



July 8, 2026

Richmond American Homes of Maryland, Inc.  
6200 Old Dobbin Lane,  
Columbia, MD 21045



Re: Notification of Planning Board Action on  
**Specific Design Plan SDP-2025-0014**  
**Oak Wood Preserve**

Dear Applicant:

This is to advise you that the above-referenced Specific Design Plan was acted upon by the Prince George's County Planning Board on **July 2, 2026**, pursuant to the Transitional Provisions of Section 27-1700 of the Prince George's County Zoning Ordinance and in accordance with the attached Resolution.

Pursuant to Section 27-528.01 of the prior Zoning Ordinance, the Planning Board's decision will become final 30 calendar days after the date of the final notice (**July 8, 2026**) of the Planning Board's decision, unless:

1. Within the 30 days, a written appeal has been filed with the District Council by the applicant or by an aggrieved person that appeared at the hearing before the Planning Board in person, by an attorney, or in writing and the review is expressly authorized in accordance with Section 25-212 of the Land Use Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland; or
2. Within the 30 days (or other period specified by Section 27-291 of the prior Zoning Ordinance), the District Council decides, on its own motion, to review the action of the Planning Board.

(You should be aware that you will have to reactivate any permits pending the outcome of this case. If the approved plans differ from the ones originally submitted with your permit, you are required to amend the permit by submitting copies of the approved plans. For information regarding reactivating permits, you should call the County's Permit Office at 301-636-2050.)

Please direct any future communication or inquiries regarding this matter to Ms. Donna J. Brown, Clerk of the County Council, at 301-952-3600.

Sincerely,  
Sherri Conner, Planning Division Chief  
Development Review Division

By: Meng Sun  
Reviewer

Attachment: PGCPB Resolution No. **2026-044**

cc: Donna J. Brown, Clerk of the County Council  
Persons of Record

PGCPB No. 2026-044

File No. SDP-2025-0014

## R E S O L U T I O N

WHEREAS, a new Zoning Ordinance, Subtitle 27, Prince George's County Code went into effect on April 1, 2022; and

WHEREAS, the subject property is within the Legacy Comprehensive Design Zone (LCD); and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 27-1704(g) of the Zoning Ordinance, property in the LCD Zone may proceed to develop in accordance with the standards and procedures of the Zoning Ordinance effective prior to April 1, 2022 (prior Zoning Ordinance), subject to the terms and conditions of prior development approvals, which it has received.; and

WHEREAS, therefore, the Prince George's County Planning Board of The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission reviewed this application under the Zoning Ordinance in existence prior to April 1, 2022; and

WHEREAS, an application was submitted by Richmond American Homes of Maryland, Inc. for approval of a specific design plan; and

WHEREAS, in consideration of evidence presented at a public hearing on June 25, 2026, regarding Specific Design Plan SDP-2025-0014 for Oakwood Preserve, the Planning Board finds:

- Request:** This specific design plan (SDP) is for development of 112 single-family detached dwelling units, with associated infrastructure improvements.
- Development Data Summary:**

|                             | EXISTING | APPROVED WITH<br>CDP-9901/<br>CDP-9901-01 | EVALUATED                             |
|-----------------------------|----------|-------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Zone                        | LCD      | R-L (prior)                               | R-L (prior)                           |
| Use                         | Vacant   | Single-family<br>Detached Residential     | Single-family Detached<br>Residential |
| <b>Total Dwelling Units</b> | 0        | 116                                       | 112                                   |
| Total Gross Acreage         | 167.70   | 167.70                                    | 167.70                                |
| Floodplain Acreage          | 29.61    | 29.61                                     | 29.61                                 |
| Total Net Acreage           | 138.09   | 138.09                                    | 138.09                                |
| Lots                        | 112      | N/A                                       | 112                                   |
| Parcels                     | 8*       | N/A                                       | 8*                                    |

**Note:** \*Three of the eight parcels were dedicated to The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission (M-NCPPC) pursuant to prior approvals and are identified as Parcels B, G, and H, as shown on the submitted site plan.

**Parking Data** (Per Section 27-568(a) of the prior Prince George's County Zoning Ordinance)

| <b>Parking</b>                                 | <b>Required</b> | <b>Provided</b> |
|------------------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Single-family detached at 2 spaces x 112 units | 224             | 336*            |

**Note:** \*Every house model includes a minimum 2-car garage, with some models having 3-car or 4-car garage options. The final garage choice will be determined by the home buyer at the time of permitting. Therefore, two garage parking spaces have been counted per unit. In addition, one space per driveway will be provided for each unit. Driveway depth will be a minimum of 20 feet from the right-of-way. Typical parking space size is 18 feet by 9 feet.

3. **Location:** The subject property is located along the east and west sides of MD 202 (Largo Road), approximately 2,220 feet south of Kent Drive.
4. **Surrounding Uses:** The site is bordered by the Western Branch stream to the west, and the Collington Branch stream to the east, with MD 202 bisecting the site. The subject property is bounded to the north by single-family detached dwellings and wooded areas in the Brock Hall community, and the Thorne Hills, Brock Hills, and Collington Estates subdivisions in the Residential Estate (RE) Zone (formerly the Residential-Estate (R-E) Zone); to the southwest by single-family detached dwellings in the Villages of Marlboro subdivision, in the Legacy Comprehensive Design (LCD) Zone (formerly the Residential Urban Development (R-U) Zone); to the east by wooded area in the Beechtree subdivision, in the LCD Zone (formerly the Residential Suburban Development (R-S) Zone); and to the south by wooded areas and single-family detached dwellings in the Residential, Rural (RR) and RE Zones (formerly the Rural Residential (R-R) and R-E Zones).
5. **Previous Approvals:** On January 26, 1994, the Prince George's County Planning Board recommended approval of Zoning Map Amendment (Basic Plan) A-9895 (PGCPB Resolution No. 94-24), to rezone the 169.15-acre property from the R-E and R-R Zones to the Residential Low Development (R-L) Zone, for development of 153 single-family detached dwelling units, subject to 18 conditions and 1 consideration.

On May 24, 1994, the Prince George's County District Council adopted the 1993 *Approved Subregion VI Study Area Master Plan and Sectional Map Amendment* (Planning Areas 79, 82A, 82B, 86A, 86B, 87A and 87B) (Council Resolution CR-54-1994, CDZ Amendment 1). The area covered by Basic Plan A-9895 was incorporated into the sectional map amendment, rezoning the subject property from the R-E and R-R Zones to the R-L Zone, for development of 153 single-family detached dwelling units.

On June 24, 1994, Basic Plan A-9895 was withdrawn by the District Council having been superseded by the Subregion VI Sectional Map Amendment.

On March 24, 2003, the District Council approved Comprehensive Design Plan CDP-9901, for a projected development of 116 single-family detached dwelling units on approximately 167.70 acres in the R-L Zone, subject to eight conditions.

On January 15, 2004, the Planning Board approved Preliminary Plan of Subdivision (PPS) 4-03071 (PGCPB Resolution No. 04-06) with 23 conditions.

On December 8, 2005, the Planning Board approved SDP-0414 (PGCPB Resolution No. 05-259) for 112 single-family detached dwelling units on 167.70 acres in the R-L Zone, the dedication of approximately 105 acres of land to M-NCPPC, private recreational facilities, and architecture for 11 single-family detached models. SDP-0414 was never constructed and expired on December 8, 2011.

On May 22, 2007, a private recreational facilities agreement (RFA) for the subject property (formerly known as Forest Hills) was recorded in the Prince George's County Land Records as Liber 27810, Folio 0711.

On December 3, 2007, a public RFA for the subject property (formerly known as Forest Hills) was recorded in the Prince George's County Land Records as Liber 28839, Folio 0701.

On February 7, 2008, final plats for the subject property (5-08008 through 5-08023) were approved by the Planning Board. The final plats were recorded on July 16, 2008, in the Prince George's County Land Records, in Plat Book PM 227 Plat Nos. 68–83.

On July 30, 2020, the Planning Board approved a waiver of the rules of procedure and a reconsideration request of PPS 4-03071, based on good cause and substantial public interest. Following the granting of the request for reconsideration, an amendment to the prior approved Basic Plan (A-9895) and CDP-9901 was required to be approved before any reconsideration of PPS 4-03071 could be completed.

On April 26, 2021, the District Council approved an amendment to Basic Plan A-9895 (A-9895-C-01, Zoning Ordinance No. 4-2021) to revise Conditions 15 and 16 concerning construction of the Western Branch Trail, due to environmental constraints. Other previous approved conditions and consideration remain in full force and effect.

On February 2, 2023, the Planning Board approved a reconsideration request with amendments for PPS 4-03071 (PGCPB Resolution No. 04-06(A)), subject to 23 conditions. Among other things, the Planning Board found that no trails or other development were to be constructed on M-NCPPC parkland within the site boundaries. The removal of the Western Branch Trail on Type 1 Tree Conservation Plan TCP1-064-95-03 was approved with CDP-9901-01.

Per Section 24-4503(a)(1) of the Prince George's County Subdivision Regulations, the property has received an automatic certificate of adequacy associated with PPS 4-03071, effective April 1, 2022, for a period of 12 years and subject to additional expiration provisions of Section 24-4503(c) of the Subdivision Regulations.

