	Condition 8. Condition 13 says a 50-foot, non-disturbance	8	MR. FLEMMING: I have.
	buffer along streams and flood plain, not a non-disturbance	9	MR. HALLER: And do you accept and agree to
	DUITER DUILINST & DUITER, and that's and and it's the	10	additional conditions of approval as referenced in the Staff
11	buffer, but just a buffer; and that's, and, and it's the		••
10	buffer from environmental features that's now 75 feet, not		Report?
	buffer from environmental features that's now 75 feet, not 50.	12	Report? MR. FLEMMING: We do. We would, we would like to
13	buffer from environmental features that's now 75 feet, not 50. MADAM EXAMINER: All right. So, you want to	12 13	Report? MR. FLEMMING: We do. We would, we would like to have some conditions consolidated as it relates to the
13 14	buffer from environmental features that's now 75 feet, not 50. MADAM EXAMINER: All right. So, you want to modify that, well, you're going to have 50 feet undisturbed	12 13 14	Report? MR. FLEMMING: We do. We would, we would like to have some conditions consolidated as it relates to the second point of access.
13 14 15	buffer from environmental features that's now 75 feet, not 50. MADAM EXAMINER: All right. So, you want to modify that, well, you're going to have 50 feet undisturbed buffer along the east side. You want to modify the second	12 13 14 15	Report? MR. FLEMMING: We do. We would, we would like to have some conditions consolidated as it relates to the second point of access. MR. HALLER: Okay. Well, let me just go through
13 14 15 16	buffer from environmental features that's now 75 feet, not 50. MADAM EXAMINER: All right. So, you want to modify that, well, you're going to have 50 feet undisturbed buffer along the east side. You want to modify the second one to decrease it to a 25-foot landscape buffer on the	12 13 14 15 16	Report? MR. FLEMMING: We do. We would, we would like to have some conditions consolidated as it relates to the second point of access. MR. HALLER: Okay. Well, let me just go through the four new conditions that Park and Planning has proposed,
13 14 15 16 17	buffer from environmental features that's now 75 feet, not 50. MADAM EXAMINER: All right. So, you want to modify that, well, you're going to have 50 feet undisturbed buffer along the east side. You want to modify the second one to decrease it to a 25-foot landscape buffer on the southside and you are agreeing to the 75-foot buffer along	12 13 14 15 16 17	Report? MR. FLEMMING: We do. We would, we would like to have some conditions consolidated as it relates to the second point of access. MR. HALLER: Okay. Well, let me just go through the four new conditions that Park and Planning has proposed, which are Conditions 14 to 17. Condition 14 says that at
13 14 15 16 17	buffer from environmental features that's now 75 feet, not 50. MADAM EXAMINER: All right. So, you want to modify that, well, you're going to have 50 feet undisturbed buffer along the east side. You want to modify the second one to decrease it to a 25-foot landscape buffer on the southside and you are agreeing to the 75-foot buffer along the environmental features?	12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Report? MR. FLEMMING: We do. We would, we would like to have some conditions consolidated as it relates to the second point of access. MR. HALLER: Okay. Well, let me just go through the four new conditions that Park and Planning has proposed, which are Conditions 14 to 17. Condition 14 says that at the time of review of the Preliminary Plan of Subdivision,
13 14 15 16 17 18	buffer from environmental features that's now 75 feet, not 50. MADAM EXAMINER: All right. So, you want to modify that, well, you're going to have 50 feet undisturbed buffer along the east side. You want to modify the second one to decrease it to a 25-foot landscape buffer on the southside and you are agreeing to the 75-foot buffer along	12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Report? MR. FLEMMING: We do. We would, we would like to have some conditions consolidated as it relates to the second point of access. MR. HALLER: Okay. Well, let me just go through the four new conditions that Park and Planning has proposed, which are Conditions 14 to 17. Condition 14 says that at the time of review of the Preliminary Plan of Subdivision, the Applicant shall allocate developable areas to provide
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	buffer from environmental features that's now 75 feet, not 50. MADAM EXAMINER: All right. So, you want to modify that, well, you're going to have 50 feet undisturbed buffer along the east side. You want to modify the second one to decrease it to a 25-foot landscape buffer on the southside and you are agreeing to the 75-foot buffer along the environmental features? MR. HALLER: Correct, yes.	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Report? MR. FLEMMING: We do. We would, we would like to have some conditions consolidated as it relates to the second point of access. MR. HALLER: Okay. Well, let me just go through the four new conditions that Park and Planning has proposed, which are Conditions 14 to 17. Condition 14 says that at the time of review of the Preliminary Plan of Subdivision, the Applicant shall allocate developable areas to provide
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	buffer from environmental features that's now 75 feet, not 50. MADAM EXAMINER: All right. So, you want to modify that, well, you're going to have 50 feet undisturbed buffer along the east side. You want to modify the second one to decrease it to a 25-foot landscape buffer on the southside and you are agreeing to the 75-foot buffer along the environmental features? MR. HALLER: Correct, yes. MADAM EXAMINER: Okay. So, really, the only part	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Report? MR. FLEMMING: We do. We would, we would like to have some conditions consolidated as it relates to the second point of access. MR. HALLER: Okay. Well, let me just go through the four new conditions that Park and Planning has proposed, which are Conditions 14 to 17. Condition 14 says that at the time of review of the Preliminary Plan of Subdivision, the Applicant shall allocate developable areas to provide adequate, onsite recreational facilities. Do you object to
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	buffer from environmental features that's now 75 feet, not 50. MADAM EXAMINER: All right. So, you want to modify that, well, you're going to have 50 feet undisturbed buffer along the east side. You want to modify the second one to decrease it to a 25-foot landscape buffer on the southside and you are agreeing to the 75-foot buffer along the environmental features? MR. HALLER: Correct, yes. MADAM EXAMINER: Okay. So, really, the only part of that that gets amended would be the, the southside, which	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Report? MR. FLEMMING: We do. We would, we would like to have some conditions consolidated as it relates to the second point of access. MR. HALLER: Okay. Well, let me just go through the four new conditions that Park and Planning has proposed, which are Conditions 14 to 17. Condition 14 says that at the time of review of the Preliminary Plan of Subdivision, the Applicant shall allocate developable areas to provide adequate, onsite recreational facilities. Do you object to this condition?
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	buffer from environmental features that's now 75 feet, not 50. MADAM EXAMINER: All right. So, you want to modify that, well, you're going to have 50 feet undisturbed buffer along the east side. You want to modify the second one to decrease it to a 25-foot landscape buffer on the southside and you are agreeing to the 75-foot buffer along the environmental features? MR. HALLER: Correct, yes. MADAM EXAMINER: Okay. So, really, the only part of that that gets amended would be the, the southside, which will be decreased to 25 feet with a landscape buffer?	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Report? MR. FLEMMING: We do. We would, we would like to have some conditions consolidated as it relates to the second point of access. MR. HALLER: Okay. Well, let me just go through the four new conditions that Park and Planning has proposed, which are Conditions 14 to 17. Condition 14 says that at the time of review of the Preliminary Plan of Subdivision, the Applicant shall allocate developable areas to provide adequate, onsite recreational facilities. Do you object to this condition? MR. FLEMMING: We do not.
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	buffer from environmental features that's now 75 feet, not 50. MADAM EXAMINER: All right. So, you want to modify that, well, you're going to have 50 feet undisturbed buffer along the east side. You want to modify the second one to decrease it to a 25-foot landscape buffer on the southside and you are agreeing to the 75-foot buffer along the environmental features? MR. HALLER: Correct, yes. MADAM EXAMINER: Okay. So, really, the only part of that that gets amended would be the, the southside, which will be decreased to 25 feet with a landscape buffer? MR. HALLER: Correct. And, and the, the wording	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Report? MR. FLEMMING: We do. We would, we would like to have some conditions consolidated as it relates to the second point of access. MR. HALLER: Okay. Well, let me just go through the four new conditions that Park and Planning has proposed, which are Conditions 14 to 17. Condition 14 says that at the time of review of the Preliminary Plan of Subdivision, the Applicant shall allocate developable areas to provide adequate, onsite recreational facilities. Do you object to this condition? MR. FLEMMING: We do not. MR. HALLER: Okay. And have you, do you have

	Page 42		Page 44
1	anticipate we're going to move some things around; but our	1	MR. BROWN: All right. So, the current
	goal and our plan is to, to have recreation amenities here	2	requirement is that the property owner improve White House
	in the community that, specifically, tot lots to accommodate		Road in front of its entire frontage on White House Road?
	the 2 to 5-year-old group; and then the pre-teens, the 5 to	4	
	12-year-olds as well.	5	MR. BROWN: All right. You also testified about
6	MR. HALLER: Okay. And let me, so now let me	6	stormwater management requirements that were no
7	address Conditions 15 and 16 which relate to access.	7	grandfathered when the prior owner, or the current owner,
8	Condition 15 states that the Basic Plan Amendment shall be	8	attempted to process a plan. How does that new stormwater
9	modified to show two vehicular access connections to the	9	management, those laws impact this development?
10	site. Condition 16 states that the Applicant shall	10	MR. FLEMMING: Well, so, for this
11	demonstrate the feasibility of reducing the number of access	11	MR. BROWN: Go ahead.
12	connections to the site through an operational and queuing	12	MR. FLEMMING: So, for this particular project, as
13	analysis which shall be evaluated with future development	13	you can see on this Concept Plan, there are, there are
14	applications. What's, what's your concern about those	14	little green areas in between and behind the lots
15	conditions?	15	MR. BROWN: Right.
16	MR. FLEMMING: Well, I know you're going to have	16	MR. FLEMMING: and so, to be consistent with
	Mr. Lenhart kind of talk a little bit more about		the now current regulations, we have created these different
	transportation, but our general concern was, it basically		areas throughout the project to capture stormwater
	were two conditions where we're asking for a second point of		management. So, it's going to be designed under the current
	access; and then an additional condition that basically		regulations and requirements.
	creates the test to whether you have to have that access or	21	
	not; and our preference would be for, to, to avoid		have garages, is that correct?
	confusion, to consolidate those into one condition where we,	23	
	we, we, we will do a test to determine whether or not we	24	5 5
25	need a second point of ingress or egress.	25	MR. FLEMMING: Two car garage. Mr. Brown, we know
	Page 43		Page 45
1	MR. HALLER: Okay. And I would note for the	1	our customers like their cars, so we made sure.
2	MR. HALLER: Okay. And I would note for the Examiner that we did submit a proposed language to	2	our customers like their cars, so we made sure. MR. BROWN: All right. And I'm just looking at
2 3	MR. HALLER: Okay. And I would note for the Examiner that we did submit a proposed language to consolidate those into one, into one condition. I think	2 3	our customers like their cars, so we made sure. MR. BROWN: All right. And I'm just looking at that plan and it's very dense; and I know we're not at SDP
2 3 4	MR. HALLER: Okay. And I would note for the Examiner that we did submit a proposed language to consolidate those into one, into one condition. I think that's Exhibit 41; and Mr. Lenhart will address that.	2 3 4	our customers like their cars, so we made sure. MR. BROWN: All right. And I'm just looking at that plan and it's very dense; and I know we're not at SDP stage yet, but there doesn't appear to be any off-street
2 3 4 5	MR. HALLER: Okay. And I would note for the Examiner that we did submit a proposed language to consolidate those into one, into one condition. I think that's Exhibit 41; and Mr. Lenhart will address that. MADAM EXAMINER: I have that. Okay.	2 3 4 5	our customers like their cars, so we made sure. MR. BROWN: All right. And I'm just looking at that plan and it's very dense; and I know we're not at SDP stage yet, but there doesn't appear to be any off-street parking at all provided. Is that accurate?
2 3 4 5 6	MR. HALLER: Okay. And I would note for the Examiner that we did submit a proposed language to consolidate those into one, into one condition. I think that's Exhibit 41; and Mr. Lenhart will address that. MADAM EXAMINER: I have that. Okay. MR. HALLER: All right. And then Condition 17	2 3 4 5 6	our customers like their cars, so we made sure. MR. BROWN: All right. And I'm just looking at that plan and it's very dense; and I know we're not at SDP stage yet, but there doesn't appear to be any off-street parking at all provided. Is that accurate? MR. FLEMMING: There, that's correct, there's no
2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. HALLER: Okay. And I would note for the Examiner that we did submit a proposed language to consolidate those into one, into one condition. I think that's Exhibit 41; and Mr. Lenhart will address that. MADAM EXAMINER: I have that. Okay. MR. HALLER: All right. And then Condition 17 states that the Applicant shall provide an interconnected	2 3 4 5 6 7	our customers like their cars, so we made sure. MR. BROWN: All right. And I'm just looking at that plan and it's very dense; and I know we're not at SDP stage yet, but there doesn't appear to be any off-street parking at all provided. Is that accurate? MR. FLEMMING: There, that's correct, there's no off-street parking. We believe there will be sufficient on-
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. HALLER: Okay. And I would note for the Examiner that we did submit a proposed language to consolidate those into one, into one condition. I think that's Exhibit 41; and Mr. Lenhart will address that. MADAM EXAMINER: I have that. Okay. MR. HALLER: All right. And then Condition 17 states that the Applicant shall provide an interconnected network of pedestrian and bike way facilities in term with	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	our customers like their cars, so we made sure. MR. BROWN: All right. And I'm just looking at that plan and it's very dense; and I know we're not at SDP stage yet, but there doesn't appear to be any off-street parking at all provided. Is that accurate? MR. FLEMMING: There, that's correct, there's no off-street parking. We believe there will be sufficient on- street between the, between the parking spaces in the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. HALLER: Okay. And I would note for the Examiner that we did submit a proposed language to consolidate those into one, into one condition. I think that's Exhibit 41; and Mr. Lenhart will address that. MADAM EXAMINER: I have that. Okay. MR. HALLER: All right. And then Condition 17 states that the Applicant shall provide an interconnected network of pedestrian and bike way facilities in term with the site. The exact location of the design of these	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	our customers like their cars, so we made sure. MR. BROWN: All right. And I'm just looking at that plan and it's very dense; and I know we're not at SDP stage yet, but there doesn't appear to be any off-street parking at all provided. Is that accurate? MR. FLEMMING: There, that's correct, there's no off-street parking. We believe there will be sufficient on- street between the, between the parking spaces in the driveways and the on-street opportunities we think will be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. HALLER: Okay. And I would note for the Examiner that we did submit a proposed language to consolidate those into one, into one condition. I think that's Exhibit 41; and Mr. Lenhart will address that. MADAM EXAMINER: I have that. Okay. MR. HALLER: All right. And then Condition 17 states that the Applicant shall provide an interconnected network of pedestrian and bike way facilities in term with the site. The exact location of the design of these facilities shall be evaluated at future applications. Do	2 3 6 7 8 9 10	our customers like their cars, so we made sure. MR. BROWN: All right. And I'm just looking at that plan and it's very dense; and I know we're not at SDP stage yet, but there doesn't appear to be any off-street parking at all provided. Is that accurate? MR. FLEMMING: There, that's correct, there's no off-street parking. We believe there will be sufficient on- street between the, between the parking spaces in the driveways and the on-street opportunities we think will be more than capable of accommodating the, the requirements.
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11	MR. HALLER: Okay. And I would note for the Examiner that we did submit a proposed language to consolidate those into one, into one condition. I think that's Exhibit 41; and Mr. Lenhart will address that. MADAM EXAMINER: I have that. Okay. MR. HALLER: All right. And then Condition 17 states that the Applicant shall provide an interconnected network of pedestrian and bike way facilities in term with the site. The exact location of the design of these facilities shall be evaluated at future applications. Do you object to that condition?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	our customers like their cars, so we made sure. MR. BROWN: All right. And I'm just looking at that plan and it's very dense; and I know we're not at SDP stage yet, but there doesn't appear to be any off-street parking at all provided. Is that accurate? MR. FLEMMING: There, that's correct, there's no off-street parking. We believe there will be sufficient on- street between the, between the parking spaces in the driveways and the on-street opportunities we think will be more than capable of accommodating the, the requirements. MR. BROWN: And you testified that your, I guess,
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. HALLER: Okay. And I would note for the Examiner that we did submit a proposed language to consolidate those into one, into one condition. I think that's Exhibit 41; and Mr. Lenhart will address that. MADAM EXAMINER: I have that. Okay. MR. HALLER: All right. And then Condition 17 states that the Applicant shall provide an interconnected network of pedestrian and bike way facilities in term with the site. The exact location of the design of these facilities shall be evaluated at future applications. Do you object to that condition? MR. FLEMMING: No, we do not.	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	our customers like their cars, so we made sure. MR. BROWN: All right. And I'm just looking at that plan and it's very dense; and I know we're not at SDP stage yet, but there doesn't appear to be any off-street parking at all provided. Is that accurate? MR. FLEMMING: There, that's correct, there's no off-street parking. We believe there will be sufficient on- street between the, between the parking spaces in the driveways and the on-street opportunities we think will be more than capable of accommodating the, the requirements. MR. BROWN: And you testified that your, I guess, the market for this are young families; and so, let's assume
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. HALLER: Okay. And I would note for the Examiner that we did submit a proposed language to consolidate those into one, into one condition. I think that's Exhibit 41; and Mr. Lenhart will address that. MADAM EXAMINER: I have that. Okay. MR. HALLER: All right. And then Condition 17 states that the Applicant shall provide an interconnected network of pedestrian and bike way facilities in term with the site. The exact location of the design of these facilities shall be evaluated at future applications. Do you object to that condition? MR. FLEMMING: No, we do not. MR. HALLER: Okay. I have no further questions of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	our customers like their cars, so we made sure. MR. BROWN: All right. And I'm just looking at that plan and it's very dense; and I know we're not at SDP stage yet, but there doesn't appear to be any off-street parking at all provided. Is that accurate? MR. FLEMMING: There, that's correct, there's no off-street parking. We believe there will be sufficient on- street between the, between the parking spaces in the driveways and the on-street opportunities we think will be more than capable of accommodating the, the requirements. MR. BROWN: And you testified that your, I guess, the market for this are young families; and so, let's assume it's, you know, two cars per home; and you testified the
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. HALLER: Okay. And I would note for the Examiner that we did submit a proposed language to consolidate those into one, into one condition. I think that's Exhibit 41; and Mr. Lenhart will address that. MADAM EXAMINER: I have that. Okay. MR. HALLER: All right. And then Condition 17 states that the Applicant shall provide an interconnected network of pedestrian and bike way facilities in term with the site. The exact location of the design of these facilities shall be evaluated at future applications. Do you object to that condition? MR. FLEMMING: No, we do not.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	our customers like their cars, so we made sure. MR. BROWN: All right. And I'm just looking at that plan and it's very dense; and I know we're not at SDP stage yet, but there doesn't appear to be any off-street parking at all provided. Is that accurate? MR. FLEMMING: There, that's correct, there's no off-street parking. We believe there will be sufficient on- street between the, between the parking spaces in the driveways and the on-street opportunities we think will be more than capable of accommodating the, the requirements. MR. BROWN: And you testified that your, I guess, the market for this are young families; and so, let's assume
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. HALLER: Okay. And I would note for the Examiner that we did submit a proposed language to consolidate those into one, into one condition. I think that's Exhibit 41; and Mr. Lenhart will address that. MADAM EXAMINER: I have that. Okay. MR. HALLER: All right. And then Condition 17 states that the Applicant shall provide an interconnected network of pedestrian and bike way facilities in term with the site. The exact location of the design of these facilities shall be evaluated at future applications. Do you object to that condition? MR. FLEMMING: No, we do not. MR. HALLER: Okay. I have no further questions of Mr. Flemming.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	our customers like their cars, so we made sure. MR. BROWN: All right. And I'm just looking at that plan and it's very dense; and I know we're not at SDP stage yet, but there doesn't appear to be any off-street parking at all provided. Is that accurate? MR. FLEMMING: There, that's correct, there's no off-street parking. We believe there will be sufficient on- street between the, between the parking spaces in the driveways and the on-street opportunities we think will be more than capable of accommodating the, the requirements. MR. BROWN: And you testified that your, I guess, the market for this are young families; and so, let's assume it's, you know, two cars per home; and you testified the lots would be 4,200 square feet, 42 by 100; and in looking
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. HALLER: Okay. And I would note for the Examiner that we did submit a proposed language to consolidate those into one, into one condition. I think that's Exhibit 41; and Mr. Lenhart will address that. MADAM EXAMINER: I have that. Okay. MR. HALLER: All right. And then Condition 17 states that the Applicant shall provide an interconnected network of pedestrian and bike way facilities in term with the site. The exact location of the design of these facilities shall be evaluated at future applications. Do you object to that condition? MR. FLEMMING: No, we do not. MR. HALLER: Okay. I have no further questions of Mr. Flemming. MADAM EXAMINER: All right. With regard, I'm	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	our customers like their cars, so we made sure. MR. BROWN: All right. And I'm just looking at that plan and it's very dense; and I know we're not at SDP stage yet, but there doesn't appear to be any off-street parking at all provided. Is that accurate? MR. FLEMMING: There, that's correct, there's no off-street parking. We believe there will be sufficient on- street between the, between the parking spaces in the driveways and the on-street opportunities we think will be more than capable of accommodating the, the requirements. MR. BROWN: And you testified that your, I guess, the market for this are young families; and so, let's assume it's, you know, two cars per home; and you testified the lots would be 4,200 square feet, 42 by 100; and in looking at one of the renderings you put up, I, with my bad eyes,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. HALLER: Okay. And I would note for the Examiner that we did submit a proposed language to consolidate those into one, into one condition. I think that's Exhibit 41; and Mr. Lenhart will address that. MADAM EXAMINER: I have that. Okay. MR. HALLER: All right. And then Condition 17 states that the Applicant shall provide an interconnected network of pedestrian and bike way facilities in term with the site. The exact location of the design of these facilities shall be evaluated at future applications. Do you object to that condition? MR. FLEMMING: No, we do not. MR. HALLER: Okay. I have no further questions of Mr. Flemming. MADAM EXAMINER: All right. With regard, I'm sorry, Mr. Brown, go ahead. MR. BROWN: Just two or three clarifying	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	our customers like their cars, so we made sure. MR. BROWN: All right. And I'm just looking at that plan and it's very dense; and I know we're not at SDP stage yet, but there doesn't appear to be any off-street parking at all provided. Is that accurate? MR. FLEMMING: There, that's correct, there's no off-street parking. We believe there will be sufficient on- street between the, between the parking spaces in the driveways and the on-street opportunities we think will be more than capable of accommodating the, the requirements. MR. BROWN: And you testified that your, I guess, the market for this are young families; and so, let's assume it's, you know, two cars per home; and you testified the lots would be 4,200 square feet, 42 by 100; and in looking at one of the renderings you put up, I, with my bad eyes, saw 30-foot by 40-foot building footprint. Is that what the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. HALLER: Okay. And I would note for the Examiner that we did submit a proposed language to consolidate those into one, into one condition. I think that's Exhibit 41; and Mr. Lenhart will address that. MADAM EXAMINER: I have that. Okay. MR. HALLER: All right. And then Condition 17 states that the Applicant shall provide an interconnected network of pedestrian and bike way facilities in term with the site. The exact location of the design of these facilities shall be evaluated at future applications. Do you object to that condition? MR. FLEMMING: No, we do not. MR. HALLER: Okay. I have no further questions of Mr. Flemming. MADAM EXAMINER: All right. With regard, I'm sorry, Mr. Brown, go ahead. MR. BROWN: Just two or three clarifying	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	our customers like their cars, so we made sure. MR. BROWN: All right. And I'm just looking at that plan and it's very dense; and I know we're not at SDP stage yet, but there doesn't appear to be any off-street parking at all provided. Is that accurate? MR. FLEMMING: There, that's correct, there's no off-street parking. We believe there will be sufficient on- street between the, between the parking spaces in the driveways and the on-street opportunities we think will be more than capable of accommodating the, the requirements. MR. BROWN: And you testified that your, I guess, the market for this are young families; and so, let's assume it's, you know, two cars per home; and you testified the lots would be 4,200 square feet, 42 by 100; and in looking at one of the renderings you put up, I, with my bad eyes, saw 30-foot by 40-foot building footprint. Is that what the building footprint is, 30 by 40 for all of the units, or just some of them?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. HALLER: Okay. And I would note for the Examiner that we did submit a proposed language to consolidate those into one, into one condition. I think that's Exhibit 41; and Mr. Lenhart will address that. MADAM EXAMINER: I have that. Okay. MR. HALLER: All right. And then Condition 17 states that the Applicant shall provide an interconnected network of pedestrian and bike way facilities in term with the site. The exact location of the design of these facilities shall be evaluated at future applications. Do you object to that condition? MR. FLEMMING: No, we do not. MR. HALLER: Okay. I have no further questions of Mr. Flemming. MADAM EXAMINER: All right. With regard, I'm sorry, Mr. Brown, go ahead. MR. BROWN: Just two or three clarifying questions, Mr. Flemming. You testified about the road	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	our customers like their cars, so we made sure. MR. BROWN: All right. And I'm just looking at that plan and it's very dense; and I know we're not at SDP stage yet, but there doesn't appear to be any off-street parking at all provided. Is that accurate? MR. FLEMMING: There, that's correct, there's no off-street parking. We believe there will be sufficient on- street between the, between the parking spaces in the driveways and the on-street opportunities we think will be more than capable of accommodating the, the requirements. MR. BROWN: And you testified that your, I guess, the market for this are young families; and so, let's assume it's, you know, two cars per home; and you testified the lots would be 4,200 square feet, 42 by 100; and in looking at one of the renderings you put up, I, with my bad eyes, saw 30-foot by 40-foot building footprint. Is that what the building footprint is, 30 by 40 for all of the units, or just some of them?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. HALLER: Okay. And I would note for the Examiner that we did submit a proposed language to consolidate those into one, into one condition. I think that's Exhibit 41; and Mr. Lenhart will address that. MADAM EXAMINER: I have that. Okay. MR. HALLER: All right. And then Condition 17 states that the Applicant shall provide an interconnected network of pedestrian and bike way facilities in term with the site. The exact location of the design of these facilities shall be evaluated at future applications. Do you object to that condition? MR. FLEMMING: No, we do not. MR. HALLER: Okay. I have no further questions of Mr. Flemming. MADAM EXAMINER: All right. With regard, I'm sorry, Mr. Brown, go ahead. MR. BROWN: Just two or three clarifying questions, Mr. Flemming. You testified about the road improvements that are required along White House Road. That	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	our customers like their cars, so we made sure. MR. BROWN: All right. And I'm just looking at that plan and it's very dense; and I know we're not at SDP stage yet, but there doesn't appear to be any off-street parking at all provided. Is that accurate? MR. FLEMMING: There, that's correct, there's no off-street parking. We believe there will be sufficient on- street between the, between the parking spaces in the driveways and the on-street opportunities we think will be more than capable of accommodating the, the requirements. MR. BROWN: And you testified that your, I guess, the market for this are young families; and so, let's assume it's, you know, two cars per home; and you testified the lots would be 4,200 square feet, 42 by 100; and in looking at one of the renderings you put up, I, with my bad eyes, saw 30-foot by 40-foot building footprint. Is that what the building footprint is, 30 by 40 for all of the units, or just some of them? MR. FLEMMING: So, we have, we have, right now we
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. HALLER: Okay. And I would note for the Examiner that we did submit a proposed language to consolidate those into one, into one condition. I think that's Exhibit 41; and Mr. Lenhart will address that. MADAM EXAMINER: I have that. Okay. MR. HALLER: All right. And then Condition 17 states that the Applicant shall provide an interconnected network of pedestrian and bike way facilities in term with the site. The exact location of the design of these facilities shall be evaluated at future applications. Do you object to that condition? MR. FLEMMING: No, we do not. MR. HALLER: Okay. I have no further questions of Mr. Flemming. MADAM EXAMINER: All right. With regard, I'm sorry, Mr. Brown, go ahead. MR. BROWN: Just two or three clarifying questions, Mr. Flemming. You testified about the road improvements that are required along White House Road. That one to \$2 million number that you quoted, would that deal	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	our customers like their cars, so we made sure. MR. BROWN: All right. And I'm just looking at that plan and it's very dense; and I know we're not at SDP stage yet, but there doesn't appear to be any off-street parking at all provided. Is that accurate? MR. FLEMMING: There, that's correct, there's no off-street parking. We believe there will be sufficient on- street between the, between the parking spaces in the driveways and the on-street opportunities we think will be more than capable of accommodating the, the requirements. MR. BROWN: And you testified that your, I guess, the market for this are young families; and so, let's assume it's, you know, two cars per home; and you testified the lots would be 4,200 square feet, 42 by 100; and in looking at one of the renderings you put up, I, with my bad eyes, saw 30-foot by 40-foot building footprint. Is that what the building footprint is, 30 by 40 for all of the units, or just some of them? MR. FLEMMING: So, we have, we have, right now we have four floor plans that we're working through the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. HALLER: Okay. And I would note for the Examiner that we did submit a proposed language to consolidate those into one, into one condition. I think that's Exhibit 41; and Mr. Lenhart will address that. MADAM EXAMINER: I have that. Okay. MR. HALLER: All right. And then Condition 17 states that the Applicant shall provide an interconnected network of pedestrian and bike way facilities in term with the site. The exact location of the design of these facilities shall be evaluated at future applications. Do you object to that condition? MR. FLEMMING: No, we do not. MR. HALLER: Okay. I have no further questions of Mr. Flemming. MADAM EXAMINER: All right. With regard, I'm sorry, Mr. Brown, go ahead. MR. BROWN: Just two or three clarifying questions, Mr. Flemming. You testified about the road improvements that are required along White House Road. That one to \$2 million number that you quoted, would that deal with all of the frontage that includes the Park and Planning property or just the frontage on where you're siting the lots?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	our customers like their cars, so we made sure. MR. BROWN: All right. And I'm just looking at that plan and it's very dense; and I know we're not at SDP stage yet, but there doesn't appear to be any off-street parking at all provided. Is that accurate? MR. FLEMMING: There, that's correct, there's no off-street parking. We believe there will be sufficient on- street between the, between the parking spaces in the driveways and the on-street opportunities we think will be more than capable of accommodating the, the requirements. MR. BROWN: And you testified that your, I guess, the market for this are young families; and so, let's assume it's, you know, two cars per home; and you testified the lots would be 4,200 square feet, 42 by 100; and in looking at one of the renderings you put up, I, with my bad eyes, saw 30-foot by 40-foot building footprint. Is that what the building footprint is, 30 by 40 for all of the units, or just some of them? MR. FLEMMING: So, we have, we have, right now we have four floor plans that we're working through the concepts of. One of the floor plans is, or all the houses will be 30-feet wide. MR. BROWN: Right.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MR. HALLER: Okay. And I would note for the Examiner that we did submit a proposed language to consolidate those into one, into one condition. I think that's Exhibit 41; and Mr. Lenhart will address that. MADAM EXAMINER: I have that. Okay. MR. HALLER: All right. And then Condition 17 states that the Applicant shall provide an interconnected network of pedestrian and bike way facilities in term with the site. The exact location of the design of these facilities shall be evaluated at future applications. Do you object to that condition? MR. FLEMMING: No, we do not. MR. HALLER: Okay. I have no further questions of Mr. Flemming. MADAM EXAMINER: All right. With regard, I'm sorry, Mr. Brown, go ahead. MR. BROWN: Just two or three clarifying questions, Mr. Flemming. You testified about the road improvements that are required along White House Road. That one to \$2 million number that you quoted, would that deal with all of the frontage that includes the Park and Planning property or just the frontage on where you're siting the lots? MR. FLEMMING: That would include the frontage in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	our customers like their cars, so we made sure. MR. BROWN: All right. And I'm just looking at that plan and it's very dense; and I know we're not at SDP stage yet, but there doesn't appear to be any off-street parking at all provided. Is that accurate? MR. FLEMMING: There, that's correct, there's no off-street parking. We believe there will be sufficient on- street between the, between the parking spaces in the driveways and the on-street opportunities we think will be more than capable of accommodating the, the requirements. MR. BROWN: And you testified that your, I guess, the market for this are young families; and so, let's assume it's, you know, two cars per home; and you testified the lots would be 4,200 square feet, 42 by 100; and in looking at one of the renderings you put up, I, with my bad eyes, saw 30-foot by 40-foot building footprint. Is that what the building footprint is, 30 by 40 for all of the units, or just some of them? MR. FLEMMING: So, we have, we have, right now we have four floor plans that we're working through the concepts of. One of the floor plans is, or all the houses will be 30-feet wide. MR. BROWN: Right. MR. FLEMMING: It's just about how deep will they
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MR. HALLER: Okay. And I would note for the Examiner that we did submit a proposed language to consolidate those into one, into one condition. I think that's Exhibit 41; and Mr. Lenhart will address that. MADAM EXAMINER: I have that. Okay. MR. HALLER: All right. And then Condition 17 states that the Applicant shall provide an interconnected network of pedestrian and bike way facilities in term with the site. The exact location of the design of these facilities shall be evaluated at future applications. Do you object to that condition? MR. FLEMMING: No, we do not. MR. HALLER: Okay. I have no further questions of Mr. Flemming. MADAM EXAMINER: All right. With regard, I'm sorry, Mr. Brown, go ahead. MR. BROWN: Just two or three clarifying questions, Mr. Flemming. You testified about the road improvements that are required along White House Road. That one to \$2 million number that you quoted, would that deal with all of the frontage that includes the Park and Planning property or just the frontage on where you're siting the lots?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	our customers like their cars, so we made sure. MR. BROWN: All right. And I'm just looking at that plan and it's very dense; and I know we're not at SDP stage yet, but there doesn't appear to be any off-street parking at all provided. Is that accurate? MR. FLEMMING: There, that's correct, there's no off-street parking. We believe there will be sufficient on- street between the, between the parking spaces in the driveways and the on-street opportunities we think will be more than capable of accommodating the, the requirements. MR. BROWN: And you testified that your, I guess, the market for this are young families; and so, let's assume it's, you know, two cars per home; and you testified the lots would be 4,200 square feet, 42 by 100; and in looking at one of the renderings you put up, I, with my bad eyes, saw 30-foot by 40-foot building footprint. Is that what the building footprint is, 30 by 40 for all of the units, or just some of them? MR. FLEMMING: So, we have, we have, right now we have four floor plans that we're working through the concepts of. One of the floor plans is, or all the houses will be 30-feet wide. MR. BROWN: Right.

