

C O R R E C T E D R E S O L U T I O N

WHEREAS, William Fortner is the owner of a 30.37-acre parcel of land known as *Parcels 11 and 17, Tax Map 132, Grid C-2 said property being in the 5th Election District of Prince George's County, Maryland, and being zoned R-E; and

WHEREAS, on November 1, 2003, William Fortner filed an application for approval of a Preliminary Subdivision Plan (Staff Exhibit #1) for 31 lots; and

WHEREAS, the application for approval of the aforesaid Preliminary Subdivision Plan, also known as Preliminary Plan 4-02096 for Aragona Village was presented to the Prince George's County Planning Board of The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission by the staff of the Commission on February 27, 2003, for its review and action in accordance with Article 28, Section 7-116, Annotated Code of Maryland and the Regulations for the Subdivision of Land, Subtitle 24, Prince George's County Code; and

WHEREAS, the staff of The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission recommended APPROVAL of the application with conditions; and

WHEREAS, on February 27, 2003, the Prince George's County Planning Board heard testimony and received evidence submitted for the record on the aforesaid application.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that pursuant to the provisions of Subtitle 24, Prince George's County Code, the Prince George's County Planning Board APPROVED the Type I Tree Conservation Plan (TCPI/47/02), and further APPROVED Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-02096, Aragona Village for Lots 1-15, Block AA; Lots 1-4, Block BB and Lots 1-12, Block CC with the following conditions:

1. Prior to signature approval of the preliminary plan of subdivision the plan shall be revised as follows:
 - a. A copy of the Stormwater Management Concept Plan Approval Letter shall be submitted and the approval number and date shall be noted on the plan.
 - b. The Type I Tree Conservation Plan, TCPI/9/00, shall be revised to:
 - (1) Revise the worksheet to indicate the total required woodland conservation as 1.32 acres.
 - (2) Revise the worksheet to indicate the proposed on-site reforestation as 0.26 acre or greater.

*Denotes correction

[Brackets] denotes deletion

Underlining denotes addition

- (3) Revise the worksheet to indicate the woodland conservation provided as 11.32

acres or greater.

- (4) Remove the note: "All woodland conservation areas shall be shown on the final plat of subdivision."
 - (5) Remove the Type II TCP approval block.
 - (6) Have the revised plan signed and dated by a qualified professional.
2. At the time of final plat approval, the applicant shall dedicate a right-of-way along South Old Fort Road of 40 feet from the centerline of the existing pavement and 80 feet for the entirety of Gunpowder Road.
3. Prior to the issuance of any building permit on the subject property, and if deemed warranted by DPW&T, the applicant shall install or fully fund the installation of a traffic signal for the intersection of Livingston and South Old Fort Roads.
4. Prior to the approval of a final plat of subdivision for Lots 1-4, Block BB, and Lots 1-12, Block CC, the extension of Gunpowder Drive to the subject property, either from Indian Head Highway to the southwest or the existing Aragona Village subdivision to the northeast, shall be in the form of a public right-of-way.
5. No building permits shall be issued for this subdivision until the percent capacity, as adjusted pursuant to the School Regulations, at all the affected school clusters is less than or equal to 105 percent or 6 years have elapsed since the time of the approval of the preliminary plan of subdivision; or pursuant to the terms of an executed school facilities agreement whereby the subdivision applicant, to avoid a waiting period, agrees with the County Executive and County Council to construct or secure funding for construction of all or part of a school to advance capacity.
6. At time of final plat, a conservation easement shall be described by bearings and distances. The conservation easement shall contain the 100-year floodplain easement, wetland and wetland buffer, and shall be reviewed by the Environmental Planning Section prior to certificate approval. The following note shall be placed on the plat:

"Conservation easements described on this plat are areas where the installation of structures and roads and the removal of vegetation are prohibited without prior written consent from the M-NCPPC Planning Director or designee. The removal of hazardous trees, limbs, branches, or trunks is permitted."
7. The final plat shall show a minimum 25-foot building restriction line from the 100-year floodplain easement.
8. The following note shall be placed on the final plat:

“Development of this site shall follow the recommendations of the report: *Geotechnical Engineering Design Phase Services, Aragona Village, PCC No. 010605*, or any other report approved by the Prince George’s County Department of Environmental Resources.”

