

**Dr. Gregory A. Prince  
JaLynn R. Prince  
13320 Signal Tree Lane  
Potomac, MD 20854**

Several years ago, a stranger knocked on our door and introduced himself as a representative of a company that planned to install solar panels in the backyard of our next-door neighbor, Dr. Lance Leithauser. He assured us there would be no detrimental outcomes for us and said that before installation of the solar panels would begin, the company would plant a row of evergreen trees that would block completely our view of the solar panels from any point on our property.

For the better part of the past year, construction of the solar farm has proceeded, often beginning at an early hour and creating sufficient noise to awaken our adult autistic son, who does not react well to such interruptions of his sleep.

The panels are now installed, but not one tree (or even plant) has been planted to block the view. The first image below, taken from our property, shows the fence encircling the solar panels.



The fence is eight feet high and topped with barbed wire. One might see similarities to a prison camp. Indeed, the following image is of the Nazi Majdanek Concentration Camp in Poland.



Chaberton built the 4-acre solar farm in Dr. Leithauser's backyard, and now it proposes to build another one, nearly 10-fold larger, that will run the entire length of our back property line. The first picture below is a view from our home office. The evergreen on the left of the image is just beyond our fence—and beyond our control.



The next image, generated by AI, shows what the neighboring field, which faces south, will look like once solar panels are installed, but without the removal of trees not on our property.





The third image, also generated by AI, shows the view when the neighbor's trees are removed. Chaberton, it should be noted, removed all shade trees from Dr. Leithauser's property as part of the installation process, without his prior knowledge or approval.



The following three photographs, similarly generated, show an even larger array of solar panels that would be visible from other rooms of our house—indeed, the panels would stretch the entire back property line of our home. The lamp posts are on our property.











Chaberton lied when they told us there would be a perpetual green barrier that would shield us from the view of the panels on Dr. Leithauser's property. We have no reason to believe they will perform any better in installing the proposed solar farm. Our investment in our property and home, which we constructed 18 years ago, exceeds \$12,000,000. Having a perpetual eyesore such as this in our backyard will have a devastating effect on our property value, for which we would have no assurance of any compensation.

Other neighbors more adept in addressing issues of safety and compliance to regulations will weigh in on this matter. Our concerns, since we are the only home in the neighborhood directly affected by both Chaberton projects, are unique.

We are in total opposition to the Victoria project.

Sincerely,

Dr. Gregory A. Prince  
JaLynn R. Prince



Doug Ortega  
13437 Signal Tree Ln  
Potomac, MD 20854  
fugo@comcast.net

January 14, 2026

Maryland-National Capital Park & Planning Commission (MNCPPC)  
2425 Reedie Drive, 14th Floor  
Wheaton, MD 20902

I have been a County resident for over 60 years and have resided on Signal Tree Lane for over 25 years. I am writing to you to express my concerns about the proposed community solar Project Victoria and my opposition to its construction.

The 3.25 MW Project Victoria proposed on a 40 acre parcel would be the second solar project in my community. Previously, Project Santa Rosa, a 1.75 MW community solar generating station was approved on Signal Tree Lane in a pilot program a couple of years ago on a 10 acre parcel. Santa Rosa is nearing construction completion and has had wide ranging negative impacts on our community, some of which will be described later in this letter. Project Victoria as proposed would directly abut Project Santa Rosa.

***Project Victoria directly abuts existing Project Santa Rosa***

Chaberton's Statement of Justification for Project Victoria leaves out drawings and maps that show how it abuts the Santa Rosa project. Here is Chaberton's image of Project

Figure 1 – Subject Property Outlined on Aerial Image  
webviewer





Victoria directly from their document. The Chaberton image doesn't show the construction development from Santa Rosa and was taken prior to 2025.

Now, here is an annotated Google Earth image from May, 2025 that illustrates how approval of Project Victoria would result in two adjacent industrial-sized Chaberton-built solar projects smack dab in the middle of residential homes!



Projects Victoria and Santa Rosa in the aggregate result in ~50 acres of property dedicated to solar power generation in the middle of our residential community. The directly abutting homesites add up to about the same amount of land as the solar farms! One of my neighbors will have his property abutted by solar facilities on two sides. This is simply unacceptable.

No matter if these two solar facilities may ultimately be owned and operated by different corporate entities, they must be considered as one large facility for planning purposes.



### ***This is truly industrial development***

It's important that the County and MNCPPC learn from the Santa Rosa development. It has direct relevance to Project Victoria.

The term "solar farm" evokes calm, agrarian, bucolic images. In reality, based on the experience of the Santa Rosa development, a solar farm is anything but that.

For size comparison, the above-grade finished space in the residence directly below Project Santa Rosa in the Google Earth image above is over 17,000 square feet. So, Santa Rosa is massive and that will be dwarfed by Project Victoria.