On February 27, 2023, the District Council approved amendment CDP-9901-01, to amend the conditions and plans to reflect the changes made by Basic Plan A-9895-C-01, relative to the removal of the Western Branch Trail through the west side of the property, subject to one additional condition.

6. **Design Features:** The subject SDP consists of 112 single-family detached dwelling units with a variety of sizes, private recreational facilities, and architecture for 9 single-family detached models. The site plan reflects 112 lots along internal dedicated public rights-of-way, open space parcels dedicated to M-NCPPC (Parcels B, G, and H), and parcels to be conveyed to the future homeowners association (HOA) containing open space, stormwater management (SWM), and the recreational facilities.

The site is bisected by the existing right-of-way of MD 202 into east and west development pods. Parcel 59 abuts the subject site's eastern development pod parallel to MD 202, is owned by State of Maryland, and is reserved for future MD 202 alignment. Parcels D and E lie between existing MD 202 and Parcel 59, and will be conveyed to the HOA, as shown on the Parcel Area summary chart on the site plan coversheet and indicated on the record plat for the property. The west development pod, Block A, includes 71 single-family detached dwelling units and the east development pod, Block B, includes 41 single-family detached dwelling units. The development includes one vehicular access point from the east and west development pods to existing MD 202 that are aligned to create a uniform intersection. Within the development, public roads form the primary vehicular circulation of the site. The provision of crosswalks and 5-foot-wide sidewalks on both sides of the roads form the pedestrian circulation for the site.

The lotting pattern and street network shown on the submitted SDP are in general conformance with the prior recorded record plats for the Forest Hill Subdivision, with a minor revision. Sheet 13 shows 0.04-acre Parcel I, and Sheet 14 shows 0.10-acre Parcel J. Both areas are labeled as future right-of-way dedication. Right-of-way dedication should not be reflected with parcel numbers, and existing Parcels D and E shall be re-subdivided to exclude the right-of-way dedication and shall be labeled as future Parcels I and J. Therefore, a condition is included herein requiring the applicant to revise the Parcel Area Summary table on the coversheet by removing reference of Parcels I and J for the two areas of right-of-way dedication, indicating those areas are right-of-way dedications from Parcels D and E, and revising the row for Parcels D and E to indicate they are to be resubdivided to Parcel I and J. Another condition is included herein requiring the applicant to revise the public utility easement delineation along Karina Lane to be behind the future right-of-way dedication.

#### **Architecture**

The subject SDP application requests approval of nine architectural models for single-family detached homes. Each model has multiple elevation options, as noted in the table below:

| Model Name | Front loaded garage | Unit width | Base GFA (sq. ft) | Typical Building Height | Front Elevation Options |
|------------|---------------------|------------|-------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| Coronado   | 2 car               | 39 ft      | 2,663             | 24 ft, 5.07 inch        | 6                       |
| Donovan*   | 3 car               | 50 ft      | 3,163             | 25 ft, 7.25 inch        | 8                       |
| Hemingway  | 2 car               | 39 ft      | 2,523             | 25 ft, 10.25 inch       | 6                       |
| Harmon     | 3 car               | 59 ft      | 4,391             | 34 ft, 3.25 inch        | 6                       |
| Hancock    | 2 car               | 58 ft      | 4,184             | 34 ft, 1.25 inch        | 7                       |
| Melody     | 2 car               | 56 ft      | 2,328             | 16 ft, 1.25 inch        | 6                       |
| Presley    | 2 car               | 50 ft      | 2,778             | 24 ft, 3.50 inch        | 6                       |
| Preston    | 2 car               | 50 ft      | 3,053             | 25 ft, 2.75 inch        | 6                       |
| Yorktown   | 3 car               | 39 ft      | 2,931             | 25 ft, 8.50 inch        | 6                       |

**Note:** \*A condition is included herein requiring the applicant to indicate the number of stories for the Donovan model in Template Sheet 5.

Each model offers varied gable roof lines and a variety of architectural features and detailing options such as gable pediments and brackets, front entries defined with columns, porches, balanced fenestration, enhanced windows and down trim, shutters, band boards, and decorative louvered vents. The architectural elevations also show adequate variation in the color of material used for the various models, including white, blue, gray, beige, green, and dark brown. The building elevations are designed to incorporate a variety of materials, including brick, stone, vinyl siding—arranged vertically or horizontally—and shake vinyl siding, to create a clean and modern design.

Sheet 3 of the site plan set identifies highly visible lots. Treatment 1 requires a minimum of three standard architectural features (such as windows, doors, a masonry water table, and/or fireplace chimneys) on all lots containing highly visible side elevations, prior to issuance of building permits. Treatment 2 requires a minimum of three standard architectural features (such as windows, doors, a masonry water table, and/or fireplace chimneys) on all lots containing highly visible rear elevations. The architectural package of high visibility side and rear elevations for all single-family detached homes were submitted showing at least three standard architectural features on side and rear elevations, as noted in Treatments 1 and 2. On the side elevation sheets, all provided architectural features are highlighted and labeled by number, which is also associated with a list of text further explaining those features. The rear elevations for all models include at least three architectural features. However, only one feature is highlighted and labeled by number with an explaining text. Since the treatment requires a minimum of three architectural features, the rest of the features should be highlighted and labeled with associated text, which is conditioned herein to be provided.

### **Recreational Facilities**

PPS 4-03071 (PGCPB Resolution No. 04-06) determined that dedication of approximately 105.12 acres of open space to M-NCPPC for public park use is required. The reconsideration of PPS 4-03071 (PGCPB Resolution No. 04-06(A)) determined that no trails or other development were to be constructed on M-NCPPC parkland within the site boundaries. PPS 4-03071 further

determined that private on-site recreational facilities are appropriate for the project development, to serve the future residents, in accordance with Section 24-135(b) of the prior Subdivision Regulations. The recreational facilities were required to be provided on the east and west sides of the subdivision and may include picnic areas, sitting areas, and playgrounds.

On May 22, 2007, a private RFA for the subject property (formerly known as Forest Hills) was recorded in the Prince George's County Land Records as Liber 27810, Folio 0711. However, the provided RFA references the previously approved, yet expired SDP. The RFA shall be amended to reference the subject SDP. The recreational facilities required by the recorded private RFA are shown on the coversheet of the submitted SDP, including two playground areas, one each on the east and west sides of the development. Each playground area includes playground equipment, benches, picnic tables, and trash receptacles. The play area in Parcel F also includes a swing set. A recreational facilities chart is included on the coversheet, which shows the estimated cost for each facility, and the total value of facilities provided is \$601,053. The details of these facilities are shown on Sheets 21–24 of the landscape plan. These on-site facilities will be bonded and constructed in accordance with the requirements of the recorded private RFA, as noted on the coversheet.

On December 3, 2007, a public RFA was recorded in the Prince George's County Land Records for the subdivision (Liber 28839, Folio 0701). On February 2, 2023, the Planning Board approved a reconsideration request, with amendments, for PPS 4-03071 (PGCPB Resolution No. 04-06(A)). In accordance with amended Condition 10 of approved PPS 4-03071, the applicant will also pay a fee of \$200,000 to the Prince George's County Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) prior to approval of the building permit exceeding 50 percent of the dwelling units approved with the SDP for the site. The public RFA recorded shall be of no further force or effect, in accordance with revised Condition 10 of the PPS.

In addition, approximately 104.26 acres of land has already been dedicated to M-NCPPC, in accordance with the record plat, and an additional 16.99 acres will be conveyed to the HOA. As such, appropriate and sufficient recreational facilities will be provided to serve the future residents of the subject development.

### **Signage**

The subject SDP includes four freestanding signs at the entrance intersections with MD 202, with two signs located on the eastern side of MD 202, and two signs on the western side of MD 202. The four freestanding signs have the same dimensions, design, and materials, and details are included on Sheet 21 of the site plan set. The signs feature a stone wall and stone veneer piers on top of a masonry wall foundation, including a central precast sign panel with lettering on top of stucco finish. The signage summary table shows the signs measure 22 feet in length and 7.9 feet in height, and approximately 44 square feet in area. However, in accordance with Section 27-591(a) of the prior Zoning Ordinance and Figure 64, the sign area should not include the overall structure but rather the actual sign area, which is reflected on Detail 4/21, Precast Sign detail. The detail shows the sign measures approximately 12.83 feet in length, 1.5 feet in height, with approximately 19.2 square feet in area. Pursuant to Section 27-591(a), to calculate the area of the faces of these letters, figures, and designs on the signage, the square footage of the sign, as would be normally computed, shall be calculated and reduced by 50 percent. Based on this, the

Planning Board estimates that the sign area for each sign is approximately 9.6 square feet. A condition is included herein requiring the applicant to revise the signage dimensions in signage summary table to reflect the actual sign measurements.

