



THE PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY GOVERNMENT

Office of the Clerk of the Council
301-952-3600

October 19, 2022

DISTRICT COUNCIL PRELIMINARY NOTICE OF CONDITIONAL ZONING APPROVAL

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 27-134 of the Zoning Ordinance of Prince George's County, Maryland, requiring notice of decision of the District Council, a copy of Zoning Ordinance No. 8 - 2022 granting preliminary conditional zoning approval of A-10059 Dobson Ridge (Farms), is attached.

In compliance with the provisions of Section 27-157(b) of the Zoning Ordinance, the applicant must file a written acceptance or rejection of the land use classification as conditionally approved within ninety (90) days from the date of approval by the District Council. Upon receipt by the Clerk's Office of a written acceptance by the applicant, a final Order will be issued with an effective date for conditional approval shown as the date written acceptance was received by the Clerk's Office.

The failure to accept the conditions in writing within ninety (90) days from the date of approval shall be deemed a rejection. Rejection shall void the Map Amendment and revert the property to its prior zoning classification.

Written approval or rejection of conditions must be received by the Clerk's Office no later than the close of business (5:00 p.m.) on January 25, 2023.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

This is to certify that on October 19, 2022, this notice and attached Order were mailed, postage prepaid, to the attorney/correspondent and applicant(s). Notice of final approval will be sent to all persons of record.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Donna J. Brown".

Donna J. Brown
Clerk of the Council



THE PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY GOVERNMENT

Office of the Clerk of the Council
301-952-3600

October 19, 2022

RE: A-10059 Dobson Ridge (Farms)
D.R. Horton, Inc./ Dobson Farms, Applicant

NOTICE OF FINAL DECISION OF THE DISTRICT COUNCIL

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 27-134 of the Zoning Ordinance of Prince George's County, Maryland requiring notice of decision of the District Council, you will find enclosed a copy of Zoning Ordinance No. 8 - 2022 setting forth the action taken by the District Council in this case on October 17, 2022.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

This is to certify that on October 19, 2022 this notice and attached Council order were mailed, postage prepaid, to all persons of record.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Donna J. Brown".

Donna J. Brown
Clerk of the Council

Case No.: A-10059-C
Dobson Ridge (Farms)

Applicant: D.R. Horton, Inc./Dobson Farms

COUNTY COUNCIL OF PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY, MARYLAND,
SITTING AS THE DISTRICT COUNCIL

ZONING ORDINANCE NO. 8-2022

AN ORDINANCE to amend the Zoning Map for the Maryland-Washington Regional District in Prince George's County, Maryland, by an individual Zoning Map Amendment.

WHEREAS, Zoning Map Amendment Application No. 10059 ("A-10059" or "Application") is a request to rezone approximately 581.06 acres of R-E (Residential Estates) and R-A (Rural Agricultural) zoned land to the R-S (Residential Suburban Development) or LCD (Legacy Comprehensive Design) Zone. The Subject Property is located south of McKendree Road and west of Timothy Branch, approximately 1400 feet west of Crain Highway. On the south, the Property runs along the north side of Mattawoman Creek to Gardner Road and expands northward, west of McKendree Village. The Property is also identified as Tax Map 154 and 164 (7 lots and 52 parcels) (see ZHE Exhibit 38, Appendix A for specifics); and

WHEREAS, the application was advertised and the property was posted prior to public hearings, in accordance with all requirements of law; and

WHEREAS, the application was reviewed by the Planning Department's Technical Staff; and

WHEREAS, on June 28, 2021, Technical Staff recommended that the Application be approved without conditions; and

WHEREAS, on July 29, 2021, the Planning Board made the same recommendation and on September 9, 2021, adopted Resolution PGCPB No. 2021-109; and

WHEREAS, on November 29, 2021, the District Council adopted CR-136-2021, thereby approving the Countywide Map Amendment (“CMA”), with an effective date of April 1, 2022; and

