



THE PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY GOVERNMENT

Office of the Clerk of the Council
301-952-3600

April 10, 2026

**RE: CSP-23002 Remand Signature Club East
Signature 2016 Commercial, L.L.C., Applicant**

NOTICE OF FINAL DECISION OF THE DISTRICT COUNCIL

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 27-3416 of the Zoning Ordinance of Prince George's County, Maryland requiring notice of decision of the District Council, you will find enclosed herewith a copy of the Council Order setting forth the action taken by the District Council in this case on April 7, 2026.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

This is to certify that on April 10, 2026, this notice and attached Council Order was mailed, postage prepaid, to all persons of record.

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Donna J. Brown".

Donna J. Brown
Clerk of the Council

Case No.: CSP-23002 Remand
TCP1-052-97-03
Variance
Signature Club East

Applicant: Signature 2016 Commercial, LLC

COUNTY COUNCIL OF PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY, MARYLAND, SITTING AS THE
DISTRICT COUNCIL

FINAL DECISION — ORDER OF APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS

A. Introduction

On July 31, 2025, after Planning Board approved Conceptual Site Plan (CSP)-23002, Type I Tree Conservation Plan (TCP1-052-97-03) and Variance from Division 2 of Subtitle 25, Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance, to remove four (4) specimen trees, to develop up to 300 multifamily units and 12,600 square feet of commercial/retail space on property located in the northeast quadrant of the intersection of MD 228 (Berry Road) and Manning Road East (16.90 Acres; Residential, Multifamily (RMF)-48 Zone (Prior; Mixed Use-Transportation Oriented (M-X-T) Zone)), written exceptions to Planning Board's decision were filed by certain persons of record in opposition and the applicant.¹ Resolution No. 2025-057, Exceptions 9/03/2025, 10/14/2025, respectively.

On October 21, 2025, the District Council, using oral argument procedures, considered the parties written exceptions and arguments. After the hearing the District Council voted to direct staff to prepare an order of remand to Planning Board. (10/21/2025, Tr.).

On October 28, 2025, the District Council adopted the prepared order of remand, which directed Planning Board to address nine (9) parts or portions of its decision. (10/28/2025, Tr.), Order of Remand, 10 /28/2025.²

¹ Exceptions were filed on behalf of Carolyn Keenan, Jordan Eberst, Robyn Braswell, Brittney Braswell, Tatiana Gomez, Laura Sanchez Ramirez, Alexander Gomez, Rana Dotson, Julian Dotson, Caleb Dotson, Victor Christiansen, Vincent Ambrosino, and Janet Taylor. Exceptions 9/03/2025. WP East Acquisitions LLC was the original applicant and purchase contractor of the property, but exceptions were filed on behalf of Signature 2016 Commercial, LLC, the owner of the property. Exceptions 10/14/2025.

² For purposes of this final decision approving the application, the order of remand is adopted and incorporated by reference herein.

On January 15, 2026, Planning Board, on remand, re-approved CSP-23002, TCP1-052-97-03 and Variance from Division 2 of Subtitle 25, Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance, to remove four (4) specimen trees, to develop up to 300 multifamily units and 12,600 square feet of commercial/retail space on the property. Resolution No. 2025-057(A).

On February 9, 2026, the District Council, on its own motion, elected to review the decision of Planning Board on remand. Subsequently, written exceptions to the decision of Planning Board on remand were filed by certain persons of record in opposition³ and the applicant.⁴ (2/9/2026, Tr.), Exceptions 2/19/2026, 2/20/2026, respectively.

On March 23, 2026, the District Council, using oral argument procedures, considered the parties written exceptions and arguments. The parties proffered that a settlement agreement has been reached in principle on the contested issues, including an agreement on the issue of compatibility that would substitute townhomes for multifamily units. In accordance with the settlement agreement, the parties also proffered certain conditions of approval. After the hearing the District Council voted to direct staff to prepare an order of approval with conditions. (3/23/2026, Tr.).

For reasons set forth herein, based on the record developed on remand, the District Council will sustain exceptions from the applicant that Planning Board erred when it did not allow an amendment of the application to substitute townhomes for multifamily units, and overrule exceptions from opposition. The decision of Planning Board on remand is affirmed subject to the following modification: CSP-23002, TCP1-052-97-03 and Variance from Division 2 of Subtitle 25, Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance, to remove four (4) specimen trees, is conditionally approved for the development of 120 townhomes and 12,600 square feet of commercial/retail space instead of 300 multifamily units and 12,600 square feet of

³ Exception were file on behalf of Carolyn Keenan, Jordan Eberst, and Victor Christiansen. Exceptions 2/19/2026. Exceptions were filed on behalf of Signature 2016 Commercial, LLC, the applicant and owner of the property. Exceptions 2/20/2026.