The subject SDP is within the prior R-L Zone, which is a Comprehensive Design Zone. In accordance with Section 27-614(f) of the prior Zoning Ordinance, in the Comprehensive Design Zones, the design standards for all freestanding on-site signs shall be determined by the Planning Board for each individual development at the time of SDP review. The Planning Board has reviewed the signage design, in comparison with Section 27-624 of the prior Zoning Ordinance, for gateway sign requirements, which states that one permanent gateway sign identifying a residential subdivision is permitted with a maximum lettering area of 12 square feet and a maximum height of 6 feet above established grade. The four freestanding signs are within the maximum area allowed and meet the location and materials standards. Since the development is bisected by MD 202 into two pods, the Planning Board finds that the number, design, and location of the signs are appropriate to provide wayfinding in each direction along MD 202.

## COMPLIANCE WITH EVALUATION CRITERIA

7. **Zoning Map Amendment (Basic Plan) A-9895 and A-9895-C-01:** On May 24, 1994, the District Council approved Zoning Map Amendment A-9895 and the accompanying basic plan for the subject site (CR-54-1994), with 18 conditions and 1 consideration, for development of 153 single-family detached dwelling units. On April 26, 2021, the District Council approved an amendment to Basic Plan A-9895 (A-9895-C-01, Zoning Ordinance No. 4-2021) to revise Conditions 15 and 16 concerning construction of the Western Branch Trail, due to environmental constraints, subject to 18 conditions and 1 consideration. The conditions of A-9895-C-01 relevant to the review of this SDP are listed below, in **bold** text. Analysis of the project's conformance to the conditions follows each one, in plain text:

1. **Prior to the issuance of any building permits on the subject property, the widening of MD 202 to a four-lane divided highway from, south of MD 193 to White House Road (as shown in the Secondary Development and Evaluation Program of the proposed FY 1994-99 Consolidated Transportation Program), shall be in place, under construction, or programmed with 100% construction funding in the next five years in the current Maryland Department of Transportation Consolidated Transportation Program or the Prince George's County Capital Improvement Program; or, in the event that a fair share contribution is made by the applicant and/or the applicant's heirs, successors, or assigns, 100% of the remaining construction funds will be committed in writing by the SHA, the DPW&T, or both agencies.**

MD 202 (E-6) exists as a four-lane divided highway between the intersections with White House Road and MD 193 (Watkins Park Drive). The condition has been met.

2. **Access to the E-6 facility from the subject property shall be limited to a single location at or near the applicant's proposed south site entrance, as shown on the Basic Plan.**

The east and west development pods shown on the submitted SDP contain only one access point to E-6, which is the existing MD 202. The access points to E-6 are properly aligned to create a uniform intersection.

4. **Only two lots shall be permitted in the area between existing and proposed MD 202. These lots shall be located in the southernmost area of this land.**

No development lots are shown on the submitted SDP in the area between existing and future MD 202. As shown on the site plan, Parcels E and D lie between existing and future MD 202; the parcels will be dedicated to the HOA.

5. **The area marked "B" just south of the Thorn Hills subdivision in the northwest corner of the site, and the area marked "A" in the southeast corner of the site, east of the preservation zone, shall be reserved for lots with an approximate area of 40,000 square feet.**

As shown on site plan, the configuration and areas of these lots were reviewed and approved with CDP-9901 and amendments, PPS 4-03071, SDP-0414 (expired), and were subsequently recorded with Plat Book PM 227, Plat 70, (Plat 3, Forest Hills). The subject SDP does not alter the configuration of the lotting pattern. Therefore, this condition is met.

6. **The applicant shall work with the Department of Parks and Recreation in creating a Type I Tree Conservation Plan to adequately allow for improvements (such as trails) in any forest preservation proposal.**

The applicant has worked with DPR for the removal of trails along the Western Branch corridor and is required to pay a fee-in-lieu instead. This is reflected in the revised basic plan. The TCPI was revised with the amended CDP-9901-01 to show the removal of these trails.

8. **The applicant shall prepare a geotechnical study of the Marlboro clays on site, in accordance with Department of Environmental Resources Criteria, and submit it with the Comprehensive Design Plan. Special attention should be paid to locating headwalls of previously failed slopes; the approximate locations should be shown on the plan delimiting the 1.5 safety factor line.**

This condition was previously addressed, and there is no change to the layout of this project except for the elimination of the trails with CDP-9901-01. An updated geotechnical report is included with this application, and additional information from this report can be found in the Environmental Planning referral section of Finding 14e below.

- 9. A Stormwater Management Concept Plan shall be approved prior to the approval of the Comprehensive Design Plan.**

The Department of Environmental Resources approved SWM Concept Plan 8000900-1996-00, on August 23, 2003, and further approved SWM Concept Plan 8000900-1996-01, on March 2, 2005. An updated Site Development Concept Plan, SIT-00606-2025, was approved by the Prince George's County Department of Permitting, Inspections and Enforcement (DPIE) on March 13, 2026, and is included in the submission for the subject SDP.

- 12. Lots shall be adjusted to allow a structure to be placed outside the noise zone (at least 395 feet from the centerline of proposed MD 202) or the applicant shall provide a noise impact study, including applicable mitigation measures, with the Comprehensive Design Plan.**

As discussed in Finding 9 below, a Phase I and Phase II noise study dated May 13, 2026, was submitted with the application. Mitigation measures include noise barriers, walls, and upgraded windows and sliding glass doors to specific lots. The Urban Design Section of the Development Review Division (DRD) has reviewed the noise analysis and mitigation measures and has found it to be sufficient.

- 13. The applicant shall dedicate 105 acres to the M-NCPPC as shown on Exhibit B (in file).**

The 104.26 acres of land was fully dedicated to M-NCPPC at the time of final plat. The land acres were based on the recorded plat data. This condition is met.

- 14. Land to be dedicated shall be subject to Conditions 1 through 7 of Exhibit C (in file).**

The 104.26 acres of land was dedicated to M-NCPPC at the time of final plat. This condition is met.

- 15. In lieu of construction of the Western Branch Trail, improvements of the trails system to the east of the property shall be funded in part by the total payment of \$200,000 by the applicant, its heirs, successors and/ or assignees to the Prince George's County Department of Parks and Recreation, which shall be indexed to the Bureau of Labor and Statistics Consumer Price Index (CPI) in 2021 dollars as of the payment date, and ultimately paid in full, prior to approval of a building permit exceeding 50 percent of the dwelling units approved with the Specific Design Plan for the site.**

To ensure DPR retains discretion over the final application of funds consistent with department guidelines, prior to issuance of the 38th building permit, the applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall pay a fee in lieu of \$200,000 to M-NCPPC for the trail improvements east of the property.

16. **The location of the trail improvements funded by Condition 15 shall be solely at the discretion of the Prince George’s County Department of Parks and Recreation provided the trail improvements are done in the Collington Trail system and in conformance with the Department of Parks and Recreation’s Guidelines for Park and Recreational Facilities.**

DPR continues to work with the applicant on the implementation approach for the required trail contribution and associated improvements.

17. **The “A” development pod east of realigned MD 202 and south of the proposed access road shall not include any land in the Preservation Zone. The area west of the Preservation Zone and east of realigned MD 202 shall not be included in any development pod (see area marked “1” on Staff Exhibit A). The area currently shown east of the Preservation Zone, just south of the proposed access road and just west of development Pod “C” may be incorporated into Pod “C” (see area marked “2”). South of Pod “C”, the western boundary of development Pod “A” shall be the eastern boundary of the Preservation Zone (see area marked “3”).**

No development is included within the preservation zone. The submitted SDP and Type 2 tree conservation plan (TCP2) are in conformance with this condition.

18. **On the west side of MD 202, Pod “B” in the southwest portion of the property shall be eliminated. Pod “C” may be expanded to include the area of Pod “B” that is outside the Preservation Zone (see area marked “4” on Staff Exhibit “A”).**

The submitted SDP shows no development is included in Pod B, on the west side of MD 202, in the southwest portion of the property. No development is included within the preservation zone. The submitted SDP and TCP2 are in conformance with this condition.

### **Considerations**

1. **The internal road in area “C” west of MD 202 shall be located at the edge of the development pod to create a view into the reservation area.**

The internal roadway located on the west side of MD 202 has been shifted towards the southern edge of the property as much as possible, to create views into the 40.02-acre preservation area (Parcel B) which was dedicated to M-NCPPC.

8. **Prince George’s County Zoning Ordinance:** The subject SDP is in conformance with the applicable requirements of the Prince George’s County Zoning Ordinance in the prior R-L Zone, as follows:

- a. This subject SDP application is in conformance with the requirements of the R-L Zone, as stated in Subdivision 8 of Division 2 of Part 8 of the prior Zoning Ordinance. In addition, single-family detached dwelling is a permitted use, in accordance with Section 27-515(b) of the prior Zoning Ordinance.

Applicable regulations in Section 27-514.10 of the prior Zoning Ordinance are analyzed, as follows:

**(a) General Standards**

|                                                     | <b>Residential Low 0.5*</b>       | <b>Residential Low 1.0*</b>       |
|-----------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| (1) Minimum size of Zone (except as provided below) | 100 adjoining gross acres         | 100 adjoining gross acres         |
| (2) Base residential density                        | 0.5 dwelling units per gross acre | 1.0 dwelling units per gross acre |
| (3) Maximum residential density                     | 0.9 dwelling units per gross acre | 1.5 dwelling units per gross acre |
| (4) Maximum mixed retirement development density    | 8 units per gross acre            | 8 units per gross acre            |

**Note:** \*The base density shall not establish the minimum density for development in the zone.

The applicable R-L Zone regulations for Residential Low 1.0 allow for a base residential density of one unit per acre. As shown on the Site Statistics chart on the coversheet, based on the density calculation method pursuant to Section 27-486(a) of the prior Zoning Ordinance, the subject development density is one unit per acre; therefore, no density increments are needed.

