

PGCPB No. 2025-080

File No. 4-25002

R E S O L U T I O N

WHEREAS, Sandra Wiseman, Troutman Family Trust, Troutman Living Trust, Dorothy B and George G Troutman Trust, and Charles Hickokare are the owners of a 202.31-acre tract of land known as Parcels 1, 2, 45, 87, 90, 96, 50, and 51, said property being in the 15th Election District of Prince George's County, Maryland, and being zoned Agricultural-Residential (AR); and

WHEREAS, on March 31, 2025, Sandra Wiseman filed an application for approval of a Preliminary Plan of Subdivision for 65 lots, 9 parcels, and 2 outparcels; and

WHEREAS, the application for approval of the aforesaid Preliminary Plan of Subdivision, also known as Preliminary Plan 4-25002 for Troutman Property 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 September 11, 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 Regulations for the Subdivision of Land, Subtitle 24, Prince George's County Code in existence prior to April 1, 2022; and

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

WHEREAS, at the September 11, 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 TCP1-015-2025, and PARTIALLY APPROVED a Variance to Section 25-122(b)(1)(G), and further APPROVED Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-25002 for 65 lots, 9 parcels, and 2 outparcels, subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to signature approval of the preliminary plan of subdivision (PPS), the plan shall be revised as follows:

- a. Revise General Note 4 to include 65 single-family detached residential dwelling units, equestrian recreational facility, and communication towers.
- b. Revise General Note 10 to provide the area of road dedication.
- c. Revise General Note 11 to include, as existing uses on the property, single-family residential, equestrian recreational facility, agriculture, and communication. Include, as proposed uses on the property, equestrian recreational facility, agriculture, and communication.
- d. Renumber general notes to assign unique numbering to each note.
- e. Revise General Note 13 to state the density is to be determined with the detailed site plan.
- f. Revise General Note 14 to provide the correct reference to Prince George's County Council Bill CB-081-2021.
- g. Complete General Note 17.
- h. Revise General Note 19 to provide the existing gross floor area to remain as 34,664 square feet.
- i. Add a parcel table to identify all proposed parcels and outparcels, their uses, acreage, and ultimate ownership.
- j. Revise boundaries of lots and parcels containing existing structures, as necessary, to ensure that all existing structures meet the minimum setback requirements per the prior Prince George's County Zoning Ordinance.
- k. Revise boundaries of lots and parcels containing existing structures, to ensure that any accessory structure associated with a principal use is located on the lot/parcel with the principal use.
- l. Label Outparcel A to be retained by the owner.
- m. Label Outparcel B to be retained by the owner, or to be conveyed to the owner of the abutting property (Parcel 42).
- n. Revise General Note 23 to state that mandatory dedication of parkland requirement is being met by providing on-site recreational facilities.
- o. Label all existing accessory structures to remain, with the use.
- p. Revise parcel designations containing existing development along Farm Road to be numbered instead of lettered.

2. Development of the site shall be in conformance with Stormwater Management Concept Plan SIT-00302-2025 and any subsequent revisions.
3. Prior to approval, the final plat of subdivision shall include:
 - a. The granting of at least a 10-foot-wide public utility easement along all public streets, in accordance with Section 24-122(a) of the prior Prince George's County Subdivision Regulations, and in accordance with the approved preliminary plan of subdivision.
 - b. Right-of-way dedication along Farm Road, in accordance with Section 24-123(a)(1) of the prior Prince George's County Subdivision Regulations, the approved preliminary plan of subdivision, and the approved detailed site plan.
 - c. Right-of-way dedication of all public streets in accordance with the approved preliminary plan of subdivision.
 - d. The granting of a 10-foot-wide public utility easement along the Farm Road public right-of-way, in accordance with the approved detailed site plan, and in accordance with Section 24-122(a) of the prior Prince George's County Subdivision Regulations.
4. Development of this subdivision shall be in conformance with an approved Type 1 Tree Conservation Plan (TCP1-015-2025), in conformance with 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 1 Tree Conservation Plan (TCP1-015-2025, or most recent revision), or as modified by the Type 2 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 and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance (WCO). 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.”
5. Prior to approval of the detailed site plan (DSP), the plan shall show a 60-foot-wide right-of-way along Farm Road throughout the subject property. This right-of-way shall be in accordance with the Department of Public Works and Transportation standards. The applicant shall, in coordination with the Prince George's County Planning Department and the Prince George's County Department of Permitting, Inspections and Enforcement, establish the alignment of the right-of-way for Farm Road and show the required public utility easements, per Section 24-122(a) of the prior Subdivision Regulations, on the DSP.
6. In accordance with the 2013 *Approved Subregion 6 Master Plan and Sectional Map Amendment* and the 2009 *Approved Countywide Master Plan of Transportation*, the applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall provide the following facilities, and the facilities shall be shown on the detailed site plan (DSP):

- a. Minimum 5-foot-wide sidewalk along both sides of all internal roadways and associated crosswalks and Americans with Disabilities Act-compliant curb ramps, unless modified by the permitting agency with written correspondence. Any modifications shall be in accordance with Prince George's County Department of Public Works and Transportation standards.
 - b. The applicant, his successors, and/or assignees shall show the master-planned trails unless otherwise modified at the time of DSP review. The timing of construction of the master-planned trails shall be determined with the approval of the DSP.
7. In accordance with Section 24-135(b) of the prior Prince George's County Subdivision Regulations, the applicant, and the applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall allocate appropriate and developable areas for and provide adequate on-site recreational facilities.
8. The applicant shall provide details of the recreational facilities with the submission of the detailed site plan application.
9. The on-site recreational facilities shall be reviewed by the Urban Design Section of the Development Review Division of the Prince George's County Planning Department, for adequacy and proper siting, in accordance with the *Parks and Recreation Facilities Design Guidelines*, with the review of the site plan. Timing for construction shall also be determined at the time of site plan.
10. Prior to the submission of the final plat of subdivision for any residential lot/parcel, the applicant, and the applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall submit an executed private recreational facilities agreement (RFA) to the Development Review Division (DRD) of the Prince George's County Planning Department for construction of on-site recreational facilities, for approval. Upon approval by DRD, the RFA shall be recorded among the Prince George's County Land Records and the Liber and folio of the RFA shall be noted on the final plat prior to plat recordation.
11. Prior to approval of building permits for residential development, the applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall submit a performance bond, irrevocable letter of credit, or other suitable financial guarantee for the construction of recreational facilities. The performance bond shall include a formula for any adjustments needed to account for inflation.
12. Prior to signature approval of the preliminary plan of subdivision, the Type 1 tree conservation plan (TCP1) shall be revised as follows:
 - a. All specimen trees shall be clearly labeled on the plan with the number and indication if the tree is proposed for removal. Specimen trees ST-10, ST-11, ST-51, and ST-69 shall be shown as to remain.
 - b. Remove the primary management area impacts for stormwater outfalls from the TCP1 plan.

- c. Revise the limits of the woodland conservation areas to avoid structures that are labeled to remain.
 - d. Revise the plan to fully afforest the stream buffers in accordance with Section 25-121(c)(1)(C) of the 2024 Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance.
 - e. Revise the TCP1 to be reflective of Natural Resources Inventory NRI-032-2025, as approved.
 - f. Correct General Note 8 to reflect that Farm Road is a scenic roadway.
 - g. For each structure to remain, provide dimension lines to demonstrate the setbacks from structures for woodland conservation as detailed in Section 25-122(b)(1) of the 2024 Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance.
 - h. Remove the Specimen Tree Removal Worksheet from the plan.
13. Prior to the issuance of permits for this subdivision, and in conformance with Section 25-119(a)(2) of the 2024 Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance, a Type 2 tree conservation plan shall be approved. The following note shall be placed on the final plat of subdivision:
- “This plat is subject to the recordation of a Woodland Conservation Easement pursuant to Section 25-122(d) with the Liber and folio reflected on the Type 2 Tree Conservation Plan, when approved.”
14. At time of final plat, and in conformance with Section 24-130(b)(5), a conservation easement shall be described by bearings and distances. The conservation easement shall contain the delineated primary management area except for any 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.
15. Prior to issuance of any permits, which impact wetlands, wetland buffers, streams or waters of the United States, the applicant shall submit copies of all federal and state wetland permits, evidence that approval conditions have been complied with, and associated mitigation plans.
16. At time of detailed site plan acceptance, in accordance with Prince George’s County Requirements provided in Techno-Grams 005-2018 and 002-2021, the applicant shall provide additional soil investigations to evaluate the presence of Marlboro clay and a global stability analysis for the retaining walls stability.

