

PGCPB No. 2025-088

File No. 4-25006

R E S O L U T I O N

WHEREAS, Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority and Old Line Realty Company, LLC are the owners of an 8.53-acre tract of land known as Parcel A and Parcel 2, said property being in the 20th Election District of Prince George's County, Maryland, and being zoned Local Transit-Oriented-Core (LTO-C); and

WHEREAS, on March 31, 2025, Standard Landover Venture LP filed an application for approval of a Preliminary Plan of Subdivision for two parcels; and

WHEREAS, the application for approval of the aforesaid Preliminary Plan of Subdivision, also known as Preliminary Plan 4-25006 for Landover Metro 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 18, 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, the staff of The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission recommended APPROVAL of the application with conditions; and

WHEREAS, at the September 18, 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 TCP1-013-2025, and APPROVED a Variance to Section 25-122(b)(1)(G), and further APPROVED Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-25006 for two parcels, 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. Add the prior PPS and final plat approved for the property to General Note 5.
 - b. Correct General Note 11 to reflect transportation use as an additional proposed use for the property.

2. Prior to approval, the final plat of subdivision shall include:
 - a. The granting of a 10-foot-wide public utility easement along the abutting public right-of-way, in accordance with the approved preliminary plan of subdivision, in accordance with Section 24-122(a) of the prior Prince George's County Subdivision Regulations.
 - b. A plat note stating that direct vehicular access to a public road is provided via an access easement to Parcels 1 and 2, in accordance with Section 24-128(b)(15) of the prior Prince George's County Subdivision Regulations, and delineation of the access easements.
3. In conformance with the 2009 *Approved Countywide Master Plan of Transportation*, and the 2014 *Landover Metro Area and MD 202 Corridor Sector Plan*, the applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall provide the following improvements and show the following facilities at the time of detailed site plan.
 - a. A minimum 5-foot-wide Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)-compliant sidewalk, ADA curb ramps and marked crosswalks along the frontage of Old Landover Road unless modified by the permitting agency with written correspondence; any modifications shall be in accordance with the Prince George's County Department of Public Works and Transportation and Maryland State Highway Administration adopted standards.
 - b. Short- and long-term bicycle parking at a location near the entrance to the building and within the building.
 - c. Designated pedestrian pathways from roadway frontages and throughout the site, including ADA curb ramps and marked crosswalks.
4. Prior to signature approval of the preliminary plan of subdivision, the Type 1 tree conservation plan (TCP1) shall be revised as follows:
 - a. Add the Specimen Tree Replacement Worksheet to the TCP1.
 - b. Label the building or add symbology for the building to the legend
 - c. Show all existing and proposed easements as cleared.
 - d. Under the specimen tree table, add the following note:

“This plan is in accordance with the following variance from the strict requirements of Subtitle 25 approved by the Planning Board on (ADD DATE) with 4-25006 for the removal of one specimen tree (Section 25-122(b)(1)(G)) specifically Specimen Trees ST-1.”
 - e. Have the plans signed and dated by the qualified professional who prepared them.

5. Development of this site shall be in conformance with Stormwater Management Concept Plan (SIT-00260-2025), and any subsequent revisions, once approved.
6. Development of this subdivision shall be in conformance with an approved Type 1 Tree Conservation Plan, TCP1-013-2025, in conformance with Section 25-121 of the 2024 Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance. 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 (TCP1-013-2025 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 (M-NCPPC), Prince George’s County Planning Department.”

7. Prior to issuance of permits for this subdivision, in conformance with Section 25-119(a)(3) 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 and wildlife habitat conservation easement pursuant to Section 25-122(d)(1)(B) with the Liber and folio reflected on the Type 2 tree conservation plan, when approved.”

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

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

9. Prior to issuance of any permits impacting 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.
10. At time of permit review, the purchase of off-site woodland conservation credits shall first be sought within the area of the 2014 *Landover Metro Area and MD 202 Corridor Sector Plan*.

11. In accordance with Section 24-135 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 in accordance with the standards outlined in the *Prince George's County Park and Recreation Facilities Design Guidelines*.
12. The on-site recreational facilities shall be reviewed by the Development Review Division, of the Prince George's County Planning Department, for sufficiency and proper siting, in accordance with the *Prince George's County Park and Recreation Facilities Design Guidelines*, with the review of the detailed site plan (DSP). Timing for construction shall also be determined at the time of DSP.
13. 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 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 Book and page of the RFA shall be noted on the final plat, prior to plat recordation.
14. 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, letter of credit, or other suitable financial guarantee for construction of recreational facilities.
15. At the time of final plat, the applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall submit to the Subdivision Section of the Development Review Division of the Prince George's County Planning Department, for review and approval, a draft access covenant and conditional access easement over the property, which delineates the easement that provide access to a public street for Parcels 1 and 2, in accordance with Section 24-128(b)(15) of the prior Prince George's County Subdivision Regulations. The document shall set forth the rights, responsibilities, and liabilities of the parties and shall include the rights of the Prince George's County Planning Board. The limits of the shared access easements shall further be reflected on the final plat. The document shall be recorded in the Prince George's County Land Records, and the Liber/folio indicated on the final plat, prior to recordation.

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 the north side of Old Landover Road, approximately 175 feet west of its intersection with Pennsy Drive. The property consists of two parcels known as Parcel A, which was recorded in Plat Book WWW 78 page 79 in the Prince George's County Land Records, as well as one deed parcel known as Parcel 2, as designated by

the Maryland State Department of Assessments and Taxation, recorded in Book 4430 page 339 of the Land Records.

The 8.53-acre property is in the Local Transit-Oriented-Core (LTO-C) Zone. However, this preliminary plan of subdivision (PPS) was reviewed in accordance with the Prince George's County Zoning Ordinance and Prince George's County Subdivision Regulations effective prior to April 1, 2022 (the prior Zoning Ordinance and prior Subdivision Regulations), pursuant to Section 24-1900 *et seq.* of the current Subdivision Regulations. Therefore, this PPS is reviewed pursuant to the standards of the prior Light Industrial (I-1) Zone, which was effective prior to April 1, 2022. The site is subject to the 2014 *Landover Metro Area and MD 202 Corridor Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment* (sector plan) and other applicable plans, as outlined herein.