⁴ On February 24, 2026, application filed letter with the Clerk to correct a typographical error in the record. According to the letter, the actual number of townhomes is 180 not 160. Ltr., 2/24/2026. Applicant has since reduced the number of townhomes to 120, which is reflected below in a condition of approval. (3/23/2026, Tr.).

commercial/retail space. PGCC § 27-280.

B. Standard of Review

District Council is authorized to review exceptions to the decision of Planning Board filed by a person of record or the District Council, on its own motion may elect to review the decision. When the District Council conducts such review, it is authorized to affirm, reverse, or modify the decision of Planning Board. Md. Code Ann., Land Use Article (LU), § 25-212 (1957, 2012 Repl. Vol., 2025 Supp.), PGCC § 27-280. *See also* Order of Remand, Standard of Review.

C. Applicant Exceptions

On remand before Planning Board, applicant filed an amended application and amended statement of justification to substitute residential townhomes for residential multifamily units, which it contends was to address the issue of compatibility in the District Council's Order of Remand. Exceptions at 3-6. According to applicant, Planning Board erred when it re-approved the application for multifamily units without analyzing the amended application and statement of justification to substitute townhomes for multifamily units. Exceptions at 3-6. As explained below, the applicant is correct.

Based on the record as a whole for this application, when Planning Board initially considered CSP-23002 at a public hearing on July 10, 2025, testimony was provided by numerous witnesses. Those in opposition testified that the proposed development lacked compatibility with the surrounding neighborhood. Testimony and comments included, but were not limited to the following:

- An attorney representing two abutting property owners, argued that the proposed apartments would not be compatible with other structures in the area. Attorney noted that the apartments would be five stories in height and that structures of that height would not be compatible with any other existing residential uses in the area. (7/10/2025, Tr., p. 27).
- Karen Thomas testified that a 300-unit apartment complex would not blend harmoniously into a community of single-family homes and townhomes. (7/10/2025, Tr., p. 35).

- Tatiana Gomez Ramirez testified that that area was semi-rural and that three high density residential buildings would pose a serious and irreversible threat to the integrity of the community. (7/10/2025, Tr., p. 44).
- Victor Christiansen testified that the project would be massive and would be an “unmitigated disaster.” (7/10/2025, Tr., pp. 47-48).

Given the testimony in the record, applicant timely filed an amended application and an amended statement of justification to substitute residential townhomes for residential multifamily units to address the issue of compatibility in the order of remand. Applicant also submitted a revised Conceptual Site Plan drawing depicting residential townhomes. Amended Application and Second Amended Statement of Justification. On the issue of compatibility, prior to remand, the District Council found as follows:

6. Under PGCC § 27-546(d)(4), the Board shall find that: “[t]he proposed development is compatible with existing and proposed development in the vicinity.”

The Board found as follows:

The approved development is compatible with the existing and planned development within the area, specifically, residential houses on the Signature Club property, which are being constructed, and residential houses approved with the Addition to Signature Club development located across Manning Road East. The multifamily dwelling units and commercial/retail spaces within the subject development will offer additional housing options and opportunities for existing and future residents to patronize locally. Resolution No. 2025-057 at 14.

In *Hayfields, Inc. v. Valleys Planning Council*, 122 Md. App. 616, 649, 716 A.2d 311, 327 (1998), the appellate court explained that “vicinity” is “the area or region near or about a place; surrounding district; neighborhood,” which makes it clear that “vicinity” means “off-site.”

In *Wahler v. Montgomery Cty. Council*, 249 Md. 62, 69, 238 A.2d 266 (1968), the appellate court explained that a particular land use may “effect some change” and still be “compatible with the residential character of the neighborhood.”

On remand, the Board shall, based on new administrative findings, state whether or not the proposed development is compatible with other off site existing and proposed development. Stated differently, on remand, the Board, based on additional administrative findings, is required to state whether or not the proposed “Signature Club East” development is compatible with other existing “off-site” and other proposed “off-site” development in the vicinity. Order of Remand at 4-5.

