

PGCPB No. 2025-043

File No. 4-24027

R E S O L U T I O N

WHEREAS, Ritchie Hill II, LLC is the owner of a 40.11-acre parcel of land known as Parcel 40, said property being in the 15th Election District of Prince George's County, Maryland, and being zoned Commercial, General and Office (CGO) and Military Installation Overlay (MIO); and

WHEREAS, on March 24, 2025, Ritchie Hill II, LLC filed an application for approval of a Preliminary Plan of Subdivision for six parcels; and

WHEREAS, the application for approval of the aforesaid Preliminary Plan of Subdivision, also known as Preliminary Plan 4-24027 for Ritchie Station Marketplace was presented to the Prince George's County Planning Board of The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission by the staff of the Commission at a public hearing on May 29, 2025; and

WHEREAS, new Regulations for the Subdivision of Land, Subtitle 24, Prince George's County Code went into effect on April 1, 2022; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 24-1900 *et seq.* of the Prince George's County Subdivision Regulations, subdivision applications submitted and accepted as complete before April 1, 2025, may be reviewed and decided in accordance with the Subdivision Regulations, Subtitle 24, Prince George's County Code in existence prior to April 1, 2022 ("prior Subdivision Regulations"); and

WHEREAS, the applicant has complied with the procedures required in order to proceed with development under the prior Subdivision Regulations contained in Section 24-1904 of the Prince George's County Subdivision Regulations; and

WHEREAS, therefore, the Prince George's County Planning Board of The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission reviewed the application under the prior Subdivision Regulations; and

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

WHEREAS, at the May 29, 2025 public hearing, the Prince George's County Planning Board heard testimony and received evidence submitted for the record on the aforesaid application.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that pursuant to the provisions of Subtitles 24 and 25, Prince George's County Code, the Prince George's County Planning Board APPROVED Type 1 Tree Conservation Plan TCPI-100-04-04 and APPROVED Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-24027 for six parcels, subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to signature approval of the preliminary plan of subdivision, the plan shall be revised as follows:
 - a. Provide the recording reference for the two existing 22-foot-wide access easements.

- b. Add “master plan right-of-way” to the label of “Future 70’ R.O.W. for I-413.”
2. In accordance with Section 24-123(a)(1) of the prior Subdivision Regulations, prior to signature approval of the preliminary plan of subdivision, the plan shall be revised to show an easement extending from the end of Ritchie Station Court to the southern end of the subject property. This easement shall be a minimum of 70 feet in width to allow the future construction of the master plan road to the Prince George’s County Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T) standards, and shall be publicly dedicated upon request by DPW&T. This easement may be used for parking and circulation associated with the parking compound, as long as it does not impede the future use of the master plan road. The applicant shall also dedicate all needed slope and drainage easements associated with the master plan road extension on the site upon request of DPW&T, provided a construction schedule is established to ensure the completion of the master plan road south to D’Arcy Road. This easement shall be extinguished if the master plan road is removed by a subsequent master plan document.
3. In accordance with the prior approved Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-04184 (PGCPB Resolution No. 05-115), as agreed to previously by the applicant, any building structures proposed within the 70-foot-wide master-planned road easement will require approval from the Prince George’s County Department of Public Works and Transportation. The property owner agrees to remove, at their expense, any said structures prior to construction of the master-planned road.
4. Development of this site shall be in conformance with Stormwater Management Concept Plan 19661-2005-07, and any subsequent revisions.
5. In accordance with Section 24-122(a) of the prior Prince George’s County Subdivision Regulations, prior to approval, the final plat of subdivision shall include granting of a minimum 10-foot-wide public utility easement along Ritchie Station Court, in accordance with the approved preliminary plan of subdivision.
6. Prior to signature approval of the preliminary plan of subdivision, the Type 1 tree conservation plan shall be revised as follows:
 - a. Revise General Note 1 to identify the associated approved preliminary plans of subdivision: 4-04184, 4-05133, 4-16025, 4-16021, and 4-24027.
 - b. Revise the woodland conservation worksheet to be in the standard form of The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission website titled “1990/2010 WC Worksheet Template” as an excel spreadsheet.
7. Development of this subdivision shall be in conformance with an approved Type 1 Tree Conservation Plan, TCPI-100-04-04, pursuant to Section 25-121 of the Prince George’s County Code. The following note shall be placed on the final plat of subdivision:

“This development is subject to restrictions shown on the approved Type I Tree Conservation Plan (TCPI-100-04-04 or most recent revision), or as modified by the

Type II Tree Conservation Plan and precludes any disturbance or installation of any structure within specific areas. Failure to comply will mean a violation of an approved Tree Conservation Plan and will make the owner subject to mitigation under the 2010 Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance. This property is subject to the notification provisions of CB-60-2005. Copies of all approved Tree Conservation Plans for the subject property are available in the offices of the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission, Prince George's County Planning Department."

8. At the time of final plat of subdivision, a conservation easement shall be described by bearings and distances, in conformance with Section 24-130(b)(5) of the prior Prince George's County Subdivision Regulations. The conservation easement shall contain the delineated primary management area except for any approved impacts and shall be reviewed by the Environmental Planning Section of the Prince George's County Planning Department prior to approval of the final plat. The following note shall be placed on the plat:

"Conservation easements described on this plat are areas where the installation of structures and roads and the removal of vegetation are prohibited without prior written consent from the M-NCPPC Planning Director or designee. The removal of hazardous trees, limbs, branches, or trunks is allowed."

9. Prior to approval, the final plat of subdivision shall include:
 - a. Existing and proposed access easements and their respective recording references.
 - b. A note stating that direct vehicular access from Parcel 46 to Ritchie Station Court is denied.
 - c. A note stating that direct vehicular access to a public road is provided from Parcels 41, 42, 43, 45, and 46 in accordance with Section 24-128(b)(9) of the prior Prince George's County Subdivision Regulations.
 - d. A note stating that direct vehicular access to I-95/495 (Capital Beltway) is denied.
10. Prior to issuance of permits for this subdivision, a Type 2 tree conservation plan shall be approved, pursuant to Section 25-119(a)(2) of the Prince George's County Code. The following note shall be placed on the final plat of subdivision:

"This plat is subject to the recordation of a Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Easement pursuant to Section 25-122(d) with the Liber and folio reflected on the Type II Tree Conservation Plan, when approved."

11. At the time of final plat, the applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall submit to The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission, for review and approval, a new draft Declaration of Restrictive Covenants and/or easement, or an amendment to the existing Declaration of Restrictive Covenants recorded in Book 39053 page 556, and Book 50719 page 80, per Section 24-128(b)(15) of the prior Prince George's County Subdivision

Regulations, over the shared access for Parcels 41 through 46. The limits of the shared access easements shall be reflected on the final plat. Prior to recordation of the final plat, the Declaration of Restrictive Covenants and/or easement shall be recorded in the Prince George's County Land Records, and the book/page of the document shall be indicated on the final plat with the limits of the shared access.

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

1. The subdivision, as modified with conditions, meets the applicable legal requirements of Subtitles 24 and 27 of the Prince George's County Code and the Land Use Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland.
2. **Background**—The subject site is located on the west side of the I-95/495 (Capital Beltway), approximately 3,000 feet south of its intersection with Ritchie Marlboro Road and is within Tax Map 82, Grids C1 and D1. The property totals 40.11 acres and consists of Parcel 40, recorded in the Prince George's County Land Records in Plat Book ME 269, page 45. The property is subject to the 2010 *Approved Subregion 4 Master Plan and Sectional Map Amendment* (Subregion 4 Master Plan and SMA).