The subject PPS qualifies for review under the prior Zoning Ordinance and prior Subdivision Regulations because it was accepted for review prior to April 1, 2025, and meets the requirements of Section 24-1904 of the current Subdivision Regulations. Pursuant to Section 24-1904(a), the applicant participated in a pre-application conference for the subject PPS on March 7, 2025. In accordance with Section 24-1904(b), the applicant provided a statement of justification (SOJ) explaining why they were electing to use the prior regulations. In accordance with Section 24-4503(a)(4) of the Subdivision Regulations, this PPS is supported by and subject to an approved Certificate of Adequacy ADQ-2025-010.

This PPS allows subdivision of the property into two parcels for the development of 275 multifamily residential dwelling units. One parcel will be owned by the applicant for the purpose of constructing the multifamily building. The second parcel will be retained by the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA) for use in conjunction with its existing transportation facilities in the vicinity.

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

3. **Setting**—The subject property is located on Tax Map 59, Grids C-1, D-1 and D-4, and it is within Planning Area 72. The subject property lies between Old Landover Road and the entrance to the Landover Metro Station operated by WMATA, which abuts the site to the north. To the west there is additional land owned by WMATA which abuts the metro tracks serving the Landover Metro Station. To the south is Old Landover Road. Across Old Landover Road there are maintenance facilities owned by WMATA, a church, and a vehicle storage yard in the Local Transit-Oriented-Edge (LTO-E) (formerly Commercial Office) Zone. To the east is vacant land owned by Pennsylvania Lines LLC, which consists of a drainage channel, and beyond Pennsy Drive to the east is an extensive industrial park in LTO-C and LTO-E (formerly I-1) Zones.
4. **Development Data Summary**—The following information relates to the subject PPS and the evaluated development.

	EXISTING	EVALUATED
Zones	LTO-C	I-1
Use(s)	Vacant, Transportation	Residential, Transportation
Acreage	8.53	8.53
Parcels	2	2
Lots	0	0
Outlots	0	0
Dwelling Units	0	275
Variation	No	No
Subtitle 25 Variance	No	Yes; Section 25-122(b)(1)(G)

The subject PPS, 4-25006, 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 28, 2025. Revised plans and documents were received on July 25, 2025, August 8, 2025, and August 14, 2025, which were used for the analysis contained herein.

5. **Previous Approvals**—The property consists of two parcels, identified as Parcel A and Parcel 2. Parcel A is subject to an approved PPS, 4-71271, which was recorded in Plat Book WWW 78, Plat No. 79, titled Bergmans Laundry, for which there are no available records. There are no other previous approvals applicable to the subject site. This PPS supersedes 4-71271 for the subject property.
6. **Community Planning**—The 2014 *Plan Prince George's 2035 Approved General Plan* (Plan 2035) and conformance with the sector plan is evaluated, as follows:

Plan 2035

Plan 2035 places the subject property in the Landover Metro Local Transit Center. Plan 2035 describes local centers as focal points for development and civic activity based on their access to transit or major highways. The plan contains recommendations for directing medium-to medium-high residential development, along with limited commercial uses, to these locations, rather than scattering them throughout the established communities. These centers are envisioned as supporting walkability, especially in their cores and where transit service is available (page 19).

Plan 2035 recommends a housing mix of mid-rise and low-rise apartments and condominiums and townhouses, with an average net housing density of 15–30 dwelling units/acre for new development in the transit center (Table 16, page 108).

Sector Plan

Pursuant to Section 24-121(a)(5) of the prior Subdivision Regulations, a PPS and final plat shall conform to the area master plan, including maps and text, unless events have occurred to render the relevant recommendations within the plan no longer appropriate, no longer applicable, or the

Prince George's County District Council has not imposed the recommended zoning. The sector plan recommends mixed-use commercial land uses (Map 3.4: Proposed Future Land Uses for the Metro Focus Area, page 42) on the subject property. The evaluated use, therefore, does not conform to the sector plan's recommended land uses. However, on November 14, 2017, the District Council adopted CB-096-2017 permitting multifamily dwellings in the Light Industrial (I-1) Zone when all or part of the property is located within 0.25 mile from an existing mass transit rail station operated by WMATA. The subject property is in the I-1 Zone under the prior Zoning Ordinance and is within 0.25 mile from the Landover Metro Station, which is a mass transit rail station operated by WMATA. Per CB-096-2017 (Section 27-473(b), Footnote 66(b) through (d)) additional qualifications for multifamily development in the I-1 Zone are as follows: "(B) The use is subject to Detailed Site Plan approval in accordance with Part 3, Division 9 of this Subtitle; (C) The bedroom percentages for multifamily dwellings as set forth in Section 27-419 shall not be applicable; and (D) Regulations concerning the height of structure, lot size and coverage, parking and loading, frontage, setbacks, density, landscaping and other requirements of the I-1 Zone shall not apply. All such requirements shall be established and shown on the Detailed Site Plan." Based on the adoption of CB-096-2017, the Council's decision to allow such uses is an event that renders the mixed-use commercial land use recommendations in the sector plan no longer appropriate, in accordance with Section 24-121(a)(5).

Pursuant to Section 24-121(a)(5) of the prior Subdivision Regulations, the PPS is also required to conform to the relevant goals, policies and strategies of the sector plan. The sector plan recommendations are intended to stimulate new residential and commercial investment and increase metro ridership over the mid- and long-term.

The revitalization plan for the sector plan focuses on three distinct focus areas. The subject property is within the metro focus area that contains the Landover Metro Station and immediate vicinity.

Metro Focus Area

The metro focus area predominantly has industrial uses and sensitive environmental areas. The vision for the metro focus area is a vibrant, walkable, transit-oriented center anchored by a green industrial district and mixed-use development primarily for research and technology office uses (page 35).

The sector plan identifies that the industrial uses found to the south and east of the Landover Metro Station are not complementary to transit usage. Sensitive environmental features surrounding the station also may limit development (page 33). While the sector plan does not define mixed-use commercial, the proposed mixed-use commercial and mixed-use residential developments within the metro focus area are expected to drive increased growth in the area, thereby boosting ridership at the Metro station. The evaluated multifamily residential development on the subject property assists in furthering the sector plan goals in shifting development in the metro focus area away from industrial uses to residential development and increasing metro ridership.

Other applicable provisions of the sector plan, including policies and strategies that are found applicable to the development of the subject property, and the preliminary plan's conformance to these, are discussed further throughout this resolution.