9. With the exception of any lots greater than one acre in size, the applicant, his successors and/or assignees shall pay a fee-in-lieu of mandatory park dedication prior to the approval of the final plat.
10. Development of this subdivision shall be in compliance with the approved Type I Tree Conservation Plan (TCP I/9/00) and the following note shall be placed on the Final Plat of Subdivision:

"Development is subject to restrictions shown on the approved Type I Tree Conservation Plan (TCP I/9/00), or as modified by the Type II Tree Conservation Plan, and precludes any disturbance or installation of any structure within specific areas. Failure to comply is a violation of an approved Tree Conservation Plan and will require mitigation under the Woodland Conservation/Tree Preservation Policy."

11. Prior to the issuance of any building or grading permits, a Type II Tree Conservation Plan shall be approved.
12. Development of this site shall be in accordance with the approved Stormwater Management Concept Plan.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the findings and reasons for the decision of the Prince George's County Planning Board are as follows:

1. The subdivision, as modified, meets the legal requirements of Subtitles 24 and 27 of the Prince George's County Code and of Article 28, Annotated Code of Maryland.
2. The property is located on the northwest side of South Old Fort Road, 500" feet north of Jomar Drive.

3. **Development Data Summary**—The following information relates to the subject preliminary plan application and the proposed development.

| | EXISTING | PROPOSED |
|-----------------|----------|-------------|
| Zone | R-E | R-E |
| Use(s) | Vacant | Residential |
| Acreage | 30.37 | 30.37 |
| Lots | 0 | 31 |
| Parcels | 1 | 0 |
| Dwelling Units: | | |
| Detached | 0 | 31 |

4. **Environmental**— The Environmental Planning Section has reviewed the revised Preliminary Plan of Subdivision for Aragona Village, 4-02096, and the revised Type I Tree Conservation Plan, TCPI/9/00, accepted for processing on January 10, 2003. The Environmental Planning Section previously reviewed preliminary plans 4-00016, 4-01029, and 4-01102 for this site. 4-00016 and 4-01029 were withdrawn prior to any Planning Board hearing and 4-01102 was disapproved by PGCPB Resolution. 02-95.

Most of the 30.37-acre property is wooded. A review of the information available indicates that wetlands and 100-year floodplain associated with Broad Creek in the Potomac River watershed occur on the site. The *Subregion VII Master Plan* shows an area of unstable substructure and an area of Conditional Reserve associated with the steep slopes on the site. Marlboro clay is known to occur on the site. According to the *Prince George's County Soil Survey* the principal soils on the site are in the Aura, Beltsville, Croom and Othello series. According to information obtained from the Maryland Department of Natural Resources, Natural Heritage Program, publication titled "Ecologically Significant Areas in Anne Arundel and Prince George's Counties," December 1997, there are no rare, threatened, or endangered species found to occur in the vicinity of this property. Indian Head Highway is the nearest source of traffic-generated noise. No historic or scenic roads are affected by this proposal. The sewer and water service categories are S-3 and W-3. The site is in the Developing Tier according to the adopted *General Plan*.

This site is subject to the provisions of the Woodland Conservation Ordinance because it is larger than 40,000 square feet in size, contains more than 10,000 square feet of woodlands, and has a previously approved Tree Conservation Plan. A Forest Stand Delineation (FSD) was previously reviewed and approved for this property in conjunction with the review and approval of the Type II Tree Conservation Plan for the timber harvest. The FSD submitted with this application has

been reviewed and found to meet the requirements for an FSD as established by the Prince George's County Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Technical Manual.

A Type II Tree Conservation Plan (TCPII/40/95) was approved in conjunction with a timber harvest permit application. A timber harvest was conducted on this property in either 1997 or 1998. The harvest removed most of the merchantable timber, leaving dead, dying, damaged and undesirable trees. During a site visit in February 2001 the forest had begun to regenerate and numerous trees were observed. There was significant competition from undesirable species including many invasive species.

A Type I Tree Conservation Plan, TCPI/9/00, has been submitted as part of this application. The TCP proposes clearing 15.30 acres of the existing 26.36 acres of upland woodland and clearing 0.02 acre of the existing 0.48 acre of floodplain woodland. The worksheet incorrectly lists the total woodland conservation required as 11.30 acres instead of 11.32 acres. The plan proposes to meet the requirements by providing 11.06 acres of on-site preservation and 0.24 acre of on-site reforestation. The area of proposed planting must be at least 0.26 acre to meet a minimum of 11.32 acres of woodland conservation required.