Planning Board reviewed the application for compliance under the M-X-T Zone of the prior Zoning Ordinance in accordance with Transitional Provisions §§ 27-1900 and 27-1704 of the new Zoning Ordinance. PGCPB No. 2025-057(A) at 1. Under the M-X-T Zone, residential townhomes are permitted. Under the prior Zoning Ordinance, an application to amend a Conceptual Site Plan is permitted and Planning Board shall follow the same procedures and make the same findings as the original application. PGCC § 27-279. *Landay v. Board of Zoning Appeals*, 173 Md. 460, 466, 196 A. 293 (1938) (explaining that zoning ordinances should be liberally construed to accomplish their plain purpose and intent). Some purposes of the prior Zoning Ordinance are to promote the most beneficial relationship between the uses of land and buildings and protect landowners from adverse impacts of adjoining development and to prevent the overcrowding of land. PGGC § 27-102 (a)(6) & (10). Some purposes of a Conceptual Site Plan are to help fulfill the purposes of the zone in which the land is located and to explain the relationships among proposed uses on the subject site, and between the uses on the site and adjacent uses. PGGC § 27-272 (b)(1)(B) & (c)(1)(A).

Under the circumstances of this case, applicant was legally authorized to amend the CSP application under the prior Zoning Ordinance, and in doing so, Planning Board was legally required to make the same findings as the original application—subject to the amendment. Therefore, Planning Board erred when it did not approve the amended application and statement of justification because applicant submitted the amendments to address the issue of compatibility in the order of remand. PGCC § 27-276 (authorizing Planning Board to approve a Conceptual Site Plan if, among other things, it finds that the Plan represents a most reasonable alternative for satisfying the site design guidelines without requiring unreasonable costs and without detracting substantially from the utility of the proposed development for its intended use, and if it finds that the Plan and proposed development meet the purposes and applicable requirements of the M-X-T Zone).

Under § 27-280 of the prior Zoning Ordinance, District Council shall affirm, reverse, or modify the decision of the Planning Board, or remand the Conceptual Site Plan one time to the Planning Board to take further testimony or reconsider its decision in accordance with specified grounds stated in the Order of Remand adopted by the Council. PGCC § 27-280(d). Because this matter was previously remanded to Planning Board, the decision of Planning Board on remand is affirmed subject to the following modification: The amended application and amended statement of justification are hereby approved and CSP-23002, TCP1-052-97-03 and Variance from Division 2 of Subtitle 25, Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance, to remove four (4) specimen trees, are conditionally approved for development of 120 townhomes and 12,600 square feet of commercial/retail space. PGCC § 27-280(d). *See also* PGCC § 27-108.01(a)(10) (“approve” includes “approve with conditions, modifications, or amendments.”).

D. Citizen-Protestants’ Exceptions

Prior to remand, District Council did not address the merits of written exceptions filed by opposition because Planning Board failed to articulate its findings and conclusions and was not precise and clear on the contested issues raised by opposition. Order of Remand at 3-9. On remand from Planning Board, opposition incorporates by reference all prior arguments and questions previously presented to District Council and Planning Board. Exceptions at 2.

Concerning prior arguments and questions previously raised by opposition, Planning Board, on remand, sufficiently articulated its findings and conclusions and was precise and clear on all contested issues raised by opposition. As such, District Council adopts and incorporates by reference Planning Board findings and conclusions—and by extension Staff Report concerning all contested issues raised by opposition—because the administrative record, including Planning Board’s Resolution, is more than adequate to overrule all prior arguments and questions previously presented to District Council and Planning Board. Resolution No. 2025-057(A) at 1-45. *West Montgomery Cty.*

Citizens Ass'n v. Montgomery Cty. Planning Bd. of the Maryland-National Park & Planning Comm'n, 248 Md. App. 314, 337-338, 241 A.3d 76, 89, 2020 citing *Maryland-Nat. Capital Park & Planning Comm'n v. Greater Baden-Aquasco Citizens Ass'n*, 412 Md. 73, 110, 985 A.2d 1160 (2009) (explaining that “It is not unreasonable for the Planning Board to rely on a Staff Report, as the Planning Board did in this case, if the Staff Report is thorough, well-conceived, and contains adequate findings of fact.”).

The three (3) additional comments raised by opposition lack merit. Exceptions at 2. Each will be addressed in turn.