WHEREAS, on December 20, 2021, pursuant to Section 27-1905(c)(2) of the prior Zoning Ordinance (2019 Edition), Applicant submitted a written request that the consideration of its Application proceed as amended to request a rezoning to the Legacy Comprehensive Design (“LCD”) Zone, and revised its Basic Plan accordingly; and

WHEREAS, on February 19, 2022, the Technical Staff submitted a memorandum noting that its recommendation of approval would not change if the property were rezoned to the LCD Zone; and

WHEREAS, on March 2, 2022, the Zoning Hearing Examiner (“Examiner”) held an evidentiary hearing on the application; and

WHEREAS, Ms. Evelyn Williams (“Opponent” or “Opposition”) testified in opposition; and

WHEREAS, at the conclusion of the evidentiary hearing, the record was kept open for the receipt of the updated traffic analysis and the record was closed on March 4, 2022; and

WHEREAS, on May 25, 2022, the Examiner recommended that the application request to rezone approximately 581.06 acres of R-E (Residential Estates) and R-A (Rural Agricultural) zoned land to the R-S (Residential Suburban Development) Zone, be approved subject to conditions; and

WHEREAS, on June 21, 2022, Opponent filed a request for oral argument in opposition of the Zoning Hearing Examiner’s Decision; and

WHEREAS, on September 9, 2022, Applicant filed a response to the June 21, 2022 Exceptions and Request for Oral Argument filed by Opponent; and

WHEREAS, a hearing was held before the District Council on September 19, 2022; and

WHEREAS, having carefully considered the issues raised by the opposition at oral argument on September 19, 2022, the District Council adopts, and incorporates by reference, the Examiner's findings and conclusions on each issue raised by the opposition, except as otherwise indicated herein; and

WHEREAS, the District Council makes the following additional findings and conclusions:

- I. A-10059 meets the requirements of approval pursuant to Section 27-195 of the prior Zoning Ordinance and is supported by substantial evidence.

Opponent generally contends without substantiated evidence that A-10059 will have a significantly negative impact on Prince George's County's "current poor and lagging educational system, the environment (neighboring streets and land), the current residential areas, and proposes no convincing improvement in the surrounding area" (Opposition Request for Oral Argument). However, the substantial evidence presented in this case (consisting of 82 exhibits and 1,113 pages) supports the conclusion that all of the required findings provided for in Section 27-195 of the prior Zoning Ordinance as well as the applicable purposes (Section 27-511 of the prior Zoning Ordinance) have been met and are supported by uncontroverted substantial evidence. Opponent's contentions are not supported by probative or substantial evidence in the record and do not make any of the Examiner's findings fairly debatable.

- a. Transportation and other existing or planned private and public facilities will be adequate for the uses proposed.

The District Council finds that the substantial evidence in the record supports a finding that the transportation facilities will be adequate pursuant to Section 27-195(b)(1)(C) of the prior

Zoning Ordinance. A Traffic Impact Study and transform model was prepared and submitted to Transportation Planning Staff for the purposes of providing traffic data for M-NCPPC's use in analyzing the master plan roads utilizing M-NCPPC's TransForm modelling software. (Ex. 10, 13 – 17; Ex. 79 and 82; *see also*, Ex. 48; Tr. pp. 51 - 63). Further the Subject Property is located within Planning area 85A and is subject to the Brandywine Road Club (CR-9-2017). Future entitlement applications will require additional traffic impact analyses as well the participation in the Brandywine Road Club, pursuant to Section 24-124 of the prior Subdivision Regulations.

Pursuant to CR-9-2017, and at the time of the preliminary plan of subdivision, the Brandywine Road Club fee for the future development will be imposed at \$1,338 per dwelling unit to be indexed by the appropriate cost indices to be determined by the Department of Permitting, Inspection, and Enforcement ("DPIE"). Further, in accordance with CB-22-2015, once the appropriate payment is made to the satisfaction of DPIE, at the time of building permit, no further obligation will be required regarding fulfillment of transportation adequacy requirements of Section 24-124(a) of the prior Subdivision Regulations. Consequently, although transportation facilities will be addressed again at the time of the preliminary plan of subdivision pursuant to Subtitle 24, the record shows, and M-NCPPC agreed, that transportation facilities will be adequate once certain mitigation efforts required by the Brandywine Road Club are addressed by Applicant, as required by Section 27-195(b)(1)(C). Thus, transportation and other existing or planned private and public facilities will be adequate for the uses proposed.