The property lies in the Commercial, General and Office (CGO) Zone, as well as the Military Installation Overlay (MIO) Zone for height. However, this preliminary plan of subdivision (PPS) was submitted and reviewed under the applicable provisions of the Prince George's County Zoning Ordinance and Prince George's County Subdivision Regulations effective prior to April 1, 2022 (the "prior Zoning Ordinance" and the "prior Subdivision Regulations"), pursuant to Section 24-1900 et seq. of the current Subdivision Regulations. Under the prior Zoning Ordinance, the entire site was in the Commercial Shopping Center (C-S-C) and Military Installation Overlay (M-I-O) Zones, which were effective prior to April 1, 2022.

The property is currently improved with 190,563 square feet of commercial development as part of the existing Ritchie Station Marketplace shopping center. The Ritchie Station Marketplace shopping center is located on approximately 121.66 acres, including 848,387-square-foot of existing and approved shopping center uses. All existing structures are to remain with no additional development or increase in square footage. This PPS allows six new parcels (Parcels 41–46) from previously approved Parcel 40, which requires the approval of a new PPS in accordance with Section 24-107(b) of the prior Zoning Ordinance.

The subject PPS allows subdivision of existing Parcel 40 into six parcels. Parcels 41, 42, 43, 44, and 46 each contain one existing retail building, and Parcel 45 consists solely of environmental features. Parcels 44 and 45 have frontage on the Capital Beltway along the southeastern boundary of the site, and Parcels 44 and 46 have frontage on Ritchie Station Court along the northwest boundary of the site. However, the subject PPS includes one vehicular access point to all parcels through a 22-foot-wide existing and approved private access easement connecting to Ritchie Station Court. A large parking lot is located centrally on the site, which jointly serves all the retail buildings, and is organized along two drive aisles connected to adjoining drive aisles within the larger Ritchie Station Marketplace shopping center.

The subject preliminary plan of subdivision (PPS) qualifies for review under the prior Zoning Ordinance and prior Subdivision Regulations because it meets the requirements of Section 24-1904 of the current Subdivision Regulations. In accordance with Section 24-1904(a), a pre-application conference was held on September 20, 2024. In accordance with Section 24-1904(b), the applicant provided a statement of justification (SOJ) which stated that they were requesting to use the prior regulations. In accordance with Section 24-1904(c), this PPS is supported by and subject to an approved Certificate of Adequacy, ADQ 2024-051.

3. **Setting**—The site is located within Planning Area 75A. The subject property is located on the west side of the Capital Beltway, approximately 3,000 feet south of its intersection with Ritchie Marlboro Road. The site is bounded to the north by existing commercial development in the CGO Zone (previously the C-S-C Zone); to the east by existing commercial development in the Commercial, Service Zone (previously the Commercial Miscellaneous Zone) and the Capital Beltway; to the west by single-family attached (townhouse) dwelling units in the Forestville Park subdivision in the Residential, Single-Family-Attached (RSF-A) Zone (previously the Townhouse Zone); to the south and southwest by existing industrial development in the Industrial, Heavy Zone (previously Heavy Industrial Zone). The subject property and its surroundings are also located in the MIO Zone for height (previously M-I-O Zone).
4. **Development Data Summary**—The following information relates to the subject PPS and the evaluated development.

	EXISTING	EVALUATED
Zones	CGO/MIO	C-S-C/M-I-O
Use(s)	Commercial	Commercial
Acreage	40.1	40.1
Parcels	1	6
Outlots	0	0
Dwelling Units	0	0
Gross Floor Area	190,563 sq. ft.	190,563 sq. ft.
Variance	No	No
Variation	No	No

The subject PPS (4-24027) was accepted for review on March 24, 2024. Pursuant to Section 24-119(d)(2) of the prior Subdivision Regulations, the PPS was reviewed by the Subdivision and Development Review Committee, which held a meeting on April 11, 2025, at which comments were provided to the applicant. Revised plans were received on April 18, 2025, which were used for the analysis contained herein.

5. **Previous Approvals**—Parcel 40 is the subject of several prior approvals, which include a Prince George’s County District Council Bill CB-65-2003, a prior PPS 4-04184, and a prior detailed site plan DSP-04080 that includes multiple subsequent amendments. All prior approvals are separately discussed in detail below:

The overall Ritchie Station Marketplace property has a long approval history, starting when it was originally zoned Planned Industrial/Employment Park (I-3) and Rural Residential (R-R) in the 1980s.

On November 25, 2003, the District Council adopted Council Bill CB-65-2003, which amended the use tables in the R-R and I-3 Zones, to permit any use allowed in the C-S-C Zone subject to certain specific criteria.

On July 14, 2005, PPS 4-04184 was approved by the Prince George's County Planning Board, for 101.83 acres of property in the I-3 and R-R Zones, to allow development of up to 1,000,000 square feet of retail space or equivalent development, subject to 20 conditions (PGCPB Resolution No. 05-115), which included the subject property. Most of those conditions were met at the time of PPS 4-04184 approval. The conditions relevant to this review are listed below in **bold**, with the responses following in plain text. The subject PPS 4-24027 supersedes 4-04184 for the subject property.

Conditions 1, 2, 3, and 4 are related to certain transportation improvements, required to support the development. Since the approval of the PPS, buildings have been constructed pursuant to those approvals. Therefore, Conditions 1–4 were met at the building permit stage.

5. **Prior to signature approval of the preliminary plan of subdivision, the plan shall be revised to show a parcel extending from the end of Ritchie Station Court to the southern end of the subject property. This parcel shall be a minimum 70 feet in width to allow the future construction of the master plan road to DPW&T standards, and shall be publicly dedicated upon request by DPW&T. This easement may be used for parking and circulation associated with the parking compound as long as it does not impede the future use of the master plan road. The applicant shall also dedicate all needed slope and drainage easements associated with the master plan road extension on the site upon request of DPW&T, provided a construction schedule is established to ensure the completion of the master plan road south to D'Arcy Road. This easement shall be extinguished if the master plan road is removed by a subsequent master plan document.**

The PPS delineates the 70-foot-wide right-of-way (ROW), along the extended parcel from the end of Ritchie Station Court as consistent with prior approvals. This PPS was referred to the Prince George's County Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T). No comments have been received by the operating agency. The ROW for master-planned industrial road I-413 (Hampton Park Boulevard) shall still be shown and labeled on the PPS in accordance with Section 24-123(a)(1) of the Subdivision Regulations, though it is not required to be shown as dedicated. Also, no development is included that will impede the area previously set aside pursuant to this prior condition. Therefore, this condition is carried forward to this PPS with modifications.

6. **Total development within the subject property shall be limited to 1,000,000 square feet of retail space, or equivalent development which generates no more than 554 AM and 1,802 PM new peak hour vehicle trips. Any development generating an impact greater than that identified herein above shall require a new preliminary plan of subdivision with a new determination of the adequacy of transportation facilities.**

This condition is applicable to this PPS; however, this PPS does not include any additional gross square footage, but rather creates new parcels and lot lines from a previously approved parcel (Parcel 40). The current shopping center includes a total of 848,387 square feet of existing and approved shopping center uses, resulting in 380 AM and 1,579 PM total trips, with a remainder of 174 AM and 223 PM trips left for future development. Any future development within the limits of this PPS will need to remain within the trip cap established with this condition.