	Page 46		Page 48
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	deep; and we have some concepts where the house is 60-feet deep; but the width of the houses will all be the same. MR. BROWN: So, excluding the garage, on average, the living area square footage for these units is about what? MR. FLEMMING: So, the, the series that we've got is between, what, the plans that are in front of you are between 2,200 and 2,800 square feet. MR. BROWN: And I don't have a problem with that, but I'm just wondering, have you developed any RS Zone in any of your other projects in Prince George's County, if you recall? MR. FLEMMING: I don't specifically recall if it's the RS Zone. We've got some, we've got a lot of projects where we have, kind of in these Master Plan communities, but I can't recall if they're specifically RS Zones. MR. BROWN: Uh-huh. Are any of those units in other projects as small as 2,200 square feet? MR. FLEMMING: Yes, they are. MR. BROWN: And, Mr. Haller, go back to the Site Plan again. MR. HALLER: Is this the one you want? MR. BROWN: Yes, yes, yes. You had testified that	2 ir 3 th 4 5 w 6 u 7 V 6 9 th 12 ir 13 r 14 r 15 th 16 17 th 19 a 21 th 22 a 23 g	here's obviously flood plain closer to White House Road and in the frontage of our property; but I don't know how far up he flood plain would travel. MR. BROWN: And looking over at the west side where the Washington Gas line right-of-way is currently under construction, you are not utilizing any of the Washington Gas line right-of-way to satisfy any green area or this project, are you? MR. FLEMMING: I don't know that answer. The, he, the gas line does go through a corner of our, of our property right there; but I don't know whether that's included in the calculations for the green space. MR. BROWN: All right. I'm looking at, in efferencing the north to south right-of-way as well? MR. FLEMMING: Yes, but that's in the, that's in he park property now. MR. BROWN: Oh, that's on the park property? MR. FLEMMING: Yes, if you see the little, there's a little piece of the right-of-way between Harry Truman and he, here you go, Tom. Yeah, thank you, thank you. There's a little component of the right-of-way, or the easement, going through our property. Whether or not that, that area
_	MR. BROWN: Yes, yes, yes. You had testified that the south boundary line, the adjacent neighbor wanted a	-	going through our property. Whether or not that, that area s included in our green space, I'll have to defer to, to,
	fence to protect livestock. I mean I drive by there every		o Mr. Dunlap or others to confirm that; but that's, that's
-	Page 47		Page 49
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	single day to and from work. I have never seen livestock on that property. It doesn't seem to be fit for livestock. And so, I'm just wondering, I know that's not your property and you cannot align your entrance with Harry S. Truman Drive on White House Road, but to your knowledge, what is that adjacent property used for on the south? I'm sorry, no, that would be the east. MR. FLEMMING: When we, when we met with Mrs. Rauch, I believe she's got an active farm over there, and I probably, if like if I; and, Mr. Haller, correct me if I'm wrong, but I thought she had horses; and she had mentioned that, that that, that was the concern about were horses would walk off the property. So, I, I believe that was the, the basis for the original request. MR. BROWN: All Right. You're, you're correct. I didn't mean the southside. Yeah, the southside there is a farm. I meant on the east side. MR. FLEMMING: Right. Well, that, that's Mrs. Rauch's property on the east side, so she has	2 th 4 to 5 6 ir 7 8 e 9 F 10 y 12 q 13 q 14 15 a 16 T 17 h 18 ir 19 a	he one component that does go through our property. MR. BROWN: Yeah, I was, wasn't concerned about hat so much as the large right-of-way that's running north o south. MR. FLEMMING: Yeah, that's, that's all in the, nside the park property now. MR. BROWN: Uh-huh. And as Mr. Dunlap testified earlier, the park property has already been dedicated to Park and Planning? MR. FLEMMING: It has been dedicated and conveyed, res. MR. BROWN: All right. Thank you. No other questions. MADAM EXAMINER: All right, sir, I'm going to address, ask you to direct your attention back to the Technical Staff Report. And so, the Technical Staff Report has 17 conditions and four considerations. You have indicated that you are requesting, or the modification of 15 and 16, Conditions 15 and 16, and consolidate them into one. So, the remaining 16 conditions are in accordance with your

	Page 50		Page 52
1	MR. FLEMMING: We do not.	1	points and public road networks which affect and will serve
2	MADAM EXAMINER: All right. Okay. Thank you.		the subject property?
	That's all.	3	
4	MR. HALLER: Okay. Thank you very much, Mr.	-	along White House Road which is an arterial roadway in the
5		5	
6	MR. LENHART: Good morning.	6	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
7	MADAM EXAMINER: There you are, Mike. All right.	7	as shown on this Site Plan.
8	Good morning, Mike. I need you to thank you so much. Do	8	The property also has a new arterial, A-39, which
9	you solemnly swear or affirm under the penalties of perjury	9	is shown on the southside of White House Road opposite Harry
10	in the matter now before you to tell the truth, the whole	10	S. Truman. That, that roadway is ultimately planned to be
11	truth and nothing but the truth?		the relocation of Ritchie Marlboro Road, which would be
12	MR. LENHART: I do.		ultimately, when the Master Plan is realized, Ritchie
13	MADAM EXAMINER: Thank you. Please state your		Marlboro Road intersects to the west of this property a
	name and business address for the record.		thousand feet or so; and that road would be terminated and
15	MR. LENHART. Yes, Michael Lenhart, 645 Baltimore	15	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	Annapolis Boulevard, Suite 214, Severna Park, Maryland	16	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
	21146.		And did you prepare a traffic analysis marked as Exhibit 43?
18	MADAM EXAMINER: Thank you.	18	
19	MR. HALLER: Thank you, Mr. Lenhart. What is your occupation?	19 20	
20	MR. LENHART: A traffic engineer and		forth in Exhibit 43?
	transportation planner.	22	
23	MR. HALLER: And by whom are you employed?		traffic impact study with Park and Planning Staff and
24	MR. LENHART: Lenhart Traffic Consulting.		obtained an approved scoping agreement. That study included
25	MR. HALLER: And we had submitted into the record		the intersections of Ritchie Marlboro Road at Sansbury Road;
	Page 51		Page 53
	T age of		
1	a document which has been marked as Applicant's Exhibit 46	1	Ritchie Marlboro Road at White House Road; White House Road
	a document which has been marked as Applicant's Exhibit 46		Ritchie Marlboro Road at White House Road; White House Road at Harry S. Truman Drive; and site access with Harry S.
2	a document which has been marked as Applicant's Exhibit 46 which is your resume. And have you qualified as an expert previously before the Zoning Hearing Examiner, as MR. LENHART: Yes.	2	Ritchie Marlboro Road at White House Road; White House Road at Harry S. Truman Drive; and site access with Harry S. Truman, I'm sorry, at White House Road. We conducted new traffic counts. We included
2 3 4 5	a document which has been marked as Applicant's Exhibit 46 which is your resume. And have you qualified as an expert previously before the Zoning Hearing Examiner, as MR. LENHART: Yes. MADAM EXAMINER: Mr. Lenhart will continue as an	2 3 4 5	Ritchie Marlboro Road at White House Road; White House Road at Harry S. Truman Drive; and site access with Harry S. Truman, I'm sorry, at White House Road. We conducted new traffic counts. We included approved, but unbuilt background developments that were
2 3 4 5 6	a document which has been marked as Applicant's Exhibit 46 which is your resume. And have you qualified as an expert previously before the Zoning Hearing Examiner, as MR. LENHART: Yes. MADAM EXAMINER: Mr. Lenhart will continue as an expert witness in the field of traffic and transportation.	2 3 4 5 6	Ritchie Marlboro Road at White House Road; White House Road at Harry S. Truman Drive; and site access with Harry S. Truman, I'm sorry, at White House Road. We conducted new traffic counts. We included approved, but unbuilt background developments that were identified in the scoping agreement; and then we included
2 3 4 5 6 7	a document which has been marked as Applicant's Exhibit 46 which is your resume. And have you qualified as an expert previously before the Zoning Hearing Examiner, as MR. LENHART: Yes. MADAM EXAMINER: Mr. Lenhart will continue as an expert witness in the field of traffic and transportation. MR. HALLER: Okay. Thank you	2 3 4 5 6 7	Ritchie Marlboro Road at White House Road; White House Road at Harry S. Truman Drive; and site access with Harry S. Truman, I'm sorry, at White House Road. We conducted new traffic counts. We included approved, but unbuilt background developments that were identified in the scoping agreement; and then we included site traffic from the 124-unit subdivision; and the results
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	a document which has been marked as Applicant's Exhibit 46 which is your resume. And have you qualified as an expert previously before the Zoning Hearing Examiner, as MR. LENHART: Yes. MADAM EXAMINER: Mr. Lenhart will continue as an expert witness in the field of traffic and transportation. MR. HALLER: Okay. Thank you MR. LENHART: Thank you.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Ritchie Marlboro Road at White House Road; White House Road at Harry S. Truman Drive; and site access with Harry S. Truman, I'm sorry, at White House Road. We conducted new traffic counts. We included approved, but unbuilt background developments that were identified in the scoping agreement; and then we included site traffic from the 124-unit subdivision; and the results of that study showed that all of the study intersections
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	a document which has been marked as Applicant's Exhibit 46 which is your resume. And have you qualified as an expert previously before the Zoning Hearing Examiner, as MR. LENHART: Yes. MADAM EXAMINER: Mr. Lenhart will continue as an expert witness in the field of traffic and transportation. MR. HALLER: Okay. Thank you MR. LENHART: Thank you. MR. HALLER: Madam Examiner. Have you been	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Ritchie Marlboro Road at White House Road; White House Road at Harry S. Truman Drive; and site access with Harry S. Truman, I'm sorry, at White House Road. We conducted new traffic counts. We included approved, but unbuilt background developments that were identified in the scoping agreement; and then we included site traffic from the 124-unit subdivision; and the results of that study showed that all of the study intersections operate at acceptable levels of service based on the full
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	a document which has been marked as Applicant's Exhibit 46 which is your resume. And have you qualified as an expert previously before the Zoning Hearing Examiner, as MR. LENHART: Yes. MADAM EXAMINER: Mr. Lenhart will continue as an expert witness in the field of traffic and transportation. MR. HALLER: Okay. Thank you MR. LENHART: Thank you. MR. HALLER: Madam Examiner. Have you been retained by the Applicant in this case to serve as their	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Ritchie Marlboro Road at White House Road; White House Road at Harry S. Truman Drive; and site access with Harry S. Truman, I'm sorry, at White House Road. We conducted new traffic counts. We included approved, but unbuilt background developments that were identified in the scoping agreement; and then we included site traffic from the 124-unit subdivision; and the results of that study showed that all of the study intersections operate at acceptable levels of service based on the full build-out of this project and all of the approved and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	a document which has been marked as Applicant's Exhibit 46 which is your resume. And have you qualified as an expert previously before the Zoning Hearing Examiner, as MR. LENHART: Yes. MADAM EXAMINER: Mr. Lenhart will continue as an expert witness in the field of traffic and transportation. MR. HALLER: Okay. Thank you MR. LENHART: Thank you. MR. HALLER: Madam Examiner. Have you been retained by the Applicant in this case to serve as their transportation planner and engineer?	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11	Ritchie Marlboro Road at White House Road; White House Road at Harry S. Truman Drive; and site access with Harry S. Truman, I'm sorry, at White House Road. We conducted new traffic counts. We included approved, but unbuilt background developments that were identified in the scoping agreement; and then we included site traffic from the 124-unit subdivision; and the results of that study showed that all of the study intersections operate at acceptable levels of service based on the full build-out of this project and all of the approved and unbuilt background developments.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	a document which has been marked as Applicant's Exhibit 46 which is your resume. And have you qualified as an expert previously before the Zoning Hearing Examiner, as MR. LENHART: Yes. MADAM EXAMINER: Mr. Lenhart will continue as an expert witness in the field of traffic and transportation. MR. HALLER: Okay. Thank you MR. LENHART: Thank you. MR. HALLER: Madam Examiner. Have you been retained by the Applicant in this case to serve as their transportation planner and engineer? MR. LENHART: Yes.	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	Ritchie Marlboro Road at White House Road; White House Road at Harry S. Truman Drive; and site access with Harry S. Truman, I'm sorry, at White House Road. We conducted new traffic counts. We included approved, but unbuilt background developments that were identified in the scoping agreement; and then we included site traffic from the 124-unit subdivision; and the results of that study showed that all of the study intersections operate at acceptable levels of service based on the full build-out of this project and all of the approved and unbuilt background developments. MR. HALLER: Okay. And in your opinion, would the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	a document which has been marked as Applicant's Exhibit 46 which is your resume. And have you qualified as an expert previously before the Zoning Hearing Examiner, as MR. LENHART: Yes. MADAM EXAMINER: Mr. Lenhart will continue as an expert witness in the field of traffic and transportation. MR. HALLER: Okay. Thank you MR. LENHART: Thank you. MR. HALLER: Madam Examiner. Have you been retained by the Applicant in this case to serve as their transportation planner and engineer?	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11	Ritchie Marlboro Road at White House Road; White House Road at Harry S. Truman Drive; and site access with Harry S. Truman, I'm sorry, at White House Road. We conducted new traffic counts. We included approved, but unbuilt background developments that were identified in the scoping agreement; and then we included site traffic from the 124-unit subdivision; and the results of that study showed that all of the study intersections operate at acceptable levels of service based on the full build-out of this project and all of the approved and unbuilt background developments. MR. HALLER: Okay. And in your opinion, would the proposed development in this application, with the frontage
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	a document which has been marked as Applicant's Exhibit 46 which is your resume. And have you qualified as an expert previously before the Zoning Hearing Examiner, as MR. LENHART: Yes. MADAM EXAMINER: Mr. Lenhart will continue as an expert witness in the field of traffic and transportation. MR. HALLER: Okay. Thank you MR. LENHART: Thank you. MR. HALLER: Madam Examiner. Have you been retained by the Applicant in this case to serve as their transportation planner and engineer? MR. LENHART: Yes. MR. HALLER: And are you familiar with the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Ritchie Marlboro Road at White House Road; White House Road at Harry S. Truman Drive; and site access with Harry S. Truman, I'm sorry, at White House Road. We conducted new traffic counts. We included approved, but unbuilt background developments that were identified in the scoping agreement; and then we included site traffic from the 124-unit subdivision; and the results of that study showed that all of the study intersections operate at acceptable levels of service based on the full build-out of this project and all of the approved and unbuilt background developments. MR. HALLER: Okay. And in your opinion, would the proposed development in this application, with the frontage
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	a document which has been marked as Applicant's Exhibit 46 which is your resume. And have you qualified as an expert previously before the Zoning Hearing Examiner, as MR. LENHART: Yes. MADAM EXAMINER: Mr. Lenhart will continue as an expert witness in the field of traffic and transportation. MR. HALLER: Okay. Thank you MR. LENHART: Thank you. MR. HALLER: Madam Examiner. Have you been retained by the Applicant in this case to serve as their transportation planner and engineer? MR. LENHART: Yes. MR. HALLER: And are you familiar with the property which is subject of today's hearing?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Ritchie Marlboro Road at White House Road; White House Road at Harry S. Truman Drive; and site access with Harry S. Truman, I'm sorry, at White House Road. We conducted new traffic counts. We included approved, but unbuilt background developments that were identified in the scoping agreement; and then we included site traffic from the 124-unit subdivision; and the results of that study showed that all of the study intersections operate at acceptable levels of service based on the full build-out of this project and all of the approved and unbuilt background developments. MR. HALLER: Okay. And in your opinion, would the proposed development in this application, with the frontage improvements anticipated as part of this development be adequate to handle the traffic generated by the project?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	a document which has been marked as Applicant's Exhibit 46 which is your resume. And have you qualified as an expert previously before the Zoning Hearing Examiner, as MR. LENHART: Yes. MADAM EXAMINER: Mr. Lenhart will continue as an expert witness in the field of traffic and transportation. MR. HALLER: Okay. Thank you MR. LENHART: Thank you. MR. HALLER: Madam Examiner. Have you been retained by the Applicant in this case to serve as their transportation planner and engineer? MR. LENHART: Yes. MR. HALLER: And are you familiar with the property which is subject of today's hearing? MR. LENHART: Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Ritchie Marlboro Road at White House Road; White House Road at Harry S. Truman Drive; and site access with Harry S. Truman, I'm sorry, at White House Road. We conducted new traffic counts. We included approved, but unbuilt background developments that were identified in the scoping agreement; and then we included site traffic from the 124-unit subdivision; and the results of that study showed that all of the study intersections operate at acceptable levels of service based on the full build-out of this project and all of the approved and unbuilt background developments. MR. HALLER: Okay. And in your opinion, would the proposed development in this application, with the frontage improvements anticipated as part of this development be adequate to handle the traffic generated by the project? MR. LENHART: Yes, it would be.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	a document which has been marked as Applicant's Exhibit 46 which is your resume. And have you qualified as an expert previously before the Zoning Hearing Examiner, as MR. LENHART: Yes. MADAM EXAMINER: Mr. Lenhart will continue as an expert witness in the field of traffic and transportation. MR. HALLER: Okay. Thank you MR. LENHART: Thank you. MR. HALLER: Madam Examiner. Have you been retained by the Applicant in this case to serve as their transportation planner and engineer? MR. LENHART: Yes. MR. HALLER: And are you familiar with the property which is subject of today's hearing? MR. LENHART: Yes. MR. HALLER: And are you familiar with the prior	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Ritchie Marlboro Road at White House Road; White House Road at Harry S. Truman Drive; and site access with Harry S. Truman, I'm sorry, at White House Road. We conducted new traffic counts. We included approved, but unbuilt background developments that were identified in the scoping agreement; and then we included site traffic from the 124-unit subdivision; and the results of that study showed that all of the study intersections operate at acceptable levels of service based on the full build-out of this project and all of the approved and unbuilt background developments. MR. HALLER: Okay. And in your opinion, would the proposed development in this application, with the frontage improvements anticipated as part of this development be adequate to handle the traffic generated by the project? MR. LENHART: Yes, it would be. MR. HALLER: And have you reviewed the conditions
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	a document which has been marked as Applicant's Exhibit 46 which is your resume. And have you qualified as an expert previously before the Zoning Hearing Examiner, as MR. LENHART: Yes. MADAM EXAMINER: Mr. Lenhart will continue as an expert witness in the field of traffic and transportation. MR. HALLER: Okay. Thank you MR. LENHART: Thank you. MR. HALLER: Madam Examiner. Have you been retained by the Applicant in this case to serve as their transportation planner and engineer? MR. LENHART: Yes. MR. HALLER: And are you familiar with the property which is subject of today's hearing? MR. LENHART: Yes. MR. HALLER: And are you familiar with the prior approvals concerning the subject property?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Ritchie Marlboro Road at White House Road; White House Road at Harry S. Truman Drive; and site access with Harry S. Truman, I'm sorry, at White House Road. We conducted new traffic counts. We included approved, but unbuilt background developments that were identified in the scoping agreement; and then we included site traffic from the 124-unit subdivision; and the results of that study showed that all of the study intersections operate at acceptable levels of service based on the full build-out of this project and all of the approved and unbuilt background developments. MR. HALLER: Okay. And in your opinion, would the proposed development in this application, with the frontage improvements anticipated as part of this development be adequate to handle the traffic generated by the project? MR. LENHART: Yes, it would be. MR. HALLER: And have you reviewed the conditions of approval recommended by Staff pertaining to this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	a document which has been marked as Applicant's Exhibit 46 which is your resume. And have you qualified as an expert previously before the Zoning Hearing Examiner, as MR. LENHART: Yes. MADAM EXAMINER: Mr. Lenhart will continue as an expert witness in the field of traffic and transportation. MR. HALLER: Okay. Thank you MR. LENHART: Thank you. MR. HALLER: Madam Examiner. Have you been retained by the Applicant in this case to serve as their transportation planner and engineer? MR. LENHART: Yes. MR. HALLER: And are you familiar with the property which is subject of today's hearing? MR. LENHART: Yes. MR. HALLER: And are you familiar with the prior approvals concerning the subject property? MR. LENHART: Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Ritchie Marlboro Road at White House Road; White House Road at Harry S. Truman Drive; and site access with Harry S. Truman, I'm sorry, at White House Road. We conducted new traffic counts. We included approved, but unbuilt background developments that were identified in the scoping agreement; and then we included site traffic from the 124-unit subdivision; and the results of that study showed that all of the study intersections operate at acceptable levels of service based on the full build-out of this project and all of the approved and unbuilt background developments. MR. HALLER: Okay. And in your opinion, would the proposed development in this application, with the frontage improvements anticipated as part of this development be adequate to handle the traffic generated by the project? MR. LENHART: Yes, it would be. MR. HALLER: And have you reviewed the conditions of approval recommended by Staff pertaining to this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	a document which has been marked as Applicant's Exhibit 46 which is your resume. And have you qualified as an expert previously before the Zoning Hearing Examiner, as MR. LENHART: Yes. MADAM EXAMINER: Mr. Lenhart will continue as an expert witness in the field of traffic and transportation. MR. HALLER: Okay. Thank you MR. LENHART: Thank you. MR. HALLER: Madam Examiner. Have you been retained by the Applicant in this case to serve as their transportation planner and engineer? MR. LENHART: Yes. MR. HALLER: And are you familiar with the property which is subject of today's hearing? MR. LENHART: Yes. MR. HALLER: And are you familiar with the prior approvals concerning the subject property? MR. LENHART: Yes. MR. HALLER: Are you familiar with the road network in the area? MR. LENHART: Yes, I am.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Ritchie Marlboro Road at White House Road; White House Road at Harry S. Truman Drive; and site access with Harry S. Truman, I'm sorry, at White House Road. We conducted new traffic counts. We included approved, but unbuilt background developments that were identified in the scoping agreement; and then we included site traffic from the 124-unit subdivision; and the results of that study showed that all of the study intersections operate at acceptable levels of service based on the full build-out of this project and all of the approved and unbuilt background developments. MR. HALLER: Okay. And in your opinion, would the proposed development in this application, with the frontage improvements anticipated as part of this development be adequate to handle the traffic generated by the project? MR. LENHART: Yes, it would be. MR. HALLER: And have you reviewed the conditions of approval recommended by Staff pertaining to this application related to transportation? MR. HALLER: And are there any issues with the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	a document which has been marked as Applicant's Exhibit 46 which is your resume. And have you qualified as an expert previously before the Zoning Hearing Examiner, as MR. LENHART: Yes. MADAM EXAMINER: Mr. Lenhart will continue as an expert witness in the field of traffic and transportation. MR. HALLER: Okay. Thank you MR. LENHART: Thank you. MR. HALLER: Madam Examiner. Have you been retained by the Applicant in this case to serve as their transportation planner and engineer? MR. LENHART: Yes. MR. HALLER: And are you familiar with the property which is subject of today's hearing? MR. LENHART: Yes. MR. HALLER: And are you familiar with the prior approvals concerning the subject property? MR. LENHART: Yes. MR. HALLER: Are you familiar with the road network in the area? MR. LENHART: Yes, I am. MR. HALLER: And have you personally inspected the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Ritchie Marlboro Road at White House Road; White House Road at Harry S. Truman Drive; and site access with Harry S. Truman, I'm sorry, at White House Road. We conducted new traffic counts. We included approved, but unbuilt background developments that were identified in the scoping agreement; and then we included site traffic from the 124-unit subdivision; and the results of that study showed that all of the study intersections operate at acceptable levels of service based on the full build-out of this project and all of the approved and unbuilt background developments. MR. HALLER: Okay. And in your opinion, would the proposed development in this application, with the frontage improvements anticipated as part of this development be adequate to handle the traffic generated by the project? MR. LENHART: Yes, it would be. MR. HALLER: And have you reviewed the conditions of approval recommended by Staff pertaining to this application related to transportation? MR. HALLER: And are there any issues with the conditions as they're currently written from a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	a document which has been marked as Applicant's Exhibit 46 which is your resume. And have you qualified as an expert previously before the Zoning Hearing Examiner, as MR. LENHART: Yes. MADAM EXAMINER: Mr. Lenhart will continue as an expert witness in the field of traffic and transportation. MR. HALLER: Okay. Thank you MR. LENHART: Thank you. MR. HALLER: Madam Examiner. Have you been retained by the Applicant in this case to serve as their transportation planner and engineer? MR. LENHART: Yes. MR. HALLER: And are you familiar with the property which is subject of today's hearing? MR. LENHART: Yes. MR. HALLER: And are you familiar with the prior approvals concerning the subject property? MR. LENHART: Yes. MR. HALLER: Are you familiar with the road network in the area? MR. LENHART: Yes, I am. MR. HALLER: And have you personally inspected the subject property and the surrounding road network?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Ritchie Marlboro Road at White House Road; White House Road at Harry S. Truman Drive; and site access with Harry S. Truman, I'm sorry, at White House Road. We conducted new traffic counts. We included approved, but unbuilt background developments that were identified in the scoping agreement; and then we included site traffic from the 124-unit subdivision; and the results of that study showed that all of the study intersections operate at acceptable levels of service based on the full build-out of this project and all of the approved and unbuilt background developments. MR. HALLER: Okay. And in your opinion, would the proposed development in this application, with the frontage improvements anticipated as part of this development be adequate to handle the traffic generated by the project? MR. LENHART: Yes, it would be. MR. HALLER: And have you reviewed the conditions of approval recommended by Staff pertaining to this application related to transportation? MR. HALLER: And are there any issues with the conditions as they're currently written from a transportation standpoint?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	a document which has been marked as Applicant's Exhibit 46 which is your resume. And have you qualified as an expert previously before the Zoning Hearing Examiner, as MR. LENHART: Yes. MADAM EXAMINER: Mr. Lenhart will continue as an expert witness in the field of traffic and transportation. MR. HALLER: Okay. Thank you MR. LENHART: Thank you. MR. HALLER: Madam Examiner. Have you been retained by the Applicant in this case to serve as their transportation planner and engineer? MR. LENHART: Yes. MR. HALLER: And are you familiar with the property which is subject of today's hearing? MR. LENHART: Yes. MR. HALLER: And are you familiar with the prior approvals concerning the subject property? MR. LENHART: Yes. MR. HALLER: Are you familiar with the road network in the area? MR. LENHART: Yes, I am. MR. HALLER: And have you personally inspected the subject property and the surrounding road network? MR. LENHART: Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Ritchie Marlboro Road at White House Road; White House Road at Harry S. Truman Drive; and site access with Harry S. Truman, I'm sorry, at White House Road. We conducted new traffic counts. We included approved, but unbuilt background developments that were identified in the scoping agreement; and then we included site traffic from the 124-unit subdivision; and the results of that study showed that all of the study intersections operate at acceptable levels of service based on the full build-out of this project and all of the approved and unbuilt background developments. MR. HALLER: Okay. And in your opinion, would the proposed development in this application, with the frontage improvements anticipated as part of this development be adequate to handle the traffic generated by the project? MR. LENHART: Yes, it would be. MR. HALLER: And have you reviewed the conditions of approval recommended by Staff pertaining to this application related to transportation? MR. LENHART: Yes. MR. HALLER: And are there any issues with the conditions as they're currently written from a transportation standpoint? MR. LENHART: Yes, there are.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	a document which has been marked as Applicant's Exhibit 46 which is your resume. And have you qualified as an expert previously before the Zoning Hearing Examiner, as MR. LENHART: Yes. MADAM EXAMINER: Mr. Lenhart will continue as an expert witness in the field of traffic and transportation. MR. HALLER: Okay. Thank you MR. LENHART: Thank you. MR. HALLER: Madam Examiner. Have you been retained by the Applicant in this case to serve as their transportation planner and engineer? MR. LENHART: Yes. MR. HALLER: And are you familiar with the property which is subject of today's hearing? MR. LENHART: Yes. MR. HALLER: And are you familiar with the prior approvals concerning the subject property? MR. LENHART: Yes. MR. HALLER: Are you familiar with the road network in the area? MR. LENHART: Yes, I am. MR. HALLER: And have you personally inspected the subject property and the surrounding road network?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Ritchie Marlboro Road at White House Road; White House Road at Harry S. Truman Drive; and site access with Harry S. Truman, I'm sorry, at White House Road. We conducted new traffic counts. We included approved, but unbuilt background developments that were identified in the scoping agreement; and then we included site traffic from the 124-unit subdivision; and the results of that study showed that all of the study intersections operate at acceptable levels of service based on the full build-out of this project and all of the approved and unbuilt background developments. MR. HALLER: Okay. And in your opinion, would the proposed development in this application, with the frontage improvements anticipated as part of this development be adequate to handle the traffic generated by the project? MR. LENHART: Yes, it would be. MR. HALLER: And have you reviewed the conditions of approval recommended by Staff pertaining to this application related to transportation? MR. LENHART: Yes. MR. HALLER: And are there any issues with the conditions as they're currently written from a transportation standpoint? MR. LENHART: Yes, there are.