17. Prior to acceptance of the detailed site plan, the applicant shall provide an assessment of the prior forest harvest area proposed for woodland preservation in accordance with Section 25-122(d)(1)(A)(i) of the 2024 Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance.
18. Prior to approval of a final plat, the applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall demonstrate that a homeowners association has been established for the subdivision. The draft covenants shall be submitted to the Subdivision Section of the Development Review Division of the Prince George's County Planning Department, to ensure that the rights of the Prince George's County Planning Board are included. The book/page of the declaration of covenants shall be noted on the final plat, prior to recordation.
19. Prior to approval by The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission's Prince George's County Planning Department of any building permits, the applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall convey land to a homeowners association (HOA), as identified on the approved preliminary plan of subdivision and detailed site plan. Land to be conveyed shall be subject to the following:
 - a. A copy of the recorded deed for the property to be conveyed shall be submitted to the Subdivision Section of the Development Review Division of the Prince George's County Planning Department.
 - b. All waste matter of any kind shall be removed from the property, and all disturbed areas shall have a full stand of grass or other vegetation upon completion of any phase, section, or the entire project.
 - c. The conveyed land shall not suffer the disposition of construction materials or soil filling, other than the placement of fill material associated with permitted grading operations that are consistent with the permit and minimum soil class requirements, discarded plant materials, refuse, or similar waste matter.
 - d. Any disturbance of land to be conveyed to the HOA shall be in accordance with an approved site plan and tree conservation plan. This shall include, but not be limited to, the location of sediment control measures, tree removal, temporary or permanent stormwater management facilities, utility placement, and stormdrain outfalls.
 - e. Stormdrain outfalls shall be designed to avoid adverse impacts on land to be conveyed to the HOA. The location and design of drainage outfalls that adversely impact property to be conveyed shall be reviewed and approved by the Development Review Division of the Prince George's County Planning Department.
 - f. Covenants recorded against the conveyed property ensuring retention and future maintenance of the property by the HOA, including the reservation of the right of approval by the Prince George's County Planning Director.

20. Add a note on the preliminary plan stating that the mandatory dedication of parkland requirement is being addressed by providing on-site recreation facilities.
21. The applicant, his successors, and/or assignees shall construct the master-planned trails unless otherwise modified at the time of the detailed site plan (DSP) review. The master-planned trails shall be designed in accordance with the standards outlined in the *Parks and Recreation Facilities Design Guidelines*.
22. Prior to submission of the final plat of subdivision for any residential lot/parcel, the applicant, and the applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall submit an original executed public recreational facilities agreement (RFA) to the Prince George's County Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) for construction of the master-planned natural surface trail as recreational facilities for approval. Upon approval by DPR staff, the RFA shall be recorded among the Prince George's County Land Records and the Liber and Folio of the RFA shall be noted on the final plat prior to plat recordation.
23. Prior to approval of the 49th building permit for residential development, or as modified by the Director of the Prince George's County Department of Parks and Recreation with supporting documentation to support the modification, the applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall submit construction drawings of recreational facilities to the Prince George's County Department of Parks and Recreation.
24. Prior to approval of a final plat, the applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall provide a draft Public Use Access Easement and Maintenance Agreement or Covenant for the Master-Planned Trail, to the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission (M-NCPPC), Department of Parks and Recreation, for approval. The easement agreement shall contain the rights of M-NCPPC, be recorded in Prince George's County Land Records, and the Liber/folio shown on the final plat, prior to recordation. The final plat shall reflect the location and extent of the easement, in accordance with the approved preliminary plan of subdivision.

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 property is located on Tax Map 109, in Grids F1, F2, F4, E1, and E4, on the north and south sides of Farm Road, 0.5 mile west of its intersection with Old Crain Highway, and east of Osborne Road. The property contains approximately 202.31 acres of land consisting of Parcels 1, 2, 45, 87, 90, and 96, which are recorded in the Land Records of Prince George's County in Liber 44670 and folio 732; Liber 17290 and folio 732; Liber 13608 and folio 731; Liber 17290 and folio 734; Liber 36271 and folio 598; Liber 44670 and folio 132; and Liber 15409 and folio 545, respectively, and Parcels 50 and 51 recorded in Book 17290 at page 734.

The property lies in the Agricultural-Residential (AR) Zone. However, this preliminary plan of subdivision (PPS) was submitted for review under the Prince George's County Zoning Ordinance and Prince George's County Subdivision Regulations in effect prior to April 1, 2022 (prior Zoning Ordinance and prior Subdivision Regulations), pursuant to Section 24-1900 *et seq.* of the Subdivision Regulations. Under the prior Zoning Ordinance, the subject property was under the Residential-Agricultural (R-A) Zone. The subject 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 January 27, 2025. In accordance with Section 24-1904(b), the applicant provided a statement of justification (SOJ) explaining why they were requesting to use the prior regulations. In accordance with Section 24-1904(c) of the Subdivision Regulations, this PPS is supported by and subject to approved Certificate of Adequacy ADQ-2025-002.

The property has no prior PPS approvals. In accordance with Section 24-107 of the prior Subdivision Regulations, the subdivision of land proposed herein requires filing a PPS and final plat. The property is also subject to the 2013 *Approved Subregion 6 Master Plan and Sectional Map Amendment* (master plan) and other applicable plans, as outlined herein.

The applicant filed a request for a variance to Section 25-122(b)(1)(G) of the 2024 Prince George's County Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance (WCO), to allow removal of 33 specimen trees. This request is discussed further in the Environmental finding of this resolution.

3. **Setting**—The subject property is located within Planning Area 82A and is bound to the north, west, and east by woodland and agricultural land in the AR (formerly R-A) Zone. The property is bound to the southeast and southwest by single-family dwellings in the Residential Estate (formerly Residential Estate R-E), Residential, Rural (formally Rural Residential R-R), and AR Zones.
4. **Development Data Summary**—The following information relates to the subject PPS and the evaluated development.

	EXISTING	EVALUATED
Zone	AR	R-A
Use(s)	Agricultural, Equestrian Recreational Facility, Communication, and Residential	Agricultural, Equestrian Recreational Facility, Communication, and Residential
Acreage	202.31	202.31
Lots	0	65
Parcels	8	9
Outlots	0	0
Outparcels	0	2

	EXISTING	EVALUATED
Dwelling Units	5	65
Nonresidential Gross Floor Area	34,664 sq. ft.	34,664 sq. ft.
Subtitle 24 Variation	No	No
Subtitle 25 Variance	Yes	Yes (Section 25-122(b)(1)(G))

The subject PPS, 4-25002, was accepted for review on March 31, 2025. Pursuant to Section 24-119(d)(2) of the prior Subdivision Regulations, the PPS was referred to the Subdivision and Development Review Committee (SDRC) and comments were provided to the applicant at its meeting on April 25, 2025. Revised plans and documents were received on June 9, 2025, June 13, 2025, and August 4, 2025, which were used for the analysis contained herein.

5. **Site Layout**—The property is currently developed with Glennwood Farm, an agricultural (equestrian) use, single-family detached uses, and communication uses (two cellphone towers), and is bisected by Farm Road with woodland filling most of the remaining property. The property contains five existing single-family residential dwelling units which are to remain. Abutting residential developments to the south of the property include stub roads to the property line of the subject site. Two of the existing stub roads, Sybaris Drive and Aquinas Avenue, are shown extended into the subject site for access to 60 single-family residential lots (Lots 1–60). Four open space parcels (Parcels B, C, D, and E) serve the residential development and shall be conveyed to a homeowners association (HOA). Parcels B, C, and E are also included to provide stormwater management (SWM) for the development. Private recreation facilities are to be located on Parcel D.

The existing development on the subject site is along Farm Road. No new development or access is approved along Farm Road. The existing single-family dwellings will be retained on individual lots (Lots 61, 62, 63, 64, and 65) with access to Farm Road. The lot boundaries, particularly for Lot 61, shall be revised to ensure that all existing structures meet the minimum setback requirements per the Zoning Ordinance. The existing equestrian recreational facility will be located on Parcel G. Parcel F contains accessory structures for the equestrian facility. Any accessory structure shall be located on the parcel with the principal use. Therefore, Parcels G and F shall be combined into one parcel, containing the principal and accessory structures associated with the equestrian facility. All existing accessory structures shall be labeled with the principal use they are associated with. Also, the boundary of Parcel G/F shall be revised so that the existing building structures meet the minimum setbacks required per the prior Zoning Ordinance. Parcel A and Parcel H are currently developed each with a cellphone tower (communications use), which are to remain. Parcel I is currently used for agriculture, which is to continue. The subdivision also includes two outparcels. Outparcel A is located to the east of the existing equestrian facility and is not approved for any use. This parcel shall be labeled as being retained by the owner. Outparcel B is a triangular tract of land, separated from the other tracts of land which are included in this PPS, under the same ownership. Outparcel B does not have frontage on, and direct access to, a public road. This parcel shall be labeled as being retained by the owner, or be conveyed to the owner of the abutting property (Parcel 42). The applicant shall provide a parcel table on the PPS, to identify all parcels and outparcels, their uses, acreage, and

ultimate ownership. In addition, the PPS requires several technical corrections prior to signature approval, which are listed as conditions of approval in this resolution.