13. **At time of final plat, a conservation easement shall be described by bearings and distances. The conservation easement shall contain the delineated Patuxent River Primary Management Area, except for areas of approved impacts, and shall be reviewed by the Environmental Planning Section prior to approval of the final plat. The following note shall be placed on the plat:**

“Conservation easements described on this plat are areas where the installation of structures and roads and the removal of vegetation are prohibited without prior written consent from the M-NCPPC Planning Director or designee. The removal of hazardous trees, limbs, branches, or trunks is allowed.”

This condition was addressed with the existing final plat for Parcel 40; however, a new final plat will be required. Therefore, this condition is carried forward.

18. **Development of this subdivision shall be in compliance with an approved Type I Tree Conservation Plan (TCPI/100/04). The following notes shall be placed on the Final Plat of Subdivision:**

“This development is subject to restrictions shown on the approved Type I Tree Conservation Plan (TCPI/100/04), or as modified by the Type II Tree Conservation Plan, and precludes any disturbance or installation of any structure within specific areas. Failure to comply will mean a violation of an approved Tree Conservation Plan and will make the owner subject to mitigation under the Woodland Conservation/Tree Preservation Policy.”

This condition was addressed with the existing final plat for Parcel 40; however, a new final plat will be required. This condition is carried forward.

On May 12, 2008, the District Council approved Zoning Map Amendment (ZMA) A-9989-C to rezone the subject property from the Light Industrial (I-3) and R-R Zones to the C-S-C Zone, for the overall 116.5-acre property, inclusive of Parcel 40 (Zoning Ordinance No. 14–2008). The approval of this application was subject to two conditions, which are relevant to any future DSP review.

On June 2, 2005, DSP-04080 for rough grading and installation of infrastructure for retail development was approved by the Planning Board for 101.83 acres (PGCPB Resolution No. 05-118), which included the subject property. Subsequently, 27 amendments have been approved by the District Council, the Planning Board, and the Prince George’s County Planning Director for various improvements. All of these DSPs included development pursuant to the approved PPS 4-04184. The subject PPS allows subdivision of existing Parcel 40 into six new parcels, with no new immediate development. As such there are no conditions of previous approvals that are applicable to this PPS. Several buildings on the property have been approved and constructed under several DSP applications. Final plat 5-24130 was approved by the Planning Director on March 11, 2025, for subdivision of Parcel 21 and Parcel 22 to Parcel 39 and Parcel 40. Several DSPs were approved for the development on Parcel 21 and Parcel 22 that currently exists on the property (Parcel 40). The applicable DSPs are listed below:

- On December 29, 2015, DSP-04080-18 was approved by the Planning Director to add 90,183 square feet of retail and restaurant buildings. This revision was for the purpose of adding a 10,875-square-foot multitenant building, a 7,757-square-foot Olive Garden Restaurant to Parcel 20, an 8,554-square-foot multitenant building to Parcel 22, and a 45,960-square-foot Regency Furniture Store and 17,000-square-foot retail space to Parcel 22.
- On June 17, 2017, DSP-04080-19 was approved by the Planning Director to add a 5,437-square-foot Buffalo Wild Wings to Parcel 26, a 2,600-square-foot Panda Express to Parcel 27, and a 112-room Residence Inn hotel to Parcel 33. Minor changes to the drive aisles on Parcel 22 and the Gold’s Gym signage on Parcel 25 were also included.
- On December 30, 2020, DSP-04080-23 was approved by the Planning Director to show a new 55,009-square-foot retail store Hobby Lobby on Parcel 21 and Parcel 22 and adding a vehicle display area on Parcel 23.
- On November 18, 2021, DSP-04080-25 was approved by the Planning Director to construct an 80,980-square-foot Floor & Decor building on Parcel 21 and to construct a food and drinking establishment, Tropical Smoothie, on Parcel 22. The approved Tropical Smoothie building was an amendment to the prior approved 8,554-square-foot multitenant building on Parcel 22, which was not built.

6. **Community Planning**—The 2014 *Plan Prince George’s 2035 Approved General Plan* (Plan 2035) and conformance with the master plan are evaluated as follows:

Plan 2035

Plan Prince George's 2035 designates the area in the Established Communities Growth Policy area. The vision for Established Communities is most appropriate for context-sensitive infill and low- to medium-density development. Plan 2035 recommends maintaining and enhancing existing public services (police and fire/EMS), facilities (such as libraries, schools, parks, and open space), and infrastructure in these areas (such as sidewalks) to ensure that the needs of existing residents are met" (page 20).

Master Plan

According to Plan 2035, all planning documents which were duly adopted and approved prior to the date of adoption of Plan 2035 remain in full force and effect, except for the designation of tiers, corridors, and centers, until those plans are revised or superseded. Pursuant to Section 24-121(a)(5) of the prior Subdivision Regulations, a PPS must conform to the area master plan, unless events have occurred to render the relevant recommendations no longer appropriate, or the Prince George's County District Council has not imposed the recommended zoning.

The subject property is within the master plan and "envision[s] balancing new development, that optimizes existing infrastructure, with maintaining and revitalizing existing neighborhoods and commercial areas through redevelopment, adaptive reuse, preservation, and conservation" (page 48). The master plan recommends a future land use of industrial on the subject property (Map 4-3: Proposed Land Use Plan, page 62). This property is within Zone 3 adjacent to Living Area E (page 107). Zone 3 is the largest of all the zones, and it was made clear from the community's input and the planning team's observations that additional neighborhood commercial and retail services are needed in the area (page 112).

The existing use does not strictly conform with the recommended land use. However, it is noted that the subject property has a long approval history. The commercial shopping center was permitted in the zone subject to CB-65-2003 and was adopted by the District Council on November 25, 2003. Future development or redevelopment on the subject property should support the goals of the master plan by incorporating applicable goals, policies, and strategies, which are listed below. Future development applications on the intended subdivided parcels should look to work collaboratively with other owners/tenants and the Prince George's County Planning Department to ensure that development is coordinated and does not create a fragmented commercial center. All future development should be guided by the master plan and further implementation studies pertaining to the subject property.

Recommendations (pages xviii–xx)

Transportation and Trails System

- **Ensure the transportation facilities are adequate prior to approval of any new development within established neighborhoods and in the designated centers in accordance with the procedures provided in the County Code.**
- **Facilitate the safe and orderly movement of traffic.**

Environmental

- **Support a subregion policy to direct redevelopment and infill development to existing and planned development areas instead of “greenfield” areas.**

Quality of Life/Community Development

- **Provide a continuous network of sidewalks and bikeways to facilitate pedestrian use and access.**

As previously stated, the subject PPS does not include any new development. However, each new parcel demonstrates adequate transportation access to Ritchie Station Court and the existing parking lots.

Living Areas E and F (Zone 3)

Recommendations

Land Use and Community Design (pages 116–117)

- **Remove or relocate the land uses that cause truck traffic impacts in the residential areas.**

Environment (page 117)

Policy 1 - Preserve environmental resources.