- i. Other public facilities are adequate, and in the case of schools, are and will be adequate once the applicable School Facility Surcharge is paid at the time of building permit.

Opponent asserts that the rezoning will not enhance the current "poor educational system in PG County." (Opposition Request for Oral Argument). At the time of preliminary subdivision,

pursuant to Section 24-122.02 of the prior Subdivision Regulations, the impact on school facilities will be analyzed. Further, the District Council takes notice that the Subject Property is located within School Cluster 6, and based on the 2021 Update of the Pupil Yield Factors and Public School Clusters, published on March 22, 2022, provides the following:

- Elementary School Cluster 6 – 78% capacity
- Middle School Cluster 6 – 90% capacity
- High School Cluster 6 – 72% capacity

Furthermore, Section 10-192.01 of the County Code establishes a school facility surcharge that includes an annual adjustment for inflation, unrelated to the provision of adequacy determination in Subtitle 24 or Section 27-195(b)(1)(D) of the prior Zoning Ordinance. The current amount of this surcharge is \$18,900 for building permits issued for all buildings outside of the Capital Beltway that are not adjacent to a mass transit rail station operated by WMATA. This fee will be required to be paid to DPIE at the time of issuance of each building permit. Thus, and notwithstanding the fact that the school capacity is adequate, Applicant will be required to pay the applicable School Facility Surcharge to DPIE in satisfaction of any adequacy requirement.

- ii. The Opposition's contention that A-10059 should include provisions to build new quality medical facilities is not a requirement of approval.

Neither Section 27-195 nor 27-511 of the prior Zoning Ordinance require the Examiner or the District Council to find that Applicant must propose to "build new quality medical facilities." (Opposition Request for Oral Argument). Notwithstanding, the District Council takes note that there are a number of high-quality medical facilities that currently exist in the area surrounding the Subject Property. For example, the Greater Baden Medical Services at Brandywine building (located at 7450 Albert Road, Brandywine, Maryland 20613) is approximately 0.38 mile from the

Subject Property; the MedStar Health building (located at 13590 Brandywine Road, Brandywine, Maryland 20613) is approximately 2.37 miles from the Subject Property; MedStar Southern Maryland Hospital Center and MedStar Health Primary Care at Clinton (located 7503 Surratts Road, Clinton, Maryland 20735) is approximately 5.61 miles from the Subject Property; and Brandywine Volunteer Fire Department (Station 840) (located at 13809 Brandywine Road, Brandywine, Maryland 20613) is approximately 2.45 miles from the Subject Property. Despite Opponent's contentions to the contrary, which are unsubstantiated, the District Council finds that Brandywine is served by a number of high-quality medical facilities that provide a wide range of medical services that are easily accessible.

- b. The environmental relationship reflects compatibility between the requested uses and surrounding uses, and proposes significant improvements through preservation, wetland enhancements, understory enhancement, ecological enhancements, and increasing habitat and biodiversity.

Opposition next argues that the approval of A-10059 will negatively effect the “already poor environment with even more debris on the . . . extremely dirty neighboring streets, green land, and main highways. . . .” (Opposition Request for Oral Argument). However the record is replete with substantial evidence that the proposed rezoning of the Subject Property, in conjunction with the Examiner's recommended conditions (which were proffered by Applicant) will be in conformance with and improve upon the requirements and policies of the Woodlands, Wildlife and Habitat Policy of the Environmental Infrastructure Section within the Subregion V Master Plan; will expand upon wetland protection and growth; and will preserve or enhance sustainability of stream and wooded floodplain. (*See* Ex. 43; Tr. at pp. 35 – 48; Ex. 63, 64, 65, 70, and 71; Ex. 38 at Sec. 7, p. 52 and pp. 32 and 24).