6. **Previous Approvals**—There are no prior approvals applicable to the subject site.
7. **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

This PPS is located within Established Communities, which Plan 2035 classifies as follows:

“Existing residential neighborhoods and commercial areas served by public water and sewer outside of the Regional Transit Districts and Local Centers, as established communities. Established communities are 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 (such as sidewalks) to ensure that the needs of existing residents are met”.

Plan 2035 recommends future land use (generalized) as Residential Low, which allows for 3.5 dwelling units per acre, primarily single-family detached dwellings.

The PPS is found to be consistent with Plan 2035's Established Communities designation, as it represents appropriate low-density development.

Master Plan

The master plan recommends Residential Low land use on the subject property. Residential Low is defined as “residential area of up to 3.5 dwelling units per acre - primarily single-family detached dwellings” (page 40). Development of 60 single-family lots is consistent with the master plan, as it represents low-density development, at approximately 0.27 dwellings per acre.

The master plan further makes the following recommendations relevant to the subject property, shown below in **bold**, with analysis provided in plain text:

Chapter: Living Areas and Community Character – Suburban/Developing Tier Communities

Policy: Continue to build high-quality, suburban development organized around a network of open space and community facilities with attention to site design.
(page 179)

Strategy 5: Ensure that all new developments in the area are compatible with existing developments in terms of architecture and scale.

- Strategy 7:** Encourage conservation subdivisions in environmentally sensitive areas and adjacent to parks where additional open space would be beneficial.
- Strategy 8:** Design site features such as storm water management facilities during the development process so that they become amenities in the development.
- Strategy 9:** Provide green edges (woods, and landscaping) in new developments to provide a buffer that blends naturally into surrounding wooded areas.
- Strategy 11:** Incorporate environmentally sensitive design and green building/energy efficiency techniques.

The PPS approves 65 lots, 2 outparcels, and 9 parcels for 65 single-family residential dwelling units. The site layout and lotting pattern incorporates open space and preservation areas in its design. These areas serve as public amenities by providing usable open space in addition to landscape buffers that naturally blend into the surrounding wooded areas and preserve sensitive environmental features. The PPS preserves approximately 88 acres of woodlands on-site and incorporates environmental site design (ESD) practices to treat stormwater. SWM facilities should be designed to incorporate walking paths, bioswales with picnic areas or seating to create functional and enjoyable spaces. New development should be consistent with the existing surrounding context in terms of architecture and scale, and incorporate green building techniques such as permeable pavement, green roofs, solar panels, and light emitting diode lighting. These amenities, architectural finishes, and design elements will be reviewed at the time of detailed site plan (DSP).

8. **Stormwater Management**—In accordance with Section 24-120(a)(8) of the prior Subdivision Regulations, an application for a major subdivision must include an approved SWM concept plan, or indication that an application for such approval has been filed with the appropriate agency or the municipality having approval authority. A SWM Concept Plan (SIT-00302-2025) is under review by the Prince George's County Department of Permitting, Inspections and Enforcement (DPIE). An unapproved copy of the plan was submitted with this PPS, which shows the use of micro-bioretenention and submerged gravel wetland facilities. No further information pertaining to SWM is required at this time. Section 24-121(a)(15) of the prior Subdivision Regulations states that the Planning Board may approve a PPS, if the Planning Board finds that such approval will not affect the subdivision. As shown on the TCP1, the stormwater facilities are in close proximity to the primary management area (PMA), and further expansion of these facilities may result in impacts to the PMA. Impacts to the PMA for the location of stormwater outfalls is considered an allowable impact. However, impacts to the PMA for the location of stormwater facilities are considered avoidable impacts and are not approved. The applicant shall avoid any impacts for the location of stormwater facilities. While stormwater outfalls are allowable impacts, the SWM concept plan has not been approved. The analysis of PMA Impacts 1 through Impact 4 are appropriate with the TCP2 companion to the DSP in association with the approved SWM concept

plan, when an approved SWM concept plan will be available. Revisions to the SWM design, if required, will not impact the lotting pattern and will not affect the subdivision. Development of the site in conformance with the SWM concept plan, once approved by DPIE, 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.

9. **Parks and Recreation**—This PPS has been reviewed for conformance with the requirements and recommendations of the master plan, the 2013 *Formula 2040: Functional Master Plan for Parks, Recreation and Open Space*, the 2022 *Land Preservation, Parks and Recreation Plan for Prince George's County*, and Sections 24-134 and 24-135 of the prior Subdivision Regulations, as they pertain to public parks and recreation and facilities.

Section 24-134 and Section 24-135 of the prior Subdivision Regulations which relate to the mandatory dedication of parkland, provide for the dedication of land, the payment of a fee-in-lieu, or on-site recreational facilities. Lots with more than 1.0 acre of net lot area are exempt from this requirement per Section 24-134(a)(3)(B). Based on the density of development, 5 percent of the net residential lot area, may be required to be dedicated to The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission (M-NCPPC) for public parks, which equates to 1.9 acres for public parklands. However, the land is not adjacent to, nor adjoins, existing M-NCPPC-owned lands, so it is not feasible for land dedication. Due to this factor, on-site recreational facilities will best serve the residents of the development.

The PPS shows the fulfillment of mandatory dedication via the provision of on-site recreation facilities on Parcel D, without details of the recreation facilities. The applicant proposed a playground with associated seating and play equipment to meet the requirement. The applicant shall consider providing recreation facilities to offer opportunities for people of all ages and abilities to engage. Outdoor spaces should be designed to foster community connections and other general fitness activities to the extent possible. The area of Parcel D which could be used to provide recreational facilities is approximately 16,900 square feet. This area is adequate to provide, at a minimum, two playgrounds for different age groups, a dog park, and elements for passive recreation. The applicant should consider additional elements to maximize recreation opportunities and provide details of the recreation facilities with the submission of the DSP application. The provision of on-site recreation meets the requirements of Section 24-135(b) of the prior Subdivision Regulations, allowing on-site recreational facilities as an alternative to the dedication of land.

A master-planned natural surface trail along the entirety of Farm Road is adjacent to the subject property within the right-of-way (ROW). There is also a north-south segment of the natural surface trail that traverses the property. This alignment and design of this segment of the natural surface trail will be further developed as part of the DSP review. The natural surface trails shall be constructed as a public recreation facility.

The provision of mandatory dedication of parkland shall be met through on-site recreational facilities, in accordance with Section 24-135(b).

10. **Transportation (pedestrian, bicycle, and vehicular)**—This PPS was reviewed for conformance with the 2009 *Approved Countywide Master Plan of Transportation* (MPOT), the master plan, and the prior Subdivision Regulations to provide the appropriate transportation facilities.

Transportation Related Master Plan Conformance

Master Plan Right-of-Way

The existing lots and parcels have direct access via Farm Road, which is designated as a scenic roadway as identified in the master plan and the MPOT. There is no development approved along Farm Road with the current PPS. The MPOT provides policy guidance regarding the review of scenic roadways.

Policy 1: Conserve and enhance the scenic and historic values along special roadways.

Strategy 3: Utilize the “Guidelines for the Design of Scenic and Historic Roadways in Prince George’s County, Maryland” DPW&T, 2006) when evaluating applications within the rights-of-way of scenic and historic roadways.

The *Guidelines for the Design of Scenic and Historic Roadways in Prince George’s County, Maryland* (2006) have since been incorporated into the Prince George’s County Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T), Specifications and Standards for Roadways and Bridges (2012), in Section I-73. ROW recommendations for a Scenic Road can be found in Table I-1, which recommends a 60-foot-wide ROW.

Strategy 4: Consider a variety of techniques in order to protect the scenic and historic qualities of the designated roads during the review of applications that involve work within the right-of-way of a designated roadway. These techniques include alternative ways to circulate traffic; the use of the historic road section as one leg of a needed dual highway; provision of bypass roads; and limiting certain types of development and signs in the viewshed.

Pursuant to Section 24-123(a)(1) of the prior Subdivision Regulations, ROWs of all highways, streets, and transit facilities shown on the General Plan, functional master plans, and area master plans shall be shown on the PPS, and when reserved or dedicated, shown on the final plat. While no development is approved along Farm Road with the current PPS, a 60-foot-wide ROW shall be dedicated along Farm Road. As identified in the MPOT and master plan, Farm Road provides an east-west connection to South Osborne Road and Old Crain Highway, as envisioned in both master plans. The PPS shall be updated to include the delineation of Farm Road, prior to the certification of the PPS. The applicant shall work with staff and DPIE to establish the final alignment of the 60-foot-wide ROW at the time of DSP.

Pedestrian and Bike Facilities

- Natural Surface Trail: Farm Road
- Natural Surface Trail: Farm Road traveling north to William Beans Road

The MPOT recommends the natural surface trail along Farm Road. The natural surface trail along Farm Road shall be provided within the 60-foot-wide ROW dedicated for Farm Road. Regarding the trail providing a northern connection from Farm Road to William Beans Road, the planned location of the trail has environmental impacts, however, the trail alignment is to be coordinated with the Prince George's County Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR), at the time of DSP.