	Page 54		Page 56
1	MR. HALLER: And what are the issues that you're	1	specifically addresses access to subdivisions, and that's in
2	concerned about?	2	Section 9.B and it discusses the number of access points
3	MR. LENHART: So, Staff proposed to add new		that would be required based upon various criteria; and one
	conditions, 15 and 16. Condition 15 states that the Basic		of the criteria is that it states that for single-family
	Plan Amendment shall be modified to show two vehicular		residential developments, a single access point should be
	access connections to the site. While Condition 16 states		limited to daily traffic volumes of 2,000 trips per day.
	that the Applicant shall demonstrate the feasibility of reducing the number of access connections to the site		And so, for single-family subdivisions, when the access exceeds 2,000 trips per day, they suggest consideration for
	through an operational and queuing analysis which shall be		a second access point.
	evaluated with future development applications. And if, if	10	
	you look at those two conditions, we believe that they, they		the subdivision would generate 1,116 trips per day, which is
	could lead to confusion because they seem to conflict with		just slightly over half of the threshold that would suggest
	each other. One is saying you must provide two access		a consideration for a second access point. So, this
14	points and the other one is saying do a study to try to	14	operates well below that threshold; and given those two,
15	reduce the access points.	15	those two issues, both show that it operates acceptably at
16	MR. HALLER: So, what would you recommend as to	16	a, as a single access point.
17	alleviate that confusion?	17	MR. HALLER: Okay. Thank you very much. Are you
18	MR. LENHART: We, we understand that the Basic		familiar with the requirements of approval for Basic Plan
	Plan was originally approved, had, had two access points,		related to transportation and public facility adequacy as
	one to Harry S. Truman extended through the site and one to White House Read, but during the proceeding of these CDR and	20 21	set forth in Section 27-195(b)(1)(C)? MR. LENHART: Yes.
	White House Road; but during the processing of those CDP and Preliminary Plans, it was determined that only one access	21 22	
	point was needed. And so, we would recommend that those two		those requirements are?
	conditions, 15 and 16, be combined into a single condition	24	
	that clearly states that the Basic Plan should be amended to	25	are.
	Page 55		Page 57
	conceptually show a second access in the event that it is	1	MR. HALLER: All right. All right. So, all
2	conceptually show a second access in the event that it is determined at later stages at the second access point as	2	MR. HALLER: All right. All right. So, all right, so, Mr. Lenhart, in your opinion, does the subject
2 3	conceptually show a second access in the event that it is determined at later stages at the second access point as needed based upon the operational and queuing analysis.	2 3	MR. HALLER: All right. All right. So, all right, so, Mr. Lenhart, in your opinion, does the subject property satisfy the transportation requirements as set
2 3 4	conceptually show a second access in the event that it is determined at later stages at the second access point as needed based upon the operational and queuing analysis. MR. HALLER: Okay. So, I'm going to pull up	2 3 4	MR. HALLER: All right. All right. So, all right, so, Mr. Lenhart, in your opinion, does the subject property satisfy the transportation requirements as set forth in the Zoning Ordinance concerning approval, the Basic
2 3 4 5	conceptually show a second access in the event that it is determined at later stages at the second access point as needed based upon the operational and queuing analysis. MR. HALLER: Okay. So, I'm going to pull up Exhibit 41, which is here it is. Condition, I mean	2 3 4 5	MR. HALLER: All right. All right. So, all right, so, Mr. Lenhart, in your opinion, does the subject property satisfy the transportation requirements as set forth in the Zoning Ordinance concerning approval, the Basic Plan?
2 3 4 5 6	conceptually show a second access in the event that it is determined at later stages at the second access point as needed based upon the operational and queuing analysis. MR. HALLER: Okay. So, I'm going to pull up Exhibit 41, which is here it is. Condition, I mean Exhibit 41 is a proposed consolidation of those conditions.	2 3 4 5 6	MR. HALLER: All right. All right. So, all right, so, Mr. Lenhart, in your opinion, does the subject property satisfy the transportation requirements as set forth in the Zoning Ordinance concerning approval, the Basic Plan? MR. LENHART: Yes. Yes, it does; and that's
2 3 4 5 6 7	conceptually show a second access in the event that it is determined at later stages at the second access point as needed based upon the operational and queuing analysis. MR. HALLER: Okay. So, I'm going to pull up Exhibit 41, which is here it is. Condition, I mean	2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. HALLER: All right. All right. So, all right, so, Mr. Lenhart, in your opinion, does the subject property satisfy the transportation requirements as set forth in the Zoning Ordinance concerning approval, the Basic Plan?
2 3 4 5 6 7	conceptually show a second access in the event that it is determined at later stages at the second access point as needed based upon the operational and queuing analysis. MR. HALLER: Okay. So, I'm going to pull up Exhibit 41, which is here it is. Condition, I mean Exhibit 41 is a proposed consolidation of those conditions. Is that the language that you would recommend to address	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. HALLER: All right. All right. So, all right, so, Mr. Lenhart, in your opinion, does the subject property satisfy the transportation requirements as set forth in the Zoning Ordinance concerning approval, the Basic Plan? MR. LENHART: Yes. Yes, it does; and that's backed up by our traffic study that shows that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	conceptually show a second access in the event that it is determined at later stages at the second access point as needed based upon the operational and queuing analysis. MR. HALLER: Okay. So, I'm going to pull up Exhibit 41, which is here it is. Condition, I mean Exhibit 41 is a proposed consolidation of those conditions. Is that the language that you would recommend to address that, to alleviate that confusion?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. HALLER: All right. All right. So, all right, so, Mr. Lenhart, in your opinion, does the subject property satisfy the transportation requirements as set forth in the Zoning Ordinance concerning approval, the Basic Plan? MR. LENHART: Yes. Yes, it does; and that's backed up by our traffic study that shows that transportation facilities will be adequate to carry the, the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	conceptually show a second access in the event that it is determined at later stages at the second access point as needed based upon the operational and queuing analysis. MR. HALLER: Okay. So, I'm going to pull up Exhibit 41, which is here it is. Condition, I mean Exhibit 41 is a proposed consolidation of those conditions. Is that the language that you would recommend to address that, to alleviate that confusion? MR. LENHART: Yes. MR. HALLER: And have you, assuming that, that this condition is approved and requires an evaluation of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. HALLER: All right. All right. So, all right, so, Mr. Lenhart, in your opinion, does the subject property satisfy the transportation requirements as set forth in the Zoning Ordinance concerning approval, the Basic Plan? MR. LENHART: Yes. Yes, it does; and that's backed up by our traffic study that shows that transportation facilities will be adequate to carry the, the traffic generated by this project. MR. HALLER: All right. Thank you. I have no further questions.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	conceptually show a second access in the event that it is determined at later stages at the second access point as needed based upon the operational and queuing analysis. MR. HALLER: Okay. So, I'm going to pull up Exhibit 41, which is here it is. Condition, I mean Exhibit 41 is a proposed consolidation of those conditions. Is that the language that you would recommend to address that, to alleviate that confusion? MR. LENHART: Yes. MR. HALLER: And have you, assuming that, that this condition is approved and requires an evaluation of whether a second point of access may be required, have you	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. HALLER: All right. All right. So, all right, so, Mr. Lenhart, in your opinion, does the subject property satisfy the transportation requirements as set forth in the Zoning Ordinance concerning approval, the Basic Plan? MR. LENHART: Yes. Yes, it does; and that's backed up by our traffic study that shows that transportation facilities will be adequate to carry the, the traffic generated by this project. MR. HALLER: All right. Thank you. I have no further questions. MADAM EXAMINER: Mr. Brown?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	conceptually show a second access in the event that it is determined at later stages at the second access point as needed based upon the operational and queuing analysis. MR. HALLER: Okay. So, I'm going to pull up Exhibit 41, which is here it is. Condition, I mean Exhibit 41 is a proposed consolidation of those conditions. Is that the language that you would recommend to address that, to alleviate that confusion? MR. LENHART: Yes. MR. HALLER: And have you, assuming that, that this condition is approved and requires an evaluation of whether a second point of access may be required, have you looked at that issue about whether a second point of access	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. HALLER: All right. All right. So, all right, so, Mr. Lenhart, in your opinion, does the subject property satisfy the transportation requirements as set forth in the Zoning Ordinance concerning approval, the Basic Plan? MR. LENHART: Yes. Yes, it does; and that's backed up by our traffic study that shows that transportation facilities will be adequate to carry the, the traffic generated by this project. MR. HALLER: All right. Thank you. I have no further questions. MADAM EXAMINER: Mr. Brown? MR. BROWN: Just one of wordsmith, this proposed
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	conceptually show a second access in the event that it is determined at later stages at the second access point as needed based upon the operational and queuing analysis. MR. HALLER: Okay. So, I'm going to pull up Exhibit 41, which is here it is. Condition, I mean Exhibit 41 is a proposed consolidation of those conditions. Is that the language that you would recommend to address that, to alleviate that confusion? MR. LENHART: Yes. MR. HALLER: And have you, assuming that, that this condition is approved and requires an evaluation of whether a second point of access may be required, have you looked at that issue about whether a second point of access would be necessary?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. HALLER: All right. All right. So, all right, so, Mr. Lenhart, in your opinion, does the subject property satisfy the transportation requirements as set forth in the Zoning Ordinance concerning approval, the Basic Plan? MR. LENHART: Yes. Yes, it does; and that's backed up by our traffic study that shows that transportation facilities will be adequate to carry the, the traffic generated by this project. MR. HALLER: All right. Thank you. I have no further questions. MADAM EXAMINER: Mr. Brown? MR. BROWN: Just one of wordsmith, this proposed condition, or combination Condition 15 and 16, Mr. Lenhart.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	conceptually show a second access in the event that it is determined at later stages at the second access point as needed based upon the operational and queuing analysis. MR. HALLER: Okay. So, I'm going to pull up Exhibit 41, which is here it is. Condition, I mean Exhibit 41 is a proposed consolidation of those conditions. Is that the language that you would recommend to address that, to alleviate that confusion? MR. LENHART: Yes. MR. HALLER: And have you, assuming that, that this condition is approved and requires an evaluation of whether a second point of access may be required, have you looked at that issue about whether a second point of access would be necessary? MR. LENHART: Yes, we have. The Traffic Impact	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. HALLER: All right. All right. So, all right, so, Mr. Lenhart, in your opinion, does the subject property satisfy the transportation requirements as set forth in the Zoning Ordinance concerning approval, the Basic Plan? MR. LENHART: Yes. Yes, it does; and that's backed up by our traffic study that shows that transportation facilities will be adequate to carry the, the traffic generated by this project. MR. HALLER: All right. Thank you. I have no further questions. MADAM EXAMINER: Mr. Brown? MR. BROWN: Just one of wordsmith, this proposed condition, or combination Condition 15 and 16, Mr. Lenhart. As I read it here, the Basic Plan shall be modified to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	conceptually show a second access in the event that it is determined at later stages at the second access point as needed based upon the operational and queuing analysis. MR. HALLER: Okay. So, I'm going to pull up Exhibit 41, which is here it is. Condition, I mean Exhibit 41 is a proposed consolidation of those conditions. Is that the language that you would recommend to address that, to alleviate that confusion? MR. LENHART: Yes. MR. HALLER: And have you, assuming that, that this condition is approved and requires an evaluation of whether a second point of access may be required, have you looked at that issue about whether a second point of access would be necessary? MR. LENHART: Yes, we have. The Traffic Impact Study that we completed, I think it was Exhibit 43, it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. HALLER: All right. All right. So, all right, so, Mr. Lenhart, in your opinion, does the subject property satisfy the transportation requirements as set forth in the Zoning Ordinance concerning approval, the Basic Plan? MR. LENHART: Yes. Yes, it does; and that's backed up by our traffic study that shows that transportation facilities will be adequate to carry the, the traffic generated by this project. MR. HALLER: All right. Thank you. I have no further questions. MADAM EXAMINER: Mr. Brown? MR. BROWN: Just one of wordsmith, this proposed condition, or combination Condition 15 and 16, Mr. Lenhart. As I read it here, the Basic Plan shall be modified to conceptually show I think we should delete the word A-N-
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	conceptually show a second access in the event that it is determined at later stages at the second access point as needed based upon the operational and queuing analysis. MR. HALLER: Okay. So, I'm going to pull up Exhibit 41, which is here it is. Condition, I mean Exhibit 41 is a proposed consolidation of those conditions. Is that the language that you would recommend to address that, to alleviate that confusion? MR. LENHART: Yes. MR. HALLER: And have you, assuming that, that this condition is approved and requires an evaluation of whether a second point of access may be required, have you looked at that issue about whether a second point of access would be necessary? MR. LENHART: Yes, we have. The Traffic Impact Study that we completed, I think it was Exhibit 43, it evaluated the site as if it only has one access that, as	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. HALLER: All right. All right. So, all right, so, Mr. Lenhart, in your opinion, does the subject property satisfy the transportation requirements as set forth in the Zoning Ordinance concerning approval, the Basic Plan? MR. LENHART: Yes. Yes, it does; and that's backed up by our traffic study that shows that transportation facilities will be adequate to carry the, the traffic generated by this project. MR. HALLER: All right. Thank you. I have no further questions. MADAM EXAMINER: Mr. Brown? MR. BROWN: Just one of wordsmith, this proposed condition, or combination Condition 15 and 16, Mr. Lenhart. As I read it here, the Basic Plan shall be modified to conceptually show I think we should delete the word A-N- D, and, and just show a second entrance. Do you see that?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	conceptually show a second access in the event that it is determined at later stages at the second access point as needed based upon the operational and queuing analysis. MR. HALLER: Okay. So, I'm going to pull up Exhibit 41, which is here it is. Condition, I mean Exhibit 41 is a proposed consolidation of those conditions. Is that the language that you would recommend to address that, to alleviate that confusion? MR. LENHART: Yes. MR. HALLER: And have you, assuming that, that this condition is approved and requires an evaluation of whether a second point of access may be required, have you looked at that issue about whether a second point of access would be necessary? MR. LENHART: Yes, we have. The Traffic Impact Study that we completed, I think it was Exhibit 43, it evaluated the site as if it only has one access that, as currently proposed on White House Road; and so, there are	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. HALLER: All right. All right. So, all right, so, Mr. Lenhart, in your opinion, does the subject property satisfy the transportation requirements as set forth in the Zoning Ordinance concerning approval, the Basic Plan? MR. LENHART: Yes. Yes, it does; and that's backed up by our traffic study that shows that transportation facilities will be adequate to carry the, the traffic generated by this project. MR. HALLER: All right. Thank you. I have no further questions. MADAM EXAMINER: Mr. Brown? MR. BROWN: Just one of wordsmith, this proposed condition, or combination Condition 15 and 16, Mr. Lenhart. As I read it here, the Basic Plan shall be modified to conceptually show I think we should delete the word A-N- D, and, and just show a second entrance. Do you see that? MR. LENHART: Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	conceptually show a second access in the event that it is determined at later stages at the second access point as needed based upon the operational and queuing analysis. MR. HALLER: Okay. So, I'm going to pull up Exhibit 41, which is here it is. Condition, I mean Exhibit 41 is a proposed consolidation of those conditions. Is that the language that you would recommend to address that, to alleviate that confusion? MR. LENHART: Yes. MR. HALLER: And have you, assuming that, that this condition is approved and requires an evaluation of whether a second point of access may be required, have you looked at that issue about whether a second point of access would be necessary? MR. LENHART: Yes, we have. The Traffic Impact Study that we completed, I think it was Exhibit 43, it evaluated the site as if it only has one access that, as currently proposed on White House Road; and so, there are two things that I would offer. One is that that site access	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. HALLER: All right. All right. So, all right, so, Mr. Lenhart, in your opinion, does the subject property satisfy the transportation requirements as set forth in the Zoning Ordinance concerning approval, the Basic Plan? MR. LENHART: Yes. Yes, it does; and that's backed up by our traffic study that shows that transportation facilities will be adequate to carry the, the traffic generated by this project. MR. HALLER: All right. Thank you. I have no further questions. MADAM EXAMINER: Mr. Brown? MR. BROWN: Just one of wordsmith, this proposed condition, or combination Condition 15 and 16, Mr. Lenhart. As I read it here, the Basic Plan shall be modified to conceptually show I think we should delete the word A-N- D, and, and just show a second entrance. Do you see that? MR. LENHART: Yes. MADAM EXAMINER: Yeah.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	conceptually show a second access in the event that it is determined at later stages at the second access point as needed based upon the operational and queuing analysis. MR. HALLER: Okay. So, I'm going to pull up Exhibit 41, which is here it is. Condition, I mean Exhibit 41 is a proposed consolidation of those conditions. Is that the language that you would recommend to address that, to alleviate that confusion? MR. LENHART: Yes. MR. HALLER: And have you, assuming that, that this condition is approved and requires an evaluation of whether a second point of access may be required, have you looked at that issue about whether a second point of access would be necessary? MR. LENHART: Yes, we have. The Traffic Impact Study that we completed, I think it was Exhibit 43, it evaluated the site as if it only has one access that, as currently proposed on White House Road; and so, there are two things that I would offer. One is that that site access point operates at acceptable levels of service that's deemed	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. HALLER: All right. All right. So, all right, so, Mr. Lenhart, in your opinion, does the subject property satisfy the transportation requirements as set forth in the Zoning Ordinance concerning approval, the Basic Plan? MR. LENHART: Yes. Yes, it does; and that's backed up by our traffic study that shows that transportation facilities will be adequate to carry the, the traffic generated by this project. MR. HALLER: All right. Thank you. I have no further questions. MADAM EXAMINER: Mr. Brown? MR. BROWN: Just one of wordsmith, this proposed condition, or combination Condition 15 and 16, Mr. Lenhart. As I read it here, the Basic Plan shall be modified to conceptually show I think we should delete the word A-N- D, and, and just show a second entrance. Do you see that? MR. LENHART: Yes. MADAM EXAMINER: Yeah. MR. LENHART: I can do that. Sorry about that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	conceptually show a second access in the event that it is determined at later stages at the second access point as needed based upon the operational and queuing analysis. MR. HALLER: Okay. So, I'm going to pull up Exhibit 41, which is here it is. Condition, I mean Exhibit 41 is a proposed consolidation of those conditions. Is that the language that you would recommend to address that, to alleviate that confusion? MR. LENHART: Yes. MR. HALLER: And have you, assuming that, that this condition is approved and requires an evaluation of whether a second point of access may be required, have you looked at that issue about whether a second point of access would be necessary? MR. LENHART: Yes, we have. The Traffic Impact Study that we completed, I think it was Exhibit 43, it evaluated the site as if it only has one access that, as currently proposed on White House Road; and so, there are two things that I would offer. One is that that site access	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. HALLER: All right. All right. So, all right, so, Mr. Lenhart, in your opinion, does the subject property satisfy the transportation requirements as set forth in the Zoning Ordinance concerning approval, the Basic Plan? MR. LENHART: Yes. Yes, it does; and that's backed up by our traffic study that shows that transportation facilities will be adequate to carry the, the traffic generated by this project. MR. HALLER: All right. Thank you. I have no further questions. MADAM EXAMINER: Mr. Brown? MR. BROWN: Just one of wordsmith, this proposed condition, or combination Condition 15 and 16, Mr. Lenhart. As I read it here, the Basic Plan shall be modified to conceptually show I think we should delete the word A-N- D, and, and just show a second entrance. Do you see that? MR. LENHART: Yes. MADAM EXAMINER: Yeah. MR. LENHART: I can do that. Sorry about that. MR. BROWN: And then go to the second sentence,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	conceptually show a second access in the event that it is determined at later stages at the second access point as needed based upon the operational and queuing analysis. MR. HALLER: Okay. So, I'm going to pull up Exhibit 41, which is here it is. Condition, I mean Exhibit 41 is a proposed consolidation of those conditions. Is that the language that you would recommend to address that, to alleviate that confusion? MR. LENHART: Yes. MR. HALLER: And have you, assuming that, that this condition is approved and requires an evaluation of whether a second point of access may be required, have you looked at that issue about whether a second point of access would be necessary? MR. LENHART: Yes, we have. The Traffic Impact Study that we completed, I think it was Exhibit 43, it evaluated the site as if it only has one access that, as currently proposed on White House Road; and so, there are two things that I would offer. One is that that site access point operates at acceptable levels of service that's deemed adequate based upon the Transportation Review Guidelines as	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. HALLER: All right. All right. So, all right, so, Mr. Lenhart, in your opinion, does the subject property satisfy the transportation requirements as set forth in the Zoning Ordinance concerning approval, the Basic Plan? MR. LENHART: Yes. Yes, it does; and that's backed up by our traffic study that shows that transportation facilities will be adequate to carry the, the traffic generated by this project. MR. HALLER: All right. Thank you. I have no further questions. MADAM EXAMINER: Mr. Brown? MR. BROWN: Just one of wordsmith, this proposed condition, or combination Condition 15 and 16, Mr. Lenhart. As I read it here, the Basic Plan shall be modified to conceptually show I think we should delete the word A-N- D, and, and just show a second entrance. Do you see that? MR. LENHART: Yes. MADAM EXAMINER: Yeah. MR. LENHART: I can do that. Sorry about that. MR. BROWN: And then go to the second sentence,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	conceptually show a second access in the event that it is determined at later stages at the second access point as needed based upon the operational and queuing analysis. MR. HALLER: Okay. So, I'm going to pull up Exhibit 41, which is here it is. Condition, I mean Exhibit 41 is a proposed consolidation of those conditions. Is that the language that you would recommend to address that, to alleviate that confusion? MR. LENHART: Yes. MR. HALLER: And have you, assuming that, that this condition is approved and requires an evaluation of whether a second point of access may be required, have you looked at that issue about whether a second point of access would be necessary? MR. LENHART: Yes, we have. The Traffic Impact Study that we completed, I think it was Exhibit 43, it evaluated the site as if it only has one access that, as currently proposed on White House Road; and so, there are two things that I would offer. One is that that site access point operates at acceptable levels of service that's deemed adequate based upon the Transportation Review Guidelines as a single point of access and, therefore, would operate	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. HALLER: All right. All right. So, all right, so, Mr. Lenhart, in your opinion, does the subject property satisfy the transportation requirements as set forth in the Zoning Ordinance concerning approval, the Basic Plan? MR. LENHART: Yes. Yes, it does; and that's backed up by our traffic study that shows that transportation facilities will be adequate to carry the, the traffic generated by this project. MR. HALLER: All right. Thank you. I have no further questions. MADAM EXAMINER: Mr. Brown? MR. BROWN: Just one of wordsmith, this proposed condition, or combination Condition 15 and 16, Mr. Lenhart. As I read it here, the Basic Plan shall be modified to conceptually show I think we should delete the word A-N- D, and, and just show a second entrance. Do you see that? MR. LENHART: Yes. MADAM EXAMINER: Yeah. MR. LENHART: I can do that. Sorry about that. MR. BROWN: And then go to the second sentence, "At the time of future development applications," the second
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	conceptually show a second access in the event that it is determined at later stages at the second access point as needed based upon the operational and queuing analysis. MR. HALLER: Okay. So, I'm going to pull up Exhibit 41, which is here it is. Condition, I mean Exhibit 41 is a proposed consolidation of those conditions. Is that the language that you would recommend to address that, to alleviate that confusion? MR. LENHART: Yes. MR. HALLER: And have you, assuming that, that this condition is approved and requires an evaluation of whether a second point of access may be required, have you looked at that issue about whether a second point of access would be necessary? MR. LENHART: Yes, we have. The Traffic Impact Study that we completed, I think it was Exhibit 43, it evaluated the site as if it only has one access that, as currently proposed on White House Road; and so, there are two things that I would offer. One is that that site access point operates at acceptable levels of service that's deemed adequate based upon the Transportation Review Guidelines as a single point of access and, therefore, would operate acceptably.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. HALLER: All right. All right. So, all right, so, Mr. Lenhart, in your opinion, does the subject property satisfy the transportation requirements as set forth in the Zoning Ordinance concerning approval, the Basic Plan? MR. LENHART: Yes. Yes, it does; and that's backed up by our traffic study that shows that transportation facilities will be adequate to carry the, the traffic generated by this project. MR. HALLER: All right. Thank you. I have no further questions. MADAM EXAMINER: Mr. Brown? MR. BROWN: Just one of wordsmith, this proposed condition, or combination Condition 15 and 16, Mr. Lenhart. As I read it here, the Basic Plan shall be modified to conceptually show I think we should delete the word A-N- D, and, and just show a second entrance. Do you see that? MR. LENHART: Yes. MADAM EXAMINER: Yeah. MR. LENHART: I can do that. Sorry about that. MR. BROWN: And then go to the second sentence, "At the time of future development applications," the second entrance, I think, would be much clearer, "Shall not be required," as opposed to saying, this entrance