Strategies

- **Address flood-prone areas and areas with recurring drainage issues through retrofitting, stream bank stabilization, reducing the amount of impervious area, increasing plantings in stream bank buffer areas, and coordinating efforts across agencies to improve water quality. The areas in Zone 3 requiring evaluation include the Southwest Branch and its tributaries, Oxon Run tributary, and the Henson Creek tributary.**

Chapter 7 Environment — Environmental Site Design (page 204)

Environmental Site Design (ESD) processes have been identified as ways to improve water quality throughout Prince George’s County, and these methods can be applied in Subregion 4.

Policy 3 - Require on-site management of stormwater through the use of environmentally sensitive stormwater management techniques (i.e., fully implement the requirements of ESD) for all development and redevelopment activities.

Strategies

- **Increase stormwater storage in appropriate areas, such as open space and preserved and constructed wetlands.**

The subject PPS does not include any modifications to the previously approved development within the project site, and is retaining the environmental features and ecological functions on the property.

Green Buildings/Sustainability (page 208)

Policy 1 - Implement environmentally sensitive building techniques that reduce overall energy consumption.

Strategies

- **Promote environmentally sensitive building techniques as designated by the U.S. Green Building Council.**
- **Require the use of latest environmental technologies in building and site designs.**

The subject PPS does not include any new development. The green area and the stormwater management runoff strategies within the project limits remain unchanged under this PPS.

Tree Canopy and Green Space (page 209)

Policy 1 - Preserve, restore, and enhance the existing tree canopy. (page 210)

Strategies

- **Require a minimum of ten percent tree canopy coverage on all new development and redevelopment projects.**
- **Encourage the preservation of existing specimen trees (defined as trees 30 inches or greater in diameter at breast height) at the time of development review.**
- **Increase the percentage of urban tree canopy by planting trees and other vegetation in public and private open spaces, along roadways, in median strips, and in residential communities.**
- **Ensure that root space is sufficient for long term survival.**

The subject PPS does not modify the forest or tree cover from the previously approved and acceptable limits.

Chapter 8 Transportation Systems, Transportation Recommendations

Goals (page 233)

- **Provide a safe, affordable, and attractive multimodal transportation system in the Subregion 4 area that:**
 - **Supports the development pattern, and the land uses associated with that development pattern, recommended by this master plan.**
 - **Reflects the 2002 General Plan goals and policies for the Subregion 4 area.**

Policy 5 - Ensure the transportation facilities are adequate prior to approval of any new development within established neighborhoods and in the designated centers in accordance with the procedures provided in the County Code. (page 239)

Chapter 9 Public Facilities, Public Safety

Policy 2 - Reduce citizen fear of and susceptibility to crime and address public safety issues in neighborhoods. (page 267)

Strategies

- **Incorporate Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED) measures in all new development and redevelopment to foster “eyes on the street.”**
- **Construct sidewalks, bicycle lanes, traffic calming devices, and streetlights where appropriate.**

The subject PPS does not include any new development. Any further development on the parcels should incorporate CPTED measures and ensure pedestrian access within the context of the larger commercial center.

Sectional Map Amendment/Zoning

The 2010 Subregion 4 SMA retained the subject property in the C-S-C Zone.

On November 29, 2021, the District Council approved CR-136-2021, the Countywide Map Amendment (CMA) which reclassified the subject property from the C-S-C Zone to the CGO Zone, effective April 1, 2022. However, this PPS was reviewed pursuant to the prior C-S-C zoning.

Aviation/Military Installation Overlay Zone

This property is within the prior M-I-O Zone and is subject to the requirements for height as outlined in 27-548.54 of the prior Zoning Ordinance. Any future development must comply with the requirements for the height for properties located in the Transitional Surface (7:1) G - Right Runway and the App/Dep Clearance (50:1) B - North End.

7. **Stormwater Management**—An application for a major subdivision must include an approved stormwater management (SWM) concept plan, or indication that an application for such approval has been filed with the appropriate agency or the municipality having approval authority. In accordance with Section 24-120(a)(8), an approved Site Development Concept Plan (19661-2005-07) and associated letter was submitted with the current PPS which is valid until August 28, 2026. No further information pertaining to SWM is required, at this time.

Development of the site, in conformance with the SWM concept plan, will ensure that no on-site or downstream flooding occurs. Therefore, this PPS satisfies the requirements of Section 24-130 of the prior Subdivision Regulations.

8. **Parks and Recreation**—In accordance with Section 24-134(a) of the prior Subdivision Regulations, the subject PPS is exempt from mandatory dedication of parkland requirements because it consists of nonresidential development.
9. **Transportation**—This PPS was reviewed for conformance with the 2009 *Approved Countywide Master Plan of Transportation* (MPOT), master plan, and prior Subdivision Regulations to provide the appropriate transportation facilities.

MPOT and Master Plan Conformance

Master Plan Right-of-Way

- Hampton Park Boulevard (I-413); 70-foot right ROW

Both the MPOT and the master plan designate this 70-foot-wide ROW, which is shown as an extension of I-413 (Hampton Park Boulevard), and which aligns with the northern boundary of Parcel 40, before running in a southerly direction, adjoining the Capital Beltway. Pursuant to 4-04184, Ritchie Station Court was constructed along a portion of I-413's alignment. The remaining portion of the master plan road's alignment was not required to be dedicated. However, the alignment of I-413 was deemed essential to be maintained, and a condition was included with the approval of prior 4-04184, to show the area of I-413 as a parcel/easement, to allow for future dedication and construction of the master plan road. The condition allowed the easement to be extinguished if, in the future, the master plan ROW was removed for the master plan. Final Plat of Subdivision REP 214-92, recorded subsequent to approval of 4-04184, also contained the following note:

4. **Any building structures proposed within the 70' Master Planned Road Easement will require approval from the Department of Public Works and Transportation. Property Owner agrees to remove at their expense, any said structures prior to construction of the master planned road.**

The plan sheets delineate the future ROW. Currently, a portion of the ROW lies within the boundary of adjoining Parcel 16 and Parcel 17, which are not part of the current PPS. The Planning Department did not receive comments from DPW&T. However, the master plan ROW for I-413 shall continue to be shown as an easement on the PPS and final plat, for future dedication and construction.

Master Plan Pedestrian and Bike Facilities

There are no master planned facilities or policies that impact or are applicable to the site.

The master plan provides guidance for multimodal circulation through the planning area:

Provide sidewalks and neighborhood trail connections within existing communities to improve pedestrian safety, allow for safe routes to Metro stations and schools, and provide for increased nonmotorized connectivity between neighborhoods.
(page 252)

The subject PPS includes no modifications to the nearby prior approved pedestrian and bicycle master-planned facilities. The site is currently developed with sidewalk and crosswalk connections to the adjacent lots and parking areas connecting to the greater shopping center and adjacent properties. The intent and goals of the master plans have been met.

Access and Circulation

The subject property has frontage on the Capital Beltway for Parcels 44 and 45 along the southeastern boundary of the site, and frontage on Ritchie Station Court for Parcel 46 along the northwest boundary of the site.

The subject PPS includes one vehicular access point through 22-foot-wide existing and approved easements. Parcel 46 has direct access to Ritchie Station Court. The existing easements provide access to Parcels 41, 42 and 43. The approved easements to the north provide additional access for Parcel 41. The approved easement to the south provides access to Parcels 44 and 45.