- Whether the Planning Board erred legally when it approved TCP1-052-97-03? Exceptions at 4-12.

On remand, Planning Board did not err when it approved TCP1-052-97-03. In accordance with the remand order, the amended resolution is well-reasoned and is precise and clear on the history of all Tree Conservation Plans and prior designation of Lot 12 as follows:⁵

Prince George’s County Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance: The site is subject to the grandfathering provisions of the 2024 Prince George’s County Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance (WCO) because the property has an approved and implemented tree conservation plan which covers Lot 12, and an approved TCP1 associated with PPS 4-01065 that covers Outparcel B, in accordance with Section 25-119(g) of the †2010 WCO. This CSP and TCP1 application is subject to the 2010 WCO because it was accepted for review prior to July 1, 2024, and the case was put on hold due to an applicant change. TCP1-052-97-03 does not include any additional woodland clearing. The property must conform to the environmental regulations of the 2010 WCO and the 2018 Environmental Technical Manual (ETM).

The subject CSP is part of the overall Manokeek and Signature Club developments. The overall site is 343.65 acres with 43.82 acres within the 100-year floodplain, for a net tract area of 299.83 acres. The phased woodland conservation worksheet provided shows the woodland conservation threshold for the overall Manokeek and Signature Club developments at 35.64 percent, or 106.87 acres. There is a total of 273.61 acres of woodlands, with 43.61 acres within the wooded floodplain. This CSP application area is 16.90 acres with no floodplain and 13.32 acres of existing woodlands.

⁵ †Denotes Amendment
Underlining indicates new language
[Brackets] and strikethrough indicate deleted language.

~~†[Previously approved TCPs showed and accounted for all the on-site woodlands within the subject application area as being removed with the future developments. The developed phases of this development met their woodland conservation requirement with off-site woodland conservation at the time of the first permit. The previously approved tree conservation plans noted that the off-site woodland conservation requirement for Outparcel B and Lot 12 were to be met at the time of the first permit. Before the issuance of the first permit for this application, the applicant must provide the entire 1.78 acres of off-site woodland conservation.]~~

†The overall TCP, which includes the Manokeek, Manokeek Village Center, and Signature Club at Manning Village developments, demonstrates that 22.65 acres of off-site woodland conservation has been provided with previous applications. The conservation worksheet on the TCP1 revision, provided as a companion to this CSP, shows that 10.04 acres proposed to be removed with this application has not been accounted for and is showing as preservation. A condition is included herein requiring that, prior to certification of CSP-23002, the applicant shall correct the worksheet to accurately reflect the clearing and the amount of off-site mitigation necessary to fulfill the total woodland conservation requirement, in accordance with Section 25-122(a)(3) of the 2010 WCO.

†The TCP1 conforms to the *Countywide Green Infrastructure Plan* and the 2013 Master Plan, as discussed in the technical staff report dated December 29, 2025. Resolution No. 2025-057(A) at 32.

Other subset arguments from opposition also lack merit. According to opposition, Planning Board 1) cannot approve a TCP that proposes to remove woodland designated for preservation, 2) at minimum, must require a TCP to cure any violative effect caused by the removal of preservation areas, and 3) failed to articulate whether the [a]pplicant took all reasonable efforts to provide onsite preservation. Exceptions at 5-12. Concerns from opposition are generalized assertions, while substantial evidence in the record demonstrates the opposite. *Motor Vehicle Admin. v. Shea*, 415 Md. 1, 997 A.2d 768 (2010) (The substantial evidence test does not turn on whether an aggrieved party [such as opposition] provided substantial evidence to support its position before the administrative agency [here the Planning Board]. On the contrary, the substantial evidence test requires a determination of whether the agency’s decision [here the Planning Board] is founded upon substantial evidence in the record. Under this standard, the reviewing body [here the District Council] must “defer to the agency’s fact-finding and drawing of inferences if they are supported by the record” and “review the agency’s decision in the light most favorable to it.” *Motor Vehicle Admin. v.*

Carpenter, 424 Md. 401, 36 A.3d 439 (2012). There is no substitution of judgment by the reviewing body “on the question [of] whether the inference drawn is the right one or whether a different inference would be better supported. The test is reasonableness, not rightness.” *Md. Dep’t of the Env’t v. Riverkeeper*, 447 Md. 88, 134 A.3d 892 (2016) (quoting *Annapolis v. Annapolis Waterfront Co.*, 284 Md. 383, 399, 396 A.2d 1080 (1979)).

