

R E S O L U T I O N

WHEREAS, the Prince George's County Planning Board is charged with the approval of Detailed Site Plans pursuant to Part 3, Division 9 of the Zoning Ordinance of the Prince George's County Code; and

WHEREAS, in consideration of evidence presented at a public hearing on December 21, 2000, regarding Detailed Site Plan SP-87048/36 for Six Flags America - The 2001 Coaster, the Planning Board finds:

1. On November 15, 1972, the District Council approved the General Concept Plan for SE-2635 for Wild World (later Adventure World and now renamed Six Flags). The plan was revised in 1999 to update and clarify the existing Concept Plan by showing the existing structures and uses at Six Flags and to show the general location of seven future rides. The Planning Board recommended approval of the revised Concept Plan on April 22, 1999 (PGCPB Nos. 99-62 and 99-63). The revised Concept Plan was approved by the District Council on July 29, 1999 (Zoning Ordinance No. 11-1999).
2. The approved Conceptual Site Plan shows the following rides to be developed in the future:
 1. Attraction No. 36 - a new ride. The nature of this ride is presently undetermined.
 2. Attraction No. 37 - a stand-up coaster which will be approximately 140 ft. in height and which will be approximately 3,000 ft. in length.
 3. Attraction No. 38 - an indoor dark ride. This will likely be a coaster type ride which is located inside a building structure. The building is proposed to have dimensions of approximately 200 ft. in height, 60 ft. in width and 70 ft. in length.
 4. Attraction No. 39 - a steel coaster which will be approximately 200 ft. in height and which will have a length of approximately 3,500 ft.
 5. Attraction No. 40 - a runaway car ride, which will have a height of approximately 80 ft. and a length of approximately 1,300 ft.
 6. Attraction No. 43 - a water ride of an undetermined nature, which will occupy approximately 2+ acres of land area.
 7. Attraction No. 44 - a Ferris wheel which will have dimensions of approximately 120 ft. in height, 120 ft. in length and 20 ft. in width.

The subject Revision to the Detailed Site Plan application is for Attraction No. 37 shown on the approved Conceptual Site Plan.

3. Attraction No. 39 is called the Superman Steel Roller Coaster Ride. This ride was approved by the District Council on March 13, 2000. The District Council Order affirmed the Planning Board's decision in Resolution No. 99-236 to approve the subject ride with three conditions of approval.
4. The subject roller coaster (Attraction No. 37) has been named the "2001 Coaster". A theme name for this coaster will be assigned at a later date. This coaster will be located just west of the load station for the Superman Roller Coaster and will be substantially smaller in height and scale than the Superman Coaster. Access to this roller coaster will be from the northeast at the north end of the Superman Roller Coaster.

It will have a maximum height of 125 feet and a length of approximately 0.6 miles. It consists of one lift hill approximately 125 feet high, with an array of dives, horseshoes, a corkscrew, a horizontal spiral, and a central loop. The ride commences at a load station which is approximately 65 feet long, 50 feet wide and 25 feet high. The ride will convey patrons up the first hill backwards. Near the top of the first hill, the ride seats recline and twist, sending patrons backward and then turning them over so that they complete the ride facing down and suspend from the steel tracks. The ride is intended to create the sensation that a rider is flying.

The ride also includes a 12 feet X 10 feet photo building 16 feet in height. Patrons will be able to purchase photographs taken as they descend the first hill, after they have completed their first ride and have exited the load station.

A stamped concrete or asphalt paving midway (25 to 45 feet in length) will also be constructed between the 2001 coaster and the Superman coaster. This midway includes pad sites for two or three food stands or gift stands.

5. The subject Detailed Site Plan must comply with the following conditions of the approved Conceptual Site Plan for SE-2635/3400 (Zoning Ordinance No. 11-1999):

1. **No structure, including any observation tower, shall be constructed higher than 200 feet in height measured from grade.**

The 2001 Roller Coaster will not exceed 125 feet in height at its highest point as measured from grade. Most of the ride will be substantially lower than 125 feet.