The proposed concept allots for approximately 16% of the site to be cleared for development, and approximately 423.67 acres (72.9%) of the Subject Property will remain as open space. (Ex. 71). It is anticipated that there will be no net loss of woodland on the site and the development will add woodland acreage above and beyond the woodland conservation required. The District Council finds that the application – along with Applicant’s proffers (adopted as conditions herein) – provides a springboard for thoughtfully designed habitat creation with interwoven neighborhoods.

The District Council agrees that the preservation of the expansive Mattawoman floodplain and woodland along with the diverse existing ecology onsite sets the stage for a marquee project showcasing what is environmentally possible in Prince George’s County. (*C.f.* Ex. 43; *See also*, Tr. at pp. 35 – 48; Ex. 63, 64, 65, 70, and 71; Ex. 38 at Sec. 7, p. 52 and pp. 32 and 24). The Subject Property sits abandoned, unmaintained, and its habitat value challenged by encroaching invasive species and undesirable habitats. Applicant’s expert arboriculturist and landscape architect, Steve Allison, testified that every inch of the Subject Property has been walked and mapped over a period of months to investigate all of the unique features of the Subject Property. (Tr. at p. 37, Line 1-14). In doing so, among other things that are detailed in testimony and exhibits (including Exhibit 43 and Exhibit 40), the Basic Plan includes a comprehensive plan that provides for (i) stream corridor assessment surveys with Natural Resource Inventory (“NRI”) plan review; (ii) on-site woodland conservation; (iii) creation and enhancement of wetlands with adjoining meadows that focus on providing wildlife habitat; (iv) enhancing biodiversity in woodland understory; and (v) ecological enhancements through selective environmental site design that both replicate and increase biodiversity of the local ecology. The District Council agrees that the

preservation and enhancement of the existing woodland and wetland systems will benefit the Mattawoman watershed by providing nearly 400 acres of woodland for this unique site.

The substantial evidence in the record supports a finding that the environmental relationship reflects compatibility between the requested uses and surrounding uses. The application and the Basic Plan satisfies Section 27-195(b)(1)(E) of the prior Zoning Ordinance.

- II. In approving A-10059, neither Sections 27-195 nor 27-511 require the District Council to find that the rezoning will not slow or negate growth in the current residential property values.

Although Opponent asserts that the approval of A-10059 will negatively affect current property values, there is no evidence in the record to support such a contention nor is there a requirement that the District Council find that A-10059 will not negate residential property values. Instead, and as the substantial evidence in the record shows, A-10059 satisfies the applicable goals, policies, and strategies of the applicable planning documents – namely *Plan Prince George's 2035 Approved General Plan* (“Plan 2035”) and the *Subregion 5 Master Plan*.

Beginning on Page 100, Plan 2035 sets forth twelve (12) Land Use and eight (8) Housing and Neighborhood Policies. These policies include goals and strategies aimed at promoting the health, safety and welfare of current and future residents and workers. The policies aim to direct higher density development to Regional Transit Districts and Local Centers and aim to ensure that a mix of housing is provided, including accessibility and affordability across the County and within developments. The application meets these goals notwithstanding that not all of the policies are within Applicant’s control, but A-10059 helps advance those that are. (*See* Ex. 38 at pp. 13 – 28; and Ex. 48 at pp. 5 – 15; *See also* Tr. at pp. 77 – 84 (regarding Master Plan conformance); Ex. 45). The District Council finds that A-10059 conforms to the principles and guidelines of the Master

Plan related to environmental issues and with respect to the number of dwelling units for Residential Low and Residential Low Transition areas.