Recommendations, Policies, and Goals

The MPOT includes the following recommendations:

Policy 1: Provide standard sidewalks along both sides of all new road construction within the Developed and Developing Tiers.

A minimum 5-foot-wide sidewalk shall be provided along both sides of all new internal roadways to meet the intent of this policy. Sidewalks will be reviewed at the time of the DSP.

The 2013 *Approved Subregion 6 Master Plan and Sectional Map Amendment* also recommends:

Policy 1: Develop a road network that balances regional mobility and local accessibility needs.

Strategy 4: Encourage street connections between adjacent subdivisions.

The new lots have access via extensions of Sybaris Drive and Aquinas Avenue, meeting the intent of the master plan. In order to preserve the scenic roadway, a vehicular connection was not provided to Farm Road. A connection from Sybaris Road to Farm Road was not considered in the MPOT. Further, maintaining Farm Road as a scenic road requires a different road cross-section that is incompatible with the current design of the adjoining development.

Additional Transportation Findings

The new lots have access via extensions of Sybaris Drive and Aquinas Avenue; both are existing public roads. Sidewalks shall be provided along both sides of all internal roads. The existing and required access and circulation are sufficient, in accordance with the strategies in the adopted MPOT.

Based on the findings presented above, multimodal transportation facilities will exist to serve the subdivision, as required under the prior Subdivision Regulations, and will conform to the MPOT and master plan.

11. **Public Facilities**—This PPS was reviewed for conformance to the master plan in accordance with Section 24-121(a)(5). The master plan contains a Public Facilities chapter which identifies the following goals:

1. **Provide residents of Subregion 6 needed public facilities in locations that serve existing and future populations.**
2. **Ensure that all new public facilities will be constructed to LEED standards and existing buildings will be retrofitted to make them as energy efficient and sustainable as possible.**
3. **Maintain the high level of service by providing essential equipment and professional training for personnel.**
4. **Priority will be given to funding public facilities to support development in the Developing Tier.**

The proposed development will not impede achievement of the above-referenced goals. This PPS is subject to ADQ-2025-002, which established that pursuant to adopted tests and standards, public safety facilities are adequate to serve the proposed development. There are no fire and emergency medical service facilities, public schools, 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.

The 2018 *Water and Sewer Plan* placed this property in the water and sewer Category 4, “Community System Adequate for Development Planning” (water and sewer lines are available and/or accessible for extending). An administrative amendment to water and sewer Category 3 “Community System” will be required prior to approval of the final plat. Category 3 includes developed land on public water and sewer, and underdeveloped properties with a valid PPS approved for public water and sewer. In addition, the site is located within Sustainable Growth Tier I. Category 4 is sufficient for PPS approval.

The subject project is located in Planning Area 82A, Rosaryville. The *2025–2030 Fiscal Year Approved CIP Budget* does not identify any new public facilities proposed for construction in the subject planning area.

12. **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 both sides of all public ROWs. The public ROWs of Sybaris Drive and Aquinas Avenue are shown extended into the subject site, along with a street branching from Sybaris Drive and Aquinas Drive, to serve the new lots. The required PUE is reflected on the PPS, along both sides of each roadway. Farm Road currently exists as a 30-foot-wide prescriptive ROW, bisecting the property and providing frontage on and direct access to existing residential and nonresidential uses on the property. A 60-foot-wide ROW shall be dedicated for Farm Road. A 10-foot-wide PUE shall be shown on both sides of the Farm Road ROW.

13. **Historic**—The master plan contains goals, policies, and strategies related to historic preservation (pages 11–17, and 161–173). The plan notes that:

Subregion 6 is defined by a strong sense of history that is reflected in the important historical, architectural, archaeological, and cultural sites found throughout the region. Native American sites, historic plantations, tobacco barns, and early port towns illustrate the evolution of settlement and trade, while sites and people associated with military engagements, churches, and recreational sites represent the gradual solidification of communities. Pristine rural landscapes are a lasting symbol of the rural heritage of the area and provide outstanding opportunities for conservation.

One stated goal of the master plan (page 162) is to “ensure that historic sites and resources as part of the subregion’s rich cultural heritage are properly documented and protected from the onset of new development through proper and consistent historic preservation practices.” There are no Prince George’s County historic sites or resources on or adjacent to the subject property.

The 2010 *Approved Historic Sites and Districts Plan* contains goals and policies related to historic preservation that are relevant to the subject property. A goal (page 59) and related policy and strategy in planning for archeology is to:

Goal: Incorporate archeological resource protection into the local land use and comprehensive planning processes through site identification and preservation.

Policy 1: Ensure that archeological resources are considered and protected through all phases of the development process.

Strategy 3: Request a Phase I archeological survey on properties subject to the subdivision regulations that have a moderate-to-high probability of containing prehistoric or historic archeological resources.

Per Section 24-121(a)(18) of the prior Subdivision Regulations, archeological investigations can be required at the time of the PPS if there is a moderate or higher potential for archeological resources on the developing property.

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 high. The applicant's archaeology consultant submitted a Phase IA report documenting a reconnaissance survey of a 38-acre portion of the subject property. The report notes that the study area had a low potential for containing historic cultural resources. However, it is more likely that the area was inhabited during the prehistoric period due to the presence of well-drained landforms with topographic relief, in proximity to wetland areas per the analysis provided in the report. The subject property, therefore, was assessed to have precontact archaeological potential.

A Phase IB archeological survey of the areas of archeological potential identified during the Phase IA survey was conducted in June 2025. 144 shovel test pits (STPs) were excavated across eight discontinuous acres of the subject property that were identified during the Phase IA survey as having the highest potential for archeology. Two isolated finds, a hand-wrought or machine-cut nail and a single lithic flake, were identified. These are not National Register of Historic Places-eligible, and no further work was recommended. No further archeological investigation into this 38-acre portion of the subject property is required. If further phases of development do occur on other portions of the subject property, further archeological investigations may be warranted.

14. **Environmental**—The PPS was reviewed for conformance with the environmental regulations of Sections 24-121(a)(5), 24-129, 24-130, 24-131, 24-132 of the prior Subdivision Regulations and Section 27-285(b) of the prior Zoning Ordinance.

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-078-91	Staff	Approved	5/7/1991	N/A
E-010-2021	N/A	Staff	Approved	4/2/2021	N/A
NRI-032-2025	N/A	Staff	Approved	7/10/2025	N/A
4-25002	TCP1-015-2025	Planning Board	Approved	9/11/25	2025-080

Applicable Environmental Regulations

This property is subject to the 2024 Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance, the 2018 Environmental Technical Manual, and the environmental regulations contained in prior Subtitles 24 and 27, because the overall property does not have a prior tree conservation plan (TCP), and this is a new PPS and was accepted prior to April 1, 2025.

Environmental Site Description

A review of the available information indicates that streams, wetlands, floodplain, and steep slopes occur on the property. There is 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 are multiple stream systems on-site, one on the southern portion and one on the northern portion. The site does not have frontage on a master plan roadway designated arterial or higher; however, Farm Road, which abuts the northern corner of the new lots, is identified as a scenic road.

Plan 2035

The site is located within the Environmental Strategy Area 2 (formerly the Developing Tier) of the Regulated Environmental Protection Areas Map as designated by *Plan Prince George's 2035 Approved General Plan* (Plan 2035), and within the Established Communities of the General Plan Growth Policy of Plan 2035. The project is not within the boundaries of a transit-oriented center as identified in Plan 2035.

Environmental Conformance with Applicable Plans

Master Plan

The Environment section of the master plan (pages 63–82) contains goals, policies, and strategies. The following guidelines have been determined to be applicable to the current project. The text in **bold** is from the master plan and the plain text provides comments on plan conformance.

Policy 1: Protect, preserve and restore the identified green infrastructure network and areas of local significance within Subregion 6 in order to protect critical resources and to guide development and mitigation activities. (page 68)

This site is located in the Western Branch of the Patuxent River watershed, which is a primary corridor in the master plan, with the on-site streams joining into the larger Charles Branch, a secondary corridor in the master plan. The site is not located within the vicinity of any special conservation areas as outlined by the master plan.

The majority of the site is within the Green Infrastructure Network and contains both regulated area and evaluation area. The regulated areas are associated with the stream systems on-site. The evaluation area is located on the remainder of the site providing connections to the regulated areas and is primarily wooded, with some unforested pasture areas. The TCP1 protects and preserves the stream system and associated buffer within an area of woodland preservation with limited impacts for SWM outfalls.

The applicant stated in their SOJ that the proposed development preserves key environmental features and does not impact the PMA or specimen trees within the PMA; however, development is shown up to the PMA line, which represents the extent of the stream buffer. This secondary corridor is not being protected with additional buffering. Impacts to the PMA for the placement of SWM outfalls are proposed,

and the removal of specimen trees within the PMA in association to these outfalls is proposed.