2. **A noise study shall be submitted with the detailed site plan for each new ride or activity that will demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Planning Board that noise levels from any sounds (including any crowd noise) will not exceed 55 dBA at all property lines, except as permitted in Condition 19 herein.**

The applicant has submitted a noise study for the proposed ride prepared by Polysonics Corporation (Harvey to Bryson, November 14, 2000). According to the study, the location and orientation of the 2001 Roller Coaster is acceptable. The distances between the ride and the nearest property lines are adequate to reduce the noise levels to 55 dBA or lower. The noise study concluded that Turns 1 and 2 and the portion of the track just after this were the loudest sections and that Turn 2 and the section following Turn 2 must be located approximately 1600 feet from the property line to not exceed 55 dBA at all property lines. The subject roller coaster meets these requirements.

The Environmental Planning Section (Markovich/Metzger to Srinivas, December 14, 2000) has stated noise will primarily come from the patrons' screams while on the ride. The impact from this operation because of its location is considered marginal and would not cause any additional noise impact to adjacent residential land uses. Although the applicant has shown the approximate location of this ride on the approved Conceptual Site Plan and submitted a site plan showing the subject ride, an overall site plan showing the exact location of this ride in relation to the approved Superman Roller Coaster and other existing rides has not been submitted. The overall site plan will be useful for determining the exact setbacks of the 2001 roller coaster from the property lines etc. A condition of approval has been added to require an overall site plan showing the exact location of the proposed 2001 roller coaster, the approved Superman Roller Coaster, the existing property lines and the setbacks for the 2001 Roller Coaster from the property lines.

3. **Prior to the approval of any detailed site plans, the applicant shall provide an updated conceptual landscaping, planting and screening plan to be approved by the Planning Board or designee that includes the area of the proposed attractions. The conceptual plan shall demonstrate the relationship and function of plantings (such as screening of parking or rides).**

This condition has been in effect for many years and has previously been satisfied.

4. **All activities which would charge a separate admission to the park will include a traffic analysis showing compliance with Sections 27-342(b)(1)(B) of the Zoning Ordinance at the time of detailed site plan submission.**

A separate admission fee will not be charged for the proposed 2001 Roller Coaster.

5. **The area in which the Six Flags management shall have discretion to freely locate movable rides shall be the area enclosed by a dashed line and labeled ■General Activity Area.●**

The proposed location of the portable carnival-type rides, food stands, game stands and other similar facilities will be located within the ■General Activity Area.●

- 6. The Six Flags management shall have discretion within the ■General Activity Area■ to freely locate movable rides, food stands, concession and/or ticket stands, or similar facilities but not major rides or structures with substantial foundations.**

The subject 2001 Roller Coaster requires substantial foundations. Therefore, a Detailed Site Plan application has been filed for review by the Planning Board. The proposed movable rides, food stands, game stands and other facilities require a Detailed Site Plan application to be reviewed at staff level. Since a Detailed Site Plan application is being filed for the 2001 Roller Coaster, the other accessory structures like the photo building, food stands and gift stands are also included with the Detailed Site Plan application.

- 8. If attendance is significantly higher than projected and extensive use is made of the ■Overflow Parking■ area, additional parking shall be provided in accordance with this conceptual site plan.**

The existing and proposed parking spaces are adequate to serve the proposed roller coaster and additional parking will not be required.

- 14. Each detailed site plan shall provide information indicating the type of glare and light that can be expected to be generated by the proposed use(s), and that such lighting will have no adverse impact on adjoining properties.**

The proposed lighting will be minimal in nature. Only lights that are necessary to safely illuminate the use of the 2001 Roller Coaster after sunset will be provided. The lighting will be directed downward so as to safely illuminate the use. Since the subject roller coaster will be located more than 400 feet from the adjacent properties, the proposed lighting will not have an adverse impact on the adjacent properties.

- 15. The facility, where feasible, shall incorporate barrier-free design to provide accessibility for handicapped patrons.**

The 2001 Roller Coaster will be constructed with ramps to insure accessibility for handicapped patrons.

- 17. There shall be no development other than that in existence, in operation, or shown on either an approved detailed or conceptual site plan as of the effective date of this Ordinance within 100 feet of the special exception property line (as revised pursuant to Sections 27-319(f) and 27-320 of the Zoning Ordinance), once such line is legally established. Notwithstanding the above, for the purposes of new additional development, if, after the special exception**

property line has been revised pursuant to Sections 27-319(f) and 27-320 of the Zoning Ordinance, the property owner(s) of property contiguous to the said revised special exception property line establishes, on its property, through a legally enforceable agreement, a nondisturbance setback area contiguous to the said revised special exception property line, then the 100-foot restriction line shall be measured from the outer boundary of the nondisturbance setback area and not from the revised special exception property line.