There are three other driveway access points to the site through driveways of the adjoining Parcel 9. The two northern access points lead to a parking area of this integrated shopping center for standard passenger vehicles. The southern access point leads to the easement per Final Plat 5-24130. Vehicular access and circulation for the PPS are found to be sufficient.

Private Access Easement

Section 24-128 (b)(15)(A) provides that the Planning Board may approve a subdivision with a private ROW or easement for an integrated shopping center in the C-S-C Zone subject to three criteria, as follows:

- (i) **Such right-of-way or easement shall have a minimum right-of-way width of twenty-two (22) feet connecting the lots to a public road;**
- (ii) **Such authorization shall be based on a written finding that the private right-of-way or easement is adequate to serve the extent of the development proposed and shall not result in any adverse impact on the access and use of other lots or parcels within the Integrated Shopping Center; and**
- (iii) **The development shall comply with all other applicable requirements of this Code.**

The above provisions are met for the use of an easement. The shopping center includes more than three retail stores; thus, it qualifies as an Integrated Shopping Center pursuant to the definition contained in Section 27-107.01(208) of the prior Zoning Ordinance.

Of the six parcels, Parcels 44, 45, and 46 have frontage on a public road. Specifically, Parcels 44 and 45 have frontage to the Capital Beltway, and Parcel 46 has direct frontage on Ritchie Station Court. Access to a public road, Ritchie Station Court, is via existing and approved 22-foot-wide access easements. Parcels 41, 42, and 43 were accessed to Ritchie Station Court by existing easements. However, the recording reference for the existing 22-foot-wide access easements were not labeled on the PPS. A condition is included herein requiring the applicant to provide the recording reference for the existing 22-foot-wide access easements.

Of the approved access easements, one easement provides additional access for Parcel 41 to Ritchie Station Court via Parcel 46. The other easement provides access to Ritchie Station Court for Parcels 44 and 45. All easements are 22 feet wide, which meets the minimum width requirements for easements. The existing and approved access easements are found to be adequate to serve the extent of the development, and will not result in any adverse impact on the access and use of other lots or parcels within the integrated shopping center.

Based on the findings presented above, the Planning Board concludes that transportation facilities will exist to serve the subdivision, as required under prior Subtitle 24 of the Prince George's County Code, and will conform to the MPOT and master plan.

10. **Public Facilities**—This PPS was reviewed for conformance to the master plan, in accordance with Section 24-121(a)(5) of the prior Subdivision Regulations. The master plan contains the following goals:

- **Project future demand for schools, libraries, police, and fire and rescue services.**
- **Review supply of health care facilities in relation to other areas of the county.**

The project will not impede achievement of the above-referenced goals. The analysis provided with this resolution and the approved ADQ-2024-051 illustrates that pursuant to adopted tests and

standards, public safety facilities and water and sewer service are adequate to serve the proposed development. There are no master-planned police, fire and emergency medical service facilities, public schools, parks, or libraries recommended on the subject property.

The 2008 *Approved Public Safety Facilities Master Plan* also provides guidance on the location and timing of upgrades, renovations to existing facilities, and construction of new facilities; however, none of its recommendations affect the subject site.

Section 24-122.01(b)(1) of the prior Subdivision Regulations states that the location of the property, within the appropriate service area of the Ten-Year Water and Sewerage Plan, is deemed sufficient evidence of the immediate or planned availability of public water and sewerage for PPS or final plat approval. The 2018 *Water and Sewer Plan* placed this property in water and sewer Category 3, Community System. Category 3 comprises all developed land (platted or built) on public water and sewer, and undeveloped land with a valid PPS approved for public water and sewer. In addition, the property is within Tier 1 of the Sustainable Growth Act, which includes those properties served by public sewerage systems. Accordingly, the subject property is in the appropriate service area for PPS approval.

11. **Public Utility Easement**—In accordance with Section 24-122(a) of the prior Subdivision Regulations, when utility easements are required by a public company, the subdivider shall include the following statement in the dedication documents recorded on the final plat:

“Utility easements are granted pursuant to the declaration recorded among the County Land Records in Liber 3703 at Folio 748.”

The standard requirement for public utility easements (PUEs) is a minimum of 10 feet wide along public ROWs. The site abuts the Capital Beltway to the southeast, and Ritchie Station Court to the northwest. The required PUE is shown along Ritchie Station Court, but not along the Capital Beltway. Prior 4-04187 and prior final plats for the subject property (REP 214-92, MMB 233-60, SJH 242-92, SJH 247-7, and ME 269-45) did not require a PUE along the Capital Beltway. The Planning Board notes that there is a 50-foot-wide Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC) utility easement along the property’s frontage with the Capital Beltway, which does not allow colocation of another utility easement. Furthermore, this PPS is for resubdivision of a parcel within an existing shopping center, with no new development. A PUE is shown along the property’s frontage to Ritchie Station Court, from which existing utilities may be extended, as needed, to serve the new parcels using this PUE. No future utility lines will be required to cross the Capital Beltway frontage of the property, since the properties on either side of the subject site are either developed or have no potential to be developed. The omission of a contiguous 10-foot-wide PUE along the Capital Beltway will have no impact on the utilities already provided and available for this development and the surrounding developments. As a result, a PUE is not being required, at this time, along the Capital Beltway.

12. **Historic**—The master plan contains goals and policies related to historic preservation (pages 287–296). However, these are not specific to the subject site or applicable to the proposed development. A search of current and historic photographs, topographic and historic maps, and locations of currently known archeological sites indicates the probability of archeological sites

within the subject property is low. A Phase I archeological survey is not required. No Prince George's County historic sites or resources are on or adjacent to the subject property.

13. **Environmental**—The following applications and associated plans were previously reviewed for the subject site:

Development Review Case #	Associated Tree Conservation Plan #	Authority	Status	Action Date	Resolution Number
N/A	TCPII-203-91	Staff	Approved	10/21/2004	N/A
DSP-04080	TCPII-203-91-01	Planning Board	Approved	5/12/2005	05-118
4-04184	TCPI-100-04	Planning Board	Approved	8/8/2005	05-115
NRI-159-05	N/A	Staff	Approved	3/23/2006	N/A
4-05133	TCPI-100-04-01	Planning Board	Approved	8/8/2006	06-143
DSP-04080-01	TCPII-203-91-02	Planning Board	Approved	10/30/2006	06-76
DSP-04080-02	TCPII-203-91-03	Planning Board	Approved	2/1/2007	07-35
DSP-04080-03	N/A	Planning Director	Approved	9/11/2009	N/A
DSP-04080-04	N/A	Planning Director	Approved	10/31/2011	N/A
DSP-04080-09	N/A	Planning Director	Approved	8/4/2011	N/A
DSP-04080-05	N/A	Planning Director	Approved	10/31/2011	N/A
DSP-04080-10	N/A	Planning Director	Approved	5/2/2012	N/A
DSP-04080-11	N/A	Planning Director	Approved	12/28/2012	N/A
DSP-04080-12	N/A	Planning Director	Approved	3/11/2013	N/A
DSP-04080-13	N/A	Planning Director	Approved	8/29/2013	N/A
DSP-04080-14	N/A	Planning Director	Approved	3/4/2014	N/A
DSP-04080-15	N/A	Planning Director	Approved	2/9/2015	N/A
DSP-04080-16	N/A	Planning Director	Approved	5/8/2015	N/A
DSP-04080-17	N/A	Planning Director	Approved	5/16/2016	N/A
DSP-04080-18	TCPII-203-91-04	Planning Director	Approved	12/29/2016	N/A
4-16025	TCPI-100-04-02	Planning Board	Approved	1/6/2017	16-146
NRI-020-20217	N/A	Staff	Approved	3/17/2017	N/A
DSP-04080-19	N/A	Planning Director	Approved	6/16/2017	N/A
4-16021	TCPI-100-04-03	Planning Board	Approved	9/14/2017	17-114
DSP-04080-20	N/A	Planning Director	Approved	6/24/2019	N/A
DSP-04080-21	N/A	Planning Director	Approved	9/10/2019	N/A
DSP-04080-22	TCPII-203-91-05	Planning Director	Approved	11/21/2019	N/A
DSP-04080-23	TCPII-203-91-06	Planning Director	Approved	12/30/2020	N/A
NRI-159-05-01	N/A	Staff	Approved	7/16/2021	N/A
NRI-159-05-02	N/A	Staff	Approved	8/27/2021	N/A
DSP-04080-24	N/A	Planning Director	Approved	9/16/2021	N/A

