



Note: Staff reports can be accessed at <https://www.mncppc.org/883/Watch-Meetings>

Preliminary Plan of Subdivision Addison Overlook

PPS-2023-006

REQUEST	STAFF RECOMMENDATION
34 lots, 12 parcels, and 2 outlots for residential development of 130 single-family and two-family attached dwelling units.	With the conditions recommended herein: • APPROVAL of Preliminary Plan of Subdivision PPS-2023-006 • APPROVAL of Type 1 Tree Conservation Plan TCP1-2025-0022 • APPROVAL of a Variation from Section 24-4102(c)(1) • APPROVAL of a Variance to Section 25-122(b)(1)(G)

Location: On the east side of Addison Road, approximately 700 feet north of its intersection with Ronald Road.

Gross Acreage: 9.76

Zone: RSF-A / RMF-20

Gross Floor Area: N/A

Dwelling Units: 130

Lots: 34

Parcels: 12

Outlots: 2

Planning Area: 75A

Council District: 06

Municipality: N/A

Applicant/Address:
Woodside Land Investments, LLC
3907 Greenway
Baltimore, MD 21218

Staff Reviewer: Salmin Monoar
Phone Number: (301) 952-4141
Email: Salmin.Monoar@ppd.mncppc.org



Planning Board Date:	10/02/2025
Planning Board Action Limit:	10/02/2025
Mandatory Action Timeframe:	70 days
Staff Report Date:	09/24/2025
Date Accepted:	06/23/2025
Informational Mailing:	04/19/2023
Acceptance Mailing:	05/23/2025
Sign Posting Deadline:	09/02/2025

The Planning Board encourages all interested persons to request to become a person of record for this application. Requests to become a person of record may be made online at

http://www.mncppcapps.org/planning/Person_of_Record/.

Please call 301-952-3530 for additional information.

Table of Contents

OVERVIEW	3
SETTING.....	4
FINDINGS AND REASONS FOR STAFF RECOMMENDATION	4
1. Development Data Summary.....	4
2. Previous Approvals.....	5
3. Community Planning.....	5
4. Stormwater Management.....	6
5. Parks and Recreation.....	7
6. Transportation.....	8
7. Public Facilities.....	11
8. Public Utility Easement.....	12
9. Historic.....	12
10. Environmental.....	13
11. Urban Design.....	32
12. Noise.....	34
13. Community feedback.....	37
14. Adjoining Municipalities.....	37
RECOMMENDATION	37

THE MARYLAND-NATIONAL CAPITAL
PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY PLANNING BOARD

STAFF REPORT

SUBJECT: Preliminary Plan of Subdivision PPS-2023-006
Type 1 Tree Conservation Plan TCP1-2025-0022
Variation from Section 24-4102(c)(1)
Variance to Section 25-122(b)(1)(G)
Addison Overlook

OVERVIEW

The subject property is located on the east side of Addison Road, approximately 700 feet north of its intersection with Ronald Road. The site includes Lots 1–56 and Parcel A, as recorded in Plat Book SJH 247, Plat Numbers 47 and 48, in the Prince George's County Land Records. The 9.76-acre property is split-zoned between the Residential Single-Family–Attached (RSF-A) Zone and the Residential Multifamily-20 (RMF-20) Zone. The site is subject to the 2010 *Approved Subregion 4 Master Plan and Sectional Map Amendment* (master plan), Subtitles 24 and 27 of the Prince George's County Code, and other applicable plans as outlined herein.

The site is currently undeveloped and wooded, saving for an area in the southeastern portion of the site improved with parking serving an adjacent residential development. This preliminary plan of subdivision (PPS) application proposes to resubdivide the property into 34 lots, 12 parcels, and 2 outlots for development of 130 dwelling units, consisting of 34 single-family attached dwelling units and 96 two-family attached dwelling units.

A major subdivision is required in accordance with Section 24-3402(b)(2)(A) of the Prince George's County Subdivision Regulations, to resubdivide land and propose residential development of more than 10 dwelling units. The applicant participated in a pre-application conference for the subject PPS on February 27, 2023, pursuant to Section 24-3302(b)(1) of the Subdivision Regulations, and held a properly noticed pre-application neighborhood meeting on April 18, 2023, pursuant to Section 24-3303(b)(1) of the Subdivision Regulations. With plans first submitted for review on June 14, 2023, the applicant prepared a written summary of the pre-application neighborhood meeting, as required by Section 24-3303(c)(3)(C) of the Subdivision Regulations. In accordance with Section 24-4503 of the Subdivision Regulations, this PPS is supported by and subject to an approved Certificate of Adequacy, ADQ-2023-007.

The applicant filed for a variation from Section 24-4102(c)(1) of the Subdivision Regulations, seeking relief from the lot depth requirement from Addison Road. This request is discussed further in the Noise finding of this technical staff report.

The applicant also 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 80 specimen trees. This request is discussed further in the Environmental finding of this technical staff report.

Staff recommend **APPROVAL** of the PPS and associated Type 1 tree conservation plan (TCP1), with conditions, **APPROVAL** of the Variation from Section 24-4102(c)(1), and **APPROVAL** of the Variance to Section 25-122(b)(1)(G) for removal of 69 specimen trees, based on the findings contained in this technical staff report.

SETTING

The subject property is located on Tax Map 73, Grids C3 and D3, and is within Planning Area 75A. The subject site is bounded to the north by land owned by Seat Pleasant Methodist Church, an institutional use within the Residential, Single-Family-65 (RSF-65) Zone. The subject site is bound to the south by Addison Arms Apartments, a multifamily residential development within the Residential Multifamily-20 (RMF-20) Zone. To the northeast and east of the site lie properties owned by The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission (M-NCPPC) within the Reserved Open Space (ROS) Zone. To the west of the site lies Addison Road, a master-planned arterial roadway (A-33), with vacant land beyond located in the Residential Multifamily-48 (RMF-48) Zone.

FINDINGS AND REASONS FOR STAFF RECOMMENDATION

- 1. Development Data Summary**—The following information relates to the subject PPS application and the evaluated development.

	EXISTING	EVALUATED
Zones	RSF-A/RMF-20	RSF-A/RMF-20
Use(s)	Vacant	Residential
Acreage	9.76	9.76
Parcels	1	12
Lots	56	34
Outlots	0	2
Dwelling Units	0	130
Variation	No	Yes; Section 24-4102(c)(1)
Subtitle 25 Variance	No	Yes; Section 25-122(b)(1)(G)

The subject application, PPS-2023-006, was accepted for review on June 23, 2025. Pursuant to Sections 24-3305(e) and 24-3403(a)(6) of the Subdivision Regulations, the PPS and variation request were referred to the Subdivision and Development Review Committee and comments were provided to the applicant at its meeting on July 7, 2025. Revised plans and documents were received on August 8, 2025, August 22, 2025, and August 28, 2025, which were used for the analysis contained herein.

2. **Previous Approvals**—This property has a history of prior development approvals. The following prior approved applications apply to the site:

In October 1987, the Prince George’s County Planning Board approved PPS 4-87179 (PGCPB Resolution No. 87-482) for residential development on the property, subject to 12 conditions. Detailed Site Plan DSP-88050 was subsequently approved on June 9, 1988 (PGCPB Resolution No. 88-270). A final plat was recorded pursuant to that approval, at Plat Book NLP 147, Plat No. 81, showing 81 lots and 2 parcels. The property has since never been developed.

In 2004, a new PPS, 4-04007, was submitted and reviewed for the subject property under the name Lincolnshire. This application was withdrawn. On July 7, 2005, the Planning Board denied PPS 4-04173 for the subject property, due to the inadequacy of public fire and rescue facilities. On July 27, 2006, the Planning Board denied PPS 4-05131, again due to the inadequacy of public fire and rescue facilities.

On March 15, 2007, the Planning Board approved PPS 4-06098 (PGCPB Resolution No. 07-31) titled Quincy Commons, to consolidate the 81 existing lots and 2 parcels into 2 parcels for residential development. DSP-08070 was approved thereafter (PGCPB Resolution No. 09-146) for development of 46 two-family dwellings and 54 multifamily dwellings. Both PPS 4-06098 and DSP-08070 have expired.

DSP-16005 was approved by the Planning Board (PGCPB Resolution No. 16-97) for development of 56 quadruple attached dwelling units, utilizing the only valid subdivision for the property (PPS 4-87179). A minor final plat of subdivision, which adjusted and consolidated the existing lots, was recorded as Plat Book SJH 247, Plat Numbers 47 and 48, in the Prince George’s County Land Records, titled Addison Overlook.

The subject PPS proposes to resubdivide the property into 34 lots, 12 parcels, and 2 outlots for residential development of 130 dwelling units. If approved, the conditions of prior approvals will be superseded and therefore, are not relevant to the review of this PPS, which is evaluated for and required to meet all current criteria of both the Subdivision Regulations and Prince George’s County Zoning Ordinance. This resubdivision utilizes lot and parcel numbers that are repetitive to the prior platting of Addison Overlook subdivision. Pursuant to Section 24-3402(c)(2)(B)(iii)(ee) of the Subdivision Regulations, the next available lot or parcel numbers shall be used in a resubdivision. Alternatively, a new or distinct subdivision name may be used to supersede the prior subdivision.

It is noted that the outlots proposed herein, Outlot A and Outlot B, contain encroachments from and are to be conveyed to the abutting property. Pursuant to Section 24-4102(f) of the Subdivision Regulations, outlots shall not remain under separate ownership and must be incorporated into an adjoining lot or parcel. If such conveyance is not accepted by the abutting property, the outlots shall be conveyed to the homeowners association (HOA) for the subject site.