Project Victoria will be more than twice the size of the Santa Rosa development complete with asphalt service roads, drainage features, transformers, electrical apparatus, cisterns for use in case of fire, detention-camp style fencing, lighting, security and more. All in a residential area!

Here is a photograph of the detention-style fencing recently erected for Santa Rosa.



Landscaping features in the Chaberton Project Victoria plans are anemic, promising screening from view in 5 years. For abutting homes that means many years of visual blight until maturity occurs. In the meantime, property values of all homes in the community will surely be depressed. This photo taken of Project Santa Rosa from an abutting property is what I mean by “visual blight”.



One neighbor in fear of proposed Project Victoria is already taking steps to plant additional trees at the cost of many, many thousands of dollars to try to avoid the blight. Given the slope of the land, this still may not suffice. No taxpayer should be forced to do this in order to enjoy peace and serenity in their residence especially considering that it was purchased with the zoning restrictions and Master Plan that existed prior to the beginning of the solar free-for-all in Maryland and Montgomery County.

The impact of large scale industrial development, whether piecemeal or all at once in the middle of a residential community must be carefully considered by MNCPPC. Further development in the Manor Stone/Signal Tree community should stop at the completion of Project Santa Rosa. Project Victoria should be denied.



***Impacts from Santa Rosa that relate to Project Victoria***

As previously stated, it's important that the County and MNCPPC learn from the Santa Rosa development as it has direct relevance to Project Victoria.

For the first time in the 25 years I've lived here I've seen coyotes on my property. I believe that the coyotes have moved to the end of Signal Tree as a result of the Santa Rosa development. I had heard stories recently of lambs being killed by coyote from my neighbor who lives directly across Signal Tree Ln from Santa Rosa. And I captured photos of them on my trail camera. Additional wildlife displacement to the nearby residences will be exacerbated if Project Victoria is built.



Traffic from (out-of-state) construction vehicles for Project Santa Rosa has been a constant. Not only is it a long term eyesore, but it is certainly damaging to the road infrastructure. For Project Victoria, the traffic and damage to a small, already non-ideal Manor Stone road surface will be even worse. The length of the drive to the end of Manor Stone from River Rd is much longer (0.85 miles) than the drive on Signal Tree Ln (0.2 miles). The frequent traffic from construction workers, dump trucks, delivery trucks, equipment trucks for excavators, graders, diggers, etc and even tractor trailers on this long route will place undue burden on and create hazards to the residents of Manor Stone, especially children and the elderly for the multiple years of construction that will be required.





The MNCPPC-proposed 60 foot radius turnaround at the end of Manor Stone will not be enough to handle the parked construction workers' vehicles as well as the large tractor-trailers. As an example, this blocked my way on Signal Tree at Santa Rosa one day.



The Verizon FiOS line for our entire neighborhood was cut by a Santa Rosa construction crew resulting in a two day outage. This affected TV, phone (including emergency services) and Internet service for residents. Those that worked remotely or had home-based business were out of commission.

These are just some of the things that I have directly observed during the course of the construction of Project Santa Rosa that will only be worse for Project Victoria.

### ***Chaberton is bypassing the Maryland PSC process***

Project Victoria was originally proposed as a much larger solar generating facility, Maryland Public Service Commission case 9770. Chaberton withdrew that case from consideration just before the first public comment hearing in the face of widespread opposition from the affected parties and the Manor Stone/Signal Tree communities, instead choosing to pare down the power capacity to just below the limits that would require a face-off before the Commission. A petition was supplied to the Commission signed by over 70 residents of the community in opposition to the project. Undoubtedly,

this petition will be provided to you during the course the Project Victoria approval process. The residents of this community are being 'run over' by Chaberton to the detriment of its citizens. Solar is good, a free-for-all is not. Calm, rational planning is being thrown out the window.

### ***Conclusion***

Our community already has Project Santa Rosa to provide solar generated clean power to other parts of the County. As a community, we're doing our part. As citizens of the County we are entitled by law to the quiet enjoyment of our property. Adding Project Victoria directly adjacent to Santa Rosa would place a disproportionate burden on the residents of this community.

Approval of County solar projects should be restricted not only based on power capacity, but should also take into account the nature of the community where the development will occur and the acreage involved. The previous focus of Maryland and Montgomery County has seemingly been to preserve the Ag Reserve at all costs while giving little consideration to dumping what amounts to a 50 acre industrial facility in the middle of a residential area. No approval for Project Victoria should proceed until such time as the County government and MNCPPC transparently and with full public debate consider the effect of and better specify the allowed density of multiple/large solar sites directly in the middle of residential communities.