Development Review Case #	Associated Tree Conservation Plan #	Authority	Status	Action Date	Resolution Number
NRI-159-05-03	N/A	Staff	Approved	10/6/2021	N/A
DSP-04080-25	N/A	Planning Director	Approved	11/18/2021	N/A
DSP-04080-26	TCPII-203-91-07	Planning Director	Approved	11/21/2023	N/A
DSP-04080-29		Planning Director	Approved	3/31/2025	N/A
DSP-04080-27	N/A	Planning Director	Approved	2/5/2025	N/A
DSP-04080-28	N/A	Planning Director	Approved	2/25/2025	N/A
DSP-04080-30		Planning Director	Approved	4/1/2025	N/A
4-24027	TCPI-100-04-04	Planning Board	Approved	5/29/2025	2025-043

Grandfathering

This property is subject to the grandfathering provisions of the 2024 Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance (2024 WCO) because the property had a TCP that was accepted for review on or before June 30, 2024.

The property must conform to the environmental regulations of the 2010 Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance (2010 WCO) and the 2018 Environmental Technical Manual (ETM). The property is also subject to the environmental regulations in prior Subtitles 24 and 27 because there is a previously approved tree conservation plan that was implemented.

Environmental Site Description

A review of the available information indicates that streams, wetlands, and steep slopes occur on the property. There is no potential forest interior dwelling species habitat mapped on-site. According to information obtained from the Maryland Department of Natural Resources Natural Heritage Program, there are no rare, threatened, or endangered species on or in the vicinity of this property. There is one stream system on-site located on the southwestern portion of the property. The site has frontage on both Ritchie Marlboro Road and the Capital Beltway, which are identified as a master plan roadways. Ritchie Marlboro Road is designated as an arterial, and the Capital Beltway is a designated freeway. The property subject to this PPS is not adjacent to Ritchie Marlboro Road which is designated as a historic roadway.

Prince George's Plan 2035

The site is located within Environmental Strategy Area 2 (formerly the Developing Tier) of the Regulated Environmental Protection Areas Map and within the Established Communities of the General Plan Growth Policy of Plan 2035.

Environmental Conformance with Applicable Plans

Master Plan Conformance

The master plan includes applicable goals, policies, and strategies. The following policies are applicable to the current project regarding natural resources preservation, protection, and

restoration. The text in **BOLD** is from the master plan, and the plain text provides comments on plan conformance:

Wildlife Habitat

Policy 1: Protect, preserve and enhance the green infrastructure network in Subregion 4.

Strategies

- **Protect green infrastructure environmental corridors by focusing development outside the network. Implement this during the review of land development proposals to ensure the highest level of preservation and restoration possible, with limited impacts for essential development elements.**
- **Assess the potential to acquire land parcels in designated network gap areas to further protect and expand the network.**
- **Evaluate land development proposals in the vicinity of SCAs (Anacostia River, Suitland Bog) to ensure that SCAs are not impacted and that green infrastructure connections are either maintained or restored.**
- **Limit impacts to the green infrastructure network to those necessary for the reasonable development of properties.**
- **Provide mitigation of impacts to the regulated areas within the development site, drainage area, subwatershed, or watershed by first exhausting the mitigation areas identified in the countywide mitigation database and then seeking other opportunities within the river basin.**

According to the approved Natural Resources Inventory (NRI-020-2017), the site contains regulated environmental features (REF) within or adjacent to the subject property. The southwestern portion of the site is within the green infrastructure network and contains regulated areas, evaluation areas and network gap areas. The regulated area is found along the on-site stream system and the Type 1 tree conservation plan (TCP1) shows the woodlands as being saved. No development is included with this PPS. Impacts to the green infrastructure network will be evaluated with subsequent development proposals.

Policy 2: Minimize the impacts of development on the green infrastructure network and SCA's.

Strategies

- **Protect and enhance water quality upstream of the Suitland Bog by requiring the preservation or establishment of 75-foot-wide buffers on streams that feed the hydrology of the bog.**
- **Require the retrofitting of existing or installation of new water quality structures to ensure that water quality is maintained or enhanced above the Suitland Bog.**

No development is included with this PPS. Impacts to the green infrastructure network will be evaluated with subsequent development proposals.

Tributary Action Items

Policy 1: Restore and enhance water quality in areas that have been degraded, and preserve water quality in areas not degraded.

Strategies

- **Prepare a strategic watershed wide plan for addressing stormwater quantity and quality.**
- **Maintain, enhance, and restore woody buffers around streams to preserve and protect water quality.**
- **Undertake water quality demonstration projects on county property (for example, at schools, parks, libraries) using ESD and other innovative techniques.**
- **Use conservation landscape techniques to be evaluated during the development review process.**
- **Assess potential drainage problem areas and areas within the 100-year floodplain for retrofit projects.**

No development is included with this PPS. Stormwater requirements for subsequent developments will be reviewed by the Prince George's County Department of Permitting, Inspections and Enforcement (DPIE).

Policy 2: Improve the base information needed for the county to undertake and support stream restoration and mitigation projects.

Strategies

- **Continue the collection of stream mitigation data for addition to the countywide mitigation database, using stream corridor assessments.**
- **During the review of land development proposals, consult the countywide mitigation database and require the restoration of streams as close to the development site as legally possible.**
- **Coordinate data contributions for possible mitigation sites (e.g., county, state, and federal agencies, citizens, nonprofits).**

The site has an approved NRI that details existing conditions of the site. The subject property has one stream system on-site and the TCP1 does not impact this stream. No stream restoration or mitigation is required as part of this PPS.

Policy 3: Require on-site management of stormwater through the use of environmentally sensitive stormwater management techniques (i.e., fully implement the requirements of ESD) for all development and redevelopment projects.

Strategies

- **Require the use of shared environmentally sensitive stormwater management facilities where appropriate.**
- **Increase stormwater storage in appropriate areas, such as open space and preserved and constructed wetlands.**

No development is included with this PPS. Stormwater requirements for subsequent developments will be reviewed by DPIE.