7. **Stormwater Management**—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. An unapproved Stormwater Management (SWM) Concept Plan (SIT-00260-2025), which is currently in review by the Prince George's County Department of Permitting, Inspections and Enforcement (DPIE), was submitted with this PPS. The unapproved concept plan shows the use of a submerged gravel wetland to meet the stormwater requirements for the site, which will require DPIE approval prior to detailed site plan. 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 associated TCP1 submitted with this PPS, the stormwater facility is located in the existing floodplain and will not impact any other regulated environmental features (REF). 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, and any subsequent revisions, will ensure that no on-site or downstream flooding occurs. Therefore, this PPS satisfies the requirements of Section 24-130 of the prior Subdivision Regulations.

8. **Parks and Recreation**—This PPS has been reviewed for conformance with the requirements and recommendations of the sector 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.

The PPS will generate an approximate additional 770 people for Planning Area 72. Sections 24-134 and 24-135, which relate to mandatory dedication of parkland, provide for the dedication of land, the payment of a fee-in-lieu, and/or the provision of on-site recreational facilities to serve the active recreational needs of residential development.

Based on the density of development, 15 percent of the net residential lot area, 1.28 acres, would be required to be dedicated to The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission (M-NCPPC) for public parks. However, given the density of the site, the provision of on-site recreational facilities for future residents will meet the mandatory dedication of parkland requirement.

This PPS shows the fulfillment of mandatory dedication via the provision of on-site recreational facilities. Proffered recreational facilities include a community room, a fitness room and equipment, a tot lot, a dog run, and a bike room. Additional outdoor recreation facilities, such as raised garden beds and seating for residents, should be included.

The applicant provided equipment details and cost estimates of the recreational facilities. The estimate demonstrates that the total value of on-site recreational facilities meets the minimum value of land that would be required in dedication, in accordance with the *Park and Recreation Facilities Design Guidelines*. The on-site recreation facilities detail will be further assessed with the review of the detailed site plan.

It is anticipated that, in addition to on-site recreational facilities, future residents of the subject development will utilize external facilities in the surrounding area. M-NCPPC-owned parks in this area include Dodge Park, Landover Park and Kenmoor Park. Both Dodge Park and Kenmoor Park are adjacent to elementary schools. The Prince George's Ballroom and Kentland Community Center are located south of the subject property.

This development is in alignment with the sector plan's intention to provide quality, safe, and convenient parks and recreational facilities within developments providing respite and contributing to the desirability and livability of the community for current and future residents.

Based on the preceding findings, the requirement of mandatory dedication of parkland will be met through the provision of on-site recreational facilities, in accordance with Section 24-135(b) of the prior Subdivision Regulations.

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

Transportation Related Master Plan Conformance

Master Plan Right-of-Way

There are no master planned roadways that directly impact the subject site. The site has frontage along Old Landover Road, which is identified as a 50-foot-wide ROW. However, access to the site is shown via a shared driveway with the adjacent Landover Metro Station. Although the site does not directly front Pennsy Drive, it is a master-planned roadway identified as a collector (C-402) with a 70-foot-wide ROW. No road dedication is required with this PPS and the existing ROW is sufficient.

Master Plan Pedestrian and Bike Facilities

There are no master-planned pedestrian or bicycle facilities that impact the subject site.

The MPOT provides policy guidance regarding multimodal transportation and the Complete Streets element of the MPOT recommends how to accommodate infrastructure for people walking and bicycling (MPOT, pages 9–10):

Complete Streets

Policy 2: All road frontage improvements and road capital improvement projects within the Developed and Developing Tiers shall be designed to accommodate all

modes of transportation. Continuous sidewalks and on-road bicycle facilities should be included to the extent feasible and practical.

Standard sidewalks shall be provided along the property frontage of Old Landover Road to include crosswalks and Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) curb ramps at vehicular crossings to meet the intent of this policy.

A pedestrian pathway is also required from the subject site to the shared driveway with the adjacent Landover Metro Station, including crosswalks and ADA curb ramps. Short- and long-term bicycle parking is required to accommodate multimodal use to and from the site.

Access and Circulation

Private Access Easement

Main access to the site is shown via a shared driveway with the adjacent Landover Metro Station. Although secondary access is shown along Old Landover Road, it is not designated as the main access due to environmental constraints. For the development to utilize the shared driveway, a private access easement agreement with WMATA is required.

Section 24-128(a) of the prior Subdivision Ordinance provides access requirements as follows:

No subdivision plan or plan of development (however designated) shall be approved that provides for a private road, right-of-way, or easement as the means of vehicular access to any lot, and no building permit shall be issued for the construction of any building in a subdivision unless such building is to be located on a lot or parcel of land having frontage on and direct vehicular access to a public street, except as hereinafter provided.

However, Section 24-128(b)(9) states:

Where direct vehicular access to an individual lot fronting on a public street should be denied due to a potentially hazardous or dangerous traffic situation, a private easement may be approved in accordance with the driveway standards in Part 11 of Subtitle 27, in order to provide vehicular access, when deemed appropriate by the Planning Board.

The property is impacted by the 100-year floodplain and, therefore, access to the site along Old Landover Road is not desired, as safe passage would not be provided. The private access easement and alternative access are approved, which are subject to approval from WMATA.

In addition, the subject property is also required to demonstrate “dry passage” per DPIE. To demonstrate this can be achieved, a secondary emergency access is shown from the western corner of the on-site parking lot to MD 202 via a bridge and elevated podium. The pathway of this connection traverses property owned by the property owner, WMATA, DPIE, and/or the Department of Public Works and Transportation and the State Highway Administration. The

intent of the Old Landover Road access is for emergency purposes only in the event of a flood and will otherwise be gated and prohibited from daily traffic flow to the development or the Landover Metro Station. Approval will be required from all operating agencies within their permitting processes.

10. **Public Facilities**—This PPS was reviewed for conformance to the sector plan in accordance with Section 24-121(a)(5) of the prior Subdivision Regulations. The sector plan contains public facilities discussion in Chapter 2 (Background) that discusses parks and public spaces, schools and fire and emergency medical facilities. The plan contains a discussion of challenges and opportunities, but does not specifically address any visions or goals for these facility discussions.

There are no master-planned police, fire and emergency medical service facilities, public schools, parks, or libraries recommended on the subject property. The analysis provided with this resolution, and approved Certificate of Adequacy ADQ-2025-010, illustrates that pursuant to adopted tests and standards, public safety facilities and water and sewer services are adequate to serve the development.