Sincerely yours,

*D. Ortega*

Doug Ortega



Nancy El-Hibri  
13340 Signal Tree Lane  
Potomac, Maryland 20854

Re: Opposition to Chaberton Project Victoria LLC (MR2026010)

To: Montgomery County Planning Board

As a next-door neighbor to Chaberton's Santa Rosa Solar Project, I am writing to formally oppose their application for Project Victoria I and II. Santa Rosa construction began in 2022, and in 2026 it is still not complete. Santa Rosa is adjacent to Project Victoria I. Living beside this project has given our community a firsthand view of what further expansion would mean for our community.

Since construction began, residents have endured the following:

1. Trees and shrubs were removed, piled on site, and set on fire during a drought. The debris smoldered for days.
2. Our home shook so violently from soil compaction for the Santa Rosa access road - just 30 feet from our property - that we initially thought it was an earthquake.
3. Our community depends entirely on private wells; there is no public water service. Our well is approximately 101 feet from the compaction zone. If the impact above ground was so severe, what has been the impact below ground?
4. Flush-mounted panels were installed, contrary to what was conveyed by Chaberton to the neighbors in 2022. This effectively creates an impervious surface and increasing runoff onto surrounding properties.
5. Chaberton claims there were no complaints about Santa Rosa. Yet early in the project the lease was transferred to an out-of-state company with no notice to neighbors, leaving residents unsure where or to whom concerns should be addressed. There was no transparency and no meaningful due process.
6. Construction crews - also from out of state - work many weekends and holidays, extending disruption to the neighborhood.
7. The contractor severed a Verizon line, cutting internet and communications to 24 homes on Signal Tree for several days. Verizon has since described the repair as only "temporary".
8. Project management has been chaotic: major equipment deliveries arriving with no one to receive them, and during recent system testing it was suddenly discovered that yet another conduit for Pepco was needed. This raises serious concerns about the legitimacy of the multiple construction extensions granted.
9. Day-to-day life in the neighborhood has been repeatedly disrupted by noise, fires, oversized vehicles making U-turns on River Road, knocking over street

signs, blocking Signal Tree Lane by lining both sides of our narrow residential streets.

*For reference, I have attached photographs documenting several of the construction impacts described above.*

Santa Rosa is a relatively small project – under 2 MW on just four acres – yet it is approaching four years of construction. Chaberton now proposes to add Project Victoria I and II, a significantly larger project, immediately adjacent to this site, in the heart of our community. If four acres have meant four years of disruption, how many years of upheaval should residents expect from a project several times larger – six, eight, ten years?

Most troubling, without warning or explanation, homeowners near the site have experienced up to a 102% increase in insurance premiums. The only significant change in our area has been the installation of this commercial solar field. The safety, affordability, and quiet enjoyment of living on River, Manor Stone, Signal Tree, Magruder Farm, and surrounding roads are now at risk.

We support responsible renewable energy development. What we cannot support is the industrialization of residential neighborhoods without transparency, accountability, and genuine consideration for the people who live here. The experience of Santa Rosa clearly demonstrates the unintended consequences of these projects, and we urge you to carefully weigh them before approving further expansion.

Sincerely,



Nancy El-Hibri





The electrified perimeter fence is located just 31 feet from our property line.





December 13, 2025: Weekend construction activity occurring adjacent to our property. My dog and I are on the horse path around our farm, illustrating the close proximity of active work to daily residential life. No plantings are in place.





Several people have mistakenly assumed this area is a pond. It is not. This is a flush-mounted solar field, which sheds water rather than absorbing it. During heavy rain, runoff is clearly visible.

**From:** [Paul Garrett](#)  
**To:** [Gatling, Tsaiquan](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Chaberton Solar Victoria  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 7, 2026 9:58:31 AM  
**Attachments:** [image001.png](#)  
[image002.png](#)  
[image003.png](#)  
[image004.png](#)  
[image005.png](#)  
[DH-Intervenor Petition vFinal.pdf](#)

---

**[EXTERNAL EMAIL]** Exercise caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding.

Tsaiquan,

Thank you for following up and the opportunity to offer additional comments. I'm available to talk anytime over the next few days if you have questions. My cell is 202-236-4652.

I want to reiterate an important issue that appears to get little attention. While there are appropriate areas in Maryland for solar farms, residential neighborhoods are not one of them, regardless of what the laws say. And, despite that fact, our neighborhood already has one solar farm (Santa Rosa). And that farm took years to construct, was riddled with mismanagement and delays by the same proposed developer, was built by out of state workers, and has provided no benefit — financial or otherwise — to our neighborhood or other residents of Maryland. Chaberton already sold the first project to an out-of-state investor (PureSky from Colo.), and they used all out-of-state construction teams (Cinterra from NC).