Additional woodland conservation is shown on the portion of the site to the north of Farm Road, which is adjacent to regulated areas and evaluation areas. The streams on the north portion of the site join with the Federal Spring Branch, and then with the Patuxent River. There are several areas of riparian stream buffer that are not afforested, as required by Section 25-121(c)(1)(C) of the 2024 WCO. This area retains a connected woodland area which can promote sustaining habitat areas. Based on the minimization of disturbance inside the Green Infrastructure network, and with the requirement of Section 25-121(c)(1)(C) of the 2024 WCO to afforest the unforested riparian stream buffers, the PPS meets the intent of protecting critical resources.

Policy 2: Restore and enhance water quality in degraded areas and preserve water quality in areas not degraded. (page 72)

This site is located in the Western Branch of the Patuxent River watershed, which is a primary corridor in the master plan, with the on-site streams joining into the larger Charles Branch, which is a secondary corridor in the master plan.

At this time, a stream corridor assessment has not been conducted for this site, as past development occurred before the Woodland Conservation Ordinance, and subsequent work on the site consisted of single-family residential development and forest harvests. The master plan states that private developers shall perform stream corridor assessments if one has not been previously completed on-site. Prior to acceptance of the DSP, the applicant shall complete a stream corridor assessment for the tributaries on the site to determine the health of these systems.

This PPS allows residential development with infrastructure. The site does not have an approved SWM concept plan. The TCP1 shows the use of submerged gravel wetlands and micro-bioretenment to meet environmental site design to the maximum extent practicable.

Policy 4: Protect, restore and enhance the Chesapeake Bay Critical Area. (page 76)

The subject property is not located in the Chesapeake Bay Critical Area.

Policy 7: Encourage the use of green building techniques and community design that reduce resource and energy consumption. (page 79)

The development applications for the subject property, which require architectural approval, should incorporate green building techniques and the use of environmentally sensitive building techniques to reduce overall energy consumption. The use of green building techniques and energy conservation techniques are encouraged and should be implemented to the greatest extent possible.

The site is located within the Environmental Strategy Area 2 (formerly the Developing Tier) of the Regulated Environmental Protection Areas Map as designated by Plan 2035, and within the Established Communities of the General Plan Growth Policy of Plan 2035. The project is not within the boundaries of a transit-oriented center as identified in Plan 2035.

Green Infrastructure Plan

The Countywide Green Infrastructure Plan (GI Plan) was approved with the adoption of the 2017 *Approved Countywide 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:

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, restored, and/or established:

- 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 majority of the subject property is within designated evaluation and regulated areas, with the main regulated area located along the on-site stream system. Development is shown within the evaluation areas and regulated areas to the south of Farm Road. The development to the south of Farm Road shows the limits of disturbance directly abutting the delineated PMA, preserving the regulated area. The portion to the north of Farm Road preserves a significant portion of the regulated area, in support for this policy and in accordance with Section 25-121(c)(1)(C) of the 2024 WCO, which require development proposals to afforest the unforested riparian stream buffers.

- 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.**

Based upon the materials provided with the PPS, the site features numerous stream systems which, along with the associated buffers, are all to be in preservation. Section 25-121(c)(1)(C) of the 2024 WCO requires developments to afforest the unforested riparian stream buffers, which is added as a condition to revise the TCP1 prior to signature approval. Impacts are proposed for stormwater outfalls to the regulated area which are further discussed in the Regulated Environmental Features section of this finding.

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

The site does not have an approved SWM plan. SWM will be reviewed by the DPIE, at the time of DSP. At this time, the PPS shows the stormwater outfalls associated with the development proposal.

- 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.**

This site features woodland areas located around the regulated environmental features (REF) between the existing uses. Additional preservation is shown to the north of Farm Road, where no development is approved; thus, a mixture of farms, grasslands (pastures), and woodlands will function as connections to REF.

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 majority of the subject property is within designated evaluation and regulated areas, with the main regulated areas located along the on-site stream systems. The property is within both the Western Branch and Charles Branch of the Patuxent River watershed and is not within a Tier II catchment area. The current plan leaves the stream system mostly undisturbed, with impacts proposed for SWM outfalls. Woodland

preservation is provided within the stream buffer and PMA to protect the on-site stream. The PPS includes additional woodland preservation around the REF, to the north of Farm Road, to further buffer the sensitive areas and protect downstream habitats. Sensitive species habitat was not identified on this site, and the property is not in a special conservation area. SWM will be reviewed by DPIE, and sediment and erosion control measures will be reviewed by the Prince George's County's Soil Conservation District. Impacts to REF are proposed with this PPS for SWM, which are discussed later in this resolution.

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 site does not have a network gap as the regulated areas are divided between the stream system north of Farm Road and to the south where development is shown. The center of the property, where the existing use is located, is outside the Green Infrastructure Plan. The remaining areas are within the evaluation area.

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.

The REF are preserved with minimal impacts for necessary infrastructure. A Type 1 Tree Conservation Plan (TCP1-015-2025) was provided with this PPS, and it shows that the required woodland conservation requirement is not fully met through on-site woodland preservation. A condition has been provided herein to show on the TCP1 how the full woodland conservation requirement will be met.

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 minimizes the impacts on the green infrastructure network on-site by limiting impacts to the regulated areas, with the majority of impacts to the wooded portions of the evaluation area.

The REF are preserved with minimal impacts for necessary infrastructure. TCP1-015-2025 was provided with this PPS, and it shows that the required woodland conservation requirement is not fully met through on-site woodland

preservation. The development does not provide the woodland conservation threshold based upon its prior R-A Zoning on-site through woodland preservation, and does not meet any portion of the requirements on-site. A condition has been provided herein to show on the TCP1 how the full woodland conservation requirement will be met.

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.

The proposal has not received SWM concept approval from DPIE, stormwater facilities are not located in the REF. The SWM concept plan shows use of submerged gravel wetlands and micro-bioretenion devices to meet the current requirements of environmental site design to the maximum extent practicable. Stream restoration is not shown at this time. As required by the master plan, Policy 2 on page 72, a stream corridor assessment will be required prior to the subsequent DSP, which will evaluate the condition of the stream and evaluate if stream restoration is warranted.

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 development includes woodland preservation located within the stream buffers on-site; however, the TCP1 does not fully afforest the remaining unforested riparian buffers as required by Section 25-121(c)(1)(C) of the 2024 WCO. The applicant, in an SOJ for the woodland conservation threshold, stated that the stream buffers are being fully preserved, with the exception of

impacts for SWM outfalls. However, the TCP1 shows 3.27 acres of cleared area within stream buffers which are not being reforested. Therefore, prior to signature approval, the TCP1 shall be revised to fully afforest the stream buffers in accordance with Section 25-121(c)(1)(C) of the WCO. As provided for in Section 25-121(c)(1)(C)(i) through (iii), with future entitlement reviews, the applicant can submit a statement to justify not fully afforesting the riparian buffer.

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.

The property is zoned R-A which has a woodland conservation threshold requirement of 50 percent. With the woodland clearing shown on the TCP1, the overall requirement for conservation on this property is 122.93 acres, in compliance with the current adopted County Code. The applicant is preserving 88.42 acres on-site; however, the worksheet provided on the TCP1 submitted by the applicant reflects the conservation requirements for the prior R-80 Zone, and does not account for the remaining 34.51 acres of conservation requirement consistent with the R-A Zone, in compliance with the current adopted County Code.

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 2018 Environmental Technical Manual (ETM), and the 2010 Landscape Manual, which can count toward the tree canopy coverage (TCC) requirement for the development. TCC requirements will be evaluated at the time of the associated DSP 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. Preservation is located within the REF on-site. 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 the associated DSP 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.**

This PPS shows existing woodland cleared to the edge of the stream buffer. Protections for the REF from development shall be put in place by planting edge treatments to prevent the loss of tree canopy.

- 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.**

Woodland conservation is located throughout the site, around the PMA and REF. This site does contain potential forest interior dwelling species habitat; however, it is not mapped 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.**

Woodland conservation is designed to minimize fragmentation and reinforce new forest edges. Woodland conservation is located throughout the site around the PMA and REF. This site does 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 Resource Inventory/Environmental Features

An unapproved Natural Resources Inventory (NRI-032-2025) was accepted for review on March 13, 2025. Upon review of the NRI, revisions and corrections were required and the applicant resubmitted the NRI on June 13, 2025. The NRI was approved on July 10, 2025, and was submitted with the response materials on August 4, 2025. A correction to the NRI is required to account for existing structures on-site which were previously not accounted for. Prior to signature approval of the PPS, a revision to the NRI shall be approved.

The approved NRI shows REF, steep slopes, floodplain, streams, and wetlands and their associated buffers comprising the PMA on this property. The site contains specimen trees. The site statistics table on the NRI shows 46.74 acres of PMA and 8,520 linear feet of regulated

streams. The NRI indicates that there are numerous invasive species within the areas included for woodland conservation. An invasive species management plan shall be included on the TCP2. The TCP1-015-2025 does not show the correct information in conformance with the NRI.

Woodland Conservation

The site is subject to the provisions of the 2024 WCO because the property does not have a prior TCP. This PPS is also subject to the ETM. TCP1-015-2025 was submitted with the subject PPS and requires revisions to be found in conformance with the WCO.