As noted above, Planning Board did not err when it approved TCP1-052-97-03. What’s more, Planning Board approved the application subject to the following: A condition is included herein requiring that, prior to certification of CSP-23002, the applicant shall correct the worksheet to accurately reflect the clearing and the amount of off-site mitigation necessary to fulfill the total woodland conservation requirement, in accordance with Section 25-122(a)(3) of the 2010 WCO.

Resolution No. 2025-057(A) at 32.

- Whether the Planning Board erred legally when it approved the Applicant’s FCA variance? Exceptions at 13-14.

Opposition mistakenly relies on *Richard Roeser Pro. Builder, Inc. v. Anne Arundel Cnty.*, 368 Md. 294, 319 (2002), to advance an argument that Planning Board erred when it approved applicant’s request for a specimen tree variance. *Richard Roeser Pro. Builder, Inc.* involves a request for a “zoning variance”—not a request for a variance from the forest conservation ordinance. Subtitle 25 of the Prince George’s County Code governs the removal of specimen trees. Specifically, Section 25-119(d) governs specimen tree variances. Section 25-119(d) sets forth specific criteria for the grant of a variance to remove specimen trees. Criteria contained in that section are qualitatively different from the criteria set forth in Section 27-230 of the prior Zoning Ordinance governing **zoning variances**. Furthermore, Section 25-119(d)(6) expressly states that “[v]ariances under this Subtitle are **not considered zoning variances**.” (Emphasis added). Recently, the Appellate Court of Maryland confirmed the distinctions between the two types of variances. *Bhargava v. Prince George’s Cnty. Plan. Bd.*, 265 Md. App. 172, 189, 333 A.3d 1018, *cert. denied*, 490 Md. 291, 334

A.3d 833 (2025) (holding that those challenging Planning Board's approval of variance request lacked standing to bring the appeal because they could not demonstrate a cognizable right in the trees that were subject to removal and that variances from forest conservation ordinances, which are authorized by Md. Code Ann., Nat. Res. § 5-1611 *et seq.* (2023 Repl.), are qualitatively different from zoning variances, which are authorized by Md. Code Ann., Land Use § 4-305).

Regardless, a request for a variance to remove specimen trees is expressly permitted under Subtitle 25 of the County Code. Specifically, § 27-119(d) sets forth standards to be reviewed in determining whether or not to authorize removal. Planning Board is authorized to consider a request for a variance to remove specimen trees as part of its review and approval of a Tree Conservation Plan and the criteria for such a request are set forth in § 25-119(3) of Subtitle 25. Upon careful review of the record, Planning Board made the required findings and conclusions under Subtitle 25 to grant applicant's request for a variance to remove certain specimen trees. Resolution No. 2025-057(A) at 35-38.

- Whether the Planning Board's Amended Resolution complies with the District Council's Order of Remand. Exceptions at 14-16.

For the reasons set forth herein, Planning Board's amended resolution complies with the order of remand. Resolution No. 2025-057(A).

E. Conclusion

As a threshold matter, having reviewed the record as a whole, including Planning Board's findings and conclusions on adequacy of transportation facilities, the District Council also finds that the proposed application, as modified herein, will provide adequate transportation facilities as required under PGCC § 27-546(d)(9). Resolution PGCPB No. 2025-057(A) at 17-21, Lenhart Traffic Impact Analysis, December 15, 2025. As the basis for this final decision, except as modified herein, District Council adopts the findings and conclusions of Planning Board in Resolution PGCPB No. 2025-057(A).