Policy 4: Assure that adequate stream buffers are maintained and enhanced and utilized design measures to protect water quality.

Strategies

- **Maintain and enhance adequate woody vegetated buffers around streams to preserve and protect water quality.**
- **Identify possible locations for additional bioretention features to serve one or more properties.**
- **Enhance buffers through the Woodland Conservation Ordinance required during the review of land development proposals.**

- **Require street tree plantings be incorporated as a stormwater management feature.**

The subject property is maintaining the existing wooded stream buffer, the stream buffer will not be impacted with this PPS.

Conformance with the Green Infrastructure Plan

The Green Infrastructure Plan (GI Plan) was approved with the adoption of the 2017 *Approved Prince George's County Resource Conservation Plan: A Countywide Functional Master Plan* (CR-11-2017), on March 7, 2017. According to the GI Plan, this site contains regulated and evaluation areas. The following policies and strategies are applicable to the subject PPS. The text in **bold** is the text from the GI Plan and the plain text provides the Planning Board's findings on plan conformance:

POLICY 1: Preserve, enhance, and restore the green infrastructure network and its ecological functions while supporting the desired development pattern of Plan Prince George's 2035.

1.1 Ensure that areas of connectivity and ecological functions are maintained, re- stored, and/or established by:

- a. Using the designated green infrastructure network as a guide to decision- making and using it as an amenity in the site design and development review processes.**

The subject property is within designated evaluation and regulated areas, with the main regulated area located along the on-site stream system. The property is within both the Southwest Branch of the Patuxent River watershed and is not within a Tier II catchment area. The current plan leaves the stream system undisturbed.

- b. Protecting plant, fish, and wildlife habitats and maximizing the retention and/or restoration of the ecological potential of the landscape by prioritizing healthy, connected ecosystems for conservation.**

The property is within both the Southwest Branch of the Patuxent River watershed and is not within a Tier II catchment area. The current plan leaves the stream system undisturbed. Woodland preservation around the stream buffer and primary management area (PMA) was provided under a previous application and have not been modified or impacted with this PPS.

- c. Protecting existing resources when constructing stormwater management features and when providing mitigation for impacts.**

No construction of SWM features is required with this PPS.

- d. Recognizing the ecosystem services provided by diverse land uses, such as woodlands, wetlands, meadows, urban forests, farms and grasslands within the green infrastructure network and work toward maintaining or restoring connections between these.**

The prior woodland conservation area located along the REF is not being modified or impacted with this PPS.

1.2 Ensure that Sensitive Species Project Review Areas and Special Conservation Areas (SCAs), and the critical ecological systems supporting them, are preserved, enhanced, connected, restored, and protected.

- a. Identify critical ecological systems and ensure they are preserved and/or protected during the site design and development review processes.**

The subject property is within designated evaluation and regulated areas, with the main regulated area located along the on-site stream system. The property is within the Southwest Branch of the Patuxent River watershed and is not within a Tier II catchment area. The current PPS does not include any disturbance to the stream system. Woodland preservation around the stream buffer and PMA was provided under a previous application and is not modified or impacted with this PPS. Sensitive species habitat was not identified on this site, and it is not in a special conversation area. SWM will be further evaluated by DPIE, and sediment and erosion control measures will be reviewed by the Prince George's County's Soil Conservation District.

POLICY 2: Support implementation of the 2017 GI Plan throughout the planning process.

2.4 Identify Network Gaps when reviewing land development applications and determine the best method to bridge the gap: preservation of existing forests, vegetation, and/or landscape features, and/ or planting of a new corridor with reforestation, landscaping and/or street trees.

The majority of the developed portions of this site are within network gaps as the green infrastructure mapping has not been updated to reflect prior development. No development is included with this PPS. The existing woodland conservation areas remain undisturbed.

2.5 Continue to require mitigation during the development review process for impacts to regulated environmental features, with preference given to locations on-site, within the same watershed as the development creating the impact, and within the green infrastructure network.

No development is included with this PPS. The existing preserved areas remain undisturbed.

2.6 Strategically locate off-site mitigation to restore, enhance and/or protect the green infrastructure network and protect existing resources while providing mitigation.

The PPS subdivides the existing Parcel 40 and does not include any impacts to the green infrastructure network. The site does have a network gap as the mapping for the GI Plan has not been updated to reflect the clearing of the site from prior applications. TCPI-100-04-04 was provided with this PPS, and it shows that the required woodland conservation requirements for prior and subsequent development are met through on-site woodland preservation and off-site credits.

POLICY 3: Ensure public expenditures for staffing, programs, and infrastructure support the implementation of the 2017 GI Plan.

3.3 Design transportation systems to minimize fragmentation and maintain the ecological functioning of the green infrastructure network.

- a. Provide wildlife and water-based fauna with safe passage under or across roads, sidewalks, and trails as appropriate. Consider the use of arched or bottomless culverts or bridges when existing structures are replaced, or new roads are constructed.**

No fragmentation of REF by transportation systems is included with this PPS.

- b. Locate trail systems outside the regulated environmental features and their buffers to the fullest extent possible. Where trails must be located within a regulated buffer, they must be designed to minimize clearing and grading and to use low impact surfaces.**

No master-planned trail systems are included with this PPS.

POLICY 4: Provide the necessary tools for implementation of the 2017 GI Plan.

4.2 Continue to require the placement of conservation easements over areas of regulated environmental features, preserved or planted forests, appropriate portions of land contributing to Special Conservation Areas, and other lands containing sensitive features.

On-site woodland conservation shall be placed in a woodland and wildlife habitat conservation easements prior to the certification of the subsequent DSP and

associated Type 2 tree conservation plan (TCP2). All remaining undisturbed areas within the PMA will be protected within a conservation easement on the plat. The development is not within a special conservation area and does not contain rare, threatened, or endangered species on or in the vicinity of this property.

POLICY 5: Improve water quality through stream restoration, stormwater management, water resource protection, and strategic conservation of natural lands.

5.8 Limit the placement of stormwater structures within the boundaries of regulated environmental features and their buffers to outfall pipes or other features that cannot be located elsewhere.

No additional stormwater features are included with this PPS. The subject property has stormwater concept approval from DPIE from previous development applications.

5.9 Prioritize the preservation and replanting of vegetation along streams and wetlands to create and expand forested stream buffers to improve water quality.

The subject property has stormwater concept approval from DPIE. The approved SWM concept plan shows an existing SWM pond in the northeast corner of the overall shopping center, which provides SWM.

POLICY 7: Preserve, enhance, connect, restore, and preserve forest and tree canopy coverage.

General Strategies for Increasing Forest and Tree Canopy Coverage

7.1 Continue to maximize on-site woodland conservation and limit the use of off- site banking and the use of fee-in-lieu.

This PPS does not include any clearing or development. There are no changes to how the prior approved TCP1 met the requirements.

7.2 Protect, restore, and require the use of native plants. Prioritize the use of species with higher ecological values and plant species that are adaptable to climate change.

Retention of existing woodlands and planting of native species on-site is required by both the ETM, and the 2010 *Prince George's County Landscape Manual*, which can count toward the tree canopy coverage (TCC) requirement for the development. TCC requirements will be evaluated at the time of subsequent development plan review.