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

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

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

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

The standard requirement for public utility easements (PUEs) is 10 feet wide along both sides of all public ROWs. The subject property has frontage on the public ROW of Landover Road. The required PUE is provided along the property’s frontage with Old Landover Road.

12. **Historic**—The sector plan contains no goals and policies related to Historic Preservation. A search of current and historic photographs, topographic and historic maps, and locations of currently known archeological sites indicates the probability of archeological sites within the

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

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

Development Review Case	Associated Tree Conservation Plan No.	Authority	Status	Action Date	Resolution Number
N/A	TCP2-138-05	Staff	Approved	4/11/06	N/A
NRI-088-2018	N/A	Staff	Approved	11/2/2018	N/A
NRI-088-2018-01	N/A	Staff	Approved	8/8/2025	N/A
4-25006	TCP1-013-2025	Planning Board	Approved	9/18/2025	2025-088

Applicable Environmental Regulations

This property is subject to Division 2 Subtitle 25 of the County Code, the 2024 Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance, because the overall property does not have a prior tree conservation plan, and this is a new PPS that was accepted prior to April 1, 2025. This PPS is also subject to the 2018 Environmental Technical Manual (ETM), and the environmental regulations contained in prior Subtitles 24 and 27.

Site Description

A review of the available information indicates that the site has stream buffers, wetlands, wetland buffers, and is predominately in the 100-year floodplain. There is no potential forest interior dwelling species (FIDS) 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. Lower Beaverdam Creek is located off-site to the east along Pennsy Drive. An existing stormwater conveyance channel bisects the southern portion of the site.

Plan 2035

The site is located within Environmental Strategy Area 1 (formerly the Developed 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 within the boundaries of a transit-oriented center as identified as Landover Metro Local Transit Center in Plan 2035.

Environmental Conformance with Applicable Plans

In accordance with Section 24-121(a)(5) of the prior Subdivision Regulations, the policies from the Environmental Section of the applicable master plans must be analyzed with the PPS. The following is the analysis of the applicable master plans.

Sector Plan Conformance

The sector plan does not contain any environmental goals, policies, or strategies; however, the environmental recommendations of the plan begin on page 38 and are evaluated below.

The sector plan recommends that an environmental study of the floodplain and wetlands constraints of the property be conducted. A floodplain study was performed for the site and indicated the site is approximately 90 percent in the Lower Beaverdam Creek 100-year floodplain. DPIE has granted a floodplain waiver to allow the development. Mitigation for impacts to the floodplain will occur on-site with a vault to capture the flood waters. A wetland delineation report was included with the Natural Resources Inventory (NRI) application. The site contains five isolated wetlands. Impacts to the floodplain and wetlands are discussed in detail in the preservation of REF finding below.

The sector plan recommends protecting existing woodlands and natural areas and restore connectivity, where possible. The TCP1 shows 0.21 acre of woodland preserved in the northwest portion of the site adjacent to the wetland identified on the plan as "System A." The plan shows 2.62 acres of wooded floodplain being retained on-site. This retained wooded floodplain is mainly along Old Landover Road and the area adjacent to the Lower Beaverdam Creek.

The sector plan recommends protecting and restoring the Lower Beaverdam Creek stream corridor greenway between Pennsy Drive and the Metro station. This PPS will not impact Lower Beaverdam Creek, which is located off-site.

Environmental Features Vision (page 67)

The sector plan recommends the forest canopy coverage be expanded by ensuring that development projects meet their woodland conservation requirements either on-site or within the sector plan area's watershed to the extent possible. The TCP1 shows 0.21 acre of woodland preservation on-site. The remainder of the woodland conservation requirement is met by obtaining off-site woodland conservation credits. The applicant shall first seek to obtain these off-site credits in a woodland conservation bank within this sector plan's watershed.

The sector plan recommends the promotion of the use of environmentally sensitive (green) development techniques. The unapproved site development concept plan shows the use of a submerged gravel wetland to meet the environmental site design to the maximum extent practicable.

The sector plan long-term vision and recommendations (page 68) recommend incorporation of sustainable SWM practices in all development in order to protect the adjacent stream corridor. The unapproved site development concept plan shows the use of a submerged gravel wetland to meet the environmental site design to the maximum extent practicable.

2017 Green Infrastructure Plan Conformance

The Green Infrastructure Plan (GI Plan) was approved on March 17, 2017, with the adoption of the 2017 *Approved Prince George's County Resource Conservation Plan: A Countywide Functional Master Plan* (CR-11-2017). According to the GI Plan, a majority of the site is either in a regulated or evaluation area within the designated network of the plan. The following policies

and strategies are applicable to the subject PPS. The text in **bold** is the text from the GI Plan, and the plain text provides findings on plan conformance:

Policy 1: Preserve, enhance, and restore the green infrastructure network and its ecological functions while supporting the desired development pattern of Plan Prince George's 2035. (page 49)

Strategies

- 1.1 **Ensure that areas of connectivity and ecological functions are maintained, re-stored, and/or established by:**
- a. **Using the designated green infrastructure network as a guide to decision-making and using it as an amenity in the site design and development review processes.**
 - 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.**
 - c. **Protecting existing resources when constructing stormwater management features and when providing mitigation for impacts.**
 - 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 project contains regulated area of the GI Plan and contains 100-year floodplain and REF. The on-site REF consists of wetlands, wetland buffers, and stream buffers. The floodplain covers approximately 90 percent of the site. The Director of DPIE has granted a floodplain waiver to allow for this development. Three impacts to the floodplain, wetlands, and its buffers are requested, as well as an impact to the stream buffer. In accordance with the GI Plan, and County Code, the remaining on-site 100-year floodplain and REF will be preserved in a conservation easement with the final plat. The woodland and wildlife habitat conservation easement recorded with the Type 2 tree conservation plan (TCP2) will provide protection to the wildlife habitat, the 100-year floodplain, and the existing REF.

The site does not have an approved SWM concept plan. SWM is currently being reviewed by DPIE. The SWM concept plan identifies a submerged gravel wetland for the development, which does not impact the on-site REF. The sediment and erosion control measures will be reviewed by the Prince George's County's Soil Conservation District. Both SWM and sediment and erosion

control requirements are to be met in conformance with state and local laws, to ensure that the quality of water leaving the site meets the state's standards. State standards are set to ensure that no degradation occurs.

