

May 8, 2026

The Honorable Krystal Oriadha
Chair, Prince George's County Council
Wayne K. Curry Administration Building
1301 McCormick Drive
Largo, MD 20774

Re: LDR-80-2026

Dear Chair Oriadha:

As required by the County's legislative amendment process for amendments to the Zoning Ordinance (Section 27-3501), the Planning Board held a public hearing on May 7, 2026, to receive comments on proposed Legislative Drafting Request LDR-80-2026.

Following discussion of LDR-80-2026, and in consideration of public comments on this proposed legislation, the Planning Board approved a motion to support LDR-80-2026 with the amendments proposed in the technical staff report and supplemental memorandum.

The link to the public hearing video may be found under the hearing date at:
<https://www.mncppc.org/883/Watch-Meetings>.

Hearing Summary:

At the public hearing, six individuals testified regarding the proposed legislation: two in support and four in opposition.

Supporters of LDR-80-2026 stated that the legislation aligns with the County's goals of expediting review processes and streamlining development applications that encourage additional housing opportunities. They also emphasized the need for modern zoning tools to address the limitations of master and sector plans that are more than 40 years old and no longer reflect current conditions or the County's housing needs.

Opponents of the legislation argued that the proposal is inconsistent with the existing master plan and incompatible with the Rural Residential Zone. They expressed concerns that the legislation could increase impervious surfaces and undermine the County's green infrastructure objectives. In addition, they raised concerns that the proposal could later be amended to allow lot sizes smaller than the currently proposed 20-acre minimum, and questioned whether the public would have adequate opportunities for participation during future Special Exception review processes.

Planning Board Proposed Amendments:

Following review of LDR-80-2026 the Department has offered the following technical and substantial amendments:

- There seems to be a typo in Page 3, Line 2 in "This footnote shall **not** apply" rather than "**note** apply".



- The Planning Director does not review and approve detailed site plans as mentioned on Page 5, Lines 26-27. For clarification, the Planning Director reviews and approves minor amendments to detailed site plans.
- Remove Sections 27-5102(c)(1)(H)(cc) through (dd) on Page 5, Lines 19–24. Section 27-6305(f), “Driveways Used to Satisfy Standards,” already establishes the minimum requirements for driveways in meeting off-street parking standards and does not need to be repeated. Additionally, the reference to Section 27-3605(f) should be removed, as it is not applicable.
- The Detailed Site Plan (DSP) requirements contained in Section 27-5102(c)(1)(H)(iii) should be removed because DSP requirements are contained in Section 27-3605. Separate DSP requirements and findings should not be placed within use-specific standards.

Section 27-3605 already requires DSP review for the “construction, expansion, or alteration” of more than one (1) two-family dwelling or ten (10) townhouses. Additionally, Section 27-5102(c)(1)(H)(iii) (aa) and (bb) of the LDR are already covered in Section 27-3605(e), Detailed Site Plan Decision Standards of the Ordinance. Any other decision standards the Council would like for this use should be relocated to this Section as well.

- The Residential infill use, as proposed, should be subject to a special exception rather than as a permitted use, given the nature of the use violates the purposes of the RR Zone and the potential impacts townhouse and two-family uses up to 20 dwelling units per acre will have on neighboring properties within a zone intended for single-family detached residential development. Accordingly, the proposed requirements for residential infill currently listed in Section 27-5102(c)(1)(H) should instead be incorporated into Section 27-5402, “Additional Requirements for Specific Special Exception Uses.”
- In order for the proposed uses to comply with the requirements of the RR Zone, the purposes of the RR Zone are required to be amended to allow for townhouse and two-family uses under limited circumstances. The following are the current purposes for which the RR Zone is intended:
 - As provided in the accompanying Staff Report, the appropriate process for developing uses not intended for a Base Zone is to rezone the property as many other properties are currently doing, and have done, for many years. Allowing development to proceed in the manner provided for in LDR-80-2026 will provide certain property owners a competitive advantage over other property owners proceeding in accordance with the processes provided for in the Zoning Ordinance.
 - Under the Planned Development process, for example, the District Council determines the mix of uses, the allowable density, the location of development, the dimensional and development standards, the amount of open space, the required public benefits that should be offered to the County in exchange for the increased density and development flexibility being granted, and other development regulations appropriate for the specific



site. The Requirements for Residential Infill the RR Zone should, therefore, be amended to require an appropriate level of public benefits (rather than “one”) and also require the establishment of standards and requirements that ensure development, at a minimum, on the perimeter of the property is designed and located to be compatible with the character of adjacent existing or approved development.

Legislative Amendment Decision Standards:

The advisability of amending the text of this Ordinance is a matter committed to the legislative discretion of the County Council sitting as the District Council and is not controlled by any one factor. Within each zone listed in the Classes of Zones (Section 27-4102), the district council may regulate the construction, alteration, and uses of buildings and structures and the uses of land, including surface, subsurface, and air rights. The provisions for each zone shall be uniform for each class or kind of development throughout the zone, and no legislative amendment may create different standards for a subset of properties within a zone, unless such standards are necessary to implement development policies within the applicable Area Master Plan, Sector Plan, development policies of the General Plan, or other approved development district; however, any differentiation of a subset of properties within a zone shall be reasonable and based upon the public policy to be served.

The Department finds that in its current form LDR-80-2026 establishes different development standards for RR properties within the Beltway than for those outside the Beltway, raising uniformity concerns inconsistent with Section 27-3501(d) of the Zoning Ordinance.

As always, Planning Department staff members are available to work with the Council and your legislative staff on any pertinent legislative matters. Please let us know if we may be of further assistance.

Should you have questions, please do not hesitate to contact the Office of the Planning Director at 301-952-3594. Thank you again for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Darryl Barnes
Chairman

Attachments