	Page 58		Page 60
1	MP PPOW/N: the second entrance	-	convoyed to the Dark and Dianning Commission; and over 10
1	MR. BROWN: the second entrance. MR. LENHART: I think I'm fine with that, sure.		conveyed to the Park and Planning Commission; and over 10 acres has already been dedicated as public rights-of-way for
3	That is more clear.		the widening of White House Road and, and the extension of
4	MR. BROWN: Other than that, no other questions.		Harry S. Truman Drive. So, that's really close to 30 acres
5	MADAM EXAMINER: All right. I have no questions.	5	
6	Thank you, Mr. Lenhart. Nice to see you as usual.	6	
7	MR. LENHART: Thank you. You, too.		development envelope which, which also, obviously, includes
8	MR. HALLER: All right. Thank you, Madam	8	
9	Examiner. Now I'd finally like to call Mr. Mark Ferguson.	9	
10	MADAM EXAMINER: Mr. Ferguson, you're batting	10	
	clean-up today.	11	
12	MR. FERGUSON: Good morning, Madam Examiner, so it	12	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	seems.		of, of public acreage with the application boundary.
14	MADAM EXAMINER: Good morning. All right. Thank	14	
	you. Do you solemnly swear or affirm under the penalties of		orient the Examiner to the property which is subject to the
	perjury in the matter now pending to tell the truth, the	16	
	whole truth and nothing but the truth?		me to pull up to do that?
18	MR. FERGUSON: I do.	18	
19	MADAM EXAMINER: All right. Would you please	19	
20	state your name and business address for the record?	20	topography, or aerial photograph of the surrounding area,
21	MR. FERGUSON: My name is Mark Ferguson. My	21	extending from the Capital Beltway, which was the western
22	business address is 5407 Water Street, Suite 206, back in	22	limit of the neighborhood in the original Zoning
23	historic, downtown Upper Marlboro, Maryland.	23	Application, out to Maryland 202 and Brown Station Road on
24	MADAM EXAMINER: All right. And you continue in	24	the right, which were the original eastern boundaries of the
25	your designation as land planner extraordinaire, expert	25	subdivision of the, the original Zoning Application. The
	Page 59		Page 61
1	Page 59 witness.	1	Page 61 southern boundary was a, a, a watershed divide, which is
1			
	witness.		southern boundary was a, a, a watershed divide, which is roughly, it's, obviously, uneven; but roughly contiguous
2 3	witness. MR. FERGUSON: Thank you, Madam Examiner.	2 3	southern boundary was a, a, a watershed divide, which is roughly, it's, obviously, uneven; but roughly contiguous
2 3 4	witness. MR. FERGUSON: Thank you, Madam Examiner. MR. HALLER: Thank you, Madam Examiner. Mr.	2 3 4	southern boundary was a, a, a watershed divide, which is roughly, it's, obviously, uneven; but roughly contiguous with the bottom of the photograph. The norther part of the,
2 3 4	witness. MR. FERGUSON: Thank you, Madam Examiner. MR. HALLER: Thank you, Madam Examiner. Mr. Ferguson, have you been retained as the Applicant's expert	2 3 4 5	southern boundary was a, a, a watershed divide, which is roughly, it's, obviously, uneven; but roughly contiguous with the bottom of the photograph. The norther part of the, of the neighborhood was Campus Drive, which is off to the
2 3 4 5	witness. MR. FERGUSON: Thank you, Madam Examiner. MR. HALLER: Thank you, Madam Examiner. Mr. Ferguson, have you been retained as the Applicant's expert land planner in this case? MR. FERGUSON: I have. MR. HALLER: Are you familiar with the property	2 3 4 5	southern boundary was a, a, a watershed divide, which is roughly, it's, obviously, uneven; but roughly contiguous with the bottom of the photograph. The norther part of the, of the neighborhood was Campus Drive, which is off to the north. This exhibit only goes as far north as Mount Lubentia Way; but you can see the neighborhood context.
2 3 4 5 6	witness. MR. FERGUSON: Thank you, Madam Examiner. MR. HALLER: Thank you, Madam Examiner. Mr. Ferguson, have you been retained as the Applicant's expert land planner in this case? MR. FERGUSON: I have. MR. HALLER: Are you familiar with the property which is the subject of the application?	2 3 4 5 6	southern boundary was a, a, a watershed divide, which is roughly, it's, obviously, uneven; but roughly contiguous with the bottom of the photograph. The norther part of the, of the neighborhood was Campus Drive, which is off to the north. This exhibit only goes as far north as Mount Lubentia Way; but you can see the neighborhood context. One thing to note, the area outlined in red is only the eastern portion of the Basic Plan area. The Basic
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	witness. MR. FERGUSON: Thank you, Madam Examiner. MR. HALLER: Thank you, Madam Examiner. Mr. Ferguson, have you been retained as the Applicant's expert land planner in this case? MR. FERGUSON: I have. MR. HALLER: Are you familiar with the property which is the subject of the application? MR. FERGUSON: Yes, I am.	2 3 4 5 6 7	southern boundary was a, a, a watershed divide, which is roughly, it's, obviously, uneven; but roughly contiguous with the bottom of the photograph. The norther part of the, of the neighborhood was Campus Drive, which is off to the north. This exhibit only goes as far north as Mount Lubentia Way; but you can see the neighborhood context. One thing to note, the area outlined in red is only the eastern portion of the Basic Plan area. The Basic Plan extended to the west across the extension of Marlboro
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	witness. MR. FERGUSON: Thank you, Madam Examiner. MR. HALLER: Thank you, Madam Examiner. Mr. Ferguson, have you been retained as the Applicant's expert land planner in this case? MR. FERGUSON: I have. MR. HALLER: Are you familiar with the property which is the subject of the application? MR. FERGUSON: Yes, I am. MR. HALLER: And have you made a personal	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	southern boundary was a, a, a watershed divide, which is roughly, it's, obviously, uneven; but roughly contiguous with the bottom of the photograph. The norther part of the, of the neighborhood was Campus Drive, which is off to the north. This exhibit only goes as far north as Mount Lubentia Way; but you can see the neighborhood context. One thing to note, the area outlined in red is only the eastern portion of the Basic Plan area. The Basic Plan extended to the west across the extension of Marlboro Drive to include the area that's now been dedicated. It's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	witness. MR. FERGUSON: Thank you, Madam Examiner. MR. HALLER: Thank you, Madam Examiner. Mr. Ferguson, have you been retained as the Applicant's expert land planner in this case? MR. FERGUSON: I have. MR. HALLER: Are you familiar with the property which is the subject of the application? MR. FERGUSON: Yes, I am. MR. HALLER: And have you made a personal inspection of the property and the surrounding area?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	southern boundary was a, a, a watershed divide, which is roughly, it's, obviously, uneven; but roughly contiguous with the bottom of the photograph. The norther part of the, of the neighborhood was Campus Drive, which is off to the north. This exhibit only goes as far north as Mount Lubentia Way; but you can see the neighborhood context. One thing to note, the area outlined in red is only the eastern portion of the Basic Plan area. The Basic Plan extended to the west across the extension of Marlboro Drive to include the area that's now been dedicated. It's worth noting, by the way, that the original Basic Plan did
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	witness. MR. FERGUSON: Thank you, Madam Examiner. MR. HALLER: Thank you, Madam Examiner. Mr. Ferguson, have you been retained as the Applicant's expert land planner in this case? MR. FERGUSON: I have. MR. HALLER: Are you familiar with the property which is the subject of the application? MR. FERGUSON: Yes, I am. MR. HALLER: And have you made a personal inspection of the property and the surrounding area? MR. FERGUSON: I have.	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	southern boundary was a, a, a watershed divide, which is roughly, it's, obviously, uneven; but roughly contiguous with the bottom of the photograph. The norther part of the, of the neighborhood was Campus Drive, which is off to the north. This exhibit only goes as far north as Mount Lubentia Way; but you can see the neighborhood context. One thing to note, the area outlined in red is only the eastern portion of the Basic Plan area. The Basic Plan extended to the west across the extension of Marlboro Drive to include the area that's now been dedicated. It's worth noting, by the way, that the original Basic Plan did cover two original requests for Zoning Map Amendment. 9-802
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 witness. MR. FERGUSON: Thank you, Madam Examiner. MR. HALLER: Thank you, Madam Examiner. Mr. Ferguson, have you been retained as the Applicant's expert land planner in this case? MR. FERGUSON: I have. MR. HALLER: Are you familiar with the property which is the subject of the application? MR. FERGUSON: Yes, I am. MR. HALLER: And have you made a personal inspection of the property and the surrounding area? MR. FERGUSON: I have. MR. FERGUSON: I have. MR. FERGUSON: I have. MR. HALLER: And what is the current zoning of the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	southern boundary was a, a, a watershed divide, which is roughly, it's, obviously, uneven; but roughly contiguous with the bottom of the photograph. The norther part of the, of the neighborhood was Campus Drive, which is off to the north. This exhibit only goes as far north as Mount Lubentia Way; but you can see the neighborhood context. One thing to note, the area outlined in red is only the eastern portion of the Basic Plan area. The Basic Plan extended to the west across the extension of Marlboro Drive to include the area that's now been dedicated. It's worth noting, by the way, that the original Basic Plan did cover two original requests for Zoning Map Amendment. 9-802 sought, originally, the approval of the RM Zone and that,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	witness. MR. FERGUSON: Thank you, Madam Examiner. MR. HALLER: Thank you, Madam Examiner. Mr. Ferguson, have you been retained as the Applicant's expert land planner in this case? MR. FERGUSON: I have. MR. HALLER: Are you familiar with the property which is the subject of the application? MR. FERGUSON: Yes, I am. MR. HALLER: And have you made a personal inspection of the property and the surrounding area? MR. FERGUSON: I have. MR. HALLER: And what is the current zoning of the property?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	southern boundary was a, a, a watershed divide, which is roughly, it's, obviously, uneven; but roughly contiguous with the bottom of the photograph. The norther part of the, of the neighborhood was Campus Drive, which is off to the north. This exhibit only goes as far north as Mount Lubentia Way; but you can see the neighborhood context. One thing to note, the area outlined in red is only the eastern portion of the Basic Plan area. The Basic Plan extended to the west across the extension of Marlboro Drive to include the area that's now been dedicated. It's worth noting, by the way, that the original Basic Plan did cover two original requests for Zoning Map Amendment. 9-802 sought, originally, the approval of the RM Zone and that, basically, corresponds to the remaining development area
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 witness. MR. FERGUSON: Thank you, Madam Examiner. MR. HALLER: Thank you, Madam Examiner. Mr. Ferguson, have you been retained as the Applicant's expert land planner in this case? MR. FERGUSON: I have. MR. HALLER: Are you familiar with the property which is the subject of the application? MR. FERGUSON: Yes, I am. MR. HALLER: And have you made a personal inspection of the property and the surrounding area? MR. FERGUSON: I have. MR. HALLER: And what is the current zoning of the property? MR. FERGUSON: As Mr. Dunlap testified, it is 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	southern boundary was a, a, a watershed divide, which is roughly, it's, obviously, uneven; but roughly contiguous with the bottom of the photograph. The norther part of the, of the neighborhood was Campus Drive, which is off to the north. This exhibit only goes as far north as Mount Lubentia Way; but you can see the neighborhood context. One thing to note, the area outlined in red is only the eastern portion of the Basic Plan area. The Basic Plan extended to the west across the extension of Marlboro Drive to include the area that's now been dedicated. It's worth noting, by the way, that the original Basic Plan did cover two original requests for Zoning Map Amendment. 9-802 sought, originally, the approval of the RM Zone and that, basically, corresponds to the remaining development area that's, that's outlined in red.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 witness. MR. FERGUSON: Thank you, Madam Examiner. MR. HALLER: Thank you, Madam Examiner. Mr. Ferguson, have you been retained as the Applicant's expert land planner in this case? MR. FERGUSON: I have. MR. HALLER: Are you familiar with the property which is the subject of the application? MR. FERGUSON: Yes, I am. MR. HALLER: And have you made a personal inspection of the property and the surrounding area? MR. FERGUSON: I have. MR. HALLER: And what is the current zoning of the property? MR. FERGUSON: As Mr. Dunlap testified, it is currently zoned LCD, which was the receiving zone for areas 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	southern boundary was a, a, a watershed divide, which is roughly, it's, obviously, uneven; but roughly contiguous with the bottom of the photograph. The norther part of the, of the neighborhood was Campus Drive, which is off to the north. This exhibit only goes as far north as Mount Lubentia Way; but you can see the neighborhood context. One thing to note, the area outlined in red is only the eastern portion of the Basic Plan area. The Basic Plan extended to the west across the extension of Marlboro Drive to include the area that's now been dedicated. It's worth noting, by the way, that the original Basic Plan did cover two original requests for Zoning Map Amendment. 9-802 sought, originally, the approval of the RM Zone and that, basically, corresponds to the remaining development area that's, that's outlined in red. Application 9-803 originally sought the LAC Zone,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 witness. MR. FERGUSON: Thank you, Madam Examiner. MR. HALLER: Thank you, Madam Examiner. Mr. Ferguson, have you been retained as the Applicant's expert land planner in this case? MR. FERGUSON: I have. MR. HALLER: Are you familiar with the property which is the subject of the application? MR. FERGUSON: Yes, I am. MR. HALLER: And have you made a personal inspection of the property and the surrounding area? MR. FERGUSON: I have. MR. FERGUSON: I have. MR. FERGUSON: I have. MR. FERGUSON: I have. MR. FERGUSON: As Mr. Dunlap testified, it is currently zoned LCD, which was the receiving zone for areas that were formerly zoned in this case RS, residential, I 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	southern boundary was a, a, a watershed divide, which is roughly, it's, obviously, uneven; but roughly contiguous with the bottom of the photograph. The norther part of the, of the neighborhood was Campus Drive, which is off to the north. This exhibit only goes as far north as Mount Lubentia Way; but you can see the neighborhood context. One thing to note, the area outlined in red is only the eastern portion of the Basic Plan area. The Basic Plan extended to the west across the extension of Marlboro Drive to include the area that's now been dedicated. It's worth noting, by the way, that the original Basic Plan did cover two original requests for Zoning Map Amendment. 9-802 sought, originally, the approval of the RM Zone and that, basically, corresponds to the remaining development area that's, that's outlined in red. Application 9-803 originally sought the LAC Zone, which roughly corresponds to the area that was conveyed to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 witness. MR. FERGUSON: Thank you, Madam Examiner. MR. HALLER: Thank you, Madam Examiner. Mr. Ferguson, have you been retained as the Applicant's expert land planner in this case? MR. FERGUSON: I have. MR. HALLER: Are you familiar with the property which is the subject of the application? MR. FERGUSON: Yes, I am. MR. HALLER: And have you made a personal inspection of the property and the surrounding area? MR. FERGUSON: I have. MR. FERGUSON: I have. MR. FERGUSON: I have. MR. FERGUSON: An what is the current zoning of the property? MR. FERGUSON: As Mr. Dunlap testified, it is currently zoned LCD, which was the receiving zone for areas that were formerly zoned in this case RS, residential, I forget what RS stood for, but RS. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	southern boundary was a, a, a watershed divide, which is roughly, it's, obviously, uneven; but roughly contiguous with the bottom of the photograph. The norther part of the, of the neighborhood was Campus Drive, which is off to the north. This exhibit only goes as far north as Mount Lubentia Way; but you can see the neighborhood context. One thing to note, the area outlined in red is only the eastern portion of the Basic Plan area. The Basic Plan extended to the west across the extension of Marlboro Drive to include the area that's now been dedicated. It's worth noting, by the way, that the original Basic Plan did cover two original requests for Zoning Map Amendment. 9-802 sought, originally, the approval of the RM Zone and that, basically, corresponds to the remaining development area that's, that's outlined in red. Application 9-803 originally sought the LAC Zone, which roughly corresponds to the area that was conveyed to the Park and Planning Commission. There's, the, I don't
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 witness. MR. FERGUSON: Thank you, Madam Examiner. MR. HALLER: Thank you, Madam Examiner. Mr. Ferguson, have you been retained as the Applicant's expert land planner in this case? MR. FERGUSON: I have. MR. HALLER: Are you familiar with the property which is the subject of the application? MR. FERGUSON: Yes, I am. MR. HALLER: And have you made a personal inspection of the property and the surrounding area? MR. FERGUSON: I have. MR. FERGUSON: I have. MR. FERGUSON: I have. MR. FERGUSON: An what is the current zoning of the property? MR. FERGUSON: As Mr. Dunlap testified, it is currently zoned LCD, which was the receiving zone for areas that were formerly zoned in this case RS, residential, I forget what RS stood for, but RS. MR. HALLER: And what is the acreage of the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	southern boundary was a, a, a watershed divide, which is roughly, it's, obviously, uneven; but roughly contiguous with the bottom of the photograph. The norther part of the, of the neighborhood was Campus Drive, which is off to the north. This exhibit only goes as far north as Mount Lubentia Way; but you can see the neighborhood context. One thing to note, the area outlined in red is only the eastern portion of the Basic Plan area. The Basic Plan extended to the west across the extension of Marlboro Drive to include the area that's now been dedicated. It's worth noting, by the way, that the original Basic Plan did cover two original requests for Zoning Map Amendment. 9-802 sought, originally, the approval of the RM Zone and that, basically, corresponds to the remaining development area that's, that's outlined in red. Application 9-803 originally sought the LAC Zone, which roughly corresponds to the area that was conveyed to the Park and Planning Commission. There's, the, I don't know that there was ever a hard boundary established between
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 witness. MR. FERGUSON: Thank you, Madam Examiner. MR. HALLER: Thank you, Madam Examiner. Mr. Ferguson, have you been retained as the Applicant's expert land planner in this case? MR. FERGUSON: I have. MR. HALLER: Are you familiar with the property which is the subject of the application? MR. FERGUSON: Yes, I am. MR. HALLER: And have you made a personal inspection of the property and the surrounding area? MR. FERGUSON: I have. MR. FERGUSON: I have. MR. FERGUSON: I have. MR. FERGUSON: As Mr. Dunlap testified, it is currently zoned LCD, which was the receiving zone for areas that were formerly zoned in this case RS, residential, I forget what RS stood for, but RS. MR. HALLER: And what is the acreage of the Kenwood Village property? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	southern boundary was a, a, a watershed divide, which is roughly, it's, obviously, uneven; but roughly contiguous with the bottom of the photograph. The norther part of the, of the neighborhood was Campus Drive, which is off to the north. This exhibit only goes as far north as Mount Lubentia Way; but you can see the neighborhood context. One thing to note, the area outlined in red is only the eastern portion of the Basic Plan area. The Basic Plan extended to the west across the extension of Marlboro Drive to include the area that's now been dedicated. It's worth noting, by the way, that the original Basic Plan did cover two original requests for Zoning Map Amendment. 9-802 sought, originally, the approval of the RM Zone and that, basically, corresponds to the remaining development area that's, that's outlined in red. Application 9-803 originally sought the LAC Zone, which roughly corresponds to the area that was conveyed to the Park and Planning Commission. There's, the, I don't know that there was ever a hard boundary established between these, those two. I did review the record of those original
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 witness. MR. FERGUSON: Thank you, Madam Examiner. MR. HALLER: Thank you, Madam Examiner. Mr. Ferguson, have you been retained as the Applicant's expert land planner in this case? MR. FERGUSON: I have. MR. HALLER: Are you familiar with the property which is the subject of the application? MR. FERGUSON: Yes, I am. MR. HALLER: And have you made a personal inspection of the property and the surrounding area? MR. FERGUSON: I have. MR. HALLER: And what is the current zoning of the property? MR. FERGUSON: As Mr. Dunlap testified, it is currently zoned LCD, which was the receiving zone for areas that were formerly zoned in this case RS, residential, I forget what RS stood for, but RS. MR. HALLER: And what is the acreage of the Kenwood Village property? MR. FERGUSON: Approximately 63, what do I say 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	southern boundary was a, a, a watershed divide, which is roughly, it's, obviously, uneven; but roughly contiguous with the bottom of the photograph. The norther part of the, of the neighborhood was Campus Drive, which is off to the north. This exhibit only goes as far north as Mount Lubentia Way; but you can see the neighborhood context. One thing to note, the area outlined in red is only the eastern portion of the Basic Plan area. The Basic Plan extended to the west across the extension of Marlboro Drive to include the area that's now been dedicated. It's worth noting, by the way, that the original Basic Plan did cover two original requests for Zoning Map Amendment. 9-802 sought, originally, the approval of the RM Zone and that, basically, corresponds to the remaining development area that's, that's outlined in red. Application 9-803 originally sought the LAC Zone, which roughly corresponds to the area that was conveyed to the Park and Planning Commission. There's, the, I don't know that there was ever a hard boundary established between these, those two. I did review the record of those original cases, but it's 800 pages long and I couldn't scroll past a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 witness. MR. FERGUSON: Thank you, Madam Examiner. MR. HALLER: Thank you, Madam Examiner. Mr. Ferguson, have you been retained as the Applicant's expert land planner in this case? MR. FERGUSON: I have. MR. HALLER: Are you familiar with the property which is the subject of the application? MR. FERGUSON: Yes, I am. MR. HALLER: And have you made a personal inspection of the property and the surrounding area? MR. FERGUSON: I have. MR. FERGUSON: I have. MR. FERGUSON: I have. MR. FERGUSON: I have. MR. FERGUSON: An what is the current zoning of the property? MR. FERGUSON: As Mr. Dunlap testified, it is currently zoned LCD, which was the receiving zone for areas that were formerly zoned in this case RS, residential, I forget what RS stood for, but RS. MR. HALLER: And what is the acreage of the Kenwood Village property? MR. FERGUSON: Approximately 63, what do I say here, 63.1 in my report. I do think it's actually worth 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	southern boundary was a, a, a watershed divide, which is roughly, it's, obviously, uneven; but roughly contiguous with the bottom of the photograph. The norther part of the, of the neighborhood was Campus Drive, which is off to the north. This exhibit only goes as far north as Mount Lubentia Way; but you can see the neighborhood context. One thing to note, the area outlined in red is only the eastern portion of the Basic Plan area. The Basic Plan extended to the west across the extension of Marlboro Drive to include the area that's now been dedicated. It's worth noting, by the way, that the original Basic Plan did cover two original requests for Zoning Map Amendment. 9-802 sought, originally, the approval of the RM Zone and that, basically, corresponds to the remaining development area that's, that's outlined in red. Application 9-803 originally sought the LAC Zone, which roughly corresponds to the area that was conveyed to the Park and Planning Commission. There's, the, I don't know that there was ever a hard boundary established between these, those two. I did review the record of those original cases, but it's 800 pages long and I couldn't scroll past a formal Zoning Map. The boundary between the two was,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 witness. MR. FERGUSON: Thank you, Madam Examiner. MR. HALLER: Thank you, Madam Examiner. Mr. Ferguson, have you been retained as the Applicant's expert land planner in this case? MR. FERGUSON: I have. MR. HALLER: Are you familiar with the property which is the subject of the application? MR. FERGUSON: Yes, I am. MR. HALLER: And have you made a personal inspection of the property and the surrounding area? MR. FERGUSON: I have. MR. FERGUSON: I have. MR. FERGUSON: I have. MR. FERGUSON: An what is the current zoning of the property? MR. FERGUSON: As Mr. Dunlap testified, it is currently zoned LCD, which was the receiving zone for areas that were formerly zoned in this case RS, residential, I forget what RS stood for, but RS. MR. HALLER: And what is the acreage of the Kenwood Village property? MR. FERGUSON: Approximately 63, what do I say here, 63.1 in my report. I do think it's actually worth noting that of the 63.1 acres which was encompassed by the, 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	southern boundary was a, a, a watershed divide, which is roughly, it's, obviously, uneven; but roughly contiguous with the bottom of the photograph. The norther part of the, of the neighborhood was Campus Drive, which is off to the north. This exhibit only goes as far north as Mount Lubentia Way; but you can see the neighborhood context. One thing to note, the area outlined in red is only the eastern portion of the Basic Plan area. The Basic Plan extended to the west across the extension of Marlboro Drive to include the area that's now been dedicated. It's worth noting, by the way, that the original Basic Plan did cover two original requests for Zoning Map Amendment. 9-802 sought, originally, the approval of the RM Zone and that, basically, corresponds to the remaining development area that's, that's outlined in red. Application 9-803 originally sought the LAC Zone, which roughly corresponds to the area that was conveyed to the Park and Planning Commission. There's, the, I don't know that there was ever a hard boundary established between these, those two. I did review the record of those original cases, but it's 800 pages long and I couldn't scroll past a formal Zoning Map. The boundary between the two was, however, intended to be the center line of the extension of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 witness. MR. FERGUSON: Thank you, Madam Examiner. MR. HALLER: Thank you, Madam Examiner. Mr. Ferguson, have you been retained as the Applicant's expert land planner in this case? MR. FERGUSON: I have. MR. HALLER: Are you familiar with the property which is the subject of the application? MR. FERGUSON: Yes, I am. MR. HALLER: And have you made a personal inspection of the property and the surrounding area? MR. FERGUSON: I have. MR. FERGUSON: I have. MR. FERGUSON: I have. MR. FERGUSON: I have. MR. FERGUSON: An the surrounding area? MR. FERGUSON: A shr. Dunlap testified, it is currently zoned LCD, which was the receiving zone for areas that were formerly zoned in this case RS, residential, I forget what RS stood for, but RS. MR. HALLER: And what is the acreage of the Kenwood Village property? MR. FERGUSON: Approximately 63, what do I say here, 63.1 in my report. I do think it's actually worth noting that of the 63.1 acres which was encompassed by the, the Basic Plan which covered the two zoning applications, 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	southern boundary was a, a, a watershed divide, which is roughly, it's, obviously, uneven; but roughly contiguous with the bottom of the photograph. The norther part of the, of the neighborhood was Campus Drive, which is off to the north. This exhibit only goes as far north as Mount Lubentia Way; but you can see the neighborhood context. One thing to note, the area outlined in red is only the eastern portion of the Basic Plan area. The Basic Plan extended to the west across the extension of Marlboro Drive to include the area that's now been dedicated. It's worth noting, by the way, that the original Basic Plan did cover two original requests for Zoning Map Amendment. 9-802 sought, originally, the approval of the RM Zone and that, basically, corresponds to the remaining development area that's, that's outlined in red. Application 9-803 originally sought the LAC Zone, which roughly corresponds to the area that was conveyed to the Park and Planning Commission. There's, the, I don't know that there was ever a hard boundary established between these, those two. I did review the record of those original cases, but it's 800 pages long and I couldn't scroll past a formal Zoning Map. The boundary between the two was, however, intended to be the center line of the extension of Harry S. Truman Drive, although the configuration of that,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 witness. MR. FERGUSON: Thank you, Madam Examiner. MR. HALLER: Thank you, Madam Examiner. Mr. Ferguson, have you been retained as the Applicant's expert land planner in this case? MR. FERGUSON: I have. MR. HALLER: Are you familiar with the property which is the subject of the application? MR. FERGUSON: Yes, I am. MR. HALLER: And have you made a personal inspection of the property and the surrounding area? MR. FERGUSON: I have. MR. FERGUSON: I have. MR. FERGUSON: I have. MR. FERGUSON: An what is the current zoning of the property? MR. FERGUSON: As Mr. Dunlap testified, it is currently zoned LCD, which was the receiving zone for areas that were formerly zoned in this case RS, residential, I forget what RS stood for, but RS. MR. HALLER: And what is the acreage of the Kenwood Village property? MR. FERGUSON: Approximately 63, what do I say here, 63.1 in my report. I do think it's actually worth noting that of the 63.1 acres which was encompassed by the, 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	southern boundary was a, a, a watershed divide, which is roughly, it's, obviously, uneven; but roughly contiguous with the bottom of the photograph. The norther part of the, of the neighborhood was Campus Drive, which is off to the north. This exhibit only goes as far north as Mount Lubentia Way; but you can see the neighborhood context. One thing to note, the area outlined in red is only the eastern portion of the Basic Plan area. The Basic Plan extended to the west across the extension of Marlboro Drive to include the area that's now been dedicated. It's worth noting, by the way, that the original Basic Plan did cover two original requests for Zoning Map Amendment. 9-802 sought, originally, the approval of the RM Zone and that, basically, corresponds to the remaining development area that's, that's outlined in red. Application 9-803 originally sought the LAC Zone, which roughly corresponds to the area that was conveyed to the Park and Planning Commission. There's, the, I don't know that there was ever a hard boundary established between these, those two. I did review the record of those original cases, but it's 800 pages long and I couldn't scroll past a formal Zoning Map. The boundary between the two was, however, intended to be the center line of the extension of