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.**

Sensitive species habitat was not identified on-site as confirmed with the NRI, and the property is not in a special conservation area as identified in the GI Plan.

Policy 2: Support implementation of the 2017 GI Plan throughout the planning process (page 50)

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 subject area does not contain network gap areas, as the regulated area is shown on the majority of the site, due to the 100-year floodplain; however, it should be noted that Lower Beaverdam Creek is located to the east of this site. The woodlands surrounding the wetlands in the northern portion of the site will remain intact except for a small area for access. The woodlands adjacent to Lower Beaverdam Creek and Old Landover Road will be retained, to the maximum extent practicable. In accordance with the GI Plan and Section 25-121(b) of the WCO, woodland preservation and afforestation/reforestation are shown in locations that will improve the green infrastructure network.

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.

Development of this site requires impacts to the 100-year floodplain, for which DPIE has granted a floodplain waiver associated with SWM Concept Plan No. SIT-00540-2025 and Floodplain Study FPS No. 201846. Flood mitigation requirements will occur on-site through the use of an underground vault under the parking area.

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 woodland and wildlife habitat conservation easements prior to the certification of the subsequent detailed site plan and associated TCP2. All remaining undisturbed areas within the primary management area (PMA) will be protected within a conservation easement on the final 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 project has not received SWM concept approval from DPIE; however, an application is in review. The proposed submerged gravel wetland shown on the TCP1 is within the 100-year floodplain. DPIE granted a floodplain waiver to allow this SWM facility to be built in the 100-year floodplain. The technical stormwater system will be reviewed by DPIE and the Prince George's County's Soil Conservation District. Both SWM and sediment and erosion control requirements will be met in conformance with state and local laws to ensure that the quality of water leaving the site meets the state's standards, which are set to ensure that no degradation occurs.

- 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's woodland preservation is located adjacent to the wetlands in the northern portion of the site. The site also retains 2.62 acres of woodlands in the 100-year floodplain which cannot be counted towards the woodland conservation requirement; however, the TCP1 does not reforest the remaining riparian buffers as required by Section 25-121(c)(1)(C) of the WCO. More information regarding this can be found in the Woodland Conservation Section of this resolution.

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.

In accordance with the GI Plan and Section 25-121(b) of the WCO, the woodland conservation requirement has been prioritized to the extent possible. No fee-in-lieu is approved; however, 1.01 acres of off-site woodland conservation credits are included.

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

Retention of existing woodlands and planting of native species on-site is required by both the ETM, and the 2018 *Prince George's County Landscape Manual* (Landscape Manual). Tree canopy coverage (TCC) requirements will be evaluated at the time of the associated detailed site plan review.

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

The site has woodland throughout, including along the stream system, with woodland preservation located adjacent to the wetlands in the northern portion.

Retention of woodlands and planting of native species on-site is required by both the ETM, and the Landscape Manual, and can count toward the TCC requirement for the development. TCC requirements will be evaluated at time of the 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 clearing of woodland to the edge of the stream buffer. Protection from development for the REF should 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.

This site does not contain the potential for forest interior dwelling species and is not within a sensitive species project 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.

The planting of native species on-site is required by the Landscape Manual and can count toward the TCC requirement for the development. In accordance with this GI Plan policy and Subtitle 25 Division 3 of the County Code, tree canopy coverage will be evaluated with the DSP. Green space is encouraged to serve multiple ecological functions.

Conformance with Environmental Regulations

Natural Resources Inventory/Environmental Features

Section 24-120(a)(22) of the prior Subdivision Regulations requires an approved NRI plan with PPS applications. An approved NRI (NRI-088-2018-01) was submitted with this PPS. The site contains 100-year floodplain and REF including wetlands, wetland buffers, stream buffer, and steep slopes that comprise the PMA. The Lower Beaverdam Creek is located to the east of the site with the stream buffer impacting the eastern boundary line of the property. The NRI shows a stormwater conveyance channel within a stormdrain easement that bisects southern portion of the property. This channel is a remnant of a former concrete channel. In an email from Ryan Din of the Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE) dated July 18, 2025, he states that the channel is not regulated by MDE.

Per the approved NRI, the property is approximately 8.53 acres in size with 7.5 acres of the site within the existing 100-year flood plain, leaving a net tract area of 1.03 acres available for development. However, a flood plain waiver from DPIE was issued which allows development on the site, subject to conditions.

The TCP1 and the PPS show all required information correctly in conformance with the NRI. No revisions are required for conformance to the NRI.

Woodland Conservation

TCP1-013-2025 was submitted with a woodland conservation worksheet showing that this 8.53-acre site contains 7.50 acres of floodplain for a net tract area of 1.03 acres, consistent with the site statistics of the NRI. This property is unique in that the site is in a Plan 2035 local transit center and is approximately 90 percent within the 100-year floodplain. The site contains a total of 0.31 acre of net tract woodlands with 6.77 acres of wooded floodplain. The TCP1 shows the

woodland conservation requirement of 1.22 acres met with 0.21 acre of on-site woodland preservation, and 1.01 acres of off-site woodland conservation credits. In conformance with the sector plan, off-site woodland credits shall be obtained within the sector plan area's watershed to the extent possible. The subject property has a woodland conservation and afforestation threshold of 15 percent or 0.15 acre, and 0.21 acre of on-site woodland conservation is provided. Therefore, the development meets the 15 percent woodland conservation threshold on-site.

Riparian Stream Buffer

The site contains a riparian stream buffer that is required to be fully wooded in accordance with Section 25-121(c)(1)(C) of the WCO. Section 25-121(c)(1)(C)(i) exempts allowable uses as established for the riparian buffer in Subtitle 32 and the ETM. Clearing of woodlands within the riparian (stream) buffer is shown that will not be replaced. The applicant requested that reforestation of the entire buffer not be required, due to critical infrastructure needs and site constraints. The purpose of the proposed clearing is to install site infrastructure. Subtitle 32 allows site infrastructure within the stream buffer. As discussed below in the "Preservation of Regulated Environmental Features/Primary Management Area" section, placement of site infrastructure within the stream buffer is a necessary and unavoidable impact per the ETM. Accordingly, compliance with the exceptions contained in Section 25-121(c)(1)(C)(i) has been demonstrated.