The plan includes the note: "All woodland conservation areas shall be shown on the final plat of subdivision." This note is appropriate in other jurisdictions; however, this note must be removed because woodland conservation areas should not be shown by metes and bounds on final plats in Prince George's County. The plan has a Type II approval block that should be removed.

This site contains natural features that are required to be protected under Section 24-130 of the Subdivision Regulations. Although no streams have been found on this property, a wetland and 100-year floodplain associated with an off-site stream extend onto this property. Based on an approved Floodplain Study for the adjacent property there is the possibility that a part of the site, part of Lot 6, Block "C-C," may include some 100-year floodplain at an approximate elevation of 43 or 44 feet. The 25-foot building restriction line required by Section 24-129 of the Subdivision Regulations is not shown; however, the TCP shows more than 25 feet of on-site woodland conservation between the 100-year floodplain and the closest area for building. Based on a site visit the wetlands on Lots 5 - 6, Block 'C-C,' appear to be correctly represented on all plans and the minimum 25-foot wetland buffers are shown. No impacts to the wetlands buffer are proposed.

The *Subregion VII Master Plan* shows an area of unstable substructure which represents an area of Marlboro clay. A geotechnical report was submitted for review. Additionally, staff met with the site design engineer and the geotechnical engineer to discuss the contents and conclusions of the report. The report includes the locations and logs of boreholes, a stratigraphic map of the site, cross-sections of critical slopes, analyses of the critical slopes with regard to slopes stability based upon proposed grading, and conclusions. The Environmental Planning Section concurs with the conclusions of the geotechnical report that the site may be graded as proposed without any significant concern for slope stability.

The *Subregion VII Master Plan* shows an area of Conditional Reserve associated with the steep slopes on the site. Page 44 of the Master Plan notes:

“Conditional Reserve Areas have moderate development constraints and some bearing on natural processes. Parts of the Conditional Reserve Areas are appropriate for active recreation facilities, and some portions may bear limited development within prescribed guidelines. Development is permissible; but careful, innovative site planning is required to protect environmental assets and to meet environmental needs.”

The Preliminary Plan proposes the use of lot size averaging as provided for in Section 24-121(a)(12) of the Subdivision Regulations. The street design provides for better access and woodland conservation than the designs proposed in applications 4-00016, 4-01029, and 4-01102. The TCP shows that the grading of the slopes is the result of the need to construct the minimum internal streets to serve the subdivision and provides for the retention of some wooded slopes. The preservation on wooded slopes abutting adjacent properties provides adequate transition of the natural features. The use of some larger lots provides for protection of woodlands in the 100-year floodplain, wetlands and wetland buffer.

Indian Head Highway is the nearest source of traffic-generated noise. The noise model used by the Environmental Planning Section predicts that the 65 dBA Ldn noise contour is approximately 373 feet from the centerline of Indian Head Highway. All of the subject property is more than 450 feet from the centerline of Indian Head Highway, and there should be no significant impact from traffic-generated noise on this property.

According to the *Prince George's County Soil Survey* the principal soils on the site are in the Aura, Beltsville, Croom and Othello series. All of these soils are highly erodible and require special attention to erosion/sediment control when associated with slopes exceeding 15 percent. Beltsville and Othello soils have additional problems with impeded drainage and potential high water tables. This information is provided for the applicant's benefit. No further action is needed as it relates to this Preliminary Plan of Subdivision review. A soils report may be required during the permit review process by the Prince George's County Department of Environmental Resources.

The Stormwater Management Concept Plan Approval Letter was not included in the review package. The approval letter needs to be submitted to the file and the approval number and date need to be placed on the preliminary plan.

5. **Community Planning**—The subject property is located in Planning Area 80 in the South Potomac-Friendly community and is subject to the 1981 *Master Plan for Subregion VII*. That master plan recommends Low Suburban residential land use at up to 2.6 dwelling units per acre and Staged Future Development. A Conditional Reserve Area is indicated for the central and western parts of this property. The 1984 *Subregion VII SMA* classified this property in the R-E Zone, in accordance with SMA policies established for “Staged Future Development” areas.