CSP-23002, TCP1-052-97-03 and Variance from Division 2 of Subtitle 25, Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance, to remove four (4) specimen trees, are APPROVED for the development of 120 townhomes and 12,600 square feet of commercial/retail space instead of 300 multifamily units and 12,600 square feet of commercial/retail space, for the above-described land, subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to certificate approval of the conceptual site plan, the following revisions shall be made, or information shall be provided:
 - a. Label the extent and limits of the ultimate right-of-way along the subject property's frontage of Manning Road East and MD 228 (Berry Road) on the plan.
 - b. Submit a revised digital copy and a single final hard copy of the Phase I Archeological Report of Lot 12 and Outparcel B that addresses all comments to Historic Preservation staff. Two hard copies and one digital copy of the final Phase I archaeological report shall also be submitted to the Maryland Historical Trust.
 - c. Add the location of potential bus stops to the plan, showing that the subject development will promote optimum and effective use of transit, in accordance with Section 27-546(d) of the prior Prince George's County Zoning Ordinance.
 - d. Update the woodland conservation worksheet to show that the Outparcel B threshold requirement is 20 percent, in conformance with Condition 7 of Zoning Map Amendment A-9960-C.
 - e. Correct the worksheet to accurately reflect the clearing and the amount of off-site mitigation necessary to fulfill the total woodland conservation requirement, in accordance with Section 25-122(a)(3) of the 2010 Prince George's County Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance.
 - f. Label the 6-foot-tall sight-tight fence along the entire northern and eastern property lines on the plan.
2. At the time of detailed site plan, in accordance with the 2013 Approved Subregion 5 Master Plan, the 2009 Approved Countywide Master Plan of Transportation, and Section 27-274(a)(2)(C) of the prior Prince George's County Zoning Ordinance, the applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall identify the following facilities on the site plans:
 - a. A minimum of 5-foot-wide sidewalks and associated Americans with Disabilities Act curb ramps along both sides of all internal roads, excluding alleys.

- b. Provide a shared-use, dual route facility along the property frontages of Manning Road East and MD 228 (Berry Road), unless modified by the operating agency, in accordance with any Prince George's County Department of Public Works and Transportation adopted standards, or in accordance with a waiver to said standards approved, pursuant to the provisions currently codified in Section 23-105(g)(1) of the Prince George's County Code, with written correspondence.
 - c. Continental style crosswalks at all vehicular access points and throughout the site where feasible.
 - d. Propose long- and short-term bicycle parking within structures located within the residential component, and short-term bicycle parking at the designated retail spaces.
3. All internal paths/trails indicated on the site plan shall be a minimum of 6 feet wide and asphalt, in accordance with Condition 13 of Conceptual Site Plan CSP-99050.
 4. Appropriate signage and pavement markings shall be provided to ensure safe pedestrian crossings at the MD 228 (Berry Road) and Manning Road East intersection.
 5. Subject to approval of the Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA), prior to approval of the first building permit for the subject property, the applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall demonstrate that the following roadway improvements, as designated below, have (a) full financial assurances, and (b) an agreed-upon timetable for construction and completion with the appropriate agency:
 - a. Modify the traffic signal to be a split-phased traffic signal for the MD 373 (Livingston Road) approaches.
 - b. Modify the lane use on the east and west legs of MD 373 (Livingston Road), as follows. This can be accomplished by restriping and adding lane use signs.
 - (1) Eastbound: One left, one shared left/through, and one shared through/right.
 - (2) Westbound: One left-turn lane, one shared left/through, and one right-turn lane.

Pursuant to an agreement between applicant and opposition, the following additional conditions shall apply:

6. Development shall include 120 residential townhouses and 12,600 sq. ft. of commercial space.
7. The townhomes and commercial uses shall be limited to three floors in height with a maximum height of 40-feet.

- 8. The applicant or its successors and assigns shall erect a 6-foot-high-sight tight fence along the northern and eastern boundary of the property. The fence will be maintained by the homeowner’s association to be formed for the project.
- 9. 1.61 acres of on-site woodland preservation shall be provided.
- 10. A 40-foot buffer/60-foot building setback will be provided on the northern and eastern side of Outparcel B.
- 11. A 20-foot buffer and a 45-foot building setback will be provided along the eastern boundary line of Lot 12.
- 12. The buffer areas described above shall be planted with additional trees to the extent reasonable.
- 13. Forest conservation easements for the on-site preservation area shall be recorded among the Land Records of Prince George’s County, Maryland.

Ordered this 7th day of April 2026, by the following vote:

In Favor: Council Members Adams, Burroughs, Dernoga, Harrison, Hunter, Olson, Oriadha and Ivey.


Opposed:

Abstained:

Absent: Council Members Adams-Stafford, Blegay, and Fisher.

Vote: 8-0.

COUNTY COUNCIL OF PRINCE GEORGE’S
COUNTY, MARYLAND, SITTING AS THE
DISTRICT COUNCIL FOR THAT PART OF
THE MARYLAND-WASHINGTON
REGIONAL DISTRICT IN PRINCE GEORGE’S
COUNTY, MARYLAND

By: 

Krystal Oriadha, Chair

ATTEST:



Donna J. Brown
Clerk of the Council