7.4 Ensure that trees that are preserved or planted are provided appropriate soils and adequate canopy and root space to continue growth and reach maturity. Where appropriate, ensure that soil treatments and/or amendments are used.

Woodland exists on-site along the stream system and throughout the site. This PPS does not include any clearing or development. The worksheet reflects how the prior development approvals met the 15 percent woodland conservation threshold on-site with on-site woodland preservation, on-site reforestation, and off-site woodland conservation credits. This PPS does not require any additional woodland conservation. The use of fee-in-lieu was not requested with this PPS. If subsequent development applications include changes to the existing woodland conservation methods, then those changes will be accounted for with associated TCP2 revisions.

Retention of existing woodlands and planting of native species on-site is required by both the ETM, and the Landscape Manual, which can count toward the TCC requirement for the development. TCC requirements will be evaluated at the time of subsequent development plan review.

Forest Canopy Strategies

7.12 Discourage the creation of new forest edges by requiring edge treatments such as the planting of shade trees in areas where new forest edges are proposed to reduce the growth of invasive plants.

No new forest edges are created with this PPS. The clearing of woodland is not included with the subject PPS.

7.13 Continue to prioritize the protection and maintenance of connected, closed canopy forests during the development review process, especially in areas where FIDS habitat is present or within Sensitive Species Project Review Areas.

Existing woodland conservation is located on-site around the PMA and REF. This site does not contain potential forest interior dwelling species habitat and is not in a sensitive species review area.

7.18 Ensure that new, more compact developments contain an appropriate percentage of green and open spaces that serve multiple functions such as reducing urban temperatures, providing open space, and stormwater management.

Clearing of woodland is not included with the subject PPS, and no new development is included. Woodland conservation is designed to minimize fragmentation and reinforce new forest edges. Existing woodland conservation is

located on-site around the PMA and REF. This site does not contain potential forest interior dwelling species habitat and is not in a sensitive species review area. Green space is encouraged to serve multiple eco-services.

Other Environmental Review

Natural Resources Inventory/Existing Conditions

The site has an approved NRI-020-2017, which shows the existing conditions of the property. No specimen trees have been identified on-site or within the immediate vicinity of the site's boundary.

The site does contain REF, which includes steep slopes, streams, and wetlands and their associated buffers, comprising the PMA. The site statistics table on the NRI shows 10.46 acres for the PMA for the site, with 3,152 linear feet of regulated streams. This NRI was given a one-year revalidation. The TCP1 shows the correct information in conformance with the NRI. Prior to any subsequent development on the site, a revision to the NRI will be required.

Woodland Conservation

The site is subject to the grandfathering provisions of the 2024 WCO because the property had a TCP that was accepted for review before June 30, 2024, and shall conform to the environmental regulations of the 2010 WCO and the ETM. TCPI-100-04-04 was submitted with the subject PPS and requires minor revisions to be found in conformance with the 2010 WCO.

No clearing of woodland is included with this PPS. The woodland conservation requirements were addressed with the prior TCP2 and DSP reviews. As such, if subsequent development review applications require additional clearing, woodland conservation requirements will be analyzed at that time. Technical revisions are required to the TCP1, prior to certification of the PPS.

Specimen Trees

The site does not contain any specimen trees, as verified on NRI-020-2017. No impacts to critical root zones or removal of specimen trees are included with this PPS.

Regulated Environmental Features

The site contains REF, including streams, stream buffers, wetlands, wetland buffers, and steep slopes, which comprise the PMA. No impacts to REF are included with this PPS.

Soils

The predominant soils found to occur on-site, according to the United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resource Conservation Service, Web Soil Survey, include the Adelphai-Holmdel complex, Collington-Wist complex, Croom-Marr complex, Fallsington sandy loam, Grosstown gravelly silt loam, Mar-Dodon complex, Udorthents, and Widewater and issue soils. According to available information, no unsafe soils containing Christiana complexes or Marlboro clay exist on-site. This information is provided for the applicant's benefit.

Based on the preceding findings, the Planning Board finds that the PPS conforms to the relevant environmental policies of the master plan and GI Plan, and the relevant environmental requirements of Subtitle 25 and prior Subtitle 24.

14. **Urban Design**—Future development of the site will require a DSP, in accordance with Section 27-289 of the prior Zoning Ordinance.

Under the prior Zoning Ordinance, conformance to the following regulations should be demonstrated if any future development is proposed:

- Section 27-454 C-S-C Zone (Commercial Shopping Center)
- Section 27-462 Regulations (in all commercial zones)
- Section 27-548.54 Requirements for height (Military Installation Overlay Zone)
- Part 11. – Off-Street Parking and Loading
- Part 12. – Signs

DSP-04080 and its numerous amendments have been approved by the District Council, Planning Board, and Planning Director for various improvements. This subject PPS is to subdivide existing Parcel 40 into six new parcels, with no new immediate development. As such there are no conditions of previous approvals that are applicable to this PPS.

Prince George's County Council Bill CB-21-2024 for the Tree Canopy Coverage Ordinance became effective July 1, 2024. Subsequently, Subtitle 25, Division 3, the Tree Canopy Coverage Ordinance, requires a minimum percentage of the site to be covered by tree canopy for any development projects that include more than 2,500 square feet of gross floor area, or disturbance, and requires a building or grading permit. The conformance of the TCC and other landscape requirements will be further evaluated if subsequent development is proposed.

15. **Community Feedback**—The Prince George's County Planning Department did not receive any correspondence from the community for this subject PPS.
16. **Planning Board Hearing**—At the May 29, 2025 Planning Board hearing, staff presented the PPS to the Planning Board. The applicant's attorney, Mr. Horne, described the project to the Board and affirmed the applicant's agreement with all of the findings and recommended conditions of approval outlined in the technical staff report.

One citizen, Ms. Belinda Queen, representing the Coalition of Central Prince George's County, registered to speak prior to the noon deadline on May 27, 2025. Following the presentation, Ms. Queen delivered her testimony virtually. She expressed concern that community members had not been informed about the subject PPS, which limited their ability to provide input. As a result, she indicated that she did not know if she was in support or opposed to the subject

application. She emphasized the community members's right to be aware of development activities and urged the applicant to improve outreach efforts for future development proposals for the Ritchie Station Marketplace shopping center.

In response, Mr. Horne stated that the applicant had mailed required notifications regarding the PPS to the community, including the Coalition. However, he acknowledged that no community meeting had been held, citing the application's limited scope—specifically, the subdivision of an existing property without any proposed new development. The Board acknowledged the applicant's general good track record of community outreach, and encouraged the applicant to engage the community in future development proposals. After the discussion, the Planning Board approved the PPS unanimously, with conditions.


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

* * * * *


This is to certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the action taken by the Prince George's County Planning Board of The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission on the motion of Commissioner Washington, seconded by Commissioner Bailey, with Commissioners Washington, Bailey, Geraldo, and Shapiro voting in favor of the motion at its regular meeting held on Thursday, May 29, 2025, in Largo, Maryland.

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 26th day of June 2025.

Peter A. Shapiro
Chairman

By 
Jessica Jones
Planning Board Administrator

PAS:JJ:MS:rpg


Approved for Legal Sufficiency
M-NCPPC Office of General
Counsel

Dated 6/5/25