The addition of this ride will not result in any development within 100 feet of the property lines.

18. **The applicant's detailed site plans shall include a safety plan for patrons, employees, surrounding property residents and animals.**

This condition has been in effect for many years and has previously been satisfied.

19. (A) **Except as permitted herein, noise levels from any sound (including any crowd noises) shall not exceed 55 dBA at all new property lines of the special exception as determined by the submission of a new site plan pursuant to Sections 27-319(f) and 27-320 of the Zoning Ordinance. However, noise levels from any sound emanating from all rides and attractions (including any crowd noise) shall not exceed 55 dBA at the property line of the special exception as approved by Zoning Ordinance No. 29-1985 until such time as a use and occupancy permit is issued for a home (not including a model home until or unless such model home is used for occupancy as a home) built on the property constituting the subject matter of Zoning Map Amendment Application A-9761(C) (the R-S zoned land to the west and north of the new property line of the special exception [as revised pursuant to Sections 27-319(f) and 27-320 of the Zoning Ordinance]). Once such a use and occupancy permit has been issued, the noise levels from any sound emanating from the above rides and attractions (including any crowd noise) shall not exceed 55 dBA at the closest boundary line of the applicable approved Specific Design Plan on which the home has been constructed.**
- (B) **Notwithstanding the above, if, after the new property lines of the special exception have been determined pursuant to Sections 27-319(f) and 27-320 of the Zoning Ordinance, the property owner(s) of the property contiguous to the said revised special exception property line establishes on its property through a legally enforceable agreement, a nondisturbance setback area contiguous to the said revised special exception property line, then noise levels specified in this condition shall be measured from either the line established by the immediately**

preceding paragraph of this condition, or the outer boundary of the nondisturbance setback area, whichever shall be farthest from the revised special exception property line.

The applicant has submitted a noise study for the proposed ride. According to the study, the noise will primarily come from the patrons' screams while on the ride. The proposed location and orientation of the ride will ensure that the noise associated with the operation of the proposed ride will not exceed 55 dBA at any property line. The Environmental Planning Section (Markovich/Metzger to Srinivas, December 14, 2000) has also confirmed that the noise levels from the proposed ride comply with this condition and will be marginal and not have any additional noise impacts on adjacent properties.

- 23. Except as provided in Condition 6, a Detailed Site Plan application shall be required to be approved after a public hearing before the Planning Board. The procedure regarding notice of the hearing shall be as follows: A minimum of 30 days notice of such hearing shall be given to all parties of record. Permanent parties of record shall include the presidents of the Kettering Civic Association, Kettering Townhouse Condominium Association, Canterbury Citizens Association, Kingsford Citizens Association, Enterprise Estates Citizens Association, Woodmore Meadows Homeowners Association and the City of Bowie and any civic association formed for the Rolling Meadows Community, i.e., any development of the property forming the subject matter of A-9761. All other parties of record shall include those persons who register with the Clerk of the Council as described below.**

Within 30 days of the final approval of this condition, the applicant shall mail, by certified mail, return receipt requested, a notice to all persons who testified before the Zoning Hearing Examiner in Case No. SE-2635 on April 26, 1984; May 1, 1984; May 10, 1984; and on May 15, 1984. This notice shall advise said persons of their responsibility to register, within 90 days of the final approval of the condition, with the Clerk of the Council in writing, if they wish to remain parties of record for a period of five more years from the date of final approval of the condition. The date of final approval shall be deemed to be the date on which the Council's resolution approving this condition is mailed to all current parties of record.

No later than 90 days prior to the expiration of each fifth year following these registrations, the applicant shall notify all those persons registered with the Clerk of the Council of the requirement to re-register for five more years. Such persons must re-register in writing prior to the expiration of said five-year period.

In any event, the presidents of the aforementioned citizens organizations and the City of Bowie shall remain permanent parties of record. It shall be the responsibility of the applicant to maintain an updated record of current presidents of the aforementioned citizens organizations and annually provide the Clerk of the Council with such information.

The subject Detailed Site Plan application has been filed for review by the Planning Board. The Notice of Hearing has been sent to all the parties of record.

- 24. The parking compound for the special exception property (as revised pursuant to Sections 27-319(f) and 27-320 of the Zoning Ordinance) shall consist of all those spaces as shown on the conceptual site plan as of the effective date of this Ordinance and overflow parking as authorized in SE-2635. That parking which is currently constructed is sufficient for all rides, attractions and improvements shown on the approved conceptual site plan as of the effective date of this Ordinance, pursuant to Section 27-342(b)(2)(A) of the Zoning Ordinance.**

The existing and proposed parking spaces are adequate to serve the proposed roller coaster and additional parking will not be required.