	Page 62		Page 64
2	Basic Plan delineation to the final form of its dedication. It's also worth noting that the original Zoning		zone; and I find that, that this amended application would continue to meet those criteria of Section 27-195 of the old
			(unintelligible).
	Applications were submitted and approved under the 1973 version of the Master Plan for Subregion 6. Just after	4	
	their approval, the '93 Master Plan was approved several		note that the Basic Plan was originally approved in 1993;
			and I know one of the exhibits we submitted was the 1993
	months after; and then, of course, we have a new Master Plan in 2013 that we must comply with today.		aerial. Would you like me to show that just to be able to,
8	MR. HALLER: Okay. Thank you. And are you		to demonstrate the changes?
9	familiar with the various referrals by the Divisions of Park	9	
_	and Planning, the other agencies which were provided as the		what, what we can see back on, on, on the, on the 2003
	basis for the Staff Report and		aerial first, however, is to, to go back to the current
12	MR. FERGUSON: I am.		aerial, if you could, Tom? So, what, what you see in the
13	MR. HALLER: 23?		current situation, obviously, is the interchange at Ritchie
14	MR. FERGUSON: I am.		Marlboro Road and the Beltway on the left side of the
15	MR. HALLER: And you've indicated you're familiar		drawing. In the southeast quadrant of that intersection,
	with the original Basic Plan for this property. In, in your		you see a townhouse development. In the northeast quadrant,
	own words, can you describe the purposes of the amendment?		you see a church; and if you look in every closely, you'll
18	MR. FERGUSON: Well, the amendment is, is		see the property lines on that exhibit do exist. They're
	principally to accommodate the new housing type that Mr.		in, they're in a lighter color. And you can see a recently
	Flemming described which requires some smaller lots and,		approved townhouse development there. You can see a Royal
	therefore, the amendment of Condition, old condition, I		Farms gasoline station at the southeast corner of the
	believe it was 7; as well as the buffers referred to in old		intersection of Sansbury Road and Ritchie Marlboro Road; and
	Conditions 8 and 13 that, that was also discussed earlier.		some surrounding commercial lots which are as yet unbuilt
	It is to be noted that the density proposed by the new Basic		upon. They're partially developed, but unbuilt upon.
	Plan will actually not change the density that was approved	25	
	-		
	Page 63		Page 65
1	under the old Basic Plan, the limitations of the lot size	1	
			Page 65 the north of the subject property, you can see subdivisions in the Presidential Woods and Largo Park subdivisions. Now
2	under the old Basic Plan, the limitations of the lot size	2	the north of the subject property, you can see subdivisions
2 3	under the old Basic Plan, the limitations of the lot size requirement, principally; but also, the buffer limitations	2 3	the north of the subject property, you can see subdivisions in the Presidential Woods and Largo Park subdivisions. Now
2 3 4	under the old Basic Plan, the limitations of the lot size requirement, principally; but also, the buffer limitations kept and, and, truthfully, the, the really large amount of	2 3 4	the north of the subject property, you can see subdivisions in the Presidential Woods and Largo Park subdivisions. Now if you travel back in time to 1993, you see much of that
2 3 4 5	under the old Basic Plan, the limitations of the lot size requirement, principally; but also, the buffer limitations kept and, and, truthfully, the, the really large amount of public dedications for the park and the road, the road	2 3 4 5	the north of the subject property, you can see subdivisions in the Presidential Woods and Largo Park subdivisions. Now if you travel back in time to 1993, you see much of that disappears. So, the interchange was not in place; the
2 3 4 5	under the old Basic Plan, the limitations of the lot size requirement, principally; but also, the buffer limitations kept and, and, truthfully, the, the really large amount of public dedications for the park and the road, the road dedications kept the project from being able to achieve its	2 3 4 5 6	the north of the subject property, you can see subdivisions in the Presidential Woods and Largo Park subdivisions. Now if you travel back in time to 1993, you see much of that disappears. So, the interchange was not in place; the Westphalia Road development was not in place; the church,
2 3 4 5 6 7	under the old Basic Plan, the limitations of the lot size requirement, principally; but also, the buffer limitations kept and, and, truthfully, the, the really large amount of public dedications for the park and the road, the road dedications kept the project from being able to achieve its approved density.	2 3 4 5 6 7	the north of the subject property, you can see subdivisions in the Presidential Woods and Largo Park subdivisions. Now if you travel back in time to 1993, you see much of that disappears. So, the interchange was not in place; the Westphalia Road development was not in place; the church, whose name is escaping me, is not in place; they have a long
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	under the old Basic Plan, the limitations of the lot size requirement, principally; but also, the buffer limitations kept and, and, truthfully, the, the really large amount of public dedications for the park and the road, the road dedications kept the project from being able to achieve its approved density. MR. HALLER: Okay. And, and are you, have you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	the north of the subject property, you can see subdivisions in the Presidential Woods and Largo Park subdivisions. Now if you travel back in time to 1993, you see much of that disappears. So, the interchange was not in place; the Westphalia Road development was not in place; the church, whose name is escaping me, is not in place; they have a long name. Obviously, the, the commercial development, the Royal
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	under the old Basic Plan, the limitations of the lot size requirement, principally; but also, the buffer limitations kept and, and, truthfully, the, the really large amount of public dedications for the park and the road, the road dedications kept the project from being able to achieve its approved density. MR. HALLER: Okay. And, and are you, have you prepared a report that addresses conformance of the proposed	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	the north of the subject property, you can see subdivisions in the Presidential Woods and Largo Park subdivisions. Now if you travel back in time to 1993, you see much of that disappears. So, the interchange was not in place; the Westphalia Road development was not in place; the church, whose name is escaping me, is not in place; they have a long name. Obviously, the, the commercial development, the Royal Farms are not in place; and even the single-family
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	under the old Basic Plan, the limitations of the lot size requirement, principally; but also, the buffer limitations kept and, and, truthfully, the, the really large amount of public dedications for the park and the road, the road dedications kept the project from being able to achieve its approved density. MR. HALLER: Okay. And, and are you, have you prepared a report that addresses conformance of the proposed Basic Plan Amendment with the applicable planning documents	2 3 6 7 8 9	the north of the subject property, you can see subdivisions in the Presidential Woods and Largo Park subdivisions. Now if you travel back in time to 1993, you see much of that disappears. So, the interchange was not in place; the Westphalia Road development was not in place; the church, whose name is escaping me, is not in place; they have a long name. Obviously, the, the commercial development, the Royal Farms are not in place; and even the single-family subdivisions in the R-80 Zone were not in place back in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	under the old Basic Plan, the limitations of the lot size requirement, principally; but also, the buffer limitations kept and, and, truthfully, the, the really large amount of public dedications for the park and the road, the road dedications kept the project from being able to achieve its approved density. MR. HALLER: Okay. And, and are you, have you prepared a report that addresses conformance of the proposed Basic Plan Amendment with the applicable planning documents and the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance? MR. FERGUSON: I have. MR. HALLER: And I believe that that report has	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	the north of the subject property, you can see subdivisions in the Presidential Woods and Largo Park subdivisions. Now if you travel back in time to 1993, you see much of that disappears. So, the interchange was not in place; the Westphalia Road development was not in place; the church, whose name is escaping me, is not in place; they have a long name. Obviously, the, the commercial development, the Royal Farms are not in place; and even the single-family subdivisions in the R-80 Zone were not in place back in 1993. So, the character of the, of the neighborhood is really, has really changed. It's worth noting that the subdivisions in the R-80 Zone are, in fact, even more dense
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	under the old Basic Plan, the limitations of the lot size requirement, principally; but also, the buffer limitations kept and, and, truthfully, the, the really large amount of public dedications for the park and the road, the road dedications kept the project from being able to achieve its approved density. MR. HALLER: Okay. And, and are you, have you prepared a report that addresses conformance of the proposed Basic Plan Amendment with the applicable planning documents and the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance? MR. FERGUSON: I have. MR. HALLER: And I believe that that report has been marked as Exhibit 46?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	the north of the subject property, you can see subdivisions in the Presidential Woods and Largo Park subdivisions. Now if you travel back in time to 1993, you see much of that disappears. So, the interchange was not in place; the Westphalia Road development was not in place; the church, whose name is escaping me, is not in place; they have a long name. Obviously, the, the commercial development, the Royal Farms are not in place; and even the single-family subdivisions in the R-80 Zone were not in place back in 1993. So, the character of the, of the neighborhood is really, has really changed. It's worth noting that the subdivisions in the R-80 Zone are, in fact, even more dense than what's being proposed here.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	under the old Basic Plan, the limitations of the lot size requirement, principally; but also, the buffer limitations kept and, and, truthfully, the, the really large amount of public dedications for the park and the road, the road dedications kept the project from being able to achieve its approved density. MR. HALLER: Okay. And, and are you, have you prepared a report that addresses conformance of the proposed Basic Plan Amendment with the applicable planning documents and the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance? MR. FERGUSON: I have. MR. HALLER: And I believe that that report has been marked as Exhibit 46? MR. FERGUSON: I believe that's correct, yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	the north of the subject property, you can see subdivisions in the Presidential Woods and Largo Park subdivisions. Now if you travel back in time to 1993, you see much of that disappears. So, the interchange was not in place; the Westphalia Road development was not in place; the church, whose name is escaping me, is not in place; they have a long name. Obviously, the, the commercial development, the Royal Farms are not in place; and even the single-family subdivisions in the R-80 Zone were not in place back in 1993. So, the character of the, of the neighborhood is really, has really changed. It's worth noting that the subdivisions in the R-80 Zone are, in fact, even more dense than what's being proposed here. It's also worth noting, by the way, that back in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	under the old Basic Plan, the limitations of the lot size requirement, principally; but also, the buffer limitations kept and, and, truthfully, the, the really large amount of public dedications for the park and the road, the road dedications kept the project from being able to achieve its approved density. MR. HALLER: Okay. And, and are you, have you prepared a report that addresses conformance of the proposed Basic Plan Amendment with the applicable planning documents and the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance? MR. FERGUSON: I have. MR. HALLER: And I believe that that report has been marked as Exhibit 46? MR. FERGUSON: I believe that's correct, yes. MR. HALLER: And can you just quickly summarize	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	the north of the subject property, you can see subdivisions in the Presidential Woods and Largo Park subdivisions. Now if you travel back in time to 1993, you see much of that disappears. So, the interchange was not in place; the Westphalia Road development was not in place; the church, whose name is escaping me, is not in place; they have a long name. Obviously, the, the commercial development, the Royal Farms are not in place; and even the single-family subdivisions in the R-80 Zone were not in place back in 1993. So, the character of the, of the neighborhood is really, has really changed. It's worth noting that the subdivisions in the R-80 Zone are, in fact, even more dense than what's being proposed here. It's also worth noting, by the way, that back in 1990, I'm sorry, back in 1973, there was, in fact, a local
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	under the old Basic Plan, the limitations of the lot size requirement, principally; but also, the buffer limitations kept and, and, truthfully, the, the really large amount of public dedications for the park and the road, the road dedications kept the project from being able to achieve its approved density. MR. HALLER: Okay. And, and are you, have you prepared a report that addresses conformance of the proposed Basic Plan Amendment with the applicable planning documents and the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance? MR. FERGUSON: I have. MR. HALLER: And I believe that that report has been marked as Exhibit 46? MR. FERGUSON: I believe that's correct, yes. MR. HALLER: And can you just quickly summarize the contents of your report for the Examiner?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	the north of the subject property, you can see subdivisions in the Presidential Woods and Largo Park subdivisions. Now if you travel back in time to 1993, you see much of that disappears. So, the interchange was not in place; the Westphalia Road development was not in place; the church, whose name is escaping me, is not in place; they have a long name. Obviously, the, the commercial development, the Royal Farms are not in place; and even the single-family subdivisions in the R-80 Zone were not in place back in 1993. So, the character of the, of the neighborhood is really, has really changed. It's worth noting that the subdivisions in the R-80 Zone are, in fact, even more dense than what's being proposed here. It's also worth noting, by the way, that back in 1990, I'm sorry, back in 1973, there was, in fact, a local activity center that was proposed by the Master Plan for the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	under the old Basic Plan, the limitations of the lot size requirement, principally; but also, the buffer limitations kept and, and, truthfully, the, the really large amount of public dedications for the park and the road, the road dedications kept the project from being able to achieve its approved density. MR. HALLER: Okay. And, and are you, have you prepared a report that addresses conformance of the proposed Basic Plan Amendment with the applicable planning documents and the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance? MR. FERGUSON: I have. MR. HALLER: And I believe that that report has been marked as Exhibit 46? MR. FERGUSON: I believe that's correct, yes. MR. HALLER: And can you just quickly summarize the contents of your report for the Examiner? MR. FERGUSON: I will. And, briefly, what, what	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	the north of the subject property, you can see subdivisions in the Presidential Woods and Largo Park subdivisions. Now if you travel back in time to 1993, you see much of that disappears. So, the interchange was not in place; the Westphalia Road development was not in place; the church, whose name is escaping me, is not in place; they have a long name. Obviously, the, the commercial development, the Royal Farms are not in place; and even the single-family subdivisions in the R-80 Zone were not in place back in 1993. So, the character of the, of the neighborhood is really, has really changed. It's worth noting that the subdivisions in the R-80 Zone are, in fact, even more dense than what's being proposed here. It's also worth noting, by the way, that back in 1990, I'm sorry, back in 1973, there was, in fact, a local activity center that was proposed by the Master Plan for the site, and that's why there was an LAC application for it;
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	under the old Basic Plan, the limitations of the lot size requirement, principally; but also, the buffer limitations kept and, and, truthfully, the, the really large amount of public dedications for the park and the road, the road dedications kept the project from being able to achieve its approved density. MR. HALLER: Okay. And, and are you, have you prepared a report that addresses conformance of the proposed Basic Plan Amendment with the applicable planning documents and the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance? MR. FERGUSON: I have. MR. HALLER: And I believe that that report has been marked as Exhibit 46? MR. FERGUSON: I believe that's correct, yes. MR. HALLER: And can you just quickly summarize the contents of your report for the Examiner? MR. FERGUSON: I will. And, briefly, what, what an amendment such as this is required to do is essentially	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	the north of the subject property, you can see subdivisions in the Presidential Woods and Largo Park subdivisions. Now if you travel back in time to 1993, you see much of that disappears. So, the interchange was not in place; the Westphalia Road development was not in place; the church, whose name is escaping me, is not in place; they have a long name. Obviously, the, the commercial development, the Royal Farms are not in place; and even the single-family subdivisions in the R-80 Zone were not in place back in 1993. So, the character of the, of the neighborhood is really, has really changed. It's worth noting that the subdivisions in the R-80 Zone are, in fact, even more dense than what's being proposed here. It's also worth noting, by the way, that back in 1990, I'm sorry, back in 1973, there was, in fact, a local activity center that was proposed by the Master Plan for the site, and that's why there was an LAC application for it; but, ultimately, the decision was, was taken to scale back
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	under the old Basic Plan, the limitations of the lot size requirement, principally; but also, the buffer limitations kept and, and, truthfully, the, the really large amount of public dedications for the park and the road, the road dedications kept the project from being able to achieve its approved density. MR. HALLER: Okay. And, and are you, have you prepared a report that addresses conformance of the proposed Basic Plan Amendment with the applicable planning documents and the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance? MR. FERGUSON: I have. MR. HALLER: And I believe that that report has been marked as Exhibit 46? MR. FERGUSON: I believe that's correct, yes. MR. HALLER: And can you just quickly summarize the contents of your report for the Examiner? MR. FERGUSON: I will. And, briefly, what, what an amendment such as this is required to do is essentially conform to the original criteria for approval for, in this	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	the north of the subject property, you can see subdivisions in the Presidential Woods and Largo Park subdivisions. Now if you travel back in time to 1993, you see much of that disappears. So, the interchange was not in place; the Westphalia Road development was not in place; the church, whose name is escaping me, is not in place; they have a long name. Obviously, the, the commercial development, the Royal Farms are not in place; and even the single-family subdivisions in the R-80 Zone were not in place back in 1993. So, the character of the, of the neighborhood is really, has really changed. It's worth noting that the subdivisions in the R-80 Zone are, in fact, even more dense than what's being proposed here. It's also worth noting, by the way, that back in 1990, I'm sorry, back in 1973, there was, in fact, a local activity center that was proposed by the Master Plan for the site, and that's why there was an LAC application for it; but, ultimately, the decision was, was taken to scale back to the RS development. And the only other thing that's,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	under the old Basic Plan, the limitations of the lot size requirement, principally; but also, the buffer limitations kept and, and, truthfully, the, the really large amount of public dedications for the park and the road, the road dedications kept the project from being able to achieve its approved density. MR. HALLER: Okay. And, and are you, have you prepared a report that addresses conformance of the proposed Basic Plan Amendment with the applicable planning documents and the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance? MR. FERGUSON: I have. MR. HALLER: And I believe that that report has been marked as Exhibit 46? MR. FERGUSON: I believe that's correct, yes. MR. HALLER: And can you just quickly summarize the contents of your report for the Examiner? MR. FERGUSON: I will. And, briefly, what, what an amendment such as this is required to do is essentially conform to the original criteria for approval for, in this case, the RS Zone which are found in Section 27-195(b). And	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	the north of the subject property, you can see subdivisions in the Presidential Woods and Largo Park subdivisions. Now if you travel back in time to 1993, you see much of that disappears. So, the interchange was not in place; the Westphalia Road development was not in place; the church, whose name is escaping me, is not in place; they have a long name. Obviously, the, the commercial development, the Royal Farms are not in place; and even the single-family subdivisions in the R-80 Zone were not in place back in 1993. So, the character of the, of the neighborhood is really, has really changed. It's worth noting that the subdivisions in the R-80 Zone are, in fact, even more dense than what's being proposed here. It's also worth noting, by the way, that back in 1990, I'm sorry, back in 1973, there was, in fact, a local activity center that was proposed by the Master Plan for the site, and that's why there was an LAC application for it; but, ultimately, the decision was, was taken to scale back to the RS development. And the only other thing that's, that's probably worth mentioning, you can sort of see the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	under the old Basic Plan, the limitations of the lot size requirement, principally; but also, the buffer limitations kept and, and, truthfully, the, the really large amount of public dedications for the park and the road, the road dedications kept the project from being able to achieve its approved density. MR. HALLER: Okay. And, and are you, have you prepared a report that addresses conformance of the proposed Basic Plan Amendment with the applicable planning documents and the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance? MR. FERGUSON: I have. MR. HALLER: And I believe that that report has been marked as Exhibit 46? MR. FERGUSON: I believe that's correct, yes. MR. HALLER: And can you just quickly summarize the contents of your report for the Examiner? MR. FERGUSON: I will. And, briefly, what, what an amendment such as this is required to do is essentially conform to the original criteria for approval for, in this case, the RS Zone which are found in Section 27-195(b). And my report simply goes through those conditions. I don't go	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	the north of the subject property, you can see subdivisions in the Presidential Woods and Largo Park subdivisions. Now if you travel back in time to 1993, you see much of that disappears. So, the interchange was not in place; the Westphalia Road development was not in place; the church, whose name is escaping me, is not in place; they have a long name. Obviously, the, the commercial development, the Royal Farms are not in place; and even the single-family subdivisions in the R-80 Zone were not in place back in 1993. So, the character of the, of the neighborhood is really, has really changed. It's worth noting that the subdivisions in the R-80 Zone are, in fact, even more dense than what's being proposed here. It's also worth noting, by the way, that back in 1990, I'm sorry, back in 1973, there was, in fact, a local activity center that was proposed by the Master Plan for the site, and that's why there was an LAC application for it; but, ultimately, the decision was, was taken to scale back to the RS development. And the only other thing that's, that's probably worth mentioning, you can sort of see the rural character south of Route, of White House Road which,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	under the old Basic Plan, the limitations of the lot size requirement, principally; but also, the buffer limitations kept and, and, truthfully, the, the really large amount of public dedications for the park and the road, the road dedications kept the project from being able to achieve its approved density. MR. HALLER: Okay. And, and are you, have you prepared a report that addresses conformance of the proposed Basic Plan Amendment with the applicable planning documents and the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance? MR. FERGUSON: I have. MR. HALLER: And I believe that that report has been marked as Exhibit 46? MR. FERGUSON: I believe that's correct, yes. MR. HALLER: And can you just quickly summarize the contents of your report for the Examiner? MR. FERGUSON: I will. And, briefly, what, what an amendment such as this is required to do is essentially conform to the original criteria for approval for, in this case, the RS Zone which are found in Section 27-195(b). And my report simply goes through those conditions. I don't go through the transportation findings because that's Mr.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	the north of the subject property, you can see subdivisions in the Presidential Woods and Largo Park subdivisions. Now if you travel back in time to 1993, you see much of that disappears. So, the interchange was not in place; the Westphalia Road development was not in place; the church, whose name is escaping me, is not in place; they have a long name. Obviously, the, the commercial development, the Royal Farms are not in place; and even the single-family subdivisions in the R-80 Zone were not in place back in 1993. So, the character of the, of the neighborhood is really, has really changed. It's worth noting that the subdivisions in the R-80 Zone are, in fact, even more dense than what's being proposed here. It's also worth noting, by the way, that back in 1990, I'm sorry, back in 1973, there was, in fact, a local activity center that was proposed by the Master Plan for the site, and that's why there was an LAC application for it; but, ultimately, the decision was, was taken to scale back to the RS development. And the only other thing that's, that's probably worth mentioning, you can sort of see the rural character south of Route, of White House Road which, which largely remains the, the subject property, of course,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	under the old Basic Plan, the limitations of the lot size requirement, principally; but also, the buffer limitations kept and, and, truthfully, the, the really large amount of public dedications for the park and the road, the road dedications kept the project from being able to achieve its approved density. MR. HALLER: Okay. And, and are you, have you prepared a report that addresses conformance of the proposed Basic Plan Amendment with the applicable planning documents and the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance? MR. FERGUSON: I have. MR. HALLER: And I believe that that report has been marked as Exhibit 46? MR. FERGUSON: I believe that's correct, yes. MR. HALLER: And can you just quickly summarize the contents of your report for the Examiner? MR. FERGUSON: I will. And, briefly, what, what an amendment such as this is required to do is essentially conform to the original criteria for approval for, in this case, the RS Zone which are found in Section 27-195(b). And my report simply goes through those conditions. I don't go through the transportation findings because that's Mr. Lenhart's area of expertise; and I do discuss the, the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	the north of the subject property, you can see subdivisions in the Presidential Woods and Largo Park subdivisions. Now if you travel back in time to 1993, you see much of that disappears. So, the interchange was not in place; the Westphalia Road development was not in place; the church, whose name is escaping me, is not in place; they have a long name. Obviously, the, the commercial development, the Royal Farms are not in place; and even the single-family subdivisions in the R-80 Zone were not in place back in 1993. So, the character of the, of the neighborhood is really, has really changed. It's worth noting that the subdivisions in the R-80 Zone are, in fact, even more dense than what's being proposed here. It's also worth noting, by the way, that back in 1990, I'm sorry, back in 1973, there was, in fact, a local activity center that was proposed by the Master Plan for the site, and that's why there was an LAC application for it; but, ultimately, the decision was, was taken to scale back to the RS development. And the only other thing that's, that's probably worth mentioning, you can sort of see the rural character south of Route, of White House Road which, which largely remains the, the subject property, of course, LCD, former RS. The properties to the south owned by the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	under the old Basic Plan, the limitations of the lot size requirement, principally; but also, the buffer limitations kept and, and, truthfully, the, the really large amount of public dedications for the park and the road, the road dedications kept the project from being able to achieve its approved density. MR. HALLER: Okay. And, and are you, have you prepared a report that addresses conformance of the proposed Basic Plan Amendment with the applicable planning documents and the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance? MR. FERGUSON: I have. MR. HALLER: And I believe that that report has been marked as Exhibit 46? MR. FERGUSON: I believe that's correct, yes. MR. HALLER: And can you just quickly summarize the contents of your report for the Examiner? MR. FERGUSON: I will. And, briefly, what, what an amendment such as this is required to do is essentially conform to the original criteria for approval for, in this case, the RS Zone which are found in Section 27-195(b). And my report simply goes through those conditions. I don't go through the transportation findings because that's Mr. Lenhart's area of expertise; and I do discuss the, the conditions that are proposed to be amended; the conformance	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	the north of the subject property, you can see subdivisions in the Presidential Woods and Largo Park subdivisions. Now if you travel back in time to 1993, you see much of that disappears. So, the interchange was not in place; the Westphalia Road development was not in place; the church, whose name is escaping me, is not in place; they have a long name. Obviously, the, the commercial development, the Royal Farms are not in place; and even the single-family subdivisions in the R-80 Zone were not in place back in 1993. So, the character of the, of the neighborhood is really, has really changed. It's worth noting that the subdivisions in the R-80 Zone are, in fact, even more dense than what's being proposed here. It's also worth noting, by the way, that back in 1990, I'm sorry, back in 1973, there was, in fact, a local activity center that was proposed by the Master Plan for the site, and that's why there was an LAC application for it; but, ultimately, the decision was, was taken to scale back to the RS development. And the only other thing that's, that's probably worth mentioning, you can sort of see the rural character south of Route, of White House Road which, which largely remains the, the subject property, of course, LCD, former RS. The properties to the south owned by the Darcy's and another, another development company has
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	under the old Basic Plan, the limitations of the lot size requirement, principally; but also, the buffer limitations kept and, and, truthfully, the, the really large amount of public dedications for the park and the road, the road dedications kept the project from being able to achieve its approved density. MR. HALLER: Okay. And, and are you, have you prepared a report that addresses conformance of the proposed Basic Plan Amendment with the applicable planning documents and the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance? MR. FERGUSON: I have. MR. HALLER: And I believe that that report has been marked as Exhibit 46? MR. FERGUSON: I believe that's correct, yes. MR. HALLER: And can you just quickly summarize the contents of your report for the Examiner? MR. FERGUSON: I will. And, briefly, what, what an amendment such as this is required to do is essentially conform to the original criteria for approval for, in this case, the RS Zone which are found in Section 27-195(b). And my report simply goes through those conditions. I don't go through the transportation findings because that's Mr. Lenhart's area of expertise; and I do discuss the, the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	the north of the subject property, you can see subdivisions in the Presidential Woods and Largo Park subdivisions. Now if you travel back in time to 1993, you see much of that disappears. So, the interchange was not in place; the Westphalia Road development was not in place; the church, whose name is escaping me, is not in place; they have a long name. Obviously, the, the commercial development, the Royal Farms are not in place; and even the single-family subdivisions in the R-80 Zone were not in place back in 1993. So, the character of the, of the neighborhood is really, has really changed. It's worth noting that the subdivisions in the R-80 Zone are, in fact, even more dense than what's being proposed here. It's also worth noting, by the way, that back in 1990, I'm sorry, back in 1973, there was, in fact, a local activity center that was proposed by the Master Plan for the site, and that's why there was an LAC application for it; but, ultimately, the decision was, was taken to scale back to the RS development. And the only other thing that's, that's probably worth mentioning, you can sort of see the rural character south of Route, of White House Road which, which largely remains the, the subject property, of course, LCD, former RS. The properties to the south owned by the

	Page 66		Page 68
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	conformance with the former RA zoning, but the Master Plan does recommend residential low development for all of that area to the south and to the east, very much in, in exact keeping with what's recommended for the subject property. So, the zoning to the south and the east simply doesn't, doesn't, it's, it's less dense than what is recommended by the Master Plan. MR. HALLER: Okay. Thank you. Is there any other items that you would like to add specifically regarding this, this request? MR. FERGUSON: No, I mean I think, I think it's, it's pretty clear; and I, I certainly adopt the contents of my, of my report is my testimony here. MR. HALLER: All right. Thank you very much. I have no further questions of Mr. Ferguson. MADAM EXAMINER: Mr. Brown? MR. BROWN: Good morning, Mr. Ferguson, but I have	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Maryland. Pickering Circle is within probably a quarter to a half mile of this property right off of White House Road. I could walk to it on any given day. For the record, I will say that Largo Civic Association has been involved with the development of this proposal probably back to the original CDP's and Detailed Site Plans. I, I have had the occasion to meet with Mr. Haller and his clients on at least two occasions. Mr. Haller and his clients have also briefed the Civic Association as recently as our October meeting. We do not oppose the application. In fact, we are looking forward to the development of the property so that the road improvements that are called for on White House Road can be made. We have long sought to have White House Road improved in that particular area. The intersection at Harry Truman and White House is very dangerous on most days,
	no questions. Thank you.		particularly right now with WSSC having the water line torn
19 20	MR. FERGUSON: Thank you, Mr. Brown. Good seeing you, however.		up and the gas line tearing up the neighborhoods. So, we were looking forward to having the road improvements made.
21	MADAM EXAMINER: All right, Mr. Ferguson, always a	21	We recognize that the cost of making those
22	pleasure to see you. Glad you're doing well. I have no		improvements is significant and has gone up considerably
	questions. Thank you.		since the original proposal for this property, and recognize
24 25	MR. FERGUSON: Thank you, Madam Examiner. MADAM EXAMINER: Mr. Haller?		that increased density is probably required to accomplish financially for the Applicant. So, we do not oppose the
	Page 67		Dogo 60
	C C		Page 69
1	MR. HALLER: That would conclude our presentation,		increase in density.
2	MR. HALLER: That would conclude our presentation, Madam Examiner. I'm happy to answer any other questions you	2	increase in density. There were a couple questions that, I know Mr.
2	MR. HALLER: That would conclude our presentation,	2 3	increase in density.
2 3 4 5	MR. HALLER: That would conclude our presentation, Madam Examiner. I'm happy to answer any other questions you may have. MADAM EXAMINER: I think I understand the application. Mr. Brown, do you have any follow-up	2 3 4 5	increase in density. There were a couple questions that, I know Mr. Brown raised one about the fencing and the, the farm to the east of this property. In fact, Mr. Brown, there are horses that are in that pasture or greenspace, whatever you want to
2 3 4 5 6	MR. HALLER: That would conclude our presentation, Madam Examiner. I'm happy to answer any other questions you may have. MADAM EXAMINER: I think I understand the application. Mr. Brown, do you have any follow-up questions?	2 3 4 5 6	increase in density. There were a couple questions that, I know Mr. Brown raised one about the fencing and the, the farm to the east of this property. In fact, Mr. Brown, there are horses that are in that pasture or greenspace, whatever you want to call it, on a daily basis. Mrs. Rauch owns that farm, as
2 3 4 5	MR. HALLER: That would conclude our presentation, Madam Examiner. I'm happy to answer any other questions you may have. MADAM EXAMINER: I think I understand the application. Mr. Brown, do you have any follow-up questions? MR. HALLER: I do not. Thank you.	2 3 4 5 6 7	increase in density. There were a couple questions that, I know Mr. Brown raised one about the fencing and the, the farm to the east of this property. In fact, Mr. Brown, there are horses that are in that pasture or greenspace, whatever you want to call it, on a daily basis. Mrs. Rauch owns that farm, as well as where she lives, and she rents out space to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. HALLER: That would conclude our presentation, Madam Examiner. I'm happy to answer any other questions you may have. MADAM EXAMINER: I think I understand the application. Mr. Brown, do you have any follow-up questions?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	increase in density. There were a couple questions that, I know Mr. Brown raised one about the fencing and the, the farm to the east of this property. In fact, Mr. Brown, there are horses that are in that pasture or greenspace, whatever you want to call it, on a daily basis. Mrs. Rauch owns that farm, as
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR. HALLER: That would conclude our presentation, Madam Examiner. I'm happy to answer any other questions you may have. MADAM EXAMINER: I think I understand the application. Mr. Brown, do you have any follow-up questions? MR. HALLER: I do not. Thank you. MADAM EXAMINER: All right. Then we'll determine that the hearing in this matter will deemed to have been concluded. The record	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	increase in density. There were a couple questions that, I know Mr. Brown raised one about the fencing and the, the farm to the east of this property. In fact, Mr. Brown, there are horses that are in that pasture or greenspace, whatever you want to call it, on a daily basis. Mrs. Rauch owns that farm, as well as where she lives, and she rents out space to individuals who stable horses right off of White House Road; and they do, in fact, allow the horses to roam around in the field or the pasture, whatever you want to call it, which is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. HALLER: That would conclude our presentation, Madam Examiner. I'm happy to answer any other questions you may have. MADAM EXAMINER: I think I understand the application. Mr. Brown, do you have any follow-up questions? MR. HALLER: I do not. Thank you. MADAM EXAMINER: All right. Then we'll determine that the hearing in this matter will deemed to have been concluded. The record (Unintelligible.)	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	increase in density. There were a couple questions that, I know Mr. Brown raised one about the fencing and the, the farm to the east of this property. In fact, Mr. Brown, there are horses that are in that pasture or greenspace, whatever you want to call it, on a daily basis. Mrs. Rauch owns that farm, as well as where she lives, and she rents out space to individuals who stable horses right off of White House Road; and they do, in fact, allow the horses to roam around in the field or the pasture, whatever you want to call it, which is immediately adjacent to this property. So, that was the
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. HALLER: That would conclude our presentation, Madam Examiner. I'm happy to answer any other questions you may have. MADAM EXAMINER: I think I understand the application. Mr. Brown, do you have any follow-up questions? MR. HALLER: I do not. Thank you. MADAM EXAMINER: All right. Then we'll determine that the hearing in this matter will deemed to have been concluded. The record (Unintelligible.) MADAM EXAMINER: Whoa, whoa, whoa, oh, Mr.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	increase in density. There were a couple questions that, I know Mr. Brown raised one about the fencing and the, the farm to the east of this property. In fact, Mr. Brown, there are horses that are in that pasture or greenspace, whatever you want to call it, on a daily basis. Mrs. Rauch owns that farm, as well as where she lives, and she rents out space to individuals who stable horses right off of White House Road; and they do, in fact, allow the horses to roam around in the field or the pasture, whatever you want to call it, which is immediately adjacent to this property. So, that was the reason that they requested the fencing.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. HALLER: That would conclude our presentation, Madam Examiner. I'm happy to answer any other questions you may have. MADAM EXAMINER: I think I understand the application. Mr. Brown, do you have any follow-up questions? MR. HALLER: I do not. Thank you. MADAM EXAMINER: All right. Then we'll determine that the hearing in this matter will deemed to have been concluded. The record (Unintelligible.)	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	increase in density. There were a couple questions that, I know Mr. Brown raised one about the fencing and the, the farm to the east of this property. In fact, Mr. Brown, there are horses that are in that pasture or greenspace, whatever you want to call it, on a daily basis. Mrs. Rauch owns that farm, as well as where she lives, and she rents out space to individuals who stable horses right off of White House Road; and they do, in fact, allow the horses to roam around in the field or the pasture, whatever you want to call it, which is immediately adjacent to this property. So, that was the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. HALLER: That would conclude our presentation, Madam Examiner. I'm happy to answer any other questions you may have. MADAM EXAMINER: I think I understand the application. Mr. Brown, do you have any follow-up questions? MR. HALLER: I do not. Thank you. MADAM EXAMINER: All right. Then we'll determine that the hearing in this matter will deemed to have been concluded. The record (Unintelligible.) MADAM EXAMINER: Whoa, whoa, whoa, oh, Mr. Renninger, Mr. Renninger, yes, Mr. Renninger, let me swear	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	increase in density. There were a couple questions that, I know Mr. Brown raised one about the fencing and the, the farm to the east of this property. In fact, Mr. Brown, there are horses that are in that pasture or greenspace, whatever you want to call it, on a daily basis. Mrs. Rauch owns that farm, as well as where she lives, and she rents out space to individuals who stable horses right off of White House Road; and they do, in fact, allow the horses to roam around in the field or the pasture, whatever you want to call it, which is immediately adjacent to this property. So, that was the reason that they requested the fencing. I'm sure there would be no objection to upgrading
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. HALLER: That would conclude our presentation, Madam Examiner. I'm happy to answer any other questions you may have. MADAM EXAMINER: I think I understand the application. Mr. Brown, do you have any follow-up questions? MR. HALLER: I do not. Thank you. MADAM EXAMINER: All right. Then we'll determine that the hearing in this matter will deemed to have been concluded. The record (Unintelligible.) MADAM EXAMINER: Whoa, whoa, whoa, oh, Mr. Renninger, Mr. Renninger, yes, Mr. Renninger, let me swear you in, sir. MR. RENNINGER: How can you forget me? MADAM EXAMINER: No, I, I don't know. You know,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	increase in density. There were a couple questions that, I know Mr. Brown raised one about the fencing and the, the farm to the east of this property. In fact, Mr. Brown, there are horses that are in that pasture or greenspace, whatever you want to call it, on a daily basis. Mrs. Rauch owns that farm, as well as where she lives, and she rents out space to individuals who stable horses right off of White House Road; and they do, in fact, allow the horses to roam around in the field or the pasture, whatever you want to call it, which is immediately adjacent to this property. So, that was the reason that they requested the fencing. I'm sure there would be no objection to upgrading the fencing from something other than black vinyl. That was proposed by the original Applicant when they came through with the plan and it was accepted; but if there's an upgrade
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. HALLER: That would conclude our presentation, Madam Examiner. I'm happy to answer any other questions you may have. MADAM EXAMINER: I think I understand the application. Mr. Brown, do you have any follow-up questions? MR. HALLER: I do not. Thank you. MADAM EXAMINER: All right. Then we'll determine that the hearing in this matter will deemed to have been concluded. The record (Unintelligible.) MADAM EXAMINER: Whoa, whoa, whoa, oh, Mr. Renninger, Mr. Renninger, yes, Mr. Renninger, let me swear you in, sir. MR. RENNINGER: How can you forget me? MADAM EXAMINER: No, I, I don't know. You know, it's a senior moment. Mr. Renninger, I need you to raise	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	increase in density. There were a couple questions that, I know Mr. Brown raised one about the fencing and the, the farm to the east of this property. In fact, Mr. Brown, there are horses that are in that pasture or greenspace, whatever you want to call it, on a daily basis. Mrs. Rauch owns that farm, as well as where she lives, and she rents out space to individuals who stable horses right off of White House Road; and they do, in fact, allow the horses to roam around in the field or the pasture, whatever you want to call it, which is immediately adjacent to this property. So, that was the reason that they requested the fencing. I'm sure there would be no objection to upgrading the fencing from something other than black vinyl. That was proposed by the original Applicant when they came through with the plan and it was accepted; but if there's an upgrade that can be done, that would be acceptable; but definitely
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. HALLER: That would conclude our presentation, Madam Examiner. I'm happy to answer any other questions you may have. MADAM EXAMINER: I think I understand the application. Mr. Brown, do you have any follow-up questions? MR. HALLER: I do not. Thank you. MADAM EXAMINER: All right. Then we'll determine that the hearing in this matter will deemed to have been concluded. The record (Unintelligible.) MADAM EXAMINER: Whoa, whoa, whoa, oh, Mr. Renninger, Mr. Renninger, yes, Mr. Renninger, let me swear you in, sir. MR. RENNINGER: How can you forget me? MADAM EXAMINER: No, I, I don't know. You know, it's a senior moment. Mr. Renninger, I need you to raise your right hand. Thank you, sir. Do you solemnly swear or	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	increase in density. There were a couple questions that, I know Mr. Brown raised one about the fencing and the, the farm to the east of this property. In fact, Mr. Brown, there are horses that are in that pasture or greenspace, whatever you want to call it, on a daily basis. Mrs. Rauch owns that farm, as well as where she lives, and she rents out space to individuals who stable horses right off of White House Road; and they do, in fact, allow the horses to roam around in the field or the pasture, whatever you want to call it, which is immediately adjacent to this property. So, that was the reason that they requested the fencing. I'm sure there would be no objection to upgrading the fencing from something other than black vinyl. That was proposed by the original Applicant when they came through with the plan and it was accepted; but if there's an upgrade that can be done, that would be acceptable; but definitely fencing is needed in that area, again, because of the active
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. HALLER: That would conclude our presentation, Madam Examiner. I'm happy to answer any other questions you may have. MADAM EXAMINER: I think I understand the application. Mr. Brown, do you have any follow-up questions? MR. HALLER: I do not. Thank you. MADAM EXAMINER: All right. Then we'll determine that the hearing in this matter will deemed to have been concluded. The record (Unintelligible.) MADAM EXAMINER: Whoa, whoa, whoa, oh, Mr. Renninger, Mr. Renninger, yes, Mr. Renninger, let me swear you in, sir. MR. RENNINGER: How can you forget me? MADAM EXAMINER: No, I, I don't know. You know, it's a senior moment. Mr. Renninger, I need you to raise	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	increase in density. There were a couple questions that, I know Mr. Brown raised one about the fencing and the, the farm to the east of this property. In fact, Mr. Brown, there are horses that are in that pasture or greenspace, whatever you want to call it, on a daily basis. Mrs. Rauch owns that farm, as well as where she lives, and she rents out space to individuals who stable horses right off of White House Road; and they do, in fact, allow the horses to roam around in the field or the pasture, whatever you want to call it, which is immediately adjacent to this property. So, that was the reason that they requested the fencing. I'm sure there would be no objection to upgrading the fencing from something other than black vinyl. That was proposed by the original Applicant when they came through with the plan and it was accepted; but if there's an upgrade that can be done, that would be acceptable; but definitely
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. HALLER: That would conclude our presentation, Madam Examiner. I'm happy to answer any other questions you may have. MADAM EXAMINER: I think I understand the application. Mr. Brown, do you have any follow-up questions? MR. HALLER: I do not. Thank you. MADAM EXAMINER: All right. Then we'll determine that the hearing in this matter will deemed to have been concluded. The record (Unintelligible.) MADAM EXAMINER: Whoa, whoa, whoa, oh, Mr. Renninger, Mr. Renninger, yes, Mr. Renninger, let me swear you in, sir. MR. RENNINGER: How can you forget me? MADAM EXAMINER: No, I, I don't know. You know, it's a senior moment. Mr. Renninger, I need you to raise your right hand. Thank you, sir. Do you solemnly swear or affirm in the matter now pending to tell the truth, the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	increase in density. There were a couple questions that, I know Mr. Brown raised one about the fencing and the, the farm to the east of this property. In fact, Mr. Brown, there are horses that are in that pasture or greenspace, whatever you want to call it, on a daily basis. Mrs. Rauch owns that farm, as well as where she lives, and she rents out space to individuals who stable horses right off of White House Road; and they do, in fact, allow the horses to roam around in the field or the pasture, whatever you want to call it, which is immediately adjacent to this property. So, that was the reason that they requested the fencing. I'm sure there would be no objection to upgrading the fencing from something other than black vinyl. That was proposed by the original Applicant when they came through with the plan and it was accepted; but if there's an upgrade that can be done, that would be acceptable; but definitely fencing is needed in that area, again, because of the active farming area. We do not oppose removal of trails through the property. There are going to be sidewalks through the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. HALLER: That would conclude our presentation, Madam Examiner. I'm happy to answer any other questions you may have. MADAM EXAMINER: I think I understand the application. Mr. Brown, do you have any follow-up questions? MR. HALLER: I do not. Thank you. MADAM EXAMINER: All right. Then we'll determine that the hearing in this matter will deemed to have been concluded. The record (Unintelligible.) MADAM EXAMINER: Whoa, whoa, whoa, oh, Mr. Renninger, Mr. Renninger, yes, Mr. Renninger, let me swear you in, sir. MR. RENNINGER: How can you forget me? MADAM EXAMINER: No, I, I don't know. You know, it's a senior moment. Mr. Renninger, I need you to raise your right hand. Thank you, sir. Do you solemnly swear or affirm in the matter now pending to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth? MR. RENNINGER: I do. MADAM EXAMINER: Thank you. Mr. Renninger, would	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	increase in density. There were a couple questions that, I know Mr. Brown raised one about the fencing and the, the farm to the east of this property. In fact, Mr. Brown, there are horses that are in that pasture or greenspace, whatever you want to call it, on a daily basis. Mrs. Rauch owns that farm, as well as where she lives, and she rents out space to individuals who stable horses right off of White House Road; and they do, in fact, allow the horses to roam around in the field or the pasture, whatever you want to call it, which is immediately adjacent to this property. So, that was the reason that they requested the fencing. I'm sure there would be no objection to upgrading the fencing from something other than black vinyl. That was proposed by the original Applicant when they came through with the plan and it was accepted; but if there's an upgrade that can be done, that would be acceptable; but definitely fencing is needed in that area, again, because of the active farming area. We do not oppose removal of trails through the property. There are going to be sidewalks through the property and, in fact, one of the issues that was raised
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. HALLER: That would conclude our presentation, Madam Examiner. I'm happy to answer any other questions you may have. MADAM EXAMINER: I think I understand the application. Mr. Brown, do you have any follow-up questions? MR. HALLER: I do not. Thank you. MADAM EXAMINER: All right. Then we'll determine that the hearing in this matter will deemed to have been concluded. The record (Unintelligible.) MADAM EXAMINER: Whoa, whoa, whoa, oh, Mr. Renninger, Mr. Renninger, yes, Mr. Renninger, let me swear you in, sir. MR. RENNINGER: How can you forget me? MADAM EXAMINER: No, I, I don't know. You know, it's a senior moment. Mr. Renninger, I need you to raise your right hand. Thank you, sir. Do you solemnly swear or affirm in the matter now pending to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth? MR. RENNINGER: I do. MADAM EXAMINER: Thank you. Mr. Renninger, would you please give me your name and address, sir?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	increase in density. There were a couple questions that, I know Mr. Brown raised one about the fencing and the, the farm to the east of this property. In fact, Mr. Brown, there are horses that are in that pasture or greenspace, whatever you want to call it, on a daily basis. Mrs. Rauch owns that farm, as well as where she lives, and she rents out space to individuals who stable horses right off of White House Road; and they do, in fact, allow the horses to roam around in the field or the pasture, whatever you want to call it, which is immediately adjacent to this property. So, that was the reason that they requested the fencing. I'm sure there would be no objection to upgrading the fencing from something other than black vinyl. That was proposed by the original Applicant when they came through with the plan and it was accepted; but if there's an upgrade that can be done, that would be acceptable; but definitely fencing is needed in that area, again, because of the active farming area. We do not oppose removal of trails through the property. There are going to be sidewalks through the property and, in fact, one of the issues that was raised going back to the original approval of this site was where
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MR. HALLER: That would conclude our presentation, Madam Examiner. I'm happy to answer any other questions you may have. MADAM EXAMINER: I think I understand the application. Mr. Brown, do you have any follow-up questions? MR. HALLER: I do not. Thank you. MADAM EXAMINER: All right. Then we'll determine that the hearing in this matter will deemed to have been concluded. The record (Unintelligible.) MADAM EXAMINER: Whoa, whoa, whoa, oh, Mr. Renninger, Mr. Renninger, yes, Mr. Renninger, let me swear you in, sir. MR. RENNINGER: How can you forget me? MADAM EXAMINER: No, I, I don't know. You know, it's a senior moment. Mr. Renninger, I need you to raise your right hand. Thank you, sir. Do you solemnly swear or affirm in the matter now pending to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth? MR. RENNINGER: I do. MADAM EXAMINER: Thank you. Mr. Renninger, would	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	increase in density. There were a couple questions that, I know Mr. Brown raised one about the fencing and the, the farm to the east of this property. In fact, Mr. Brown, there are horses that are in that pasture or greenspace, whatever you want to call it, on a daily basis. Mrs. Rauch owns that farm, as well as where she lives, and she rents out space to individuals who stable horses right off of White House Road; and they do, in fact, allow the horses to roam around in the field or the pasture, whatever you want to call it, which is immediately adjacent to this property. So, that was the reason that they requested the fencing. I'm sure there would be no objection to upgrading the fencing from something other than black vinyl. That was proposed by the original Applicant when they came through with the plan and it was accepted; but if there's an upgrade that can be done, that would be acceptable; but definitely fencing is needed in that area, again, because of the active farming area. We do not oppose removal of trails through the property. There are going to be sidewalks through the property and, in fact, one of the issues that was raised