Chaberton is now proposing two more solar farms — that are bigger than Santa Rosa — directly ADJACENT to Santa Rosa. If this co-location is permitted, that will make a **Mega-Solar-Farm** totaling 5 to 6 MWs (which this developer already tried to do with the State PSC and then withdrew its application when it knew it would fail). There is no basis, reason, or justification for Maryland or Montgomery County to knowingly approve of three adjacent solar farms in SAME neighborhood. There are endless other areas that would be appropriate for industrial scale solar farms.

I also do not believe there has been any analysis of whether the current Pepco electrical grid could even handle the addition of 4 MW of electricity. Apparently, Santa Rosa failed the first start up test and is not yet operational. They have until May 2026 to get it online. Without a careful and thorough evaluation of the electrical grid in the area, it would be reckless for the County to approve the two proposed projects. Has anyone ever done this analysis? In addition, Pepco is currently in active litigation over problematic, unsafe live wires on Manor Stone Drive. Is the staff even aware of this significant situation with Pepco? Again, it would be suspect for the County to approve new solar projects on land adjacent to land with unsafe, known live wires.

Plus, this 5-6 MW monstrosity would be constructed in a residential neighborhood that does not have fire hydrants. So the county would be approving and sanctioning a potential disaster, if there were to be some sort of fire which spreads to the neighborhood. I'm sure Montgomery County does not want to be defending some of the issues that Los Angeles County has been dealing with for the past year. My family lost two houses in the Palisades, so I know a little



about this subject, as today is the first anniversary of the fires.

The environmental damages from Santa Rosa, the traffic impacts have been significant, and the repeated delays have been unfortunate. The project has been totally mismanaged. Attached is Mr. Hoffman's June 2025 *petition to intervene* submitted to the PSC, which is a public document. Please make it part of the record and share it with the Board.

Thanks again for allowing me to share input. Hope to meet you in person on the 29th.

I think this one graphic (attached) tells the whole story - each star is a house. This is not rural, this is suburbs. If you compare this to what the developer submitted, you get a very different story and can understand our real safety concerns about brush fires and electrocution.

Paul

On Tue, Jan 6, 2026 at 3:52 PM Gatling, Tsaiquan  
<[tsaiquan.gatling@montgomeryplanning.org](mailto:tsaiquan.gatling@montgomeryplanning.org)> wrote:

Mr. Garrett,

I am writing to follow up with you regarding the Chaberton Solar Victoria Mandatory Referral projects. I am the lead reviewer for these applications and have taken your initial email comments as part of our review and will incorporate them into the Staff Report. I am reaching out now to ask if you have further comments you wanted to provide or questions you want to pose to myself or the Applicant head of the scheduled January 29<sup>th</sup> Planning Board hearing. I will look forward to your response; my contact information is below if you'd prefer to talk via phone.

Thank you,

Tsaiquan Gatling

**Tsaiquan Gatling**

**Planner III, West County Planning**

Montgomery County Planning Department

2425 Reedie Drive, Wheaton, MD 20902

[Tsaiquan.Gatling@montgomeryplanning.org](mailto:Tsaiquan.Gatling@montgomeryplanning.org)

p: 301.495.2116

---

**From:** Paul Garrett <[paul@jsjetty.com](mailto:paul@jsjetty.com)>

**Sent:** Wednesday, November 19, 2025 10:25 AM

**To:** Flynn, Meghan <[meghan.flynn@montgomeryplanning.org](mailto:meghan.flynn@montgomeryplanning.org)>

**Cc:** Dickel, Stephanie <[Stephanie.Dickel@montgomeryplanning.org](mailto:Stephanie.Dickel@montgomeryplanning.org)>; Gatling, Tsaiquan <[tsaiquan.gatling@montgomeryplanning.org](mailto:tsaiquan.gatling@montgomeryplanning.org)>; Lindsey, Amy <[amy.lindsey@montgomeryplanning.org](mailto:amy.lindsey@montgomeryplanning.org)>

**Subject:** Re: Chaberton Solar Victoria

**[EXTERNAL EMAIL]** Exercise caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding.

Meghan

Thanks so much for the information. As we discussed, the neighborhood surrounding Chaberton's new proposed projects (Manor Stone, Signal Tree Road, and Magruder Farm) is organized. It successfully fought Chaberton on its original proposal for a CPCN with the State PSC this past summer (Case #9770). Four neighbors were granted legal intervenor status by the PSC back in the summer.