3. **Community Planning**—Pursuant to Sections 24-4101(b)(1) and 24-3402(e)(1)(D)(iv) of the Subdivision Regulations, a major PPS shall be consistent with the 2014 *Plan Prince George’s 2035 Approved General Plan* (Plan 2035), and shall conform to all applicable area master plans, sector plans, or functional master plans. Consistency with Plan 2035 and conformance with the master plan are evaluated as follows:

Plan 2035

Plan 2035 places the subject property in the Established Communities Growth Policy Area. The vision for the Established Communities Growth Policy Area is that it is most appropriate for context-sensitive infill and low- to medium-density development. Plan 2035 recommends maintaining and enhancing existing public services (police and fire/EMS), facilities (such as libraries, schools, parks, and open space), and infrastructure in these areas (such as sidewalks) to ensure that the needs of existing residents are met” (page 20). In addition, it is noted that this property is located in proximity to the Addison Road Metro Local Transit Center and supports Plan 2035’s vision to strengthen and enhance the established community’s growth tier.

Policy 8: Strengthen and enhance existing residential areas and neighborhoods in the Plan 2035 Established Communities. (page 115)

By developing homes south of the transit center, it will improve opportunities for multimodal transportation, encourage growth, and provide employment opportunities near Addison Road-Seat Pleasant Metro Station.

Master Plan

The master plan recommends medium-high density residential land uses on the subject property. Medium-high density residential is defined as residential development between 8 and 20 dwelling units per acre. The total site density proposed by this application is approximately 13.22 dwelling units per acre, which is within the recommended density range and aligns with the vision of the master plan.

The provisions of the master plan and other functional master plans, including policies and strategies applicable to the development of the subject property, and the PPS conformance to these policies and strategies, are further discussed throughout this technical staff report.

4. **Stormwater Management**—Pursuant to Section 24-4303(b) of the Subdivision Regulations, a PPS shall not be approved until evidence is submitted that a stormwater management (SWM) concept plan has been approved by the Prince George’s County Department of Permitting, Inspections and Enforcement (DPIE). A SWM Concept Plan (01785-2023-SDC/P00105-2024-SDC) and an associated letter approved by DPIE on July 29, 2024 were submitted with this PPS. The approved plan shows the use of microbio retention facilities to meet the stormwater requirements for the site. As proposed on the TCP1, the stormwater facilities indicate two large “pond” structures, one along the frontage of Addison Road South, and the other at the rear of the site labeled as Pond 1 and Pond 2, respectively. These features are shown on the approved SWM plan, but are not listed in the Best Management Practice (BMP) summary table. The applicant proposes off-site impacts for an outfall from Pond 2. One of the two surface retention basins is located along the shared property line with M-NCPPC-owned land, and the PPS shows an outfall onto M-NCPPC property, which will require a right-of-entry and easement, and a construction and maintenance agreement. The applicant must coordinate with Prince George’s County Department of Parks and Recreation staff to ensure minimal impact on M-NCPPC property during construction.

Staff find that development of the site, in conformance with SWM concept approval and any subsequent revisions approved by DPIE, will ensure compliance with SWM policies,

standards, and practices. Green building and green infrastructure are highly encouraged. Therefore, this PPS satisfies the requirements of Sections 24-4303 and 24-4403 of the Subdivision Regulations.

5. **Parks and Recreation**—This PPS has been reviewed for conformance with the requirements and recommendations of the master plan, Plan 2035, the 2022 *Land Preservation, Parks and Recreation Plan for Prince George's County*, the 2013 *Formula 2040: Functional Master Plan for Parks, Recreation and Open Space*, and Section 24-4600 of the Subdivision Regulations, as they pertain to public parks and recreational facilities.

The subject property is within Park Service Area 5 and is adjacent to the undeveloped Suitland District Heights Park. Nearby park facilities also include Rollins Avenue Park, Capital Heights Park, Maryland Park, the Brooke Road Community Center Park, and the Walker Mill Regional Park.

Sections 24-4600 and 24-4601 of the Subdivision Regulations, which relate to mandatory dedication of parkland, provide for the mitigation of inadequate park facilities through the dedication of land, payment of a fee-in-lieu, or on-site recreational facilities. Based on the proposed density of development, 15 percent of the net residential lot area would be required to be dedicated to M-NCPPC for public parks, which equates to 1.46 acres for public parklands, if the proposed subdivision was inadequately served by public parks and recreation facilities. The land is adjacent to Suitland District Heights Park, and staff conducted a field visit and determined that the land proposed for conveyance is not feasible for M-NCPPC acquisition. Due to this factor, on-site recreational facilities will best serve the residents of the proposed development and conform to the requirements and recommendations of the applicable master plans.

The 2025 *Prince George's County Recreational Facilities Design Guidelines* also set standards based on population. For the projected 330 new residents, the typical recreational needs include outdoor sitting and eating areas, a 2,400-square-foot tot lot, a 100-foot by 200-foot open play area, and hard surface paths for facility access.

The PPS shows provision of on-site recreation facilities, including outdoor sitting and eating areas, a 2,400-square-foot tot lot, a 100-foot by 200-foot open play area, and hard surface paths for facility access. Staff recommend that the applicant consider providing recreation facilities to accommodate different mobility levels and offer opportunities for people of all ages and abilities to engage. Staff recommend designing outdoor spaces for fitness stations for adults, inclusive playgrounds for toddlers, interactive equipment for tweens and teens, raised bed gardens, croquet or bocce, and other general fitness activities to the extent possible. The applicant should provide details of proposed recreation facilities with the submission of the DSP application.

The proposed on-site recreational facilities align with the master plan's intention to improve existing neighborhoods while providing facilities that met the changing needs of the community.

Based on the preceding findings, staff find that pursuant to Section 24-4101(b)(1), the provision of on-site recreation facilities, subject to the conditions recommended in this technical staff report, is in conformance with the applicable master plans.

6. **Transportation**—This PPS was reviewed for conformance with the 2009 *Approved Countywide Master Plan of Transportation* (MPOT), the master plan, the Zoning Ordinance, and the Subdivision Regulations, to provide the appropriate transportation recommendations.

Site Layout

The subject property fronts Addison Road to the west. The site will be served by an existing public right-of-way and a proposed private street internal to the site. The development proposes one full movement access point along Addison Road. The lots proposed as part of this application are to be accessed via private internal road. The plan includes internal sidewalks and a marked bikeway facility along Addison Road. Internal sidewalks and private streets are to be conveyed to a HOA.

Master Plan Right-of-Way

- **Addison Road (A-33); 120-foot Right-of-way**

Both the MPOT and master plan recommend a minimum 120-foot-wide right-of-way. The plan sheets identify various distances from centerline to property line, with 77.3 feet from centerline being the least, which exceeds the minimum 60 feet from centerline. No additional dedication is required with this application.

Master Plan Pedestrian and Bike Facilities

- **Addison Road: Planned bicycle lane**

Both the MPOT and master plan recommend sidewalks and on-road bicycle facilities. The PPS includes a proposed shared road pavement marking along the frontage of Addison Road. In its current configuration with a wide shoulder area, pavement markings and signage can be installed, or a striped bicycle lane to meet the intent of the policy.

Recommendations, Policies and Goals

The Complete Streets element of the MPOT reinforces the need for multimodal transportation and includes the following:

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

Staff recommend a minimum 5-foot-wide sidewalk be provided along both sides of the internal roadways to meet the intent of the policy.

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.

Shared road pavement marking is shown along Addison Road. Staff recommend a minimum 5-foot-wide sidewalk, Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) curb ramps, and marked crosswalk also be provided at the time of DSP along the frontage of Addison Road, with connection to the internal sidewalk network.

The master plan includes the following recommendations regarding the accommodations of pedestrian and bicycle facilities:

Policy 1: Incorporate appropriate pedestrian-oriented and TOD features in the centers.

Staff recommend a minimum 5-foot-wide sidewalk, ADA curb ramps and marked crosswalk also be provided at the time of DSP along the frontage of Addison Road, with connection to the internal sidewalk network.

Policy 2: Provide sidewalks and neighborhood trail connections within existing communities to improve pedestrian safety, allow for safe routes to Metro stations and schools, and provide for increased non-motorized connectivity between neighborhoods.

Shared road pavement parking is proposed along the frontage of Addison Road. Staff recommend a minimum 5-foot-wide sidewalk, ADA curb ramps, and marked crosswalk also be provided at the time of DSP along the frontage of Addison Road, with connection to the internal sidewalk network.

Policy 3: Develop bicycle-friendly roadways in conformance with the latest standards and guidelines, including the 1999 AASHTO Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities.

Shared road pavement parking is proposed along the along Addison Road. In its current configuration with a wide shoulder area, pavement markings and signage can be installed, or a striped bicycle lane to meet the intent of the policy.

Compliance with Regulatory Requirements

Section 27-6104 of the Zoning Ordinance provides guidance for the review of PPS development applications. Section 24-4200 of the Subdivision Regulations provides guidance for circulation standards. In addition, Section 27-6200 of the Zoning Ordinance provides specific requirements for the current application.

Regarding Section 24-4200, the submitted plans demonstrate that the site will be served by an existing public right-of-way along Addison Road, and by a proposed private internal street network. In accordance with Section 24-4201(b) of the Subdivision Regulations, all master-planned roadway rights-of-way are shown and labeled on the PPS; no additional right-of-way dedication is required. There are no master plan trails that impact the subject property.