	Page 70		Page 72
1	those individuals objected to any further extension of the	1	close the record as of today. A decision will be
	trails and would not grant trails use on their property.		forthcoming. I thank everybody
	So, to put a lot of money into creating some additional	3	MR. HALLER: Thank you very much.
	trails through that property if they're not actually	4	MADAM EXAMINER: for participating. Thank you
5	sidewalks or something else would be a waste of somebody's	5	all. Take care.
	money.	6	MR. HALLER: Goodbye.
7	With that, I'd be happy to answer any questions	7	MADAM EXAMINER: Bye.
8	that anyone may have.	8	MR. HALLER: Thank you.
9	MADAM EXAMINER: Mr. Brown?	9	(Whereupon, the hearing was concluded.)
10	MR. RENNINGER: Oh, I will add for the record, the	10	
11	Civic Association did consider the request at its October	11	
12	meeting and did not object to this proposal.	12	
13	MR. BROWN: Yes, good morning, Mr. Renninger.	13	
	That was going to be my only question. I did not see in the	14	
	record, it may be there, but was there a letter that	15	
	documented the Largo Park Civic Association's	16	
	recommendation?	17	
18	MR. RENNINGER: We did not submit a letter to the	18	
	record. Again, we just had this meeting a couple of weeks	19	
	ago. It was the meeting in October, I believe the date was	20	
	the 19th, and we did not submit a record, a letter for the	21	
	record because I was planning to come and testify on the record on behalf of the Association. So, there is no, no	22 23	
	letter in the record.	24	
25	MR. BROWN: All right. If you could, could you	25	
	Page 71		Page 73
-	automista the Europeines but the and of the use of the state	1	CERTIFICATE
	submit to the Examiner by the end of the week just a short letter confirming the Association's recommendation?	2	DEPOSITION SERVICES, INC., hereby certifies that the
3	MR. RENNINGER: If I can type. Right now, I have	3	attached pages represent an accurate transcript of the
	a problem.	4	electronic sound recording of the proceedings before the
5	MR. BROWN: Oh, I	5	Prince George's County Office of the Zoning Hearing Examiner
6	MR. RENNINGER: Yeah. I fell on Sunday and came	6	in the matter of:
7	down on my wrist, and I was originally told I had three	7	BHC, INC. C/O MID ATLANTIC BUILDERS/KENWOOD VILLAGE
8	broken bones, one in my hand and two in my wrist. They	8	Case No. A-9002-C and A-9003-C
9	later came back, no, they're not broken, so they put me in	9	
10	this cast of sorts. So, I'm limited to use of this hand.	10	By:
11	MR. BROWN: All right. We'll take your word for	11	
	it. Thank you. No, no problem. Don't forget about the	12	
	letter.	13	
14	MADAM EXAMINER: All right. Yeah, I'm going to	14 15	
	take Mr. Renninger's word for it. Okay. And I'm sorry for	16	
	potentially skipping you, but I'm glad you participated. I'm glad you're happy with the project and I'm looking at	17	Tracy, Hahn Transcriber
	you and glad that you're doing well because we've missed	18	
	you and glad that you're doing wen because we ve missed you.	19	
20	MR. RENNINGER: Thank you.	20	
21	MADAM EXAMINER: All right. That being said	21	
22	Mr. Haller, can I close the record?	22	
1		1	
23	MR. HALLER: You may.	23	
24	MR. HALLER: You may. MADAM EXAMINER: Okay. Then the hearing in this	23 24	
24	MR. HALLER: You may.		

\$ \$2 (2) 27:5;43:20 Α A-(1) 4:7 A-39(1) 52:8 A-9802(1) 3:7 A-9803 (2) 3:7;4:8 ability (3) 31:12,20:36:19 able (6) 26:25:28:10:34:17: 37:21:63:5:64:7 above (1) 8:25 absorb (1) 27:8 abuts (1) 16:18 abutting (1) 16:15 accept (3) 9:24;10:21;41:9 acceptable (3) 53:9;55:20;69:17 acceptably (2) 55:23;56:15 accepted (3) 9:22;10:2;69:16 access (38) 13:20:16:12:17:2,4; 19:4.4.8:31:24:32:3: 41:14;42:7,9,11,20,21; 51:25;52:5;53:2;54:6, 8,13,15,19,22;55:1,2, 12,13,17,19,22;56:1,2, 5,7,9,13,16 accommodate (4) 30:14;38:7;42:3; 62:19 accommodated (2) 31:22;32:2 accommodating (2) 29:10:45:10 accomplish (1) 68:24 accordance (1) 49:20 accurate (2) 20:3:45:5 accurately (1) 17:18 achieve (2) 28:25:63:5 Acquisition (1)

21:2 acre (3) 5:11,13:14:18 acreage (2) 59:19:60:13 acres (4) 59:23,25;60:2,4 across (4) 26:5;31:15;35:19; 61:9 active (2) 47:9;69:18 activity (1) 65:16 actuality (1) 19:17 actually (10) 23:15;25:4;26:13; 37:16;38:10,20,21; 59:22;62:25;70:4 adapting (1) 32:23 add (4) 27:13;54:3;66:9; 70:10 added (5) 4:23;13:19;14:6,11, 16 adding (4) 35:12,12,12,13 additional (7) 18:15:23:14:27:14: 36:2;41:10;42:20;70:3 additionally (4) 25:23;31:15,23; 33:25 address (20) 7:15;8:2,4;20:19; 23:22;28:4;29:14,23; 30:5;31:16;32:13;42:7; 43:4;49:15;50:14;55:7; 58:20,22;67:23,25 addressed (2) 14:13;38:7 addresses (2) 56:1;63:8 adequacy (1) 56:19 adequate (4) 41:20;53:15;55:21; 57:8 adjacent (3) 46:24;47:6;69:11 adjust (1) 30:5 administrator (1) 3:22 adopt (1) 66:12 adopted (2) 4:10:14:21 advantage (1) 28:1

aerial (5) 60:19,20;64:7,11,12 affect (1) 52:1 affiliated (2) 6:4:21:8 affirm (5) 7:22;20:14;50:9; 58:15;67:19 affordability (1) 35:19 AG (1) 65:25 again (9) 12:21;22:24;34:1,22; 35:15;36:13;46:21; 69:18;70:19 against (1) 36:17 agencies (1) 62:10 aggregate (1) 29:5 ago (1) 70:20 agree (1) 41:9 agreeing (1) 39:17 agreement (2) 52:24:53:6 ahead (3) 38:7;43:16;44:11 align (1) 47:4 alleviate (2) 54:17:55:8 allocate (2) 41:19,24 allow (7) 6:7,16;28:6;31:12; 35:18:36:19:69:9 allowed (1) 31:21 almost (1) 59:25 along (19) 6:13;11:10;12:8; 14:2,4;15:17,20;17:23; 36:10;37:6;38:2,16,23; 39:1,9,15,17;43:19; 52:4 although (2) 5:19;61:24 always (1) 66:21 amend (2) 3:6.7 amended (14) 11:5.8,16:15:6,12; 16:15;17:2,15,21; 18:12;39:21;54:25; 63:24;64:1

Amendment (10) 5:3:29:18:42:8:54:5: 61:12;62:17,18,21; 63:9.18 amendments (3) 6:5;29:12,13 amenities (3) 29:1,5;42:2 amongst (1) 33:24 amount (2) 60:12:63:3 A-N- (1) 57:16 analysis (4) 42:13;52:17;54:9; 55:3 Annapolis (1) 50:16 anticipate (5) 27:4;28:14;31:3; 36:1:42:1 anticipated (1) 53:14 appear (1) 45:4 applicable (1) 63:9 Applicant (12) 10:25:11:4:18:16; 19:18:21:4:41:19; 42:10;43:7;51:10;54:7; 68:25:69:15 Applicant's (2) 51:1;59:4 application (25) 3:6,11;4:16;5:1;6:4, 23:7:10:10:8:11:5.9: 15:9;21:11;22:2;53:13, 19;59:8;60:13,16,23, 25:61:16:64:1:65:17: 67:5:68:11 applications (10) 5:3,4;9:10;41:1; 42:14;43:10;54:10; 57:22;59:24;62:3 applied (1) 16:10 apply (1) 14:7 approval (19) 4:19,22;5:15,24:7:5; 12:1;13:4;14:20;26:21; 31:25;40:20;41:10; 53:18;56:18;57:4; 61:13;62:5;63:19; 69:23 approvals (3) 26:20;40:22;51:17 approved (36) 4:8,11;5:10,12,12,17, 18,18,19,20;6:16;13:7; 15:12;17:6,13;18:24;

19:5;26:13;27:17;28:7; 29:19.20:31:1.8:41:1: 52:24;53:5,10;54:19; 55:11;62:3,5,25;63:6; 64:5,20 approximately (7) 3:5;19:10;22:15; 27:5;30:15;59:21;60:6 April (2) 19:19,23 Architect (6) 8:10;9:2,5;10:2,3; 18:12 architecture (6) 8:20;10:11,22;11:1; 22:23;24:11 area (24) 17:7,9,11,14,25; 24:14;29:5;46:4;48:7, 23;51:20;59:11;60:8, 20;61:7,8,10,14,17; 63:23;66:3;68:16; 69:18,19 areas (7) 6:16;29:3;31:8; 41:19;44:14,18;59:16 around (2) 42:1:69:9 arrive (1) 31:6 arterial (3) 16:20:52:4.8 assessed (1) 18:9 assist (1) 10:6 Associates (8) 7:12,18;8:4,9,17,21, 21:10:24 Association (5) 23:16;68:5,10;70:11, 23 Association's (2) 70:16;71:2 assume (1) 45:12 assuming (1) 55:10 Atlantic (9) 6:4,8;21:2,3,8;22:5, 6:23:3:24:6 attempted (1) 44:8 attention (1) 49:15 authorized (1) 22:1 **AUTOMATED (1)** 3:2 automobiles (1) 36:5 average (1) 46:3

avoid (1)	34:11
42:22	beginnin
award (1)	24:25
23:15	behalf (1
aware (2)	70:23
25:7;26:7	behind (1 44:14
В	below (2)
back (18)	30:3;50 Beltway
28:23;34:18;36:12;	4:6;33:
38:14;40:13;46:20;	64:14
49:15;58:22;64:10,11;	Ben (3)
65:3,9,14,15,18;68:6;	8:17,20
69:23;71:9	best (2)
backed (1)	26:14;
57:7	BHC (10
background (2)	6:2;7:1
53:5,11	20:20;2
back-up (1)	22:1
3:14	BHC's (1
backyards (1)	21:10 bike (1)
29:3 bad (1)	43:8
45:15	bit (3)
Baltimore (1)	28:20;3
50:15	black (4)
based (11)	14:4;3
5:13;15:19;25:22;	Board (1
28:16;29:4;31:25;35:4;	4:2
53:9;55:3,21;56:3	Board's
basements (2)	3:14
35:25;36:1	body (2)
basic (69)	10:13,1
4:7,10,12,14,21;5:11,	bones (1)
15,19,22;6:6,18,20,25;	71:8
7:2,4,7,8,9;9:17;10:7;	border (2
11:5,8,16,16,22,23;	13:18;
12:16,18,22,23;13:3,7,	borders
10;14:20;15:7,12,13;	14:4
16:6,15;17:2,12,13,15, 15,21;18:12,23;19:22;	both (8) 4:9;5:8
29:13,18;39:24;40:12;	24:21;2
42:8;54:4,18,25;56:18;	69:25
57:4,15;59:24;61:8,8,	bottom (
11;62:1,16,24;63:1,9;	14:14;
64:5	61:3
basically (7)	Boulevar
6:24;28:7;30:7;	50:16
34:15;42:18,20;61:14 basis (3)	boundar 6:14;14
47:14;62:11;69:6	36:11;0
bathroom (1)	boundar
35:16	15:20;
batting (1)	38:23;
58:10	60:13;0
became (1)	Bowie (1
24:25	23:9
bed (1)	Brandyw
35:12	23:1
bedroom (4)	breadth
34:15;35:12,13,13	22:23
bedrooms (1)	brief (1)

ıg (1) 1) 1)) 6:14 (4) :10;60:21; 0;9:8 35:3)) 4;10:25; 21:2,5,14,18,24; 1) 37:21;42:17 7:5,9;69:14) (1)16) 2) 17:23 (1) 3;16:20,22; 29:14;56:15; **4**) 15:15;16:11; rd (1) ies (5) 4:3:17:21; 60:24 y (11) 18:2;31:10,16; 39:1;46:24; 61:1,19,22 vine (1) (1)

3:11 briefed (1) 68:9 briefly (1) 63:17 broken (2) 71:8.9 brought (1) 23:24 Brown (51) 10:5,6,10;19:13,14, 23:20:1,5:43:16,17; 44:1,5,11,15,21,24,25; 45:2,11,23;46:3,9,17, 20,23;47:15,20,22; 48:4,13,18;49:2,7,12; 57:12,13,21;58:1,4; 60:23;66:16,17,19; 67:5;69:3,4;70:9,13, 25;71:5,11 buffer (32) 14:2;15:17;31:11,13, 16,17,20,21;36:18,20, 21,22,22,24;37:16; 38:2,8,15,19,22;39:1,4, 7,9,10,10,11,15,16,17, 22;63:2 buffered (1) 37:2 buffers (12) 6:13:13:18:14:8; 36:9.10.12.16:37:12: 38:21:39:7:40:3:62:22 build (5) 24:18;25:24;26:4; 27:6;32:5 **Builders** (5) 21:2,3,8;22:5,6 Builder's (1) 23:15 building (6) 22:6:23:23,25:32:21; 45:16,17 build-out (1) 53:10 builds (3) 24:8,9,9 built (4) 22:14;24:17,20;35:4 business (5) 8:2;20:19;50:14; 58:20,22 buyer (1) 28:15 buyers (2) 28:19;33:5 Bye (1) 72:7 С calculated (1) 17:14

calculations (1) 48:12 call (10) 20:11;28:21;33:13, 18;34:8,16;50:5;58:9; 69:6.10 called (5) 4:9;23:1,8;32:21; 68:13 calling (1) 7:17 came (6) 37:14,15,19;69:15; 71:6,9 Campus (1) 61:4 Can (47) 3:23,24;9:24;13:13; 15:4,11,24;17:9,19,19; 18:19;19:15;21:21; 22:10,11,18;27:18; 29:5,6;32:5,8;33:3,4, 19,25;36:3;37:23; 41:24;44:13;51:25; 56:22;57:20;60:18; 61:6;62:17;63:15;64:9, 10,19,20;65:1,20; 67:15;68:13;69:17; 71:3,22 cap(1)14:17 capable (1) 45:10 capacity (1) 32:1 Capital (1) 60:21 capture (1) 44:18 car (2) 35:22;44:25 care (1) 72:5 carry (1) 57:8 cars (3) 35:24;45:1,13 case (9) 10:25;21:4;32:18,25; 51:10;56:10;59:5,17; 63:20 cases (1) 61:21 cast (1) 71:10 **CDP** (3) 5:16;19:22;54:21 **CDP's** (1) 68:6 center (5) 18:1;24:1,18;61:23; 65:16 certain (1)

47:25 Certainly (3) 52:22;61:25;66:12 certificate (1) 21:18 certification (1) 21:24 certified (8) 4:18,24;7:8;12:3,9; 13:6,8;14:25 chain (1) 14:4 chain-(1) 37:5 chain-link (3) 37:9,18,22 change (2) 26:22;62:25 changed (2) 61:25;65:11 changes (6) 6:16,25;12:8;15:11; 30:3;64:8 changing (2) 32:15;35:14 character (2) 65:10,21 Charles (5) 8:3,8,21;10:24;67:24 children (2) 28:16,18 church (2) 64:17:65:5 Circle (2) 67:25;68:1 circulation (1) 19:9 circumstance (1) 25:21 circumstances (1) 32:24 Civic (4) 68:4,9;70:11,16 clarifying (2) 11:13;43:17 clean-up (1) 58:11 clear (2) 58:3;66:12 clearer (1) 57:23 clearly (1) 54:25 clients (2) 68:8,9 close (3) 60:4;71:22;72:1 closely (1) 64:17 closer (3) 28:6;33:10;48:1 Code (1) 9:14

collection (2) 34:6:35:18 color (1) 64:19 combination (2) 34:22:57:14 combined (1) 54:24 coming (1) 37:17 commercial (2) 64:23:65:7 **Commission** (2) 60:1;61:18 common (2) 29:3,5 communities (12) 22:14,15;23:7,21; 24:1,3,17,22;32:17,18; 34:14;46:15 community (14) 23:1,5,8,13,22,23; 24:8,12,22;27:13;31:5, 6;32:20;42:3 company (2) 21:3;65:24 compared (1) 13:14 complete (2) 32:25,25 completed (1) 55:16 comply (1) 62:7 component (2) 48:22;49:1 comprehensive (4) 8:25;9:17;12:14; 19:17 Concept (13) 18:18:24:5:30:18.21. 23:32:13:33:21.25; 34:4,19,23;36:12; 44:13 concepts (5) 32:7,18;45:21,25; 46:1 conceptual (2) 15:19;18:21 conceptually (3) 17:2:55:1:57:16 concern (3) 42:14,18;47:12 concerned (3) 20:3;49:2;54:2 concerning (2) 51:17;57:4 conclude (1) 67:1 concluded (3) 67:10:71:25:72:9 Condition (42) 5:22;6:6,10,11,12,

14;13:22,25;14:5,9; 29:25:30:1:36:9.15: 37:13,15:38:1,4,10; 39:8.8:40:11.17.20: 41:17,21;42:8,10,20, 23;43:3,6,11;54:4,6,24; 55:5,11;57:14,14; 62:21,21 conditions (42) 3:7;4:19;6:5,9,11,19; 7:1;11:25;13:4;14:11, 20;16:8;18:23;25:23; 29:14,24;36:8,9;37:5; 38:9,22;40:23;41:10, 13,16,17;42:7,15,19; 49:17,19,20,22;53:17, 22;54:4,11,24;55:6; 62:23;63:21,24 conducted (1) 53:4 conference (1) 3:2 configuration (3) 33:1.12:61:24 confirm (1) 48:25 confirming (1) 71:2 conflict (1) 54:12 conflicts (1) 40:13 conform (2) 18:12:63:19 conformance (3) 63:8,24;66:1 confusion (4) 42:23;54:12,17;55:8 conjunction (1) 26:9 connection (1) 31:1 connections (4) 42:9,12;54:6,8 connectivity (1) 41:3 connects (1) 16:13 consider (2) 33:11;70:11 considerably (2) 23:24:68:22 consideration (2) 56:8.13 considerations (3) 14:12;49:17,25 considered (1) 16:20 consistent (2) 16:16:44:16 consolidate (3) 42:23:43:3:49:19 consolidated (1)

41:13 consolidation (1) 55:6 construct (1) 29:19 constructability (1) 29:15 constructed (1) 22:21 constructing (1) 27:2 construction (2) 15:22:48:6 Consulting (1) 50:24 contact (1) 3:12 contacted (1) 4:17 contain (1) 49:21 contains (1) 4:22 contents (2) 63:16;66:12 context (1) 61:6 contiguous (1) 61:2 continue (5) 16:15:37:7:51:5; 58:24:64:2 contract (2) 6:2:21:12 convenience (3) 28:20;29:6,11 convenient (1) 33:9 conventional (1) 60:6 conversation (1) 12:4 conveyed (3) 49:10;60:1;61:17 coordination (2) 16:1,11 coordinator (1) 40:19 copy (3) 13:10;21:21,23 corner (3) 17:5:48:10:64:21 correspond (1) 7:9 corresponds (2) 61:14,17 cost (4) 27:2,11,12;68:21 costs (3) 27:5,9,15 Council (11) 4:11;12:24;13:5,22, 23,25;14:5,10,12,22;

16:9 Council's (1) 4:16 counts (1) 53:4 County (13) 9:12,14;10:4;22:7, 14,22;26:22;27:24; 32:14;34:17;35:4: 46:11:52:5 couple (2) 69:2:70:19 couples (1) 28:17 course (3) 60:9;62:6;65:22 cover (1) 61:12 covered (1) 59:24 **CPJ** (5) 7:12,17;8:15;9:8; 15:7 craftsman (1) 34:4 create (5) 25:20;27:22;28:8,9; 35:19 created (2) 36:24:44:17 creates (1) 42:21 creating (2) 31:19:70:3 creative (2) 28:5.9 criteria (5) 56:3,4;63:19,25;64:2 cue (1) 23:18 current (24) 12:12,13,16:15:19; 16:25;18:22;22:25,25; 23:13;25:19,22;26:1, 17;33:5;38:6;40:13; 44:1,7,17,19;59:13; 60:19;64:11,13 currently (10) 15:22;25:8,12;32:6, 21;34:3;48:5;53:22; 55:18:59:16 cursor (1) 17:24 customers (8) 29:8;33:8,22;34:17, 25;35:2;36:5;45:1 D daily (2) 56:6:69:6 dangerous (1) 68:17