Further, other public facilities are adequate (libraries and fire facility) or, in the case of schools, will be once appropriate surcharges are paid at the time of preliminary plan of subdivision review. Police facilities are not mentioned within subsection 27-195(b)(1)(D), but the record addressed the fact that Applicant may either seek waiver from the adequacy test for police via Council Resolution, or other mitigation may be needed if police response times are not met. Police response times, however, will be tested with the subdivision, and the District Council notes that based on the current 12-month rolling average, police response times in the vicinity of the Subject Property are currently being met. In addition, the areas proposed for development are within Water and Sewer category 4 (Community System Adequate Development Planning). Section 27-195(b)(1)(D) is met.

Finally, the Examiner's decision indicated approval of the R-S Zone and not the LCD Zone. On this issue, the District Council adopts, and incorporates by reference, the People's Zoning Counsel's analysis regarding the application and approval of the LCD Zone. In opining that the LCD Zone may not be imposed, the Examiner relies on Sections 27-3601(b)(2) and 27-4205(a); however, those sections of the new Zoning Ordinance are not applicable to A-10059. That is, Section 27-3601 deals with a zoning map amendment ("ZMA") filed pursuant to the new Zoning Ordinance, and not the prior Zoning Ordinance. A-10059 is not a ZMA filed pursuant to Section 27-3601; instead, it is a ZMA filed pursuant to Section 27-195 of the prior Zoning Ordinance.

A-10059 was accepted for review on February 17, 2021, more than a year prior to the effectuation of the new Zoning Ordinance. The publication of the Technical Staff Report (June 28, 2021); the Planning Board hearing (July 29, 2021); the adoption of the Planning Board's

resolution (September 9, 2021); and the Examiner's hearing (March 2, 2022) all occurred prior to the effectuation of the new Zoning Ordinance (April 1, 2022). Moreover, Section 27-1703(a) specifically provides:

Any development application, including a permit application or an application for zoning classification, that is filed and accepted prior to the effective date of this Ordinance may be reviewed and decided in accordance with the Zoning Ordinance and Subdivision Regulations in existence at the time of the acceptance of said application. An application for zoning classification decided after the effective date of this Ordinance must result in a zone set forth within this Ordinance.

Thus, the District Council agrees with the People's Zoning Counsel, Technical Staff, and Applicant that A-10059 must be reviewed and decided in accordance with Section 27-195 of the prior Zoning Ordinance (which it is). Further, since the decision of A-10059 is now occurring after April 1, 2022 (the effective date of the new Zoning Ordinance), it must result in a zone set forth within the new Zoning Ordinance pursuant to Section 27-1703(a). Based on this and given the inapplicability of Section 27-3601 (of the new Zoning Ordinance), the Examiner's conclusion that that section prohibits the ability to impose the LCD Zone for this ZMA application is incorrect.

The Transitional Provisions of Section 27-1703(a) contained in the new Zoning Ordinance contemplated this very scenario and made accommodations for the same when it unambiguously provided that a pending ZMA may continue to be reviewed and approved under the prior Zoning Ordinance (in this case Section 27-195), but that the decision to approve the pending ZMA after the effectuation date of the new Zoning Ordinance (April 1, 2022) must result in a zone set forth in the new Zoning Ordinance.

With the endorsement of the CMA by the Planning Board on October 28, 2021, and the adoption of the CMA by the District Council on November 29, 2021, Applicant, in conformance with Part 19 of the prior Zoning Ordinance, was required to elect to move forward with A-10059

and elect a new replacement zone based on the new Zoning Ordinance, which it did on December 20, 2021. (Ex. 51, with attachments). This not only ensured compliance with Section 27-1905(c)(2) of the prior Zoning Ordinance (which was still applicable until April 1, 2022), but also ensured future conformance with Section 27-1703(a) (which is now applicable).

On February 19, 2022, James Hunt, Planning Division Chief of the Development Review Division, of M-NCPPC, confirmed, in response to Applicant's December 20, 2021 letter (Ex. 51), that "Technical Staff finds that a new technical staff report is unnecessary as the requested [replacement] from the originally requested R-S Zone to the new LCD Zone has no impact on staff's recommendation in any manner." (Ex. 55).