- 29. The applicant shall establish a citizens advisory committee to advise it about how to operate the special exception use in a manner compatible with the surrounding community.**

The following shall apply to this committee:

- (A) At a minimum, the committee's membership shall include members of the Kettering Civic Federation, the Kingsford Civic Association, the Enterprise Estates Civic Association, and the Kettering Townhouse Condominium Association, and representatives of the City of Bowie, the Planning Commission, and the County's Department of Environmental Resources.**
- (B) On a finding, by majority vote of the full committee, that any condition stated herein has been violated, the committee may petition the Director of Environmental Resources for modification of conditions, revocation, or other appropriate action.**

The Citizens Advisory Committee has been formed and meets annually. The applicant has submitted a letter (Gibbs to Srinivas, November 21, 2000) describing the procedure for compliance with this condition.

- 31. Except for parking, access and appropriate signage, no rides, attractions, or other development shall be placed within 800 feet of the current right-of-way line of Central Avenue.**

The proposed roller coaster will not be located within 800 feet of the current right-of-way.

- 33. The applicant shall submit detailed site plans for each of the new attraction shown on the Conceptual Site Plan.**

The subject Detailed Site Plan application is for Attraction No. 37.

- 34. Information regarding compliance with Conditions 1 to 32 of this approval as applicable shall be provided at the Detailed Site Plan stage for each of the new attractions shown on the Conceptual Site Plan. The Detailed Site Plan application for each new attraction shall reference the Attraction Number on the Conceptual Site Plan. The location of attractions #36 and #40 shall be approved by DER at the detailed site plan stage. During the detailed site plan stage, attraction #43 may be relocated to the water ride area if it is determined that it is appropriate to locate all water-related attractions in one area.**

Compliance of the subject Detailed Site Plan with Conditions 1 to 32 of the approved Conceptual Site Plan has been addressed by the above findings.

6. Condition #2 of the District Council Order (adopted on March 13, 2000) affirming the Planning Board's decision in Resolution No. 99-236 states as follows:

- 2. Prior to submission of any subsequent Detailed Site Plan for Six Flags America which requires a public hearing before the Planning Board, the applicant shall confer with the Historic Preservation Commission regarding the ultimate disposition of the historic site known as Partnership, which is located on the park property.**

The applicant has submitted a letter dated December 8, 2000 describing the procedure for compliance with this condition. The Historic Preservation Section (Higgins to Srinivas, December 8, 2000) has also stated that the applicant is currently in negotiations with the Historic Preservation Commission regarding the future of Historic Site 74A-015, thereby meeting the above condition.

Referral Comments

7. The Permit Review Section (Bakka to Srinivas, December 4, 2000) has stated that the proposal must comply with the conditions of the Revisions to the Special Exception ROSP

2635 and 3400, the Preliminary Plat 4-99062 and the Detailed Site Plan SP-87048 and subsequent revisions.

8. The Department of Environmental Resources (Guzman to Srinivas, November 27, 2000 and December 5, 2000) has stated that there is no approved stormwater management plan for this project and subsequently that the 2001 roller coaster is not consistent with the previously approved storm water management concept plan #8329119-2000. The Plan must include information regarding the water quality infiltration trenches. A condition of approval has been added to require the same.
9. The Transportation Planning Section (Masog to Srinivas, December 8, 2000) has no comments regarding this proposal.
10. The Environmental Planning Section (Markovich/Metzger to Srinivas, December 14, 2000) has confirmed that the noise levels from the proposed ride will be marginal and not have any additional noise impacts on adjacent properties.

The preliminary comments regarding the Type II Tree Conservation Plan states that the applicant proposes disturbances to a stream and the associated 50-foot buffer for construction of an access road for emergency vehicles and the placement of footings for the proposed 2001 Roller Coaster. The Section has requested revision of the Sediment and Erosion Control Plan to reduce the proposed impacts. The applicant has submitted a revised sketch with the required changes. Three conditions of approval are proposed to require minor changes to the Type II TCP Plan, obtain federal and state permits to allow disturbances and revise the limits of disturbance.