Pursuant to Section 24-4202 of the Subdivision Regulations, vehicular access and circulation are proposed via one full-movement access point along Addison Road, and circulation is provided internally through a system of private streets and alleys.

In accordance with Section 24-4204(b)(1)(D) of the Subdivision Regulations, private streets and alleys may serve the subdivision in any zone where townhouse or two-family dwellings are permitted. Per this section, the pavement width of private streets shall not be less than 22 feet in width and that of private alleys shall not be less than 18 feet in width. It is also required that the accessibility of the private streets and alleys to emergency equipment is ensured by the Prince George's County Fire Chief. The PPS proposes private streets and alleys, meeting the minimum pavement width requirement, for vehicular access to the dwelling units. However, the applicant did not provide an exhibit to demonstrate that the proposed private streets and alleys will be accessible to fire and emergency equipment. Staff recommend that prior to signature approval, an exhibit be provided to show the turning movement of emergency vehicles through the proposed private streets and alleys is acceptable for fire access.

Pursuant to Section 24-4203 of the Subdivision Regulations, all sidewalks along the frontage of Addison Road are to be compliant with the permitting agency requirements and are subject to their approval. The internal sidewalks are to be a minimum 5-foot-wide and ADA-compliant. The layout of sidewalks, which is depicted on the TCP1 and the approved SWM concept plan, is shown connecting all proposed units and the recreational facilities to the proposed sidewalk along the frontage on Addison Road.

Regarding Section 27-6204 of the Zoning Ordinance, the submitted plans demonstrate circulation through the site and meet the requirements of this section. One full movement access point is proposed along Addison Road. Staff recommend 5-foot-wide sidewalks along Addison Road, and along both sides of the internal road, connecting to Addison Road.

Regarding Section 27-6206 of the Zoning Ordinance, the application proposes vehicular access via a single access point along Addison Road, a classified arterial roadway. Section 27-6206(d) limits access to properties with frontage on an arterial to circumstances where no alternative direct vehicular access from a lower classified accessway is available or feasible. The site only has frontage along Addison Road, and no other access is available. Therefore, access via Addison Road is appropriate, and staff find that the applicant meets the requirements of this section.

The development proposes one alley, and all public and private streets are classified appropriately, consistent with Section 27-6206(a) and (b) of the Zoning Ordinance. Internal circulation is provided by private roads and alleys serving the attached residential units, and no direct vehicular access is proposed from individual units to Addison Road, consistent with Section 27-6206(c) of the Zoning Ordinance.

The site is adjacent to residential and institutional (church) uses. As noted in Section 27-6206(e) of the Zoning Ordinance, there are no mixed-use developments adjoining the property to require vehicular cross-access. The potential for cross-access will be further evaluated with the DSP.

Traffic calming measures, as required under Section 27-6206(j) of the Zoning Ordinance, will be coordinated with the permitting agency and included in the DSP.

Regarding Section 27-6207 of the Zoning Ordinance, the development includes a recommended internal pedestrian network. Staff recommend 5-foot-wide sidewalks along both sides of the internal road, connecting to Addison Road and along Addison Road

frontage, consistent with Section 27-6207(a). Pedestrian connectivity is proposed along Addison Road. The applicant is requesting a waiver of the pedestrian cross-access requirement, citing the presence of a landscape buffer and the lack of existing sidewalks on the abutting site. Staff recommend the applicant provide justification for this waiver request in accordance with the applicable criteria. Further evaluation of the cross-access will occur at the time of DSP, consistent with Section 27-6207(b).

Regarding Section 27-6208 of the Zoning Ordinance, bicycle access is provided via a marked bikeway facility (sharrow) along the property's Addison Road frontage. Internal bicycle circulation can be accommodated via the private internal street network, and short-term bicycle parking is recommended in recreational areas, to be reviewed further at the time of DSP. The applicant is also requesting a waiver of bicycle cross-access, citing the same limitations described above for pedestrian access. As required by Section 27-6208(b), justification should be provided and will be further evaluated with the DSP.

Regarding Section 27-6900 of the Zoning Ordinance, which governs Multifamily, Townhouse, and Three-Family Form and Design Standards, Section 27-6903(a) recommends secondary access for emergency vehicles for townhouse developments with 20 or more dwelling units. The applicant has stated that secondary access is not feasible as the site only has frontage along Addison Road, and there are no adjacent roadways or lower classification roadways to accommodate secondary access. Staff acknowledge these constraints and find that this requirement has been addressed appropriately for the purpose of this PPS review.

Based on the preceding findings, staff find concludes that the multimodal transportation facilities will exist to serve the proposed subdivision, meet the required findings of Subtitle 24 of the County Code, and conform to both the MPOT and master plan, subject to the recommended conditions.

7. **Public Facilities**—This PPS was reviewed for conformance to the master plan and in accordance with Section 24-4101(b) of the Subdivision Regulations. The master plan contains the following strategies:

Policy 1: Establish a standard minimum site size for new construction, rehabilitation, and the adaptive reuse of structures for schools within urban settings. (page 264)

Policy 2: Preserve, retain, and support existing public schools, school facilities, school sites, and properties owned by Board of Education. (page 264)

Policy 3: Provide safe connections to schools withing Subregion 4. (page 265)

Policy 1: Develop and maintain facilities that allow public safety personnel to respond to needs as quickly and efficiently as possible. (page 267)

Policy 1: Operate water treatment facilities to meet or exceed state effluent standards. (page 276)

Policy 2: Limit the increase of the region's impervious surfaces without unduly limiting development in accordance with the comprehensive plan. (page 276)

The proposed development is in conformance with above-referenced strategies of the master plan. This PPS is subject to Certificate of Adequacy ADQ-2023-007, which established that pursuant to adopted tests and standards, public safety facilities are adequate to serve the proposed development. There are no police, fire and emergency medical service facilities, public schools, parks, or libraries recommended on the subject property.

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

The subject project is located in Planning Area 75A – Suitland-District Heights and Vicinity. The 2025–2030 Fiscal Year Approved Capital Improvement Project (CIP) Budget identifies two new public facilities proposed for construction, which do not affect the subject site.

Water and Sewer

The subject property is located within Sustainable Growth Tier I, and per Section 24-4404 of the Subdivision Regulations, must be served by public sewer. According to Section 24-4405 of the Subdivision Regulations, the 2018 *Water and Sewer Plan* places the property in water and sewer Category 3, “Community System,” which includes developed land on public water and sewer, as well as underdeveloped properties with valid PPS approval for public water and sewer. Category 3 is appropriate for PPS and final plat approval.

Staff find that the applicable public facility standards and conformance with the master plan are met, pursuant to the Subdivision Regulations.

8. **Public Utility Easement**—Section 24-4401 of the Subdivision Regulations requires that preliminary plans and final plats of subdivision be designed to show all utility easements necessary to serve anticipated development on the land being subdivided, consistent with the recommendations and standards relevant to public utility companies. When utility easements are required by a public utility company, the subdivider shall include the following statement in the dedication documents:

“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 given in Section 24-4205 of the Subdivision Regulations. PUEs must be located outside of the sidewalk, and must be contiguous to the right-of-way. The subject site has frontage along the public right-of-way of Addison Road, along its western boundary. This PPS provides the required 10-foot-wide PUE along the property’s boundary line, abutting the existing and proposed right-of-way line. In addition, new private streets are proposed internally to the development, which demonstrate the required PUEs will be provided along at least one side of the streets.

9. **Historic**—The master plan contains goals and policies related to historic preservation (pages 287–296). However, these are not specific to the subject site, or applicable to the proposed development. The subject property does not contain and is not adjacent to any designated Prince George’s County historic sites or resources.

The 2010 *Approved Historic Sites and Districts Plan* also includes goals and policies related to archeology (pages 55–61). Relevant goals and strategies include incorporating archeological resource protection into local land use planning, ensuring archeological resources are considered and protected during development, and requesting Phase I archeological surveys on properties with moderate to high potential for archeological resources.

Per Section 24-1316 of the Subdivision Regulations, archeological investigations may be required at the time of PPS for properties with moderate or higher archeological potential. A Phase I archeological survey was conducted on the subject property in 2006, as part of a prior subdivision review (PPS 4-04173). No archeological artifacts or intact buried cultural features were identified. Therefore, no further archeological investigation is recommended for this application.

- 10. Environmental**—Staff find that the PPS is in conformance with the environmental regulations in Sections 24-4101(b) and 24-4300 of the Subdivision Regulations, and Section 27-6800 of the Zoning Ordinance, as discussed herein. The following applications and associated plans were previously reviewed for the subject site:

Development Review Case Number	Associated Tree Conservation Plan Number	Authority	Status	Action Date	Resolution Number
4-87179	N/A	Planning Board	Approved	10/22/1987	87-482
DSP-95067		Planning Board	Denied	10/7/1996	96-60
4-04007	N/A	Planning Board	Withdrawn	5/25/2004	N/A
4-04173	TCPI-010-04	Planning Board	Denied	6/16/2005	05-135
NRI-011-06	N/A	Staff	Approved	3/1/2006	N/A
4-05131	TCPI-010-04	Planning Board	Denied	7/6/2006	06-165
4-06098	TCPI-010-04	Planning Board	Approved	2/1/2007	07-31
DSP-08070	TCPII-127-95-01	Planning Board	Approved	10/1/2009	09-146
NRI-011-06-01	N/A	Staff	Approved	12/21/2015	N/A
DSP-16005	TCP-012-16	Planning Board	Approved	7/21/2016	16-97
4-23004	N/A	Planning Board	Withdrawn	2/27/2023	N/A
DSP-23007	N/A	Planning Board	Withdrawn	2/27/2023	N/A
NRI-011-06-02	N/A	Staff	Approved	5/13/2025	N/A
PPS-2023-006	TCP1 2025-0022	Planning Board	Pending	Pending	Pending

Applicable Woodland Conservation Ordinance

This property is subject to the 2024 Prince George's County Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance (WCO) because the property does not have an implemented tree conservation plan. TCP1-2025-0022 was submitted with the subject application and requires revisions to be found in conformance with the WCO. This application is also subject to the 2018 Environmental Technical Manual (ETM) and the environmental regulations contained in Subtitles 24 and 27 of the County Code.