The 2002 *General Plan* placed the property in the Developing Tier and in the vicinity of a designated Corridor Node (MD 210 and Swann Creek Road). The northwestern portion of the subject property is located within approximately one-quarter mile of the intersection of MD 210 and Swann Creek Road (C-231). This area is designated as a node for more intensive development along the MD 210 Corridor by the 2002 Prince George's County *General Plan*. Other properties classified in the C-S-C and R-E Zones are between the subject property and Indian Head Highway.

The Prince George's County *General Plan*, approved in October 2002, identifies "seven Corridors where more intensive development and redevelopment should be encouraged... The plan promotes development and redevelopment of higher intensity residential and nonresidential mixed uses at appropriate locations along key transportation routes. This development should occur at local centers and other appropriate nodes within one-quarter mile of major intersections or major transit stops along the corridor, in concert with planned investments in public infrastructure. Compatibility of higher intensity development with existing communities is essential, thus close attention needs to be paid to design and land use relationships within and surrounding each project. Accordingly, it is anticipated that policies will differ for Corridors and Corridor segments within each Tier.

"In particular, it should be noted that when a limited access highway is designated as a corridor, nodes extend one-quarter mile from the designated interchanges...." (February 2002 Preliminary General Plan text, p. 42 as modified by the May 2002 Adopted General Plan Addendum, p. 2 and approved by CR-47-2002 (Draft 2) on October 7, 2002.)

The *General Plan* text identifies policies and strategies for further defining and implementing the concepts described above, generally in context of more detailed master plan or sector plan studies and subsequent rezoning. No planning studies to further define the extent or components of this recommended Corridor node have taken place since approval of the *General Plan* in October 2002. However, the master plan for this area is scheduled to be updated beginning at the end of the current fiscal year (FY 2003) and is expected to address these issues.

This preliminary subdivision proposal is consistent with the residential land use recommendation of the 1981 Master Plan as interpreted in the 1984 SMA. It is essentially the same proposal as previously submitted and there are no significant master planning issues. The proposed single-family residential subdivision in the R-E Zone is not consistent with the *General Plan* Corridor development concepts for this location.

6. **Parks and Recreation**— Staff of the Department of Parks and Recreation (DRP) has reviewed the submitted preliminary plan. In accordance with Section 24-134(a)(3)(B) of the Subdivision Regulations, Lots 1, 7, 8, 10, and 15, Block AA; Lot 1, Block BB; and Lots 5 and 6, Block CC, are exempt from mandatory dedication requirements because they are all proposed to be over one acre in size.

In accordance with Section 24-134(a), the Park Planning and Development Division recommends

that a fee-in-lieu of dedication be required for the remainder of the site because land available for dedication is unsuitable based on its size and location.

7. **Trails**—There are no master plan trails issues. However, in keeping with approvals for adjacent and nearby subdivisions, standard sidewalks are recommended along both sides of all internal roads and along the subject property's frontage of South Old Fort Road.
8. **Transportation**—The Transportation Planning Section reviewed the subject application. The subject property consists of approximately 30.37 acres of land in the R-E Zone. The applicant proposes a residential subdivision consisting of 31 single-family detached lots.

The subject property is divided into two parts. The northern half, consisting of 16 lots, is planned to access Gunpowder Road, a master-planned collector facility that is not constructed on both sides of the subject property. The submitted plan reflects adequate dedicate for the portion that is within the subject property. The southern portion of the proposed development will access South Old Fort Road and consists of the remaining 15 lots. South Old Fort Road is also a collector facility. The findings and recommendations outlined below are based upon a review of these materials and analyses conducted by the staff of the Transportation Planning Section, consistent with the *Guidelines for the Analysis of the Traffic Impact of Development Proposals*.

Growth Policy - Service Level Standards

The subject property is located within the Developing Tier, as defined in the *General Plan* for Prince George's County. As such, the subject property is evaluated according to the following standards:

Links and signalized intersections: Level-of-service (LOS) D, with signalized intersections operating at a critical lane volume (CLV) of 1,450 or better.

Unsignalized intersections: The *Highway Capacity Manual* procedure for unsignalized intersections is not a true test of adequacy but rather an indicator that further operational studies need to be conducted. Vehicle delay in any movement exceeding 50.0 seconds is deemed to be an unacceptable operating condition at unsignalized intersections. In response to such a finding, the Planning Board has generally recommended that the applicant provide a traffic signal warrant study and install the signal (or other less costly warranted traffic controls) if deemed warranted by the appropriate operating agency.