- (b) Public benefit features and density increment factors**
- (c) Public benefit features and density/intensity increment factors for mixed retirement development.**

These two regulations are related to public benefit features and density increment factors, which are not needed for this application.

**(d) Other regulations.**

- (1) The types of dwelling units permitted shall be limited to one-family detached and attached dwellings. No more than thirty-five percent (35%) of the total number of dwelling units shall be attached units. These regulations do not apply to a Mixed Retirement Development located on a tract containing a minimum of one hundred fifty (150) acres.**

The included dwelling units only include one-family detached dwellings, which meet this requirement.

- (2) Each lot shall have frontage on, and direct vehicular access to a public street, except lots for which private streets or other access rights-of-way have been authorized pursuant to Subtitle 24 of this Code.**

All approved lots have frontage and direct vehicular access to a public street.

- (3) Additional regulations concerning development and use of property in the R-L Zone are as provided for in Divisions 1, 4, and 5 of this Part, General (Part 2), Off-Street Parking and Loading (Part 11), Signs (Part 12), and the Landscape Manual.**

The subject SDP is in conformance with additional regulations concerning development and use of property in the R-L Zone, as provided for in Divisions 1, 4, and 5 of this Part, General (Part 2), Off-Street Parking and Loading (Part 11), Signs (Part 12), and the 2010 *Prince George's County Landscape Manual* (Landscape Manual), as discussed in detail in Findings 2, 6, and 14.

- (4) Recreational development consisting of an eighteen (18) hole golf course, within an open space public benefit feature, may be eliminated provided the recreational development is not needed to sustain a density increment granted by the applicable Comprehensive Design Plan initially approved prior to 1996. A Specific Design Plan hearing is required prior to issuance of fifty percent (50%) of the permits for the development, demonstrating to the satisfaction of the Planning Board or the District Council that (1) any required tennis court, teen court, swimming center or other recreational facilities will be completed and open prior to the issuance of any residential permit exceeding fifty percent (50%) of the density approved on the Comprehensive Design Plan; (2) that proper and final preservation, design and access to the former golf course land as permanent open space is approved as part of the Specific Design review; and (3) it is determined whether or not other recreation facilities in lieu of the golf course are necessary to provide the homeowners with a well-balanced program of recreational facilities.**

The subject SDP does not include a golf course; therefore, this requirement is not applicable.

- b. Section 27-480, General development regulations, of the prior Zoning Ordinance includes various additional standards relevant to townhouse, multifamily, and mixed-use development. Section 27-480(b) through (e) concerns townhouse units, which are not applicable to the subject SDP. Section 27-480(f) concerns multifamily dwellings and

Section 27-480(g) concerns mixed-use development, which are not applicable to the subject SDP. Therefore, only Section 27-480(a) is relevant to this application, as follows:

- (a) **Except as provided in Subsection (g), the exception of the minimum lot area requirement for townhouses as set forth in (b), below, and the height limitation for multifamily dwellings as set forth in (f), below, dimensions for yards, building lines, lot area, lot frontage, lot coverage, and building height shown on an approved Specific Design Plan shall constitute the development regulations applicable to the development of the land area addressed by that particular Specific Design Plan.**

The development data for the single-family detached lots, shown on the coversheet of the site plan set, is consistent with the development standards established with approval of CDP-9901 and PPS 4-03071. The development standards with SDP-2025-0014 are established as follows:

|                                                       |                        |                                                     |
|-------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|
| Minimum lot size (Square feet)                        |                        |                                                     |
| Standard Lot                                          | 10,000 – 12,500        |                                                     |
| Intermediate Lot                                      | 12,501 - 20,000        |                                                     |
| Large Lot                                             | 20,001 – 40,000        |                                                     |
| Very Large Lot                                        | 40,001+                |                                                     |
|                                                       |                        |                                                     |
| Maximum Building Height (feet)                        | 42                     |                                                     |
|                                                       |                        |                                                     |
| Minimum Lot Width at Street line(feet)                | 75                     |                                                     |
| Minimum Lot Width at Street line (Cul-de-sacs) (feet) | 25                     |                                                     |
|                                                       |                        |                                                     |
|                                                       | Standard Lot Standards | Intermediate Lot Standards                          |
| Front Setback(feet)                                   | 25                     | 25                                                  |
| Rear Setback(feet)                                    | 20                     | 20                                                  |
| Side Setback(feet)                                    | 8                      | 8                                                   |
| Side Setback (corner lot) (feet)                      | 25                     | 25                                                  |
|                                                       |                        |                                                     |
|                                                       | Large Lot Standards    | Very Large Lot Standards                            |
| Front Setback(feet)                                   | 35                     | 50                                                  |
| Rear Setback(feet)                                    | 50                     | 50                                                  |
| Side Setback(feet)                                    | 10                     | 20                                                  |
| Side Setback (corner lot) (feet)                      | 35                     | 35 along street facing yards, all other setbacks 20 |

- c. Section 27-528(a) of the prior Zoning Ordinance contains the following required findings for the Planning Board to grant approval of an SDP:

- (1) The plan conforms to the approved Comprehensive Design Plan, the applicable standards of the Landscape Manual, and except as provided in Section 27-528(a)(1.1), for Specific Design Plans for which an application is filed after December 30, 1996, with the exception of the V-L and V-M Zones, the applicable design guidelines for townhouses set forth in Section 27-274(a)(1)(B) and (a)(11), and the applicable regulations for townhouses set forth in Section 27-433(d) and, as it applies to property in the L-A-C Zone, if any portion lies within one-half (1/2) mile of an existing or Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority Metrorail station, the regulations set forth in Section 27-480(d) and (e);**

The subject SDP application is in conformance with approved CDP-9901 and CDP-9901-01 as discussed in Finding 9 below. Specifically, the approved CDP and amendment show that the property is to be developed with residential uses and includes design guidelines that established standards for lot sizes, lot widths, setbacks, and building heights. These standards were further reviewed with PPS 4-03071, and with the final plats for the project. The submitted SDP is in full conformance with the prior recorded record plats for the subdivision, and no changes are being requested to any recorded lots, parcels, or streets within the subdivision. As discussed in Finding 8b above, the subject SDP conforms to the development data and lot standards established with CDP-9901. The SDP only contains single-family detached dwelling units, and the design guidelines for townhouses as set forth in Sections 27-274(a)(1)(B) and (a)(11) of the prior Zoning Ordinance, and the applicable regulations for townhouses set forth in Section 27-433(d) of the prior Zoning Ordinance are not applicable. Further, this SDP also conforms to the applicable standards of the Landscape Manual, as discussed in Finding 11 below.

- (1.1) For a Regional Urban Community, the plan conforms to the requirements stated in the definition of the use and satisfies all requirements for the use in Section 27-508 of the Zoning Ordinance;**

This requirement is not applicable to the subject SDP application.

- (2) The development will be adequately served within a reasonable period of time with existing or programmed public facilities either shown in the appropriate Capital Improvement Program, provided as part of the private development or, where authorized pursuant to Section 24-124(a)(8) of the County Subdivision Regulations, participation by the developer in a road club;**

Public facility adequacy was reviewed concurrently with PPS 4-03071, and conditions related to improving or providing adequate transportation facilities

were established at PPS approval. The subject SDP application will have no impact on the previous finding of PPS 4-03071, that the subject development project will be adequately served within a reasonable time period, subject to the transportation conditions applicable under PPS 4-03071, which should be met prior to issuance of building permits within the development to ensure compliance with Section 27-528 of the prior Zoning Ordinance.

- (3) Adequate provision has been made for draining surface water so that there are no adverse effects on either the subject property or adjacent properties;**

The Site Development Concept Plan (SIT-00606-2025), which was approved by DPIE on March 13, 2026, demonstrates that adequate provisions have been made for draining surface water with no adverse effects on the subject property or adjacent properties.

- (4) The plan is in conformance with an approved Type 2 Tree Conservation Plan; and**

TCP2-2026-0037 was submitted with the subject SDP and is approved, with conditions, herein. The submitted site plan is in conformance with the submitted TCP2.

- (5) The plan demonstrates that the regulated environmental features are preserved and/or restored to the fullest extent possible in accordance with the requirement of Subtitle 24-130(b)(5).**

The plan demonstrates that the regulated environmental features (REF) on the site have been preserved in conformance with previous approvals of Comprehensive Design Plans (CDP-9901 and CDP-9901-01) and Preliminary Plan of Subdivision (PPS 4-03071). The previous approved primary management area (PMA) impacts remain, but the sizes have been modified to meet current design requirements of the County and the Washinton Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC). An analysis of these impacts is provided in Finding 14e below. The REF has been preserved, to the fullest extent possible, in accordance with the requirement of Section 24-130(b)(5) of the prior Subdivision Regulations.

