The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission
PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY
Planning Department
1616 McCormick Drive, Largo, MD 20774 • pgplanning.org • Maryland Relay 7-1-1

June 14, 2026

TECHNICAL STAFF REPORT

TO: Prince George's County Planning Board

FROM: Chad Williams, LEED AP BD+C, Master Planner – Countywide Planning Division

SUBJECT: Legislative Drafting Request LDR-153-2026
Streamlining Site Plan Review Act of 2026

The Prince George's County Planning Department's legislative team has reviewed the proposed legislative amendment to the Zoning Ordinance and provides the following comments.

LDR 153-2026 constitutes a major overhaul of the development process in Prince George's County that will require substantive amendments to the County's Subdivision Regulations, Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation and Tree Canopy Coverage Ordinances, and several other County Codes, regulations, and procedures. This LDR, therefore, is premature and will significantly disrupt the County's current development processes if adopted in its current form.

LDR-153-2026 appears to be one of four items identified for proposed legislation on the June 24, 2026 agenda of the County's Streamlining Development Review Work Group. The legislative team understands the recommendations of this work group have not been referred for comment. The Planning Department recommends those four recommendations, and associated details or justification supporting them, and any other recommendations of the Work Group be finalized before moving forward with the preparation of draft legislation.

Staff are extremely supportive of the streamlining and clarification of the development process in Prince George's County and are more than willing and available to collaborate on effective solutions. However, LDR-153-2026 presents significant issues that make it a nonviable approach. There are no amendments staff can identify that would make LDR-153-2026 a workable solution, but staff propose alternative approaches to streamlining in this Technical Staff Report for the consideration of the Planning Board and County Council.

The legislative team presents the following evaluation and findings and recommends the Planning Board **OPPOSE** the legislation and recommend the Council take two immediate actions to ensure draft recommendations of the County's Streamlining Development Review Work Group be referred to the Planning Department, DPIE, environmental agencies and organizations, and other major stakeholders for review and comment prior to finalization, and direct Council staff and the Planning Department to meet and prepare comprehensive draft legislation that will carry out the final recommendations of the County's Streamlining Development Review Work Group, once completed.

I. BACKGROUND

A. Purpose: Establishing a combined application for detailed site plans and preliminary plans of major subdivision; authorizing concurrent review of certain development-related applications, including natural resource inventory plans, stormwater management concept plans; and generally related to development plan review.

B. Impacted Property: The proposed LDR impacts every property in the County that requires both a detailed site plan and a preliminary plan of major subdivision.

Staff believe the establishment of this combined application process, should LDR-153-2026 ultimately become law, will cause the combined application to become the most common development application type requiring public hearings before the Planning Board. Staff would expect every development that may require both a preliminary plan of major subdivision and detailed site plan to pursue this combined application and review process.

The proposed LDR will also impact any property Countywide that becomes subject to the approval of a DSP, special exception or Planned Development (PD) Zoning Map Amendment by changing the requirement for an approved natural resource inventory (NRI) to a "submitted proposed NRI". It also applies to any proposed DSP by changing requirements pertaining to stormwater management concept plans.

The proposed LDR attempts to apply to any property Countywide that may be required to provide proof of an approved NRI prior to the application, review, and approval of any preliminary plan of subdivision (minor or major). However, LDR-153-2026 is a zoning bill and as such, it has no impact whatsoever on Subtitle 24, the Subdivision Regulations. A separate subdivision bill would be necessary to change NRI requirements and establish the "Combined Application for Detailed Site Plan and Preliminary Plan of Major Subdivision" process in the Subdivision Regulations.

Finally, the proposed LDR attempts to apply to any property Countywide that may be required to provide proof of approved NRIs prior to site disturbance or development, such as property that requires a stormwater management plan or a sediment and erosion control plan. Again, since LDR-153-2026 is a zoning bill, it cannot and does not supersede such NRI requirements in other Subtitles (Subtitle 32, Subtitle 25, and Subtitle 5). Separate legislation would be necessary to change the requirements of other Subtitles, including the Subdivision Regulations (Subtitle 24).