Environmental Site Description

A review of the available information indicates that streams, wetlands, and floodplain, do not occur on the property. Steep slopes do occur on the property along the edges. The approved natural resources inventory (NRI) plan verified that forest interior dwelling species buffer does exist on-site extending from the forest edge of the adjacent parkland. 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.

Environmental Conformance with Applicable Plans

In accordance with Section 24-4101(b), the policies from the Environmental Section of the applicable master plans must be analyzed with all PPS. The following is the analysis of the applicable master plans.

Master Plan

The master plan includes applicable goals and guidelines. The following guidelines are applicable to the current project regarding natural resources preservation, protection, and restoration. The text in **bold** is the text from the master plan, and the plain text provides comments on plan conformance.

Green Infrastructure

Policy 1: Protect, preserve and enhance the green infrastructure network in Subregion 4. (page 200)

Strategies

- **Protect green infrastructure environmental corridors by focusing development outside the network. Implement this during the review of land development proposals to ensure the highest level of preservation and restoration possible, with limited impacts for essential development elements.**

This PPS proposes clearing 9.32 acres of woodland within the evaluation area of the Green Infrastructure Plan (GI Plan) of the 2017 *Approved Prince George's County Resource Conservation Plan: A Countywide Functional Master Plan*, and an additional 1.16 acres of off-site clearing within the evaluation and regulated areas on the site to the east and along the right-of-way to the west. The applicant is proposing no on-site woodland preservation, but proposes 0.44 acre of reforestation adjacent to the existing park. The applicant cites the narrowness of the site and steep slopes as justification for not

providing any woodland conservation on-site, along with the proximity to the Addison Road-Seat Pleasant Metro Station platform. While the PPS is in proximity to the Metro station, it is not within the associated transit center and cannot utilize the transit-oriented center (defined in Section 25-118(b)) benefits of the WCO which include the use of landscape credits. This application is providing 0.44 acre of reforestation on-site. In a statement of justification (SOJ) dated August 5, 2025 and revised August 28, 2025, provided for not meeting the woodland conservation threshold on-site pursuant to Section 25-121(c)(3) of the WCO, the applicant stated that opportunities will be explored at the time of DSP.

- **Assess the potential to acquire land parcels in designated network gap areas to further protect and expand the network.**

This application does not feature any land in areas identified as network gaps. The property is mostly wooded except for the existing parking lot and open areas adjacent to the apartments.

- **Evaluate land development proposals in the vicinity of SCAs (Anacostia River, Suitland Bog) to ensure that SCAs are not impacted and that green infrastructure connections are either maintained or restored.**

This application is not located in the vicinity of any special conservations areas as identified in the master plan.

- **Limit impacts to the green infrastructure network to those necessary for the reasonable development of properties.**

This application is fully within the evaluation area, with off-site impacts proposed to the regulated area of the GI Plan. As such impact to the green infrastructure network cannot be limited but can be mitigated through on-site woodland preservation or reforestation. This application proposes 0.44 acre of on-site reforestation abutting the Suitland-District Heights Park. At the time of DSP, the applicant shall explore opportunities to provide additional woodland conservation on-site.

- **Provide mitigation of impacts to the regulated areas within the development site, drainage area, subwatershed, or watershed by first exhausting the mitigation areas identified in the countywide mitigation database and then seeking other opportunities within the river basin.**

No regulated areas of the GI Plan exist on-site. However, impacts are proposed to the regulated areas located just off-site on the adjacent property to the east, for a Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission easement for water and sewer utility connections and a SWM outfall. No mitigation is proposed with this application. Any

mitigation for impacts to regulated waterways or wetlands will be determined by the Maryland Department of Natural Resources at the time of permit review.

Policy 2: Minimize the impacts of development on the green infrastructure network and SCAs. (page 200)

Strategies

- **Protect and enhance water quality upstream of the Suitland Bog by requiring the preservation or establishment of 75-foot-wide buffers on streams that feed the hydrology of the bog.**

This site is not located in the vicinity of Suitland Bog.

- **Require the retrofitting of existing or installation of new water quality structures to ensure that water quality is maintained or enhanced above the Suitland Bog.**

This site is not in the vicinity of the Suitland Bog.

Water Quality and Stormwater Management

Policy 1: Restore and enhance water quality in areas that have been degraded, and preserve water quality in areas not degraded. (page 205)

Strategies

- **Maintain, enhance, and restore woody buffers around streams to preserve and protect water quality.**

This application proposes off-site impacts to streams and their associated buffers. No restoration or enhancement to off-site stream buffers is proposed with this application; however, any mitigation for impacts to regulated waterways or wetlands will be determined by staff at the time of permit review.

- **Use conservation landscape techniques to be evaluated during the development review process.**

No on-site conservation landscaping is proposed with this application. Staff will evaluate conservation landscaping with the DSP.

- **Assess potential drainage problem areas and areas within the 100-year floodplain for retrofit projects.**

No floodplain is located on-site.

Policy 2: **Improve the base of information needed for the county to undertake and support stream restoration and mitigation projects. (page 205)**

No streams are located on this property.

Policy 3: **Require on-site management of stormwater through the use of environmentally sensitive stormwater management techniques (i.e., fully implement the requirements of ESD) for all development and redevelopment activities. (page 205)**

The site does have an approved SWM concept plan, which was reviewed by DPIE. The proposal identifies stormwater outfalls associated with the development, including those located off-site, and the approved SWM concept plan incorporates microbioretention devices to meet the current requirements of the environmental site design (ESD) to the maximum extent practicable. Stream restoration is not proposed at this time. At the time of DSP, the applicant shall demonstrate minimization of the impacts to the stream buffers to the greatest extent practicable and seek opportunities for forest enhancement areas along the edges of the impact areas.

Policy 4: **Assure that adequate stream buffers are maintained and enhanced and utilize design measures to protect water quality. (page 205)**

Strategies

- **Maintain and enhance adequate woody vegetated buffers around streams to preserve and protect water quality.**

No streams are located on-site; however, this application does propose impacts to off-site stream buffers. No enhancements to off-site stream buffers are proposed with this application. At the time of DSP, the applicant shall demonstrate that the development minimizes impacts to the stream buffers and seek opportunities for forest enhancement areas along the edges of the impact areas.

- **Identify possible locations for additional bioretention features to serve one or more properties.**

The stormwater features proposed with this application serve only this site.

- **Enhance buffers through the Woodland Conservation Ordinance required during the review of land development proposals.**

Reforestation area of 0.44 acre is proposed with this application. The applicant shall seek to provide on-site woodland conservation mitigate the proposed off-site impacts.

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

Street tree plantings are not proposed with this application in proximity to stormwater facilities. The Development Review Division will evaluate street tree plantings with the DSP.

- **Assess potential drainage problem areas and areas within the 100-year floodplain for retrofit projects.**

No floodplain is located on-site.

Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions (page 205)

Policy: **Reduce air pollution to support public health and wellness by placing a high priority on transit-oriented development and transportation demand management (TDM) projects and programs. (page 206)**

The project is not identified as a transportation demand management project.

Noise Intrusion (page 206)

Policy: **Reduce adverse noise impacts so that the State of Maryland's noise standards are met. (page 207)**

The analysis of noise relevant to the site is discussed in detail in the Noise finding of this technical staff report and ensures mitigation of adverse impacts.

Green Buildings/Sustainability (page 207)

Policy 1: **Implement environmentally sensitive building techniques that reduce overall energy consumption. (page 208)**

This policy will be further evaluated at the time of DSP.

Policy 3: **Increase the county's capacity to support sustainable development. (page 208)**

Sustainable development will be evaluated at the time of DSP.

Chesapeake Bay Critical Area (page 208)

Policy: **Ensure that the Chesapeake Bay Critical Area is protected to the maximum extent possible through the implementation of water quality and other related measures. (page 209)**

This site is not within the Chesapeake Bay critical area.

Tree Canopy and Green Space (page 209)

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

Policy 2: **Improve the county's capacity to support increases in the tree canopy.** (page 210)

Tree canopy will be evaluated at the time of DSP.

Addison Road Metro Boundary

The master plan does not feature specific environmental section goals, policies, or strategies. Thus, staff defer to the GI Plan for specific policies related to the environment.

Plan 2035

The site is located within Environmental Strategy Area 1 of the Regulated Environmental Protection Areas Map and in the Established Communities of the General Plan Growth Policy map, as designated by the 2014 *Plan Prince George's 2035 Approved General Plan* (Plan 2035). The project is not within the boundaries of a transit-oriented center as identified in Plan 2035.