Chaberton's new proposed projects are merely an addition to Project Santa Rosa and an attempt to do an end-around of the original project that it was forced to withdraw. Here is my testimony before the PSC on 10/29 - go to minute 10 - <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3OJs-siUSq8&t=1013s>

There are endless details about the mismanagement and problems with Santa Rosa & Victoria, which are detailed in the intervenor filings (linked [here](#) - items 33, 37 & 39). I encourage you all not only to review those filings but also to come visit Santa Rosa (13300 Signal Tree). You will learn about how the project directly injures four neighbors' properties, the negative impact on the neighborhood from water run-off, erosion, etc., the environmental/wildlife/livestock destruction, and the damage to the street from all the construction. And that is not to mention the life-safety issues created by the proposed massive enlargement of the solar fields in a neighborhood with no ability to fight fires. Solar has a place in Maryland - just not in residential neighborhoods.

History proves that Chaberton's business model is to flip these projects to out-of-state



private equity funds - that's what they did with Santa Rosa. Chaberton will likely do the exact same thing with the new proposed projects, i.e., sell this project well before the completion. They have also primarily used out-of-state construction workers, so Maryland and MoCo are not even seeing the supposed (limited) economic benefit they promise in applications. Lastly and most importantly, this combined and enlarged collective project presents real and present life-safety risks from both brush fire and electrocution given the age and frailty of Pepco's grid.

Here are the pictures of the two signs they posted to announce the new phase. They are hardly accessible and certainly are not readable, consistent with the poor quality and misinformation they exhibited in building Santa Rosa. The neighborhood looks forward to further interface with your office. Members are planning on attending the public hearing when it is scheduled in January.

Please reach out with questions and let me know if you or anyone on your team would like to visit the sites.

Paul Garrett

28 year Potomac resident

C 202-236-4652

On Tue, Nov 18, 2025 at 12:35 PM Flynn, Meghan  
<[meghan.flynn@montgomeryplanning.org](mailto:meghan.flynn@montgomeryplanning.org)> wrote:

Mr. Garrett,

I'm following up on our conversation this morning about the new solar project near you, and with this email I am connecting you to the regulatory supervisors coordinating our review, Stephanie Dickel and Amy Lindsey. I also wanted to amend a piece of incorrect information I gave you – the review period for a Mandatory Referral is 60 days, not 90. So, to estimate a Board date, we'd be looking at mid-January, not mid-February.

For the benefit of the planners copied here, I'll also give a brief summary of our conversation. You are Paul Garrett, living at 13513 Magruder Farm Ct, with an interest in and opposition to the new project called Chaberton Solar Victoria, located on P133 on River Rd, 1000ft West of Signal Tree Lane. The Victoria project consists of:

Forest Conservation: F20260280 for the whole property, this being 38.21 acres according to SDAT, but called 42 acres in the application (applicants are allowed to include prior dedications

in calculating tract size).

Mandatory Referrals: MR2026010 for a 2MW facility on the North half of the property, this being 12.2 acres of P133

MR2026011 for a 1.25MW facility on the South half of the property,  
this being 8.3 acres of P133

The Victoria project is adjacent to its sister project, Caberton Santa Rosa, at 13330 Signal Tree Ln. The site plan 820220210 approved the project for a 1.75MW facility on a 10 acre parcel.

Paul, I'll let you know when the project passes intake and the files become available online. Please let me know if you have any other questions,

MF



**Meghan Flynn** *she / her*

**Planner | Westcounty Division**

Montgomery County Planning Department

2425 Reedie Dr, Wheaton MD 20902

[Meghan.Flynn@montgomeryplanning.org](mailto:Meghan.Flynn@montgomeryplanning.org)

o: (301) 495-4609 | Info Desk: (301) 495-4610



**From:** [Paul Garrett](#)  
**To:** [Gatling, Tsaiquan](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Chaberton Solar Victoria  
**Date:** Thursday, January 15, 2026 9:51:02 AM  
**Attachments:** [image001.png](#)  
[image002.png](#)  
[image003.png](#)  
[image004.png](#)  
[image005.png](#)  
[Lett-Pl-Bd-8-29-24-w.Exhibits.pdf](#)

---

**[EXTERNAL EMAIL]** Exercise caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding.

Tsaiquan,

Below is additional information that the staff and Board should consider in evaluating proposed Project Victoria 1 and 2.