Consequently, the Examiner's decision to approve the R-S Zone, as the required findings of Section 27-195 have been satisfied and are supported by substantial evidence, results in the affirmative ability for the District Council to approve A-10059 and, pursuant to Section 27-1703(a), impose the LCD Zone as the appropriate replacement zone for the R-S Zone; and

WHEREAS, the Applicant's request to rezone approximately 581.06 acres of R-E (Residential Estates) and R-A (Rural Agricultural) zoned land to the LCD (Legacy Comprehensive Design) Zone is hereby conditionally APPROVED.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED AND ENACTED:

SECTION 1. The Zoning Map for the Maryland-Washington Regional District in Prince George's County, Maryland, is hereby amended to rezone approximately 581.06 acres of R-E (Residential Estates) and R-A (Rural Agricultural) zoned land to the LCD (Legacy Comprehensive Design) Zone, located south of McKendree Road and west of Timothy Branch, approximately 1400 feet west of Crain Highway. On the south, the Property runs along the north side of Mattawoman Creek to Gardner Road and expands northward, west of McKendree Village. The

Property is also identified as Tax Map 154 and 164 (7 lots and 52 parcels) (see ZHE Exhibit 38, Appendix A for specifics).

SECTION 2. The request to rezone approximately 581.06 acres of R-E (Residential Estates) and R-A (Rural Agricultural) zoned land to the LCD (Legacy Comprehensive Design) Zone, is hereby APPROVED, subject to the following Conditions, Development Data, and all other information shown on the Basic Plan:

Development Data Table

Gross Tract Area	581.06 ac.
100-year Floodplain	213.84 ac.
½ Floodplain	106.92 ac.
Net Tract Area*	474.14 ac.
*Net Tract Area=Gross Tract Area-1/2 Floodplain	

Base Density recommended 474.14ac@1.6DU/ac 758

Units Max. Density recommended 474.14ac@2.6DU/ac

1,232 Units Density Proposed 857-1,106 Units

Parcel Identification Table

Tax Map	Grid	Parcel	Parcel ID	Street Address (*Brandywine, MD 20613)	Liber	Folio
164	A3	6	11-1133958	Gardner Road, Waldorf, MD 20601	34595	78 & 87
164	C2	8	11-1156447	*McKendree Road	34595	78 & 87
164	E2	10	11-1152032	*16305 McKendree Road	34677	101 & 110

This application includes the following Lots in the “Country Club Estates” Subdivision (Plat Book WWW 61 Plat No. 51) and acquired by deeds recorded in Liber 34004 at folio 498 and Liber 41072 at folio 211:

Tax Map	Grid	Lot-Block	Parcel ID	Street Address (Brandywine, MD 20613)
164	E1	1-A	11-1156462	7100 Meadow Drive
164	E1	**1-B	11-1156454	Meadow Drive
164	E1	2-B	11-1156470	6901 Meadow Drive
164	E1	3-B	11-1156488	6809 Meadow Drive
164	E1	4-B	11-1156496	6805 Meadow Drive
164	D1	5-B	11-1156504	6801 Meadow Drive
164	D1	1-C	11-1156520	16304 Meadow Court
164	D1	2-C	11-1156538	16308 Meadow Court
164	D1	3-C	11-1156546	16312 Meadow Court
164	D1	4-C	11-1156553	16400 Meadow Court
164	D1	**5-C	11-1156454	Meadow Road
164	D1	6-C	11-1156561	16408 Meadow Court
164	D1	7-C	11-1156579	16412 Meadow Court