Green Infrastructure Plan

The GI Plan was approved with the adoption of the 2017 *Approved Prince George's County Resource Conservation Plan: A Countywide Functional Master Plan* (Prince George's County Council Resolution 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 application. The text in **bold** is the text from the GI Plan, and the plain text provides staff's findings on plan conformance:

Policy 1: Preserve, enhance, and restore the green infrastructure network and its ecological functions while supporting the desired development pattern of Plan Prince George's 2035. (page 33)

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

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

The entirety of the subject property is within designated evaluation areas, with the regulated area located along the off-site stream system to the east. Development is proposed within the evaluation areas for residential lots and impacts in the regulated areas for stormwater and utilities are located off-site. There are no stream systems on-site, and there is no mitigation proposed for the off-site

impacts to the riparian buffer. In accordance with Section 25-121(c)(1)(C) of the WCO, that requires development proposals to afforest the unforested riparian stream buffers. At the time of DSP, the applicant shall demonstrate minimization of the impacts to the stream buffers to the greatest extent practicable and seek opportunities for forest enhancement areas along the edges of the impact areas.

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

The entirety of the subject property is within designated evaluation areas, with the regulated area located along the off-site stream system to the east. Development is proposed within the evaluation areas for residential lots and impacts in the regulated areas for stormwater and utilities are located off-site. There are no stream systems on-site, and there is no mitigation proposed for the off-site impacts to the riparian buffer. In accordance with Section 25-121(c)(1)(C), that requires development proposals to afforest the unforested riparian stream buffers. At the time of DSP, the applicant shall demonstrate minimization of the impacts to the stream buffers to the greatest extent practicable and seek opportunities for forest enhancement areas along the edges of the impact areas.

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

The site does have an approved SWM plan. SWM was reviewed by DPIE, at the time of DSP. At this time, the proposal does identify the stormwater outfalls associated with the development proposal located off-site. At the time of DSP, the applicant shall demonstrate minimization of the impacts to the stream buffers to the greatest extent practicable and seek opportunities for forest enhancement areas along the edges of the impact areas.

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 does not feature any regulated environmental features (REF) and is almost entirely wooded except for the areas utilized by the abutting apartment complex. REF are located off-site and woodland areas located around the REF are proposed to be impacted. 0.45 acre of reforestation is proposed. At the time of DSP,

the applicant shall demonstrate minimization of the impacts to the stream buffers to the greatest extent practicable and seek opportunities for forest enhancement areas along the edges of the impact areas.

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 this site, and the property is not in a special conservation area.

Policy 2: Support implementation of the 2017 GI Plan throughout the planning process. (page 38)

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 any network gaps and is fully within the evaluation area. Regulated area exists off-site to the east along a stream system and to the south where a blueline stream is mapped on PGAtlas.

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

No REF are located on-site, and 0.44 acre of reforestation is proposed with this application. Impacts to REF are proposed for the non-woody buffer, a stormwater outfall, and necessary infrastructure. At the time of DSP, the applicant shall demonstrate minimization of the impacts to the stream buffers to the greatest extent practicable and seek opportunities for forest enhancement areas along the edges of the impact areas.

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 proposes the impacts to evaluation area of the green infrastructure network on-site through the full clearing and grading of the site. Impacts to off-site regulated areas are proposed for utility connections and a

stormwater outfall resulting in an increased woodland conservation requirement. As the REF are located off-site, no impact SOJ is required.

A TCP1 was provided with this application, showing that the required woodland conservation requirement will not be fully met on-site. The development is proposing to provide 0.44 acre of the requirement on-site as reforestation. The remaining 10.83 acres of the woodland conservation requirement is proposed to be met off-site. At the time of DSP, the applicant shall provide additional woodland conservation on-site to the greatest extent practicable.

Policy 4: Provide the necessary tools for implementation of the 2017 GI Plan.
(page 40)

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.

This application proposes 0.44 acre of reforestation. Any on-site woodland conservation shall be placed in woodland and wildlife habitat conservation easements prior to the certification of the subsequent DSP and associated Type 2 tree conservation plan (TCP2). 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. (page 41)

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 received stormwater concept approval from DPIE; stormwater facilities are not located in the REF. A stormwater outfall is located off-site in REF. The approved concept plan shows use of microbioretention devices to meet the current requirements of the ESD to the maximum extent practicable. Stream restoration is not proposed at this time.

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 does not propose preservation or afforestation on-site. The riparian buffers are located off-site, the TCP1 does not propose to afforest fully the remaining unforested riparian buffers as required by Section 25-121(c)(1)(C), as these areas are off-site. The applicant did not provide a statement with this application 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) of the WCO, 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 PPS is subject to the WCO. The property is zoned Residential, Single-Family-Attached (RSF-A) and Residential, Multifamily-20 (RMF-20), which has a woodland conservation threshold requirement of 20 percent. The development proposal is for 0.44 acre of the woodland conservation requirements in reforestation on-site and is electing to meet the remainder of the requirement off-site. The worksheet on the TCP1 does not include the 1.16 acres requested off-site clearing. A condition has been provided to correct the worksheet and to encourage providing more of the woodland conservation requirement on-site.

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), which can count toward the tree canopy coverage (TCC) requirement of Subtitle 25, Division 3 of the County Code, 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 with the exception of the areas utilized by the adjacent apartments. This application proposes 0.44 acre of reforestation. 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 of Subtitle 25, Division 3 of the County Code, 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 application proposes to fully clear the existing woodland to the boundaries and the reforestation of 0.44 acre abutting the Suitland-District Heights Park and proposes off-site impacts to an adjacent 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 application proposes 0.44 acre of reforestation. At the time of DSP, the applicant shall provide additional woodland conservation on-site to the greatest extent practicable. Opportunities for additional woodland conservation shall be explored throughout the site focused on areas that connect to protected woodlands and where the site borders off-site primary management area (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.**

Although the property is not located within a Plan 2035 transit-oriented center, it is approximately three quarters of a mile from the Addison Road-Seat Pleasant Metro Station. Woodland conservation is designed to minimize fragmentation and reinforce new forest edges. At the time of DSP, the applicant shall provide additional woodland conservation on-site to the greatest extent practicable. Opportunities for additional woodland conservation shall be explored throughout the site focused on areas that connect to protected woodland and to further buffer the off-site 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.

Conformance with Environmental Regulations

Natural Resources Inventory/Environmental Features

Section 27-6802 of the Zoning Ordinance requires an approved natural resources inventory (NRI) plan with PPS applications. The approved NRI-011-06-02 was submitted with this application. The approved NRI shows steep slopes on this property and 45 specimen trees on-site and 56 specimen trees off-site within 100 feet of the property boundary. No PMA is

located on-site; however, a stream network is located off-site on the adjacent site to the east which this application proposes to impact for utilities and a stormwater outfall. An ephemeral stream is located just south of the site which will also be impacted by this development. Several specimen trees listed within the specimen tree table are not to the specimen tree size of 30 inches diameter at breast height (dbh). Specimen trees ST-95 (29 dbh), ST-100 (29 dbh), and ST-101 (28 dbh) do not meet the minimum 30 dbh and shall not be considered specimen trees. Prior to signature approval of the PPS, the NRI shall be revised to account for these trees, if these trees have grown to specimen tree size in the interim, no revision to the NRI is required. The TCP1 does not require revisions and is in conformance with the approved NRI.

Woodland Conservation

The TCP1 worksheet shows 9.32 acres of woodlands in the net tract, which results in a woodland conservation threshold of 20 percent, or 1.95 acres. The TCP1 proposes to clear the full 9.32 acres of woodland on-site. The woodland conservation worksheet does not accurately account for the proposed 1.16-acres of off-site woodland clearing for infrastructure. With this additional clearing, the requirement increases to 12.43 acres of which the applicant proposes 0.44 acre of on-site reforestation and to meet the remaining 11.99 acres off-site. The woodland conservation worksheet shall be corrected to accurately reflect the total proposed woodland clearing, both on and off-site. The applicant has submitted a SOJ for Section 25-119(d) of the WCO, to meet the woodland conservation threshold off-site. This request to allow the woodland conservation threshold to be met off-site is evaluated herein; however, at the time of DSP, the applicant shall provide additional woodland conservation on-site to the greatest extent practicable.

Technical revisions are required to the TCP1 prior to signature approval and are included in the recommended conditions provided in this technical staff report.

Section 25-121(c)(1) Woodland Conservation 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 RSF-A and RMF-20 Zones is 20 percent. The TCP1 provides 0.44 acre of reforestation on-site, and the applicant is requesting that the remaining 1.51 acres of the conservation threshold and the rest of the woodland conservation requirement be met off-site.

Statement of Justification Request

At the time of acceptance of the PPS, Section 25-121(c)(3) required a variance for not meeting the woodland conservation threshold requirement on-site. A variance request and a statement justifying the request were included in the acceptance package. Since the acceptance, Prince George’s County Council Bill CB-046-2025 was passed by the County Council and became effective on September 8, 2025. The bill removed the variance requirement for not meeting the woodland threshold on-site, only requiring a SOJ. A letter dated August 27, 2025, was submitted by the applicant formally withdrawing the variance request.

The applicant provided a SOJ revision dated August 28, 2025, to meet a portion of the woodland conservation threshold off-site. The justification includes the proximity to the Addison Road-Seat Pleasant Metro Station, the narrowness of the property, site geometry and topography, master-planned right-of-way dedication, lack of flexibility to accommodate the development constraints, and impact of the WCO including multiple legislative changes to the WCO.

