
From: Monique Morman <mrsmorgan2k17@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 15, 2026 9:17 PM
To: Clerk of the Council
Subject: Appeal of Planning Board Decision – CDP-9306-06 (Bailey's Village Lot 10)
Attachments: Appeal re CDP-9306-06_M. Morman.pdf; Statement to the Prince George's County Planning Board_6.16.pdf

CAUTION: This email originated from an external email domain which carries the additional risk that it may be a phishing email and/or contain malware.

Dear Clerk of the County Council,

Please accept the attached Petition for Review of the Planning Board's decision regarding Comprehensive Design Plan CDP-9306-06 (Bailey's Village Lot 10), submitted pursuant to Section 27-523 of the Prince George's County Zoning Ordinance.

I respectfully request that this appeal be accepted for filing and transmitted to the District Council for its consideration.

For reference, I have also attached my testimony as presented at the June 18 Planning Board hearing.

Please confirm receipt of this submission and advise if any additional information or documentation is required.

Thank you for your assistance.

Respectfully,

Monique Morman
A Person of Record re: CDP-9306-06
mrsmorgan2k17@gmail.com

Monique Morman
14205 Hardy Tavern Drive
Accokeek, MD 20607
301-518-7614
mrsmorman2k17@gmail.com

July 15, 2026

Prince George's County District Council
c/o Donna J. Brown, Clerk of the Council
Wayne K. Curry Administration Bldg.
1301 McCormick Drive, 2nd Floor
Largo, MD 20774

Re: Petition for Review of Planning Board Decision – CDP-9306-06 (Bailey's Village Lot 10)

Dear Clerk of the Council,

I respectfully request that the District Council exercise its authority under Section 27-523 of the Prince George's County Zoning Ordinance to review, on its own motion, the Planning Board's decision approving Comprehensive Design Plan CDP-9306-06 for Bailey's Village Lot 10.

I am a Person of Record in this case and testified at the June 18, 2026 Planning Board hearing. A copy of my testimony is attached for your reference.

This request is not based on opposition to development itself. Rather, it is based on the belief that the Planning Board's decision relies on planning assumptions that no longer reflect the community as it exists today.

Bailey's Village Lot 10 is the final undeveloped parcel within the Preserve at Piscataway. The property is less than two acres and is located at the interior entrance to our community at St. Mary's View Lane and Floral Park Road. Any residents or customers visiting future commercial uses on this site would be required to drive through the neighborhood to reach it, making this location fundamentally different from a retail site situated along a major roadway.

When the original planning approvals were granted, the Preserve was envisioned as an 18-hole golf course community with a mixed-use activity center. That vision never became reality. Like many developments in Southern Prince George's County, the golf course and commercial amenities were never built. Instead, the area developed into a well-

established residential community of nearly 1,000 homes, with additional townhomes replacing many of the originally planned amenities.

These changes matter.

The current application continues to rely on planning assumptions and studies prepared years ago for a community that no longer exists. There has been a significant change in circumstances since the original application and prior approvals were filed. The community has matured, development patterns have changed, and the purpose of the originally designated mixed-use area no longer fits the character or needs of the neighborhood.

Throughout this process, residents have made every effort to preserve this parcel. The Preserve at Piscataway Homeowners Association explored purchasing the property, sought assistance from the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission to preserve it as open space, and actively participated throughout the review process in opposition to the proposed amendment. These efforts reflect the importance residents place on protecting the last remaining undeveloped parcel within our community.

Although the developer reduced the amount of proposed retail space, that change does not address the community's primary concern. The issue is not the size of the retail component—it is whether retail is appropriate at this location at all. Commercial uses on this parcel would still introduce additional traffic, parking demands, deliveries, and activity into the interior of an established residential neighborhood. Reducing the square footage does not eliminate those impacts or make the proposed use more compatible with the surrounding community.

The Planning Board's decision also raises a broader planning question that deserves the District Council's attention. Rather than continuing to amend a decades-old Comprehensive Design Plan, the County should determine whether the existing zoning and land-use designation remain appropriate. The mixed-use designation may have made sense when the area was planned around a golf course and commercial center, but those conditions no longer exist.

I respectfully ask the District Council to review whether this property should instead be rezoned or otherwise redesignated to reflect the residential community that has developed over the past three decades. Any future development should be evaluated using current planning standards and should be compatible with the surrounding neighborhood in terms of use, scale, and intensity.

The residents of the Preserve at Piscataway are not asking for special treatment. We are asking for planning decisions based on today's community rather than yesterday's plans. The significant changes that have occurred since the original approvals warrant a fresh review of whether this proposal—and the underlying land-use designation—remain appropriate.

For these reasons, I respectfully request that the District Council exercise its authority to review the Planning Board's decision and determine whether continued reliance on this outdated planning framework serves the best interests of the community and Prince George's County.

Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

Monique Morman

Person of Record

Preserve at Piscataway Homeowner

Statement to the Prince George's County Planning Board

Members of the Planning Board,

I am speaking today as a resident, homeowner, taxpayer, and advocate for the Preserve at Piscataway community in Southern Prince George's County. My comments are not simply about a development proposal—they are about fairness, accountability, and responsible planning.