II. EVALUATION CRITERIA

Proposed legislative amendments to the Zoning Ordinance are reviewed under the requirements of Section 27-3501, Legislative Amendment, of the Prince George's County Zoning Ordinance. The Planning Department has considered the following in reviewing this proposed legislative amendment:

A. The Prince George's County Zoning Ordinance;

B. The *Plan Prince George's 2035 Approved General Plan*;

C. The current area master plans, sector plans, and functional master plans for Prince George's County;

D. The Prince George's County Climate Action Plan; and

E. Referral comments.

III. COMPLIANCE WITH LAW, ASSESSMENT OF TECHNICAL DRAFTING CONVENTIONS, AND PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

The Department has determined that the proposed bill was drafted in a manner consistent with the legislative style and conventions of the current Zoning Ordinance.

IV. POLICY ANALYSIS

LDR-153-2026 proposes a new "Combined Application for Detailed Site Plan and Preliminary Plan of Major Subdivision."

Streamlining and clarification of the development review process in Prince George's County is the major goal (along with modernization) of the Zoning Ordinance and Subdivision Regulations rewrite and both Subtitles 27 and 24. As a matter of historical record, initial proposals for what became the current Zoning Ordinance and Subdivision Regulations went much further in attempting to streamline development procedures and shorten timeframes than what was ultimately enacted in 2018 and through subsequent amendment bills and which became law April 1, 2022.

However, there are significant issues with LDR-153-2026. The following subsections break the proposed language into smaller components to assist in analysis and decision-making.

Combined Application for Detailed Site Plan and Preliminary Plan of Major Subdivision – Unified Development Code

The proposed new term and process essentially constitute what most American jurisdictions refer to as a unified development code. Unified development codes, where permitted by State and local laws, allow jurisdictions to combine zoning, subdivision, and other aspects of land development into a single, consolidated ordinance.

It is unclear to staff whether unified development codes are authorized under Maryland law in either Prince George's or Montgomery Counties (pursuant to Division II of the Land Use Article). At the beginning of each county's respective zoning rewrite projects, staff in both counties considered unified development codes and were unable to conclude that there was authority under State law to do so.

State law separates zoning and subdivision authority in both Divisions I and II of the Land Use Article. This is reflected in the Prince George's County Code as separate Subtitles 24 (Subdivision Regulations) and 27 (Zoning Ordinance). The assignation of separate application numbers for preliminary plans of subdivision and DSPs allows each to take their own path of approval and appeal pursuant to their respective local laws, without confusion as to the review, decision, and applicable criteria to both these stages.

It is unclear from the structure of Division II of the Land Use Article that zoning and subdivision may be consolidated in the manner proposed by LDR-153-2026, and the review and approval of Subdivision applications is within the exclusive jurisdiction of the Planning Board per State law.

Concurrent Review Already Common

Turning to the primary policy goal of LDR-153-2026, staff notes that the ability to concurrently review a preliminary plan of major subdivision and a DSP for the same property and development proposal already exists with no amendments necessary to Subtitles 24 or 27. Administrative procedures are long-established that permit concurrent review and concurrent or very closely linked approval of the preliminary plan of major subdivision and DSP. These procedures extend to allowing applicants to consolidate their pre-application conference and pre-application neighborhood meeting.

As recently as June 11, 2026, both the preliminary plan of major subdivision (following a prior continuance) and the detailed site plan for The Mark at College Park were heard and decided by the Planning Board on the same day.

There is no need to create a new process to allow for concurrency of review, decision, pre-application requirements, or other factors of zoning and subdivision review.

Legal Timing Concern

The proposed requirement on Page 2, Lines 24-26 that "[t]he time requirements and limits applicable to a Combined Application for Detailed Site Plan and Preliminary Plan of Major Subdivision shall be those applicable to a Detailed Site Plan in accordance with this Section" violates § 23-205. Preliminary subdivision plan – Prince George's County of Division II of the Land Use Article.

§ 23-205(b) and (d) provide for the maximum amount of time in which a preliminary plan of subdivision may be decided. § 23-205(b)(1) provides for an initial review period not to exceed 70 days after submittal of a complete plan application to the Planning Board. § 23-205(d) authorizes applicants to consent to an extension not greater than 70 days, for a total review period not to exceed 140 days. Additional extensions are not authorized by State law. These timeframes are codified in Subtitle 24 for the review of preliminary plans of minor and major subdivision.