The property is zoned R-A which has a woodland conservation threshold requirement of 50 percent, per the current adopted County Code. However, the TCP1 worksheet, as provided by the applicant, uses the R-80 Zone to calculate the woodland conservation requirement. A condition is provided herein to revise the TCP1 to reflect the prior R-A Zone requirements. The project is not within the boundaries of a transit-oriented center as identified in Plan 2035. The TCP1 worksheet shows 114.13 acres of woodlands in the net tract and 7.87 acres of wooded floodplain. The woodland conservation requirements reflective of the threshold requirements of the R-A Zone were calculated, which results in a woodland conservation threshold of 50 percent, or 97.22 acres. The TCP1 includes clearing of 25.71 acres of woodland resulting in a total woodland conservation requirement of 122.93 acres.

The woodland conservation requirement is met with 88.42 acres on-site preservation. However, since the TCP1 uses calculations for the prior R-80 Zone rather than the R-A Zone in accordance with the current adopted County Code, the methods of meeting the woodland conservation requirements for the prior R-A Zone were not calculated.

As detailed in Section 25-122(d)(1)(A)(i) of the WCO, woodlands which have been previously harvested require a report from a qualified professional to verify that the woodlands are in good condition, in the process of regeneration, and contain 15 percent or less invasive or exotic plants. The submitted NRI identifies several areas which were previously harvested. The applicant shall provide a report from a qualified professional for all areas of previous forest harvest which are to be utilized for woodland conservation, prior to acceptance of the DSP. Existing structures are shown within the wooded area to the north of Farm Road which is shown as preservation. Structures cannot remain inside of woodland conservation and shall be removed in accordance with the design requirements for woodland conservation detailed in Subtitle 25 122(b) of the WCO prior to approval of the TCP2. The applicant shall revise the TCP1 to account for the structures on-site and if those structures are to remain then woodland conservation shall not be placed in the same location. The woodland conservation worksheet shall be revised to reflect these changes.

The development shows preservation within the stream buffers on-site; however, the TCP1 does not fully afforest the remaining unforested riparian buffers as required by Section 25-121(c)(1)(C) of the 2024 WCO. The applicant did not provide a statement with this PPS justifying not afforesting the stream buffers. Therefore, prior to signature approval, the TCP1 shall be revised to fully afforest the stream buffers in accordance with Section 25-121(c)(1)(C). As provided for in Section 25-121(c)(1)(C)(i) through (iii), with future entitlement reviews the applicant can submit a statement to justify not fully afforesting the riparian buffer.

Technical revisions are required to the TCP1, prior to certification of the PPS, in conformance with the conditions provided herein.

Woodland Conservation Threshold (WCT) Requirements

Section 25-121(c)(1) of the WCO requires that properties “shall comply with the woodland conservation and afforestation threshold requirements established in Table 1. The threshold establishes the minimum acreage requirement of woodland conservation for a site (other calculations must be performed to determine the total amount of woodland conservation required) and is calculated as a percentage of the net tract area of the site.” The woodland conservation threshold for the prior R-A Zone is 50 percent. The applicant requested that the conservation threshold not be met on-site for this project.

Statement of Justification

The SOJ states that of the 202.31-acre property, the WCT applied to this site is 97.22 acres, and with 25.71 acres of clearing, the woodland conservation requirement is 122.93 acres, in accordance with the current adopted County Code. The site currently has 114.13 acres of woodlands and with 25.71 acres of clearing shown with this PPS, the remaining woodland on-site will be 88.42 acres, a deficit of 8.80 acres to the WCT. The SOJ describes that the cleared area of the site is fully occupied by the existing residential use, equestrian operation, and support for the equestrian operation through the production of hay from the fields, and that there is no opportunity on the site to provide the 8.80 acres of reforestation required to fulfill the WCT.

It is important to note that the provisions of Footnote 147 in the Prince George’s County adopted Code require that in order to develop this property with lots of 10,000 square feet or greater, a portion of the property shall be retained for an equestrian recreational facility. This footnote does not stipulate the acreage necessary to fulfill this requirement; however the SOJ indicates that the site, with the exception of the area approved for development of the residential community, is operating at the minimal limit to be viable as an equestrian recreational facility.

Section 25-122(c)(1) of the WCO provides the required priorities for woodland conservation methods, to meet this requirement. The applicant provided a justification for all 14 criteria (A through N). The two relevant criteria are discussed below in **bold** and comments in plain text:

A. On-site preservation and conservation of streams and buffers, including the planting of unforested stream buffers.

On page 12 of the SOJ, the applicant states that the stream buffers, with the exception of areas required to remain clear for SWM outfalls, are fully wooded and under preservation. The TCP1, however, identifies 3.27 acres of stream buffer that are not wooded, and are not part of the woodland preservation of the site.

G. Off-site afforestation/reforestation of connected planting areas using transplanted native stock, relocated from the site or surrounding areas.

On page 14 of the SOJ, the applicant states that the woodland to remain and the 42 of the 76 specimen trees to remain “will meet the requirements that other 10,000 SF lot performing development plans (which are typically in the current RSF-95 Zone and thus have significantly less preservation thresholds) must provide in addition to the equestrian facility.” In addition, the applicant contends that “the generic language and clear intent of CB-081-2025 would allow for the Planning Board to designate the Property as a [prior] R-80 subdivision (which is the current RSF-95 zone) and allow for the development to only provide twenty percent (20%) of its Woodland Conservation Threshold on-site.” The applicant asserts that “while not sought with this application, this designation could be considered since the language within the legislation refers to the approval of standards with a forthcoming detailed site plan that are in general harmony with the establishment of lots that are at least 10,000 square feet (which is again akin to a prior R-80 subdivision).” Thus, the applicant concludes that “there is a rationale to reduce the Woodland Conservation Threshold to align with an RSF-95-zoned property, which is twenty percent (20%) of the net lot area.” This would then result in a requirement of only 38.88 acres of woodland preservation on-site.

The referenced Council Bill allows for this subdivision to be developed using a density consistent with the prior R-80 Zoning; however, it is determined that the referenced Footnote 147(D), “Bulk regulations concerning the height of structures, lot size and coverage, frontage, setbacks, density, number of uses, and other requirements of the specific zone do not apply”, does not include the provisions of the WCO. These requirements listed in the footnote refer specifically to the bulk regulations of the Zoning Ordinance and do not reference the WCO, under the current adopted County Code.

Given the existing equestrian use on the property and the requirement by Footnote 147 in the County Code to retain that use, the Planning Board approved to not providing the full WCT on-site, with conditions to revise the TCP1 to recognize the WCT criteria for the R-A Zone, and to provide reforestation to fulfill the requirements of Section 25-122(c)(1)(A) of the WCO by proposing planting for the unforested areas of the stream buffer, with an exception of areas approved for SWM outfalls. The remaining woodland conservation requirements of the R-A Zone can be met through off-site banking or, if qualified through the provisions of CB-046-2025, fee-in-lieu.

Specimen Trees

Section 25-122(b)(1)(G) requires that “Specimen trees, champion trees, and trees that are part of a historic site or are associated with a historic structure shall be preserved and the design shall either preserve the critical root zone of each tree in its entirety or preserve an appropriate percentage of the critical root zone in keeping with the tree’s condition and the species’ ability to survive construction as provided in the [Environmental] Technical Manual.” The code, however, is not inflexible.

The authorizing legislation of the WCO is the Maryland Forest Conservation Act, which is codified under Title 5, subtitle 16 of the Natural Resources Article of the Maryland Code. Section 5-1611 of the Natural Resources Article requires the local jurisdiction to provide procedures for granting variances to the local forest conservation program. The variance criteria in WCO are set forth in Section 25-119(d). Section 25-119(d)(4) clarifies that variances granted under Subtitle 25 are not considered zoning variances.

A Subtitle 25 variance application and statement dated June 13, 2025 were submitted for review with this PPS. The TCP1 shows the removal of ST-10, ST-11, ST-17 through ST-27, ST-29 through ST-38, ST-51, ST-55, ST-56, ST-60, ST-69 through ST-72, ST-74, and ST-75 for a total of 33 specimen trees. The condition of trees proposed for removal ranges from poor to good.

Review of Subtitle 25 Variance Request

A Subtitle 25 Variance Application and an SOJ in support of the variance was received on June 9, 2025.

Section 25-119(d)(1) of the 2024 WCO contains six required findings to be made before a variance can be granted. The SOJ submitted seeks to address the required findings for the variance.

Statement of Justification Request:

A variance from Section 25-122(b)(1)(G) was requested for the clearing of the 33 specimen trees on-site. The subdivision allows development of the site for single-family detached residential dwelling units.

This variance is requested to the 2024 Woodland and Wildlife Conservation Habitat Ordinance (WCO) which requires, under Section 25-122 of the Prince George's County Zoning Ordinance, that "woodland conservation shall be designed as stated in this Division unless a variance is approved by the approving authority for the associated case." The Subtitle Variance Application form requires an SOJ of how the findings are being met.