Staff would note for the record that mitigation, as defined by Section 24-124(a)(6) of the Subdivision Ordinance, is permitted within any tier subject to meeting the geographical criteria in the *Guidelines*.

Because the proposed lots in the northern half can only be developed when the planned Gunpowder Road is constructed in accordance with the Department of Public Works and Transportation standards, in either direction to provide access to the other road facilities, staff has

determined that the intersection of South Old Fort Road with Livingston Road should be the critical intersection for the proposed 15 lots in the southern half of the subject property. This unsignalized intersection is the nearest intersection to the site and would serve virtually all of the site-generated traffic.

The transportation staff received recent counts taken in October 2002 in support of the proposed preliminary plan. These counts indicate that the critical intersection currently operates with average delays of 10 and 12 seconds for any movements during the AM and PM peak hours, respectively.

The average delay with the background traffic conditions (existing traffic volumes plus applicable growth in through traffic and the traffic generated by all approved but not built developments in the general vicinity) during the AM and PM peak hours would reach the unacceptable average delay levels of 124 and 274 seconds, respectively.

With the development of the proposed 15 residences, the site would generate 12 AM (3 in and 9 out) and 14 PM (9 in and 5 out) peak-hour vehicle trips. By adding the site-generated traffic to the background traffic, staff found that this intersection would operate during AM and PM peak hours with average vehicle delays of 145 and 290 seconds, respectively, which both exceed the acceptable level established by the *Guidelines* (50 seconds).

Both Gunpowder Road and South Old Fort Road are designated as collector roadways. The submitted plan shows dedication of 40 feet from centerline along South Old Fort Road and dedication of 80 feet for Gunpowder Road within the limits of the subject property.

Based on the preceding findings, the Transportation Planning Section concludes that adequate transportation facilities would exist to serve the proposed subdivision as required under Section 24-124 of the Prince George's County Code if the application is approved with conditions pertaining to appropriate dedication of access rights-of-way, time restrictions for the platting of a portion of the property, and the need for a traffic signal at the intersection of Livingston and South Old Fort Roads.

9. **Schools**— The Historic Preservation and Public Facilities Planning Section has reviewed the subdivision plans for adequacy of public facilities in accordance with Section 24-122.02 of the Subdivision Regulations and the *Adequate Public Facilities Regulations for Schools* (CR-23-2001).

Impact on Affected Public School Clusters

| Affected School Clusters # | Elementary School Cluster 6 | Middle School Cluster 3 | High School Cluster 3 |
|----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| Dwelling Units | 31 sfd | 31 sfd | 31 sfd |
| Pupil Yield Factor | 0.24 | 0.06 | 0.12 |
| Subdivision Enrollment | 7.44 | 1.86 | 3.72 |
| Actual Enrollment | 4651 | 4598 | 8393 |
| Completion Enrollment | 82 | 66 | 132 |
| Wait Enrollment | 39 | 15 | 29 |
| Cumulative Enrollment | 21.36 | 11.16 | 22.32 |
| Total Enrollment | 4800.80 | 4692.02 | 8580.04 |
| State Rated Capacity | 4492 | 5114 | 7752 |
| Percent Capacity | 106.87% | 91.75% | 110.68% |
| Funded School | N/a | N/a | Surrattsville addn. |

Source: Prince George's County Planning Department, M-NCPPC, January 2003

These figures were correct on the day this memorandum was written. They are subject to change under the provisions of CB-40 and CR-23. Other projects that are approved prior to the public hearing on this project will cause changes to these figures. The numbers that will be shown in the resolution of approval are the ones that will apply to this project.

The affected elementary and high school clusters percent capacities are greater than 105 percent. There is no Funded School in the affected elementary school cluster. The Surrattsville addition is the Funded School in the affected high school cluster. Therefore, this subdivision can be approved with a six-year waiting period in accordance with Section 24-122.02.

10. **Fire and Rescue**—The Historic Preservation and Public Facilities Planning Section has reviewed the subdivision plans for adequacy of public facilities.

a. The existing fire engine service at Allentown Road Fire Station, Company 47, located at 10900 Fort Washington Road, has a service travel time of 4.29 minutes, which is within the 5.25-minute travel time guideline.

b. The existing ambulance service at Allentown Road Fire Station, Company 47, located at

10900 Fort Washington Road, has a service travel time of 4.29 minutes, which is within the 6.25-minute travel time guideline.