In contrast, the timeframes of the Zoning Ordinance for the review and approval of DSPs are codified in Section 27-3605(d)(7)(D), which provides for an initial 70 day period for the Planning Board to make its decision, which may be extended by not more than 45 additional

calendar days "or such other additional time period as determined by the applicant." Often, applicants will provide what is referred to as an indefinite waiver, which waives any time period in which the Planning Board must act on a DSP application.

These timeframes are clearly in conflict with each other in two ways: (1) the DSP timeframe is shorter than that authorized for preliminary plan of major subdivision review by State (and local) law, and (2) extensions to preliminary plan timeframes are not authorized by State law.

Although some may argue that § 23-205(b) and (d) establish maximum timeframes and local laws may reduce the time for review and approval of preliminary plans of subdivision, Section (b)(1) reads: "[t]he county planning board shall approve or disapprove a preliminary plan of subdivision within 70 days after the complete plan application is submitted to the county planning board." Section (d) reads: "[a]n applicant may consent to an extension not greater than 70 days." Staff's understanding of the clear language of these clauses is that these two 70-day periods were set by the State legislature and cannot be reduced through local laws. No authorization clause is provided to allow the local laws of the County to deviate from these two 70-day specified timeframes.

Further, decades of practice in Prince George's County indicate shorter timeframes than the total 140 days authorized by State law are not practicable. Many preliminary plans of subdivision end up receiving approval near the end of the total 140-day period due to the need to provide or revise supporting materials or subdivision plan documents. Reducing this potential timeframe will most likely result in numerous disapprovals of proposed preliminary plans of major subdivision due solely to lack of time.

The timing requirements of State law pertaining to preliminary plan of subdivision review and approval will control and thus proposed Subsection (f)(3) on Page 2, Lines 24-26 is not implementable.

Impracticality of District Council Hearings on Combined Applications for Detailed Site Plan and Preliminary Plan of Major Subdivision

The attempt by LDR-153-2026 to limit review of combined applications before the District Council to only "satisfaction of the requirements of a Detailed Site Plan application in accordance with this Section" is understood by staff to be a recognition of the District Council that exclusive jurisdiction over subdivision is granted by State law to the Planning Board as well as an attempt to limit hearing testimony, consideration, and decision-making to the DSP "component" of the combined applications.

The problem is this proposed solution seems impractical in practice to the point of impossibility.

Staff believe there to be no effective way to separate record exhibits, record testimony, and other elements of a combined development application into the wholly distinct and disparate components from which they were originally drawn in the drafting of LDR-153-2026. In other words, in a combined application, the entirety of the case record is for *all aspects of that application.* This by necessity includes both the preliminary plan of major subdivision, the DSP, and required application materials associated with each case type.

Staff review and recommendations on a consolidated application run with that consolidated application and cannot be separated out into smaller components. Agency comments, municipal comments and testimony, party of record testimony, applicant and expert testimony – all of these factors are associated permanently with the consolidated application casefile and cannot be distinguished.

The creation of a consolidated application eliminates the ability to sever and split off sub-components into different "buckets" for purposes of record exhibits, record testimony, recommendations by review bodies, or decisions by decision-making bodies. Once the record opens, it seems impossible to separate component elements of record materials for any potential District Council hearing.

In practical terms, this approach will likely create significant procedural challenges during District Council hearings. Counsel may need to raise repeated interjections and/or provide guidance to ensure parties of record and other speakers avoid addressing matters that are outside the scope of the hearing. Likewise, the Council Chair could face additional logistical challenges in maintaining orderly and efficient proceedings. This issue is compounded by the fact that relevant materials are already part of the combined application casefile – they are literally part of the combined application record.

It would be difficult and impractical to try and limit testimony to the DSP part of a combined application when the preliminary plan of major subdivision elements are part of the same record and available for testimony and commentary. Legally it may also not be possible for a preliminary plan of major subdivision, under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Planning Board per State law, to be part of the open case record under active consideration by the District Council.

Proposed Subsection 27-3506(f)(4) on Page 2, Lines 27-29 poses substantial challenges due to these considerations.