Below are the six criteria listed in Section 25-119(d)(1) for variance approval.

(A) Special conditions peculiar to the property have caused the unwarranted hardship.

To meet this finding, the applicant must show that the variance is necessary to allow for a use of its property that is significant and reasonable. Further, the applicant must demonstrate that the use cannot be accomplished elsewhere on the property without a variance.

The applicant states in the variance request that special conditions peculiar to the property have caused unwarranted hardship. Due to the existing floodplain and other REF which consists of 21 percent of the overall site, the varying topography of the property resulting in elevation differences of up to 60 feet, and the location of the specimen trees throughout the property, the applicant states

that limited development pockets are formed. The applicant contends further that, if these 33 specimen trees were required to be retained, the development would rely on single-loaded roads, which is not an efficient way to layout a development. The specimen trees proposed for removal are located throughout the site in multiple rolling hills and valleys, which require grading in order to establish the infrastructure for the site. The applicant states that the preservation of the 33 specimen trees would leave 33 percent of the site not available for development and would create inefficient development areas. The Planning Board agrees with the applicant, as it pertains to 29 of the 33 specimen trees requested for removal.

It should be noted that the applicant's variance request only identifies 29 specimen trees for removal, yet requests the removal of 33. In addition, the applicant states no specimen trees within the PMA are requested for removal, yet ST-10, ST-11, ST-51, and ST-69 are all within the PMA. This evaluation was corrected to account for this actual request.

The property features significant floodplain area, and areas of steep slopes which require extensive grading. The PMA exists in isolated pockets with limited floodplain in the area approved for development. Based on approved NRI-032-2025, the site features five forest stands that are identified as priority for preservation. Given the nature of the NRI, specimen trees were only considered within the area approved for development. The majority of specimen trees on-site are within the PMA. Of the 33 specimen trees proposed for removal, 29 specimen trees are outside of the PMA and 4 are located within the PMA. Eight are in good condition, 14 are in fair condition, and 11 are in poor condition. Construction tolerances vary depending on the tree species and given conditions. Impacts to specimen trees in good condition should be minimized or avoided with future applications, to meet the intent and purpose of Woodland Conservation under the currently adopted County Code. With this PPS, avoidance of additional impacts to the floodplain and PMA has shifted development to the western and central portions of the site where these specimen trees in fair to good condition are located.

The evaluated use, for a residential community characteristic of the prior R-80 Zone, is allowed in the prior R-A Zone, through CB-081-2021. The proposed stormwater facilities for the development abuts the PMA without providing a buffer. This results in impacts to the critical root zone of multiple specimen trees in proximity to and within the PMA identified as Specimen Trees ST-12, ST-13, and ST-61. At this time, the SWM concept plan is unapproved. Further review from DPIE may result in the expansion of SWM facilities or extensions/relocations of the associated outfalls which may expand impacts to PMA and specimen trees. Alternative grading or layouts shall be explored to avoid further impacts to the PMA and specimen trees which are in proximity to the PMA.

The applicant preserved many of the on-site specimen trees located within the PMA and undevelopable area. Specimen trees, with critical root zones impacted by development, but not proposed for removal, shall be placed within a specimen tree maintenance plan with the TCP2 to monitor the health of the trees. Details shall be included as part of the subsequent DSP. In accordance with the current adopted County Code, 29 specimen trees are found to meet the criteria for removal; however, Specimen Trees ST-10, ST-11, ST-51, and ST-69 are not approved for removal because removal of these four trees is in association with the unapproved SWM concept plan. As such, the Board finds that an analysis of these trees may be appropriate with the TCP2 associated with the DSP, when an approved SWM concept plan will be available.

(B) Enforcement of these rules will deprive the applicant of rights commonly enjoyed by others in similar areas.

The applicant states that without the removal of these specimen trees the site could not be developed and would require significant retaining walls of over 10 feet in height. In addition, due to its rolling topography, the site is divided into multiple drainage areas. This results in the need for multiple SWM devices, in order to provide adequate stormwater controls. The applicant states that limiting the developable area by protecting root zones and specimen trees will deprive them of the opportunity to create a development where road grades and utilities do not exceed the requirements for road construction, stormwater controls, and utilities set forth in Subtitle 32.

Due to the existing topography, and the necessity to construct an extension of Sybaris Road for site access, the applicant is required to conduct significant grading to establish the SWM controls for this development. The trees that are proposed for removal are located within the central portions of the site. Several specimen trees within the PMA will be impacted by the proposed development. Grading and SWM is an expected feature of a typical residential development, and the proposed development should coexist with the existing natural features by minimizing the removal of specimen trees. The goal of SWM is to mimic woodland in good condition to prevent increased flow rates and sediment runoff. Any development on the site would need to provide SWM, which is not a unique enforcement of the rules. The retention of specimen trees in the upland areas could result in the removal of specimen trees adjacent to and within the REF. The central portion of this site features a tributary of the Charles Branch, which is afforded special protection in the master plan and along which woodland preservation should be placed to further buffer the stream network. This PPS seeks to remove specimen trees in primarily fair condition within the central upland areas of the site, and in proximity to the REF. Any application which proposes development on this site would be subject to the same review.

(C) Granting the variance will not confer on the applicant a special privilege that would be denied to other applicants.

The applicant states that given the evidence in Findings (A) and (B) above, not granting the variance would prevent the project from being developed within the County standard design parameters and would render the land undevelopable.

Not granting the variance would prevent the applicant from grading and developing the project as intended. This is not a special privilege that would be denied to other applicants. If other properties encounter trees in similar locations on a site with significant REF and PMA, the same considerations would be provided during the review of the variance application. The proposed residential community is a use that is allowed in the prior R-A Zone; however, the PPS approves lots based on the prior R-80 Zone by use of a text amendment to the prior Zoning Ordinance approved by CB-081-2021.

The removal of specimen trees and impacts to REF are expected with development. As noted in the master plan, the Charles Branch stream system should be afforded additional protections for any development along its reach. With future applications, the development shall seek to limit impacts to the REF on the site, while meeting the standard designs for utilities, roads, and walls.

(D) The request is not based on conditions or circumstances which are the result of actions by the applicant.

The applicant states that this request is based on the existing conditions for the site and the associated requirements for development. The variance SOJ states that the layout minimizes the impacts to REF while abiding by design standards, which are not a result of actions taken by the applicant.

The request for removal of the 33 trees is a result of their location on the property and the limitations on site design, which are not the result of actions by the applicant. Stormwater, road grades, slope grading, and other requirements are established by the County. Any development on this site would be subject to meeting the current requirements of the County based on the scope of that proposed development. As mentioned in the findings above, the location of REF on the site limit development to specific areas. While the lot layout does impact a significant portion of specimen trees (44 percent), it also retains specimen trees within and adjacent to the REF and PMA; however, four specimen trees within the PMA were requested for removal with this PPS.

(E) The request does not arise from a condition relating to land or building use, either permitted or nonconforming, on a neighboring property; and

The applicant states that this request is not from a condition on a neighboring property. The request to remove the specimen trees does not arise from a condition relating to land or building use, either permitted or nonconforming on a neighboring property.

(F) Granting of the variance will not adversely affect water quality.

The applicant states that the site is governed by the SWM regulations that went into effect on May 5, 2010, which require the post-development site to mimic pre-development conditions as “woods in good condition.”

Granting the variance for removal of 29 specimen trees will not adversely affect water quality because the applicant is required to meet current SWM requirements on-site. Stormwater requirements will be evaluated by DPIE and additional information regarding the proposed stormwater facilities can be located in the Stormwater Management finding of this resolution. Sediment and erosion control measures for this site will be subject to the requirements of the Prince George’s County Soil Conservation District (PGSCD). Removal of the 29 specimen trees will not result in a marked degradation of water quality.

The applicant proposed to remove Specimen Trees ST-17 through ST-27, ST-19 through ST-38, ST-55, ST-56, ST-60, ST-70 through ST-72, ST-74, and ST-75 for a total of 33 specimen trees removed for grading, roadways, and stormwater. The variance to remove 29 specimen trees, specifically ST-17 through ST-27, ST-29 through ST-38, ST-55, ST-56, ST-60, ST-70 through ST-72, ST-74, and ST-75, is APPROVED. Specimen trees ST-10, ST-11, ST-51, and ST-69 are NOT APPROVED for removal, as the removal of these trees is in association with the unapproved SWM concept plan. The analysis of these trees shall be deferred to DSP, when an approved SWM concept plan will be required. A specimen tree replacement worksheet was placed on the TCP1; this worksheet shall be evaluated with the TCP2.

Preservation of Regulated Environmental Features/Primary Management Area

The site contains REF, including streams, stream buffers, wetlands, wetland buffers, and steep slopes, which comprise the PMA.