- c. The existing paramedic service at Allentown Road Fire Station, Company 47, located at 10900 Fort Washington Road, has a service travel time of 4.29 minutes, which is within the 7.25-minute travel time guideline.

The above findings are in conformance with the *Adopted and Approved Public Safety Master Plan 1990* and the *Guidelines for the Analysis of Development Impact on Fire and Rescue Facilities*. The proposed subdivision will be within the adequate coverage area of the nearest existing fire/rescue facilities for fire engine, ambulance and paramedic service.

11. **Police Facilities**—The proposed development is within the service area for Police District IV-Oxon Hill. In accordance with Section 24-122.01 (c) (1) (A) and (B) of the Subdivision Regulations of Prince George's County, the staff concludes that the existing county police facilities will be adequate to serve the proposed Aragona Village development. This police facility will adequately serve the population generated by the proposed subdivision.
12. **Health Department**— The Division of Environmental Health reviewed the subject application and had no comments to offer.
13. **Stormwater Management**— The Department of Environmental Resources (DER), Development Services Division, has determined that a combination of on-site and off-site stormwater management is required. A Stormwater Management Concept Plan was approved with conditions on March 25, 1999, to ensure that development of this site does not result in on-site or downstream flooding. Development must be in accordance with this approved plan.
14. **Cemeteries**^{3/4} General Notes 7 and 8 on the Preliminary Plan state that there are no historic sites or cemeteries on the subject property.
15. **Lot Size Averaging**^{3/4} The applicant has proposed to utilize the lot size averaging (LSA) provision provided for in Section 24-121(a)(12) of the Subdivision Regulations for development of this property. The property is approximately 28.41 acres and in the R-E Zone. Section 27-423 of the Prince George's County Zoning Ordinance establishes the zoning requirements for lot size averaging. Specifically, in the R-E Zone:
 - a. The maximum number of lots permitted is equal to the gross acreage divided by the largest minimum lot size in the zone (40,000 square feet).
 - b. At least 50 percent of the lots created shall equal or exceed the largest minimum lot size in the zone (40,000 square feet).

For the 30.37 acres located in the R-E Zone, 33 lots would be allowed. The applicant proposes 31

lots; 16 of the proposed lots meet or exceed 40,000 square feet. Therefore, the proposed

subdivision meets the minimum Zoning Ordinance standards for lot size averaging.

Further, Section 24-121(a)(12) requires that the Planning Board make the following findings in permitting the use of lot size averaging:

- A. *The subdivision design provides for better access, protects or enhances historic resource or natural features and amenities, or otherwise provides for a better environment than that which could be achieved by the exclusive use of standard lots.*

The site has significant environmental features that include wetlands and floodplain. The applicant has utilized LSA to locate these features on the largest lots to provide adequate usable yards for all the proposed lots. The proposed subdivision layout protects and enhances certain existing natural features of the site that could not be accomplished utilizing conventional R-E zoning standards.

- B. *The subdivision design provides for an adequate transition between the proposed lot sizes and locations of lots and the lots, or lot size standards, of any adjacent residentially zoned parcels.*

The lots along all the street frontages meet or exceed the minimum 40,000-square-foot requirement. While the current zoning for the portion of the existing Aragona Village to the north and east is R-E, the lot sizes are considerably smaller because of the regulations and zoning in place at the time they were created.

- C. *The subdivision design, where applicable, provides for an adequate transition between the proposed natural features of the site and any natural features of adjacent parcels.*

The preservation on wooded slopes abutting adjacent properties provides adequate transition of the natural features. The use of some larger lots provides for protection of woodlands in the 100-year floodplain, wetlands and wetland buffer.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that an appeal of the Planning Board's action must be filed with Circuit Court for Prince George's County, Maryland within thirty (30) days following the adoption of this Resolution.

* * * * *

This is to certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the action taken by the Prince George's County Planning Board of The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission on the motion of Commissioner Scott, seconded by Commissioner Eley, with Commissioners Scott, Eley, Lowe and Hewlett voting in favor of the motion, at its regular meeting held on Thursday, February 27, 2003, in Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 27th day of March 2003.

Trudye Morgan Johnson
Executive Director

By Frances J. Guertin
Planning Board Administrator

TMJ:FJG:AH:rmk