Darcy's (1) 65:24 data (2) 14:15:15:14 date (1) 70:20 day (5) 47:1:56:6.8,11:68:3 days (1) 68:17 dead-end (1) 69:24 deal (1) 43:20 decision (9) 4:11;13:23;14:1,6, 10,12;16:9;65:18;72:1 decrease (1) 39:16 decreased (1) 39:22 dedicated (9) 16:23,24;17:12,16; 49:8,10;59:25;60:2; 61:10 dedication (2) 61:25;62:1 dedications (3) 16:25;63:4,5 deemed (3) 55:20:67:9:71:25 deep (6) 30:8,16;33:19;45:24; 46:1.2 deeper (1) 33:20 defer (1) 48:24 definitely (1) 69:17 degrees (1) 33:18 delete (3) 6:10;38:10;57:16 deleted (1) 40:21 deletion (1) 6:6 delineation (1) 62:1 demonstrate (3) 42:11;54:7;64:8 dense (3) 45:3;65:12;66:6 density (10) 5:10,12;14:17;26:1; 28:7;62:24,25;63:6; 68:24:69:1 depicting (2) 3:12:4:14 depicts (2) 18:17;30:24 describe (7)

15:11;17:9,20;18:17; 30:24:33:4:62:17 described (2) 16:7;62:20 design (20) 8:25;9:17,18;11:1; 12:14;19:17;24:4; 25:19:26:1:27:25:28:6; 29:10;31:21;32:20,23; 33:1:34:21:35:3:38:7: 43:9 designation (1) 58:25 designed (6) 24:23;27:22;32:14; 36:2,5;44:19 designing (3) 6:8;23:21;32:17 designs (6) 23:20;24:11;30:15, 15;32:20,22 desired (1) 34:25 detach (1) 33:15 detached (4) 6:8;15:16;25:8; 27:13 detail (1) 10:7 detailed (3) 8:23:9:16:68:6 determine (2) 42:24:67:8 determined (6) 25:18;27:15;33:15; 40:19:54:22:55:2 develop (2) 23:2;24:11 developable (1) 41:19 developed (5) 22:14;24:16;32:4; 46:10;64:24 developing (2) 10:1;34:3 development (32) 11:2;14:13;15:18; 18:6,22;23:14,16; 25:13;26:9;27:12,14; 30:2.3:37:1:40:25: 42:13;44:9;53:13,14; 54:10;57:22;60:7; 61:14;64:16,20;65:5,7, 19,24;66:2;68:5,12 developments (3) 53:5,11;56:5 different (10) 22:21;23:21;24:18, 23:28:1,8:33:12:35:17; 40:11;44:17 direct (2) 13:20:49:15

disappears (1) 65:4 discuss (3) 7:13,14;63:23 discussed (1) 62:23 discusses (1) 56:2 discussions (1) 26:8**District** (10) 4:11;12:24;13:4,23, 25;14:5,10,12,21;16:9 disturbance (3) 31:9;36:12;39:1 divide (1) 61:1 divided (1) 31:2 **Divisions** (1) 62:9 document (7) 15:5;18:19,25;21:22; 22:12.18:51:1 documented (1) 70:16 documents (1) 63:9 done (8) 23:8,10,14;26:16; 31:5:34:9,13:69:17 Dorsev (1) 69:25 down (4) 30:6;34:12,20;71:7 downstairs (1) 35:13 downtown (1) 58:23 DPIE (2) 26:8;29:20 dramatic (1) 34:16 drawing (2) 15:24;64:15 **Drive** (11) 13:22;16:13,19;17:9; 46:25;47:5;53:2;60:4; 61:4,10,24 driveway (1) 36:4 driveways (1) 45:9 due (1) 5:21 Dunlap (67) 4:23;7:12,17,19,20, 25;8:3,3,10,14,17,22; 9:3,6,11,19;10:6,9,11, 14,17,19,21;11:3,7,10, 15,19;12:6,6,8,11,13, 17,20,22,25;13:3,12, 16;14:23;15:2,6,10,14,

25;16:5,18,24;17:4,11, 22:18:8.14.20.21:19:2. 7,14,20,25;20:4,9,10; 48:25;49:7;59:15 Dunlap's (2) 9:21;10:1 during (3) 9:7:18:10:54:21 dwelling (5) 5:14:17.18:25:8; 56:10 Dver (3) 8:17,20;9:8 Е earlier (5) 16:7;30:22;36:13; 49:8;62:23 easement (2) 31:19;48:22 east (12) 4:5;14:2;36:10,17; 39:15;47:7,17,19;52:6; 66:3,5;69:4 eastern (6) 6:13:13:18:31:10; 38:23;60:24;61:8 effect (1) 19:19 egress (1) 42:25 either (2) 49:25:69:24 elevations (1) 34:3 else (3) 32:24;41:3;70:5 elsewhere (1) 35:5 Elton (1) 8:4 employed (1) 50:23 encompassed (1) 59:23 encourages (1) 27:22 end (3) 23:7:52:6;71:1 engineer (3) 30:18;50:21;51:11 enough (1) 32:1 entire (1) 44:3 entity (1) 21:14 entrance (9) 23:6,10,18;31:4; 47:4;57:17,23,24;58:1 envelope (2) 15:19;60:7

envelopes (1) 30:2 environmental (8) 17:20,24;18:4,9; 38:16:39:11.18:40:2 envision (1) 28:12 erodible (1) 14:8 escaping (1) 65:6 essentially (2) 33:16;63:18 established (6) 5:22;6:12,13,15; 14:9;61:19 estimates (1) 27:2 evaluate (1) 25:11 evaluated (7) 18:6,10;40:19;42:13; 43:10;54:10;55:17 evaluation (1) 55:11 even (3) 36:1;65:8,12 event (1) 55:1 everybody (2) 3:5:72:2 everyone (1) 7:19 exact (2) 43:9:66:3 exactly (1) 17:5 EXAMINER (94) 3:4,9,16,19,21,24; 4:17,25;6:25;7:20;8:1, 6;9:20,24;10:5,12,15, 18,20,23;11:13,18,21; 12:2,6,10;13:6;14:25; 16:1,6;19:12,13;20:7, 12,18,23;22:2;29:25; 30:9,11;38:12,14,18, 24;39:5,13,20;40:1,4,9, 15;43:2,5,15;49:14,24; 50:2,7,13,18;51:3,5,9; 56:24;57:12,19;58:5,9, 10,12,14,19,24;59:2,3; 60:15;63:16;66:16,21, 24,25;67:2,4,8,12,16, 22;70:9;71:1,14,21,24; 72:4,7 exceeds (1) 56:8 exception (1) 8:24 excluding (1) 46:3 Exhibit (53) 3:13;4:3,12,12,13,

14;6:22;7:3,4,6,7,8; 9:21:11:14.15.18:12:4. 7,19,21,22,25;13:9,14, 15:14:25:15:4.24: 18:16,18;21:21;22:10, 11,18,19;30:22,23; 32:12;33:3;39:25;43:4; 51:1;52:17,21;55:5,6, 16;60:16,19,19;61:5; 63:13:64:18 exhibits (2) 7:7:64:6 exist (2) 18:4:64:18 existing (1) 52:5 expanded (1) 14:7expect (1) 28:17 expectation (1) 37:24 experience (4) 10:1;24:21;27:8; 28:16 expert (5) 10:21;51:2,6;58:25; 59:4 expertise (1) 63:23 expired (1) 5:25 explain (2) 27:18;51:25 exploring (1) 27:19 extended (2) 54:20:61:9 extending (1) 60:21 extension (6) 16:20;17:8;60:3; 61:9,23;70:1 extensive (2) 23:10;25:19 extensively (1) 31:3 exterior (1) 28:21 extraordinaire (1) 58:25 eyes (1) 45:15 F facilities (6) 41:20,24;43:8,10; 52:20;57:8 facility (1)

5:25;65:12,15;68:11;

56:19

fact (7)

69:4,9,22 fair (2)24:6.10fairly (2) 60:8,12 familiar (9) 9:13;12:15;51:13,16, 19;56:18;59:7;62:9,15 families (3) 24:20;28:15;45:12 family (1) 34:18 far (2) 48:2:61:5 farm (4) 47:9,17;69:3,6 farmhouse (1) 34:4 farming (1) 69:19 Farms (2) 64:21;65:8 feasibility (4) 25:11,22;42:11;54:7 feasible (2) 25:25;27:15 feature (3) 23:6,10;31:4 features (14) 17:20;18:4,5,9;23:3, 8,14,18:35:17,18; 38:17;39:11,18;60:8 feel (1) 29:3 feet (22) 5:23,23;30:2,3,6,8; 31:16,17;34:1,9;38:6, 24;39:3,11,14,22;40:3, 3;45:14;46:8,18;52:14 fell (1) 71:6 felt (2) 28:5;36:25 fence (11) 14:4;37:6,7,8,9,17, 18,21,23,25;46:25 fencing (5) 37:11;69:3,12,14,18 Ferguson (30) 7:16;19:15;58:9,10, 12,18,21,21;59:2,4,6,9, 12,15,21;60:12,18; 62:12,14,18;63:11,14, 17;64:9;66:11,15,17, 19,21,24 few (1) 11:10 field (4) 10:11,21;51:6;69:10 file (1) 12:24 Final (6) 11:15;14:21;26:20,

24:38:9:62:1 finally (1) 58:9 financial (1) 28:9 financially (1) 68:25 find (1) 64:1 findings (2) 52:20;63:22 fine (1) 58:2 first (10) 9:4;10:18;13:16; 16:5;22:4;23:4;29:25; 32:9,13;64:11 fit (2) 27:17;47:2 Flemming (88) 7:13;20:11,12,17,20, 20,24;21:1,6,9,12,16, 19,23;22:3,8,13,19; 23:4;24:10,16;25:5,10, 15,18;26:4,11,14,18; 27:4,10,20;28:14; 29:17,22;30:5,10,12, 20,25;32:6,11,16;33:7; 35:10,23;36:16;37:8, 15,23;38:5;39:2;40:16, 22;41:8,12,22,25; 42:16:43:12.14.18.24: 44:4,10,12,16,23,25; 45:6,19,24;46:6,13,19; 47:8,18,21,25;48:9,16, 19;49:5,10,23;50:1,5; 62:20 flexibility (2) 28:1;37:21 flood (7) 6:15:14:8:38:3:39:9: 47:23:48:1.3 Floor (3) 20:21;45:20,21 floorplan (2) 33:20,23 focus (2) 29:25;35:2 foire (1) 10:18 follow-up (1) 67:5 foot (3) 14:7;30:14;36:22 footage (3) 17:17;35:20;46:4 footprint (2) 45:16,17 forget (3) 59:18;67:15;71:12 form (1) 62:1 formal (1)

61:22 formality (1) 33:23 former (4) 38:22;40:12;65:23; 66:1 formerly (1) 59:17 forth (5) 13:25;14:21;52:21; 56:20;57:4 forthcoming (1) 72:2 fortunate (1) 27:21 forward (3) 26:25;68:11,20 forward-thinking (1) 23:20 found (3) 12:3,23;63:20 four (4) 7:11;41:16;45:20; 49:17 fourth (1) 6:6 front (5) 31:5;43:25,25;44:3; 46:7 frontage (9) 26:5,8:43:21,22,24; 44:3;48:2;52:3;53:13 full (2)26:19:53:9 function (2) 33:4;34:20 further (7) 15:25;19:12;34:12; 43:13;57:11;66:15; 70:1 future (9) 16:19:18:6,10:36:25; 37:1;42:13;43:10; 54:10;57:22 G garage (4) 35:25;36:3;44:25; 46:3 garages (3) 35:22;44:22,24 Gas (9) 15:21;31:18;36:23; 37:2;48:5,7,10,15; 68:19 gasoline (1) 64:21 general (1) 42:18 generally (1) 9:14 generate (1)

56:11 generated (3) 24:14;53:15;57:9 George's (6) 9:12,14;10:4;22:6; 32:14;46:11 Georgetown (1) 20:21 gets (1) 39:21 given (2) 56:14:68:3 gives (5) 28:23;33:19,20,20, 21 Glad (4) 66:22;71:16,17,18 goal (1) 42:2 goes (2) 61:5:63:21 good (14) 3:4,9;7:19,20;21:14, 18,24;50:6,8;58:12,14; 66:17,19;70:13 Goodbye (1) 72:6 grandfather (1) 40:7 grandfathered (3) 26:23:40:6:44:7 grant (1) 70:2 graphic (1) 10:7 grass (1) 29:9 Great (1) 40:15 green (4) 44:14;48:7,12,24 greenspace (1) 69:5 group (1) 42:4 groups (1) 35:2 guess (2) 26:21;45:11 Guidelines (2) 55:21,25 Η half (5) 13:19;26:5;56:12; 60:6:68:2 Haller (168) 3:8,9,18,20,22,25; 8:7,12,15,19;9:1,4,7, 13,20,25;10:20,23; 11:4,8,12,20,23;12:5, 11,15,18,21;13:1,9,13;

14:19,24:15:3,8,11,23; 16:2,14,22;17:1,7,19, 24;18:3,11,15,25;19:3, 11;20:9,11,24;21:4,7, 10,14,17,20,25;22:4,9, 17;23:2,6;24:6,13; 25:3,7,11,16;26:2,7,12, 16:27:1,7,16:28:12; 29:12,18,23;30:17,21; 32:4,9,12:33:3:35:8, 21;36:7;37:4,13,20; 38:1,9,13,16,20,25; 39:6,19,23;40:5,10,16; 41:5,9,15,23;42:6;43:1, 6,13;46:20,22;47:10; 50:4,19,23,25;51:7,9, 13,16,19,22,25;52:16, 19;53:12,17,21;54:1, 16;55:4,10;56:17,22; 57:1,10;58:8;59:3,7,10, 13,19;60:11,14;62:8, 13,15;63:7,12,15;64:4; 66:8,14,25;67:1,7;68:8, 9;71:22,23;72:3,6,8 hand (5) 7:21;20:13;67:18; 71:8,10 handle (1) 53:15 happy (4) 37:11;67:2;70:7; 71:17 hard (1) 61:19 Harry (13) 13:21;16:13,19;17:9; 47:4;48:20;52:9;53:2, 2;54:20;60:4;61:24; 68:16 Hearing (13) 4:17,24;13:6;14:25; 16:1,6;22:2;29:7;51:3, 14;67:9;71:24;72:9 held (1) 8:12 help (1) 11:10 Hi (1) 7:20 highlights (1) 35:9 historic (1) 58:23 hold (2) 3:23;30:22 **home** (7) 6:8;24:8,25;28:23; 33:21,21;45:13 Homes (13) 6:4;22:6,16,21;24:7, 9,18,20;32:21;33:4; 34:6,7;35:21 horses (5)

47:11,12:69:4,8,9 House (42) 4:5;13:21;16:19; 17:5,23;19:5,8;22:21; 25:25;26:5;30:15;31:2; 33:16;34:1,19,21,23; 35:3,11;43:19;44:2,3; 45:25;46:1;47:5;48:1; 52:4,6,9;53:1,1,3; 54:21:55:18:60:3: 64:25;65:21;68:2,13, 15,17;69:8 houses (7) 29:10;33:12,15; 35:18,25;45:21;46:2 housing (2) 37:1;62:19 hundred (2) 24:18;30:7 Ι identical (1) 19:8 identified (1) 53:6 identify (8) 13:13;15:4,24;18:19; 21:21;22:10,11,18 immediately (2) 65:25:69:11 impact (3) 44:9:52:23:55:15 impacts (2) 18:5.8 important (1) 12:4 improve (1) 44:2 improved (1) 68:16 improvement (2) 26:12;28:11 improvements (13) 25:25;26:3,3,8;27:2; 28:4;29:16,20;43:19; 53:14;68:13,20,22 Inc (7) 6:3;7:14;10:25; 20:20;21:5,18;22:1 include (4) 16:7;23:5;43:24; 61:10 included (6) 11:9;48:12,24;52:24; 53:4,6 includes (4) 17:25;22:24;43:21; 60:7 including (2) 9:16:14:16 incorporate (2) 23:19;35:2

Incorporated (2) 21:24:24:2 incorporates (1) 34:20 incorporating (1) 24:3 increase (1) 69:1 increased (3) 6:17;40:3;68:24 indicated (6) 14:11:21:7:24:13; 27:7;49:18;62:15 individuals (2) 69:8;70:1 indoor/outdoor (3) 24:5;28:22;34:24 information (1) 5:13 ingress (1) 42:25 initial (1) 15:9 inside (2) 36:20;49:6 inspected (1) 51:22 inspection (1) 59:11 install (1) 36:19 installation (1) 36:23 installed (1) 31:19 instead (2) 17:18;39:3 integrated (1) 33:24 intended (2) 29:14;61:23 intention (1) 29:19 interchange (3) 4:6;64:13;65:4 interconnected (1) 43:7 interest (1) 24:14 interior (4) 19:9,9:35:17:60:9 internal (1) 40:18 intersection (3) 64:15,22;68:16 intersections (2) 52:25;53:8 intersects (1) 52:13 into (15) 6:21;9:20,22;23:20; 24:12:29:5:31:13:35:2; 42:23;43:3,3;49:19;

50:25:54:24:70:3 introduce (1) 34:14 introduced (1) 35:16 introduces (1) 34:13 introduction (1) 6:7 involved (1) 68:5 issue (2) 29:15:55:13 issues (6) 7:16,16;53:21;54:1; 56:15;69:22 items (1) 66:9 J J-1113 (2) 4:13,15 J-113 (3) 12:19,25;13:15 January (1) 4:8 Jason (5) 7:12,17;8:3,7;10:23 Johnson (4) 8:3.8.21:10:24 joining (1) 8:15 jurisdictional (1) 17:25 justification (2) 6:3:40:1 iustified (1) 16:9 K keep (2) 34:12;37:17 keeping (1) 66:4 Kenwood (12) 4:9;11:6;12:16;19:5; 23:25;24:2,15;25:1,4; 32:25:40:23:59:20 kept (2) 63:3,5 Kevin (3) 7:13;20:11,20 key (1) 7:7 kind (20) 22:22;23:24;24:3,4, 4;25:18;27:10,22,24; 28:2,23;29:10;33:17, 24;34:13,20;35:2,18; 42:17;46:15 knowledge (3)

26:14:35:3:47:5 known (1) 23:3 L label (1) 13:17 labeled (1) 18:18 LAC (3) 5:8;61:16;65:17 Lake (1) 32:21 land (8) 14:15,16;17:8;21:1; 23:16;27:12;58:25; 59:5 Landscape (19) 8:10,20,23;9:2,5,9, 15;10:2,3,4,11,21,25; 18:12;31:17;36:22; 39:4,16,22 landscaped (1) 38:19 landscaping (2) 31:3,14 language (2) 43:2:55:7 large (3) 5:21:49:3:63:3 largely (1) 65:22 Largo (4) 65:2;67:25;68:4; 70:16 later (3) 14:13;55:2;71:9 latest (2) 17:15:24:4 lawn (1) 28:21 laws (1) 44:9 lavout (3) 15:19;30:18,21 LCD(5)12:13;19:16;20:3; 59:16;65:23 lead (2) 28:10:54:12 learn (1) 37:13 learned (4) 29:4;33:7;35:1,5 least (2) 35:25;68:8 leave (2) 28:21:29:11 left (2) 60:6;64:14 Legacy (2) 12:13:19:17

Lenhart (40) 7:15:42:17:43:4: 50:5,6,12,15,15,19,21, 24,24;51:4,5,8,12,15, 18,21,24;52:3,18,22; 53:16.20.24:54:3.18: 55:9,15;56:21;57:2,6, 14,18,20,25;58:2,6,7 Lenhart's (1) 63:23 less (4) 28:21,21;33:23;66:6 lessons (1) 35:5 letter (6) 70:15,18,21,24;71:2, 13 level (2) 34:16,19 levels (3) 34:10;53:9;55:20 library (1) 22:24 licensed (1) 9:2 lifestyle (5) 23:19;28:20;29:7,11; 35:6 lighter (1) 64:19 likely (1) 28:15 limit (1) 60:22 limitations (2) 63:1.2 limited (2) 56:6:71:10 limiting (1) 25:13 line (12) 15:21:36:24:38:23; 39:1;46:24;48:5,7,10, 15;61:23;68:18,19 lines (2) 37:3;64:18 link (2) 14:4;37:6 listing (1) 22:13 little (8) 28:20:34:12:37:21: 42:17;44:14;48:19,20, 22 live (1) 33:18 lived (1) 24:24 lives (2) 33:17:69:7 livestock (4) 37:17;46:25;47:1,2 living (5)

24:5:33:11,14:34:10; 46:4 local (1) 65:15 locate (1) 13:17 located (3) 4:4;17:8,20 location (3) 29:5:40:18:43:9 locations (2) 33:9;41:24 lock (2) 28:21;29:11 logical (1) 41:3 long (7) 8:7,12;22:5;25:3; 61:21;65:6;68:15 look (5) 27:11;30:18;34:23; 54:11;64:17 looked (2) 33:13;55:13 looking (13) 25:4,5;28:2;29:9; 33:23;45:2,14;47:22; 48:4,13;68:11,20; 71:17 looks (1) 22:24 lost (1)40:8 lot (14) 5:22;6:12;13:24,24; 30:1,4,6,7,14;31:21; 33:1:46:14:63:1:70:3 lots (20) 5:19,20;6:17,17; 13:21:18:22:25:13: 30:9,12,12,13;32:2,5; 42:3:43:23,25:44:14; 45:14;62:20;64:23 low (1) 66:2 lower (2) 5:10;34:15 Lubentia (1) 61:6 Μ ma'am(1)30:10 **MADAM (76)** 3:4,16,19,21,24; 7:20;8:1,6;9:20,24; 10:5,12,15,18,20,23; 11:13,18,21;12:2,6,10; 14:25;19:12,13;20:7,

50:2,7,13,18:51:5,9: 56:24:57:12.19:58:5.8. 10,12,14,19,24;59:2,3; 66:16,21,24,25;67:2,4, 8,12,16,22;70:9;71:14, 21,24;72:4,7 Madame (4) 3:9:38:14,18,24 maintain (1) 36:18 maintained (3) 31:1,11,24 maintenance (2) 28:21,22 majority (1) 9:11 making (1) 68:21 manage (1) 31:8 management (7) 26:23:31:13.13: 36:20;44:6,9,19 Manager (1) 8:11 mandatory (1) 8:24 many (1) 27:23 **Map** (4) 4:1:5:3:61:12.22 March (1) 8:14 Mark (3) 7:16;58:9,21 marked (3) 51:1;52:17;63:13 market (5) 25:23;27:18;28:12; 32:15:45:12 marketplace (1) 33:6 Marlboro (10) 4:6;52:11,13,15,25; 53:1;58:23;61:9;64:14, 22 Maryland (9) 8:5;9:2,5;20:21; 21:15;50:16;58:23; 60:23;68:1 Master (12) 16:16,16,21;46:15; 52:5,12;62:4,5,6; 65:16;66:1,7 material (1) 37:10 matter (7) 7:23;20:15;50:10; 58:16;67:9,19;71:25 maximum (4) 5:12,14;14:18;15:15 may (7) 17:20;40:1;55:12;

67:3:70:8,15:71:23 McNeill (2) 4:18:12:3 mean (7) 8:7;40:6;46:25; 47:16;55:5;64:9;66:11 meant (1) 47:17 median (1) 31:2 meet (3) 33:1:64:2:68:7 meeting (4) 68:10;70:12,19,20 meets (1) 33:5 members (1) 34:18 mentioned (6) 24:17;26:2;27:16; 32:16:37:5:47:11 mentioning (1) 65:20 met (1) 47:8 Michael (1) 50:15 Mid (9) 6:4,8;21:2,3,8;22:5, 6:23:3:24:6 Mike (5) 7:15:20:13:50:5.7.8 mile (1) 68:2 million (2) 27:6;43:20 minimum (7) 5:22;6:12;13:24,24; 30:1.4.6 minor (1) 6:17 missed (1) 71:18 modern (1) 34:4 modification (3) 6:19;13:16;49:18 modifications (3) 13:14;16:3;49:21 modified (9) 5:8;6:23;11:24,25; 14:15;16:1;42:9;54:5; 57:15 modify (10) 4:20;6:11;13:1; 29:24;31:20;36:8,14; 38:10;39:14,15 moment (1) 67:17 money (2) 70:3,6 months (1) 62:6

more (18) 23:12.24:24:24: 28:19,20;29:6,7,7,10; 32:1;33:9,21;34:4; 35:19;42:17;45:10; 58:3;65:12 morning (14) 3:5,9,10;7:10,11,17, 19,20;50:6,8;58:12,14; 66:17:70:13 most (3) 23:20:32:17:68:17 Mount (1) 61:5 move (3) 34:18;35:11;42:1 move-down (1) 28:18 moving (1) 17:24 mow (1) 29:8 **Mrs** (4) 37:16;47:8,18;69:6 much (16) 19:11;20:8;21:25; 29:8;33:21;34:24;49:3; 50:4,8;52:16;56:17; 57:23;65:3;66:3,14; 72:3 multi-generation (1) 34:16 multi-generational (1) 34:20multiple (1) 34:11 must (2) 54:13;62:7 Ν name (9) 8:2;20:19;50:14; 58:20,21;65:6,7;67:23, 24 narrow (1) 33:18 natural (3) 31:20;36:24;60:8 necessarily (2) 29:3:37:10 necessary (1) 55:14 need (7) 7:21,21;20:12;34:17; 42:25;50:8;67:17 needed (4) 28:4;54:23;55:3; 69:18 needs (2) 23:22;33:5 neighbor (1) 46:24

neighborhood (4) 60:22:61:4.6:65:10 neighborhoods (1) 68:19 network (4) 31:7;43:8;51:20,23 networks (1) 52:1 new (20) 6:7:15:15:24:11.11; 32:17,19,20,21,22,23; 33:1;40:6;41:16;44:8; 52:8;53:4;54:3;62:6, 19.24 next (3) 23:12;34:13;36:7 Nice (1) 58:6 non- (2) 36:11;38:25 non-disturbance (9) 6:13;14:1,7;15:17; 38:2,22;39:3,8,9 non-disturbed (1) 13:17 normal (1) 27:14 normally (1) 33:16 north (8) 17:22:23:9:48:14: 49:3:61:5.5:64:25:65:1 northeast (2) 17:5:64:16 norther (1) 61:3 northern (1) 17:23 note (8) 5:2:13:20.23:14:1. 10:43:1:61:7:64:5 noted (5) 4:18;6:3;9:7;16:8; 62:24 notes (6) 4:21,22;13:19;16:7, 8,10 noting (5) 59:23;61:11;62:2; 65:11,14 notwithstanding (1) 5:24 November (1) 3:6 number (5) 6:17;42:11;43:20; 54:8;56:2 0 oath (2)

12,18,23;30:9,11;

38:12;39:5,13,20;40:4,

9,15;43:5,15;49:14,24;

10:13,16

object (3)

41:20;43:11;70:12 objected (1) 70:1 objection (2) 10:10;69:13 obtained (3) 21:18;27:1;52:24 obviously (5) 48:1;60:7;61:2; 64:13:65:7 occasion (1) 68:7 occasions (1) 68:8 occupation (2) 20:25;50:20 October (5) 4:25;15:2;68:10; 70:11,20 off (4) 47:13;61:4;68:2; 69:8 offer (1) 55:19 offering (1) 34:6 offsite (4) 27:6;28:4,10;31:19 off-site (1) 25:24 off-street (2) 45:4.7 old (6) 13:15;20:21;62:21, 22:63:1:64:2 on- (1) 45:7 one (48) 3:17;6:22,24;11:24; 12:2,18;15:14,25;16:9; 18:15;19:14;22:20; 23:12;24:7,7,23;29:5; 34:1;35:15,23;37:4; 39:16;42:23;43:3,3,20; 44:24;45:15,21;46:22; 49:1,19;54:13,14,20, 20,22;55:17,19;56:3; 57:13;61:7;64:4,6; 65:25;69:3,22;71:8 ones (1) 34:2 only (10) 5:20;36:3;39:20; 54:22;55:17;60:5;61:5, 8;65:19;70:14 onsite (1) 41:20 on-street (1) 45:9 onto (1) 37:17 open (3)

opening (1) 3:11 openness (1) 35:14 operate (2) 53:9;55:22 operates (3) 55:20;56:14,15 operational (3) 42:12:54:9:55:3 opinion (3) 18:11;53:12;57:2 opportunities (2) 27:23;45:9 opportunity (4) 27:25;28:3;34:11; 41:6 oppose (3) 68:11,25;69:20 opposed (2) 20:3:57:24 opposite (1) 52:9 orders (1) 14:21 **Ordinance** (8) 18:13;19:18,21;20:2; 26:22;38:6;57:4;63:10 orient (1) 60:15 original (29) 4:7.19.22:6:6.25:7:8: 11:21,23;12:22;16:6; 17:11,14;31:8,24; 47:14;60:22,24,25; 61:11,12,20,25;62:2, 16:63:19:68:6.23; 69:15.23 originally (13) 5:4,5;6:20;13:3; 15:12;19:5;27:17;40:5; 54:19;61:13,16;64:5; 71:7 others (1) 48:25 out (5) 3:10;16:8;52:22; 60:23;69:7 outlined (3) 4:4;61:7,15 over (6) 26:22;29:2;47:9; 48:4;56:12;60:1 own (1) 62:17 owned (1) 65:23 owner (4) 26:17;44:2,7,7 owners (2) 26:17,18 owns (1) 69:6

Р pages (1) 61:21 Park (19) 7:2;17:12;41:7,16; 43:21,25;48:17,18; 49:6,8,9;50:16;52:23; 60:1;61:18;62:9;63:4; 65:2;70:16 parking (3) 45:5,7,8 Parkside (5) 24:1,19;28:17;29:4; 32:20 part (9) 4:3;5:1,21;10:8; 11:20:14:5:39:20; 53:14:61:3 partially (1) 64:24 participated (1) 71:16 participating (1) 72:4 particular (3) 44:12:60:16:68:16 particularly (1) 68:18 past (2) 31:5;61:21 pasture (2) 69:5,10 pedestrian (1) 43:8 penalties (3) 20:14;50:9;58:15 pending (4) 7:23:20:15:58:16; 67:19 people (3) 11:11;28:23;29:6 per (9) 5:11,13;14:18;16:11; 17:15;45:13;56:6,8,11 percent (2) 27:11,14 perjury (3) 20:15;50:9;58:16 permitted (1) 13:21 personal (1) 59:10 personally (1) 51:22 pertaining (1) 53:18 Phase (1) 40:20 photograph (3) 22:20;60:20;61:3 Pickering (2)