The applicant calculates that the property is approximately three quarters of a mile from the Addison Road-Seat Pleasant Metro Station platform. Although the PPS is outside of the Plan 2035 transit center, the proximity to the Metro station creates the potential for walkability and connectivity for future residents. If the property was included in the Plan 2035 transit center, the WCO could then accept landscape credits in accordance with Section 25-122(b)(1)(I), to count on-site in the form of landscape credits. It is noted that the applicant stated that at the time of DSP, they would explore filing of a variance to the WCO to allow for the use of on-site landscape credits towards their woodland conservation threshold requirement.

The property is infill development and is relatively narrow. The abutting property to the south is developed with multifamily residential, and the property to the north is partially developed as a church. The remainder of the abutting property to the north and east is parkland. Expanding the current development proposal to the abutting properties to lessen the narrowness is not an option. It is the applicant's position that the narrowness of the site prevents optimal design, because development of the site with residential townhouses providing necessary roads would result in edge woodland conservation areas that could not meet the 50-foot width requirements established for woodland conservation areas.

The applicant states that the changes in elevation require additional cut and fill resulting in expansive tree clearing and the requirement for the site to dedicate 60 feet of right-of-way, which the applicant portends makes it unrealistic to meet the woodland conservation threshold on-site. The grading to provide compliant road grades and building sites is substantial extending to the property lines as demonstrated by the applicant with the provided cut and fill relief map.

The applicant states that there are additional development constraints in the Prince George's County Code (SWM, utilities, safe vehicular access) and the impact of the WCO with the development not being grandfathered to the prior 2010 WCO is a hardship. Staff contend that the woodland conservation goals of the WCO should be as important as other development requirements in the County Code and the goals of the State of Maryland for no net loss of tree canopy are implemented by the Environmental Planning Section of the Prince George's County Planning Department. Staff recommend that at the time of DSP the applicant provide additional woodland conservation on-site to the greatest extent practicable and encourage the applicant to file a variance to the WCO for this development to allow for the use of on-site landscape credits toward meeting the woodland conservation threshold requirement.

Staff find that there is potential for on-site woodland conservation or afforestation to meet a portion of the threshold requirements on-site. A portion of the threshold requirements could be met along the edges of the site where it borders Parks owned property and adjacent areas of woodland preservation.

Summary

Staff find that application does not fully meet the criteria for relief from Section 25-121(c)(1) to allow this site to not meet the woodland conservation threshold on-site. Staff recommend that at DSP the applicant provides additional woodland conservation on-site to the greatest extent practicable and encourage the applicant to explore filing of a variance to the WCO for this development to allow for the use of on-site landscape credits towards their woodland conservation threshold requirement.

Specimen Trees

Section 25-122(b)(1)(G) of the WCO 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 Prince George's County's 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) of the WCO clarifies that variances granted under Subtitle 25 are not considered zoning variances.

A Subtitle 25 variance application and statement dated August 5, 2025, was submitted for review with this PPS application, and received on August 8, 2025. The TCP1 shows the removal of Specimen Trees ST-1 through ST-4, ST-7 through ST-11, ST-13 through ST-16, ST-21 through ST-74, ST-85, ST-88, ST-89, ST-92 through ST-101, for a total of 80 specimen trees. The condition of trees proposed for removal ranges from poor to excellent.

Review of Subtitle 25 Variance Request

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. Details specific to individual trees have also been provided in the following chart.

Statement of Justification Request

A variance from Section 25-122(b)(1)(G) is requested for the clearing of the 80 specimen trees. The current proposal for this property is to develop the site as a single family attached subdivision.

Staff note that three trees identified as ST-95, ST-100, and ST-101 do not meet the definition of a specimen tree per Section 25-118(b)(84) of the WCO. Therefore, staff are evaluating a request for a variance request for the remaining 77 specimen trees as follows. The text in **bold** below is the text for the findings and the plain text provides comments on the findings:

- (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 the 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 cites significant elevation changes throughout the property, and the master-planned expansion of Addison Road South right-of-way into the property, as unique conditions specific to the property which have caused an unwarranted hardship. While Addison Road South was dedicated with a previous development application, the section of the right-of-way was not developed or evaluated for the specimen trees. It is likely that at that time, the trees, based on the size and species, had not achieved specimen tree size.

The property is infill development and is relatively narrow. The property abuts a multifamily residential to the south and the two properties to the north; a property developed with a church which contains a woodland conservation easement abutting part and The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission (M-NCPPC) parkland, which also abuts to the east.

The applicant states that the changes in elevation require significant cut and fill resulting in expansive tree clearing. In addition, the applicant is required to dedicate 60 feet of right-of-way through the site, further limiting the development potential for this property. The proposed grading to provide compliant road grades for the right-of-way and building sites for the proposed dwelling units is substantial and extends to the property lines.

The site does feature areas of steep slopes, primarily along the western boundary abutting the parkland, the eastern boundary along the Addison Road South right-of-way, and along the southern border. These steep slopes; however, are not throughout the site and are generally located towards the edges. Staff agree that the site is particularly narrow and opportunities to develop the site are limited, especially given the grading and right-of-way standards that must be met for development. Staff also agree that the SWM outfall and utility line extensions have been designed to minimize disturbance to the woodland and specimen trees. However, staff find that the applicant is pushing the SWM facilities to the very edge of the property, requiring considerable clearing and grading off-site, on M-NCPPC lands, thereby requiring additional clearing to accommodate the Prince George's County Soil Conservation District (PGSCD) non-woody buffer standards.

The majority of the specimen trees have been found to meet the criteria for removal and based on the features and conditions of the site discussed above, development would not be possible without the removal of specimen trees; however, specimen trees ST-23 and ST-24 are not recommended for removal because these trees are located off-site within a protected woodland conservation easement (TCP2-016-12) on the adjacent property. Specimen Trees ST-16 and ST-99 are also located off-site and outside the scope of the application. The request to remove Specimen Trees ST-3, ST-92,

ST-93, and ST-94 for the establishment of non-woody buffers on the adjacent M-NCPPC lands is a self-created hardship by extending the SWM facilities to the boundaries of the site.

(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 the specimen trees the site could not be developed as the applicant would be severely restricted in their ability to construct the road infrastructure in accordance with the MPOT. Furthermore, the applicant cites unique environmental regulatory burdens on the site and that adherence to preservation would result in forfeiture of necessary infrastructure.

As discussed in Finding A, the right-of-way dedication along the frontage will require clearing to grade into the site; however, this does not justify the removal of specimen trees elsewhere on the site. No additional master-planned right-of-way is being dedicated for this project. The proposed circulation will be private roads and alleys. Based upon the approved NRI-011-06-02, the site does not contain floodplain, streams, or wetlands, identified as the PMA. As a result, staff is uncertain regarding the “unique environmental regulatory burdens” mentioned by the applicant. Not granting the variance would prevent the proposed project from grading and developing in the applicant’s proposed manner. This is not a special privilege that would be denied to other applicants. If other properties encounter trees in similar locations on a site, without significant 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 RSF-A and RMF-20 Zones. Furthermore, there are no areas of PMA located on-site which further limit the development.

The removal of specimen trees is expected with development, especially on small, narrow sites where the specimen trees are abundant and scattered throughout the property; however, the scope of development with this application has expanded beyond the site, requiring 1.16 acres of off-site woodland clearing. While majority of the specimen tree impacts are for rights-of-way, stormwater, and infrastructure, there is a significant impact to the adjacent M-NCPPC parkland property for establishing a non-woody buffer to the on-site SWM facility. The infrastructure for the site should, within reason, be contained to the site itself and not result in significant impacts to adjacent properties. With future applications, the development should seek to limit impacts to specimen trees, while meeting the standard designs for utilities and roads

(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 that sensitive environmental areas have already limited development.

Specimen trees and steep slopes occur on sites throughout the County. While these features do have environmental regulatory requirements, these requirements apply to all sites which feature specimen trees.

Other properties in the County that have similar characteristics have been evaluated using the same standards and afforded the same relief and restrictions, especially where specimen trees are abundant and scattered throughout the site. Other projects are typically held to the boundary lines of the property, except where required for roads, utilities, and stormwater outfalls. This site proposes disturbance and clearing beyond the boundary lines for the PGSCD non-woody buffer and is grading in such a manner that the critical root zone of trees on adjacent protected areas will put the trees in jeopardy.

(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 of the site and the associated requirements for development. The variance SOJ states that the layout minimizes, to the extent practicable, specimen tree removal and that impacts to REF are abiding by design standards and are not a result of actions taken by the applicant.

The request for removal of the 77 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. The removal of 77 specimen trees is requested to achieve the application's development for the proposed residential use with associated infrastructure. The applicant has not taken any actions which require retroactive approval of a specimen tree variance. As mentioned in the findings above, no PMA is located on the site which would further limit development to specific areas.

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

The applicant states that this request is not from a condition on a neighboring property. In addition, the adjacent Parks property to the east remains undeveloped.

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. This request is based entirely on the narrowness of the site and the abundance of specimen trees scattered throughout the site.

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

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

Granting the variance for the removal of 77 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 finding of this technical staff report. Sediment and erosion control measures for this site will be subject to the requirements of PGSCD. The removal of the 77 specimen trees will not result in a marked degradation of water quality.

Staff recommend the Prince George’s County Planning Board grant the variance to remove 69 of the 77 specimen trees, specifically specimen trees ST-1, ST-2, ST-4 through ST-11, ST-13 through ST-15, ST-21, ST-22, ST-25 through ST-74, ST-88, ST-89, ST-96, ST-97 and ST-98. Staff find that the conditions of the site, the location of the trees, and the necessary grading to meet infrastructure, development, and SWM requirements merit the removal of these trees.