Lack of Clarity Regarding Subdivision Approval

Proposed Subsection 27-3506(f)(5) on Page 2, Lines 30-31 and Page 3, Line 1 indicates that approval of the proposed combined application grants the applicant an approved DSP but is silent as to whether or how the preliminary plan of major subdivision is approved. For example, does the applicant receive an approved preliminary plan of major subdivision upon the approval of a "Combined Application for Detailed Site Plan and Preliminary Plan of Major Subdivision?" At minimum it seems a reference to preliminary plan of major subdivision approval pursuant to the procedures in Subtitle 24 is warranted, but in some respects, this also seems somewhat counter to the intent of LDR-153-2026.

Subdivision Regulations Revisions Are Necessary

As briefly touched on in the Background section, above, LDR-153-2026 is a zoning bill and as such, it has no impact on Subtitle 24, the Subdivision Regulations. A separate subdivision bill is necessary to incorporate any of the proposed revisions to Subtitle 24 incorporated in LDR-153-2026.

What this means in practice is that even should LDR-153-2026 become law, the combined application process will not be usable until the Subdivision Regulations are also amended to establish the process and revise the application, pre-acceptance stages, and other requirements pertaining to the acceptance, review, and approval of preliminary plans of subdivision (minor or major).

Per the June 24, 2026 agenda of the County's Streamlining Development Review Work Group, staff understand a companion Subdivision bill was identified but such bill does not yet seem to be part of the Council's Legislative Zoning Information System and such bill will likely share similar issues as LDR-153-2026. Staff believe the proposed joint meetings with Council staff and the Planning Department can address this.

Proposed Changes to Natural Resource Inventory (NRI) and Stormwater Management Concept Plan Requirements Are Problematic

The proposed revisions to DSP submittal requirements on Page 2, Line 10 (for Natural Resource Inventories, or NRIs) and Section 27-6802 starting on Line 3 of Page 3 to change approved NRI requirements to "submitted proposed NRI" requirements to permit the approval of Planned Development (PD) Zoning Map Amendments, special exceptions, detailed site plans, and preliminary plans of subdivision (minor or major) constitute a substantial departure from the requirements of the current and prior, repealed Zoning Ordinance and Subdivision Regulations and are not supportable by staff.

An approved NRI would also be required for applications through other Subtitles of the County Code such as Subtitle 32 for Stormwater Management. Subtitles other than 27 (Zoning Ordinance) and 24 (Subdivision Regulations) are listed in Section 27-6802 for informational purposes to the development community and other stakeholders. Changes to 27-6802 will not remove NRI requirements from those other Subtitles. Should the Council wish to do so, separate legislation is necessary.

This proposed revision to Section 27-6802 goes well beyond the more limited revision proposed on Page 2, Line 10, which would be limited to all detailed site plan applications and change the submittal requirement from an approved NRI to "a submitted proposed Natural Resource Inventory plan" (a proposed NRI "plan" is an undefined term and it is unclear to staff what this may mean).

Similarly, staff cannot support the proposed revisions to stormwater concept plans and approval letters on Page 2, Lines 12-14 as currently drafted.

A DSP is a final development plan and should include final delineation of any natural resources and stormwater management facilities to ensure proper planning for these elements which will affect the placement of building and other structures as shown on a DSP. Failure to ensure delineation of all of these items could result in approvals with inadequate/overstated development and require amendments to approvals.

The basis of environmental planning review of proposed development and of DPIE's stormwater management review is the *approved* NRI plan. A recommendation on any development application cannot be made to the Planning Board without such approval. An approved NRI determines support for proposed impacts to regulated environmental

features and may be the justification to approve an unconventional development pattern for the avoidance of disturbance to these features.

Features like the floodplain area on a property proposed for development directly informs the allowable development density, a factor featuring prominently in recent County legal actions. Unsafe soils are located through the NRI, as are appropriate buffers from streams. These features and more all contribute to staff's understanding and the Planning Board and District Council's determinations in how a site can be developed to avoid violating State and local laws, and even preventing loss of property or loss of life due to adverse natural circumstances. The approved NRI plan also factors in not only regulated features, but rare, threatened, and endangered species, forest interior dwelling species, and specimen trees, all of which are regulated by the State of Maryland.