- 9. Comprehensive Design Plan CDP-9901 and CDP-9901-01:** CDP-9901 was approved by the District Council on March 24, 2003, for a projected development of 116 single-family detached dwelling units, subject to 8 conditions. CDP-9901-01 was approved by the District Council on February 27, 2023, to amend the conditions and plans regarding the removal of the Western Branch Trail through the west side of the property, subject to one additional condition. In accordance with this one additional condition, all of the previous conditions of approval of CDP-9901 remain in full force and effect, with the exception of the following conditions, which were deleted in their entirety: Conditions 1(a)(11), 1(a)(12), 3(d), 5, and 7 of the District Council's approval of the original CDP-9901. The conditions relevant to the review of this SDP

are listed below in **bold** text. Analysis of the project's conformance to the conditions follows each one, in plain text:

4. **During the Specific Design Plan review, the applicant shall:**

- a. **Submit additional rear elevations for the rear yards of the houses facing MD 202. The design of the houses shall be as attractive as the front elevations with respect to details, number of design features, and articulation. The chimneys of the houses along MD 202 (not including gas vent enclosures for gas fireplaces) shall be constructed of masonry.**

As discussed in Finding 8 above, the lots with rear yards that face MD 202 are identified as highly visible lots. Treatment 2 requires a minimum of three standard architectural features (such as windows, doors, a masonry water table, and/or fireplace chimneys) on all lots containing highly visible rear elevations. The submitted high visibility elevations show at least three standard architecture features on rear elevations. There are no chimneys included with elevations. This condition is met.

- b. **Submit architectural drawings with noise mitigation measures for review and approval by the Environmental Planning Section.**

A Phase I and Phase II noise study, dated May 13, 2026, were submitted with the application. The noise study includes on-site 24-hour noise level measurements, computer modeling, determination of future noise levels, and outdoor and indoor mitigation. Noise contours in dBA Ldn units for ground level and upper level unmitigated and mitigated noise wall locations and heights, as well as mitigation methods, are included in the noise study, as well as shown on Sheet 22 of the site plan.

This analysis has found that four single-family homes (Lots 1 and 66–68, Block A, directly west of MD 202) of the subject development will be exposed to future transportation noise levels above 65 dBA Ldn, with a noise impact up to 69 dBA Ldn on Lot 1. Noise levels in the rear yards directly west of MD 202, Lots 66–68, will be above 65 dBA Ldn, despite the set of 6-foot-tall noise barriers designed for the site. An extended 8-foot-tall noise barrier in proximity to Lots 64–71, and a 9-foot-tall noise barrier around Lot 1, will mitigate noise at or below 65 dBA Ldn noise limits for the impacted outdoor yards.

Regarding interior noise for the impacted single-family home on Lot 1, upgraded windows (up to 30 sound transmission Class (STC)) and sliding glass doors (up to 28 STC) will be required to maintain interior noise levels at the required 45 dBA Ldn noise limit. The remaining three impacted single-family homes will not require modifications to the exterior building construction to achieve an interior noise level of 45 dBA Ldn or less. General Note 26 on the coversheet indicates the mitigation required for Lot 1, Block A. No exterior wall

modifications are required for any other single-family home for subject development.

All remaining single-family lots (108) throughout the site will not be exposed to transportation noise levels above 65 dBA Ldn, and further analysis of the residences or modifications to the exterior building construction will not be required to comply with Prince George's County's noise regulations. The Urban Design Section of DRD has reviewed the noise analysis and mitigation measures and has found it to be sufficient.

8. **The District Council adds a condition not included by the Planning Board, as to water quality and stormwater management. The CDP-9901 project shall, where feasible and approved by DER staff, be completed with use of best management practices for stormwater management and low-impact development techniques.**

Site Development Concept Plan, SIT-00606-2025, was approved by DPIE on March 13, 2026, and is submitted with this SDP. This plan includes the use of low-impact development techniques and environmental site design, such as submerged gravel wetlands, in the handling of stormwater runoff, to the maximum extent practicable. These facilities will improve water quality, recharge groundwater, cool runoff from impervious areas, and decrease downstream pollution and sedimentation.

10. **Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-03071:** PPS 4-03071 was approved by the Planning Board on January 15, 2004 (PGCPB Resolution No. 04-06), subject to 23 conditions. A reconsideration request with amendments for PPS 4-03071 was approved by the Planning Board on January 12, 2023, subject to 23 conditions. The approved reconsideration revised Conditions 10 and 11, regarding construction of the Western Branch Trail through the property. The conditions relevant to the review of this SDP are listed below in **bold** text. Analysis of the project's conformance to the conditions follows each one, in plain text:

2. **Development shall be in conformance with Zoning Map Amendment A-9895 and Comprehensive Design Plan CDP-9901 or any approved revisions thereto.**

As discussed in Findings 7 and 9 above, the development in the subject SDP is in conformance with Zoning Map Amendment A-9895 and A-9895-C-01, as well as CDP-9901 and CDP-9901-01.

3. **A Phase II Noise Study addressing specific noise attenuation measures for proposed Lots 1-9, Block "A," and Lots 1-5, Block "F," shall be included as part of the Specific Design Plan application package.**

As discussed in Finding 9 above, a Phase II noise study was submitted for noise analysis for all approved lots. Block F is now Block B. The lot layout has been revised in accordance with final record plat. The Urban Design Section of DRD has reviewed the noise analysis and mitigation measures and found that the noise mitigation method is sufficient.

**4. No woodland conservation for other future projects shall be permitted on this site.**

A TCP2 was submitted with the SDP. The TCP2 does not include woodland conservation for any project except for Tippet Estates. This mitigation bank was approved prior to the submission of PPS 4-03071 and the condition is intended to prohibit any additional use of the woodlands on the property as a mitigation bank. The woodland conservation is discussed in detail in Finding 14e below.

**5. Development of this subdivision shall be in compliance with the approved Type I Tree Conservation Plan (TCPI/64/95-01). The following note shall be placed on the Final Plat of Subdivision:**

**“Development is subject to restrictions shown on the approved Type I Tree Conservation Plan (TCPI/64/95-01) or as modified by the Type II Tree Conservation Plan, and precludes any disturbance or installation of any structure within specific areas. Failure to comply will mean a violation of an approved Tree Conservation Plan and will make the owner subject to mitigation under the Woodland Conservation/Tree Preservation Policy.”**

The submitted site plan shows that the development is in compliance with the approved Type I Tree Conservation Plan (TCPI-64-95-01). Conformance to this condition will be further evaluated at the review of final plat of subdivision.

**6. A Type II Tree Conservation Plan shall be approved at the time of Specific Design Plan.**

A TCP2 was submitted with the SDP, and is approved, with conditions.

**7. The proposed PMA impacts shall be further evaluated and minimized to the extent possible during the review of the Specific Design Plan.**

The applicant includes impacts to the PMA with this SDP and companion TCP2. In response to comments at the Subdivision and Development Review Committee meeting, and in coordination with the Environmental Planning Section, the applicant has revised the PMA impacts and submitted a revised statement of justification for the impacts to the PMA. The PMA impacts have been further evaluated and have been modified to meet current regulations, due to which further minimization was unable to occur. Impacts to the PMA are discussed in detail in Finding 14e below. This condition is met.

**9. The Type I Tree Conservation Plan, TCP-I 64/95-01, shall be revised in consultation with the DPR staff to remove excess woodland conservation easement areas on dedicated parkland.**

The consultation was conducted and TCPI-64-95-01 was approved.

- 10. In lieu of construction of the Western Branch Trail, improvements along the Collington Trail system shall be funded, in part, by the total payment of \$200,000 by the applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assignees to the Prince George's County Department of Parks and Recreation, which shall be indexed to the U.S. Bureau of Labor and Statistics Consumer Price Index in 2021 dollars, as of the payment date, and ultimately paid in full, prior to approval of a building permit exceeding 50 percent of the dwelling units approved with the specific design plan for the site. The public recreation facilities agreement recorded in Liber 28839 folio 701 of the Prince George's County Land Records shall be of no further force or effect.**

To ensure DPR retains discretion over the final application of funds consistent with department guidelines, prior to issuance of 38th building permit, the applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall pay a fee in lieu, as described above, to M-NCPPC for the trail improvements east of the property.

- 11. The location of the trail improvements funded by Condition 10 above shall be solely at the discretion of the Prince George's County Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR), provided the trail improvements are done in the Collington Trail system and in conformance with DPR's Park and Recreation Facilities Guidelines.**

As discussions are ongoing and refinement of the scope and location of improvements is still in progress, DPR shall determine the exact alignments of the master plan trails for the trail improvements, along the Collington Branch.