164	E1	8-C	11-1156587	6808 Meadow Court
164	E1	Outlot A-C	11-1156512	6900 Meadow Drive
164	D1	1-D	11-1156595	16305 Meadow Court
164	D1	2-D	11-1156603	16309 Meadow Court
164	D1	3-D	11-1156611	16313 Meadow Court
164	D1	4-D	11-1156629	16401 Meadow Court
164	D1	5-D	11-1156637	6708 Meadow Drive
164	D1	**6-D	11-1156454	Meadow Drive
164	D1	7-D	11-1156645	16412 Green View Lane
164	D1	8-D	11-1156652	16408 Green View Lane
164	D1	9-D	11-1156660	16404 Green View Lane
164	D1	10-D	11-1156678	16310 Scenic Avenue
164	D1	11-D	11-1156686	16306 Scenic Avenue
164	D1	1-E	11-1156694	16313 Scenic Avenue
164	D1	2-E	11-1156702	16309 Scenic Avenue
164	D1	3-E	11-1156710	16305 Scenic Avenue
164	D1	1-F	11-1156728	16401 Scenic Avenue
164	D1	2-F	11-1156736	16405 Scenic Avenue
164	D1	3-F	11-1156744	16409 Scenic Avenue
164	D1	11-G	11-1156751	16406 Scenic Avenue
164	D1	12-G	11-1156769	16401 Green View Lane
164	D1	13-G	11-1156777	16405 Green View Lane
164	D1	14-G	11-1156785	16409 Green View Lane
164	D1	15-G	11-1156793	16413 Green View Lane
164	D1	16-G	11-1156801	6608 Meadow Drive
164	D2	17-G	11-1156819	6604 Meadow Drive
164	D1	1-H	11-1156827	6709 Meadow Drive
164	D1	2-H	11-1156835	6705 Meadow Drive
164	D1	3-H	11-1156843	6701 Meadow Drive
164	D1	4-H	11-1156850	6611 Meadow Drive
164	D2	5-H	11-1156868	6605 Meadow Drive
164	D2	6-H	11-1156876	6601 Meadow Drive
164	E1	p/o Outlot A-K	11-1156884	16301 McKendree Road

** Lot 1, Block B; Lot 5, Block C; and Lot 6, Block D were included in the deeds recorded in Liber 34004 at folio 498 and Liber 41072 at folio 211, but were not included in the Country Club Estates Subdivision Plat. Said lots are identified as Parcel 35 on Tax Map 164.

Conditions:

At the appropriate stage of development:

1. The Applicant shall provide a stream corridor assessment survey with a NRI plan review.
2. The Applicant shall meet the entire Woodland Conservation requirement on-site for the prior R-S Zone applicable prior to April 1, 2022. The Tree Canopy Coverage requirements shall be met on-site pursuant to the standards of the prior R-S Zone applicable prior to April 1, 2022.

3. The Applicant shall create new wetland and enhance existing wetlands with adjoining meadows focusing on providing wildlife habitat.
4. The Applicant shall provide selective woodland understory enhancement focusing on habitat and biodiversity.
5. The Applicant shall provide ecological enhancement through selective environmental site design planting motifs that both replicate and increase the biodiversity of the local ecology.

The Approved Basic Plan is ZHE Exhibit 56.

SECTION 3. A building permit, use permit, or subdivision permit, as applicable, may not be issued or approved for the subject property except in accordance with the conditions set forth in this Ordinance.

SECTION 4. If the Applicant fails to accept the land use classification conditionally approved in this Ordinance, in writing, within ninety (90) days, the subject property shall revert to the R-E (Residential Estates) and R-A (Rural Agricultural) Zones.

SECTION 5. BE IT FURTHER ENACTED that this Ordinance shall become effective on the date of its enactment.

ENACTED this 17th day of October, 2022, by the following vote:

In Favor: Council Members Franklin, Harrison, Hawkins, Medlock, Streeter, Turner and Taveras.

Opposed: Council Members Burroughs, Dernoga and Ivey.

Abstained: Council Member Glaros.

Absent:

Vote: 7-3-1.

COUNTY COUNCIL OF PRINCE GEORGE'S
COUNTY, MARYLAND, SITTING AS THE
DISTRICT COUNCIL FOR THAT PART OF THE
MARYLAND-WASHINGTON REGIONAL
DISTRICT IN PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY,
MARYLAND

By: Calvin S. Hawkins, II
Calvin S. Hawkins, II, Chair

ATTEST:

Donna J. Brown

Donna J. Brown
Clerk of the Council