Further, attempting to shift the timeframe for NRI approval to prior to the issuance of building or grading permits for the other Subtitles and zoning or subdivision applications listed in Section 27-6802 compounds the problem and expands it through multiple County agencies and key steps in the land development process where detailed information on existing natural resources on land subject to proposed development is essential in ensuring proper stormwater management controls, sediment and erosion controls, and other environmental goals essential to good development practice.

It is unclear to staff that shifting application requirements from approved NRIs to "proposed NRI plans" constitutes any streamlining of the development process in Prince George's County. Rather, it seems much more likely that this proposed shift will lengthen the development process and add complexity, at minimum, by adding a significant moving part to the review and approval of major application types that may not even be approved prior to when the associated parent applications are approved.

Currently, , approved NRIs are required for the acceptance of an application for a preliminary plan of subdivision (minor or major) in Subtitle 24, and for the acceptance of applications for detailed site plans and special exceptions, and would be required prior to the approval of (but not for the submittal of) a Planned Development (PD) Zoning Map Amendment. Similarly, under the prior, repealed Zoning Ordinance and Subdivision Regulations, approved NRIs were required for the acceptance of applications for preliminary plans of subdivision (both minor and major subdivisions), conservation subdivisions, special permits, amendments of approved Chesapeake Bay Critical Area Overlay Zones, conceptual site plans, detailed site plans, and special exceptions.

The proposed changes pertaining to NRIs in LDR-153-2026 would change decades of practice in Prince George's County. Before undertaking such an effort, in-depth analysis and discussion among all impacted operating agencies, the development community, municipalities, environmental organizations, and other key stakeholders should take place.

Importance of Complete Applications

In proposing to draw back from approved NRIs and Stormwater Management Concept Plans, LDR-153-2026 contributes to an extremely common issue present in the prior Zoning Ordinance and Subdivision Regulations that the current laws attempted to resolve: incomplete applications. The single most common factor leading to delays or extensions in

the review of development applications under the prior codes were incomplete application and supplemental materials necessary for the complete review of the applications. The current codes require complete applications and establish an application completeness procedure in an attempt to streamline development review and approval in Prince George's County by mandating developers provide complete application packages prior to acceptance.

It is increasingly common for applicants even under the current Zoning Ordinance and Subdivision Regulations to seek regulatory and/or interpretive relief from existing requirements rather than simply submitting a legally conforming, complete development application. While a certain level of flexibility is necessary in the County's development codes, and while conversations are underway and will continue as to how to provide for more flexibility, relaxing application completeness requirements is not a good way to go about meeting shared goals for expedited review and incentivizing quality development. Prince George's County may well simply find itself facing the same issues the Zoning Rewrite explicitly attempted to resolve and see development applications slow down on the back end and require time extensions (when authorized by local laws), when just a little more due diligence at the front end, and yes, perhaps a bit more time up front, will result in faster overall development timeframes.

Alternatives to LDR-153-2026

Various approaches to streamline the current Zoning Ordinance and Subdivision Regulations could be considered in lieu of LDR-153-2026. Although the Planning Department has not received a referred report or set of recommendations from the County's Streamlining Development Review Work Group, several immediate staff recommendations emphasizing the Zoning Ordinance which were based on initial Zoning Rewrite concepts come to mind.

One alternative to consider is to greatly broaden the criteria under which a DSP may be required. Staff recommend exempting any number of single-family detached and three-family dwellings from DSP review. There is very little value-added to requiring DSPs for more than one dwelling unit; even large single-family detached subdivisions consisting of hundreds of units have little value-added to the County for DSP review – all of the major decisions for such developments, including impacts on public facilities, have already been addressed in the subdivision phase.

Two-family dwellings, commonly appearing in a two-over-two form, should be grouped with townhouse dwellings and the DSP threshold increased from ten or more units to twenty-five or even fifty or more units. The threshold for requiring a DSP for nonresidential development should be increased to at least the 75,000 square feet originally proposed in drafts of the current Zoning Ordinance, if not higher, with the threshold for mixed-use development increasing to the originally-proposed 25,000 square feet of nonresidential development and/or twenty-five or more dwelling units.