As discussed below, there are serious and significant issues with the power grid in the area of the proposed projects. Specifically, there have been (and possibly continue to be) active live wires adjacent to not only the Santa Rosa project, but more importantly to the proposed sites of Victoria. One would think that this situation alone should eliminate any further consideration of the Project Victoria sites. And if those issues were not enough, the addition of 3 solar farms (Santa Rosa and two Victoria) to the Pepco grid in this area would cause even more problems. Indeed, ***Chaberton itself has admitted to the Montgomery County Planning Board that power lines have limitations and an electrical line can only handle one solar project:***

**"Electrical line hosting capacity.** Power lines have limitations and a typical line can only handle one Community Solar project," and "Community solar facilities are limited to 2MW pursuant to the Maryland Community Solar program rules and regulations." Aug. 29, 2024 Letter from Francoise M. Carrier to Montgomery County Planning Board for Project Sugarloaf, Ex. B. While the Board has already received this letter, a copy is attached for your and its convenience. It is noteworthy that Ms. Carrier continues to represent Chaberton with respect to the proposed Victoria projects. It is also important to note that Santa Rosa is a 2MW farm, and Chaberton has been trying (and failing) to connect to the Pepco line

***Chaberton has also admitted to the Montgomery County Planning Board that there cannot be solar projects on adjacent parcels:***

**"Co-location restrictions.** The Maryland Community Solar program does not allow projects on adjacent parcels." Ex. B.

These restrictions that Chaberton has previously acknowledged to the Board should prevent Chaberton's proposed Victoria projects.

Paul Garrett

On Wed, Jan 7, 2026 at 9:57 AM Paul Garrett <[paul@jsjetty.com](mailto:paul@jsjetty.com)> wrote:  
| Tsaiquan,

Thank you for following up and the opportunity to offer additional comments. I'm available to talk anytime over the next few days if you have questions. My cell is 202-236-4652.

I want to reiterate an important issue that appears to get little attention. While there are appropriate areas in Maryland for solar farms, residential neighborhoods are not one of them, regardless of what the laws say. And, despite that fact, our neighborhood already has one solar farm (Santa Rosa). And that farm took years to construct, was riddled with mismanagement and delays by the same proposed developer, was built by out of state workers, and has provided no benefit — financial or otherwise — to our neighborhood or other residents of Maryland. Chaberton already sold the first project to an out-of-state investor (PureSky from Colo.), and they used all out-of-state construction teams (Cinterra from NC).

Chaberton is now proposing two more solar farms — that are bigger than Santa Rosa — directly ADJACENT to Santa Rosa. If this co-location is permitted, that will make a **Mega-Solar-Farm** totaling 5 to 6 MWs (which this developer already tried to do with the State PSC and then withdrew its application when it knew it would fail). There is no basis, reason, or justification for Maryland or Montgomery County to knowingly approve of three adjacent solar farms in SAME neighborhood. There are endless other areas that would be appropriate for industrial scale solar farms.

I also do not believe there has been any analysis of whether the current Pepco electrical grid could even handle the addition of 4 MW of electricity. Apparently, Santa Rosa failed the first start up test and is not yet operational. They have until May 2026 to get it online. Without a careful and thorough evaluation of the electrical grid in the area, it would be reckless for the County to approve the two proposed projects. Has anyone ever done this analysis? In addition, Pepco is currently in active litigation over problematic, unsafe live wires on Manor Stone Drive. Is the staff even aware of this significant situation with Pepco? Again, it would be suspect for the County to approve new solar projects on land adjacent to land with unsafe, known live wires.

Plus, this 5-6 MW monstrosity would be constructed in a residential neighborhood that does not have fire hydrants. So the county would be approving and sanctioning a potential disaster, if there were to be some sort of fire which spreads to the neighborhood. I'm sure Montgomery County does not want to be defending some of the issues that Los Angeles County has been dealing with for the past year. My family lost two houses in the Palisades, so I know a little about this subject, as today is the first anniversary of the fires.

The environmental damages from Santa Rosa, the traffic impacts have been significant, and the repeated delays have been unfortunate. The project has been totally mismanaged. Attached is Mr. Hoffman's June 2025 *petition to intervene* submitted to the PSC, which is a public document. Please make it part of the record and share it with the Board.

Thanks again for allowing me to share input. Hope to meet you in person on the 29th.

I think this one graphic (attached) tells the whole story - each star is a house. This is not rural, this is suburbs. If you compare this to what the developer submitted, you get a very different story and can understand our real safety concerns about brush fires and electrocution.

Paul

On Tue, Jan 6, 2026 at 3:52 PM Gatling, Tsaiquan  
<[tsaiquan.gatling@montgomeryplanning.org](mailto:tsaiquan.gatling@montgomeryplanning.org)> wrote:

Mr. Garrett,

I am writing to follow up with you regarding the Chaberton Solar Victoria Mandatory Referral projects. I am the lead reviewer for these applications and have taken your initial email comments as part of our review and will incorporate them into the Staff Report. I am reaching out now to ask if you have further comments you wanted to provide or questions you want to pose to myself or the Applicant head of the scheduled January 29<sup>th</sup> Planning Board hearing. I will look forward to your response; my contact information is below if you'd prefer to talk via phone.