If the final comments from the Environmental Planning Section require any changes/modifications to the preliminary comments/ recommendations, they will be presented at the Hearing. The Section is recommending approval of TCPII/45/98 with conditions.

The draft memorandum from the Environmental Planning Section states as follows:

■The Environmental Planning Section has reviewed the Six Flags America, 2001 Coaster plans and finds the Type II Tree Conservation Plan and Detailed Site Plan to be acceptable.

■Woodland Conservation

■The applicant has submitted a revision to the previously approved Type II Tree Conservation Plan, TCPII/45/98, to address the woodland conservation requirements for the entire Six Flags America ownership. The plans as received by the Environmental Planning Section on December 14, 2000 have been reviewed and found to satisfy the requirements of the Prince George's County Woodland Conservation Ordinance. This 514.68 acres property has a net tract area of 458.35 acres and a Woodland Conservation Threshold (WCT) of

107.18 acres or 23.4 percent. The WCT for this property was calculated for each of the zoning categories and then totaled. All woodland clearing on the R-A portion of the property is subject to the 2:1 replacement requirement while the woodland clearing on the R-S portion of the property is subject to the 4:1 replacement requirement. The total replacement requirement for this property is 5.07 acres for a total requirement of 112.25 acres. The woodland conservation requirement is being satisfied by 125.25 acres of on-site preservation in priority retention areas. An additional, 33.77 acres of woodlands on the net tract and 51.60 acres of floodplain woodlands are being preserved but not counted towards the Woodland Conservation requirements.

■TCPII/45/98 is recommended for approval subject to the conditions in the recommended conditions section of this memorandum.

■Streams, Wetlands, 100-year Floodplain and Associated Buffers

■Streams, wetlands and 100-year floodplains have been found to occur on this property. This application proposes disturbances to a stream and the associated 50-foot buffer for the construction of an access road for use by emergency vehicles and for the placement of footings for the proposed 2001 Coaster. Although there are no wetlands associated with this stream, the stream is a tributary to a larger stream which is associated with wetlands of special state concern. The Environmental Planning Section evaluated the proposed stream impacts and requested that the Sediment and Erosion Control Plan be revised to reduce the proposed impacts. Based on a sketch plan submitted to the Environmental Planning Section on December 12, 2000 the proposed impacts have been minimized and SP-87048/36 is supported subject to the conditions in the recommended conditions section of this memorandum.

■Noise

■The revised site plan, as submitted, seeks to establish the construction and operation of a new coaster steel ride, the 2001 Coaster. This ride essentially operates on gravitational force in its entirety except at the initial motorized upward thrust. The major noise sources of the operation are generally manmade due to screams which strongly influence the resultant noise environment of the area. However, the attenuation of this noise generally takes place through ground terrain features and atmospheric absorption. The impact from this operation is considered marginal because of its location and would not cause any additional noise impact to adjacent residential land uses.

■Other Environmental Issues

■There are no Scenic or Historic Roads on or adjacent to this site. No Marlboro clays have been identified in the vicinity and the soils have no significant constraints that might adversely impact the proposed development of this site.

■Recommended Conditions

- 1. Prior to certification SP-87048/36 the applicant shall make the following revisions to TCPII/45/98:
 - a. Show all woodland conservation areas with the same shading regardless of the zoning category.
 - b. Label each woodland conservation area with an identifying letter or number and provide the acreage with the label or in a corresponding table.
 - c. Revised the worksheet to provided a grand total column that indicates the sum of the requirements for both zoning categories.
 - d. Combine the woodland conservation provided columns on the worksheets into a single column.
 - e. Revise the limit of disturbance for the 2001 Coaster to be consistent with the exhibit provided to the Environmental Planning Section on December 12, 2000 or as otherwise agreed to by the Environmental Planning Section.
 - 2. Prior to the issuance of any grading permits impacting the stream or stream buffer the applicant shall obtain the appropriate federal and/or state permits to allow disturbances to the stream and stream buffer. A copy of the federal and/or state authorization for the disturbance to the stream and stream buffer shall be included in the grading permit application.
 - 3. Prior to certification of SP-87048/36 the applicant shall revise the limits of disturbance to reflect all sediment and erosion control practices as reflected on the December 12, 2000 plan submitted to the Environmental Planning Section.●
11. The Subdivision Section has stated that the site is a portion of Parcel B recorded on Plat VJ 183@51 and the subject of Preliminary Plat 4-91060, PGCPB Resolution No. 91-251. The conditions of approval require review of a Type II Tree Conservation Plan if required by the Environmental Planning Section, conformance with State and Federal wetland permits and conformance with the Health Department's standards for contaminated soils if any are located on the subject site. The referral from the Environmental Planning Section addresses these issues.
12. The Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (Albeitr to Srinivas, November 28, 2000) has stated that there are no impacts due to the proposal.
13. The Historic Preservation Section (Higgins to Srinivas, December 8, 2000) has stated that the construction of the new 2001 Roller Coaster will not have any effects on the Historic Site 74A-015. It will be smaller than the other coasters in the vicinity and will be less visible from the Historic Site. The related photo booth, concrete pad and the food stands will also not affect the Historic Site.