For too long, South County residents have felt like the forgotten part of Prince George's County. While other communities receive thoughtful investments, infrastructure improvements, and development that reflects current needs and realities, South County is too often expected to accept projects based on outdated assumptions and plans that no longer reflect the community that exists today.

The proposal before you is a prime example.

The application before you, CDP-9306-06, traces its origins to CDP-9306, a Comprehensive Design Plan approved in March of 1994. That original approval contemplated approximately 878 acres and was based upon a vision for a sprawling golf course community that included residential development, recreational amenities, and a Local Activity Center.

Thirty-two years later, that vision no longer reflects the reality of the community that exists today.

The Preserve at Piscataway is now a fully established residential community of nearly 1,000 homes. Significant portions of the original vision were never realized, and conditions throughout Southern Prince George's County have changed dramatically. Yet the developer is asking this Board to continue amending and relying upon a planning framework approved in 1994 to justify development on a 1.65-acre parcel that represents the last meaningful piece of undeveloped green space within our community.

To be clear, I understand that the County may have legal authority to process amendments to CDP-9306. However, legality and good planning are not always the same thing.

The question before this Board should not simply be whether the developer is permitted to seek another amendment to a decades-old approval. The question should be whether a planning framework approved in 1994 for an 878-acre golf course community remains an appropriate basis for land-use decisions affecting a small parcel located within a fully developed residential neighborhood in 2026.

In my opinion, it does not.

What is particularly telling is that the developer is now seeking to modify core elements of the original plan itself. If the assumptions that supported the original Local Activity Center

and retail requirements no longer make economic or practical sense, that is evidence that conditions have changed significantly since 1994. Rather than continuing to revise and reinterpret a decades-old framework, the County should ask whether a fresh planning process is warranted.

During a recent community meeting, representatives of the development team acknowledged that they did not want to pursue a new application process because doing so would be more costly. While perhaps unintended, that admission is revealing. The primary justification for relying on a 32-year-old planning framework should not be convenience or cost savings for a developer.

Residents should not be asked to accept an outdated development framework simply because it represents the path of least resistance.

The fact that previous development proposals for this site have faced scrutiny further demonstrates the disconnect between the original zoning assumptions and current community conditions. Residents will recall that a previous proposal for 26 townhomes failed to advance because it was determined to be inconsistent with the applicable planning and zoning framework. If a residential proposal could not satisfy those standards, it raises serious questions as to why a mixed-use development containing retail space should now be considered appropriate.

At a minimum, this suggests there has long been recognition that the original assumptions governing this parcel may no longer align with the realities of the community that exists today.

Before this Board proceeds any further, I respectfully request answers to several important questions:

- What legal authority allows CDP-9306 to remain active after 32 years?
- How many amendments, reconsiderations, modifications, or extensions have been approved since 1994?
- Has Planning Staff ever formally evaluated whether the assumptions underlying CDP-9306 remain valid under current conditions?
- What vested rights are being relied upon to support continued amendments to this approval?
- If ownership of the property has changed over time, what legal basis allows successive developers to continue relying upon approvals granted in 1994?
- Most importantly, if this 1.65-acre parcel were submitted today as a brand-new application, would Planning Staff recommend the same land use, zoning framework, and mixed-use development concept?

That final question may be the most important question before this Board.

Because if the answer is no, then we should ask ourselves why a development proposal that would not be considered appropriate under today's conditions should continue to move forward simply because it originated from a plan approved more than three decades ago.

Of particular concern is the proposed retail component.

This community is overwhelmingly residential in character. Retail uses would introduce additional traffic, congestion, parking demands, noise, and other impacts that residents did not anticipate when choosing to live here. This parcel sits at the front door of our neighborhood, and commercial activity would fundamentally alter the character of that entrance and the surrounding community.

Most importantly, this property represents the last meaningful piece of undeveloped green space within our community.

Residents have watched open space disappear as development continued throughout Southern Prince George's County. In fact, residents even attempted to purchase this property themselves in order to preserve it as open space for future generations. That offer was declined. This demonstrates both the depth of community concern and the value residents place on maintaining green space in an area that has already experienced substantial development.

At some point, the County must ask whether every remaining parcel of land should be developed simply because it can be.

Not every dollar is a good dollar.

Responsible growth requires balance. Economic development should improve communities, not diminish them. Development should be accompanied by infrastructure, planning, and community benefits—not simply built because old approvals make it easier.

The Planning Board has both the authority and the responsibility to ensure that development decisions reflect today's realities, not yesterday's assumptions.

South County residents are not asking for special treatment. We are asking for the same thoughtful consideration that every community in Prince George's County deserves.

We respectfully request that the Board require a comprehensive reevaluation of this proposal and direct the developer to prepare plans that reflect current conditions, current community needs, and the vision of the neighborhood that actually exists today.

The issue is not whether development can occur. The issue is whether a development proposal based on a planning framework approved in 1994 can legitimately be considered compatible with a neighborhood that did not exist when those assumptions were made.

Our community's value should not be taken for granted. The decisions made here will affect thousands of residents for generations. We ask that you place good planning,

responsible stewardship, and the interests of the community ahead of convenience, outdated approvals, and continued overdevelopment.

Thank you for your consideration.