- 12. The applicant, his successors, and/or assignees shall provide adequate, private recreational facilities in accordance with the standards outlined in the Parks and Recreation Facilities Guidelines.**
- a. A site plan shall be submitted to the Development Review Division (DRD) of the Prince George's County Planning Department that complies with the standards outlined in the Parks and Recreation Facilities Guidelines.**
  - b. Submission of three original, executed public Recreational Facilities Agreements (RFA) to DRD for their approval, three weeks prior to a submission of a final plat. Upon approval by the DRD, the RFA shall be recorded among the land records of Prince George's County, Upper Marlboro, Maryland.**
  - c. Submission to DRD of a performance bond, letter of credit or other suitable financial guarantee, in an amount to be determined by DRD, within at least two weeks prior to applying for building permits.**
  - d. The developer, his successor and/or assignees shall satisfy the Planning Board that there are adequate provisions to assure retention and a future maintenance of the proposed recreational facilities.**

As discussed in Finding 6 above, on May 22, 2007, a private recreational facilities agreement (RFA) for the subject property (formerly known as Forest Hills) is recorded on December 28, 2006, in the Prince George's County Land Records as Liber 27810, Folio 0711. The submitted site plan shows the location and details of private recreational facilities, in accordance with the private RFA. The design of the facilities complies with the 2024 *Park and Recreation Facilities Design Guidelines*. These on-site facilities will be bonded and constructed in accordance with the requirements of the recorded private RFA, as noted on coversheet. Another note should be added to indicate the plan sheets where the details of the recreational facilities are provided, which is conditioned herein.

The site plan shows that parcels totaling 16.99 acres will be conveyed to the HOA, which include parcels on which the recreational facilities will be located. As such, the developer, his successor, and/or assignees have demonstrated that there are adequate provisions to assure retention and future maintenance of the recreational facilities.

- 14. The private recreational facilities shall be reviewed by the Urban Design Review Section of DRD for adequacy and property siting prior to approval of the specific design plan by the Planning Board.**

As discussed in Finding 6 above, the Urban Design Section of DRD has reviewed the adequacy and property siting of the private recreational facilities. The submitted SDP includes two playground areas, one each on the east and west sides of the development, on Parcels A and F, which are located at the center of each development pod with easy access. Each playground area includes playground equipment, benches, picnic tables, and trash receptacles, and the play area on Parcel F also includes a swing set. The Planning Board finds that the recreation facilities are sufficient in terms of adequacy and siting.

- 17. If closed section roadways are used within the subdivision, standard sidewalks shall be provided along one side of all internal roads, per the concurrence of DPW&T.**

The plan sheets identify standard 5-foot-wide sidewalks along both sides of all internal roads. This condition is met.

- 18. Development of this site shall be in conformance with the approved stormwater management concept plan, #8000900-1996-00, or any approved revisions thereto.**

The SDP shows SWM facilities that are consistent with DPIE case SIT-00606-2025, which was approved on March 13, 2026. SWM is discussed in detail in Finding 14e below.

- 21. The applicant, his heirs, successors and/or assignees shall provide for any necessary turn lanes and frontage improvements as required by SHA. These may include turn lanes for deceleration and acceleration of vehicles at the site as well as left turn lanes and/or bypass lanes on both approaches of MD 202. Additional right-of-way dedication to SHA may be required for these improvements.**

The turn lanes and frontage improvements will be reviewed and approved by the Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA) during their access review process, and right-of-way dedication will be coordinated through that process, as necessary. Evidence of approval by SHA for the necessary MD 202 (P-602) improvements shall be reviewed, prior to building permit issuance.

- 23. As described in PGCPB No. 02-184 and CDP-9901, the following improvements shall be funded in part by the payment of \$100,000 to the State Highway Administration by the applicant, his heirs, successors and/or assignees:**
- a. The widening of MD 202 to four lanes between MD 725 and Black Swan Drive.**
  - b. The installation of a traffic signal within the study area at a location to be determined by the State Highway Administration. The location will be chosen to best serve traffic flow along MD 202 between MD 725 and Black Swan Drive with consideration given to side street delays as well as mainline traffic flow.**

The applicant shall demonstrate compliance with this condition, prior to issuance of building permits.

- 11. 2010 Prince George's County Landscape Manual:** Per Section 27-528(a)(1) of the prior Zoning Ordinance, an SDP must conform to the applicable standards of the Landscape Manual. The subject development is subject to Section 4.1, Residential Requirements; Section 4.6, Buffering Development from Streets; and Section 4.9, Sustainable Landscaping Requirements, of the Landscape Manual. The required plantings and schedules are shown on Sheets 4–6 of the landscape plan, which demonstrate conformance with these requirements.
- 12. Prince George's County Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance:** This property is subject to the grandfathering provisions of Subtitle 25, Division 2 of the Prince George's County Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance (WCO) because the property has a tree conservation plan that was approved prior to September 12, 2010, and revised prior to July 1, 2024, and shall therefore conform to the environmental regulations of the 1993 WCO. A Type 1 Tree Conservation Plan, TCP1-064-95-03, was approved on March 28, 2023, which was grandfathered to the 1993 WCO. The property must conform to the environmental regulations of the 1993 WCO and the 2018 *Environmental Technical Manual*. The property is also subject to the environmental regulations in prior Subtitles 24 and 27 of the Prince George's County Code because there is a previously approved PPS.

In accordance with Section 27-527(b)(4) of the prior Zoning Ordinance, a TCP2 is required with an SDP. TCP2-2026-0037 was submitted with the application, and meets the minor revision criteria in Subsection 25-119(c)(4)(A) of the WCO. TCP2-2026-0037 shows this is a 167.70-acre site with 29.67 acres of floodplain for a net tract area of 138.03 acres. The plan is to clear 46.69 acres of net tract woodland, and 0.33 acre of woodlands in the floodplain. The resulting woodland conservation requirement is 46.51 acres, which is to be met with 57.45 acres of on-site

preservation. The development meets the 25 percent woodland conservation threshold on-site. In addition, the site provides 20.28 acres of mitigation for Tippetts Estates, which is not reflected in the calculations.

The Planning Board approved CDP-9901-01 to remove the trail along the Western Branch. DPR has confirmed this. The TCP2 shall be revised to remove this trail and the limits of disturbance for trail construction. Technical revisions to the revised TCP2 are required and included in the conditions of approval.

13. **Prince George's County Tree Canopy Coverage Ordinance:** Subtitle 25, Division 3, the Tree Canopy Coverage Ordinance, requires a minimum percentage of the site to be covered by tree canopy for any development projects that include more than 2,500 square feet of gross floor area, or disturbance, and requires a grading permit. Per Section 25-128(b) of the Tree Canopy Coverage Ordinance, properties in the LCD Zone, such as this one, are required to meet the tree canopy coverage (TCC) requirements specified in Prince George's County Council Bill CB-27-2010, for the prior zoning of the property. This property was previously zoned R-L and is required to provide a minimum of 20 percent of the gross tract area in TCC. The gross area for the site is 167.70 acres and the required TCC is 33.54 acres (1,461,002 square feet). The schedule shows that the requirement will be met on-site through a combination of woodland preservation and additional landscape trees. A condition is included herein requiring the applicant to revise the total on-site woodland conservation provided to be consistent with the number shown on the TCP2.
14. **Referral Comments:** The subject application was referred to the concerned agencies and divisions. The referral comments are incorporated herein by reference and summarized as follows:
  - a. **Historic Preservation**—In a memorandum dated May 28, 2026, (Stabler, Smith, and Chisholm to Huang), it was noted that there are no Prince George's County historic sites or resources on or adjacent to the property. The subject property has not been surveyed for archaeological resources. A Phase I archaeology survey cannot be required on the property at this stage of development. The 2013 *Approved Subregion 6 Master Plan and Sectional Map Amendment* (master plan) contains goals and policies related to historic preservation (pages 161–185). However, these are not specific to the subject site, or applicable to the subject development.
  - b. **Community Planning**—In a memorandum dated May 22, 2026 (Perry to Sun), it was noted that, pursuant to Part 8, Division 4, Subdivision 2 of the prior Zoning Ordinance, master plan conformance is not required for this application. However, the subject development aligns with the 2014 *Plan Prince George's 2035 Approved General Plan* recommendations for Established Communities, and the general recommendations and guidance of the master plan. The application includes a single-family detached development along MD 202, north of the Town of Upper Marlboro. The site design and architecture with this SDP are consistent with the recommendations of the master plan related to land use, environment, transportation, and community character.

- c. **Subdivision Review**—In a memorandum dated May 22, 2026 (Cain to Sun), a review of the subject SDP for conformance with the conditions to the approval of PPS 4-03071 was provided. The relevant comments have been included in the findings and conditions of approval of this resolution. It was also noted that, in accordance with Section 24-4503(a)(1), the property has received an automatic certificate of adequacy associated with PPS 4-03071, effective April 1, 2022, for a period of 12 years, and subject to additional expiration provisions of Section 24-4503(c).
- d. **Transportation Planning**—In a memorandum dated May 22, 2026 (Milliken to Sun), an analysis of the prior approvals was provided, the analysis is incorporated into the findings and conditions of approval of this resolution. The memorandum also provided the following analysis:

#### **Master Plan Recommendations**

The recommendations of the 2009 *Approved Countywide Master Plan of Transportation* (MPOT) and the master plan are as follows:

#### **Master Plan Right-of-Way**

**Largo Road (P-602): primary road, 70 feet wide, two to four lanes:** Both the MPOT and the master plan classify a portion of MD 202 (Largo Road) between its convergence with Largo Road (E-6) and Ring Road as a “primary road” with an ultimate right-of-way width of 70 feet. The site plan sheets identify a north-south portion of right-of-way situated between Taleen Court and Karina Lane as Largo Road. Its widths as measured from the centerline are 35 feet to either side. The plans comply with the MPOT and master plan for this primary road facility.