Staff do not recommend that the Planning Board grant a variance for the removal of specimen trees ST-3, ST-16, ST-23, ST-24, ST-92, ST-93, ST, 94, and ST-99. These trees are either within a protected woodland conservation easement on the adjacent property, located off-site and outside the scope of the application, or needed because of the encroachment on adjacent M-NCPPC lands for the SWM facility.

Regulated Environmental Features

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

Section 24-4303(d)(5) of the Subdivision Regulations states: “Where land is located outside the Chesapeake Bay Critical Area Overlay (CBCAO) zones, the preliminary plan of subdivision (minor or major) and all plans associated with the application shall demonstrate the preservation and/or restoration of regulated environmental features in a natural state, to the fullest extent possible, consistent with the Environmental Technical Manual established in accordance with Subtitle 25: Trees and Vegetation, of the County Code. Any lot with an impact shall demonstrate sufficient net lot area where a net lot area is required in accordance with Subtitle 27: Zoning Ordinance, of the County Code, for the reasonable development of the lot outside the regulated feature.”

Impacts to the 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 the County Code. Impacts to REF must first be avoided and then minimized.

Summary of Proposed Off-Site Impacts

While not required to be approved by the Planning Board, this application does propose off-site impacts to the PMA for the purposes of SWM and utilities. A total of 1.16 acres of off-site clearing is proposed for the establishment of a stormwater outfall, non-woody buffer, and connection to utilities across the adjacent Parks owned property. As previously stated, impacts to the PMA off-site do not require a PMA SOJ, and this is provided for informative purposes only.

Soils

In accordance with Section 24-4101(c) of the Subdivision Regulations, this application was reviewed for unsafe land restrictions. According to the United States Department of Agriculture Natural Resource Conservation Service Web Soil Survey, the predominant soils found to occur include the Collington-Wist complex, Collington-Wist-Urban land complex, Sassafras-Urban land complex, Marr-Dodon-Urban land complex, and Marr-Dodon complex. According to available mapping information, unsafe soils containing Marlboro clay or Christiana clay do not occur on this property. Marlboro Clay is not mapped within proximity to the site.

- 11. Urban Design**—A DSP is required for this development, in accordance with Section 27-3605(a) of the Zoning Ordinance. The townhouse lots proposed for this property in the RSF-A zoned portion of the site are permitted per Section 27-5101(c) of the Zoning Ordinance. Under the Zoning Ordinance, conformance with, but not limited to, the following regulations will be required to be demonstrated at the time of DSP review:

- Section 27-4202(f), Residential, Single-Family-Attached (RSF-A) Zone
- Section 27-4202(h) Residential, Multifamily-20 (RMF-20) Zone
- Section 27-5101(c), Use Regulations
- Section 27-6200. Roadway Access, Mobility and Circulation
- Section 27-6300 Off-Street Parking and Loading
- Section 27-6400. Open Space Set Asides

- Section 27-6500 Landscaping
- Section 27-6600 Fences and Walls
- Section 27-6700 Exterior Lighting
- Section 27-6800 Environmental Protection and Noise Controls
- Section 27-6900 Multifamily, Townhouse, and Three-Family Form and Design Standards
- Section 27-61200 Neighborhood Compatibility
- Section 27-61500 Signage
- Section 27-61600 Green Building Standards

Open Space Set-Aside

Pursuant to Section 27-6403 of the Zoning Ordinance, development located in the RSF-A Zone is required to provide 20 percent open space set-aside area based on development site area. The subject property is approximately 9.76 acres, and the submitted open space set-aside exhibit shows that approximately 35 percent (approximately 3.43 acres) of open space set-aside will be provided, exceeding the required 20 percent (approximately 1.95 acres). The plans indicate that 15 percent of the total required minimum open space set-aside area (approximately 0.29 acre) consists of active recreational areas. The applicant should consult Table 27-6404(a): Open Space Set Aside Features, of the Zoning Ordinance, to determine if proposed SWM areas qualify as site amenities. The requirements of this section will be further evaluated at the time of DSP review.

All proposed dwelling units will be accessed via proposed private streets and alleys. The proposed townhouse dwelling units are to be front-loaded, and the proposed two-family dwelling units are proposed to be rear-loaded. In a submitted exhibit, on-street parking spaces are provided. Sufficient parking will be further evaluated at the time of DSP.

Conformance with the requirements of the 2018 *Prince George's County Landscape Manual* (Landscape Manual) and the Prince George's County Tree Canopy Coverage Ordinance will also be evaluated at the time of the DSP. Section 4.6(c)(1)(B) of the Landscape Manual requires a minimum 50-foot-wide buffer where any yard of a two-family dwelling is oriented toward an arterial road (Addison Road), consisting of 6 shade trees, 16 evergreen trees, and 30 shrubs, or an equivalency of 170 plant units per 100 linear feet.

Section 4.10 of the Landscape Manual provides regulations for street trees along private streets. All private streets should be designed for conformance to the requirements of the Landscape Manual, in accordance with Section 24-4201 of the Subdivision Regulations. The applicant provided street cross sections to demonstrate how the requirement related to street trees will be achieved. However, only private roads within Parcel A conform to the provided cross sections. The width of private roads within Parcels C, D, and F do not conform to the provided cross sections, which shows a minimum 44 feet width for a private street. Prior to signature approval of the PPS, the widths of Parcels C, D, and F shall be

revised to provide the minimum width for private street as shown on the provided cross sections. The PPS shows a lotting pattern that includes 8 feet of open space between individual sticks of townhouse lots. However, this width is not dimensioned. Prior to signature approval of the PPS, the width of open space between Lots 4 and 5; Lots 13 and 14; Lots 20 and 21; and Lots 27 and 28 should be labeled as 8 feet.

12. **Noise**—The proposed development is subject to the lot depth requirements of Section 24-4102(c) of the Subdivision Regulations, and the noise control standards contained in Section 27-6810 of the Zoning Ordinance. Section 24-4102 of the Subdivision Regulations states the following:

(c) Minimum Lot Depth

- (1) Lots or parcels used for residential purposes adjacent to existing or planned streets classified as arterials shall be platted with a minimum depth of 150 feet**
- (3) Adequate protection and screening from traffic nuisances shall be provided in accordance with the requirements of the Landscape Manual.**

Addison Road is an arterial roadway abutting the property to the west. The PPS demonstrates that not all lots meet the minimum 150-foot lot depth requirement of Section 24-4102(c)(1). Specifically, Lots 1-4 are located within 150 feet of Addison Road, as measured parallel from the right-of-way. The applicant requested a variation from the Section 24-4102(c)(1) lot depth requirement as follows:

Variation

Section 24-3403(a) of the Subdivision Regulations requires that the following criteria are met for approval of a variation. The criteria are in **bold** text below, while findings for each criterion are in plain text.

(a) Purpose

Where the Planning Board finds that extraordinary hardship or practical difficulties may result from strict compliance with this Subtitle and/or that the purposes of this Subtitle may be served to a greater extent by an alternative proposal, it may approve variations from these Subdivision Regulations so that substantial justice may be done and the public interest secured, provided that such variation shall not have the effect of nullifying the intent and purpose of this Subtitle and Section 9-206 of the Environment Article; and further provided that the Planning Board shall not approve variations unless it shall make findings based upon the evidence presented to it in each specific case that:

- (1) The granting of the variation will not be detrimental to the public safety, health, or welfare, or injurious to other property.**

The granting of this variation will not be detrimental to public safety, health, or welfare, or injurious to other properties. The applicant has stated that previously approved dedications, along with the physical constraints of the subject property, limit the potential unit yield due to the requirement for lots and parcels to have a minimum depth of 150 feet. Staff acknowledge these constraints and note that the site is narrow and includes steep terrain. Lots 1-4 are set back a sufficient stance from the roadway. A Phase 1 noise study was submitted and determined that outdoor activity areas will be mitigated to 65 dBA Leq during the day and 55 dBA Leq during nighttime hours. The 12 two-family dwelling units are not proposed to contain outdoor activity areas. Conformance with the requirements of the Landscape Manual will be required at the time of DSP, and the noise requirements of Section 27-6810 will ensure that adequate protection is provided, which will be in accordance with Section 24-4102(c)(3) of the Subdivision Regulations. Thus, reducing the lot depth will not be detrimental to the public.

(2) The conditions on which the variation is based are unique to the property for which the variation is sought and are not applicable generally to other properties.

The subject site is unique due to prior right-of-way dedication under PPS 4-06098, which recommended the dedication of approximately 120 feet as Addison Road is classified as A-33 by the 2000 *Addison Road Metro Area Approved Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment*. Pursuant to the conditions provided in the approved PPS 4-06098, the applicant was required to provide a 60-foot right-of-way along Addison Road from the master plan center line. The actual right-of-way width varies along the frontage ranging from 77.30 feet to 150.92 feet, thus exceeding both the required right-of-way and the recommended. The applicant has stated that this affects approximately 1.60 acres of the site. In addition, the site is narrow (approximately 350 feet in width), elongated, and topographically steep. These combined constraints limit the lotting pattern and building placement and are not generally applicable to other nearby properties along Addison Road. Without a variation, development would result in an inefficient layout and inconsistent interface with the existing right-of-way. Staff acknowledge the unique challenges the applicant faces due to the parcel's location adjacent to an arterial road, its steep topography, and its narrow shape. Furthermore, denying this variation would result in an incompatible alignment of development and streets. These factors together provide an appropriate basis for seeking variation, and they create conditions which are not generally applicable to other properties.

(3) The variation does not constitute a violation of any other applicable law, ordinance, or regulation.