The applicant is currently in negotiations with the Historic Preservation Commission regarding the future of the Historic Site. The applicant has submitted a Historic Area Work Permit for demolition of the Partnership site. The application for demolition was presented at the November 21, 2000 meeting. The Commission is concerned that the concessions offered by Six Flags is not sufficient to mitigate the loss of this significant Historic Site. The item has been continued to the December 12, 2000 meeting.

14. The Community Planning Division (D'Ambrosi to Srinivas, December 6, 2000) has stated that the proposed detailed site plan incorporates the recommendations of the Master Plan.
15. The Bureau of Special Hazards (December 6, 2000) has stated that the applicant must submit the profile of the new ride for coordination with the fire stations responding to the amusement park.
16. Referrals have been sent to the Maryland Department of Natural Resources, the Western Shore Conservancy, the Health Department, the Enterprise Road Corridor and the City of Bowie. No comments have been received as of this date.
17. With the proposed conditions, Detailed Site Plan SP-87048/36 will be consistent with the approved Conceptual Site Plan and will not significantly alter the previously approved site plans for the subject site. The plan is found to represent a reasonable alternative for satisfying the site design guidelines without requiring unreasonable costs and without detracting substantially from the utility of the proposed development for its intended use.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that pursuant to Subtitle 27 of the Prince George's County Code, the Prince George's County Planning Board of The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission adopted the findings contained herein and APPROVED Tree Conservation Plan TCPII/45/98 and further APPROVED the Detailed Site Plan SP-87048/36 for the above-described land, subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to certification of the Detailed Site Plan,
 - a. the applicant shall submit an overall site plan showing the exact location of the proposed 2001 roller coaster, the approved Superman Roller Coaster, the existing property lines and the setbacks for the 2001 Roller Coaster from the property lines.
 - b. the applicant shall obtain a new stormwater management concept approval for the subject site from the Department of Environmental Resources or revise the Plan to conform to the approved stormwater management concept.
 - c. the applicant shall make the following revisions to TCPII/45/98:

- (1) Show all woodland conservation areas with the same shading regardless of the zoning category.
 - (2) Label each woodland conservation area with an identifying letter or number and provide the acreage with the label or in a corresponding table.
 - (3) Revised the worksheet to provided a grand total column that indicates the sum of the requirements for both zoning categories.
 - (4) Combine the woodland conservation provided columns on the worksheets into a single column.
 - (5) Revise the limit of disturbance for the 2001 Coaster to be consistent with the exhibit provided to the Environmental Planning Section on December 12, 2000 or as otherwise agreed to by the Environmental Planning Section.
- d. the applicant shall revise the limits of disturbance to reflect all sediment and erosion control practices as reflected on the December 12, 2000 plan submitted to the Environmental Planning Section.
- e. the applicant shall submit the profile of the new ride for coordination with the fire stations responding to the amusement park.
2. Prior to the issuance of any grading permits impacting the stream or stream buffer the applicant shall obtain the appropriate federal and/or state permits to allow disturbances to the stream and stream buffer. A copy of the federal and/or state authorization for the disturbance to the stream and stream buffer shall be included in the grading permit application.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that an appeal of the Planning Board's action must be filed with the District Council of Prince George's County within thirty (30) days following the final notice of the Planning Board's decision.

* * * * *

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 Brown, seconded by Commissioner Lowe, with Commissioners Brown, Lowe, Eley and Hewlett voting in favor of the motion, at its regular meeting held on Thursday, December 21, 2000, in Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

PGCPB No. 00-232
File No. SP-87048/36
Page 14

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 11th day of January 2001.

Trudye Morgan Johnson
Executive Director

By Frances J. Guertin
Planning Board Administrator

TMJ:FJG:LS:rmk