**Largo Road (E-6): expressway, 150 to 200 feet wide, four to eight lanes:** Both the MPOT and the master plan classify a portion of Largo Road from Pennsylvania Avenue to Crain Highway as an expressway (E-6) with an ultimate right-of-way width of 150 to 200 feet. The site plan sheets identify a north-south portion of unimproved SHA right-of-way that bisects Karina Lane, and converges with Largo Road (P-602) at the north end of the project site. The SHA right-of-way exceeds 200 feet wide along the frontage of the western boundary of Block B and Parcel F of the development. The plans conform to the MPOT and master plan for this facility.

#### **Master Plan Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities**

**Largo Road (P-602): Shared roadway:** SHA currently allows bicycles to use the wide asphalt shoulders in place along this segment of Largo Road. The MPOT and Subregion 6 Plan do not articulate a shared roadway for this portion of Largo Road, but the master plan includes strategies to provide wide shoulders for bicyclists to use as a commuting alternative. Previously cited as Condition 16 of PPS 4-03071, the applicant will be installing a “Share the Road with a Bike”

sign along this segment of Largo Road prior to issuance of the first building permit, in coordination and with approval from SHA.

## **Recommendations, Policies, and Goals**

### **MPOT Complete Streets Policies**

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

Five-foot-wide sidewalks are included along both sides of all internal roads, with Americans with Disabilities Act compliant curb ramps and crosswalks. The plans support Policy 1 of the MPOT.

#### **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.**

SHA allows bicycles to use the wide asphalt shoulders in place along this segment of Largo Road. Previously cited as Condition 16 of PPS 4-03071, the applicant will be installing a “Share the Road with a Bike” sign along this segment of Largo Road prior to issuance of the first building permit, in coordination and with approval from SHA.

#### **Policy 4: Develop bicycle-friendly roadways in conformance with the latest standards and guidelines, including the 1999 *American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities*.**

Previously cited as Condition 16 of PPS 4-03071, the applicant will be installing a “Share the Road with a Bike” sign along this segment of Largo Road prior to issuance of the first building permit, in coordination and with approval from SHA.

### **Master Plan**

The following master plan policies are applicable to the proposal:

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

The subject development dedicates right-of-way to Largo Road (P-602) to achieve its ultimate width established within the MPOT and master plan, allowing for future development of alternate means of accessibility along this segment for pedestrians and bicycle users. Both pods of development access

Largo Road at one point, with the access points aligned for visibility. The applicant shall work with SHA to determine the appropriate lane configurations for vehicular traffic to safely access the development from this segment of Largo Road. The applicant shall also work with SHA to determine adequate pedestrian crossing opportunities at or near to this development location to safely access bus stops.

**Policy 2: Ensure that the road system is improved concurrently with development, so that road and intersection capacities match demand.**

Right-of-way was previously dedicated along this segment of Largo Road to meet requirements for the development of the subject property. The applicant shall work with SHA to determine the necessary lane configurations for acceleration and deceleration, along with necessary turn lanes, to safely provide access to the development to and from Largo Road.

**Policy 8: Promote and encourage cycling and walking as an alternative to the car for commuting and recreational purposes.**

Wide shoulders exist along the adjacent segment of Largo Road (P-602), which bicycle users may utilize. Previously cited as Condition 16 of PPS 4-03071, the applicant will be installing a “Share the Road with a Bike” sign along this segment of Largo Road prior to issuance of the first building permit, in coordination and with approval from SHA.

- e. **Environmental Planning**—In a memorandum dated May 22, 2026 (Rea to Sun), a comprehensive analysis of the SDP’s conformance with all applicable environmental-related conditions attached to previous approvals was provided. The analysis has been included in the findings and conditions of approval of this resolution. Additional analysis is as follows:

**Natural Resources Inventory**

In accordance with Section 27-527(b)(5) of the prior Zoning Ordinance, an approved natural resources inventory (NRI) is required with an SDP. Valid NRI-2025-0100 was submitted with this application. The TCP2 shows all required information in conformance with the current NRI.

**Specimen Trees**

NRI-2025-0100 identifies 226 specimen trees on or adjacent to the property. The TCP2 shows 34 specimen trees to be removed. The current layout of this development shown in this application is in conformance with the approved PPS. No variance was required to remove these specimen trees with prior approvals because the prior TCPI and TCPII were approved under the 1993 WCO, and the approvals were later grandfathered from the variance requirements established in the subsequent WCO. Since the specimen trees to be removed are within the developable areas of the PPS, and are species with low construction tolerance, no further review of the specimen trees is required.

The subject application, SDP-2025-0014, is reliant on the prior approvals. No additional specimen trees are requested for removal with this application.

### **Regulated Environmental Features**

The site contains 100-year floodplain and PMA comprised of REF including streams and associated buffers, steep slopes, and wetlands with their associated buffers.

Section 27-528(a)(5) of the prior Zoning Ordinance, the plan shall demonstrate the preservation and/or restoration of the REF in a natural state, to the fullest extent possible. The development includes impacts to the PMA, which were reviewed and approved by the Planning Board with PPS 4-03071 and SDP-0414. The impacts are associated with SWM facilities, sewer connections, roadway, and future trails. The plans for this application have been refined to show the final grading, the current SWM plan, and WSSC standards. The applicant has provided an exhibit which shows the prior approved PMA impacts compared to the impacts as shown for this application.

The trail along the Western Branch was removed with the reconsideration of PPS 4-03071 and these PMA impacts are no longer necessary. DPR has confirmed this. This is shown as impacts 1, 5, and 6 on the submitted PMA Impact exhibit.

The impacts for the sanitary sewer connections are a necessity for this project. Impacts 2 and 3, as shown on the PMA Impact exhibit, remain unchanged. Impact 4 is in the same location, but the impact has increased from 8,656 square feet to 9,314 square feet. The location of the sanitary sewer shown as Impact 9 has shifted locations from the previously approved plans as requested by WSSC and now requires 16,138 square feet of impact. These impacts cannot be avoided or further minimized as they are required to meet current County and State regulations for roadway construction, SWM, and WSSC requirements.

Two stormwater outfalls will impact the PMA. Impact 8 was previously approved in the same location but has expanded from 2,876 square feet to 6,196 square feet. This impact cannot be avoided or further minimized as this increase is required to meet the current stormwater regulations and standards. Impact 10 is a new impact for a SWM facility outfall. The location of the outfall was selected to minimize the distance to the stream, and the amount of disturbance to the PMA, while still meeting the SWM requirements. DPIE is the reviewing agency for SWM, and the SDP is consistent with the approved SWM plan.

Two PMA impacts are needed for roadway construction. Impact 7 was previously approved for the construction of Agassi Court, which is a platted road. This impact has increased from 716 square feet to 1,469 square feet to allow room to tie out to existing grades. Impact 11 was also previously approved but has increased from 880 square feet to 6,805 square feet. This impact is for the right-of-way for Largo Road, including the necessary road improvements and required soundwall installation. These impacts cannot be avoided or further minimized as they are required to meet current County and State regulations for roadway construction and noise control.

The subject application, SDP-2025-0014, is reliant on the prior PMA impact approvals and the revised impacts included with the subject application. Impacts 2, 3, 4, and 7–11 are approved.

### **Stormwater Management**

In accordance with Section 27-528(a)(3) of the prior Zoning Ordinance, the plan demonstrates that there are no adverse effects for SWM on either the subject property or adjacent properties. The approved SWM concept plan and approval letter (SIT-00606-2025) shows the use of a submerged gravel wetlands on the west side of the development to manage the stormwater. Marlboro clay is present on the east side of the development and no additional SWM ponds or environmentally sensitive design facilities are within the east side because of the Marlboro clay.

This development will be subject to a site development fine grading permit and continuing reviews by DPIE and the Prince George's Soil Conservation District. Any changes to the stormwater or erosion and sediment control plans must be reflected on the TCP2 prior to permit.

### **Soils**

The predominant soils found to occur, according to the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) Web Soil Survey (WSS), include Marr-Dodon complex, Sassafras-Croom complex, Widewater and Issue soils, frequently flooded, Grosstown gravelly silt loam, Westphalia and Dodon soils, Adelphia-Holmdel, and Collington-Wist complex. Christiana clays do not occur on or in the vicinity of this site, but Marlboro clay occurs on or in the vicinity of this property.

Marlboro clay is mapped on the property according to PGAtlas. A geotechnical engineering report, titled 'Oakwood Preserve', prepared by Geo-Technology Associates, Inc. and dated March 3, 2026, was submitted with the subject application and confirmed the unsafe clay is present on-site. The geotechnical report included a global slope stability analysis on 14 sections of the slopes. It appeared that the slope analysis resulted in the presence of 1.5 factor of safety lines at several locations of the property. However, there is a sufficient setback between the houses and the 1.5 factor of safety lines, which no additional mitigation on the slope is required. The 1.5 factor of safety lines and grading are correctly shown on the TCP2 and the SDP.