Specimen Trees

Tree conservation plans are required to meet all requirements of Subtitle 25, Division 2, which includes the preservation of specimen trees, per Section 25-122(b)(1)(G). Every effort should be made to preserve the trees in place, considering the different species' ability to withstand construction disturbance (refer to the construction tolerance chart in the ETM for guidance on each species' ability to tolerate root zone disturbances).

If, after careful consideration has been given to the preservation of the specimen trees there remains a need to remove any of the specimen trees, a variance to Section 25-122(b)(1)(G) is required. Applicants can request a variance to the provisions of Division 2 of Subtitle 25, the Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance (WCO) provided all of the required findings in Section 25-119(d) can be met. An application for a variance must be accompanied by a letter of justification (LOJ) stating the reasons for the request and how the request meets each of the required findings.

Review of Subtitle 25 Variance Request

The site contains one specimen tree. A Subtitle 25 Variance application and an SOJ in support of the variance were received on August 8, 2025 for the removal of one specimen tree, identified as ST-1. The tree is located in a central part of the property and is listed in very poor condition as identified on the approved NRI. The TCP1 shows the tree centrally located near the eastern property line and is located in the location of the proposed building footprint and associated infrastructure.

Section 25-119(d)(1) of the 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. A variance to Section 25-122(b)(1)(G) was requested for the clearing of one specimen tree on-site. This

variance was requested to the 2024 WCO which requires, under Section 25-122, 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.

The text below in **bold**, labeled A–F, are the six criteria listed in Section 25-119(d)(1). The plain text provides responses to the criteria:

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

To meet this finding, the applicant must show that: (1) the variance is necessary to allow for a use of its property that is significant and reasonable; and, (2) the use cannot be accomplished elsewhere on the property without a variance.

The applicant stated in the variance request that special conditions peculiar to the property have caused unwarranted hardship. In relation to other properties in the area, special conditions peculiar to the property would cause an unwarranted hardship if the applicant were required to retain the one specimen tree identified as Specimen Tree ST-1. Those special conditions consist of: (1) the subject property’s REF, which consist of the 100-year flood plan, wetlands, a stream and its buffers; and (2) the need to provide dry passage across the development for the residents of the building and patrons of the Metro station during flooding events.

The SOJ indicates that Specimen Tree ST-1 is proposed for removal because it is located within the footprint of the proposed building. The proposed building is a 275-unit multifamily building that will be located adjacent to the Landover Metro Station. The evaluated multifamily project is a significant and reasonable use which cannot be achieved elsewhere on the property. Specifically, the sector plan shows the property within the Metro Focus Area, which targets development at the subject property. Plan 2035 places this property within a local transit center. As discussed in the Community Planning finding above, this development is in conformance with these recommendations. Accordingly, it is a significant and reasonable use of the subject property.

This multifamily project cannot be achieved elsewhere on the subject property. The specimen tree to be removed is listed in very poor condition and any development within its vicinity would further stress the tree and it would likely not survive. Developing around the tree would result in greater impacts to other sensitive features of the property, like the wetlands and PMA. Impacts associated with buildings are considered avoidable and unsupportable, per the ETM.

In addition, this specimen tree removal variance request was evaluated using the Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Priorities as outlined in Section 25-121(b)(1) of the WCO. The specimen tree requested for removal will

allow for the protection of the woodlands with the highest priorities as listed in Section 25-121(b)(1) of the WCO to the maximum extent practicable and allow for the development of this site to occur in the lower priority areas of the site. Requiring the applicant to retain this one specimen tree on the site by designing the development to avoid impacts to the critical root zone (CRZ) would require clearing of higher priority woodlands per Section 25-121(b)(1) of the WCO.

Finally, this development cannot be achieved elsewhere on the subject property is the need to design the development to provide dry passage for the residents of the building and patrons of the Metro station during flooding events, and the site is designed in such a way that disturbance is limited to the developable areas, as allowed by the approved floodplain waiver. As outlined in the applicant's SOJ, the dry passage is in the form of a route through the proposed parking garage to a bridge which will extend above Old Landover Road, out of the floodplain. The need to provide this dry passage limits options for redesigning the development to avoid removing ST-1.

Based on the foregoing, special conditions peculiar to the property have caused the unwarranted hardship.

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

Enforcement of the requirement that all specimen trees be preserved, along with an appropriate percentage of their CRZ, would deprive the applicant of rights commonly enjoyed by others in similar areas – specifically, other properties directly adjacent to high capacity rail transit stations that are recommended for intense development.

Specimen trees grow to such a large size because they were left undisturbed on a site for sufficient time to grow. The development is required to provide SWM, grading, safe circulation, utilities, and landscaping on-site in conformance with other sections of the County Code. The applicant states that complying with the additional requirement to preserve the existing specimen tree on-site, there is not enough room to then develop the site for a multifamily residential building without compromising other requirements of the sector plan and zoning for required building locations. The site has been designed in a way which maximizes the buildable areas of the site, while limiting the impacts to the PMA to only those which are allowable, reasonable, and necessary. Other sites that contain constraints and conditions similar to these would be given the same considerations during the review of the variance application.

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

All variance applications for the removal of specimen trees are evaluated in accordance with the requirements of Subtitle 25 of the County Code and the ETM for site-specific conditions. When similar trees were encountered on other sites for comparable developments, they have been evaluated under the same criteria.

The applicant stated that, given the site constraints due to the majority of the project being in the 100-year floodplain, not granting the variance would prevent the project from being developed within the County standard design parameters. The applicant pointed out that as designed, development layout will provide dry passage for the residents and patrons of the Metro station during flooding events. The applicant has also made considerable efforts to avoid additional PMA impacts. The specimen tree shown for removal is in very poor condition rating and is centrally located along the eastern property line. The PPS preserves 0.21 acre of woodland on-site and 2.62 acres of woodlands are retained, but not credited, in the floodplain. Given these circumstances, removing ST-1 is not a special privilege that would be denied to other applicants. If other properties encounter trees in similar locations on a site with 100-year floodplain and REF, the same considerations would be provided during the review of the variance application.

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

The variance SOJ stated that this request is based on the existing conditions for the site and the associated requirements for development, while abiding by design standards. These are not the result of actions taken by the applicant.