Thank you,

Tsaiquan Gatling

**Tsaiquan Gatling**

**Planner III, West County Planning**

Montgomery County Planning Department

2425 Reedie Drive, Wheaton, MD 20902

[Tsaiquan.Gatling@montgomeryplanning.org](mailto:Tsaiquan.Gatling@montgomeryplanning.org)

p: 301.495.2116

---

**From:** Paul Garrett <[paul@jsjetty.com](mailto:paul@jsjetty.com)>

**Sent:** Wednesday, November 19, 2025 10:25 AM

**To:** Flynn, Meghan <[meghan.flynn@montgomeryplanning.org](mailto:meghan.flynn@montgomeryplanning.org)>

**Cc:** Dickel, Stephanie <[Stephanie.Dickel@montgomeryplanning.org](mailto:Stephanie.Dickel@montgomeryplanning.org)>; Gatling, Tsaiquan  
<[tsaiquan.gatling@montgomeryplanning.org](mailto:tsaiquan.gatling@montgomeryplanning.org)>; Lindsey, Amy  
<[amy.lindsey@montgomeryplanning.org](mailto:amy.lindsey@montgomeryplanning.org)>

**Subject:** Re: Chaberton Solar Victoria



**[EXTERNAL EMAIL]** Exercise caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding.

Meghan

Thanks so much for the information. As we discussed, the neighborhood surrounding Chaberton's new proposed projects (Manor Stone, Signal Tree Road, and Magruder Farm) is organized. It successfully fought Chaberton on its original proposal for a CPCN with the State PSC this past summer (Case #9770). Four neighbors were granted legal intervenor status by the PSC back in the summer.

Chaberton's new proposed projects are merely an addition to Project Santa Rosa and an attempt to do an end-around of the original project that it was forced to withdraw. Here is my testimony before the PSC on 10/29 - go to minute 10  
- <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3OJs-siUSq8&t=1013s>

There are endless details about the mismanagement and problems with Santa Rosa & Victoria, which are detailed in the intervenor filings (linked [here](#) - items 33, 37 & 39). I encourage you all not only to review those filings but also to come visit Santa Rosa (13300 Signal Tree). You will learn about how the project directly injures four neighbors' properties, the negative impact on the neighborhood from water run-off, erosion, etc., the environmental/wildlife/livestock destruction, and the damage to the street from all the construction. And that is not to mention the life-safety issues created by the proposed massive enlargement of the solar fields in a neighborhood with no ability to fight fires. Solar has a place in Maryland - just not in residential neighborhoods.

History proves that Chaberton's business model is to flip these projects to out-of-state private equity funds - that's what they did with Santa Rosa. Chaberton will likely do the exact same thing with the new proposed projects, i.e., sell this project well before the completion. They have also primarily used out-of-state construction workers, so Maryland and MoCo are not even seeing the supposed (limited) economic benefit they promise in applications. Lastly and most importantly, this combined and enlarged collective project presents real and present life-safety risks from both brush fire and electrocution given the age and frailty of Pepco's grid.

Here are the pictures of the two signs they posted to announce the new phase. They are hardly accessible and certainly are not readable, consistent with the poor quality and misinformation they exhibited in building Santa Rosa. The neighborhood looks forward to further interface with your office. Members are planning on attending the public hearing

when it is scheduled in January.

Please reach out with questions and let me know if you or anyone on your team would like to visit the sites.

Paul Garrett

28 year Potomac resident

C 202-236-4652

On Tue, Nov 18, 2025 at 12:35 PM Flynn, Meghan  
<[meghan.flynn@montgomeryplanning.org](mailto:meghan.flynn@montgomeryplanning.org)> wrote:

Mr. Garrett,

I'm following up on our conversation this morning about the new solar project near you, and with this email I am connecting you to the regulatory supervisors coordinating our review, Stephanie Dickel and Amy Lindsey. I also wanted to amend a piece of incorrect information I gave you – the review period for a Mandatory Referral is 60 days, not 90. So, to estimate a Board date, we'd be looking at mid-January, not mid-February.

For the benefit of the planners copied here, I'll also give a brief summary of our conversation. You are Paul Garrett, living at 13513 Magruder Farm Ct, with an interest in and opposition to the new project called Chaberton Solar Victoria, located on P133 on River Rd, 1000ft West of Signal Tree Lane. The Victoria project consists of:

Forest Conservation: F20260280 for the whole property, this being 38.21 acres according to SDAT, but called 42 acres in the application (applicants are allowed to include prior dedications in calculating tract size).

Mandatory Referrals: MR2026010 for a 2MW facility on the North half of the property, this being 12.2 acres of P133

MR2026011 for a 1.25MW facility on the South half of the property,  
this being 8.3 acres of P133

The Victoria project is adjacent to its sister project, Caberton Santa Rosa, at 13330 Signal Tree Ln. The site plan 820220210 approved the project for a 1.75MW facility on a 10 acre parcel.