- f. **Prince George's County Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR)**—In a memorandum dated May 26, 2026 (Thompson to Sun), DPR provided an analysis of the prior approvals and recommended conditions of approval, which are incorporated in this resolution. In addition, DPR provided instructions on Right of Entry and Easement Requests, as follows:

### **Right Of Entry (ROE) and Easement Requests**

The installation of SWM will require the coordination of permits and agreements with DPR for sewer lines, stormwater outfall, and potentially a gravel road on Parcel B. The

request for these permits and agreements shall be coordinated with the Engineering Section, Capital Planning and Development Division of DPR.

Use and/or access to park property, for any other reason than as listed, may require an easement. The request for easements shall be coordinated with the Land Acquisition and Development Review Section of the Park Planning and Development Division of DPR.

- g. **Prince George's County Department of Permitting, Inspections and Enforcement (DPIE)**—In a memorandum dated May 11, 2026 (Abdullah to Sun), DPIE offered a list of comments which will be addressed at the time of permitting.
  - h. **Prince George's County Health Department**—In a memorandum dated April 29, 2026 (Adepoju to Sun), the Health Department provided several comments relating to availability of healthy foods, and comments addressing potential construction activity impacts (noise and dust) extending into adjacent properties during construction. Adherence to construction standards will be required by DPIE during the permitting process.
  - i. **Prince George's County Police Department**—The Police Department did not offer comments on this application.
  - j. **Prince George's County Fire/EMS Department**—The Fire/EMS Department did not offer comments on this application.
  - k. **Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC)**—In an email dated January 26, 2026 (Atencio to Barba), WSSC noted that a site development project was conceptually approved by WSSC (DA8196Z26 Forest Hills), and offered comments related to water and sewer mains, which will be addressed at the time of permitting.
  - l. **Public Utilities**—On April 27, 2026, the subject SDP application was referred to Verizon, Comcast, AT&T, the Potomac Electric Power Company, and Washington Gas, for review and comments. No correspondence has been received from these public utility companies.
15. **Community Feedback**— The Prince George's County Planning Department received two opponent exhibits from Judith Artman and Greg Smith. Ms. Artman expressed concerns about increased traffic, flooding, and loss of open space over the past 20 years in the area, and suggested mitigating traffic and preserving the ecosystem for future generations. Mr. Smith requested that the Planning Board consider postponing the hearing to ensure the Board's decision is based on a full evidentiary record developed through a fair and transparent public process.
16. **Planning Board Hearing:** The Planning Board held a public hearing on this application on June 25, 2026. At the hearing, and in rendering its decision, the Board considered all written and oral testimony, along with all exhibits submitted according to the Planning Board's procedures. Prior to the hearing, and in accordance with the Planning Board's procedures, the applicant provided eight exhibits. Applicant Exhibit 1 is a colored illustrative site plan, and Applicant

Exhibits 2–8 include the resumes of experts. The Board also received two opponent exhibits, as discussed in Finding 15 above.

The public hearing began with staff giving a technical staff presentation. The presentation addressed written comments submitted by Ms. Artman. Regarding concerns about increased traffic, staff noted that traffic adequacy findings were made with the approval of PPS 4-03071, approved in 2004. The PPS findings meet the SDP finding that development will be adequately served within a reasonable period of time with existing or programmed public facilities. The applicant shall comply with the applicable transportation conditions of the PPS and automatic certificate of adequacy. Regarding concerns about loss of open space and preserving native plants, staff noted that the landscape plan has met Landscape Manual requirements, including landscape buffer along MD 202, and complied with the TCC requirement. The woodland conservation requirement is proposed to be met by on-site preservation. Regulated features have been preserved and/or restored, to the maximum extent possible. With respect to community concerns regarding flooding, SWM is required and approved by DPIE. The applicant submitted an approved SWM concept plan, which meets the required finding that adequate provision has been made for draining surface water and that no adverse effects are caused on either the subject property or adjacent properties.

Following staff's presentation, the applicant provided a presentation. Following the applicant's presentation, community members Judith Artman, Geoffrey Collions, and Greg Smith provided testimony, voicing concerns about preserving existing trees and native plants, increased traffic on MD 202, increased flooding in the area, and inaccurate information for the project record. The applicant's attorney provided a response to all the concerns. The Board recommended that the applicant continue to work with the opponents and community members to answer their questions and address their concerns. The Board asked questions about increasing school capacity, as well as dog waste stations. The applicant clarified that the subject development would contribute to the fund expanding school facilities in the area, and the applicant proffered to provide dog waste stations for the development. Following the discussion, the Planning Board voted to approve Specific Design Plan SDP-2025-0014 and Type 2 Tree Conservation Plan TCP2 2026-0037, subject to the recommended conditions of approval within the technical staff report.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that pursuant to Subtitle 27 of the Prince George's County Code, the Prince George's County Planning Board of The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission adopted the findings contained herein and APPROVED Type 2 Tree Conservation Plan TCP2 2026-0037, and further APPROVED Specific Design Plan SDP 2025-0014 for the above-described land, subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to certification of the specific design plan (SDP), the applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall revise the SDP or provide the specific documentation, as follows:
  - a. Highlight, label, and list a minimum of three standard architectural features on rear elevations for all models in the high visibility architectural elevation package.

- b. Revise the signage dimensions in the signage summary table to reflect the actual sign measurements for freestanding signs based on Detail 4/21, Precast Sign Detail, on Sheet 21.
  - c. Indicate the number of stories for the Donovan model in the Template Sheet.
  - d. Revise the Parcel Area Summary table on Sheet 1 to include the second Parcel C, a 5,406-square-foot parcel recorded in Plat Book PM 227 Plat No. 68. Label this parcel to be dedicated to the homeowners association.
  - e. Revise the Parcel Area Summary table on Sheet 1 to provide the correct areas for all parcels, as recorded on the final plats in Plat Book PM 227 Plat Nos. 68 through 83.
  - f. Revise the Subdivision Summary table on Sheet 1 to show nine parcels, as approved by the preliminary plan of subdivision, and as recorded in the final plats. Ensure that all parcels are correctly labeled on all plan sheets.
  - g. Label the 3.2106-acre Parcel C, recorded in Plat Book PM 227 Plat No. 79, on Sheets 9, 12, and 13 with its recording reference.
  - h. Add a note below the Recreational Facilities Chart on Sheet 1 of the SDP, to indicate the plan sheets where details of the recreational facilities are provided.
  - i. Label the parcels dedicated to The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission on the individual plan sheets of the SDP and Type 2 tree conservation plan with their designation and acreage.
  - j. Show and label all property lines with their bearings and distances, in accordance with Plat Book PM 227 Plat Nos. 68 through 83.
  - k. Show and label the prior right-of-way dedication along MD 202 (Largo Road), in accordance with Plat Book PM 227, Plat No. 79.
  - l. Revise the Parcel Area Summary table on the coversheet by removing reference of Parcels I and J for right-of-way dedication, indicating those areas are right-of-way dedications from Parcels D and E, and revise the information for Parcels D and E to indicate they are being resubdivided to Parcels I and J.
  - m. Revise the public utility easement alignment to be behind the proposed right-of-way dedication line along Karina Lane.
2. Prior to certification, the applicant shall revise the total on-site woodland conservation provided to be consistent with the number shown on the Type 2 tree conservation plan.
3. Prior to certification of the specific design plan, the Type 2 tree conservation plan shall be revised as follows:

- a. Remove the limits of disturbance for the trail along the Western Branch.
  - b. The specimen trees along what was the trail for the Western Branch shall be shown as to be retained.
  - c. Have the revised plan signed and dated by the qualified professional preparing the plan.
4. Prior to issuance of building permits, the applicant shall:
  - a. Provide evidence of compliance with the applicable transportation conditions of Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-03071 and automatic certificate of adequacy.
  - b. Obtain approval of and record a plat of resubdivision to dedicate the public right-of-way, as shown on Sheets 13 and 14 of the specific design plan.
  - c. Submit an executed amended private recreational facilities agreement (RFA) to the Development Review Division (DRD) of the Prince George's County Planning Department for approval. Upon approval by DRD, the RFA shall be recorded among the Prince George's County Land Records.
5. Prior to issuance of the 57th building permit, the applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall demonstrate compliance with Condition 10 of Prince George's County Planning Board Resolution No. 04-06(A) for Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-03071.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that an appeal of the Planning Board's action must be filed with the District Council of Prince George's County within thirty (30) days following the final notice of the Planning Board's decision.

\* \* \* \* \*

This is to certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the action taken by the Prince George's County Planning Board of The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission on the motion of Commissioner Geraldo, seconded by Commissioner Jenkins, with Commissioners Geraldo, Jenkins, Matthews, and Okoye voting in favor of the motion at its regular meeting held on Thursday, June 25, 2026, in Largo, Maryland.

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 2nd day of July 2026.

Billy Okoye  
Vice Chairman

By   
Jessica Jones  
Planning Board Administrator

BO:JJ:MS:ac

APPROVED AS TO LEGAL SUFFICIENCY



David S. Warner  
M-NCPPC Legal Department  
Date: June 29, 2026