Given the strong baseline level of development quality incorporated in the development standards of Part 27-6: Development Standards, the DSP thresholds could be increased even further to execute a transition from discretionary to administrative review for many development applications. Administrative review will significantly advance County

development goals and help diversify the tax base by acting as a natural incentive for nonresidential and mixed-use development. Administrative review also remarkably reduces the time and costs associated with pre-development activities including the review and approval of development proposals.

Internal staff referral comments informing this Technical Staff Report and which also support a transition to more administrative review and approval focus on the fact that there is little to no compelling government interest in requiring mandatory discretionary review of DSPs in many situations where they are currently required. Staff note Prince George's County competes economically with jurisdictions locally, regionally, and nationwide who approve development applications at the staff level through the review and issuance of permits. Little tangible public benefit is gained by discretionary review of many DSPs that would have little community impact and comprise complex engineering and architectural drawings, especially when such community impacts as may be generated by the proposed development would have been previously evaluated and mitigated through the review and approval of a preliminary plan of subdivision.

The current required findings of DSPs are easy to meet and result in a very high rate of approval, costing developer applicants hundreds of thousands of dollars for months of delays for development they could construct pursuant to a staff-level, administrative building permit in competing jurisdictions. The purpose of the County Zoning Ordinance is to establish the rules and process by which development shall occur. An application either meets the requirements or it does not.

While discretionary review may be necessary for departures or variances from the Zoning Ordinance, or for complex applications such as a Planned Development (PD) Zoning Map Amendment, such review for basic approval of the physical design of a site absorbs substantial time and money for both County taxpayers and for developer applicants, and it has, for decades, created frustration and mistrust among the public, who have often inferred that the discretionary site plan approval process is an opportunity for the Planning Board and/or District Council to stop an unwanted, but legally permitted, development, when such hearings and reviews cannot do this.

These are but a few examples, consistent with regional and national best development practices, and which would result in the kind of streamlining and incentivization desired by County leadership.

V. COMPLIANCE WITH EVALUATION CRITERIA

Pursuant to Section 27-3501(c)(2)(B), staff finds the following with respect to the proposed amendment:

(i) Is consistent with the goals, policies, and strategies of Plan Prince George's 2035 (or any successor General Plan), area master plans, sector plans, functional master plans, and any other applicable approved plans;

LDR-153-2026 is not "consistent with the goals, policies and strategies of Plan Prince George's 2035 [Plan 2035] (or any successor General Plan), area master

plans, sector plans, functional master plans, and any other applicable approved plans" pursuant to Section 27-3501(c)(2)(B)(i) of the Zoning Ordinance".

Consistency with General Plan

Modern, Streamlined, Simpler Ordinance

The first critical initiative identified in Plan 2035 is to "undertake a comprehensive update of the County's Zoning and Subdivision Ordinances to modernize, streamline, and simplify the County's regulatory environment."[1]

This proposed legislation appears partially intended to address this recommendation by consolidating the review of development applications: LDR-153-2026 proposes to combine several unrelated development applications through amendment of the Zoning Ordinance.

However, a single Zoning Bill cannot do what this bill proposes, because the streamlining intended here requires amending several sections of the County Code simultaneously, does not address the reasons why these applications are processed independently, and conflicts with State laws governing subdivisions and site plans.

Legislation that does not conform to State law is not modern, streamlined, or simple. Processing an application as proposed by this legislation could subject that application to legal challenge that would have the opposite effect as what is intended by LDR-153-2026, which would be a simpler, more streamlined process.

As legislation that fails to meet the requirement for General Plan consistency fails to comply with Section 27-3501(c)(2)(B)(i) of the Zoning Ordinance, and because this bill was not drafted in consultation with the Planning Department nor referred to the Department with sufficient time for review; staff cannot evaluate this legislation's consistency to the County's 38 approved Area Master Plans, Sector Plans, Functional Master Plans, and Transit District Development Plans.

(ii) Addresses a demonstrated community need;

"Identified community need" is not defined by the Zoning Ordinance and is subjective. Although streamlining and incentivizing development in Prince George's County addresses demonstrated community needs for diversification of the tax base, provision of proximate jobs, goods, and services, and other goals, LDR-153-2026 does not address demonstrated community needs because it is an infeasible solution as drafted.