Paul, I'll let you know when the project passes intake and the files become available online.  
Please let me know if you have any other questions,

MF



**Meghan Flynn** *she / her*

**Planner | Westcounty Division**

Montgomery County Planning Department

2425 Reddie Dr, Wheaton MD 20902

[Meghan.Flynn@montgomeryplanning.org](mailto:Meghan.Flynn@montgomeryplanning.org)

o: (301) 495-4609 | Info Desk: (301) 495-4610



**From:** [Paul Garrett](#)  
**To:** [Flynn, Meghan](#)  
**Cc:** [Dickel, Stephanie](#); [Gatling, Tsaiquan](#); [Lindsey, Amy](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Chaberton Solar Victoria  
**Date:** Wednesday, November 19, 2025 10:25:31 AM  
**Attachments:** [image001.png](#)  
[image002.png](#)  
[image003.png](#)  
[image004.png](#)  
[image005.png](#)

---

**[EXTERNAL EMAIL]** Exercise caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding.

Meghan

Thanks so much for the information. As we discussed, the neighborhood surrounding Chaberton's new proposed projects (Manor Stone, Signal Tree Road, and Magruder Farm) is organized. It successfully fought Chaberton on its original proposal for a CPCN with the State PSC this past summer (Case #9770). Four neighbors were granted legal intervenor status by the PSC back in the summer.

Chaberton's new proposed projects are merely an addition to Project Santa Rosa and an attempt to do an end-around of the original project that it was forced to withdraw. Here is my testimony before the PSC on 10/29 - go to minute 10 - <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3OJs-siUSq8&t=1013s>

There are endless details about the mismanagement and problems with Santa Rosa & Victoria, which are detailed in the intervenor filings (linked [here](#) - items 33, 37 & 39). I encourage you all not only to review those filings but also to come visit Santa Rosa (13300 Signal Tree). You will learn about how the project directly injures four neighbors' properties, the negative impact on the neighborhood from water run-off, erosion, etc., the environmental/wildlife/livestock destruction, and the damage to the street from all the construction. And that is not to mention the life-safety issues created by the proposed massive enlargement of the solar fields in a neighborhood with no ability to fight fires. Solar has a place in Maryland - just not in residential neighborhoods.

History proves that Chaberton's business model is to flip these projects to out-of-state private equity funds - that's what they did with Santa Rosa. Chaberton will likely do the exact same thing with the new proposed projects, i.e., sell this project well before the completion. They have also primarily used out-of-state construction workers, so Maryland and MoCo are not even seeing the supposed (limited) economic benefit they promise in applications. Lastly and most importantly, this combined and enlarged collective project presents real and present life-safety risks from both brush fire and electrocution given the age and frailty of Pepco's grid.

Here are the pictures of the two signs they posted to announce the new phase. They are hardly accessible and certainly are not readable, consistent with the poor quality and mis-information they exhibited in building Santa Rosa. The neighborhood looks forward to further interface with your office. Members are planning on attending the public hearing when it is scheduled in January.

Please reach out with questions and let me know if you or anyone on your team would like to visit the sites.

Paul Garrett  
28 year Potomac resident  
C 202-236-4652

On Tue, Nov 18, 2025 at 12:35 PM Flynn, Meghan  
<[meghan.flynn@montgomeryplanning.org](mailto:meghan.flynn@montgomeryplanning.org)> wrote:

Mr. Garrett,

I'm following up on our conversation this morning about the new solar project near you, and with this email I am connecting you to the regulatory supervisors coordinating our review, Stephanie Dickel and Amy Lindsey. I also wanted to amend a piece of incorrect information I gave you – the review period for a Mandatory Referral is 60 days, not 90. So, to estimate a Board date, we'd be looking at mid-January, not mid-February.

For the benefit of the planners copied here, I'll also give a brief summary of our conversation. You are Paul Garrett, living at 13513 Magruder Farm Ct, with an interest in and opposition to the new project called Chaberton Solar Victoria, located on P133 on River Rd, 1000ft West of Signal Tree Lane. The Victoria project consists of:

Forest Conservation: F20260280 for the whole property, this being 38.21 acres according to SDAT, but called 42 acres in the application (applicants are allowed to include prior dedications in calculating tract size).

Mandatory Referrals: MR2026010 for a 2MW facility on the North half of the property, this being 12.2 acres of P133

MR2026011 for a 1.25MW facility on the South half of the property, this being 8.3 acres of P133

The Victoria project is adjacent to its sister project, Caberton Santa Rosa, at 13330 Signal Tree Ln. The site plan 820220210 approved the project for a 1.75MW facility on a 10 acre parcel.

Paul, I'll let you know when the project passes intake and the files become available online. Please let me know if you have any other questions,

MF