Section 24-130(b)(5) of the Subdivision Regulations states: “Where a property is located outside the Chesapeake Bay Critical Areas Overlay Zones the preliminary plan and all plans associated with the subject application shall demonstrate the preservation and/or restoration of regulated environmental features in a natural state to the fullest extent possible consistent with the guidance provided by the Environmental Technical Manual established by Subtitle 25. Any lot with an impact shall demonstrate sufficient net lot area where a net lot area is required pursuant to Subtitle 27, for the reasonable development of the lot outside the regulated feature. All regulated environmental features shall be placed in a conservation easement and depicted on the final plat.”

Impacts to REF should be limited to those that are necessary for the development of the property. Necessary impacts are those that are directly attributable to infrastructure required for the reasonable use, and orderly and efficient development of the subject property, or are those that are required by County Code for reasons of health, safety, or welfare.

Necessary impacts include, but are not limited to, adequate sanitary sewerage lines and water lines, road crossings for required street connections, and outfalls for SWM facilities. Road crossings of streams and/or wetlands may be appropriate if placed at the location of an existing crossing or at the point of least impact to the REF. SWM outfalls may also be considered necessary impacts if the site has been designed to place the outfall at a point of least impact. The types of impacts that can be avoided include those for site grading, building placement, parking, SWM facilities (not including outfalls), and road crossings where reasonable alternatives exist. The cumulative impacts for the development of a property should be the fewest necessary and sufficient to reasonably develop the site in conformance with County Code. Impacts to REF must first be avoided and then minimized.

A letter of justification (LOJ) and exhibit for PMA impacts were provided in response to SDRC comments with this PPS. This LOJ identifies four impacts. PMA are identified in accordance with the reviews conducted by other agencies, the Army Corps of Engineers, and the Maryland Department of the Environment. A detailed summary of the revisions to each impact is below.

Impact 1

With this PPS, Impact 1 proposed 2,743 square feet (0.063 acre) of permanent impacts to PMA and stream buffer for a stormwater outfall. While stormwater outfalls are allowable impacts, the SWM concept plan has not been approved. Analysis of PMA Impact 1 will be appropriate with the TCP2 companion to the DSP in association with the approved SWM concept plan, when an approved SWM concept plan will be available.

Impact 2

With this PPS, Impact 2 proposed 2,735 square feet (0.063 acre) of permanent impacts to the PMA and stream buffer for a stormwater outfall. While stormwater outfalls are allowable impacts, the SWM concept plan has not been approved. Analysis of PMA Impact 2 will be appropriate with the TCP2 companion to the DSP in association with the approved SWM concept plan, when an approved SWM concept plan will be available.

Impact 3

With this PPS, Impact 3 proposed 2,756 square feet (0.063 acre) of permanent impacts to the PMA and stream buffer for a stormwater outfall. While stormwater outfalls are allowable impacts, the SWM concept plan has not been approved. Analysis of PMA Impact 3 will be appropriate with the TCP2 companion to the DSP in association with the approved SWM concept plan, when an approved SWM concept plan will be available.

Impact 4

With this PPS, Impact 4 proposed 3,124 square feet (0.07 acre) of permanent impacts to the PMA and stream buffer for a stormwater outfall. While stormwater outfalls are allowable impacts, the SWM concept plan has not been approved. Analysis of PMA Impact 4 will be appropriate with the TCP2 companion to the DSP in association with the approved SWM concept plan, when an approved SWM concept plan will be available.

Summary of PMA Impacts

Four impacts were identified on the PMA/REF LOJ for this PPS, totaling 11,358 square feet (0.26 acre) of PMA impacts. The SOJ identifies the total as 11,475 square feet, yet only requests 11,358 square feet of impacts. Of these four impacts, all are for stormwater outfalls. While stormwater outfalls are allowable impacts, the SWM concept plan has not been approved. Analysis of PMA Impacts 1 through Impact 4 will be appropriate with the TCP2 companion to the DSP in association with the approved SWM concept plan, when an approved SWM concept plan will be available. Therefore, PMA Impacts 1 through 4 are NOT APPROVED.

Soils

In accordance with Section 24-131, this PPS was reviewed for unsafe land restrictions. The predominant soils found to occur according to the U.S. Department of Agriculture Natural Resource Conservation Service, Web Soil Survey include the Adelphia-Holmdel complex, Dodon fine sandy loam, Marr-Dodon complex, Potobac-Issue complex, Udorthents – reclaimed gravel pits, and Westphalia and Dodon soils. According to available mapping information, unsafe soils containing Marlboro clay or Christiana clay do not occur on this property. However, Marlboro Clay is mapped within proximity to the site. This information is provided for the applicant's benefit.

A preliminary geotechnical report, titled Troutman Farm, dated May 2, 2025, and prepared by Geo-Technology Associates, Inc., was submitted. Based on the results of the subsoil investigations, Marlboro clay was not encountered within the depths of the soil borings which ranged from 20 feet to 25 feet below surface. However, according to PGAtlas, the Marlboro clay is anticipated at elevations 130 or lower in the vicinity, deeper soil borings shall be performed to further evaluate the subsoil conditions prior to acceptance of the DSP. In addition, the geotechnical report stated that retaining walls, with a maximum height of approximately 10 feet with a 3H:1V slope behind them, are planned on-site. Additional soil investigations and analysis will be required for the retaining walls with the DSP. The geotechnical investigations and analysis shall be performed in accordance with Prince George's County Requirements, Techno-Grams 005-2018 and 002-2021.

15. **Urban Design**—The evaluated use “Dwelling, one-family detached (as part of a property assembly with an equestrian recreational facility)” is permitted in the R-A Zone subject to Footnote 147 of Section 27-441(b) of the prior Zoning Ordinance, which requires a DSP. Per this footnote, all bulk regulations shall be determined with the DSP, except the minimum lot size which shall be 10,000 square feet. The DSP will have to include any details for the proposed/existing equestrian recreational facility.

Under the prior Zoning Ordinance, conformance to the following regulations, but not limited to, shall be demonstrated:

- Part 3, Division 9, Subdivision 3 – Requirements for Detailed Site Plans
- Section 27-426 – R-A Zone (Residential-Agricultural)
- Section 27-441 - Uses permitted.
- Part 11 – Off-Street Parking and Loading; and
- Part 12 - Signs

Conformance with the 2010 Prince George's County Landscape Manual

The proposed development is subject to the requirements of the Landscape Manual. The site is subject to: Section 4.1, Residential Requirements; Section 4.6, Buffering Development from Streets; Section 4.7, Buffering Incompatible Uses; and Section 4.9, Sustainable Landscaping Requirements. Conformance with these requirements will have to be demonstrated with the required DSP.

Conformance with the Tree Canopy Coverage Ordinance

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 propose more than 2,500 square feet of gross floor area, or disturbance, and requires a building or grading permit. The Tree Canopy Coverage Ordinance is not subject to the current Zoning Ordinance grandfathering provisions and does not contain any grandfathering provision for prior zoning, except for specified legacy zones or developments that had a previously approved landscape plan demonstrating conformance to tree canopy coverage (TCC). Therefore, this PPS will be required to conform with the TCC requirement for the current property zone, which is the AR Zone, and is exempt from the minimum TCC requirement. This exemption should be noted on the required DSP.

16. **Citizen Feedback**—The Prince George's County Planning Department did not received any written correspondence from members of the community regarding this project.
17. **Planning Board Hearing**—The applicant submitted six exhibits, prior to the September 9, 2025 noon deadline, that were entered into the record as Applicant Exhibits 1–6. At the September 11, 2025 Planning Board hearing, staff presented the PPS to the Planning Board and summarized the exhibits submitted by the applicant. Applicant Exhibit 1 included a request for revisions to two of the recommended conditions of approval. Applicant Exhibits 3–6 included resumes of the applicant's engineering team and expert witnesses. Applicant Exhibit 2 was a revised TCP1 with an updated woodland conservation worksheet. The revised TCP1 indicated that the woodland conservation requirement is to be met with a combination of on-site woodland preservation and a fee-in-lieu. However, Section 25-122 of the WCO sets forth criteria for using fee-in-lieu to meet this requirement. The applicant shall provide the requisite documentation, in conformance with this section, at the time of the TCP2 application. As such, staff recommended that Condition 12c, as published in the technical staff report, be deleted, since this condition has been satisfied.

The applicant's attorney, then spoke on behalf of the applicant, providing a background and summary for the proposed development. One citizen attended the Planning Board hearing and signed up to speak regarding the PPS. During their testimony, the citizen stated that they had not heard anything they were opposed to and, therefore, declined to make any comments regarding the project. The Planning Board approved the PPS unanimously, with conditions, as recommended by staff and as revised by Applicant Exhibit 1, with the deletion of Condition 12c.

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 Geraldo, with Commissioners Washington, Geraldo, and Barnes voting in favor of the motion at its regular meeting held on Thursday, September 11, 2025, in Largo, Maryland.

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 2nd day of October 2025.

Darryl Barnes
Chairman

By 
Jessica Jones
Planning Board Administrator

DB:JJ:JB:rpg


Approved for Legal Sufficiency
M-NCPPC Office of General
Counsel

Dated 9/25/25