67:25;68:1 picture (3) 22:25:23:12:28:25 pictures (2) 22:21,25 piece (1) 48:20 place (5) 65:4,5,6,8,9 plain (6) 6:15;14:8;39:9; 47:23:48:1.3 plains (1) 38:3 plan (107) 4:12,14,18,20,21,23, 24,25;5:11,15,17,19, 21,22;6:7,18,20;7:1,2, 4,7,8,9;10:7;11:5,9,16, 16,17,22,23;12:16,18, 22,23;13:2,3,7,11,19; 14:16,20;15:1,7,12,13; 16:3,7,15,16,16,21,25; 17:2,12,13,15,16,21; 18:12,21,23;19:22; 26:24;29:13,18;30:23; 31:4,9;34:13;36:13; 39:24;40:12;41:18; 42:2,8;44:8,13;45:3; 46:15,21:52:5,7,12; 54:5,19,25;56:18;57:5, 15:59:24:61:8.9.11: 62:1,4,5,6,16,25;63:1, 9;64:5;65:16;66:1,7; 69:16 planned (2) 52:6.10 planner (4) 50:22;51:11;58:25; 59:5 Planning (17) 3:14:4:2:7:2.16; 16:12;17:13;41:7,16; 43:21,25;49:9;52:23; 60:1;61:18;62:10;63:9; 70:22 plans (31) 4:7,10,10;5:8;7:13; 8:22,23,23,23,24,25; 9:9,15,16,17,17,17,18; 10:1,4;17:6;26:12,24; 34:5;35:11,15;45:20, 21;46:7;54:22;68:7 plats (1) 19:9 platted (3) 25:8,12,14 please (12) 7:22;8:1;18:19; 20:18;50:13;51:25; 52:19;56:22;58:19; 60:14,19:67:23 pleased (1)

3:10pleasure (2) 3:8;66:22 plus (1) 35:24 point (22) 16:12;17:4;19:4,7; 25:21:31:24:32:3: 40:14;41:14;42:19,25; 52:15;54:23;55:2,12, 13,20,22;56:5,9,13,16 points (7) 17:2;19:4;52:1; 54:14,15,19;56:2 pond (2) 31:14;36:20 portion (3) 5:6,7;61:8 position (3) 8:8,13;40:24 potentially (1) 71:16 PowerPoint (1) 4:2 preceding (1) 31:9 predicated (1) 31:18 preference (2) 37:11:42:22 pre-filed (1) 18:16 Preliminary (6) 5:17,20;9:16;27:1; 41:18:54:22 premised (1) 10:1preparation (2) 9:15:10:7 prepare (5) 10:3;11:5,8;30:18; 52:17 prepared (9) 11:13,15;12:6;13:11; 15:7,20;18:25;41:6; 63:8 preparing (2) 8:22;9:9 presentation (2) 4:2;67:1 presented (2) 4:2:27:24 President (1) 21:1Presidential (1) 65:2 pre-teens (1) 42:4 pretty (1) 66:12 prevented (1) 25:16 previous (2)

24:5;33:21;34:22

15:16:19:21 previously (10) 12:14;17:6,16;19:6, 10;31:1,7;32:17;40:23; 51:3 price (2) 25:21:32:15 primarily (1) 24:22 primary (3) 17:4;34:15,19 Prince (6) 9:12,14;10:4;22:6; 32:14;46:11 principally (2) 62:19;63:2 prior (16) 5:24;8:15,16;12:19; 19:19,23;20:2;26:7,16, 18;40:6,19,25;44:7; 49:21;51:16 privacy (1) 28:24 probably (6) 34:9;47:10;65:20; 68:1,6,24 problem (3) 46:9;71:4,12 problems (1) 49:25 proceeding (2) 19:18.20 proceeds (1) 18:1 process (5) 18:7;19:22,22;25:1; 44:8 processing (1) 54:21 product (12) 6:8:23:22:25:20: 27:17.23:28:3.6.8.19; 32:5,14,19 product-type (1) 29:14 profile (1) 28:15 programming (1) 35:6 project (21) 4:9;8:11;11:1;23:11, 16;25:5,22,24;26:19, 20,24;29:21;32:21; 44:12,18;48:8;53:10, 15;57:9;63:5;71:17 projects (5) 23:2;24:9;46:11,14, 18 promise (1) 7:22 properties (1) 65:23 property (78)

3:13:4:4,7:5:6,7,13, 16.24:6:2.14:12:12: 16:18;17:3;18:5,23; 19:16:21:11.13:24:15: 25:7,12;26:6,10,17; 31:15;36:17,25;37:2,6, 7,17,18;40:5;43:22; 44:2;47:2,3,6,13,19; 48:2,11,17,18,23;49:1, 6.8;51:14,17,23;52:2,3, 6,8,13;57:3;59:7,11,14, 20;60:15;62:16;64:18; 65:1,22;66:4;68:2,12, 23;69:4,11,21,22,25, 25;70:2,4 proposal (3) 68:6,23;70:12 proposed (29) 6:18,19;7:14;11:2; 15:21;17:8,12;18:22; 25:20;29:13:30:15; 33:4;38:3;39:24;40:18; 41:16;43:2;44:21; 53:13;54:3;55:6,18; 57:13;62:24;63:8,24; 65:13,16;69:15 proposing (12) 5:1;6:9,11;28:13,19; 30:4;31:22;32:2;33:2; 36:8,14:37:6 protect (1) 46:25 provide (4) 10:25;41:19;43:7; 54:13 provided (3) 14:2;45:5;62:10 provisions (1) 9:14 proximate (1) 33:10 public (5) 52:1;56:19;60:2,13; 63:4 **pull (11)** 12:21;13:9;15:3,23; 18:18;22:10,17;36:12; 55:4;60:17,18 pulled (1) 30:22 purchased (1) 65:25 purchaser (1) 21:12 purchasing (1) 25:12purposes (2) 62:17;63:25 put (7) 11:17:28:22:31:12; 37:11;45:15;70:3;71:9

Q quadrant (2) 64:15,16 qualification (1) 10:10 qualified (2) 10:3;51:2 quantities (1) 14:15 quarter (1) 68:1 queuing (3) 42:12;54:9;55:3 quickly (1) 63:15 quoted (1) 43:20 R **R-80 (2)** 65:9.12 **RA**(1) 66:1 raise (3) 7:21;20:13:67:17 raised (2) 69:3,22 range (1) 5:10 Rauch (6) 31:15;36:17;37:16; 47:9;69:6,25 Rauch's (1) 47:19 **RE (3)** 5:6,7,9 read (1) 57:15 realized (1) 52:12 really (14) 20:1;24:24,25;25:20; 27:17,22;34:5,22; 39:20;60:4,12;63:3; 65:11,11 rear (1) 34:23 reason (3) 5:2;36:22;69:12 reasons (1) 6:24 recall (4) 40:1;46:12,13,16 receiving (1) 59:16 Recently (3) 23:23:64:19:68:10 recognize (4) 12:23;36:4;68:21,23 recognized (1)

28:3 recommend (4) 54:16,23;55:7;66:2 recommendation (2) 70:17;71:2 recommended (4) 7:1;53:18;66:4,6 record (29) 4:12,13,16;5:2;6:21; 7:3;8:2;9:21,22;11:17; 12:19;20:19;22:11; 50:14,25;58:20;61:20; 67:10,24;68:4;70:10, 15,19,21,22,23,24; 71:22:72:1 recorded (2) 3:3;19:8 recreation (1) 42:2 recreational (1) 41:20 red (3) 4:4;61:7,15 reduce (2) 36:21;54:15 reduced (1) 39:2 reducing (2) 42:11;54:8 re-establishes (1) 15:18 reference (1) 35:9 referenced (9) 4:11,14;12:19;32:19; 36:13;38:1,21;39:7; 41:10 referencing (2) 40:17:48:14 referrals (2) 8:24;62:9 referred (1) 62:22 referring (1) 26:3 reflect (12) 4:19,20;6:18,24;7:1; 11:24,25;13:4,7;14:6; 15:15;17:18 reflected (2) 14:24:40:12 reflects (4) 13:22;14:20;16:25; 22:12 regard (3) 18:3;36:14;43:15 regarding (4) 22:2;26:8;52:20; 66:9 registered (4) 9:1.4:10:2.3 regulated (3) 18:4,9;60:8

regulations (4) 40:2.14:44:17.20 reiterate (1) 36:14 relate (2) 36:9:42:7 related (6) 8:20;9:15;11:1;21:2; 53:19;56:19 relates (2) 6:10;41:13 relationship (1) 21:10 relocated (1) 52:15 relocation (1) 52:11 remaining (3) 14:11;49:20;61:14 remains (2) 5:24;65:22 removal (1) 69:20 removed (4) 40:24,25;41:2,4 removes (1) 15:17 **Rendering** (2) 18:18;19:3 renderings (1) 45:15 Renninger (15) 67:13,13,13,15,17, 21,22,24,25;70:10,13, 18;71:3,6,20 Renninger's (1) 71:15 rents (1) 69:7 Report (12) 4:3;41:6,11;49:16, 16;59:22;62:11;63:8, 12,16,21;66:13 representation (1) 22:23 represents (2) 22:15;27:11 request (8) 5:5,9;9:25;40:21; 47:14;49:21;66:10; 70:11 requested (5) 4:20;6:25;29:24; 40:20;69:12 requesting (1) 49:18 requests (2) 6:5;61:12 required (12) 13:24:26:9:27:3: 40:7,12,17;43:19; 55:12;56:3;57:24; 63:18;68:24

requirement (5) 25:24:26:4:40:11: 44:2:63:2 requirements (11) 18:13;20:2;35:24; 44:6,20;45:10;56:18, 23,24;57:3;63:10 requires (6) 36:10,11,11;38:6; 55:11:62:20 residential (4) 13:20;56:5;59:17; 66:2 resources (1) 28:10 responsibilities (1) 8:19 responsible (1) 9:9 responsive (1) 32:15 result (1) 4:21 results (1) 53:7 resume (4) 9:21,23,24;51:2 retain (2) 19:3;33:10 retained (3) 10:24;51:10;59:4 review (7) 18:6;25:19;41:6,18; 55:21.25:61:20 reviewed (1) 53:17 revise (1) 5:1 revised (11) 4:21;6:20;7:2,9; 11:16;13:10;14:20; 15:7;16:15;17:1;39:24 revision (1) 38:3 revisions (4) 6:18;7:13,15;39:24 rezone (1) 5:5 rezoning (1) 5:9 right (64) 3:4,4;7:21;10:20; 12:2,3;15:3;16:11; 17:19;19:11;20:1,5,7,9, 12,13;21:17,25;32:11; 36:7;38:25;39:13; 40:16;43:6,15;44:1,5, 15;45:2,19,23;47:15, 18,22;48:11,13;49:12, 14,24;50:2,7;57:1,1,2, 10;58:5,8,14,19,24; 60:11,24;66:14,21; 67:8,18;68:2,18;69:8;

48:7:57:3 70:25;71:3,11,14,21 right-of-way (9) Savannah (2) 16:22,25;48:5,7,14, 23:1.12 15,20,22;49:3 saw (1) 45:16 rights (1) 16:16 saying (3) rights-of-way (1) 54:13,14;57:24 60:2 scale (1) Ritchie (8) 65:18 4:6;52:11,12,15,25; scoped (1) 53:1;64:13,22 52:22 **RM** (2) scoping (2) 5:6:61:13 52:24;53:6 Road (63) screen (6) 4:5,6;8:4;13:21; 3:12,17;6:21;7:4; 16:14,19;17:5,23;19:8; 11:25;21:20 20:21;25:24,25;26:2,3, screened (1) 5,12;27:2;28:4,10; 31:14 29:15,20;31:2,7;43:18, scroll (2) 19;44:3,3;47:5;48:1; 23:7;61:21 51:19,23;52:1,4,6,9,11, **SDP** (4) 5:18,25;19:22;45:3 13,14,25,25;53:1,1,1,3; 54:21;55:18;60:3,23; **SDT** (1) 61:25;63:4,4;64:14,22, 5:21 22,25;65:5,21;68:2,12, second (18) 13,15,20;69:8 3:17;16:12;20:21; roads (3) 39:15;41:14;42:19,25; 16:20,23;27:6 55:1,2,12,13,24;56:9, roadway (3) 13;57:17,21,22;58:1 52:4,5,10 secondary (1) roam (1) 16:12 69:9 section (6) Rockville (1) 26:5;55:25;56:2,20; 20:21 63:20:64:2 rooms (1) seeing (3) 33:24 34:24;35:11;66:19 roughly (3) seeking (1) 61:2,2,17 7:5 Route (1) seem (2) 47:2;54:12 65:21 Royal (2) seemed (1) 64:20;65:7 41:3 seems (2) RS (13) 5:9;12:14;19:25; 47:23;58:13 27:21;46:10,14,16; Senior (2) 59:17,18,18;63:20; 8:10;67:17 65:19,23 sentence (1) running (1) 57:21 49:3 separate (2) rural (1) 14:15;38:21 65:21 series (1) 46:6 S serve (2) 51:10;52:1 service (2) same (13) 5:4;14:6;16:10;17:5; 53:9;55:20 19:4,4,7,10;23:19; services (1) 28:9;31:11;36:18;46:2 11:1 Sansbury (2) set (5) 52:25;64:22 13:25;14:21;52:20; sat (1) 56:20;57:3 5:16 setback (1) satisfy (2) 6:15

sets (1) 29:2 several (3) 4:22:5:16:62:5 Severna (1) 50:16 shall (14) 20:15;30:1;40:18; 41:19;42:8,10,13;43:7, 10:54:5,7,9:57:15,23 shallow (1) 33:17 share (1) 32:7 sharing (2) 3:12,17 shopping (1) 33:11 short (1) 71:1 show (13) 4:20;14:11;16:15; 17:2,16;34:2;42:9; 54:5;55:1;56:15;57:16, 17;64:7 showed (2) 11:24;53:8 showing (3) 4:1;21:20;34:5 shown (9) 6:21;7:3;13:19; 16:13:17:11.14:19:10: 52:7.9 shows (6) 4:4:15:20,21:18:22; 19:7;57:7 side (9) 15:18;36:17,24;37:1; 39:15;47:17,19;48:4; 64:14 sidewalks (2) 69:21:70:5 signature (3) 23:3;31:4;35:16 signed (1) 7:8 significant (2) 60:8;68:22 Silver (1) 8:5 similar (5) 8:20;15:16;31:4,7,24 simply (3) 25:13;63:21;66:5 single (8) 24:20;31:23;32:3; 47:1;54:24;55:22;56:5, 16 single-family (12) 6:7:15:16:24:8.24; 25:8;27:13;33:13,16; 56:4,7,10;65:8 Site (32)

4:1;8:22,23,23,24; 9:9.15.16:10:4:14:14: 15:14,21;16:10;18:1, 21;36:2,17;42:10,12; 43:9;46:20;52:7;53:2, 7;54:6,8,20;55:17,19; 65:17;68:7;69:23 siting (1) 43:22 situation (1) 64:13 size (4) 13:24;30:4,6;63:1 sizes (6) 5:23;6:12;13:24; 30:1;31:21;33:1 skipping (1) 71:16 sliding (1) 34:12 slightly (1) 56:12 slopes (1) 14:8 small (1) 46:18 smaller (1) 62:20 soils (1) 14:9 solemnly (4) 20:14;50:9;58:15; 67:18 solution (1) 28:8 somebody's (1) 70:5 someone (1) 19:1 somewhere (2) 27:5;34:8 sorry (9) 38:13,13,14;43:16; 47:6;53:3;57:20;65:15; 71:15 sort (1) 65:20 sorts (1) 71:10 sought (3) 61:13,16:68:15 south (14) 13:18;24:2;32:21; 36:21,24;46:24;47:6; 48:14;49:4;65:21,23, 25:66:3.5 southeast (2) 64:15,21 southern (9) 6:14;14:2;15:18,20; 18:2;31:15;36:10;39:1; 61:1 southside (6)

4:5:39:17.21:47:16, 16:52:9 spa (1) 35:16 space (6) 24:5;34:24;41:24; 48:12,24;69:7 spaces (4) 28:22;36:3,4;45:8 SPEAKER (1) 3:2 special (1) 8:24 specific (4) 8:23;9:17;16:8; 24:24 specifically (7) 13:13;18:17;42:3; 46:13,16;56:1;66:9 spectrum (1) 35:19 spot (1) 17:5 Spring (1) 8:5 square (13) 5:23,23;17:17;30:2, 3,6,14;34:9;35:20; 45:14;46:4,8,18 stable (1) 69:8 Staff (9) 4:3:41:6,10:49:16, 16;52:23;53:18;54:3; 62:11 stage (1) 45:4 stages (4) 14:13;18:6,10;55:2 staircases (1) 35:15 standing (3) 21:15,18,24 standpoint (2) 7:6;53:23 start (5) 3:10;7:17;23:4; 30:25;32:22 state (7) 8:1;9:2;20:18;21:15; 50:13:55:24:58:20 statement (3) 3:11:6:3:40:1 states (10) 13:20,23;14:1;42:8, 10;43:7;54:4,6,25;56:4 stating (1) 14:17 Station (2) 60:23:64:21 steep (1) 14:8 still (2)

16:18:31:14 stood (1) 59:18 stop (1) 3:16 storage (2) 35:24;36:2 stormwater (7) 26:22;31:12,13; 36:20:44:6,8,18 streams (5) 6:15;14:7;17:25; 38:2:39:9 street (2) 45:8;58:22 streets (1) 60:9 structural (1) 35:17 structures (1) 44:21 study (8) 34:15;52:23,24;53:8, 8;54:14;55:16;57:7 style (4) 24:7,7,24;35:6 styles (3) 22:24;24:18,23 subdivided (1) 19:6 Subdivision (11) 5:17:9:16:19:9:27:8: 40:6,7;41:18;53:7; 56:11:60:9.25 subdivisions (6) 56:1,7;65:1,2,9,12 subject (14) 17:3;18:4;21:11; 24:15;51:14,17,23; 52:2:57:2:59:8:60:15: 65:1,22;66:4 submit (4) 43:2;70:18,21;71:1 submitted (14) 4:15,16,21;5:5;6:21, 22;9:20;11:17;15:8; 16:5;22:20;50:25;62:3; 64:6 Subregion (1) 62:4 subsequent (1) 40:22 subsequently (3) 4:17,24;6:23 sufficient (2) 30:14;45:7 suggest (2) 56:8,12 Suite (4) 8:4:34:15:50:16: 58:22 summarize (3) 52:19;56:22;63:15

Sunday (1) 71:6 supervision (2) 11:11:19:1 Sure (17) 13:16;15:6,14;16:10; 17:22;20:20;22:13,19; 23:4;27:20,20;30:25; 33:7;45:1;58:2;64:9; 69:13 surrounding (4) 51:23;59:11;60:20; 64:23 Susie (1) 3:22 swear (7) 7:21,22;20:14;50:9; 58:15;67:13,18 swing (1) 29:2 Т Table (1) 15:15 talk (2) 32:8;42:17 talked (2) 23:11;31:10 tearing (1) 68:19 technical (4) 18:13;41:6;49:16,16 tend (1) 32:22 term (1) 43:8 terminated (1) 52:14 test (2) 42:21,24 testified (10) 10:12,15;19:16; 43:18;44:5;45:11,13; 46:23:49:7:59:15 testifies (1) 19:16 testify (2) 22:1;70:22 testimony (1) 66:13 therefore (2) 55:22;62:21 third (1) 39:6 thought (5) 11:21;24:25;29:19; 38:18;47:11 thousand (1) 52:14 three (6) 6:5,11;34:7;38:21; 43:17;71:7

threshold (2) 56:12.14 throughout (3) 22:22;27:24;44:18 today (10) 6:5;7:5;10:8;22:1; 27:18;33:22;49:22; 58:11:62:7:72:1 today's (2) 21:11:51:14 told (1) 71:7 **Tom (3)** 3:19;48:21;64:12 took (2) 26:19;40:24 top (2) 13:19;27:14 topography (1) 60:20 torn (1) 68:18 tot (1) 42:3 towards (4) 16:10;17:22;18:1,2 Town (2) 23:25:24:17 townhome (1) 24:2 townhomes (2) 23:24:24:19 townhouse (3) 24:7:64:16.20 townhouses (2) 24:23;33:14 towns (1) 24:21 traffic (13) 7:15:50:21,24:51:6; 52:17,23;53:4,7,15; 55:15:56:6:57:7.9 trail (1) 40:23 trails (8) 6:10;40:18,19;69:20, 24;70:2,2,4 **Transportation (16)** 16:17,21;32:1;42:18; 50:22;51:6,11;52:20; 53:19,23:55:21,25: 56:19;57:3,8;63:22 travel (2) 48:3:65:3 tried (2) 24:11;31:8 trips (3) 56:6,8,11 Truman (13) 13:22;16:13,19;17:9; 47:4:48:20:52:10:53:2. 3:54:20:60:4:61:24: 68:17

truth (15) 7:23,23,24;20:16,16, 16:50:10,11,11:58:16, 17.17:67:19.20.20 truthfully (1) 63:3 try (2) 23:5:54:14 trying (5) 28:24,25;29:1;34:25; 35:16 turn (2) 20:13;33:17 two (32) 5:3;6:24;7:6;24:17, 18,23;31:18;34:10; 35:24;36:3,4,8;39:7; 42:9,19;43:17;44:25; 45:13;54:5,11,13,19, 23;55:19;56:14,15; 59:24;61:12,20,22; 68:8:71:8 two-car (1) 44:24 type (4) 6:8;27:17;62:19; 71:3 types (2) 9:10;14:16 typical (2) 27:12:33:13

U

Ultimately (7) 5:8,16,20;26:20; 52:10,12:65:18 unable (1) 26:23 unbuilt (4) 53:5,11;64:23,24 under (19) 6:2;10:13,16;11:11, 11;15:22;19:1,18,20; 20:14;23:13;25:25; 40:6;44:19;48:6;50:9; 58:15;62:3;63:1 undeveloped (1) 5:25 undisturbed (2) 38:15:39:14 uneven (1) 61:2 unintelligible (5) 3:15,20;27:18;64:3; 67:11 unique (7) 23:5,21;25:1;27:22; 28:1,5,8 uniqueness (1) 24:12 units (13) 5:11,12,14;14:17,18;

15:15;25:9;28:7,13;	37:9;69:14	7:23;20:16;50:10;	Yep (2)	17:18;41:17,17
45:17;46:4,17;56:10	vinyl-clad (1)	58:17;67:20	15:25;19:7	14.1 (1)
unusual (1)	37:5	whose (1)	young (2)	17:14
60:12	vinyl-coated (1)	65:6	28:15;45:12	15 (9)
up (21)	14:4	wide (4)	,	22:20;42:7,8;49:18,
5:19;12:21;13:9;	volumes (1)	30:7,16;33:17;45:22	Z	19;54:4,4,24;57:14
15:3,23;18:19;22:10,	56:6	widening (1)	Ľ	150 (1)
	50.0	60:3		24:20
17;28:5;35:17;36:12;	XX 7		zone (20)	
38:14;45:15;48:2;55:4;	\mathbf{W}	width (1)	5:4,6,6,7,8,9,9;19:17;	16 (9)
57:7;60:17,18;68:19,		46:2	20:3;27:21;28:2;46:10,	42:7,10;49:19,19,20;
19,22	walk (3)	willing (1)	14;59:16;61:13,16;	54:4,6,24;57:14
update (1)	30:23;47:13;68:3	33:11	63:20;64:1;65:9,12	17 (3)
13:7	Washington (4)	within (4)	zoned (4)	41:17;43:6;49:17
updated (3)	15:21;48:5,7,15	17:21;31:8;32:1;	19:16;59:16,17;	1751 (1)
17:15,17;40:2	waste (1)	68:1	65:25	8:4
updates (1)	70:5	without (1)	Zones (1)	18 (1)
15:14		28:18	46:16	8:17
	water (5)			
upgrade (4)	23:8,10,14;58:22;	witness (2)	Zoning (24)	19 (1)
37:21,23,24;69:16	68:18	51:6;59:1	5:3;12:12,13;13:6;	4:13
upgrading (1)	watershed (1)	witnesses (1)	16:1,6;18:13;19:21,23;	19.05 (1)
69:13	61:1	7:11	20:2;22:2;26:22;51:3;	59:25
upon (7)	way (8)	won (1)	57:4;59:13,24;60:22,	19.1 (1)
5:13;10:1;55:3,21;	16:16;26:19;40:14;	23:15	25;61:12,22;62:2;	17:18
56:3;64:24,24	41:1;43:8;61:6,11;	wonderful (1)	63:10;66:1,5	1973 (2)
Upper (1)	65:14	27:25	03.10,00.1,5	62:3;65:15
58:23			1	
	ways (1)	wondering (2)	1	1980s (2)
upstairs (1)	29:9	46:10;47:3		22:8,16
35:13	week (1)	Woodmore (2)	1 (6)	1990 (1)
urban (1)	71:1	23:9,9	13:20,22;16:8;19:19,	65:15
24:4	weeks (1)	Woods (1)	23;27:5	1993 (6)
use (5)	70:19	65:2	1,116 (1)	4:8;40:13;64:5,6;
14:15,16;37:9;70:2;	well-received (1)	word (3)	56:11	65:3,10
71:10	35:7	57:16;71:11,15	1.6 (1)	19th (1)
		· · ·		70:21
used (1)	weren't (1)	wording (1)	5:11	70:21
47:6	25:25	39:23	1/2 (1)	2
using (1)	west (4)	words (1)	27:5	2
33:3	17:8;48:4;52:13;	62:17	10 (1)	
usual (1)	61:9	wordsmith (1)	60:1	2 (3)
58:6	western (1)	57:13	10,000 (2)	13:23;40:20;42:4
utilizing (1)	60:21	work (3)	5:23;30:3	2-(1)
48:6	Westphalia (12)	9:11;24:14;47:1	100 (2)	35:21
40.0			30:13;45:14	2,000 (2)
V	23:25;24:1,14,17,19,	working (2)		, ,
v	22;28:17;29:4;32:19;	34:3;45:20	100-year (1)	56:6,8
	33:8,14;65:5	worst (1)	14:8	2,200 (3)
various (3)	wetlands (1)	32:23	11611 (1)	34:8;46:8,18
9:10;56:3;62:9	17:25	worth (6)	20:21	2,300 (1)
vehicular (2)	what's (6)	59:22;61:11;62:2;	12/31 (1)	22:16
42:9;54:5	7:3;23:24;42:14,14;	65:11,14,20	5:25	2,800 (1)
version (1)	65:13;66:4	wrist (2)	1220 (1)	46:8
62:4		71:7,8		2.18 (2)
	Whereupon (1)		67:25	
Vice (1)	72:9	written (1)	124 (6)	5:12;14:17
21:1	White (31)	53:22	6:17;15:15;18:22;	2.6 (1)
vicinity (2)	4:5;13:21;16:19;	wrong (1)	28:7;32:2;56:10	5:11
3:13;4:1	17:4,23;19:4,8;25:25;	47:11	124-unit (1)	20 (5)
view (1)	26:5;31:2;43:19;44:2,	WSSC (1)	53:7	18:18;22:20;30:22,
3:13	3;47:5;48:1;52:4,6,9;	68:18	126 (4)	23;59:25
Village (9)	53:1,1,3;54:21;55:18;		5:14,19;14:18,18	2003 (1)
1 1111 GC (1)		Y	12-year-olds (1)	64:10
1.9.11.6.12.16.10.5.	60.3.61.75.65.71.68.7		1Δ -vcai-0ius (1)	04.10
4:9;11:6;12:16;19:5;	60:3;64:25;65:21;68:2,	1		2005 (1)
24:15;25:2,4;40:23;	13,15,17;69:8		42:5	2005 (1)
24:15;25:2,4;40:23; 59:20	13,15,17;69:8 whoa (8)	year (1)	42:5 13 (6)	5:17
24:15;25:2,4;40:23; 59:20 Villages (2)	13,15,17;69:8 whoa (8) 38:12,12,12,12,12;	year (1) 23:17	42:5 13 (6) 6:14;14:9;36:9;38:1;	5:17 2007 (2)
24:15;25:2,4;40:23; 59:20	13,15,17;69:8 whoa (8)	year (1)	42:5 13 (6)	5:17

40:2	7:7;11:20,21;12:8;		
2013 (3)	13:14	6	
5:18;25:6;62:7	37 (1)	6	
202 (1)	9:21		
60:23	38 (1)	6 (1)	
		62:4	
2021 (2)	22:18	6,000 (2)	
8:14;23:17	39 (1)	5:23;30:2	
2022 (3)	22:11	60-feet (2)	
4:25;19:19,23		30:16;46:1	
206 (1)	4	63 (2)	
58:22		59:21;60:5	
20852 (1)	4 (4)	63.1 (2)	
20:22	6:10;14:6;38:11;	59:22,23	
20903 (1)	40:17	-	
8:5	4,200 (3)	645 (1)	
21 (5)	30:6,13;45:14	50:15	
		6-foot-high (1)	
6:1,22;11:18;12:22;	40 (2)	14:3	
15:4	21:21;45:17		1
21146 (1)	40-foot (1)	7	
50:17	45:16		-
214 (1)	41 (3)	7 (5)	
50:16	43:4;55:5,6	5:22;6:11;13:25;	
23 (3)	42 (11)	30:1;62:22	
3:13;4:3;62:13	7:3,4,8;11:14,15;		
25 (3)	12:4,7;15:24;30:13;	72 (3)	
31:17;39:3,22	39:25;45:14	5:20;25:8,13	
	42-feet (1)	72-lot (2)	
25-foot (3)		25:19;27:8	
36:22;38:18;39:16	30:7	75 (3)	
26 (1)	43 (3)	38:6;39:11;40:3	
4:25	52:17,21;55:16	75-foot (3)	
26th (1)	45 (2)	38:7,14;39:17	
15:2	60:19,19		4
27-195 (1)	450 (1)	8	
64:2	23:9	U	_
27-195b (1)	46 (2)	9 (7)	
63:20	51:1;63:13	8 (7)	
27-195b1C (1)		6:12;14:5;36:9,10,	
	47 (1)	15;39:8;62:23	
56:20	32:12	800 (1)	
29 (1)	4-bedroom (2)	61:21	
4:8	34:7,21		-
2nd (1)		9	
3:5	5	,	_
	-	0.21 (1)	
3	5 (3)	9:31 (1)	
~	14:10;16:8;42:4	3:5	
3 (1)		90 (1)	
3 (1)	50(5)	33:17	
14:1	31:16;38:24;39:12,	93 (1)	
3,000 (1)	14;40:3	62:5	
34:9	50- (2)	9802 (1)	
30 (5)	14:6;36:21	4:8	
27:11,14;34:1;45:17;	50-foot (7)	9-802 (1)	
60:4	6:15;13:17;14:1;		
300 (1)	15:17;36:10;38:2;39:8	61:12	
8:4	54 (1)	9-803 (1)	
		61:16	
30-feet (2)	34:1	9B (1)	
30:16;45:22	5407 (1)	56:2	
30-foot (1)	58:22		
45:16	54-feet (1)		
	45:25		
33 (1) 22:15	45:25		
33 (1) 22:15	45:25 5-year-old (1)		
33 (1) 22:15 33- (1)	45:25		
33 (1) 22:15	45:25 5-year-old (1)		