The request for removal of the specimen tree is a result of its location on the property, its condition, and the limitations on site design, which are not the result of actions by the applicant. As detailed in the finding above, these limits include the site's REF and the need to provide dry passage. The REF are naturally occurring. Also, the need to provide dry passage results from a natural condition – the presence of floodplain. Accordingly, they are not the result of the applicant's actions.

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

There are no existing conditions, existing land, or building uses on the site, or on neighboring properties that necessitate the removal of ST-1. The special conditions discussed above are located on the subject property.

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

The site is governed by state and local SWM regulations, which require the post-development site to mimic pre-development conditions as “woods in good condition.”

Granting the variance for the removal of one specimen tree 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 Prince George’s County Soil Conservation District (PGSCD). Both SWM and sediment and erosion control requirements are to be met in conformance with state and local laws to ensure that the quality of water leaving the site meets the state’s standards, which are set to ensure that no degradation occurs.

The required findings of Section 25-119(d)(1) have been adequately addressed for the removal of one specimen tree identified as ST-1.

The variance for removal of one specimen tree is approved, for development of the site.

Preservation of Regulated Environmental Features/Primary Management Area

The subject area contains REF including steep slopes, floodplains, wetlands, streams, and their associated buffers which comprise the PMA.

Section 24-130(b)(5) of the prior 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 the 100-year floodplain and 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 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 the County Code. Impacts to 100-year floodplain and REF must first be avoided and then minimized.

Approximately 90 percent of the subject property is located in the Lower Beaverdam Creek 100-year floodplain. The County's Floodplain Ordinance states that to develop a property in the floodplain, other than as permitted by the Ordinance, the applicant is required to obtain a waiver from the Director of DPIE or the Director's designee. Per County Code 32-205(f), structures are not allowed in floodplains. Per County Code 32-206, fill is not permitted in the floodplain unless a waiver is granted. The applicant requested a floodplain waiver from the code restrictions on fill and structures in the floodplain from DPIE on June 6, 2025. A floodplain waiver was granted by the Director of DPIE on August 13, 2025. This waiver allows placement of fill and structures in the floodplain.

The floodplain waiver requires the following to occur with this development:

- The proposed building elevation is to be at or above the flood protection elevation.
- A bridge over Old Landover Road is shown to serve as safe access to the site during 100-year flood events.
- A vault is shown under the parking area for floodplain fill compensatory storage.

An LOJ and exhibit for PMA impacts were submitted August 8, 2025, in response to SDRC comments with this PPS. In this request, the applicant included an aerial photo from 1977 that shows the entire site having been graded during the construction of the adjacent Landover Metro Station.

Impact 1: Building, associated parking, and site access

This LOJ requested 4.45 acres of impact to the floodplain located in the PMA. The floodplain must be impacted to provide access to the property from the WMATA driveway and a bridge over Old Landover Road. Development of the building above the floodplain also constitutes an impact to the floodplain. Building impacts are generally considered avoidable; however, in this case the floodplain covers approximately 90 percent of the subject property making building impacts unavoidable. As mentioned above, a floodplain waiver for the development of this site has been granted by DPIE. Mitigation of the floodplain will be handled by DPIE, which proposes a vault under the development's parking lot.

Impact 2: Building, associated parking, and site access

Located within the floodplain are five isolated wetlands, totaling 0.06 acre of wetland and 0.46 acre of wetland buffer, that will be impacted. Impacts to the isolated wetlands are necessary to allow reasonable development of the property and cannot be avoided. The impacts to the wetland and wetland buffer in the northeastern corner of the property are necessary to access the existing WMATA driveway. This impact is less than would be

required to construct a new access to Pennsy Drive and is located to limit the impact on the wetlands. Building and parking REF impacts are generally considered avoidable; however, as mentioned above, a floodplain waiver for the development of this site has been granted by DPIE, and the wetlands are within the same geographic area as the floodplain. Site access, as determined by other agencies, is located at the safest point for vehicular traffic to access the site and the resulting impact is unavoidable. Mitigation of the impacted wetlands will be handled by MDE, prior to permit.

Impact 3: Building and grading.

The applicant proposed impacts to 0.15 acre of stream buffer associated with the off-site stream located to the east of this property for development of site infrastructure. Due to the required access requirements, and in order to grade and install site infrastructure, a small area of the stream buffer must be graded and left clear. Building REF impacts are generally considered avoidable; however, as mentioned above, a floodplain waiver for the development of this site has been granted by DPIE, and the stream buffer is within the same geographic area as the floodplain.

Summary of Proposed Impacts

This site contains 7.72 acres of PMA consisting of stream buffers, wetlands, wetland buffers, steep slopes, and 100-year floodplain. Three impacts to the PMA were identified for this site for a total of 4.45 acres. These 4.45 acres of impacts are within 100-year floodplain, which received a floodplain waiver from the County. The floodplain area contains wetlands, wetland buffer, and stream buffer which will be impacted by this development. Development of this site is not possible without impacting the PMA. The design of the site above the floodplain will ensure that the development will have no detrimental impact on the environment. This site has been designed to avoid and minimize impacts to the PMA, to the fullest extent possible, by limiting impacts for the building and associated infrastructure, including safe passage out of the floodplain.

Based on the level of design information currently available, the limits of disturbance shown on the TCP1, and the impact exhibit provided shows that the 100-year floodplain and REF on the subject property have been preserved and/or restored to the fullest extent possible. Therefore, PMA Impacts 1 through 3 are approved.

Soils

Section 24-131 of the prior Subdivision Regulations states “The Planning Board shall restrict or prohibit the subdivision of land found to be unsafe for development. The restriction or prohibition may be due to natural conditions, such as, but not confined to, flooding, erosive stream action, high water table, unstable soils, or severe slopes, or to man-made conditions on the property, such as, but not confined to, unstable fills or slopes.”

According to the U.S. Department of Agriculture Natural Resource Conservation Service, Web Soil Survey, the predominant soils found to include Issue-Urban land complex, Russett-Christianana-Urban land complex, Udorthents, highway, Urban Land-Issue complex, Urban land-Russett-Christianana complex, Urban land-Zekiah complex, and Zekiah and Issue soils. According

to available mapping information, unsafe soils containing Marlboro clay do not occur on this property. However, Christiana clay is mapped within the site.