(iii) Is consistent with the purpose and intent of the zones in this Ordinance, or would improve compatibility among uses and ensure efficient development within the County;

[1] Plan 2035, p. 252.

LDR-153-2026 is generally consistent with the purpose and intents of the zones in this Ordinance. Staff do not have enough information to evaluate compatibility among uses. LDR-153-2026 will not ensure efficient development within the County.

(iv) Is consistent with the implementation of the strategies and priority recommendations of the Prince George's County Climate Action Plan;

Staff find that LDR-153-2026 is not consistent with the implementation of any aspect of the Prince George's County Climate Action Plan. As discussed throughout this Technical Staff Report, the lack of an approved NRI and stormwater management concept plan makes it impossible to evaluate or determine any environmental impacts including climate impacts.

(v) Is consistent with other related State and local laws and regulations; and

LDR-153-2026 is not consistent with State laws and is inconsistent with other local laws and regulations, particularly provisions in Subtitles 5B, 24, 25, and 32.

(vi) Would avoid creating significantly adverse impacts on the natural environment, including but not limited to water, air, noise, stormwater management, wildlife, vegetation, wetlands, and the natural functioning of the environment.

LDR-153-2026 will very likely and directly result in significant adverse impacts on the natural environment. Not having approved NRIs and stormwater management concept plans during the review of any proposed "Combined Application for Detailed Site Plan and Preliminary Plan of Major Subdivision" severely compromises the ability of staff, DPIE, the Planning Board, and the District Council to evaluate and make informed decisions on impacts to the natural environment, including but not limited to water, air, noise, stormwater management, wildlife, vegetation, wetlands, and the natural functioning of the environment.

VI. PLANNING BOARD PUBLIC HEARING

Section 27-3501(c)(2)(D) requires the Prince George's County Planning Board to hold a public hearing and make comments on the proposed legislative amendment within 30 days of the date of the transmittal of the Clerk of the Council. Said public hearing must be noticed by electronic mail at least 21 days prior to the public hearing, sent to every community organization in the County registered pursuant to Section 27-3407(b)(3) of the Zoning Ordinance, and to any person or organization registered pursuant to Section 27-3402(d) of the Zoning Ordinance.

Notice for the public hearing on LDR-153-2026 was sent on July 9, 2026, as required by the Zoning Ordinance. The Planning Board public hearing will be held on July 30, 2026, thus meeting the notice requirement of the Zoning Ordinance.

Comments offered by the public prior to and during the Planning Board's public hearing will be summarized, along with the Planning Board's comments, in the Board's recommendation to Clerk of the Council.

VII. PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Following review of LDR-153-2026, the Department refers to the policy discussion of Section IV, above, as to whether it may make sense to consider other streamlining proposals. As to the substance of LDR-153-2026 itself, staff are unable to identify any amendment that may make this proposed bill a workable or feasible approach.

VIII. RECOMMENDATION

LDR-153-2026 was not prepared in accordance with the legal requirements of Section 27-3501(c)(2)(A) of the Zoning Ordinance, which states that the Council's staff "shall prepare the proposed amendment in consultation with the Planning Director…." Had such consultation occurred, many of the concerns identified in this Technical Staff Report would have been addressed prior to its transmittal to the Planning Director by the Clerk of the Council.

The legislative team also recommends two immediate steps that could greatly improve collaboration and ensure effective legislation:

1. Once developed, draft recommendations of the County's Streamlining Development Review Work Group should be referred to the Planning Department, DPIE, environmental agencies and organizations, and other major stakeholders for review and comment prior to finalization.

2. The County Council should direct Council staff and the Planning Department to meet and prepare comprehensive draft legislation that will carry out the final recommendations of the County's Streamlining Development Review Work Group, once completed.

Based upon the foregoing evaluation and analysis, the Planning Department's legislative team recommends that the Planning Board adopt the findings of this report and recommends the Planning Board take a position to **OPPOSE** LDR-153-2026 to establish a combined application for detailed site plan (DSP) and preliminary plan of major subdivision and endorse and transmit the two immediate recommendations to the County Council.