The variation from Section 24-4102(c)(1) is unique to, and under the sole authority of, the Planning Board. No other known law, ordinance, or regulation will be violated by this request.

- (4) **Because of the particular physical surroundings, shape, or topographical conditions of the specific property involved, a particular hardship to the owner would result, as distinguished from a mere inconvenience, if the strict letter of these regulations is carried out.**

The property is affected by prior excessive right-of-way dedication and its narrow configuration and steep grade. The elevation of the site varies significantly from west to east, requiring grading that limits the usable buildable area. Strict enforcement of the 150-foot depth standard would require elimination of Lots 1–4, resulting in unit loss and reduced feasibility for development due to the narrow width of the property. These physical characteristics give rise to a particular hardship that can be distinguished from a mere inconvenience if the strict letter of the regulations is carried out.

- (5) **In the RMF-12, RMF-20, and RMF-48 zones, where multifamily dwellings are proposed, the Planning Board may approve a variation if the applicant proposes and demonstrates that, in addition to the criteria in above, the percentage of dwelling units accessible to the physically handicapped and aged will be increased above the minimum number of units required by Subtitle 4 of the Prince George's County Code.**

This criterion is not applicable since multifamily dwellings are not proposed with this subdivision. The impacted lots are proposed for single-family attached dwelling units.

Staff find that the variation request is supported by the required findings. Approval of the variation will not have the effect of nullifying the intent and purpose of the Subdivision Regulations which, in part, encourage creative residential subdivision design that accomplishes these purposes in a more efficient manner. Therefore, staff recommend approval of the variation from Section 24-4102(c)(1) to allow a reduction to the required lot depth along Addison Road for Lots 1–4.

Section 27-6810(d) of the Zoning Ordinance states the following:

Residential lots and uses that are adjacent to existing or planned streets classified as arterial or higher shall demonstrate that outdoor activity areas are mitigated to 65 dBA during the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m., and 55 dBA during the hours of 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m., and that interior noise levels are mitigated to 45 dBA or less through the submission of a noise study prepared and signed by a professional engineer with competence in acoustical engineering.

The applicant submitted a noise study with the subject application, dated February 12, 2024, to study the effects of the noise generated by the adjacent roadways.

The noise study evaluated average outdoor sound levels separately 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), at the ground and upper level, 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. For exterior noise, the proposed outdoor recreation area will not be impacted by future noise levels greater than 65 dBA Leq during the day or 55 dBA Leq during the night. Additional mitigation for this area will not be required. However, outdoor noise levels will reach the 55 dBA Leq nighttime noise limit in front of the twelve two-over-two units directly facing Addison Road at the southwestern end of the development. In addition, the study shows that noise impact of 65 dBA Leq approaches the stick of residential units directly facing Addison Road at the upper level, however, the impact does not exceed 65 dBA Leq under daytime or nighttime conditions. With the assumption that standard building construction provides a minimum of 20 dBA of noise reduction, all living units will meet the 45 dBA Leq interior noise limit requirement without additional analysis.

In accordance with Section 27-6810(d), a Phase II noise analysis and mitigation of impacted areas will be regulatory requirement at the time of DSP, with which conformance will need to be demonstrated.

13. **Community feedback**—At the time of the writing of this technical staff report, the Prince George's County Planning Department has not received any correspondence from the community regarding the subject application.
14. **Adjoining Municipalities**—The subject property lies within one mile of the municipal limits of the City of Seat Pleasant, Town of Capitol Heights, and the City of District Heights. This PPS was referred to the municipalities on June 23, 2025. At the time of the writing of this technical staff report, the Planning Department has not received any correspondence from the municipalities regarding the subject application.

RECOMMENDATION

APPROVAL, subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to signature approval of the preliminary plan of subdivision, the plan shall be revised as follows:
 - a. Label the width of open space between Lots 4 and 5, Lots 13 and 14, Lots 20 and 21, and Lots 27 and 28 as 8 feet.
 - b. Delineate the pavement width and right-of-way width for all internal private streets and alleys.

- c. Add a parcel table to identify all proposed parcels and outlots, their uses, acreage, and ultimate ownership. All parcels and outlots must be clearly labeled on the plans, and staff shall confirm and approve the proposed conveyance in accordance with the Prince George's County Subdivision Regulations.
 - d. Revise the widths of Parcels C, D, and F to provide the minimum 44 feet width for private streets, as shown on the private street cross sections, to demonstrate conformance to the requirements of the 2018 *Prince George's County Landscape Manual*, and in accordance with Section 24-4201 of the Prince George's County Subdivision Regulations.
 - e. Provide an exhibit to demonstrate that sufficient turning movements of emergency vehicles through the proposed private streets and alleys are provided.
 - f. In accordance with Section 24-3402(c)(2)(B)(iii)(ee) of the Prince George's County Subdivision Regulations, lots and parcels shall be numbered in sequence starting from the prior platting of the Addison Overlook subdivision, or a new or distinct subdivision name shall be provided.
2. Development of the site shall be in conformance with Stormwater Management Concept Plan No. 01785-2023-SDC/P00105-2024-SDC and any subsequent revisions, in accordance with Section 24-4303 of the Prince George's County Subdivision Regulations.
3. Prior to approval, the final plat of subdivision shall include:
- a. The granting of a minimum 10-foot-wide public utility easement along both sides of all public streets, and along at least one side of all private streets, in accordance with Section 24-4205 and Section 24-4401 of the Prince George's County Subdivision Regulations.
 - b. A note indicating the Prince George's County Planning Board's approval of a variation from Section 24-4102(c)(1) of the Prince George's County Subdivision Regulations, in accordance with the approving resolution for Preliminary Plan of Subdivision PPS-2023-006, for lots not meeting the minimum lot depth requirement.
 - c. In accordance with Section 24-4102(f) of the Prince George's County Subdivision Regulations, Outlots A and B shall be labeled to indicate that they are to be conveyed to the abutting property owner. If evidence is provided that the abutting property will not accept the conveyance, Outlots A and B shall be consolidated into Homeowners Association Parcel E and Parcel 5, respectively.
4. Prior to signature approval of the preliminary plan of subdivision, the Type 1 tree conservation plan (TCP1) shall be revised as follows:
- a. The woodland conservation worksheet shall be revised to include all off-site clearing proposed.
 - b. Revise the TCP1 to be reflective of Natural Resources Inventory Plan NRI-011-06-02 when approved.

- c. Add the new DARTS tree conservation plan approval block.
 - d. Remove Specimen Trees ST-95, ST-100, and ST-101 from the Specimen Tree Table.
5. The Natural Resources Inventory Plan (NRI-011-06-02) shall be revised prior to signature approval of the Type 1 tree conservation plan, to remove Specimen Trees ST-95, ST-100, and ST-101 from the specimen tree table, as they do not meet the size requirements of 30 inches diameter at breast height (dbh) needed to be considered specimen trees. If the trees meet the size requirement for specimen trees, the applicant shall provide revised forest stand delineation information indicating that these specimen trees are 30 dbh or greater.
6. Development of this subdivision shall be in conformance with an approved Type 1 Tree Conservation Plan (TCP1-2025-0022), in conformance with Section 25-121 of the 2024 Prince George's County 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 (TCP1-2025-0022 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."
7. Prior to issuance of permits for this subdivision, and in conformance with Section 25-119(a)(2) of the 2024 Prince George's County 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."
8. At the time of final plat, and in conformance with Section 24-4303(d)(5) of the Prince George's County Subdivision Regulations, 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 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 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.
10. In accordance with the 2010 *Approved Subregion 4 Master Plan*, 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 show the locations and extent of the facilities, at the time of detailed site plan:
 - a. A standard bicycle lane along the frontage of Addison Road, to include pavement markings and signage, unless modified by the permitting agency with written correspondence. Any modification shall be in accordance with Prince George's County Department of Public Works and Transportation and Maryland State Highway Administration adopted standards.
 - b. A minimum 5-foot-wide sidewalk along the property frontage of Addison Road, unless modified by the permitting agency with written correspondence. Any modification shall be in accordance with Prince George's County Department of Public Works and Transportation and Maryland State Highway Administration adopted standards.
 - c. A minimum 5-foot-wide sidewalk along both sides of all internal roadways.
 - d. Continental-style crosswalks with associated Americans with Disabilities Act-compliant curb ramps across all vehicular access points and throughout the site.
 - e. Short-term bicycle parking in all recreational areas.
 - f. An emergency vehicle turning exhibit to demonstrate movement throughout the site.
11. The applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall allocate appropriate and developable areas for, and provide, sufficient on-site recreational facilities, in accordance with the standards outlined in the *Prince George's County Parks and Recreation Facilities Design Guidelines*.
12. 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 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.
13. 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 sufficiency and proper siting, in accordance with the *Prince George's County Parks 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 the DSP review.

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 the construction of recreational facilities.
15. 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.
16. Prior to approval of 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 reservation of the right of approval by the Prince George's County Planning Director.
17. Prior to approval of any building permit, and pursuant to Section 24-4102(f) of the Prince George's County Subdivision Regulations, the applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall convey Outlots A and B to the abutting property owner,

unless it is determined that ownership will be to the homeowners association at the time of final plat.

STAFF RECOMMEND:

- Approval of Preliminary Plan of Subdivision PPS-2023-006
- Approval of Type 1 Tree Plan Conservation Plan TCP1-2025-0022
- Approval of a Variation from Section 24-4102(c)(1)
- Approval of a Variance to Section 25-122(b)(1)(G)