14. **Urban Design**—This development requires filing a detailed site plan in accordance with Section 27-473, Footnote 66 of the prior Zoning Ordinance. The multifamily residential use evaluated for this property in the I-1 Zone is permitted, per Section 27-473, Footnote 66. Under the prior Zoning Ordinance, conformance to the following regulations, but not limited to, will be required to be demonstrated at the time of detailed site plan review:

- Section 27-469 – I-1 Zone (Light Industrial)
- Section 27-473 – Use Permitted
- Section 27-474 – Regulations
- Part 11 – Off-Street Parking and Loading; and
- Part 12 – Signage

2010 Prince George’s County Landscape Manual

In addition, this development is subject to the requirements of the 2010 *Prince George’s County Landscape Manual*. The site is subject to: Section 4.1, Residential Requirements; Section 4.3, Parking Lot Requirements; Section 4.4, Screening Requirements; Section 4.7, Buffering Incompatible Uses; and Section 4.9, Sustainable Landscaping Requirements. Conformance with the applicable landscaping requirements will be further evaluated at the time of detailed site plan review.

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 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 TCC. Therefore, this development will be reviewed for conformance with the TCC requirement for the current property zone, which is the LTO-C Zone. Therefore, it is required to provide a minimum of 15 percent of the net tract area to be covered by tree canopy. Compliance with this requirement will be evaluated at the time of detailed site plan review.

Noise Controls

This development is subject to the noise control standards contained in Section 24-121(a)(4) of the Subdivision Regulations, which states the following:

Residential lots adjacent to existing or planned roadways of arterial classification shall be platted with a minimum depth of one hundred and fifty (150) feet.

Residential lots adjacent to an existing or planned roadway of freeway or higher classification, or an existing or planned transit right-of-way, shall be platted with a depth of three hundred (300) feet. Adequate protection and screening from traffic nuisances shall be provided by earthen berms, plant materials, fencing, and/or the establishment of a building restriction line, when appropriate.

The subject property is adjacent to the Landover Metro Station as well as other master-planned roadways of arterial and higher classification. The lot depth is met by the PPS; however, adequate protection from traffic nuisances must still be addressed. Accordingly, a noise study, dated June 26, 2025, was submitted with the subject PPS to study the effects of the noise generated by the adjacent roadways. This analysis evaluated noise impact from the freeway of US 50 (John Hanson Highway), arterial roadway of MD 202 (Landover Road), and Pennsy Drive, in addition to the two Metro and three Amtrak railway lines.

The noise study evaluated average sound levels during the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. (daytime) and 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. (nighttime), with the goal of identifying dwelling units and outdoor activity areas which may be impacted by more than 65 dBA equivalent continuous sound level (Leq) during daytime hours, and more than 55 dBA Leq during nighttime hours, and interior noise levels within the dwelling units impacted by more than 45 dBA Leq during both the daytime and nighttime. It was identified that the concept location of the multifamily building will not be exposed to future transportation noise levels exceeding 65 dBA Leq (daytime or nighttime). Therefore, future interior noise levels will not exceed 45 dBA Leq during either daytime or nighttime hours. The building construction may be used without additional acoustical modifications. In addition, there are no outdoor amenity areas for the site according to the current site concept plan; therefore, no further noise analysis is required for the subject property.

Also, a vibration study, dated June 25, 2025, was submitted with the subject PPS to study the analysis of ground-borne vibration levels at the planned Landover Metro multifamily residential building. This was an analysis of vibration levels generated by Metro, Amtrak, MARC, and CSX trains as measured under current site conditions, evaluated according to the maximum vibration level criteria specified in the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Document (2018).

The analysis shows that over the course of 24 hours, nine vibration events were recorded which exceeded the 72-vibration velocity decibel (VdB) criteria for “frequent events” occurring more than 70 times per day. In other words, for events occurring more than 70 times per day, exceeding this level even once is considered an impact. Therefore, the site’s vibration levels as measured on the ground are impacted according to the FTA guidelines. It should also be noted that it is possible for building structures to amplify vibration levels at the upper floors by up to 5–10 VdB, which could result in “distinctly perceptible” levels of vibration depending on the construction. Based on the PPS layout, ground-borne vibration levels generated by railway activity slightly exceed the FTA guidelines for railway vibration impact upon residential buildings. While the majority of trains passing will generate vibration which is on the order of at least “barely perceptible” within the multifamily building, the vibration levels at the site will not result in structural damage. The train passings producing the highest vibration impact to the site will result

in a vibration level that lies somewhere between “barely perceptible” and “distinctly perceptible,” however these events occur less than 10 times per day.

These results apply only to the site’s existing conditions at the time of the measurements, and may change once the site has been developed. Stated differently, once the site has been regraded and buildings have been added, the soil compaction and ground characteristics may be altered and produce different vibration levels. Vibration levels on different floors of the future multifamily building may be higher than those measured at the ground, as structures can amplify vibration levels such that vibration will increase with building height depending upon the construction. Upper-level vibrations can increase 5–10 VdB above those levels measured at the ground level.

Mitigation of the ground-borne vibration in this type of development normally comes in the form of thick isolation pads between the structure and the foundation requiring design and engineering service.

An additional vibration study may be required as necessary with the detailed site plan, when the exterior building materials are provided and the location of recreational facilities is determined, to demonstrate complete vibration analysis and any mitigation needed to achieve conformance with the noise standards. The analysis should also consider the actual building materials proposed at the time of detailed site plan.

15. **Community Feedback**—The Prince George’s County Planning Department did not receive any correspondence from the community regarding the subject application.
16. **Planning Board Hearing**—At the September 18, 2025, Planning Board hearing, staff presented the PPS to the Planning Board. Staff noted that the applicant sent the informational mailing and notice of acceptance mailing to all municipalities within a mile of the subject property, as required by the prior Subdivision Regulations. This proposed development requires filing of a DSP, at which time, additional notification mailings will be sent out by the applicant, and a referral will be sent by the Planning Department, which will provide the municipalities with an additional opportunity to comment. The applicant’s attorney, then spoke on behalf of the applicant, providing a background and summary for the proposed development. The Planning Board approved the PPS, unanimously, with conditions, as recommended by staff.

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 18, 2025, in Largo, Maryland.

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 9th day of October 2025.

Darryl Barnes
Chairman

By 
Jessica Jones
Planning Board Administrator

DB:JJ:MV:rpg

APPROVED AS TO LEGAL SUFFICIENCY



David S. Warner
M-NCPPC Legal Department
Date: October 7, 2025